

LTS-062

Date: November 21, 2005

To: Kirk Robinson, Project Manager
From: Don and Lena Whitson
Subject: Libby to Troy Proposed Rebuild

Thank you for arranging the informational meeting on November 17 on EMF's. We learned some new information, but we had the distinct feeling that some others there had a completely separate agenda for the meeting. Anyway, thank you to Monty Tumominen and Dan Bracken for their presentations and to you for fielding questions later.

As language unfit for any professional person resounded through our valley on November 3, Don encountered the source of it in the person of a surveyor for the proposed BPA project. The surveyor indicated where the line was to go. The proposed line's location in respect to our house can be summed up in a matter of four words: IT IS TOO CLOSE. We will not be signing the *Permission to Enter Property* document if the line is at this location.

We feel we have been singled out as the "fall guy" for everyone else. Why can Plum Creek say, "We don't want you on our property," and you change the line for them? Why do the voices of the people in Big Horn Terrace WHERE YOU ALREADY HAVE A RIGHT-OF-WAY appear so very important? Is our property less valuable, or are our concerns somehow not as important? Will a different tower devalue their property? I don't think so, but but our property *will be* devaluated, since the aesthetic value of our place in its somewhat isolated location is one of its greatest assets. We even feel we have been singled out from our two adjacent neighbors to bear the burden of the proposed transmission line.

There are alternatives to consider. If indeed, relocation is decided to be the better alternative to leaving the line at its present location, please consider modifying the present plan. An alternative *could have* been designed which avoided all personal private property because of the vast amount of Forest Service land in our immediate area. Even from the present dog-leg design, a more southerly route, somewhat like a proposal many years ago, could possibly miss any individual personal property. A variation of the proposed alternative could be easily accomplished by moving QCAP 4 and QCAP 1 even a matter of several yards to the north, as the terrain acceptable for towers extends along the flats where the project is proposed. What is the opposition to these proposals? The enclosed map illustrates the proposals mentioned.

Sincerely,

Don and Lena Whitson

NOV 28 2005

Rec'd
NOV 28 2005

NOV 28 2005

