

From: John & Margaret Smith
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2007 7:37 PM
To: BPA Public Involvement
Subject: Comments on the BPA Rebuild of the Libby (FEC)-Troy Section of BPA's 115-Kv Transmission Line
Dear Sir,

Please accept this letter with my comments as it is a day late. I have been told that BPA has stated that our previously submitted letters with questions and comments for draft EIS consideration last winter may no longer have any status. If this is true, may I ask why as virtually all the comments were not addressed in the recent draft EIS Report? Would you please refer to the letters for the comments as they are still valid, untreated and applicable to the draft...and now the final report.

My review of the draft revealed no reference (other than to the cancer threat...which is controversial) was made to the residents and others (please refer to my previous letters) that live very near, or travel under, the existing and proposed power line easement. The draft did present extensive details on such variables as bear habitat and line threat to low flying aircraft, but absolutely no reference to effects on the numerous humans such as aesthetics, safety and lot restrictions, etc. A recent newspaper article quoted a BPA official as stating that a major reason for effecting the Kootenai River Crossing Realignment was to remove power lines from being seen by those visiting the Falls visitor area. If tourist amenities were this important, why weren't considerations or benefits to populated neighborhoods discussed? This later consideration would seem even more important as it was concern for the many existing residents along the power line that led State of Montana to recommend the inclusion of the Quartz Creek Realignment when the project kicked-off. State officials should be alarmed to learn that their concern was largely ignored in the report. Poorly prepared EIS reports hurt everyone.

The disregard for local residents is further shown by the failure to publish the names of those who submitted written comments to the EIS in the EIS. Their comments, though solicited, were not responded to, published, categorized, quoted or counted in the draft or its Appendices. Accountability for possibly very important input was totally ignored.

It is also disconcerting to recall a previous disregard for residents that was caused by failing to notify the many residents of the largest populated area in the path of the transmission line that the Enhancement Project was underway. This failure prevented residents from attending scheduled project information meetings for two months.

The EIS, against all reason and consideration for fairness, was prepared by an in-house agency or BPA contracted agency. Fears relative to this reality have been substantiated. The intent of the EIS, and its process, have been badly short-changed. The welfare of an important part of the environment--residents--has also been badly neglected.

Thank you for accepting my comments, if you will.

Sincerely yours,

John D. Smith