

APPENDIX B – COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED

This appendix contains all the communications received during the post-centerline release period from November 18, 2010 through December 31, 2011. In addition, the table below contains contact and organization names and the communication identification number assigned to each communication. The communication text in this appendix is ordered by the communication identification number. For reference, the table below is ordered by last name followed by illegible and anonymous signatures. Referenced attachments can be found by searching for the communication on the project website <http://www.bpa.gov/corporate/I-5-EIS/search.cfm>.

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13665	7/20/2011	ANDREW	ABBOTT	
13665	7/20/2011	JACK	ABERNATHY	
13665	7/20/2011	CRYSTAL L	ADAMS	
13395	1/29/2011	PHIL	AKELY	
13667	7/20/2011	AMBER	ALEXANDER	
13665	7/20/2011	BOB	ALEXANDER	
13665	7/20/2011	CHEE	ALLISON	
13755	10/6/2011	ROBERT	AMMONS	
13683	8/3/2011	CANDICE D	ANDERSON	
13418	2/10/2011	CURTIS L	ANDERSON	
13207	12/2/2010	M.	ANDERSON	
13073	11/22/2010	GINA L	ANDREWS	
13836	12/15/2011	JIM	ANEST	STATE OF WASHINGTON, RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE
13665	7/20/2011	TRAVIS	APP	
13665	7/20/2011	BOB	APPLING	
13665	7/20/2011	JEREMY	ARIONUS	
13665	7/20/2011	CHUCK	ARNST	
13322	12/8/2010	DALE W	AROLA	
13321	12/9/2010	DALE W	AROLA	
13320	12/10/2010	DALE W	AROLA	
13527	1/28/2011	DALE W	AROLA	
13320	12/10/2010	DARREN F	AROLA	
13527	1/28/2011	DARREN F	AROLA	
13321	12/9/2010	DWAYNE D	AROLA	
13527	1/28/2011	DWAYNE D	AROLA	
13665	7/20/2011	BRIAN	ASBURRY	
13665	7/20/2011	JENNY	ASBURRY	
13317	11/29/2010	KAREN	ASHFORD	
13351	1/8/2011	SANDY K	ATCHISON	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13459	2/17/2011	CARMEN	ATTEBERY	
13665	7/20/2011	CHERYL	AYRES	
13061	11/18/2010	MARLA B	AZINGER	
13622	6/21/2011	MELISSA	BACHELDER	
13115	11/23/2010	ROBERT	BACHELDER	
13622	6/21/2011	ROBERT	BACHELDER	
13372	1/10/2011	STEPHEN M	BAILEY	
13372	1/10/2011	DONNA	BAILEY TRUSTEE	
13665	7/20/2011	BRIAN	BAKER	
13755	10/6/2011	MARK A	BALDWIN	
13665	7/20/2011	GEORGE	BALLARD	
13664	7/11/2011	L DAVID	BALLARD	
13665	7/20/2011	L DAVID	BALLARD	
13735	9/16/2011	L DAVID	BALLARD	
13175	11/22/2010	WILLIAM B	BANGS	
13395	1/29/2011	DENNIS	BARBUR	
13791	11/29/2011	DENNIS	BARBUR	
13395	1/29/2011	MARLA	BARBUR	
13791	11/29/2011	MARLA	BARBUR	
13665	7/20/2011	NICK	BARRON-KERTIS	
13755	10/6/2011	JENNY	BARTON	
13610	6/1/2011	JIM	BARTON	
13088	11/19/2010	CHARLES	BATTEN	
13608	5/31/2011	HENRY E	BAUMANN	
13423	2/10/2011	GLENN L	BEAN	
13395	1/29/2011	ERV	BEARD	
13534	4/5/2011	INA E	BEARD	
13338	1/6/2011	NANCY	BEAUDET	
13556	4/4/2011	ANNA	BEJAN	
13755	10/6/2011	JAYME B	BENDER	
13665	7/20/2011	DIANE	BENNETT	
13617	6/10/2011	MARLENE	BENNETT	
13665	7/20/2011	PAUL	BENNETT	
13805	12/8/2011	SANDRA S	BENNETT	
13854	12/8/2011	SANDRA S	BENNETT	
13358	12/29/2010	SUSAN A	BENNETT	
13665	7/20/2011	TIFFANY A	BERNABE	
13371	1/18/2011	ED H	BERNDT	
13138	11/21/2010	EDWARD H	BERNDT	
13677	4/23/2011	GUY	BERNOVICH	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13667	7/20/2011	GUY	BERNOVICH	
13681	4/24/2011	MELISSA	BERNOVICH	
13667	7/20/2011	MELISSA	BERNOVICH	
13486	2/24/2011	DVIJA	BERTISH	
13665	7/20/2011	RICHARD	BIDES	
13665	7/20/2011	CRYSTAL	BIELEC	
13665	7/20/2011	JIM	BIERMANN	
13665	7/20/2011	JAMES S ETUX	BILYEU	
13810	12/8/2011	JAMES S ETUX	BILYEU	
13665	7/20/2011	KATHERINE	BILYEU	
13665	7/20/2011	SHERRON	BILYEU	
13810	12/8/2011	SHERRON	BILYEU	
13858	12/8/2011	SHERRON	BILYEU	
13665	7/20/2011	CHRISTINE	BISSON	
13665	7/20/2011	TAMMY	BISTER	
13874	12/8/2011	MICHELE L	BLACK	
13755	10/6/2011	WALTER A	BLACK	
13587	5/9/2011	MARGUERITE	BLACKMAN	
13665	7/20/2011	MARGARET	BLAIR	
13665	7/20/2011	AMY	BLANKENSHIP	
13101	11/19/2010	ROGER D	BLOOD	
13424	2/10/2011	BARBARA	BLOOMFIELD	
13643	6/22/2011	BARBARA	BLOOMFIELD	
13628	7/1/2011	BARBARA	BLOOMFIELD	
13646	7/5/2011	BARBARA	BLOOMFIELD	
13653	7/11/2011	BARBARA	BLOOMFIELD	
13621	6/16/2011	JOHN	BOESCH	
13850	12/17/2011	JERRY D	BOHANAN	
13763	10/24/2011	MARC	BOLDT	CLARK COUNTY
13170	11/23/2010	JOYCE	BOLES	
13615	6/6/2011	SKYE C	BOLSOY	
13064	11/18/2010	JACOB	BOOMHOUWER	
13064	11/18/2010	SUSAN	BOOMHOUWER	
13351	1/8/2011	MARGIE J	BORCHERS	
13370	1/12/2011	MARGIE J	BORCHERS	
13395	1/29/2011	MARGIE J	BORCHERS	
13538	3/23/2011	MARGIE J	BORCHERS	
13583	5/3/2011	MARGIE J	BORCHERS	
13585	5/4/2011	MARGIE J	BORCHERS	
13665	7/20/2011	MARGIE J	BORCHERS	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13766	11/1/2011	MARGIE J	BORCHERS	
13665	7/20/2011	WILLIAM L	BORCHERS	
13766	11/1/2011	WILLIAM L	BORCHERS	
13665	7/20/2011	SHERRI	BOSCH	
13665	7/20/2011	BRUCE	BOSSIO	
13141	11/24/2010	JULIE A	BOSTER	
13415	2/9/2011	JULIE A	BOSTER	
13415	2/9/2011	MIKE	BOSTER	
13673	4/21/2011	CYNTHIA J	BOUCHER	
13667	7/20/2011	CYNTHIA J	BOUCHER	
13324	12/13/2010	ROBERT A	BOYD	
13395	1/29/2011	ROBERT A	BOYD	
13391	2/1/2011	ROBERT A	BOYD	
13330	12/30/2010	MARGARET	BOYLE	
13388	1/29/2011	MARGARET	BOYLE	
13504	3/12/2011	MARGARET	BOYLE	
13511	3/21/2011	MARGARET	BOYLE	
13573	4/4/2011	MARGARET	BOYLE	
13665	7/20/2011	TRAVER	BRAACK	
13808	12/8/2011	E GREGORY	BRADY	
13343	1/9/2011	EUGENE GREGORY	BRADY	WITTER/REVESZ FAMILY TREE FARMS
13345	1/9/2011	EUGENE GREGORY	BRADY	
13751	10/15/2011	EUGENE GREGORY	BRADY	WITTER/REVESZ FAMILY TREE FARMS
13566	4/4/2011	KEELI	BRADY	
13234	12/7/2010	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13347	1/8/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13351	1/8/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13507	2/7/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13488	2/17/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13521	2/23/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13496	2/25/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13495	2/27/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13503	3/9/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	
13509	3/16/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13575	3/18/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13537	3/29/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13588	5/10/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	
13590	5/11/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13591	5/13/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13592	5/13/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13657	7/12/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13658	7/12/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	
13659	7/14/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13665	7/20/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13666	7/29/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	
13717	8/10/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13726	9/2/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13747	10/7/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13790	11/16/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13793	12/1/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13796	12/2/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13830	12/7/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13847	12/8/2011	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13318	12/15/2010	RICHARD	BRANTLEY	
13395	1/29/2011	RICHARD	BRANTLEY	
13671	3/27/2011	RICHARD	BRANTLEY	
13665	7/20/2011	CLIFFORD	BRATTIN	
13665	7/20/2011	PAULINE H	BRATTIN	
13409	2/9/2011	RICHARD A	BREMS	
13479	2/21/2011	GEORGIA TANIYA	BRENNER	
13665	7/20/2011	KYLE	BREWER	
13817	12/8/2011	MARK PATRICK	BRISLAWN	
13665	7/20/2011	TAMI	BRISLER	
13195	11/30/2010	PAT	BRISTER	
13665	7/20/2011	DAVID	BROCK	
13665	7/20/2011	DYLAN	BROCK	
13665	7/20/2011	PHYLLIS A	BROCK	
13755	10/6/2011	CHARLENE P	BROOKS	
13363	1/14/2011	DONNA L	BROSSEAU	
13461	2/17/2011	JANICE FAY	BROWN	
13481	2/17/2011	JANICE FAY	BROWN	
13665	7/20/2011	LUCAS	BROWN	
13481	2/17/2011	MONTE C	BROWN	
13665	7/20/2011	DALLAS	BROWNING	
13755	10/6/2011	JACKEE	BROWNING	
13049	11/19/2010	DIANA	BRUMBAUGH	
13602	5/28/2011	DAVID FD	BUCK	
13665	7/20/2011	ANTHONY	BULL	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13230	11/24/2010	ANN	BULLETSSET	
13395	1/29/2011	ERIC	BURCO	
13665	7/20/2011	TIMOTHY M	BURKE	
13395	1/29/2011	CLARICE	BURKHART	
13665	7/20/2011	CLARICE	BURKHART	
13389	1/30/2011	PEGGY L	BURNHAM	
13828	12/8/2011	KENT	BURNS	
13850	12/17/2011	KENT	BURNS	
13574	4/4/2011	JACEY	BUSH-TSCHASIK	
13665	7/20/2011	ALAN	BUTTERFIELD	
13665	7/20/2011	MADDISON	CADLING	
13665	7/20/2011	MAYA	CADY	
13514	3/18/2011	CECILE L	CALABRESE	
13327	12/30/2010	PERRY J	CALABRESE	
13331	12/30/2010	PERRY J	CALABRESE	
13353	12/30/2010	PERRY J	CALABRESE	
13356	1/11/2011	PERRY J	CALABRESE	
13367	1/18/2011	PERRY J	CALABRESE	
13443	2/10/2011	PERRY J	CALABRESE	
13529	4/1/2011	PERRY J	CALABRESE	
13539	4/7/2011	PERRY J	CALABRESE	
13580	4/27/2011	PERRY J	CALABRESE	
13586	5/7/2011	PERRY J	CALABRESE	
13718	8/24/2011	PERRY J	CALABRESE	
13873	12/8/2011	PERRY J	CALABRESE	
13137	11/21/2010	DAN L	CAMPBELL	WILDLIFE SERVICES CO. INC.
13463	2/18/2011	DAN L	CAMPBELL	
13482	2/21/2011	DAN L	CAMPBELL	
13603	5/30/2011	DAN L	CAMPBELL	
13767	11/4/2011	DAN L	CAMPBELL	
13201	12/1/2010	MARSHA	CANNADY	
13791	11/29/2011	CATHERINE E	CANNIVET	
13749	10/13/2011	MARIA	CANTWELL	U.S. CONGRESS
13769	11/11/2011	JASON	CARPENTER	
13875	12/8/2011	JASON	CARPENTER	
13305	12/17/2010	DAVID A	CARSON	
13507	2/7/2011	TERESA H	CARTER	
13755	10/6/2011	TAD L	CASTUL	
13665	7/20/2011	GINO	CATANIA	
13755	10/6/2011	SHARI L	CATANIA	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13349	1/10/2011	CATHY	CGRAGGEN	
13665	7/20/2011	WESLEY	CHANCE	
13665	7/20/2011	W WAYNE	CHANDLER	
13766	11/1/2011	W WAYNE	CHANDLER	
13132	11/20/2010	DARYN	CHAPMAN	
13791	11/29/2011	MARGARET A	CHARPILLOZ	
13665	7/20/2011	DONNA	CHAVEZ	
13498	3/3/2011	LISA	CHEMARIN	
13223	12/4/2010	ALLAN	CHENEY	
13060	11/18/2010	DANIEL S	CHERRINGTON	
13134	11/20/2010	DAVID	CHERRINGTON	
13361	1/13/2011	DAVID	CHERRINGTON	
13740	9/21/2011	DAVID	CHERRINGTON	
13060	11/18/2010	TESSIE M	CHERRINGTON	
13160	11/18/2010	TESSIE M	CHERRINGTON	
13390	1/28/2011	WALTER	CHURCH	
13835	12/8/2011	DANIEL L	CLARK	
13843	12/8/2011	DANIEL L	CLARK	
13635	5/31/2011	ZEPHYR L	CLAYTON	
13351	1/8/2011	BARBARA J	CLEMENT	
13755	10/6/2011	BARBARA J	CLEMENT	
13351	1/8/2011	PAUL W	CLEMENT	
13641	6/2/2011	H J	COCKRELL	LONGVIEW FIBRE COMPANY
13736	9/22/2011	TIMOTHY C	COE	
13665	7/20/2011	JOY	COLBORN	
13665	7/20/2011	ROBERT	COLBORN	
13755	10/6/2011	JOSEPH C	COLLINS	
13548	4/4/2011	LEVI	COLLINS	
13235	12/9/2010	BART	COLSON	T-28, LLC
13174	11/29/2010	PATTY	COLSON	
13395	1/29/2011	MARY	COMBS	
13395	1/29/2011	RONALD	COMBS	
13665	7/20/2011	DUSTIN	CONDON	
13143	11/22/2010	CHRISTOPHER L	CONGER	
13649	6/7/2011	KURT J	CONGER	ENERGY EXPERT SERVICES INC
13144	11/22/2010	MICHELLE C	CONGER	
13727	9/7/2011	TERRY L	CONSTANCE	
13853	12/8/2011	TERRY L	CONSTANCE	ANOTHER WAY BPA
13665	7/20/2011	M B	CONWAY	
13755	10/6/2011	GERALDINE E	COOK	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13755	10/6/2011	WILBUR M	COOK	
13665	7/20/2011	MARK G	COOKSEY TRUSTEE	
13766	11/1/2011	MARK G	COOKSEY TRUSTEE	
13665	7/20/2011	SUSAN G	COOKSEY TRUSTEE	
13766	11/1/2011	SUSAN G	COOKSEY TRUSTEE	
13351	1/8/2011	MICHAEL S	COOPER	
13665	7/20/2011	MARTIN D	CORNELL	
13665	7/20/2011	PHYLLIS P	CORNELL	
13665	7/20/2011	ASHLEY	COSTENTINE	
13665	7/20/2011	PAUL	COTTERILL	
13665	7/20/2011	SUSAN	COTTERILL	
13604	5/30/2011	VICTORIA	COUSINS	
13167	11/21/2010	DAVE	COWAN	
13417	2/10/2011	ANN	COX	
13103	11/20/2010	RAND L ETUX	CRANDALL	
13755	10/6/2011	LOLA	CRAWFORD	
13359	1/12/2011	GEORGE	CUMMINGS	THE MAZAMAS
13665	7/20/2011	CHRISTOPHER	CUMMINS	
13755	10/6/2011	ELVA M	DABBINS	
13069	11/22/2010	LAVERN	DAHLIN	
13665	7/20/2011	GREG	DALLY	
13755	10/6/2011	DONALD E	DALZELL II	
13497	3/8/2011	DESIREE	DAMICO	
13597	5/24/2011	DESIREE	DAMICO	
13600	5/26/2011	DESIREE	DAMICO	
13721	8/31/2011	DESIREE	DAMICO	
13739	9/27/2011	DESIREE	DAMICO	
13755	10/6/2011	BENJAMIN K	DANG	
13755	10/6/2011	ELLEN	DANNENBERG	
13093	11/19/2010	LYLE	DAUGHERTY	
13202	12/1/2010	LYLE	DAUGHERTY	
13055	11/19/2010	MARGARET M	DAUGHERTY	
13665	7/20/2011	MAEGAN	DAVIES	
13222	12/5/2010	JANICE	DAVIS	
13395	1/29/2011	JANICE	DAVIS	
13665	7/20/2011	JANICE	DAVIS	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13747	10/7/2011	JANICE	DAVIS	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13790	11/16/2011	JANICE	DAVIS	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13243	12/11/2010	RICHARD A	DAVIS	
13314	12/19/2010	RICHARD A	DAVIS	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13209	12/2/2010	TERRY	DAVIS	
13665	7/20/2011	LESLIE	DAVISSON	
13153	11/26/2010	DAVID	DAWSON	
13063	11/18/2010	JERRY	DAYNES	
13392	1/24/2011	MICHAEL	DE JONG	
13523	2/3/2011	MICHAEL	DE JONG	
13665	7/20/2011	JUSTIN	DEARMIN	
13665	7/20/2011	BILLY	DECK	
13665	7/20/2011	EDWARD	DECK	
13395	1/29/2011	PHILLIP L	DELANY	
13416	2/11/2011	PHILLIP L	DELANY	
13189	11/30/2010	KATHY	DELL	
13189	11/30/2010	KEN	DELL	
13665	7/20/2011	ALEXANDRA	DEMETRO	
13665	7/20/2011	MIKE	DENDY	
13097	11/19/2010	THOM	DENMAN	
13426	2/10/2011	THOM	DENMAN	
13755	10/6/2011	IDA MAE	DENOYER	
13665	7/20/2011	CLIFF	DESCLOUX	
13665	7/20/2011	SHELBY	DESCLOUX	
13665	7/20/2011	TAYLOR	DEVANEY	
13755	10/6/2011	RAY A	DEYOTT	
13665	7/20/2011	CLAUDIA W	DICKERSON	
13448	2/15/2011	DEBRA SUE	DICKERSON	
13706	8/8/2011	GEORGE T	DILL	
13665	7/20/2011	ROSE	DIMENT TRUSTEE	
13084	11/19/2010	ETHEL	DITTMAN TRUSTEE	
13205	11/19/2010	ETHEL	DITTMAN TRUSTEE	
13148	11/22/2010	STEVE	DOBBINS	
13797	12/3/2011	STEVE	DOBBINS	
13665	7/20/2011	JEANETTE	DOHERTY	
13665	7/20/2011	ALLAN	DOHN	
13665	7/20/2011	SHERRY	DOOLEY	
13755	10/6/2011	DALE J	DORCHEUS	
13755	10/6/2011	DARLENE J	DORCHEUS	
13665	7/20/2011	JASON	DOSS	
13665	7/20/2011	RYAN	DOSS	
13395	1/29/2011	WILLIAM E	DOTY	
13792	12/1/2011	JAMES	DOW	
13792	12/1/2011	JANE	DOW	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13315	12/18/2010	ROSE	DOWNING	
13100	11/19/2010	WESLEY	DOWNING	
13395	1/29/2011	CHARLES E	DUKE	
13667	7/20/2011	CHARLES E	DUKE	
13755	10/6/2011	JEFF	DUNLAP	
13755	10/6/2011	RUTHELLEN	DUNLAP	
13665	7/20/2011	KELLY	DUNMYER	
13350	1/10/2011	MARY C	DUNN	
13395	1/29/2011	MARY C	DUNN	
13665	7/20/2011	ROY	DUNN	
13665	7/20/2011	SARAH	DURR	
13665	7/20/2011	TIMOTHY	DURR	
13543	4/4/2011	CHLOE	DUTHALER	
13113	11/22/2010	JOYCE	DUTRO	
13351	1/8/2011	APRIL B	DUVIC	
13105	11/20/2010	GREGORY	DUVIC	
13351	1/8/2011	GREGORY	DUVIC	
13516	3/19/2011	GREGORY	DUVIC	
13665	7/20/2011	MICHAEL A	DYER	
13665	7/20/2011	CHERYLE	EASTER	
13665	7/20/2011	CLETE C	EASTWOOD	
13766	11/1/2011	CLETE C	EASTWOOD	
13665	7/20/2011	DONNA L	EASTWOOD	
13766	11/1/2011	DONNA L	EASTWOOD	
13795	12/2/2011	GEORGE A	EATON	
13665	7/20/2011	EMIL T	ECKSTROM	
13753	9/24/2011	SUSAN	ECONOMON	
13774	11/16/2011	ROBERT W	EDSTEDT	
13692	7/30/2011	KENNETH	EDWARDS	CLARK COUNTY FARM FORESTRY ASSOCIATION
13395	1/29/2011	DELRAE	EGGLESTON	
13669	3/27/2011	DELRAE	EGGLESTON	
13665	7/20/2011	DELRAE	EGGLESTON	
13191	11/30/2010	BARBARA	EICKNER	KWIK CENTER LLC
13665	7/20/2011	CURTIS	ELLIOTT	
13665	7/20/2011	TYLER	ELLIOTT	
13665	7/20/2011	DUSTIN	ELLIS	
13665	7/20/2011	W CHARLES	ELMURE	
13755	10/6/2011	TODD	EMBERY	
13665	7/20/2011	CHAD	EMERICK	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13351	1/8/2011	BRAD	ENARSON	
13395	1/29/2011	BRAD	ENARSON	
13351	1/8/2011	KIM	ENARSON	
13395	1/29/2011	KIM	ENARSON	
13642	6/16/2011	PAULA	ENSLEY	
13665	7/20/2011	CLARENCE	EPPERLY	
13111	11/20/2010	JERRY	ERICKSON	
13155	11/26/2010	ORVILLE D	ESTEB	
13665	7/20/2011	JADE M	EVANS	
13665	7/20/2011	TRACY	EVANS	
13665	7/20/2011	WILLOW	EVERETT	
13395	1/29/2011	BRENDA	FAIRBANKS	
13395	1/29/2011	JAMES E	FARBER	
13665	7/20/2011	GLENN	FARLEY	
13399	2/9/2011	JULIA HART STOLL	FEARON	
13219	12/3/2010	V MICHAEL	FENNELLY	
13818	12/8/2011	V MICHAEL	FENNELLY	
13598	5/24/2011	JAYSIAH	FERGUSON	KELLER WILLIAMS
13395	1/29/2011	SANDRA	FERNEDING	
13644	6/25/2011	SANDRA	FERNEDING	
13351	1/8/2011	ANITA R	FERRIE	
13634	5/30/2011	HOWARD	FERRIS	
13397	2/6/2011	BEVERLY JANE	FIELDING	
13464	2/12/2011	BEVERLY JANE	FIELDING	
13822	12/8/2011	BEVERLY JANE	FIELDING	
13866	12/8/2011	BEVERLY JANE	FIELDING	
13665	7/20/2011	JEREMY	FIELDS	
13665	7/20/2011	SARAH	FIELDS	
13072	11/19/2010	DICK	FILION	
13755	10/6/2011	KELLY D	FINK	
13755	10/6/2011	MICHAEL	FINK	
13395	1/29/2011	SANDRA	FINKEL	
13351	1/8/2011	BARRY A	FINKEL TRUSTEE	
13395	1/29/2011	BARRY A	FINKEL TRUSTEE	
13827	12/8/2011	BARRY A	FINKEL TRUSTEE	
13831	12/10/2011	BARRY A	FINKEL TRUSTEE	
13665	7/20/2011	ROBERT S	FISHER	
13665	7/20/2011	TRACY	FISHER	
13077	11/20/2010	VANDI	FISHER	
13665	7/20/2011	JAN	FITZGERALD	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13665	7/20/2011	BARRY	FITZTHUM	
13665	7/20/2011	TANA	FITZTHUM	
13665	7/20/2011	DEBBIE	FLEEMAN	
13630	5/27/2011	DANIEL C	FLEGEL	
13690	8/5/2011	DANIEL C	FLEGEL	
13755	10/6/2011	NANNETTE	FLOWERS	
13506	3/15/2011	ROY L JR	FORD	
13755	10/6/2011	CAROL L	FOSS	
13755	10/6/2011	WILLIAM C	FOSS	
13086	11/19/2010	FRANK A	FOURNIER	
13723	9/3/2011	JOHN L	FOWLER IV	
13665	7/20/2011	MITCHELL L	FOX	
13665	7/20/2011	ALLEN	FRASIER	
13755	10/6/2011	DUANE A	FREDRICKSON	
13791	11/29/2011	JUDY G	FRINK	
13791	11/29/2011	THOMAS D	FRINK	
13665	7/20/2011	AUSTIN	FULLER	
13665	7/20/2011	DOUG	FURTH	
13791	11/29/2011	DONALD E	GABBERT	
13110	11/20/2010	KEIRA	GALLAS	
13570	4/4/2011	BRANDON	GALVAN	
13510	3/18/2011	RAMONA L	GAMBLE	
13395	1/29/2011	MARY ANNE	GARCIA	
13670	3/27/2011	MARY ANNE	GARCIA	
13665	7/20/2011	AMY	GARD	
13665	7/20/2011	TODD	GARD	
13665	7/20/2011	NICK	GARDNER	
13519	3/19/2011	VALERIE	GARDNER	
13747	10/7/2011	VALERIE	GARDNER	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13790	11/16/2011	VALERIE	GARDNER	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13395	1/29/2011	WARREN R	GARDNER	
13755	10/6/2011	HOPE D	GARTNER	
13665	7/20/2011	LEVI	GARVEY	
13665	7/20/2011	PATTY	GARVEY	
13665	7/20/2011	DAVID	GAUTHIER	
13204	12/1/2010	EILEEN P	GEORGE	
13780	11/16/2011	EILEEN P	GEORGE	
13780	11/16/2011	JACK E	GEORGE II	
13395	1/29/2011	DAN	GERGES	
13395	1/29/2011	HERMI	GERGES	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13609	6/1/2011	MARTIN J	GETCH	
13684	8/3/2011	BHRIGHA REBECCA L	GETZ	
13431	2/11/2011	JOHN	GIBSON	
13791	11/29/2011	RICHARD J	GIERLOFF	
13665	7/20/2011	AARON	GIESE	
13403	2/9/2011	JULIE	GILLAND	
13665	7/20/2011	CHARLES	GILLILAND	
13665	7/20/2011	DAWN	GLADDEN	
13411	2/9/2011	JOANNE L	GOFF	
13655	7/9/2011	CHERYL	GOLLIHER	
13491	3/3/2011	GARY L	GONSER	
13491	3/3/2011	MARCIE	GONSER	
13541	4/4/2011	MANUEL	GONZALEZ	
13665	7/20/2011	ISABELLA	GORINI	
13665	7/20/2011	RICHARD	GOVE	
13458	2/17/2011	VICKIE	GRAGG	
13226	11/30/2010	RICHARD	GRAHAM	
13665	7/20/2011	JACEN	GRAY	
13104	11/20/2010	LESTER	GREEAR	
13665	7/20/2011	PEGGY	GREEN	
13821	12/8/2011	KATHY L	GREENBERG	
13755	10/6/2011	JAIMEE	GROCE	
13159	11/18/2010	JAMES S	GRUHER	
13801	12/8/2011	JAMES S	GRUHER	
13801	12/8/2011	MONICA S	GRUHER	
13157	11/26/2010	WILLIAM JOHN	GUITTEAU	
13665	7/20/2011	DEANNA J	GUNDERSON	
13800	11/29/2011	DEANNA J	GUNDERSON	
13665	7/20/2011	WILLIAM A	GUNDERSON	
13800	11/29/2011	WILLIAM A	GUNDERSON	
13665	7/20/2011	DOUGLAS	GURHNRE	
13814	12/8/2011	BRUCE A	HAACK	
13665	7/20/2011	GARY	HAAG	
13450	2/14/2011	STEPHEN	HAGENSEN	
13513	3/19/2011	VIVIAN M	HALE	
13351	1/8/2011	TODD A	HALEY	
13665	7/20/2011	LANA L	HALL	
13766	11/1/2011	LANA L	HALL	
13665	7/20/2011	LEANNE D	HALL	
13766	11/1/2011	LEANNE D	HALL	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13108	11/20/2010	CINDY	HALLETT	
13406	2/9/2011	CINDY J	HALLSTROM	
13094	11/19/2010	ELIZABETH L	HAMILTON	
13095	11/19/2010	ELIZABETH L	HAMILTON	
13432	2/12/2011	ELIZABETH L	HAMILTON	
13433	2/12/2011	ELIZABETH L	HAMILTON	
13515	3/19/2011	ELIZABETH L	HAMILTON	
13722	9/1/2011	ELIZABETH L	HAMILTON	
13738	9/26/2011	ELIZABETH L	HAMILTON	
13746	10/5/2011	ELIZABETH L	HAMILTON	
13823	12/8/2011	ELIZABETH L	HAMILTON	
13845	12/8/2011	ELIZABETH L	HAMILTON	
13838	12/18/2011	MICHAEL C	HAMMERQUIST	
13838	12/18/2011	THERESA	HAMMERQUIST	
13339	1/10/2011	JOHN R	HANCOCK	
13339	1/10/2011	JONI E	HANCOCK	
13212	11/22/2010	SHLOMO	HANDELI	
13216	11/25/2010	HILDEGARD	HANLEY	
13216	11/25/2010	WILLIAM	HANLEY	
13713	8/8/2011	WILLIAM	HANLEY	
13665	7/20/2011	SUSAN	HANSEN	
13208	12/2/2010	SUSAN M	HANSEN	
13563	4/4/2011	JOSHUA	HARCUFF	
13665	7/20/2011	CHRIS	HARMON	
13665	7/20/2011	KELLY	HARMON	
13526	1/29/2011	MARGERET P	HARMS	
13237	12/14/2010	JAMES A	HARO	CITIZENS AGAINST THE TOWERS
13316	11/24/2010	BILL C	HARPOLE	
13316	11/24/2010	PHILIPPINA	HARPOLE	
13351	1/8/2011	DONNA L	HARRIS	
13804	12/8/2011	JAMES	HARRIS	
13714	8/8/2011	MARY J	HARRIS	
13332	11/30/2010	CARL A	HARRY	
13332	12/21/2010	CARL A	HARRY	
13778	11/16/2011	SCOTT J	HARSHBARGER	
13665	7/20/2011	KATELIN	HARTELOO	
13665	7/20/2011	JEANNE M	HARTSELL	
13665	7/20/2011	KEVIN G	HARTSELL	
13246	12/15/2010	JOSHUA L	HATCHER	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13048	11/19/2010	BETTY J	HAUSER	
13075	11/22/2010	MARILYN	HAUZENBERGER	
13154	11/26/2010	MIKE R	HAYDEN	COUGAR AREA TRAIL SEEKERS
13601	5/27/2011	MIKE R	HAYDEN	COUGAR AREA TRAIL SEEKERS
13782	11/18/2011	MIKE R	HAYDEN	COUGAR AREA TRAIL SEEKERS
13807	12/8/2011	JOHN	HAYENGA	
13605	5/30/2011	MOLLY	HAYES	
13645	6/29/2011	MOLLY	HAYES	
13665	7/20/2011	JUSTIN	HAYS	
13665	7/20/2011	KAREN D	HAYS	
13665	7/20/2011	RANDALL W	HAYS	
13651	7/5/2011	AL	HAYWARD	
13096	11/19/2010	RODNEY DALE	HAZEN	
13752	10/18/2011	MICHAEL	HEDRICK	
13665	7/20/2011	CARRIE	HELTEMES	
13665	7/20/2011	COY	HELTEMES	
13584	5/3/2011	LISA K	HELTEMES	
13665	7/20/2011	LISA K	HELTEMES	
13744	9/27/2011	LISA K	HELTEMES	
13665	7/20/2011	RICHARD	HELTEMES	
13665	7/20/2011	ROGER W	HELTEMES	
13341	1/10/2011	HEATHER	HENDERSON	
13142	11/24/2010	JEANINE	HENDRICKS	
13665	7/20/2011	AARON	HENDRICKSON	
13200	11/30/2010	SUZANNE R	HENDRICKSON	
13777	11/18/2011	MARGARET A	HENDRIX	
13803	12/8/2011	MARGARET A	HENDRIX	
13813	12/8/2011	PHILLIP N	HENDRIX	
13753	9/24/2011	GREGG	HEPPNER	
13512	3/21/2011	ROBERT H	HERNDON	
13660	6/20/2011	JAIME	HERRERA BEUTLER	STATE REPRESENTATIVE
13665	7/20/2011	MARGARET	HERZ	
13235	12/9/2010	ART	HESSLER	T-28, LLC
13242	12/13/2010	JENNIFER	HICKS	
13242	12/13/2010	PATRICK	HICKS	
13665	7/20/2011	DAN	HIGGINS	
13665	7/20/2011	STEFFY	HILL	
13351	1/8/2011	KAREN J	HILLER	
13730	9/13/2011	MICHELE L	HILLMAN	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13166	11/21/2010	LARRY C	HILLS	RASHFORD TREE FARM & INVESTMENTS COMPANY
13618	6/13/2011	VERNE	HOFFMAN	
13612	4/11/2011	DENA R	HOINOWSKI	
13668	4/15/2011	DENA R	HOINOWSKI	
13791	11/29/2011	MICHELE C	HOLDER	
13647	6/6/2011	LESLIE M	HOLEMAN	
13374	1/4/2011	RONALD H	HOLEMAN	
13647	6/6/2011	RONALD H	HOLEMAN	
13665	7/20/2011	LISA	HOLLIDAY	
13546	4/4/2011	BRAD	HOLTEN	
13811	12/8/2011	BRAD	HOLTEN	
13811	12/8/2011	JORENE	HOLTEN	
13786	11/22/2011	KATHRYN LYNN	HOOD	
13546	4/4/2011	RYAN	HOOSER	
13333	1/3/2011	LEWIS L	HOPE	
13341	1/10/2011	LEWIS L	HOPE	
13665	7/20/2011	DAN	HORLACHOR	
13380	12/10/2010	LEWIS	HOUCK	
13380	12/10/2010	LINDA M	HOUCK	
13351	1/8/2011	DAVID B	HOUSE	
13395	1/29/2011	DAVID B	HOUSE	
13665	7/20/2011	DAVID B	HOUSE	
13395	1/29/2011	PEGGY MARIE	HOUSE	
13665	7/20/2011	PEGGY MARIE	HOUSE	
13383	1/25/2011	BARBARA R	HOUSER	
13629	5/27/2011	JOHN S	HOWARD	
13665	7/20/2011	LEE	HOWARD	
13665	7/20/2011	JOHN	HOWELL	
13665	7/20/2011	TONYA	HOWELL	
13062	11/18/2010	GREGORY R	HOYT	
13140	11/22/2010	JAMES R	HUBBARD	
13140	11/22/2010	PATTI	HUBBARD	
13755	10/6/2011	BECKY	HUESTIES	
13054	11/19/2010	ED	HUFFMAN	
13755	10/6/2011	JOHN D	HUFFMAN	
13703	8/8/2011	KATHRYN A C	HUFFMAN	
13755	10/6/2011	KATHRYN A C	HUFFMAN	
13665	7/20/2011	ALICIA	HUFFORD	
13665	7/20/2011	KATHLEEN	HUGHES	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13665	7/20/2011	TAMIE	HUGHES	
13071	11/19/2010	CURTIS E	HUGHEY	
13164	11/19/2010	ALAN C	HULL	
13665	7/20/2011	DANIEL P	HULL	
13665	7/20/2011	DOUGLAS	HUNT	
13665	7/20/2011	SARAH	HURST	
13665	7/20/2011	SUSAN	HURT	
13665	7/20/2011	JOSEPH W	HURT JR	
13665	7/20/2011	LARRY J	HUTCHINGS	
13163	11/18/2010	WILLIAM	HUYETTE	
13449	2/15/2011	SALLY J	HYDE	
13700	8/8/2011	JUDITH	IBBS	
13707	8/8/2011	JUDITH	IBBS	
13709	8/8/2011	JUDITH	IBBS	
13755	10/6/2011	JUDITH	IBBS	
13732	8/20/2011	JUDITH LYNN	IBBS	YALE VALLEY COALITION
13665	7/20/2011	JANE	IPPOLITI	
13766	11/1/2011	JANE	IPPOLITI	
13665	7/20/2011	THOMAS	IPPOLITI	
13766	11/1/2011	THOMAS	IPPOLITI	
13663	7/14/2011	DEANNE	ISAACSON	
13663	7/14/2011	JOHN	ISAACSON	
13665	7/20/2011	TIM	ISHAM	
13755	10/6/2011	R	ISSELHARD	
13145	11/22/2010	KENT	IVEY	
13553	4/4/2011	JAYDEN	JACKSON	
13206	12/1/2010	WILLIAM	JACKSON	
13755	10/6/2011	CONNIE K	JACOX	
13665	7/20/2011	GAYLE L	JAMES	
13665	7/20/2011	FRANK	JAMES II	
13761	10/26/2011	DAVID A	JARVIS	
13765	10/28/2011	DAVID A	JARVIS	
13665	7/20/2011	JEREMY	JOHNS	
13665	7/20/2011	ANDREW	JOHNSON	
13665	7/20/2011	BONNIE K	JOHNSON	
13665	7/20/2011	CHRISTOPHER	JOHNSON	
13665	7/20/2011	DAVID	JOHNSON	
13665	7/20/2011	DAVID C	JOHNSON	
13377	1/23/2011	KRISTY	JOHNSON	
13533	4/4/2011	KRISTY	JOHNSON	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13351	1/8/2011	NEAL E ETUX	JOHNSON	
13665	7/20/2011	NOEL	JOHNSON	
13665	7/20/2011	PATRICK	JOHNSON	
13665	7/20/2011	RENEE	JOHNSON	
13444	2/10/2011	WALTER	JOHNSON	
13791	11/29/2011	ROY COURTNEY	JOHNSON TRUSTEE	
13648	6/6/2011	ROBYN	JOHNSTON	
13665	7/20/2011	HARRIETT	JONDAHL	
13419	2/10/2011	ANTOINETTE V	JONES	
13240	12/9/2010	CHERIL	JORDAN	
13665	7/20/2011	DAVID	JOY	
13791	11/29/2011	JESSICA L	JULSON	
13616	6/4/2011	JOHN H	KANDOLL	
13354	1/10/2011	JANE	KANE	
13395	1/29/2011	JANE	KANE	
13354	1/10/2011	JOHN A	KANE	
13395	1/29/2011	JOHN A	KANE	
13414	2/9/2011	JOHN A	KANE	
13665	7/20/2011	JONATHAN	KANE	
13755	10/6/2011	GEORGE ETUX	KANOUSE	
13851	12/21/2011	MICHAEL	KARNOFSKI	COWLITZ COUNTY
13676	7/10/2011	CR	KASER	
13667	7/20/2011	CR	KASER	
13755	10/6/2011	TONI D	KASKI	
13665	7/20/2011	CRYSTAL	KATZER	
13236	12/9/2010	CREIGHTON	KEARNS TRUSTEE	
13236	12/9/2010	JOKAY	KEARNS TRUSTEE	
13192	11/30/2010	JAMES M	KELLY	
13755	10/6/2011	BOBBY G	KELSAY	
13334	1/4/2011	JAYNEE CLAIRE	KENNEDY	
13336	1/5/2011	JAYNEE CLAIRE	KENNEDY	
13665	7/20/2011	MARGIE DIANE	KENT	
13665	7/20/2011	RANDI	KERLE	
13665	7/20/2011	NICHOLAS	KERSEN	
13665	7/20/2011	STELLA M	KERSEN	
13117	11/23/2010	HOLLY	KETTLETY	
13567	4/4/2011	VIANNEY	KEYMOLEN	
13559	4/4/2011	MACKENZIE R	KIKEL	
13665	7/20/2011	BILL	KIMBLE	
13665	7/20/2011	DENNY R	KING	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13550	4/4/2011	KRISTY	KIRK	
13425	2/10/2011	DELBERT G	KISSINGER	
13477	2/21/2011	DELBERT G	KISSINGER	
13478	2/21/2011	DELBERT G	KISSINGER	
13520	3/22/2011	DELBERT G	KISSINGER	
13773	11/16/2011	DELBERT G	KISSINGER	
13665	7/20/2011	JAY	KLANDT	
13437	2/14/2011	RALPH	KLINE	
13385	1/17/2011	LEONARD	KLINK	
13394	1/17/2011	LEONARD	KLINK	
13131	11/29/2010	TRACY	KLUTH	
13755	10/6/2011	MARK S	KNUDSON	
13099	11/19/2010	GREGORY S	KOLACEK	
13665	7/20/2011	AMBER	KOMM	
13665	7/20/2011	TYLER	KOMM	
13395	1/29/2011	SHIRLEY M	KOON	
13755	10/6/2011	MICHAEL	KOPACZEWSKI	
13665	7/20/2011	ANGELA	KOPKIE	
13665	7/20/2011	LARRY L	KOR	
13364	1/15/2011	ROBERT S	KORELL	
13492	3/3/2011	DIANE	KOSER	
13665	7/20/2011	CASEY	KOSTMAN	
13665	7/20/2011	PETER	KRAAKMAN	
13158	11/21/2010	KENNETH	KRAISLER	KASKILLAH SUBDIVISION
13169	11/29/2010	FREDRIC C	KRAUSE	
13472	2/16/2011	FREDRIC C	KRAUSE	
13190	11/30/2010	LEONARD R	KREBS	
13791	11/29/2011	DONALD C	KULLA	
13791	11/29/2011	ROXANNE	KULLA	
13755	10/6/2011	FRAN	LADROW	
13755	10/6/2011	FRANK	LADROW	
13762	10/27/2011	BEN R	LAFOUNTAIN	
13665	7/20/2011	JON	LAHTI	
13665	7/20/2011	DENNIS D	LAKE	
13665	7/20/2011	DAWN	LAMASCUS	
13665	7/20/2011	STEPHANIE	LAMASCUS	
13665	7/20/2011	DOMINIC	LANG	
13665	7/20/2011	BEN	LANGENBACH	
13395	1/29/2011	CLAYTON	LARSON	
13665	7/20/2011	GREG B	LARSON	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13544	4/4/2011	LARISSA	LARSON	
13485	2/22/2011	STEVE	LARSON	
13665	7/20/2011	LINDA	LAUGHLIN	
13665	7/20/2011	LINDA	LAWFFER	
13665	7/20/2011	MOLLIE J	LAWFFER	
13351	1/8/2011	NOEL J	LAWFFER	
13665	7/20/2011	NOEL J	LAWFFER	
13755	10/6/2011	BRYAN R	LEAKE	
13755	10/6/2011	SHAWNA	LEAKE	
13665	7/20/2011	DAVID	LEBLANC	
13755	10/6/2011	KENT S	LEE	
13755	10/6/2011	JANICE K	LEE	
13082	11/19/2010	WILLIAM J	LEISTRITZ	
13395	1/29/2011	WENDY J	LEMIEUX	
13665	7/20/2011	JULIE A	LEPAK	
13791	11/29/2011	DINAH	LEVANEN	
13536	3/24/2011	MARK	LEVANEN	
13791	11/29/2011	MARK	LEVANEN	
13395	1/29/2011	MELISSA	LEVANEN	
13395	1/29/2011	RIC	LEVANEN	
13791	11/29/2011	RIC	LEVANEN	
13395	1/29/2011	SALLY G	LEVIN	
13791	11/29/2011	SALLY G	LEVIN	
13199	11/30/2010	KERI L	LIGHTFOOT	
13650	6/8/2011	SCOTT	LILJEDAHL	COWLITZ COUNTY
13686	8/3/2011	LARS L	LINDBERG	
13395	1/29/2011	MARTHA	LINDBERG	
13665	7/20/2011	DENNIS	LINDEMAN	
13319	12/6/2010	MARY	LINDQUIST	
13731	8/15/2011	JOSH	LINGO	
13731	8/15/2011	KATHLEEN	LINGO	
13446	2/12/2011	BOB	LITTLETON	MICAJAH COMMUNITY RESEARCH
13508	2/23/2011	BOB	LITTLETON	MICAJAH COMMUNITY RESEARCH
13737	9/23/2011	BOB	LITTLETON	
13665	7/20/2011	TIM	LITTON	
13198	11/30/2010	HOWARD D	LOCKWOOD	
13665	7/20/2011	TERESA	LOGAN	
13351	1/8/2011	TIMOTHY E	LOHNES	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13665	7/20/2011	CEDRIC	LOHRMANN	
13665	7/20/2011	JOHN D	LONDON	
13856	12/8/2011	KENNETH	LONG	
13665	7/20/2011	GEORGE	LONNEE	
13218	12/3/2010	PATRICIA	LONNEE	
13665	7/20/2011	PATRICIA	LONNEE	
13133	11/20/2010	LINDA R	LOONEY	
13395	1/29/2011	KIM	LOUKES	
13357	1/11/2011	LESLIE M	LOUNSBERRY-BRADY	WITTER/REVESZ FAMILY TREE FARMS
13688	8/4/2011	LESLIE M	LOUNSBERRY-BRADY	WITTER/REVESZ FAMILY TREE FARMS
13751	10/15/2011	LESLIE M	LOUNSBERRY-BRADY	WITTER/REVESZ FAMILY TREE FARMS
13808	12/8/2011	LESLIE M	LOUNSBERRY-BRADY	WITTER/REVESZ FAMILY TREE FARMS
13665	7/20/2011	LESLIE M	LOUNSBERRY BRADY	
13665	7/20/2011	JENNIFER	LUDIN	
13665	7/20/2011	CODY	LUDWIG	
13476	2/19/2011	BEVERLY J	LUNDEEN	
13116	11/23/2010	CHRIS	LURAY	
13791	11/29/2011	LYNDI DAWN	MACDONALD	
13791	11/29/2011	ROBERT	MACDONALD	
13340	1/9/2011	CANDACE L	MACKEY	
13400	2/9/2011	SHIRLEY E	MACKEY	
13400	2/9/2011	WILBUR M	MACKEY	
13665	7/20/2011	TOM	MACKOWSKI	
13665	7/20/2011	DERONDA	MADES	
13791	11/29/2011	BONNIE L	MAHANEY	
13665	7/20/2011	MIKE	MAHANEY	
13791	11/29/2011	ROGER A	MAHANEY	
13665	7/20/2011	JIM	MALINOWSKI	
13755	10/6/2011	MARTIN L	MALLARS	
13755	10/6/2011	SUSAN	MALLARS	
13665	7/20/2011	JANET	MANAHAN	
13660	6/20/2011	MIKE	MANCHESTER	
13824	12/8/2011	IAN	MANCLARK	
13665	7/20/2011	MARVIN ALLEN	MANES	
13665	7/20/2011	SHEILA RAE	MANES	
13755	10/6/2011	SHEILA RAE	MANES	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13665	7/20/2011	SHANNON	MANGIS	
13665	7/20/2011	LYNETTE	MAREK	
13766	11/1/2011	LYNETTE	MAREK	
13665	7/20/2011	STEVEN	MAREK	
13766	11/1/2011	STEVEN	MAREK	
13231	11/24/2010	DAVID W	MARINER	
13806	12/8/2011	SHARON	MARKS	
13351	1/8/2011	KELLY A	MARTIN	
13571	4/4/2011	AINNE	MARTINEZ	
13080	11/19/2010	MONTE W	MARTINSEN	
13471	2/16/2011	JOE	MARTSEN	
13620	6/15/2011	JOE	MARTSEN	
13067	11/19/2010	ANDREW D	MASON	
13611	6/2/2011	KARLA J	MASON	
13791	11/29/2011	LARRY N	MASON	
13665	7/20/2011	RICK	MASSER	
13460	2/17/2011	SONJA	MASSIE	
13613	5/8/2011	ZULA B	MASTER	COWLITZ POMONA GRANGE #7
13225	12/7/2010	KEITH A	MATHESON	
13863	12/8/2011	KEITH A	MATHESON	
13809	12/8/2011	KEITH	MATHISON	
13665	7/20/2011	ANDY	MATSON	
13665	7/20/2011	JODI	MATSON	
13328	1/3/2011	REBECCA M	MATSON	
13755	10/6/2011	CHRISTINE	MATTHEWS	
13087	11/19/2010	LINDA	MATTHEWS	
13668	4/15/2011	DARIN	MATTIX	
13798	12/3/2011	GAYLE	MATTSON	
13799	12/7/2011	GAYLE	MATTSON	
13661	7/15/2011	TODD	MATZ	
13665	7/20/2011	S R	MATZDORFF	
13505	3/14/2011	DICK	MAUGG	
13755	10/6/2011	CAROL A	MAULER	
13730	9/13/2011	MIKE	MAXWELL	
13106	11/19/2010	CHERYL	MCATEE	
13755	10/6/2011	JOHN	MCCAMISH	
13791	11/29/2011	ELIZABETH K	MCCAMMON	
13665	7/20/2011	POLLIEANN	MCCARTER	
13665	7/20/2011	MARY	MCCARTHY	
13056	11/19/2010	CAROLYN E	MCCLELLAN	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13469	2/10/2011	TIA A	MCCLURG	
13665	7/20/2011	DON	MCCOY	
13193	11/30/2010	LARRY D	MCCOY	
13665	7/20/2011	BROOKLYN	MCCRACKEN	
13089	11/19/2010	DENNIS	MCCUNE	
13665	7/20/2011	DAN M	MCDANIEL	
13358	12/29/2010	KEN	MCDERMOTT	
13358	12/29/2010	LYNN	MCDERMOTT	
13665	7/20/2011	ROBERT J	MCELDOON	
13665	7/20/2011	ROSELINDA L	MCELDOON	
13325	12/21/2010	SCOTT	MCEWEN	COLUMBIA LAND TRUST
13351	1/8/2011	DANIELLE	MCFARLAND	
13351	1/8/2011	DANNY P	MCFARLAND	
13351	1/8/2011	JOCELYN P	MCFARLAND	
13665	7/20/2011	PATRICK J	MCGARRY	
13665	7/20/2011	JUSTIN	MCGARY	
13665	7/20/2011	DENNIS	MCGEE	
13665	7/20/2011	DR JERRY	MCGEE	
13665	7/20/2011	KENNETH C	MCGOFFIN	
13815	12/8/2011	RACHEL	MCGUIRE	
13815	12/8/2011	SCOTT	MCGUIRE	
13549	4/4/2011	ALYSSA	MCILMOIL	
13398	2/5/2011	JENNIFER J	MCKEE	
13665	7/20/2011	JUNE	MCKEE	
13551	4/4/2011	ETHYN	MCLAUGHLIN	
13351	1/8/2011	BONNIE	MCNAUGHTON	
13369	1/11/2011	BONNIE	MCNAUGHTON	
13755	10/6/2011	ANDREW	MCNEAL	
13435	2/14/2011	RON	MCPEAK	
13427	2/10/2011	THOMAS G	MEADE	
13682	7/9/2011	PETER	MELVOIN	
13665	7/20/2011	PETER	MELVOIN	
13667	7/20/2011	PETER	MELVOIN	
13665	7/20/2011	E L	MENDOZA	
13755	10/6/2011	ALICE A	MERKLE	
13755	10/6/2011	DONNELL J	MERKLE ETUX	
13490	3/3/2011	CARRIE L	MERRILL	
13402	2/9/2011	KENNETH A	MERRILL	
13395	1/29/2011	DAVID	MERRIMAN	
13791	11/29/2011	DAVID	MERRIMAN	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13395	1/29/2011	KELLI	MERRIMAN	
13791	11/29/2011	KELLI	MERRIMAN	
13395	1/29/2011	KURT L	MERRIMAN	
13791	11/29/2011	KURT L	MERRIMAN	
13395	1/29/2011	STACI E	MERRIMAN	
13791	11/29/2011	STACI E	MERRIMAN	
13665	7/20/2011	KEITH D	MESERVEY	
13337	1/5/2011	JEFF S	METSCHER	
13665	7/20/2011	LINDA	MEZZIE	
13665	7/20/2011	BRYCE	MICHAELIS	
13665	7/20/2011	GLORIA	MIELKE	
13763	10/24/2011	TOM	MIELKE	CLARK COUNTY
13053	11/19/2010	VICTORIA	MIEZEJESKI	
13405	2/9/2011	ROGER L	MILES	
13665	7/20/2011	ROGER L	MILES	
13734	9/19/2011	ROGER L	MILES	
13665	7/20/2011	DEBORAH	MILLAR	
13665	7/20/2011	ASHLEY	MILLER	
13665	7/20/2011	CATHERINE	MILLER	
13665	7/20/2011	DIANA	MILLER	
13085	11/20/2010	DOROTHY I	MILLER	
13665	7/20/2011	GARY	MILLER	
13872	12/8/2011	GREGORY S	MILLER	
13665	7/20/2011	RONALD	MILLER	
13129	11/19/2010	STACY	MILLER	
13665	7/20/2011	LISA C	MILLS	
13665	7/20/2011	WILLIAM L	MILLS	
13674	4/24/2011	APRIL L	MINISTER	
13667	7/20/2011	APRIL L	MINISTER	
13675	4/24/2011	BOLTON C	MINISTER	
13626	5/26/2011	BOLTON C	MINISTER	
13667	7/20/2011	BOLTON C	MINISTER	
13747	10/7/2011	BOLTON C	MINISTER	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13790	11/16/2011	BOLTON C	MINISTER	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13850	12/17/2011	BOLTON C	MINISTER	
13680	4/24/2011	LOLA	MINISTER	
13667	7/20/2011	LOLA	MINISTER	
13755	10/6/2011	CHARLES E	MINSINGER	
13851	12/21/2011	JAMES	MISNER	COWLITZ COUNTY
13665	7/20/2011	ALEJANDRA	MITCHELL-KEENEY	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13665	7/20/2011	SHELLY	MOLINA	
13360	1/13/2011	VICENTE A	MOLINOS	ANOTHER WAY BPA
13452	2/14/2011	VICENTE A	MOLINOS	
13855	12/8/2011	VICENTE A	MOLINOS	ANOTHER WAY BPA
13665	7/20/2011	KIRKPATRICK	MOODY	
13665	7/20/2011	LINETTE	MOODY	
13665	7/20/2011	DANIEL	MOOERS	
13665	7/20/2011	JEANNE	MOOERS	
13665	7/20/2011	DOUGLAS	MOORE	
13665	7/20/2011	E CARLINE	MOORE	
13665	7/20/2011	JAMES	MOORE	
13667	7/20/2011	JAMES	MOORE	
13665	7/20/2011	MERLE	MOORE	
13462	2/17/2011	RONALD L	MOORE	
13665	7/20/2011	SHERRI	MOORE	
13665	7/20/2011	TERRY	MORAN	
13665	7/20/2011	ROBERT	MORRIS	
13791	11/29/2011	BRUCE J	MORTON	
13665	7/20/2011	DEBRA	MORTON	
13665	7/20/2011	TERRY	MORTON	
13534	4/5/2011	BILL	MORVEE	
13665	7/20/2011	ABBY	MOSCHETTI	
13395	1/29/2011	DOUGLAS	MOSCHETTI	
13785	11/21/2011	SUSAN B	MOUTON-BRIGGS	
13540	3/22/2011	WILLIAM E	MOYER	
13832	12/8/2011	WILLIAM E	MOYER	
13865	12/8/2011	WILLIAM E	MOYER	
13665	7/20/2011	JAMES E	MUIR	
13665	7/20/2011	JEFFREY	MURPHY	
13665	7/20/2011	MICHELLE	MURPHY	
13667	7/20/2011	MICHELLE	MURPHY	
13665	7/20/2011	SAMMI	MURPHY	
13749	10/13/2011	PATTY	MURRAY	U.S. CONGRESS
13056	11/19/2010	LAVERN	NATHAN	
13564	4/4/2011	PATRICK	NATION	
13665	7/20/2011	JULIA	NAUMAN POOLE	
13623	6/21/2011	KIRK	NAYLOR	PACIFICORP
13665	7/20/2011	GEORGENE	NEAL	
13351	1/8/2011	JAMES A	NEIMAN	
13665	7/20/2011	MARK	NELLES	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13665	7/20/2011	DAN	NELSON	
13652	7/8/2011	DUANE	NELSON	
13366	1/18/2011	WILLIAM A	NELSON	
13711	8/8/2011	WILLIAM A	NELSON	
13849	12/8/2011	WILLIAM A	NELSON	
13665	7/20/2011	LAVETTA	NELSON BINDER	
13468	2/10/2011	PAUL	NELSON TRUSTEE	
13227	12/6/2010	MIKE	NERLAND	CAMAS SCHOOL DISTRICT
13351	1/8/2011	JOHN R	NESBITT	
13440	2/9/2011	JOHN R	NESBITT	
13668	4/15/2011	JOHN R	NESBITT	
13679	4/21/2011	LOIS J	NEUMAN	
13665	7/20/2011	LOIS J	NEUMAN	
13667	7/20/2011	LOIS J	NEUMAN	
13051	11/19/2010	R. G.	NEW	
13665	7/20/2011	ELIZABETH	NEWLAND	
13161	11/27/2010	TIFFANY	NEWTON	
13665	7/20/2011	MICHAEL	NICHOLAS	
13058	11/18/2010	JONATHAN EDWARD	NICHOLS	
13665	7/20/2011	SABRINA	NICHOLSON	
13755	10/6/2011	MICHAEL T	NIELSON	
13783	11/20/2011	LEVIN F	NOCK	
13465	2/12/2011	ROD	NYLUND	
13499	3/8/2011	ROD	NYLUND	
13779	11/16/2011	ROD	NYLUND	
13613	5/8/2011	PHYLLIS J	OGDEN	COWLITZ POMONA GRANGE #7
13395	1/29/2011	SANDRA	OGDEN	
13395	1/29/2011	CAROL	OJA	
13530	4/1/2011	DEBORAH	OJA	
13689	8/4/2011	DEBORAH	OJA	
13691	8/5/2011	DEBORAH	OJA	
13725	9/6/2011	DEBORAH	OJA	
13756	10/20/2011	DEBORAH	OJA	
13689	8/4/2011	MICKEY LEE	OJA	
13691	8/5/2011	MICKEY LEE	OJA	
13725	9/6/2011	MICKEY LEE	OJA	
13756	10/20/2011	MICKEY LEE	OJA	
13395	1/29/2011	TOM	OJA	
13244	12/15/2010	RYAN	OJERIO	WASHINGTON TRAILS ASSOCIATION

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13665	7/20/2011	JANELLA	OLIN	
13329	12/29/2010	JERRY C ETUX	OLSON	
13665	7/20/2011	JERRY C ETUX	OLSON	
13456	2/16/2011	MARY	OLSON	
13171	11/19/2010	PATTI	OLSON	
13329	12/29/2010	PATTI	OLSON	
13362	1/13/2011	PATTI	OLSON	
13373	1/19/2011	PATTI	OLSON	
13381	1/21/2011	PATTI	OLSON	
13382	1/21/2011	PATTI	OLSON	
13395	1/29/2011	PATTI	OLSON	
13480	2/21/2011	PATTI	OLSON	
13517	3/19/2011	PATTI	OLSON	
13525	3/24/2011	PATTI	OLSON	
13577	4/12/2011	PATTI	OLSON	
13619	5/30/2011	PATTI	OLSON	
13665	7/20/2011	PATTI	OLSON	
13742	9/21/2011	PATTI	OLSON	
13748	10/13/2011	PATTI	OLSON	
13770	11/10/2011	PATTI	OLSON	
13852	12/8/2011	PATTI	OLSON	
13665	7/20/2011	BRENDA	OLSTAD	
13665	7/20/2011	ANDREA	OLSTEAD	
13775	11/17/2011	KELLIE A	ONEILL	
13665	7/20/2011	MATTHEW	O'NEILL	
13662	7/21/2011	ED	ORCUTT	STATE REPRESENTATIVE
13165	11/29/2010	JUDITH L	ORLOSKE	
13165	11/29/2010	RONALD L	ORLOSKE	
13665	7/20/2011	MICHAEL	ORTHMEYER	
13245	12/15/2010	JAMES	OSBORN	
13665	7/20/2011	JEFF	OSBORNE	
13081	11/19/2010	RICHARD	OWEN	
13162	11/18/2010	CHARLES	PACE	
13168	11/22/2010	CHARLES	PACE	
13151	11/24/2010	JARED W	PAINE	
13152	11/24/2010	JARED W	PAINE	
13791	11/29/2011	DAVID P	PALADENI	
13378	12/2/2010	HAROLD P	PALADENI	
13791	11/29/2011	HAROLD P	PALADENI	
13791	11/29/2011	JOHN	PALADENI	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13078	11/19/2010	MARGARET	PALADENI	
13378	12/2/2010	MARGARET	PALADENI	
13791	11/29/2011	MARGARET	PALADENI	
13791	11/29/2011	WADE S	PALADENI	
13304	12/15/2010	HAROLD	PALMER	
13755	10/6/2011	RIVERS DARCI M	PANKRATZ	
13755	10/6/2011	ROBERT G	PANKRATZ	
13665	7/20/2011	DOUG	PARIS	
13665	7/20/2011	LINDSEY	PARIS	
13430	2/10/2011	JOYCE	PARKER	
13755	10/6/2011	DAY D	PARKHILL	
13083	11/19/2010	WAYNE	PARRIS TRUSTEE	
13136	11/20/2010	JOHN	PARSONS	
13395	1/29/2011	MICHAEL ROSS	PATTERSON	
13365	1/18/2011	RANDALL D	PEARL	
13439	2/9/2011	RANDALL D	PEARL	
13351	1/8/2011	L	PEARSON	
13665	7/20/2011	NICOLE	PEARSON	
13351	1/8/2011	BRITTANY J	PEDERSEN	
13351	1/8/2011	JON K	PEDERSEN	
13755	10/6/2011	WELLES K	PEDERSON	
13665	7/20/2011	AUSTIN	PENNINGTON	
13665	7/20/2011	CATHRYN	PENNINGTON	
13755	10/6/2011	WILLIAM V	PENNY	
13768	11/9/2011	TODD A	PERCIVAL	
13791	11/29/2011	TODD A	PERCIVAL	
13665	7/20/2011	ED	PERNINGTON	
13607	5/31/2011	JUDY	PERRY	
13816	12/8/2011	JEFF	PETERSEN	
13665	7/20/2011	CHERYL	PETERSON	
13665	7/20/2011	DEJA	PETERSON	
13665	7/20/2011	ERIK	PETERSON	
13665	7/20/2011	JORDAN	PETERSON	
13665	7/20/2011	MARIE	PETERSON	
13665	7/20/2011	MIKE	PETERSON	
13665	7/20/2011	TOM	PETERSON	
13665	7/20/2011	VICTORIA M	PETERSON	
13066	11/19/2010	SHERRI	PHILLIPS	
13665	7/20/2011	STEVE	PHILLIPS	
13420	2/10/2011	TINA	PICCHIONI	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13475	2/18/2011	PHILLIP	PICKETT	
13694	8/10/2011	CHRISTINA	PILE	
13695	8/10/2011	CHRISTINA	PILE	
13870	12/8/2011	CHRISTINA	PILE	
13693	8/9/2011	MARSHALL L	PILE	
13694	8/10/2011	MARSHALL L	PILE	
13695	8/10/2011	MARSHALL L	PILE	
13772	11/16/2011	MARSHALL L	PILE	
13554	4/4/2011	ESTEBAN	PINAULA	
13665	7/20/2011	ASHLEY	PINSON	
13466	2/18/2011	ANDREA E	PIRRONE	
13665	7/20/2011	JOSETTE	PIVA	
13665	7/20/2011	UWE	PLUMHOFF	
13665	7/20/2011	CONNIE	PLUMMER	
13665	7/20/2011	SEAN	PLUMMER	
13059	11/18/2010	JUSTIN M	POELING	
13395	1/29/2011	DIANE	POER TRUSTEE	
13355	1/12/2011	JOHN R	POER TRUSTEE	
13395	1/29/2011	JOHN R	POER TRUSTEE	
13841	12/8/2011	JOHN	POLOS	
13346	1/8/2011	ANDREW H	POOLE	
13395	1/29/2011	ANDREW H	POOLE	
13665	7/20/2011	JEFF	POPHAM	
13665	7/20/2011	BILL	POTEET	
13665	7/20/2011	MICHAEL	POTEET	
13665	7/20/2011	DAVID	POUNDS	
13213	12/1/2010	DEBRA	PRENTICE-THORNLEY	
13848	12/8/2011	DEBRA	PRENTICE-THORNLEY	
13562	4/4/2011	RUSIAN	PRIMACHENKO	
13665	7/20/2011	BRAD	PROTHERO	
13665	7/20/2011	SYLVIA M	PROUTY	
13692	7/30/2011	RONALD P	PURSLEY	COWLITZ COUNTY FARM FORESTRY ASSOCIATION
13665	7/20/2011	STEPHEN	PUTNAM	
13839	12/8/2011	JERRY	QUILLING	
13839	12/8/2011	MAURA	QUILLING	
13558	4/4/2011	TAYLER	R	
13637	5/31/2011	KATHLEEN	RAFFERTY	
13851	12/21/2011	GEORGE	RAITER	COWLITZ COUNTY
13565	4/4/2011	ERICK	RAMIREZ	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13781	11/18/2011	HEATHER	RAMSAY	U.S. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
13665	7/20/2011		RAMSEY	
13665	7/20/2011	JOY L	RANTALA	
13120	11/19/2010	STEVE	RAPALUS	
13860	12/8/2011	STEVE	RAPALUS	
13825	12/8/2011	HOLLY	RASMUSSEN	
13678	7/9/2011	JOHN	RAVEN	
13665	7/20/2011	JOHN	RAVEN	
13667	7/20/2011	JOHN	RAVEN	
13665	7/20/2011	GLEN	RAY	
13057	11/18/2010	PAULA	RAYA	
13057	11/18/2010	ROBERT C	RAYA	
13755	10/6/2011	ERIC	REESE	
13755	10/6/2011	HARRY L ETUX	REESE	
13755	10/6/2011	JANIS SUE	REESE	
13755	10/6/2011	MARIA HART STOLL	REESE	
13665	7/20/2011	CODY	REID	
13119	11/24/2010	JAMES	RELYEA	
13172	11/29/2010	JAMES	RELYEA	
13173	11/29/2010	JAMES	RELYEA	
13632	5/28/2011	CHARLES	RENEAU	
13755	10/6/2011	CALLEE	REUTTER	
13751	10/15/2011	JANE M	REVESZ	WITTER/REVESZ FAMILY TREE FARMS
13771	11/14/2011	JANE M	REVESZ	WITTER/REVESZ FAMILY TREE FARMS
13867	12/8/2011	JANE M	REVESZ	WITTER/REVESZ FAMILY TREE FARMS
13395	1/29/2011	PETER	REVESZ	
13751	10/15/2011	PETER	REVESZ	WITTER/REVESZ FAMILY TREE FARMS
13771	11/14/2011	PETER	REVESZ	WITTER/REVESZ FAMILY TREE FARMS
13868	12/8/2011	PETER	REVESZ	WITTER/REVESZ FAMILY TREE FARMS
13665	7/20/2011	JAVIER	REYES	
13303	12/18/2010	ANDREA	RHODES	
13665	7/20/2011	TOM	RHODES	
13535	3/29/2011	RAYMOND B	RICHARDS	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13665	7/20/2011	RAYMOND B	RICHARDS	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13719	8/10/2011	RAYMOND B	RICHARDS	
13743	9/27/2011	RAYMOND B	RICHARDS	
13747	10/7/2011	RAYMOND B	RICHARDS	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13790	11/16/2011	RAYMOND B	RICHARDS	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13791	11/29/2011	RAYMOND B	RICHARDS	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13850	12/17/2011	RAYMOND B	RICHARDS	
13791	11/29/2011	ARTHUR P	RICHARDSON	
13755	10/6/2011	MICHAEL G	RIETMAN	
13755	10/6/2011	CINDY A	RIGGS	
13755	10/6/2011	KYLE D	RIGGS	
13233	11/30/2010	AMY	RINGSAGE	
13467	2/10/2011	NICK T	RITTER	
13494	3/4/2011	NICK T	RITTER	
13665	7/20/2011	JODI	RIU	
13800	11/29/2011	JODI	RIU	
13662	7/21/2011	ANN	RIVERS	
13665	7/20/2011	EDWARD M	ROANE	
13665	7/20/2011	JANINE	ROBERTS	
13667	7/20/2011	JANINE	ROBERTS	
13665	7/20/2011	JOHN WAYNE	ROBERTS	
13665	7/20/2011	JEREMIAH	ROBERTSON	
13665	7/20/2011	MELISSA	ROBERTSON	
13665	7/20/2011	ANGIE	ROBINSON	
13665	7/20/2011	JUAN	ROBLES	
13667	7/20/2011	JUAN	ROBLES	
13665	7/20/2011	SHEILA K	ROBLES	
13667	7/20/2011	SHEILA K	ROBLES	
13114	11/23/2010	JAMES E	ROBSON	
13665	7/20/2011	JANET	ROBY	
13150	11/22/2010	DARRYL T	RODEBACK	
13665	7/20/2011	DIANE	RODEWALD	
13665	7/20/2011	DIK	RODEWALD	
13665	7/20/2011	BELINDA	ROGER	
13665	7/20/2011	ANNIE E	ROGERS	
13665	7/20/2011	DANIELLE	ROGERS	
13665	7/20/2011	WILLIAM J	ROGERS	
13755	10/6/2011	WILLIAM J	ROGERS	
13665	7/20/2011	DONALD	ROONEY	
13766	11/1/2011	DONALD	ROONEY	
13665	7/20/2011	SHIRLEY	ROONEY	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13766	11/1/2011	SHIRLEY	ROONEY	
13050	11/19/2010	RUTH E	ROOT	
13395	1/29/2011	TIFFANY	ROSE	
13395	1/29/2011	WILLIAM	ROSE	
13421	2/10/2011	JOHN L	ROSENLUND	
13368	1/19/2011	JAMES P	ROTH TRUSTEE	
13376	1/21/2011	JAMES P	ROTH TRUSTEE	
13438	2/9/2011	JAMES P	ROTH TRUSTEE	
13149	11/22/2010	BRENT	ROTSCHY	YACOLT MOUNTAIN QUARRY
13379	11/30/2010	CECIL C	ROTSCHY	
13125	11/19/2010	DREW G	ROTSCHY	
13665	7/20/2011	EATHYL	ROTSCHY	
13665	7/20/2011	KAREN	ROTSCHY	
13379	11/30/2010	MARIE	ROTSCHY	
13665	7/20/2011	SAMANTHA	ROUGH	
13755	10/6/2011	KATHLEEN D	ROY	
13755	10/6/2011	DAVID R	ROY SR	
13665	7/20/2011	ASHLEY	RUFF	
13665	7/20/2011	JENNIFER	RUSER	
13665	7/20/2011	ORIEN R	RUSK	
13665	7/20/2011	JESSICA	RUSSELL	
13068	11/19/2010	ROCKY	RUSSELL	
13121	11/19/2010	J SCOTT	RUSTAY	
13665	7/20/2011	MARCIA	RUTLEDGE	
13665	7/20/2011	STEVE	RUTLEDGE	
13228	12/2/2010	MILMA	SAASTAMO	
13395	1/29/2011	REYNOLD L	SABATA	
13665	7/20/2011	LORRIE J	SAMS	
13665	7/20/2011	RANDY W	SAMS	
13079	11/19/2010	TERRY	SANBURG	
13665	7/20/2011	EDWARD	SANCHEZ	
13545	4/4/2011	HECTOR	SANCHEZ	
13473	2/18/2011	FREDRIC J	SANTOLUCITO	
13638	7/4/2011	FREDRIC J	SANTOLUCITO	
13656	7/10/2011	FREDRIC J	SANTOLUCITO	
13196	11/26/2010	ERNA	SARASOHN	
13453	2/12/2011	ERNA	SARASOHN	
13451	2/14/2011	ERNA	SARASOHN	
13452	2/14/2011	ERNA	SARASOHN	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13627	6/29/2011	ERNA	SARASOHN	ANOTHER WAY BPA,CITIZENS AGAINST THE TOWERS
13685	8/3/2011	ERNA	SARASOHN	
13705	8/8/2011	ERNA	SARASOHN	
13697	8/12/2011	ERNA	SARASOHN	ANOTHER WAY BPA,CITIZENS AGAINST THE TOWERS
13699	8/17/2011	ERNA	SARASOHN	
13720	8/29/2011	ERNA	SARASOHN	
13728	9/5/2011	ERNA	SARASOHN	ANOTHER WAY BPA,CITIZENS AGAINST THE TOWERS
13745	9/29/2011	ERNA	SARASOHN	
13758	10/6/2011	ERNA	SARASOHN	ANOTHER WAY BPA,CITIZENS AGAINST THE TOWERS
13750	10/12/2011	ERNA	SARASOHN	
13759	10/19/2011	ERNA	SARASOHN	
13784	11/18/2011	ERNA	SARASOHN	
13840	12/8/2011	ERNA	SARASOHN	
13844	12/8/2011	ERNA	SARASOHN	
13844	12/8/2011	LESTER	SARASOHN	
13229	12/2/2010	WILLIAM	SAYER	
13802	12/8/2011	DAVID	SCHAAF	
13123	11/19/2010	RAYMOND A	SCHEIMER	
13665	7/20/2011	WILLIAM	SCHILLINGER	
13387	1/26/2011	YARO	SCHNOEBELEN	
13351	1/8/2011	STEVEN C	SCHOENEMAN	
13413	2/9/2011	LINDA L	SCHRADER	
13090	11/19/2010	PHYLLIS	SCHRODER	
13639	6/1/2011	REBECCA	SCHROEDER	STATE OF WASHINGTON, DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY
13755	10/6/2011	RONALD E	SCHULTZ	
13665	7/20/2011	RAY	SCHURMAN	
13665	7/20/2011	AMANDA	SCHWABE	
13665	7/20/2011	CHET	SCIBEK	
13127	11/19/2010	MARK	SCOTT	
13455	2/16/2011	RONNIE R	SEALS	
13665	7/20/2011	WENDY	SETTLE	
13755	10/6/2011	TRACY	SEXTON	
13139	11/21/2010	PHILIP	SHANTEAU	
13375	1/20/2011	PHILIP	SHANTEAU	
13788	11/20/2011	PHILIP	SHANTEAU	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13665	7/20/2011	LARRY M	SHARP	
13665	7/20/2011	SHARON L	SHARP	
13429	2/10/2011	TERRI A	SHARPE	
13665	7/20/2011	DANIEL M	SHAW	
13568	4/4/2011	ALINA	SHINTAR	
13787	11/16/2011	DOLORES	SHIRTS	
13395	1/29/2011	DANIEL	SHULTZ	
13741	9/27/2011	DANIEL	SHULTZ	
13665	7/20/2011	DEREK	SILVA	
13665	7/20/2011	JODI	SILVA	
13665	7/20/2011	JOHN	SILVA	
13861	12/8/2011	CATHI	SIMMONS	ANOTHER WAY BPA
13862	12/8/2011	JOHN	SIMMONS	
13203	12/1/2010	JANIS L	SIMONEN	
13665	7/20/2011	AUSTIN	SIVITS	
13112	11/20/2010	FRED	SKUBE	
13755	10/6/2011	E	SLAMA	
13755	10/6/2011	THOMAS J	SLAMA	
13665	7/20/2011	VERA	SLAUGHTER	
13665	7/20/2011	JENNIFER J	SLAYTON	
13755	10/6/2011	JENNIFER J	SLAYTON	
13665	7/20/2011	JODY W	SLAYTON	
13755	10/6/2011	JODY W	SLAYTON	
13593	5/16/2011	CAREY	SMITH	COLUMBIA RIVER FISHERIES PROGRAM OFFICE
13614	5/31/2011	CAREY	SMITH	COLUMBIA RIVER FISHERIES PROGRAM OFFICE
13253	12/17/2010	ERIC A	SMITH	
13665	7/20/2011	JUDY	SMITH	
13665	7/20/2011	JUSTIN	SMITH	
13640	6/2/2011	KIM L	SMITH	
13239	12/9/2010	LAURA R	SMITH	
13241	12/10/2010	LAURA R	SMITH	
13253	12/17/2010	LAURA R	SMITH	
13384	1/26/2011	LAURA R	SMITH	
13665	7/20/2011	NATALIE	SMITH	
13555	4/4/2011	OLIVIA	SMITH	
13665	7/20/2011	ROD	SMITH	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13747	10/7/2011	ROD	SMITH	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA
13790	11/16/2011	ROD	SMITH	A BETTER WAY FOR BPA

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13625	6/26/2011	ROSE	SMITH	
13395	1/29/2011	SUSAN R	SMITH	
13047	11/19/2010	WILLIAM	SMITH	
13118	11/23/2010	WILLIAM	SMITH	
13665	7/20/2011	JEFF	SNYDER	
13126	11/19/2010	DAVE	SOCOLOFSKY	GREEN MEADOWS NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
13552	4/4/2011	KAELEE	SOM	
13665	7/20/2011	CHAE	SPACKMAN	
13665	7/20/2011	KIM	SPADY	
13404	2/9/2011	PATRICK	SPARKS	
13665	7/20/2011	PATRICK A	SPERLING	
13791	11/29/2011	LINDA	SPOLAR	
13791	11/29/2011	TRENTON J	SPOLAR	
13859	12/8/2011	TRENTON J	SPOLAR	
13755	10/6/2011	CAROL A	SPRINGER	
13528	3/30/2011	KEN	SPURLOCK	
13524	2/2/2011	MARGARET	STAPENHORST TRUSTEE	
13470	2/15/2011	MARGARET	STAPENHORST TRUSTEE	
13483	2/20/2011	MARGARET	STAPENHORST TRUSTEE	
13712	8/8/2011	MARGARET	STAPENHORST TRUSTEE	
13819	12/8/2011	MARGARET	STAPENHORST TRUSTEE	
13560	4/4/2011	ALEX	STAVRAKIS	
13447	2/13/2011	JASE E	STEFANSKI	
13447	2/13/2011	JENNIE S	STEFANSKI	
13319	12/6/2010	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13395	1/29/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13454	2/11/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13582	5/2/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13638	7/4/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13700	8/8/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	YALE VALLEY COALITION
13701	8/8/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13702	8/8/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	YALE VALLEY COALITION
13703	8/8/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13704	8/8/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	YALE VALLEY COALITION
13705	8/8/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13706	8/8/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13707	8/8/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13708	8/8/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13709	8/8/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13710	8/8/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	YALE VALLEY COALITION
13712	8/8/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13713	8/8/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13714	8/8/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13715	8/8/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13716	8/8/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13698	8/16/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13754	10/6/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13755	10/6/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13760	10/25/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	
13857	12/8/2011	ARDELLE M	STEIN	YALE VALLEY COALITION
13708	8/8/2011	DENNIS M	STEIN	
13698	8/16/2011	DENNIS M	STEIN	
13755	10/6/2011	DENNIS M	STEIN	
13715	8/8/2011	LYNN	STIGLICH	CITIZENS AGAINST THE TOWERS
13733	8/22/2011	LYNN	STIGLICH	CITIZENS AGAINST THE TOWERS
13820	12/8/2011	LYNN	STIGLICH	
13335	1/3/2011	GARY	STOCKER	
13335	1/3/2011	LINDA J	STOCKER	
13755	10/6/2011	LINDA J	STOCKER	
13846	12/8/2011	RICHARD	STONER	
13665	7/20/2011	REBECCA L	STOOLFIRE	
13407	2/9/2011	ELTON L	STRANGE	
13665	7/20/2011	MICHAL	STRONG	
13569	4/4/2011	DAKOTA	STROZINSKY	
13410	2/9/2011	CHARLES	STRUNK	
13755	10/6/2011	GARY L	STUART	
13395	1/29/2011	GERI	STUART	
13395	1/29/2011	ROBERT	STUART	
13755	10/6/2011	SHARON R	STUART	
13763	10/24/2011	STEVE	STUART	CLARK COUNTY
13102	11/19/2010	ARTHUR	STUBBS	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13531	4/2/2011	LAWRENCE G	STUDEBAKER	
13665	7/20/2011	AMANDA	SUDAN	
13348	1/8/2011	DALE C	SULLIVAN	
13665	7/20/2011	KARL W	SUND	
13665	7/20/2011	SCOTT	SUNDBERG	
13871	12/8/2011	GWEN	SUNDERLAND	
13547	4/4/2011	SLAVIK	SVISTUNOV	
13589	5/13/2011	JACK	SWANSON	
13665	7/20/2011	CULLEN	SWATOSH	
13755	10/6/2011	CHANTEL	SWETT	
13147	11/22/2010	RUSSELL	SWIRE	
13665	7/20/2011	TERRA	TABOR	
13812	12/8/2011	DON E	TALBOTT	
13522	2/9/2011	ANDREW	TARANGUL	
13522	2/9/2011	ELEANOR	TARANGUL	
13557	4/4/2011	BAILEY	TAYLOR	
13126	11/19/2010	CINDY L	TAYLOR	
13217	12/3/2010	DARCY	TAYLOR	
13396	2/4/2011	JUSTINA	TAYLOR	
13665	7/20/2011	SUSAN	TEETER	
13606	5/31/2011	JUDY	TEITZEL	FRIBERG PROPERTIES LLC
13352	1/10/2011	JUSTINE M	TEMPLEMAN	
13665	7/20/2011	HOMER	TERRY	
13755	10/6/2011	DOUGLAS	THOMAS	
13395	1/29/2011	JOANN M	THOMAS	
13791	11/29/2011	JOANN M	THOMAS	
13572	4/4/2011	KAITLYN	THOMAS	
13755	10/6/2011	KRISTEE	THOMAS	
13665	7/20/2011	MILDRED	THOMAS	
13755	10/6/2011	T	THOMAS	
13412	2/9/2011	PEGGY	THOMPSON	
13344	1/9/2011	RICHARD R	THORMAHLEN	
13665	7/20/2011	IRENA	THOSTENSON	
13665	7/20/2011	CAROLE	TILLERY	
13122	11/19/2010	SAMUEL J	TILTON	
13636	5/31/2011	DEBORAH	TOGNAZZINI	
13636	5/31/2011	NOEL A	TOGNAZZINI	
13595	5/18/2011	CARLA	TOLLE	
13578	4/22/2011	PAUL W III	TOLLE	
13594	5/18/2011	PAUL W III	TOLLE	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13486	2/24/2011	MONICA	TONEL	U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
13665	7/20/2011	TOMAS	TOURIKIS	
13323	12/13/2010	BRUCE	TOWLE	
13323	12/13/2010	DIANE	TOWLE	
13665	7/20/2011	SUE	TOWNSEND	
13665	7/20/2011	DEBBIE	TRAPP	
13766	11/1/2011	DEBBIE	TRAPP	
13326	12/29/2010	BRIAN	TREMBLEY	
13665	7/20/2011	LINDA M	TRIBE	
13561	4/4/2011	NOEL	TRUJILLO	
13814	12/8/2011	JENNIFER L	TUCKER	
13156	11/28/2010	JOHN PAUL	TUINGA	KASKILLAH ROAD ASSOCIATION
13445	2/12/2011	JOHN PAUL	TUINGA	KASKILLAH ROAD ASSOCIATION
13665	7/20/2011	PETE	TURKINGTON	
13755	10/6/2011	MICHAEL J	TURNBULL	
13665	7/20/2011	ANDY	TURNER	
13696	8/12/2011	BEVERLY G	TURNER	
13776	11/17/2011	BEVERLY G	TURNER	
13791	11/29/2011	BEVERLY G	TURNER	
13755	10/6/2011	JAMES A	TURNER	
13395	1/29/2011	TERRY R	TURNER	
13791	11/29/2011	TERRY R	TURNER	
13665	7/20/2011	WANDA F	TURNER	
13395	1/29/2011	ANDREW	TUSON	
13757	10/5/2011	ANDREW	TUSON	
13221	12/3/2010	MARGIE	ULLAND	
13076	11/19/2010	ARDEN D	UNGER	
13401	2/9/2011	JOYE E	UNGER	
13665	7/20/2011	KRISTI	UNHOLZ	
13091	11/19/2010	MAE	USKOSKI	
13665	7/20/2011	JACK	VALENTINE	
13665	7/20/2011	TERESA M	VALENTINE	
13842	12/8/2011	RICHARD	VAN DIJK TRUSTEE	ANOTHER WAY BPA
13842	12/8/2011	VIVIAN	VAN DIJK TRUSTEE	
13833	9/14/2010	MARGARET	VAN NUS	
13395	1/29/2011	MARGARET	VAN NUS	
13834	12/11/2011	MARGARET	VAN NUS	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13395	1/29/2011	SANDRA	VAN SOEST	
13395	1/29/2011	WAYNE	VAN SOEST	
13665	7/20/2011	JEFF	VAN TASSEL	
13442	2/9/2011	CHRISTINA A	VANDENBERG	
13107	11/20/2010	WENDY	VANDENBERG	
13484	2/22/2011	ELAINE	VANDERHOOK	
13864	12/8/2011	GEORGE F	VAUGHAN	
13665	7/20/2011	CHRIS	VERLINDE	
13665	7/20/2011	VERN	VEYSEY	
13074	11/22/2010	DAVID G	VIGNA SR	
13665	7/20/2011	ROBERT D	VINCENT	
13065	11/19/2010	DAVID	WAHL	
13441	2/9/2011	KEN	WAKE	CONTECH CONSTRUCTION PRODUCTS
13532	4/4/2011	JOY	WALDEN	
13138	11/21/2010	RENEE	WALDEN	
13434	2/13/2011	JULIE A	WALKER	
13791	11/29/2011	ZOEANNE	WALKER	
13665	7/20/2011	ROCHELLE	WALLWAY	
13665	7/20/2011	LARRY	WALTERS	
13395	1/29/2011	SHAUNA	WALTERS	
13672	3/27/2011	SHAUNA	WALTERS	
13837	12/15/2011	RONALD	WANGER	ROYAL RIDGES RETREAT
13665	7/20/2011	JASON	WARD	
13665	7/20/2011	LEW	WARD	
13755	10/6/2011	JANA M	WARNER	
13755	10/6/2011	JOSEPH D	WARNER	
13395	1/29/2011	BRUCE J	WATSON	
13791	11/29/2011	BRUCE J	WATSON	
13395	1/29/2011	HARVEY	WATSON	
13518	3/19/2011	HARVEY	WATSON	
13395	1/29/2011	LORETTA	WATSON	
13351	1/8/2011	NORMA	WATSON	
13395	1/29/2011	NORMA	WATSON	
13791	11/29/2011	NORMA	WATSON	
13665	7/20/2011	TABITHA	WAYSON	
13395	1/29/2011	EMILY A	WEBBER	
13667	7/20/2011	EMILY A	WEBBER	
13052	11/19/2010	RUBY	WEEKS	
13665	7/20/2011	HEATHER	WEIDNER	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13225	12/7/2010	TIMOTHY E	WEIHE	
13493	1/19/2011	CHRISTOPHER I	WEINGARTNER TRUSTEE	
13701	8/8/2011	CHRISTOPHER I	WEINGARTNER TRUSTEE	
13395	1/29/2011	GEORGE	WEISENBORN	
13130	11/19/2010	MARY ANN	WEISONG	
13665	7/20/2011	SAMANTHA	WESTON	
13436	2/14/2011	ROSE	WETMORE	
13474	2/22/2011	KATHY	WEYAND	
13395	1/29/2011	VERNON	WHEELER	
13665	7/20/2011	BARBARA J	WHITE	
13755	10/6/2011	GLEN D	WHITE	
13665	7/20/2011	LARRY E	WHITE	
13755	10/6/2011	MARCIE C	WHITE	
13428	2/10/2011	MAXINE	WHITE	
13500	3/9/2011	MAXINE	WHITE	
13665	7/20/2011	SHIRLEY	WHITE	
13092	11/19/2010	PHYLLIS	WHITE TRUSTEE	
13232	11/29/2010	JIM	WICK	HOLTEN-ANDERSEN PER COMPANY
13665	7/20/2011	KEITH B	WIERIMA	
13395	1/29/2011	JUDY D	WILLARD	
13665	7/20/2011	LINDA	WILLETTE	
13665	7/20/2011	CORTNEY	WILLIAMS	
13386	1/17/2011	DANA	WILLIAMS	
13393	1/17/2011	DANA	WILLIAMS	
13665	7/20/2011	JANET	WILLIAMS	
13665	7/20/2011	LEN	WILLIAMS	
13794	12/1/2011	ROGER	WILLIAMS	
13665	7/20/2011	TYLER	WILLIAMS	
13502	3/10/2011	JAMES P	WILSON	
13501	3/10/2011	JENNI	WILSON	
13596	5/19/2011	MIKE	WILSON	
13665	7/20/2011	SHERRY	WILSON	
13665	7/20/2011	BRANDON	WILWORTH	
13665	7/20/2011	JULIE	WING	
13124	11/19/2010	ROBERT A	WINSOR	
13665	7/20/2011	MICHAEL	WISNIEVSKI	
13665	7/20/2011	VINCE	WITT	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13342	1/9/2011	PATRICIA LEE	WITTER	WITTER/REVESZ FAMILY TREE FARMS
13687	8/4/2011	PATRICIA LEE	WITTER	WITTER/REVESZ FAMILY TREE FARMS
13751	10/15/2011	PATRICIA LEE	WITTER	WITTER/REVESZ FAMILY TREE FARMS
13869	12/8/2011	PATRICIA LEE	WITTER	WITTER/REVESZ FAMILY TREE FARMS
13395	1/29/2011	LEE	WITTER-KAHN	
13665	7/20/2011	LEE	WITTER-KAHN	
13665	7/20/2011	KENDRA	WITTHAUER	
13665	7/20/2011	TODD	WITTHAUER	
13487	2/11/2011	JO ANN	WOHLERS	
13665	7/20/2011	AMANDA	WOLFF	
13665	7/20/2011	DON	WOMELSDORF	
13764	10/27/2011	CAROLINE	WOOD	
13665	7/20/2011	MARK	WOODS	
13665	7/20/2011	SAYUMI	WOODS	
13755	10/6/2011	DAVID R	WOODSON	
13755	10/6/2011	LORETTA M	WOODSON	
13098	11/19/2010	BARBARA	WRIGHT	
13220	12/3/2010	BARBARA	WRIGHT	
13755	10/6/2011	CHARLES R	WRIGHT	
13631	5/28/2011	VICKIE	WRIGLEY	
13850	12/17/2011	VICKIE	WRIGLEY	
13457	2/17/2011	MARKUS D	WUERTH	
13581	4/26/2011	MARKUS D	WUERTH	
13665	7/20/2011	T BU	YAN	
13128	11/19/2010	WALTER H	YEAW	
13599	5/10/2011	LEONARD S	YOUNG	STATE OF WASHINGTON, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
13665	7/20/2011	RUSSELL	YOUNG	
13665	7/20/2011	THERESA	YOUNG	
13755	10/6/2011	TAMERIA R	YTREEIDE AKERLEY	
13070	11/19/2010	ALGIRDAS	ZALPYS	
13070	11/19/2010	ELIZABETH	ZALPYS	
13662	7/21/2011	HONORABLE JOSEPH	ZARELLI	STATE SENATOR
13791	11/29/2011	DEE DEE	ZASKE	
13146	11/22/2010	DINO P	ZEPPELELLA	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13755	10/6/2011	JUSTIN	ZIMMERMAN	
13755	10/6/2011	SHERI	ZIMMERMAN	
13665	7/20/2011	DARCI	ZITT	
13665	7/20/2011	LOLA	ZITT	
13489	2/28/2011	RANDY	ZMRHAL	
13692	7/30/2011	ROBERT J	ZUMSTEIN	
13665	7/20/2011	GREG	M	
13422	2/10/2011		MRS. SEALS	
13789	11/23/2011	JEREMIAH		
13665	7/20/2011	THOMAS A		
13665	7/20/2011	(ILLEGIBLE)	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13665	7/20/2011	(ILLEGIBLE)	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13755	10/6/2011	(ILLEGIBLE)	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13755	10/6/2011	(ILLEGIBLE)	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13755	10/6/2011	A (ILLEGIBLE)	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13665	7/20/2011	ARLINE	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13755	10/6/2011	B (ILLEGIBLE)	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13665	7/20/2011	BRYAN	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13755	10/6/2011	C (ILLEGIBLE)	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13665	7/20/2011	CHARLES	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13755	10/6/2011	GALEN	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13755	10/6/2011	J (ILLEGIBLE)	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13755	10/6/2011	KAT (ILLEGIBLE)	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13755	10/6/2011	KRISTIN	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13755	10/6/2011	P (ILLEGIBLE)	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13665	7/20/2011	ROB	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13755	10/6/2011	S (ILLEGIBLE)	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13755	10/6/2011	T (ILLEGIBLE)	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13665	7/20/2011	ZACHARY	(ILLEGIBLE)	
13579	4/26/2011	MELISSA	(UNKNOWN)	
13755	10/6/2011	(ILLEGIBLE)	A (ILLEGIBLE)	
13755	10/6/2011	A	A (ILLEGIBLE)	
13755	10/6/2011	(ILLEGIBLE)	BISHOP	
13755	10/6/2011	(ILLEGIBLE)	HAMILTON	
13755	10/6/2011	R (ILLEGIBLE)	HIGGINS	
13755	10/6/2011	FRED	PAT (ILLEGIBLE)	
13755	10/6/2011	(ILLEGIBLE)	PED (ILLEGIBLE)	
13755	10/6/2011	D (ILLEGIBLE)	R (ILLEGIBLE)	
13755	10/6/2011	J (ILLEGIBLE)	R (ILLEGIBLE)	
13665	7/20/2011	(ILLEGIBLE)	ROBERTS	

Number	Date	Name - First	Name - Last	Organization
13665	7/20/2011	J (ILLEGIBLE)	ST (ILLEGIBLE)	
13665	7/20/2011	TH (ILLEGIBLE)	STEVENSON	
13665	7/20/2011	(ILLEGIBLE)	TAYLOR	
13654	7/9/2011	(ANONYMOUS)		
13826	12/8/2011	(ANONYMOUS)		
13829	12/8/2011	(ANONYMOUS)		
13238	12/9/2010	ANONYMOUS		MOUNTAIN VIEW BAPTIST CHURCH
13408	2/9/2011	ANONYMOUS		

Communication ID: 13047

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: WILLIAM SMITH

I understand there is a print of the map with towers proposed for all of the different segments. My name is William R Smith [address]. Could you please mail me one of those? Thank you.

Communication ID: 13048

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: BETTY J HAUSER

It's Betty Hauser and I'm at [address]. Property is at this address. And I can't remember what else you picked. So, ok, thank you.

Communication ID: 13049

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: DIANA BRUMBAUGH

Hi, yes, I would very much like to have one of the maps. My name is Diana, D-I-A-N-A, Brumbaugh, B-R-U-M-B-A-U-G-H, [address] and that's also my mailing address. My phone number is [phone]. Thank you very much.

Communication ID: 13050

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: RUTH E ROOT

This is Ruth Root, R-O-O-T as in Tom. [address]. I would like a new copy of the proposed line from Castle Rock to Troutdale. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13051

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: R. G. NEW

The address is [address] and we would like a map of the proposed line for the power and the name is R. G. New. That's initial R initial G last name New N-E-W. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13052

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: RUBY WEEKS

Ruby Weeks [address]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13053

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: VICTORIA MIEZEJESKI

Voicemail 11/19/2010 9:03 AM

I'm calling about the new map that they put out. This is Victoria Mizejeski M-I-E-Z-E-J-E-S-K-I [address]. And we have two pieces of property the other one is at [partial address]- all I need is one map, so, I would appreciate it and I thank you. Bye.

Voicemail 11/19/2010 9:12 AM

This is Victoria Mizejeski [address] I would like one of the maps, the new maps that came out that's connecting BPA station between Castle Rock and Troutdale. Appreciate it, thank you very much.

Communication ID: 13054

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: ED HUFFMAN

Yes, my name is Ed Huffman. My address is [address]. I would like a copy of the newest map that you just advertised in the paper today. Telephone number is [phone]. Thank you very much.

Communication ID: 13055

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: MARGARET M DAUGHERTY

This is Margaret Daugherty. I live at [address]. Yes, I would like a map because I'm afraid if this goes near my property I'm going to have an absolute fit. My phone number is [phone]. Thanks.

Communication ID: 13056

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: CAROLYN E MCCLELLAN, LAVERN NATHAN

This is Lavern Nathan, [address]. And I would like a copy of the map that shows where the transmission lines are coming in since I'm pretty sure they're going to go through my daughter's property. I'd like to have a map. Thank you. Oh, and my phone number is [phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13057

Date Received: 11/18/2010

Name: PAULA RAYA,ROBERT C RAYA

We just want to know where we stand with this proposed line 26 and IF or HOW we may be affected. Please be thorough and honest we are so stressed over this situation! Please respond ASAP!!!!

Communication ID: 13058

Date Received: 11/18/2010

Name: JONATHAN EDWARD NICHOLS

Dear Sir, You have now two possible paths through my property in [property location]. You already have a RofW to the East #2 on map and now a new one #1. Please be advised, we are currently mining rock in the area and moving away from our old location to the West and will some day be mining right under your new proposed line to the West. The good rock is about exhausted on the East side of the pit. Yours Truly, Jonathan

Communication ID: 13059

Date Received: 11/18/2010

Name: JUSTIN M POELING

Your Option F still is too close to our home. There is an alternate alignment I proposed to Mark Korsness that would miss my home as well as all my neighbors. This alignment is a very minor adjustment to your overall project and would be easy to implement.

Communication ID: 13060

Date Received: 11/18/2010

Name: TESSIE M CHERRINGTON,DANIEL S CHERRINGTON

My husband and I are in are early 30's and have two small children. We are both very hard workers and have worked hard for many years for what we have. We have property where we have planned to build our dream house for the past 10 years. We planned on raising our children there and living there for the rest of our lives. Now that we are getting close to making our dream come true, you want to put two towers on our property. We have our building site cleared and a septic system in place. We have an orchard that has been there for several years and we had planned on them being there for several

more. Our property is located in a newly developed gated community. I still do not understand why you wouldn't put these towers on property that you already own. I do realize that these areas are now more populated than they were in 1940, but the people who built there were aware that there were already power lines in place and the possibility of new lines coming in. It really makes me wonder if the BPA is just trying to take advantage of our hard economic times and purchase more for less while they can. I do have a question for whoever reads this...What would you do if this was your property? What would you do to fight this? Would you raise your children next to power lines? I don't even know where to start, I do know that we've worked hard for everything we have and it's sickening to know that our dreams are being taken away.

Communication ID: 13061

Date Received: 11/18/2010

Name: MARLA B AZINGER

NO on route P NO on route P NO on route P NO on route P NO on route P NO on route P. THIS IS STILL TO CLOSE TO HOMES THAT CHOSE TO MOVE INTO TERRITORY WITHOUT THESE HAZARDOUS POWER LINES. This is the NW where we choose to keep it green and healthy. Have respect for that please. BPA needs to go public with a commitment to bury the lines or not do the expansion. BPA needs to stop ignoring its own state and make a route up OR as well.

Communication ID: 13062

Date Received: 11/18/2010

Name: GREGORY R HOYT

Hello, I have reviewed the most recent map that shows the routes that are under consideration for newly proposed power BPA lines. To my dismay, it appears that line 35 is going to run just off of my east property line. Currently, I have a tremendous view from my deck and back yard looking out over the forest with an unobstructed view of Jackson Pass in the background. It is a beautiful view. If the BPA lines are built in this location, there is no doubt in my mind that it will interfere with my wonderful view. That view is one of the reasons that I bought this property. These lines will definitely have an impact on my property value now and into the future. My hope is that this line is not chosen as the eventual route. Short of that, if there was a chance of moving the line further to the east, perhaps it wouldn't be so conspicuous. In addition, and this is very important, you currently show a proposed tower standing off of my east property line that may also obstruct my view. If the line does wind up getting built, it would mean a lot to me if there was any way to move the proposed tower just north of my property so that I don't have to look at it. It doesn't seem like it would need to be moved very far north at all to accommodate this request. Again, I'd rather that line 35 did not get built in its proposed location along my property line at all. I will be following your updates to see if my concerns are addressed. Thank you, Greg Hoyt

Communication ID: 13063

Date Received: 11/18/2010

Name: JERRY DAYNES

Your map search program does not accept my address. Does that mean that I do not live near enough to any of your proposed towers or right-of-ways for the search engine to work? Thank you. I live east of Battle Ground at [address]

Communication ID: 13064

Date Received: 11/18/2010

Name: JACOB BOOMHOUWER,SUSAN BOOMHOUWER

I was disappointed that the head of BPA so easily dismissed an Oregon routing. After all, the power is for Oregon users. But, if you must route through Clark County I suggest you go as far east as possible through federal and state forrest land. Why would you devalue private property when such eastward routings are available. Jake and Susan Boomhouwer

Communication ID: 13065

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: DAVID WAHL

My Name is David Wahl – W-A-H-L, I would like to have a map sent property address is [address]. Send that to [address]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13066

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: SHERRI PHILLIPS

Yes, I would like a print map. The name is Sherri Philips: S-H-E-R-R-I, last name P-H-I-L-L-I-P-S. Address [address]. Phone number is [phone]. I'd like a print out of the map please for the BPA power line. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13067

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: ANDREW D MASON

Hello, my name is Andrew Mason. I would like to request a map. I'm on Dial-up so I'm having trouble pulling this up real well, but my address is the address is specific to [address]. That's also the mailing

address. I was on the internet, it also mentioned about if we have questions about the placement for input from us I'd like to- I would like to speak to someone if I could. My phone number is [phone]. Thank you, bye.

Communication ID: 13068

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: ROCKY RUSSELL

My name is Rocky Russell. Address is [address]. I'm calling about section N could you please send it right out. I appreciate that. My phone number is [phone]. Thank you very much. Bye.

Communication ID: 13069

Date Received: 11/22/2010

Name: LAVERN DAHLIN

Yes, I'm concerned about the tower location in a new map that I can reach. I do not have access to the internet so I would appreciate very much a copy of the map. My name is Lavern L Dahlin D-A-H-L-I-N. Address [address]. Thank you very much. Bye bye.

Communication ID: 13070

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: ELIZABETH ZALPYS,ALGIRDAS ZALPYS

Hi. We would like to get a copy of your map. The updated map with the powerline information. Our property address is [address]. Our mailing address is [address]. Our names are Algird and Elizabeth. Algird is spelled A-L-G as in George-I-R-D as in David. We had gotten something before in the mail from you guys but somehow you morphed our names and our address happened to have with our my sister and brother in law which live in Camas, and they have a similar, same last name, and similar address. So I will just out of interest give you that address too. Their address is, it will take me just one second, it's William and Luana L-U-A-N-A, Zalpys same last name Z as in Zebra-A-L-P as in Peter-Y-S as in Sam. And their address is [address]. But if you could mail us one of those maps, that would be very helpful. Thank you very much, bye. Oh, and if you need to call me back my phone number is here in Vancouver, [phone]. Thank you, bye.

Communication ID: 13071

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: CURTIS E HUGHEY

Yes, I'd like the map. This is Curtis Hughey H-U-G-H-E-Y at [address]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13072

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: DICK FILION

Hello, my name is Dick Filion F as in Frank-I-L-I-O-N. My phone number is [phone] and I live in Battle Ground, Washington. My address is [address]. I'd like to have a print version of the map so that we can discuss- there's several of us that are kind of interested in it. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13073

Date Received: 11/22/2010

Name: GINA L ANDREWS

My name is Gina Andrews and I would like an updated map. I don't like that little black map you sent me at all. I don't even have a point or beginning to see where your [unintelligible] is going to and I'm a timberland owner and your [unintelligible] on Section 7 on mine too for a couple or several miles. And I would like an updated map please and we'll go from there. My name is Gina L Andrews, [Address] and I would really appreciate a really good map, an updated map, thank you very much. Bye bye.

Communication ID: 13074

Date Received: 11/22/2010

Name: DAVID G VIGNA SR

Yes, this is David G. Vigna Sr. My phone is [Phone number]. My mailing address [Address]. I would appreciate if you could send me a map of your recent locations on this power grid. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13075

Date Received: 11/22/2010

Name: MARILYN HAUZENBERGER

This is Marilyn Hauzenberger at [Phone] and I would like a call back regarding our property at [Address] and I ran a problem locating it in the map and if it is involved with the project. Please give me a call and let me know. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13076

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: ARDEN D UNGER

Hello, this is Arden and Joie Unger. Our address is [Address]. We would like more specific, a map if possible, perhaps you could give us a call here at [Phone number]. Since we do not have access to the internet, we would like a little more, a map that we could read. We appreciate anything you can do for us. Thank you so much, and hope to hear from you. Bye.

Communication ID: 13077

Date Received: 11/20/2010

Name: VANDI FISHER

Hi, my name is Vandi, V-A-N-D-I, Fisher, F-I-S-H-E-R, I would like to request an updated corridor map being mailed to me. My address is [Address]. Thank you. Bye.

Communication ID: 13078

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: MARGARET PALADENI

Thank you. I'm calling to get one of those maps for property owners, and where the line might possibly come across our land. Our address is [Address]. Name is H Pete Paladeni and Margaret and our phone number is [Phone number]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13079

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: TERRY SANBURG

My name is Terry Sanburg, and I would like a map of your proposed line location. My actual physical street address is [Address]. My mailing address is [Address]. Phone number is [Phone number]. Thank you very much, bye.

Communication ID: 13080

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: MONTE W MARTINSEN

Hi this is Monty Martinson, [Address]. I'd like any current maps or information regarding the revised right of way in my neighborhood. Thank you. Bye.

Communication ID: 13081

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: RICHARD OWEN

Yes, this is Mrs. Richard E. Owen. Our address is [Address]. We would like the updated map of the I-5 project, thank you. Bye.

Communication ID: 13082

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: WILLIAM J LEISTRITZ

Hi. Bill Leistriz. Address: [Address]. Two questions: Could you define what the notification buffer means, and also the right of way on 25/53, how wide is that and is there any thought of increasing that width. Thank you, goodbye.

Communication ID: 13083

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: WAYNE PARRIS TRUSTEE

This is Wayne Parris, and my address is [Address]. I would like to have a copy of your printed map which you indicate here in your pamphlet. Thank you very much.

Communication ID: 13084

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: ETHEL DITTMAN TRUSTEE

This is Ethel Dittman, [Address]. Will you please mail me a map of the I-5 Corridor project? I have a computer, but I'm 80 years old and honey, I really don't know how to use it. So I would like to have something in my hand. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13085

Date Received: 11/20/2010

Name: DOROTHY I MILLER

We would like a copy, a print copy, of a map of the project for I-5 corridor. The name is Art and Dorothy Miller, [Address]. Our telephone is [Phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13086

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: FRANK A FOURNIER

Yes, my name is Frank Fournier. My address where I live at is [Address]. This is pertaining to the power line which goes across the back of my property. I also have the properties adjacent to me, that's [Address]. That is three properties, because I have [House address] that is listed as a property, and it's got the same, [Address]. And that's zip code [Zip, City]. The previous two addresses were the same zip code. I have a piece of property, it's [Address]. My phone number is [Phone]. I've been getting some mail off and on and I have been down sick for about a year, off and on, off and on, and then I've been really down for over six months, and I'm still kind of recuperating and I have missed out on going to meetings and what have you, as far as this power line extension that's going to go on here, from Bonneville Power, and go to the east. Anyway, I don't have my paperwork with me, as such, I got this last one that was mailed to me, they give me a map here, and some total of information is a yellow line with a black dot. That's a proposed power location, and the line is yellow and it's got the number nine on it, and halfway through the yellow line there's a white square and it says "Proposed Power Locations" in the white one, and there is two more black....

[Message cut off]

Communication ID: 13087

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: LINDA MATTHEWS

Hi, My name is Linda Matthews and I'd like a printed copy of the map that tells where the power line towers will be. My name is Linda Matthews, and my property address is [Address]. My mailing address is the same. My phone number is [Phone number] if you need to get a hold of me, otherwise just send me a copy of the map where the towers are going to be because I don't have a computer. Thank you very much. Again my name is Linda Matthews.

Communication ID: 13088

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: CHARLES BATTEN

This is Charles Batten, [Address] and I would like a map of your proposed route for your electric lines. My phone is [Phone]. Thank you very much. Bye bye.

Communication ID: 13089

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: DENNIS MCCUNE

This is Dennis McCune. Phone number is [Phone number] and the address is [Address]. My question is what is the notification area on this proposed improvement, for updating the power lines? I'm curious and I would appreciate a call back. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13090

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: PHYLLIS SCHRODER

Hi my name is Phyllis Schroder, at [Address]. I would like a copy of that map, please. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13091

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: MAE USKOSKI

Yes, could you please send me that detail interactive map that shows the line running through Clark County, and Cowlitz County? My name is Mae Uskoski. My address is [Address]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13092

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: PHYLLIS WHITE TRUSTEE

I would like information sent to me. I'm Phyllis T. White, [address], and I live just about half a block from the green belt. I'm 83, I moved here in my house in 1960, planning to spend the rest of my life here, like about half of us on this street. So we're vitally interested in what might be affecting our property here. Thank you very much. My telephone number is [phone number].

Communication ID: 13093

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: LYLE DAUGHERTY

Yes, my name is Lyle Daugherty and my phone number is [Phone Number], and I'd like to get a map of the proposed new tower right of way and all that stuff, where you're gonna be putting in that 500 kV, but at any rate, my address is [address]. Thank you very much.

Communication ID: 13094

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: ELIZABETH L HAMILTON

Yes, I called just a little while ago and I forgot to give you my actual home address, which is [address]. This is Liz Hamilton. I'm the little short section 11, and I could be well avoided with F, so if I could get a copy of the map showing that area, where it joins up with G, H, I, J, and K. That would inform me as to where my property is in relation to this new line, F, which is what I hope goes through. Anyways, I'm

that little short segment of 11 that's still on here, on this other map. My phone number, area code, [phone number], and my mailing address is [address], and my home address is [address]. Please send me the latest copy of this tower map.

Communication ID: 13095

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: ELIZABETH L HAMILTON

Yes, this is Liz Hamilton, address is [Address]. I would like and appreciate a print out of this latest map because I do not do anything, I don't have a computer or any high tech technology regards to all that stuff. According to this little flyer I got in the mail, it says to call if I want one, so I would appreciate one. My phone number is area code [Phone]. This is Liz Hamilton, [Address]. Thank you very much. Bye now.

Communication ID: 13096

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: RODNEY DALE HAZEN

I would like a copy of the map that you've got showing the tower locations, etc. and my name is Rodney Hazen. Address, [address]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13097

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: THOM DENMAN

The address is [Address]and that's in Washington. I have a, what's called, a project update, I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project November 2010 and I'm looking for a map, a printed copy of a map to see where the existing right of ways are, or whatever you have as far as where these towers are going to go for this project or where you're going to go through. So it said to call and ask for the map, so that's what I'm doing. I guess that's all, last name is Denman. You already have us on your mailing list, so I just want a copy of the map, it says to call you if we ever need one. Buh bye.

Communication ID: 13098

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: BARBARA WRIGHT

Hello, my name is Barbara Wright, and my address is [address], and I would like to receive a current project map, and I would like to inform you that you send me two mailings each time, one to Lloyd Wright and Barbara Wright, and one to Barbara Wright. My husband Lloyd is passed away, so we need to discontinue the one mailing, I need the mailing, Barbara Wright. I don't understand the new proposal

at all. If it impacts my property, I am opposed to it. I am waiting to see what the interactive online map shows, but I don't have a computer, so I need to see a read out. Thank you very much!

Communication ID: 13099

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: GREGORY S KOLACEK

My name is Greg Kolacek, my physical address is [address], my mailing address is [address]. I would like to get an information packet sent to me. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13100

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: WESLEY DOWNING

Hi, our name is Wesley Downing and we're on Route 26 and our address is [Address] and we'd like the information on the preliminary location. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13101

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: ROGER D BLOOD

Hello, my name is Roger Blood and you sent me an update in the mail here on the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project. My address is [Address], and, my request is please don't send me this stuff anymore. All it does is get my blood pressure going. So, take me off your mailing list if you will please. Thank you. Bye.

Communication ID: 13102

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: ARTHUR STUBBS

Yes, my name is Art Stubbs, I live at [address]. My property backs up against your existing line. I'm on your mailing list, cause I receive your information here. I tried to go online to see the latest lines that you have put up, or your specific new power line map at www.bpa.gov/go/I/5, and all I get is that the web address entered cannot be found. Evidently, you're not up yet and running. I don't know, I don't understand, how I get to your website. You can call me at [phone number]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13103

Date Received: 11/20/2010

Name: RAND L ETUX CRANDALL

Hi, my name is Rand Crandall, I live at [Address] and I'm requesting a printed copy of the map so I can view the project. Once again my name is Rand Crandall, my mailing address is [Address] and I'm requesting a printed map of the latest proposals. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13104

Date Received: 11/20/2010

Name: LESTER GREAR

Please send a map to Lester Greear, [address]. Thank you, good bye.

Communication ID: 13105

Date Received: 11/20/2010

Name: GREGORY DUVIC

Hi, I'd like a site map of the power line route. My name is Greg Duvic. [address]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13106

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: CHERYL MCATEE

I'm calling to request a copy of the map, the current map, for the powerline. My name is Cheryl Mcatee. My address is [address] [phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13107

Date Received: 11/20/2010

Name: WENDY VANDENBERG

Hi, my name is Wendy Vandenberg. I live at [address]. My mailing address is [address]. My number is [phone number]. I would like to have information sent to me, I do not have internet access. I would like to have a copy of the preliminary design showing the tower and the right of way, and also the info on the new segment F and any other printed information you can send to me. I am obviously not very happy with this. If this goes through it affects myself, my daughter, my nephew, my brother in law, my mother in law, and numerous other family members that are all looking at basically being ousted from our homes. So I would like any information you can send to me. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13108

Date Received: 11/20/2010

Name: CINDY HALLETT

Hi, this is Cindy Hallett, at [phone number], and I would like an update on the map. I am on the mailing list. I live on [address], and that's in Kelso, WA. My question is, how soon would a person know when the routes are, I don't know, it might be too soon, will it be within a year, or, I'm just wondering about that. That was my major question. I have another question, which is, if they decide to use my land, do they necessarily have to take my home, or since I have 5 acres, could they just use partial part of my field. I'm just wondering, instead of taking my home, that way at least I could just stay here. And I know the pros and cons about the health hazards when it comes to the tower. Anyway, those are my two questions, and I'm hoping to hear back from you. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13110

Date Received: 11/20/2010

Name: KEIRA GALLAS

This is Keira Gallas. We're at [address]. Phone number [phone number]. We would like to have a map to see what the effect is going to be on our property.

Communication ID: 13111

Date Received: 11/20/2010

Name: JERRY ERICKSON

I would like, mailed to me, the information, on the I-5. Well, anyway. My name, Jerry Erickson, address [address]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13112

Date Received: 11/20/2010

Name: FRED SKUBE

This is Fred Skube. I tried the internet, I can't get on there, can't get you guys. You just don't respond. You just don't work. Anyways, I need you to send me a copy of whatever it is. My address is [address]. My mailing address is [address]. That's the only way you can mail me anything. My phone number at home is [phone number]. And please, if you people are going to come through there, send me a copy. If you're not, don't bother me no more with this stuff I have to think about. It's a serious thing, write me a letter. I need to know if you're coming through or not. If you're not, you're not. I don't want to be harassed by this any longer. You got my address, you got my mailing address, you got my phone number, send me a copy, do what you gotta do. Thank you, bye.

Communication ID: 13113

Date Received: 11/22/2010

Name: JOYCE DUTRO

This is Joyce Dutro. My mailing address [address]. My property is in Vancouver, and you've been sending me notices of what's going on, but now I would like to have the maps that you've advertised if I called this number. The new maps for the proposed lines will go, and I thank you very much. MY property is about 5 acres just off of 117th Ave in Vancouver, and 65th St goes through it. Mail it through my PO Box in Washougal, and thank you for the maps.

Communication ID: 13114

Date Received: 11/23/2010

Name: JAMES E ROBSON

My name is Jim Robson, my address is [Address]. What I'm interested in knowing is, if you can tell me where the towers are going to be. I understand a new line is going to go through my property and I would appreciate knowing where the towers are going to be if possible. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13115

Date Received: 11/23/2010

Name: ROBERT BACHELDER

This is Robert Bachelder [phone]. Address is [address]. It's on powerline 48. Pole 13 is on my property and I was just wondering if the green area on the new map came out right now is what would be required for the new line or if the area that's in the yellow check mark is what's in it. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13116

Date Received: 11/23/2010

Name: CHRIS LURAY

Hi, I'd like to request a print version of the current proposed transmission line and my name is Chris Luray. My address is [ADDRESS]. Telephone number is [PHONE]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13117

Date Received: 11/23/2010

Name: HOLLY KETTLETY

Hello, my name is Holly Kettlely. I'm at [address]. My phone number is [phone]. And my question is, you already have an easeway, you know, an easement in my property and if you take more property out, I

won't qualify for forestry, which means I'll have to pay a lot of backed taxes and I'm trying to figure out what you plan on doing with my particular piece of property. So if you could call me and let me know that, I'd appreciate that. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13118

Date Received: 11/23/2010

Name: WILLIAM SMITH

This is William R Smith [address] My phone is [phone]. I would like a call back. You sent, I received today your maps of locations and it shows our address with the little pink icon that shows where your location is and it's incorrect. It shows us south of Yacolt close to Parcel Avenue and we're actually I guess northwest of Yacolt on Garner Rd. And so, there seems to be some kind of a- we were on line 26 and none of the maps that has the pink icon of our location shows that correctly. I would like a call back. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13119

Date Received: 11/24/2010

Name: JAMES RELYEA

Yeah, this is Jim Relyea and I've called before at different times along the project way and left input but it seems like now you're narrowing it down to where we're going to be involved. My address is [address]. I would like a map. I'd also like somebody to call me and talk to me because I've seen the map online and been able to do it that way but I would like to talk to a real live person. I think BPA still has live people I hope. The property that I'm involved in is located at [address] Thank you, bye. Oh, my number is area code [phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13120

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: STEVE RAPALUS

Routes P and V impact a smaller group of people than the routes they replaced, but they impact those people significantly. You changed proposed routes after citizens complained. It looks like you moved to areas where you knew you would get "smaller" groups of angry people. That is not an honorable way to act. Route O is the only route that is reasonable. If it costs more, all the customers that use power should share in the cost. Don't put the sacrifice on the backs of those few that will live under the shadows of routes P and V.

Communication ID: 13121

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: J SCOTT RUSTAY

Proposed tower 25/89 appears to be right in front of our house. (There are some more open areas to the north and south.) In the final design stage we ask that BPA consider slight shifts in tower locations to reduce visual impacts to adjacent homes

Communication ID: 13122

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: SAMUEL J TILTON

We have been notified that we are in the immediate pathway of the lines. In lieu of the fact that we already have lines on our property, if these new lines are added, we have been told that BPA already has right of way based on contracts from decades ago-thus releasing them from any financial responsibility to compensate us for the the guaranteed loss of property value, let alone the intrusion of these lines not only into our property but also our lives. I would rather you pull eminent domain, use the muscle of the federal government and buy us all out at a fair market value as well as expenses for moving,etc. I do not believe that you represent the will of the people, nor do I believe you respect and value individuals, their right to own their property free of government interference. you will do what is in the best interest of BPA and other corporate interests involving powerful people far beyond the scope of common citizens. It is a farce, smoke screen that you are putting up to appease us, letting us feel that you are "Taking into consideration all possible options." I believe you truly have made up your minds and will proceed with the course that is the most direct route. If you can push aside homeowners with some pre-existing contract it releases you from culpability. You get your lines, Portland gets it's power, the powers at be are satisfied and the citizens who are most affected will once again be at the mercy of a government agency bent on it's own agenda. It is a farce to truly believe that you are working side by side with the citizens "In the corridor" Please simply do what you are going to do-stop trying to soft-sell it.

Communication ID: 13123

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: RAYMOND A SCHEIMER

Please drop the proposed Route P in favor of routes which will be furhter away from homes. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Communication ID: 13124

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: ROBERT A WINSOR

Does BPA put gates on their right of way. If the route enters Warehouse property would/could Warehouse install a gate to keep vehicles from their property - Thanks

Communication ID: 13125

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: DREW G ROTSCHY

I am very concerned about the proposed power line and tower on and through my property! I manage my property as a tree farm and I'm concerned about not being able to grow trees under the power lines. More disturbing than that, I have a million dollar view to the east from my house, and the proposed 30/2 tower is located in front of my face! Can the lines and tower be moved at least 300' east down hill and the tower be moved to one side of my view or the other? I'm not totally against this project, but a tower in front of my picture window is not what I care to look at. I would appreciate a visit to my home, so you can better understand my point of view. Can you PLEASE work with me on this!

Communication ID: 13126

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: DAVE SOCOLOFSKY,CINDY L TAYLOR

No one wants new higher towers near their property. Please locate any additional lines away from the more populated residential areas, especially other than the I-5 corridor. New larger BPA power lines close to residences very negatively impact home value, resident health, and quality of life. Thank you W. David Socolofsky

Communication ID: 13127

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: MARK SCOTT

I see that we are in what your interactive map calls the "notification buffer". We have not received any notification about the proposed project and would like to start. Thanks, Mark Scott

Communication ID: 13128

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: WALTER H YEAW

As a homeowner in the Stoney Meadows subdivision who property abutted the proposed NEW # 40 Line, we are very much against this proposed route for the new and higher power transmission towers. Currently we have 90 foot towers running to the NE of our property and do not feel it is necessary to create a new route for taller and larger towers directly behind our property. This route will not only

effect our already depressed real estate values, but studies exist that point to health issues stemming from High power lines. In addition these towers will have a negative effect on the quality-of-life and beautiful sub-division. It is somewhat understandable the need for transmission lines to better serve the power needs of SW Washington, but to go through this process, cost and effect on Washington property in order to better serve the power needs of California is something we are not in agreement. Since we already have power lines and towers in our "backyard", we are taking the position this time of "not in our backyard" again. We also realize that the BPA will end up doing whatever it wants to do and find numerous ways to "justify" their decision, however increase the size and location of the New route will directly effect our quality of life and we are STRONGLY against the proposed #40 route. Thank you for listening, Walter Yeaw Stoney Meadows Sub-division

Communication ID: 13129

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: STACY MILLER

Please locate any additional lines away from the more populated residential areas, especially other than the I-5 corridor. New larger BPA power lines close to houses negatively impact their values. They weren't here when we purchased and we don't want them near us now. You should find the least populated areas to place these towers to impact the fewest houses as possible.

Communication ID: 13130

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: MARY ANN WEISONG

No one wants new higher towers near their property. There must be somewhere else these towers can be located & additional lines that will be away from the more populated residential areas, especially other than the I-5 corridor. My property value has already diminished considerably due to the economy, homeowner don't need an additional issue that will negatively impact home value, resident health, and quality of life. Thank you

Communication ID: 13131

Date Received: 11/29/2010

Name: TRACY KLUTH

Concerning segment 40. This runs through a sensitive habitat and breeding grounds for ducks, geese, and many native birds. The impact would be devastating not only for wildlife but on private citizens who live in the immediate area and are raising children. The health impact alone is reason to move the line EAST through less populated areas. We are also concerned about decreasing property values. PLEASE listen to the community..move EAST.

Communication ID: 13132

Date Received: 11/20/2010

Name: DARYN CHAPMAN

November 20, 2010 I'm writing to express my concerns and strong opposition to the proposed location of the BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project high voltage lines as it relates to my property. Previously, I spoke with BPA representatives to express my concerns over the placement of the lines and was disappointed when the updated map was published that provided no consideration to my concerns. My property is tax parcel [Parcel] and is adversely effected by the proposed locations of towers 49/5, 49/6, 49/7, 49/8 and 49/9. My property has four estate home sites immediately to the north of the proposed tower locations. These are extraordinary sites with panoramic views of the Columbia George, Mt. Hood, Portland, and surrounding mountains and valleys are extremely rare and difficult to replace. The proposed high voltage lines will destroy these settings and have a dramatic negative impact on the entire property. The reality of the line placement is that no one, including myself, would want a million dollar estate lot that sits right on top of high voltage power lines. The lines would destroy the views and would prevent most people from wanting to purchase or live on a property that is immediately adjacent to the lines for health concerns that BPA denies but the general public clearly believes. Either way the value of these amazing estate settings are lost. I spent 10 years searching for an amazing acreage that is very close to town that offers such incredible views and setting to have my plans and hard work destroyed by BPA. I do understand that if the project goes forward that the lines must go somewhere and that ultimately hundreds of people will be adversely affected. If I end up being one of those people, I want to make it clear to BPA that what is being taken from me has extraordinary value well beyond typical land values due to the amazing setting, view, size and proximity to Portland. I don't believe that BPA's planning of the line locations fully considered this value or impact to my property. I ask that the lines not be run on my property and that this line segment be re-routed to preserve this amazing property. Regards, Daryn Chapman

Communication ID: 13133

Date Received: 11/20/2010

Name: LINDA R LOONEY

Looking at the interactive map I don't see why you couldn't go straight across at A that is where it ends on the map as far north as it shows and then go across until you'd be able to connect into G...eliminating F all together. There must be a better way to get these lines in with a whole lot less impact on the Gassman Road segment. Either give me enough money to buy my cottage at the beach or forget it!! I know you guys say....you wouldn't want these lines over your house but as we all know someone else would be okay until of course you ask them. Please reconsider getting away from the Gassman Road area. I beg of you, I moved here from Alaska six years ago and this was such a nice quiet place to live and now you want to take that all away. I know cry me a river...and I would if I could. But I'd much rather you found a route just a few short miles further north. Have a Great day and Happy Thanksgiving!!

Communication ID: 13134

Date Received: 11/20/2010

Name: DAVID CHERRINGTON

To whom it may concern, I previously have written BPA administrators regarding the property where my dream home was intended (F40 and F41). Your updated map confirms that if you choose route F you plan on going directly through the middle of both of these pieces of property (these pieces of property are jointly owned by me and my brother). I'm still definitely of the belief that the citizens of Washington should not have to take the brunt of this project. If the project is absolutely necessary then those who will benefit the most (not the citizens of Cowlitz County) should bare whatever expense is necessary to avoid harming citizens in an economically deprived area of the state where in many cases the only wealth people have is tied up in their property. As someone who has loyally served the state of Washington through thick and thin I would love to see the politicians of this state take a stronger stance on this project, however, if that does not happen I would hope that at the very least they see to it that this project harms the least amount of people as possible. As I stated in my letter to the BPA administrators I survived [description of medical condition] that I was diagnosed with at the age of 25 to enjoy the small legacy that my grandfather was able to pass down to me. In order to survive that disease, I was given somewhere in the ballpark of a million dollars of an experimental regimen of a new treatment. Luckily, I survived, and in the past year married my wife who also happens to be a [description of medical condition] survivor and has been a long time team captian of a successful relay for life team in the area. I am a direct descendant of the Huntingtons' who discovered Castle Rock and the greater Cowlitz County area and my wife's family has a long history of service in local politics in the Lewis County area. There are obviously a lot of people that want to see us succeed in life after what we've been through. Having your towers go through the middle of our dream property is heartbreaking. Although I believe you have better alternatives, if you must use route F I'm asking that you adjust your route in one of the following ways: 1) adjust your lines and towers to the far western property line of F40 and F41 so that the impact of your lines is shared by all property owners in the area, 2) adjust your lines to the far east of the F40 and F41 property line along Fir Lane road so that the impact of your lines are shared by other property owners in the area, or best case scenario 3) adjust your lines to the far east of your notification barrier in the segment where F40 and F41 are located which would impact the least amount of people all together. Thank you for your consideration. David Cherrington

Communication ID: 13136

Date Received: 11/20/2010

Name: JOHN PARSONS

The interactive map data leads one to believe the existing power line and tower (25/38) on our property is within the center of the existing 250' BPA easement. This of course you already know is not correct as the line and tower are along the western edge of the easement allowing room for expansion without the taking of more private lands. The proposed easement appears to seek a additional 250' on the western

easement line and a additional 300" or more on the eastern line. Why do you need a 800 to 1000foot wide easement for the addition of one more line? You already have adequate lines,easement areas that have yet to be utilized. Please advise.

Communication ID: 13137

Date Received: 11/21/2010

Name: DAN L CAMPBELL

The proposed power line on our property as shown in Section B, Map 32, would have a serious economic impact on our family forestry and wildlife businesses. The site is currently under long term litigation with BPA because of BPA damage to our property. Further BPA activity is expected to further impact our land and resources and increase environmental damage to wetlands

Communication ID: 13138

Date Received: 11/21/2010

Name: EDWARD H BERNDT,RENEE WALDEN

Please send us a map of our property with the proposed changes on it. We are having trouble seeing what is going on. My parents are Edward Berndt at [Address] Castle Rock. Thankyou.

Communication ID: 13139

Date Received: 11/21/2010

Name: PHILIP SHANTEAU

I own two properties on your Number 3 route, [Address]. As this proposed line will run just outside my 6 picture windows to my south, posing a serous health and safety risk, are you planning to buy me out? I also noticed that you have tower sights 3/8 and 3/7 just off my property. This proposed line will severely and adversely impact my property value. I built both houses on these properties. My intention was to retire in the log home. I had no intention of selling either home. The house on the [address1] property is less than 200 feet from the line and tower 3/7 were to go down and fell north anyone in that home ([Address] Hazel Dell Road) would be killed. I want you to buy me out at full market value! If you do not buy me out I do expect to receive compensation for the severe damages your line will do to my property value and I will sue to get it. Your line will make the [address2] property un-sellable and likely un-rentable. It will also be devastating on my plans for my retirement home, [Address3] Hazel Dell Road, that I designed and built. I personally lifted every log and drove every nail. Let it be known I will use every legal means to not be robbed and damaged by you. I further believe that each and every person who is impacted by this proposed line of BPA, and who is within a 1/4 mile range of this line should be bought out by BPA at fair market value, or a reasonable compensation must be given to the property

owners at the discretion of the property owner. Please respond to me at this address and e-mail. Philip Shanteau [Address] [email address]

Communication ID: 13140

Date Received: 11/22/2010

Name: PATTI HUBBARD,JAMES R HUBBARD

We have property that may be affected by the proposed BPA Corridor Reinforcement Project.

I tried to visit the map via the project homepage but the map that came up was for some other property.

I emailed my request but haven't received an answer.

Please send me a map that shows if our property is impacted by your current proposal. I am often not able to open PDF on my computer so that is not a good option.

James and Patricia Hubbard

Communication ID: 13141

Date Received: 11/24/2010

Name: JULIE A BOSTER

Hello, my name is Julie Boster. My street address is [address]. My mailing address is [address]. My phone number is [phone]. I'm calling to please receive a map. We do not have internet access at home and I'd really appreciate an updated version of the map. Thank you for your time and have a nice day.

Communication ID: 13142

Date Received: 11/24/2010

Name: JEANINE HENDRICKS

Hi, I would like a map sent to my home please of the current options for the new powerline. The name is Jeanine Hendricks [address]. Phone is [phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13143

Date Received: 11/22/2010

Name: CHRISTOPHER L CONGER

The latest newsletter arrived today and I see that the proposed line could still go behind my house and subdivision. I cannot believe that BPA would continue to consider installing these 500 kilovolt lines in

populated areas. These lines will represent significant health concerns and reduction in property values. In addition, any lines proposed to go near schools is irresponsible as there continues to be many unknown effects of EMF transmissions to the health of children. Does BPA really have zero concerns for public health? I understand that BPA is in business to make money, but there must be a line that cannot be crossed. Negatively affecting the lives and damaging private citizen's property value must be a line that you don't cross.

Communication ID: 13144

Date Received: 11/22/2010

Name: MICHELLE C CONGER

We are all aware of the negative impact these towers will have on so many levels. Health risks and decrease in property values being the top two for obvious reasons. For JUST ONCE can our elected officials put the well-being of human lives first and money at the bottom of the list. I'm tired of everything being about "business". You are messing with "real people" and it needs to stop. God help whomever passes this if it does go through and people end up sick, etc. I can only imagine with class action law suits that will knocking on your doors...that's when we will be all about business as well. Take some time and really ask yourselves how excited you would be about this if you lived in my house.

Communication ID: 13145

Date Received: 11/22/2010

Name: KENT IVEY

My address is in the Rosewood Gardens area just west and southwest of proposed line segment 40. I appreciate the opportunity to provide BPA with my input. I believe I speak for the entire Rosewood Gardens neighborhood with the following input: Proposed line segment 40 runs very much through an area that is basically ancient wetlands and is still a large migratory bird habitat. There are thousands of geese, ducks as well as raptor type birds such as hawks and eagles there. This line segment would be new while proposed line segment 41, which is perhaps a couple of miles further east, has moved largely away from the wide expanse of wetland area used by large bird migrations and seasonal habitat that segment 40 traverses. Line 41 comes down a hill NE of the wetland area mentioned and goes across Green Mountain Golf Course adjacent to an existing line. I believe that as more and more population dictates more power lines, which is evident by this whole project, it is imperative to keep lines confined to areas of existing lines whenever possible to minimize the widespread distribution of towers and lines. Line 41 at least keeps lines and towers out of the most notable migratory bird area and combines lines and towers for the sake of consolidation of facilities, etc. Thanks for your consideration.

Communication ID: 13146

Date Received: 11/22/2010

Name: DINO P ZEPPELELLA

EMF. Your publication does offer some insight on EMF, but you do skirt around any real details of it. You offer a link to read more about it, but that link does not respond. I have three small children and if I understand your map of the proposed line location, I will become the closet property next to your line segment. Can you provide real information on EMF and not your marketing information please. Thank You, Dino P. Zeppetella

Communication ID: 13147

Date Received: 11/22/2010

Name: RUSSELL SWIRE

What is the potential to run the new lines on the 51 stretch? It is very important we have some indication as soon as possible if we are going to be impacted. Please reply asap with a reasonable assesment for impacting our home. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13148

Date Received: 11/22/2010

Name: STEVE DOBBINS

The new power line would come just feet from my home if a route down the existing right of way #25 were to be used. This would negativly affect my personal property value and cutting the necessary buffer trees down on the right of way would put all of my existing trees in jeopardy of being subject to the SW wind. Once the buffer trees are gone my fir and cedar trees would not last one year! If these two reasons are not enough I am affraid of the physical harm the transmission lines would have on my families personal health being located so close. I know BPA has an existing right of way but that doesn't give them the right to negativly affet my property. Steve Dobbins

Communication ID: 13149

Date Received: 11/22/2010

Name: BRENT ROTSCHY

To Whom it may concern, My name is Brent Rotschy and I am affected by BPA's proposed Segment 30 which is proposed to cross my property. This is the first comment I have made on this new route question. I and my family own a rock quarry and live on our properties which would be adversely affected by the new proposed line. The Quarry was just recently permitted at tremendous expense with a long term amortization and aggregate supply of 40 to 60 years. The permitted resource is much larger than the currently developed area that shows up on current aerial photos. The power lines encroach dangerously close to the Quarry's current limits and cross future possible resource. The Quarry is the only real long term hard rock resource remaining in Clark County and has recently been approved as a

rare source of jetty material. It is currently supplying projects as far away as east Vancouver and up the Kalama river even in these times. It will undoubtedly soon be an important source for the Pacific coast jetties. My primary concerns are the dangers associated with the stray flyrock from blasting operations and the huge clouds of mineral dust from each blast. This poses an arcing hazard from the proposed lines not to mention inconvenience to BPA's customers from damaged lines or shortouts. For several decades the weekly blasting operations would continue at an elevation well above the proposed lines putting them at more than average risk of serious conflict. Electromagnetic fields would prohibit completely the use of electric detonators and I fear could hamper the use of future technology. I am unsure if quarry radio communication would be affected but is a safety concern. At the very least the lines could drive production cost up significantly - especially if one considers that market area is exponentially decreased as the market radius is diminished by even slight increase in production costs of a few cent per ton. This not only has serious economic impacts to me of course, but also to the public as a consumer of aggregates. Of course any towers that may be situated upon valuable resource is not in mine nor the public's interests either. Also on my land is a major telecommunications site with all of the cellular phone providers and a 911 tower with many different users and collocates, many of which have small microwave paths aiming here and there. I am not sure of all of the potential adverse affects, if any, that a close power line may cause, but I trust that BPA seriously studies and factors in its true cost analysis any known impacts. We of course would much rather not live next to power lines for all of the typical reasons too, of which I need not enumerate as you have already heard them all before from others. These are only a few of the reasons I would suggest abandoning Segment 30. As I am also a general excavation and utility contractor very familiar with cost estimates, I would think that locating the line to the east on timber and State lands would definitely be in the best interests of everyone and at the lowest real cost. Indeed, I heretofore have been so sure that eventually the line will be built there that I have not bothered yet to even put in my two bits, expecting Segment 30 to have already been abandoned. Thanks for your consideration. Brent Rotschy

Communication ID: 13150

Date Received: 11/22/2010

Name: DARRYL T RODEBACK

My wife & I Live at [Address] And from the looks of the map f-17 & f-18 you will be looking at having a right of way in the S.W corner of our land ! This is where our well is located ! Will you have to move the fence and the well or will you be able to leave them ? If we could have someone come out and look and tell us what the plan is that would be great ! Also if you look at the line you have from f-16 tower to f-18 tower f-17 tower go's North about 50ft more than the other two towers ! Is ther maybe a way you can line the f-17 tower up with the other two by moving it back 25 to 50ft to miss our well and fence then everything would be straight !? Just a thought Thanks for your time ! Happy Thanksgiving and Marry Christmas To you !!!! Darryl & Jill Rodeback

Communication ID: 13151

Date Received: 11/24/2010

Name: JARED W PAINE

I own property on the southern end of proposed segment K. Additionally, I hold an environmental science degree from Washington State University. I am concerned that the route segment right of way between k/88 and k/89 will adversely impact the four season creek that originates in the small lake immediately adjacent to the right of way. This creek is small, however it supports a healthy trout population and the portion of the creek on my land is home to several beavers. The right of way crosses the point where water flows from the lake into the creek. I am concerned the the right of way may interrupt the flow of water from the lake or negatively impact the quality or quantity of water flowing in the creek. There is a distinct possibility that heavy equipment used in this area could disrupt this fragile ecosystem.

Communication ID: 13152

Date Received: 11/24/2010

Name: JARED W PAINE

I own land immediately adjacent to proposed segment k/88 - k/90. The siting of this segment will have a significant negative impact on the economic and aesthetic value of this property and those nearby. The proposed segment runs along the peak of the steep ridgeline that dominates the view to the east. If the segment was sited further to the east, toward Yale dam it would be less obtrusive and have a much smaller impact on the value of the large number of view parcels in the area. Moving the segment further to the east would also minimize impact on sensitive wetland ecosystems in the k/88 - k90 area.

Communication ID: 13153

Date Received: 11/26/2010

Name: DAVID DAWSON

Route P now impacts many families over the cancelled routes further east. Please remove route P from consideration, and move the power lines further east where any impact would away from people, be shared at low level by the people of Washington on remote public, recreational and national lands. The EM fields, under constant exposure create health hazards, most notably childhood cancers. As such, it's BPA's responsibility to mitigate these effects by locating the lines in the most remote location possible.

Communication ID: 13154

Date Received: 11/26/2010

Name: MIKE R HAYDEN

We are a group of mostly retired citizens looking for a place to ride our ATV's We have about 10% of our members are diaabled and a lot of them are vets. With the closing of all the public lands we would like to make and maintain a ATV trail along the power lines. WE would do out own policing of the area and

keep it clean and make sure there is no damage to the roads or area with an eyes in the woods type approach. Our ATV's have given us a new life in being able to get out and see nature and areas that we cannot walk to. We hope to be able to make a legal place to ride and enjoy. thanks Mike

Communication ID: 13155

Date Received: 11/26/2010

Name: ORVILLE D ESTEB

I'd just like to say shame on you for not running the easterly most line through DNR ground instead of our private lands . If you'd of moved it a mile to the east it would have been on public ground , you know the DNR is a public entity , and not impacted all of us private land owners . Bureaucrats looking after Bureaucrats I guess . I , and my neighbors plan to fight your location off public lands all the way to the supreme court if needed . Shame on you .

Communication ID: 13156

Date Received: 11/28/2010

Name: JOHN PAUL TUININGA

John P Tuininga [Address] November 28, 2010 Dear BPA: I am writing to express our concern about BPA's proposed Line 30 and P in the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project and the pending decision to acquire Right-of-Way along our subdivision. Our subdivision is located east of Battle Ground and is adjacent to DNR land. Needless to say it is a very pristine area with many view lots of both the Yacolt National Forest and the valley below. The thought of BPA erecting main transmission lines through this area is very alarming to the homeowners. BPA has placed the lines and towers on DNR land adjacent to private land and along some of the most expensive subdivisions in Clark County. The fact of the matter is that nobody up here wants the power lines or substations anywhere near our area, for many reasons. The erection of transmission lines would directly affect home and property values for the worse. I have had a comparable property study done by a realtor and it could drop our home and property values by \$100,000 or more. In fact it has affected our home values already. There are the health effects but also it can affect household electronics. Nobody wants to hear the ever present hum and snap of high voltage lines adjacent to their house. Scientists have mixed opinions on the effects of EMF and what it can do to people and livestock; however there are cases where it is believed it has had a detrimental effect. I personally know the effects of the power lines because I have worked around them. I am not going out to my truck each morning to get shocked nor have all my household electronics corrupted so they can reinforce the grid for California or Oregon. Line P does have many obstacles that are in front of it. You will be crossing wetlands that are close to me and they are fish bearing. Security will be an issue because it will be behind DNR locked gates. I do not want my property or others subject to trespassers. DNR prefers line O because of this reason and others. Our homeowners live here for many of the same reasons, the views, rural surroundings, peace and quiet, and to make a better life for our families to be raised. The proposed Line 30 and P directly affect our way of life and we will not sit idle while BPA

attempts to jeopardize this. The BPA Line 30 and P proposed Right-of-Way is rather large and it is unclear how it was ascertained. If you do choose line P it would be very easy to shift the alignment another 500 feet or further East along the Eastern proposed Right-of-Way. Starting at tower P1 through P7 and still maintain your alignment. Get it away from our homes. BPA has other routes they could use to construct transmission lines that would have less impact on people. Line O is unpopulated and on open DNR land, DNR likes this route. As the area keeps growing this would put your lines out of the area and it would no longer be a concern. Please choose line O. I thank you for your time and I am looking forward to your response. Sincerely, John Tuininga President Kaskillah Road Association

Communication ID: 13157

Date Received: 11/26/2010

Name: WILLIAM JOHN GUITTEAU

Yes, hello. My name is William Guitteau and I have a parcel number in the Rose Valley area of [Parcel]. I would like to obtain any current maps of your proposed plan at the address of [Address]. Thank you very much.

Communication ID: 13158

Date Received: 11/21/2010

Name: KENNETH KRAISLER

Subject: select segment O now and release those of us on segment 30 / P and V now

Mark:

Your decision to put power lines along populated areas is unacceptable and not necessary. Your decision to not release properties no longer affected is also completely unacceptable and also not necessary. You have viable options along segment O. You have no reason to place power lines near individual homes as you are wrongly doing along segment 30, segment P and segment V.

Sincerely

Ken Kraisler

[address]

Communication ID: 13159

Date Received: 11/18/2010

Name: JAMES S GRUHER

Mark,

My name is Jim Gruher and I reside at [address]. My phone number is [phone number]

I am writing to you because our property is impacted by one of the proposed route segments for the new power line. We are located on route segment 41/45. I have reviewed the updated map which shows tower locations and expanded right of ways. I have many specific questions about the project especially considerations regarding the desirability of routes 41/45 and tower locations.

I would like to come to the BPA offices and meet with you and/or a project engineer to discuss my questions and to find out more information. I have attended many local meetings but would prefer a one-on-one if that is possible. I realize you are all very busy but I think I would need only 30 minutes with the right person. This is a huge potential impact to my property and family so please take this request seriously.

Please let me know if this is possible and, if so, whom I should contact to arrange a meeting.

Thank you,

Jim Gruher

Communication ID: 13160

Date Received: 11/18/2010

Name: TESSIE M CHERRINGTON

ORIGINAL COMMUNICATION---

Hi Mark,

I met you at the Castle Rock meeting a few weeks ago. My husband and I own the property off Firlane that is next to your friends. First of all, I do want to thank you for being so professional. I'm sure that this project has you under a lot of stress and I appreciate your sincerity. With that being said, I've just taken a look at the new proposed tower locations and see that we have two on our property and that the line will basically cut our property in half. I know that the final decision is not up to you, but is up to Steve Wright. Do you have any advice on how to stop or change this? What would you do if this was your family being affected? I'm thankful that we have not built our dream home yet and feel horrible for those that have worked so hard for theirs. My husband and I have worked very hard for what we have. His parents have appreciated how hard we have worked and wanted to reward us early. To do that, they gave each of their children some land so that they could watch them build a house and enjoy it. We've known for several years that they were going to give us the land, but they just signed it over this year. One month later, they received the paperwork about the new proposed route. We have the land cleared for a house, there is already a septic system in place, and a beautiful orchard that my husband's father planted years ago. Our children have helped us work up their, thinking that someday that will be where they will live. I'm literally sickened over this whole thing. Any advice would be appreciated

Thanks,

Tessie M. Cherrington

---RESPONSE TO MARK---

Sent: Friday, November 19, 2010 6:49 PM

Hi Mark,

The structure numbers are f40 and f41.

What would the odds be of moving the towers further North? If you moved the towers to basically where the yellow lines are now and went behind the houses on Firlane Rd, less homes would be affected. Just a suggestion:)

Tessie M. Cherrington

Communication ID: 13161

Date Received: 11/27/2010

Name: TIFFANY NEWTON

Hi there, my name is Tiffany Newton and we want to get information about what's going on with the I-5 Corridor Project. Our address is [Address] and that's [Address]. We would like to question about what the maps mean, if someone could call us back, it's [Phone], that would be great. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13162

Date Received: 11/18/2010

Name: CHARLES PACE

Subject: Animals and plants affected by locations

BPA's responsibility for impacts of the I-5 corridor project on plants, fish and wildlife that are listed under the Endangered Species Act, and other "sensitive" species that are not yet listed is required by law, and the agency is willfully and flagrantly failing to conduct

its activities in accord with law. Soliciting "input" from

individual landowners as to their awareness of sensitive plants and animals in the area of the proposed tower locations is a waste of resources. The agency knows what it needs to do to comply with the environmental laws, but it refuses to do so. This puts all investments in energy infrastructure at risk. BPA is not above the law. The agency must initiate formal consultation with USFWS and NMFS on all aspects of its marketing and transmission activities.

Communication ID: 13163

Date Received: 11/18/2010

Name: WILLIAM HUYETTE

Mark: I have received the latest mapping on the project and was disappointed to see that in map area 37, specifically 37/3 and 37/2, that no consideration was given to moving the line to the South to avoid impacting all the homes along N.E. 48th Cir. I may be misreading the mapping, so if I am, please call me. Thanks....Bill Huyette

Communication ID: 13164

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: ALAN C HULL

Your Project Update flier arrived today with instructions on accessing your interactive map.

First Problem: The online address as printed is www.bpa.gov/go/i-5. However, that address does not take you to your site that provides access to the map. Further computer investigation shows the actual address is www.bpa.gov/go/i5. It has NO dash between i and 5.

Second problem: My address is [address]. The search engine initially takes my computer right to the actual location. Good. Type in address of 5800 Rose Valley Road and it takes the computer right to somewhere around the 4200 block. BAD. Type in the address of [address] again and it takes the computer right to somewhere around 4900 block on Rose Valley. BAD. Each time it shows a different proposed corridor. BAD. The locations that your program takes our computers to, vary around one-half to one mile from the actual locations. VERY BAD.

NOW JUST WHERE IS THIS PROPOSED CORRIDOR(S) SUPPOSED TO BE LOCATED IN RELATIONSHIP TO OUR ADDRESSES?? We cannot find out since your program takes us all over the map somewhere in the vicinity of a mile radius of an arbitrary point on the map. It appears you must be using "Google Maps" since it is well known that out here in the eastern section of Rose Valley, all GPS programs take UPS, USPS, and FedEx delivery trucks to unknown locations instead of to an actual mapped location. That is why residents out here make sure our mailboxes have very large addresses printed on them so people can find us. WHY CAN'T YOU FIND US?

Concerned,

Alan Hull

Communication ID: 13165

Date Received: 11/29/2010

Name: RONALD L ORLOSKE, JUDITH L ORLOSKE

Yes, I would be interested in having the latest printed map. I do not have email and I am on your mailing list, Ronald Orloske. Our mailing address is [Address]. I would like to have the map of, that includes four lots on Sugar Pine Road, which on the map that I seen, you are calling it, it is misnamed. You have Jack Pine. You have it listed as Jack Pine Road and it's Sugar Pine Road. The four addresses that we have on there, [Address], which is also in Ariel. And also, I would like to know if there is any map that is concerning North Dubois Road, if there is anything that is also going that direction. I'm referring to your latest project update where it says that we could get, that you would send us a map, seeing as we are not online and have no other way to get one except through you. And we do appreciate getting your project updates. And again that is for Ronald and Judith Orloske, [Address]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13166

Date Received: 11/21/2010

Name: LARRY C HILLS

Sirs.

Thank you for finally giving us a usable expose on your plans via www.bpa.gov/go/i-5.

In addition to concerns about silt run-off into fish-bearing Cedar Creek as a result of clearing your ROW on steep terrain, there are other concerns we have:

We are patently opposed to allowing your project to transit our property. Rashford Tree Farm owns a specific parcel at [parcel] that is within your proposed rounting M/26. This property is an ongoing commercial tree farm and we feel the placement of your proposed power line would disrupt our current operations and open up the property to recreational users via the cleared right-of-way. Pilfering of firewood and commercial trees would surely ensue, but our biggest fear is fire caused by trespassers emboldened by your right-of-way.

Also, would you please explain who and how the ownership/harvesting rights to the timber on the proposed ROW are theoretically handled?

Thank you.

LARRY C. HILLS

President

Rashford Tree Farms

Communication ID: 13167

Date Received: 11/21/2010

Name: DAVE COWAN

As a Stoney Meadows resident I am opposed to the proposed power I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project. These lines will encroach on sensitive environmental areas as well as residential neighborhoods. State land is available for your proposed project that would not impact private property and private property values. I encourage you to reevaluate the proposed lines that run thru our neighborhood.

Dave Cowan
Mill Machinery LLC
[phone number]
[email]

www.millmachinery.net

Communication ID: 13168

Date Received: 11/22/2010

Name: CHARLES PACE

Ms. Asgharian,

Thank you for your response. Please understand that the agency's responsibilities under ESA (and other environmental laws) require much more than a coordinated review. BPA must consult with NMFS and with the USFWS regarding the full range of its activities. It cannot dispose of its obligations by committing ratepayer funds for the purpose of securing affirmation of adequacy and forbearance from a handful of tribes. It cannot dispose of its obligations by adopting a "relational analysis" wherein it shifts responsibility for compliance with ESA etc. onto purchasers of the power that BPA markets and transmits. The agency's failure in this respect are attributable directly to the Administrator's mistaken view of the discretion he has under law, which is much more limited than the agency recognizes. Unfortunately, this situation has progressed from a failure to comply with ESA to something far worse, i.e., racketeering, bribery, fraud and extortion. This places the agency and the basin at risk. That risk, however, is self-inflicted. What is necessary to restore integrity to the basin's fish and wildlife program and energy plan is for the Administrator and high-level officials in BPA who have knowingly supported and engaged in this continuing criminal behavior to resign. The fact that BPA is not above the law will, hopefully, be brought home in the litigation over the biological opinion for the FCRPS. For example, when Judge Redden speaks of "breathing longevity" into the deal struck between the Administrator and a handful of tribes and states, he is using the language of conspiracy, fraud, and interference with interstate commerce. It is important to deal with this criminal behavior prior to proceeding with investments in energy infrastructure. My hope is that the agency will "get it right" and "do what needs to be done." It cannot do that with the leadership that is presently in place.

Regards,

Charles Pace

Communication ID: 13169

Date Received: 11/29/2010

Name: FREDRIC C KRAUSE

My name is Fredric C Krause. To start with, the spelling of my name is incorrect, there is no 'K' on the back of my first name. Also, I need to have my mailing address changed. I do not have a mailbox on my property and I receive my mail at [Address]. That's all I have to say, so if someone could implement these changes.

Excuse me, I think I must have made a mistake in my PO BOX. It's [Address]. Thanks for your help and if you want to call me about this the phone number is [Phone]. Thanks.

Communication ID: 13170

Date Received: 11/23/2010

Name: JOYCE BOLES

ORIGINAL MESSAGE---

This is my fifth call and I haven't been able to reach a live person and no one ever calls me back.

---RESPONSE AFTER MARYAM CALLED HER BACK---

You are invisible in Clark County, no one knows who you are. You need a telephone listing in Clark County and need billboards as well, to actively solicit public input.

Instead of putting up towers, run the lines underground, under the river (like the Portland big pipe project). Underground would be safer as well, protected from terrorism.

It would be obviously cheaper to build and maintain underground. It can't cost more.

Communication ID: 13171

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: PATTI OLSON

Dear Mr. Driessen;

I doubt that you remember me, but we spoke at length at the last BPA meeting at the Amboy school. We were talking about the fact that your cutting trees, specifically referring to those that will lay outside your dedicated 150 easement, would remove the visual barrier that exists between our home of 30 years, and your proposed K-line towers. At that time, you said, "Well, we would of course leave the trees, if we could, to screen your house from view of the towers." Or words very much to that effect; I may have a word or two wrong. And I replied, "Oh, so you mean you are not heartless monsters?" and you said, "Well, we try not to be!", or similar.

While I am relieved that the K-line, as proposed, does not come onto our home property, I do not see how you can run the right-of-way directly down our property line without planning on cutting many of our huge fir trees. These trees have been here since the Yacolt burn and are from 180 to 200 feet tall. The area is also densely interspersed with large old-growth snags, obviously heavily inhabited. The main stand of fir trees stands directly between our house and your tentative tower location. I hope you will consider moving the right-of-way at tower K-84 100 or so feet further to the west of the property line. It is hard on the neighbors, but...they don't live there!!! If you cut down our trees along the crest of that hill, every time we set foot out of our back door, about 15 times a day, the first thing we are going to see is your horrendous tower.

I hope you will seriously consider this issue. I realize our legal options are limited, if widespread cutting of nearly old-growth adjacent fir trees falls under your 'eminent domain' seizure plans, but we will fight with every tool at our disposal to prevent you from destroying the serenity of our long-time home, especially since a better option is so readily available. While we have not allowed, and will not allow, indiscriminate access to our property, we would be happy to look at the site, specifically of tower K-84, with you or another responsible representative (not a survey/brushing crew!) and go over the issues. With appointment.

If you could give me any encouragement regarding this issue, as you did do at the Amboy meeting, it would be immensely appreciated. If not, please state that, also, so we can begin our defense. It is only fair.

Sincerely, Patti Olson

Communication ID: 13172

Date Received: 11/29/2010

Name: JAMES RELYEA

Yes this is Jim Relyea, my home address, you already send me, I'm already on your mailing list a couple time you've sent me a couple deals each time. But my business address that's affected is [Address]I think. I need to meet with somebody and see what's going on because this is my retirement project that pays for my retirement and it looks like you're going to wipe it out. I just need some reassurance, I need to know what's going on, I need to meet with somebody. I'm getting a little frustrated, this is the third call I've left and haven't got any response. My call back number is [Phone]. Thank you much, bye.

Communication ID: 13173

Date Received: 11/29/2010

Name: JAMES RELYEA

Yes this is Jim Relyea, this is about the 4th or 5th time I've called and I went in to BP trying to find something out in there, but I couldn't get through the red tape or all the people, couldn't even find

somebody to talk to. I need somebody to talk to and tell me what's going on on my property and my property that's involved is located at [Address], now they sent me some maps to my home address with question marks on it and a whole bunch of diddy stuff. But you're supposed to know who I am, I've been in there and I've talked to you people before, but you said you couldn't talk to me because you hadn't made up the decision on where the line was going to go. But now that you've made up the decision you wont talk to me now, I'm really frustrated. My address, you got it, you sent me stuff, so it's all wrong. My phone is [Phone]. All I need is a name of somebody I can talk to, somebody who knows something, and somebody who can give me information on what's going to happen on my property. I don't care about everybody elses property, they can work out there own. My next call is going to be to a lawyer. Please give me a call back, thank you.

Communication ID: 13174

Date Received: 11/29/2010

Name: PATTY COLSON

Hi my name is Patty Colson. The property doesn't have an actual address as their land and my address to mail it to. This probably isn't going to work.

Communication ID: 13175

Date Received: 11/22/2010

Name: WILLIAM B BANGS

William Bangs left a message on the official I-5 phone on 11/9/10 requesting updates on any information on the project before he makes any improvements to his property. He said this involves his parcel numbers: [parcel numbers].

Communication ID: 13189

Date Received: 11/30/2010

Name: KATHY DELL,KEN DELL

Hi, my name is Kathy and Ken Dell. Our address is [address] and it is in the subdivision that is in question. We have the home rented out at this time. Our address to mail us a map if we could have an update on if it is in the line of your development- it's important information to us. Our (mailing) address where we are at is Ken and Kathy Dell [mailing address]. And it would be great if we just know whether we are still in the process of being considered as a home that might be in the way. So, thank you very much.

Communication ID: 13190

Date Received: 11/30/2010

Name: LEONARD R KREBS

Yes, this is Leonard Krebs. My address is [Address] and I got a letter stating that you would send out specific information on where the towers are going to go and I was just wondering if you could send me that information. I'm curious if one tower will be going on my property or not. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13191

Date Received: 11/30/2010

Name: BARBARA EICKNER

Hello, this is Barbara Eickner with Kwik Center LLC. Previously we have received a letter from BPA stating that our property is not included in their route segment for proposed line. However, just recently, I got the November 20, 2010 project update in the mail and I'm not sure why I got the project update. Is it automatically sent to everyone, even to those people who have been formally notified by letter that their property is no longer subject to the plan, or, I'm a little confused on this. I just need a little clarification, should I file this away or keep it or what? Call me back at [Phone]. Thank you, goodbye.

Communication ID: 13192

Date Received: 11/30/2010

Name: JAMES M KELLY

My name is Jim Kelly, the address is [Address]. Please send me a copy of the latest map as to how this tower thing is going to affect my property. Send it to [Address]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13193

Date Received: 11/30/2010

Name: LARRY D MCCOY

12:40 p.m.

Yes, I would like to receive a print copy of the new map and it should be sent to [Address] and both addresses are the same for the property and mailing address and the name is Larry McCoy. Thank you very much.

12:41 p.m.

Yes, I would like to request a current copy of the map. I left another message but forgot to include my town. It should be mailed to Larry McCoy, the property address and the mailing address are the same, it's [address]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13195

Date Received: 11/30/2010

Name: PAT BRISTER

This is Pat Brister, address is [Address] and we went online and there's no way that we can tell, we live in Ostrander and we were unable to attend the meetings that you have had but we would like a detailed map of where it's projected to go in Ostrander. On your map we can't tell if it's going to be on our property so I appreciate a letter in the mail or a picture or some definition. Have a good day, bye.

Communication ID: 13196

Date Received: 11/26/2010

Name: ERNA SARASOHN

Subject: Homeowners questions

Maryam,

I received several questions from a homeowner and I was able to answer all but two. If this is within your area of expertise, I will appreciate your help. If you don't have the answers to the questions, please just let me know and I will search elsewhere.

1. Do we know of existing 500kv lines in populated areas? If yes, how recently were they installed? Also, were they put up in existing communities or were the communities built after the lines and towers were up?
2. Do we know of state laws in other states that prohibit high voltage lines in populated areas?

Maryam, I understand 26 states will not allow the lines within specific distances of schools but I am not sure if there are regulations re communities.

Thank you Maryam--I hope you had a splendid Thanksgiving with a lot of gingerbread men.

Erna

Communication ID: 13198

Date Received: 11/30/2010

Name: HOWARD D LOCKWOOD

Dear BPA, We have owned this property and adjacent property for over 20 years. We spent a great part of our life planning, designing, researching, working with an architect, and building our dream home on this property. We actually started planting trees and other landscape five years in advance of building this home. It took us three years to build our home, and we did a lot of the work ourselves. We had the architect design the house to best block out the views of the power lines as they presently exist. With all

this planning, and blood, sweat, and tears invested into our home it is devastating to have to worry at this point that this huge eye-sore may be placed in our front yard! We already have absorbed a property assesment devaluation from a high of around \$1.2 million, to now around \$850,000 due to the collapse in the housing market. The collapse in the market was unavoidable. The placement of these lines is a choice. There is no question that adding the new power lines in our front yard will futher devaluate our home and property. Is BPA going to compensate for this? Sincerely, Howard Lockwood

Communication ID: 13199

Date Received: 11/30/2010

Name: KERI L LIGHTFOOT

My husband Doug and I are against this proposed project - in particular we are opposed to Route P. We request Route P at minimum be dropped from the options but would prefer this entire project be dropped altogether in SW Washington. We wonder - Why isn't this being proposed instead in Oregon?

Communication ID: 13200

Date Received: 11/30/2010

Name: SUZANNE R HENDRICKSON

To whom it may concern, It is my opinion that you have your mind made up on this project already. There is a tower behind my house and my neighbors house. There are empty acres also. It is my opinion that if you insist in putting a larger monstrosity behind our homes, you should locate it farther back into the empty land and not so close to our homes. Please take this into consideration. You would not want a 500-kilovolt next to your own home by your children and family. Thank you. Suzanne Hendrickson

Communication ID: 13201

Date Received: 12/1/2010

Name: MARSHA CANNADY

This is Marsha Cannady, property owner of [ADDRESS]. We would like to have a copy of the project map please. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13202

Date Received: 12/1/2010

Name: LYLE DAUGHERTY

Yes this is Lyle Daugherty calling. I'm already on your mailing format. My address is [address]. My home phone number is [phone]. My questions are I got the map you sent me. What's really irritating to me, if I read this thing right, you're going to use your existing power line which is next door to us. I mean, we

boarder the highlight. So, because of the recession we've lost almost half of our property value. Now you want us to lose another hundred thousand dollars, and the big thing is, who would even think about buying the house? If this is the format that you're going to use for the line, is the existing line, why you would take and devalue our property when you can go through and take down trees in a national forest. Yeah, there's a lot of tree huggers out there, environmentalists that don't want you to do that, but that's not devaluing the forest. It's not taking money out of people who have worked hard to pay for their homes and then you're going to take that away. That's like throwing money into a fire and burning it. I mean, you get money and you try to build something with this here, so you have a savings or whatever for later on in life, and then somebody like you people come and take it away. To me, that's not right. Anyway, so that's all my comments on this, but the main thing is I want to know, the question is, are you going to run this new power thing on the same lines that are existing? Which is next door to our property. That's my question. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13203

Date Received: 12/1/2010

Name: JANIS L SIMONEN

Yeah, I don't have a computer. I've got two properties: One's at [address]. And, the other one's at [address]. And I would like your map to find out if you're planning on destroying either of those properties. Thank you very much. Bye.

Communication ID: 13204

Date Received: 12/1/2010

Name: EILEEN P GEORGE

Yes, I would like, the homeowner, a new map of the proposed project up in Castle Rock here. Eileen George, my husband's Jack George at [address]. I only have a dial-up computer so I am unable to get your maps very well on my computer. I guess that's it. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13205

Date Received: 11/19/2010

Name: ETHEL DITTMAN TRUSTEE

Sirs:

I called 800 230 6593 but instead of my being able to leave a message the woman just hung up.

So...

Please send me a printed update what you have available.

I am only one block from the proposed new line.

Ethel Dittman

Communication ID: 13206

Date Received: 12/1/2010

Name: WILLIAM JACKSON

My address is [address]

Communication ID: 13207

Date Received: 12/2/2010

Name: M. ANDERSON

Name is M. Anderson. Address is [address] and that's the same for both the addresses.

Communication ID: 13208

Date Received: 12/2/2010

Name: SUSAN M HANSEN

Hi my name is Suzie Hansen. I have one of the proposed property, you know, the route, and you're coming right through my property. I really need to speak to someone about this. My address is [address]. My number is [phone]. If you could please give me a call back ASAP I'd appreciate it. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13209

Date Received: 12/2/2010

Name: TERRY DAVIS

Yes, my name is Terry Davis and my address is [address]. And I am requesting a copy of your new map. I do not have internet access and I fear the project may affect my daughter. I will probably dial this number at a later time to ask some questions as to where your little stations are going over in the Washougal area. My telephone number is area code [phone]. Please call me if there's any problem with shipping me that map. I'd appreciate it as soon as possible. I do have a map that I might be able to overlay and my strong suggestion is that you print that map where it's crossing on various main streets so people can understand where it's coming down to, specifically the furthest one over to the east. Anyway, that is my suggestion so that people can look it up and be able to comment more exactly how it will affect them. I'm sure that you've contacted some of the people up in the Yacolt area and everything else but I'm curious where you're coming down in the Washougal/Camas area. Again, please send me

the map and especially if you have a copy of the map that shows basic streets overlaid on your proposed routes. Please send that to me as soon as possible. Thank you very much. Have a good day.

Communication ID: 13212

Date Received: 11/22/2010

Name: SHLOMO HANDELI

To: BPA I-5 corridor reinforcement project manager,

The Western Yacolt Burn State Forest provides recreation opportunities to two million people living within a 45 minutes drive, a population expected to increase significantly in the next decade. Silver Star Mountain borders the Yacolt Burn State Forest and is the star attraction for many outdoor enthusiasts.

The proposed construction of a high power transmission line segment "O" just west of Silver Star Mountain would permanently damage those recreation opportunities for the communities of SW Washington for generations to come.

The 150 ft. high towers and clear-cut right-of-way will spoil one of the most spectacular views in the area, invite the illegal dumping, ORV incursions and vandalism that are often attracted to such openings in the landscape. Also, the proposed power line would cross the Chinook Trail, the Tarbell Trail and several proposed trails that are included in the newly approved Western Yacolt Burn Recreation Plan.

Please construct the power transmission line away from the Western Yacolt Burn State Forest to preserve our pristine environment.

All the best,

Shlomo Handeli
[address]

Communication ID: 13213

Date Received: 12/1/2010

Name: DEBRA PRENTICE-THORNLEY

Please search your November 2010 interactive map for our address, [address]. Our property is near the intersection of Segments 45, 46, 47 and 50. The new re-routing of Segment 50 to the west and south of us passes through Clark County owned property. You need to be aware that county maps and some of your maps incorrectly show the creek that passes through our neighborhood. It actually passes 75-150 feet to the west of our western property line. It then crosses at the back of our property along the southern line and flows into Lacamas Lake, which flows into the Columbia River. In the winter, there are at least 2 beaver dams along this creek; one that is 100-200 feet long is right where you propose siting the tower at the northwest corner of our property. This entire area is designated wetlands and is a

Wildlife Preserve with the associated plants, fish and wildlife. This includes deer, gray squirrel, bald eagles and the occasional cougar. We have contacted Karen Streeter with Clark County and Steve Manlow with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to make them aware of the correct location of the creek and the wetlands. We would agree to providing one or more of your field engineers escorted access through our property to look at the site. (In other words, we want to be here when they are.) The only other access is via a fire road that begins at Camp Currie. However, access from there in the winter is limited due to flooding. You need someone physically on the ground to look at this site; a fly-over or Google Earth is inadequate.

Communication ID: 13216

Date Received: 11/25/2010

Name: WILLIAM HANLEY, HILDEGARD HANLEY

Dear Dr. Steven Chu:

My wife and I are currently residing in Vancouver, Washington (Clark County). The BPA I-5 Corridor Project proposal of adding 500kv electrical lines through populated residential areas has been very upsetting to us and thousands of residents in Clark County. These additional lines are being used to send electrical power to Oregon and California, not for our use. A recent public hearing with Mr. Steve Wright, BPA Administrator, was disappointing to say the least, since he refused to put Oregon back on the table for erecting these electrical lines. His so-called reasons were excuses, or maybe political.

We are deeply worried about major health concerns with these electrical lines being considered over populated areas, including schools. We need your support to make sure that the BPA move their proposal over non-populated public lands. This makes more sense, and possibly less expensive. Our home values have already declined, and realtors are not showing homes for sale in my neighborhood, since prospective buyers already head that these 15 story towers might come through our area. This will certainly cause lower tax rates and revenue for Clark County for public use.

We need your support Secretary Chu.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Happy Thanksgiving.

Sincerely,

William and Hildegard Hanley

Communication ID: 13217

Date Received: 12/3/2010

Name: DARCY TAYLOR

Yes, I'm Darcy Taylor. I'm calling for my mother whose property address is [address]. I would like a copy of the map for her and my mailing address is [address]. My email address is [email]. My phone number is [phone] and again I would like the powerline map. Thank you. Bye.

Communication ID: 13218

Date Received: 12/3/2010

Name: PATRICIA LONNEE

Yes, My name is Pat Lonnee. My address is [address]. I'd like to receive a map if I could. Thank you very much. Buh bye.

Communication ID: 13219

Date Received: 12/3/2010

Name: V MICHAEL FENNELLY

Last August two other citizens and I met with a BPA official at their office. This was suggested by the BPA spokesperson in response to a question I asked at a Castle Rock public meeting, regarding a proposed route that would have minimal impact on our Southwest Washington communities. 3 months later and that route STILL is not listed as a viable alternative. WHY???

Communication ID: 13220

Date Received: 12/3/2010

Name: BARBARA WRIGHT

Received 12:36 PM

Hello, my name is Barbara Wright and my address is [address]. My phone number, [phone]. And I wanted to thank you for sending me the project map request because I don't have a computer. My understanding of the map- I don't see a proposed new right-of-way near my property. I do see a proposed tower near my property- a new tower. My property backs right up to your existing right of way. I have a chain-link fence at the top of my property all on my property. I have Douglas firs and oaks at the top of my property. My property is a 0.9 acre, it has been made into a wildlife sanctuary except for the house site. It has ponds and ducks, mallards, and wood ducks come in the spring, and some in the fall, and it has been planted with trees, willows and maples and things like that. The hill, I would say, that backs up to your right of way and the existing tower is not a real stable hill. My ground is clay, but I would say it's very not a stable soil. It has water, a lot of water coming through it. It would really destroy my property and it places that tower close to a residential area and I do not think that it is appropriate. My desire is for you to move this project to areas that are not inhabited rather than bring it right through the middle of already stable developed area. So, give me a call and let me know at least you have my input. Thank you. Goodbye.

Received 1:17 PM

Hello this is Barbara Wright again at [address]. And my phone number [phone number]. I forgot one other comment. My hill, the whole hill that my property backs up to that has your right-of-way on the other side is visible from the 205 Corridor north bound and/or south bound if you look. And with the current trees, the visibility line is beautiful and you add another tower and you have to cut down any trees, or you have to take down the hill to gain the ground that you need for the tower, you will destroy it. And I think that, you know, putting it here, it's not so accessible to the public eye as a better plan. Thank you. Goodbye.

Communication ID: 13221

Date Received: 12/3/2010

Name: MARGIE ULLAND

Yes, I would like to have a map sent to me. My name is Margie Ulland and my address is [address]. And my phone number is [phone]. Thank you very much. Bye.

Communication ID: 13222

Date Received: 12/5/2010

Name: JANICE DAVIS

I am wondering why areas 17, 23, & 24 and some others in that same area are not on the virtual map like they are on the maps that you pass out at the meetings?

Communication ID: 13223

Date Received: 12/4/2010

Name: ALLAN CHENEY

My name is Allan Cheney. My mailing and residence is [address]. And I'm asking for you to send me the map of the proposed route. Kay, thank you, talk to you later.

Communication ID: 13225

Date Received: 12/7/2010

Name: KEITH A MATHESON, TIMOTHY E WEIHE

BPA Representatives,

I'm writing, as I'm concerned about the placement of the towers along section P. Specifically towers P and 30 where they intersect with section V. I've included some close up photos of the map so you can see just how close these proposed towers are to our homes. I would prefer the far eastern route O be

used to avoid populated areas. However, if the western route is chosen, I would strongly urge you to push them out to the east. The entire P section hugs the edge of private property as it goes through DNR land, and specifically through our neighborhood. Towers P and 30 appear to be at the minimum allowable 150ft from our homes. We all have a nice view off to the east and these proposed towers would literally tower over our homes. I believe if the towers were to be placed as proposed it would have a severe economic and aesthetic impact. There is nothing to the east of us, why not push it out so as to not have such a detrimental effect on our lives.

Please review these maps I've included so you can see just how close these towers actually are to our homes.

Thank you,

Tim Weihe
[address]
[phone]

Communication ID: 13226

Date Received: 11/30/2010

Name: RICHARD GRAHAM

To Whom Will just Throw This Away!

Your comment about wanting to hear from the people that will be affected by the power line is just a big joke. You already have your mind made up no matter what you may tell us. Having lived on the edge of right-of-way for years, I find it very difficult to understand why its so important to make your project now. This area is not growing with any real sense of need. I realize that Portland/Vancouver may be. If this is the case for your project then put your line on the Oregon side.

The proposal to bring the line down this side of the Columbia is only motivated now because of the decrease in land values due to the economy. The real truth is you will do what you want, no matter what. Your disregard for what the public officials tried to tell you only shows your real attitude. Once again stop playing games and tell us where you will build your unnecessary line.

If by some chance some lowly secretary reads this, you can add my feelings to that of many others.

Regards,

Richard Graham
[address]
[phone]

Communication ID: 13227

Date Received: 12/6/2010

Name:

RE: BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project (TEP-TPP-3)

80-acre DNR Trust Site Parcel # 173416000

Dear Mark Korsness,

We provided input earlier to the planning and environmental impact analysis for the BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project with reference to our current facilities, specifically Camas High School. We also want to inform you of our plans to purchase property to accommodate future growth. Our 20-year Capital Facilities Plan contemplates the need for a second comprehensive high school and up to two additional middle schools. As you most likely know, it is very difficult to find suitable parcels in the 30-60 acre size range within or adjacent to the urban growth boundary.

The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) have partnered to provide an inventory of suitable DNR Trust Lands for school sites in high growth school districts such as Camas. The above referenced 80-acre DNR Trust Site meets the criteria for a school site, including no geological hazards, wetlands, endangered species habitats, or environmental cleanup areas. It also currently does not have overhead power lines. The BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project includes alternate Section 43, which bisects the site north to south, rendering it unusable as a school site. We respectfully submit that you avoid Section 43 in your alternatives analysis.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,

Mike Nerland,

Superintendent

Communication ID: 13228

Date Received: 12/2/2010

Name: MILMA SAASTAMO

Please, send us your printed map of proposed line segments, we have our property located in Yale-area.

Thank you,

Sign,

Milma Saastamo

[phone]

Communication ID: 13229

Date Received: 12/2/2010

Name: WILLIAM SAYER

Dec. 2 2010

BPA- I-5 Corridor reinforcement Project

Portland Office

Thank you for your thorough survey of the needs of our Northwest. We will really need the life-giving power you are bringing to the area.

I don't have a connection to the web- so I would like a print out of the study so far in my Lexington area.

You have my physical address here in the cul-de-sac as:

William Sayer

[property address]

Home phone, (leave messages) [phone]

I received my 1st class mail at...

[mailing address]

Thanks again!

William Sayer

Communication ID: 13230

Date Received: 11/24/2010

Name: ANN BULLETSSET

I received the November, 2010, Project Update. It was mentioned that we could request the materials mentioned. I would appreciate getting any materials possible, please. My name and address are:

Ann Bulleset

[address]

Thank you,

Ann

Communication ID: 13231

Date Received: 11/24/2010

Name: DAVID W MARINER

Hi,

My name is David and my wife and I used to rent our home at [former address]. We have sold our home and no longer wish to be informed with updates on the I-5 corridor reinforcement project. If you could please mail the updates to the current residents at [former address] and take us off the mailing list. Our address currently that the updates are being sent to is [address] Thank you.

Sincerely,

David Mariner

Communication ID: 13232

Date Received: 11/29/2010

Name: JIM WICK

We moved our office and are still receiving updates for the I-5 project at our old address. Would you please change the mailing address for Woodlandd Management Inc. Holten Andersen to [ADDRESS].
Thanks

Jim Wick Agent for Holten Andersen

Communication ID: 13233

Date Received: 11/30/2010

Name: AMY RINGSAGE

Since my property is on one of the "proposed" routes, I would like to know if the "new" proposed towers are going to be replacing the other set that is currently behind our property. In other words, are you going to take the two parallel (smaller) existing towers out and replace with the larger one? Also, will there be more than one new tower installed (like the side by side ones that are here now) ?

Please have someone email or call me with the answer.

Thanks!

Communication ID: 13234

Date Received: 12/7/2010

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

Hi Maryam,

I have a few more questions for you:

1. Remember the conversation we had about Doug telling me that BPA would double circuit the lines in the Covington area with "aluminum clips." You said something like, "how does Doug remember this kind of thing" because it was technical information that you have a hard time understanding or remembering. I would like to get this information about those aluminum clips and BPA's ability to double circuit the lines in narrow areas along your existing easement in writing. Would you please get that for me?

Weather is a factor right now up around the higher foothills here. Silverstar is under a heavy layer of snow probably until the spring. Gardeners here plant their gardens based on the snow on Silverstar being gone in late spring. The "O" route crosses in this area.

2. How will your repair crews get access in case of a power outage where the weather is so harsh all winter long?

3. Will dependable harsh weather influence the choice of one route over another?

4. Isn't the lower elevations more preferable for a power line?

Here are the other questions I asked previously so you have them in one place.

5. Who is liable if BPA or its contractors has an accident on private property when given permission to enter by the property owner? Could the private property owner be held liable or sued if an accident occurs by BPA or its contractors?

6. Along BPA's existing corridors 9 and 25, Ross to Camas, will any home have to be taken?

7. Is BPA required to follow the State of Washington Forest Practices Act? More specifically, does BPA have to follow the State of Washington Forest Practices Act when placing towers and lines across or alongside waterways?

8. Are you going to be bringing a power point projector? If so, would you allow us to use it?

Cheryl Brantley

A Better Way for BPA

<http://abetterway4bpa.org>

"When a man points a finger at someone else, he should remember that four of his fingers are pointing at himself"---Louis Nizer

Communication ID: 13235

Date Received: 12/9/2010

Name: BART COLSON,ART HESSLER

Subject - I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

Line Segment H; #10-12; Towers 10-32 to 10-33

To whom it may concern,

We have recently become aware of the proposed Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project over and around some river front parcels of land along the Kalama River. As Owner's of the parcels, we vehemently oppose the proposed project and in no way, shape or form approves of any ground or aerial easements for such parcels or grants BPA the right-of-way for such project.

This proposed route affects current and future property values, views, and recreational activities over and around these river front parcels.

This letter is not intended to grant BPA the right to enter any of the parcels in question.

Art Hessler, Owner

Bart Colson, Owner - T-28, LLC

Attachments (1) - Overview Map

Communication ID: 13236

Date Received: 12/9/2010

Name: CREIGHTON KEARNS TRUSTEE,JOKAY KEARNS TRUSTEE

BPA,

I am writing in response to the current route selections for the upcoming power line project. It seems reasonable try to avoid routes that have higher density for the least disruption in livability and land value.

Please seriously consider using the far east route in order to limit the health concerns and the huge economic impact this project will have on rural communities.

Thank you,

Creighton and Jokay Kearns

Yacolt Property Owners

Communication ID: 13237

Date Received: 12/14/2010

Name: JAMES A HARO

I have attended almost all of the meetings and feel that with all of the information we have provided, that Route O should be the only route considered for this project. The health of our children, property values, and the view of the poles make the route a no brainer. We need to affect as few people as possible. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13238

Date Received: 12/9/2010

Name: ANONYMOUS

Good morning, I wanted to leave a name change for [address] to- the church that's now meeting at that location is not the Landmark Missionary Baptist Church but now is Mountain View Baptist Church. So, if you would change that on your mailing address to Mountain View Baptist Church [address] then we'll get your updates. Thank you then, have a good day. Bye.

Communication ID: 13239

Date Received: 12/9/2010

Name: LAURA R SMITH

Hi, my name is Laura Smith and my property is on [address] and it's going right over the top of our property and I wanted to send in the information as to say, the impact it will have on our property if you could call me at [phone] and let me know the address I need to send that to I would appreciate it. Again, my name is Laura, [phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13240

Date Received: 12/9/2010

Name: CHERIL JORDAN

Thank you, I would like a copy of the portion of the map that affect a piece of property that I'm an owner of. My name is Cheril Jordan. My mailing address is [mailing address]. The property location is in the [property location]. Approximate address would be [approximate address].

Communication ID: 13241

Date Received: 12/10/2010

Name: LAURA R SMITH

Hi, this is Laura Smith and we're kind of playing phone tag, I need to actually speak to you in person. My husband actually already spoke with you and you requested specific things that we needed and one of them is an actual map of the property showing the lines that were going over it, and then there was some other information and since I'm the one that's doing it and he's the one that spoke with you, I'd just kind of rather talk with you directly so I make sure that everything that you need is on there in order to get this information over to the proper people. So, if you could call me back, this time I'm going to give you my cell phone just in case I'm not home when you call, I can get the call. So, my cell phone number is [phone]. And again my name is Laura and the property that we're talking about is the [address]. So, if you could call me back and let me know what all I need I can get this faxed over to you and that would be something off my list of to do during this busy time, so, that would be wonderful. Thank you for your time. Buh bye.

Communication ID: 13242

Date Received: 12/13/2010

Name: JENNIFER HICKS,PATRICK HICKS

Yes, my name is Jennifer Hicks. I've called a few times. I would just like to request that you take my husband and I off your mailing list because we moved so we don't need the information anymore regarding the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. And again, my name is Jennifer Hicks, my husband's name is Patrick Hicks and our address is [address]. And if you could give me a call back, the number is [phone] just to let me know that you've taken my husband and I off the mailing list. Ok, thank you, bye bye.

Communication ID: 13243

Date Received: 12/11/2010

Name: RICHARD A DAVIS

Call me about rt 18 tower #s 18/29, 28, 27 wet land / stream etc.

—

Many people proposed a more eastern route, I was one of them. Your newer eastern route is a failure. It only would move the lines onto different small property owners. You did not move it near far enough. Use forest service, state or huge land owners such as weyerhaeuser.

Because you failed to provide a good option to the east, most people, including myself, feel you should use your own property, your existing easement.

Also your route 18 -> east end goes thru wetland below NE Fern Rd. You should move the line south over ridge and use existing roads on state land instead of using creek / wetland area. If you have questions on tower #s etc call [phone] Richard.

Communication ID: 13244

Date Received: 12/15/2010

Name: RYAN OJERIO

Can you clarify what the clearing width for the corridor will be through forested areas? Specifically I'm wondering about the "O" line segment that goes through high value recreation areas in the Western Yacolt Burn State Forest. I have heard some people say that the corridor will be cleared 300 ft. wide through forested areas to reduce the risk of "hazard trees". But I have also read on the website that the right-of-way will be 150 ft. Is there a difference between clearing width and right-of-way width? Can you please clarify for me what the "corridor" will look like? -Thank You

Communication ID: 13245

Date Received: 12/15/2010

Name: JAMES OSBORN

Yeah, hi, I heard from my neighbor that the potential new line may actually run over most of our property and while, you know, there's talk about granting an easement, and that kind of thing, well, if the lines run right through my house, then I think that's more than an easement. That's an eviction. I'd like more information about this and I actually would like somebody to call me and I'd like a map mailed to me. My address is [address]. My home phone number is [home phone], but I'd like a call to my cell number, which is, [cell phone]. Yeah, I'm understandably concerned and I'd like to be able to talk to somebody about it. Thank you, bye.

Communication ID: 13246

Date Received: 12/15/2010

Name: JOSHUA L HATCHER

why did your serveyors lie to me and say they were working for the rocky mt elk foundation when they dont even have any land near my house

Communication ID: 13253

Date Received: 12/17/2010

Name: ERIC A SMITH, LAURA R SMITH

Dear BPA,

Attn: Lisa

We are sending this letter with the enclosed map with the identifying numbers of 38 & 39 as you can see on the map the power lines will cross right over our property [address].

Our Daughter Alisha and her Husband Ryan Doehne and there two children Kylee and Makenzie, just finished there home this summer. Which is also marked on the enclosed map [address]. We have our well and power to our property and as you can see this is something we have had to clear out put the driveway it has been a labor of love and with a great anticipation of being able to live next door and be so close to our Daughter and her family. We are not at all happy with the proposed lines going across ours and my Daughters property this would be a great big deal for our family my son is also planning on building later this has been a plan for many years and would be a great loss for our family. I am asking you to please take this into consideration as this would effect our whole family.

Sincerely,

Eric and Laura Smith

Communication ID: 13303

Date Received: 12/18/2010

Name: ANDREA RHODES

My name is Andrea Rhodes. My address is [address]. Please add me to your list and send me whatever information you can on what's going on, I'm very interested. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13304

Date Received: 12/15/2010

Name: HAROLD PALMER

Hello,

regarding the November I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project update newsletter... I would appreciate receiving printed maps that include my homesite at [address] and my mother's residence property located approximately 1 mile west of here at [mother's address].

Thank-you

Harold Palmer [address]

Communication ID: 13305

Date Received: 12/17/2010

Name: DAVID A CARSON

I am requesting a printed map of the proposed route for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

David Carson
[address]
[phone]

Communication ID: 13314

Date Received: 12/19/2010

Name: RICHARD A DAVIS

re. route 18 18/27 18/28 18/29 wetland, creek and aquifer for fern rd property owners. please move towers south to top of ridge or further. Move towers farther away from small private properties in this area. Use existing dnr roads in this area. Thanks

Communication ID: 13315

Date Received: 12/18/2010

Name: ROSE DOWNING

MR. KORSNESS,

YOU HAVEN'T HEARD FROM ME IN A LONG TIME, BUT I'LL SAY IT AGAIN- NO TOWERS OVER POPULATED AREAS-USE THE PUBLIC LANDS!

[Name]

Communication ID: 13316

Date Received: 11/24/2010

Name: BILL C HARPOLE, PHILIPPINA HARPOLE

Dear Governor Gregoire,

I am writing in regard to the fifteen story towers and 500kv power line being proposed near us by BPA [I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project] which would adversely impact home values, potentially our health and create an environmental eye sore in our cities and neighborhoods.

Last year you and Governors from four other western states rightly opposed a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission draft rule that would add billions of dollars onto utility bills of residents. The rule would connect remote wind and solar projects to the power grid but residents would receive little or no benefit from the new power lines.

Governor Gregoire, you again need to come to the aid of Washington residents who would receive little benefit from a new 500kv power line but may suffer great harm.

The Wall Street Journal reported on 11/11/10 that OMB and Treasury found severe problems with the "economic integrity of government support for renewables". They singled out an 845-megawatt wind farm the federal Energy Department had guaranteed in Oregon called Shepherds Flat, a \$1.9 billion installation. With stimulus and other federal and state subsidies, the total taxpayer cost is about \$1.2 billion. Thus the taxpayers are paying for 65% of a project that doesn't even meet its normal cost-benefit test.

In an August, 2010 Fact Sheet, BPA states "the line will enable us to bring in renewable energy from eastern Washington and Oregon". Clearly without this line, it would not be possible to supply energy from these renewable projects. The line cost of about \$350 million will add to utility bills with little benefit to residents of southwest Washington since Oregon [and California] is expected to use 90 % of the power.

A more direct Oregon route would cross the Columbia river near Longview. BPA stated no Oregon route study was made as the route would be farther to a substation, crossing the Columbia river more difficult and cost more. The reasons given are not convincing and ignore the cost from losses on Washington home values with resulting loss of property tax revenues. I believe the real reason for no Oregon study was because BPA expected stronger Oregon opposition would delay the process and the Energy Department and BPA are under pressure to provide renewable 'success stories'. One of the routes being considered goes through the heart of greater Vancouver. [There are 95 schools within 1/8 to one mile of this route]. A route on the eastern side of Clark and Cowlitz counties, away from populated areas, should be selected.

Real estate agents and appraisers have said home values would decline, compounded by almost nonexistent buyers for homes near a 500kv power line with 15 story towers. BPA has stated they will not compensate for any loss in value. We are already suffering financially and it is obscenely unfair for us to absorb further losses resulting from the power line. It is dishonest for the federal government to demand the other BP [British Petroleum] pay for damages caused by an oil spill, but BPA, a federal government entity, deny responsibility for losses on home owner property values. FHA will not insure loans on homes near something that impacts value. A buyer has backed out of purchasing a neighborhood home after learning of the power line. A listing agent has said many real estate agents will not show homes in our neighborhood because of the potential line. Our neighborhood is now considered undesirable and will become even more so if the line is built near us. Our lives are in limbo for over another year until a route is selected.

In a 250 page report BPA states there is potential health risk from high voltage lines such as childhood leukemia and other cancers. Several studies have shown at least twice the risk of leukemia for children and fetuses. It is known that people with certain types of pacemakers are at risk near the lines. My wife [description of medical condition] and we are extremely concerned because of her [description of medical condition]. BPA claims they don't have conclusive evidence that such high power lines are dangerous for people. BPA is reckless and irresponsible to propose such a high voltage power line through populated areas while admitting there is potential health risk.

Reportedly BPA spends \$850 million each year to protect fish and wildlife. A route through Oregon or a more eastern route in Washington might add a one time cost of \$30 to \$60 million but have minor rate impact.

The irresponsible actions of BPA and the Energy Department, deeply trouble us. We are concerned residents may suffer if it benefits federal agendas. Governor, the harm some in southwest Washington now face would be more injurious than the Commission draft rule you opposed last year. The state of Washington also needs laws that prohibit high voltage lines in populated areas. As a responsible state official, we ask for your support.

Respectfully,

Bill and Philippina Harpole
[address]

Attached: Wall Street Journal article

Communication ID: 13317

Date Received: 11/29/2010

Name: KAREN ASHFORD

To all concerned,

I strongly object to the new proposed high voltage transmission lines running east of our property in Woodland, WA. We have power lines already running south and west of us in the Little Kalama River Valley. Now you want to put lines to the east – we'll be surrounded! We have more than enough power lines in our community, as you can see on the map.

We, all of us, need to use less energy and learn to conserve. Alternate sources of power is what we believe in – wave, wind and solar. People are so wasteful, it's a terrible reflection of our society. I believe the extra energy is sold for higher prices to states OTHER than Washington and Oregon.

I would have sent this letter sooner, but I know it won't make a bit of difference, greed always winds, one way or another.

Sadly,

Karen Ashford
[address]

[attachment indicating segment 12] Go 2 miles east!

Communication ID: 13318

Date Received: 12/15/2010

Name: RICHARD BRANTLEY

Build the line on you're existing I-5 Right of Way. STOP messing with us north county landowners!

Richard Brantley

Communication ID: 13319

Date Received: 12/6/2010

Name: MARY LINDQUIST,ARDELLE M STEIN

Dear Mr. Wright

As elected president of the Washington Education Association, I represent more than 80,000 public school employees in the state of Washington. At the WEA Representative Assembly in May 2010, a member expressed deep concern that BPA would place a 500-kilovolt transmission line near schools. In response, the delegates adopted a new business item regarding BPA's proposed new 500-kilovolt transmission line in southwest Washington. The new business item directed WEA to study the impact of high voltage lines on children's and school employee's health.

WEA's Indoor Environmental Quality work team reviewed scientific literature pertinent to this issue. One study, done in Australia in 2007 on a small number of participants, greatly influenced the work team. The Australian study tracked the delayed effect on adults of childhood exposure to magnetic fields of lines up to 220kv. It found a significant increase in lymph cancer occurrence rates for adults who had had residential exposure to such fields. Other studies have not demonstrated that low level exposure to electro magnetic fields is safe. There appears to be no scientific consensus that long term exposure to high voltage lines is not harmful to humans.

It would be wise to apply the precautionary principle in deciding where to place the new 500-kilovolt transmission line. This principle holds that if proposed action risks harm to public health, and science cannot demonstrate that the action is not harmful, the action should not be taken. An example of this precautionary principle is the state of California's School Site Selection and Approval Guide, which states that because EMF fields may or may not be hazardous to human health, school districts should be conservative and not place new schools within 350 feet of 500kv lines.

Accordingly, the WEA requests that BPA place the new 500kv southwest Washington line in the east, on unpopulated public land, entirely away from homes and schools. If this is impossible, the new 500kv line should be placed far away from any existing schools or sites chosen for new schools on the date BPA finalizes the route. Children spend many hours a week at school, and children may stay in one school for 6 years; employees work in schools for longer hours and may stay 20 or more years at the same school. Adding exposure at school to residential exposure may be devastating the health of some individuals, particularly children. By siting its lines away from homes and schools, BPA can demonstrate its willingness to avoid an action that might adversely affect human health.

Thank you.

Mary Lindquist

C: Rae Ann Engdahl, Chair, IEQ Work Team

Communication ID: 13320

Date Received: 12/10/2010

Name: DALE W AROLA,DARREN F AROLA

Attn: Mark Korsness

My name is Darren F. Arola. I am a land owner in segment #26 of the proposed 500 kV transmission line.

My 5 acre parcel [parcel number] is located at proposed tower #26/11. My parcel is well stocked with a 24 year old stand of Douglas Fir. The parcel is classified as timberland, and enjoys a lower property tax as long as all 5 acres are stocked. If a portion of the timber is removed to provide right of way for the line, I will loose the deferred property tax easement. Therefor, I will not provide an easement.

Darren F Arola

By Dale W Arola, his attorney in fact

Mailing address: [address]

Communication ID: 13321

Date Received: 12/9/2010

Name: DALE W AROLA,DWAYNE D AROLA

Attn: Mark Korsness

My name is Dwayne Arola. I own a 5 acre parcel of timberland that will be negatively affected by the proposed segment #26 Right of Way. The parcel serial number is [parcel number] and is located approximately 200' north of proposed tower # 26/11. If a portion of the timber is removed for the right of way, I will loose the preferred lower property tax assessment.

I will not provide an easement.

Dwayne Arola

By Dale W. Arola, his attorney in fact

Mailing address: [address]

Communication ID: 13322

Date Received: 12/8/2010

Name: DALE W AROLA

Re: I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

Attn: Mark Korsness

I own 2 parcels of land in the proposed segment #26 Right of Way. Parcel # [parcel number] (5 acre tract), will lose the lower property tax assessment if timber stocking falls below a full 5 acres.

Parcel # [parcel number] is 8.63 acres. I have a potential home site at the N.E. corner to capture the view to the north, however I see that tower #26/10 is proposed for that location, destroying that home site potential.

Dale Arola

[address]

Communication ID: 13323

Date Received: 12/13/2010

Name: DIANE TOWLE, BRUCE TOWLE

RE: Alignment concerns

To whom it may concern:

We are the owners of Tax Parcel number [parcel number]. We would like to object to the proposed alignment crossing our property. Your segments "P" and "35" cross our tree farm.

One main concern is our proximity with the Jones Creek ATV area. When we first moved here in 1985-86 we had serious problems with ATV's using City of Camas watershed roads to get near our property. When they could see roads on our tree farm they would cross and use our property as a high speed return to Jones Creek. Roads were damaged, trash left, trees damaged and many motorcycles ran by our house at a very high rate of speed. Fences put up to keep them out wouldn't last one weekend before they were cut or pulled down.

Finally City of Camas felled hundreds of trees across many of their roads in the area. This stopped the traffic long enough that the roads that they built to connect to our roads grew up with brush and trees. So for the past 15 years or more we have had no problems. With your lines crossing our tree farm these problems will start all over again.

We don't have any confidence that you will be able to control access to your access roads and cleared right-of-way. Crossing the middle of our property with your line would be difficult enough, but the traffic that would follow would make our lives miserable again.

We request that you move the location of the tower at the intersection of the "P" and "35" segments north to allow avoid our property. We will not willingly grant you access or right-of-way across our property.

Sincerely,

Bruce and Diane Towle

[address]

[phone]

Communication ID: 13324

Date Received: 12/13/2010

Name: ROBERT A BOYD

I am very concerned about the environmental impact on your project. I moved to my retirement property 4 ½ years ago ([address]). I looked forward to living with the mountain views, the forest tranquility and the Mt. St. Helens Elk Herd that grazes 60 yards outside my living room window. The majestic eagles and osprey have been enjoyed by myself, wife, children and grandchildren, I fear soon to be replaced by looming towers, the hum of electric lines and crackle of rain bouncing off power lines (ahh, the golden years of retirement).

If you are serious about staying off of private residential property, you have two choices- 1) Stay on existing "Right of Way." You have shown "reliability" on these lines and I see no reason why that won't continue. Also lines in remote areas would be more open to "acts of terrorism" or vandalism as there is no one to see these acts carried out.

2) If you have to have separate lines, continue your easterly north/south line due north to the Swift Dam, cross there and head west to intersect with segment K staying on public land.

I am becoming increasingly skeptical of your commitment to staying of private residential property. I urge you to choose one of these two options. Thank you.

Robert A Boyd.

Communication ID: 13325

Date Received: 12/21/2010

Name: SCOTT MCEWEN

Re: Bonneville Power Administration I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, Clark and Cowlitz Counties

Dear Bonneville Power Administration Representative:

Columbia Land Trust is writing to express our concern regarding the proposed O, 10 and 12 route segments of the Bonneville Power Administration I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project in Clark and Cowlitz Counties. The proposed new right-of way notification buffer crosses two properties where the Columbia Land Trusts holds conservation easements

(parcel nos. [parcel numbers]) and one property owned by Columbia Land Trust for conservation (parcel no. [parcel number]). The Columbia Land Trust is a non-profit land conservation organization and is responsible for protecting the conservation values of these sites in perpetuity.

Our concerns regarding the proposed transmission route on these conservation properties are outlined below.

Kalama River Conservation Properties - The Kalama River properties are sites where private landowners have donated permanent conservation easements to the Columbia

Land Trust.

The following is a summary of key conservation values for the Kalama River conservation easement sites. The Columbia Land Trust's enforcement of the conservation easement terms focuses on conserving the values of the site. These terms are fully described in the recorded conservation easement and a baseline assessment report, which include:

- Protection of key habitat communities including Douglas fir/Western hemlock forest and riparian habitat.
- Protection of critical habitat for state and federally listed sensitive species including Chinook and Coho salmon, Steelhead, and searun Cutthroat trout.
- Protection of natural, scenic, open space and recreational values.

In 2002, the Columbia Land Trust accepted conservation easements on the Sweet and Welch properties along the Kalama River to protect important conservation values within this river corridor. The Kalama River originated from the southern slopes of Mt. St. Helens and boasts riverbanks lined with towering Douglas fir and cedar and shading pools filled with salmon and steelhead trout. The Kalama is so rich in fish and habitat that fishermen have named this stretch of the river "The Holy Waters".

The conservation easement properties are located along the Kalama River in Cowlitz County, within the Kalama River watershed. In addition to the high quality Kalama River flowing through both of these properties, the Welch property supports two small high water quality tributaries and the Sweet property contains a perennial spring and numerous intermittent seeps. Additionally, within the immediate vicinity of the Sweet property, are two of the most highly functioning tributaries in the Kalama watershed. Wildhorse Creek enters the Kalama River between the two Sweet parcels and Gobar Creek is located to the east.

The Welch and Sweet properties provides intact forest habitat for a wide variety of species. The relatively mature vegetation (dominant vegetation is estimated to be older than 75 years) and diverse understory located along a major riparian corridor provides an important refuge in an area that experienced intense timber harvest within the past 25 years.

Elk and black-tail deer are frequently sighted on the conservation properties, and cougar, black bear, bobcat, river otter, bald eagle and beaver have all been regularly sighted in the vicinity. The mature forest vegetation provides habitat for flying squirrel, pileated woodpecker and other cavity nesting species. Additionally, there are local landowner reports of lynx and wolf in the project vicinity within the past 20 years, but no verified sightings have been documented.

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) Priority Habitat and Species database includes records for a number of other sensitive species within the project vicinity. These include a great gray owl nest location, a mountain quail record and several records of Cascade torrent salamanders in small tributaries and seeps. None of these records are located on the Welch or Sweet properties; however the presence of these species in the vicinity indicates the potential use of the conservation properties by these species.

The Kalama River provides critical habitat for a number of anadromous fish species including Summer and Fall Chinook (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscho*) and Summer and Winter steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), both of which are listed as federally threatened/state species of concern, federally threatened coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus keta*) and searun cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki clarki*). The Kalama River is included in the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Plan recovery area, with populations of fall Chinook, spring Chinook, winter and summer steelhead and Coho targeted as priority regional recovery objectives. The anadromous fish utilize the river mainstem as well as Wild horse and Gobar Creeks for migration, spawning and rearing habitat. These rivers and tributaries are high functioning systems in part due to the intact habitat along the riparian corridor. The shading provided by this intact habitat, makes the Kalama one of the only rivers in this evolutionarily significant unit (Footnote 1) (ESU 4) for salmonids that is not thermally challenged or lethal to fish during the late summer. In addition to the major tributaries, there are significant seeps and drainages throughout the corridor that provide important water quality and fish habitat benefits.

(Footnote 1: An evolutionarily significant unit, or ESU, of is considered to be a "distinct population segment" and thus a "species" under the Endangered Species Act.)

Copper Creek Conservation Area - The Copper Creek Conservation Area is a site that Columbia Land Trust purchased in 2006 using Washington State Salmon Recovery Funds for the purpose of conserving priority river habitat, working forests and wildlife habitat. The Land Trust is responsible for managing this property and protecting the conservation values of this site in perpetuity.

The following is a summary of key conservation values for the Copper Creek conservation property. The Columbia Land Trust's management of this property focuses on protecting the conservation values of the site, which include:

- Protection of key shoreline, riparian and associated upland habitat on the East Fork Lewis River
- Protection of critical habitat for state and federally listed steelhead.
- Protection of wildlife habitat for elk, deer, bear, river otter, beaver and a variety of woodland and riparian bird species.
- Protection of natural, scenic, open space and recreational values.

In 2006 the Land Trust purchased the Copper Creek Conservation Area to protecting the riparian area and salmonid habitat along the East Fork Lewis River. The East Fork Lewis River has been determined to be a high priority for threatened salmonids habitat in Clark County, not only through the Land Trust's conservation planning efforts, but through the planning efforts of other local non-profits, County, State and Federal agencies, the Northwest Power and Conservation Council, and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board.

The Copper Creek Conservation Area is located near the eastern boundary of Clark County, along the East Fork Lewis River at river mile 31. The property spans the river on the west end of the property to the north and south, and includes approximately 3,500 feet of riverfront property on the south side and 500 feet on the north side. The headwaters for the river are located in Skamania County near Green Lookout Mountain in the Gifford Pinchot National Forest several miles upstream. Copper Creek is one of the two largest tributaries in the upper basin, and is located just east of the property about a quarter mile.

In addition to the East Fork Lewis River, there are several seasonal drainages on the property that support significant volumes of water (capable of eroding and washing out roads, and contributing sediments to the East Fork Lewis River) on both the north and south aspects of the property. This property supports important salmonids habitat. Federally threatened steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) has been documented by WDFW in the East Fork Lewis River from the mouth of the East Fork Lewis River to the headwaters.

The Copper Creek property consists of primarily of 15-year old alder stands. Remnant Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), big leaf maple (*Acer macrophyllum*), and larger diameter red alders (*Alnus rubra*) are scattered throughout the property, concentrated primarily in drainages and along the East Fork Lewis River. The understory is comprised primarily of sword fern (*Polystichum munitum*), vine maple (*Acer circinatum*), and salmonberry (*Rubus spectabilis*). The existing vegetation community is an early successional condition following large disturbance (clear-cut).

In addition to providing important habitat for salmonids, the Crooked Creek Conservation Area provides important habitat values for a variety of wildlife, including elk, deer, bear, river otter, beaver and a variety of woodland and riparian bird species. The WDFW Priority Habitat and Species database lists portions of this site as high priority riparian habitat.

As mentioned above, conservation easements and fee ownership of the properties along the Kalama and East Fork Lewis Rivers was granted to the Columbia Land Trust in 2002 and 2006. The Land Trust has

been monitoring these sites for years and believes the proposed tower locations and line segments have the potential to negatively impact sensitive species and habitats within these sites. While the current, draft configuration for the proposed new right-of-way will not directly impact the properties, any shifts within the notification buffer could directly impact these lands, resulting in the permanent loss of sensitive species and habitats. In addition to the potential for direct impacts resulting from both construction and the ongoing maintenance of the proposed BPA right-of-way, there are potential indirect impacts including invasive species spread, erosion and runoff, and reduction of scenic values.

Columbia Land Trust requests that BPA amends their proposed plans to avoid locating the transmission line within the conservation properties. We understand and respect the difficulties related to routing this type of infrastructure. That said, the protection of conservation values is fundamental to the mission and purpose of Columbia Land Trust and to our stewardship obligations to the donors and the citizens of the state of Washington. The Land Trust is obligated to take all measures at its disposal to protect natural resources on its conservation lands.

If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Scott McEwen

Conservation Director

Communication ID: 13326

Date Received: 12/29/2010

Name: BRIAN TREMBLEY

My wife and I have been building on this property for approximately 12 years, with our intention of putting up a bed and breakfast. Our site is closest to line segment 23, between towers 3 and 4. Our intention is to have a B and B that touts silence, the proposed line static being my primary concern. Also, your interactive map shows my property line incorrectly. It shows my pole building on the adjoining property by approximately 50 to 75 feet. Multiple surveys will confirm that your map, when zoomed in, is off by at least that regarding property lines. This puts my property even closer to your proposed line at this location. Should this line be installed through Segment 23, this would diminish our years of effort. Please relocate this segment further north, more into uninhabited DNR property, or abandon 23 in favor of Segment K.

Communication ID: 13327

Date Received: 12/30/2010

Name: PERRY J CALABRESE

Tower # 2-15 Kelso is home to America's largest home land slide. THE PROPOSED NEW RIGHT OF WAY will take many trees from our hillside that is a documented RED SLIDE ZONE by Cowlitz County. Tower # 2-15 will be placed at the top of the slide zone. A few years ago, before the project went public, BPA logged a portion of our property w/o permission, then entered our property and surveyed w/o permission. Since then, EVERY cement slab on our property has developed cracks. EVERY sidewalk is cracked and separating 1-2 inches. EVERY window and door is out of square. Some doors have had to be re-hung in the last three years. Cracks are appearing on our walls. As a Veteran of the United States Marines (enlisted 1974 Vietnam Era) I'm asking more accountability from our government. Thanks in advance, Perry Calabrese

Communication ID: 13328

Date Received: 1/3/2011

Name: REBECCA M MATSON

January 3, 2011

I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

PO Box 9250

Portland, OR 97207

Steven Wright

Mark Korsness

Printed in the Battle Ground Reflector, Dec. 27th issue.

Put Yourself in Their Shoes, Mr. Brown

Two viewpoints on the BPA transmission line issue have been editorialized here recently. Mark Brown gave a patronizing scolding to unenlightened folks who are asking BPA to route the huge transmission lines away from their homes. Mr. Brown expects them to roll over and "let BPA do their job." What is Mr. Brown saying? If a few homeowners get screwed, oh well. It's for the greater good of society? Maybe Mr. Brown doesn't understand private property ownership.

In contrast, Robert Zumstein, Sr. expressed his view that private property owners should be justly compensated if affected by this BPA business investment. From those of us being asked to sacrifice our homes, our retirement and our peace of mind, "Thank you, Mr. Zumstein." You are right, sir. No entity, public or private, should have the right to destroy private property without just compensation. In this case, there is a viable alternative through public forest lands just a few miles off to the east.

Mr. Brown also asserted that the straightest route is the cheapest and therefore the best route. Not necessarily. Currently BPA spends over \$850 million each year to protect fish habitat endangered by their lines! Why can't we ask them to do the same for HUMAN habitat?

There is a sensible alternative. Routing this 500kv line a bit further east to avoid populated private property won't cost BPA even 1% of what they spend to protect fish every single year. Since this power is destined for California anyways, it won't degrade the lines too heavily if they add a couple miles to the project.

Yes, I am a bit sore about Mr. Brown's comments. This gets a bit personal when our 24 acre property is in the bulls eye. If Segment 26 is chosen, we'll have crackling, buzzing power lines looming over our peaceful 2 acre pond, and a hideous tower will be situated on a beautiful hilltop that I'd always imagined one of our children or grandchildren living on someday. Five potential building sites will be destroyed, each with stunning panoramic views. We'd hoped to retire up on Sunset Knob. If BPA destroys this property, we will have an ugly 150' tower smack in the middle of our view, along with the health risks involved with constant high levels of EMF.

Yes, Mr. Brown, objecting to the confiscation and destruction of one's home and land is quite selfish, isn't it? We've only invested 40 years improving this property and paying our taxes faithfully. What do you think BPA would pay us for their 150 foot easement? A couple thousand dollars? What value would they destroy for us? Over a million dollars worth. Mr. Brown, would you consider that to be my fair share for this "luxury of technology?" I wonder what Mr. Brown would be willing to contribute?

Finally, this isn't about reliability of the local grid. Brown outs are not imminent. BPA was not suddenly caught off guard by increased power demand necessitating urgent upgrades. The fact is, local usage is trending markedly lower, due to the bad economy and our good conservation practices. It is rather curious how quickly the grid became "unreliable" as soon as Senator Murray handed BPA a blank check. This is not about local power. This is about wheeling excess power to California where it can be sold for a good price; and it is about \$3.25 billion in taxpayer money funding this business venture. Huh. Wonder how long it took BPA to figure out that it'd be cheaper and faster to confiscate private property than it would be to broker arrangements with state agencies?

Private citizens should not be required to sacrifice their homes because BPA neglected to plan ahead for this venture. They've had decades to strategize with state agencies to minimize both the cost of grid upgrades and their impact on private homeowners. I'd say it's back to the drawing board, BPA. Come up with some workable solutions with your public money that do not rob private citizens.

I join Mr. Escue in asking this community to speak out on this issue. There is a better way. Thank you!

Becky Matson

Communication ID: 13329

Date Received: 12/29/2010

Name: PATTI OLSON,JERRY C ETUX OLSON

When we spoke by phone several months ago, you encouraged me to e-mail "any time." (Head-slap.) I've been meaning for several months to send these weather records and comments to several

addresses of BPA personnel who might be interested. Oh, and you, too! The real issue here is not the amounts, though you'll note our annual precipitation is running at a 30-year average of about 112"; or even the huge amounts of snow that fell in the winter of 07-08 and 08-09, though it was astounding (particularly 08-09) and caused serious damage to our house, garage, and, especially, the riding arena. The critical fact here, in regards to your proposed towers and access, is the form that snow takes as it is rained on, refrozen, snowed on again, rained on again, refrozen, etc. etc. By the end of the snowfall in Jan. 09, we had about 4 1/2 feet of 'snow' on the ground, made up mostly of 10" thick layers of ice, interspersed with a little snow, then another foot of ice, etc. I know, because I had to chip out traditional-ice-block size chunks to create paths from the paddock gates out into the paddocks, or over to the trees, so I could get my horses out after two weeks of stall confinement. It took me days to get 18" wide paths chopped out for everyone, and the resulting piles of ice chunks remained in the paddocks for months. I realize you guys think you know 'snow', oh, ho-hum, snow, but because of our rather unique position on the transition line between valley/west side weather, and mountain/east side weather, our snow here is not like snow most anywhere else.

Are the towers heated? The 'Extra-Large' size towers (2XL

really!) that you are proposing for this line appear to have some pretty substantial cross-bars etc. that could catch quite a pile of snow, and all the rest. Also, highway access (necessary to get equipment, snow cats, men, etc., out to the line for repairs) can be closed for days.

So that's my input on our local snow and other snow-like buildup.

Will you be on this project until at least the start of construction? (i.e., through tower placement, is what I'm really getting at here.) While I know you assured me that (BPA personnel) are NOT heartless monsters, or "try not to be", I'm not all that convinced from what I've read, seen at meetings, etc., that some of them 'try not to be' quite as diligently as a hapless landowner might desire. Anyway, I appreciate having someone at the office that I sort of feel might actually have a smattering of concern for the people involved. Of course, we hope desperately that it won't come to a vicious battle over tower placement on the K-line, but.... . Hey, I can give more graphic details of the nasty snow/ice issue, complete with photos!...

I'm going to send Jerry's 30-year rain summary and snow summary in a separate e-mail, with some additional notes

re: his records. I hope.

Thank You, and Happy New Year! Patti Olson

—

Dear Sirs and Madam,

My husband, Jerry Olson, has been keeping weather records at our home here about 500 feet east of your proposed K-84 tower for over 30 years now. I am attaching his annual summaries of total

precipitation, and that which falls as snow. The issue isn't the total amount, though please note that our average annual precip. stands at about

112". Likewise, it isn't even the massive amounts of snow

that fell in the winter of 07-08, and especially 08-09, to which I draw your attention. (Although, also note, we had over 9 feet of snow fall the latter winter.) It is the unique character of that snow, and what happens to it as it sits around for weeks or months, that I think you should consider. (Yes, I realize you believe you know all about

snow...)

I guess because we are situated on the dividing line between west side/valley weather, and east side/mountain weather patterns, our snow can't be counted on to just drift down and sit around fluffily for its duration. By the time the 'big snow' ended in late Jan. 09, we had about 4 1/2 feet on the ground, which consisted of a few two-inch layers of snow sandwiched between three or four 10 to 12 inch layers of solid compacted ice. I know, I had to chip through it to provide my horses access to their paddocks.

That took days. It appears that the huge towers being considered for this project have some pretty substantial cross-members, capable of catching a goodly pile of snow and whatever might come after or in-between. Also, the highways can be inaccessible for days during a major snow event. In other words, there would be no way to get snow-cats, repair equipment, or crews out to the line, not to mention the difficulty of getting/keeping power line access roads open.

Jerry has been sending his monthly weather reports to our local newspaper, The Reflector, for over twenty years (in case there was any interest in verifying these figures.)

Sincerely, Patti Olson

Communication ID: 13330

Date Received: 12/30/2010

Name: MARGARET BOYLE

I live along Line 26, and with the most recent updated map, my property is where tower 26/16 is proposed. After living with the I-5 Corridor Replacement Project hanging over my head for the past 14 months, it did not come as a big shock my home is being targeted. To tell you the truth, there isn't much BPA could do to shock me at this point, except remove Line 26 from consideration altogether. The simple fact that BPA is threatening to use the power of eminent domain to condemn my land and destroy my home's monetary, emotional, and aesthetic value instead of using existing rights of way was and is the biggest shock. It's beyond me to see why you would torture thousands of citizens and leave us in limbo for so long. You might think the term torture is a bit melodramatic, but I assure you, if you were in my shoes, you would not think so. We bought this home, this property, specifically because it had no power lines near it. Even the lines to the house are buried. We could have moved anywhere in the

United States. We chose this place, this property, this home. Now, you at BPA can take that away from us. We put our life's savings into buying this place. With the real estate market the way it is, that money is now gone. We do not have the option of simply selling and moving someplace else. We have no money to do that with. and BPA KNOWS those of us on the proposed lines must disclose that fact. Who in their right minds would buy here now? I have 3 neighbors who have simply handed their homes back to the bank this past year. Now, of all times, in the middle of a great economic recession, why are you pursuing this? The most logical answer I can come up with is so that BPA can pay bottom dollar for any new rights of way they want to purchase. Why else wouldn't you be using existing easements? Sounds to me like you're preparing not just for this project, but for the next one another 40 years down the road, all on the backs of, or rather, out of the pockets, of people like me today. So, yes, I oppose using Line 26 for this project. I oppose you using any line where you must condemn or purchase any new property. The heartache, stress, and torment you at BPA are causing is reason enough to disqualify those lines. The sooner you do that the better. Margaret Boyle

Communication ID: 13331

Date Received: 12/30/2010

Name: PERRY J CALABRESE

BC Hydro offered to buy out any homes from home owners that felt uncomfortable living close to 500kv. Will BPA make the same offer?

Communication ID: 13332

Date Received: 11/30/2010

Name: CARL A HARRY

I would really like to talk to someone about the routing of power lines due to the fact that they are showing to be running parallel with my properties. It looks like the lines could be moved a little to the west and not affect me or my neighbors nearly as much. Also wondering what kind of compensation their might be for the inconvenience of having to listen to all of that noise, along with the health concerns with EMF's. Also wondering about compensation for the decrease in land value, I just spent alot of money dividing this property for future investment purposes. I already have a home sight cleared.

Communication ID: 13332

Date Received: 12/21/2010

Name: CARL A HARRY

This is my second attempt to get a response, wondering about all of my Previous questions, along with why do you want to ruin my home and Quality of life with this I-5 Corridor Replacement Project. Please respond Back with email or call [phone] or [phone].

Communication ID: 13333

Date Received: 1/3/2011

Name: LEWIS L HOPE

i sure wish when you change your proposed route you tell the property owners involved i have been waiting twenty years to build a nice garage to replace the rundown buildings on my property i do all the permits no one said a word i have the building allmost up then hear about it from a neighbor after looking at your map it will go directly over it why would the county let a building permit go out in this area if this could happen last time i looked at your maps it was going north of me or i wouldn't have started all of this in june of last year now the money is all spent and building is up now what do i do
Lewis Hope

Communication ID: 13334

Date Received: 1/4/2011

Name: JAYNEE CLAIRE KENNEDY

Yes, I'd like the information about the I-5 Corridor sent to me at [address]. The name is Kennedy. And I also want someone to call me about the relocation that I understand. I want to be perfectly clear on what it is. And I never got called back, this is probably my sixteenth request. So my next request will probably be made a little more forcefully, probably over the news media. So, would like a call, you're welcome to call me at work [work schedule] [phone] in Longview so it's [phone]. I would certainly appreciate a call back. I would think that that would be something very professional to return my call. Thank you very much.

Communication ID: 13335

Date Received: 1/3/2011

Name: GARY STOCKER,LINDA J STOCKER

We live at [address] and are very near your proposed route. Please note that my husband, Gary has an [description of medical condition]and cannot be near the EMF that your lines will generate.

Communication ID: 13336

Date Received: 1/5/2011

Name: JAYNEE CLAIRE KENNEDY

Yes, I've called before, I still haven't gotten a call back, haven't received any mail, so we'll try it again. Name is J.C. Kennedy. Address is [address]. Yes, I do want a current map, I want to be on the mailing list, and this will be my fourth request, that I'd like someone in the relocation section to call me because I

want more details on what happens evidently on the map you guys put a tower right over the top of my house so I want some specific information. Obviously I'm not going to live in limbo for three years. So, specific information on how the relocation is done, what is done. I'd like some information. I will call back again tomorrow because that will be my fifth call and if I don't receive a call then, then I'll be calling every few minutes, so let's get somebody to call me in relocation and I would prefer somebody who doesn't just say "Well, it depends on the situation." I want specifics. So, have my information ready please and have someone in relocation call me. And my work number that you can reach me from [schedule] is [phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13337

Date Received: 1/5/2011

Name: JEFF S METSCHER

I would first like to say that I do not completely oppose the construction of a new power lines. They provide a needed service and many jobs. I do think however that the BPA should take segment 35 and segment Q out of consideration. Each of these segments will impact many private land owners in the area. The impact would lower property values not just for the property the lines cross but to the many others who would now have a power line in their otherwise pristine territorial view. The other issue these line segments bring up is the little Washougal river head waters. This river system (which includes Boulder and Jones creeks) is currently undergoing significant steps to improve the wild salmon runs up the Washougal River. The little Washougal river head waters would I believe be negatively impacted by the additional runoff and erosion that is sure to occur with the clearing of trees and vegetation to make way for the transmission lines. These line segments would also impact the water quality for the city of Camas. The city has several water sheds that provide drinking water to the city from Boulder creek and Jones creek. Now with all that said line segment R which is far enough east not to affect as many land owners. Nor will it impact the Little Washougal head waters is a more logical choice.

Communication ID: 13338

Date Received: 1/6/2011

Name: NANCY BEAUDET

For what it's worth....probably no different than any other land owner. We bought 8 beautiful acres and then a house in 1998. The property has old beautiful Maples and Cedars.....this was and is my dream property. I'm 58 years old...please don't make me go to my grave sooner than I plan on. I'm getting gray hairs just thinking about it.

Communication ID: 13339

Date Received: 1/10/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,JOHN R HANCOCK,JONI E HANCOCK

Dear Mr. Korsness:

Your agency has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. Your stated objectives are to minimize costs whenever possible and to minimize impacts to the natural and human environment. The least expensive alternative and the one with virtually no human or environmental impact would be to use routes 9 and 25 where you already have towers and lines. Any of the new corridors that you have proposed would require a 70-mile long clear-cut through the countryside of two counties. All of these proposed rural routes would destroy homes, farms and businesses. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife. You have told us there is enough room on your existing easements for this project and that no homes would be taken. We say you should use your existing easements. It just makes the most sense!

- The existing easements have 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.
- The existing easements would be the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA for this project.
- There is minimal impact from adding lines where towers and lines already exist.
- Using the existing easements would save the environment from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties. We ask you to not create a 70-mile long clear-cut that will damage our sensitive waterways and ecosystems forever.

We ask you to be a good shepherd of the land by using your existing easements for this project. We ask you to use our ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on a route where lines and towers already exist.

It's time to stand up for your landowner rights. No one can do this for you. Our group, A Better Way for BPA, is working to help you along the way by providing resources and information to make this very troubling situation a little easier for you. Jay and Joni Hancock

Communication ID: 13340

Date Received: 1/9/2011

Name: CANDACE L MACKEY

Mr. Korsness:

Your agency has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. Your stated objectives are to minimize costs whenever possible and to minimize impacts to the natural and human environment. The least expensive alternative and the one with virtually no human or environmental impact would be to use routes 9 and 25 where you already have towers and lines. Any of the new corridors that you have proposed would require a 70-mile long clear-cut through the countryside of two counties. All of these proposed rural routes would destroy homes, farms and businesses. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife. You

have told us there is enough room on your existing easements for this project and that no homes would be taken. We say you should use your existing easements. It just makes the most sense!

- The existing easements have 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.
- The existing easements would be the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA for this project.
- There is minimal impact from adding lines where towers and lines already exist.
- Using the existing easements would save the environment from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties. We ask you to not create a 70-mile long clear-cut that will damage our sensitive waterways and ecosystems forever.

We ask you to be a good shepherd of the land by using your existing easements for this project. We ask you to use our ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on a route where lines and towers already exist.

This letter has been copied and pasted to your comment section, but we are in full agreement with the statements made. We DO NOT want you destroying our valley. Candace Mackey

Communication ID: 13341

Date Received: 1/10/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,HEATHER HENDERSON,LEWIS L HOPE

Dear Neighbor, We're involved in the fight of our lives to protect our landowner rights and save our beautiful natural landscapes from BPA's towers and 500 kV lines. Regarding further east routes BPA has (in their opinion) given us our "further east" route in "unpopulated areas" by creating the "O" route. Unfortunately this "O" route is not unpopulated. It traverses through the Yale Valley, Chelatchie Prairie and into the Merwin area. BPA has moved the lines from prior routes onto thousands of landowners land to form the "P" route. This route also joins with other routes that possibly will come across the Merwin area, Amboy, Yacolt, cross into the Yale Valley, Chelatchie Prairie, Hockinson, and Venesborg. On all these routes there are thousands of people who live, do business, work, and enjoy the outdoors. Don't be fooled, factually, there is no where further east for a new route to go that would not impact thousands of new landowners and people. BPA is done moving lines to the east and are moving forward. We also need to move forward, and quickly. More than ever, you need to speak out against the routes that will affect us, the Clark and Cowlitz County landowners impacted by BPA's new routes that weave throughout our communities. Start today by copying and pasting the below letter to the BPA comment page here: <http://www.bpa.gov/corporate/i-5-eis/ecomment.cfm>

Mr. Korsness:

Your agency has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. Your stated objectives are to minimize costs whenever possible and to minimize

impacts to the natural and human environment. The least expensive alternative and the one with virtually no human or environmental impact would be to use routes 9 and 25 where you already have towers and lines. Any of the new corridors that you have proposed would require a 70-mile long clear-cut through the countryside of two counties. All of these proposed rural routes would destroy homes, farms and businesses. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife. You have told us there is enough room on your existing easements for this project and that no homes would be taken. We say you should use your existing easements. It just makes the most sense!

- The existing easements have 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.
- The existing easements would be the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA for this project.
- There is minimal impact from adding lines where towers and lines already exist.
- Using the existing easements would save the environment from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties. We ask you to not create a 70-mile long clear-cut that will damage our sensitive waterways and ecosystems forever.

We ask you to be a good shepherd of the land by using your existing easements for this project. We ask you to use our ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on a route where lines and towers already exist. It's time to stand up for your landowner rights. No one can do this for you. Our group, A Better Way for BPA, is working to help you along the way by providing resources and information to make this very troubling situation a little easier for you. Cheryl Brantley A Better Way for BPA <http://abetterway4bpa.org>

Communication ID: 13342

Date Received: 1/9/2011

Name: PATRICIA LEE WITTER

Not all members of our 4-generation Witter/Revesz/Brady/Stevens family tree farm business live in Clark County currently but we all participate actively in the management and perpetuation of our family tree farm business. We maintain a light footprint on the land and are devoted to continued forestry use of it. A very careless and imperial presence always threatening our ability to practice good forestry is Pacificorp whose Yale Merwin powerline crosses one of our tree farms. We fervently believe that trees and powerlines don't mix. Line O proposes to go across us, and lines 18 and 28 either cross us or lie right next to us. Why tear up pristine land in Clark County in order to provide power from Eastern Washington to Oregon and California?

Communication ID: 13343

Date Received: 1/9/2011

Name: EUGENE GREGORY BRADY

Proposed line "O" would run right through my tree farm which includes King Creek, a protected wetland, and timber stands that we have spent decades nurturing. Have a heart and locate that line where it obviously belongs, down the pre-existing corridor!!!!

Communication ID: 13344

Date Received: 1/9/2011

Name: RICHARD R THORMAHLEN

I DO NOT AGREE WITH THE PRECEDING LETTER THAT "A BETTER WAY FOR BPA" IS ASKING PEOPLE TO SEND TO YOU. THE FURTHER EAST THE BETTER.

Mr. Korsness:

Your agency has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. Your stated objectives are to minimize costs whenever possible and to minimize impacts to the natural and human environment. The least expensive alternative and the one with virtually no human or environmental impact would be to use routes 9 and 25 where you already have towers and lines. Any of the new corridors that you have proposed would require a 70-mile long clear-cut through the countryside of two counties. All of these proposed rural routes would destroy homes, farms and businesses. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife. You have told us there is enough room on your existing easements for this project and that no homes would be taken. We say you should use your existing easements. It just makes the most sense!

- The existing easements have 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.
- The existing easements would be the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA for this project.
- There is minimal impact from adding lines where towers and lines already exist.
- Using the existing easements would save the environment from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties. We ask you to not create a 70-mile long clear-cut that will damage our sensitive waterways and ecosystems forever.

We ask you to be a good shepherd of the land by using your existing easements for this project. We ask you to use our ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on a route where lines and towers already exist. It's time to stand up for your landowner rights. No one can do this for you. Our group, A Better Way for BPA, is working to help you along the way by providing resources and information to make this very troubling situation a little easier for you. Cheryl Brantley A Better Way for BPA

Communication ID: 13345

Date Received: 1/9/2011

Name: EUGENE GREGORY BRADY

The injustice and brutality of cutting a destructive swath through private property when you have plenty of public lands and existing easements to work with is truly amazing. The Kangley line proves that you can and already have run two 500 KV lines through the same easement. In a democracy, abuse of power has consequences, so do yourselves and the citizenry a favor and adopt a more rational and humane approach!

Communication ID: 13346

Date Received: 1/8/2011

Name: ANDREW H POOLE

Mr. Korsness:

I am a resident of Amboy and do not live in on one of the proposed routes but have grave disagreements with the direction of the BPA as it relates to this issue.

Your agency has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. Your stated objectives are to minimize costs whenever possible and to minimize impacts to the natural and human environment. The least expensive alternative and the one with virtually no human or environmental impact would be to use routes 9 and 25 where you already have towers and lines. Any of the new corridors that you have proposed would require a 70-mile long clear-cut through the countryside of two counties. All of these proposed rural routes would destroy homes, farms and businesses. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife. You have told us there is enough room on your existing easements for this project and that no homes would be taken. We say you should use your existing easements. It just makes the most sense!

- The existing easements have 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.
- The existing easements would be the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA for this project.
- There is minimal impact from adding lines where towers and lines already exist.
- Using the existing easements would save the environment from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties. We ask you to not create a 70-mile long clear-cut that will damage our sensitive waterways and ecosystems forever.

We ask you to be a good shepherd of the land by using your existing easements for this project. We ask you to use our ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on a route where lines and towers already exist.

It is beyond belief that the BPA would pursue a course that is so disruptive to so many people in the two counties. I simply do not "buy" the rationale for not using current routes.

Communication ID: 13347

Date Received: 1/8/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

January 8, 2011

Congresswoman Jami Herrera Beutler
1130 Longworth HOB
Washington, DC 20515

Congresswoman Herrera Beutler:

Bonneville Power Administration has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. BPA's stated objectives are to minimize costs whenever possible and to minimize impacts to the natural and human environment.

The least expensive alternative and the one with virtually no human or environmental impact would be to use routes 9 and 25 where BPA already has towers and lines.

Any of the new corridors that BPA has proposed would require a 70-mile long clear-cut through the countryside of two counties. All of these proposed rural routes would destroy homes, farms and businesses. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife.

BPA tells us there is enough room on their existing easements for this project and that no homes would be taken. We say BPA should use their existing easements. It just makes the most sense!

- The existing easements have 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.
- The existing easements would be the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA for this project.
- There is minimal impact from adding lines where towers and lines already exist.
- Using the existing easements would save the environment from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties.

We ask BPA to not create a 70-mile long clear-cut that will damage our sensitive waterways and ecosystems forever. We ask BPA to be a good shepherd of the land by using its existing easements for this project. We ask BPA to use our ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on a route where lines and towers already exist.

We ask that you support our efforts to protect our communities and our environment from the destruction a new route would create by these massive 150-foot towers and 500-kV power lines will create.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Brantley, President
A Better Way for BPA

Communication ID: 13348

Date Received: 1/8/2011

Name: DALE C SULLIVAN

Hi, my name is Dale Sullivan my property address is [property address]. My mailing address is [mailing address]. I'm curious to know if the intended lines are going to cross over my property. I've been absent from the site for a while, but the map online seems fairly useless as far as details, so if you could send me a map with that detail or get back to me I'd really appreciate it. Thank you. Sorry, my number is [phone].

Communication ID: 13349

Date Received: 1/10/2011

Name: CATHY CGRAGGEN

Considering our national debt, the state of our economy and a huge unemployment rate it is hard to believe you would be using tax payer's money (Borrowing Authority through the Federal Stimulus Fund) to create such a massive project at this time. Already rates are rising in Cowlitz county I assume in anticipation of paying off this enormous debt. How are citizens able to afford this huge increase when many do not even have jobs? It would be interesting to see if Oregon and California will be able to pay their fair share of the burden. I believe you have selected a very poor time to impose this project on us. It should have been postponed long ago. If it is not delayed or eliminated you must run these lines where they will not impact the citizens of Cowlitz and Clark County and use existing rightways for the least cost.

Communication ID: 13350

Date Received: 1/10/2011

Name: MARY C DUNN

Mr. Korsness:

Please think about if this was YOUR home the lines were going to be on! Your agency has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. Your stated objectives are to minimize costs whenever possible and to minimize impacts to the natural and human environment. The least expensive alternative and the one with virtually no human or environmental impact would be to use routes 9 and 25 where you already have towers and lines. Any of the new

corridors that you have proposed would require a 70-mile long clear-cut through the countryside of two counties. All of these proposed rural routes would destroy homes, farms and businesses. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife. You have told us there is enough room on your existing easements for this project and that no homes would be taken. We say you should use your existing easements. It just makes the most sense!

- The existing easements have 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.
- The existing easements would be the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA for this project.
- There is minimal impact from adding lines where towers and lines already exist.
- Using the existing easements would save the environment from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties. We ask you to not create a 70-mile long clear-cut that will damage our sensitive waterways and ecosystems forever.

We ask you to be a good shepherd of the land by using your existing easements for this project. We ask you to use our ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on a route where lines and towers already exist.

Communication ID: 13351

Date Received: 1/8/2011

Name: SANDY K ATCHISON, MARGIE J BORCHERS, CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY, PAUL W CLEMENT, BARBARA J CLEMENT, MICHAEL S COOPER, GREGORY DUVIC, APRIL B DUVIC, BRAD ENARSON, KIM ENARSON, ANITA R FERRIE, BARRY A FINKEL TRUSTEE, TODD A HALEY, DONNA L HARRIS, KAREN J HILLER, DAVID B HOUSE, NEAL E ETUX JOHNSON, NOEL J LAWFFER, TIMOTHY E LOHNES, KELLY A MARTIN, JOCELYN P MCFARLAND, DANNY P MCFARLAND, DANIELLE MCFARLAND, BONNIE MCNAUGHTON, JAMES A NEIMAN, JOHN R NESBITT, L PEARSON, JON K PEDERSEN, BRITTANY J PEDERSEN, STEVEN C SCHOENEMAN, NORMA WATSON

Mr. Korsness:

Your agency has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. Your stated objectives are to minimize costs whenever possible and to minimize impacts to the natural and human environment. The least expensive alternative and the one with virtually no human or environmental impact would be to use routes 9 and 25 where you already have towers and lines. Any of the new corridors that you have proposed would require a 70-mile long clear-cut through the countryside of two counties. All of these proposed rural routes would destroy homes, farms and businesses. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife. You have told us there is enough room on your existing easements for this project and that no homes would be taken. We say you should use your existing easements. It just makes the most sense!

- The existing easements have 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.
- The existing easements would be the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA for this project.
- There is minimal impact from adding lines where towers and lines already exist.
- Using the existing easements would save the environment from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties.

We ask you to not create a 70-mile long clear-cut that will damage our sensitive waterways and ecosystems forever.

We ask you to be a good shepherd of the land by using your existing easements for this project. We ask you to use our ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on a route where lines and towers already exist.

Communication ID: 13352

Date Received: 1/10/2011

Name: JUSTINE M TEMPLEMAN

Attn: BPA

I am a homeowner living within a buffer area in your proposed 500K power line project. Segments 30, V and P adversely affect my home, lifestyle and ability to retire. My only asset is my home, which you have already caused to be devalued by these lines. I urge you to deselect these lines and use the "O" segment in order to affect fewer homes and lives. Please do not build in populated areas. As a data warehousing specialist, I can appreciate why BPA would prefer to have alternate routes for power. Frankly, I doubt that anything the public, special interest groups or elected officials might do to encourage the 9/25 lines, they will NOT be chosen; you wouldn't be going through this process just to use existing lines. Therefore, you are headed into new territory, further east. As this power is obviously to benefit the populace in California, why should it negatively affect people in Washington? (Denying this fact at public meetings is a waste of time for us all.) My neighborhood has all lines underground - that is, until you come through. It appears as though lines further east from 30, V and P would affect far fewer families. Please put your lowest cost alternatives to the wayside and choose either the "O" alternative, or even further east, in order to affect fewer homes and families. I would hate to have to relocate to California in order to benefit from this project!

Regards,

Justine Templeman

Communication ID: 13353

Date Received: 12/30/2010

Name: PERRY J CALABRESE

Tim,

The BPA wants to build a 150' tall transmission tower carrying 500kv at the top of a scarp on my property. I'm concerned this may trigger a slide that could take my home and putting my family at risk as well as the trailer court at the bottom of the hillside.

My address is [address]. The area is already on file as a slide zone with Cowlitz County.

Here are some specifics:

A few years ago the BPA came in and trimmed trees off the slope in preparation for the new power line project. Since then, every cement slab on the property has developed cracks. Every window in the home is out of square as are the doors. I've re-hung two of the doors in the home just to get them to close in the last two years. We have trees that are no longer vertical on the slope. Some plaster in the home has developed cracks. The porches are pulling away from the home.

I've discussed this over the phone with Cowlitz County. The person I talked to agreed that the transmission tower, it's weight, wind sheer and loading, and the need to cut additional trees from the hillside for the project to proceed would put homes at risk from a catastrophic slide.

Can you help?

Thanks,

Perry Calabrese

[address]

cc:

Patty Murray

Communication ID: 13354

Date Received: 1/10/2011

Name: JANE KANE,JOHN A KANE

10 January, 2011

Mr. Korsness:

This letter is in response to your agency's potentially devastating proposal to construct a 500-kv power line through the gorgeous rural countryside of two counties in order to augment transmission capacity between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon.

Your stated objectives are to provide a substantial increase in transmission capacity which will satisfy the foreseen growth in demand for decades into the future, while minimizing impacts to the natural environment, and minimizing costs whenever possible.

Yet the arguments which have been presented, the decisions being made and the routes on the table clearly demonstrate that other (unstated or misstated) criteria are having a huge influence on the project.

The alternative having the lowest overall cost and having dramatically less human and environmental impact would be to use routes 9 and 25 where you already have easements, towers and lines. Land acquisition costs would be negligible. Construction costs and environmental impact costs would be minimized. Litigation costs would be minimized. The intangible cost of public opposition would be mitigated.

Some time ago, you stated that paralleling existing transmission lines is unacceptable because of the inherent reduction in capacity caused by parallel, collocated lines. While that might be technically true, the net reduction of the increased capacity would be relatively small. BPA has stated that the existing network contains adequate capacity to satisfy existing demand and projected growth in demand until the reinforcement project is complete. Therefore, the 90-95% increase in capacity provided by a parallel, collocated second line (in place of the much more expensive 100% increase) would logically be a better alternative.

Recently, BPA has apparently discovered that 500-kv lines CAN be parallel and collocated without significant capacity reduction. How is it that BPA is so technically lagging on that subject, when other utilities have known that for decades? (I can cite numerous examples of 50+ mile runs of parallel 500-kv lines already in existence.) This convenient enlightenment further supports our contention that BPA is not acting in good faith.

Now, taking the "parallel-collocated" argument one step further, a fully or partially- subterranean line along existing easements would quickly amortize the (allegedly) greater short-term construction cost by virtue of the above-mentioned lower land acquisition costs, lower environmental impact and litigation costs, plus much lower maintenance costs made possible by:

- (a) substantially reduced vulnerability to damage from:
 - (i) weather phenomena (ice storms, wind storms, etc),
 - (ii) aircraft
 - (iii) seismic activity and
 - (iv) the (unquantifiable) probability of terrorist attack;

(b) substantially reduced mechanical and thermodynamic issues resulting from the large differences in ambient air temperature (0 - 100 degrees F for the sake of conversation) as compared to the nearly isothermal (55 - 65 degrees F), nearly-infinite-heat-sink properties of the subterranean environment.

Any of the new corridors that you have proposed would require an extensive long clear-cut through the pristine rural countryside of two counties. All of these proposed rural routes would destroy homes, farms, businesses and hard-earned retirement equity. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife.

You have told us there is enough room on your existing easements for this project. We say you should use your existing easements.

Here are some additional points supporting that position:

(a) The existing easements would be the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA for this project.

(b) There is minimal impact from adding lines where towers and lines already exist.

(c) Using the existing easements would save the environment from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties.

(d) The existing BPA scars are already in place and many of the adjacent landowners bought those properties fully aware of the visual and environmental impacts of those lines (and probably secured bargain prices as a result of their existence).

(d) The existing easements have 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.

Clearly, the security history of the existing transmission lines has been enhanced by virtue of the lines being located in urban and relatively urban environments, where any suspicious activity has a high probability of being reported.

By way of contrast, a highly unpopular 70 mile run of new lines through isolated and rural areas would have a much higher exposure to undetected and/or unreported subversive activity and subsequent costly damage. In fact, based on the strong local opposition to this proposed land-grab, it would not be surprising to discover that active resistance could be very enthusiastic.

We implore you to not create a 70-mile long clear-cut that will damage our sensitive waterways and ecosystems forever. We ask you to be a good steward of the land by using your existing easements for this project. We ask you to use your ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on a route where lines and towers already exist.

Sincerely,

Jack & Jane Kane
[address]

Communication ID: 13355

Date Received: 1/12/2011

Name: JOHN R POER TRUSTEE

Your stance that one route (paralleling your current line) would make it more susceptible to terrorist attack and natural disasters doesn't hold water. How many times have you had natural disasters on that route, closing that service? Two side by side routes would not likely be severed by one disaster. Terrorists could blow up two separate route lines as easy as one route. They would need two groups to effectively disable a side by side route or separate routes. Stay off private property when you have a sensible route in existence; The following is a sensible approach.

Mr. Korsness: Your agency has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. Your stated objectives are to minimize costs whenever possible and to minimize impacts to the natural and human environment. The least expensive alternative and the one with virtually no human or environmental impact would be to use routes 9 and 25 where you already have towers and lines. Any of the new corridors that you have proposed would require a 70-mile long clear-cut through the countryside of two counties. All of these proposed rural routes would destroy homes, farms and businesses. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife. You have told us there is enough room on your existing easements for this project and that no homes would be taken. We say you should use your existing easements. It just makes the most sense!

- The existing easements have 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.
- The existing easements would be the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA for this project.
- There is minimal impact from adding lines where towers and lines already exist.
- Using the existing easements would save the environment from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties. We ask you to not create a 70-mile long clear-cut that will damage our sensitive waterways and ecosystems forever.

We ask you to be a good shepherd of the land by using your existing easements for this project. We ask you to use our ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on a route where lines and towers already exist.

Mr. Korsness: Your agency has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. Your stated objectives are to minimize costs whenever possible and to minimize impacts to the natural and human environment. The least expensive alternative and the one with virtually no human or environmental impact would be to use routes 9 and 25 where you already have towers and lines. Any of the new corridors that you have proposed would require a 70-mile long

clear-cut through the countryside of two counties. All of these proposed rural routes would destroy homes, farms and businesses. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife. You have told us there is enough room on your existing easements for this project and that no homes would be taken. We say you should use your existing easements. It just makes the most sense!

- The existing easements have 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.
- The existing easements would be the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA for this project.
- There is minimal impact from adding lines where towers and lines already exist.
- Using the existing easements would save the environment from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties. We ask you to not create a 70-mile long clear-cut that will damage our sensitive waterways and ecosystems forever.

We ask you to be a good shepherd of the land by using your existing easements for this project. We ask you to use our ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on a route where lines and towers already exist.

Mr. Korsness: Your agency has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. Your stated objectives are to minimize costs whenever possible and to minimize impacts to the natural and human environment. The least expensive alternative and the one with virtually no human or environmental impact would be to use routes 9 and 25 where you already have towers and lines. Any of the new corridors that you have proposed would require a 70-mile long clear-cut through the countryside of two counties. All of these proposed rural routes would destroy homes, farms and businesses. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife. You have told us there is enough room on your existing easements for this project and that no homes would be taken. We say you should use your existing easements. It just makes the most sense!

- The existing easements have 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.
- The existing easements would be the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA for this project.
- There is minimal impact from adding lines where towers and lines already exist.
- Using the existing easements would save the environment from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties. We ask you to not create a 70-mile long clear-cut that will damage our sensitive waterways and ecosystems forever.

We ask you to be a good shepherd of the land by using your existing easements for this project. We ask you to use our ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on a route where lines and towers already exist.

Mr. Korsness: Your agency has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. Your stated objectives are to minimize costs whenever possible and to minimize impacts to the natural and human environment. The least expensive alternative and the one with virtually no human or environmental impact would be to use routes 9 and 25 where you already have towers and lines. Any of the new corridors that you have proposed would require a 70-mile long clear-cut through the countryside of two counties. All of these proposed rural routes would destroy homes, farms and businesses. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife. You have told us there is enough room on your existing easements for this project and that no homes would be taken. We say you should use your existing easements. It just makes the most sense!

- The existing easements have 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.
- The existing easements would be the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA for this project.
- There is minimal impact from adding lines where towers and lines already exist.
- Using the existing easements would save the environment from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties. We ask you to not create a 70-mile long clear-cut that will damage our sensitive waterways and ecosystems forever.

We ask you to be a good shepherd of the land by using your existing easements for this project. We ask you to use our ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on a route where lines and towers already exist.

Thank you for your consideration, John Poer

Communication ID: 13356

Date Received: 1/11/2011

Name: PERRY J CALABRESE

IF YOU BUILD TOWER #2-15 PLEASE BUY OUT OUR HOME!!! We do not want to live in the shadow of 500kv. BC Hydro bought out landowners that felt unsafe under their towers, WILL OUR COUNTRY EXTEND THE SAME RESPECT TO AMERICAN FAMILIES???

Communication ID: 13357

Date Received: 1/11/2011

Name: LESLIE M LOUNSBERRY-BRADY

I am a tree farmer whose farm and living would be ruined by "line 0". My tree farm is in [address]. You would be committing a crime to cross King Creek, which is protected by the wild river act. The path for

the big power lines you already have would obviously be the better route to choose, not to waste a lot of money to ruin peoples homes, farms, lives. It's clearly wrong!

Communication ID: 13358

Date Received: 12/29/2010

Name: SUSAN A BENNETT,LYNN MCDERMOTT,KEN MCDERMOTT

To Whom It May Concern:

My family has lived for generations on the property located at [address 1] and [address 2]. As such, I would like to make known my strong objections to the proposed transmission line going through these properties. Health concerns as well as a decreased in property values, should these properties be chosen as the selected route, are also a concern. I would also like to take this opportunity to notify the BPA that I will not willingly ever allow anyone from your agency on this property. I will be attending any and all public forums addressed to this issue and it is my hope that a decision will be made soon as to the selected route so that the stress posed by the transmissions lines being placed on property against property owners' objection will at least be alleviated for some. Further, my husband, Ken McDermott also affirms the above objections.

It should also be noted that my mother Zula Fae Vernon passed away earlier this year and the property at 1906 Hazel Dell Road passed on to my sister, Susan Bennett. She joins me in my concerns, as is noted by her signature on this letter.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn and Ken McDermott

Susan Bennett

Communication ID: 13359

Date Received: 1/12/2011

Name: THE MAZAMAS ,GEORGE CUMMINGS

Dear BPA:

The Mazamas is a 3,000-member climbing and outdoor organization founded in 1894 and based in Portland, OR.

We write to express our concern about a proposed new power line near Silver Star Mountain northeast of Vancouver, WA. Alternative Route O of the 70-mile I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would cut a clear-cut swath through state forest about 2.5 miles west of the summit of 4,170-foot Silver Star Mountain.

Silver Star Mountain is highly visible from Portland-Vancouver. It is a prominent feature of the northeast skyline. Bright snowfields blanket alpine meadows, making it a winter landmark. Hiking Silver Star Mountain brings the realization of how remote and wild it is considering its proximity to the city. It is worth protecting.

The Mazamas oppose Route O for its negative impact on hiking, snowshoeing and cross-country skiing. Route O would cross the Tarbell Trail System, the Chinook National Recreation Trail and three proposed trails. Tarbell Trail hikers would be forced to walk under humming 500-kilovolt power lines for about a mile on the northwest side of Silver Star, a half-mile on the southwest side. Our members hike, snowshoe and cross-country ski to the alpine meadows and summit of Silver Star using this trail network. We don't like hiking under power lines.

The Mazamas also oppose Route O for its negative visual impact. A line of 150-foot-tall steel transmission towers would be visible from Silver Star summit and surrounding alpine meadows. We oppose Route O because of its visibility from Portland-Vancouver. It would damage views of a mountain landmark beloved for generations of Portland-Vancouver residents.

The Mazamas suggest that if a new transmission line is necessary, it be routed along the already developed Interstate-5 corridor. We appreciate BPA's conservation efforts, efforts we hope will apply to preserving a local treasure, Silver Star Mountain.

Sincerely,

George Cummings, President

The Mazamas

Communication ID: 13360

Date Received: 1/13/2011

Name: VICENTE A MOLINOS

Mark,

Maryam requested a copy of the route we suggested to you last September.

Attached is a fresh pdf copy. It is consistent with the hardcopy map we gave you and the Cowlitz comms.

The southern portion was drawn after a field visit and discussions with knowledgeable local people so as to,

minimize impacts on people and sensitive areas,

minimize the need for new road construction,

maximize use of mainline logging roads.

Fire risk is a valid concern and most of these roads have no public access. You would have to keep it that way which I believe is in keeping with your own security concerns.

After the crossing of the Swift man made canal there is some steep terrain that DNR has mentioned it manages with care for endangered species.

My sense is that if you kept on edge of the DNR property, you would have better luck with them.

Best in 2011,

Vicente Molinos

Board member, NO LINES IN POPULATED AREAS

A Washington, non profit 501c3 corporation.

Communication ID: 13361

Date Received: 1/13/2011

Name: DAVID CHERRINGTON

Dear BPA, I'm writing you in regards to our connection involving my property(F40 and F41). I hope you had a good holiday season. It certainly was a bittersweet year for me and my family. I married the love of my life this last April, but then learned that you would like to put towers through the middle of where our home was intended in August. I survived what was said to be [description of medical condition] when I was 25, and after marrying the love of my life who is a recent [description of medical condition] survivor and long-time successful relay for life team captain it certainly was not the happy ending we were hoping for. However, on a positive note we are both very well conditioned for seeing the glass half full and believe something good is going to come from this. In the interest of seeing the glass half full my wife and some of our friends from around the state of Washington were hoping you could lend your support to our relay for life team this year. I realize you most likely cannot donate because you are a non-profit organization, but I was thinking possibly we could get together with you soon and do something along the lines of a short story with a news organization? I believe that if we could get together and tell a little bit of our story we could potentially garner some much needed support for the cause. I believe me and my wife have a powerful story, but with your help I believe we may be able to make a bigger impact than ever for this years relay. It would certainly help shed a positive light on things if you are able to help us out in any way possible. My wife has dreamed of making an impact for cancer patients since she was 7 years old. I think if there is a positive out of this it is that her years of devotion to relay and her training as a communication specialist may all be coming together at just the right time. I believe that this may just be the best chance my wife will ever get to make the impact she has always dreamed of. I'm hopeful that we can get together with you soon, but would be very pleased if we were to hear from you first in regards to whether we can count on your help in this very important cause.

Sincerely, David Cherrington

Communication ID: 13362

Date Received: 1/13/2011

Name: PATTI OLSON

Dear Mr. Driessen,

I took the opportunity this morning during a break in the rain to go up and walk around in 'The Trees.' I played with a little sketch (attached) (I hope) that shows exactly what it means for a 180' tree to be on the edge of a 150'

right-of-way, 75' to centerline of a 150' tall tower. I suppose you have all sorts of formulas etc. to delineate just this situation, but I think I've got the basics pretty well covered, don't you? I also did a quick survey of how many trees are in the 100' wide by 250' long strip that runs along the property line there, about 200' north of the 1/4 corner to where the slope dives down, and about 50' south to where it is well over the edge of the ridge there. By the way, whoever has been in to that corner must not have wanted the unnecessary burden of carrying full spray-paint cans back out to the road. It will be decades, if ever, before someone can pretend not to be able to find that corner.

'Lo, send your blind, your aged, and your just plain slow survey crews to the 1/4 corner, and they, too, shall find it.' And so it came to pass.

Anyway, there are about 28 of the large firs in that 100 foot wide swath across the ridge there. A few smaller ones, and some other species. I just want to be sure that 'the project team' realizes the extent of the problem here. I mean, you've got miles and miles of clear sailing on south, I realize, but NOT HERE. And this is so, so important.

There is no compensation that could make up for our looking at our western vista and seeing, not our magnificent grove of firs, but your tower! From the bedroom, the back door, and the entirety of the yard. Seeing the setting sun, in the summer (when that finally arrives), not through fir boughs but through the metal arms of a 150' tower! The last newsletter said to let the environmental people know of issues, like this, I assume. Should I do that, or will you share this with them? I know this may well end up being a huge waste of a lot of people's time. I hope so, so much!

But I don't want to wait until it's too late, and then be trying to stop some runaway train.

Okay (deep breath.) I'm done. It is so nice and warm today. I checked on my Daffodils down in the lower lawn. I have a variety, February Gold, that are often in bloom by this time. There are a few fat buds showing yellow, so that will only be a day or two. And the fat stubby little Iris histriodes shoots are coming up through the gravel terrace (and everywhere.) The daff blooms are made of pretty sturdy stuff, but the Iris are so gossamer. It always amazes me how they can go through what they do and just keep coming back, fresh and unassuming, every year. One would think they'd get blown into frozen mush. This spring will be especially interesting in the garden, because I planted 90 grape vines last spring. 15 were nice big robust 2 year old (+, I think) Tempranillos. They grew like crazy last year and

even had some tiny little clusters, which I had to pick off. I'm hoping to let enough partial clusters mature to make one gallon of wine this fall. I'm sure it will be awful! The other 75 were tiny rootling Pinot Noirs. Some of them struggled a little getting established, and I may find a few haven't made it through the winter. I have a few pots of replacements at the ready, though.

Thank you once again for your patience. Patti Olson

Communication ID: 13363

Date Received: 1/14/2011

Name: DONNA L BROSSEAU

By looking at the proposed site, it appears that there will be a line very close (right next to us), but we are not included in notification area. I have so many concerns, too many to list. I would like to be notified if this is going to occur, as we do have livestock etc. I think that this project is most upsetting to us as we really overpaid for our property (knowingly), then the Sub-station changed out the transformer to a 35 year old one, that makes tons of noise, the market dropped on housing, and now this. With all this change, we are losing everything we have invested. We moved there to have a healthy, quite, indendent farm life. I just feel very frustrated, and feeling as if BPA has certainly affected my life and plans for retirement. Please add me to the notification list if possible. I have added us onto the web announcements a couple months ago, but have not received anything as of yet. Thank you for you time.

Communication ID: 13364

Date Received: 1/15/2011

Name: ROBERT S KORELL

Mr.BPA,

I am a landowner in your study area on map 112 line 50. On my property, I have a small organic farm. We produce fruits and vegetables for several families in Clark county. We are concerned regarding the impact on our small business. I addition to the health and wellbeing of our 3 small children and the habit of many animals that make our property home. If you extend the powerlines onto my acreage, I WILL do whatever I can to keep BPA off this very special land. I will seek legal counsel or solicit the help of some liberal group that protects the breeding of Great Gray Owls and Blue Herons. There has to be another way. We shouldn't have to scarifice our well being and livelyhood for your benefit. You are losing our respect. Please reassure me I won't have to legally and publically fight for my property, health and investment. This property is all we have! Robert Korell 6 Acre Farms

Communication ID: 13365

Date Received: 1/18/2011

Name: RANDALL D PEARL

We are homeowners in the Highlands at Pleasant Valley development in Vancouver, WA., Which is adjacent to BPA's 9 and 25 route under consideration for the I-5 Reinforcement project. Selection of route "O" through the industrial timberlands to the east makes the most sense from a private property impact perspective. This route would not visually impact Clark County residents. Choosing a route through any populated area is not necessary and is unacceptable. We are two of many that will suffer significant negative impacts on property value if BPA retains route choices through populated areas. Please pursue the Eastern-most corridor route instead.

Sincerely,

Mary Kay Moskal & Randall Pearl

Communication ID: 13366

Date Received: 1/18/2011

Name: WILLIAM A NELSON

Go Away B.P.A. The existing right-of-way won't work. We can't afford to risk losing all our electrical power in the event of a terrorist attack or natural disaster on a single transmission line. We can't afford the health risks associated with close proximity to 500 kilovolts. We can't afford the loss in property values from having 15 story metal monsters in our neighborhoods. The people of Clark County have made their case and clearly B.P.A. must do the right thing and go away from the populated areas and build a separate new electrical transmission line.

Bill Nelson

Communication ID: 13367

Date Received: 1/18/2011

Name: PERRY J CALABRESE

I don't like lying in bed and having my cells flip flop back and forth 60 times a second from your alternating current magnetic fields. NO POWER LINES IN POPULATED AREAS! I was amazed by how powerful 500kv lines really are: 50-100mG a quarter mile away! Do the right thing, usually never the cheapest, keep 500kv away from families, American citizens. "A person standing directly under a high-voltage transmission line may feel a mild shock when touching something that conducts electricity. These sensations are caused by the strong electric fields from the high-voltage electricity in the lines." 500kv lines are going near playgrounds, schools, near our kids! A government agency must be more accountable to our children.

Communication ID: 13368

Date Received: 1/19/2011

Name: JAMES P ROTH TRUSTEE

Question: Rte#25(between /64&65) is my back yard. What does the cross hatching on your map indicate? Is this land that I would lose if you build the new line here? How much would I be compensated? Thanks Jim Roth

Communication ID: 13369

Date Received: 1/11/2011

Name: BONNIE MCNAUGHTON

Mr. Korsness:

I am adding my name once more to the plea that you NOT put power lines through our pristine area. Twin the routes already in use or put them through the Government Forest areas. Public Power should use Public Land, not taken from the residents in those areas. If this was YOUR home, you'd be fighting for its sanctity too!

Your agency has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. Your stated objectives are to minimize costs whenever possible and to minimize impacts to the natural and human environment. The least expensive alternative and the one with virtually no human or environmental impact would be to use routes 9 and 25 where you already have towers and lines. Any of the new corridors that you have proposed would require a 70-mile long clear-cut through the countryside of two counties. All of these proposed rural routes would destroy homes, farms and businesses. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife. You have told us there is enough room on your existing easements for this project and that no homes would be taken. We say you should use your existing easements. It just makes the most sense!

- The existing easements have 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.
- The existing easements would be the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA for this project.
- There is minimal impact from adding lines where towers and lines already exist.
- Using the existing easements would save the environment from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties.

We ask you to not create a 70-mile long clear-cut that will damage our sensitive waterways and ecosystems forever. We ask you to be a good shepherd of the land by using your existing easements for this project. We ask you to use our ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on a route where lines and towers already exist.

Communication ID: 13370

Date Received: 1/12/2011

Name: MARGIE J BORCHERS

Mr. Korsness:

I absolutely agree with this message and wish to emphasize its importance:

Your agency has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. Your stated objectives are to minimize costs whenever possible and to minimize impacts to the natural and human environment. The least expensive alternative and the one with virtually no human or environmental impact would be to use routes 9 and 25 where you already have towers and lines. Any of the new corridors that you have proposed would require a 70-mile long clear-cut through the countryside of two counties. All of these proposed rural routes would destroy homes, farms and businesses. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife. You have told us there is enough room on your existing easements for this project and that no homes would be taken. We say you should use your existing easements. It just makes the most sense!

- The existing easements have 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.
- The existing easements would be the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA for this project.
- There is minimal impact from adding lines where towers and lines already exist.
- Using the existing easements would save the environment from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties.

We ask you to not create a 70-mile long clear-cut that will damage our sensitive waterways and ecosystems forever. We ask you to be a good shepherd of the land by using your existing easements for this project. We ask you to use our ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on a route where lines and towers already exist.

Communication ID: 13371

Date Received: 1/18/2011

Name: ED H BERNDT

My property lies adjacent to an existing BPA right of way.

BPA also has an easement road across my property.

Description & address of my property is located in sec [number]

We have prepared a building site and plan on beginning construction in 2011.

It now appears one of BPA proposed right of way would lie east of the existing right of way, which could affect where our new building will be placed.

We would appreciate a marker indicating how far it would enter on our property. It may be necessary to change our site location. We need a specific marker before we can continue.

E H Berndt

Communication ID: 13372

Date Received: 1/10/2011

Name: STEPHEN M BAILEY,DONNA BAILEY TRUSTEE

Ms. Teresa Kubo
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Northwest Region
805 S.W. Broadway
Portland, OR 97205

December 2, 2010

Dear Ms. Kubo,

My brother, Dr. Raymond Bailey, spoke to you on the phone about the Bonneville Power Administration's proposal to install high voltage lines across our property along the East Fork of the Lewis River. My family and I strongly oppose BPA's route 30.

Enclosed are copies of our letters to BPA, and a copy of our letter to u.s. Representative, Henry Waxman, in which we outline some of our objections to BPA's proposal.

Since we wrote these letters, BPA's website indicates that the new (narrower) proposed route 30 would cross directly over the sensitive spawning grounds described in our letter of November 12, 2009. The new proposed route would cut through the wildlife refuge also described in our letter. It has been estimated that our grove on the north side of Lucia Falls Rd. shelters as many as twenty-five deer. This grove contains some old growth trees and a spring which provides water for the animals.

BPA's new proposed route 30 threatens an important spawning ground for trout, steelhead and salmon. In our November letter we described the characteristics of the banks and the river-bottom. The particular pool that contained approximately fifty fingerlings and the water replenishing aquifer would be specifically threatened. The south bank of the river under the route is distinguished by a rich array of grasses, sedges and ferns, important summer habitat for insects, other invertebrates and small animals which serve as food for the fish. Higher on the bank are some big firs and several red alders (*Alnus rubra*). The riverside alders should not be cut. They are particularly important to the riparian eco-system because they shade the banks and fix large quantities of atmospheric nitrogen for the use of the grasses,

sedges and ferns (see J. Pojar and A. Mackinnon, *Plants of the Pacific Northwest Coast*, Redmond, WA, 1994, pg. 44).

The spawning ground functions as a natural fish nursery. This is due to the physical features of the riverbed. A large exposed volcanic rock extends from the south bank into the river. During the winter and spring the rock acts like a jetty. It creates an upstream catch basin. The carcasses of deer and fish become trapped in the basin's eddy. The carcasses provide nutrients to the smolt during the winter and spring. As the water recedes carnivorous land animals and raptors, such as bald eagles also feed on the carcasses. As our neighbor, Dr. Thomas Wolford noted in his letter to the BPA, bald eagles are particularly vulnerable to overhead transmission lines because they fly looking down with their wings overhead. Eagles, hawks and numerous other birds would surely be endangered if the BPA were to use route 30.

Among the many diverse species of plants and animals on our property, we wish to call attention to a beautiful, fully transformed, giant green terrestrial salamander. We found the animal in a patch of young Lady Ferns shaded by Red Alders and a California Hazel Nut near a wetland. The animal does not appear to be any of the species described in W. Leonard et al., *Amphibians of Washington and Oregon*, Audobon Society, 1993. Ms. Karen Hart, Aquatist at Turtle Bay in Redding suggests that the animal might be the rare Cope's Giant Terrestrial Salamander (*Dicamptodon copei*) (Leonard,

pp. 30ff.) or an unknown sub-species of it. This animal and many other species of native animals and plants should not be impacted by transmission lines.

Our stretch of the East Fork of the Lewis River is scenic and pristine. It has waterfalls, rapids, deep volcanic canyons, old growth firs and magnificent animals such as the Bald Eagle. It should not be compromised by BPA's project. We hope the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency will join us in opposing BPA's route 30.

On behalf of my brother, Dr. Raymond Bailey, and the other members of my family we wish you and your colleagues happy holidays.

Sincerely,

Dr. Stephen M. Bailey and

Donna M. Bailey

I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

P.O. Box 9250

Portland, OR. 97207

January 9, 2011

Dear Sirs,

In our letters dated October 5, 2009 (submitted Nov. 4th) and November 12, 2009, we outlined some of our objections to proposed route 30. In these letters we pointed out that route 30 is inappropriate because it crosses the East Fork of the Lewis River in an ecologically sensitive, scenic and historic area. We also brought up some of the issues which make condemning private property in this area illegal. Now we see that the BPA has narrowed its route 30 to pass directly over and through our property. We are dismayed to see that BPA's new route 30 passes directly over the sensitive spawning grounds described in our letter of November 12, 2009.

We wish to reaffirm our objections to new route 30 and add some additional ones. We enclose a copy of our recent letter to the regional chair of the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency. In this letter we give some of the reasons why your new route 30 is particularly threatening to fish, birds and other wildlife. We are in the process of preparing an annotated list of many of the native plants which would be impacted by your project.

In a separate letter we call attention to the new Moulton Falls scenic trail which would be seriously disfigured by transmission lines.

If new proposed route 30 is being considered because of cost considerations, BPA should factor in the long term costs to the environment and to our natural, aesthetic and historical heritage.

We feel that installing transmission lines in new proposed route 30 is inappropriate, unnecessary and unlawful.

We strongly urge BPA to abandon new proposed route 30.

Sincerely,

Donna M. Bailey and

Dr. Stephen M. Bailey

I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project
P.O. Box 9250
Portland, OR. 97207

January 8, 2011

Dear Sirs,

In addition to the objections which we made in our letters of October 5, 2009 and November 12, 2009, we oppose your new route 30 because it would disfigure the new Moulton Falls scenic hiking trail. The wide, flat trail is located on the pristine south side of the river, on an historic logging road. The level 1, "very easy" trail goes to Hantwick Rd. and Lucia Falls. It was designed to allow nearly everyone, including the disabled and women with infants to enjoy the beauty and wildlife of the East Fork of the Lewis River. High voltage lines would not only disfigure the scenic trail, they would pose a significant health risk to

hikers, bikers, joggers and infants. A horse trail which generally parallels the new trail would likely also be adversely affected by BPA's project.

The nearly three mile long Moulton Falls trail could easily be classified as an "8" on a scale of 1 to 10 (10 being best) in the popular book Pacific Northwest Hiking Trails. On our last hike, in August, we saw a bald eagle while we were sitting on the first bench about a third of the way down the trail. The beautiful bird landed on a maple tree about twenty-five feet away. The Moulton Falls trail not only provides a chance to see wildlife, it features spectacular views of the river, small creek waterfalls, the historic Lucia Mill Pond and an anthropomorphic rock. The rock which is about halfway down the trail, on the south side, is in the shape of an American bison. This rock must have been sacred to native aboriginal peoples such as the Cathlepootle who were seen in the general area by members of the Lewis and Clark expedition.

We strongly object to BPA's new proposed route 30. It threatens an environmentally sensitive, scenic and historic area.

We urge the BPA to abandon proposed route 30 and protect this magnificent area.

Sincerely,

Donna M. Bailey

Dr. Stephen M. Bailey

Communication ID: 13373

Date Received: 1/19/2011

Name: PATTI OLSON

Subject: Route Selection

To the Editor:

I wish to correct the impression being given the public by some members of the Anti-BPA Powerline groups. Their pet project has been the so-called Eastern Route, and to promote it, they like to refer to it as 'unpopulated' and 'land owned by timber companies.' In fact, this proposed line zigzags through eastern Yale Valley and impacts hundreds of residents there. There are a number of homes within a few hundred feet of the line, and, yes, children live in some of those, also! This is NOT a line through an 'unpopulated area' as they are eager to assert.

They also state repeatedly that the line runs mostly through timber company holdings. Not so. For instance, the easement runs down the property line between us, with our home of 32 years, and our neighbors. Most of the residents in Yale Valley and vicinity live on small acreages, many of which are partly forested. However, none of them are timber companies, either!

I researched powerlines 9 and 25 on the BPA map of routes under consideration for this project. Those two powerlines were constructed in 1939. Over 70 years ago. Since then hundreds of homes have been built next to those easements.

And people bought them, and rent them, and live in them. But when they did so, they knew the power lines were there! It was a decision they willingly made, for reasons of convenience, economics, or whatever. But it was their decision. Current KV loads for those lines are from 230 KV to 345 KV, and the existing towers range from 60' to 125'

tall. The new line, built here, would increase the KV to 500 and the tower heights to 120' to 150'. I'm even told that having multiple lines can actually decrease the EMF readings. This is where the new line should go.

The people in Yale Valley tolerate many inconveniences to live in our secluded little mountain valley community. To be treated as though we do not count for anything, (or, in fact, do not even exist!), is not only an insult. It is just plain wrong.

Patti Olson

Communication ID: 13374

Date Received: 1/4/2011

Name: RONALD H HOLEMAN

I have called and left a voice mail message with Kathy Pierce asking the following question. Can someone tell me the width of the Notification Buffer from the center line of a proposed line segment to the outer edge of the Notification Buffer? Specifically I am interested in that segment of proposed segment 25, traveling east and on the Ross/Dittmer Complex property. I can be reached by telephone at [phone] or by email at [email]. Thank you for your response.

Ron Holeman

Retired BPA Employee

Communication ID: 13375

Date Received: 1/20/2011

Name: PHILIP SHANTEAU

Line 3 tower 3/7- 3/8 endanger two homes. I have two homes on Hazel Del Rd. [address 1] and [address 2]. Both homes are dangerously close to the proposed lines. [address 1] home is within 100' of line and because the high winds come from the south, a bad storm will drop the line on the home. Also in areas that close EMF can have health hazards as well as electrocution hazards for firefighters in case of a home fire. There is also the danger of falling ice in condition that happens almost every year. The road

access is on steep hill sides that has a real risk of erosion and lose of access to the home. Questions: Is this route still on the table? If this route is used are you going to have to buy these homes? What is the safe distance? Are you going to maintain and guarantee the road that your stripping the hill side of trees will likely destroy? If residences in these homes develop brain cancer how may billons will they be able to sue you for? If you do not buy me out how much are you going to compensate for property value lose an added risk? I do expect a reply to my questions. Sincerely Phil Shanteau

Communication ID: 13376

Date Received: 1/21/2011

Name: JAMES P ROTH TRUSTEE

This is my 2nd request. What do the cross hatch marks mean on the map. I live along the #25 segment, and the cross hatch area takes half of my property. How will I be compensated for this if it comes my way. Please Reply Jim Roth

Communication ID: 13377

Date Received: 1/23/2011

Name: KRISTY JOHNSON

I live along the Minehaha section of the possible transmission lines and if these go in, I want BPA to give me fair value price for our home and buy us out before the installation. I will not stay living near this lines or supporting BPA. We will move back to Oregon where the threat of new lines is not feasible. I do not support these lines.

Communication ID: 13378

Date Received: 12/2/2010

Name: MARGARET PALADENI, HAROLD P PALADENI

To Whom it May Concern:

Thank you for sending the maps.

However, they are more than a little upsetting to us! This proposed line goes through several of our parcels -- one being a prime building site and which we were in the process of selling to one of our grandsons.

We have sold nearby parcels to four other grandchildren and of course it is very upsetting to them, as well as us.

We bought our original place from my husband's parents in 1949 and they had owned it from 1925 so it has been in the Paladeni family for many years. We had hoped to give our grandchildren a chance to enjoy our forest land and river frontage for many years.

We feel we have been good stewards of our land and our sick with the thought that our land could be scarred and devalued with the power line.

Of course we are hoping and praying that the line will be moved to the east away from the many affected homes.

Sincerely,

Harold P. & Margaret Paladeni

Communication ID: 13379

Date Received: 11/30/2010

Name: MARIE ROTSCHY, CECIL C ROTSCHY

RE: I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project [location information]

Gentlemen:

We wrote to you in January, expressing our concern about Route 26. recently we reviewed the latest. Your proposed line passes right over our new place.

We finished this house and shop recently. the bank appraiser appraised this place at [appraisal].

I have had [description of medical condition] since, and I wonder if I could even live close to that much electricity. Does it affect [description of medical condition]?

I would appreciate having someone from BPA come take a look, and discuss what's next.

Sincerely,

Cecil & Marie Rotschy

[appraisal attachment]

Communication ID: 13380

Date Received: 12/10/2010

Name: LEWIS HOUCK, LINDA M HOUCK

Dear BPA:

We wrote our concerns when the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project first came about. The first meeting we attended, we noted our precious, priceless 20 acres was in the middle of segment 26. Now that the segments have been identified with the proper right-of-way and towers, we are more concerned than ever!

We see the proposed right-of-way on segment 26 crosses NE Grantham Road, Amboy east of our driveway until it reaches our east property line with a proposed tower, 26-13. The right-of-way then heads north, placing another tower, 26-12, near the home we had built just 5 1/2 years ago.

We've owned this property over 20 years. Before buying, we made sure there weren't any existing right-of-way for us to worry about when the time came to finally build our dream home and retire from our jobs.

We have several concerns we'd like to draw your attention to:

1 - Rock Creek crosses our property, flowing east to west. Another branch of the creek flows in areas along our east property line - right in the proposed right-of-way.

2 - Placement of tower 26-12 is in our front yard! What a sad thought to imagine walking out the front door everyday and instead of the beauty of the trees and wildlife and the solitude it brings, we'll have a transmission tower at least 150 feet tall!

3 - Tower 26-12, if not on top, will be very close to our pump house and well.

4 - The right-of-way for tower 26-12 will eliminate the ag building we built and need.

5 - The right-of-way for tower 26-12 is just 58 feet from our front door!

6 - The required 150 foot right-of-way, that must be accessible for construction and maintenance, means a clear-cut through our timber. The disruption of soil will invite evasive plants, such as scottish broom and several kinds of thistle. They will flourish in their new environment! We, as well as our neighbors, have worked hard over the years to keep such evasive weeds from our properties and tree farms.

7 - Talking with a friend, a 30 year lineman for PUD, we were reminded of the noise the 500 Kv lines will emit, especially in inclement weather. So much for the desire for tranquility for the remainder of our lives!

8 - We all know power lines' right-of-ways invite dirt bikes, quads, snowmobiles and 4x4 vehicles. With that comes the risk of vandalism to our property and home. Also, the destruction of an insulator would cause a dropped conductor and could be a fire hazard upon reaching the ground. - Do I need to say again, "that's 58 feet from our front door!"?

Our dreams of leaving a "piece of heaven on earth" to our children and grandchildren seems lost in the shadow of a high voltage, 500 Kv transmission line ~~~~~ and, in the palms of your hand.

We still strongly believe "public power on public lands". We urge you to look farther east to DNR land and State land. One meeting we attended, Mark Korsness stated there is an existing right-of-way planned about 40 years ago. We ask you to highly consider public land first and existing right-of-way second. Don't just read our words, please hear what they're saying. Please do not destroy the lives, the homes, the livelihood of us all by connecting the segments for the new right-of-way for the 70 miles of transmission lines.

Sincerely,

Lewis Houck

Linda M. Houck

Communication ID: 13381

Date Received: 1/21/2011

Name: PATTI OLSON

Hi, Lou,

The big rainstorm forecast for last weekend, Jan. 15-17, kind of petered out here in the Yale Valley - we only got 8.48" over those three days. I looked up some other memorable rain events of the past several years.

November 1-7, 2006: 22.51", including 13.78" in two days, Nov. 6 &

7. A 30-year record for one day, also - 8.74" on the 6th.

November 11 & 12, 2008: 9.02"

January 5-8, 2009: 13.15". This fell on about a foot of snow, and

by dusk on January 7, it had washed out one and one-half lanes of Hwy.

503 about a third of the way down Speelyai grade, 3/8 mile west of where the K-line goes over the ridge heading south out of Yale Valley. (We got stopped at the top of the hill on our way home and had to walk a mile and a half home in the dark!) It took three weeks to repair so any local traffic could pass.

That's my point, of course; it has to go somewhere! There is a spring partway down Tabbutt's property (our neighbors, that the K-line route runs through) that looks like a gushing culvert during some of these times of heavy rain.

Thanks for your time! Patti Olson

Communication ID: 13382

Date Received: 1/21/2011

Name: PATTI OLSON

Hi, Lou,

I've skimmed through this morning's articles on the possible 5-year delay of line construction. I hope that wouldn't mean that final route selection would also be delayed by five more years! Living under this uncertainty for that much longer would truly be awful, really unbearable. Would you at least choose your final route along the current time frame, even if the actual construction WAS delayed? (That part would be okay!)

Patti Olson

Communication ID: 13383

Date Received: 1/25/2011

Name: BARBARA R HOUSER

This is in response to the recent article in The Columbian "BPA might delay planned power line" By Erik Robinson. So BPA plans on holding property owners hostage indefinitely? What about my rights? What about our property? What about our property values? So we're supposed to put up with five more years of our property being held hostage? It is unconscionable (far beyond what is considered reasonable) for the BPA to hold property owners hostage for another for five or more years in order for BPA to figure out what they are going to do. I request an immediate release of our property from your proposed route so we may have the freedom move forward with our lives and property.

Communication ID: 13384

Date Received: 1/26/2011

Name: LAURA R SMITH

Yes, my name is Laura Smith, and I sent in a letter on December 13th in regards to the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. I haven't received any response back. The two addresses that we were commenting on are [address 1] and [address 2] in Castle Rock. If somebody could call me back and let me know if there's been any changes made, again as I stated in the letter we have property there that we've been working on. We have septic information that we've paid for and were told not to submit it and basically our lives are kind of on hold here so I'd appreciate it if I could get a response back so we kind of know what direction that we're headed in, are we just kind of putting our lives on hold and not pursue that building up there, or what we're supposed to do. If you could call me back, [phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13385

Date Received: 1/17/2011

Name: LEONARD KLINK

Dear Mr. Korsness:

I write you today with my concerns about the 70 miles of high voltage 500 kv transmission lines BPA has planned for Clark and Cowlitz counties. Although none of your segments are near my home, I will be affected by your and BPA's actions.

When not at work, I spend alot of time in north Clark county. How relaxing "to leave city life and all it holds" to enjoy the beauty and peacefulness of the country. What beauty what peacefulness if the landscape is marred with 15 story tall towers??

I've seen the stress BPA has laid upon my aunt and uncle. I know they aren't alone in their concerns for their future. Their future is in your hands. I ask you, "How would your day be, knowing a 15 story tall tower was being placed in your yard"?

Do the right thing, Mr. Korsness, by using the existing right of way that was planned for years ago. Allow the people who chose to live in that area to enjoy it all, undisturbed by BPA's hands. Leave it untouched by towers for all of us to enjoy today tomorrow for the rest of our lives.

Sincerely,

Leonard Klink

Communication ID: 13386

Date Received: 1/17/2011

Name: DANA WILLIAMS

Dear Mr. Korsness:

I am aware of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, with it's 70 miles of high voltage 500kV transmission lines and 15 story-high towers, planned for Clark and Cowlitz counties. Though deemed necessary, I'm amazed at the number of segments you have created. The turmoil and stress you are causing homeowners, when you have the option to use the right-of-way planned years ago, is uncalled for and cruel.

Though my home is not in one of the segments, my good friends, a retired couple who built their home on acreage just 5 years ago, are "blessed' (??) with 2 towers! Is this their reward for years of hard work - a tower in their yard?

BPA needs to use their existing right-of-way. BPA needs to leave the areas of Clark and Cowlitz county free of towers. To mar our forests, hillsides, tree farms, and homesteads with these huge towers is devastating, not only to the people and families on the chosen segments, but to all of us.

I hope you'll help Mr. Wright to make the right decision. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dana Williams

Communication ID: 13387

Date Received: 1/26/2011

Name: YARO SCHNOEBELEN

To the editor: We learned today that the folks at BPA are no longer in a hurry and likely are going to wait 5 years before building a new electrical transmission line through Clark County. This decision ought to free up BPA planners and engineers to focus intently on route selection and deliver a prompt verdict to anxious citizens. Those of us living along proposed routes 9 and 25 have been waiting patiently for well over a year for word from BPA and we should not continue to be held hostage awaiting a route decision. We want to hear soon that BPA has chosen a route through the unpopulated areas of Clark County.

Sincerely

Yaro Schnoebelen

[email]

Communication ID: 13388

Date Received: 1/29/2011

Name: MARGARET BOYLE

January 29, 2011 BPA: It has come to my attention that certain citizen groups have located another route possibility even further east and north than those currently under consideration. These routes add no new homes to BPA's Rights of Way. I fully and whole-heartedly support this route. If it costs the BPA and the public more money to complete the project that way, so be it. It will save any one person having to bear the financial burden of a cheaper project for the benefit of all. And let's face it, that increase in construction cost will easily be offset by cheaper easement acquisition costs and, if needed, additional revenue from paying customers. Isn't it the paying customers who should bear the cost of the project anyway, not a private citizen?

Communication ID: 13389

Date Received: 1/30/2011

Name: PEGGY L BURNHAM

I have tried to find the map of where you are planning on putting the line, and size of them by our home. your web page should let me put in the address and find out. Very hard to find any information. I don't want to have to look at or hear the power lines. That is why I bought this property! So could you please help me with this web page? Thank you

Communication ID: 13390

Date Received: 1/28/2011

Name: WALTER CHURCH

Dear BPA;

The local Cowlitz PUD has been increasing their transmission lines in our area by replacing their lines with larger wire size over the same pole system. Is it possible to increase the size of wire on existing towers to gain the desired capacity, would the existing towers carry the extra weight?

Just food for thought to maintain the existing right of way and towers?

Walter Church

Communication ID: 13391

Date Received: 2/1/2011

Name: ROBERT A BOYD

Option one - non-wire alternatives - shame on you this should have been explored in its entirety before all others.

Option two - The grey-line map as proposed by "Another Way BPA" stay off private land and impact no residence.

Option three - Your existing right of way - Impact no new residence.

These should be your only choices if you are truly committed to "No impact to the public and their children and grandchildren and great grandchildren and....."

Communication ID: 13392

Date Received: 1/24/2011

Name: MICHAEL DE JONG

To Whom It May Concern:

I have noticed recently that some people who live along the proposed routes for the BPA's 500kV towers have taken to "infighting". Instead of showing a united front and insisting that the BPA place their towers on the easternmost unpopulated routes, some of my fellow citizens are suggesting that the BPA place their new towers on existing easements.

This is unfortunate. I live on proposed route 25 and I certainly don't want the towers in my back yard, but I also don't want to see them in anyone else's back yard either. I won't attempt to throw my neighbors "under the bus" by suggesting routes that won't affect me but will affect many other people.

I have a better idea -- let's band together and tell the BPA they have other viable route alternatives that do not affect populated areas. Routes "O" and "K" are prime examples of routes that do not affect the populated areas of Clark and Cowlitz Counties.

Please allow me to share a few reasons why I believe placing these 500kV power lines near any populated areas is a colossal mistake.

Health Effects: The health hazards from exposure to Electro Magnetic Fields (EMF) are fairly well understood. Numerous studies point to a significant causal link between exposure to EMF and many types of cancers. Children are most likely to be effected but all age groups are at risk. If these lines are constructed in and among the population centers of Southwest Washington approximately 14,000 children will attend schools near the power lines and tens of thousands more will live near the lines. Many states have laws that prevent power lines from being erected near schools due to concerns that long term exposure to high levels of EMF likely contribute to childhood leukemia. Sadly, Washington is not one of those states. The power industry will tell you that this link between EMF and cancer has not been "proven" and their stance on this issue is remarkably reminiscent of the tobacco industries claims that cigarettes weren't dangerous either. Make no mistake if these lines are constructed in populated areas people will die.

Property Values & Reduced Tax Base: Property values have already plummeted in recent years. Placing the new power lines in populated areas will further decimate property values. This reduction in property value will harm the individual homeowner as well as the cities and counties who will suffer a severe loss of tax revenue.

Security Issues: Placing the new power lines on an existing easement will put all the power "eggs" in one basket. If a natural disaster or terrorist attack occurs it will cripple the power supply because nearly all of the power runs down a common line.

The fact remains that viable alternate routes do exist. It is not necessary to wreak havoc on the lives of the citizen's of Southwest Washington. I urge the BPA to select the easternmost routes that will not affect the population centers of Clark and Cowlitz counties. People are not less valuable than a few trees!

Sincerely,

Michael De Jong
Vancouver, WA

Communication ID: 13393

Date Received: 1/17/2011

Name: DANA WILLIAMS

Dear Mr. Wright:

I write you today to urge you "to do the right thing" I am aware that the final decision on the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project is yours.

My home is not in one of the segments, but your decision will affect me, as it will thousands of others. To mar the beauty of northern Clark County and Cowlitz County with 15 story-high towers is devastating. People choose to live there or visit and spend time there, for the beauty and peacefulness. That will be taken from us if you piece segments together rather than use the existing right-of-way you have already have along segments 9 and 25.

All the letters and emails you receive, Mr Wright, I hope you don't just read ... but hear what they say and do the right thing.... Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dana Williams

Communication ID: 13394

Date Received: 1/17/2011

Name: LEONARD KLINK

Dear Mr. Wright,

My letter to you today holds the concern I have for the decision you will be making for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project. Although no segments are planned by my home, that doesn't mean you haven't touched my life and the future you have in store for me..... for all of us.

Through my aunt and uncle (segment 26), I've been made aware of the plan for 70 miles of 500 Kv transmission lines through Clark and Cowlitz counties. What stress BPA has caused them with the knowledge that 2 towers could be placed on their property - one tower's right-of-way just 60 feet from their front door!

I urge you to not destroy the lives of many with a decision to mar these areas with towers. Instead, I ask you to do the right thing by using your existing right-of-way that was planned for years ago. Or, "Public power on public land", as I've heard my aunt say, sounds like a great idea!

I hope you will listen to all who are deeply concerned with the decision you will make. You will make a decision, and we will be the ones who are forced to live with it.

Sincerely,

Leonard Klink

Communication ID: 13395

Date Received: 1/29/2011

Name: PHIL AKELY,DENNIS BARBUR,MARLA BARBUR,ERV BEARD,MARGIE J BORCHERS,ROBERT A BOYD,RICHARD BRANTLEY,ERIC BURCO,CLARICE BURKHART,MARY COMBS,RONALD COMBS,JANICE DAVIS,PHILLIP L DELANY,WILLIAM E DOTY,CHARLES E DUKE,MARY C DUNN,DELRAE EGGLESTON,BRAD ENARSON,KIM ENARSON,BRENDA FAIRBANKS,JAMES E FARBER,SANDRA FERNEDING,SANDRA FINKEL,BARRY A FINKEL TRUSTEE,MARY ANNE GARCIA,WARREN R GARDNER,HERMI GERGES,DAN GERGES,PEGGY MARIE HOUSE,DAVID B HOUSE,JANE KANE,JOHN A KANE,SHIRLEY M KOON,CLAYTON LARSON,WENDY J LEMIEUX,RIC LEVANEN,MELISSA LEVANEN,SALLY G LEVIN,MARTHA LINDBERG,KIM LOUKES,KELLI MERRIMAN,DAVID MERRIMAN,KURT L MERRIMAN,STACI E MERRIMAN,DOUGLAS MOSCHETTI,SANDRA OGDEN,CAROL OJA,TOM OJA,PATTI OLSON,MICHAEL ROSS PATTERSON,JOHN R POER TRUSTEE,DIANE POER TRUSTEE,ANDREW H POOLE,PETER REVESZ,TIFFANY ROSE,WILLIAM ROSE,REYNOLD L SABATA,DANIEL SHULTZ,SUSAN R SMITH,ARDELLE M STEIN,ROBERT STUART,GERI STUART,JOANN M THOMAS,TERRY R TURNER,ANDREW TUSON,MARGARET VAN NUS,WAYNE VAN SOEST,SANDRA VAN SOEST,SHAUNA WALTERS,BRUCE J WATSON,LORETTA WATSON,HARVEY WATSON,NORMA WATSON,EMILY A WEBBER,GEORGE WEISENBORN,VERNON WHEELER,JUDY D WILLARD,LEE WITTER-KAHN

Mr. Wright:

Bonneville Power Administration has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. Your slated objectives are to provide a substantial increase in transmission capacity, which will satisfy the projected growth in demand for decades into the future, while minimizing impacts to the natural and human environment and minimizing costs whenever possible.

The alternative having the lowest overall cost and having dramatically less human and environmental impact would be to use routes 9 and 25 where you already have easements, towers and lines. Land acquisition costs would be negligible. Construction costs and environmental impact costs would be minimized. Litigation costs would be minimized. The intangible cost of public opposition would be mitigated.

Any of the new corridors that you have proposed would require an extensive long clear-cut through the pristine rural countryside of two counties. All of these proposed rural routes would depreciate home and land values; destroy farms, businesses and hard-earned retirement equity. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife.

If you choose a rural route, you promise to cut 150 feet through private landowner's property for your towers and lines. In addition, we are told that you will also need to remove any tall trees adjacent to this new right of way that would threaten to fall into your towers and lines. In the proposed rural routes, a Douglas fir tree can grow up to 200 feet tall. This could mean in addition to the 150-foot clear-cut you

would take for the towers, you could clear-cut an additional 200 feet on either side adjacent to the new right of way, creating a 550-foot clear-cut through the rural private landowner's property.

You have assured us there is enough room on routes 9 and 25 and that no homes would be taken. Now knowing you can collocate the 230 kV and 500 kV lines along these routes, we argue that using these routes would lower land acquisition costs, lower environmental impact and litigation costs, plus much lower maintenance costs made possible by substantially reduced vulnerability to damage from weather phenomena (ice storms, wind storms, etc.).

Here are some additional points supporting that position:

(a.) The existing easements would be the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA for this project.

(b.) There is minimal impact from adding lines where towers and lines already exist.

(c.) Using the existing easements would save the environment from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties

(d.) The existing BPA scars are already in place and many of the adjacent landowners bought those properties fully aware of the visual and environmental impacts of those lines.

(e.) The existing easements have 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.

Regarding security, it is clear that the 70-year security history of the existing transmission lines has been and will continue to be enhanced by virtue of the lines being located in urban and relatively urban environments, where any suspicious activity has a high probability of being reported. In contrast, a 70-mile run of new lines through isolated and rural areas would have a much higher exposure to undetected and/or unreported subversive activity and adversarial physical damage.

We implore you to not implement a new 70-mile long clear-cut and do not build your massive new infrastructure in our rural communities. We ask you to use our ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing your new lines and towers where you intended to run them when you purchased land rights 70 years ago to do so, where lines and towers already exist, where the visual scar has faded into the background, and where the environmental damage has already been done along your existing easements of routes 9 and 25.

Sincerely,

[signature]

[address]

Communication ID: 13396

Date Received: 2/4/2011

Name: JUSTINA TAYLOR

Maryam Asgharian spoke with Justine on the phone.

They aren't able to pay mortgage. Their bank is finally willing to work with them, but their neighborhood is at an intersection of two segments. They wouldn't want to live there if the line comes through. She was hoping to learn what the likelihood of BPA choosing a segment near them was.

Communication ID: 13397

Date Received: 2/6/2011

Name: BEVERLY JANE FIELDING

Dear Mr. Wright,

As a citizen that resides and owns property along existing BPA power lines and proposed segments to be acquired for the I-5 Corridor Project, I have followed the project development, met with engineers that were surveying my property and attended public meeting. The only encouraging information that I have taken from all of these activities is BPA's commitment that the displacement of even one family would be unacceptable.

In reviewing the interactive map when it were released in November, I was devastated to see that one of the proposals would place tower 43/9 on the corner of my property. The proposed tower and new lines would require an additional easement across my property. The impact to my property, home and environment would be substantial.

The placement of Tower 43/9 is within a stand of Douglas Fur that shelters a ravine created by a tributary of the Lacamas Watershed. The ravine currently provides shelter and water for area wildlife. The lines that would run from Tower 43/9 and connect back to the replacement line within the current easement on Section 48 would necessitate removal of additional Douglas Fur which currently stabilize the steep sides of the ravine and shelter the watershed. Destabilizing this area would impact the watershed and wildlife through erosion, an increase in temperature, and loss of vegetation. Clark County has actively protected this watershed for more than 15 years.

The impact to my residence would be significant. My home is currently located outside of the easement. The assumption is that residing outside of the easement lowers the negative health impact of living by power lines. The interactive map available in November included the exact location of the easement edge on a close up of individual properties. Thought that feature is no longer available, using it in November provided me with a clear location of the new easement. The easement would not only cross the ravine at its deepest point, but would continue across the back of my home. The easement boundary went directly across the back of my bedroom. It continued on crossing the back of the mobile home where my two disabled sons live. As the back of their home is heavily wooded, more trees will need to be removed along the Watershed.

The placement of Tower 43/9 was originally proposed to create a spur line that connected the proposed lines to Segment 50 and added an access road under the spur line. Engineers surveying the area determined that this was not a viable route and it was removed from consideration. I would propose the continued use of Tower 43/9 is a result of this abandoned route and that an alternate tie line to Segment 48 that remained within the current easement could easily be identified and used. As I reviewed many of the proposed routes on the interactive map I noted a number of instances where the proposed route intersections were at 90 degrees. In other words, it appears that Tower 47/3 could be located directly on Segment 48 instead of slightly south of the intersection. Were it moved in line with the current power lines and easement, the impact to my home, the Lacamas Watershed and wildlife that shelter in the ravine would be eliminated.

I respectfully request that this adjustment be made to the route. In keeping with your commitment to limit the impact of the final route on homes, it is a viable, cost effective and easy answer.

I would appreciate a response to my proposal. I can be reached at [cell phone] (cell) or [work phone] (work). I look forward to speaking to and meeting with a BPA representative to discuss this matter.

Sincerely,

Jane Fielding

Communication ID: 13398

Date Received: 2/5/2011

Name: JENNIFER J MCKEE

Comment was initiated from http://www.bpa.gov/corporate/public_affairs/calendar/

Mark - I was told that BPA would be choosing a preferred route in December 2010. I have not heard one. According to the Columbian newspaper, the project "may" be postponed. Do you plan on proposing a preferred route and then postponing it, or do we all sit and remain stagnate in anticipation? Waiting to decide which way to go. I would just like to be informed.

Please Contact Me

Jennifer McKee

Communication ID: 13399

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: JULIA HART STOLL FEARON

Hi, this is Julia Stoll. Address [address] and I'd like to have a current project map mailed to me. My phone number is [phone]. I received the project update letter in the mail today but I would like to have the current map mailed to me. Thank you. [address].

Communication ID: 13400

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: WILBUR M MACKEY,SHIRLEY E MACKEY

Wilbur and Shirley Mackey. [address]. And I'm requesting a detailed map of the transmission lines proposed and showing our property in relation to what is happening. We appreciate it as soon as possible. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13401

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: JOYE E UNGER

Hello, this is Joye Unger at [address]. We just received your project update in the mail today and we do not have access to the internet. Therefore, we would like you to send us a map of our location at [address] and how it will affect us. We would appreciate that in the mail as soon as possible and thank you for your trouble. Once again, please send us a map of our property and how we will be affected. Thank you, goodbye.

Communication ID: 13402

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: KENNETH A MERRILL

Printed copy, please. Ken Merrill [address]. Telephone number [phone]. Thank you, bye.

Communication ID: 13403

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: JULIE GILLAND

Hi, this is Julie Gilland, and I'm calling to get a map to include our address so we can see if our property is on the route. So, our address, [ADDRESS]. That's our mailing address. So, please mail us out a map that includes our property on it to see if we are in the line of the project. Thank you so much.

Communication ID: 13404

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: PATRICK SPARKS

Hi, my name is Patrick Sparks and my address is [address]. And I got something in the mail and I don't know if this is just an update or informational letter or if this is a notification letter so I wanted to, in

regards to your powerline. So, I wanted to find out if we are in a zone that is considered potentially an area where the power stuff is going to go or not. So if you could call me back and leave me a message I'd appreciate it. Again, my name is Patrick Sparks. Our property address and mailing address is the same. [address]. And again I want to know if we are in the area being considered for the powerline or not. Ok, thanks. Number here is [phone]. Bye.

Communication ID: 13405

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: ROGER L MILES

Has a statistical analysis been completed addressing the probability of a service interruption "disaster", if you located the additional 500 KV line in the same right-of-way as the present line? If so, what were the statistical conclusions? Also, what is the history of such "disasters" along the existing right-of-way?

Communication ID: 13406

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: CINDY J HALLSTROM

Hi, this is Cindy Hallstrom and I'd like to- I don't have internet access so if you could please send me a map to see where our property falls in on this, hopefully it doesn't. But, anyway, our property address is [address]. And that's our same mailing address. The [address]. This is Cindy Holstrom my phone number is [phone] and I'd appreciate a copy of the map showing our property and how it would affect it, hopefully it doesn't but I'd just like to see for myself. Ok, thanks, bye.

Communication ID: 13407

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: ELTON L STRANGE

Yes, my name is Elton Strange, my address is [address]. My phone number is area code [phone], and one of your line segments goes right through my property and I need to talk to somebody about it personally so that I can maybe make a suggestion because it goes really close to my house and things of that sort. I have an option that may be beneficial. I called before but nobody called me back. I'd appreciate a phone call, thank you. Bye.

Communication ID: 13408

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: ANONYMOUS

Phone number, [phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13409

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: RICHARD A BREMS

Hello, my name is Richard Brems. I'm interested in receiving a printed copy of the proposed route, or the map of the proposed route to the affects our property. The property address and mailing address is [address]. My phone number is [phone]. Thank you very much.

Communication ID: 13410

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: CHARLES STRUNK

This is Charlie Strunk. I'd just like to talk to someone. I'm Charlie Strunk, my address is [address]. My phone number is [phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13411

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: JOANNE L GOFF

Hi, my name is Joanne Goff, my address is [address]. I need a property locator and a map of what this project entails. I don't have internet access so I need to know if this is going to affect me. My address again is [address]. My phone number is [phone]. I'd like a copy of the map where these supposedly towers are supposed to go.

Communication ID: 13412

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: PEGGY THOMPSON

Yes, this is Peggy Thompson. And I would like to have a copy of the map with our property as I do not have internet access. My address for the property is [property address]. And my mailing address is [mailing address]. And I just would like to know if my house in Amboy is on the map so please send me a map. Thank you. Bye.

Communication ID: 13413

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: LINDA L SCHRADER

Hello, this is Linda Schrader. I'm at [address]. And I'm looking at the right of way and the property boundary notification, the yellow lines that are coming out which takes a good share of our property, I'm wondering, how is that affected if we are within the yellow lines of the notification buffer. Does that mean that our property is affected? Or will that property be taken? If your plan goes through. I'll give you my cell number. It's [phone]. Please tell me again the date when these decisions will be finalized so we'll know if our property is definitely included. Thank you, goodbye.

Communication ID: 13414

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: JOHN A KANE

My name is Jack Kane, I just got a flyer in the mail on the project update claiming that the access roads have been added to the map at GIS/i5gmviewer.html. I'm at that site right now looking at the map which I look at quite regularly and there is no trace of any access roads having been added to it. Even with the segment that shows on the flyer, the intersections of segments 14, 9 and 25. I'd like to know when those proposed access roads will be added and when the site will be updated to reflect that. Please get back to me, [phone]. My property is in Amboy your tower number 26-11 is right smack in the middle of my property. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13415

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: MIKE BOSTER,JULIE A BOSTER

Hello, our names are Michael Boster, Julie Boster. Our phone number is [phone]. Our mailing address is [mailing address]. Our property address is [property address]. I'd like to request a printed out map through the mail and any other information that you might have. Thank you and have a great day.

Communication ID: 13416

Date Received: 2/11/2011

Name: PHILLIP L DELANY

Yes, my name is Phil Delany – D-E-L-A-N-Y. I'm a property owner on Route O post new routes. And I've been trying to find where the proposed access roads might be in relation to my property. When I go to the website you have listed there, www.bpa.gov etcetera. It keeps coming up saying nothin can be found. I've entered it several times and I don't come up with anything. I have been able to find a map showing where the right of way goes in my area, but I can't find where the access roads will be. So if you could give me information on that. My number is [Phone number]. My address is [Address]. My e-mail address is [e-mail]. [email]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13417

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: ANN COX

I would like the map. My name is Ann Cox. [Address]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13418

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: CURTIS L ANDERSON

Well I just wanted to know if it was going to affect my property. It's at [Address]. And my name is Curtis Anderson. I just don't know if it is going to affect me. I see all of your literature coming through the mail, but I haven't even looked at your maps. So I thought I'd just call and see if it was going to affect my place or not. Let me know. My phone number is [Phone number]. Thank you. Bye.

Communication ID: 13419

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: ANTOINETTE V JONES

This is Antoinette Jones I'd like more information as to how this project is coming close to my property. My property is [Address]. I understand you have additional printed information. That's what I'm looking for. Thank you, Bye

Communication ID: 13420

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: TINA PICCHIONI

Hi this is Tina Picchioni. I am with the City of Vancouver and I support our Planning Commission. It looks like we just received a mailing, but it looks like we need to update your list of the Planning Commissioners. Some of the addresses and names that you have are old Commissioners and we have some new people that have taken their place. So I would like to get that list updated. If you could give me a call back at [Phone number] I would appreciate it. Or, another route for you to gain access to our Commissioners is our website and on our Planning Commission page. Otherwise I can forward you our roster or just give me a call and I can just let you know our new members. So, thank you – I appreciate your help.

Communication ID: 13421

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: JOHN L ROSENLUND

This is John Rosenlund. [Address]. [Phone number]. I'm wondering if I can get a map that shows my property along with where these power lines are going. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13422

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: MRS. SEALS

Yes. This is Mrs. Seals. I live at [Address]. My phone number is [Phone number] and I'd like a copy of a map showing exactly where this is going to go and where my property is within that area. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13423

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: GLENN L BEAN

Yeah, this is Glenn Bean and my address is [Address]. And I've received information about this. I'd like to know how it impacts my property and would like the map showing the impact. Been on the internet but I can't understand it. I'd appreciate a copy. My address is [Address]. And the name is Glenn Bean. Appreciate any information, a little better detail of how it's going to impact. Very important. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13424

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: BARBARA BLOOMFIELD

Hi my name is Barbara Bloomfield. My address is [Address]. I just have a question, I understand the map quite clearly. I don't know the definition of a notification buffer. What does that have to do with the building. My property is right in the middle of that line 25 where there is kind of a "V" set up. How does the notification buffer affect my property. Is my question. My work phone is [Phone number] from 7:30-4:00 Monday through Friday if you could contact me there please. That's [Phone number] and I need information regarding the notification buffer. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13425

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: DELBERT G KISSINGER

My phone number is area code [Phone number] and I live at [Address]. You already got my mailing address apparently, but I want to find out – I want you to give me a map, I want to see where my land lays and just how you're gonna go about this power line and if it is gonna hit my property at all. Send me a map and we'll go from there. That's all. Bye-bye.

Communication ID: 13426

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: THOM DENMAN

I have two requests: One is what is this non-wires measure, what do they mean non-wires? The other thing is the map for the property address at [Address]. That map has to do with that property and that's a good mailing address. But your explanation – non-wire – in the brochure doesn't mean a thing. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13427

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: THOMAS G MEADE

Yes. Thomas G. Mead. [Address]. Would like to see what part of the property they intend on using for whatever. Would like to have more information. Thank you, bye.

Communication ID: 13428

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: MAXINE WHITE

Hello, I would like a copy of the correct map. I want it to be the map that would include [Address]. One that would include [Address]. And one that would include [Address]. My phone number is [Phone number] and if you could please circle those on the map or maps if there is more than one so we know where those properties are located. That's [Address], [Address] and [Address]. All in [City]. My name Mrs. White.

Communication ID: 13429

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: TERRI A SHARPE

Hi, my name is Terri Sharpe. My phone number is [Phone number] and my cell phone is [Phone number] and I received the updated flier you guys sent out and I was just – I also got the e-mail – and I just had a couple of questions regarding the new access road and the something about the tower where they are connecting – it looks like they are going to be on our property and I just wanted some further information on that. If you could give me a call back I would appreciate it. Thank you so much. Bye

Communication ID: 13430

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: JOYCE PARKER

Hi, my name is Joyce Parker, and my address is [Address]. And I would like to request a printed copy of the map that includes my property at [Address], [Address], and [Address]. I'd like a map that shows me my property in relation to where your towers and transmission lines and access roads are going to be. I guess I thought...I got this mailing today...and I guess I thought it was on hold for 5 years, but evidently, this doesn't look like that's the case. So, if I'm wrong, please let me know. Ok, thank you so much, bye-bye.

Communication ID: 13431

Date Received: 2/11/2011

Name: JOHN GIBSON

I would like to have a map of the property and our address is [Address]. Telephone number is [Phone number]. Thank you. The name is John Gibson.

Communication ID: 13432

Date Received: 2/12/2011

Name: ELIZABETH L HAMILTON

This is Liz Hamilton. My address is [Address]. My land description is [Parcel description]. Also [Parcel description]. Township 16 and the other was Township 8. Ok, first I would like to request the latest map showing the proposed access road and location of towers. For the whole line if possible, or at least where it crosses my land. We'd like to suggest that you stick with Line F and avoid Line 11 all together. Weyerhaeuser sell its land for development from time to time and that entire electric line if it went further north and east would be more in line with future development of lands than it is here. Since what electric there is right here is very close to where you're proposing this line. And it's already established and satisfied. My thought would be to get the line in back further North and East before development takes place so that you're not interfering with people. And it will already be in and that's that. The other thing is, some lady called and said she would send me a hard copy of questions and answers. And I have never received it. So I'd still like that. Also I would like to ask about electric arching. Just how is that going to affect various things such as satellite dishes on the property for receiving television, also, for affecting my cell phone and underground wiring and plumbing and well and all that sort of thing. As well as my above ground fencing for keeping in cattle. Anyway, I would appreciate a return on all of this. And right now especially a map showing my proposed access roads and location of towers. Thank you very much. My phone number is area code [Phone number]. I hope that you're able to go with Weyerhaeuser's number 11, that to me would be a lot more practical down the road to have that line back further so that it would be in line with future development. Thank you again. I hope to hear from you. And also Mark Korsness he's always been welcome to come out and see what is

transpiring out here and it may still be too early for him to do it, but it would help in regards location of access lines and towers. Thanks again. Bye now. This is Liz. [Phone number]. Bye now.

Communication ID: 13433

Date Received: 2/12/2011

Name: ELIZABETH L HAMILTON

Yes this is Liz Hamilton again. I forgot to add to my first comment, so this is comment # 2. I do not have a computer, I have no way of accessing any of this on the internet or whatever. So you do need to write and send me this stuff that I requested on the first request. The other thing is what is "non-wire?" I'm not just sure I understand it – if it means no wires over head than I'm assuming then you mean wires underground. Anyway I'd like to understand that further. Isn't it possible you could use your already existing right of way along I-5, just put up your taller towers or non-wires or whatever. Again, this is Liz Hamilton, [Phone number] and my mailing address is [Address]. Just add this to my first comment. The first call just prior to this one. A moment ago. Thanks again, bye now. This is Liz.

Communication ID: 13434

Date Received: 2/13/2011

Name: JULIE A WALKER

Hi this is Julie Walker at [Address]. And I'd like a copy of the map to include that address that I just gave you. Thank you very much. Have a great day, bye.

Communication ID: 13435

Date Received: 2/14/2011

Name: RON MCPEAK

Hello my name is Ron McPeak, I have a 5 acre piece of property in Cowlitz County right where Highway 503 comes off the hill down towards Cougar. And the address or description is the [Parcel description]. I'm trying to find out where the proposed power lines are relative to my property. And would like a map showing my property relative to the proposed power lines. My name again is Ron McPeak – mailing address [Address]. Spelling of my last name is MCPEAK and would like either a call or a printed version. Thank you very much. My phone number is [Phone number]. Cell phone or home phone [Phone number]. Thank you, Bye.

Communication ID: 13436

Date Received: 2/14/2011

Name: ROSE WETMORE

My name is Rose Wetmore. My address here is [Address]. My telephone number here all day long is [Phone number]. I've been getting information from you in the mail and I got your latest and I don't know if I'm included in this new corridor or not, I can't tell from your map. Could you please call me and let me know whether I'm in the new corridor or not. I don't care one way or another. Just kind of curious. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13437

Date Received: 2/14/2011

Name: RALPH KLINE

My mailing address has changed. Wondering if someone can give me a call back at [Phone number]. Thank you. Goodbye.

Communication ID: 13438

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: JAMES P ROTH TRUSTEE

Where do I find the location of new proposed access roads that might impact me? Thanks Jim Roth

Communication ID: 13439

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: RANDALL D PEARL

as of 2/9/11 Your online map does NOT show proposed roads as you describe in the mailed newsletter.

Communication ID: 13440

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: JOHN R NESBITT

Dear BPA, Our home is impacted by segment 26 between towers 16 and 17. The access road to tower 17 is our driveway. The proposed access road runs up our driveway about 500 feet then passes between our house and shop in the paved area where my kids ride bikes, play basketball, etc. This is obviously unacceptable. Please review your work and let me know what changes will be made to this access road. Thank you, John R. Nesbitt

Communication ID: 13441

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: KEN WAKE

I have been trying to locate the design engineers for this project to help with Road, Drainage, and Bridge design on on access roads. BPA currently purchases culverts and stormwater treatment devices through our company but I have been unable to find a contact for this project. Any help is greatly appreciate. Ken Wake

Communication ID: 13442

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: CHRISTINA A VANDENBERG

I am horrified that this "project" is even happening. Many home and landowners who are doing the right thing by living debt free, contributing to their communities, and abiding by the laws set by our government are going to be uprooted and "sent on their way." The great people of Washington state do not deserve to be treated like second class citizens. The message this project gives is, "Hey, your doing the right thing, but we're going to just take your property anyway, but hey we'll reimburse you in a crummy economy." This is un-American. BPA "officials" should be uprooted from their homes and see how they like it! I don't know how you guys can sleep at night. From my knowledge, this plan is going to help Canada's powerlines, how American is it that we're hurting our citizens for the benefit of a foreign country. When will this crap stop?!

Communication ID: 13443

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: PERRY J CALABRESE

Tower #2-15 has been moved to the top of the documented slide zone. The earth is moving folks and you are causing damage to my home and property. Why haven't you contacted or visited me so I can show you first hand the damage you've caused? DO NOT CUT, TRIM, MOVE EARTH, IN THIS AREA! DO YOU WANT A REPEAT OF THE KELSO SLIDE? DO NOT PUT MY FAMILY OR PROPERTY IN DANGER OR HARMS WAY!

Communication ID: 13444

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: WALTER JOHNSON

Why don't you reduce the need for new wires by encouraging alternative energy projects placed closer to actual power customers? Why is BPA resistant to burying its power lines. Clearly some of these big towers are likely to fall during an earthquake and they are certainly far more vulnerable to terrorism than buried lines. Burying in flexible conduit the lines should not be at risk of any damage except where they cross fault lines, and at those points they will break whehter above or below ground if the fault line moves much. In the last city I lived in I actually paid the electric utility to move my lines below ground,

including an extra dollar a month in line. The city also prohibited an increase in the number of utility poles, which forced most new line construction under ground. I have never heard of outages caused by problems with underground lines, but every winter I hear of serious outages and problems caused by downed electrical lines which sometimes just get overwhelmed by the weight of ice even when a tree or tree branch doesn't fall on them. I have also never heard of an electrocution caused by buried lines that weren't cut by excavation equipment. Finally, all of the superconductor developments that will eventually lead to a room temperature super conductors, will work only in underground installations, so BPA could put itself in the position of being an early adapter of superconductor long distance power lines simply by going underground now and needing only to pull through new wiring. It is unlikely there ever will be super conductor wires that can tolerate a hot day or all the regular flexing from wind and outdoor temperature changes that current high tension lines have to tolerate.

Communication ID: 13445

Date Received: 2/12/2011

Name: JOHN PAUL TUININGA

To BPA, Your recent update of the maps with the access roads has a few problems with it. Kaskillah, 230th, and 235th are private roads for the homeowners and are more or less paved driveways. They are not county roads and hve little or no subbase and only 2 inches of asphalt and most roads are 8-10 feet wide. The roads are not rated for truck traffic. Garbage trucks do not even go on them. They are not county roads. Furthermore the one access road to tower P2 cuts accross my property to DNR land. It is steep ground on one side. The road goes through my well head and tank. I am also currently building a shop right off my driveway which will conflict whith where you want your road. If you did want an access road you would have to get an easement. There is a simple answer to accessing P1 and P2. There is a logging road that takes you within 50-100 feet of each pole off of Berry Rd. I do not know how you are getting your access road information but you need to get people on the ground to look at this. You are driving 2 miles out of the way to go 50 feet. I have worked construction for years, mainly building roads and could assist you in this. The engineers that did the layout are very ignorant of the local surroundings. Feel free to contact me for information or if your layout engineers need help. Looking forward to your response. John T.

Communication ID: 13446

Date Received: 2/12/2011

Name: BOB LITTLETON

Now we have a new tactic thrust upon the property owners---the "non-wires" screening report. Why was this not mentioned at the beginning of the process? This "non-wires" report serves two functions: it could provide the BPA with another justification for building the line and it could allow BPA to postpone building the line until the political conditions are favorable. If spending cuts are made to stimulus projects BPA may not have the money available to build. BPA certainly does not want to give up on the

idea of building the I5 Project and seems intent on "branding" real estate for years to come. I suspect that the "spin doctor" public relations firm that BPA hired is behind this move and I encourage all homeowners to continue to voice opposition to this unreasonable encumbrance. In effect, this holds the homeowner hostage to the whims of BPA

Communication ID: 13447

Date Received: 2/13/2011

Name: JASE E STEFANSKI,JENNIE S STEFANSKI

Mr. Korsness: My Name is Jase Stefanski and my wife is Jennie and our six kids are Judge, Justus, James, Joshua, Jewel and Josiah. Our home is currently in Camas but we have been planning for some time now to build on our 16 acres at [address]. My in-laws now live on 5 of those acres at address [address] and we now are spending 2 to 3 days a week up there putting up fences, working on shop and gardens but our house building plans are now on hold due to your proposed line route. My oldest boy is 9 years old and my youngest is 7 months. I purchased the first of 3 lots ([parcel numbers]) in 2001. Here is a link to our first lot - [hyperlink] Your proposed K route would forever negatively impact our property and most likely prevent us from building anything further on these 16 acres other than fences. We are a home school family and my kids are very bright and will make a significant impact on this area. I would hate to have them grow up with a negative view of BPA. I am sure you have already seen the following statement but I am attaching it since short of you putting the line in the ground like I have publicly stated at two of your meetings then this is the only reasonable option left for you. Use your own current routes, put it in the ground or if you can prove those are not possible then you must pay for all negative impact to private property - not just easement locations. The last option would make in ground application near people very much more affordable. I would welcome you meeting my family personally at one of your future events.

Your agency has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. Your stated objectives are to minimize costs whenever possible and to minimize impacts to the natural and human environment. The least expensive alternative and the one with virtually no human or environmental impact would be to use routes 9 and 25 where you already have towers and lines. Any of the new corridors that you have proposed would require a 70-mile long clear-cut through the countryside of two counties. All of these proposed rural routes would destroy homes, farms and businesses. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife. You have told us there is enough room on your existing easements for this project and that no homes would be taken. We say you should use your existing easements. It just makes the most sense!

- The existing easements have 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.
- The existing easements would be the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA for this project.
- There is minimal impact from adding lines where towers and lines already exist.
- Using the existing easements would save the environment from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties.

We ask you to not create a 70-mile long clear-cut that will damage our sensitive waterways and ecosystems forever. We ask you to be a good shepherd of the land by using your existing easements for this project.

We ask you to use our ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on a route where lines and towers already exist.

Communication ID: 13448

Date Received: 2/15/2011

Name: DEBRA SUE DICKERSON

Hi this is Debbie Dickerson my address is [Address]. And I would like to have a new site map sent to us and maybe our property circled so I can tell what's going on now. And our PO BOX is [Address] for sending. Also, if you have any more questions, give me a call at [Phone number]. Thanks, Bye.

Communication ID: 13449

Date Received: 2/15/2011

Name: SALLY J HYDE

I oppose the proposed line location crossing over westside hwy at Castle Rock. My family has owned this property for almost 100 years. We consider it an heirloom and it is kept for future generations. The Shaws (my sister) are greatly impacted. The route would have two towers on their land! This would effectively ruin the riverside property and destroy any hope of passing it on to their children. We want other routes considered. Sincerely, Sally Hyde

Communication ID: 13450

Date Received: 2/14/2011

Name: STEPHEN HAGENSEN

Yes, I'd like to get a change of address for material you're mailing us. The current address, and it's under FPM Properties, LLC, [Former address]. And I'd like to have it changed to my home and it'll still be under FPM Properties, LLC, the address is [new address] Thank you.

Communication ID: 13451

Date Received: 2/14/2011

Name: ERNA SARASOHN

Good afternoon Maryam,

I think people waited until the weekend to study the BPA February newsletter because I had a lot of people contact me over the weekend.

The are asking about the "Northern alternative, north of Silver Lake" article and in particular the paragraph "We have concluded that this proposal may relieve one set of home and landowners from

impacts, but burdens another set". I am being asked how many HOMEOWNERS will be relieved and how many HOMEOWNERS will be burdened--not land owners but homeowners. They also want me to verify if these burdened homeowners are not currently impacted.

Thanks Maryam, I appreciate your time.

Erna

Communication ID: 13452

Date Received: 2/14/2011

Name: VICENTE A MOLINOS,ERNA SARASOHN

Maryam,

Vicente asked me to forward this to you.

Thanks

Erna

Please note that the white line on my digital photos is less curved than what it should be based on the coordinates. I pasted a strip of tape above the real path so as not to cover the road labels. Now I cannot take it off.

Most importantly, the drawing of the line after going below Lake Merrill should show going horizontally just below the southern boundary of the Volcanic Monument. The beginning of the horizontal portion, point 6a, is exactly aligned with the eastern boundary of the DNR properties just to the West of Cougar.

It might not hurt for BPA to get these coordinates table if you have not sent it before. Erna, if this is OK with Terry, why don't you send them to Maryam to return her courtesy?.

Thanks,

V

Communication ID: 13453

Date Received: 2/12/2011

Name: ERNA SARASOHN

Maryam,

What Bill Moyer has written is way beyond the average persons comprehension. Could you explain in layman's terms what BPA is saying?

Thank you

Erna

Communication ID: 13454

Date Received: 2/11/2011

Name: ARDELLE M STEIN

Mr. Wright,

Here is a copy of a letter to be published in the Battle Ground Reflector next week. If it really does HAUNT you.....Don't sell us out!!!

To the Bpa From the Yale Valley.....Here in our picturesque little valley, many of us if not all of us are gravely concerned about the BPA's decision to locate a proposed route past our school and over the heads of several of our residents. The proposed line cuts directly through the heart of this residential, recreation and habitat area. Initially we were not in the direct line of fire, until folks from the original proposed lines suggested that the BPA go FURTHER EAST into UNPOPULATED AREAS. A seemingly reasonable request, but that line landed smack in the middle of a DENSELY POPULATED SCENIC AREA.

My home, business of 35 years and 4 investment rentals all lie within less than a quarter mile. The towers would be virtually IN MY BACK YARD and actually even closer to some of my longtime neighbors. Some would actually be looking out their kitchen windows at the monolith towers proposed for the area. WHO made this decision and what did they not comprehend about further east to unpopulated areas. This Valley has over 150 permanent residences which means many families and retirees. There are many more nonresident property owners. That puts the population in the many hundreds, hardly an unpopulated area.

There are several businesses, some that are dependent on the valley's scenic quality (one a set of lodges that entertains wedding, family reunion and other outdoor events). We have a school, a church, a gun club and a new sanctuary for elk being developed practically on the proposed line. We boast Speelyai Bay and Yale Boat launch swimming and picnic areas and other major recreation points. It is literally the gateway to Cougar and all its services and the MT. ST. Helens Monument and all it's recreational activities including hunting, fishing, hiking, boating, skiing, snowmobiling and the list goes on. This is obviously not the Further East unpopulated area others had in mind.

There is an alternative around this area that is truly further east and unpopulated and is currently "being looked at "as stated to me by a BPA representative last week at a meeting in Amboy. It is called the GRAY LINE and can be seen on the map at the NowayBPA website. It was proposed by a citizens group who really knows the areas. That is a big part of the problem knowing the areas. BPA doesn't seem to have a clue about the areas. That is why a citizens advisory board made up of all the proposed lines area residents should be a vital part of the decision making. Who do you ask when you are in an unknown

state, town, rec area...why the locals of course. Just ask any of us and we can give you the entire clear picture of our communities without ever having to fire up a helicopter.

We really feel ignored out here in the Yale Valley. We are coalescing now to "RALLY THE VALLEY" and stop this encroachment on our homes, businesses and lifestyles. BPA take a long hard look at the GRAY LINE. It just may be that Easiest and Cheapest way your looking for. With 120+ million to be spent on property acquisition you will have practically no residences to buy out and will be dealing mainly with a few large private business and state entities. And since you will be receiving stim dollars, why not recycle those to state agencies who are struggling to stay solvent and boost the local economy to boot. They should be anxious for funds.

I hope everyone will join those of us from the Yale Valley who want to see this truly go further east to unpopulated areas. BPA GO ALL THE WAY ON THE GREY! BPA GO EAST WITH THE BEAST. I don't know about anyone else but I'm mad as hell and I'm not gona take it anymore!!!!!!!

Stephen Wright said all of this with the homeowners "HAUNTS HIM" I certainly hope so.....

Ardie Stein Long time Yale Valley Resident

Postscript:

Two days after submitting this letter, I received as did probably everyone in the area, a prematurely released newsletter from the BPA. The BPA gent at the Amboy meeting said it would be LATE February before any decision could be reached about the new proposals. Hmmm what happened to that? Awfully quick look don't you think? The letter states that the GREY LINE would require impact statements have construction difficulties and would be longer. Every proposed line requires impact statements and has its own set of construction difficulties. True the GREY LINE would be slightly longer, but uninhabited for the greater length of the line, consequently less individual acquisition and impact on residences. It also stated that one group would get relief, while another new group would be impacted. What new group and how many of them are there? Come on BPA what generalities! This feels like "OK we looked, (because we had to) we have already made up our minds, go away don't bother us".

Wouldn't the costs of land acquisition be reduced significantly if they missed the Yale Valley and the hundreds of residents there, to say nothing of all the thousands of folks WEST of K and O? There are no permanent year round residences anywhere Northeast of the Yale Valley, only Weyerhaeuser, Longview Fibre and DNR, 2 of which are rumored to be on board or in negotiations currently. Even if they left the original lines south to the K line and then circumvented the Yale Valley, heading thru uninhabited areas northeast of Yale and Cougar and retie into the original O line, there would be no NEW residences impacted at all, only thousands alleviated! Is this not a WIN WIN?

I really think that Steven Wright has made up his mind and is just going thru the motions, putting us off. BPA needs to be more definitive and transparent about comparative costs and requirements. What say Yee? neighbors and friends. I still say PUSH THE BEAST EAST!!!! I'm sure it could be done if the will was there. It might even save us some money. Even if it did cost a little more, it would alleviate the angst,

fear and dread of diminishment of our real estate and lifestyles for many thousands of citizens. I would be willing to pay a few cents more for power, than loose the value of everything I have worked for and cherish. The BPA as a government agency is supposed to serve and supply it's citizenry not diminish and destroy. Its our power grid, put it where we want it and where it will do the least harm and get off our collective backs.....It's the American way!!!

Communication ID: 13455

Date Received: 2/16/2011

Name: RONNIE R SEALS

Hi, this is Ronnie Seals and I live at [address]. My phone number is [phone]. That number again is [phone]. I'd like somebody to call me because I'd like to know just exactly where this is going because I'm too damn old to move and I want to make damn sure that I don't have to move. I'm just not into this. You people are stressing me out and I'd like to know just exactly what my options are because I'm damn near 70 years old and I say I can't- I just can't do this. So, you're just going to have to call me and so I can talk to somebody. Thanks, bye.

Communication ID: 13456

Date Received: 2/16/2011

Name: MARY OLSON

Hello, my name is Mary Olson. I'm currently on your mailing address. My old address was [old address]. I'd like to give you a change of address if you could please change it to [new address] and the zip code is [zip]. My phone number if you need to contact me is area code [phone]. Thanks, bye.

Communication ID: 13457

Date Received: 2/17/2011

Name: MARKUS D WUERTH

Hello, my name is Markus Wuerth and my telephone number is [phone] and the property address is [property address]. And my mailing address is [mailing address]. I'm calling to make some comments and questions on the route 1 that you're proposing. Please give me a call, thank you.

Communication ID: 13458

Date Received: 2/17/2011

Name: VICKIE GRAGG

Hi, my name is Vicky Gragg and my address is [address]. My phone number is [phone]. And I have got a project update mailing from you and then I went on the internet and I'm having trouble finding our

property and I want to ask a few questions regarding the existing BPA easement that our house is abut to. And so if someone would give me a call that would be great. My question mainly is, is this easement still a consideration for the enhancement and if so I want to ask if there will be an additional tower put up, the taller, it's the 500 kV single circuit tower or if the current one, which is the 230, will be just made larger. So if someone could just please give me a call back and help me either locate my property on the map or answer those questions or both would be great. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13459

Date Received: 2/17/2011

Name: CARMEN ATTEBERY

My name's Carmen Attebery. [phone]. And the address is [address]. I do not have internet access. So I would like a clear map that shows exactly where the towers are and the wires and the access roads. I'd like to be able to clearly see how it would affect my property. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13460

Date Received: 2/17/2011

Name: SONJA MASSIE

Hi, I would like to get a printed copy of the map for my property. My name is Sonja Massie. The address is [address] and you can mail it to that same address. If you need other information, my phone number is [phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13461

Date Received: 2/17/2011

Name: JANICE FAY BROWN

Yes, this is Jan Brown and I live at [address]. And I would like to know if the powerlines are going to go through our property. Please, could you write me something and let me know. My phone number is [phone]. Thank you very much.

Communication ID: 13462

Date Received: 2/17/2011

Name: RONALD L MOORE

Yes, this is Ron Moore. I live at [address]. The back of my property goes to the corridor reinforcement project. I'd like to know if that line is going around the back of my property. So, mail it to [address]. My phone number is [phone]. Thank you, bye.

Communication ID: 13463

Date Received: 2/18/2011

Name: DAN L CAMPBELL

Yes, this is Dan Campbell at [phone]. Our residential address is [address]. I'm calling about our property on the Italian Creek Rd off the Kalama River which is affected by the proposal sent out on the BPA I-5 Corridor business. And the question is regarding the assignment of road locations and in our property there are no roads located where it says that they would improve roads that are located there. And a couple of other things too, so if you want to give me a call back please do so. Again, [phone]. Thanks.

Communication ID: 13464

Date Received: 2/12/2011

Name: BEVERLY JANE FIELDING

I have requested a meeting with a representative. When will that meeting be scheduled?

Regards,

Jane Fielding

Communication ID: 13465

Date Received: 2/12/2011

Name: ROD NYLUND

I Just received this email and also recently a certified letter stating that you are insisting that you get access to my property to explorer your planed route. I noticed on this email and map that you are proposing a access road that runs across the east portion of my property.

I discussed verbally with a BPA employee on the phone months back about compensation for loss of value to my property. I did not receive an answer to my satisfaction, rather the answer was vague and not definitive.

My home is on 20 acres with a view of vancouver and portland and is a large estate with approx value of 1.5 mil. This proposed BPA line running along the east property line would devastate my resale value of my estate, not to mention the health issues associated with a high power line so close to my home. I am self employed and use my cell phone at my home here all day. I assume there would be interference with my cell coverage also.

This email is to inform you that you DO NOT have my permission to enter onto my property unless I have something in writing stating that I will be compensated financially should this high power line go in.

I am not looking to gain a wind fall, just be fairly compensated for loss of value and especially if you look to gain access across my property for a service road.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Rod Nylund

Communication ID: 13466

Date Received: 2/18/2011

Name: ANDREA E PIRRONE

BPA:

I think your segment "V" is the wrong way to go. Your company would be crossing the river in two different areas and we have Bald Eagles that fly down the river here where you plan to put the lines...Could be an issue.

Thank You for your time,

Andrea Pirrone

Communication ID: 13467

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: NICK T RITTER

My name is Nick Ritter. My property address is [address]. I would like to know the implications of the recently released road access maps. I want to know the details of the roads that have been selected. Compensation, construction, and possible movement of the roads. If you could please contact me soon I would appreciate it.

Nick Ritter

[phone]

Communication ID: 13468

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: PAUL NELSON TRUSTEE

This delay (up to 5 years according to the news) is wrong on BPA part.

You are leaving us in limbo for another 5 years.

Some of us are retired.

Some of us want to do things to enhance our home.

Some of us may want to move.

None of this can be done because of the situation you have put us in.

Just get the route to the east and get off your ---- and get going.

Thanks for listening.

Paul Nelson

[phone]

Communication ID: 13469

Date Received: 2/10/2011

Name: TIA A MCCLURG

We need some sidewalks alongside 39th Avenue (north of 99th Street) in Vancouver (current BPA powerline location & identified as a route for new project). Who would provide these? Is this the responsibility of the county or does this fall under BPA?

Communication ID: 13470

Date Received: 2/15/2011

Name: CITIZENS AGAINST THE TOWERS ,MARGARET STAPENHORST TRUSTEE

Hi Maryam,

I received your email address from Erna Sarasohn. (I am on the Citizens Against the Towers committee with Erna).

She said you were the best in getting back to us with answers to our questions!

I would like to know:

Where in the PNW are there 500kv lines/towers?

Are there neighborhoods along these existing lines?

If so, where? How many?

How many homes/lots are within BPA's area of 'notification' for these lines?

What is the average distance between the ROW and actual homes?

Also, there seems to be a theme in the communications from BPA regarding the exploration of other viable options for the I-5 Reinforcement Project.

The word 'burdened' has been used several times ...as in additional land/homeowners would be burdened. The implication is that BPA will not

consider other viable options because additional entities will be impacted. Like it's OK to impact/burden those of us along the lines proposed but not any others?

You can see how that could be infuriating to those looking for the best option. Please explain further.

Thanks Maryam for your time and I look forward to receiving your reply.

Sincerely,

Margaret Stapenhorst

Communication ID: 13471

Date Received: 2/16/2011

Name: JOE MARTSEN

Maryam Asgharian had a voice message from Joe Martsen of Kelso, WA.

Joe had heard that if BPA purchases land for this project, BPA would only pay 70% of the value. Joe wanted to know if that is true.

Communication ID: 13472

Date Received: 2/16/2011

Name: FREDRIC C KRAUSE

Frederick Krause's mother passed away, but is still receiving updates from us. He and his brother also receive the updates, so he said we should remove his mother's name/address.

-Maryam Asgharian

Communication ID: 13473

Date Received: 2/18/2011

Name: FREDRIC J SANTOLUCITO

Fred Santolucito

From a BPA financial perspective, placement of the proposed 500KV lines and towers on existing right of ways appears to make good business sense. It would be the lowest initial costs.

However, there are other considerations that should take precedence over these relatively small cost savings.

Placement of the 500kv lines parallel to the existing ones pose greater risk to our communities. Disasters could jeopardize both lines and expose the northwest region and California to the consequences of a prolonged blackout.

Such a risk to this large populated area is unacceptable.

Disasters could result for a number of reasons. Earthquakes, mudslides, airplane crashes, lightning strikes and terrorist activity should be given the utmost consideration due to their impact on the region.

The outcome could be devastating, resulting in costs that far exceed any upfront savings.

Separating the lines greatly reduces the likelihood of such a disaster.

In 1977 New York City mayor Abe Bean described the northeast blackout as follows:

We've been needlessly subjected to terror in many communities.....

"The costs when finally tallied will be enormous"!

BPA, please keep the new lines and towers separated from the existing right of way and the current lines and towers.

Communication ID: 13474

Date Received: 2/22/2011

Name: KATHY WEYAND

Hi, this is Kathy Weyand [address]. I do need you to change my address. You have me as [former address] which was my old address. At that time I believe BPA was also looking at running a line through there. So I guess I would like a map as well. At [address] we do have power lines already on our property. Hopefully you're not planning on putting another one, so I've been out of the loop a little bit so if you'd be nice enough to call me back [phone]. Again it's Kathy Weyand. Wanting to change my address and wanting to know if- I am on Delameter out here- in a direct line of the possibility of having one more line added to my property. Ok, thank you very much, it is Friday about 3:30. Bye.

Communication ID: 13475

Date Received: 2/18/2011

Name: PHILLIP PICKETT

Hi, my name is Phillip Pickett I'm at [address]. My phone number is [phone] and I just have some questions about- we border right on the BPA power lines that are on the I-5 corridor project and I'm just

wondering when will we have any kind of definite yes your property will be taken or purchased. My second question is if, we were thinking of moving, would there be any kind of early buy-out of property? Because really, with this thing hanging over our property there's really no way we can sell it. Anyway, please give us a call. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13476

Date Received: 2/19/2011

Name: BEVERLY J LUNDEEN

This week surveyors were on our private road, Ammeter, which is owned by the HOA, Ammeter Heights. No one asked permission nor was a request sent and signed (to our knowledge) that it was okay to enter the road for this purpose. It has caused great concern among us. The workers had no information to share except that they were working for BPA. What is going on and who is the contact person?

Communication ID: 13477

Date Received: 2/21/2011

Name: DELBERT G KISSINGER

Yeah, my name is Delbert Kissinger. I live at [mailing address] is my mailing address. I want to get some information on my other house that I'm selling to my daughter. It's at [property address]. And I want you to send me something on that house that I'm selling to her in Ostrander. You already sent me mine, and I want that one. Thank you. My phone number, if you have any questions, is area code [phone] is my phone number. Thank you very much. Bye.

Communication ID: 13478

Date Received: 2/21/2011

Name: DELBERT G KISSINGER

Yeah my name is Delbert Kissinger my address is [address] is my zip code my telephone number is area code [phone]. And I want to know how far away from those lines or the towers can a person live away from that electric magnetic field. I heard it was 100 yards you had to be 100 yards away if you live. I don't know, I want to make sure that you send me something on that electric magnetic field because apparently I've got some lines that are going to go fairly close to my property, so I'd like to know that. That's all, bye bye.

Communication ID: 13479

Date Received: 2/21/2011

Name: GEORGIA TANIYA BRENNER

Yes, I was calling to find out about getting a map with my property. The name is Taniya Brenner. The address is [address]. And I just wanted to be able to overlook the map and see how this is going to impact my property. Thank you, have a nice day.

Communication ID: 13480

Date Received: 2/21/2011

Name: PATTI OLSON

Dear Ms. Pierce;

I wish to express concerns about the wetlands lying under your proposed line between K-83 and K-84, and issues related to those wetlands. K-83 is on our property, and K-84 is contiguous to our homesite on the south slopes of the Yale Valley.

A beaver pond runs for 350 feet in the proposed r/w here, and from the south end of the pond to the base of the steep hill running up to K-84, a distance of another 200 feet, is an extensive area of wet ground resulting from widespread spring activity. The creek which feeds the pond from the east is seasonal; the springs from the south feed it year-around. In fact, tucked in to the very foot of that slope, about 15 feet east of the easterly proposed r/w line, sits an old concrete cistern that has been there since the 1940's. Until 10 years ago that spring was the sole water source for the house at the end of Williams Rd., (K-83 site,) and also for the gun club. It still functions as an emergency gravity-feed water supply for that house (there is a working spigot carrying spring water by the house) and also for us, which is important, as we have a number of horses that must have water even during power outages etc.

In spite of Pacificorp's much-vaunted 'elk habitat' project, the elk are in fact much more likely to be found standing in our beaver pond, having a sip; or hanging out in our nearby open woods, which we underplanted with grass many years ago; or taking a catnap on Tabbutts' (K-84 site) open 30-acre slope than they are to be found picking their way through the dense second-growth fir of Pacificorp's 40 acre parcel located on the south side of the K-84 ridge, where there is no food or water source. That's a fact. We also enjoy the presence of the wood ducks, mallards and other birds which return annually to nest and raise their young on this pond.

I understand that you would have to 'mitigate' the damage this line would do to the wetlands and habitat in this location. But I am told that could take place possibly miles from here and would in fact do NOTHING to reverse the damage done to this pond, these wetlands, the decades-old traditional watering source of the local elk herd, and potentially to a 70-year-old domestic water source. So while mitigation would serve the letter of the law, it would do nothing to diminish the destruction to our habitat-rich and highly valued local environment.

Sincerely, Patti Olson

Communication ID: 13481

Date Received: 2/17/2011

Name: MONTE C BROWN,JANICE FAY BROWN

To How It May Concern

I would like to get more information on where these lines are going in regards to our property at: [address]. The maps that you show us do not tell where the roads are so can you you please confirm where they are.

I hope we are not getting more lines than we already have around us now. I have relatives that live by a power station and they all have had [description of medical condition] of some kind.

So having said that, we prefer not to have more power lines in this area. There has to be a better place to put them a than residential area.

Thank You

Monte & Janice Brown

Email Address: [email]

Communication ID: 13482

Date Received: 2/21/2011

Name: DAN L CAMPBELL

BPA

Your map on the photo including our Italian Creek property, off Kalama River, indicates it is not part of the new proposed line.

Furthermore, the existing (??) roads needing rebuilding shown on our property, do not exist.

Please make corrections and send us a corrected copy.

Thanks.

Dan L. Campbell

Communication ID: 13483

Date Received: 2/20/2011

Name: MARGARET STAPENHORST TRUSTEE

Maryam, thanks for the info. Another quick question for you. Several folks are saying the existing lines (9 & 25) are seventy years old. Can you tell me when the ROW was created and when the lines were constructed? I seem to recall Mark Korsness mentioning 40 years not 70. Thanks!

Margaret

Communication ID: 13484

Date Received: 2/22/2011

Name: ELAINE VANDERHOOK

Pay off mortgag

Communication ID: 13485

Date Received: 2/22/2011

Name: STEVE LARSON

Steve Larson spoke with Maryam Asgharian on the phone. He heard that BPA would have a decision soon about which route BPA would use for the project.

Communication ID: 13486

Date Received: 2/24/2011

Name: DVIJA BERTISH,MONICA TONEL

Mark-

Thought to let you know that I was contacted again by Dvija Bertish with questions about the I-5 BPA project. I wasn't much help in responding to his questions/concerns. If you could please call Dvija to hear his questions/concerns, that would be greatly appreciated.

Dvija's phone number is [phone]. I told Dvija that I would provide to you his phone number- he is ok with that.

Thank you for your time and attention to this.

- Monica Tonel

Site Assessment Manager

Office of Environmental Cleanup, Superfund Program

USEPA Region 10

Communication ID: 13487

Date Received: 2/11/2011

Name: JO ANN WOHLERS

I appreciate the emails and updates from BPA. I would ask that BPA place the project in an area that would impact less homeowners and schools, an option that takes the line east or underground.

At the meeting that the Clark and Cowlitz Counties commissioners had with BPA back in October, it was mention by a BPA rep that one of the reasons why the Pearl route was removed was for the safety of the employees due to several radical people that live along the Pearl route (threatening employee with guns?) . I am requesting more information in regards to this issue of employee safety and how it is decided if property owners are inclined towards threats against employees. I am requesting general information as well as specific incidents of reports.

Highest Regards,

Jo Ann Wohlers

Communication ID: 13488

Date Received: 2/17/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

Hi Maryam,

I just got off the phone with Mark K asking to set up a meeting with him on the 22nd to discuss the easterly route that was analyzed and decided against by BPA. He told me he would talk to you about this and get back to me.

Also, about the access roads. I wanted to remind you of my question earlier this week about width of these roads and some additional questions.

1. Width of private property that will need to be taken, i.e. right-of -way width.
2. Will there be a easement purchase with access roads as well?
3. Rocked surface width of access roads.
4. Contact name and number for the Road Construction Engineer assigned to this part of the project.
5. Maximum usable grade of road acceptable to use.

6. Will these roads need to be sprayed with herbicides regularly to keep the road clear? If so, how often in a year would this be done?

I also have some questions for your EMF person

1. Would the EMF strength of 230 kV and 500 kV side-by-side be concerning to the State Health Department?

2. How many places in WA State have 230 kV and 500 kV lines side-by-side?

3. How fast does EMF strength drop off with distance away from 500 kV power lines?

4. Would buried 500 kV lines EMF strength be the same as above ground 500 kV lines?

5. What danger would these 500 kV lines have to school children attending a school that is close to these 500 kV lines at 1 mile, ½ mile, ¼ mile or 1/8-mile?

I need these answers soon, hopefully before next week if possible.

Thank you,

Cheryl Brantley

A Better Way for BPA

<http://abetterway4bpa.org>

"When a man points a finger at someone else, he should remember that four of his fingers are pointing at himself"---Louis Nizer

Communication ID: 13489

Date Received: 2/28/2011

Name: RANDY ZMRHAL

Hi, my name is Randy Zmrhal. Email [email]. [address]. I'm interested in getting a map that includes the location of my property and reference points. For the life of me I cannot figure out the interactive maps on the internet. I was finding it incredibly confusing with the numbers and the letters and et cetera. So, I'm reasonably conversant in internet use, mapping, et cetera, but this particular one that you guys have provided is incredibly confusing. So if somebody could help me, that would be great. Phone number is [phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13490

Date Received: 3/3/2011

Name: CARRIE L MERRILL

Hi, this is Carrie Merrill. My phone number is [phone] and my address- I wanted to know where I'm at in the proposal. I keep getting information but I can't figure out where I'm at in it. My address is [address]. If you could tell me what number, I guess is what I need to know, the grid number, I think that would help me, and am I in the current path of what they're looking at. Thank you very much, and again my number is [phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13491

Date Received: 3/3/2011

Name: GARY L GONSER, MARCIE GONSER

Your proposed transmission line Segment F should be abandoned entirely and any upgrades should be done on BPA's current, existing right-of-way, which was stated in your own newsletters could accommodate these upgrades. This would be the least impact to anyone or anything. Segment F would totally destroy our family's prime property by cutting through the middle of it and rendering it useless for our current and future plans. Your updated proposed access roads even impact another parcel of our land, further devaluing our property. Most people who live in the country moved here to enjoy the serenity, peacefulness, healthy lifestyle, and beauty of the country. Segment F would destroy what our neighbors and my family have enjoyed for decades and have intended to enjoy for many more. My family is adamantly opposed to BPA's proposed Segment F. Again, any upgrades to BPA's transmission lines can, and should be done on your own current, existing right-of-way. Sincerely, Gary & Marcie Gonser [addresses]

Communication ID: 13492

Date Received: 3/3/2011

Name: DIANE KOSER

Hi, this is Diane Koser. We're looking at property and want to be sure that we are outside of any of the corridors that are proposed. So, if the maps, if your printed information will help us with that, that would be great. If there's a place that we can call too, or places we can go online and enter our address, the properties that we're looking at, to find out if they're in any of the corridors, that would also be helpful. My phone number here is [phone]. The address is [address]. And again it's Diane Koser. Thank you very much, bye.

Communication ID: 13493

Date Received: 1/19/2011

Name: CHRISTOPHER I WEINGARTNER TRUSTEE

To the Editor:

BPA's New 500,00 Volt Transmission Line (Sent to Newspapers around the area on 1/19/2011) An open letter to those it concerns regarding a new 500,000 volt transmission power line through the heavily populated parts of Clark and Cowlitz Counties, Washington. I have sent letters opposing the route being considered paralleling the existing 230 KV line called the I5 Corridor. I am limiting my points in this letter to a few, as I have done before, to limit it's length (although I also have other concerns).

1) BPA management, hereafter referred to as BPA, appears to take the position that since they have an existing right-of-way, they can do anything on it, with impunity, no matter how it affects the community. When BPA was granted the right-of-way in the late 1930's, a power line of the size now being considered wasn't envisioned in Clark and Cowlitz Counties. These Counties were sparsely populated. The new line is a game changer in physical size (fifteen stories high), power, voltage, radiation, etc. The present line is of much lower power, voltage, size, and radiation. It is further away behind a treed buffer area. To accommodate the new line the trees will be removed and this monstrosity will butt right up to the property lines of homes, sometimes within 30 feet of the house itself.

2) BPA claims it has no intention of compensating property owners for the loss of property value because "it is just aesthetics, and a price can't be put on aesthetics" therefore the property value is not lowered. This is so silly and unbelievable that one has to wonder about the honesty and/or sanity of BPA. Ask anyone with experience and/or training in property valuation (which I have), and they will refute this. In fact, we the people know that is a scam on the face of it. Property values are lowered, period. What BPA is doing is transferring the true cost of the line to Clark and Cowlitz County residents so they can save a minuscule amount of money per watt, kilo watt, or mega watt sold over the life of the line (probably to California, although they will deny that also).

3) "No buffer zone is needed because there is no proof that the radiation from the new higher power line is detrimental to health." This has been put into question by many a study that indicate otherwise. The arguments put forth by BPA is reminiscent of the arguments put forth by the tobacco company's management in regards to the safety of smoking. Deny, deny, (lie, lie). Remember how those tobacco company executives got up before Congress and lied under oath about their knowledge of the health risks of tobacco use? BPA, put the line to the east of town in the forested area away from the populated area of Clark and Cowlitz Counties! Do the right thing! Don't shift the true costs to us!

Communication ID: 13494

Date Received: 3/4/2011

Name: NICK T RITTER

Hi, my name is Nick Ritter. I had a question- I had filed an email question and got a response back from someone named Lisa and she had identified the wrong lot- our address, the wrong information. So I wanted to clarify a few things. My phone number is [phone] and my house address is [address] and the question was concerning the new map that came out with the access roads. The map shows an access road coming up our driveway, our private driveway, and actually shows a line going directly through the

middle of our living room. So, had some questions there. If you could give me a call back, my phone number is [phone]. Thank you, bye.

Communication ID: 13495

Date Received: 2/27/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

Maryam,

In the discussion with Mark the day I dropped off some landowners letters addressed to Stephen Wright, Mark answered some of my questions about a further easterly route that is called the gray line.

1. Mark told me at the Swift crossing of the proposed gray line was not possible because there were spotted owls. Is this true?
2. Mark also told me that a crossing further south down the reservoir of Swift or Yale would be not feasible because BPA would need 400' towers. Is this true?

We also discussed the crossing on the map across Merwin Reservoir near Yale Dam.

1. Mark told me that BPA was working with PacificCorp as well as 26 other agencies to make that crossing. Is this true?

Cheryl Brantley
A Better Way for BPA

Communication ID: 13496

Date Received: 2/25/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

Hi Maryam,

Thank you for answering my previous questions. I have a few more questions for you.

1. Will you be able to provide an Engineer from your road department to answer questions about access roads at our next meeting on March 19, 2011?
2. If not, will Mark Korsness be able to come answer specific detailed questions about the engineering of these roads?
3. Has BPA ever dropped a project because of EMF?
4. How wide and how deep will the footings be for the towers?

5. Are concrete trucks used to transport concrete for the tower footings?

6. Concrete trucks are very heavy at 30,000 lbs empty. A full concrete truck carrying 10 yards will weigh approximately 70,000 pounds. Will each access road be built up enough to hold the weight of a concrete truck carrying a full load?

- These questions are very specific, but general when building roads. BPA has done projects similar to this and access roads must have been built to some specific standards. We should not have to wait until the DEIS comes out for an answer.
- For our next meeting we need specialists, not just PR staff who will say they need to go get the answer because they don't know the answer or that we will have to wait until the DEIS comes out. We are very concerned about what these access roads will do to our landowners properties and they deserve to have their questions answered completely by engineers in the field of building and maintaining access roads.

Thank you,

Cheryl Brantley
A Better Way for BPA
<http://abetterway4bpa.org>

Communication ID: 13497

Date Received: 3/8/2011

Name: DESIREE DAMICO

Hi, this is Desiree Damico. Our address is [address]. I think I need an updated version of that map. We haven't heard anything in a while. I had heard rumors that you had either delayed the project or changed the routes again. I noticed there are some different areas that are up in arms about it. I do live, I have main running lines right behind me that run off of 63rd St in the Minnehaha area and then they come over to Green Meadows. If you could send me an updated map, mailing address is the same, [address]. It's Greg and Desiree Damico. I would also like to talk to someone about what is the latest news since we really haven't heard anything in a while. Thank you. Our number, [phone]. Buh bye.

Communication ID: 13498

Date Received: 3/3/2011

Name: LISA CHEMARIN

I am purchasing a property located at [address]. I was unable to located the field online where you can access data by entering an address. I would like to know if there is any impact to this property and it appears the closest line would be approx. 1 1/2 miles from the house. Is that correct?

Lisa Chemarin
[phone]

Communication ID: 13499

Date Received: 3/8/2011

Name: ROD NYLUND

you did not respond to the simple question, are you going to reimb property owners for the devaluation and access across there property? yes or no?

Rod

Communication ID: 13500

Date Received: 3/9/2011

Name: MAXINE WHITE

Hello, I have been trying to reach Lisa. I had left the addresses of myself and my two daughters to receive a map, and I didn't leave which address to mail them to. I'm Maxine White. The home address is [address]. Another one is [address]. My address is [address]. I'd like the maps mailed to [mailing address]. My phone number is [phone]. If you can get those in the mail, I'm sorry I couldn't reach you with the mailing address before. Thank you so much.

Communication ID: 13501

Date Received: 3/10/2011

Name: JENNI WILSON

Hi, my name is Jenni Wilson. My phone number is [phone]. I'm a resident of Vancouver, WA. Me and my husband are currently looking to buy a home that's in the notification buffer area for one of the proposed routes and I wanted to get some more information about it before we make our decision on whether to buy the home or not. If you have, please can you give me a call back? [phone]. I would love more information. Also, you could fax me more information at [fax]. I'd love to be able to chat with someone as I'm just now trying to get involved in this whole project now. Again, we are trying to buy a home that's in the notification buffer zone of one of the proposed lines through Camas. Thank you very much for the call back, buh bye.

Communication ID: 13502

Date Received: 3/10/2011

Name: JAMES P WILSON

My wife and I considering buying a house at the address of [address]. The property happens to be in the notification buffer zone. My question is what is the current status of the proposed line that intersects the property and what is the possibility of BPA moving the right of way line closer to the house on the lot. Please let me know as soon as possible as our home decision will be affected by the status of the project. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13503

Date Received: 3/9/2011

Name: CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

An ice storm and 120 mph winds doesn't sound like weather west of the Cascades, but we need to have confirmation on this information.

Here is my question:

Has any of your towers in western WA, west of the Cascades fallen?

Cheryl Brantley

Communication ID: 13504

Date Received: 3/12/2011

Name: MARGARET BOYLE

My property is where tower 26/16 is proposed to be located. Today, I looked at your proposed access road. Again, I am opposed to this project using line 26. Please locate to power line to the east, the 'grey' line. Do not condemn a single person's property for this project.

Communication ID: 13505

Date Received: 3/14/2011

Name: DICK MAUGG

Hi, I'm trying to get ahold of Mark Korsness. I have an easement question on a road that is no longer passable underneath the BPA powerlines up on Old Spreadborough Rd Mountain View- at the end of Mountain View Rd that I've got a project on and I can't pass that road now that somebody's dug it out. My phone number is [phone]. Dick Maugg. If somebody could call me back as soon as possible, I would appreciate it. It is Monday, March 14th in the evening. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13506

Date Received: 3/15/2011

Name: ROY L JR FORD

I just received your flier in the mail for February March and it has a real nice photo in here about your new additions to the map, but it has no basis. You don't know what the map is about or where it's located. You need to put something on the map that will tell you what the map is about because an aerial photo looking down don't tell the average person anything. My number is [phone]. My Name is Roy Ford. I'm trying to figure out whether I'm on this map or not and it doesn't show me anything. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13507

Date Received: 2/7/2011

Name: CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY, TERESA H CARTER

Communication received from public meeting in Amboy via Doug Johnson of BPA:

Mark,

Last week, I attended a meeting in Amboy held by abetterway4BPA. At that meeting, gentleman asked me to follow up on a question he claims to have asked you a couple of months ago. He would like to know if we are aware of a vacant right-of-way extending from the area near Swift Dam many miles south. He has asked why we are not considering that for the project. He has asked me to run that by you and get an answer to his daughter, who has property that is on one of the proposed segments. He would also like me to get the answer to Cheryl Brantley, so she can post it on Abetterway's web site. Does this ring a bell? (note from Doug: The guy I spoke with told us to send the answer to his daughter: Teresa Carter, [address]. He also asked I send it to Cheryl, so she can post the response on the website.) Thanks.

Doug Johnson
Bonneville Power Administration
503-230-5840

Communication ID: 13508

Date Received: 2/23/2011

Name: BOB LITTLETON

Too wordy and too much spin! Just give the bottom line!

My question is: What would you say to someone who needs to sell their home between now and 2013? You must realize that no houses in this area will sell while this project is pending. Therefore, you are holding people hostage for another 2+ years. Sounds like a lawsuit to me.

Bob Littleton

Communication ID: 13509

Date Received: 3/16/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

Hi Maryam,

I called and left a message today asking if you have been given another rendition of the other groups proposed "gray line" and if you are looking at this route now. The last communication I had with you about the grey line was that you were not currently looking at any other proposals of routes. Is that still true?

I have attached a newsletter by the other groups. The article heading "Landowner and Homeowner Counts Unavailable Says BPA" they are quoting Mark as saying "I am not familiar with the grey line eastern path." The subjects in this article will be included in our questioning to Mark at our meeting on Saturday and we would like Mark to be able to address this topic. Giving the heads up on that as a courtesy.

Cheryl Brantley
A Better Way for BPA
<http://abetterway4bpa.org>

Communication ID: 13510

Date Received: 3/18/2011

Name: RAMONA L GAMBLE

My name is Ramona Gamble. My address is [address]. My phone number is [phone]. I have questions about the Bonneville Power I-5 Corridor and the proposed line. I do have a map but do not understand it. If someone could please return my call. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13511

Date Received: 3/21/2011

Name: MARGARET BOYLE

I am a homeowner whose home is where tower 26/16 is proposed. Use the 'Grey Line' instead of my home.

Communication ID: 13512

Date Received: 3/21/2011

Name: ROBERT H HERNDON

Conversation record completed by Paul B Woolson of BPA:

Mr. Herndon had called and left a message on the I-5 (1-800) . I returned the call. He said that he was familiar with the citizen comment website and said that it was very unuseful. He could not find out what anyone else had to post to the website. He said that one would have to know the name of the person who posted it to find out what was posted. I said that I would talk to the folks who were familiar with the website and get back to him.

1. He asked if I could name one time when on this I-5 project that we actually changed our plans because of what the citizens brought up during the public meetings or in the various postings. He actually didn't wait to here my response.
2. this is a Federal project and it should be put on federal land even it does mean that it will cost more money. we should put the project far to the east.
3. he received notice of the Castle Rock meeting only 12 days prior to the meeting. He got a request for a PEP which he was not planning to sign. He said that the meeting was structured so that people could not get comments or questions answered. the people were given only 20 minutes for questions.
4. He said that a woman (Marian wolcott) said that if the tower and line were on right of way which is just off of his property then he would get not compensation.
5. the value of land in Cowlitz County is going down but taxes are going up.
6. Overall informaiton is deliberately contradictory and elusive.
7. Public meetings are too far apart and are just "dog and pony" shows.
8. What's the deal with the newspaper article of the "no build option" and almost immidiately afterwards BPA sends out a letter "full steam ahead". We are not interested in anything but what we have already decided.
9. the proposed plans call for a big ugly 150 foot tower going right next to his proeprty and he gets no compensation for it.
- 10 further reminder that the website does not allow for browsing.

Communication ID: 13513

Date Received: 3/19/2011

Name: VIVIAN M HALE

Access road Beaver Pond Rd has a bridge that will probably be need to reinforced. Roads may also need to be graded and upgraded. Includes Sugarpine Rd also.

Communication ID: 13514

Date Received: 3/18/2011

Name: CECILE L CALABRESE

My home is located on line 2 next to proposed tower 15. I am concerned with hillside stability in this area. A few years ago, BPA cleared the right of way and removed many large trees along the upper edge of our property. Since then we have had the cement around and within our house crack and there are new cracks in the plaster walls. Trees growing on the slopes on and adjacent to our property are leaning significantly. A 200-300 foot section of the Hazel Dell Rd needed to be rebuilt after it cracked and fell away-directly below our home's location. I'm concerned both about the effect new tower placement would have on our land, and subsequently the future stability of the tower itself on this unstable terrain. Cowlitz County slide maps show older and active slides in this vicinity.

Communication ID: 13515

Date Received: 3/19/2011

Name: ELIZABETH L HAMILTON

Go as far north and east through timber land such as 10-15 miles. Otherwise move line 11 600 to 1,000 ft more N&E. Line F would be better than 11.

Also, if looking 30 years from now plan ahead for future development. As of now I am at outer edge of the late existing 30 year plan (7 mi from I5). So move new line N&E of the new proposed line so that development could be on either side of new line.

Who is liable BPA? Would like more info/response.

Communication ID: 13516

Date Received: 3/19/2011

Name: GREGORY DUVIC

An access road you are considering crosses several small year round streams and on substantial creek. The existing road is the driveway for four residence. It is roughly twelve feet wide with large trees close to the edge and forming a canopy over the roadway in many places. The road is paved in gravel and approximately 1000' of asphalt. The asphalt strip is twelve feet wide.

The continuation road that you propose on your map appears to pass less than 50' from our house.

Of course we hope you do not build line 26 but if you do I hope you reconsider the use of our driveway as an access road.

Communication ID: 13517

Date Received: 3/19/2011

Name: PATTI OLSON

The proposed access road for K-84 is in an impossible location. It goes up our narrow, private 3/4 mile driveway which would require a complete, expensive, environmentally damaging and ugly rebuild.

Then it goes through a gate into our 3 1/2 acre fenced yard and garden, in front of our house, through our dwarf fruit trees, up the lawn slope through my garden for 250 feet (by the way, the grade up the lawn is 22%!), through another gate, and bulldozes through our 110-year old grove of Douglas fir trees before getting to the tower site.

Or, gee, let's look to the south. Here's Lansing Lane, already built and maintained for heavy equipment use. From the N.E. corner of it, a 600' road would reach the tower site and 80% of it would be in the power line easement!! Isn't that a good thing???

(See attached)

Communication ID: 13518

Date Received: 3/19/2011

Name: HARVEY WATSON

Existing road to purple X. New fence along purple line.

Question about road entry to tower and exit to next tower concerning existing fences and gates.

Would fences and gates be removed and relocated.

Land has livestock pasturing on it.

Communication ID: 13519

Date Received: 3/19/2011

Name: VALERIE GARDNER

I am entirely against this line passing through my property. My property value has already suffered a huge hit. This is also rumored to be a health hazard. Please try another better way!

Communication ID: 13520

Date Received: 3/22/2011

Name: DELBERT G KISSINGER

Yeah, my name is Delbert Kissinger. My address is [address]. They've already notified me that Bonneville Power Administration is going to come quite close to my property but the neighbor to the north of me- I may want to buy some of his land, seeing it's going to mess his up a little bit. I want to know how wide is the line that's going through the property to the north of me, just to the north of my property.

Jungworth is the last name, I don't know their first name, but anyway, I want to know how wide a swath

goes through there and I want to know also, can you put fences across your right of way that you buy through there? I see that they do that on the gas lines but I didn't know if they could do it on power lines. I would like those two questions answered to me and it would help me a lot to deal with the land owner to the north of me. I'm going to tell you again that my name is Delbert Kissinger [address] and I have a phone number area code [phone]. You could send me a letter or you could call me and go through that with me if you want to. That's all. Bye bye.

Communication ID: 13521

Date Received: 2/23/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

Attention:

Jim Luce / Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
Clark County Board of Commissioners
Cowlitz County Board of Commissioners
Steve Wright / Bonneville Power Administration
US Senator Patty Murray
US Senator Maria Cantwell
Congresswoman Jaime Herrera-Beutler
Board of Directors / No Lines in Populated Areas

Recently Jim Luce, Chairman of the Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council requested a meeting with members of A Better Way for BPA. Representatives from the Board of Directors and the Advisory Board sat down with Mr. Luce for a candid conversation about the status of BPA's Interstate Five Corridor Reinforcement Project. Mr. Luce emphasized the importance of all of the various groups opposing the project come together at some level. To that end, he suggested that A Better Way for BPA come up with a list of issues we thought everyone involved in the project would be in agreement.

With that challenge, we have compiled a list of basic principles we feel all parties would concur. We stand ready to discuss any and all of these ideas.

Issues we believe all parties agree on regarding the BPA's Interstate 5 Corridor Reinforcement Project:

Property:

-The project must have the least impact on private property owners. Regardless of which route is chosen, the lines must follow property lines, running along edges/borders, instead of bisecting private properties.

-Property owners who lose real estate to this project should be financially compensated for their loss of land. In instances where agricultural properties are concerned, landowners should be

compensated/made whole for the present and future losses they'll incur. Loss of scenic value is important as well.

Facts and Science:

-Transmission lines are a way of life.

-Everything that runs on electricity puts off electromagnetic fields, from blow dryers to transmission lines.

Environment:

-Protection of wildlife and habitat

-Protection of water sources, above and below ground.

-No clear cutting of trees

Technological solutions:

-Engineering ingenuity should be used, and lines should be buried in areas neighbors want them underground.

Cost:

-With the national debt at record high levels, every opportunity should be taken to ensure this project is completed in the most financially responsible way possible. SPA will argue that the project is funded with "ratepayer" funds, but in fact a substantial amount set aside for the project comes from stimulus dollars allocated by the Federal Government. In the end, there really is little difference between "ratepayer" and "taxpayer" dollars.

A Better Way for BPA

[address]

abetterway4bpa.org

Communication ID: 13522

Date Received: 2/9/2011

Name: ANDREW TARANGUL,ELEANOR TARANGUL

Dear Sirs,

Andrew Tarangul - deceased.

Eleanor M. Tarangul does not own the property at [address]. It has been sold. It was sold.

Sincerely,

Eleanor M. Tarangul

Communication ID: 13523

Date Received: 2/3/2011

Name: MICHAEL DE JONG

Dear Mr. Korsness,

I am a homeowner who lives on route 25 of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. When I purchased my home twelve years ago I did my homework and determined that the 4 milli-gauss exposure level to EMF in the rear portions of my home were an acceptable risk given the green space I enjoy in my backyard. I never imagined that additional power lines could be constructed on this easement. If I had, I would certainly have purchased property elsewhere. If you build these 500kV towers in my backyard my family's level of EMF exposure will increase exponentially. The new higher levels of EMF will certainly be unsafe for long-term exposure.

I do understand that choosing route 25 would be the cheapest and easiest option for BPA but I hope you will understand that doing the easiest thing is seldom the right thing.

There are thousands of children who live and attend school on route 25. We all know that a causal link between EMF exposure and cancer does exist. This is especially true for childhood cancers such as leukemia.

In light of this situation, I am once again calling upon you to do the right thing. Please place these dangerous 500kV power lines on the easternmost and unpopulated proposed routings. Please do not pronounce a death sentence on our families by placing these transmission lines in the populated areas of Clark County.

Sincerely,

Michael De Jong
[address]

Communication ID: 13524

Date Received: 2/2/2011

Name: MARGARET STAPENHORST TRUSTEE

Dear Mr. Korsness,

We have been told on numerous occasions to write to BPA and tell you how the proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project will affect us.

Attached is a letter which is basically our story. If the new 500KV lines are placed on lines 9 and 25, we will have a 150' tower directly behind our home. It will stand approximately 45-50 feet from our property line, 70' off of our deck, less than 100 feet from our home.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Margaret Stapenhorst

[address]

We moved to the NW in 1993 after 10 months of house hunting. If we were going to be living in the NW, we wanted trees. The realtor showed us many beautiful homes, but if there weren't trees, we weren't interested.

We finally found a new home in a new neighborhood on Y, acre lots, The Highlands at Pleasant Valley. The house was on a cul-du-sac and backed up to a greenbelt. Perfect! The lot had a premium because of the 'green space'.

Over the past 17 years we have worked our way through our home doing remodels to update the house and put our own stamp on it. We have a lovely gourmet kitchen that is the envy of many. We also have transformed the backyard from nothing but 6 large Western Red Cedars and a few other deciduous trees to a beautiful, private retreat. Our garden was part of the 'Association of Northwest Landscape Designers' garden tour this past summer. Over 220 folks passed through our garden.

BPA announced the 'I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project' in 2009. One of the options is the existing Right of Way, lines #9 and #25. Our 'green space' is the BPA R.O.W. along line #9. Our beautiful home, garden and life could be changed forever: The forested greenbelt would be razed and 150', 15 story, 500,000 volt lines would stand less than 45' from our property line, less than 100' from our back door.

You can't move. You can't stay. Quite a dilemma.

Can't move:

Who would want to buy a home with those towers looming over the property? If someone was interested, we would never get the true value of the home, including our many upgrades.

We were on track towards retirement; paying off the house, eliminating debt, building up 401k's etc. We are beyond the age where starting over is possible.

We would never make up this loss.

A neighbor's home down the street has been on the market for over a year. They have reduced the price nearly \$100,000. Still no offers. The towers would not be visible from their home but, a realtor told them that houses in our neighborhood (and others affected by the proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project) are not even being shown to prospective buyers. There is just too much inventory on the market to bother. As soon as the prospective buyer learns of the proposed lines/towers, they are not

interested. So, some realtors feel it's a waste of their time and the buyers' time to show homes for sale affected by the proposed new lines.

We had a well known local realtor come by to give us a market evaluation of our home. As soon as she arrived, she said, "let's go see what is going to sell this home" and went out to the back yard. Her comments were that most new homes have all the new 'bells and whistles' i.e. granite countertops, tile and/or hardwood floors, stainless steel appliances and so forth. The difference is the location, the lot, the setting. With a cleared green space and 15 story, 500kv towers ...we have nothing special to offer. In fact, it would be a severe detriment.

Can't stay:

We love our home and the atmosphere looking out our back windows onto the green space. Our yard has been certified by the National Wildlife Federation as a wildlife habitat. We have birds, squirrels, rabbits, deer etc. It's 'Home' ... a peaceful place to escape to from the rigors of life. All of that would be gone. The tower placement is directly behind our home and would be a constant reminder of what we had and what we lost. The traffic noise from the I-5 and I-205 freeways would be deafening once the greenbelt was cleared, not to mention the constant humming and zapping noise from the lines ... which I understand is worse during wet and damp weather (8-9 months of the year in the NW!!!). My husband has had [description of medical condition] twice. Two unrelated types: [description of medical condition]. We can not take any additional risk from EMF's.

We attended the meeting with Steven Wright and the Clark and Cowlitz County Commissioners in November. I had signed up to ask a question but the meeting ran late and we had to leave. During Mr. Wright's presentation, he mentioned different factors that go into the decision making process. One was the safety of BPA's employees. Not once during Mr. Wright's talk did he mention the safety of the homeowners/residents along the proposed new lines.

One of the items mentioned for not crossing the Columbia River in Longview was 'occurrences and probabilities' ... i.e. terrorism, severe ice storms, windstorms, even aircraft that may fly into the lines. What about these same occurrences and probabilities in heavily populated areas? If there is ever an 'occurrence' where the towers/lines fall/fail. ...we may not wake up that morning if we have 500,000 volts of electricity lying over our home. What assurances can BPA make that the safety of the population will be considered?

There are no other instances where 500KV, 15 story towers have been placed in heavily populated areas in the Northwest. How can you in good conscience consider doing so now when you have other viable alternatives? DO THE RIGHT THING and put these new lines to reinforce the I-5 Corridor in unpopulated areas....Oregon or through DNR land in eastern Clark County.

Margaret Stapenhorst

[address]

[phone]

Communication ID: 13525

Date Received: 3/24/2011

Name: PATTI OLSON

Yes, my name is Patti Olson and what I'm actually wondering if I can get is a number of the larger full two-fold map of the project. I have some things coming up that I would like to have some available to give to interested people. Actually, I'd like to get about 50, I don't know if that's possible, but my number is [phone] and my mailing address is [address]. I'm already on your mailing list, so I don't need to be added to that, but if you could let me know about whether I could get those maps or not, I would appreciate it. Thank you, bye.

Communication ID: 13526

Date Received: 1/29/2011

Name: MARGERET P HARMS

Mr. Wright:

Bonneville Power Administration has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. Your slated objectives are to provide a substantial increase in transmission capacity, which will satisfy the projected growth in demand for decades into the future, while minimizing impacts to the natural and human environment and minimizing costs whenever possible.

The alternative having the lowest overall cost and having dramatically less human and environmental impact would be to use routes 9 and 25 where you already have easements, towers and lines. Land acquisition costs would be negligible. Construction costs and environmental impact costs would be minimized. Litigation costs would be minimized. The intangible cost of public opposition would be mitigated.

Any of the new corridors that you have proposed would require an extensive long clear-cut through the pristine rural countryside of two counties. All of these proposed rural routes would depreciate home and land values; destroy farms, businesses and hard-earned retirement equity. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife.

If you choose a rural route, you promise to cut 150 feet through private landowner's property for your towers and lines. In addition, we are told that you will also need to remove any tall trees adjacent to this new right of way that would threaten to fall into your towers and lines. In the proposed rural routes, a Douglas fir tree can grow up to 200 feet tall. This could mean in addition to the 150-foot clear-cut you would take for the towers, you could clear-cut an additional 200 feet on either side adjacent to the new right of way, creating a 550-foot clear-cut through the rural private landowner's property.

You have assured us there is enough room on routes 9 and 25 and that no homes would be taken. Now knowing you can collocate the 230 kV and 500 kV lines along these routes, we argue that using these routes would lower land acquisition costs, lower environmental impact and litigation costs, plus much lower maintenance costs made possible by substantially reduced vulnerability to damage from weather phenomena (ice storms, wind stonns, etc.).

Here are some additional points supporting that position:

(a.) The existing easements would be the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA for this project.

(b.) There is minimal impact from adding lines where towers and lines already exist.

(c.) Using the existing easements would save the environment from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties

(d.) The existing BPA scars are already in place and many of the adjacent landowners bought those properties fully aware of the visual and environmental impacts of those lines.

(e.) The existing easements have 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.

Regarding security, it is clear that the 70-year security history of the existing transmission lines has been and will continue to be enhanced by virtue of the lines being located in urban and relatively urban environments, where any suspicious activity has a high probability of being reported. In contrast, a 70-mile run of new lines through isolated and rural areas would have a much higher exposure to undetected and/or unreported subversive activity and adversarial physical damage.

We implore you to not implement a new 70-mile long clear-cut and do not build your massive new infrastructure in our rural communities. We ask you to use our ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing your new lines and towers where you intended to run them when you purchased land rights 70 years ago to do so, where lines and towers already exist, where the visual scar has faded into the background, and where the environmental damage has already been done along your existing easements of routes 9 and 25.

Sincerely,

Margeret P. Harms
[address]

I have property in Yacolt, WA. that could be affected.

Communication ID: 13527

Date Received: 1/28/2011

Name: DALE W AROLA,DARREN F AROLA,DWAYNE D AROLA

Attn: Mark Korsness

Please find enclosed three copies of a letter that I delivered to the Amboy Middle School on 12-11-10 when I attended a meeting about the "Project". You was unable to attend, however, a lady delegate was present. I hope you rcvd the letters.

Since that time, I have had council with my attorney again to gain asvice about "what if" segment #26 is the chosen route, and my five acre parcels and my two sons parcels fall below a full stocking of five acres each. After conferring with Clark County Government, my attorney said that I "we" had two options.

Option #1 Pay the back taxes and interest to the tune of about \$6000.00 for each parcel and then start paying taxes at the higher rate of about \$1800.00 per year for each parcel. Option #1 is not an option.

Option #2 Combine contiguous parcels to establish 10 acre parcels to satisfy the tree stocking requirement in order to continue the much lower yearly tax of approximately \$30.00 for each parcel. Looks good, but if a need for some cash arises, a 10 acre parcel will only fetch a small percentage more than a five acre parcel, therefore, we have lost almost 1/2 of the market value. Also, the value of the now 10 acre parcels is diminished because of the transmission line and the uncontrolled right of way. Additionally, we have four parcels 660' to the west of proposed segment #26. They are not physically impacted, but are devalued because of the "line".

All items considered, my family may loose \$300,000 to \$500,000 in value.

Terrorism- What!!??

I don't buy that excuse to not locate the "line" adjacent to existing "lines". The bad guys are well orchestrated, they can disable lines 100 miles apart within seconds each.

Aircraft damage??

What is the tract record?? None that I know of. I know how towers are anchored into the each with much re-bar and concrete. The conductors for a "line" of this kilovolt amperage will be large and very sturdy- only a commercial aircraft could take out a line of this design. Small aircraft will only trip the line out, but no major damage and can be restored soon.

The Arola Family

[phone]

[parcel info attached]

Communication ID: 13528

Date Received: 3/30/2011

Name: KEN SPURLOCK

Hello, my name is Ken Spurlock and I'd like to find out if the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project is going to affect a certain piece of property. The address is [property address]. My number is area code [phone] and you can mail me one of the maps, the corridor maps, at [mailing address]. Again, this is Ken Spurlock. Thanks.

Communication ID: 13529

Date Received: 4/1/2011

Name: PERRY J CALABRESE

I am a Citizens Band Radio user and will be working on my amateur radio license 2 meter. I plan on joining the REACT emergency radio team for Cowlitz County. How will the 550kv line interfere with my Rx and Tx? the line will be within 75 feet of my base antennas. What about shock hazard? Please email me your reply... Thanks, Perry

Communication ID: 13530

Date Received: 4/1/2011

Name: DEBORAH OJA

NO TRESPASSING! BPA and its agents are prohibited from entering and crossing the above property.

You will not destroy my property or my life by installing 500 kV lines on or near my property.

Move the lines to non populated areas.

BPA is causing undue stress to hundreds of families. Life is already full of hassles, deadlines, frustrations & demands. Please back off & move the lines to non-populated areas. Respect the people!

Communication ID: 13531

Date Received: 4/2/2011

Name: LAWRENCE G STUDEBAKER

As a property owner near route F I am greatly concerned that selection of route F will dramatically impact the rural character of the area which I love, decreasing enjoyment of the lakes and forests of the region for all of us. You will likely receive substantial negative feedback from more populated areas along existing right-of-ways simply because more people live there; but for the most part the residential neighborhoods along existing right-of-ways have grown up around them. Like living near an airport; it is there when you move to the area, you accept it and you must also understand and expect that it may expand with growth over the years. For example, the impact of increased tower height along an existing right-of-way cannot be nearly as great as creation of a new right-of-way with new 150 foot towers. I

urge you to make every effort to select routes along existing right-of-ways. This will have minimal increased impact upon Cowlitz County residents overall.

Communication ID: 13532

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: JOY WALDEN

Paul

please let me know the status of the line for our property located @ [address]

thanks

joy walden

Communication ID: 13533

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: KRISTY JOHNSON

I want to know what the new poles are that were installed behind our house?

Communication ID: 13534

Date Received: 4/5/2011

Name: INA E BEARD,BILL MORVEE

Yes, my name is Bill Morvee calling on behalf of one of the individuals that is on one of the planned routes. Her name is Ina E Beard at the address of [address]. Please give me a call in regard to Ina, my mother, who passed away last year, so that we can have an address change. My number is at [phone]. Please contact me so that we can take care of the mailings that she's been getting forwarded to me. I just need to get it in your system. Thank you, [phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13535

Date Received: 3/29/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,RAYMOND B RICHARDS

Mark,

Regarding the existing I5 corridor, primarily routes 9 and 25---

When was the right-of-way purchased?

When was the existing line constructed?

My understanding is that the average width of the corridor is 250 feet. Was that the original footprint or was it widened in subsequent years? If so, when?

The existing corridor is obviously a viable route for a new 500-kV line since it is one of several that BPA is considering. Was the original right-of-way created with future expansion in mind or was corridor width added later to facilitate another set of lines and towers?

What is a brief history 500-kilovolt lines? How long has that voltage been used for transmission?

Thanks,

Ray Richards
A Better Way for BPA

Communication ID: 13536

Date Received: 3/24/2011

Name: MARK LEVANEN

Conversation record completed by Paul Woolson:

Mr. Levanen owns property which is near [address]. It is actually right in the middle of route "V" and is bisected by route "V". Mr. Levanen said that he cleared the lot. the lot to the north is owned by his father in law. This is a good building lot. He is concerned that if the transmission line were to go across where indicated the building lot would be ruined. I said that if the lot were to be bisected then the property would have to be appraised for not only what was to be "taken" but also what was damaged. We talked about the vacant right of way running along parallel I-5 and that many don't want the project to be within the vacant corridor. They want it to run way to the east. He said that there are those in the easterly portion of the county who want it to run within the existing right of way. He was not going to sign the PEP.

Communication ID: 13537

Date Received: 3/29/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

Steve,

Thank you for taking the time to discuss BPA's herbicide use. I look forward to receiving information about research and studies on herbicide use and communicating further with you with the many questions our members have posed on this topic. Again, our group's goal is to provide information to the landowners in the rural communities who do not currently have a BPA easement on or near their

properties. This is new to all of us and we're trying to learn as much as possible about what could happen to our communities.

Thank you,

Cheryl Brantley
A Better Way for BPA
<http://abetterway4bpa.org>

Communication ID: 13538

Date Received: 3/23/2011

Name: MARGIE J BORCHERS

Dear Maryam,

Please write or call me (info below) to set up an appointment for a BPA representative to come out to look at Beaverbrook I and II, off of Gabriel road. Many of us will be directly affected if Line #26 is chosen.

Margie Borchers

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

I am requesting a BPA representative visit our Beaverbrook area of about 60 homes on 5 acres each, off of Gabriel Road. We are an area filled with underground tributaries, streams and wetlands. Probably we should have never been allowed to build here because this area harbors diverse wildlife, ferns, Oregon grape, even trillium, etc. and such forested beauty, including snags and huge old-growth stumps. Our electricity is underground.

Cheryl Brantley would be present with us also, as we drive along Beaverbrook Road, Lakeview Drive, Collard Lane, and Dawn Lane and any other area you would like to see.

I am retired and home almost all the time, so whatever time/day is convenient for your representative would most likely work for us. Thank you with your help on this.

~Margie Borchers

Communication ID: 13539

Date Received: 4/7/2011

Name: PERRY J CALABRESE

How tall and how do towers #4-3 and #4-4 differ from the standard height of other 500kv towers?

Thanks, Perry

Communication ID: 13540

Date Received: 3/22/2011

Name: WILLIAM E MOYER

Mark Korsness:

First and foremost I want to thank you and your staff for the serious and careful consideration given to my suggested route variant from Castle Rock to Pearl Substation via the Alston Substation. Based on the information available to me previously it appeared, and to an extent still appears to me, to be a potentially feasible alternative with both unique challenges to and advantages for BPA.

To that end, I offer the enclosed comments on BPA's criticism of my admittedly sketchy concept, in hope they may prove of some value. But realistically only if BPA does in fact delay implementation of the project beyond the current timeline, as has been reported recently by the media to be under serious consideration. If so, then at that time I earnestly hope that some form of Pearl route can be brought back onto the table and carried through the full NEPA process as one of the 500 kV reinforcement routing candidates.

I had hoped that revising the existing river crossing of the two BPA 500 kV lines and one BPA 230 kV line could be accomplished using the existing towers at Longview, with new towers and with more widely separated routings of the existing parallel 500 kV lines from Castle Rock down to the north shore of the Columbian and from the south shore down to Alston Substation, as necessary to eliminate parallel proximity reliability concerns, without reduction of capacity. Then from Alston Substation to Pearl, a new sufficiently separated 500 kV line routing would be of comparable difficulty to, but shorter than, any of the more-Eastern routes to a new Troutdale Substation and its river crossing subtleties.

Here's something new to consider: The fact that the power network, after reinforcement of the BPA 500 kV distribution, can evidently tolerate potential simultaneous outage of one of the two 500 kV lines and a proximate 230 kV line (specifically the existing 230 kV line and the new 500 kV line if routed within the existing right of way through Vancouver and Clark County) is suggestive. This implies that it might well be possible and (reliability-acceptable) for BPA to route the new 500 kV line and a new 230 kV line (between the two 500 kV lines) within a slightly expanded existing right-of-way from Alston to Pearl. That would provide the unique advantage of also reinforcing the sole BPA 230 kV line from Centralia to Vancouver and greater Portland, which logically should increase flexibility of Operations and Maintenance switching and scheduling of outages. The resultant three parallel adjacent powerlines should, I think, be at no greater risk of outage than the tens of miles of similar routing in the existing Chehalis to Castle Rock BPA power corridor.

From a power industry outsider's viewpoint, if new special 450 foot plus towers would be needed at Longview, it is to be hoped that as with the existing special 450 foot plus towers, sufficient extended lead-time replacement equipment spares would be stockpiled in a nearby warehouse as is appropriate to minimize disaster recovery down-time. Regarding costs, I would assume that the cost of special towers with expanded Substations (Alston and Pearl) would be comparable to or less than the cost of lower towers with two new Substations (Castle Rock and Troutdale).

Regarding the alternative of routing the new 500 kV line within the existing 230 kV line right-of-way through Vancouver and Clark County, I believe there is a fundamental problem which needs to be addressed. That problem being BPA's apparent unwillingness to explain the selection criteria and weighting factors that will be employed in deciding on the new 500 kV route.

Lacking a present clear people-first priority schema, residents and home owners rightly fear that the decision will be based primarily on cost and convenience (to BPA), with impact to residents' perceived quality of life, neighborhood beauty (absence of looming adjacent 15-story power towers and lines), loss of sound buffering trees along the boundary within the right-of-way, and substantial loss of property values in stigmatized adjacent neighborhoods given little more than lip service.

Choosing the route which impacts the least number of residents' homes and schools is, I believe, essential. Use of the existing 230 kV route would result, in many cases, in taller towers located closer to homes than the present towers are positioned. That, I think, would be the last thing BPA would want to do.

William E. Moyer

Communication ID: 13541

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: MANUEL GONZALEZ

Dr. Steven Chu I know you are a busy man, but I am very concerned about the 500 kV lines about to be put up next to Covington. I am a student here at Covington and I strongly disagree with the BPA putting this up. I know I can't prove that it is a health hazard but if it is you will get sued for millions and millions of dollars. It is better to be safe than sorry.

I bet your too much of a little girl to go the long route. So to prove me wronge go the long way and in the long run you'll make millions.

Sincerely,

Manuel Gonzalez

I'm 12 years old

Communication ID: 13543

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: CHLOE DUTHALER

Hello! My name is Chloe Duthaler. I'm a 7th grader that goes to Covington Middle School. I don't want transmission lines by our soccer field.

One reason why I don't want transmission lines is because it could cause cancer. Some kids at our school could get leukemia. 3% of the world have cancer from those 500,000 watts of power.

Another reason why is if you wanted to move your property will be hard to sell. You will lose \$40,000 off of your house. You could use that \$40,000 to buy gas, food, furniture, etc.

So why put in those \$500,000 watts of power when we already have power? I disagree with the BPA's idea. I hope you agree with me.

Thanks for your time,

Chloe Duthaler
7th Grade Student
[address]

Communication ID: 13544

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: LARISSA LARSON

Dear Dr. Steven Chu,

I think that putting 500 kV lines on route 25 is a horrible idea. Lots of people live within less than 1/3 of a mile.

Health concerns leukemia. There would be a higher exposure to magnetic radiation and over time can cause serious health concerns.

Sincerely,

Larissa Larson

Covington Middle School

12 Years old

Communication ID: 13545

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: HECTOR SANCHEZ

Dear Dr. Steven Chu,

Would you care about your childrens health if the power line was in your neighborhood? Think about all the children that live in all those neighborhoods. Also think about the schools.

One reason is their health will be affected and it gives you a higher risk to get leukemia. Also it could affect the schools on route 25 there are neighborhoods and there is my school covington middle school. I personally don't want to get a much higher risk of getting luekemia.

So I say let the kids keep their health and move away the power lines. Save the kids and change the route.

Sincerely,

Hector Sanchez 12 years old
Covington Middle School

Communication ID: 13546

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: BRAD HOLTEN,RYAN HOOSER

Dear Mr. Wright,

We are two teachers who work at Covington Middle School in Vancouver, Washington. Our school borders Bonneville Power Administration's existing 230-kV power lines. On this route (#25), there is strong consideration by BPA with the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project to construct a new 500- kV power line, beginning as early as next year. Our students have been doing work related to our state standard LS1F: Lifestyle choices and living environments can damage structures at any level of organization of the human body and can significantly harm the whole organism. This has included researching how increased voltages of everyday household electrical appliances also increase the level of magnetic radiation, measured in milligauss (mG).

Route #25 cuts between our school and nearby Orchards Elementary, where many students have younger brothers and sisters. We have also been learning about electric magnetic fields (EMF's) that exist from high voltage power lines, including the possible health impacts. In addition, many of our students' homes are next to, or close to, the existing lines. BPA has stated that, "EMF cannot be ruled entirely safe because of weak evidence that exposure may pose a small leukemia risk to children." (Excerpt taken from article "How BPA addresses EMF", August/2010).

As part of our learning this week we have given students time to consider the impact that these proposed 500-kV lines would have for our school. In language arts, students have been learning persuasive writing and we wanted to provide a real-life writing experience for them to develop these skills, including a call to action. Enclosed are letters that represent these students' viewpoints.

As students and teachers, we appreciate all the work you do in serving public interests. We acknowledge that it is very difficult at times to discern what is best. We simply wanted to let you hear the voices of these students for your consideration.

Thank you for your time,

Sincerely,

Ryan Hooser

Brad Holten

Communication ID: 13547

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: SLAVIK SVISTUNOV

Dear: Stephen J. Wright

I would like to request that the 500 kV powerlines do not go through route 25 because my house and my middle school. If the powerlines go through such a populated area the exposure to magnetic radiation will be much greater than the power lines that we have already. If you put the lines here it will be us paying the price with our health in our future. Too much exposure to magnetic radiation may cause health problems such as Leukemia. The powerlines will go straight through an Elementary school where little kids didn't do any thing wrong to have health problems in their future.

Please help us by not putting these powerlines In such a populated area. Please put them somewhere where there is no population. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Slavik Svistunov
Covington Middle School
13 Years old

Communication ID: 13548

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: LEVI COLLINS

Dear Stephen J. Wright,

I'm on homeowners side. Do you think its really a good idea to build were tons of kids are. Do you think it could fall or cause health problems. If your not scared of it build a 500 kV power cable near your kids if you have any.

What if a powerline fell on the school and the field caught on fire and the school caught on fire all the kids would die of toxic gas/smoke and you would have just wasted 50 to 63 million dollars and you lose way more for the lawsuit. So please don't build it and when your working on it, it could make to much noise for the schools and jobs. So please again don't build it.

Sincerlly Levi Collins
Covington Middle School
I am 12 yrs old

Communication ID: 13549

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: ALYSSA MCILMOIL

Dear Stephen J. Wright

Hello! My name is Alyssa and I am 12 years old and I go to Covington Middle School. I think that building a 500-kV tower is UNEXPENDIBLE!!!! because... Kids in Orchards elementary school are very very very very very very very very very very very very very very exposed to RADIATION.

Please stop making this and put it somewhere unpopulated so people aren't exposed to RADIATION.

Sincerely,

Alyssa McIlmoil
Covington Middle School
Age 12

Thanks for listening!

Communication ID: 13550

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: KRISTY KIRK

Dear Mr. Wright,

I am currently against BPA putting 500-kV by schools, & homes. This is very unhealthy for kids, & grown up's. Because of the testing of it causing sickness, (cancer) and it has a greater chance of this happening, to kid when the towers are in there play grounds.

I live like 30 feet away from power lines so I have a higher risk of cancer. So I think its healthy to at least keep them a mile away from homes & schools, just populated place's. So its less sickness. Thank you for taking your time to read my letter.

Kristy Kirk
Covington Middle School
I am 12 years old.

Communication ID: 13551

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: ETHYN MCLAUGHLIN

Dear Mr. Wright,

I am writing this letter to inform you about the dangers of your company building 500 kV lines on route 25. If you put these lines up, the radiation from the EMF's coming off of them will go over an Elementary School and right next to my middle school, which I live relatively close to.

I know that the connection between electro-magnetic fields and Leukemia isn't proven. But I don't want to take the risk of me or my family getting Leukemia. So I encourage your company not to build these 500 kV lines on Route 25.

Sincerely,

Ethyn McLaughlin
Covington Middle School
12 years old.

Communication ID: 13552

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: KAELEE SOM

Dear Stephen J. Wright,

I think that building a 500-kV radiation tower next to and Orchards is a bad choice. Because it might effect students health, like, childhood leukemia. Because that is too much exposure to our health. I know it hasn't been proven yet, but better being safe than sorry.

I think an alternative choice could be putting the towers by a less populated area. Might be a much better choice. Thank you for your time!

Sincerely,

Kaelee Som
Covington Middle School
13 years old.

Communication ID: 13553

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: JAYDEN JACKSON

Dear Stephen J. Wright

I think building a 500-kV by Covinging Middle School & Orchards is a bad idea because it might effect student's health & for example childhood leukemia because that is to much exposure to radiation.

I think an alternate choice could be putting the towers by a less populated area. Might be a much better choice thank you.

Sincerely,

Jayden Jackson

Communication ID: 13554

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: ESTEBAN PINAULA

Dear Mr. Wright

I believe that 500 kV lines should be placed by a population is a horrible idea. Its a bad idea because the lines would be near my home and school, that would be bad because theres a beleif thad magnetic radiation causes Lukimia and other sicknesses. Scientists are still studing if magnetic radiation actually causes deadly sicknesses. This would just be like when scientest were studing if sigerets were bad and people thought it was just a beleife but now ats a cold fact. So dont risk youn and inisent lives for a litle more saved money and put the 500 kV lines near a populated area, and just move it to another area. Thank you for reading my presuasive letter to possibly save lives.

Sincerely

Esteban Pinaula
Covington Middle School
13 years old

Communication ID: 13555

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: OLIVIA SMITH

Dear Stephen J. Wright

Hello, I am writting this to you because I am against the BPA putting 500 kV power lines next to our homes and schools because kids wen they are younger its a better chance to get leukemia.

So I think we shouldn't put the power lines so then no one will get leukemia.

Sincerely,

Olivia Smith
Covington Middle School
13 years old

P.S. Don't forget to smile today

Communication ID: 13556

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: ANNA BEJAN

BPA vs. Homeowners

Dear Stephen J. Wright,

I am writing to you because I am against you putting up a 500 kV power line on route 25. First of all it is near populated urban areas. In populated areas where a lot of people live, it's dangerous because kids can get leukemia and diseases. And there is nothing more sadder than little babies having cancer! =(

So please, if you can put up the 500 kV power lines. Just not in populated areas. I know that you would probably have to cut down a couple trees, but a couple trees won't hurt the world, and we will still be able to breath and live. And people will be happy and safe living in a home where they know nothing bad will happen. =) thank-you!

Make the world a better place!

Sincerely,

Anna Bejan :)

Covington Middle School

13 years old

Communication ID: 13557

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: BAILEY TAYLOR

Dear Mr. Wright

My name is Bailey Taylor I am a seventh grade student at Covington Middle School. I am 13 years old and have a growing concern about the new power lines and tower replace the old lines and towers. Although no official test or studys have been cunducted, E.M.F. (Electro Magnetic Fields) are there and will cause health problems. To stay healthy you want a low to no dosage of E.M.F. (Electro Magnetic Fields). Your workers were a device around there need to check the level of E.M.F. they have seen or come in contact with and once they have reached the safe dosage they are sent home for the day. Were do my friends go when they have come in contact with there E.M.F. doseage if the lines are in there back yard.

Mr. Wright my friends and family will loose there homes. Please reconsider the placement of the towers.

Communication ID: 13558

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: TAYLER R

Dear Stephen J. Wright

Hi my name is Tayler I go to at Covington Middle School and we are just asking why are you going to do that because we got a powerline in are socer feild at are school because I think we got enough powerlines and we need to give calorfina some power and I think we got a enough power so I we need to give other states some power.

We all need to get power and the people that need power will have a black out so we need to give other states a change and the people other people need power so trust me and give other states power so they can watch TV and turn on a lamp every morning and they can see what is inside there house.

You need to give other states a chance so we have enough power in Washington give some to New York, Wyoming, Nevada, and Calforania so give all the states what I just told you give those state a changes with power we just have enough power so give them a changce with power please don't put no more power in Washington.

And make sure you give Stephen you need to be in the other state

P:S When you read this please write back my name is Tayler. R

From Tayler. R

Communication ID: 13559

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: MACKENZIE R KIKEL

Dear Mr. Stephen J. Wright

Hello! I'm Mackenzie R. Kikel, I'm twelve year old, I live on [address] and I go to Covington Middle School in Vancouver, WA. At my school we have electrical towers on our soccer field. I'm worried that we'll lose the school property or it's school properties value. I'm worried that one of these days one of my friends or I could contract leukemia or some sort of cancer. So, can you please move the towers to the north of washington please and thank you

Sincerely

Mackenzie Rose Kikel

Communication ID: 13560

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: ALEX STAVRAKIS

Dear, Steven Chu

I am against BPA putting 500 kV lines next to our school because the radiation gives kids a high risk of getting Leukemia.

I think you should help use from getting Leukemia and move the power lines. I don't think you should get rid of them I jest think you should move them so we don't get Leukemia. So please write back.

Sincerely, Alex Stavrakis
Covington Middle School
12 years old

Communication ID: 13561

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: NOEL TRUJILLO

Dear Dr. Steven Chu,

Hello! My name is Sheila Noel Trujillo. I'm 12 years old and a 7th grader at Covington Middle School. I believe your doing a wonderful job but you may want to look over the BPA and the 500,000 watts transmission lines they want to put in our community.

If you put in transmission lines it will cause health problems to almost everyone. A health problem that could happen is miscarriage. If a couple was pregnant and they sleep with an electric blanket or an electric waterbed the baby will have a big chance of dying. Another health problem is leukemia. The BPA says it's okay if there is a chance of getting childhood leukemia because there's no proof. But childhood leukemia is very serious and dangerous and can take away a child's life.

Another reason is loss of property cost. If there were huge transmission lines running through my backyard than my house value would lower by \$40,000 than regular price of my house. I might move next summer, for a better environment to grow up in. How would I be able to have enough money to buy another house, and furniture if I had a huge transmission line in my backyard?

Thank you for your time.

Noel Trujillo
[address]

Communication ID: 13562

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: RUSIAN PRIMACHENKO

Dear: BPA dont you think that you shouldn't put the power lines next to our school or home, if you still want to put them than you shouldn't, because number 1 is if you put power lines than people and kids would get leukemia. But you can put the power lines close to east where there is not that many people living, and it would be fine. So if you put the power lines then did you think about you, you can get leukemia too, if you think you cant then you are wrong you cant Stay at one place for ever. and we are not old, and we have our hole lives in front of us.

Sincerely,

Rusian Primachenko
13 years old.

Communication ID: 13563

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: JOSHUA HARCUFF

Dear Dr. Steven Chu,

I think you should not put 500 kV powerlines because there is a 50/50 chance it gives children Leukemia! And we dont want leukemia. Also, if you do, a lot of trees and wildlife will get destroyed. If you cut down trees, we get less and less Oxygen. If we cant breath, then we will die. So you should put 500 kV lines up.

Sincerely,

Joshua Harcuff
Covington Middle School
13 years old

Communication ID: 13564

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: PATRICK NATION

Dear Steven Chu,

I am a student from Covington. I think the BPA should move the lines because the lines are going right over Covington. There are a lot of kids who want to go on with there lives and kids can die from 500 volts. And I don't want any kids lives to end at a young age. Kids have a long ways of life ahead of them.

Life is more important than lines. Those lines can destroy wild life and plants, it;s good to have power but to much can kill a lot of important stuff that we need. Send this to Obama too please, Obama please send me back please.

Sincerley Patrick Nation

[address]

Communication ID: 13565

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: ERICK RAMIREZ

Dear Dr Chu

I am a student at Covington Middle School. My name is Erick Ramirez. I am sending this letter to you because one of the BPA's power lines are right next to my school and next to a elementary school. If the BPA dont move the power lines it can cause serious health problems. Lukemia is one of them and 1 kid died because of it. Thank you for your time.

Communication ID: 13566

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: KEELI BRADY

Dear Dr. Chu,

My name is Keeli. I'm 12. I'm a seventh grader at Covington Middle School. I live in Vancouver Washington [address].

In my Science Class we're learning about how real situations can affect our bodies. Well, real situation we are learning about is how the B.P.A. wants to put new towers in the existing lines for 500,000 volts more power. The towers in the lines now go right through our soccer field and those towers are big. Imagine even bigger towers in the current lines. And with bigger towers comes more E.M.F. (electro magnetic force.) Our bodies can only take a certain amount of E.M.F. B.P.A. workers wear things around their necks that count there E,M,F, intake, and after a certain amount of E.M.F. intake B.P.A. sends their workers home. If the same policy were held here at Covington more students would be sent home then needed because some classrooms are close to the lines already. One of our special needs teachers at Covington will have her home taken away by B.P.A. if the purposed lines go in. And her husband works for B.P.A. B.P.A. is only going to give her market price. With the housing market so bad, it will be hard for her and her husband to find a new house. Plus teachers don't make that much money anyway but they live with it so they can teach us students. If the purposed lines do go up, then her, and a lot of others will have a hard lifestyle for a while.

If the purposed lines go up property value will go down. No one would want to buy a house with big power lines and/or big towers in their backyard. The B.P.A said "houses and trees can shield E.M.F" E.M.F can easily go through doors, walls, and windows. The only thing that can "shield" E.M.f is lead and lead is poisonous. Too much E.M.F could give people Leukemia and other health problems. If you own a pacemaker you will have to be a certain distance away from the new purposed lines because the E.M.F will make your pacemaker beat irregularly.

I'm not saying that we don't need more power, we do. I'm just trying to say that there are different routes B.P.A can use to get more power. Instead of using bigger towers on the current lines why not move towers out to Eastern Washington. There is plenty of unpopulated area over there.

But B.P.A is trying to be cheap and save money on lines they already own. But in the end the cheap way is going to end up costing B.P.A more. With health problems and E.M.F being too much in certain areas people can sue B.P.A for putting the towers there instead of somewhere else. If B.P.A moves the towers to Eastern Washington it will be a win-win situation. Portland, Vancouver and other places get the power they need while B.P.A won't have to spend billions of dollars if we have blackouts without the new towers. Dr. Chu please consider my idea, I want to be able to go outside in our soccer field at Covington without having to be a certain distance away from one of the new towers and risk getting Leukemia and other health problems. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Keeli Brady

Communication ID: 13567

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: VIANNEY KEYMOLEN

Dear Dr. Steven Chu,

I am hoping you will reconsider placing 500 kV lines next to our school. While we all need power, 500 kV lines can cause serious problems. My concerns are that dangerous radiation can harm the health of students. Also, lightning strikes to the power lines could possibly cause fires, not to mention harm animals and wildlife. These are unhealthy situations to have near our school.

Finally, Dr. Chu, I am asking you to take action against 500 kV lines. These lines decrease property values, cause health problems and pose dangers to the local community. All these reasons are more important than the extra power, these lines could provide.

Please consider the children and their safety first.

Sincerely,

Vianney Keymolen

Covington Middle School
13 7th grade

Communication ID: 13568

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: ALINA SHINTAR

Dear Dr. Steven Chu,

No! No! No! I don't want this to happen in our school! The reason why I don't want BPA putting 500 kV power lines next to our school (route 25) because loss of my parents property and health problems also kids and vandalism "tagging on towers." Public hazards if lines come down and risk of natural causes.

BPA could build the towers in a non-residential area, and where it wouldn't cause harm to people or animals and also it could shock us when there is lightning.

Sincerely Alina Shintar
Covington Middle School
Age - 12

Communication ID: 13569

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: DAKOTA STROZINSKY

Dear Dr. Steven Chu,

Please don't do this to me and my family and friends! The reasons I don't want BPA to build their towers on route 25 is because, of health concerns, loss of my familys property, kids and vandalisin, "tagging on towers," and risks of public hazards if lines break.

BPA could build the towers in a non-residential area and where it wouldn't cause harm to people or animals. Also they could ensure the towers safety by building them elsewhere, away from vandels and dense forests, which could cause a fire.

Sincerely,

Dakota Strozinsky
12
Covington Middle School

Communication ID: 13570

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: BRANDON GALVAN

Dear Dr. Steven Chu

My name is Brandon and I'm in 7th grade at Covington Middle School in Vancouver, WA and I know that you thinking to build towers here my school. I understand how important this can be for your business and maybe all the money has or will in this and although I don't know much about the subject I am aware of the damage that these towers can cause to health of citizens, especially to all children!

So I ask in the most attentive manner to see inside your heart before you act and take in consideration our concern. I read on the internet a little about radiations and how potentially dangerous they are. STudies have linked cancer, including brain tumors leukemia, lymphoma, and breast cancer to exposure to radiation emitted by towers and antennas. Please think before you build, about the right that we all have to live happy and healthy. Thank for reading my letter and God bless you and your family.

Brandon Galvan 13-year old
Covington Middle School
(Building towers on route 25)

Communication ID: 13571

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: AINNE MARTINEZ

Dear Dr. Steven Chu I am writing to you guys because I think its wrong for you guys to put 500 kV next to neighborhood. It can be bad and deadly. Kids dont know what they are and how it can harm them. I think you guys should try to move it ferther away. I just hope you guys take my opinion.

Sincerely,

Ainne Martinez
Covington Middle School
13 years old.

Communication ID: 13572

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: KAITLYN THOMAS

Dear Dr. Steven Chu,

I am against BPA constructing 500 kV power lines going over route 25. The risk of problems is too high. Like, Leukemia and the rate of radiation.

Leukemia is effecting everyone from the dangers of radiation. Children are the most effected from this because they have more growing cells than adults. Would you want your children to get cancer from living next to a 500 kV power line? 23,000 homes are built under or near power lines which is unsafe. The rate of radiation is another problem. There were some levels recorded in certain areas were twice the time higher than the legal maximum radiation. Really unsafe!

Sincerely,

Kaitlyn Thomas (12 years old)
Covington Middle School

Communication ID: 13573

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: MARGARET BOYLE

Dear Mr. President, Mr. Secretary, and Senators:

My name is Margaret Boyle. I am writing to express my intense dissatisfaction with the Bonneville Power Administration's I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. My home is located where Tower #26/16 is being proposed. Not only will the 150' tall tower destroy the beauty of my home, combine that with a 150' wide clear cut path for the lines and an access road suitable for heavy repair equipment, and you have our dream home turned into a nightmare. The same is true for the many, many, many other homeowners who are being told they must sacrifice for the 'greater good' of moving energy to metropolitan areas.

Citizen groups have proposed an alternate route that goes through publicly owned lands, commonly referred to as the "Grey Line". PA has flatly refused to consider this route. The Grey Line is located further east than any other proposed line, and will not add a single new homeowner to BPA's Right-of-Way. Should not the public be asked to sacrifice for the public's 'greater good' in the form of a new right of way through publicly held lands, rather than private citizens?

Should BPA run Line 26 through my property and put Tower 26/16 on my property, we will be financially devastated. I do understand that some people would choose to live with a 150' tall power line at their home, but I am not one of them. We NEVER would have bought this property if a power line was within sight, let alone on the grounds. Our home is not worth what we paid for it in 2008. We do not have the option to simply sell and move somewhere else. We will be forced to either live with a line and risk any health effects and have a home that we hate, or lose \$160,000, our life savings, we put down to buy this home. Will BPA reimburse me that money? No. Not even remotely close to it.

This nightmare has been going on since October 2009. Three of my neighbors have already either been foreclosed upon or are in the process of being foreclosed upon. No one can sell their homes with the BPA project looming overhead. We need your help. Please tell BPA to move the I-5 Corridor Replacement Project further east to the proposed 'Grey Line.'

Thank you,

Margaret Boyle

[address]

[email]

Communication ID: 13574

Date Received: 4/4/2011

Name: JACEY BUSH-TSCHASIK

Dear Dr. Steven Chu,

I am against BPA putting a 500 kV line on route 25. Putting a 500 kV line on route 25 near Orchards elementary and Covington Middle School because of the magnetic radiation exposure. It has been proven that high levels of magnetic radiation can cause serious health hazards, such as leukemia.

The safe level of exposure to radiation 4 mG. The levels from the 500 kV line ar over 40. We need to keep the citizens safe.

Sincerely,

Jacey Bush-Tschasik

Covington Middle School

Communication ID: 13575

Date Received: 3/18/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

Hi Mark,

I have attached the questions from our community. These will be shortened to some degree so we can get through the meeting and get them answered, but I wanted you to see the thought and concern that's put into these questions/statements. Please remember we are the rural landowners with no BPA easement and that our properties will be the most impacted by your project. Our concerns are very real to us and I would like you to understand that aspect and respect us by not wasting our time with answers like "it will be in the EIS" or "it will vary with each landowner." Those really aren't answers at all and we deserve better.

Like I requested to you on the phone, please have a document of road specs available for landowners to take home.

Thank you Mark, I'm glad we're able to work together to get our community the information they deserve.

Cheryl

Cheryl Brantley

A Better Way for BPA

BPA's proposed route "V" would cut through my family's property and cross the East Fork of the Lewis River a few hundred feet downstream from our house. This potential crossing is in a site class 3 riparian management zone where all logging is banned for a width 101 feet on each side of the river, measured from the outer edges of the river at its normal winter flow. If transmission lines were sited here would BPA clear-cut a 150 foot long section of shoreline, 101 feet wide on both sides of the river? If so, would it maintain this shoreline clear-cut using herbicides up to the river's edge?

These are actions that are illegal for me to do, nor would I ever consider doing them.

In all I have read, I have never learned who, exactly, is this energy for. California, Oregon, Washington??

The recipient should be the ones to pay for the product.

Whomever this is for, it should go underground.

1: Is BPA really going to be fair when it comes to financially compensating people? It seems to me that to pay a fair price to all the owners of the 70 mile clear cut they are proposing would be so high that buried lines on their own easement would be very much better. What if people are not happy with the price they are offered?

2: Is BPA going to cover the cost for timber owners to be able to grow other crops on the under the power lines? In my case, it is steep timberland, and would need to be step farmed, the acidity of the soil corrected and fertilized, all the stumps removed, a tractor, and a much more labor intensive type of farming than timber growing takes, which means an expensive work force would need to be paid. Is BPA going to pay for all that in a way that really IS FAIR? Or do they intend to toss the farmers some peanuts and just pretend it was fair?

3: Poisoning people's farms with toxic defoliants is completely unacceptable, and deadly to the farm and the farmer. The death toll amongst livestock and wild animals would also be enormous, and on my place, would run off in to King Creek, which runs in to the Lewis river, which runs in to the Columbia, all three officially protected wild rivers, and all fish bearing. Is BPA going to pay for keeping the power lines clear to be done manually? Pretending they use only "safe" defoliants is just not true. They are highly toxic, and they know it. Our familie's longtime logger who has cleared the trees from a power line they sprayed underneath with defoliants came down with lymphoma, and almost died. The rate of this is twice as high in farmers as the rest of the population, and it has been scientifically linked to pesticides and defoliants, such as BPA uses. The power lines themselves are also cancer causing. As we watch the threat of radiation causing mass cancer in Japan on the news, are we going to allow BPA to do it to our farms and farmers and animals for the sake of their corporate greed?

4: What sort of roads do they have in mind? On my property, there are only small one lane roads, most of them only summer roads. They are all private, not "state road 1100" as it appears on the map. The ones that have rock in them have all been rocked and maintained by myself and my family, with not one penny of government money put in. If I were to put in a housing development, I would be legally required to have a 2 lane road with a 15 foot fire lane on each side. Is BPA going to do that, and pay for it all? Would I get a fair price for the extra forest they would be destroying? Will they pay what is necessary to maintain it? Will they repair the damage they would do tearing up the road when it's not the dry season? Are they aware that my place snows in every winter and they would need a snowplow to get in for maintenance to their power line approximately 4 or 5 months of the year? Would BPA fix the road afterwards each time? Promptly? When they wreck the roads on my mother's farm to get to their power line, we have to hire a lawyer each time to get the repairs done, and have never been reimbursed for his fee. Will they cover ALL COSTS or just stick the poor land owner with the constant road and land repairs of constant destructive trespassers?

5: My brother's and my property has only a temporary bridge over King Creek on it, that is in very bad shape, and can not be driven over any more. We could not legally get a permanent permit, and so the bridge will not be there much longer. How is BPA planning to get a new permit that is not currently legally allowed? How are they going to build a new bridge while honoring the 200 foot shoreline boundary laws? The road is only good for the summer, what are they going to do about power line maintenance during winter storms?

6: This farm has been in my family for three generations. I have made my living on it all my life. I am in my 50's, and I don't know how to do anything else. Is BPA going to pay for me to go to college? Are they going to support me throughout a college education, and until I can find a job, at my age, in this economy? My farm is not only how I make a living, it is also the entirety of my retirement plan. Farmers are not people who feel the world owes them a living, but if BPA cheats them out of their farms and therefore out of their livings, then yes, BPA does owe them a living. Are they going to make that up to the farmers too? A one time payment for land people don't want to sell in the first place does not make up for the horrible harm BPA is doing. Are they willing to take a fair look at the long term loss?

1) I understand it will be necessary to 'rebuild' most private driveways that you use as access roads to a width of 14', as very few private one-home driveways are that wide. In the rural foothills areas, many private driveways are built at least partially on sidehills and include a cut bank and fill slope. When it is necessary to excavate into the cut banks to widen the road, what happens to the power and phone utility lines that are buried in the ditches on the cut bank side of driveways?

2) Would culverts existing in private driveways also have to be removed and replaced? In addition to the fact that they would be too short when the driveways are widened, I understand that specifications for minimum culvert diameter have increased since many of these culverts were installed by property owners during driveway construction, possibly several decades ago (or more.)

3) Along that same line, environmental guidelines for road construction in wetlands and sensitive areas have changed dramatically in the decades since many of these driveways were built. Before you

commence re-building of driveways through these types of areas, will you be required to apply for and get a wetlands/habitat/critical lands permit like a private citizen would be required to do if they were to attempt the same activity?

4) When the area impacted by reconstruction includes a sizable additional width, in addition to road surface and ditch, for the regraded cut banks and modified fill slope, is that additional width covered with additional compensation for a wider easement? If not, I assume landowners would be free to maintain the slopes in the manner they chose, such as growing vegetation of their choice?

5) Cut banks and fill slopes of established driveways, like ours, have decades worth of ferns, grasses, and other types of native vegetative growth stabilizing the steep slopes and making them visually appealing to the property owner. What efforts, if any, are made immediately, or any time, after reconstruction to re-plant the newly denuded cut banks and fill slopes with native vegetation? Is there any attempt to return the private driveways to a visually appealing state such as they were in before undergoing BPA reconstruction?

6) Where property owners have surfaced their driveway or private road with a specific product, will that be replaced in kind after BPA's rebuilding removes and/or compromises the material? For instance, if a driveway was originally constructed with 1" gravel without underlying ballast, would it be reconstructed to the same standard? (Ballast works up to the surface of the road, creating rough driveways and hampering maintenance.)

7) How big (long, tall, wide) will the equipment be that will be using the access roads? How frequently do you anticipate alignment or equipment size issues requiring the removal of additional trees at roadway corners, etc.?

8) If access road easements, including cut banks and fill slopes, are to be sprayed with herbicides, is this a broadcast spraying of broadleaf herbicide that would kill ferns and other native vegetation and leave only non-native grass or other introduced ground cover?

Are they even considering the "gray line"

Whats new in underground technology? Anything to make it more affordable and feasible?

Will you remind Mark that in addition to the 150' easement, they will take 200' on either side for big trees, PLUS more land for the access roads? Are landowners being compensated for all this lost property?

One of the proposed routs is the property adjacent to mine is BPA prepared to compensate land owners for lost value or marketability for properties near or adjacent to their lines?

1. Please hand out an outline of specifications for access roads--width, Dimensions, slope, radius of turns, frequency of drainage culverts, ditching, size of culverts used for creeks, etc. ; What acreage is needed for assembly of towers and for delivery of towers by helicopter? Will roads be built for year-

round access that will not be damaged by large equipment that may be required for maintenance or repair?

2. On a tree farm, access roads must meet the landowner's forest management and operations needs (often multiple owners are involved) as well as requirements set by DNR for year-round road use. Do your specs for road quality meet DNR's approval for year-round haul?

3. How have road locations been selected on private land without conferring with owners or without your representatives being on the land? Who from BPA did the selecting?

4. Some of your road locations on our property are not satisfactory selections and will serve neither you nor us as well as other locations. How will such conflicts be resolved?

5. It would seem at this stage, lines under serious consideration would have access roads selected for each tower location. Can we assume if an identified tower on private property has no identified access road, that the line that tower is on is not being taken very seriously as a final choice?

6. For those of us private landowners contained within the Yacolt Burn State Forest area, there is almost no law enforcement, yet you choose to come across private land for more than a mile. How do you propose to provide seriously effective protection for your line and the shoreline stream you will cross? Have you checked out the DNR blogs on vandalism, road and gate damage and destruction? DNR at times has a law enforcement officer, but he does not take care of private land infringements unless it also includes DNR land. In addition, our family tree farm provides a longer rotation philosophy and smaller cuts than DNR and provides more fish and wildlife protection. Why are you locating your line on our continuous cover private family tree farm when it is surrounded by DNR land that is rapidly clearcutting the Yacolt Burn Recreation area?

You (Korsness) need to explain to me why it is cheaper to buy land, now that BPA has protracted the line decision long enough to get the price down, put up towers and string up lines than putting lines underground on your own existing right-of-way. Underground would nullify your "terrorist" concerns of towers toppling on towers, eliminate property confiscation, would not destroy the scenery and pacify a lot of very angry US citizens. If gas pipelines can be run from Alaska to California surely you can figure out how to run a few wires underground for a few miles thru populated areas. If not then hire a pipeline company."

The first Question is one that you identify as a common concern that all private property owners can unite around, and I'm sure the second Question is also a big common concern.

Q 1: Under what circumstances is it absolutely necessary for BPA's easement to bisect a family tree farm forest rather than locating the transmission line along the edge of the property, and under what circumstances would it be possible to shift the proposed line to the property's edge, thus preserving more of the function of the property?

Q 2: Has BPA considered the factor of potential for major earthquakes when studying possible locations for this transmission line, and if so how would a location east of the Cascades compare with one located west of the Cascades re possible damage and disruption from a major earthquake?

1. BPA's construction, modification and extension of private forestry roads as Access Roads to towers requires intense coordination between BPA and the landowners, and among the affected landowners themselves. Our family has several daisy-chains of landowners who share the ongoing road use and maintenance. Common security gates and locks, road-use agreements and operating procedures require pre-arranged communication contacts, sharing of information about lawless happenings, interaction with law enforcement (when available), day-to-day coordination of vehicle traffic, access to gates, training and formal agreements with contractors and subcontractors on gate use and who has keys to locks – permanently or time-limited.

The whole issue of liability, the related insurance, documentation and assessment of damages, arrangement of timely repairs, agreed-on procedures for billing and compensation – all these need to be addressed prior to any land acquisitions.

2. When and how does BPA make time, competent representatives and compensation available to work with landowners on the above and related issues – during the phases of route determination, road layout and design, time-line, budgeting and financing work, contracting, implementation, testing and cutover.

3. As landowners, we will need the professional services of attorneys, financial consultants and accountants, road engineers and surveyors, forestry consultants and appraisers, insurance agents and others, so we can conduct the negotiations and mutual planning that BPA held and is still holding with the DNR, Fish and Wildlife, Ecology and other governmental agencies. How and when will BPA compensate us private forest landowners as BPA does for DNR and other agencies?

PLEASE UNDERSTAND THESE CONCERNS – THEY ARE DERIVED FROM DECADES OF EXPERIENCE WITH CRISES (MAN-MADE AND OTHERWISE), UNDER A HIGH-VOLTAGE POWERLINE. WE OPPOSE DEALING WITH THE PROBLEMS WE AND YOU WOULD SHARE IF THE I-5 PROJECT COMES TO OUR RUGGED FOREST TREE FARMS.

In light of the recent Japan disasters, and the fact that Washington and Oregon have the same kind of "plate" beneath them, why does BPA even consider putting the system above ground?

QUESTIONS FROM RURAL LANDOWNERS FOR THE MARCH 19, 2011 MEETING IN AMBOY, WA

abetterway4bpa.org

Communication ID: 13577

Date Received: 4/12/2011

Name: PATTI OLSON

I attended the March 19th 2011, meeting at Amboy at which Mark Korsness spoke re: access roads. I filled out the BPA provided comment sheet and had the BPA staff in the back room print a copy of the map which shows the tower and access road affecting my home. I personally stapled my comment sheet TO the map before turning both back into staff. Yes, the map I attached WAS the proper map, showing the access road to K-84. I am very familiar with it. I have looked at it dozens, if not hundreds, of times in the past two months. There is absolutely NO CHANCE that I turned in anything else.

Imagine my surprise when, upon checking your "Comments of Public Record" site, I found that a completely different and inapplicable map had been included as the attachment to my comments, and this is what now exists in your public record. My response was, "Well, children will be children;" but my husband insists that since it is a matter of record, I make one attempt to get my correct comments, including the CORRECT map, entered, instead of what is currently there. So I am attaching, below, the copy of my comments, as presently shown in your record (please note the obvious typos, which I have corrected); and I have included a copy of the map of the access road to K-84 and have included the comments I made on that map, as nearly as I can remember them, before stapling the map to the comment sheet and turning it in to BPA staff on March 19th.

Sincerely, Patti Olson

Communication ID: 13578

Date Received: 4/22/2011

Name: PAUL W III TOLLE

I currently live in Kelso along route #09 which has an existing line and is also a proposed expansion line. If this route is chosen for the new line would the existing right away be expanded on my property?

Communication ID: 13579

Date Received: 4/26/2011

Name: MELISSA (UNKNOWN)

Hi, my name is Melissa and we live at [address] in Kelso, Washington. And, we're going to be looking to sell our property in the next 6 months so, we were just wondering if Bonneville goes through our property we were just wondering if you would be interested in buying it or what your advice is. Thank you. Phone number is [phone1] or cell phone is [phone2]. Thank you, bye.

Communication ID: 13580

Date Received: 4/27/2011

Name: PERRY J CALABRESE

My home and property is in ruin because BPA vegetation crews ignored my warnings about cutting in a slide zone! Mark, you did not listen to me or my wife at the public meetings when we told you NOT TO CUT ON OUR PROPERTY and now our home may be damaged beyond repair. Perry Calabrese

Communication ID: 13581

Date Received: 4/26/2011

Name: MARKUS D WUERTH

I am writing to oppose the power line routing thru my property. We have four ten acre lots. The proposed line would run across the middle of one. All of the lots are view property. I have recently brought in underground power, a road and well. The transmission line would make one ten acre lot valueless and the others would drop drastically. BPA would never reimburse me for my true loss. BPA has a current easement elsewhere and if BPA sites the line on my property I will view this as stealing my land.

Markus Wuerth

My parcel numbers are [parcel 1], [parcel 2], [parcel 3], [parcel 4]

Communication ID: 13582

Date Received: 5/2/2011

Name: ARDELLE M STEIN

Yes, I need some information about where I can locate one of the towers. Maybe in Cowlitz County somewhere, Cowlitz or Clark County. One of the new 150-foot towers that may be going in across, somewhere across the southwest area here. I would need to get some photography of that, so if someone could call me with that information my number is [phone]. This is Ardie Stein. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13583

Date Received: 5/3/2011

Name: MARGIE J BORCHERS

I live in Beaverbrook Estates and the proposed eastern line encroaches on our property. I sent an email to Maryam Asgharian for a representative from BPA to visit here to see the extensive forested wetlands that would be severely impacted. That was over a month ago and no one has called or written. I would appreciate some indication that my request has been heard.

Communication ID: 13584

Date Received: 5/3/2011

Name: LISA K HELTEMES

Placing the power lines across ours and other properties near our home will completely alter my and my family's well being. We chose our home location to get away from the poor air quality and noise in other areas, to be closer to nature, and enjoy the peace and tranquility that it has to offer, a huge investment for our well-being -- the creek, the wildlife, the trees, and all the sounds of nature. We enjoy the outdoors very much, walking, hiking and biking, on an almost daily basis, right outside our back door. Placing the power lines by our home will ruin the tranquil setting that we have, as well as what our neighbors have and enjoy as well. The noise, EMF's, static interference, change in the physical landscape, ugly towers and not to mention the herbicide use due to the powerlines are all bad things that we do not want in our neighborhoods!!! You can count on people with motorcycles and 4-wheelers riding the cleared pathways under the powerlines -- there goes the peace again! Plan a path for the powerlines where there are no homes or people living out their day to day lives. Period.

Communication ID: 13585

Date Received: 5/4/2011

Name: MARGIE J BORCHERS

Hi Maryam-- our property is in the lower left square. Inside that square it is at the top right where 3 property lines form a Y. Ours is the base of the Y on the right side where the dashed line runs..... Hope that is clear.

Thank you.

~Margie

Communication ID: 13586

Date Received: 5/7/2011

Name: PERRY J CALABRESE

The BPA will go the way of the dinosaur: <http://www.bloomenergy.com/> BPA will say that bloom energy is too expensive. So were digital calculators, computers, flat screen TV's. If I were a young BPA employee, I'd be thinking of a new career...

Communication ID: 13587

Date Received: 5/9/2011

Name: MARGUERITE BLACKMAN

Record of correspondence between Laura J. Martin of HDR and Marguerite Blackman:

From: Martin, Laura [email]

Sent: Monday, May 09, 2011 3:59 PM

To: Wittpenn,Nancy A - KEC-4; Morris,Brenda F - TERS-3

Subject: Tax ID 171912034

Hi Nancy

I just spoke to Margarite (sp?) Blackman, who is the President of Stoney Meadows, HOA. I was calling about access to the property which she (and the owners) deny. Her concern is that these lands are wetlands and appear to be protected (bald eagles, etc.). I told her that these alignments are proposed and BPA is in the investigative stage right now and the EIS should reflect any wetlands/protected areas.

She said that all the property owners have written to BPA about their concerns and she feels like they are not being heard. I mentioned that BPA is reviewing comments and concerns – I was only addressing the issue that was PEP was not returned. She also said that the BPA interactive map is incorrect – or at least the information in the key. BPA's Legend states there is an existing public/private road to be reconstructed. Margarite says that it is not a road at all, it is a walking trail.

Basically, she wants to make sure that BPA is aware that the lands are wetlands and protected and that there is in fact NO existing road on the property. Although she denies access, now she is wondering if BPA should come onto the property just to confirm that what BPA is saying is an existing road is actually a walking trail.

Brenda – can you confirm her concerns and those of the homeowners are noted somewhere in the database? (Would you have record of that?)

Nancy – can you please let me know what I can say, if anything, to appease her concerns at this point?

Thanks!

Laura J. Martin
Junior Agent
Real Estate & Right-of-Way Services
HDR | ONE COMPANY | Many Solutions

[contact info]

Communication ID: 13588

Date Received: 5/10/2011

Name: CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

Hi Maryam,

Thank you for the information. I look forward to hearing Mark and Steve's response on the topic about the general cost for each route. I'm pretty sure that's what was said in our meeting in Portland last year.

I went to the post office yesterday and the maps were there. I don't go daily so I'm not sure when they arrived. Thank you very much!

Thanks again,

Cheryl

Communication ID: 13589

Date Received: 5/13/2011

Name: JACK SWANSON

Hi, my name is Jack Swanson. I'm interested in the I-5 Corridor Project. I'm a land owner. I actually live in Kennewick, Washington right now, but we have land where we're going to build just out of Castle Rock on the northeast corner of parcel number [parcel number] pretty much right next to your tower D-11 in your project. Anyway, we'd like to build there and we kind of want to know what exactly the plan is. So if you could give me a call, I'd appreciate it. My phone number is area code [phone]. Once again, my name is Jack Swanson. And my mailing address is [address]. This is Jack Swanson at [phone]. Thank you.

--

Hi, this is Jack Swanson again, I just left you a message and I think I might have said the northeast corner of the parcel [parcel number] it's actually the northwest corner. Right next to tower D-11. And we have a building site and we'd like to start building a house. So we would like an answer as to whether if there is a definitive plan with what you're going to do in that area. So once again, this is Jack Swanson, phone number [phone].

Communication ID: 13590

Date Received: 5/11/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

Hi Maryam,

We see a map that's been titled "grey route" on the another way group web site, which is a line on an old BPA project map with no land features, topography, or private property land parcels on it. Did BPA receive any map from this group with a route drawn on it other than the one that's on their web site? If so, would you please send it to me.

Thank you,

Cheryl

Cheryl Brantley
A Better Way for BPA
<http://abetterway4bpa.org>

Communication ID: 13591

Date Received: 5/13/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

I'm sorry, I should have explained myself better. I was wondering if there was a map presented by them that's a real map, with topography, land parcels, etc. Is BPA aware of any professionals they hired to study this route, such as engineers, wildlife biologists, or other credible experts in siting power lines?

Cheryl Brantley
A Better Way for BPA
<http://abetterway4bpa.org>

Communication ID: 13592

Date Received: 5/13/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

Hi Maryam,

1. What is the NERC criteria that requires you to have a remedial action scheme in place?
2. What are the elements of RAS?
3. What type of multiple contingency outages are you addressing with regards to needing a RAS?
4. Would you need a RAS in place along a new corridor?

3. We hear people complaining about the height of these towers. In some areas along route 25 some of your existing towers are shorter than others. For these 500 kV towers, could you use shorter towers in these same areas if you were to choose route 25?

Thank you,

Cheryl

Cheryl Brantley
A Better Way for BPA
<http://abetterway4bpa.org>

Communication ID: 13593

Date Received: 5/16/2011

Name: COLUMBIA RIVER FISHERIES PROGRAM OFFICE ,CAREY SMITH

To Whom It May Concern,

I have reviewed your proposed I-5 corridor reinforcement Project. My concern is the proposed segment forty running through Lacamas Prairie in Clark County. I retired from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service after more than thirty years as a wetland ecologist and now own an international consulting firm concentrating on wetland protection and restoration. I also served for more than ten years on the Clark County planning commission.

So I believe I am well versed in both wetland ecology and the critical wildlife areas within Clark County. Your proposed segment 40 runs all the way through what is likely the most environmentally sensitive area in Clark County. The entire Lacamas floodplain is subject to periodic flooding throughout the winter. There is up to three feet of water along your proposed route for four to five months. A boat would often be necessary to access the towers during this period.

This intermittent flooding is a great attraction for waterfowl. It is not unusual to have five to ten thousand Canada geese in the floodplain. Several hundred tundra swans use the floodplain as a resting area between Ridgefield National Wildlife Refuge and Franz Lake National Wildlife Refuge. There are also thousands of ducks that winter in the Lacamas watershed. For many years, I was the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's regional biologist, in charge of the biological programs on more than one hundred national wildlife refuges in seven western states. With that background, I can say that there are many times during the winter that the waterfowl use in the Lacamas floodplain exceeds the numbers found in any Southwest Washington refuges. During the winter I spend a lot of time walking and paddling through the flood plain and often find dead waterfowl that have collided with your existing power line on foggy days. This list includes ducks, geese and swans. Rotting waterfowl can be a catalyst for avian botulism, which can cause outbreaks killing thousands of waterfowl. Power lines in densely populated waterfowl areas and botulism have been linked in many areas. We can expect a significant increase in collisions given the size of the proposed towers.

In recognition of the Lacamas Floodplain's environmental sensitivity, Clark County has designated the area as priority species habitat, a priority species buffer area, and a priority habitat buffer area.

The Washington Department of Natural Resources also recognizes the ecological importance of the Lacamas Prairie. In 2008, the prairie was designated as a state Natural Area. Due to its importance for endangered species, it was designated as the highest priority for protection within the State of Washington. The Washington Department of Natural Resources, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife, The Nature Conservancy, and the Columbia Land Trust have formed a partnership to purchase the lands bisected by your power lines. They are on the verge of acquiring a 99-acre parcel on both sides of Goodman Road. According to your map, four or five towers could be placed on this acquisition site.

Following additional planned acquisitions, Clark County Parks would have the opportunity to extend the existing Lacamas Lake trail several miles with great views of Mount Hood all the way from Goodman Road to Fourth Plain Avenue. This is not likely if there are 150 foot towers along the route.

Your proposed segment could be eliminated simply by running east to run parallel with segment 41 or 43. This would limit the intrusion into the state Natural Area and county environmental priority areas to those that already exist. It would also protect one of Vancouver's most significant view sheds across the wetlands and toward Mount Hood.

Sincerely,

Carey Smith

Columbia River Fisheries Program Office

[address]

[phone]

Communication ID: 13594

Date Received: 5/18/2011

Name: PAUL W III TOLLE

I live next to existing power lines with a right away through my property. The existing lines are also proposed route #9. My question is; will the right away be expanded if this route is chosen for the reinforcement project? A yes or no answer will suffice. A prompt answer would be appreciated. Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Communication ID: 13595

Date Received: 5/18/2011

Name: CARLA TOLLE

Yes, I currently live along proposed route number 9. My question is, will the right of way be expanded if our route is chosen for the reinforcement program. I need an answer so we can determine what we will be doing with our property as soon as possible. Our address is [address]. Our phone number is [phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13596

Date Received: 5/19/2011

Name: MIKE WILSON

Hi, my name is Mike Wilson. I live in Castle Rock, Washington. Address is [address1]. I'm shopping for a piece of property that might be in the vicinity of, if I'm reading this map right, section F. The property is

[address2] and to get to Firlane Place you go east on from I-5 go up headquarters Rd a couple of miles, take a right on, I think, Firlane Road or Drive, and in less than a mile is Firlane Place to the right. And it's kind of hard to tell by this map but apparently it's going to be pretty close to that section F. The location of the line would have a lot to do with whether I bid on this property or not. If you could, call me back and give me an answer, that would be adequate too. My number is [home phone]. Or, my cell phone is [cell phone]. Anyhow, thank you very much.

Communication ID: 13597

Date Received: 5/24/2011

Name: DESIREE DAMICO

Hi, this is Mrs. Damico. Yes, I do have a big question. We're looking at purchasing a house in the Camas area up in Lookout Ridge. And when I go on a map I'm seeing that that's the end of all these routes because it takes the last line segment over to Troutdale. So, number 52, I wanted to know if 51 and 52 are definitely part of the consideration for the new BPA power line. If someone would call us back please, it's [phone]. Greg and Desiree Damico. Our house is [address]. And actually we do back up to another segment of the line. So, we are moving but now the house we're looking to buy might be on the other end of the line. We would really appreciate it if someone would get back us soon about that. Again our number, [phone] and it's the Damicos. Thank you, bye.

Communication ID: 13598

Date Received: 5/24/2011

Name: JAYSIAH FERGUSON

Hi, my name is Jaysiah Ferguson I'm with Keller Williams Realty and I'm calling for a client who is looking into purchasing a home. The address is [address]. And I looked on your map, it looks like route 49 may go directly in front of that property. However, talking with the sellers and the agent, they're saying that that is not a valid route anymore. I just needed some clarification as to what is valid at this point and most plausible. If you could give me a call back, my number is [phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13599

Date Received: 5/10/2011

Name: STATE OF WASHINGTON, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES ,LEONARD S YOUNG

May 10, 2011

Mr. Mark Korsness

Project Manager, I-5 Corridor Reinforcement

Bonneville Power Administration

PO Box 9250
Portland, OR 97207

Dear Mr. Korsness:

This letter is to update Washington State Department of Natural Resources' (DNR) NEPA scoping comments (dated Dec. 10, 2009) in light of additional information BPA has made available to the public, such as removal and addition of proposed line segments. The enclosed document reiterates previously raised issues where applicable as well as new issues; it is intended to provide a quick reference to BPA regarding issues needing consideration throughout the development and implementation of the I-5 Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The concerns listed in the enclosure are referenced to the original comments submitted by DNR dated December 10, 2009 whenever the issue originated from those comments.

Sincerely,

Leonard Young
Department Supervisor

ENCLOSURE

Washington DNR Updated Scoping Comments

BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

May 10, 2011

Alternatives:

1) DNR appreciates BPA's willingness to propose new line segments, and remove others, in response to issues raised by DNR as well as members of the public. However, we believe additional work is required to ensure that a reasonable range of alternatives are analyzed in the project EIS.

a) No alternative other than the existing right-of-way appears to substantially avoid conflict with DNR state trust land management mandates, or adequately mitigates, minimizes and avoids disproportionate impacts to DNR managed state trust lands.

b) Two items require additional consideration relative to the existing right-of-way in order to be responsive to DNR and public issues raised in scoping:

i) A full analysis of the Non-Wires Screening Report recommendations is essential to establishing a reasonable range of alternatives that are responsive to the issues.

ii) In addition and in concert, analyze the extent to which the project's purpose and need could be achieved by replacing conductors and insulators on existing tower structures, within the existing right-of-way, with second-generation high temperature superconductors (G2 HTC) that allow far greater power transmission capacity and far lower line loss.

c) Clearly develop and identify objectives in consultation with DNR to ensure the analyses of an adequate range of impacts and alternatives and future expansion plans. (Young, 12-10-09, p.2)

d) Give equal consideration to federal Department of Defense lands, USDA Forest Service lands, county lands, e.g., Camp Bonneville, and Pacific Power and Light Lands in consideration of the expense of near-term and long-term impacts to trust land management and environmental stewardship on DNR managed state trust lands. (Young, 12-10-09, p.2) For example, routes through Camp Bonneville would straighten out segment P and cause significantly less severance to DNR managed trust lands.

i) DNR has previously requested consideration of a route to the east of DNR's Yacolt Block, along the DNR boundary shared with the Gifford Pinchot National Forest, which would avoid bifurcating DNR managed trust lands. Subsequently, a group of citizens proposed a "gray line" route that would follow a similar path. BPA's rationale in the February, 2011 project update document are insufficient to eliminate these route proposals from further study. The portion of the "gray line" proposal that would affect the Siouxon Block of trust lands located east of Yale Lake would incur negative impacts for federally listed spotted owls and their associated habitat. This should be avoided by a routing alternative that turns west at the southern Siouxon boundary and crosses the Lewis River at or just east of Yale Dam.

ii) Segment K has been proposed to replace Segments 11, 20, and 21 from early versions of publicly released routing alternative maps, in an effort to avoid PacifiCorp lands. This choice, in turn, has a negative bifurcation impact on DNR managed state trust lands to north of the Lewis River Road. Additional impacts to homes around Yale would be incurred as well. The environmental, social and economic impacts of this decision have yet to be vetted publicly and should be included in the draft EIS analysis.

e) Analyze and compare the costs of crossing state lands versus federal lands given the October 23, 2009 MOD between multiple federal agencies that expedite the siting and construction of qualified electric transmission infrastructure on federal lands. (DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, p.9, 12-10-09)

f) Consider route (s) that avoid habitat identified specifically for or linked to threatened and endangered species.

g) The Lacamas Prairie Natural Area was designated by the Commissioner of Public Lands to conserve populations of both federal- and state-listed endangered, threatened, and sensitive species, as well as wet prairie and oak woodland habitats that are rare within Washington State, and DNR is near closing on the purchase of the core area. BPA should avoid siting within areas identified as natural areas by the DNR. Proposed line segments 36, 40, and 46 (vicinity of T2N R3E, Sections 18, 20, 39, 50, and 52) cross through approximately 3.5 miles within the approved Lacamas Prairie Natural Area boundary. Construction of the proposed line segments could have direct impacts on these species' populations and high-quality habitats. A large portion of the proposed segments are located within the Lacamas Creek floodplain and associated wetlands that are included in the natural area design. Most of the species and habitats within the natural area are dependent on specific hydrological conditions and would be very sensitive to hydrological changes that may result from construction of new powerline segments. The federally listed *Lomatium bradshawii* that occurs within the natural area boundary is a wetland species

dependent on sufficient water resources and has a fairly narrow hydrological regime tolerance. In addition, access road development and use may further alter hydrology and would present a vector for non-native invasive species that threaten the species and habitats. For additional information, contact the DNR Natural Areas Program.

h) Consider route(s) that avoid transecting the Larch (Yacolt) block and the Yacolt Burn Recreation Area. Define impacts to current and planned DNR- provided recreation opportunities in the Larch (Yacolt) block, as outlined in the Yacolt Burn Recreation Plan. Include a cost projection for re-creating the Yacolt Burn Recreation Plan's implementation schedule to account for BPA's impacts to recreation. (DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, pp.10, 11, 12-10-09)

i) Segments O and 30 are unresponsive to this issue and should therefore be eliminated from consideration.

ii) Segment P could be re-routed to avoid directly overtopping adjacent homes without significant additional negative trust land bifurcation impacts to those already incurred by P. Consider turning north at proposed tower site P/27 instead of at P/24, and turning westward onto the trust land boundary at proposed tower site P/18.

i) Consider route(s) that avoid DNR managed trust land transfer parcels or which are identified in potential land transactions.

i) A trust parcel in T2N, R3E, Section 16 under segment 43 (directly east of Vancouver) has been identified as a potential school site for the Camas School District which could be bifurcated by the power line.

j) Consider route(s) that avoid forest riparian conservation easements held by the state, i.e., DNR currently holds a conservation easement in T07N, R01W, Section 4 lying within the segment 9 route that was purchased 12/23/08 at a value of \$118,878.63.

k) Consider route(s) that avoid lands that have medium to high wind power potential, e.g., areas with 6.5 m/s and greater wind speeds at 80m as shown on maps at windpoweringamerica.gov/images/windmaps/wa_80m.jpg or as designated to have wind power potential by DNR based on site-specific information. The transmission line should be located in order to supply power from sources such as wind while not eliminating the best possible lands for harnessing wind.

l) Consider route(s) that avoid genetically selected tree areas (Genetic Reserves). (DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, 12-10-09, p.17). There is currently one genetic reserve lying very close to route 30 in T4N, R3E, Sec.23.

2) BPA has added the Casey Roads Substation Site as possibly being located on state trust lands. This may require the sale of state land. The substation proposal requires detailed information for evaluation such as the exact location, the size, impacts outside the area, access to the substation, and others. For substation locations that may affect DNR managed trust lands, the EIS should identify and analyze:

- a) Unauthorized public access opportunities and resource damage issues.
- b) Land Transactions: easement vs. fee ownership transfer.
- c) Consistency with DNR's Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan (RMAP) for access routes that could potentially be utilized by BPA.
- d) Storm water management of potential sites.

Impacts

3) Disclose the potential environmental, economic and other impacts to DNR managed state lands as well as impacts to all non-federal lands related to DNR's regulatory and other programs, i.e., Geology and Earth Resources, Forest Practices, and Fire Protection. (Young, 12-10-09, p.2; DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, 12-10-09, pp.8,9)

a) Develop and propose mitigation measures for DNR-managed lands that minimize potential short-term and long-term environmental, economic and social impacts of the alternatives through project design and development similar to those agreed upon with King County and documented in the Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project Record of Decision dated July 21, 2003. (DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, 12-10-09, p.10).

4) Analyze the impacts of the I-5 Corridor Options on the threatened and endangered species that are currently covered under DNR's Incidental Take Permit (ITP) (#PRT-812521 USFWS) and (#1168 NMFS) and Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). (Also please refer to Mitigation Item 20 later in these comments.)

a) Analyze whether BPA's proposed transmission line use will limit DNR's ability to protect the threatened and endangered species as envisioned in the ITP and HCP and seek DNR's input during any Endangered Species Action consultation between BPA and the National Marine Fisheries Service or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for any project effects that have the potential to put DNR at risk of noncompliance with its ITP and HCP.

b) Include the analysis of impacts on threatened and endangered species for those species that may be adversely affected by the I-5 Corridor Options (and include a draft of the Biological Assessment or Biological Opinion prepared pursuant to ESA consultation in the FEIS) and that are also covered by DNR's ITP and HCP in separate sections of the EIS to enable an efficient analytical structure for assessing project impacts on state owned lands.

5) Work with DNR to determine and confirm state-ownership of aquatic lands; Analyze the impacts on cultural, historic and archaeological resources on all aquatic crossings, preferably in conjunction with consultation pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act; Identify impacted DNR aquatic licenses, leases, easements and sales; and calculate lost revenue to the state over the next fifty years. (DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, pp. 11,12, December 10,2009.)

6) Consider impacts to land that is subject to forest riparian conservation easements and provide compensation and/or mitigation for the loss of conservation capacity intended by these easements impacted by the transmission line. Obtain consent from DNR on impacted easements prior to obtaining an easement from the landowner. (Young, 12-10-09, p.3; DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, 12-10-09, p.13) (SEE item 1.k. of this document)

7) Analyze and avoid negative impacts to the current use or reasonably foreseeable future development of any communication site, e.g., existing sites include DNR's Larch Mountain site in T3N, R4E, Sec. 27, SW1/4, NE1/4 and the Casey Road site in T10N, R2W, Sec.18, SE1/4. (DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, p.7,9, 12-10-09)

8) Analyze impacts to the local economy caused by impacts to the timber industry and recreation. (DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, 12-10-09, p.9)

a) Analyze and avoid impacts to the potential future revenue from biomass production, carbon credits and development rights on DNR managed state trust lands. (DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, 12-10-09, p.7)

9) Analyze the effects, restrictions and other threats (negative easements) of BPA's proposed corridors on DNR trust management activities that occur outside of BPA's right-of-way and prevent DNR from fully managing state lands. (DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, 12-10-09, p.6)

a) Define restrictions on current and reasonably foreseeable DNR managed state land activities outside the BPA right-of-way, particularly where the corridor will disallow, limit or increase the cost of timber harvest, timber hauling, wind power production, solar energy development, communication sites and recreation use or eliminate the potential for a special land management option. (DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, 12-10-09, p.9)

b) Develop and model an estimation of the amount and location of current danger trees that would require removal. Identify areas outside of the normal R/W corridor width that would require low-growing vegetation to be maintained and include within the transmission line corridor. This would include areas with trees upslope of the line, diseased areas, areas with undesirable species, and other existing conditions that will be considered a hazard or concern once the transmission line is built.

10) Clearly identify the vegetation management activities that will occur within and outside the right-of-way per BPA's May 2000 Transmission System Vegetation Management Program Final EIS (DOE/EIS-0285) and supplements including those near any DNR-managed natural area or water body where State Owned Aquatic Lands are located. (DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, pp.10,12, 12-10-09)

11) Quantify and analyze the economic impact on long term trust revenue where the corridor will disallow, limit or increase the cost of timber harvest and timber hauling, or managing for other special forest products or agricultural land uses. This should include a mitigation and compensation plan in coordination with DNR for the life of the project.

a) Determine the effects on DNR's timber harvest from the removal of lands by each Watershed Analysis Unit (WAU). Work with DNR using DNR's timber harvest modeling software to arrive at these impacts. This includes assessing hydrologic modeling for rain on snow related procedures and potential future DNR harvest limitations due to new corridors. DNR will supply the data. (DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, p. 10, 12-10-09)

12) Describe and analyze the cumulative impacts that may result from unauthorized use and damage to state lands and public resources, e.g., garbage dumping, trail building, ORV use, vandalism and theft. Prepare a sample survey on a given portion of existing power line representative of DNR ownership on the proposed I-5 project and prepare a quantitative prediction of unauthorized use and the cumulative impacts that may result. Include costs to repair or mitigate predicted damage. (DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, p.11, 12-10-09)

13) Address the potential for geologic hazards (DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, 12-10-09, pp. 13-15):

a) Identify landslide hazards using DNR's GIS Statewide Landslide database and then create a site-specific geologic map.

b) Identify unstable slopes using DNR's Shalstab model or through landforms in the Landslide Hazard Zonation projects where available data exists.

c) Identify slope hazards associated with slope modification or vegetation removal at construction areas.

d) Identify seismic shaking potential on the Lacamas Lake Fault as well as movement potential.

e) Reconsider corridor locations in moderate to high liquefaction sensitive areas by using GIS modeling to identify the least sensitive lands.

14) Define impacts to established research plots and propose measures to mitigate impacts. Potential plots of concern in addition to those for genetic reserves identified in I)n) above are listed in DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, 12-10-09, p.17.

Mitigation

15) Develop mitigation such as a Statewide Memorandum of Agreement with DNR that addresses existing encumbrances on state land and management of existing, proposed and future corridors such as the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project to reduce environmental damage, assures state forest land productivity and ensures appropriate compensation to the legal beneficiaries of state trust lands when lands are used by BPA. Use this broader agreement to form the basis for easements and to establish a Maintenance and Operations Agreement for the I-5 Corridor project. (Young, 12-10-09, p.3) The Statewide Memorandum of Agreement should include the following items:

a) Road design, construction, improvement, maintenance and abandonment best management practices and, separately, develop BPA Road Standards. Road standards should mimic DNR standards, or BPA should accept DNR standards that are acceptable and in accordance with Forest Practices Rules;

- b) Managing low growing native vegetation;
- c) Identification of adequate crossings for equipment required for hi-lead logging including towers and shovels and wind power related equipment.
- d) Unauthorized uses that damage lands and public resources;
- e) Removal of danger trees outside the right-of-way and other right-of-way corridor expansions w/o adequate compensation to the state (Also see DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, 12-10-09, p.9); and
- f) Conflicts with the state's long-term forest management obligations and in some cases contractual obligations of the DNR's federally approved HCP.

16) Commit to meet the intent of the Forest Practices Act and Rules within BPA's ownership or easement corridors. Evaluating alternatives that mitigate impacts to riparian areas and threatened and endangered species throughout the construction phase and during future maintenance of the project will minimize the need for identifying additional mitigation under SEPA. (Young, 12-10-09, p.3,4; DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, 12-10-09, p.16) The project should incorporate the following considerations, impact analysis and mitigation:

- a) Agree to implement the 2002 agreement between DNR and BPA regarding forest practices or Agree to work with the underlying and neighboring landowners to obtain Forest Practices Applications and comply with the Forest Practices Act and rules. Notification should be done either via coordination at annual meetings or in writing. This should also include maps of activities identifying where work along the line segment will be.
- b) Evaluate the project alternatives based on the impacts they will have on threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality concerns.
- c) Limit the impacts to potentially unstable slopes as defined in WAC 222-16-050(1)(d)(i).
- d) Conduct an environmental analysis of the impacts to unstable slopes, riparian function and water quality for all stream crossings that will be impacted. Provide a mitigation plan for the project to specifically guide the removal and manipulation of vegetation near stream crossings not limited to topping of trees or leaving riparian vegetation where adequate conductor clearance is anticipated.
- e) Minimize vegetation and ground disturbance during construction adjacent to streams. Emphasize native vegetation that will provide for riparian function. Where trees must be removed, consider replacing existing tree species within the corridor with a native species that will provide forest vegetation both within and adjacent to the corridor for riparian function while limiting the hazards to the lines and providing reliable service to the customer.
- f) Work with landowners(s) in identifying and adhering to any prescriptions/requirements within the Upper Coweeman Watershed Analysis area.

g) Agree to apply only pesticides that are registered for forest use, follow the label requirements and adhere to the Forest Practices Rules relating to pesticide use.

17) Agreement from BPA, in writing or via some other form of agreement, that its actions and those of its contractors will comply with Chapter 76.04 RCW Forest Protection and Chapter 332.24 WAC Forest Protection. (Young, 12-10-09, p.4; DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, p.16, 12-10-09)

a) Work with DNR to mitigate concerns of increased fire susceptibility and safety concerns and limitations they place on firefighting efforts. (Young, 12-10-09, p.4)

b) Take responsibility for extreme fire hazard abatement related to falling of danger trees and follow state extreme fire hazard abatement laws. (Young, 12-10-09, p.4)

c) Reimburse DNR Resource Protection for the full cost of suppressing any wildfires occurring on the BPA right-of-way or as a result of BPA operations in the area, regardless of cause. (DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, p.16, 12-10-09)

18) Identify and map all existing and new roads on state lands that BPA will use and construct, and agree to meet DNR standards for road construction and maintenance. This should include analysis/coordination with developed RMAP plans. (DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, 12-10-09, p.9)

19) Ensure protection to species and special habitats while providing mitigation equal to that required by DNR's Habitat Conservation Plan that will be necessary as a result of:

a) Fragmenting of habitat by corridors and roads;

b) Introducing noxious and invasive weeds;

c) Impacting water quality;

d) Increasing slides on unstable slopes;

e) Creating or failing to remove fish barriers;

f) Inviting unregulated public use,

g) Generally providing a lesser standard of environmental protection. (Young, 12- 10-09, p.3; DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, p.9, 12-10-09); and

h) Threats to cultural resources or significant local Tribal areas.

20) Develop mitigation measures to address impacts on endangered and threatened species on state lands and that are covered by DNR's ITP and HCP.

a) Incorporate any conservation measures or aspects of the proposal that are relied upon to support informal or formal consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service and the US Fish and Wildlife Service (Federal Services) under the Endangered Species Act and obtain input during consultation from

DNR for any project effects that relate to any species covered by DNR's ITP and HCP on state lands (DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, pp.10, 12-10-09):

b) Develop a mitigation plan for new construction and establish a mitigation account for future habitat restoration that may be needed if BPA's proposal results in the removal of Permit Lands (as defined in DNR's ITP) from coverage along the proposed corridors and their buffers or otherwise affects DNR's ability to comply with its ITP and HCP due to impacts associated with BPA's transmission line construction or ongoing operation and maintenance.

c) Develop a mitigation plan in coordination with the Federal Services and DNR that reflects commitments DNR has made in its ITP and requires BPA to incorporate additional measures needed to address project effects to maintain DNR's compliance with its ITP as it relates to BPA's intended use of Permit Lands (as defined in DNR's ITP).

21) Follow the DNR/BPA Appraisal MOU. (DNR NEPA Scoping Comments, p.11, 12-10-09.)

DFD

Communication ID: 13600

Date Received: 5/26/2011

Name: DESIREE DAMICO

Hi, this is Desiree Damico again. I spoke with someone from the environmental part of the program for the reinforcement project yesterday and found out that the connector piece number 52 that goes from Camas to the new Troutdale substation- that that piece is a definite and would not move east or west at the final between section 51 and Troutdale- that that piece will always be those lines because that's what I was told. So I went back to the neighborhoods that would be impacted by that because we're looking at buying a home there, and of course everyone's all upset because they're saying "we hadn't heard that" and "nothing's been sent to us" and that kind of thing. That would be like the Washougal Home Association. So, if my information is wrong, please let me know because now I've got some people upset. And again our address is [address]. This is the Damico residence. We also back up to the lines- different lines, the Minnehaha ones- so, that's one of the reasons we're moving and now we don't want to move to another set of lines. So, if someone could get back to us, [phone] and this is Desiree Damico. Thank you, buh bye.

Communication ID: 13601

Date Received: 5/27/2011

Name: MIKE R HAYDEN

I am the president of an ATV club and would like to be included in your environmental study as a user to adopt a section of the power line right of way for a ATV recreation trail.

Communication ID: 13602

Date Received: 5/28/2011

Name: DAVID FD BUCK

Dear BPA,

I am pleased that the EIS will include an analysis of Public Health and Safety, however I remain concerned about prejudice in the analysts. At public hearings, BPA agents have repeatedly dismissed health concerns related to electromagnetic exposure. This viewpoint is both wrong and dangerous. No educated and truthful person would deny that EMR exposure can negatively impact health. The question is not if EMR is harmful, the question is only at what level is EMR exposure acceptable. And the answer to this question is not well understood. Thus, we need to take a precautionary approach to minimize EMR exposure. There are many things we do know which should lead a logical person to avoid placing high voltage power transmission lines near existing residential homes, such as: - The human body is full of electric signals that flow through our nerves, enzymes, cells, our brain, our heart, and so on. And we know that electric fields are attracted to conductive objects, including people, and cause current flow in the body, upsetting its natural electric signal systems, ion balance, and even DNA fragmentation. Anecdotally, I have personally experienced the affects of EMR exposure. My 3 sons and I were standing near a 230kV line when I touched my son's face to wipe away some dirt. He flinched and said "ouch" when I touched him. I too had felt a strange sensation. I touched one of my other sons and the same thing happened. We learned later, after speaking with a BPA agent, that it is common for your body to pick-up an electric charge from nearby transmission lines. In fact, he cautioned against walking barefoot on moist grass because your feet will be shocked. So, beyond longer-term major health impacts, I have firsthand experience with real physical discomfort due to power transmission lines. - There is active, ongoing development of weapons that use non-lethal levels of EMR to create physical pain and/or psychological confusion. We know non-lethal levels of EMR exposure can negatively impact physical and psychological health. - There is a sharp contrast between the EMR exposure from wiring and electric appliances in the home, and a background source such as power transmission lines. A power transmission lines is always on, always exposing nearby residents to elevated levels of EMR, whereas in-home sources can be placed farther away to minimize exposure, and they only transmit EMR when in use. In addition, the EMR from a power transmission line is incremental to EMR from other sources (i.e., one must consider the additive effect of EMR from a power transmission line and not simply compare that EMR level to what is seen in a typical home). Again, we need to take a precautionary approach to minimize EMR exposure to humans, and for this reason I strongly oppose the West Alternative route.

Sincerely,

David Buck

Communication ID: 13603

Date Received: 5/30/2011

Name: DAN L CAMPBELL

THE PURPOSE FOR NEW ALTERNATE ROUTES THROUGH OUR PROPERTY IS UNCLEAR AND THE MAPS CANNOT BE READ WHEN MAGNIFIED TO DEFINE OUR PROPERTY,ROADS, LINES, ETC.

Communication ID: 13604

Date Received: 5/30/2011

Name: VICTORIA COUSINS

Yes, I'm calling on behalf of Russel Cousins Sr. He is my husband. My name is Victoria Cousins. I need you to remove Mary K Cousins off of his mailing address because she no longer exists here and never has. And my address is [address]. My phone number is [phone]. Thank you very much. Bye.

Communication ID: 13605

Date Received: 5/30/2011

Name: MOLLY HAYES

You have us as a possible tower in front property and easment road in the back of property. These are wet lands and will not do well with a large tower and lines. The front of the property where the tower may go is close to the house and we will not want to be that close to the lines. My husband has [description of medical condition] and does not need the added stress of the troubles a 5K line can/may cause. WE also really worry about the wetlands, weed killer you may put on property (and our well water) and wildlife. How can we help you to consider another route that would be less of an impact to the enviroment and us? Thank you for the feedback. We know it needs to go somewhere, but is there a better way to go????????

Molly Hayes

Communication ID: 13606

Date Received: 5/31/2011

Name: JUDY TEITZEL

My name is Judy Teitzel. My mailing address is [address]. I would like a map of what you are proposing. We currently- Friberg Properties LLC owns property off of 18th St. It's [address]. And I can't tell by your map whether this new proposal attaches to that or if it's even close by and I would certainly like to have that information before I comment any further. So I would appreciate having that map sent to me or maybe someone could call me on the phone and let me know where the existing lines are because this report that I got called Project Update May 2011, which actually didn't come until Friday, which is a little late, doesn't really give a clear picture. Thank you very much. Good bye.

Communication ID: 13607

Date Received: 5/31/2011

Name: JUDY PERRY

Yes, my name is Judy Perry, my address is [address]. I noticed on your map, we are in the notification area. I don't know what that means. Can you call me or email me at [email] or call me at [phone] and tell me what that means. I couldn't find it in your questions and answers. Thanks a lot, bye.

Communication ID: 13608

Date Received: 5/31/2011

Name: HENRY E BAUMANN

My name is Henry Baumann. I live at [address]. My phone number is [phone]. And I was calling to find out what this was all about. So, if you want to give me a buzz, give me a buzz. If you don't, then don't. Talk to you later.

Communication ID: 13609

Date Received: 6/1/2011

Name: MARTIN J GETCH

As a property owner on the upper Kalama I am very concerned about the route through that area. Legs 10 and 12 meet almost directly across the river from my cabin. This line going through that area would ruin my view and peacefulness of a piece of property I paid a lot of money for and has also been in my family for 60 years. The upper Kalama river is a beautiful stretch and should be avoided at all costs. This area is home to a huge herd of elk, Bald eagles nest within a about 100 yards of the proposed route among a large amount of other things that will be impacted other than just us land owners who would have to look at this eyesore.

Communication ID: 13610

Date Received: 6/1/2011

Name: JIM BARTON

On the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, I am in favor of the most rural routes that would affect the least amount of people with negative tax impacts and potential negative health effects. The East Alternative would be my first preference, and I even own 2 acres on Yale Lake because the least amount of people would be impacted with this route. The Central Alternative or the Crossover Alternative would be my next choices. Thank You! Jim Barton

Communication ID: 13611

Date Received: 6/2/2011

Name: KARLA J MASON

This email is just to ask you to mail my information to the above address, instead of my property address [address]. The property still belongs to me but currently has renters and the mail will only be forwarded for a while longer. I already signed up for the email alerts as well. Also I would like to request that you remove my ex-husbands name from the mailings. Brian E Mason does not have any ownership in the property and hasn't since 2008. Letters should come to Karla J Mason only. Thankyou

Communication ID: 13612

Date Received: 4/11/2011

Name: DENA R HOINOWSKI

[Additional comments on form letter 13668]

Your comments about this project: Use their own land! I sold real estate - I know what lines do to value - not to mention your health.

Communication ID: 13613

Date Received: 5/8/2011

Name: COWLITZ POMONA GRANGE #7 ,ZULA B MASTER,PHYLLIS J OGDEN

May 8th, 2011

To Department of Energy

Bonneville Power Administration

P.O. Box 491

Vancouver, WA 98666

This resolution was passed at our regular meeting of Cowlitz Pomona Grange #7, on April 16, 2011.

Phyllis Ogden, Secretary

Cowlitz Pomona Grange #7

[address]

Phone: [phone]

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, The Bonneville Power Administration has proposed a 500-kilovolt I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project which would build new power lines between Castle Rock, Wash. and Troutdale, Ore.; and

WHEREAS, The proposed lines would run across residential and farm lands through Southwest Washington; and

WHEREAS, The proposed lines would carry electricity to the Vancouver, Washington and Portland, Oregon areas; and

WHEREAS, The proposed route would increase the health risk and diminish the quality of life to individuals and families living within the proposed route; and therefore be it

RESOLVED, The proposed BPA power lines be rerouted east of Interstate-5 through timbered and mostly unpopulated areas held by Longview Fibre, Weyerhaeuser and the Department of Natural Resources.

Pleasant Hill approved 4-11-11

Catrin aproved

[ill] aproved

Zula Bryan Master

Passed - 4-16-11

Communication ID: 13614

Date Received: 5/31/2011

Name: WASHINGTON WILDLIFE AND RECREATION COALITION ,CAREY SMITH

To Whom It May Concern,

I sent an earlier letter describing the environmental sensitivity of the Lacamas floodplain bisected by your segment 41. I have enclosed more information on this sensitivity from the Washington Department of Natural Resources in the form of their application to the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program for acquisition funds. The request was funded last year and the acquisitions are in progress.

Carey Smith

Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition

Leveraging Public Funds for Parks, Wildlife, and Working Farms

Lacamas Prairie Natural Area 2008

Status: Funded in 2009

WWRP Applicant: Dept of Natural Resources

WWRP Category: Natural Areas

WWRP Grant: \$3,540,022

Project Type: Acquisition

County: Clark

Legislative District: 18th

The Washington Department of Natural Resources will use this grant to buy 225 acres of Willamette Valley wet prairie northeast of Vancouver, the only wet prairie of that size and quality in Washington. The land supports the second largest of 20 known populations of Bradshaw's Lomatium, a globally critically imperiled, federally-listed endangered plant species. It also contains habitat for five state sensitive plant species and the rare slender billed white breasted nuthatch. This purchase is the second of a multi-phased and multi-agency effort to protect a larger area of wet prairie and oak woodland. Other partners in the effort include the Columbia Land Trust, Washington Nature Conservancy, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Clark County. This project was the top ranked project of eight competing for funding in the natural areas category of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program. (08-1180)

RCO Project

Number: 08-1180

What is the WWRP?

The Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) is a state grant program that creates and conserves local and state parks, wildlife habitat and working farms. The Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office administers WWRP grants, and the legislature funds the program.

Communication ID: 13615

Date Received: 6/6/2011

Name: SKYE C BOLSOY

I am very concerned about the location of a tower on route 26. The tower will impact our property heavily although we will not be compensated since the tower doesn't physically touch our property. It stands just along our driveway where our 7 children walk home from school. We have a beautiful sunset view that will be partially obstructed by the unsightly tower and the lines running across to the north. The value of our property and the quality of life at this residence which borders my grandparents' homestead will dramatically reduced. Please choose an alternative route! It is especially frustrating that we won't be compensated in any meaningful way. Please e-mail a response soon. Thank you for considering our perspective.

Communication ID: 13616

Date Received: 6/4/2011

Name: JOHN H KANDOLL

Hi, this is John Kandoll. I want to be taken off your mailing list. I do not live at this property anymore. The address of the property is [address]. So, please take me off your mailing list. Any questions, my phone number is [phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13617

Date Received: 6/10/2011

Name: MARLENE BENNETT

This is Marlene Bennett and I live at number [current address]. You have been sending the mail to my old address which was [old address]. So I just wanted to update you on that new address so I could continue getting mail. Also, I would like a map, you said something about that you would send people a map. I would like that if possible. Now, my new address is number [current address]. If you have any questions my telephone number is [phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13618

Date Received: 6/13/2011

Name: VERNE HOFFMAN

This is Verne Hoffman I live at [address] and I've been receiving your project comments ever since I attended your meeting on my son's behalf. I am no longer interested in your project report, if you would please cancel any other shipment of your project update. Also, you might correct my address. You sent it to [wrong address]- I live at [address]. My phone number is [phone]. Thank you, bye.

Communication ID: 13619

Date Received: 5/30/2011

Name: PATTI OLSON

I wish to continue getting your mailed project updates; however, PLEASE remove 'Chilton Stuart Enterprises' from our mailing address info. We have nothing to do with them, except we purchased (other) property from them years ago which has been long since paid for. Thank you! Patti Olson

Communication ID: 13620

Date Received: 6/15/2011

Name: JOE MARTSEN

[Joe Martsen called Maryam Asgharian to talk about his concern that BPA would be building on Segment 9 - Joe Martsen lives very close to proposed tower 9-10. The call was cut off. Maryam Asgharian left Joe Martsen a message with her number.]

Communication ID: 13621

Date Received: 6/16/2011

Name: JOHN BOESCH

My name is John Boesch. [address]. And I'd like to make a comment about the power grid, your new power transmission line. I see that you're doing a 500 kilovolt system or some such thing. I was wondering if you're going to be connecting, or if you're affiliated with the new system that's going on in the Midwest. They're using 750 systems out there in this new state-of-the-art national power grid system and I was wondering if that is part of this or not. If so, I would probably be in favor, and if not, I have a lot of questions on whether or not this is valid and whether or not you should wait until that system comes online and the whole thing can be connected together with it. That would be my concern and I just wanted to know a little more about it and get some input in that regard. And once again, [address] and my phone is [phone].

Communication ID: 13622

Date Received: 6/21/2011

Name: ROBERT BACHELDER, MELISSA BACHELDER

Hi, this is the Robert Bachelder residence [address]. We are on the property at 39 on your map, on your project map, and they have unloaded a big bulldozer onto our property and no one has informed us that they just said that they would be doing work and no one has informed us what is happening and we use that land for a hay field and we own the land, we're paying property tax on that land as far as we know. So, we wonder what you're doing to compensate us if you are taking away more of the right to use our property from us what we should do, what you feel you have the right to do. We wonder, we were not informed about what was happening up there at all. So, [phone]. Leave a voice message or mail us something as fast as you can- they're actually working on it right now. So, they just unloaded their bulldozer last night or this morning. So, we want to know if it's about your little project or if it's unrelated so let us know. Thank you very much.

[Follow-up call received 4 minutes later]

Hi, this is Melissa Bachelder calling back from [address]. We are line 48 and tower 13 if you're looking at the map. I just found that information, so I thought I would add it to the previous comments that I put on there. So hopefully you'll get back really quickly. We really would like to know what's going on. So, thank you very much. Buh bye.

Communication ID: 13623

Date Received: 6/21/2011

Name: PACIFICORP ,KIRK NAYLOR

June 13, 2011

Mark Korsness
I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project
PO Box 9250
Portland, OR 97207

Subject: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

Impacts and Preliminary Assessment for PacifiCorp Project Lands

Dear Mr. Korsness,

The Lewis River Settlement Agreement of November 30, 2004 governs the environmental provisions of the Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects operated by PacifiCorp and Public Utility District No. 1 of Cowlitz County (Cowlitz PUD). Section 14.1 of the Settlement Agreement (Coordination and Decision Making) established the Terrestrial Coordination Committee (TCC), which is tasked with coordination and monitoring implementation of terrestrial protection, mitigation and enhancement measures specified in the Settlement Agreement and within the Wildlife Habitat Management Plans (WHMP) of each utility. In addition to PacifiCorp and Cowlitz PUD, the TCC is represented by individuals from the following agencies, tribes and conservation organizations, which have contributed to the review of the BPA proposed project:

- United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- USDA Forest service (USDA-FS)
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)
- Cowlitz Indian Tribe
- Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation (RMEF)

In 2010, PacifiCorp and the TCC were notified by the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) of the proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. In order to understand how BPA's proposed corridor routing may impact PacifiCorp's Wildlife Habitat Management Plan (WHMP) lands and required ongoing mitigation actions, PacifiCorp and the TCC identified the need to acquire specific habitat information and evaluate an established bald eagle winter roost site. The TCC's assessment of the proposed BPA project impacts to WHMP lands is fully addressed in Attachment A to this letter.

The TCC's review comments were shared with the Lewis River Aquatics Coordination Committee (ACC) on May 12, 2011 to ensure that aquatics resource issues were addressed. The ACC stakeholders commented that woody debris components contributed from tributaries to the North Fork Lewis River

are significant to the recovery of the lower river basin fisheries. Any loss of this resource from adjacent riparian habitats and tributaries would require mitigation. The TCC comments (see attachment A) include the recognition of riparian habitat effects on the ecological function of aquatic habitats.

Within the Settlement Agreement and FERC licenses, there is only limited opportunity for actions unrelated to wildlife management to occur on WHMP lands. Section 10.8.5.5, Mitigation for Impacts on Wildlife Habitat states:

If PacifiCorp proposes to take actions on its Interests in Lands managed under its WHMP, other than those actions specifically prescribed in the settlement agreement or its WHMPs and that action makes those lands no longer available for wildlife habitat. PacifiCorp shall consult with the Terrestrial Coordination Committee (TCC) to determine if any mitigation is necessary.

There is no existing authority within the FERC licenses and the supporting governing documents - including the Biological Opinion, the Settlement Agreement and the Wildlife Habitat Management Plan - for any external agency or organization to "take actions ... [that] makes those lands no longer available for wildlife habitat." Therefore, the TCC strongly recommends BPA select a corridor for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project that entirely avoids PacifiCorp's WHMP lands within the Lewis River watershed.

The TCC has reviewed the BPA transmission line corridor proposals with respect to the goals and objectives of the WHMP in the attachment to this letter. It is the opinion of the TCC that any proposed alignment of the BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project that crosses WHMP lands will have significant adverse negative impacts on the habitats, species and ecosystem function of these mitigation lands. This would be in direct conflict with numerous goals and objectives of the WHMP, FERC licenses and supporting documents. In addition, the BPA proposed action would affect listed species and critical habitat in ways not authorized under the existing BiOp. Any new effects to listed species or critical habitats on WHMP lands from the BPA project will require re-initiation of formal consultation with the USFWS to determine the affects to northern spotted owls (*Strix occidentalis caurina*), and would necessitate the modification or amendment of PacifiCorp's and Cowlitz PUD's Biological Opinion.

The standard Use and Occupancy articles of the Merwin and Yale FERC licenses (Articles 413 and 414 respectively) identify the licensee's authority to grant permission for certain types of use and occupancy of project lands. The pertinent portion of the article reads as follows:

The licensee may exercise the authority only if the proposed use and occupancy is consistent with the purposes of protecting and enhancing the scenic, recreational, and other environmental values of the project.

Constructing a transmission line through existing mitigation lands that are managed for wildlife habitat purposes is not consistent with protecting or enhancing the scenic, recreational, and other environmental values of the project. Hence, the TCC believes that PacifiCorp's authorization of the BPA transmission line on WHMP lands within the FERC project boundary would be inconsistent with Articles 413 and 414.

The TCC also believes BPA does not have the authority to take actions on PacifiCorp's WHMP lands without TCC concurrence. Although the proposed transmission line corridor siting action is proposed by BPA and not PacifiCorp, the TCC shall retain consulting authority per Section 10.8.5.5. of the Settlement Agreement to "determine if any mitigation is necessary." The decision ultimately rests with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to obtain their approval for easements or rights-of-way across projects lands and they will likely consider the opinion and recommendations from the TCC.

A FERC license amendment proceeding could take several months to complete even if the proposal has support of all regulatory agencies and stakeholders. It could take substantially longer if the license amendment was opposed.

Based on this potential action, and consistent with Section 10.8.5.5. of the Settlement Agreement, the TCC believes that if a BPA transmission corridor is ultimately sited on

PacifiCorp WHMP lands, mitigation will be required. The TCC therefore agrees to consult cooperatively with BPA to further characterize and quantify the significant adverse impacts resulting from routing the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project on, over or across PacifiCorp's WHMP lands. The TCC will also cooperatively develop mitigation strategies and alternatives that will, as effectively as possible, offset decreased ecosystem function and loss of ecological integrity on PacifiCorp's Wildlife Habitat Management Plan lands resulting from BPA's transmission corridor.

Regards,

Kirk S. Naylor, on behalf of the Lewis River Terrestrial Coordination Committee

PacifiCorp Co-Chair for TCC
825 NE Multnomah, Suite 1500
Portland, Oregon 97232

End: Cover Letter - Public

Attachment A - Final TCC Response for BPAT-line Project Impacts

Attachment B - Buffers by Corridor

Attachment C - Vegetation by Corridor

SUBJECT: Assessment of Bonneville Power Administration Proposed 500-Kilovolt Line on Lewis River
Wildlife Habitat Management Lands

ISSUE:

The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) has proposed routes for a new 500-kilovolt transmission line in southwest Washington that cross Lewis River Wildlife Habitat Management Plan (WHMP) lands and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Project Boundaries for PacifiCorp's Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects (Merwin and Yale). PacifiCorp lands are managed according to their respective

FERC license requirements as mitigation for ongoing hydroelectric project effects and are overseen by the Terrestrial Coordination Committee (TCC).

This document is a summary of PacifiCorp's and Cowlitz PUD's (the Utilities) obligations and the potential BPA project effects relating to the utilities commitments under its licenses, United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Biological Opinion and Settlement Agreement.

This document summarizes impacts to WHMP lands that may result from BPA's proposed transmission line routes. Information used in this analysis has been provided by BPA and its contractors, as well as by PacifiCorp's internal GIS datasets and analyses of stream buffers, wetlands and shorelines. Additionally, PacifiCorp and TCC biologists used existing knowledge and information on habitat impacts, species impacts, impacts to riparian, wetland, and shoreline buffers, and impacts to Northern spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*) habitat, as described in the WHMP.

BACKGROUND:

In February 2010, BPA met with the TCC and identified several proposed transmission line corridors that would cross WHMP lands. The TCC expressed several concerns regarding corridors identified through recreation management areas, bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) nest areas and old-growth habitat. Several corridors were later removed from further consideration by BPA, but some remaining routes still impacted WHMP lands and protected habitat.

PacifiCorp requested BPA hire consultants to conduct vegetation cover type mapping, as well as winter roost eagle surveys, along remaining routes proposed on WHMP lands. On May 11, 2011, BPA and Mason, Bruce & Girard (MB&G, consultants to BPA) presented results of these studies to the TCC. During discussion, the TCC was informed that the BPA-proposed study area boundary on PacifiCorp property was based on a 150-foot transmission right-of-way (ROW) plus up to 200 feet of potential additional clearing to a "backline" on each side of the ROW. This clearing-to-backline was represented to the TCC as BPA's standard practice to ensure all potential hazard trees within reach of the line would be removed. Vegetation would be allowed to re-grow in the 200-foot zone beyond either side of the ROW, as long as trees did not reach a height that would threaten the transmission line. This initially could result in a 550-foot wide clearing along the entire length of the selected transmission line route (not necessarily all on PacifiCorp WHMP lands).

The Vegetation Cover Type Mapping Survey Report (MB&G 2011) identified the total area of WHMP lands under consideration for BPA proposed routes encompassed 243 acres. The MB&G survey did not include the area (ROW and backline) in T6N R4E Sec 30 and T6N R4E Sec 19 located north of the MB&G survey area. This property was purchased by PacifiCorp in December 2011 as part of PacifiCorp's license implementation requirements. The area of WHMP lands in this recent acquisition potentially affected by Corridor Segment K was added to this assessment document by PacifiCorp, following the same study (backline) width assessed by MB&G immediately south along the same corridor (Appendix A and B).

The TCC believes that the edge effect of these transmission line clearings will result in significant secondary effects on the adjacent WHMP lands, such as increased potential for wind damage (blown-

down trees). The strength of secondary effects will depend on many variables, such as age of the surrounding timber, aspect, slope and soil types. These additional impacts to the goals and objectives of the WHMP are not yet fully assessed, but at a minimum are expected to extend into the stand a distance equal to the height of one to two site-potential trees (site potential varies on tree species and site class).

The TCC concludes that a complete assessment of BPA's proposed transmission line across WHMP lands cannot be fully evaluated until a final corridor is selected and additional evaluations are made. The Utilities do not have sufficient time and resources to conduct further necessary evaluations for all corridor options.

Wildlife Habitat Management Plan

The requirement for protection of PacifiCorp-owned Lewis River lands for wildlife habitat originated in the November 30, 2004, Lewis River Settlement Agreement reached with 26 parties including state, federal, tribal and local governments concerning the relicensing of the Lewis River Hydroelectric Projects (Merwin, Yale, Swift No. 1 and Swift No. 2). The agreement required PacifiCorp, for its appropriate land ownership, develop a WHMP in consultation with parties to the agreement. The ongoing purpose of the WHMP is to offset habitat impacts and associated wildlife losses resulting from continued operation of the Lewis River Projects by protecting, mitigating and enhancing existing wildlife habitat on the Licensees' owned and/or controlled lands that are associated with the Projects. In developing the WHMP, parties identified specific standards and guidelines based upon overall management objectives. Goals and objectives applicable to this assessment include:

- Old-growth Habitat Management,
- Wetland Habitat Management,
- Raptor Site Management,
- Forestland Habitat Management,
- Invasive Plant, Species Management,
- Riparian Habitat Management,
- Public Access Management, and
- Transmission Line Rights-of-Way (ROW) Habitat Management.

Over a two-year period between 2006 and 2008, PacifiCorp worked with stakeholders to develop the Wildlife Habitat Management Plan. On May 29, 2009, it was approved by the FERC. The Plan includes specific habitat and species management goals and objectives as well as plan-wide goals and objectives for invasive plant management, raptor management, public access management and monitoring. As new land is purchased, it is to be managed per WHMP objectives.

The following sections clarify each of the habitats, goals and objectives identified within the WHMP lands potentially affected by BPA's proposed transmission corridors.

1. Old-growth Habitat and Species

The WHMP goal is to Protect and maintain existing old-growth conifer stands and identify mature conifer stands to develop into old-growth habitat. The specific objectives pertinent to the proposed BPA action are further identified as:

- Objective b: Protect and maintain existing old-growth conifer stands to provide high quality habitat for pileated woodpeckers (*Dryocopus pileatus*), other cavity nesters, and other species over the life of the licenses.
- Objective c: Protect and manage forested buffers adjacent to streams, wetlands, and reservoir shorelines to promote the development of large trees where appropriate, and to provide connectivity between existing old-growth conifer stands over the life of the licenses.
- Objective d: Within 5 years of the Lewis River WHMP implementation, identify and evaluate specific mature conifer stands or other areas that could improve habitat connectivity between old-growth stands or increase number or size of old-growth patches, and develop a schedule to manage/protect these areas as appropriate.

Based on the BPA Vegetation Cover Type Mapping Survey Report prepared by Mason, Bruce & Girard (MB&G, 2011), habitat type acreages were summarized (Table 1) to show the impacts to old-growth habitat, mature conifer and riparian vegetation. These acreages are the areas of potential effect where proposed transmission line corridors and associated access roads impact habitat. These acreages would otherwise (per the WHMP objectives above) be managed to promote the development of large trees and provide connectivity between existing old-growth conifer stands.

Table 1. Summary of WHMP Vegetation Cover Types within the Project Survey Boundary Associated with WHMP Old-growth Objectives. [see attachment]

The loss of old-growth habitat and structure is a part of each transmission alternative and violates not only the BiOp (see Raptor Site Management) but the very intent to manage for and benefit a broad range of wildlife, fish and native plant species. Depending on the corridor, the loss of oldgrowth habitat represents from 7 - 35% of all the old-growth currently mapped on WHMP lands (Corridor L = 7%; Corridor M =14%; Corridor K-W = 31%; and Corridor L-N-W = 35%). The influence of clearing adjacent to old-growth timber stands (edge effect) could cause additional wind-throw and other mortality effects ranging from 16 to 137 m into the interior of the adjacent stands (Chen et al. 1992). In old-growth conifer stands the edge effect will increase desiccation and drying effects and increased influence of light, which may affect species growth and community composition. Areas impacted by these secondary effects are not included in this table. Other influences of edge are determined by the patch size of the adjacent stand, but significantly-decreased ecological function in the relatively small existing old-growth stands on PacifiCorp lands is anticipated.

The WHMP also has a goal and an objective identified for raptors (See #4) that includes the

Northern spotted owl which is related to old-growth habitat. The WHMP Raptor Site management goal is to: Provide and protect habitat for, and minimize or avoid disturbance to, raptors, including bald eagles (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) buteos, ospreys (*Pandion haliaetus*), accipiters, and owls. The specific objective pertinent to the proposed BPA action and old-growth habitat is identified as:

- Objective i: Unless separated by a reservoir from the Siouxeon Spotted Owl Special Emphasis Area, over the life of the licenses, manage at least 50 percent of the WHMP lands within a 2-mile buffer outside of the Siouxeon Spotted Owl Special Emphasis Area to provide/develop high-quality nesting spotted owl habitat, as defined by Washington Administrative Code 222-16-085 (1) (a).

Objective i of the WHMP includes those lands within corridor K-W (Appendix A) lying on both sides of Canyon Creek. High quality nesting habitat is identified as old-growth and mature conifer stands. Those lands along Canyon Creek identified as old growth and mature forest are critical to PacifiCorp meeting this objective. The loss of this habitat is not replaceable in terms of meeting this objective. Managing other vegetation or habitat types to become old-growth or mature habitat to replace what was lost in the same area may require as much as 100 years to obtain at minimum mature conifer forest structure (average stand diameters of 21 inches to 26 inches diameter at breast height). Setting aside additional land within PacifiCorp's ownership east of Canyon Creek (assuming loss of old growth and mature habitat based on the transmission corridor) would then limit available habitat in this area to meet other objectives for species (specifically elk) that require early seral forest habitat.

The BPA proposals will also impact PacifiCorp's ability to meet terms and condition of the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Biological Opinion (BiOp). The BiOp states: For those lands managed under the WHMPs, no suitable spotted owl nesting habitat (Old-growth and mature stands) would be removed, The BiOp is based on the settlement agreement conditions which directed the WHMP measures, and it concluded that PacifiCorp's management is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the spotted owl. They also concluded that the WHMP implementation would not likely jeopardize the continued existence of the bald eagle. The BiOp was written to cover both PacifiCorp and the Public Utility District No. 1 of Cowlitz County [Cowlitz PUD].

2. Riparian and Wetland Habitat Management

The WHMP goal is to Protect, maintain, and/or enhance riparian and wetland areas by establishing buffers up to 300 feet (depends on stream/wetland size and fish presence/absence).

Riparian habitat and the respective buffers probably provide some of the most diverse, dynamic and complex terrestrial habitats in the Pacific Northwest. Additionally, reservoir shorelines (200 foot buffers per WHMP), while not considered riparian habitats, offer the best perching and nesting habitat for osprey and bald eagles. Riparian and wetland habitat buffers provide a number of important ecosystem functions, including stream-bank stabilization, stream temperature control, flood control, and wildlife habitat. These habitats also contribute to the aquatic food web and provide structural diversity by contributing large woody debris to stream or wetland systems. Riparian habitats are designated by the

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife as a Priority Habitat in Washington and the large buffers identified on WHMP lands reflect this priority. The proposed transmission routes would remove from 11.0 to 53.4 acres of buffer habitat (including lands already identified as old-growth) based on clearing-to-backline in ROW corridors. Stream and wetland buffers are identified in Table 2 for each potential corridor option and maps are located in Appendix B.

Table 2. Summary of Aquatic Buffer Acreage Potentially Affected by Transmission Corridors. [See attachment]

Transmission line corridors K-W and L-N-W affect wetland habitat by clearing a portion of designated wetland buffers. The most significant of these is the 2.1 acres of wetland buffer associated with the K-W corridor. This wetland and the surrounding property were purchased in 2010 to provide additional mitigation habitat for wildlife. Even though transmission lines can often span portions of a riparian area or stream without all vegetation being removed it is unknown at this time to what extent this will be possible. PacifiCorp has extensive experience in managing riparian and wetland habitats within transmission ROW's and understands the limitations to vegetation height, potential conflicts with transmission line clearances and unintended introduction of invasive plants in these habitats.

3. Raptor Site Management

The WHMP goal is to: Provide and protect habitat for, and minimize or avoid disturbance to, raptors, including bald eagles (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), buteos, ospreys (*Pandion haliaetus*), accipiters, and owls. The bald eagle is a Washington State sensitive species and receives federal protections under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. PacifiCorp has developed a Bald Eagle Management Plan (BEMP) as part of the Lewis River Wildlife Habitat Management Plan (WHMP) to satisfy the Washington State Bald Eagle Protection Rule (Washington Administrative Code [WAC] 232-12-292). According to guidance outlined in PacifiCorp's BEMP, bald eagle roost monitoring will be conducted when activities with the potential to disturb roosting eagles (e.g., timber harvest operations, construction) occur within 0.25 mile of known communal roosts during the key wintering period of November 15 - March 31 (PacifiCorp 2008). At the request of PacifiCorp, BPA hired Mason, Bruce & Girard (MB&G) environmental consultants to survey a known bald eagle communal roost near the K and W Corridors (Yale Site) as a preliminary action for assessing these corridors.

In the 1980s, a bald eagle communal roost site was identified along the Lewis River below the Yale Dam and near Canyon Creek. Although only low concentrations of bald eagles were observed at this site (fewer than six eagles roosting at one time), bald eagle activity was observed over the course of several years (Anderson et al. 1985, Anderson and Ichisaka 1986). MB&G biologists concluded that the Yale Site continues to be utilized by bald eagles as a communal winter roost, based upon Phase I surveys (2010/2011). MB&G concluded that given the bald eagle activity observed, particularly at the Yale Site, avoidance of the sites and selection of other transmission line routes would be the best way to avoid or reduce impacts to wintering bald eagles (MB&G 2011).

The Merwin Site (not currently identified as a bald eagle roost) consists of 57.8 acres of primarily old-growth Douglas-fir and western red cedar dominated forest located on the southern shore of the Lewis

River (MB&G 2011). This site provides access to suitable foraging habitat (e.g., stunned/dead fish moving through the dam; waterfowl), multiple suitable perch and roosting locations, and protection from inclement weather, which is provided by the steep slope and dense timber. At the completion of both surveys, it was concluded that bald eagles were utilizing the area and could potentially use the site for night roosts although a communal roost was not confirmed (MB&G 2011). Proposed BPA corridor M would directly remove this suitable habitat for all species of raptors but specifically affect (disturb) important flight paths along the Lewis River corridor that bald eagles use to access foraging areas and roost sites.

MB&G (2011) also identified that the Segment-W transmission corridor passes directly through habitat where eagles were observed perched or roosting on the east side of Canyon Creek. While bald eagles are certainly of significant and unique importance, the transmission line corridors also remove habitat where other forest raptors and owls have their own unique habitat requirements. Many use large trees and snags for roosting, perching, foraging and nesting.

4. Forestland Habitat Management

The WHMP goal is to: Promote forestland species composition and structures that benefit wildlife and provide an appropriate mosaic of big game hiding cover and forage. The specific objectives pertinent to the proposed BPA action are further identified as:

- Objective a: Provide a range of alternatives for developing and maintaining a mix of forage and cover for elk.
- Objective b: Over the life of the licenses, maintain or create at least eight snags (≥ 20 inches dbh), green retention trees (≥ 15 inches dbh), or wildlife reserve trees per acre if available within each harvest area.
- Objective c: At the Management Unit level, promote forest habitat diversity for wildlife by increasing or maintaining minor native tree species (e.g., cottonwood [*Populus sp.*], big-leaf maple [*Acer macrophyllum*], western red-cedar [*Thuja plicata*]) composition where appropriate site conditions exist over the life of the licenses.

Forestland is a general term for upland areas dominated by trees; it encompasses all forest types, structures, and age classes. The composition, structure, and habitat quality of forestlands for wildlife vary greatly. As identified in the objectives, snags are a significant habitat component that will be negatively affected by the presence of a transmission ROW and additional access roads.

Existing strategic management for the WHMP would be greatly affected by the transmission ROW through forest lands. PacifiCorp purchased 479 acres of land northwest of Yale Dam in 2010 as part of the settlement agreement to protect additional wildlife habitat in the vicinity of the Yale Hydroelectric Project. The BPA proposed K-corridor would bisect this property and negatively affect the ability to manage significant areas of forestland habitat due to the position of the ROW along the primary ridges on the parcel. This placement will preclude techniques of forest management and selective harvest

because of the location of the transmission line. Because this property was purchased specifically to protect additional wildlife habitat, the proposed ROW compromises the intent for purchasing the property. Although transmission ROW's can be managed to provide good elk forage habitat when managed correctly, the corridors can also contribute to elk vulnerability due to long site distances along the corridors especially where they cross public roadways. The age and forest stand structure of the recently purchased property was developed from densely planted seedlings and managed for long-term fiber production. This has resulted in trees with insufficient crowns that will be highly vulnerable to wind-throw when a long linear transmission corridor (including backline) is created. This could pose significant threats to effective management and development of small interspersed forage and cover habitat components for big game species as intended for this particular area.

Western redcedar is a dominant, co-dominant or sub-dominant species in many of the Upland Mixed (forest stands characterized by > 30% and < 70% conifer or deciduous trees) and Mature Conifer (forest stands characterized by average stand diameters 21 inches to 26 inches dbh with uniform vertical and horizontal structure) forest stands, as identified in the MB&G surveys. The MB&G surveyors recorded a total of 1,871 western redcedar trees within the survey area and created nine polygons representing particularly high concentrations of western redcedar. Black cottonwood trees are scattered throughout the survey area and were particularly concentrated on the L-corridor. Both of these tree species are identified in the WHMP as species that promote forest habitat diversity and are retained as a Best Management Practice on WHMP lands. This is especially so when most surrounding private, state and industrial forest lands are managed for single species primarily consisting of Douglas-fir.

PacifiCorp and the USFWS consulted on forest management with respect to managing suitable spotted owl roosting and foraging habitat on WHMP lands. Suitable roosting and foraging habitat was defined as mid-successional (forest stands characterized by average stand diameters 16 inches to 20 inches dbh with uniform structure) and upland mixed vegetation types. The development of small clearcuts in these forest types for other wildlife habitat purposes was recognized as adversely affecting the Northern spotted owl. However, the protection measures provided for old-growth, mature conifer and extensive buffers for streams and reservoirs that may eventually develop into suitable habitat allowed the USFWS to conclude in the biological opinion that implementation would not likely jeopardize the continued existence of the Northern spotted owl. For clearcuts to be conducted in dispersal habitat, at least 50 percent of the Utilities (PacifiCorp and Cowlitz PUD) owned lands would need to provide dispersal habitat at any point in time. The BPA proposal to develop a permanent corridor (regardless of location) through these lands will reduce the Utilities forest land management capabilities based on permanent loss of additional dispersal habitat, compounded with loss of suitable nesting habitat and will require USFWS consultation.

5. Invasive Plant Species Management

The WHMP goal is: Work to prevent the establishment and spread of noxious weeds currently listed by the Washington State Noxious Weed Control Board and Clark, Cowlitz, and Skamania County weed control boards, and other undesirable or invasive plants identified by the TCC.

Transmission line ROW's are recognized as corridors for the establishment and spread of invasive plant

species and requires regular maintenance and management to prevent establishment and spread to other areas. The linear nature of these areas promotes the rapid spread of wind borne seed and those carried in through the network of roads related to managing the transmission line. Because PacifiCorp has specific internal requirements regarding what herbicides may be used on its lands, these same restrictions would therefore be required for management under a BPA transmission line located on project lands.

6. Public Access Management

The WHMP goal is: Minimize disturbance to wildlife and protect their habitats while managing access for non-motorized recreation, which includes legal hunting and fishing, and activities associated with implementation of the WHMP. The specific objectives pertinent to the proposed BPA action are further identified as:

- Objective g: provide vegetated buffers along roads open to the public, where needed, to conceal big game and other wildlife using adjacent habitat.

The addition of roads and the associated transmission ROW's unintended for WHMP implementation requires additional access control, prevention of erosion, management of water control structures at road crossings, and managing vegetation buffers along roads to conceal big game and other wildlife. Managing to prevent unauthorized motor vehicle access along roads requires more than just gates and includes monitoring and enforcement of the company's policies to protect the WHMP mitigation lands from disturbance.

7. Transmission Line Rights-of-Way (ROW) Habitat Management

The WHMP goal is: While allowing for the safe and reliable transmission of electricity, promote the establishment and maintenance of desirable vegetation on utility-owned lands in transmission line rights-of-way to provide habitat for wintering deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) and elk (*Cervus elaphus*) and a diverse mix of shrub and other early-successional habitats.

The specific objectives pertinent to the proposed BPA action are further identified as:

- Objective a: Manage and develop patches of desirable shrubs in the transmission rights-of-way and along edges to break up line-of-sight distances and provide screening/hiding cover for elk and multi-layered habitat structure for birds. Evaluate alternative techniques to provide security cover and reduce line-of-sight where needed.
- Objective b: Identify and manage suitable areas within transmission line rights-of-way to provide "enhanced forage" for elk and deer. Enhanced forage is defined as a mix of grasses and forbs that are considered forage species by elk and deer that may be mowed, fertilized, and/or seeded.
- Objective c: Identify and provide screening cover for deer and elk, where needed, along public roads that cross transmission rights-of-way.

Transmission line ROW's require significant man-power resources to conduct inspections, coordinate with vegetation control contractors and documenting that goals and objectives are being achieved. Like

roads, managing to prevent unauthorized motor vehicle access along transmission ROW's requires more than just gates and includes monitoring and enforcement of the company's policies to protect the WHMP lands from disturbance.

Summary of Effects:

The TCC has reviewed the vegetation cover type and eagle survey reports prepared by Mason, Bruce & Girard (2011) for BPA and reviewed the WHMP requirements to determine the associated effects of one or more of the proposed BPA corridors. While certain aspects of the proposed transmission line can be mitigated, it is the opinion of the TCC that certain compliance obligations cannot be resolved without violating the Biological Opinion and the Merwin and Yale Project license article for Use and Occupancy. Specifically, the old-growth habitat loss and riparian habitat effects are potentially a significant impact to the overall WHMP.

Total acres of habitat impacts by corridor on WHMP lands are summarized in Table 4. The route that affects the greatest total acres of WHMP managed lands as well as having an unacceptable risk to bald eagles and their roost habitat is the K-W corridor through Canyon Creek and across the Lewis River. This route will cross the primary flight paths of bald eagles accessing foraging areas and/or winter roost habitat near Yale dam. This particular route would also affect habitat and management opportunities on almost 190 acres of WHMP lands. This option would also eliminate almost 23 acres of existing old-growth habitat, and fragment the remaining portions such that the old-growth functions and usability for many old-growth reliant species may be lost. Old-growth coniferous forest as a resource on WHMP lands was intended to be preserved, maintained. Its expansion was to come in the maturing riparian and shoreline buffers that are also impacted by this route.

Maintaining snags is an important habitat component to enhance wildlife and habitat functions in all habitats and would be negatively impacted by the clearing of transmission line ROW's, access roads and adjacent habitat. Snags are specifically identified as management objectives in the WHMP objectives for old-growth habitat, riparian habitat, wetland habitat, shrublands and all managed forestland. All stream, shoreline and wetland buffers are also managed to provide snags and coarse woody debris as foraging, roosting, nesting and perching habitat for a variety of priority species (pileated woodpecker [*Dryocopus pileatus*], bald eagle, etc.). Snags provide critical habitat for both primary and secondary cavity nesters and loss of this habitat component would represent non-compliance with WHMP objectives. Potential loss of snags from any of the alternative corridors is best represented by looking at the total acres in the vegetation survey area shown in Table 4. While the number of snags cannot be determined from this table, at least 80% of the vegetation cover types would be expected to provide snags (excludes existing ROW's, developed and disturbed habitats etc.). The number of snags would be determined based on requirements described in the WHMP; 4 snags/acre greater than 20 inches in diameter in oldgrowth managed habitat and at least 8 trees/acre managed as snags or wildlife reserve trees in managed forest habitat.

Table 4. Summary of Cover Types Identified within the Project Survey Boundary [see attachment]

As previously stated, the BPA project will impact PacifiCorp's ability to meet a key habitat term and condition of the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Biological Opinion (BiOp). The BiOp states: For those lands managed under the WHMPs, no suitable spotted owl nesting habitat (Old-growth and mature stands) would be removed. The BiOp is based on the settlement agreement conditions which directed the WHMP measures, and it concluded that PacifiCorp's management is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the spotted owl. They also concluded that the WHMP implementation would not likely jeopardize the continued existence of the bald eagle. The BiOp obviously did not anticipate the construction of the BPA transmission line across the primary flight corridors of bald eagles accessing roost and foraging areas along the river or the loss of suitable spotted owl nesting habitat.

Communication ID: 13625

Date Received: 6/26/2011

Name: ROSE SMITH

Hi, my name is Rose Smith. I'm a realtor. I have a property I have clients interested in purchasing and we want to see if any of the BPA is going to be on the proposed route. The address is [address]. You can reach me at [phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13626

Date Received: 5/26/2011

Name: BOLTON C MINISTER

May 26, 2011

Mr. Steve Wright, Administrator
A-7 Bonneville Power Administration
PO Box 3621
Portland, OR 97208-3621

RE: Bonneville Power Administration I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project – 500 KV Transmission Line
Alternate Route - "P" Line

Dear Mr. Wright:

My family and I own 8 parcels of land adjacent to the proposed "P" Line in Clark County, Washington. I have commented previously on this proposed route. I would like to provide you with some factual information that will demonstrate why I believe your agency has made an error in the location of the proposed alignment of the "P" Line adjacent to our properties.

The "P" Line adjacent to our property is located along the western boundary of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) ownership in [parcel description]. The enclosed Exhibit "A" shows proposed towers P/22, P/23 and P/24 along that boundary.

In 2009 and 2010 the DNR logged a portion of their property in that section under the file name "Oceanspray Timber Sale #84262". Enclosed as Attachment #1 is a copy of the State SEPA document for that sale. According to that document the DNR did a detailed study of their property to make sure that any logging conformed to the Forest Practices Act (Chapter 76.09RCW). As a result of that study, they developed a Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan (RCP) that conformed to the Act. They determined that the easterly branch of the North Fork of LaCamas Creek adjacent to our property was a "Type 3 Water". The State's definition of a "Type 3 Water" is enclosed as Attachment #2. They classified that creek as "Type 3 Water" because it provides a significant habitat for fish and wildlife and is highly significant for protection of downstream water quality. I have personally observed the presence of cutthroat trout and salamanders in the creek and have seen many blacktail deer, black bear, bald eagles, osprey, owls and blue herons in and around this creek bed. The DNR, following the requirements of the Forest Practices Act, properly established Riparian Management Zones (RMZ) and Wetland Management Zones (WMZ) of between 175 feet and 190 feet on both sides of the Type 3 Stream to protect water quality, provide corridors for wildlife and maintain a habitat for fish and amphibians (see Mitigation Measures Attachment #1 SEPA document). These RMZ and WMZ were not logged or disturbed, see Exhibit "A".

Your proposed "P" Line is located almost entirely within the RMZ and WMZ zones of this "Type 3" stream along approximately 3,000 feet of the western boundary of Section 25 and Section 24 to the north. When you log and build towers in this riparian and wetland management zone, you will be in direct violation of the Forest Practices Act and the Forest Practices Act Conservation Plan (HCP) that was established for the Oceanspray Timber sale. You will destroy this fragile eco-system. The problem with your proposal is that it goes right up the creek rather than simply crossing the creek. Not only will you destroy the local eco-system, you will also seriously affect the downstream water quality, increasing stream turbidity, spread noxious weeds and invasive species, raise stream temperatures and spread herbicides downstream that your agency will spray to control vegetation.

This branch of LaCamas Creek flows directly into Camp Bonneville to the south. Enclosed as Attachment #3 is a "Site Description" of Camp Bonneville. This is Section 2 of an environment review that was performed for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District under Contract No. DACA87-00-D-0038, Task Order #17. Section 2.2.11 lists threatened and endangered species and Federal and State species of concern in Tables 2.1 and 2.2. If these species exist in Camp Bonneville which is a very short distance to the south, it is logical to assume that they exist partially or wholly along this branch of LaCamas Creek that flows directly in Camp Bonneville. At any rate, those species that exist within the boundaries of Camp Bonneville will be affected by any downstream deterioration of water quality caused by your project.

The Washington State Forest Practices Act is subject to all lands in the State of Washington that are not owned by the Federal government. Absent BPA assertion of ownership, all Forest Practices obligations exist, which include obtaining an application and complying with the Acts rules. This land is owned by the State of Washington and, therefore, is subject to those rules. According to the NEPA Scoping comments (see Attachment #4); Washington State Department of Natural Resources for the I-5 Corridor Project in 2002, DNR and BPA came to a common understanding regarding Forest Practices activities

related to BPA's lines and those that would be constructed in the future. I would expect BPA and the BPA contractors to recognize that previous agreement and abide by it. The construction of the proposed access roads as shown on Attachment #5 would destroy additional habitat and wetlands in and adjacent to the "Type 3" streams.

The waters of LaCamas Creek flow into the Columbia River and as such are "waters of the U.S." and are thereby subject to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Any disturbance of "waters of the US" are required to be permitted by the Corps. I will be sending copies of this document and attachments to Colonel Anthony Wright, Seattle District and Colonel Steven R. Miles, Portland District, also to Kevin Moynhan, Chief of Regulatory Function for the Portland District, asking them to carefully review any permits requested by BPA for full compliance of Federal and State environmental laws. I will ask them to specifically review this section of the "P" Line.

Because this portion of the "P" Line obviously would violate the Forest Practices Act, it should be relocated further east or removed from consideration.

Sincerely,

Bolton C. Minister

Communication ID: 13627

Date Received: 6/29/2011

Name: ANOTHER WAY BPA ,CITIZENS AGAINST THE TOWERS ,YALE VALLEY COALITION ,ERNA SARASOHN

Luanna,

Per your request, I am sending you and Maryam a PDF of our desired Outcomes.

It was good seeing you last night.

Stay well,

Erna

—

Another Way BPA P.O. Box 820152 Vancouver, WA 98682

Citizens Against the Towers 13023 NE Hwy 99 Ste. 7 Vancouver, WA 98686

Yale Valley Coalition PO Box 44 Cougar, WA 98616

Bonneville Power Administration I-5 Corridor Proposal

Citizen's Desired Outcomes and Principals

Principals:

1. Human Impact Assessment

A. Elevate human impacts over marginal increases in the delivered cost of electricity to the final consumers over the minimal impact it would have on the natural environment.

B. Minimize electrocution risks of lines fallen by wind, ice, landslides, earthquakes or accidents; consider two thirds of the span between towers as the minimum clearance for new electric transmission lines from homes and schools.

C. Subject to 1A above, adopt California's prudent avoidance approach regarding possible EMF health risks for homes and schools. See NEPA footnote.

1 NEPA footnote:

Throughout NEPA, environment is referred to in three ways: natural environment, human environment and environment. When just the natural or human environment is intended in the text, it is so identified. When "environment" is used alone it must, therefore, be intended to refer to both the human and natural environment. That is the result of just common sense reading of the statutory language. The general term means the "whole," the specific term means the "part of the whole." Those of us from the property rights perspective tend to react to the word "environment" as something only for nature. When reading NEPA, "environment" includes both the human and natural.

2. Economic Impact Assessment:

Consider the long-term and recurring lost economic opportunity costs of the routes to the Southwest Washington public and local governments. This analysis should determine the impact of the lines on local economies within a date range, including the economic impacts on the local communities who may or may not benefit from the new transmission lines. These regional costs of degrading economically more valuable lands could be compared to the marginal increases or decreases in the delivered cost of electricity to final consumers.

Impact to property owners must be minimized and at the same time the most cost effective approach should be used. The grey line, although longer, is the least expensive due to being unpopulated and timberlands being assessed at a much lower valuation. Due to The planned removal of existing towers and lines within existing easements, will be prohibitive and would subject property owners to excessive burden and ratepayers to additional expense over other alternatives in unpopulated areas. The litigation that would be generated should also be part of the cost analysis for this project.

3. Full Individual Compensation:

Develop fair compensation for affected property owners for their actual cost of granting easements or their actual cost of moving to avoid safety risks from new power lines. Include these costs in the evaluation of different routes. An unbiased board made up of an uneven number of members should administer the compensation. These members should not be affiliated with government agencies or be their representatives.

- A. Compensation should include expenses and resettlement losses to property owners who are displaced.
- B. Compensate property owners to cover the recurring property taxes property owners must pay for the land rendered unusable for their intended residential or business purposes.
- C. Compensate tree and other agricultural farmers and ranchers based on the actuarial of lost income, plus the higher operating costs. Compensation to include those that are not only farmers and ranchers, but are using properties as businesses or for other income.
- D. The project must have minimal impact on private individual property owners. Regardless of which proposed BPA route is chosen, the lines must follow property lines, running along edges/borders, instead of bisecting properties. Any new easements must also have minimal impact and not dissect their land. Private property owners have the same rights as government land owners.
- E. Property owners who lose real estate to this project should be financially compensated for losses of homes and land. In instances where agricultural and farmland properties are concerned, landowners should be compensated and made whole for the present and future losses they'll incur. Loss of scenic, aesthetic value is important as well and should be factored in to the financial loss a property owner may experience. This loss in value should be assessed by an independent property consultant, or Realtor.

4. Natural Impact assessment:

- A. Protection of wildlife, habitat and wetlands.
- B. Protection of water sources, above and below ground.
- C. No clear cutting of trees beyond defined line easement boundaries.

See NEPA footnote

2 NEPA footnote:

Throughout NEPA, environment is referred to in three ways: natural environment, human environment and environment. When just the natural or human environment is intended in the text, it is so identified. When "environment" is used alone it must, therefore, be intended to refer to both the human and natural environment. That is the result of just common sense reading of the statutory language. The general term means the "whole," the specific term means the "part of the whole." Those of us from the property rights perspective tend to react to the word "environment" as something only for nature. When reading NEPA, "environment" includes both the human and natural.

Desired Outcomes:

1. Add gray line concept preferred by citizens to BPA map

- A. This concept minimizes human safety risks and regional economic impacts. Provides for increased electrical reliability, low security risks and allows the expansion room for future grid improvements.

B. BPA must adequately mitigate fire risks, erosion from off-road vehicle access, and water pollution from herbicide maintenance practices of power line easements on all routes.

C. Consider public/private partnerships and similar mechanisms of citizen involvement to ensure proper environmental and wildlife stewardship, fire safety, and line security in all areas.

D. The easterly grey line is unpopulated and mostly timberlands. The assessed valuation is much lower so although longer in length, costs would be less.

2. Full Evaluation of Connection Options by Using the Existing Crossing at Camas and Bonneville Dam

A. Include cost comparisons and impacts of any needed substations for utilizing existing river crossing at Camas and comparison to Bonneville Dam.

B. The Bonneville Dam option minimizes the human impact and reliability risks of a Camas area Columbia River crossing due to population, existing lines and local issues.

C. Engineering ingenuity should be used, and lines could be buried in areas of county or city or where statute or code requires them underground.

3. Remove the following proposed sectors from consideration, as they are inessential and not in compliance with NEPA minimum alternative requirements. 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 23, 26, 28, 30, 35, P, H, G, J, and possibly others.

Another Way BPA

Citizens Against the Towers

Yale Valley Coalition

3 NEPA footnote:

Throughout NEPA, environment is referred to in three ways: natural environment, human environment and environment. When just the natural or human environment is intended in the text, it is so identified. When "environment" is used alone it must, therefore, be intended to refer to both the human and natural environment. That is the result of just common sense reading of the statutory language. The general term means the "whole," the specific term means the "part of the whole." Those of us from the property rights perspective tend to react to the word "environment" as something only for nature. When reading NEPA, "environment" includes both the human and natural.

Communication ID: 13628

Date Received: 7/1/2011

Name: BARBARA BLOOMFIELD

Hi, my name is Barbara Bloomfield. I sent an email to your I5@bpa.gov on June 22nd and I have not heard a response yet. I would appreciate a response. I am home now, today and through next week. It has been over 8 days since I sent it so I should have expected a response by this time. My address is [address]. I am on line 25 between towers 25/103 and 25/108. Please respond to me. My home phone, [phone]. Please respond to me. Even if you're saying you're not responding, I will try to carry this further if I don't hear a response from you. Barbara Bloomfield. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13629

Date Received: 5/27/2011

Name: JOHN S HOWARD

We live at [address] and have been thinking about selling the home. However the realestate people have asked where is the power line going to go thru, what can we tell them??\

thank you

Communication ID: 13630

Date Received: 5/27/2011

Name: DANIEL C FLEGEL

So BPA,

WHEN will the draft environmental review documents be available to critic? How long will the review documents be available for review? When are finals being decided on, in regards to the environmental documents? What are current projections of the EIS at this time? How may we (as a organized group) respond to all the EIS documents?

Are all EIS projections, comments, suggestions, identified by range,township, county, and state? Are survey community coordinates being ID'ed in the EIS? Are population densities of areas in the site projections being addressed? Are geological soils, landscapes, sub-soils, forest densities, structural densities be addressed in the EIS?

Please respond ASAP!

Grassman

Communication ID: 13631

Date Received: 5/28/2011

Name: VICKIE WRIGLEY

Hello BPA,

I am a bit confused for the need for more power to sell Oregon and California, when you are shutting down the wind turbines, because you have too much power. Can you explain?

I was visiting a friend, and her health requires her to have a pacemaker. The technician that was setting her pacemaker, commented that the pacemaker reveals she is near heavy machinery. Well, she is not near heavy machinery, she is 80+ years old and doesn't leave the home much. My thoughts are it's the high power lines. I feel you will reply, there's no evidence that the high voltage lines cause this problem with pacemakers. We all know the standard line that BPA gives the community.

I feel wind power is much safer for us all. BPA please consider health and property, before the might dollar. Greed has only gotten the USA closer to financial ruin.

We appreciate the power you provide please do the right thing for us all.

Best Regards,

Vickie Wrigley

Communication ID: 13632

Date Received: 5/28/2011

Name: CHARLES RENEAU

Dear Sirs,

I support the West Alternative for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. This will have the least affect on sensitive wild areas.

Thanks,

Charles Reneau
North Portland, OR

Communication ID: 13634

Date Received: 5/30/2011

Name: HOWARD FERRIS

Has BPA determined a "Preferred Alternative" and if so which corridor are they thinking. Also, if they have not selected a preferred alternative, when in the process will this take place. Thank you for your response.

Communication ID: 13635

Date Received: 5/31/2011

Name: ZEPHYR L CLAYTON

Gentlemen - I live on [address] and my daughter lives across I-5 at [address]. My daughter has acreage (6.5) behind her home by the current gas/power lines. Will this affect her and other properties when this new line goes in? How about access to Castle Rock via the frontage road? I have studied the maps mailed to me as a homeowner but don't know how each of us will be affected. The maps are not really very clear in detail so I have questions.

Thank you!

Communication ID: 13636

Date Received: 5/31/2011

Name: NOEL A TOGNAZZINI,DEBORAH TOGNAZZINI

We have sold our property that might have been impacted by the Corridor Reinforcement Project. Could you please remove us from your mailing list. Our mailing address was [mailing address]. The property address was [physical address].

Thank you.

Noel Tognazzini
[phone]

Communication ID: 13637

Date Received: 5/31/2011

Name: KATHLEEN RAFFERTY

We no longer own the property affected by this project. Please update your records:

Thank you,

Ernest C Stempel Trustees

Kathleen Rafferty
[address]

Communication ID: 13638

Date Received: 7/4/2011

Name: FREDRIC J SANTOLUCITO,ARDELLE M STEIN

My recent submission to the Columbian talks about the 500KV Line and Tower placement taking into account the "total costs and consequences" vs just deciding based on the initial cost impact:

In recent submissions to "Our readers view", statements have been made about the placement of the new BPA 500 KV lines and towers along existing lines and corridors due to lower upfront cost savings.

In business there is a term called "Total Cost of Ownership". This suggests that there are more costs to be recognized than just the initial cost in any purchase. (quality, service/responsiveness, technology and environmental impact each has an associated cost).

Such is the case with the building of the new BPA 500KV lines and towers.

If the new lines were to be built next to the existing lines it would mean high vulnerability to any natural or manmade disaster. It should be recognized that these lines run unguarded for thousands of miles and serve the whole of the Northwest and California.

The loss of power for any prolonged period of time would be devastating from both monetary and human terms. Such a real life scenario was realized in the 1977 NY City blackout.

Separating of the lines on a new corridor would make such a simultaneous occurrence negligible. While one set of lines may be disabled, the other line could continue to fulfill the critical needs of the large US region.

BPA should not make this major decision based on the easiest way or least initial costs. Serious consideration should be given to the best long term decision and the Total Cost of Ownership.

Fred Santolucito [phone]

Communication ID: 13639

Date Received: 6/1/2011

Name: REBECCA SCHROEDER

Please add my email address to the list for the email updates. Thanks.

Rebecca Schroeder

Communication ID: 13640

Date Received: 6/2/2011

Name: KIM L SMITH

Dear BPA,

I live on Segment 35. Segment 35 is an approximate 2 mile long section in the proposed project. If BPA selects a route that includes 35, there will be a minimum of 3 stream crossings in that 2 mile segment. Those streams are in the Little Washougal Watershed as shown on the Clark County website. The extensive clearing that would be required to run a line up Segment 35 would severely impact the entire

watershed for both surface water quality and temperature and therefore impact fish habitat downstream into the Washougal River. At least one of the streams that would be crossed on Segment 35 is fish-bearing and is a major tributary.

There has also been a lot of discussion lately about herbicide/pesticide impact on fish populations. That impact would be ongoing and pervasive as part of crossing three streams within a 2 mile run.

Finally, state rules recognize any stream as riparian habitat and establish a minimum of 75' setbacks to clearing near seasonal streams and up to 200' setbacks to clearing near fish-bearing streams. Can BPA meet those rules that any private land-owner would be required to meet?

Drop Segment 35 from consideration in this project.

Kim Smith
Segment 35

Communication ID: 13641

Date Received: 6/2/2011

Name: H J COCKRELL

Please change the address on future mailings for the BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project from:

[old address]

To the new address of:

[new address]

Thanks

Lisa

Communication ID: 13642

Date Received: 6/16/2011

Name: PAULA ENSLEY

Hello,

I looks as though my property is targeted to be directly impacted on one or two of the plans.

[address]

Would you let me know if I filled out something to authorize that placement?

During that time I was going through the death of my mom, as well as, a divorce. I was very distressed. I need to find out if something was sent back to approve that as being okay on our property.

Our land has a special timber tax status that I just had to pay a sizeable sum to plant many saplings. And also there is a protected habitat creek area that butts up against our property on the south end.

This is very upsetting for our family.

Paula Ensley
[phone]

Communication ID: 13643

Date Received: 6/22/2011

Name: BARBARA BLOOMFIELD

BPA

Please read the attached letter outlining my questions and concerns relating to the I-5 Corridor Project and my property located in the notification zone..

Barbara Bloomfield

—

I-5@bpa.gov

June 22, 2011

Re: I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

My home is located on line 25 of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project and my address is [address]. I have a few questions and request a response to each specific question. Please respond to my email address: [email]

1. My home is located in the "notification buffer zone". A)Please define how this affects my property. B)Does this mean BPA has an option for an easement to the property? C) Or since I'm within 500 feet of one of the towers, would BPA possible take my property for use in the project? I am located between the existing tower 25/103 on the north, approx 500 feet from my home and existing tower 25/108 to the south, approximately 700 feet from my home. D)That means to me that if BPA expands the towers there will be 1 million volts of power within a short distance of my home. The notification buffer zone encompasses all the area around my home, 19th Ave, 20th Court. And most of 21st Ave and 22nd Ct. My property is located near the "V" on line 25 where it branches into two separate lines 25.
2. With 1 million volts in the air above my property, I am concerned about this affect on safety. Your Keeping the way clear for safe, reliable service article listed on your website, states: "And second, trees

and other vegetation can conduct electricity, a situation that can jeopardize people, pets and property. If electricity flows through a tree to the ground, that tree essentially becomes "electrified," and anyone who touches it can be seriously injured or even killed. Another danger is that electricity from the line can make a tree branch so hot it catches fire, which can threaten homes in residential neighborhoods and spark wildfires in rural areas. Trees don't even have to touch power lines to be dangerous. In the case of high-voltage transmission lines, if circumstances are right, electricity can jump or arc between wires and vegetation or other objects connected to the ground that are up to 15 feet away." I understand this reference trees located directly by the towers, however with double the power in my area, can this affect "electricity can jump or arc between wires and vegetation or other objects connected to the ground" affect someone that trims the tall cedar and fir trees with power tools that are thickly populated in our subdivision? Or any work by someone using power tools on the ground?

3. Line 25/104 is located at 17th Ave and Minnehaha. There is an apartment complex at this intersection, literally right in the parking lot. It is a two story complex. Your article on your website Living and Working Safely Around High-Voltage Power Lines states: "In other words, do not lift, evaluate, build or pass under a power line with any object, equipment, facility or vehicle that could come close to the energized wires." And "As a general precaution, when under a line, never put yourself or any object any higher than 14 feet above the ground." What happens to the residents of this complex? A two story complex is definitely taller than 14 ft. Surely it cannot be safe to live directly under a 500K line.

These are just a few examples of the concerns I have about BPA expanding the existing lines to 500K. The expansion of 500K lines are near schools, bus stops, roads that have high traffic with all types of vehicles.

Please reconsider and choose an alternate route to the east. These lines are negatively impacting our community, health and properties.

Barbara A Bloomfield

Communication ID: 13644

Date Received: 6/25/2011

Name: SANDRA FERNEDING

The M line crosses my property that overlooks Merwin Dam. In fact the lines that run south out of the dam are on the Western edge of my property. If the M line goes through it will cross a watershed that feeds the springs that supply my household and starts a nice creek feeding into Pup Creek and then Cedar Creek. I know that spraying and vegetation control are a must under high power lines from my dealings with Pacific Power and polluting the headwaters of that creek and my water supply is not acceptable. Not to mention the hours of reforestation my family have devoted to that part of our property, that is showing real promise.

I strongly urge you to consider the East alternative or stick to the route where you already own the right of way. Thank you for your consideration.

Sandra Ferneding
[address]

Communication ID: 13645

Date Received: 6/29/2011

Name: MOLLY HAYES

Thanks for the feedback. We are worried as is everyone who might be affected; we are concerned about the impact on the wetlands here, the value of our home, and health issues. My husband has [description of medical condition] and does not need to have EMF issues as well.....not sure what it will do to my mothers [description of medical condition]that close to the house. We are caught in a bind..... for us and the environment!

Thanks for taking some of this into consideration,

molly hayes

Communication ID: 13646

Date Received: 7/5/2011

Name: BARBARA BLOOMFIELD

Hi, this is Barbara Bloomfield calling. I has called last Friday and requested a response to my email and a Scott Baker called back later in the day and I wasn't home. I am requesting that you respond to the email and my email is [email]. I sent a message on June 22nd and my request is that you respond by email to those specific items in the email. My phone number is [phone]. It's Tuesday about 11 o' clock. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13647

Date Received: 6/6/2011

Name: RONALD H HOLEMAN,LESLIE M HOLEMAN

We were receiving mailed notices regarding the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project at the following address:

Ronald H Holeman

Leslie M Holeman

[address]

With the following numbers shown above our mailing address: 214366 851694 38.

The Vancouver house was sold to new owners effective April 26, 2011. You can find the new owners contact information in the Clark County Property Records. You certainly have no obligation to continue sending us information regarding the proposed Project, but should you choose to do so (since I am a retired BPA employee and still interested in what may be decided), our new mailing address is [new address]. Thank you.

Ron H.

Communication ID: 13648

Date Received: 6/6/2011

Name: ROBYN JOHNSTON

Please update my address, I am on the projects update mailing list.

old:

[address]

new:

[new address]

Thanks, Robyn Johnston

Communication ID: 13649

Date Received: 6/7/2011

Name: KURT J CONGER

Please change my contact information and address of record in the mailing list for this process to:

Kurt J. Conger

Power Marketer

[phone]

Email: [email]

IM: [IM]

Seattle City Light

Mailing address | [mailing address]

Shipping address | [shipping address]

Communication ID: 13650

Date Received: 6/8/2011

Name: SCOTT LILJEDAHN

Please remove Hope Keistinen as a County of Cowlitz Commissioner.

She resigned eighteen months ago and has been replaced by Scott Liljedahl.

Thank you for your prompt attention in this matter.

Regards,

Scott Liljedahl

Communication ID: 13651

Date Received: 7/5/2011

Name: AL HAYWARD

[Al Hayward called me yesterday to ask us to consider undergrounding as an option through areas near Washougal.

His phone number is [phone]

Email - [email] - he'd like to receive our updates electronically.

Maryam Asgharian]

Communication ID: 13652

Date Received: 7/8/2011

Name: DUANE NELSON

[Map request filled out at Amboy Territorial Days 2011.]

Communication ID: 13653

Date Received: 7/11/2011

Name: BARBARA BLOOMFIELD

Hi, my name is Barbara Bloomfield. I sent you an email on June 22nd to the email provided and I have asked, this is my third request, that you respond to me by email. I had several questions and I'm sure that you can answer them. And I am asking that you respond by email. So this is my third call and the email. The email is listed under [email]. So that's Barbara Bloomfield. Please respond to my email. I'm not home during the day much so it's hard to catch me. Cell is [phone] but I do appreciate an email. I will take this up further if I don't hear from you. Please respond. Today is Monday, July 11th. Thanks.

Communication ID: 13654

Date Received: 7/9/2011

Name: (ANONYMOUS)

Review of easement use - taxation of property and availability to use by property owner that had easement installed on property; what are property owner benefits?

What are simultaneous projects for security of systems current?

Communication ID: 13655

Date Received: 7/9/2011

Name: CHERYL GOLLIHER

Power lines need to go somewhere. North Clark Co is a perfect rural environment for power lines that the entire NW needs. Has to go somewhere. Here is perfect.

Cheryl Gollhier

Communication ID: 13656

Date Received: 7/10/2011

Name: FREDRIC J SANTOLUCITO

Hello Maryam,

Thank you for your reply.

I have an elderly neighbor off of 19th Street that borders the Ross Complex. She is concerned about what to do with her property and is convinced that BPA will take it over if the Western option is selected (#25).

Is there a way to know if her property would be selected for purchase or possession by BPA if this option were one the final decision for the placement of the 500KV lines?

Thank you,

Fred Santolucito

Communication ID: 13657

Date Received: 7/12/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

Michael Mowrey, International Vice President

[address]

Mr. Mowrey,

We had a disturbing incident last weekend at our local summer celebration in Amboy, Washington with some linemen. Our group had a booth at the celebration and we had a petition that was being circulated at this event. Unfortunately, a group of linemen that apparently had too much to drink called one of our petitioners horrible names and told her they tear up our road signs when they see them and that everyone with a sign in front of their home should have their electricity shut off. This kind of behavior is unacceptable.

Mr. Mowrey, we like electricity, we are not against Bonneville Power Administration or this project. I have attached our latest newsletter. Would you please circulate this to your linemen in our area so that they read about our issues and understand that our land and our property rights are risk here and we do not deserve the attacks by your linemen on top of everything else.

If Bonneville Power Administration hires from your union and they choose a rural route that cuts through rural private properties, we will have to have these linemen in our communities. I think it best that this kind of ugliness stops before these men come onto our private properties.

Thank you,

Cheryl Brantley

[phone]

A Better Way for BPA

<http://abetterway4bpa.org>

Communication ID: 13658

Date Received: 7/12/2011

Name: CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

To: Maryam

Date: July 12, 2011

RE: Amboy Territorial Days 2011

Maryam, Your informational booths should have real maps showing property parcels, lines, towers, and access roads so people can find their properties. We had numerous people come to our booth to tell us they get BPA letters, but don't know if a tower, line, or access road goes through their property. I know you have the capacity to place the maps on tripods and display them and that really should be available to people in any setting where BPA or its contractors are present. I had to physically write out what to look for on your web site to find the interactive map. I used the back of BPA's business card (that Seth gave me), which has the I-5 web address on it, and then how to find their property using the interactive map search tab. If BPA truly desires to have information for people, this should be written out in detail and available for people to pick up so they can do it themselves. You folks are in the profession of

getting information out there, I'm not. I cannot understand why, for the past 21 months, it's been such a difficult thing to understand that people need real maps if they are to understand this project.

Thank you,

Cheryl Brantley

Communication ID: 13659

Date Received: 7/14/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

Hi Maryam,

Who has ownership of the 500-kV Tacoma – Raver #1 transmission line from Tacoma Substation to Covington Substation (15/6), the 500-kV Tacoma – Raver #2, 230-kV Tacoma – Covington #2, 230-kV Tacoma – Covington #3, and the 230-kV Tacoma – Covington #4 transmission lines? ? Are these lines BPA-owned land, an easement, or both?

We need this answer before we meet next Wednesday with some of BPA personnel on July 20th.

Thank you,

Cheryl

Cheryl Brantley

A Better Way for BPA

<http://abetterway4bpa.org>

Communication ID: 13660

Date Received: 6/20/2011

Name: JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER,MIKE MANCHESTER

Jeffrey Lane

Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs

U.S. Department of Energy

Forrestal Building, Room 7B138

1000 Independence Avenue, SW

Washington, DC 20585-0001

Dear Mr. Lane:

My constituent, Mike Manchester, has contacted me regarding the US Department of Energy. I have enclosed a copy of related documentation for your reference.

I kindly request that you give this matter a full review and provide me with a response that addresses his concerns. Please direct your reply to the attention of Jordan Meade in my Vancouver office.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Jaime Herrera Beutler
Member of Congress

[Attached Document]

Our problem is with Bonneville Power Administration taking 50 to 80 acres from us for a substation. For more detail please see enclosed letter, map and photo.

[Attached Document]

Dear Representative Herrera,

I appreciate your recent visit to Longview and look forward to your service on our area's behalf.

My name is Mike Manchester. Our family has owned and operated an independent business in Longview, WA and a beef farming operation in the Castle Rock area for two generations. In late 2009 the Bonneville Power Administration notified us that they were considering placing a substation and a 500,000 volt transmission line on our property, which would wipe out our farming operation. Our home and lives as well as those of eight other neighbors would be placed at risk of electric shock as the recent deaths of a family in San Bernardino, CA tragically show.

All routes that BPA has proposed so far will inflict considerable economic damages to Cowlitz County by taking or affecting lands which have a much higher economic growth and tax revenue potential for our county. In our case, we would lose 50 to 80 acres that are excellent for cattle and timber growing, or perhaps some day, real estate development potential. Because of our location of low elevation, high quality soil and plenty of moisture this area is very productive. This type of business is essential for our economy because it creates many other jobs (saw mills, construction, restaurants, trucking, stores, etc.).

We feel we will be forced to relocate because of the risk of cancer from Electric and Magnetic Fields. This is a major concern to us. About twenty five years ago we lived one hundred feet from the BPA line. After that my five year old daughter and my wife both got [description of medical condition]. We built a new house about one quarter of a mile away and moved there. Now the proposed substation will be so large it will be right by that house, where we live now (see enclosed copy of the proposed substation).

Last fall citizens' groups proposed to BPA an alternative route further North and East (shown in gray in the attached map). This "gray route" would start from a proposed substation ("Casey Road substation") which is further north and would avoid virtually all homes. It is longer because it detours around cities and towns instead of ploughing through them and their suburbs as all the current BPA proposed lines do.

In their February update BPA has chosen to dismiss the "gray route" with misleading statements that do not represent the facts. The citizen proposed gray route would:

- Minimize electrical risks and financial impacts to homeowners
- Minimize economic and tax revenue damages to Cowlitz County
- Provide BPA with room for several future expansions at reduced costs

BPA's actions show that they do not listen to citizens and are more interested in their own well being than the region's future. Representative Herrera, could you please help us by writing to BPA so they will make a full evaluation of the "gray route" attached?

Sincerely,

Mike Manchester

[address]

[email]

[phone number]

Cc: Cowlitz County Commissioners; George Raiter, James Misner, and Mike Karnofski

State Representative Ed Orcutt

Communication ID: 13661

Date Received: 7/15/2011

Name: TODD MATZ

I support the east alternate route my family will put up one hell of a fight if you cross our land.

Communication ID: 13662

Date Received: 7/21/2011

Name: ED ORCUTT,ANN RIVERS,HONORABLE JOSEPH ZARELLI

Washington State Legislature

July 21, 2011

Mark Korsness, Project Manager
I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project
PO Box 9250
Portland, OR 97207

Dear Mr. Korsness,

We are continuing to hear concerns raised by citizens in Clark and Cowlitz County regarding the proposed routes for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. We must, therefore, reiterate our concerns over how BPA has developed and proposed routes for this project.

In previous letters, we clearly asked for routes to be developed East of areas where there is private property and for you to seek a route across state and federal lands - lands that taxpayers already own.

While overall cost is a concern, we are also concerned about lines being located in areas where there are dense populations and schools. We are further concerned about private property rights and the potential of the rural routes to decimate landowners' retirement accounts - which is what their land and timber is, for many of them. The same issues which DNR has used to convince you not to seek a route across their lands arise with the routes proposed to cross other private timber lands. If it is too much impact on the state lands, it is way too large an impact on private lands. Since many of these landowners own small acreages, any crossing - especially one which crosses diagonally or through a property - can cause access issues and geographically isolate some areas of their property, rendering them useless. This is a far greater burden than if you crossed through the middle of DNR or USFS lands as they would have large enough holdings that such a crossing would still leave them with areas on each side that were economical to manage.

We believe that you have not taken seriously your duties to explore alternative routes which either cross state and federal property or which crosses the Columbia River at Longview and extends south through Oregon. At numerous meetings, we have heard excuses - not reasons, but excuses - for why you have failed to consider such routes with those routes currently proposed.

We also understand that BPA has more time than they previously claimed when stating that there was not enough time to go back and develop these route alternatives. We believe that recent events have provided you another chance to develop such routes and we hereby call on you to do so without further delay.

Sincerely,

Representative Ed Orcutt
18th Legislative District

Representative Ann Rivers
18th Legislative District

Senator Joseph Zarelli
18th Legislative District

Communication ID: 13663

Date Received: 7/14/2011

Name: JOHN ISAACSON,DEANNE ISAACSON

July 14th, 2011

From:

John and Deanne Isaacson

[address]

[phone]

To:

Mr. Mark Korsness, Project Coordinator

A-7 Bonneville Power Administration

P.O. Box 3621

Portland, OR 97208-3621

Re: Bonneville Power Administration 1-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project500

K Y Transmission Line Alternate Route - "P" Line

Dear Mr. Korsness,

I am the owner of a 20 acre parcel of land bordering the west boundary of [parcel description], which is adjacent to the proposed "P" Line. My residence is located very near the proposed "P" Line.

I am writing to voice my support for the letter dated May 26, 2011 and information packet, containing fact, that was submitted by my neighbor Bolton Minister. In that packet Bolton cites numerous environmental constraints that would come to bear if powerline towers and cleared easements were constructed in the Riparian Management Zones and Wetland Management Zones that were established by the Dept. of Natural Resources in the western portion of Section 25 T3N, R3E. The DNR left a lot of the timber uncut in those zones according to the Forest Practices Act. In the attachment Bolton also submitted, NEPA Scoping Comments, wherein it states that DNR and BPA came to a common agreement that BPA will comply with all Forest Practices requirements in future powerline construction. I expect a public agency such as yourselves; to lead by example with responsible actions.

I am also submitting the same request as Bolton has submitted; to locate the proposed "P" Line further to the east.

I think the reasoning exists that in order to serve the people's needs best and at the same time minimize impacts to everyone; the proposed "P" line needs to move eastward in this sector. There are many homes located very near to this proposed line and just 1/2, mile to the east, is completely vacant land. Even if DNR wishes to keep the line out of the center of their properties for whatever reasons, it doesn't mean that we need to place the line at the extreme western edge of their properties, but rather we should place it in a considerate position of both residences and them.

By moving the proposed "P" line eastward we can negate or minimize the impacts for both the residences and DNR properties. This would serve the needs of the people in the least impacting way as well as avoid the environmental constraints that Bolton has already pointed to in his letter and fact.

Sincerely,

John M. Isaacson

Communication ID: 13664

Date Received: 7/11/2011

Name: L DAVID BALLARD

July 11, 2011

Mr. Stephen J. Wright, Administrator
A-7 Bonneville Power Administration
PO Box 3621
Portland, OR 97208-3621

Dear Mr. Wright,

The parcel of land where I reside on Vinemapple road is adjacent to the proposed "P" Line in Clark County, Washington.

The "P" Line is located along the western boundary of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) ownership in [parcel description]. The North Fork of LaCamas Creek is adjacent to my property line, and according to the State of Washington, is defined as "Type 3 Water".

On May 26, 2011 my neighbor, Mr. Bolton C. Minister, wrote a letter to your office, pointing out that building transmission lines through "Type 3 Water" is in violation of the State of Washington Forest Practice Act. Without duplicating the facts in Mr. Minister's letter, I would strongly suggest your office comply with State of Washington requirements.

The fact that Bonneville Power Administration is still considering building a 500 KV high-power transmission line, with 15 story towers, through our neighborhood, where there is no pre-existing BPA rights of way, is still shocking and is unconscionable, to say the least.

We trust that you will look into these matters, and "find a better way" to build your transmission lines in a way and along a route which will honor our property rights and protect the beauty and environment of our neighboring hills.

Sincerely,

David Ballard
[address]

Communication ID: 13665

Date Received: 7/20/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,THOMAS A ,(ILLEGIBLE) (ILLEGIBLE),ZACHARY (ILLEGIBLE),(ILLEGIBLE) (ILLEGIBLE),CHARLES (ILLEGIBLE),BRYAN (ILLEGIBLE),ARLINE (ILLEGIBLE),ROB (ILLEGIBLE),ANDREW ABBOTT,JACK ABERNATHY,CRYSTAL L ADAMS,BOB ALEXANDER,CHEE ALLISON,TRAVIS APP,BOB APPLING,JEREMY ARIONUS,CHUCK ARNST,BRIAN ASBURRY,JENNY ASBURRY,CHERYL AYRES,BRIAN BAKER,L DAVID BALLARD,GEORGE BALLARD,NICK BARRON-KERTIS,DIANE BENNETT,PAUL BENNETT,TIFFANY A BERNABE,RICHARD BIDES,CRYSTAL BIELEC,JIM BIERMANN,JAMES S ETUX BILYEU,SHERRON BILYEU,KATHERINE BILYEU,CHRISTINE BISSON,TAMMY BISTER,MARGARET BLAIR,AMY BLANKENSHIP,MARGIE J BORCHERS,WILLIAM L BORCHERS,SHERRI BOSCH,BRUCE BOSSIO,TRAVER BRAACK,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY,PAULINE H BRATTIN,CLIFFORD BRATTIN,KYLE BREWER,TAMI BRISSLER,PHYLLIS A BROCK,DAVID BROCK,DYLAN BROCK,LUCAS BROWN,DALLAS BROWNING,ANTHONY BULL,TIMOTHY M BURKE,CLARICE BURKHART,ALAN BUTTERFIELD,MADDISON CADLING,MAYA CADY,GINO CATANIA,WESLEY CHANCE,W WAYNE CHANDLER,DONNA CHAVEZ,ROBERT COLBORN,JOY COLBORN,DUSTIN CONDON,M B CONWAY,MARK G COOKSEY TRUSTEE,SUSAN G COOKSEY TRUSTEE,MARTIN D CORNELL,PHYLLIS P CORNELL,ASHLEY COSTENTINE,PAUL COTTERILL,SUSAN COTTERILL,CHRISTOPHER CUMMINS,GREG DALLY,MAEGAN DAVIES,JANICE DAVIS,LESLIE DAVISSON,JUSTIN DEARMIN,BILLY DECK,EDWARD DECK,ALEXANDRA DEMETRO,MIKE DENDY,SHELBY DESCLOUX,CLIFF DESCLOUX,TAYLOR DEVANEY,CLAUDIA W DICKERSON,ROSE DIMENT TRUSTEE,JEANETTE DOHERTY,ALLAN DOHN,SHERRY DOOLEY,JASON DOSS,RYAN DOSS,KELLY DUNMYER,ROY DUNN,SARAH DURR,TIMOTHY DURR,MICHAEL A DYER,CHERYLE EASTER,CLETE C EASTWOOD,DONNA L EASTWOOD,EMIL T ECKSTROM,DELRAE EGGLESTON,TYLER ELLIOTT,CURTIS ELLIOTT,DUSTIN ELLIS,W CHARLES ELMURE,CHAD EMERICK,CLARENCE EPPERLY,JADE M EVANS,TRACY EVANS,WILLOW EVERETT,GLENN FARLEY,JEREMY FIELDS,SARAH FIELDS,ROBERT S FISHER,TRACY FISHER,JAN FITZGERALD,TANA FITZTHUM,BARRY FITZTHUM,DEBBIE FLEEMAN,MITCHELL L FOX,ALLEN FRASIER,AUSTIN FULLER,DOUG FURTH,AMY GARD,TODD GARD,NICK GARDNER,LEVI GARVEY,PATTY GARVEY,DAVID GAUTHIER,AARON GIESE,CHARLES GILLILAND,DAWN GLADDEN,ISABELLA GORINI,RICHARD GOVE,JACEN GRAY,PEGGY GREEN,DEANNA J GUNDERSON,WILLIAM A GUNDERSON,DOUGLAS GURHNRE,GARY HAAG,LANA L HALL,LEANNE D HALL,SUSAN HANSEN,CHRIS HARMON,KELLY HARMON,KATELIN HARTELOO,KEVIN G HARTSELL,JEANNE M HARTSELL,JUSTIN HAYS,RANDALL W HAYS,KAREN D HAYS,LISA K HELTEMES,ROGER W HELTEMES,RICHARD HELTEMES,CARRIE HELTEMES,COY HELTEMES,AARON HENDRICKSON,MARGARET HERZ,DAN HIGGINS,STEFFY HILL,LISA HOLLIDAY,DAN HORLACHOR,DAVID B HOUSE,PEGGY MARIE HOUSE,LEE HOWARD,TONYA HOWELL,JOHN HOWELL,ALICIA HUFFORD,TAMIE HUGHES,KATHLEEN HUGHES,DANIEL P HULL,DOUGLAS HUNT,SARAH HURST,SUSAN HURT,JOSEPH W HURT JR,LARRY J HUTCHINGS,JANE IPPOLITI,THOMAS IPPOLITI,TIM ISHAM,GAYLE L JAMES,FRANK JAMES II,JEREMY JOHNS,NOEL JOHNSON,ANDREW JOHNSON,RENEE JOHNSON,CHRISTOPHER JOHNSON,BONNIE K JOHNSON,DAVID JOHNSON,PATRICK JOHNSON,DAVID C JOHNSON,HARRIETT JONDAHL,DAVID JOY,JONATHAN KANE,CRYSTAL KATZER,MARGIE DIANE KENT,RANDI KERLE,STELLA M KERSEN,NICHOLAS KERSEN,BILL KIMBLE,DENNY R KING,JAY KLANDT,AMBER KOMM,TYLER KOMM,ANGELA KOPKIE,LARRY L KOR,CASEY

KOSTMAN,PETER KRAAKMAN,JON LAHTI,DENNIS D LAKE,DAWN LAMASCUS,STEPHANIE LAMASCUS,DOMINIC LANG,BEN LANGENBACH,GREG B LARSON,LINDA LAUGHLIN,LINDA LAWFFER,MOLLIE J LAWFFER,NOEL J LAWFFER,DAVID LEBLANC,JULIE A LEPAK,DENNIS LINDEMAN,TIM LITTON,TERESA LOGAN,CEDRIC LOHRMANN,JOHN D LONDON,GEORGE LONNEE,PATRICIA LONNEE,LESLIE B LOUNSBERY BRADY,JENNIFER LUDIN,CODY LUDWIG,GREG M,TOM MACKOWSKI,DERONDA MADES,MIKE MAHANEY,JIM MALINOWSKI,JANET MANAHAN,MARVIN ALLEN MANES,SHEILA RAE MANES,SHANNON MANGIS,LYNETTE MAREK,STEVEN MAREK,RICK MASSER,JODI MATSON,ANDY MATSON,S R MATZDORFF,POLLIEANN MCCARTER,MARY MCCARTHY,DON MCCOY,BROOKLYN MCCRACKEN,DAN M MCDANIEL,ROBERT J MCELDOON,ROSELINDA L MCELDOON,PATRICK J MCGARRY,JUSTIN MCGARY,DR JERRY MCGEE,DENNIS MCGEE,KENNETH C MCGOFFIN,JUNE MCKEE,PETER MELVOIN,E L MENDOZA,KEITH D MESERVEY,LINDA MEZZIE,BRYCE MICHAELIS,GLORIA MIELKE,ROGER L MILES,DEBORAH MILLAR,GARY MILLER,RONALD MILLER,CATHERINE MILLER,ASHLEY MILLER,DIANA MILLER,WILLIAM L MILLS,LISA C MILLS,ALEJANDRA MITCHELL-KEENEY,SHELLY MOLINA,LINETTE MOODY,KIRKPATRICK MOODY,DANIEL MOOERS,JEANNE MOOERS,MERLE MOORE,DOUGLAS MOORE,SHERRI MOORE,E CARLINE MOORE,JAMES MOORE,TERRY MORAN,ROBERT MORRIS,TERRY MORTON,DEBRA MORTON,ABBY MOSCHETTI,JAMES E MUIR,MICHELLE MURPHY,JEFFREY MURPHY,SAMMI MURPHY,JULIA NAUMAN POOLE,GEORGENE NEAL,MARK NELLES,DAN NELSON,LAVETTA NELSON BINDER,LOIS J NEUMAN,ELIZABETH NEWLAND,MICHAEL NICHOLAS,SABRINA NICHOLSON,MATTHEW O'NEILL,JANELLA OLIN,JERRY C ETUX OLSON,PATTI OLSON,BRENDA OLSTAD,ANDREA OLSTEAD,MICHAEL ORTHMEYER,JEFF OSBORNE,LINDSEY PARIS,DOUG PARIS,NICOLE PEARSON,CATHRYN PENNINGTON,AUSTIN PENNINGTON,ED PERNINGTON,MARIE PETERSON,DEJA PETERSON,JORDAN PETERSON,CHERYL PETERSON,MIKE PETERSON,VICTORIA M PETERSON,ERIK PETERSON,TOM PETERSON,STEVE PHILLIPS,ASHLEY PINSON,JOSETTE PIVA,UWE PLUMHOFF,SEAN PLUMMER,CONNIE PLUMMER,JEFF POPHAM,MICHAEL POTEET,BILL POTEET,DAVID POUNDS,BRAD PROTHERO,SYLVIA M PROUTY,STEPHEN PUTNAM

July 20, 2011

Bonneville Power Administration
I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project
PO Box 9250
Portland, OR 97207

The board of A Better Way for BPA and its members circulated the enclosed petition obtaining approximately 412 signatures from citizens who agree that Bonneville Power Administration should use their own land along routes 9 and 25 instead of creating a new corridor that would cut private properties into pieces, take away landowner rights, and destroy communities and sensitive ecosystems forever.

Please acknowledge receipt of this Petition, and publish the same as a general comment on the project website and records.

On behalf of the board of A Better Way for BPA and its members,

Cheryl Brantley – President

A Better Way for BPA

[address]

[phone]

BPA use your OWN land!

Bonneville Power Administration has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. The least expensive alternative and the one with the least impact on property rights and the environment would be to use routes 9 and 25 where BPA already has towers and lines. Any of the new routes that BPA has proposed would require a 70-mile long clear-cut through the countryside of Clark and Cowlitz counties. All of these rural routes would invade private property, restrict landowner rights and render some parcels useless. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife. BPA tells us there is enough room on its current right-of-way for this project. We say BPA should use this existing corridor. It just makes the most sense!

- The existing corridor has 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.
- Placing the new lines on the existing corridor is the least expensive alternative and would be the best use of ratepayers' money.
- There is minimal impact to private property owners from adding lines on a corridor where towers and lines already exist.
- Using the existing corridor would save our countryside from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties and consuming an estimated 1300 acres.

We, the undersigned, ask BPA to not create a new 70-mile long clear-cut that will violate our property rights and pollute our waterways. We ask BPA to use our ratepayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on its own land, the existing corridor of routes 9 and 25 where it has had lines and towers for the past 70 years.

Communication ID: 13666

Date Received: 7/29/2011

Name: CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

[Phone conversation between Maryam Asgharian and Cheryl Brantley about petitions and herbicides]

Communication ID: 13667

Date Received: 7/20/2011

Name: AMBER ALEXANDER,GUY BERNOVICH,MELISSA BERNOVICH,CYNTHIA J BOUCHER,CHARLES E DUKE,CR KASER,PETER MELVOIN,BOLTON C MINISTER,LOLA MINISTER,APRIL L MINISTER,JAMES MOORE,MICHELLE MURPHY,LOIS J NEUMAN,JOHN RAVEN,JANINE ROBERTS,SHEILA K ROBLES,JUAN ROBLES,EMILY A WEBBER

Stephen J. Wright, Administrator
PO Box 3621
Portland, OR 97209-3621

Mr. Wright:

As you know, your agency has proposed building a 500 kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. Your stated objectives are to provide a substantial increase in transmission capacity which will satisfy the projected growth in demand while minimizing impacts to the natural and human environment and minimizing costs.

The alternative having the lowest overall cost and dramatically less human and environmental impact would be routes 9 and 25 where your easements, towers and lines already exist. Land acquisition costs would be negligible. Construction costs and environmental impact costs would be minimized.

Any of the new corridors that have been proposed would cut a swath 70-miles long and 150-foot wide, consuming 1,273 acres in two counties. The required access roads would be another invasion taking additional acreage. All of these proposed rural routes would decrease home and land values; destroy farms, businesses and hard-earned retirement equity. These routes would also degrade the rivers, streams and wetlands that provide fish and wildlife habitat.

If a rural route is chosen, your agency promises to cut a 150-foot-wide swath through private landowners' properties for your towers and lines. In addition, your agency tells us you will also need to remove any tall trees adjacent to your new right of way that would threaten to fall into the towers and lines. In the proposed rural routes a Douglas fir tree can grow up to 200 feet tall. This could mean in addition to the 150-foot wide corridor, your agency could clear-cut an additional 200 feet on either side of the new right of way, creating a 550-foot clear-cut through the rural private landowner's property!

I have learned from your agency staff that the existing right of way along routes 9 and 25 was specifically planned and designed for expansion. I have been assured by your agency staff that there is enough room to add 500 kV lines and that no homes would be taken. I argue that using these routes would result in negligible land acquisition costs, lower environmental impact and less litigation costs. Maintenance costs would be reduced due to substantially less vulnerability to damage from weather (ice storms, wind storms, etc.) and wildfire compared to the heavily timbered portions of the easterly routes.

Here is a summary of my position:

(a.) Using the existing right-of-way would be the least expensive option and therefore the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to your agency.

(b.) There is minimal impact from adding capacity where towers and lines already exist. Owners along routes 9 and 25 bought those properties fully aware of the lines and towers along the EDGES of their land.

(c.) Using the existing corridor would save rural landowners from a new 70-mile-long clear-cut bulldozed THROUGH their land, consuming an estimated 1300 acres for the corridor and access roads, compared to a few hundred square feet in four locations your agency may need to purchase on YOUR right-of-way.

(d.) The existing corridor has 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.

The existing corridor has a proven security history by virtue of the lines being located in a more urban environment where any suspicious activity has a high probability of being reported. In contrast, a 70-mile run of new lines through isolated and rural areas would create new opportunities for trespassing and vandalism.

I ask you to ensure that your agency does not bisect any rural private landowner's properties with a new 70-mile-long clear-cut and access roads. I ask your agency to use my ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing your new lines and towers in the safe, stable, and reliable corridor that was specifically designed for expansion many years ago, and which has been in use for 70 years, on routes 9 and 25.

Communication ID: 13668

Date Received: 4/15/2011

Name: DENA R HOINOWSKI,DARIN MATTIX,JOHN R NESBITT

Mr. Wright:

Bonneville Power Administration has proposed building a 500 kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. The stated objectives are to provide a substantial increase in transmission capacity which will satisfy the projected growth in demand while minimizing impacts to the natural and human environment and minimizing costs.

The alternative having the lowest overall cost and dramatically less human and environmental impact would be routes 9 and 25 where easements, towers and lines already exist. Land acquisition costs would be negligible. Construction costs and environmental impact costs would be minimized.

Any of the new corridors that have been proposed would cut a swath 70-miles long and 150-feet wide, consuming 1,273 acres in two counties. The required access roads would be another invasion taking additional acreage. All of these proposed rural routes would decrease home and land values; destroy farms, businesses and hard-earned retirement equity. These routes would also degrade the rivers, streams and wetlands that provide fish and wildlife habitat.

If a rural route is chosen, BPA promises to cut a 150-foot-wide swath through private landowners' properties for their towers and lines. In addition, we are told that BPA will also need to remove any tall trees adjacent to this new right of way that would threaten to fall into the towers and lines. In the proposed rural routes a Douglas fir tree can grow up to 200 feet tall. This could mean in addition to the 150-foot wide corridor, BPA could clear-cut an additional 200 feet on either side of the new right of way, creating a 550-foot clear-cut through the rural private landowner's property!

I have learned from BPA that the existing right of way along routes 9 and 25 was specifically planned and designed for expansion. I have been assured by BPA that there is enough room to add 500 kV lines and that no homes would be taken. I argue that using these routes would result in negligible land acquisition costs, lower environmental impact and less litigation costs. Maintenance costs would be reduced due to substantially less vulnerability to damage from weather (ice storms, wind storms, etc.) and wildfire compared to the heavily timbered portions of the easterly routes.

Here is a summary of my position:

- (a.) Using the existing right-of-way would be the least expensive option and therefore the best use of ratepayers' money and taxpayers' federal stimulus dollars loaned to BPA.
- (b.) There is minimal impact from adding capacity where towers and lines already exist. Owners along routes 9 and 25 bought these properties fully aware of the lines and towers along the EDGES of their land.
- (c.) Using the existing corridor would save rural landowners from a new 70-mile-long clear-cut bulldozed THROUGH their land, consuming an estimated 1300 acres for the corridor and access roads, compared to a few hundred square feet in four locations BPA may need to purchase on their right-of-way.
- (d.) The existing corridor has 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.

The existing corridor has a proven security history by virtue of the lines being located in a more urban environment where any suspicious activity has a high probability of being reported. In contrast, a 70-mile run of new lines through isolated and rural areas would create new opportunities for trespassing and vandalism.

I ask you assist me in my plea to BPA that they do not bisect any rural private landowner's properties with a new 70-mile-long clear-cut and access roads. I ask you to obtain assurance from BPA that they will use my ratepayer and taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new lines and towers in the safe, stable, and reliable corridor that was specifically designed for expansion many years ago, and which has been in use for 70 years, on routes 9 and 25.

Sincerely,

[signature]

[address]

Communication ID: 13669

Date Received: 3/27/2011

Name: DELRAE EGGLESTON

[Unique comments on form letter 13395]

Do not want in my area, too close to my home.

Communication ID: 13670

Date Received: 3/27/2011

Name: MARY ANNE GARCIA

[Unique comments on form letter 13395]

No Way!

Communication ID: 13671

Date Received: 3/27/2011

Name: RICHARD BRANTLEY

[Unique comments on form letter 13395]

These structures need to be located on the existing right of way which was expressly purchased - with ratepayers money - for this purpose!!

Thank you

Communication ID: 13672

Date Received: 3/27/2011

Name: SHAUNA WALTERS

[Unique comments from form letter 13395]

Route 26

Please don't destroy our land!

Communication ID: 13673

Date Received: 4/21/2011

Name: CYNTHIA J BOUCHER

[Unique comments from form letter 13667]

It is significant to note that use of the existing right-of-way along routes 9 and 25 was specifically planned and designed for expansion.

Communication ID: 13674

Date Received: 4/24/2011

Name: APRIL L MINISTER

[Unique comment on form letter 13667]

Protect our way of life. BPA must use its right of way which was designed for this purpose. No eastern routes! Protect the environment and property rights! Save ratepayer money!

Communication ID: 13675

Date Received: 4/24/2011

Name: BOLTON C MINISTER

[Unique comments from form letter 13667]

The proposed "P" line adjacent to our property will destroy the buffers of a category 3 stream in direct violation of the State Forest Practices Act and other State and Federal environmental laws.

Communication ID: 13676

Date Received: 7/10/2011

Name: CR KASER

[Unique comments from form letter 13667]

Do the right thing!

Communication ID: 13677

Date Received: 4/23/2011

Name: GUY BERNOVICH

[Unique comments from form letter 13667]

It will cost millions less to build along 9 & 25!

Communication ID: 13678

Date Received: 7/9/2011

Name: JOHN RAVEN

[Unique comments from form letter 13667]

Do not want here!

Communication ID: 13679

Date Received: 4/21/2011

Name: LOIS J NEUMAN

[Unique comments from form letter 13667]

Private land destruction is not ok. BPA must find a better way.

Communication ID: 13680

Date Received: 4/24/2011

Name: LOLA MINISTER

[Unique comments from form letter 13667]

Please choose lines 9 and 25. This is the best for our environment and also better use of taxpayers' money!

Communication ID: 13681

Date Received: 4/24/2011

Name: MELISSA BERNOVICH

[Unique comments from communication 13667]

Protect our environment and property rights! No eastern routes! Save rate payer money!

Communication ID: 13682

Date Received: 7/9/2011

Name: PETER MELVOIN

[Unique comments from form letter 13667]

Do the right thing!

Communication ID: 13683

Date Received: 8/3/2011

Name: CANDICE D ANDERSON

My property is on line 26. If chosen, the lines will be visible from my property. This will push my property value down even further. My neighbors will lose a significant portion of their land to you. Many trees will be lost. Please use your existing right of way and do not steal land from the private land owners, put acres and acres of land, thousands of animals, and native plants and streams at risk.

Communication ID: 13684

Date Received: 8/3/2011

Name: BHRIGHA REBECCA L GETZ

Use your own land and release all the private landowners you are holding hostage in this fiasco ASAP! BPA's existing right-of-way of routes 9 and 25: BPA owns the land and the rights to build on the land. BPA needs less than 9 acres along the edges of forested and agricultural lands. No land will be taken from any neighborhood. A New Rural Corridor: There would be more than 1,300 acres taken, bulldozing through private properties, bisecting and quartering private properties, taking away private property and property rights from the rural landowner. This is just wrong. BPA - Your currently-owned right of way is the right way!

Communication ID: 13685

Date Received: 8/3/2011

Name: ERNA SARASOHN

I would like to submit this link as a public comment so it will be addressed in the DEIS.

<http://news.yahoo.com/magnetic-field-exposure-linked-asthma-risk-225815780.html>

Communication ID: 13686

Date Received: 8/3/2011

Name: LARS L LINDBERG

To whom it may concern, When did this great nations common sense go out the window? I have yet to read any reasoning compelling enough to put Homeowners through this trauma. Please cast a vote if your sincerity is worth anything and hear the voices. A. Would the common citizen be willing to spend more tax dollars to send the route east? B.Does the common citizen wish the new lines stay in existing owned BPA right of ways? I personally would rather pay you people the atrocious amount of money we are about to spend on legal fees to prevent you from destroying our estate. L.L.Lindberg

Communication ID: 13687

Date Received: 8/4/2011

Name: PATRICIA LEE WITTER

As a small forest landowner, I have observed some 60 years of a power company's struggle with nature and with the surrounding tree farming operation which a powerline creates when it cuts through deep forest. I've seen this because PacifiCorp's Yale Merwin transmission line cuts across my timber tree farm. PacifiCorp and I have constant difficulties regarding access road issues, vegetation control practices, control of vandalism, erosion on steep slopes, danger trees and other problems caused by their powerline corridor. Now, in Dole Valley, the BPA Line O proposal would cut through even steeper, less suitable, more inaccessible terrain in order to create a brand new corridor----when BPA already owns an existing corridor near I-5. As the nation starts to try to dig its way out of annual deficits and mounting debt, one way to save taxpayer money is to NOT cut new powerline corridors through remote heavily forested terrain where not only is the initial cost higher but the questions of security, forest fire potential and vandalism are harder and more expensive to control. Using the existing BPA corridor along I-5 makes better economic sense.

Communication ID: 13688

Date Received: 8/4/2011

Name: LESLIE M LOUNSBERRY-BRADY

I am a third generation family tree farmer who is utterly heartbroken that BPA wants to put it's power lines through my property. Between my brother and myself, 3/4 of a mile x the 550 feet that line o wants to destroy, that's 50 acres lost right in the middle of our property. It would go through our best timber, our young trees that have been so hard to get above the deer, and many sizes in between, the best view, down a steep slope to fall right in to King Creek, from both sides. All of this would then be sprayed with herbicides and pesticides very close to agent orange from Viet Nam ("oh yes, it's safe" HA!)This would all flow in to King Creek, then in to the Lewis river, then in to the Columbian, then in to the ocean. When asked what tree farmers can farm insted of timber on their taken land, Mark Korsness (BPA's project manager) said "I never thought about it, no one has ever asked me that question before". I suggest BPA thinks about it now. How can BPA think about going through so many farms without thinking about how the farmers can survive? AND everyone downstream from this horror? All farmers speak up!

Communication ID: 13689

Date Received: 8/4/2011

Name: MICKEY LEE OJA,DEBORAH OJA

Our property is [address] Please use your existing right-of-way of routes 9 and 25: You own the land and the rights to build on the land. Stay off our land!

Communication ID: 13690

Date Received: 8/5/2011

Name: DANIEL C FLEGEL

I appreciate the fact that you folks even got back to me in regards to my question. It's been several months has it not? I will tell you that if in fact you people do want and accept line 9 and other easements you currently own, probably all "hell" will break out!!! A good example follows what the tea baggers in congress are attempting to do at this time. I hope your choice reflects what is best for everyone vs. what you believe is the CHEAPEST alternative. It will not work, thus do the high forest alternative, as Weyco/Fibre and other's are chopping at the bit to sell you their forest land for the new line. GO FIGURE WILL YOU ?!!! Flegel

Communication ID: 13691

Date Received: 8/5/2011

Name: MICKEY LEE OJA,DEBORAH OJA

Mr Steven Wright Our property is [address] Do not take our home & property. We could never rebuild what we currently have. Please do not destroy our lives. Mick & Debbie Oja

Communication ID: 13692

Date Received: 7/30/2011

Name: CLARK COUNTY FARM FORESTRY ASSOCIATION ,COWLITZ COUNTY FARM FORESTRY ASSOCIATION ,KENNETH EDWARDS,RONALD P PURSLEY,ROBERT J ZUMSTEIN

July 30, 2011

I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

PO Box 9250

Portland, OR 97207

Dear Sir or Madam:

Tree farmers from Clark and Cowlitz counties formed a task force in March 2011 to develop the following guidelines as considerations for determining the value of tree farm land and timber in western Washington that is impacted by a high voltage powerline. Tree farming families often have had this land for multiple generations. They preserve the land for animal and plant habitat, as well as improving water, air quality, and carbon sequestering, and rely on the timber revenue to support their families. The negative effects of a high voltage powerline on tree farming activities needs to be given serious deliberation by Bonneville Power Administration.

We respectfully submit these guidelines for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Robert Zumstein
Task Force Chairman

Ken Edwards
President, Clark County Farm Forestry Association

Ron Pursley
President, Cowlitz Farm Forestry Association

Considerations for Valuing Timber Land Taken for Powerline

Right-of-Way

1. Initial Requirements:

- a. Pay for the bare land value - independent appraisal based for highest and best use. Land varies by soil productivity (site class), slope/aspect, annual precipitation, location from populated areas, etc.
- b. Pay for younger trees based on present worth of value at maturity (forester's appraisal).
- c. For mature timber pay based on the cruised value. Give at least one year notice so the landowner can log instead if they wish.
- d. Build and maintain roads to DNR standards so trucks and equipment can use them. If the DNR rules change, BPA needs to follow the new rules.
- e. Clearly mark the edges of the right-of-way.

Ongoing Requirements:

2. Lease option, if not sold for highest and best use. Pay an annual lease payment for the lost opportunity to grow timber. This would be on a per acre basis and based on the average growth rate of 700 bf/acre/year with a stumpage value of \$500/Mbf. This would be \$350/acre/year initially and would be adjusted for inflation based on the producer price index. The above is an example actual numbers are specific for each site in consultation with a forester.

Note: There are significant differences between the small timber owner and state or federal land and the large industrial timber owner regarding the value of timber. Thus, values from state, federal, or large industrial timber owners are not useful in valuing the timber for small timber owners. Two primary differences are that small timber owners may wait until the market price is attractive and may export their wood. However, the growth rate will be site and specie specific.

3. A number of other issues surface with power lines generally involving trespass. The BPA needs to put in adequate gates (refer to BPA documents on stockyard gates; this is a starting point depending upon trespass issues) and maintain them, let it be generally known that this is private land and trespassers will

be prosecuted with the BPA paying these costs. Provide frequent signage indicating land is private and no trespassing allowed. A mutually agreed upon standard for managing and controlling the short and long-term impacts of unauthorized public use of the right-of-way needs to be determined.

4. There needs to be an agreed upon standard for roads including: inspection and maintenance schedules, reporting requirements, maintenance standards, and road construction, reconstruction, and abandonment standards as well as the cost sharing. Landslide potential for roads needs to be assessed. Road grades would vary depending on the land slide potential. Roads would be rocked where needed for dust abatement, stability, load bearing and seasons of use. BPA has road design sheets that may be used in conjunction with DNR standards for building and maintaining roads.

5. The Access Roads required for each Power Line Tower - from a public road to the tower - need special, individual contracts between the BPA and the private landowners. These roads may be for exclusive BPA use only, or they may shared with one or more landowners in a chain of land parcels. They may be shared with multiple ownerships on branched roads. Whatever the configuration of each road system, the specifics must be negotiated with all impacted owners. The issues include:

- Mutual planning and coordination of road use,
- Agreed-on responsibility for maintenance timing and quality control,
- Assessment of damages - man-made,
- Procedures for notifying all owners and users of road availability or blockage
- Procedures for coordinating security - policing security gates, multiple locks and keys among owners and users, between owners, contractors, subcontractors and regulatory personnel (refer to BPA road design spec).

6. BPA needs to prevent any spreading of weeds during construction and afterwards. BPA needs to comply with all noxious weeds rules county, state, and federal. The BPA integrated pest management plan should be approved by the landowner.

7. Native wildlife and plants needs to continue to have good habitat. Perhaps low growing shrubs could be placed by streams to maintain reasonable water temperatures. A plan for promoting the growth of low growing, native plants needs to be agreed upon.

8. The term of the lease should be for the life of the powerline.

9. The lease is for a single use by the BPA and not for any other utility.

10. Compensation needs to be made for any other land that is taken out of timber production or encumbered because the location of the powerline (i.e. causes land to be inoperable or increases harvest costs) or additional BPA roads - a severance right-of-way.

11. Even if the adjacent land is not within the powerline right-of-way, its value will be reduced and an evaluation of the just compensation is necessary.
 12. Any additional property taxes over the amount for timberland will be paid annually to the county by the BPA.
 13. The agreement needs to be signed "under threat of condemnation for the public good." Refer to IRS Publication 544 or an accountant for tax implications. Wording in our agreements "lawfully seized and possessed of the lands and premises aforesaid,"
 14. BPA's contractor assumes all risks of damage to the property or injury to the contractor in connection with construction and maintenance of the powerline. Landowner will not be liable for any claims.
 15. Fire protection will be provided by the contractor during construction and construction will be suspended, if considered necessary. The landowner and BPA will determine a mutually agreeable fire prevention and suppression plan for both the construction phase and the operation and maintenance of the BPA powerline.
 16. Any damage to agricultural land (fences, crops, irrigation) during construction, reconstruction, or maintenance of the lines shall be repaired or paid for by BPA.
 17. BPA needs to notify the landowner, whenever they will be coming on your land for maintenance. Agreement on the notification protocols for maintenance, repair and reconstruction activities.
 18. The owner and successors have the right to use the land for all purposes not inconsistent with the BPA's use. The owner has the right to freely cross and if possible, use the land for normal agricultural purposes. The owner may access timber on both sides of the powerline, pull logs underneath and use the roads to haul logs.
 19. If danger trees were removed outside of the right-of-way to protect transmission lines or the towers the landowner must be reimbursed for the trees based on their present worth of value at maturity.
 20. The value of the land for future purposes is being lost. Some examples are hunting leases, recreational uses, and carbon credits.
 21. Any construction permit with the BPA or its contractor needs to also include items listed in this outline such as use of roads, access, maintenance rock, pay for damages, and cash deposit. You don't need to accept their proposed construction permit.
-

Communication ID: 13693

Date Received: 8/9/2011

Name: MARSHALL L PILE

I already have Transmission Lines in my Face everyday that are too close to my Family. Use any other route except the West line please. We face the health risks enough with these lines toooo close to our house. More power, means more health concerns.

Communication ID: 13694

Date Received: 8/10/2011

Name: MARSHALL L PILE,CHRISTINA PILE

August 10, 2011

Dear Mark,

We are writing to vehemently oppose building a new transmission line and associated substations along the existing BPA transmission lines of Segments 9 and 25. We are deeply concerned about the potential exposure to EMF radiation as well as the inherent buzzing noise associated with the new transmission lines. It can be argued back and forth the long term effects of EMF radiation but unless the BPA can 100% guarantee that there are no possible side effects, this proposal puts hundreds of families in harm's way. Although building the new transmission lines along the existing lines is probably more economically feasible, the potential health problems far outweigh the financial savings of this project. It would make much more sense to build the lines further east where the population is less dense.

Another great concern of ours is the lower property value that is inevitable if the new transmission lines are built along the existing lines of Segments 9 and 25. We feel that we are held hostage by the BPA. People cannot sell their homes now without disclosing the possible building of the new transmission lines. Hundreds of homes currently exist next to the 230KV power lines with a greenbelt as a barrier. If the proposed 500KV towers are built next to the 230KV lines, the greenbelts will be cut down and people will be forced to look at the massive towers, which can be built as close as 75 feet from their homes. Who will want to buy a home that borders the towers? How many tens of thousands of dollars would our property values decrease? In addition, many people could not sell their homes unless it was a cash buyer because the property would be appraised below either an outstanding mortgage or what the property is actually worth.

Property values will definitely be affected, possibly by as much as \$100,000 per household. That also means that homeowners will demand for new home assessments. The reduction in property tax revenue will affect needed funds for schools, libraries, fire districts and the county, including road funds.

The BPA proposed route of 9 and 25 needs to be stopped before it is started. We plead with you to put pressure on the BPA to build the transmission lines further east in less populated areas. Thank you for your consideration.

Our home is actually next to the existing smaller line, this in itself is a Health risk to us. The new more powerful lines will be closer and only increase our Health risks as we get older.

Sincerely, Marshall & Christina Pile, [address]

Communication ID: 13695

Date Received: 8/10/2011

Name: MARSHALL L PILE,CHRISTINA PILE

Mark, Thanks for the response. M&C Pile

"Our house is protected by the good Lord and a gun, you might meet em both if you come unwelcomed"

Communication ID: 13696

Date Received: 8/12/2011

Name: BEVERLY G TURNER

WE HAVE WITNESSED A HUGE AMOUNT OF GROWTH IN CLARK COUNTY OVER THE PAST 50 YEARS.RURAL OPEN SPACES HAVE DECREASED SIGNIFICANTLY. WE DO NOT NEED TO LOSE MORE LAND TO A NEW CORRIDOR WHEN THE EXISTING CORRIDOR COULD BE USED. USING THE EXISTING CORRIDOR SAVES LAND AND RATEPAYER DOLLARS. THE PROPOSED ROUTE SEGMENT"V" CROSSES THE EAST FORK OF THE LEWIS RIVER AND CUTS THROUGH HUNDREDS OF ACRES FOREST AND WETLANDS. THIS WOULD BE HUGELY DISTURBING TO THE ECOSYSTEM.

Communication ID: 13697

Date Received: 8/12/2011

Name: ANOTHER WAY BPA ,CITIZENS AGAINST THE TOWERS ,ERNA SARASOHN

Mr Steven Wright. Administrator

Bonneville Power Administration

We have been told the DEIS will be released by BPA about December 20, 2011 and the public will have as few as 40 days to respond. December is the time of the year for families so people will not have time to read through their areas of concern, sorting through thousands of pages in the DEIS and respond in a timely manner. Their families, and rightly so, will be a priority during the holidays.

The people are requesting that you release the DEIS January 9, 2012 which will allow the citizens the time to properly respond to the DEIS.

Thank you for your consideration.

Erna Sarasohn

Citizens Against the Towers

Another Way BPA

Communication ID: 13698

Date Received: 8/16/2011

Name: ARDELLE M STEIN,DENNIS M STEIN

Will BPA strike the final death blow

Will BPA strike the final death blow to your financial life? Recently we got another big hit from the Cowlitz County assessors office. We received a new hefty reduction in our assessed values. Good news for BPA as their easement procurement gets cheaper and cheaper and homeowners suffer more. Will BPA pay us near nothing for their easements and our homes if taken, while thousands struggle to stay above financial flood waters? Will the final nail in your financial coffin be hammered in by the "good old boys " at BPA as your property values plummet further should you be on the "chosen" line.

How dare they even think of putting our neighborhoods, valleys and communities in this quagmire, when all the while there have been and continue to be options impacting virtually no private homes, or citizen's properties. Up to now all our requests to at least just study those options have been rebuffed.

BPA needs to back up and reconsider just what they are asking the citizenry to accept, especially in this economic climate. They need to practice due diligence, stop breaking or ignoring NEPA rules and regulations and respect the citizen's will. Our demands have fallen on deaf ears. We want them to respect our community input and work with us. Their leadership seems to be a direct reflection of the soft, weak leadership we see coming out of the other Washington, just totally out of touch with the average citizen.

Dennis Stein

[address]

[phone]

Communication ID: 13699

Date Received: 8/17/2011

Name: ERNA SARASOHN

REFLECTOR POLL RESULTS

Poll conducted August 2 – 9, 2011

Shown below are the results of a poll done by The Reflector, an excellent weekly newspaper that serves Vancouver, Battle Ground, Ridgefield, La Center, Amboy, Yacolt, Woodland, Brush Prairie, Ariel, Cougar and Heisson. By an overwhelming margin the readers preferred an uninhabited route.

Online Poll

Which BPA decision, regarding the installation of new power lines, would best serve our communities and ratepayers?

Use only uninhabited areas – 354 votes (68%)

Use the current BPA right-of-ways – 140 votes (26%)

Use lightly inhabited rural areas – 3 votes (3%)

Delay the project by improving conservation efforts – 19 votes (4%)

The Poll is not scientific and run by the Reflector as a fun way to have the community participate.

Clearly this poll does reflect what the majority of the people feel is best.

The actual number of votes were supplied directly from the Reflector.

TAKE THE BEAST EAST!!!

Communication ID: 13700

Date Received: 8/8/2011

Name: ANOTHER WAY BPA ,CITIZENS AGAINST THE TOWERS ,YALE VALLEY COALITION ,JUDITH IBBS,ARDELLE M STEIN

BPA transmission lines should “get out of town”

Remember the old westerns where Clint Eastwood and the like would tell the bad guys to “get out of town?” Well, that is just what the BPA should do. Another Way, Citizens Against the Towers and Yale Valley Coalition have been telling BPA for months to “get out of Dodge.” Again today, there were two more letters in the papers telling the BPA to take the high road east--way east. What is it that BPA does not understand with the constant barrage of phone calls, emails and letters to the editor and the outright vocal opposition from the citizenry in both counties? Whatever happened to “by the people, of the people and for the people?” BPA--serve us, don't ignore us. TAKE THE BEAST EAST!

Judith Ibbs

Yale Valley Coalition

Ariel

Communication ID: 13701

Date Received: 8/8/2011

Name: ARDELLE M STEIN,CHRISTOPHER I WEINGARTNER TRUSTEE

BPA appears to take the position that since they have an existing right-of-way they can do anything on it with impunity, no matter how it affects the community. When BPA was granted the right-of-way in the late 1930's, a power line of the size now being considered wasn't envisioned in Clark and Cowlitz Counties. These Counties were sparsely populated.

The new line is a game changer in physical size (fifteen stories high), power, voltage, radiation, etc. The present line is much smaller in every way. It is farther away behind a treed buffer area and out of sight and mind. To accommodate the new line, the trees will be removed and this monstrosity will butt right up to the property lines of homes, sometimes within 30 feet of the house itself.

BPA claims it has no intention of compensating property owners for the loss of property value because "it is just aesthetics, and a price can't be put on aesthetics," therefore the property value is not lowered. Ask anyone with experience and or training in property valuation (which I have) and they will refute this. Property values are lowered, period.

What BPA is doing is transferring the true cost of the line to Clark and Cowlitz County residents so they can save a minuscule amount of money per kilowatt sold over the life of the line. The BPA should put the line to the east of town in the forested area away from the populated areas of Clark and Cowlitz Counties! Do the right thing! Don't shift the true costs to us!

Christopher Weingartner

Salmon Creek

Communication ID: 13702

Date Received: 8/8/2011

Name: YALE VALLEY COALITION ,ARDELLE M STEIN

BPA decision could worsen affects of down economy

BPA shouldn't destroy what's left. Everyone is hurting in this economy. Don't destroy what we have left of our financial lives, investments, retirements, property values and lifestyles. We can't even sell our properties if we wanted to escape this impending nightmare. Who is going to remodel, build or invest further in properties that may be condemned or rendered wholly undesirable?

My husband and I were planning to invest in a minimum of three more new homes on our 50 acres, but all that is on hold now. We want to sell some of our houses and retire, but we can't. What about the retired on fixed incomes? What about the folks who lost their jobs, but have been able to find work elsewhere? They can't pursue it because they can't sell their homes. Who will buy a home under these conditions? Only scavengers looking to pick clean the bones of our economic desperate. I hope everyone will join those of us from the Yale Valley who want to see this truly go farther east through unpopulated areas. BPA has not practiced due diligence with the grey line. They need to reexamine it and do a real study. Then BPA should TAKE THE BEAST EAST!

Ardie Stein Yale Valley Coalition

Communication ID: 13703

Date Received: 8/8/2011

Name: KATHRYN A C HUFFMAN,ARDELLE M STEIN

Only unpopulated options should be considered by the BPA

I am writing to express my concern and opposition to the BPA proposed routes for building high voltage lines and towers in populated areas. I live in the beautiful Yale Valley, which is situated between the Merwin and Yale lakes. One of the currently proposed lines (The East Alternative) would go right through our valley and many of our properties. Contrary to what some may think we don't have one residence every 5 or 10 miles up here. Our approximately 7-8 mile long Yale Valley is home to 300-400 residents.

These high voltage lines would cause economic hardship and possible physical problems for many, just in this small area. When we multiply this by the many people who would be impacted by the whole East Alternative route, it is simply unacceptable to consider building this line. Actually, this route (East Alternative route) was moved east last year so it would not impact so many people. But it was certainly not moved far enough east! It now just impacts a different group of people.

Another route has been proposed, called the Gray Line, which would be an acceptable route through unpopulated DNR and corporate held lands. This is the only proposed route which is acceptable to us. I recently received the latest project update report from BPA. It stated that BPA is studying four alternative proposed lines to develop the draft environmental impact statement for this project (EIS). I am greatly disturbed that the Gray Line farther east proposed line) is not one of the alternative lines being studied. This is simply unacceptable. The Gray Line must be included in the study, as an alternative that is totally in unpopulated areas. Building the Gray Line farther east might be slightly more costly, but is just a drop in the bucket compared to how much financial profit BPA will make over the years from the sale of electricity over this line. TAKE THE BEAST EAST!

Kathy Huffman Yale Valley

Communication ID: 13704

Date Received: 8/8/2011

Name: YALE VALLEY COALITION ,ARDELLE M STEIN

BPA should follow admonitions of public representatives

"BPA must take the concerns of local residents seriously as it moves forward," said Senator Murray. "That's why I've continued to push Mr. Wright to engage local communities and to take into

consideration how these transmission lines will impact Southwestern Washington.” Senator Patty Murray Sept 2010

“BPA has not satisfactorily explained why its suggested routes make the most sense. I believe all available options should be explored in an attempt to limit impact to residents of Clark and Cowlitz counties, including options that would enable BPA to work with the State Department of Natural Resources.” Representative Jaimie Herrera Beutler May 2011

“The county has suggested that BPA design and conduct a more complete public involvement effort. The County has also urged BPA to form a BPA Citizen Advisory Committee in order to be fully informed and to provide input. This would allow immediate dissemination of definitive information on the project.” Cowlitz County Board of Commissioners. May 2011

So has the BPA followed the guidelines, dictates and admonitions of any of our public representatives? Have they considered the citizens will as required by the National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA)? “The public has an important role in the NEPA process, particularly during scoping, in providing input on what issues should be addressed in an EIS and in commenting on the findings in an agency’s NEPA documents. The lead agency must take into consideration all comments received from the public and other parties on NEPA documents during the comment.”

Have they heard our voices? As of yet there is no sign of a citizen advisory committee. Again regarding the citizen’s will, it should be obvious that none of the proposed lines goes unopposed and the Grey Line proposal is a win-win for all. There are high expectations for BPA and we hope they are listening closely. We are. Now we are asking all citizens to demand that BPA practice due diligence, do a thorough unbiased study of the Grey Line and come back to us with transparency and true costs, which should make it clear the Grey Line may be very feasible.

We say “no lines in populated areas”. What does that drive? It drives the line right out to the timberlands. Engineers have told us early on it is not only feasible, but a relatively simple application and the best alternative and minimal population impact, Three to five homes can easily be mitigated or avoided completely with a little bit of clever engineering.

We say TAKE THE BEAST EAST and stop the agony.

Ardie Stein Yale Valley Coalition

Communication ID: 13705

Date Received: 8/8/2011

Name: ERNA SARASOHN,ARDELLE M STEIN

Cost of electricity not strong argument in selecting BPA route

I recently read a Letter to the Editor stating, “You will see that increase in your electricity bill” if BPA builds the 15-story towers and high voltage lines in the forested area. These are the facts provided by

Clark Public Utilities--"It would take an increase in Clark PUD costs of \$3,800,000 to require a 1 percent increase in electricity rates." "The costs that BPA would incur for the construction of transmission lines would be recovered from all its transmission customers" (not just SW Washington). "It would take more than a 20 percent increase in BPA transmission costs to Clark PUD to cause a 1 percent rate increase." Only 4.3 percent of our electricity bill represents transmission costs, so the public would receive a maximum increase of 1 percent on 4.3 percent of their bill. Clark PUD tells us the increase in our monthly bill will be less than one penny per month. Since BPA spends \$850 million a year every single year protecting fish and wildlife, spending a few dollars more, one time only, to protect the people, their health, property values and the aesthetics of our communities and properties is the right thing for BPA to do. Build the lines where people do not live.

Erna Sarasohn Vancouver

Communication ID: 13706

Date Received: 8/8/2011

Name: GEORGE T DILL,ARDELLE M STEIN

BPA's Iron Curtain

Brace yourself. This article uses some examples from foreign countries. Not to be unpatriotic, but the USA already has foreign sources for over 90% of our household consumables. It is hard to admit that someone else has a better idea, not just lower cost, but in attractiveness and functional design. BPA shows a backward facing, closed outlook on design and placement of high voltage lines. In BPA open houses held recently, citizens requested a study with results concerning buried power lines. So far BPA has rejected the idea with no written explanation.

Instead BPA publishes many online comments which appear to be "frosting." A company based in New England, American Superconductor, offers underground "Power Pipelines." Why won't they work here? (Answer please, BPA.) If above ground towers are to be used, why must they resemble menacing structures out of the "apocalypse?" In Holland and Finland utility companies have developed "graceful" towers which also reduce EMF (health concern). Can't we import these designs like the other 90% of our goods? See TenneT on line. (Answer please, BPA.).

Last year this writer tried to contact DOE (Department of Energy, Wash. D.C.) which operates BPA, along with numerous subsidiary organizations. That letter was returned to the Portland-based BPA office who then answered for the DOE. The the messages of the local open houses. Dr. Chu, head of DOE, just guaranteed a loan for high voltage towers across Nevada, so I know he's alive and well. I bet the towers are not a new, improved version. DOE/BPA shows classic signs of monopoly. An open market would not accept a product which has no appeal and degrades the landscape and homesite values.

George Dill Battle Ground

Communication ID: 13707

Date Received: 8/8/2011

Name: JUDITH IBBS,ARDELLE M STEIN

Oregon power/Oregon grid

You may be aware of the wireless approach to the 1-5 power grid project. Very basically this means BPA has hired a company to analyze the possibility of managing power consumption differently, in an attempt to reduce the demand and thereby possibly delay the need for a new grid as far out as five years or more. In the meantime, they could come up with other strategies, or define new technology to negate the effects.

We have been told by BPA that Washington State will only consume 25 percent of the power. If they can delay the entire project for several years through new usage practices, why couldn't Washington state easily and readily use these same practices to negate a measly 25 percent permanently. Then we give the rest of the mess back to Oregon where it really belongs, since they will be the heaviest consumers of power generated. Let them deal with California and any other designate state that wants to buy power. Let's put those lines in the state that will really benefit from the grid. Oregon power/ Oregon grid.

Judith Ibbs Yale Valley

Communication ID: 13708

Date Received: 8/8/2011

Name: ARDELLE M STEIN,DENNIS M STEIN

A recent letter from a Better Way representative suggested the grey line would cost millions extra for construction and environmental remediation. I would like to see where her figures came from, or is this just an assumption? How can she even make that claim as BPA has yet to actually study the grey line? Later she states that BPA should go underground in places in their right-of-way. Steven Wright and everyone from BPA have been telling us from the early meetings that going underground is many times the cost. How would that be fiscally responsible as she suggested?

The suggestion that anyone knew there was a right-of-way and should have been prepared or this is ludicrous. I have lived here in the Yale Valley for almost 40 years and have the local power line running right through my 50 acres. Never in a million years did I think I might have the giant lines proposed by BPA stomping across that easement.

She states that EMF does not cause cancers or other health issues. The actual facts are, they haven't proven it one way or the other. Experts suggest when in doubt, children, especially young children, should avoid exposure. Shouldn't we err on the side of safety? And what about the assumption that a terrorist attack would be more likely further from town? Wouldn't terrorists be most likely to hit a double set of lines in a populated area, where the havoc and damages would be much greater?

Better Way is the only group left opposing the grey line and proposing the right-of-way. I hope they will see the futility in this and join us to demand that BPA get off our collective backs and out of our collective back yards and TAKE THE BEAST EAST!

Dennis Stein Yale Valley

Communication ID: 13709

Date Received: 8/8/2011

Name: JUDITH IBBS,ARDELLE M STEIN

BPA project all about California's need

We, the residents of SW Washington recognize the smoke and mirrors with BPA's pretense of 'transparency' and 'regional responsiveness'. Despite pro and con, the need is California's; being met by marketers trading Canadian and NW power through BPA's system. BPA's lawyer, testifying before the California Public Utilities Commission, stated it would be very difficult to build new lines in areas where the citizens see no direct benefit. We know full well that this line would provide no direct benefit to us.

We know BPA hopes to gain political capital with a meaningless non-wires study, with ideas like building generators south of Portland, importing power from California during the summer or games with dispatch and curtailments while they continue on with their misconceived plan. The E3 report is double-speak. Non-wires may be possible, but plan for wires.

Sufficient doubt has been cast on the justification for this boondoggle. We expect BPA to comply with a simple regional demand, "no lines in populated areas." Put them far east in timberlands or west in Oregon where they really belong. We refuse to let you put Canadian and corporate interests over our interests.

Judith Ibbs Ariel, WA

Communication ID: 13710

Date Received: 8/8/2011

Name: ANOTHER WAY BPA ,CITIZENS AGAINST THE TOWERS ,YALE VALLEY COALITION ,ARDELLE M STEIN

Human and environmental protection should be BPA priority

A huge amount of information has been delivered to the public this last year by county commissioners, state representatives, senators and citizen groups about the BPA I-5 corridor project. Another way BPA and associate groups- -Citizens Against The Towers and the Yale Valley Coalition would like to clear the air on some of these issues. Our groups have and always will promote a more easterly route through the timberlands, meaning Weyerhaeuser, Longview Fibre, DNR and PacifiCorp. The grey-line is not a currently proposed line, but a suggested timberland route. Our groups created this suggested swath and we have

never suggested that any line go anywhere populated, urban or rural.(See No Way BPA website/meeting 7/27/10). “No lines in populated areas” is our mantra.

Our groups believe EMF is and will always be suspect as long as you can walk under the lines with a fluorescent shop light in your hand and have it light up. See youtube.com/watch?v=OzGnfl Cc7m. Yes, it is possible to find scientists on both sides, but there is no absolute science on this issue. In other states they err on the side of safety, especially for children and schools, by having a 350 foot setback.

All the political and environmental groups involved have suggested common ground regarding BPA’s proposals. We offer that common ground should be based first on the protection of lives, health, school environment, homes, properties and their values. While we feel these things should be paramount, we also have our concerns for environmental factors including water, plants and wildlife. The grey-line, while supporting the human factor, would have little impact on the natural environment. Even with the Spotted Owl in the general area along the suggested swath, there is plenty of timber to mitigate the impact. The swath will be only 150 foot wide and easily mitigated, while maintaining a 70 acre circle around a nesting site.

A group asking us to find common ground approached us, but they offered only generalities and did not address the human environment as first priority. That is our core concept, so we found it impossible to find common ground. Since last year, they dropped their original mantra “no lines in populated areas”, changed their position on EMF and dropped their original support of an easterly timberlands route. They seem to have trouble finding steady ground and principles, let alone common ground. Our groups on the other hand choose to try and protect everyone, even them.

Ardie Stein

Yale Valley Coalition

Communication ID: 13711

Date Received: 8/8/2011

Name: WILLIAM A NELSON

BPA lines should be erected in unpopulated area

Ms. Cheryl Brantley continues to post letters asking the BPA to stay away from her country property with any new electrical transmission lines. She evidently doesn’t get into town much as she doesn’t think many folks will be affected by constructing the towers in populated areas.

Her latest brilliant insight suggests that since the BPA planned 70 years ago for future expansion along the original corridor, they should obviously go right ahead and build there. Somehow, I don’t believe that BPA knew 70 years ago that there would be 10,000 people living along that corridor and that nearly all would object to having 15-story towers in their back yards.

Get with the program Ms. Brantley and join with the vast number of people asking the BPA to build the new line away from populated areas.

Bill Nelson Vancouver

Communication ID: 13712

Date Received: 8/8/2011

Name: MARGARET STAPENHORST TRUSTEE,ARDELLE M STEIN

BPA's use of current easement would affect tens of thousands

In response to Patti Olson of Ariel "BPA eastern route infringes...", there are no anti-BPA power line groups. The groups involved in the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project are doing their best to ensure that Bonneville Power executes a responsible plan impacting the least amount of residents. The eastern route is not a 'pet project' but seems to offer a reasonable solution. The eastern route is less populated than lines #9 and #25 which run through the heart of Clark County

Residents along routes 9 and 25 were aware of the BPA easement, but it's not just the folks immediately next to the lines who would be adversely affected. BPA is only required to notify property owners within so many feet of their right of way. For example, in my neighborhood, 35 out of 144 homeowners were notified of the new lines. Yet, we would all see the 15 story towers every day and suffer from decreased property values and health concerns. This scenario would be repeated all along the 70 miles of the existing lines so you can see that tens of thousands of people will actually be impacted. We should look forward and not try to squeeze future power needs onto an existing 40+year old easement or we will be revisiting this issue in the near future.

Margaret Stapenhorst Vancouver

Communication ID: 13713

Date Received: 8/8/2011

Name: WILLIAM HANLEY,ARDELLE M STEIN

BPA should utilize federal and state land--without delay

I wish to express my opinion in regards to the BPA I-5 Corridor Project. I have read the recent articles in The Columbian, The Reflector and The Daily News that the BPA might delay planned power line five+ years beyond the 2015 target date. It seems that this is another sly delay tactic from the BPA to unload more grief, harassment and anxiety on thousands of residents in Clark and Cowlitz Counties.

I have written many letters to my congressional representatives-- both state and federal. Only Senator Patty Murray has come forth asking the BPA staff to investigate other routes over nonpopulated areas.

Also, many thanks to our County Commissioners for taking a strong stand in favor of routing towers and wires over non-populated areas, as well as to our City Council of Vancouver.

Many residents have already expressed concerns regarding the health hazards of these 500 kv wires, lower home values, security issues and less revenue to our schools. Yes, I know that all this additional electrical energy is slated for Oregon, California and Canada and everyone knows that Clark County does not need this extra electrical power. I will not elaborate any further on these concerns. Enough has been said.

Apparently BPA still does not get it. Why anyone would even consider these ridiculous looking 15 story towers strung across Clark and Cowlitz Counties and the problems it has already generated among the residents is beyond me—health hazards, decreased property values, environmental concerns, security and loss of school revenue.

I guess it comes down to \$\$\$\$\$. However, the BPA stated this project would cost in the neighborhood of \$340--\$360 million dollars. I thought the BPA received around \$3.4 billion from stimulus moneys. I'm sure the extra change should take care of unforeseen costs. Doug Johnson, BPA spokesman, stated in The Columbian, dated January 21, 2011 that "you want to look at everything you think is possible." I agree. However, I agree with Commissioner George Raiter that the BPA should have considered citizens advisory representatives to be included along with resurrecting the non-wires panel.

It seems that the citizens are always ignored when it comes down to a healthy and clean environmental way of living.

Wake up BPA. Take these towers/wires over non-populated areas--eastward--and utilize federal and state lands. There should be considerable savings. Quit delaying this project! Strong leadership and positive decision making should be applied for the betterment of all.

Bill Hanley

Vancouver

Communication ID: 13714

Date Received: 8/8/2011

Name: MARY J HARRIS,ARDELLE M STEIN

BetterWay4BPA Nimbyism

On Sat., Jan. 29, a group called A BetterWay4BPA held a meeting at Amboy Middle School to oppose the Bonneville Power Administration I-5 corridor project of running 500-kv power lines through the countryside of Southwest Washington. Rather, they would like to see the new 15 story towers and lines run through lines 9 and 25, which is the existing right of way.

Cheryl Brantley, a spokesperson for ABetterWay started the meeting saying that she is concerned about citizens in the rural area getting cancer by being exposed to the EMF's of the power lines. I am appalled that she has concern for her rural neighbors getting cancer but thinks it is okay for the thousands of people who live along the existing lines to be exposed to the harmful EMF's. She justified that argument by saying that the people who bought property along lines 9 and 25 already knew the visual, environmental and health impact associated with the lines.

Does that make it right to put thousands of people at risk by adding huge 15 story towers that are twice as powerful as the current ones? There are a number of schools that are close to the existing lines. Does she care about all the children that would be exposed? Nope, all she cares about is preserving the gorgeous rural countryside where she lives. I believe protecting human life is more precious than preserving salamanders in the forests.

Two other groups, Citizens Against the Towers and AnotherWay BPA, are opposed to building the new 500 KV towers and lines in all populated areas, including the proposed lines in Amboy and Yacolt. Another Way has come up with a new proposed line (called the Grey Line) which runs further north and east in unpopulated DNR forest land. It would impact virtually no property owners. The BPA is currently reviewing this option.

Sorry, Cheryl and Better-Way.your slogan "BPA, Your Right of Way is the Right Way" is not the answer. The answer is for the BPA to do the right thing, which is to construct the new towers and lines away from all populated areas.PERIOD.

Mary Harris

Vancouver

Communication ID: 13715

Date Received: 8/8/2011

Name: ARDELLE M STEIN,LYNN STIGLICH

Groups opposing BPA plan have strong support

Stop Towers Now and No Way BPA are two citizens groups opposing BPA's plans to erect new 500kV transmission lines through Clark and Cowlitz counties. Their message from the onset has been no new lines in populated areas. You might think these groups are a small minority with no real backing and few supporters, but you would be mistaken. A partial list of supporters in favor of locating new lines away from populated areas includes the Commissioners of Clark and Cowlitz counties, the City of Battle Ground, Senator Patty Murray, State Senators Don Benton, Joseph Zarelli and Craig Pridemore, State Reps Ed Orcutt and Jim Moeller, the Town of Yacolt, and Battle Ground and Hockinson school districts.

Additionally, many thousands of families opposed to the lines are busy working and raising their children. They have attended meetings, written letters and held signs. Given the concerns about health,

real estate values and safety, I'm not sure who would support the building of new lines close to schools, neighborhoods and privately owned land. Many folks have spoken up – let's hope BPA is hearing them.

Lynn Stiglich

Vancouver

Communication ID: 13716

Date Received: 8/8/2011

Name: ARDELLE M STEIN

Is everyone at BPA deaf ? They keep holding public meetings, private talks and you can be sure they are at all the public meetings the citizens hold, but to what avail. They feign interest in what we say. They ask for our input, but is anyone seriously listening? They take mail in comments and post them on their website (as required by NEPA). They give us those pre-constructed pat answers to all our questions, but never give us anything resolute or negotiable.

We have asked them time and time again to work with us on alternatives, to consider other ideas, to consider shortening instead of extending deadlines. We have pleaded with them to drop the tangle of unnecessary segments, alternatives and alternates they keep renaming. There are four major proposals with a gazillion little nonsensical probabilities, when there should only be two well defined proposals with limited segmentation. Who is running this? The guys from Maze.com? Here is the statement from their website called Get involved:

“Engaging the public and developing long-term relationships with communities are critical to the success of the Bonneville Power Administration. BPA invites your involvement on public process, programs and projects.” Give me a break!

BPA can't even seem to establish any respectful positive short term relationships, what to say of long term. The public has been fully engaged from day one, it is the BPA who will not engage us. Shame on them, talking out of both sides of their mouths as usual. If they want respect and engagement then reciprocate!

I recently ran in to one of our Cowlitz county commissioners. I ask him about the BPAs lack of consideration to the citizens will. He said good luck with that as they are not listening to ANYONE. The council has asked them twice now for some kind of citizens advisory board or commentary group, but were turned down flat. No discussion, no interest, no respect. If these were elected positions they would all be out on their butts by now!

Communication ID: 13717

Date Received: 8/10/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

Maryam,

I left a message with you today about the below questions. Would you please provide the answers for me?

Thank you.

Cheryl

1. De-rating versus Redundancy, what's the difference?
2. What changed from your first report to our communities that you couldn't use your existing corridor because you would need to "de-rate the lines" and you didn't want to "put all your eggs into one basket" to later saying you could use it and that it will remain in the study until a final route is chosen?
3. What's the approximate percentage of cost difference associated with building a new corridor as opposed to building along an existing corridor?

From BPA's Literature:

The five factors that BPA considered for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, and in any decision that BPA makes regarding the construction of new transmission lines, are based on the impacts on our business, our environment, our legal authority, our work force, and the impact on serving the public interest including any political concerns. BPA will attempt to achieve the following purposes:

1. Responsible and efficient use of ratepayer funds
 2. Minimize impacts to the natural and human environment
 3. Optimize transmission system performance
 4. Maintain BPA transmission system reliability through industry standards
 5. Meet BPA's statutory obligations set forth in the NW Power Act and the Federal Columbia River Transmission Act
4. When deciding a route for this project using the above factors, how much weight to you place on:
- a. Cost.
 - b. Political influences
 - c. Impact to private property owners by the taking of their land
 - d. Impact to people in general, even if they are not directly impacted by having land taken.
 - e. EMF
5. Where are buried 500 kV lines operating successfully in the United States?

6. Can Christmas trees be grown in this new 500 kV corridor?
7. Are all trees restricted from being grown in this new 500 kV corridor?
8. Has there ever been a tower collapse or line failure along the existing corridor, routes 9 and 25?
 - a. When and what caused it?
 - b. What was the length of time of power outage?
 - c. What was the Geographic extent of the power outage?
 - d. From Columbus Day Storm?
 - e. From Ice storms?
9. Are you planning to tear down and replace any towers along the existing ROW of routes 9 and 25?
10. What is the status of the conceptual further east route?

Cheryl Brantley

A Better Way for BPA

<http://abetterway4bpa.org>

“Every accomplishment starts with the decision to try.”

Communication ID: 13718

Date Received: 8/24/2011

Name: PERRY J CALABRESE

Thanks Cheri, I enjoyed reading that information.

Unfortunately, I enjoy AM, CB, and Ham radio - especially at night - listening to news reports from all over the world. I use a Panasonic multi band LW, AM, SW, CB radio receiver with external antenna - NOT GOOD near a 500kv line! My CB radio use is more than a hobby: we do not have reliable cell phone service (due to the existing 230kv and 115kv lines I was told) so in an emergency, the CB radio may be our only communication out of our home. Our property borders the 115kv line with little or no EMF or line noise on our property measured.

The magnetic effects would also interfere with my analog recording equipment. It's very important to keep recording heads free of magnetic fields or they become magnetized with reduced or impeded efficiency. I also have hundreds of vintage reel to reel tapes and cassettes that also must be free of stray magnetic fields. Any unshielded line connecting equipment would also be a problem. Unfortunately, vintage analog recording equipment does not use shielded lines. Noise is also a concern when making recordings (I'm a professional musician and teacher). We chose to live in our rural environment to avoid industrial noise (corona noise is classified as industrial) just for this purpose.

I was amused that the findings of this report were from samples taken in Kennewick Wa where it rarely has foggy or other types of Western Washington weather that increases EMF or EMI line noise! Western Washington results would be VASTLY different than the data presented in this report and I challenge the BPA to provide accurate information concerning Western Washington Residents.

Sincerely,

Perry Calabrese

[address]

Segment #2 500kv I-5 project

Communication ID: 13719

Date Received: 8/10/2011

Name: RAYMOND B RICHARDS

Bonneville Power Administration should use its own land, the existing right-of-way on routes 9 and 25, for its I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. This option is the least expensive, has the fewest adverse effects on waterways and wildlife, and impacts private property owners less than any of the alternatives.

Any of the proposed new routes would consume a new swath of land totaling 1300 acres; taking, bisecting and invading private property. Who would pay for this needless new corridor? Landowners and ratepayers!

BPA's proposed route segment "V" would cut through my family's property, crossing the East Fork of the Lewis River a few hundred feet downstream from our house, cutting through 200 acres of our forestland. This property is currently being managed for timber production. The effect of a new power line corridor would be to render some of our land unusable for this purpose. Our property is also legally segmented for potential home-sites which would be devalued by the invasion of a new corridor.

Any new crossing of the East Fork would cause environmental and scenic damage to Clark County's largest remaining free-flowing river. This portion of the river is preserved for wild fish. Bald eagles are seen flying up and down this river. There is a 101 foot riparian zone on both sides the river where no tree cutting is allowed. I am bound by and support this legal restriction. BPA, however, does not have to obey this state regulation and could clear-cut to the river's edge.

In contrast, siting the new lines on the existing corridor would have minimal impact on private property owners and the environment since BPA would be using its own land where lines and towers are already present.

When BPA makes its final decision it should choose its own land, the existing corridor --- the route that has been in use for seventy years. This choice will have negligible effect on private property owners, have minimal environmental impact and spend the least amount of ratepayer dollars.

Communication ID: 13720

Date Received: 8/29/2011

Name: ERNA SARASOHN

Maryam,

Please include this with the public comments and share with the EMF staff.

Thank you

Erna

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20843128>

The incidence increases by kV strength and 600 meter distance to transmission lines.

National Institute of Health article.

Communication ID: 13721

Date Received: 8/31/2011

Name: DESIREE DAMICO

Hi, this is Desiree Damico and I live at [address]. We're in the Green Meadows Golf Course neighborhood and we back up to a set of powerlines that are at issue. I was told back in the early summer that by August or September you would make another decision. Some of the environmental impact studies would be done. So I was wondering if you had any new information on which line you may be leaning toward or what you're looking at now. There is someone down the street from us who has just expanded their home and built all these extra rooms on and they're practically under the powerline towers so I'm thinking, do they know something we don't know? That maybe you're not interested in this line. So anyway, it would be nice to get some information back and see where we stand. Our home is for sale and you know of course we have to disclose everything and we're just wondering if I had some more information to tell people. Thank you. Again, it's [phone] and it's Desiree Damico. Thank you, bye.

Communication ID: 13722

Date Received: 9/1/2011

Name: ELIZABETH L HAMILTON

Yes, my name is Elizabeth L Hamilton. I live on [parcel 1], also [parcel 2]. These are both parcels that are tentative at least on your line 11. So I'm going to ask that you go with the West Alternative, which was 9 and 25, to avoid and reduce environmental damage. I would like to ask you on the second one would be

your East Alternative, which would be my second guess rather than my first. Your East Alternative using Weyerhaeuser line F, I, and K, and eliminate 11 and J. All these towers that I can see are not necessary, it'd be more in a straight line, and since you have already had Weyerhaeuser F, I, and K on one of your alternatives, that's a possibility. I'm wanting 11 eliminated and J because that's me. It would be my two parcels of land that would be chopped up and forever ruined. And I'd like you to go with your west alternative which is your original right-of-way that you already have, it already exists, and I'm sure lots of people have suggested that. I appreciate this opportunity to at least tell you how I feel about it and any further information that you might get- I would like to know what is going with non-wires, how that could be instilled and even if it means waiting a couple years to do that would be interesting to know more about it. I'd like to know more about your non-wires, your round table and some of your input on that. My address is [address]. Thank you very much for this time and I will hope that you don't need to chop up more land to acquire what you need, that you could go with your already existing land. Thank you very much, goodbye now.

Communication ID: 13723

Date Received: 9/3/2011

Name: JOHN L FOWLER IV

My only comment is to have you make your decision already. I have property that I would like to sell that is on one of the proposed segments. This property is adjacent to an already existing BPA power line in the Rose Valley area of Kelso, WA. I need to sell this property so my family and I can afford to buy a new house. We have outgrown our current house in Longview. I can't sell that property without knowing one way or the other if it is on the new right-of-way that will be created. My family's lives are on hold until you make your decision. So get on with it so the rest of us who have been put in limbo over this project can make plans for our future.

Communication ID: 13725

Date Received: 9/6/2011

Name: MICKEY LEE OJA,DEBORAH OJA

Please use your existing right of way & stay off our land. Thank you Mick & Debbie Oja

Communication ID: 13726

Date Received: 9/2/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

Hi Maryam,

Is your schedule still on point for releasing the DEIS in late fall?

What's the status of the grey line concept?

Thanks and hope you have a great holiday,

Cheryl

Cheryl Brantley

A Better Way for BPA

<http://abetterway4bpa.org>

Communication ID: 13727

Date Received: 9/7/2011

Name: TERRY L CONSTANCE

Maryam,

Attached is the version of the map that has the wider grey line alternate path.

Please continue to use the previous version for BPA discussion etc.

This version is a more undefined public version that will be in the fall newsletter.

We understand that anyone can request the other map but it will not matter to us.

We are officially requesting BPA remove all segments on the map of the I-5 corridor reinforcement proposal from consideration with the exception of the unpopulated grey line alternative displayed in the attached map.

In the event the grey line alternative path proves impossible for BPA to build within after a thorough study of the area is completed, we expect BPA to modify the lettered segment paths so as to not impact any homes in the associated communities and could support this as a second choice if these changes are made.

Below is a short summary of our meeting on 8-30-2011

Please add this to the record on this project.

Best,

Terry

Meeting location: [address]. August 30, 2011 1:00pm, Duration 1.25 hrs.

Hard and soft copies of the following materials were given to Mark Korsness and Maryam Asgharian

1. Went over detailed field trip notes from work with Leslie Bell, Ardie Stein and I in mostly Clark County w/ verbal description. Detailed field trip notes from work with Richard Van Dyjk and I in Cowlitz County.
2. Presented final grey line alternative coordinates 4 pg. document.
3. Displayed graphic on impacted homes on segment "O", w/ verbal description.
4. Displayed modified Google Earth of grey line alternative with extensive description of reasoning behind our goals in pursuing this route.
5. Displayed the grey line alternative map.
6. Presented a copy of the Herrera letter that mentioned Ariel area impact for MK explanation.

He responded to the 3rd item as follows.

The preliminary draft is not complete and no one has seen a preferred route.

This part of the letter is referring to the lack of an eastern route such as the grey line.

The Ariel impact refers to the segments proposed currently.

Communication ID: 13728

Date Received: 9/5/2011

Name: ANOTHER WAY BPA ,CITIZENS AGAINST THE TOWERS ,YALE VALLEY COALITION ,ERNA SARASOHN

Mr Steven Wright, Administrator

Bonneville Power Administration

Mr Wright,

I saw an article in the Columbian Newspaper this weekend stating that you sent a reply to Representative Herrera Beutler's June 28, 2011 letter directed to you and I have questions about several of your statements.

You are quoted as saying, "Those include a much wider crossing of the Columbia River near Longview, compared with the proposed Washington routes that cross the river NEAR Camas." Isn't it correct any selected route will go THROUGH Camas and not NEAR Camas?

According to the article, you also stated "In May, the BPA identified four routes that stretch through different parts of Clark and Cowlitz counties, ranging from a "west alternative" that comes NEAR Vancouver to an "east alternative" that runs east of Yacolt and continues down the eastern edge of Clark County." Mr Wright, the west alternative does not come NEAR Vancouver, it runs through the most densely populated area of Clark County and THROUGH the City of Vancouver.

Doug Johnson is quoted as saying "Before that happens, the BPA will compile a full count of houses along the proposed routes-another request of Herrera Beutler's. That count could be completed by the end of September, Johnson said." I would like to know the criteria for counting a house, is it 500 ft from the lines? Do you agree if you can see the tower from your home/ property, you should be counted as there is no doubt whatsoever that it will lower the value of your property. We have been told by professional appraisers if you are close to the line, your property will drop as much as 40% and if you are further away but can see the towers, 30% to 10%, depending on the distance.

I will appreciate any clarification you can provide to my questions

Erna Sarasohn

Citizens Against the Towers
Another Way BPA
Yale Valley Coalition

<http://www.columbian.com/news/2011/sep/03/bpa-responds-to-herrera-beutler-letter-on-power-li/>

Communication ID: 13730

Date Received: 9/13/2011

Name: MICHELE L HILLMAN,MIKE MAXWELL

Hi, my name is Mike Maxwell. Telephone number is [phone]. I've got a lady that lives west of Amboy, and this would be concerning the line that is one of the lines that you're looking at on the map. And we're trying to find out if her property is located involved with this line. I went on a computer and had lots of unsuccess of trying to do the locator stuff. Her name is Michele Hillman. Her address is [physical address]. Her address is [mailing address]. Her telephone number is [phone]. We would like someone to just let her know or me know or whatever if- the maps are not showing roads. So, they're showing just certain main highways. I've tried to see if her property is on one of the alternative lines that you're talking about but would appreciate somebody just kind of coming back to her or me or someone and seeing if that line is on her property or going to if it is approved or whatever. Thank you very much. Talk to you later. Bye.

Communication ID: 13731

Date Received: 8/15/2011

Name: KATHLEEN LINGO,JOSH LINGO

August 15, 2011

Secretary Steven Chu
1000 Independence Ave. SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Secretary Steven Chu,

I am writing you AGAIN in regards to the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project that is proposed by Bonneville Power Administration in hopes that my voice will be heard this time. I am generally not one to protest. However, I have the utmost concern about this project and I am convinced it is important for my family and community for you to address these concerns about the adverse affects these 500kv transmission lines would have on the individuals living in SW Washington. It WAS my hope that BPA would work with the community and consider more appropriate routes; ones that are located in unpopulated areas away from schools, hospitals, and vibrant residential communities. However, this has not happened yet.

I am a homeowner living in one of the paths of the proposed transmission line routes. I have two young children whose health and safety are of the utmost importance to me. I have been to several meetings in which employees of BPA have stated that there is no evidence that supports the idea that electromagnetic fields (EMF) can cause harm to individuals. This is a misrepresentation of the facts because there are several studies that demonstrate electromagnetic fields are in fact related to various health conditions including: high blood pressure, cancer, migraine headaches, fibromyalgia, asthma, ADHD, and brain tumors. I have researched many studies and have spoken to several people in the medical field who have shared with me their belief of the negative health risks of being exposed to EMF.

Even if there was hard evidence to support BPA's opinion of the effects of EMF (which there is not), there is a very negative perception about this colorless, odorless substance and no amount of propaganda will change the minds of the many people affected by these power lines. BPA has suggested that putting these power lines in unpopulated areas would be more costly. However, I feel that doing just that, even if it cost more money, is the morally right thing to do. Money can always be recovered, but that is not the case for the health of our family members. In order to better understand my fears, I ask you to consider this question, "Would you move your own family into a community adjacent to this type of danger"? I can answer that question for the majority of the population. The answer is "NO".

My husband and I have put our home on the market and although we have received potential offers to buy our home, EVERY offer has fallen through for the simple reason of the possibility of power lines. My family feels captive in our own home and unable to make any potential changes in our lives because of these power lines. We have waited for 2 years for a decision from BPA and I feel like all of our outcry and concern has fallen on deaf ears. We are in such difficult economic times right now and I do not feel there is any argument that justifies placing a larger burden on the people that live in the pathway of the proposed power lines. As citizens and residents of SW Washington, I believe we have a right to expect integrity from both our corporate and political leaders. We are only asking for a safe solution and I hope that you will act justly and responsibly as an advocate for families such as ours who seek your support.

As an elected official, I know that you rely on the support of this community. Do not let this community down by failing to support it. I beg of you to publicly voice your opposition to the BPA power lines in populated areas. I would appreciate a personal response to this concern to know that you are really listening.

Sincerely,

Kathleen and Joshua Lingo

Communication ID: 13732

Date Received: 8/20/2011

Name: YALE VALLEY COALITION ,JUDITH LYNN IBBS

Secretary Steve Chu
1000 Independence Ave SW
Washington DC 20585

Mr. Secretary -

Why is it we must remind you that in your "current" position as a public servant your job is to work for and serve the people. It is our tax dollar that is paying you what you have not earned.

Stop hiding behind your desk. Stop being a coward. Stop lying to the people.

I not only request, but demand that you make a public statement and advise Bonneville Power Administration NOT to put their lines and towers where people live.

Judith Ibbs

Yale Valley Coalition Committee Member

[address]

Communication ID: 13733

Date Received: 8/22/2011

Name: CITIZENS AGAINST THE TOWERS ,LYNN STIGLICH

Secretary Steven Chu
1000 Independence Ave. SW
Washington, DC 20585

August 22, 2011

Dear Secretary Chu,

I am hoping that you will assist me and the Citizens Against the Towers group as we try to get Bonneville Power Administration's attention and efforts directed to doing the right thing regarding plans to install 500 kV power lines through populated areas within Clark County.

The Citizens Against the Towers group is trying to get BPA to select a preferred route, and an alternative route when the DEIS is released and drop all other lines. This will unburden thousands of people. The Citizens Against the Towers group is ready to fly over the area and film the Grey Line, the Peoples Alternative. It will be presented to BPA at a yet to be scheduled meeting to show the route that will impact no homeowners.

I am concerned that if BPA releases the DEIS on December 20th, people will be preoccupied with their families and the holidays and that will decrease the public comment received. Please ask them to consider a release date of Jan 9, 2012 for the DEIS, to allow the public to make the appropriate comments.

I am asking you to do your job and protect the citizens of SW Washington. You must advise BPA not to put up these lines where people live. Please ask BPA to select the route that impacts the fewest number of people. We want our health, children, property values and communities protected from the BPA plan to put up 15 story towers and 500 kV high voltage lines through populated areas ie our neighborhoods! Please be aware of the views and concerns of the people in Southwest Washington State.

Thank you very much!

Best Regards,

Lynn Stiglich

[address]

Email: [email]

Ps - I have enclosed an article from our local paper, The Columbian, which summarizes the protest and how I feel about it. Take the Beast East!

Communication ID: 13734

Date Received: 9/19/2011

Name: ROGER L MILES

[Unique comments from petition 13665]

Please acknowledge receipt of this petition and publish the same as a general comment on the project website and records.

Thank you,

Roger Miles

[address]

Communication ID: 13735

Date Received: 9/16/2011

Name: L DAVID BALLARD

[Unique comments on petition 13665]

Enclosed is my signed petition requesting that BPA use the existing easement corridor of routes 9 and 25 they have had for 70 years.

Please acknowledge receipt of this petition and publish the same as a general comment on the project website and records.

Sincerely,

David Ballard

[address]

Communication ID: 13736

Date Received: 9/22/2011

Name: TIMOTHY C COE

[Tim Coe had a phone conversation with Maryam Asgharian asking about proposed tower placement in his neighborhood along Segments 9 and 25.]

Communication ID: 13737

Date Received: 9/23/2011

Name: BOB LITTLETON

On Sept. 8, 2011, the Oregonian newspaper published an article regarding an expected drop in electrical use over the next decade. The Electric Power Research Institute indicates that electrical demand will actually decrease in the next ten years. If that is the case, we should not be building additional lines and should abandon the BPA I-5 Corridor project.

Communication ID: 13738

Date Received: 9/26/2011

Name: ELIZABETH L HAMILTON

Yes, this is Elizabeth L Hamilton. My address is [address]. My phone number is [phone]. I would appreciate a current report on this Bonneville 500 kilovolt power line. The question I have for you is since I read in the paper that you have settled on a new line from The Dalles Oregon substation to Goldendale substation 4 miles southwest of Goldendale. Does this, as I understand, culminate the process started in 2009? Does that mean that you will be releasing our land from consideration that has been considered part of potential lines. I would prefer a written response but right now I'd be tickled to

get any kind of a response. I'm in line 11 going through [parcel description]. I'm assuming from the way the article was written that this culminated your process of determining the line and that this would be the final solution. I'm glad you were able to consider the input of external things such as the windmills which I can see as being very very forward thinking in regard to the future use of energy. I would appreciate a response. Thanks you very much. Bye now.

Communication ID: 13739

Date Received: 9/27/2011

Name: DESIREE DAMICO

Hi, this is Desiree Damico. I live in the Green Meadows neighborhood in Vancouver, Washington. And of course we have power lines behind us and I have a question. My phone number is [phone] and we're at [address]. My question is I read something in the paper several days ago and haven't seen any follow-ups since about some new high-powered route being sent down from the north area like Yacolt or somewhere up there down to The Dalles, maybe it was called the Grey Line or something. And it's also going to connect further east to one of the small towns. So I was wondering, is that in place of the ones you were looking at in Vancouver right off of 63rd Street and other areas; I think it was called number 25, line number segment 25? So, I just want an answer back. I mean that would be great if you decided to move it east. Or is that just another one that you're adding to this whole program and you're still looking at other routes? Again our number is [phone]. If you could get back to me I would appreciate it. We're the ones that have the house for sale and I'd also like to be in contact with our home association to let them know what's going on. Thank you again. Bye bye.

Communication ID: 13740

Date Received: 9/21/2011

Name: DAVID CHERRINGTON

Dear Mr. Korsness,

Dear Mr. Korsness,

I'm writing you in regards to our connection involving my property(F40 and F41). As you have recently been made aware of by Mr. Ryan O'Neal there are angels on my side. Mr. O'Neal and others are aware of me and my wife's story and are willing to lend us the support necessary to get the word out about your intentions with our property.

I survived what was said to be incurable [description of medical condition] when I was 25, and after having gone through that I went on to marry the love of my life who is a recent [description of medical condition] survivor herself. We were married a few short months before you made us aware of your potential desire to go right through the middle of where our home was intended. In moving forward with life we have since then welcomed into the world a beautiful baby girl, and now we intend on

securing the future we have fought so hard for. I'm continuing to pray for you and your ability to make the right decision in regards to this matter.

Sincerely,

David Cherrington

Communication ID: 13741

Date Received: 9/27/2011

Name: DANIEL SHULTZ

Yeah, my name is Daniel Shultz at [address]. I've been following the progress of this since we bought this piece of property last year and realized that we're right in the middle of one of your proposed routes. In fact you're even showing a tower on our property which would require an access road and all kinds of things. So I've got some major questions about that. You know we bought this piece of property to do organic gardening and to build a bed and breakfast. And so that line would not help us out at all. We're sort of stuck in limbo as to what to do with this piece of property that we just purchased. So, I'd like to ask some questions to somebody about what our options are. If you could give us a call back at [phone] I would highly appreciate it. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13742

Date Received: 9/21/2011

Name: PATTI OLSON

[Unique comments on petition 13665]

Bonneville Power Administration
I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project
PO Box 9250
Portland, OR 97207

Dear BPA:

Please enter the attached petition and signatures into the public comments regarding the above referenced project. Please acknowledge receipt of this cover letter and the attached petition signature pages.

Thank You,

Patti Olson

[address]

Communication ID: 13743

Date Received: 9/27/2011

Name: RAYMOND B RICHARDS

[Unique comments on petition 13665]

Please submit as comments on the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project:

Communication ID: 13744

Date Received: 9/27/2011

Name: LISA K HELTEMES

[Unique comment on petition 13665]

Please acknowledge receipt of this petition and public the same as a general comment on the project website and records.

Thank you,

Lisa Heltemes

Resident and concerned landowner, [address]

Communication ID: 13745

Date Received: 9/29/2011

Name: ERNA SARASOHN

Maryam,

please include this in the public comment and send to the BPA EMF staff.

Thank you,

Erna

<http://www.powerlinefacts.com/EMF.htm>

Communication ID: 13746

Date Received: 10/5/2011

Name: ELIZABETH L HAMILTON

Hello. This is Elizabeth Hamilton. My [address]. My phone number is [phone].

Yesterday I was out and you evidently returned my call. I got a portion of it before my machine time ran out and I missed most of it. So I would appreciate a print out of your decision material, at least the latest, if possible, because I do not have computer. Where I live they don't deliver the newspaper either.

I would like to know, first, on this 500 feet from a house are you considering in that 500 feet the 100 feet of timber distance that can't grow beyond the 150 foot swath? The second question; do you survey the lines and corners? I know the past surveys have not been accurate. Have you already surveyed the lines and corners? That would be my next question.

Also, I want to thank you very much for the non-wires material you sent me. I've read every bit of it. A lot of it makes good sense. I would like to know if you're considering the non-wires will you release the four line alternatives that you are now considering if you go non-wires?

Thanks again for the phone call yesterday. I'm sorry that I missed it. And what did get recorded was not enough for me to have answers to my questions. So, if you would consider the non-wires alternative will you release the four line alternatives that you have. I would appreciate your latest material in regards to all of this so that I can kind of stay on top of it.

I'm somewhat thinking I still like the original line because you already have the right-of-way. And on this central alternative versus the east alternative is there any way you're going to cut off 11? That's where I live, and of course, that's where my main interest is. If you were to go with the Weyerhaeuser line F, go right on down that blue line to I and K, you would miss me. That would be swell.

Anyway, I would like to know what the latest decision-making is and get a copy of that map showing these four alternatives. Thank you very much. I appreciate your time. I know you have a great problem with a lot of people, and, I guess I'm one of them. But I do want to know what's going on.

And I have also hiked out on my corners and lines and I see pink ribbons are already there and I'm wondering, did Weyerhaeuser do this, or did Bonneville Power do this? And what does that represent to me in regards the corners that you've located and the accuracy of somebody's locating them, anyway? I know according to the aerial photo the boundary line is way off. I would lose approximately six acres of my land to just improper boundary line according to the aerial photo of my area up here which would be [parcel description].

Okay, thank you very much. I do appreciate your time and I do like to understand a little better about how I'm going to be affected. Goodbye now. My number again [phone]. Please send me something in the mail. That's easier for me to look at. Bye now.

Communication ID: 13747

Date Received: 10/7/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY,JANICE DAVIS,VALERIE GARDNER,BOLTON C MINISTER,RAYMOND B RICHARDS,ROD SMITH

RE: Bonneville Power Administration I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

Please acknowledge receipt of the attached letter and enter it into your records.

Thank you,

Cheryl Brantley

[phone]

A Better Way for BPA

<http://abetterway4bpa.org>

—

The Honorable Jaime Herrera Beutler

1130 Longworth HOB

Washington, DC 20515

Congresswoman Herrera Beutler:

We are writing to ask you to revise your position supporting a further east route for BPA's I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. Contrary to what you have been told, this "grey line alternative" route impacts new, unsuspecting landowners and would cross through private properties, not just corporate and state-owned lands. We believe that as our Congresswoman, this is not a position you should be endorsing, the taking of private properties.

In your June 26, 2011 letter, you asked Bonneville Power Administration to provide you the "number of property owners or parcels near or within the right-of-way of each route." We have been very clear in our assertion that the pertinent question to ask BPA is "How many property owners or parcels would lose land to new easements along each of the routes." The answer to this question will show you that the vast majority of landowners losing value and use of their properties will be those located along any new corridor.

If you are interested in meeting with us to discuss these issues, we would be more than happy to meet with you.

Thank you,

The board of A Better Way for BPA

Cheryl Brantley – Chair

Bolt Minister – Vice Chair

Valerie Gardner – Secretary

Ray Richards – Treasurer

Rod Smith – Media Advisor

Jan Davis – Membership

Communication ID: 13748

Date Received: 10/13/2011

Name: PATTI OLSON

Hi, Lou,

Several days ago I 'visited' the I-5 etc. website and saw the new chart of 'Number of Homes ...Different Routes.' Or whatever. Normally I would verify the exact title, but I just don't feel up to looking at that again this morning. Still, I trust you know what chart I mean. Anyway, on the site, it has an e-mail message box to use 'only if you feel information on this site is inaccurate or missing.' Well, I do feel information is 'missing.' What is missing is the rest of the story regarding the impacts the various routes inflict. I sent in a suggestion that the information regarding the impact of access roads on private property, which surely must also be considered pertinent (It is to us rural property owners, if not to the BPA) should also be calculated and published in a similar fashion. In the stratospherically unlikely event that anyone on 'the team' is actually planning on looking into that, I would like to clarify what I meant. I mean, how much acreage from private property will be confiscated by the BPA for tower access roads on the various routes. This could not just tally the length of the roads times 25 feet (includes ditch,) because, especially here in the foothills, the required additional cut and fill slopes could easily exceed the width of the road itself. And those banks would also be under BPA control, as I understand it; i.e., they would be sprayed under BPA guidelines, and choice of vegetation would be controlled by BPA guidelines, etc.

Let's see, what can I use for an example? Hmm..I'm casting about in my mind, here... Well, let's take, for example, the proposed access road that cuts across 30' from the front of our house and then plows up the hill through my garden. There, for instance, since the slope is 22%, it would have to be built across the sidehill, then would have to turn and go back across the sidehill to get up to the flat beyond the garden gate. So, that's:

$75' \times (25' \text{ rd} + 20' \text{ cut/fill}) = 3,375 \text{ sq. ft.}$ The first 75 feet isn't quite at 22%, so I'm cutting back on the total width

$200' \times (25' \text{ rd} + 30' \text{ c/f}) = 11,000$ Through my garden and up to the garden gate

$300' \times (25' \text{ rd} + 5' \text{ misc.}) = 10,500$ From the garden gate through our 110 yr old woods to prop. Line @K-84

24,875 sq. ft or .57 ac.

Now let's add in the 'reconstruction' of our private driveway. Although I say it's 3/4 mile long, I think it is really only about 3700 feet, not counting the turn-around and parking area. So, you will widen that to 14', plus ditch, so 19'. (Say 20' to allow for those little extras.)

800' x 20' = 16,000 sq. ft. The first 800' is fairly level, though it does run through wetlands

600' x 40' = 24,000 This portion cuts across a moderate sideslope

1,000' x 60' = 60,000 This portion runs along a very steep sideslope with extensive cut and fill banks (currently secured by 30+ years growth of sword ferns, native grasses, etc.)

1,300' x 40' = 52,000 Varying conditions along drive, between barns, through lower garden, fruit trees, etc.

152,000 sq. ft or 3.49 ac

=====

Total acreage to be confiscated by BPA for ONE tower access rd: 4.06

Just think of this multiplied by the, what, 180 towers or so you have on the K-line? That's a whole lot of private property you guys are planning to gobble up. Oh, yes, I know, we can still 'use' it, as long as we abide by your guidelines. And no doubt you feel we should be able to learn to know and love (or not) the unannounced, unexpected intrusions into our yards, family events, the nephews' game of 'extreme croquet,' etc.; realizing, of course, said intrusion can happen at absolutely any time, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

Yes, I know this is all old news. But, as long as the BPA is 'quantifying' impacts, I think you should 'quantify' this! In many instances, the impact of the access roads is going to be far, far worse than the view of a 150' tower 3 or 4 hundred feet away. I guess someone sure figured out how to shut me up about that, anyway, didn't they?

Patti Olson

Communication ID: 13749

Date Received: 10/13/2011

Name: MARIA CANTWELL,PATTY MURRAY

Stephen J. Wright
Administrator
Bonneville Power Administration
905 NE 11 th Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Administrator Wright:

We write regarding the Bonneville Power Administration's proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, which involves the construction of a new electric transmission line from the Castle Rock area in Cowlitz County, Washington to Troutdale, Oregon.

It has been 41 years since the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) built a high-voltage transmission line in southwest Washington. Since then, the population in southwest Washington has more than doubled. Businesses and industries have grown along the I-5 corridor, resulting in substantial economic development. We understand that BPA believes additional high-voltage transmission capacity in southwest Washington is necessary to continue providing reliable electricity service to citizens and businesses, and capacity for future economic growth.

We appreciate your work to ensure continued low-cost, reliable electricity service for the northwest and Washington State. It is the economic backbone for our region. While these benefits must be maintained, we share the concerns that many of my constituents have raised regarding possible locations for the new transmission line.

We understand that BPA has undertaken substantial efforts to engage local residents as part of the public comment process required by the National Environmental Policy Act in drafting an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project. We are pleased that BPA extended the comment period at our request for the initial scoping of the environmental review process to allow more residents to participate. It is also important that affected residents have ample time outside of the busy holiday season to offer comments on the Draft EIS (DEIS) that is expected to be released in the coming months. To this end, we respectfully request that you postpone the release of the DEIS until January 2012 at the earliest.

While an exact route for the proposed transmission line has not been chosen, we urge you to carefully listen to local residents' concerns and identify a solution has the smallest impact on property owners as possible. We look forward to hearing from you as the public process for identifying an appropriate route for the proposed transmission line continues.

Sincerely,

Maria Cantwell
United States Senator

Patty Murray
United States Senator

Communication ID: 13750

Date Received: 10/12/2011

Name: ERNA SARASOHN

Greetings Maryam,

I am sorry to bother you again but I noticed Representative Herrera Beutler requested "The number of property owners or parcels near and within the right of way along each route" in her June 28, 2011 letter to Mr Wright. When BPA provided the count Sept 30, 2011, it appears the count is a housing only count. Did BPA provide a separate count of parcels near and within the right of way along each route in a separate document? If yes, will you please e mail me a copy. If it has not been given to the Congresswoman, when will BPA provide the information as requested by Representative Herrera Beutler?

I also noticed that no counts were given for any of the "option" routes that BPA is considering in the DEIS. I believe if Representative Herrera Beutler realized there are segments on the map that are not attached to one of the four routes, she would also have requested a count for the number of those property owners or parcels as it is impacting those citizens lives just as much as it is impacting the lives of the people living near the four routes. When these figures are provided to the Congresswoman, I will appreciate your sending me a copy.

Thank you Maryam, as always, your time is appreciated.

Erna

Communication ID: 13751

Date Received: 10/15/2011

Name: EUGENE GREGORY BRADY,LESLIE M LOUNSBERRY-BRADY,JANE M REVESZ,PETER REVESZ,PATRICIA LEE WITTER

This is a letter to Mark Korsness

—

October 15, 2011

Mark Korsness, Senior Project Manager

7500 NE 41st Street, Ste 130, Vancouver, WA 98662

RE: IN DEFENSE OF OUR FAMILY'S CLARK COUNTY TREE FARM BISECTED BY LINE O'S CURRENT LOCATION specifically TAX PARCELS [parcel 1], [parcel 2] and [parcel 3]

Dear Mr. Korsness,

As a four-generation tree farm family in Clark County, we feel it is critical that we be able to convey to you how unsuitable [parcel number] on Line O is for BPA's transmission line.

The attached letter was sent to Mr. Woolson in May in response to repeated requests from BPA for permission to enter the Brady/Lounsbery parcels on Section 27. The letter explains that E.G. Brady and Leslie Brady Lounsbery own the Section 27 parcels that Line O proposes to cross but other family members (Jane and Pete Revesz) control the gate and private road that grant access to the Brady/Lounsbery parcels, as well as other neighbors served by the access roads. Security problems which we have in common with all Yacolt Burn owners---fire, theft, vandalism etc.---have made us install strict measures and procedures. The power line would of course magnify these problems.

We expected a response from BPA in order to proceed with working out an arrangement for BPA's one-time permission for an accompanied entrance to the Revesz-owned gate and roads that give access to the Brady and Lounsbery parcels on Line O.

But we have heard nothing from BPA. It is very important that BPA allow us to demonstrate on site the many problems a transmission line would encounter in Section 27.

The letter to Mr. Woolson outlines some of the problems that putting a transmission line across King Creek on Section 27 would pose, but does not include a full list of the problematic issues which would include additional items such as the Summer and Winter Steelhead Threatened Species Area, unstable slopes, topographic features, wetlands and considerable further information.

Therefore our request to BPA is: Please arrange with us for an accompanied one-time site visit to view the unsuitability of Section 27 as a location for a transmission line, at which time we will provide supportive documentation as well.

Sincerely,

Jane and Peter Revesz

ph: [phone]

[email]

[address]

Lee Witter

ph: [phone] [email]

as designated Representatives of Eugene Gregory Brady and Leslie Brady Lounsbery

ATTACHMENT: copy of May 2011 letter sent to BPA's Paul Woolson re Permission to Enter the parcels

To Paul B. Woolson, BPA Representative

Bonneville Power Administration

PO Box 3621-TERS-3 Portland, OR 97208-3621

RE: BPA's REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO ENTER PARCELS [parcel 1], [parcel 2] and [parcel 3] IN [parcel description]

Dear Mr. Woolson:

We are a 4-generation tree farming family in Clark County whose 70-year tree farming business is gravely threatened by BPA's various proposed transmission line locations. This letter pertains specifically to BPA's request for permission to enter the three parcels [parcel 1], [parcel 2] and [parcel 3] in [parcel section] which would be bisected by Line O. This letter is written to explore with BPA the conditions under which, and only under which, we would grant that permission.

Parcel [parcel 2] is owned by Eugene Gregory Brady who currently is teaching English in Mexico. Parcel [parcel 3] is owned by his sister Leslie Brady Lounsbery who lives in Bothell WA and parcel [parcel 1] is jointly owned by Eugene and Leslie. This letter is being written by their mother Lee Witter who gifted them the property in the 1960's and who acts as Eugene's agent while he is away. I, Lee Witter, was gifted the property in question in the 1950's by my parents L.E. and Winifred Witter.

To understand our situation regarding this tree farm, please first review Section 27 on the attached Metzger Map from the 1950's. Section 27 at that time was owned by our first generation of tree farmers, L. E. Witter and his wife Winifred Witter, parents/grandparents of the current owners. At present, 540 acres of Section 27 remain in our family's ownership with our various parcels bearing the names of Revesz, Brady, Lounsbery and Stevens.

Parcels [parcel 1], [parcel 2] and [parcel 3] are situated in the east half of Section 27 and can only be accessed through the west half of Section 27, but the owners of the west half have not been contacted by BPA for permission to enter their locked gate nor to use their access road. (The owners are Jane and Pete Revesz, aunt and uncle of Eugene and Leslie Brady.)

Please note that the road crossing Section 27 on this map is the family's private road. There is a locked gate on the west entrance to Section 27, and entrance to---and crossing of--- Section 27 is tightly controlled by Jane and Pete Revesz, who own the gate and the land it and the access road are on. Vandalism, theft and other criminal activity, lock cutting, dumping of garbage and other misuse of this property by the public have required them to totally restrict and monitor access. Jane and Pete Revesz live in Battle Ground and spend much of their time fighting the problems listed above.

BPA's access road map pertaining to proposed towers # 48, 49, 50 and 51 on Line O makes liberal use of the Revesz' private road but they have never been contacted by BPA regarding permission to enter their property nor to use their road. I and my grown children Eugene and Leslie do not have the ability to grant BPA permission to use the Revesz road nor enter the Revesz gate.

Line O, as proposed, would bisect from north to south the forest stands owned by Eugene Brady and his sister Leslie Brady Lounsbery. Eugene, Leslie and I feel that it would be wise to allow BPA to inspect the Brady/Lounsbery parcels where towers # 49, 50 and 51 (and possibly also #48) are proposed to go, because it will be readily apparent to you that this is a very poor site for a transmission line and attendant access roads. Section 27's topography includes very steep slopes, roads with major slide hazards we have contended against for generations, extensive wetlands, and a history of multiple wildfire conflagrations due to the autumn weather-and-wind conditions of this Yacont Burn terrain. Your

proposed Line O egregiously bisects the best forest stands on the Brady/Lounsbery parcels. Section 27's major creek, King Creek, is protected under the Shoreline Master Plan all across Section 27 and halfway across Section 26 to the east. Weather conditions in winter make access difficult, especially on the King Creek Canyon portion of our road system (see below).

Not only are topographical conditions and environmental concerns unfavorable on Section 27 for the placement of the transmission line, but the specific locations for these towers and placement of their access roads pose a number of problems, readily apparent on the ground.

For example, the above-mentioned road into King Creek Canyon you propose to use to access Tower #48 is very steep and remains frustratingly narrow due to a rock face that our family has been afraid to tamper with for fear the whole steep hillside would then slide into King Creek.

In summary, since we feel it advisable to show BPA the conditions that Line O would face should it go through Section 27, we would be willing to discuss with BPA the stipulations under which we would grant that permission to enter, but first you must obtain from Jane and Pete Revesz the permission to enter the gate that controls access, and to use their road.

Most of our family members will be out of the state for the remainder of May but we hope to discuss this situation with you in June.

In defense of sustainable forestry,

Eugene Gregory Brady

Leslie Brady (Lounsbery)

Lee Witter

Attachments:

1. Metzger Map from 1950's prior to construction of SR 1100
 2. Shoreline Management Plan Map showing status of King Creek across Section 27
-

Communication ID: 13752

Date Received: 10/18/2011

Name: MICHAEL HEDRICK

Hello, my name is Michael Hedrick. I would like a printed map and as much information as you can send me in the mail about the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project as well as anything about BPA in general. So, Michael Hedrick, [address]. My phone is [phone] and I would love to be on your mailing list. Thanks so much. Bye bye.

Communication ID: 13753

Date Received: 9/24/2011

Name: SUSAN ECONOMON,GREGG HEPPNER

Hello.

We have recently completed an offer to purchase property that may be affected by the placement of the proposed transmission line through Clark and Cowlitz Counties and before we can proceed are hoping to get some more specific information as to how this property will be affected. The property is located at [address] and according to the current owners,Ed and Jackie Brown, BPA has not yet "released" the property. Please advise us as to how we might access more information in this matter.

Thank you for your assistance,

Susan Economon

Gregg Heppner

Communication ID: 13754

Date Received: 10/6/2011

Name: ARDELLE M STEIN

[Unique comment from petition 13755]

Mr. Wright,

Please take the minute or less that it will take to view our short photo clip so you may have a more intimate visual representation of our close knit community. We are not just a group of scattered farmers as suggested by those who do not know our area.

Our valley is a beautiful pastoral place (only 4 miles long). We want very much to keep it that way, as you can see by the enclosed petition of 127 signatures. There are 150 year round residences here and many more seasonal homes as well. We have an elementary school, a fire house, a church and scenic Speelyai Bay and Yale Lake day use parks.

A huge scar made by the monster towers and connecting lines would be devastating both financially and aesthetically. The science is still out on EMF and the dangers there.

Please help us find a way to work with BPA and develop compromise with options that deliver the energy and at the same time protect our homes, properties and lifestyles. Let's discuss our ideas.

Thank you,

Citizens of Yale Valley

YVC Coordinator Ardie Stein [email]

P.S. We have petitioned our commissioners and legislators to contact you and join you and your staff in finding better options than the current proposals. We have several other ideas, beginning with the Grey Line. Please include us in your creation of another way for BPA.

Communication ID: 13755

Date Received: 10/6/2011

Name: KRISTIN KRISTIN (ILLEGIBLE),(ILLEGIBLE) (ILLEGIBLE),A (ILLEGIBLE) (ILLEGIBLE),T (ILLEGIBLE) (ILLEGIBLE),C (ILLEGIBLE) (ILLEGIBLE),GALEN (ILLEGIBLE),(ILLEGIBLE) (ILLEGIBLE),J (ILLEGIBLE) (ILLEGIBLE),S (ILLEGIBLE) (ILLEGIBLE),P (ILLEGIBLE) (ILLEGIBLE),KAT (ILLEGIBLE) (ILLEGIBLE),B (ILLEGIBLE) (ILLEGIBLE),A A (ILLEGIBLE),(ILLEGIBLE) A (ILLEGIBLE),TAMERIA R YTREEIDE AKERLEY,ROBERT AMMONS,MARK A BALDWIN,JENNY BARTON,JAYME B BENDER,(ILLEGIBLE) BISHOP,WALTER A BLACK,CHARLENE P BROOKS,JACKEE BROWNING,TAD L CASTUL,SHARI L CATANIA,BARBARA J CLEMENT,JOSEPH C COLLINS,WILBUR M COOK,GERALDINE E COOK,LOLA CRAWFORD,ELVA M DABBINS,DONALD E II DALZELL,BENJAMIN K DANG,ELLEN DANNENBERG,IDA MAE DENOYER,RAY A DEYOTT,DALE J DORCHEUS,DARLENE J DORCHEUS,RUTHELLEN DUNLAP,JEFF DUNLAP,TODD EMBERY,MICHAEL FINK,KELLY D FINK,NANNETTE FLOWERS,WILLIAM C FOSS,CAROL L FOSS,DUANE A FREDRICKSON,HOPE D GARTNER,JAIMEE GROCE,(ILLEGIBLE) HAMILTON,R (ILLEGIBLE) HIGGINS,BECKY HUESTIES,KATHRYN A C HUFFMAN,JOHN D HUFFMAN,JUDITH IBBS,R ISSELHARD,CONNIE K JACOX,GEORGE ETUX KANOUSE,TONI D KASKI,BOBBY G KELSAY,MARK S KNUDSON,MICHAEL KOPACZEWSKI,FRANK LADROW,FRAN LADROW,BRYAN R LEAKE,SHAWNA LEAKE,KENT S LEE,JANICE K LEE ,MARTIN L MALLARS,SUSAN MALLARS,SHEILA RAE MANES,CHRISTINE MATTHEWS,CAROL A MAULER,JOHN MCCAMISH,ANDREW MCNEAL,Alice A MERKLE,DONNELL J MERKLE ETUX,CHARLES E MINSINGER,MICHAEL T NIELSON,ROBERT G PANKRATZ,RIVERS DARCI M PANKRATZ,DAY D PARKHILL,FRED PAT (ILLEGIBLE),(ILLEGIBLE) PED (ILLEGIBLE),WELLES K PEDERSON,WILLIAM V PENNY,J (ILLEGIBLE) R (ILLEGIBLE),D (ILLEGIBLE) R (ILLEGIBLE),JANIS SUE REESE,ERIC REESE,MARIA HART STOLL REESE,HARRY L ETUX REESE,CALLEE REUTTER,MICHAEL G RIETMAN,KYLE D RIGGS,CINDY A RIGGS,WILLIAM J ROGERS,DAVID R SR ROY,KATHLEEN D ROY,RONALD E SCHULTZ,TRACY SEXTON,THOMAS J SLAMA,E SLAMA,JODY W SLAYTON,JENNIFER J SLAYTON,CAROL A SPRINGER,ARDELLE M STEIN,DENNIS M STEIN,LINDA J STOCKER,GARY L STUART,SHARON R STUART,CHANTEL SWETT,T THOMAS,DOUGLAS THOMAS,KRISTEE THOMAS,MICHAEL J TURNBULL,JAMES A TURNER,JOSEPH D WARNER,JANA M WARNER,GLEN D WHITE,MARCIE C WHITE,DAVID R WOODSON,LORETTA M WOODSON,CHARLES R WRIGHT,JUSTIN ZIMMERMAN,SHERI ZIMMERMAN

500 KV TRANSMISSION LINE PETITION

We are asking Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) to remove from consideration all proposed segments from Bonneville Power Authority I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project as outlined in their study map, and consider only the citizens proposed segment that is easternmost beyond segments F-I-K and O. The new segment would be primarily on public lands, away from private property and urban and rural population areas. We have proposed a swath of land we named the grey-line. We expect BPA to

examine this area closely and apprise us of the comparative costs. We think the grey-line is a very justifiable alternative. And there are other options not yet discussed.

The proposed corridors will significantly devalue our homes and property. Expected loss of property value has been estimated in the thousands for some individuals, according to real estate agents we have contacted. Residents living 75 feet from the centerline will have 150-foot towers looming over their homes. We have major concerns about the feasibility to sell our homes at all if the proposed towers are within 75 feet from our property lines. We have been told that BPA does not include decreased property values as a "cost" when comparing alternative routes. However, this is a very real cost to individual homeowners. The collective financial impact on individual homeowners is an impact we want BPA to include in their analysis.

There are a number of scientific studies on electric magnetic fields (EMF) and health that suggest a link between long term EMF exposure and cancer and neurodegenerative diseases in adults; including studies that are documented in the Electrical and Biological Effects of Transmission Lines: A Review. This is a review that is authored by Jack M. Lee Jr. Phd and assisted by the BPA's own Biological Task Team. Based on the available data, there is no conclusive evidence that long term exposure to high voltage transmission lines does NOT affect tissue at a cellular level resulting in cancer (in particular leukemia, brain and breast cancer), Alzheimer's disease and Lou Gehrig's disease. There is definitive scientific evidence that exposure to magnetic fields from power lines greater than 4 milligauss is associated with an elevated risk of childhood leukemia. The link between long term EMF exposure, cancer and other diseases is still being studied and is at this time "inconclusive" at best. Thus we, the citizens of Cowlitz County do NOT want to be exposed to the electrical magnetic field of a 500kV transmission line and be the "guinea pigs" to this on-going debate.

Noise: Clearly audible noise is emitted from 500 kV power lines. This noise increases on wet days of which we have many and it will be a constant annoyance for residents forced to live near the proposed towers.

Respectfully submitted by the landowners and concerned individuals who wish to PROTECT environmental quality and resources, health of our children and community, private property rights, property value, business interest and the aesthetic beauty of our area, We have a right to a quality of life for ourselves and every generation after us that is clean, healthy and safe.

Communication ID: 13756

Date Received: 10/20/2011

Name: MICKEY LEE OJA,DEBORAH OJA

There is minimal impact from adding capacity where towers and lines already exist. Owners along routes 9 and 25 bought their properties fully aware of the lines and towers along the EDGES of their land. We bought our property for the beauty of living in the country away from street lights & power lines. Stay away from our beautiful land!

Communication ID: 13757

Date Received: 10/5/2011

Name: ANDREW TUSON

Mr. Stephen J. Wright
Administrator
Bonneville Power Administration
905 NE 11th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232

Dear Mr. Wright,

I am a homeowner in Clark County, WA and have been under the threat from the Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) I-5 Corridor reinforcement Project. The Threat is that you are looking to take my land and possibly my home for this project.

The BPA has several possible routes available. One route uses the existing easement and requires the least amount of land taken from Private landowners. Another route that is the furthest to the East takes next to the least amount of land from private landowners. The others in the middle affect numerous landowners and I am one of those.

As BPA Administrator, I am asking you what your position is on the taking of Private property for the use by BPA in this project. I am strongly against the taking of any property unless it is absolutely necessary for the "purpose of benefiting the general public" and in that vain you should only take the minimum amount of private property to accomplish the project. Since BPA has several options, I am requesting that you select a route that will minimize the number of landowners impacted. BPA does not need to take private property when they have an existing easement or can use government land to the east.

I am a retired Air Force Lt Col having served my country for 22 years. I bought 10 acres of property in a rural area of Clark County on the very top of a hill with a 360 degree view. I personally built my home on my property, much of it with my own hands. We intentionally put all the power to the homes underground to avoid having it destroy our view. I have an outstanding view in all directions, Portland city lights to the south, Mt St Helens to the north, Mt Adams to the east and Longview to the west. I raised 3 children there and have visions of them living on our property after I pass on. All of my hopes and dreams for my home and future are being destroyed by the threat of BPA putting a tower right on my property/house. I am on Route 26 and any tower on my property would destroy the scenic view and absolutely destroy my property value at a time things are pretty bleak nationwide.

I am asking for your support in this matter. It needs to be a real voice that is for the people you serve. You need to be loud and clear on your position. In a time we are all hurting we don't need a government agency trampling our rights unnecessarily. BPA has other options. Please do not let them take my property or home.

Sincerely,

Andrew R. Tuson

Communication ID: 13758

Date Received: 10/6/2011

Name: ERNA SARASOHN

[refers to response to communication 13728]

Maryam,

Please provide me the house count by individual segments in addition to the chart you provided earlier giving us the number of houses near route alternatives.

Thank you Maryam

Communication ID: 13759

Date Received: 10/19/2011

Name: ERNA SARASOHN

Maryam,

I am sorry to bother you again today but will you please tell me when the NEPA process will be completed?

Thank you Maryam,

Erna

Communication ID: 13760

Date Received: 10/25/2011

Name: ARDELLE M STEIN

1. Do EMF travel in all directions (up, down and sideways)?
 2. Does putting lines underground stop the EMF?
 3. What is the average cost per mile for underground lines? Compared to overhead?
-

Communication ID: 13761

Date Received: 10/26/2011

Name: DAVID A JARVIS

we are considering purchasing a home directly west of segment 52. currently the view from that address towards mt. hood and east up the columbia is unobstructed as it looks over the top of the existing lines. Will the new lines replace the old ones or are you adding more beside them? Will they be taller than the existing lines? will the existing tower locations remain or will location change? How tall are the current towers on either end of segment 52? Thank you

Communication ID: 13762

Date Received: 10/27/2011

Name: BEN R LAFOUNTAIN

To the BPA, I am property owner along the proposed I5 Corridor Reinforcement project. I unlike many others who probably write to you about this project would like to sell my property. Right now it is a rental property and its worth less than I owe on it. The property is at [address]. The property is next to a wooded area where I believe you want to put your new transmission lines. I believe my property could be used as a good access point to the transmission lines. Please let me know if you are interested in my proposal. Thank you, Ben LaFontaine

Communication ID: 13763

Date Received: 10/24/2011

Name: COUNTY OF CLARK ,MARC BOLDT,TOM MIELKE,STEVE STUART

October 24, 2011

Stephen J. Wright, Administrator
Bonneville Power Administration
905 N.E. 11th Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Mr. Wright,

As you are aware, the Board of County Commissioners takes seriously the Bonneville Power Administration's proposal to build a new transmission line through Clark County. The board has written numerous letters to your agency requesting information and held joint meetings with BPA regarding the siting process. As a cooperating agency, Clark County has appreciated BPA's willingness to answer questions and provide information. In that spirit, we write today hoping to get answers to residents' recent questions. We also write to reaffirm positions we have taken regarding your project.

Recently, the board received a copy of a letter Washington's Senator Patty Murray and Senator Maria Cantwell sent you requesting that release of the project's final draft EIS be delayed. We add our support to that Oct. 13, 2011 request, and ask BPA to make public its decision about when it will release the

draft EIS. We agree with our senators that concluding the draft's comment period during the holiday season is not in the best interest of our constituents.

Also, we understand your agency is considering adding another alternative route, dubbed the "gray line," to the November 2010 project map. Is BPA indeed considering the addition of another alternative? If so, will BPA officially amend the map of alternatives to include the gray line? We reaffirm our opinion that BPA also should study the Pearl Alternatives. Their inclusion would complete a fair and proper scope of alternatives for the National Environmental Policy Act process.

Regarding the NEPA process and alternatives studied for the EIS, the Board of County Commissioners requests a formal update regarding BPA's progress on the "non-wires" panel work. We know residents are excited, hopeful and confused about future outcomes and the intent of this work. We believe the process could be more transparent. With Portland General Electric building additional transmission capacity for its customers, slow economic growth and a strong public awareness of energy conservation, many people are focusing on the "no-action" or "no-build" alternative as a viable alternative.

The board would like to know if BPA intends to use the "non-wires" panel conclusion as its "no-action" or "no-build" alternatives in the EIS for NEPA? If not, why not? How does the "non-wires" work differ from work and research done for a "no-build" alternative? If the "non-wires" work proves a new transmission line could be delayed five years or more, would the project be put on hold?

BPA has said the draft EIS will propose mitigation to avoid and reduce impacts on Clark County residents. Will those mitigation measures be route-specific only for the preferred alternative or are they measures that will benefit all Clark County residents for bearing the burden of another line through their county? Will the Board of County Commissioners be apprised of suggested mitigation measures prior to the release of the draft EIS? The board hopes that as a cooperating agency, Clark County would be invited to talk with BPA about potential mitigation measures for its residents.

Finally, we appreciate and find useful the work that BPA did to determine housing numbers impacted on the edge of the right of way for each route. We believe that the number of impacted homes within five hundred feet should be the focus for BPA when making determinations about a preferred alternative. Has BPA done a similar study for the Pearl Alternatives? If not, will it do one? We reaffirm our positions that it was improper for BPA to administratively remove the Pearl Alternative from the scope of the EIS. BPA's own research shows that most of the need for future load growth is driven by Oregon users and that the Pearl Alternatives would impact a fewer number of homes.

Thank you for your attention to these questions. Our inquiry follows our repeated call for BPA to establish a citizen advisory panel to formalize communication and efficiently distribute information during the siting process. The transmission line issue is important, complex and of considerable concern to the people living along the proposed routes. We think many questions residents here continue to ask will be better served and answered through a more formal public process.

Again, we greatly appreciate BPA's willingness to answer questions and provide information throughout this process. We respectfully ask that BPA works to reach a decision that respects property rights by building a transmission line that would impact the fewest property owners possible.

We look forward to your timely response.

Sincerely,

Tom Mielke, Chair

Marc Boldt

Steve Stuart

Communication ID: 13764

Date Received: 10/27/2011

Name: CAROLINE WOOD

Public Information Request

Caroline Wood

[email]

[phone]

[address]

I am on the verge of buying some property that, by the viewing of the map in today's Longview Daily News, looks as though it might be in the path of one of the proposed sites for the new power lines. This is east of I-5 and reaches above Silver Lake, it's the one our Cowlitz County Commissioners are approving. If there is a map of any kind that could give me a clearer view I would really appreciate it. The property I'm looking at is five acres seven miles up [street name], which connects with Spirit Lake Hwy. This would be hugely appreciated.

Thank you, Caroline Wood

Communication ID: 13765

Date Received: 10/28/2011

Name: DAVID A JARVIS

Hi Seth, We forgot to ask this when we spoke the other day: Due to the increased height of the new towers 52-4 and 52-5, will there be lights on them? If so, strobe, red, blinking, etc?

Communication ID: 13766

Date Received: 11/4/2011

Name: WILLIAM L BORCHERS,MARGIE J BORCHERS,W WAYNE CHANDLER,MARK G COOKSEY TRUSTEE,SUSAN G COOKSEY TRUSTEE,CLETE C EASTWOOD,DONNA L EASTWOOD,LEANNE D HALL,LANA L HALL,JANE IPPOLITI,THOMAS IPPOLITI,LYNETTE MAREK,STEVEN MAREK,DONALD ROONEY,SHIRLEY ROONEY,DEBBIE TRAPP

Dear Mr. Wright,

Enclosed please find the sixteen signatures from concerned property and home owners located on the proposed route #26. We are part of Beaverbrook Estates in Yacolt, WA, and we are strongly protesting any new corridor as all new corridors cross eco-sensitive land. Our area is laced with wetlands and species such as Northern Flickers, raccoons, deer, moles, slugs, Mountain Beavers, etc. as well as old growth stumps and the endangered trillium flower.

We request that you use the existing corridors (#9 #25) as they can be expanded at a minimum cost to everyone.

Please acknowledge receipt of this petition and publish the same as a general comment on the project website and records. Thank you.

Marguerite Borchers

[address]

[phone]

[email]

Communication ID: 13767

Date Received: 11/4/2011

Name: DAN L CAMPBELL

Comment was initiated from <http://www.bpa.gov/corporate/i-5-eis/ecomment.cfm>

I do not seem to be able to send my comment?

Please Contact Me

DAN CAMPBELL

[email]

[phone]

Communication ID: 13768

Date Received: 11/9/2011

Name: TODD A PERCIVAL

We just moved to this address on [Road name] on October 1st 2011. Much to my surprise and lack of diligence on my part I just recently became aware that the proposed "Central Alternative Route" specifically segment "V" on the route map, is literally going down the hill directly behind my house. Please consider very seriously about taking the East Alternative Route to build the new power lines. There would be so fewer people affected in that part of the county. This is a beautiful area and the single purpose of us purchasing this property last month, would be absolutely destroyed by the construction of the power lines literally in my back yard. Not to mention MY driveway has been selected as one of the main access roads to build these new towers. I have a very young family and I absolutely DO NOT want my child exposed the possible dangers of these power lines and exposure to all the vehicles infringing on my property to build these power lines. I understand Weyerhaeuser if fighting strongly to keep an east alternative from becoming a reality due to the loss of revenue from the trees they would be unable to harvest as a result of the power lines. The private citizens in this area certainly can't compete with the money Weyerhaeuser has to fight this. But please consider they aren't the ones that have to LIVE around these power lines permanently on a daily basis. It would make me absolutely sick to think BPA will destroy the lives of private citizens over a "big money" corporation who has no personal tie to the property these power lines would be constructed on. Please. We literally beg you not to use the Central Alternative route. Please find another alternative. There are many beautiful homes and property in this part of Clark County that would be absolutely devastated by the construction of these proposed power line in our backyards. Thank for your time and serious consideration. Todd Percival [Address]

Communication ID: 13769

Date Received: 11/11/2011

Name: JASON CARPENTER

BPA needs to use their existing right away. Rate payers in the past have paid for that land just so it could be used for such existing power line needs. For them to come in and for our so called govt. representatives to give them any possible alternative is flat out wrong. We all need to stand up for our property rights since our elected officials won't. I for one will fight BPA in court if they put a line over my property and I am not alone. Then all of rate payers, not just the ones being directly impacted by these power lines can pay higher rates due to the increased expenses BPA will endure by taking or trying to take our land.

Communication ID: 13770

Date Received: 11/10/2011

Name: PATTI OLSON

Hi, Lou,

I just happened to look at the BPA website. I usually do every Friday, since I've noticed BPA has more or less adopted Obama's strategy of the 'Friday afternoon document dump.' Of course, this is LIKE a Friday afternoon, since tomorrow is a Federal holiday. Not a private businessman's holiday, however.

Anyway, that aside, what has caused this delay? As I've mentioned to you several times, the agony of this horrible uncertainty dragging on for months and months, and now into years, is very distressing. And now this??!! I originally was told the DEIS, with the legendary 'preferred route' identified, would be out this fall. You know, the information for which I've been waiting, for over a year now, to learn what will be the fate of my home, my garden, my driveway. After the previous recent schedule adjustment, the verdict was to be unleashed soon after the holidays, anyway. Are you hoping we will all just be committed after succumbing to two or three years of mind-blowing anxiety, and our estate managers won't care enough to fight on for the cause of our homes and properties?

I'm sorry; I don't imagine you welcome the delay, either. But it isn't YOUR HOME that is hanging in the balance!! I so hoped to know something before the Christmas holidays. Sometimes I think almost ANYTHING would be better than this not knowing. So what happened?

Very sincerely, Patti

Communication ID: 13771

Date Received: 11/14/2011

Name: JANE M REVESZ,PETER REVESZ

To Mark Korsness, Doug Johnson, and Maryam Asgharian,

With our heightened concern that the Grey Line is being taken seriously as recently presented by Terry Constance and his associated groups, we are submitting a preliminary criticism that focuses on a segment drawn through our Tarbell Tree Farm, [Parcel].

This is not to imply we approve of or prefer any of the other alternatives that are on or next to our family tree farms. In fact, the very worst choice remains the "O" line that bisects our family's King Creek Tree Farm on [Parcel] and has multiple access roads that all together results in a terrible situation for our tree farm and one that would not serve you well either.

Peter and Jane Revesz Clark County Tree Farmers

A SPECIFIC CRITICISM OF THE LATEST GREY LINE ROUTE FROM HARMED LANDOWNERS

As landowners who may be severely affected by the I-5 Reinforcement Project Transmission Line(s), we are alerting those concerned that a segment of the "Grey Line" proposed by three activist groups and others is in a very bad location. We are referring to the southern east-west segment on the Google Earth

portrayal of the Grey Line that is own to project to the east from the "O" line in the Yacolt Burn area south of the East Fork of the Lewis River.

This portion of the line travels within our property in [Parcel]; the 90 degree turn of the "Grey Line" on the eastern end of this segment is on our property and then runs west approximately 2200 feet through our property. No one approached us about the characteristics of this portion even though they say they used GPS on the ground and are experts. Did they trespass? We certainly gave no permission. Since this tree farm—The Tarbell Place on Kloochman Butte—has been owned by our family since before the Forest Road 1100 was built, we know the terrain, the artifacts, the fish-bearing streams, the homesteader's history (Mr. Tarbell), and the forest and its special high elevation vegetation very well. We also know where the corner survey monuments are. The property lines that are implied on this "Google Earth.kmz file for the Latest Grey Line Route (October, 2011) on the nowaybpa.com website" are substantially off so that some "experts" may have assumed they were putting the "Grey Line" on DNR land. Whether this particular segment was owned privately or not, it would be a very damaging location to put the line. Anyone who is aware that steep land is not a good choice for transmission lines could easily tell by looking at a topographic map that these 2200 feet with two steep canyons each with a fish-bearing creek in the bottom would be an outlandish choice.

We must also mention this line would decimate our best timber stands on the place, run over the historic location of the Tarbell cabin with the surviving trees he planted, put in danger some cultural trees (Western red cedar with markings from 1890 use by Native Americans), and cause severe disruption of riparian zones on fish-bearing creeks. One of the affected creeks, Icicle Creek, had its culvert under the 1100 road replaced by a concrete bridge at considerable cost that included Federal dollars within the last few years by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Washington Department of Natural Resources, to remove a fish-barrier. This Grey Line, which is placed just upstream of this bridge, would result in clearing of the ROW that would encompass the entire length of the newly opened fish habitat and its protective riparian area.

We can provide much detail on our tree farms and why they are inappropriate locations for the transmission line, however, we find our time severely hampered by one proposed line after another. Just within the last couple of months some five different "grey lines" have appeared in the press or online. Since our tree farms were purchased "out there" where a tree farm ought to be, we are repeatedly threatened. Our family has been able to keep the tree farms pretty much intact and in our ownership. However, this most recent threat of alternative lines has taken more of our time than we can afford. If the proposed loss to transmission lines of land, timber, and peace of mind comes to pass we could be out of business. We are threatened.

On all the BPA line alternatives except the BPA-owned right of way, our family tree farms are under the gun. As BPA's consultant and Pacificorp acknowledge, at least a 550-foot swath is affected if the objective is growing up to 200-foot tall trees. Much of east county forestlands are affected by severe east winds, which increase the damages to the forests that adjoin the cleared right of way. Beyond that, the edge effects and the consequence of winds contribute to blow down and change of flora and fauna into the remaining timber stands.

This project should not be allowed to decimate great swaths of forestland. Western Washington's tall timberlands, much of which has been taken already for development, should be kept for timber production while we can. The zoning of Forest Tier I and II in Clark County was to retain timberlands that are kept for working forests. As stated by BPA, transmission lines and trees are incompatible. Some better solution needs to be found than kicking these utilities out to the sustainable timberlands. It makes no sense that we be put out of business to serve others when the purpose of our lands is precisely to grow timber and provide those advantages that healthy forests provide. As timberland owners, our service to the people of our country should be to continue to provide home grown timber for the provision of shelter, to keep the forests for the diversity of fish and wildlife and native plants and continue to provide the forests where streams originate. Let's not so overburden our forest owners that we send our timber growing abroad and we have to start over again in this country to build productive, working forests.

Peter and Jane Revesz

November 14, 2011

Communication ID: 13772

Date Received: 11/16/2011

Name: MARSHALL L PILE

Take the Beast East Please. Less impact on our communities than any other route. These high power lines in our neighborhoods and near the schools is not the right choice. The Eastern options are the Right Choice. It's not a tough decision at all.

Communication ID: 13773

Date Received: 11/16/2011

Name: DELBERT G KISSINGER

Yeah, my name is Delbert Kissinger. My address is [address]. My phone number is area code [phone]. I want to know what your latest proposal on that route, that I-5 Corridor that's coming. The last time they said it was coming awful close to my property and my house. I don't know if they changed it or not. Send me something to show me the route that would concern me in my area. That's all. Bye bye.

Communication ID: 13774

Date Received: 11/16/2011

Name: ROBERT W EDSTEDT

This is probably a very basic question, but can you tell me in which direction the electricity will be flowing? It seems that it is going from Castle Rock to the Gresham/Troutdale area? Is this true? Thank you.

Communication ID: 13775

Date Received: 11/17/2011

Name: KELLIE A ONEILL

Your map is not accurate, i.e. The city of Battle Ground is located too far east of 503. Also, the map does not provide enough information. Please identify and locate accurately towns, minor roads and landmarks, i.e. Battle Ground Lake and other parks. Thanks you.

Communication ID: 13776

Date Received: 11/17/2011

Name: BEVERLY G TURNER

BPA should use the existing corridor for their reinforcement Project. This would be the most economical choice and the most environmental friendly choice. Why waste taxpayers money destroy property??

Communication ID: 13777

Date Received: 11/18/2011

Name: MARGARET A HENDRIX

I will not be able to attend the meeting on December 8, but trust this e-mail comment can count as my voice for that evening....please do not impact the children and physically fragile whole live the the 3000 plus homes that the Clark/Cowlitz route impact to say nothing of the children attending the schools along the route...spending a little more each month to protect these lives is worth it....

Communication ID: 13778

Date Received: 11/16/2011

Name: SCOTT J HARSHBARGER

Our address is [address]. We reside at the location that the existing BPA crosses I-5 in Kelso. Without regard to which route you expect to take, it is my understanding that the existing lines are going to increase in power capacity. I wish to advise you that I have a metal plate in my neck that will cause me medical risk when the voltage is increased. I will not be able to remain in this house when this voltage increase occurs. Fortunately I am willing to relocate. I have no idea if my circumstance will affect you overall decision but, I want to be forthcoming to assist in your efforts. Should you require the medical details regarding my implant, please contact me and documentation will be provided.

Thank You,

Scott Harshbarger

[address]

[phone]

Communication ID: 13779

Date Received: 11/16/2011

Name: ROD NYLUND

I am not going to attend meeting. But my comments as a tax payer and Home owner living next to the proposed line are simple. If its true there is room on your existing right of way, then why not due the most cost effective simple solution and put it there. If thats not true then why not move it to the middle of State and Longview fibre land so the impact to home owners is minimal.

Why does Burocrocy always need to waste time, and tax payer money on wasted studies, meeting etc. when theres a common sense solution?

Rod Nylund

Communication ID: 13780

Date Received: 11/16/2011

Name: EILEEN P GEORGE,JACK E GEORGE II

Battleground is just too far for us to travel to for your "listening" evening, and driving in the dark in winter weather is not an option. Please hold one of these meetings in Castle Rock as well.

Thank you.

Eileen and Jack George

Communication ID: 13781

Date Received: 11/18/2011

Name: HEATHER RAMSAY

You currently have correspondence routed to Gloria Shinn for LWCF and UPARR issues. Please note that I am the correct contact for projects in Washington state. Thanks for updating your information.

Communication ID: 13782

Date Received: 11/18/2011

Name: MIKE R HAYDEN

I have asked and requested That our ATV group be given the availability to use some or part of the power line for recreation purposes. most of our members are retired and disabled with a desire to be able to ride their quad in Washington. I have not had any response from your group as to a pro or con on the idea. I have seen in other areas that power lines can be used for trails and recreation. let me know Thanks Mike

Communication ID: 13783

Date Received: 11/20/2011

Name: LEVIN F NOCK

Additional Non-wires Alternatives for the I-5 Corridor

By Levin Nock

Aerotek contractor to BPA in Energy Efficiency Emerging Technologies

November 2011

Introduction

Please consider the following non-wires alternatives, to broaden the portfolio of alternatives already studied in the "Non-wires Screening Report" of January 2011.

In the 6th Power Plan, energy conservation is the preferred way to address load growth. Therefore, it seems to me that energy conservation should be preferred over new infrastructure, where feasible, to address the summer load growth that is anticipated in the I-5 Corridor. While the Screening Report considered deferral of construction for 5 years (with a savings of almost \$94M), the report did not consider permanent replacement (with a value of \$342M). The alternatives should be evaluated in terms of a budget of \$342M for permanent replacement.

The proposed transmission line has provoked protests from thousands of ratepayers, and will have negative environmental impact. Few of the alternatives (from the screening report, and additional ones listed below) are likely to cause any protests or negative environmental impact. If BPA eliminates protests and eliminates negative environmental impact, this will reduce the risk of project delays and enhance BPA's image. The value of this risk reduction and image enhancement should be included in the calculated value of the non-wires alternatives.

The Screening Report described a risk that adequate redispatch might not become available in time. With the additional alternatives listed below, and a budget based on permanent replacement rather than deferral, the total alternative opportunity is more than sufficient. However, in order for a complete portfolio of alternatives to actually materialize by 2015, this will need to be pursued promptly, with

substantial funding. To the extent that the alternatives and the transmission line are both pursued in parallel, this could raise the total cost of the overall project.

Additional Alternatives

Five alternatives are listed, roughly prioritized with the most cost-effective first. They are:

-All Available Cost-Effective Energy Efficiency

-Plant Trees

-Cool Roofs

-Energy Storage

-Distributed Generation

All Available Cost-Effective Energy Efficiency

According to the 6th Power Plan, “the most cost-effective and least risky resource for the region is improved efficiency of electricity use”. Throughout 2011, BPA’s Energy Efficiency group has found that conservation is available in larger quantities and at lower prices than predicted by the 6th Plan. In other words, aggressive energy efficiency targets beyond the 6th Plan targets are achievable at reasonable cost.

Despite the high priority placed on conservation in the 6th Plan, and the recent experience of BPA’s Energy Efficiency group in procuring plentiful and cost-effective conservation, the Non-wires Screening Report (p.47-49) assumed load reductions for PGE and Clark PUD that were more conservative than the 6th Plan. Further, the report apparently assumed that only the existing funding would be available for efficiency programs, without additional funds to reflect the additional value to BPA represented by summer peak reduction in the I-5 corridor.

If BPA provides extra funds to existing energy efficiency programs, the programs will capture energy savings that are larger than the 6th Plan predictions. Some of these energy savings will be available at the prevailing annualized price of \$0.02/kwh. When those opportunities have been exhausted, additional energy savings will be available at higher prices. Higher prices may be reasonable in the context of buying a year or two of extra time for negotiations about redispatch.

As a bonus benefit, some summer-peak measures will also provide energy savings during the winter peak. For instance for packaged HVAC rooftop units, measures that save energy all year long include enhanced maintenance programs and VFD retrofits.

Plant Trees

Urban trees reduce the urban heat island effect, reducing the peak summer demand for cooling. For instance, this study found a value in energy cost savings of \$20 to \$60 per year per tree. The City of New York is promoting cool roofs plus street trees to save electricity in the summer. Portland has existing

volunteer-based tree-planting programs such as Friends of Trees that could be leveraged very cost-effectively. Ideally, urban tree-planting programs would be coordinated with rooftop solar programs, to plan the best locations for each.

The Willamette Partnership is quantifying the regional market for ecosystem services, with rigorous verification and clearly defined value. For example, if a farmer in the Willamette Valley plants trees to shade a section of the Willamette River, a wastewater treatment plant downstream can run their chillers less frequently, to cool the wastewater discharge entering the river. In a market for ecosystem services, the wastewater treatment plant operator pays the farmer for the service.

As an energy conservation measure, the performance of each tree improves over several decades, and the typical persistence of the measure is 50 to 100 years. Non-energy benefits include enhanced air quality, stormwater management, wildlife habitat, aesthetics, carbon sequestration, and (for fruit and nut trees) locally grown food. Net environmental impact is strongly positive.

Cool Roofs

Partnerships with the local cities, counties, Metro, and/or trade associations could address many commercial and residential rooftops by 2015, promoting white reflective roofs, green (vegetated) roofs, and/or rooftop solar panels. White, reflective roofs are incredibly cost-effective in California, where they reduce summer cooling loads. Green roofs reduce peak demand for summer cooling and also for winter heating, while providing non-energy benefits such as stormwater management, avian habitat, and increased longevity of the roofing membrane with UV protection and reduced thermal cycling. Non-energy benefits such as stormwater management bring significant resources to the table, such as Portland's existing green roof program. In addition to the benefits within each building, white roofs and green roofs reduce the urban heat island effect, reducing the peak cooling demand of neighboring buildings.

Rooftop solar panels shade the roof underneath, reducing peak cooling loads, while simultaneously generating locally-distributed electricity during times of peak summer demand. SolarCity, LeaseSolarNow/CitizenRe, and ImagineEnergy all offer local zero-money-down solar PV (photo-voltaic) installations. The industry association OSEIA could probably suggest cost-effective leverage points for incentives for the local market. In Germany, distributed PV systems maintain automatic 2-way communication with the grid operator. Similar communications could be required for incentivized PV systems, to address concerns about unpredictable distributed generation.

Energy Storage

Grid-scale energy storage technology has developed rapidly in the past few years, since the 6th Power Plan was written. While gas peaking plants are fueled by natural gas with fluctuating prices, energy storage is "fueled" by surplus nighttime electricity—which BPA has plenty of.

If energy storage is only used during a few weeks of each year for peak summer demand, then the cost may be prohibitively high. However, a fleet of containerized mobile flow batteries could be parked near

Portland during the summer, and moved to other locations as needed throughout the year. This would provide a flexible resource to manage various challenges at various points in the transmission/distribution grid, and to respond as loads and generation evolve over time. This could provide a cost-effective and flexible asset, compared to permanent upgrades in transmission and distribution infrastructure. For example, if the \$128M project budget for land acquisition were invested in flow batteries with a system capital cost of \$1400/kW, that would provide 91 MW of deployable storage with a capacity of 3 to 4 hours. While 91 MW would not solve the entire challenge, it might comprise one component of a comprehensive solution. Capital costs are dropping below \$1000/kW for some brands of flow batteries, and are expected to continue dropping over the next decade. Other methods of energy storage are also developing rapidly for stationary applications, such as compressed air in underwater air tanks.

Thermal ice storage may be cost-effective in specific focused applications. For instance, the Portland airport could use a system such as Cryogel to cool airplanes rapidly without high peaks in demand. This is popular in airports such as Atlanta, Miami, Chicago and San Francisco.

Distributed Generation

BPA could partner with Pacificorps & Clark PUD to develop dispatchable distributed power programs similar to PGE's. Admittedly, small diesel generators have a negative environmental impact, and are unlikely to offer a longterm solution as air pollution standards grow more stringent. Nevertheless, distributed diesel power programs could provide an interim solution for distributed power while solar PV prices continue to drop. Solar PV is mentioned above under "Cool Roofs".

Communication ID: 13784

Date Received: 11/18/2011

Name: ERNA SARASOHN

Maryam,

Thank you for the PGE figures. I will appreciate it if you would re send me the PGE figures for both the winter and summer peak leads.

Thank you

Erna

Communication ID: 13785

Date Received: 11/21/2011

Name: SUSAN B MOUTON-BRIGGS

[Maryam Asgharian responded to a communication asking about specific properties in reference to the project.]

Communication ID: 13786

Date Received: 11/22/2011

Name: KATHRYN LYNN HOOD

I am the owner of both the [address 1] AND [address 2] properties and I do NOT want any power upgrades and/or right of ways (access) anywhere near, on or around my properties. BPA has other alternatives that can be used without disrupting family neighborhoods. It has been proven that California has defaulted on it's power payments to local utilities (BPA subs) and there is NO reason to continually feed them our power when the taxpayers are the ones that have to make up the 18% difference by the increase in OUR Electrical bills. I am NOT going to pay for california. Stay away from my properties as this is not a reinforcement project but just one to gain more money from other states who will pay for the power. You are NOT welcome here. Kathryn Hood

Communication ID: 13787

Date Received: 11/16/2011

Name: DOLORES SHIRTS

Hello Heidi,

Here is the comment that I was trying to leave in the comment box concerning the suggested new routes that BPA is considering:

The Western route being suggested takes every home in our cul-de-sac except us. Also all the homes up and down 39th Street and across Sherwood Drive from us, plus hundreds more. This leaves us sitting in an open field which in effect destroys the value of our home and causes displacement of many, many families. You will be expected to provide descent roadways for us alone!!! Why in the world would you make a decision to destroy so many homes and neighborhoods when you could choose an Eastern route in the woods?????

Communication ID: 13788

Date Received: 11/20/2011

Name: PHILIP SHANTEAU

Dear BPA I-5 I own two houses on route 3 between 3/7 and 3/8 towers. The house [address] within the 150' corridor and you will need to strip the trees off the hill side and the erosion will eventually take out the access to the house. If you decide you are going to use this route I believe you will have to condemn my house. I will be expecting highest possible price for my home. Be clear this is my legal right. Also I

have a log home at [address] that has a South facing window that will be severely impacted by having power lines running through it. I will demand compensation for the destruction of my property value. And I would prefer to be bought out again at the highest possible sale value. I also know you have existing right away you can use that impacts no one so why are you insisting on destroying peoples property? If you think you can use the Homeland Security issues think again! A fair shot with a good rifle and a scope could put the power line on the ground in seconds with less than six well placed round. And if they had a suppressor they could do it just about anywhere. The transmission lines are undefendable and having several routes will not make it any safer. Philip Shanteau

Please Contact Me

Communication ID: 13789

Date Received: 11/23/2011

Name: JEREMIAH

[Maryam Asgharian received a phone call from Jeremiah (no last name given). Jeremiah asked if any proposed line went through [address]]

Communication ID: 13790

Date Received: 11/16/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,DOLE VALLEY LANDOWNERS' COALITION ,FRIENDS OF UPPER LACAMAS CREEK ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY,JANICE DAVIS,VALERIE GARDNER,BOLTON C MINISTER,RAYMOND B RICHARDS,ROD SMITH

November 16, 2011

Bonneville Power Administration
Stephen J. Wright, Administrator
PO Box 3621
Portland, OR 97209-3621

Mr. Wright:

You have proposed building a 500 kV transmission line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon to reinforce the high-voltage power grid in southwest Washington.

We request that you respect property rights and the landowners impacted by your project by

- minimizing the impact to landowners. Regardless of which Alternative is chosen, the transmission corridor must follow property lines, running along edges or borders, instead of bisecting private land.
- extending the public comment period with release of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the Preferred Alternative.

- compensating agricultural landowners for any present and future losses they may incur.
- compensating landowners for the loss of viewscapes created by a new transmission corridor.
- finding alternative ways to route access roads so that they do not cut through private properties.
- building this project on existing BPA right-of-way using options that add as little new property as possible.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Brantley – Chair

Bolt Minister – Vice Chair

Valerie Gardner – Secretary

Ray Richards – Treasurer

Rod Smith – Media Advisor

Jan Davis – Membership

Working Together To Preserve Our Landowner Rights

Dole Valley Landowners' Coalition

A Better Way for BPA

Friends of Upper Lacamas Creek

Communication ID: 13791

Date Received: 11/29/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,DOLE VALLEY LANDOWNERS' COALITION ,DENNIS BARBUR,MARLA BARBUR,CATHERINE E CANNIVET,MARGARET A CHARPILLOZ,THOMAS D FRINK,JUDY G FRINK,DONALD E GABBERT,RICHARD J GIERLOFF,MICHELE C HOLDER,ROY COURTNEY JOHNSON TRUSTEE,JESSICA L JULSON,D

Please submit the following comment on the BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project:

The Dole Valley Landowner Coalition in conjunction with A Better Way for BPA says

BPA use your OWN land!

Bonneville Power Administration has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. The proposed "V" would pass through or near all of our members' properties, invading private land, restricting landowner rights and rendering some parcels useless. This

route would harm the East Fork of the Lewis River, Rock Creek, other tributary streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife. The least expensive alternative and the one with the least impact on property rights and the environment would be to use routes 9 and 25 where BPA already has towers and lines. Any of the new routes that BPA has proposed would cut a 70-mile long swath through the countryside of Clark and Cowlitz counties. BPA tells us there is enough room on its current right-of-way for this project. We say BPA should use its own land, the existing corridor. It just makes the most sense!

-The existing corridor has 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.

-Placing the new lines on the existing corridor is the least expensive alternative and would be the best use of ratepayers' money.

-There is minimal impact to private property owners from adding lines on a corridor where towers and lines already exist.

-Using any route other than the existing corridor would cost landowners in two counties a loss of an estimated 1300 acres.

We, the undersigned, ask BPA to not violate our property rights. We ask BPA to use our ratepayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on its own land, the existing corridor of routes 9 and 25, where it has had lines and towers for the past 70 years.

Communication ID: 13792

Date Received: 12/1/2011

Name: JAMES DOW,JANE DOW

Hi, I'd like to get removed from the mailing list because I've moved out of the area. I'm Jane M Dow and on the address card that we got recently it said James Dow and Jane Dow. The address is [address]. There are new owners there now so they might like to get the information. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13793

Date Received: 12/1/2011

Name: CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

December 1, 2011 There is a distinct difference between the already impacted areas along your existing transmission corridor compared to the impact to the land, people, and the environment on any of the new proposed transmission corridor alternatives.

Communication ID: 13794

Date Received: 12/1/2011

Name: ROGER WILLIAMS

[Called BPA asking about location of proposed line in respect to his property]

Communication ID: 13795

Date Received: 12/2/2011

Name: GEORGE A EATON

A new transmission line should be in a remote area where the fewest homeowners, business and schools are affected.

Communication ID: 13796

Date Received: 12/2/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

1. Will the Alternative Data be updated and current in the Spring 2012 DEIS?
2. Is the existing ROW going to stay in the study even after release of a preferred alternative, essentially narrowing route choices down to two (Existing ROW and Preferred Alternative)?
3. When we met last month, we understood that the routes are all "shelved" and when a route is chosen you will study it more closely. Will you revisit and study all the routes at that time?
4. Is BPA implementing a 500' setback (buffer) from homes for the towers and lines in this project?
5. Why is BPA only addressing Alternatives and not Options? Are the Options out of the study?
6. We request a date as to when you will announce a decision on the "grey" route.

Notes from our board to you and the BPA staff on this project

There is a distinct difference between land already impacted by your existing transmission corridor compared to any new transmission corridor. The numbers of homes, land, ornamental shrubs, and schools, along your existing transmission corridor are already impacted by your existing transmission corridor, no matter what you or anyone else tells us.

Cheryl Brantley

[phone]

A Better Way for BPA

<http://abetterway4bpa.org>

Join us on Facebook: <http://www.facebook.com/pages/A-Better-Way-for-BPA/470367100121>

"The three great rights are so bound together as to be essentially one right. To give a man his life, but deny him his liberty

is to take from him all that makes his life worth living. To give him his liberty, but take from him the property which is the

fruit and badge of his liberty is to still leave him a slave."- George Sutherland, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, 1921.

Communication ID: 13797

Date Received: 12/3/2011

Name: STEVE DOBBINS

It is reasonable to assume that future electric demands may see the need to expand electric power lines further. It will likely be at a time when hostility toward a new line will be greater than today. Why not select an additional easement route other than the one that exists today in an area that is least populated. Then at the appropriate time the existing lines in the current easement space can be replaced with more efficient lines using the same tower locations and spacing that presently exist. Houses were built with the present power line configuration and using the same location as they exist now would be the least intrusive method. If power lines were to be placed alongside the existing ones, it would negatively impact a large number of home owners along present easement, as I am one of these. It would affect our health, both real and perceived, reduce buffer trees that protect our trees making them vulnerable to winds, create powerlines closer to our homes where they didn't exist previously, and reduce our property values. It is true that people will be impacted no matter which approach is adopted, but shouldn't we impact the fewest possible with a plan that will meet not only near future demand, but all future demand. Thank You, Steve Dobbins

Communication ID: 13798

Date Received: 12/3/2011

Name: GAYLE MATTSON

How close would this be to 50th Avenue in the Pleasant Valley area?

Please Contact Me

Gayle

Communication ID: 13799

Date Received: 12/7/2011

Name: GAYLE MATTSON

Thank you so much for your reply. The reason I am asking is that we are considering buying property around 50th Ave and NE 125th Circle. On the map I saw the present right of way, but not the proposed right of way. How might this impact the area I mentioned? Would we regret buying in this area? What

timeline is being considered? If you could reply as soon as possible, that would help. We are thinking of doing this soon.

Thank you again for your help.

Gayle

Communication ID: 13800

Date Received: 11/29/2011

Name: WILLIAM A GUNDERSON,DEANNA J GUNDERSON,JODI RIU

[Unique comments on petition 13665]

Please submit the following comment on the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project:

Communication ID: 13801

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: MONICA S GRUHER,JAMES S GRUHER

DO NOT chose WEST!!

Our home of ten years is on the populated and also highly environmental west segments 41/45. This area is home to two beautiful golf courses, environmental wetlands and many homesites. The placement of these high voltage lines will render our property (which we have over \$750,000 invested) virtually unsaleable. It is very close to our house where two small children live. There are many families and nice homes in this segment line whose health will be adversely impacted. They would ride their pony weaving in and out of the legs of the towers submitting themselves daily to substantial health risks. In addition you will be destroying most of the city of Camas and east Vancouver, not to mention our entire net worth. Please do not chose this segment line, be responsible! If the west alternative is unwisely chosen, 36B, 40, 46-50 would affect fewest homes, or 39 to R. Be responsible - chose the East or Central alternative to stay away from populated areas and "protected" wetlands!

Communication ID: 13802

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: DAVID SCHAAF

There is no acceptable reason and no need to route high voltage lines through general residential areas when alternatives exist. Considering economic and potential health risks/legal action, I urge the decision makers to route these wires through the area of least human impact. We are beyond choosing between trees and electricity. Our lifestyles demand the supply BPA, etc are working to deliver. Now it is up to

BPA and its consultants to choose the path which has the least impact on its customers, constituents and hosts. Please respect the will of the people.

Communication ID: 13803

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: MARGARET A HENDRIX

While you own the existing right of way, it now stands in the middle of major urban development. You are endangering the health of generations of South West Washington children.

Communication ID: 13804

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: JAMES HARRIS

Will you add the grey line to the DEIS?

You have sat on this for close to a year, how much longer do you need?

Communication ID: 13805

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: SANDRA S BENNETT

The route currently favored by the BPA goes right through our neighborhood.

Bonneville Power originally announced it needed this new mega power line in case an act of terrorism or natural disaster disrupted power along the existing line.

Then they said that Oregonians had threatened to take up arms if the line crossed into Oregon via the PEARL route, a more logical route.

Later we learned that the power from the new lines would primarily be sold to Oregon and California.

Recently it has been reported that there is a GLUT of power in Washington because of a surplus of water behind the dams AND because of all the Wind Turbines....many of which have been turned off because they can't sell their power.

BPA has not adequately addressed concerns about health hazards associated with EMFs emitted from towers of this size, and they have been indifferent to the negative impact these mega-towers, if built along the I-5 Corridor (it's preferred route) will have on home values in the area.

Home owners in Clark and Cowlitz counties have already lost significant property value due to the recession. It would be unconscionable to cause further loss of property value by having these mega-towers imposed on them.

BPA says it will be far more costly to place the new line in the far eastern quadrant of the county, but why should we have to give up our land so BPA can sell more power?

It appears that the primary beneficiaries of BPA's scheme to expand its market will be Oregon and California. Thus, if extra funding is needed for the line BPA should look to those two states and quit trying to ram to scheme down our throats.

Communication ID: 13806

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: SHARON MARKS

I live in a beautiful neighborhood. Beautiful homes, a wonderful green space. Lovely walking paths and trails.

You want to destroy all that - sacrifice our home values, the pleasure in our lives, perhaps our health to save a multi-billion dollar company a little money.

I don't know how you can sleep at night.

Communication ID: 13807

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: JOHN HAYENGA

We support the new line to be placed as far east as possible. This will minimize the EMF exposure and unsightly blight of the lines to the least populated areas.

When the existing right-of-way was reserved for power line use, it would never have been conceived to put 150 foot towers on it through potentially mainly populated areas.

If it is put through the existing right-of-way, compensation should be paid to those whose home values will be decimated.

Putting this line through Oregon should be an option.

Communication ID: 13808

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: E GREGORY BRADY,LESLIE M LOUNSBERRY-BRADY

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF BPA'S PROPOSED LINE "O" ON THE 220-ACRE KING CREEK TREE FARM NOW OWNED BY LESLIE BRADY (LOUNSBERY) AND GREG BRADY, GRANDCHILDREN OF ORIGINAL OWNERS LEON AND WINIFRED WITTER

ACRES LOST

BPA Right of Way (O) 50.0 Acres

ORPHANED STRIP (C) 24.5 Acres

ACCESS ROADS 12.4 Acres

TOTAL BPA IMPACT: 86.9 Acres Lost from Forestry Usage

[graphic included in attachment]

KEY:

Acres remaining for normal forestry (A) = 122.5 minus Access Roads (12.4) = 110.1

BPA ROW (O) =150 ft wide Easement + 200 feet each side to be cleared

Orphaned Strip (C) = 270 ft wide orphaned strip becomes prey to wind throw, etc.

Additional Acres lost from normal forestry due to Riparian Buffer on King Creek (R) =23 acres reducing usable acres for normal forestry to 110.1 acres (A)

HISTORY:

"SEND THE BEAST EAST" assumes the forests of Eastern Clark County have insignificant private property rights or human history value and don't represent the investment of family savings and sweat equity for generations: WRONG!! Like most Small Business operations in the US, Family Forestry represents decades of effort and dedication. Government, instead of driving Family Forestry off the land, should be recognizing what good stewards of the land Small Forest Landowners are.

Here's an example of a 4-generation tree farm family who love their land and practice sustainable, light-footprint forestry in order to keep it as natural and unspoiled as possible:

Winifred Fletcher and Leon Witter, the original owners, met and married in Yacolt in the 1920's and lived in an expandable cabin along the East Fork of the Lewis River; he was a dentist (Yacolt, Vancouver and Battle Ground) and she a nurse who ran his office. They raised their family camping and hiking and fishing in Eastern Clark County, through the Great Depression and World War 2. At that time dentists weren't covered by Social Security so as they grew older, they planned for their retirement by purchasing land in the Yacolt Burn area because, on that scarred land inhabited by old-growth snags and lots of brush, they could see the young Doug fir trees struggling to get above the competition. They knew that if our family all worked hard to hack down the alder and the brush, the young Doug fir would survive and grow into merchantable timber by the time they retired. Winifred lived to age 97 and Leon

to 91 as they gradually logged and replanted their land to cover the modest needs of their retirement and start a new crop of seedlings for subsequent generations to care for. This is the land we children, grandchildren and great grandchildren cherish. But the "Taking" of the value of our timber by government agencies is making it harder and harder to manage our timber land in a sensible and sustainable manner. Our private-property rights are being threatened. Our attempts have been brushed aside by BPA to point out how poorly laid-out Line O is in terms of steep slopes, potential landslides and protected aquatic species. Why BISECT a hard-established stand of timber and unnecessarily orphan many cut-off acres? And please be aware that keeping a 550-foot-wide Right of Way cleared of tall timber in the Yacolt Burn area will require massive doses of herbicide in perpetuity on a protected stretch of King Creek. SO WE ARE HERE TO INSIST THAT THERE ARE REAL COSTS TO RUNNING THIS TRANSMISSION LINE THROUGH RURAL CLARK COUNTY, in terms of environmental concerns, property rights issues and small business impacts.

Communication ID: 13809

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: KEITH MATHISON

Go East young man

From the 8/2010 Fact sheet....

The Fact Sheet says "State renewable resource mandates" in the same paragraph as "access to low-cost power."

1) Please prove that wind power is low-cost? What are the actual results to date? When I drive by wind farms I rarely see them spinning so do they really working efficiently? Where are the studies to prove we should keep building wind farms?

2) Why am I paying for renewable resource "mandates?" Did the people have a chance to vote on these expensive "mandates?"

The Fact Sheet talks about "both new and existing rights-of-ways."

1) When old rights-of-ways get developed on all sides why is not the highest and best use of the land changed?

2) It seems to me old power line rights-of-ways might become obsolete for many reasons much like old private airports do, so why not move the rights-of-ways farther out where fewer developed properties are adversely effected?

15% of BPA's revenues are derived from surplus power sales.

1) If you using inefficient wind farms because of "mandates" not approved by voters, how can you say all of the revenue is used to lower rates? Correct me if I am wrong but I believe rates are higher because of wind farms.

2) The battery power industry says there is a short supply of lithium too so electric cars are nothing but short term PR not a long term solution.

Keith Mathison
Battle Ground, WA
[phone]

Communication ID: 13810

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: JAMES S ETUX BILYEU, SHERRON BILYEU

Thank you for this opportunity to give my story

In 1960, my husbands family purchased our property, and we inherited it in 1985. Our children grew up spending a lot of time there finding out the name of flowers, birds,, trees and much more. It was the ideal place to learn about nature and the environment. One of our daughters currently lives near us, and she and her husband does volunteer work to improve paths for hikers around this beautiful state.

One or both us, spent about 2 - 3 weeks each month at our property, constantly keeping up with the things that needs to be done as homeowners, and stewards of nature.

There are six properties, and at one time, we were all related. We all are careful how we treat the environment. Our properties are next to Speeleyi Creek, which is home to small frogs, salamanders and fingerlings. In 1987, a biologist from Washington State Fisheries and Game, examined the creeks viability, and we were told not to go in the creek, as it was important to the marine life that was coming back.

Our cabins get our water from underground springs, which also feeds into the creek. The creek also boasts mallards, wood ducks and their families. Beavers, otters and fishers use the water as home. Blue heron, kingfishers and cedar waxwings are seen daily when it's warmer weather. Piliated woodpeckers attack old growth timer, and you can see the burnt remains from the Yacolt Fire, jutting into our roadway. Chickadees and hummingbirds expects food from all of us and know when we are there. Bats, screech owls and tiny pygmy owls visit yearly, resting in the fire remains.

We also have an agreement with the Wa. State Fire Wise program, of which we received a grant to keep are properties safe from fires.

Trilliums, Indian pipe, wild columbine, snow drops and ancient rhodies, grow along the road in the shade. Salmonberry, thimbleberry, service berry, salal, kinnikinnick and Oregon grape grow profusely.

Our concern is the impact on the environment that putting access roads, towers, constant noise from the power lines will have on the wildlife and waterways, which we have guarded since 1960. On a personal note, I am concerned with my health and the magnetic field the lines produce.

There is more I'd like to say, that I think you need to know, but time limits me.

Cordially,

Sherron and Jim Bilyeu

[address]

[see PDF for two map graphics]

Communication ID: 13811

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: JORENE HOLTEN, BRAD HOLTEN

Please do not -NO- put it on west alternative

we have three children (ages 2, 5, and 7 years old. It would be right outside in the back of our yard. Thanks for considering. Please don't.

Sincerely,

Jorene Holton

Communication ID: 13812

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: DON E TALBOTT

Build away from populated areas

Communication ID: 13813

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: PHILLIP N HENDRIX

The I-5 Corridor would lower property enjoyment rights and values. It would ignore the fact that some are fearful of health impact. It is disrespectful of those now living along the proposed line. BPA has not been fair or upright with the larger number of people impacted.

Communication ID: 13814

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: BRUCE A HAACK,JENNIFER L TUCKER

December 8, 2011

Dear BPA,

I am writing to vehemently oppose building a new transmission line and associated substations along the existing BPA transmission lines of Segments 9 and 25. I am deeply concerned about the potential exposure to EMF radiation as well as the inherent buzzing noise associated with the new transmission lines. This proposal puts hundreds of families in harm's way, and the potential health problems far outweigh the financial savings of this project. It makes more sense to build the lines further east where the population is less dense.

Another great concern is the lower property value that is inevitable if the new transmission lines are built along the existing lines of Segments 9 and 25. Those living near the existing line are held hostage by the BPA as individuals cannot sell their homes now without disclosing the possible building of the new transmission lines. Hundreds of homes currently exist next to the 230KV power lines with a greenbelt as a barrier. If the proposed 500KV towers are built next to the 230KV lines, the greenbelts will be cut down and people will be forced to look at the massive towers, which can be built as close as 75 feet from their homes. Property values would decrease ten of thousands of dollars, possibly by as much as \$100,000 per household. That also means that homeowners will demand new home assessments. The reduction in property tax revenue will affect needed funds for schools, libraries, fire districts and the county, including road funds.

Please take routes 9 and 25 of the table. Thank you for your consideration.

Communication ID: 13815

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: SCOTT MCGUIRE,RACHEL MCGUIRE

Please go east and announce it quickly. This has impacted my future. My home is nearly unsaleable

As one who has been let go from their job, I would like my flexibility back to make a change. I know you've heard all the sad stories, but each one is very real. Get creative and try extraordinary measures to eliminate the impact to people.

Thanks,

Scott McGuire

Communication ID: 13816

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: JEFF PETERSEN

As a retiree I am very concerned about the visual, financial and economic impacts to our property (which we developed and built on 25 years ago). When you consider the route selection ask yourself the question would you consider purchasing a home or property next to these new towers?

Thank you.

Communication ID: 13817

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: MARK PATRICK BRISLAWN

My wife and I are life long Clark Co. Residence. We built a home on Salmon Creek in 1984 and have enjoyed many happy years there raising our kids and sharing our grandchildren. The east side of the BPA right-of-way is 67' from our home on section 25. If the new 500 KV line is allowed to forward it would greatly impact not only our property value but also our quality of life. Please consider the impact this will have on us and our family. Take the eastern route to minimize the impact on our lives.

Thank you,

Mark Brislawn

Communication ID: 13818

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: V MICHAEL FENNELLY

How can your "fact sheet" say you listen to citizens when you don't even recognize the far east route (around the east side of Silver Lake) that many citizens have proposed?

Communication ID: 13819

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: MARGARET STAPENHORST TRUSTEE

I hope that some one at BPA is forward thinking... not trying to squeeze the area's future energy needs onto a 70 year old easement! I fear that if the existing ROW is selected, we will be revisiting this situation before the I-5 corridor project is even completed = reference recent article from "The Oregonian" and "The Columbian" and the increase in renewable energy/wind power.

Do the right thing for SW WA

" " " " Clark Co

" " " " The People!

" " " " our Future Energy Needs

TAKE THE BEAST EAST!

Communication ID: 13820

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: LYNN STIGLICH

As BPA and the people heard this evening, a compelling combination of emotion, scientific fact and logic make clear there is only one clear choice and decision - take this transmission line far east - away from populated areas. The principle of prudent avoidance is of utmost importance, the health risks associated with exposure to electromagnetic fields are real and non-trivial. The need for technical excellence in engineering decision making and the need to look into the future to plan appropriately taking into account population growth is paramount - and appears to be sorely lacking in the work of the last several years on this project. Maybe there is another clear choice - Don't build it at all - maybe real costs and power needs in the future do not justify this project. Pay attention to the people - we do matter.

Communication ID: 13821

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: KATHY L GREENBERG

DO PEOPLE MATTER??? BPA spends 850 million dollars annually for fish and wildlife but to even think about putting this line so close to schools and neighborhoods is baffling. The recent article in the Columbian stated that 2 schools were within 500' of the proposed towers. You must be counting just Orchards and Covington. We counted 14 schools and daycare within 660! 3,789 children attend those schools, with a total of 14,000 within 1320!

You've had plenty of time to announce the preferred line.

TAKE THE BEAST EAST!!!

Communication ID: 13822

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: BEVERLY JANE FIELDING

I have asked for someone to come and speak to me about the proposed tower siting on my land. Any chance at this stage?

Communication ID: 13823

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: ELIZABETH L HAMILTON

Bonneville Power Administration chief STEPHEN WRIGHT

Dear Sir:

I appreciate all the information you sent me in regards Non- Wires. Since our PUD for Cowlitz County has plainly said their problem is not with a lack of energy lines to move energy, but with too much energy and the inability to sell it to anybody. They have had to shut down their Wind Farm for 6 months of the year. Can't sell it. California owes us 9 Million, so they arn't buying either. Calif. restricts state's utilities from buying out-of-state renewable power.

I would like for you to consider our County Commissioners proposal for a new route that would avoid most populated areas of two counties and string mostly through Weyerhaeuser. Percentage wise I stand to lose more timber than Weyerhaeuser due to my small land size. Weyerhaeuser is also in the Real estate and development business. I would think it to be to their advantage and for BPA to plan for a 100 years from now where people will spread outward in development.

Please consider dropping lines: 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, G, J, H...

Go with F I K, or preferably the the Grey Line.

Thank you,

Elizabeth L. Hamilton

Communication ID: 13824

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: IAN MANCLARK

- Ensure that you take the total cost into accout. \$ spent is important - the less you spend the less it will cost the whole community

- Don't let a minority of people decide the project

- Take into account the total impact on a property - impacting a view is not as significant as taking a property

Communication ID: 13825

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: HOLLY RASMUSSEN

I support no lines in populated areas. 15 story mega towers have no place anywhere near schools!

Do the right thing!

Communication ID: 13826

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: (ANONYMOUS)

Why do you constantly lie to the public about these towers. Why do you put our lives in limbo. Remember you work for the people not the other way around.

Put the towers far from the populated areas.

Do your job correctly.

Communication ID: 13827

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: BARRY A FINKEL TRUSTEE

I have concluded that, because of its mission statement, PBA cannot arrive at a solution that does not involve new transmission lines and so will never arrive at a globally optimum solution. The real problem is that the power generators are too far from the future power users. A more optimum solution would be to require developers to install local co generation facilities for new business and residential construction.

Communication ID: 13828

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: KENT BURNS

The least expensive route is the best route! Any other option would be complete waste of money.

Communication ID: 13829

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: (ANONYMOUS)

LIES

LIES

LIES

[comment written on project fact sheet]

Communication ID: 13830

Date Received: 12/7/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

one more question we would like Mark to discuss Access roads have been somewhat swept under the rug and BPA needs to discuss it more. on access road counts and assumption sheet #14, where does the numbers 30 feet and 20 feet come from and why are they different for existing and new roads?

Cheryl Brantley

A Better Way for BPA

<http://abetterway4bpa.org>

Communication ID: 13831

Date Received: 12/10/2011

Name: BARRY A FINKEL TRUSTEE

When I read the Non-wires study I finally realized what the real problem is: it's that the generators are too far from expected new loads. Then when I looked at BPA's mission statement I discovered that BPA is in the power transmission business. The conclusion I reached is that, because of its charter, BPA cannot consider a solution that does not require new transmission capability and cannot arrive at a solution that is optimum in the overall system sense. BPA's December 2011 non-wires update speaks of small-scale power generation technology but does not explicitly mention co-generation. I toured a new, multi-million square foot building in San Francisco that had a small natural gas fired co-generator on installed on the roof. I was astonished to learn that something that small, about four times the size of my home electric furnace, could not only power the entire building but the waste heat provided hot water for heating the building and there was enough surplus capacity to sell power back to the local power utility. A solution to the current problem, getting power from where it is generated to where it is needed, which eliminates the need to build new, large transmission facilities, would be to require developers to install local utility owned co-generation facilities in large new business facilities, business parks and housing developments. It's well within the state of the art and should be significantly less expensive and more environmentally friendly than new power lines. So, the problem then reduces to gathering together the appropriate governmental agencies and local power utilities to mandate co-generation in new developments. I sincerely hope that BPA, local utilities and politicians can think outside the box to provide a 21st century solution.

Communication ID: 13832

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: WILLIAM E MOYER

Thoughts following on BPA's December 8, 2011 Listening Session on the I-5 Transmission Line Reinforcement Project.

With the delay in energization need date, afforded by the results of the BPA's No-Lines study, a win-win outcome appears possible for BPA and the public. BPA now has the time to delay completion of the no longer time-critical Draft Environmental Impact Statement and instead do the job right.

BPA should immediately drop all line alternates through populated areas, urban or rural from further consideration, and replace all four existing BPA-sanctioned alternate routes with two alternate non-populated area routes. One a north-eastern Castle Rock to Troutdale substation "Grey-Line" route through Federal and State land minimizing proximity to anyone's homes in Washington. And the other a similar south-western populated area-avoiding Castle Rock to Pearl substation route through Oregon. Such populated area avoidance will minimize the public's EMF health concerns, and current residential property value loss concerns.

Simple fairness dictates that residents of Clark and Cowlitz County, here in Washington state, should not be automatically burdened with the lion's share of the impacts of a project, where by anyone's analysis at least 80% of the local benefit is to Portland and residents of Oregon. A DEIS comparing a populated-area avoiding south-western Oregon route against a populated-area avoiding north-eastern Washington route would best serve the public's need for a fair and honest evaluation of an appropriate range of alternatives satisfying NEPA laws and get BPA past their largely self-induced firestorm of public criticism and rancor. And that should minimize the lawsuits BPA will face before the project can be completed.

Routing new 500 kV transmission lines on 150 foot tall towers in populated areas near homes, schools, and churches is a really bad idea. The fact that all present BPA alternate routes for this project do just that is a travesty.

William Moyer

Vancouver

Communication ID: 13833

Date Received: 9/14/2010

Name: MARGARET VAN NUS

Hello Mark,

Mike introduced us at the open meeting in Camas last Sunday. He indicated it would be best for me to be in direct contact with you concerning the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

My property, [address] (Parcel # [parcel number]), on the Coweeman River, is completely inside the swath marked "F" on the map sent to me. The original homesteader's cabin burned; the next owner erected a substantial 3 car garage which we (as present owner) made into a one room "cabin type" dwelling to use throughout the year when caring for the treed land, and for family vacations. There is a

well not presently hooked up, and an old septic field roughly in the middle of the land, East to West, and closer to the Southern border than the north. Electricity is underground. There are 8 acres designated "timber land" with just under 2 acres "set aside for a dwelling"--a more permanent one is planned. Presently I reside in Vancouver.

I check marked the box for "drop-in hours with BPA staff along the route" on the BPA "survey" form, giving the address. If any of the staff feel it advantageous to see the land, I am most happy to meet them at the site. There is a locked gate at the entrance just off Rose Valley Road, very near Jim Watson Creek.

Thank you for your attention,

"Marge" van Nus

Margaret van Nus

[address]

[phone]

Communication ID: 13834

Date Received: 12/11/2011

Name: MARGARET VAN NUS

Mark,

Thank you for the opportunity last Thursday the 8th Dec. for land owners to verbalize their concerns about the I-5 corridor project.

Comments from that meeting, plus my frustration at not finding my property located correctly on the BPA interactive map, led me to further research.

Incredibly, the address we have successfully used for many years is not correct! I now find that there is *no designated* address for the 9.45 acre Parcel [parcel number] we own. The mailbox with [address] was at our driveway on [address] when we purchased the land. A few years ago all the mailboxes were moved closer to Maranatha Road where it intersects with Rose Valley Road. We then changed all correspondence to our address in Vancouver.

We purchased the property in 1984, worked with the proper authorities (including the Forestry Service) to have 8 acres designated as timber land and 1.45 as residential. My late husband and I cleared the underbrush and planted 2500 Douglas Firs. It was his desire to replant trees that would not be cut for "300 years", to build back the lost duff and soil, to allow plants, animals and birds an oasis adjacent to Longview Fiber land. With help from our family we have maintained and continually improved the property. I am preparing copies of various documents proving these statements and will mail them to your office. We do have written records, and a photo journal, of all our work should you want any further information or more proof.

There is one stream, with fish, that flows into the Coweeman River, another stream flowing most years also empties into the Coweeman, plus an intermittent stream, all of which cross through the property. The land does keep shifting. There are 3 cracks in the garage (cum one room cabin) floor. We had boulders dumped beside the building to prevent further slippage and cracking.

No one from BPA has ever contacted me about walking the land. At the meeting in Camas I did turn in a card stating I would be happy to meet with a representative ---but obviously (inadvertently) gave the wrong address---although I did say at the driveway entrance by Jim Watson Creek. It is known locally as Kathryn Creek.

I fervently urge BPA to consider the Gray Line. Yes, I did hear one person (only) speak against it---but she has 3 other acreage's of trees! Even though I am a "green" person at heart, it really is easier for any displaced animal to move to new habitat than it is for displaced people to relocate.

BPA Line F passes directly over my property. With one stroke of the pen BPA will completely obliterate the reforestation my husband and family have so passionately worked to reclaim.

Thank you for listening, and for your consideration,

Margaret van Nus

[phone]

ps. am mailing my neighbor, Gary Miller, at [address], a hard copy. Carbon copies of this are going to my family, A Better Way For BPA, and my attorney.

pps. to locate the property on line: www.co.cowtitz.wa.us/gis/ click on "GIS maps"—hover over the blue earth ball top right and click "Arial" in dropdown window.---in lower right window "locate by parcel" type in [parcel number] and click search---in same window click purple square with "APS" in it. —the map with a smaller window of my name as owner pops up—delete that small window and the map of the property will be shown outlined in green. It does show the open space with the building and all the trees. ~ M

Communication ID: 13835

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: DANIEL L CLARK

[Mark Korsness contacted Dan Clark as follow up from December 8, 2011 listening session]

Communication ID: 13836

Date Received: 12/15/2011

Name: STATE OF WASHINGTON, RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE ,JIM ANEST

Hello, my name is Jim Anest. I work with the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office. And it's important that you call me because we have some grant-funded properties that might be affected for outdoor recreation conservation salmon recovery, that kind of thing, in your area, and we need to make sure that they are not being compromised by your plan. I don't know if they will be, but we need to make that determination otherwise counties and park districts and whatever could be held liable for replacing property diminished by various effects of your project. So please give me a call soon. My number again is [phone]. I'm the compliance lead, the enforcement lead at the recreation and conservation office and let's make sure that we're doing this correctly. Thank you.

Received 12/15/2011 9:43 AM

Hello, my name is Jim Anest from the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office. I left a message a little while ago. It's Thursday morning at 9:40 and I wanted to let you know that you don't need to call me back because I tried another number and got hold of one of your staff people, Maryam Asgharian, 503-230-4413 and she was very helpful and it's being taken care of. So unless that's the wrong person or you still need to call me, don't bother. But if you do, of course, feel free [phone] but you don't need to.

Communication ID: 13837

Date Received: 12/15/2011

Name: RONALD WANGER

I am Ronald L. Wanger the Director of Royal Ridges Retreat located at [address] Royal Ridges is a Youth Camp and Retreat Center. The vision and generosity of Leroy Andersen established the 200 acre camp and in addition the Andersen Family allows our programs to use another 190 acres that surround the camp on the North, East, and South sides of the camp. Each year approximately 4,000 visitors come to Royal Ridges. Over 2,000 of them come to lead or participate in the summer camps in June, July, and August. Another 1,000 come for weekend retreats and another 1,000 come for weekly activities such a horseback riding lessons. The annual average attendance is approximatley 75 persons per week. Royal Ridges has been blessed with the beauty of the "ridges", the quiet of the forest and the security that comes from a large parcel of land with limited access. People feel safe and can "retreat" to the natural environment. Royal Ridges allowed access to the BPA line investigators. We asked that they check in at the office for security purposes. We wanted BPA to have all the information they needed on our property and our operations so they could make a wise decison when considering the best route for their line. We were hoping...and still are hoping that BPA will recognize the impact a line would have on our ministry here at Royal Ridges. I am concerned that our objective only resulted in towers being located on non-Royal Ridges Property. In fact, only about 1,000 feet of the proposed line 26 crosses any of our 200 acres. HOWEVER, what has happened is that IF line 26 is chosen in its current location, BPA has actually circled our Camp and Retreat Center, placed a tower on every "Ridge", obstructed every view-point with the power line and created additional access to our property. Why the line jogged to the West then back to the East and then South again...I do not understand....but it will have a dramatic impact on our operation. Who wants to send a child to a summer camp that has power lines on three

sides. Who from an urban setting wants to bring a group on a Retreat to view power lines? Compensation is not the concern. It has nothing to do with land value. But line 26 in its current location will have major financial ramificationsno one will want to come and use our programs and facilities. It will be the end of a dream and vision the Leroy Andersen worked his whole life for. I urge you to remove line 26 from consideration OR if that is not possible and you MUST use 26 that the jog to the West be eliminated and a route farther East be considered. If the jog West must take place then PLEASE continue down the front of our property along Kelly Road thereby avoiding the circling of our facility and the destruction of ALL the natural beauty of our Camp and Retreat Center. I would also urge you to re-label your map of our facility. "Royal Ridges Paintball" is NOT an accurate description. Royal Ridges Retreat is our name. Paintball is an activity that our guests enjoy. Thanks in advance for your consideration of my comments. Please let me know if you have any questions or need more information. Respectfully, Ronald L. Wanger Director

Communication ID: 13838

Date Received: 12/18/2011

Name: THERESA HAMMERQUIST, MICHAEL C HAMMERQUIST

We have submitted on several occasions the particulars about our property and residence. Details about our spring fed well especially. Disruption of service, and possible compromised quality and reliability of our water supply deeply worry us. Our current concern lies with the proposed maintenance road. From Ammeter road, it follows the existing maintenance road for a short distance and then branches off northwesterly directly in front of our well house. It seems that a less invasive approach would follow the existing maintenance road to a point west of our well, then branch NW to the same desired end. We have not received any communication from BPA to date, and as this may be due to the fact that a decision has yet to be made on the grid reinforcement route. Any acknowledgements would be appreciated.

Thank you, sincerely Mike & Teri Hammerquist

Communication ID: 13839

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: JERRY QUILLING, MAURA QUILLING

JERRY QUILLING:

I would like to make a point that the children went over the three minutes.

Good evening. My name is Jerry Quilling, and my wife Maura and myself have five acres of land just off Kelly Road in Yacolt. We're on route segment 26.

It was announced that the BPA was going to have a meeting in Battle Ground, and you are going to listen and not answer questions, which I thought was refreshing. In the past I have been lazy and let other

people do the job of fighting for their and my home and property. To those people I say thank you, thank you very much, and Cheryl especially on segment 26 has done a very good job.

Maura and I purchased this land because it was not only beautiful, but the people are kind and generous. Our elevation is 1100 feet and we can sit on our west deck and see the Oregon coastal range, and on clear days we can see sunsets that would take your breath away.

We have a log home -- not a cabin, but a log home with a 1700-foot barn. We have lived here for 18 years, and what I'm trying to do is put a face to the people you're doing this to instead of just the numbers and the pictures that you have.

Maura -- I would like you to know a little bit more about us. Maura had a Girl Scout troop for ten years. We both are active members of North Clark County Lion's Club and participate in making this a better place to live. I'm on the Board of Directors for Dogpaw, which runs five outreach parks for dogs in Clark County. For the last six years I have also volunteered at the Southwest Humane Society. Maura works for Papa Murphy's, so she has about a half an hour drive everyday.

I'm a disabled vet having been wounded in Vietnam. I spent three months in Nam and three years in the hospital after being wounded at Fort Lewis. My doctors have told me in the future I would possibly have to use a wheelchair, and to accommodate that we built our home here that is on one floor with three 3-0 doors and small cabinets that are shorter in some places.

In looking at the BPA's map we are saddened how much of our property is going to be affected. We estimate it to be 35 to 40 percent. Cables will be very close to the west end of our house and we have numerous tall trees that are going to have to be cut down. The dish satellite and cell phones probably won't work there and we may have to move out of the area, leaving our friends and associates here behind. And the value of our house and property is low, and so we are asking BPA to understand what could happen to all the families and communities on your proposed routes.

Communication ID: 13840

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: ERNA SARASOHN

ERNA SARASOHN:

I just wanted to say that that song was written by Rosalie Karalekas. She is a recently retired elementary school teacher, and she wrote that song because of a great concern and love for children. And the beautiful voice of her daughter Nicole, she came from Portland to sing for us, and the children of course.

The one point I want to make is each one of those children tonight live with the threat of having a line placed within 500 feet of their house. Two years ago when this project was announced and the public became concerned about the risk to our health linked with power lines, BPA told us the issue was still

under debate in the scientific community. As the public did more research and became further alarmed, the answer evolved into it is one of the many factors we are considering in the decision-making process.

However, some very credible studies have been finalized these past few years. One of these studies was partially funded by the power industry and published in one of the most prestigious medical journals. The study was a control group of 29,000 children over a period of 33 years, because children are the most vulnerable to the EMF exposure. In their findings they wrote, "Scientific data convincingly and consistently show a link between magnetic fields greater than two to four mg and cancer. "People who live within 656 feet of an overhead power line had 70 -- that's 7-0 -- percent increased risk of getting cancer, and living 1,968 feet from a power line they had a 20 percent increase.

BPA data shows that there are 232 families that live with the threat of these lines being located 50 feet or less from their homes, and thousands of families live with the threat of living with the power lines at 50 to 500 feet from their homes; all unsafe distances.

The World Health Organization published a document on EMF and they state, "Action should be taken to avoid harm even when it is not certain to occur." The Leukemia Foundation supports a prudent avoidance approach in relationship to high levels of EMF exposure, and then there's a prudent avoidance law that says if you're considering doing something like putting up a power line and you cannot guarantee the safety of the public, then don't put up the line.

So I think my question to you is this: Knowing all of this information at this point of the project, which has to be at least three years, why am I looking at a BPA map that still has lines in populated areas?

I just have one more thing. I want you to know that what the public really wants is for you to give us a map in the near future that has all populated areas removed, both rural and urban. Remember the children.

Communication ID: 13841

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: JOHN POLOS

JOHN POLOS:

Wow, that's a tough act to follow. Thank you for letting me speak. I am John Polos. I've lived out east of Battle Ground lake for 40 years. 30 of my 47 years with the Boy Scouts of America was as Scout Master in Battle Ground of Troops 344 and 475, and I want to address you tonight on a couple of issues.

Horace Greeley said, "Go west, young man, go west," and he never left New York City. And now everybody is telling BPA, "Go east, BPA, go east." Well, we'll see.

I think the two speakers that preceded me have really hit it on the head. The way to get an agency to listen to you and to do the things you believe are correct is to be polite and present a logical argument supported with facts, and that's things like how many houses on the route, how many properties, how

many near the route. Those kinds of things are really important, and in dealing effectively with a federal or any other agency you want to proceed in a logical manner, not threatening and not, "I'm going to sue you." This doesn't work. And who is the guy that's got the spotted owls? I'm just kidding. No fair putting spotted owls on the site.

I want to ask you people in the audience -- I'm going to turn this around. I want to ask you to do two things to help BPA. And I don't know if I mentioned I'm a retired civil and electrical engineer. I want you to do two things to help BPA. I want you to continue with what you're doing in a logical manner and don't give up. Keep presenting your arguments and get your facts straight, and I want you to do something really totally off the wall. I want you to help BPA find their beloved Julie Weflen. She was abducted from a Bonneville Power substation while on duty as a sub operator and they've never found her.

I want to tell you what you can do to help. It was in the Spokane area. They've just uncovered new evidence. If you have any friends or relatives in Spokane, they know what's going on. They've been watching KREM Channel 2 News or the Spokane Spokesman Review newspaper. Call them, encourage them to write in to the newspaper and the TV station and to keep encouraging the sheriff up there to keep looking for our beloved Julie. Thank you very much.

Communication ID: 13842

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: RICHARD VAN DIJK TRUSTEE,VIVIAN VAN DIJK TRUSTEE

RICHARD van DIJK:

My name is Richard van Dijk, and on the left is my wife Vivian, who is going to give a speech, and I'm conceding some of my time to her because her presentation is slightly over four minutes, and I will cut mine short.

VIVIAN van DIJK:

Vivan Van Dijk. We appreciate BPA making possibly the only decent decision it's made in the past two years, and that is to delay the EIS until the new year. We would like to think it was our pressure, but more likely it was the thought of having our senators and members of congress on the phone; they, themselves, stirred out by us, we the people. Yes, we the folks that pay the power bills have absolutely nothing to gain, and in fact, we have a whole lot to lose if BPA flies in the face of reason and logic and persists in trying to build this line across the populated areas of Clark and Cowlitz Counties.

BPA has a clear three-way choice. Does this line get built at all? In the past two years BPA has presented a wondrous range of magical numbers that they claim prove this line is needed. We have successfully challenged each set of assumptions, and we have compelled BPA to re-imagine its justification. In the process BPA has pressured both Clark and Cowlitz PUD's to support its logic, but

neither utility has gotten behind this because, in part, they know that they will not see one microwatt of energy from this proposed enhancement to the Canadian-California electric expressway.

The only half plausible sets of numbers that BPA has shown the world indicate that any increase in local load that this line might carry is actually in Oregon, and only in Oregon. For that they would cheerfully and without an iota of remorse rip the hearts of out of generations of Washingtonians by destroying their homes, their neighborhoods and their land holds.

If eventually this line is built, be it in five years or fifteen years, BPA must dispose the principles that they tout in other areas such as the current network open season reform, to let cost follow causation. Southwest Washington is not the cause for needing this line. Oregon and California are. Let them carry the burden for this. Build the line in Oregon where it clearly belongs, or way out east, and let the profiteering merchants in Oregon, California and Canada pay for the extra costs.

Why does BPA think it can justify assaulting Southwest Washington and its citizens? It is for the sake of corporate profits, for Portland General, the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, and British Columbia's power heads.

If, despite all of our appeals for reason, BPA proceeds to build this towering insult to sanity, homes and neighborhoods and landholdings, then for the sake of our souls and for the sake of our property, build it where it will do the least harm. Build the beast way out east on lands already owned by the Federal Government or the State, or that which can be easily obtained from corporate timberland owners who can be bought off with a lot fewer dollars than it takes to save the salmon.

Every time we turn around BPA has thrown yet a few more million dollars at some worthy and no doubt necessary wildlife or fish habitat project that contribute to making the fish in the Columbia River some of the most staggeringly expensive fish on the planet. Curiously, most of these projects are in Oregon, Idaho or Montana and very few, if any at all, are in Washington. These millions of dollars for the most part stay in the communities where they are spent, and as I said, these moneys are not spent in Washington, yet BPA plans to strip-mine a several-hundred-foot-wide swath right through the heart of Southwest Washington, leaving nothing behind except scarred homesteads, scarred neighborhoods and a scarred countryside.

And let us not forget the scarred hearts of those who have been involuntarily dispossessed by the callous disregard BPA has for people. All it would take to mitigate the impact of this line on people and their property is a few dollars; a few tens of millions of dollars, to be precise. This sounds like a lot until you compare it with the \$850 million BPA spends each and every year on fish. Perhaps, fellow citizens, we should make like Kevin Costner in the movie Water World; grow gills and fins. Then perhaps we, along with the salmon, might have a fighting chance.

Communication ID: 13843

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: DANIEL L CLARK

DANIEL CLARK:

My wife and I spent 30 years trying to get our dream -- my name is Dan Clark. We live in Castle Rock. We bought 67 acres to build our dream, which could have been a park, could have been anything. This situation is horrible for us because you go right through the middle of it and destroy everything that we had planned. It's almost worthless. We can't sell it. And for what? If you could tell me it's going to benefit us, okay, so be it. But how is it going to benefit us? If you're going to do this to us, tell us you're going to do it, because I don't have that much time to live. You're using up my time. So be fair. Tell us what you're going to do. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13844

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: LESTER SARASOHN, ERNA SARASOHN

LES SARASOHN:

My name is Les Sarasohn, and I would like to concede my time to the family spokesman, Erna Sarasohn.

ERNA SARASOHN:

I just wanted to point out two things. We understand that the line going east into an unpopulated area is going to cost more money, but it's only going to cost a fraction of what is spent by BPA every year on fish and wildlife, and it seems to me that it is appropriate for a one-time-only cost to protect the people of Southwest Washington.

I think it gets down to one question: How much is a child's life worth? And I think we really have no choice but to take it east. I also want to point out that we hear that the rate payers are going to have to cover the burden of this, but the fact is that according to Wayne Nelson of Clark PUD, the CEO of Clark PUD, it would take a whopping and unprecedented 20-percent increase in BPA's transmission costs for Clark PUD to cause a one-percent increase in their rates. One percent to the public would be less than one penny per month per household. I think we can all afford that in order to make sure these lines do not go up in populated areas.

The other thing I wanted to note is I know this is not an answering session tonight, but I would like to know when the draft EIS comes out, which is going to be one full year past the original target date, do you plan on naming a preferred route, a backup alternative route, and removing everything else from consideration and unburden the people? You don't know? Okay. Let me just tell you, then, I'll assume -- I'll take that for a no. And so what I want to say to you is these people have been living in chaos for the last two years, and you absolutely have to remove some of the lines when the draft EIS comes out.

These people have to be able to get back to planning their future, and right now the fact that you're leaving them on the line doesn't hurt BPA because it's being done at the expense of the people by continuing to hold them hostage. When the draft EIS comes out, I mean these people have to be able to

know if they're going to sell their homes, if they're going to be able to remodel. You have to give them some freedom and unburden them. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13845

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: ELIZABETH L HAMILTON

LIZ HAMILTON:

My name is Liz Hamilton and I just recently had an increase in my electric rate from our local Cowlitz County PUD, and I understand part of it is because California no longer is going to buy surplus power. So what are we going to do with all this extra power? Kelso's wind farm has been shut down because they can't sell it. They've looked for buyers and there are no buyers.

All right. There's a lot of electricity out there. What do we need another line for? Otherwise, I would suggest that you go through Weyerhaeuser -- I mean, I suppose they're going to be mad at me for saying that, but go out for 100 years -- not just 70, but 100 years where there are no people, put your line through before it gets developed so that I think it would be to Weyerhaeuser's advantage and interest, since they also are in real estate and development, to plan on the future that maybe there will be development across their land somewhere, sometime. Yes, there will be. Do it while there's nobody out there.

The gray line should be considered right now, and maybe you can even avoid the one house that it would take. Anyway, my feeling is right now I would suggest that you drop lines 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, G, J and H. I happen to be in H.

By the way, I have 130 acres and I've lived there 55 years, and the timber that I stand to lose percentage-wise is greater than Weyerhaeuser's because of the small land size that I have. So I really would like to see everybody think way out further east. Get clear out there where there's nobody and shoot your line through. Our county commissioners have advocated that. They've also written a letter to Steven Wright, and I'm all for them supporting us, and I also think supporting the future would be to do that in your planning stages now. Get away from the people right now and all of our lifelong plans.

I have backed up information here on the fact that California no longer is purchasing surplus power, as well as today's newspaper that came out with wind energy shutdowns because they've got all this electricity, but now they've got to shut them down. The taxpayers paid for that when they were subsidized by the government, and now the taxpayers are going to pay for the losses that these plants cannot produce.

And we're getting it right now -- this year alone I believe our PUD in Cowlitz County has increased at approximately 25 percent, 18 percent just recently. I think that's the gist of what I've got to say, and thank you. Mark, you can come sometime out for a cup of coffee.

Communication ID: 13846

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: RICHARD STONER

RICHARD STONER:

My name is Richard Stoner. People call me Dick or just, hey you, but my property lays just south of Castle Rock at the top end of Headquarters Road. It's a 15-year to a 50-years reforestation program. If the one projected line goes through where it's indicated it will gut my property, and there's a lot of money involved.

And speaking of money, how does Bonneville Power Administration attempt to compensate those who lose property, in Dan's case lose his dream, and in what amount? When it comes down to the money there's no price on my property. I feel that there's been too few alternatives explored about where to put this line. As far as I'm concerned, they could put it across the Columbia in Oregon, and those people over there will scream and holler just like the people on this side of the river.

Communication ID: 13847

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: A BETTER WAY FOR BPA ,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

CHERYL BRANTLEY:

My name is Cheryl Brantley. On behalf of the Board of a Better Way for BPA I want to thank BPA for providing this opportunity for landowners to share their concerns with you about this project. I also want to thank BPA for providing us with preliminary route data.

In this data we learned that it will cost millions more to route a new corridor on land other than BPA's existing right-of-way. These millions will be reflected in what BPA charges for its electricity. At a time when our country and its citizens are struggling financially we believe no governmental entity should needlessly spend millions more on new land when it can build on the land it already owns rights to.

We also learned that there was a flaw, a missing component to the preliminary route data. BPA elected to exclude a parcel count, counting parcels that would land along each of the route alternatives. To provide us this information wouldn't have been too difficult. Not nearly as difficult as counting ornamental trees.

Since this information is missing, members of our Board utilized BPA's own data and counted all the parcels that would lose land to this project along each of the route alternatives. For any of the new eastern alternatives here is the number of parcels that will be taken, cutting a 550-foot swath through properties -- through properties:

The central alternative will take 231 parcels, the east alternative will take 211 parcels, the crossover alternative will take 132 parcels. On BPA's existing right-of-way, the west alternative along parcel edges, BPA will need 24 parcels. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13848

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: DEBRA PRENTICE-THORNLEY

DEBBY PRENTICE:

My name is Debby Prentice. My neighborhood is at the intersections of segments 45, 46, 47 and 50. I would like to let you sit with that for a moment; four segments.

I'm quoting from BPA's website how routes are developed. "Sensitive habitats: Engineers consider potential impacts to plants and animals and try to avoid wetlands, nesting sites, et cetera." In looking at your wetlands data that you just released I find it incredible that on the west alternative there are potentially 148 acres of wetlands to be cleared and 19 acres of wetlands to be filled in for towers and access roads. I can't even build a storage shed 450 feet from the wetlands by us, but you can fill them in? Rhetorical question.

How is it that the west alternative still has almost twice as many acres of wetlands to be cleared as the next highest, which is the crossover alternative at 83 acres? Particularly since a large part of the west alternative is a right-of-way you already own, it would appear that most of the wetlands acres are between the end of segment 25 and the Camas River crossing.

People who want you to use your existing right-of-way must think that the west alternative ends somewhere in the middle of the city of Vancouver. It continues through to Camas and crosses the river. I'm assuming that when you clear those acres of wetlands of their trees and vegetation that you will be spraying vegetation killer like you would on other parts of a right-of-way. That vegetation killer could leach down into our wells, some of which are as shallow as 34 feet. Many of us do not have alternate sources for our drinking water. Vegetation killer could also flow into streams, many of which flow directly into the Columbia River.

After analyzing all of these potential problems with the wetlands on the west alternative, I can't help but ask the question, when does the Army Corps of Engineers get to look at your proposed alternatives? If they had at the beginning many of these segments would have been eliminated and not included in those four alternatives.

And one final comment: BPA has a unique opportunity here. The citizens of Southwest Washington have provided you the possibility of an alternative number five, the gray line. If you choose the gray line alternative to avoid environmental impact to humans you could be thought of as the only government agency in existence right now that is actually made up of fellow human beings.

Communication ID: 13849

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: WILLIAM A NELSON

BILL NELSON:

My name is Bill Nelson. On the one hand I'm extremely sympathetic to you folks at BPA. The voters and politicians have asked you to do the impossible; seamlessly blend wind power into your system. It's not a reasonable request. On the other hand, I can't for the life of me understand why you've turned something much, much simpler -- the selection of a new transmission line route -- into a complicated mess.

You had to know fairly quickly, two years ago, that there was widespread opposition to your main proposal to use the existing route for massive new towers. You have 800 engineers at your disposal and could have quickly plotted a gray line in the far eastern part of the county away from people. End of discussion. Instead, we've had endless meetings, excuses and stalling for two long years.

I think everyone here tonight wants to believe that the Bonneville Power Administration is a competent and reasonable government agency with a job to do. It's way past time for you to decide on a gray line route and let all of us off the hook. That's what we would like to hear from you tonight. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13850

Date Received: 12/17/2011

Name: JERRY D BOHANAN,KENT BURNS,BOLTON C MINISTER,RAYMOND B RICHARDS,VICKIE WRIGLEY

Please publish as general comment on the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project website and records:

BPA use your EXISTING right-of-way!

Bonneville Power Administration has proposed building a 500-kilovolt power line between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon. The least expensive alternative and the one with the least impact on property rights and the environment would be to use routes 9 and 25 where BPA already has towers and lines. Any of the new routes that BPA has proposed would cut a 70-mile long swath through the country-side of Clark and Cowlitz counties. All of these rural routes would invade private property, restrict landowner rights and render some parcels useless. These routes would also harm rivers, streams, wetlands, fish and wildlife. BPA tells us there is enough room on its current right-of-way for this project. We say BPA should use this existing corridor. It just makes the most sense!

- The existing corridor has 70 years of proven reliability, stability and security.
- Placing the new lines on the existing corridor is the least expensive alternative and would be the best use of ratepayers' money.

- There is minimal impact to private property owners from adding lines on a corridor where towers and lines already exist.
- Using the existing corridor would save our countryside from a new 70-mile long scar spanning two counties and consuming an estimated 1300 acres.

We, the undersigned, ask BPA to not violate our property rights and pollute our waterways. We ask BPA to use our ratepayer dollars wisely and efficiently by placing the new line on its own land, the existing corridor of routes 9 and 25 where it has had lines and towers for the past 70 years.

Communication ID: 13851

Date Received: 12/21/2011

Name: COUNTY OF COWLITZ ,MICHAEL KARNOFSKI,JAMES MISNER,GEORGE RAITER

Board of Commissioners

December 21, 2011

Mark Korsheness, Project Manager
I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project
Bonneville Power Administration
P. O. Box 9250
Portland, OR 97207

RE: Support for Alternative Route

Dear Mr. Korsheness:

The Board of Cowlitz County Commissioners recognizes and appreciates BPA's commitment to look at alternate routes and giving updates to us. This communication has been extremely helpful.

We understand you are considering 4 alternatives entitled Western, Eastern, Central and Crossover Lines. We respectfully request that BPA consider a route that affects fewer individuals and is more northerly and easterly.

Thank you for considering our request.

Sincerely,

Board of County Commissioners of Cowlitz County, Washington

George Raiter, Chair

Michael Karnofski, Commissioner

James Misner, Commissioner

Communication ID: 13852

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: PATTI OLSON

PATTI OLSON:

My name is Patti Olson. My husband and I live in Yale Valley, and I actually had hoped to have some visual aids, which is not going to work out very well, I don't think, but I'll run across some facts about the line as it's proposed through the Yale Valley.

There will be seven towers from the north end of the Yale Valley crossing -- that lead across the valley to the south ridge. Not including state highway and county roads, there will be, for those seven towers, 14,100 feet of access roads. That's over 2,000 feet per tower, or four tenths of a mile per tower.

Reconstruction would take 5,470 feet. That's three acres. New construction would be 3,880 feet. That's 2.7 acres of property that would be bulldozed across private property to be used by the federal government at will 24/7/365. That's a lot.

Also, in Yale Valley where it crosses Speelyai Creek I have written -- I have drawn on here some property parcels and do note from K80 to K82 this power line runs directly through these two parcels. This is a family enclave that's been in the family for over 50 years. This cabin is back here by the creek, this one is out by the road. They're going to be both totally demolished. These two do not even appear on the data sheet. They are not there. It is kind of an insult to these people looking at their homes being destroyed by the BPA and not be included in the data sheet.

We're down here, our home. This is about 4,000 feet total, and this is our home on the access road. A friend of ours took this last July of our home. We've lived here 30 years. There was nothing when we bought it. We did everything. We built the road, we built everything. This is my garden, three and a half acres, fenced for elk and deer. I cannot fence out the BPA, I guess.

Most of this I've been growing for 20 years or more, some of it the last 10 to 20. There's a large shrub and tree island here, and another one here, and this is what the BPA -- I hear about the impact -- we hear so much about the impact on homeowners, on property owners. This is what they have planned for my home of 31 years. This is our driveway, our three-car driveway they will rebuild. They would be getting it down to the dirt and rebuilding it. It goes 25 feet out here in front of my house and across here it would have to zigzag across here and go out to their tower. So this is evidently the impact on rural property owners.

Communication ID: 13853

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: ANOTHER WAY BPA ,TERRY L CONSTANCE

TERRY CONSTANCE:

My name is Terry Constance. I'm the chairman of Another Way BPA, and I serve as director on that group and I live in Clark County. We have a corporation that's non-profit that's No Lines in Populated Areas and we are an umbrella for other groups, and we kind of put together a list of things that people can come together and kind of support this movement that we have against Bonneville's invasion of the human environment.

Mark Korsness, just a minute ago, brought up the word "environment," and he just used the word "environment" by itself, but the National Environmental Policy Act defines the word, and in that Act the word is defined as natural and human, not just natural. So the NEPA was created to protect people from agencies like this taking people's livelihood from them.

And so when you see an agency come along to impact people in this way and destroy their lives, NEPA will prevent that from happening when they do a review and find that has occurred. Debby Prentice, a moment ago, mentioned the Army Corps of Engineers. Through the Freedom of Information Act we've discovered a document related to Article 404B of the Army Corps of Engineers that recalls that BPA did a fasttrack on this project and skipped over the wetlands mitigation and jumped right through it. This made the United States Army Corps of engineers extremely upset. They are trying to do some patchwork now to correct that issue. Whether they'll get it corrected in time is just a question.

The Army Corps of Engineers must permit this project. If they don't stamp it, it doesn't get built. The assessed value missing from their document they just put out is really an insult to the people that live here. There's human impact in there that's missing. It's not just homes, it's not just property. There's people there. You should have put the number of people that are impacted in that document and listed their children, because who's the voice of the children?

We proved in a presentation that I did in Mark Korsness' -- with his bosses at BPA in their offices that this will not benefit Clark and Cowlitz Counties, and yet they still have this agenda to create this path right through the heart of the most populated area in Washington state. That's never been done before and they are not following prudent avoidance, and I've outlined a series of NEPA violations that they've had and listed about ten of them. I'm not going to go over those in detail right now, but you have to have Americans have a safe environment to live in. That's required by law and it's required by the NEPA principles, and you have to follow those.

When the Clark County Commissioners and Cowlitz County Commissioners asked on November 4th if there was a study, you completely denied there was a study in process, although E3 was completely underway. You didn't mention that whatsoever. You didn't mention the Army Corps hadn't signed off on the permits or done a study on the wetlands. You just yanked it right off the map without anyone's permission or anyone's input at a coffee break. That's not right for the people of Washington state. You can't do that kind of stuff.

This year we saw an electricity load forecast. Have we seen a BPA lower electrical bill forecast? No. The load is dropping. PGE built towers south of Portland to solve that load. Why is BPA still going to build this project? It makes no sense whatever.

The gray line impacts the least number of people. The very least number of people. You have to consider it. It's got to be in the draft. We want you to pick it as a preferred route.

Communication ID: 13854

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: SANDRA S BENNETT

SANDRA BENNETT:

Hi, I'm Sandra Bennett. The route currently favored by BPA goes right through our neighborhood, and I'm the president of the neighborhood association. Bonneville Power originally announced it needed this to make a power line in case an act of terrorism or natural disaster disrupted power along the existing line. Then they said that Oregonians had threatened to take up arms if the line crossed into Oregon via the more logical route.

Later we learned that the power from the new lines would primarily be sold to Oregon and California. Recently it's been reported that there's a glut of power in Washington because of a surplus of water behind the dams and because of all the wind turbines, many of which have been turned off because they can't sell their power.

BPA has not adequately addressed the concerns about health hazards associated with EMF submitted from the towers of this size and they have been indifferent to the negative impact these mega towers, if built along the I-5 corridor preferred route, will have in home values in the area. As a former real estate appraiser, I can unequivocally state that these power lines will diminish the value of adjacent and nearby properties and has reduced the value -- comparable value of homes that already exist adjacent to the existing lines.

Homeowners in Clark County and Cowlitz County have already lost significant property value due to the recession. It would be unconscionable to cause further loss of property value by having these mega towers imposed on them.

BPA says it will be far more costly to place the new lines in the far eastern gray line quadrant of the county, but why should we have to give up our land so BPA can sell more power? It appears that the primary beneficiaries if BPA seems to expand its market will be Oregon and California. Thus, if the extra funding is needed for the line BPA should look to those two states and stop trying to ram this scheme down our throats.

Communication ID: 13855

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: VICENTE A MOLINOS

VICENTE MOLINOS:

Hello, good evening. My name is Vicente Molinos. I am on the board of Another Way BPA. I live in the Coweeman River area, Cowlitz County, and I am very happy to see the information that you posted in the website. I think that's a good start; particularly a good start for evaluating the direct costs of the project today, the present cost. If BPA really wants effective public participation, it's very important that you also post some of the detailed backup studies that produced those conclusions. That's the only smart way for us to participate.

The second major point is that, as you know, all projects have direct costs and benefits and indirect costs and benefits. I think you have, up to this point, ignored the future costs and benefits of the project. Particularly on the cost side, both Cowlitz and Clark County stand to lose tremendous amounts of property tax revenues and also economic opportunities by routing lines on the most valuable lands in the county. We're doing some analysis of that, and if you could share some of the detailed studies that were done we will happily help you evaluate that.

Until you do evaluate all those different economic opportunity costs and impacts for both counties, both now and projected, I don't think you are in compliance with NEPA. And as you heard here today, the fact that two counties that are not the richest counties in the country are paying for the energy that will benefit largely other counties that are much better prepared than us to support some of those costs, I think again that's a violation of the NEPA principles.

In closing, I think until you evaluate those external costs, present and future, and you look at all alternatives, including the gray line alternative, which you will find out very quickly that compensates for all the extra costs of going further east for the gray line, in less than 30 years, probably much less than that, you will have paid for the costs. Thank you very much.

Communication ID: 13856

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: KENNETH LONG

KEN LONG:

My name is Ken Long. I live in the Highlands, and the west alternative route is going to affect our house. My wife also works on the committee working with the rest of the community people.

I guess, you know, one of the key things -- I'm talking from the heart. I don't have any notes in front of me. The big question I have to BPA is why you are trying to influence us about the need of this going through this populated area. I understand the greater need. I also understand that it was a huge commitment on the current administration and the new windmills that are plaguing the eastern and -- eastern Washington and Oregon counties that are being shut down. You're under contract to have those

built and maintain some sort of revenue for the people that have contracted you to have those built. Okay, fine. We understand most of the energy needs in this area are being transferred down to -- this microphone is not doing good.

The energy that you're producing is by -- you can't produce enough of it to support the grid, and you want to sell the energy to our southern neighbors. We're not going to benefit at all in this county, so when I look at the fact that you want to bring all these transmission lines through a heavily populated area, the most populated area that you could possibly -- route that you could possibly pick, we have two things that are involved that are going to affect us. One are property values, which to me is lower than the ultimate; the health risks and the health expenses that we may have to take care of without any assistance whatsoever from this government.

So how much more suffering does this government and BPA want us to deal with with having a project that there is no benefit to us whatsoever? We've lost property values tremendously with this new economic situation the government has, you know, presented to us, and now you're asking us to bear the burden of more expenses and more burden.

To me this is a very simple analysis. You move it as far away as possible to least impact -- to have the least impact on the population in this area. It can't be anymore difficult than that. I don't care about the expenses because the expense that we are going to partake in should be given to the people that are going to benefit from that energy. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13857

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: YALE VALLEY COALITION ,ARDELLE M STEIN

ARDIE STEIN:

I'm Ardie Stein. I'm the coordinator from the Yale Valley. We have a coalition here so that we won't have these lines come through our area.

First of all, you made a grown man cry. Shame on you. Second of all, we human beings are a part of that natural environment. Everyone that I know who is a human being is a natural being. My first question is, what is BPA expecting to hear at this listening meeting that they have not heard, seen or read ad nauseam for two years, dragging people through it this long? Shame on you. That's all I can say about that.

Assuming the BPA is up to the task of building the I-5 corridor project, why is it necessary to hold citizens on four proposed lines hostage? We, meaning the Yale Valley Coalition, Another Way BPA, and Stop the Towers, are demanding a preferred route and one alternative be chosen immediately and that the other two lines be released.

If two years of studying and scoping has not rendered a clearer decision than four alternatives, what will three or four more months of deliberations and two more years of torturous indecision change, unless you have been sincere in your commitment to study the gray line alternative and include it in your EIS? We submit that two lines should be chosen now and one of those be the gray line alternative, which would release that third group of homeowners from this seemingly ongoing, endless nightmare for two counties.

Currently and exactly at what phase is the scoping and siting of the gray line, and will it be included in the EIS for spring? We all think you should take your best shot.

Communication ID: 13858

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: SHERRON BILYEU

SHERRON BILYEU:

Hi, Mark. How are you? My name is Sherron Bilyeu, and I want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to give my story.

First of all, this is personal to you. I want to tell you a little bit about my property. In 1960 my husband's family purchased our property, which is just off Williams Road and Yale Bridge Road, and we inherited it because of death in 1985. Our children grew up spending a lot of time there finding out the names of flowers, birds, weeds, animals and much more, thanks to my wonderful mother-in-law. It was the ideal place to learn about nature and the environment.

One of our daughters currently lives near us, and she and her husband do volunteer work for the Forest Service to improve paths for hikers around this beautiful state. One or both of us spend at least two to three weeks every month at our property constantly keeping up with the things that need to be done as homeowners and stewards of nature.

There are six properties, and at one time we were all related. Six properties on ten acres. We are all careful how we treat the environment. Our properties are next to Speelyai Creek, which is home to small frogs, salamanders and fingerlings. In 1987 biologists from Washington State Fisheries and Game examined the creek's viability and we were told not to go in the creek, as it was important to the marine life that was coming back at that time.

Our cabins get our water from underground springs, which is the only way that we get our water. And along with the families that live on that ten acres, the creek also boasts mallards, wood ducks and their families. Each spring we see a new load of babies paddling along the way. Beavers, otters, fish use the water as their home. Blue heron, King Fishers and cedar waxwing are seen daily when it's warm weather. Pileated woodpeckers attack old growth timber across the creek, and you can see the burnt remains of the Yacolt fire jutting into our roadway.

Chickadees, hummingbirds expect food when we arrive. They know we're coming and they're waiting. Bats, screech owls and tiny pygmy owls visit yearly. We also have an agreement with Washington State Firewise Program with which we received a grant to keep our property safe from fire. Trilliums, Indian pipe, wild columbine, snow drops and ancient rhodies grow along the road in the shade. All of these plants that I just mentioned were there before we got our property, so they have been there a long, long time. Salmonberry, thimbleberry, serviceberry, salal, kinnikinnick and Oregon grape grow profusely.

Our concern is the impact on the environment that's putting access roads, towers, constant noise from power lines will have on our wildlife and waterways, which we have guarded since 1960.

On a personal note, I am concerned with my health and the magnetic field that these lines will generate. I have a neurostimulator installed inside my spinal column, and anywhere that I get near a magnetic field it will set it -- it will burn my spinal cord. It will kill me.

There's more I would like to say, but I think you know that the time limits me. My husband and I would like to invite you up to our property, not to discuss anything else, but to have you look around to see what we'll all be missing. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13859

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: TRENTON J SPOLAR

TRENTON SPOLAR:

My name is Trent Spolar, and I'm a physician, dermatologist, internist, but sometimes being even accused of being a surgeon because I like to get to a problem and cut through it if I can.

I have a personal axe to grind and that is that I have an electrical stimulator too, and I feel the jolt when I get into a magnetic field. There's been no real decisions made on how dangerous electromagnetic fields are, but the general feeling is they are not good, and no one wants to be next to them. For that reason I like the gray line; but on the other hand, the surgical personality in me says you've got a line, use it.

Communication ID: 13860

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: STEVE RAPALUS

STEVE RAPALUS:

Hello. My name is Steve Rapalus. I live about -- well, in the Venersborg area. I think I find it interesting that we're talking about counting homes, counting heads as part of the process, and the reason -- well, I'll get to that in a minute, but we need to pick a route. Instead of figuring out how many homes there are we need to pick a route with no homes, and here's why: When you guys first came out with the first

set of plans I went to the first meeting, ran quick, got the map, checked my house and went, boy, I escaped that one, but I felt pretty bad when I looked at it and saw it going over other people's homes. So I started writing editorials to the paper and submitted comments to BPA, and then you guys came out with a new set of routes, and that one -- the first one was two and a half miles from my house, the second one was about 3,000 feet. And I said oh, good, when they come out the third time they'll be right overhead.

So you've heard stories from some folks today. When the last route came out I traced it, and there's a guy about 3,000 feet from me and it goes right over his place out in the middle of the woods. This guy built a place recently and I said if that was me it would pretty much destroy my happiness out there.

Let me give you a comparison. My son is at Helmand Province right now, and it's the second time. And let's say that something happened to him over there, God forbid. That would pretty much destroy my life too, as you can probably understand. Yet if he was the only soldier that got hurt that month, let's say, most people around the country would say, oh, we had a pretty good month in Afghanistan. They don't know me, they don't know my son, and I don't know these people here today that the lines are going right over their house, but I can certainly understand what it would do to them if the line does go to their house. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13861

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: CATHI SIMMONS

CATHI SIMMONS:

My name is Cathi Simmons. You know, recently -- in fact, I think it was today -- in the newspaper it has come out that fracking indeed causes contamination in water. Now, all of us have watched the PR going on around about natural gas, and yet -- and it has been fantastic, good looking guys, like yourself and others, like Doug Johnson and others, and Maryam -- good looking people who are in PR who are presenting a case which is palatable to the general public. What I am saying is that the case for EMF is a stronger, and getting stronger case.

A friend of mine's husband who works on electromagnetic -- excuse me, on imaging of the brain, they're getting closer and closer to realizing the effects of these things. To take a chance as these children got up here this morning (sic), you know, in their innocence, because they really don't know what it involves, it's the adults who take the responsibility for these children and these babies. When I first came out -- when I first found out about this it wasn't property values that concerned me. It was EMF.

I spoke to one of your very good PR people who told me that he used to live indeed on a transmission line. I said, how many kV's? 125,000. Well, quite a difference between that and 500,000. I just want to leave you with the fact that these are human lives, and just because it is the easiest route in the sense that you have nice people here and that others -- and you know will remain to be seen what will be

happening in the future, but if this continues a number of us are not going to put up with this, and you know that.

I want to encourage everybody who is here to join either Another Way BPA or Stop Towers Now. There is nothing else to do but fight this with everything that you have. And why? Because you have an opportunity for the human factor. Not the monetary factor, and the fact that we've got these wind farms up and that the government has dangled some money in front of us, or in front of the BPA so we can increase what we don't need in our area here, not because of those reasons, but because they are human beings and they are little children who will be impacted by this. Thank you very much.

Communication ID: 13862

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: JOHN SIMMONS

DR. JOHN SIMMONS:

My name is John Simmons. I want to start by saying we live on route 50, which is part of the west route, and this is the so-called Alcoa line. It has a right-of-way of 100 feet. It will be extended 50 feet -- that's 25 on either side -- a number which is a joke compared to what a right-of-way should be. It's going right through Camas, it goes by two churches, it goes through a business park, and quite close to the Camas High School. It is a disaster, and it's one where the lines are going to have to be piled on top of another to get it in, and it's a disaster and a travesty. And then from there it will go to route 52, which happens to -- however you go, you blindly demand crossing to Troutdale and endangering all the people at that crossing, which is inhuman and not to be tolerated.

Now, I wanted to say that the country these days, we're seeing this incredible resurgence of conservatism in which it is stated the government is incompetent. Don't let the government, which is influenced by big business, power companies and the like, don't let them be pawns and minions with PR people giving the lie to what is nothing but a monetary goal. Don't let that government control our lives.

And we've seen government officials making decisions such as the disastrous introduction of eels into Lake Michigan, such as the monstrous TVA environmental errors, and many, many more that you should table this entire project until you have got a perspective on what the long-term is, because the technology is now changing dramatically, all the conditions are changing dramatically, alternative fuels and transmissions are changing dramatically.

You are not competent to choose this, and just because some politician ahead of you, for expedient purposes pushed by power plants, has given you shelter so that you can sleep at night after you commit a colossal failure for years is not something that should be tolerated.

Communication ID: 13863

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: KEITH A MATHESON

KEITH MATHISON:

Thank you, and I'm sure you're feeling a lot of heat, and it's sort of like the pain that everybody else is feeling that is going to be near these lines, so take it that way. One thing I would like to say is go east. And I was looking over the fact sheets and I had a few questions that I know I could get it done in three minutes.

The fact sheet states state renewable resource mandates in the same paragraph as access to low cost power. I think you need to prove that wind power is low cost, because there's been several testimonies showing that a lot of them are idle, and I know when I drive by the wind farms very few blades are moving. And so why are we subsidizing that if we're trying to reduce costs? Were these mandates ever voted on by the people, or were they just put in place by some environmentalists that are trying to jam it down our throats? So that was one thing on the fact sheet.

The other thing is the fact sheet talks about both new and existing right-of-ways. When old right-of-ways get developed on all sides why is not the highest and best use of the land changed? I mean, zoning laws change for private properties. Why are these just sacred ground that never changes? It seems that old power line right-of-ways might become obsolete for many reasons, as has been stated. Much of the old private airports that get built around end up being obsolete, and they have to move out. There's one on Mill Plain or Fourth Plain right now that's being converted. And I think these old right-of-ways, especially for power lines, need to be reconsidered.

Then it also says 15 percent of BPA's revenues are derived from surplus power sales. If you are using inefficient wind farms because of mandates not approved by voters, how can you say all the revenue is used to lower the cost? Correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe rates are higher because of wind farms, and that power companies are being mandated to use a certain amount of expensive environmentally correct energy doesn't make sense.

But bottom line is I think you just need to go east. It affects everybody here just like it's affecting you hearing it and taking the heat for all of this stuff. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13864

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: GEORGE F VAUGHAN

GEORGE VAUGHAN:

My name is George Vaughan, and I live on the west route over in west Vancouver, Hazel Dell area. I just want to thank everybody for coming out tonight and voicing your opinions. I haven't agreed with everybody, but I think it's wonderful that people take time out to do this.

I have a couple of concerns. Many of my concerns have already been voiced by some people very articulately. My concern is for even though I live along an existing line and it would require the least amount of property acquisition for BPA to install the new transmission line, it's going to affect many, many more people than any of the other routes. For one thing, the new line would carry at least 500 kilovolts, if not more than that, because the line already carries 250 kilovolts there. So I don't know if that would triple the capacity to this existing west route or what, but in any case, the towers would be twice as high at least, and the transmission of electricity would be twice as great, so it would be affecting all of us along this line for many hundreds of feet. And I'm just very concerned about all the people living on the line, and I just wanted to speak for them tonight.

And I think that BPA should definitely take another look at this and see if it's really necessary. And if they think it is really necessary after looking at all the facts -- I think the facts that come in all the time about this -- and for the necessity of this new transmission line, that you look at another alternative route that would not affect the number of people that these existing routes would. And I think also that you ought to seriously consider going into Oregon and bringing the line down that way. I think that that -- if it is deemed to be necessary -- and it seems to be necessary for most of the people south of us -- that would be ethically the thing to do. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13865

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: WILLIAM E MOYER

WILLIAM MOYER:

My name is William Moyer, and I would like to speak to one aspect of the use of the existing route which I don't think has been fully aired in the public media, specifically in the newspapers, and that is those of us who are close to or directly on, or possibly with the exception of those who are directly on that existing route, really did not know in advance that that was subject to expansion.

The existing route is a relatively low-level power line, physically low, it is below the tree level. You don't see it. The new lines that are proposed are going to be on 150-foot high towers; a 15-story building. That's going to be about 100 feet above the tree level. It makes a significant difference, and it is unfair, honestly, for anyone to say, oh, you're on an existing route, you should have known better.

Communication ID: 13866

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: BEVERLY JANE FIELDING

JANE FIELDING:

My name is Jane Fielding. When I came in I felt like I needed to give my credentials; who did I represent, what group was I with. And I represent a citizen, which we all are who live on, unfortunately one of the

routes that has been put on the lines to devastate our homes and our properties without any benefit to us.

Last spring I found engineers on my property. They wanted to know why I was there, and I told them that I lived there, and then we went about looking at a spur line that was supposed to connect route 43 down to route 50. It went through wetlands, it went through a ravine that is up to 30 feet deep. It really would have devastated that, and I felt really great when I found that it was taken off the proposal, because the engineer stated at that time, you know, if they just looked at the pictures they could have seen that this was wetlands and they shouldn't be in this area.

What I found when I looked at the map again was that although they had taken the spur line off, they had left the last tower, seeming like an afterthought, bringing the lines over the top of route 48, connecting it to the last tower of the spur line, and then angling it back to back across 48 to a new 150-foot tower. That effectively puts the lines, or the easement of the lines, at my deck.

We heard at one stage that it wasn't okay to displace any families, and it's pretty hard to see how you would be able to continue to live in a place where you are right under the power lines. I have sons that are disabled, but everybody in this room has a really wrenching story to tell.

You can't put these lines in populated areas without affecting someone. So again, I feel kind of selfish talking about just my place, but consider we're talking about everybody's place and not just mine. In my case I have a son that's had a VNS implanted. That's an implant that sends electrical impulses to his brain to try to stop seizures. I can't imagine what will happen when now all of a sudden he's living in this kind of a magnetic field.

I can't imagine what's going to happen to anybody that's living in those magnetic fields, and I think you have lots of information that says not good things, but we keep ignoring that.

Go east. Go on the Department of Natural Resource land. That's public land. We're part of the public, so benefit the public by using that instead of devastating the public by putting it through populated areas. Even one home, as you said, is too many to lose.

Communication ID: 13867

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: JANE M REVESZ

JANE REVESZ:

I'm Jane Revesz. I was born in Clark County 77 years ago, and along with four generations of my family I am dedicated to keeping and managing our family tree farm, so this is kind of the other side of things. These tree farms that we have were purchased in the 1940's and early '50's by my folks who saw that the burned over hills of our east -- and I emphasize east -- county would one day be valuable, productive, tall trees again. It was just snags and brush when I was a kid, but they saw trees.

They loved the back country, the creeks, the fishing, especially the trees, the view, everything about those places, and they found their dream tree farms. They bought and sold land for some time, saved money, and now we have four tree farms. And we are really trying as a family to keep those tree farms and continually improve them for timber production, first goal; fish and wildlife, clean water and the piece of mind they bring before BPA and some of the threatening of other regulatory things to put us out of business.

We are definitely east county and are ridiculously, severely threatened by the proposed BPA transmission lines and access roads. Family tree farms are really important for Clark County and they have been through very hard times -- of course you know that with the housing and so on, the bubbles -- and the timber prices went way down. We had some timber markets this year, but not much for the last five years, and most of these are not in the west alternative.

The central, the crossover and the eastern alternatives all hit one or more of our four tree farms. And now what about the gray line? The gray line goes through our fourth tree farm. I don't know how we could be so lucky. We have had a terrible couple of years, but the gray line -- the County road maps are wrong. It goes inside our property, it goes through the old Tarbell homestead near a 400-year-old tree. It might be the oldest one in the County. It's kind of ugly because the top broke out, but it's our pet.

And then on the west side of that it's about a half mile that thing goes inside our property line. Well, you know what that does. There are two fish-bearing creeks already. Please, please don't destroy our tree farms.

Communication ID: 13868

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: PETER REVESZ

PETER T. REVESZ:

Good evening. I'm Peter Revesz. I need to speak up anyway because I'm not only speaking for the recording, but also for all of us. Here's what my story is about: I married into the Witter family 55 years ago, and when I married in there our trees were about 5 to 15 feet tall. They came in after the Yacolt burn and here we are today, 150-foot trees in beautiful stands. We harvest in two- to five-acre lots as opposed to hundreds of acres as institutional, government and industrial ones do.

At a difficult time of our economy we are the quiet small, but stern backbone of small tree farming, sustainable -- in fact, sustained for four generations in our family. I'm very proud of our accomplishments and I think we set an example of how agriculture should behave, does behave and does during difficult times like we do.

We find it strange that when BPA comes in with these power lines to put those 500-kilovolt lines through our place, does permanent damage to small areas, which means our percent of hurt is bigger than the industrial ones, and yet we are the ones who, because of the family, of the survivable backbone

of forestry and some of the best forestry in Clark County, and perhaps the world, it is therefore with that larger viewpoint that I'm saying when we penalize those that are trying to do the very best kind of job, it flies in the face of something that as an American I must face up to because I was born behind the Iron Curtain.

I came here and I enjoyed private free enterprise. Now, for gosh sakes, let's protect private free enterprise, which is the small forest landowner in particular. Why don't we put these lines outside of private -- particularly small private properties? It can be done, and with careful layout let's make it a rule of thumb that we will go around private property, particularly the small ones.

Communication ID: 13869

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: PATRICIA LEE WITTER

LEE WITTER:

My name is Lee Witter, and I am also part of the Witter-Revesz four-generational tree farm family, and I am also here to talk about in laying out the lines, please respect the rights of small forestland owners. And I have prepared this visual aid which Jane is showing, and in our 220-acre tree farm which was my parents' and then was mine and now belongs to my children, the line O which is the red line, would bisect the best stands of timber on that as presently line O is located. And again, all family farms are in trouble now. Lots of small businesses are in trouble now.

Our type of farming happens to be tree farming, but the blue line that you see is the expanded riparian buffer that goes along King Creek, which has already removed 23 of the 220 acres from normal forestry. Line O would take an additional 50 acres, so O is the red line, and then the yellow line is an orphan -- line O orphans 24 and a half more acres, which would be subject to wind throw and really very difficult to tree farm normally.

And then the access roads -- there are going to be three towers on our property and one just north. One here, one here, one here, very steep slopes and erosion here, and then another one right here [indicating], so we figure that it will take at least 12 and a half acres more across the green forestry remnant to put access roads to those towers.

And so we figure from our 220 acres of timber -- that as Jane and Pete mentioned, represent 80 years of family forestry, blood, sweat and tears and so on -- we are going to have 110.1 acres on which to practice normal forestry. And so our plea is that you pay attention to the property rights of small private landowners, and we would certainly like to consult with you. As Jane mentioned, we have four properties in forestland, and if you include the gray line, each one of those properties somehow is threatened by one of these lines. It's unbelievable. Anyhow, our plea is not to forget the family tree farm.

Communication ID: 13870

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: CHRISTINA PILE

CHRISTINA PILE:

Good evening. My name is Christina Pile, and I am really new to this fight. We were one of the unfortunate home purchasers that were not aware of what was about to come, and as many people here said, we dreamt of being able to be out in the country and worked very, very hard to have what we call green acres. The house looks like Green Acres.

My biggest concern is not money or loss of property or loss of my home value. My greatest concern is for human health and safety, and when I think of that -- we are already close to your 250-megavolt power lines. We can see them out our front door, we can walk to them if we want to. So we knew they were there. We did some checking.

EMF is a huge concern. There are EMF devices that are approved by the FDA for use in healing soft tissue and broken bones. If it can heal and if it can stimulate cellular regrowth in soft tissue, then that stands to reason it is a medical scientific fact that EMF's have an effect on human health. If it can have a positive effect, it can also have a negative effect.

We need to be very careful about what we're doing with the amount of human lives that we're impacting, whether that be a physical life, or in the case of many of these other people, their livelihoods, or simply the lives that they have tried to build for their entire lives. Indiscriminate exposure to high-voltage power lines creating huge EMF fields, as we've heard from several people who have implants, are very, very dangerous. As many people have said before, we're learning more and more about them.

I urge you, I beg you, how much is a human life worth? How much? Even if it's one life, is it worth one life, a physical life or a livelihood or the life someone has built for this power line? Is there not some way to protect -- I happen to have noticed -- and I don't know how much that yellow gives me -- in your own statement it states, "For this project, as with every transmission project, we work to minimize impact to the natural and human environment."

Among other issues, human health, safety, including electromagnetic fields, if what you say here is true, then you must move your lines as far away from human population as is possible. One life isn't worth the dollars.

Communication ID: 13871

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: GWEN SUNDERLAND

GWEN SUNDERLAND:

My name is Gwen Sunderland, and I have some comments, first of all for my neighbors, and then for those at BPA. Today I read BPA's annual report for 2010 and I learned some interesting things. First, BPA has a \$360 million shortfall for fiscal 2010. Second, the annual report notes that the transmission services are the one bright spot in an otherwise bleak financial picture. BPA is, by definition, a fiscally mismanaged company. Any company that loses \$360 million is fiscally mismanaged. They have a huge financial incentive to grow transmission services such as those they want to hoist on us.

Of note, I also found that BPA was censured by the Ninth Circuit Court for mismanaging REP settlements and improperly managing funds, and yet I also looked at BPA open jobs and found them to be quite cushy. \$100,000 to \$150,000 for an open managerial position, for example, and many others in this range. This is several times the average for folks in this area. BPA acts as a reverse Robin Hood taking from those with less to enrich those that already have more.

Now my comments for BPA. Your corporate history and your dealings with us thus far do not inspire trust. You have a financial incentive to grab our land. I am not here to reason with you, I am not here to tell you my story. I'm here to tell you that we don't want you here.

You already have a viable route on land you've already appropriated, and you need to build underground. That technology has been around forever, you should use it. I'm here to tell you to use your own land and keep your hands off ours. I am further here to advise you that if you attempt to grab our land we will be out to stand in front of the bulldozers. That means me, that means my 80-year-old father in a wheelchair, and that means many of us here. And we'll be outside your offices as well. And the gentleman who spoke earlier and who said -- and he was perfectly correct to note that the spirit of the times is with us and not with you. You are Goliath, the big guy attempting to take from the little guy, and we are David. We are a room full of Davids here and we are here to stop you, and this is a message for your upper management. We will stop you.

Communication ID: 13872

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: GREGORY S MILLER

GREG MILLER:

I am Greg Miller from La Center, Washington on the west route. I bought my property about four years ago. There was no mention of this at the time of buying the property. I looked at the title documents and I did see that there was a right-of-way of the BPA. I walked the property, I looked the property over. It was not even obvious that you could build another line on the back of the property. I thought, I've got a good green space between me and the next property owner, the lines were down in a draw, you can't see them, so we bought the property. It's 330 feet wide by 128 feet deep.

We had a manufactured home on the front of the property. We lived in the manufactured home with the intent of building our dream home on the back of the property, away from the main road, 41st Avenue. We picked the spot that we were going to build the house, we invested the time in clearing the

property. I went to the building department two years ago, applied for the building permit. I was not notified by the building department at all that there was even a proposal to put a line back there, but they issued a building permit to me, and within a few weeks of the building permit I get a letter that's postmarked at least a month in advance that should have been mailed to me.

So now I've got a postmarked letter from the BPA notifying me that they want the right to come on my property, that this is going to be an issue, and at that point I have to say to myself, okay, what do I do? I've got a building permit, it's all mapped out where I'm going to put my house. Do I put my life on hold for the next, who knows how many years while BPA decides what they're going to do with my property? It's total [expletive].

My house now, which I spent two years of my life building, pretty much every stick of it I built myself, it's my dream home. It's got a great view, sunsets. It will all be ruined if this goes through. Do you think I'm going to stand there and let you do that? Hell, no. You said you were going to come out with an EIS study in December. We asked you to postpone it because of the time of the year. You postpone it another six months? [Expletive]. No one could run a business the way you guys run a business. In any kind of relationship with a customer, with a client, it's totally ridiculous that you would put us on hold.

You've got so much land to the east that you could put this on that wouldn't affect anybody. I don't understand. The gray line is the alternative. That is the one that you should be looking at, and it should be not affecting anybody. There's plenty of land out there. I'm a pilot. I fly over this country all the time. There's so much property out there that you could put it on and not affect anybody. I can't believe you couldn't do this.

Communication ID: 13873

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: PERRY J CALABRESE

PERRY CALABRESE:

Hi, Mark. My name is Perry Calabrese, and I live at [address]. My property borders segment number two, the Ross/Lexington line. I'm a property owner that has lost everything already. Let's get that established right now.

I like the way this forum started out at the beginning and they said let's stick to the facts, so I'm going to do that tonight. My dad told me once, and I believe it now, the cheapest way is never the right way, so let's invest the extra dollars, let's invest the extra money that's needed and take the best east. That is the right thing to do.

One thing that really humored me watching TV -- and I don't spend a whole lot of time watching TV, but it's a Portland General Electric commercial and the commercial boasts -- I mean, they really do -- they brag that they don't need any extra power. They talk about due to their conserve -- or conservation efforts and new technology and appliances and lighting and energy efficient homes, that commercial

specifically says they do not need any additional power in the Multnomah County area. And so I took the liberty to e-mail them and I got in contact -- I'm sorry, I don't know the name of the person right now, and I gave them a phone call also and I said, is this really true? And he said yes. In fact, their energy use is down. And that is the commercial that's broadcast on, I believe it's mostly on Channel 8.

Then there's another issue with people -- the controversy over whether California needs the power. Well, California law SB X 1-2 states that by the year 2020 the majority, more than 80 percent of the power produced in California, must come from within the state of California, not outside sources. And that is due to technology advancing as fast as it is with bloom energy servers. The Bloom Energy Server is coming way down in price and a majority of the largest technology corporations in southern California now are supplementing their power with renewable Bloom Energy Service.

I work in a school district just north of here. I work in the La Center school district. That school district survives mostly on local tax dollars without much industry help at all. In fact, about the only income that they get from industry are some of the downtown shops, which is a very small downtown if you've never been there, and a couple of casinos. Everything else relies -- the school relies on residential property taxes, and putting this power line through that school district is going to severely impact future taxable income from land that will not be able to be developed and will not be able to contribute to the wellbeing of our school district and children.

The route through Lexington is tragic. If you've seen the maps, that is just horrible of what those people are going to deal with. One of the towers is being placed directly behind newly built homes which is sandwiched between a church, a church and school, probably about 600 apartments and one of the fastest growing residential areas just north of Kelso.

And I would like to play for you right now -- I will end as soon as you guys hear this. This is amazing. This is a digital recording of me sitting in my car on Delameter Road near the current line. [Playing recording]. That is just sitting in my seat. I would like to end, and I will end quickly knowing that there aren't any other people after this anyway.

You're a geotech, right? I'm going to share this photograph with you. This is Hazel Dell Road shortly after a half acre was clearcut in a known slide area above my property, which is causing my home and my property to slide. You need to take a look at the depth of this. And this is before the road actually slid. And also the other picture is just in my front yard, and this crack is about 20 to 24 feet long. And when I left -- before I left I took my iPad and I did a picture for you of my daughter's bedroom that has a crack that goes from the floor of her bedroom, which is on the bottom floor of the house, all the way up to the second floor to the ceiling. That is what's happening to my home right now.

Now in closing, I think a BPA employee stated it best, and that employee's name is Steve Noralski. He's the vegetation control person for BPA. He told my wife on leaving our property, "If you don't like it, Mr. Calabrese, file a tort claim against the BPA." Thank you.

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: MICHELE L BLACK

MICHELE BLACK:

Hi, Mark; hi, Maryam. Long time no see.

There's a couple points that I want to make in closing, and one has to do with the misconception and some rhetoric that's been thrown around about how if this line is put in, particularly on the gray line -- because it would be the most expensive -- how it would impact rates. As I think most people know, but some people may not be aware, that what BPA does is they transmit the power. You don't actually own the power, but you're transmitting it for your customers. You have hundreds of customers and those customers have thousands, if not millions of rate payers.

This line is a national infrastructure project and will use embedded rates if it is built. In other words, BPA is going to absorb the entire cost of the line within the current transmission rate structure for the entire BPA network. So it's not as if this line is put in Southwest Washington and only Southwest Washington rate payers are going to absorb the cost. It's going to be spread out among the entire BPA system. What this means is that the cost will be distributed and it means pennies, if that, that will increase the rates, because your transmission rates, according to Wayne Nelson, who is the CEO of Clark PUD, when we met with him last year that your transmission rates to your Clark PUD bill is about four percent of that bill. And of that four percent he stated to us it would literally be pennies. And we estimated that using the BPA's 2012 rate structure, if I estimate that the cost of transmission delivered to my home is about two tenths of a penny per kilowatt per hour, you -- like me -- may use 2000 kilowatts per month. Only a few pennies of my \$169 bill pays for BPA transmission costs.

So although \$100 million dollars seems like an incredible amount of money, and it is to individuals, to BPA it really is insignificant, and to the rate payer it's insignificant. In fact, I would say to you that because BPA's transmission lines will increase the capacity -- the load capacity that BPA can transmit, it actually could possibly reduce rates because they can then transmit more power and make more money from their customers. So I wanted to clear that up.

The second thing I want to talk about is I live against the existing right-of-way. Yes, I knew I was against an existing right-of-way when I purchased my home, and I knew that the 230-kV line was put in the existing right-of-way 40 years ago. Maybe I'm stupid, but maybe I'm not. I don't think the average individual understands how a power company's right-of-way works.

I was never told and had no idea in looking at it -- like this gentleman has said, had no idea that they could put 80-foot towers -- I didn't know that 80-foot towers were even possible -- or 150-foot towers, excuse me, could be fit next to the existing towers that are there.

I also would like to say that to those who have said, well put it in the existing right-of-way, they're living next to it anyway, to take a 230-kV line and add a 500-kV line next to it is like saying, well, you live next

to a county road, so having the state come in and put in an interstate next to it should be acceptable. That's absolutely ridiculous.

I have one more thing. Regarding the 40 years that has gone by, things have changed, times have changed. There's more science, there's more data to support adverse health effects. There wasn't this data 40 years ago. In fact, I don't know that 40 years ago we even knew that there could be a 500-kV line that could exist. I don't know that this was even technology that was even there. So to be able to predict 40 years ago that people were going to be able to move in around these lines probably wasn't even -- people probably never really thought much of it.

I think that BPA has a responsibility to its neighbors, as I have a responsibility to my neighbors. There are laws that have been put into place, rules that have been put into place in 40 years. 40 years ago I could have a chicken farm in my backyard or I could have a 15-foot fence. Now I can't, because there are laws that are in place for me to protect my neighbors. I think BPA has that same responsibility to its neighbors. Thank you.

Communication ID: 13875

Date Received: 12/8/2011

Name: JASON CARPENTER

JASON CARPENTER:

My name is Jason Carpenter, and apparently I'm the unfortunate recent home buyer on segment 26. I bought my place back in February not knowing that you guys are thinking about putting power lines through the back half of my ten acres. If my real estate agent was here right now I would be strangling him, but I guess it was my responsibility, and unfortunately at the time I didn't know about your pretty map here that I could have found on line.

I'm one of the people here in the room that would like to start building and think about building a future of 31 years and making plans for my property. I'm 46 years old, and God willing I'll be here for another 46, and this is my very first home purchase.

Ever since a small child when you're looking into your future of what is your future going to hold and dreaming of your -- how your life is going to be and what your house is going to look like, and are you going to live by the ocean or on the lake or on a houseboat or whatever, I have always wanted a house with a view. I didn't care if I had a big yard, but the only thing I wanted was a house with a view. So for years I've been scrimping and saving, and finally, after a year and a half of searching and looking at over 100 properties, I finally found my piece of heaven, so I thought, and hopefully it will remain that way.

When I moved up here from Oregon I brought my business with me as well as two employees, and I am in the process of hiring about another six or seven employees. Should you decide to run power lines through the back of my property, which will kill my view -- absolutely kill it -- there's no towers on my property. You're going to put a tower on my neighbor's property and you're going to put another tower

on the other property and you're going to swing power lines across the back half where I'm looking off towards Portland and over Fargher Lake. And tonight we had a spectacular red sunset view -- sunrise -- sunset. It was great. At the nighttime you can sit on the back porch and hear the crickets chirping away. I'm looking forward to that rather than power lines chirping away.

I'm not going to live the rest of my life with this situation. I'll sell my property at a loss. And since I just recently bought my property, I pretty much know how much I paid for that view. I'm kind of wondering if BPA is going to compensate me for that view, because what I've heard is you're compensated if there's actually a power line on your property, but if you lose a view you get zilch.

My feeling, until I heard some comments tonight, was that the west alternative would be a better way to go. You already own that land. People who live next to the west alternative, they bought that knowing going into that. People like us didn't know that. Anyway, the gray line sounds like the better way to go.
