

## Stenehjem, Carlene R - DKC-7

---

**From:** on behalf of BPA Public Involvement

**Subject:** FW: TNP-TPP-3 - Proposed Summer Falls and Main Canal Hydropower Interconnection Transmission Line

---

**From:** Rick Heiberg

**Sent:** Monday, August 28, 2006 1:30 PM

**To:** BPA Public Involvement

**Subject:** TNP-TPP-3 - Proposed Summer Falls and Main Canal Hydropower Interconnection Transmission Line

Dear good people,

I was unable to attend the recent Coulee City meeting regarding the proposed new power line that would connect the main canal hydropower generation site with the new "Pinto Ridge Substation". As a resident and concerned citizen of Coulee City, I have a few questions, comments, and suggestions.

Questions:

1. Will BPA and it's partners prepare an EIS (environmental impact statement)? There are surely health concerns for the people who live in the path of the proposed line especially the portion which would run through town. An additional concern that I've heard expressed has to do with the unsightly nature of additional poles and/or lines running through town.
2. Will there be additional public meetings in order for people to be able to let their concerns be known?
3. Why was alternative 1 chosen over alternative 2?

Comments:

Coulee City is in the middle of the Washington State Coulee Corridor Scenic Byway. People traveling through the area to enjoy the magnificent geological formations, cliffs, lakes and birds travel directly through our town. It seems to me that an additional power line with it's associated poles would detract from the aesthetic value of the area in general and Coulee City in particular. There are already existing lines in the area to be sure, but adding more cannot be attractive. No one wants to have additional overhead power lines going through his neighborhood.

It is a hope of people here that taking advantage of the Coulee Corridor could result in additional jobs and revenues desperately needed to meet governmental responsibilities as well as to meet the need of residents. I have found no one here who thinks that this is would be a positive good for our community!

Suggestions:

Why not construct the new line alongside the canal using the "proposed transmission lines - alternative 2? Using this alternative would, it seems to me, eliminate all of the potential problems.

1. It would eliminate any possible health hazards.
2. There would be no detracting additional poles/lines to clutter up town.
3. Almost no private property would be infringed upon.
4. There would be less cost in terms of the need to purchase private property.

5. Alternative 2 is a shorter distance. Construction costs would be less.

Conclusion:

Use of alternative route 2 would be a win-win for everyone involved and should be adopted. Everyone would benefit. Citizens fears would be allayed. Costs to Seattle City Light and Tacoma Power and their respective rate payers would be less. We urge that alternative route 2 be used!