

BPA I-5 CORRIDOR REINFORCEMENT – SCOPING SUMMARY

APPENDIX C- COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED

This appendix contains all the communications submitted during the scoping period. The table below contains contact and organization names and the communication identification number assigned to their communication. The appendix is ordered by communication number. For reference, this table is ordered by last name.

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11982	11/23/2009	JENNIFER	AARON	
10999	10/30/2009	KATHIE	AASETH	
10999	10/30/2009	ALLEN	AASETH	
11975	11/25/2009	LISA	ABBOTT	
12314	12/14/2009	LYLE L	ABERTNATHY	
11909	11/23/2009	DEANNA	ADAMS	PACIFICORP
11000	11/3/2009	MUBARIK	AHMAD	
11975	11/25/2009	CAL	AHO	
11975	11/25/2009	WANDA A	AHO	
11975	11/25/2009	ANDREY	AHO	
11975	11/25/2009	LINDSAY	AHO	
11855	11/22/2009	PHIL	AKELY	
11999	12/1/2009	MONIQUE A	AKERLEY	
10967	10/28/2009	CHARLOTTE	AKIN	
12221	12/12/2009	RALPH	AKIN	
10479	10/27/2009	RON	ALLCOTT	
10479	10/27/2009	LAUREN	ALLCOTT	
11203	10/29/2009	PAM	ALLEN	
11709	11/19/2009	PATRICK	ALLEN	
11900	11/24/2009	DAVID	ALLEN	
11975	11/25/2009	SUSAN	ALLISON	
12368	12/14/2009	MICHAEL J	ALLISON	
10247	11/3/2009	DANIEL A	ANDERSON	
11589	11/14/2009	APRIL	ANDERSON	
11714	11/18/2009	KRISTEN M	ANDERSON	
11724	11/19/2009	CANDICE D	ANDERSON	
11975	11/25/2009	ANN	ANDERSON	
12094	12/4/2009	APRIL	ANDERSON	
12156	12/10/2009	DAVID P	ANDERSON	
12213	12/12/2009	MARILYN J	ANDERSON	
12289	12/14/2009	LISA A	ANDERSON	
12325	12/13/2009	JOHN	ANDERSON	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
12325	12/13/2009	LISA A	ANDERSON	
12326	12/14/2009	JUDITH A	ANDERSON	
12331	12/14/2009	JAMES	ANDERSON	
12361	12/13/2009	ANNE	ANDERSON	
12364	12/14/2009	JAMES	ANDERSON	
12376	12/14/2009	JOHN	ANDERSON	
12496	11/24/2009	JOHN	ANDERSON	
12506	11/24/2009	LISA A	ANDERSON	
11700	11/18/2009	LORI L	ANDERSON- BENSON	REMAX EQUITY GROUP REALTORS
11412	11/13/2009	DENNIS	ANDRADE	
11668	11/5/2009	DENNIS	ANDRADE	
11668	11/5/2009	DONNA	ANDRADE	
12201	12/11/2009	MARY A	ANDRADE	
10033	10/19/2009	GINA	ANDREWS	
10191	10/27/2009	DAPHNA	ANDREWS	
12494	12/14/2009	GINA	ANDREWS	
10963	10/28/2009	DALE	ANDRING	
11975	11/25/2009	DENNIS	ANDROCK	
11975	11/25/2009	DONNA	ANDROCK	
10168	10/27/2009	STEVEN D	ANGLIN	
11726	11/17/2009	STEVEN D	ANGLIN	
11226	11/6/2009	JONATHAN	ARAGORN	
11982	11/23/2009	LARRY	ARLINT	
12404	12/14/2009	CARL	ARMY	
11974	11/25/2009	DOUG	ARNDT	
12166	12/11/2009	DOUG	ARNDT	
12450	11/19/2009	RAMONA	ARNOLD	
11975	11/25/2009	CARLOS	ARTEAGA	
11404	11/13/2009	ADRIANNA J	ASFRDGDH	
10109	10/25/2009	MARYAM	ASGHARIAN	
10952	10/27/2009	PAM C	ASHFORD	
11757	11/19/2009	PAM C	ASHFORD	
11761	11/19/2009	PAM C	ASHFORD	
12325	12/13/2009	PAM C	ASHFORD	
12264	12/13/2009	JULIE K	ATCHLEY	
11860	11/22/2009	WILLIAM	ATKINS	
11975	11/25/2009	DOUG	AULT	
10075	10/22/2009	KATHY	AYERS	
10075	10/22/2009	ROBERT	AYERS	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11241	11/8/2009	MARLA B	AZINGER	
11242	11/8/2009	JIM A	AZINGER	
11413	11/13/2009	MARLA B	AZINGER	
11942	11/20/2009	STEPHEN M.	BAILEY	
11942	11/20/2009	DONNA M	BAILEY	
11942	11/20/2009	JOSEPH R	BAILEY	
11982	11/23/2009	NICHOLE L	BAILEY	
12192	12/11/2009	DONNA M	BAILEY	
12192	12/11/2009	JOSEPH R	BAILEY	
11951	11/27/2009	LARRY K	BAIR	
11621	11/17/2009	BRIAN N	BAIRD	U.S. CONGRESS
10449	10/27/2009	MARY	BAKER	
11982	11/23/2009	RONALD	BAKER	
10125	10/26/2009	SHELIA	BALDWIN	
11841	11/21/2009	PAT	BARBER	
11247	11/7/2009	MARLA	BARBUR	
12007	11/25/2009	VALERI	BARDINI	
12035	11/25/2009	JANE	BARIL	
12519	10/23/2009	CARL	BARK	
12124	12/8/2009	BARBARA J	BARNARD	
12126	12/8/2009	DALE E	BARNARD	
10738	10/28/2009	BRIAN	BARNES	
11622	11/17/2009	NANCY	BARNES	CLARK PUBLIC UTILITIES
11416	11/13/2009	MICHAEL A.	BARRETT	
12222	12/12/2009	TED R	BARRETT	
11998	12/1/2009	SUSAN M	BARROWS	
12360	12/14/2009	SUSAN M	BARROWS	
11655	11/17/2009	LINDA K	BARRY	
11655	11/17/2009	RICHARD	BARRY	
11944	11/26/2009	ROBERT T	BARRY	
12115	12/9/2009	SUSAN M	BARTH	
12054	12/1/2009	JAMES	BARTON	
10178	10/27/2009	MARGARET	BATES	HOCKINSON SCHOOL DISTRICT
12184	12/11/2009	MARK S	BAYLES	
12209	12/12/2009	CYNTHIA A	BAYLES	
10215	10/31/2009	DENISE L	BEARD	
11414	11/13/2009	LEAH L.	BECHTOLDT	
11593	11/15/2009	GARY K	BECHTOLDT	
12404	12/14/2009	KAREN	BECKER	
11975	11/25/2009	LU	BECKETT	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11975	11/25/2009	JEFF	BECKLEY	
11560	11/14/2009	CONNIE J	BEITEY	
10089	10/23/2009	AMANDA E	BELL	
11980	11/25/2009	CATHY	BELL	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
11980	11/25/2009	BRYAN	BELL	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
12488	12/14/2009	BRUCE AND LESLIE	BELL	
11719	11/18/2009	RICHARD D	BEMM	LONGVIEW PARKS & RECREATION DEPARTMENT
12404	12/14/2009	WHITANY	BEN	
12374	12/14/2009	WALTER C	BENDER	
11386	11/9/2009	CAROLYN	BENJAMIN	
11685	11/17/2009	CHRIS	BENJAMIN	
11740	11/19/2009	CAROLYN	BENJAMIN	
12020	11/25/2009	BARBARA	BENNETT	
12020	11/25/2009	CHARLES W	BENNETT	
12098	12/6/2009	DONALD	BENZ	
10988	11/3/2009	LAURA	BERG	
10988	11/3/2009	KEN	BERG	
11979	11/25/2009	KEN S	BERG	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
11678	11/16/2009	FRANK	BERGE	
11678	11/16/2009	JULIE	BERGE	
10950	10/27/2009	MARK AND MEGAN	BERGLUND	
11975	11/25/2009	PATRICIA	BERKETT	
11982	11/23/2009	ADRIAN	BERRY	
11982	11/23/2009	BECKY	BERRY	
12369	12/14/2009	JONATHON J	BEST	
12113	12/8/2009	ALAINA R	BEZOLD	
12348	12/14/2009	MATTHEW E	BEZOLD	
11568	11/16/2009	GIGI A	BICE	
10014	10/13/2009	MIKE	BIELEC	
12034	11/22/2009	DAVID	BILLINGER	WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
11579	11/14/2009	DOUGLAS W	BINGHAM	
11652	11/17/2009	LOU J	BINTZ	
10097	10/25/2009	KIM	BISHOP	
10233	11/3/2009	SANDRA L	BISHOP	
10240	11/3/2009	SANDRA L	BISHOP	
11939	11/20/2009	SANDRA L	BISHOP	
11975	11/25/2009	SANDRA L	BISHOP	
11975	11/25/2009	RIC	BISHOP	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11772	11/19/2009	PATRICIA L	BLACK	
11892	11/25/2009	PATRICIA L	BLACK	
12306	12/13/2009	MICHELE	BLACK	
12306	12/13/2009	TOM	BLACK	
11382	11/6/2009	MARGUERITE	BLACKMAN	STONE MEADOWS HOA, STONEY MEADOWS SUBDI...
11382	11/6/2009	JEFF	BLACKMAN	STONE MEADOWS SUBDIVISION
11982	11/23/2009	ANAMAE	BLACKSTONE	
12327	12/14/2009	CAROLYN	BLAIN	
10227	11/2/2009	SCOTT	BLANTON	
11608	11/16/2009	WENDY	BLANTON	
11781	11/20/2009	RONALD F	BLEHM	SUMMER HILLS HOA
12266	12/13/2009	JUSTIN M	BLETH	
11591	11/15/2009	REBECCA	BLICK	
11654	11/17/2009	REBECCA	BLICK	
11654	11/17/2009	MICHAEL	BLICK	
12081	12/4/2009	JANE	BLICKENSTAFF	
11975	11/25/2009	ALAN	BLOCH	
11978	11/22/2009	ROBERT AND CECELIA	BLODGETTE	
11982	11/23/2009	MIRIAM	BLONDIN	
10070	10/22/2009	BILL	BOATMAN	
10970	10/28/2009	JERRY	BOATRIGT	
11240	11/8/2009	CONRAD S	BOCK	
11788	11/20/2009	GARY	BOCK	
11799	11/20/2009	CONRAD S	BOCK	
10059	10/13/2009	RICHARD C.	BOEHM	
12401	12/14/2009	SHIRLEY	BOEHM	
12453	12/11/2009	RICHARD C.	BOEHM	
11982	11/23/2009	RICHARD Q	BOHLIEY	
11982	11/23/2009	JOSEPH	BOHLIG	
10002	10/12/2009	LARRY	BOITANO	
10040	10/13/2009	MARC	BOLDT	BOARD OF CLARK COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
12071	12/1/2009	MARC	BOLDT	BOARD OF CLARK COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
12388	12/14/2009	MARC	BOLDT	BOARD OF CLARK COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
12203	12/11/2009	MATTHEW A	BOLSOY	
10978	10/28/2009	JOE	BOND	
10019	10/14/2009	JACOB	BOOMHOUWER	
11751	11/19/2009	JACOB	BOOMHOUWER	
11786	11/20/2009	CHRIS	BORDELON	
12173	12/8/2009	MIKE	BORGE	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
12229	12/12/2009	PATRICK	BORUNDA	
12230	12/12/2009	PATRICK	BORUNDA	
12231	12/12/2009	PATRICK	BORUNDA	
12232	12/12/2009	PATRICK	BORUNDA	
12318	12/13/2009	PATRICK	BORUNDA	
12325	12/13/2009	PATRICK	BORUNDA	
12333	12/13/2009	PATRICK	BORUNDA	
12397	12/14/2009	PATRICK	BORUNDA	
11797	11/20/2009	RICHARD D	BOSLAUGH	
12477	12/14/2009	MIKE	BOSTER	
12477	12/14/2009	JULIE	BOSTER	
12189	12/11/2009	MARK	BOTTOMLY	
12265	12/13/2009	PAUL M	BOUDREAUX	
11844	11/16/2009	PHIL	BOURQUIN	CITY OF CAMAS
12418	12/14/2009	PHIL	BOURQUIN	CITY OF CAMAS
11848	11/20/2009	RICHARD	BOUSLAUGH	
10954	10/27/2009	HOLLY	BOWER	
12295	12/13/2009	TAMRRA J	BOWIE	
12310	12/14/2009	MIKE J	BOWIE	
11259	11/3/2009	ROBERT	BOYD	
11899	11/24/2009	STEFEN J	BOYD	
11225	11/6/2009	PATRICIA L	BOYDEN	PORT OF VANCOUVER
10093	10/24/2009	ROBERT J.	BOYLE	
12381	12/14/2009	MARGARET	BOYLE	
12392	12/14/2009	KEVIN G	BOYLE	
12505	11/24/2009	ROBERT J.	BOYLE	
10038	10/19/2009	BILL	BRAACK	
11232	11/7/2009	CHARLENE L	BRAACK	BRAACK MOTORSPORTS, INC
11001	10/30/2009	BRADLEY	BRAINARD	
12516	11/30/2009	TED	BRANCH	
12516	11/30/2009	SANDY	BRANCH	
10201	10/29/2009	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	
11570	11/16/2009	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	
11994	12/1/2009	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	
12029	12/2/2009	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	
12030	12/2/2009	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	
12131	12/8/2009	RICHARD	BRANTLEY	
12325	12/13/2009	CHERYL KAY	BRANTLEY	
12507	11/24/2009	RICHARD	BRANTLEY	
10031	10/18/2009	OLE	BRAPEDERSON	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
12423	12/14/2009	STEVEN	BRATT	
10013	10/14/2009	CHRISTOPHER	BRAUN	
10035	10/15/2009	CHRISTOPHER	BRAUN	
11811	11/21/2009	THEODORE	BRAUN	
11811	11/21/2009	MRS.	BRAUN	
12167	12/11/2009	CHRISTOPHER	BRAUN	
12168	12/11/2009	WILLIAM A.	BRAUN	
12325	12/13/2009	BILL	BRAUN	
12325	12/13/2009	CAROLYN	BRAUN	
11984	11/30/2009	ANNE	BRAY	
11683	11/17/2009	DEAN	BREMER	
10981	11/3/2009	STEVE	BRETZ	
12257	12/13/2009	COLLEEN	BRIGGS	
10209	10/29/2009	ROBERT	BRINK	POMEROY-PLOWMAN RANCH LTD.
12243	12/13/2009	JENNIFER D	BRINKMAN	
11245	11/8/2009	DOUGLAS R	BROCKBANK	
11598	11/13/2009	DOUGLAS R	BROCKBANK	
11975	11/25/2009	JANE	BROCKBANK	
12325	12/13/2009	DOUGLAS R	BROCKBANK	
12325	12/13/2009	JANE	BROCKBANK	
12425	12/14/2009	DOUGLAS R	BROCKBANK	
12508	11/24/2009	DOUGLAS R	BROCKBANK	
11047	11/3/2009	FAITH	BROCKWAY	
11047	11/3/2009	JIM	BROCKWAY	
11556	11/13/2009	ADAM J	BROOKS	
11982	11/23/2009	LARRY	BROOKS	
11975	11/25/2009	ANGELA	BROSIUS	
11975	11/25/2009	RANDY	BROSIUS	
10202	10/29/2009	LESLIE J	BROWN	
10207	10/30/2009	LESLIE J	BROWN	
10467	10/27/2009	JOYCE B.	BROWN	
11708	11/17/2009	RICHARD	BROWN	
11708	11/17/2009	JENNIFER	BROWN	
12006	11/25/2009	MARGUERITE M	BROWN	
12211	12/12/2009	DIANE S	BROWN	
12284	12/13/2009	PATRICK J	BROWN	
12363	12/14/2009	DANA J	BROWN	
12404	12/14/2009	JENNIFER	BROWN	
12044	11/25/2009	LORI	BRUCHER	
12404	12/14/2009	RICHARD	BRUM	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10229	11/2/2009	MARGO M	BRYANT	
11249	11/7/2009	SHARON	BUCHER	
10518	10/27/2009	WALTER	BUCK	
10951	10/27/2009	NANCY	BUCKBEE	
11557	11/13/2009	DAVID A	BUDDE	
11946	11/24/2009	DAVID A	BUDDE	
11636	11/17/2009	DIANE M	BUDDEN	
11982	11/23/2009	RONALD	BURCHAR	
12148	12/9/2009	MICHAEL D	BURDICK	
11876	11/23/2009	TRACY	BURGESS	
12097	12/5/2009	STEPHEN X	BURINSKY	
10022	10/15/2009	THOMAS	BURKE	COLUMBIA LAND TRUST
10995	11/4/2009	DAVE	BURLINGAME	COWLITZ INDIAN TRIBE, CULTURAL RESOURCES DEP...
10244	10/27/2009	KENT	BURNS	
11975	11/25/2009	MARLA	BURNS	
11628	11/17/2009	LISA M	BUSCH	
11628	11/17/2009	GEOFF	BUSCH	
10076	10/23/2009	JULIANA G	BUTLER	CHESTNUT FARMS
10076	10/23/2009	GARY	BUTLER	
10121	10/26/2009	JULIANA G	BUTLER	CHESTNUT FARMS
11704	11/17/2009	JULIANA G	BUTLER	CHESTNUT FARMS
11704	11/17/2009	GARY	BUTLER	
10179	10/27/2009	ALAN	BUTTERFIELD	
11044	11/3/2009	ALAN	BUTTERFIELD	
11789	11/20/2009	HORNE FAMILY TREE FARM, LLC	C/O ERNEST HORNE	HORNE FAMILY TREE FARM, LLC
10234	11/3/2009	PERRY J	CALABRESE	
12390	12/14/2009	DIRELLE R.	CALICA	AFFILIATED TRIBE OF NORTHWEST INDIANS
10446	10/27/2009	LANCE	CALSTOY	
10175	10/27/2009	LINDA	CAMPBELL	
11008	10/30/2009	PAT	CAMPBELL	
11661	11/13/2009	PAUL	CAMPBELL	
11662	11/13/2009	ANAMARIA	CAMPBELL	
12180	12/11/2009	SANONA	CAMPBELL	
12180	12/11/2009	ERNIE	CAMPBELL	
11675	11/17/2009	RON D	CAMPOS	
10081	10/23/2009	MARI C	CAMPUZANO	
10977	10/28/2009	MARI C	CAMPUZANO	
12199	12/11/2009	A M	CANDEE	
12183	12/11/2009	LINDA	CANFIELD	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11621	11/17/2009	MARIA	CANTWELL	U.S. CONGRESS
11234	11/7/2009	ORAL W	CARPER	
11235	11/7/2009	ORAL W	CARPER	
11236	11/7/2009	ORAL W	CARPER	
11237	11/7/2009	ORAL W	CARPER	
11238	11/7/2009	ORAL W	CARPER	
12440	12/2/2009	RICHARD	CARSON	
10239	10/29/2009	THERESA	CARTER	
10450	10/27/2009	THERESA	CARTER	
12430	12/11/2009	THERESA	CARTER	
12431	12/14/2009	THERESA	CARTER	
10007	10/13/2009	MARVIN	CASE	
11262	11/9/2009	B.J. B	CASELL	
12355	12/14/2009	SHEREE R	CASELL	
11703	11/18/2009	MARITES	CASTRO	
12032	12/2/2009	MARITES	CASTRO	
12082	12/4/2009	MARITES	CASTRO	
11982	11/23/2009	MAY L	CAUGH	
11964	11/29/2009	MONTY L	CENTER	
11866	11/24/2009	JACK	CGRAGGEN	
11866	11/24/2009	CATHY	CGRAGGEN	
10230	11/2/2009	KIRK	CHAMBERLAIN	
10230	11/2/2009	JUDY	CHAMBERLAIN	
11988	11/30/2009	DAVID	CHAMBERS	
12158	12/10/2009	BENJAMIN T	CHAMBERS	
11975	11/25/2009	SIDNEY	CHAN	
11975	11/25/2009	LINDA J	CHAN	
12051	11/25/2009	SIDNEY	CHAN	
12051	11/25/2009	LINDA J	CHAN	
12121	12/8/2009	SIDNEY	CHAN	
12121	12/8/2009	LINDA J	CHAN	
11746	11/18/2009	RICHARD	CHANEY	
10248	11/3/2009	DANN	CHAPPELLE	
12256	12/13/2009	ANTHONY C	CHARLES	
12404	12/14/2009	MARY	CHARLES	
11732	11/18/2009	SHAUNA N	CHAVEZ	
11919	11/24/2009	CORDELIA	CHEN	
10152	10/28/2009	ROMAN V	CHERNICHENKO	
10087	10/23/2009	LYNN K	CHMELIR	
11794	11/20/2009	LYNN K	CHMELIR	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10182	10/27/2009	CHERYL	CHRISTENSEN	
11975	11/25/2009	DIANE	CHRISTENSEN	
11975	11/25/2009	DEAN A	CHRISTENSEN	
12393	12/14/2009	KAMIE	CHRISTIANSEN	
11626	11/17/2009	K. D.	CHRISTIANSON	
10032	10/18/2009	GREG R	CHRISTISON	CHRISTISON FAMILY FARM
10032	10/18/2009	ROY	CHRISTISON	
10032	10/18/2009	MINERVA	CHRISTISON	
10216	11/1/2009	GREG R	CHRISTISON	CHRISTISON FAMILY FARM
12118	12/8/2009	GREG R	CHRISTISON	CHRISTISON FAMILY FARM
10127	10/26/2009	KEN	CHRYSLER	
12499	11/24/2009	KEN	CHRYSLER	
12139	12/9/2009	MICHAEL	CIRAULO	
12305	12/13/2009	CONCERNED	CITIZENS	
11775	11/19/2009	KELLY B	CLARK	
11975	11/25/2009	RAY	CLARK	
12103	12/7/2009	CHRIS L	CLARK	
12103	12/7/2009	LYNETTE	CLARK	
11975	11/25/2009	ROBIN	CLARKE	
11982	11/23/2009	JAMES A	CLAY	
10117	10/26/2009	GARY	CLEMENTS	
10088	10/23/2009	ANDREW C	COBURN	
10112	10/23/2009	ANDREW C	COBURN	
11982	11/23/2009	STEVE	COCHTS	
10989	11/3/2009	STEVE	COCKRELL	
11049	11/3/2009	STEVE	COCKRELL	
11049	11/3/2009	COLLEEN	COCKRELL	
11975	11/25/2009	NICK	CODINO	
10101	10/26/2009	PAUL C	COFFIN	
11705	11/18/2009	ROGER J	COLBY	
11819	11/23/2009	SIDNEY	COLE	
11053	11/6/2009	FLOYD	COLLINS	
12000	12/1/2009	JEFF	CONDON	
11041	11/6/2009	KURT J	CONGER	ENERGY EXPERT SERVICES, INC.
12008	12/1/2009	TAMI	CONGLETON	
11583	11/15/2009	BECKY A	CONNOLLY	
10194	10/29/2009	GILLIAN L	CONROY	
11884	11/24/2009	TERRY	CONSTANCE	
12185	12/11/2009	TERRY	CONSTANCE	
12185	12/11/2009	TRISH	CONSTANCE	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10136	10/27/2009	JULIE D	COOP	
11265	11/9/2009	LARRY	COPLEY	
10142	10/27/2009	PHILIP F	CORDOVA	
11975	11/25/2009	NICK	CORREN	
12052	11/25/2009	NEAL	CORRY	
11853	11/20/2009	JAMES	COURTNEY	
12457	12/14/2009	JAMES	COURTNEY	
11927	11/19/2009	MARY JO	COUSENS	
10228	11/2/2009	DOROTHY A	COUSOUBOS	
11828	11/22/2009	DOROTHY A	COUSOUBOS	
12202	12/11/2009	SIDNEY	COWSKI	
11006	10/30/2009	DALE	COX	
11006	10/30/2009	YVONNE J	COX	
11764	11/19/2009	DON D	COX	
11871	11/23/2009	KEVIN J	COX	
11587	11/15/2009	SHAWN S	CRABTREE	
11975	11/25/2009	SHERRY	CRAMER	
11975	11/25/2009	GARY	CRAMER	
11975	11/25/2009	TAYLOR	CRAMER	
11567	11/16/2009	EVELINA H	CRAWFORD	
11607	11/16/2009	JAMES H	CRAWFORD	
12102	12/7/2009	EVELINA H	CRAWFORD	
12110	12/7/2009	EVELINA H	CRAWFORD	
11953	11/27/2009	MARGARET	CREIGHTON GRAY	
11005	11/3/2009	ROB	CRIDER	
11005	11/3/2009	CHRISTIN	CRIDER	
11906	11/24/2009	ROB	CRIDER	
11906	11/24/2009	CHRISTIN	CRIDER	
12271	12/13/2009	JEFF A	CROPPER	
11875	11/23/2009	TOM	CROSS	
11875	11/23/2009	NOLA	CROSS	
12399	12/14/2009	DOUG	CROUCH	
11741	11/19/2009	DR HEATHER L	CRUMBAKER	
11982	11/23/2009	LISA	CRUZ	
12278	12/13/2009	LYNN C	CULBERTSON	
11982	11/23/2009	VALERIE	CUMMING	
11982	11/23/2009	MONTE	CUMMING	
12106	12/7/2009	MARY	CUMMINGS COSBROW	
10080	10/23/2009	DAVID	CURRIER	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10080	10/23/2009	KAY	CURRIER	
11991	11/25/2009	DAVID	CURRIER	
11991	11/25/2009	KAY	CURRIER	
11622	11/17/2009	CAROL	CURTIS	CLARK PUBLIC UTILITIES
10116	10/26/2009	JAMES	CYRILIUS	
11975	11/25/2009	FRANK	DAHFER	
11686	11/17/2009	LAVERN	DAHLIN	
12254	12/13/2009	ED	DAHLQUIST II	
12424	12/14/2009	ED	DAHLQUIST II	
10470	10/27/2009	CASEY	DALE	
10520	10/27/2009	CASEY	DALE	
11972	11/25/2009	CASEY	DALE	
11738	11/18/2009	RICHARD	DALTON	
11965	11/30/2009	GREG	DAMICO	
11965	11/30/2009	DESIREE	DAMICO	
10128	10/26/2009	CHARLOTTE	DANEBURG	
11407	11/12/2009	KATHERINE	DANIELS	OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND D...
11982	11/23/2009	PHILIP A	DANIELS	
11601	11/16/2009	PRISCILA	DARAKJIAN	
12107	12/7/2009	JAMES B	DAVIDSON	
12120	12/8/2009	VIVKIE L	DAVIDSON	
12132	12/8/2009	JAMES M	DAVIDSON	
12178	12/11/2009	VIVKIE L	DAVIDSON	
11982	11/23/2009	JAY	DAVIES	
11759	11/19/2009	RICHARD A	DAVIS	
11957	11/27/2009	LEE R	DAVIS	
12063	12/3/2009	RICHARD A	DAVIS	
12269	12/13/2009	RICK J	DAVIS	
12438	11/29/2009	LEE R	DAVIS	
11718	11/18/2009	DAVID	DAWSON	
12009	11/25/2009	DAVID	DAWSON	
12101	12/7/2009	CHRISTINE M	DAWSON	
12448	12/14/2009	CHARLES R.	DE TEMPLE	
12164	12/11/2009	FRANK E	DEATHHELL	
10947	11/4/2009	SHERRY	DEFENBAUGH	
11699	11/17/2009	FLORIAN	DEISENHOFER	
12114	12/8/2009	FLORIAN	DEISENHOFER	
12244	12/13/2009	DIANA M	DELAY	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
12322	12/13/2009	LIANNA	DELYANIS	
11975	11/25/2009	JACKIE	DENMAN	
11975	11/25/2009	THOM	DENMAN	
11043	11/3/2009	DENA	DERR	
11975	11/25/2009	DARREN	DESCHARD	
11975	11/25/2009	LACY	DESCHARD	
10151	10/28/2009	LAURIE S	DESROCHERS	
10177	10/27/2009	LAURIE S	DESROCHERS	
10437	10/27/2009	LAURIE S	DESROCHERS	
11617	11/16/2009	FRED	DEUCHAN	
11617	11/16/2009	JERRI	DEUCHAN	
12404	12/14/2009	JERRI	DEUCHAN	
11978	11/22/2009	LOUIS V	DIAZ	
11978	11/22/2009	SUSAN L	DIAZ	
11978	11/22/2009	KATIE L	DIAZ	
11978	11/22/2009	LINDSEY M	DIAZ	
11015	10/29/2009	JON	DIETER	
10021	10/14/2009	KATHY A	DIETRICH	
11949	11/28/2009	KATHY A	DIETRICH	
11824	11/22/2009	GEORGE T.	DILL	
11975	11/25/2009	BRIAN	DILOLL	
11671	11/13/2009	DARREL F	DIXON	
10971	10/28/2009	STEVE	DOBBINS	
12307	12/14/2009	LOU	DOCKENFRICKEL	
11222	11/5/2009	JULIE	DOLL	
12285	12/13/2009	MARILEE I	DONOVAN	
11585	11/15/2009	BRYAN S	DRENDEL	
12128	12/8/2009	JUDY L	DRIVER	
10110	10/26/2009	ROB A	DRUSHELLA	
11637	11/17/2009	DENNIS E	DUBOIS	CITIZENS FOR A HEALTY POWER SYSTEM
12216	12/12/2009	CHARLES E	DUKE	
11381	11/11/2009	DEBBIE H	DUNHAM	
11735	11/19/2009	MARY L	DUNN	
11735	11/19/2009	MICHAEL	DUNN	
11937	11/20/2009	JOHN W	DUSH	
12371	12/14/2009	JOHN W	DUSH	
11975	11/25/2009	JIM M	DUTCHESS	
11975	11/25/2009	KEN	DUTCHESS	
10237	10/27/2009	DARA L.	EASTHAM	
10237	10/27/2009	DANNY C.	EASTHAM	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10961	10/28/2009	GARY AND RENE	ECKERT	
12417	12/14/2009	GARY AND RENE	ECKERT	
11980	11/25/2009	DENNIS	EDISON	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
11980	11/25/2009	KAY	EDISON	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
11975	11/25/2009	RICHARD	EDLICH	
11975	11/25/2009	THOMAS	EDMONT	
10216	11/1/2009	TARYN	EDWARDS	
11617	11/16/2009	THOMAS	EDWARDS	
11617	11/16/2009	JUDITH A	EDWARDS	
11826	11/22/2009	KEN L	EDWARDS	
11869	11/24/2009	ERIC	EDWARDS	
12008	12/1/2009	THOMAS	EDWARDS	
12008	12/1/2009	JUDITH A	EDWARDS	
10009	10/13/2009	BARBARA	EIGNER	KWIK CENTER LLC
10055	10/15/2009	BARBARA	EIGNER	KWIK CENTER LLC
10155	10/27/2009	BARBARA	EIGNER	KWIK CENTER LLC
10158	10/28/2009	BARBARA	EIGNER	KWIK CENTER LLC
11595	11/16/2009	BARBARA	EIGNER	KWIK CENTER LLC
11619	11/12/2009	BARBARA	EIGNER	KWIK CENTER LLC
11639	11/17/2009	BARBARA	EIGNER	KWIK CENTER LLC
11640	11/17/2009	BARBARA	EIGNER	KWIK CENTER LLC
11641	11/17/2009	BARBARA	EIGNER	KWIK CENTER LLC
11642	11/17/2009	BARBARA	EIGNER	KWIK CENTER LLC
11643	11/17/2009	BARBARA	EIGNER	KWIK CENTER LLC
11644	11/17/2009	BARBARA	EIGNER	KWIK CENTER LLC
11645	11/17/2009	BARBARA	EIGNER	KWIK CENTER LLC
11647	11/17/2009	BARBARA	EIGNER	KWIK CENTER LLC
11814	11/19/2009	BARBARA	EIGNER	KWIK CENTER LLC
12174	12/8/2009	BARBARA	EIGNER	KWIK CENTER LLC
12521	12/7/2009	BARBARA	EIGNER	KWIK CENTER LLC
10174	10/27/2009	NANCY	ELLIFRIT	
12068	12/3/2009	WILLIAM M	ELLIOTT	ELLIOT CONSULTANTS
10042	10/15/2009	GERALD	ELLS	
12279	12/13/2009	KIRSTEN W	ELSON	
12329	12/13/2009	DAVID B	ELSON	
11975	11/25/2009	JOHN L	EMMETT	
12037	11/22/2009	JOHN L	EMMETT	
12280	12/13/2009	JOHN L	EMMETT	
10211	10/30/2009	JAMES C	ENGSTROM JR	
10027	10/16/2009	MACK	EPPERSON	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10043	10/16/2009	MACK	EPPERSON	
11370	11/10/2009	DARYL	ERICKSON	
11963	11/29/2009	TOM W	ERKERT	
11963	11/29/2009	VON	ERKERT	
12255	12/13/2009	CHRIS	ESCOLA	
12255	12/13/2009	MARIA	ESCOLA	
11742	11/19/2009	FARZAM	ESHRAUGH	
12039	12/2/2009	ORVILLE D	ESTEB	
10045	10/16/2009	JIM	EYCHANER	STATE OF WASHINGTON - RECREATION AND CONSERV...
12175	12/11/2009	JOANNE	FAGALY	
11737	11/17/2009	JOHN	FALLON	
11737	11/17/2009	ANITA	FALLON	
11975	11/25/2009	MARK	FANDLY	
11822	11/21/2009	JAMES F.	FARBER	
10015	10/13/2009	STEVE B	FAULSTICK	
12258	12/13/2009	MARIT	FEDERCELL	
12323	12/14/2009	MARIT	FEDERCELL	
12325	12/13/2009	MARIT	FEDERCELL	
12336	12/13/2009	MARIT	FEDERCELL	
10039	10/19/2009	CHARLES	FELL	
10138	10/23/2009	CHARLES	FELL	
10959	10/28/2009	CHARLES	FELL	
11603	11/16/2009	BETHE N	FERGUSON	
11815	11/19/2009	CHRIS	FERGUSON	
10187	10/27/2009	SANDRA	FERNEDING	
10842	10/29/2009	NANCY	FERRAN	
10034	10/19/2009	HOWARD	FERRIS	
10993	11/4/2009	BARRY A	FINKEL	
12140	11/24/2009	BARRY A	FINKEL	
11033	11/5/2009	GREG	FISCHER	
11033	11/5/2009	DEBBIE L	FISCHER	
12480	12/14/2009	GREG	FISCHER	
12480	12/14/2009	DEBBIE L	FISCHER	
12292	12/14/2009	R L	FISHER	
11272	11/9/2009	MARK A	FLEISCHAUER	
12254	12/13/2009	PAT	FLIPPEN	
12424	12/14/2009	PAT	FLIPPEN	
12404	12/14/2009	BREANE L	FLUMSEN	
10170	10/27/2009	DAVID	FORBUSH	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10145	10/27/2009	KELLY J	FOSTER	
11941	11/20/2009	MAE J	FOSTER	
11941	11/20/2009	JACK R	FOSTER	
12099	12/6/2009	DANICE JO	FOSTER	
12470	12/14/2009	JEANNE	FOSTER	
10130	10/26/2009	LARA B	FOWLER	GORDON THOMAS HONEYWELL LLP
10212	10/30/2009	EARL T	FOYTACK	
10058	10/18/2009	DINO	FRANCHIIVO	
11030	11/5/2009	ALLEN	FRASIER	
11243	11/7/2009	RANDALL	FREE	
11243	11/7/2009	KAREN	FREE	
11933	11/18/2009	RANDALL	FREE	
11933	11/18/2009	KAREN	FREE	
11337	11/7/2009	RICHARD	FREEDING	
11755	11/19/2009	CHRISTY L	FREEMAN	
11220	11/5/2009	KATHY	FRICE	
11795	11/20/2009	MARY V.	FROLICH	
11694	11/13/2009	RUSSELL	FUNK	
11694	11/13/2009	BARBARA	FUNK	
11975	11/25/2009	PATRICK	FUNK	
11975	11/25/2009	MARY	FUNK	
11868	11/22/2009	DAVID	FUNKHOUSER	
11868	11/22/2009	DEANNA	FUNKHOUSER	
11960	11/28/2009	BRUCE A	FURMAN	
11397	11/12/2009	PAULA	GALLUCCI	
11975	11/25/2009	WENDY	GANETT	
12237	12/13/2009	DAVID	GARCIA	
12335	12/14/2009	DAVID	GARCIA	
12218	12/12/2009	AARON	GARNER	
11578	11/15/2009	JOHN	GARRETT	
11578	11/15/2009	KAREN R	GARRETT	
11885	11/23/2009	KAREN D	GARRETT	
10067	10/21/2009	SALLY E	GARRIGUES	
10129	10/26/2009	DENNIS	GASTON	
12482	12/14/2009	LINDA	GENTUGUA	
10050	10/20/2009	JOHN "JACK"	GERSTKEMPER	
11975	11/25/2009	JOHN "JACK"	GERSTKEMPER	
11975	11/25/2009	BARBARA	GERSTKEMPER	
12491	12/14/2009	JOHN "JACK"	GERSTKEMPER	
12492	12/14/2009	JOHN "JACK"	GERSTKEMPER	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11982	11/23/2009	GABRIEL	GIBERSON	
12179	12/11/2009	PRISCILLA	GIBSON	
12291	12/14/2009	SUSAN R	GIDEON	
12291	12/14/2009	TOM	GIDEON	
12437	12/14/2009	SUSAN R	GIDEON	
11975	11/25/2009	DAWN	GILLHOOVEN	
11605	11/16/2009	RICHARD R	GILLHOOVER	
12133	12/8/2009	LUCY	GILLINGHAM	
11630	11/17/2009	JODIE M	GILMORE	
11617	11/16/2009	MIKE	GINTER	
11617	11/16/2009	SALLY	GINTER	
12008	12/1/2009	MIKE	GINTER	
12008	12/1/2009	SALLY	GINTER	
12064	11/16/2009	MIKE	GINTER	
12064	11/16/2009	SALLY	GINTER	
12065	11/19/2009	DON	GINTER	
12065	11/19/2009	IRENE	GINTER	
12065	11/19/2009	MIKE	GINTER	
12065	11/19/2009	SALLY	GINTER	
12066	11/19/2009	DON	GINTER	
12066	11/19/2009	IRENE	GINTER	
12315	11/16/2009	MIKE	GINTER	
12315	11/16/2009	SALLY	GINTER	
12053	12/3/2009	JAMES	GIPE	
12343	12/14/2009	CARLA M.	GISH	
10198	10/29/2009	GRAHAM	GLASS	
10198	10/29/2009	ELANA D	GLASS	
12427	12/14/2009	ELANA D	GLASS	
12212	12/12/2009	CAROL P	GOETZ	
12238	12/13/2009	LEEANNE K	GOETZ	
11817	11/2/2009	RON	GOLD	
10090	10/23/2009	BEVERLY A	GOMEZ	CAMPERS HIDEAWAY
12358	12/14/2009	HARRY C	GORDON	
12267	12/13/2009	GREG M	GOSPE	
10164	10/29/2009	SUE	GOTELLI	
11569	11/16/2009	SUE	GOTELLI	
11975	11/25/2009	STEVE	GOURDE	
11975	11/25/2009	MARCY	GOURDE	
11020	10/29/2009	JAIME	GRAFF	
11846	11/21/2009	JANET	GRANT	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11847	11/22/2009	JANET	GRANT	
10006	10/13/2009	DOUG	GRASSETH	
10028	10/16/2009	DOUG	GRASSETH	
10060	10/13/2009	DOUG	GRASSETH	
11975	11/25/2009	DUSTIN	GRAY	
11270	11/9/2009	KATHY L	GREENBERG	
12405	12/14/2009	CAROL R	GREENLEE	
11793	11/20/2009	R.	GREGORY	
12296	12/14/2009	MARK H	GREISZ	
12296	12/14/2009	GAIL	GREISZ	
11975	11/25/2009	BOBBIE	GREM	
11975	11/25/2009	CYNTHIA	GREW	
11975	11/25/2009	MARTY	GREW	
11980	11/25/2009	JOHN	GRIES	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
11980	11/25/2009	SUZANNE	GRIES	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
11010	10/29/2009	C	GROGGEN	
11050	11/3/2009	ERIN E	GROVER	
11336	11/7/2009	ERIN E	GROVER	
12040	12/2/2009	ERIN E	GROVER	
12169	12/11/2009	ERIN E	GROVER	
12262	12/13/2009	ALYSSA B	GROVER	
12274	12/13/2009	MARK	GROVER	
12275	12/13/2009	LYNSEY J	GROVER	
12325	12/13/2009	ERIN E	GROVER	
12385	12/14/2009	ERIN E	GROVER	
12501	11/24/2009	ERIN E	GROVER	
12198	12/11/2009	MICHAEL	GRUBBS	HOCKINSON SCHOOL DISTRICT
11377	11/10/2009	JANET L	GULLBERG	
11895	11/25/2009	DAVID K	GUTSCHMIDT	
10010	10/13/2009	GARY	HAAG	
11903	11/24/2009	GARY	HAAG	
11975	11/25/2009	KINARD E	HADEN	
11975	11/25/2009	SAMULE	HADEN	
12345	12/14/2009	KINARD E	HADEN	
12458	12/14/2009	BARBARA	HAGEDORN	
12301	12/14/2009	HEIDI E	HAHN-TROXLER	
12302	12/14/2009	HEIDI E	HAHN-TROXLER	
12325	12/13/2009	HEIDI E	HAHN-TROXLER	
11665	11/13/2009	MAX AND MELISSA	HALBERG	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11680	11/17/2009	JANE	HALL	
11680	11/17/2009	RONALD	HALL	
12325	12/13/2009	JANE	HALL	
12325	12/13/2009	RONALD	HALL	
12486	12/14/2009	JANE	HALL	
10018	10/14/2009	JENNIFER C	HALLECK	VANCOUNVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS
11612	11/12/2009	JENNIFER C	HALLECK	VANCOUNVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS
11613	11/9/2009	JENNIFER C	HALLECK	VANCOUNVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS
11910	11/23/2009	JENNIFER C	HALLECK	VANCOUNVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS
10997	11/3/2009	LYNN	HALVORSON	
11975	11/25/2009	GERRY	HAM	
11975	11/25/2009	DIANE	HAM	
11865	11/22/2009	JOHN	HAMILTON	
12109	12/7/2009	GEORGE	HAMILTON	
11743	11/17/2009	RALPH	HAMM	
11743	11/17/2009	SHARON L	HAMM	
12003	11/25/2009	FRANCES A	HAMM	
12366	12/14/2009	ALLAN	HAMM	
11887	11/23/2009	MITCHELL R	HAMMITT	
12204	12/11/2009	MICHAEL J	HAMPEL	
10095	10/24/2009	JOHN R.	HANCOCK	
10095	10/24/2009	JONI E.	HANCOCK	
10137	10/27/2009	JOHN R.	HANCOCK	
12479	12/11/2009	DAVE	HANCOCK	TOWN OF YACOLT
11622	11/17/2009	BYRON	HANKE	CLARK PUBLIC UTILITIES
11861	11/24/2009	HILDE	HANLEY	
11861	11/24/2009	BILL	HANLEY	
10048	10/15/2009	KATHRYN M.	HANSEN	
10167	10/27/2009	LEE	HAPKONSTAD	
12251	12/13/2009	MOLLY E	HARDER	
11886	11/24/2009	JACOB R	HARKER	
11982	11/23/2009	BUCK	HARMAN	
11950	11/20/2009	LETISHA	HARPER	
11950	11/20/2009	BRIAN	HARPER	
11952	11/20/2009	BRIAN	HARPER	
12282	12/13/2009	HARRY J	HARPER	
12433	12/14/2009	BRIAN	HARPER	
11376	11/10/2009	BILL C	HARPOLE	
10047	10/14/2009	EUGENE "BUD"	HARRIS	
11374	11/10/2009	DONNA	HARRIS	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11375	11/10/2009	MARY J	HARRIS	
11375	11/10/2009	JAMES	HARRIS	
10108	10/26/2009	SCOTT J	HARSHBARGER	
11748	11/19/2009	LINDA J	HARTWELL	
12313	12/14/2009	ADAM I	HASPIEL	
10172	10/27/2009	KATHY	HATNDEN	
11219	11/5/2009	BETTY	HAUSER	
12059	12/1/2009	HARVEY	HAVEN	
12059	12/1/2009	DEBRA	HAVEN	
11975	11/25/2009	RUTH	HAWES	
11975	11/25/2009	JOAN E	HAY	
12021	11/25/2009	JOHN	HAYENGA	
12021	11/25/2009	KATHLEEN	HAYENGA	
10189	10/27/2009	HOPE	HAZEN	
11968	11/20/2009	THOMAS	HEFFNER	
11968	11/20/2009	JUDITH	HEFFNER	
11869	11/24/2009	MARY	HEFT-EDWARDS	
12512	12/12/2009	CARL	HEIDEGGER	
12512	12/12/2009	RHONDA	HEIDEGGER	
12260	12/13/2009	JENNIFER L	HEINE-WITHEE	
11982	11/23/2009	PAM	HELLEN	
12170	12/11/2009	LONNIE	HELTZEL	HIGHVALLEY HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
10069	10/22/2009	KAY	HENDERSON	
11975	11/25/2009	LORENE T	HENDERSON	
11975	11/25/2009	JERRY S.	HENDERSON	
12286	12/13/2009	LORENE T	HENDERSON	
12411	12/14/2009	JERRY S.	HENDERSON	
12300	12/14/2009	SUSAN R	HENDRICKSON	
12352	12/14/2009	JAIME	HERRERA	STATE REPRESENTATIVE 18TH
10012	10/14/2009		HERRINGTON	
11635	11/17/2009		HERRINGTON	
11982	11/23/2009	PHYLLIS	HEUETT	
10094	10/24/2009	ROBERT K.	HICKEY	
11975	11/25/2009	LARRY	HIEL	
11975	11/25/2009	BONITA	HIEL	
12487	12/14/2009	SANDI	HIGGINS	
11907	11/23/2009	ROBERT	HILBRECHT	
10051	10/20/2009	SUSAN	HILL	
10053	10/20/2009	SUSAN	HILL	
11400	11/12/2009	LARRY E.	HILL	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11720	11/18/2009	JIM	HILL	
11975	11/25/2009	DAVID	HILL	
11975	11/25/2009	BONNIE	HILL	
12014	11/25/2009	LARRY E.	HILL	
10014	10/13/2009	KAREN J	HILLER	
11867	11/22/2009	KAREN J	HILLER	
11274	11/10/2009	DALE E	HILLMAN	
11275	11/10/2009	EDDIE H	HINKLE	
10232	11/2/2009	ROGER S	HINTON	
11576	11/15/2009	RICHARD P "RICK"	HOBLITT	
12468	12/9/2009	GREGORY L	HODGES-TINNER	
12468	12/9/2009	MARGOT Y	HODGES-TINNER	
11575	11/15/2009	FRED W	HODGKINS	
11349	11/7/2009	CURTIS	HOGUE	
12206	12/11/2009	MARY K	HOIME	
12207	12/11/2009	THOMAS R	HOIME	
12446	12/9/2009	MARGARET	HOLAHAN	
11982	11/23/2009	MIKE	HOLE	
11975	11/25/2009	LONNIE	HOLMES	
11975	11/25/2009	JOHN	HOLMES	
11975	11/25/2009	NELSON	HOLMES	
11975	11/25/2009	SCOTT	HOLMES	
10049	10/15/2009	BRAD	HOLTEN	
12479	12/11/2009	KAREN	HOLYK	TOWN OF YACOLT
10166	10/27/2009	DANIEL	HOLZER	
11410	11/13/2009	RUTH	HOMOLA	
11410	11/13/2009	HUBERT	HOMOLA	
12153	12/8/2009	CLIFFORD	HOMOLA	
12153	12/8/2009	HELEN	HOMOLA	
10224	11/2/2009	KATHERINE	HOOD	
11975	11/25/2009	STEVEN N	HOPMONN	
11975	11/25/2009	VICTORIA	HOPMONN	
12008	12/1/2009	DAVID & CINDEE	HORSCH	
12460	12/14/2009	LEWIS	HOUCK	
12460	12/14/2009	LINDA M	HOUCK	
12100	12/6/2009	CHARLES	HOUGHTEN	
12100	12/6/2009	JACQUIE J	HOUGHTEN	
11852	11/20/2009	DAVID	HOUSE	
11852	11/20/2009	PEGGY	HOUSE	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
12085	12/4/2009	BARBARA R	HOUSER	
11938	11/20/2009	ALAN	HOVEN	
11938	11/20/2009	CINDY	HOVEN	
11046	11/3/2009	VALERIE	HOWARD	
11733	11/19/2009	MARK R	HOWARD	
12117	12/9/2009	JAMES D	HOWSLEY	MILLER NASH LLP
12400	12/14/2009	JAMES D	HOWSLEY	MILLER NASH LLP
11721	11/18/2009	DEBBIE N	HOZACK	
11721	11/18/2009	ROBERT	HOZACK	
10029	10/16/2009	CHESTER	HU	
10241	11/3/2009	JUDY	HUDSON	
10241	11/3/2009	GLENN	HUDSON	
10241	11/3/2009	CLARA	HUDSON	
11017	10/29/2009	JUDY	HUDSON	
11017	10/29/2009	GLENN	HUDSON	
11017	10/29/2009	CLARA	HUDSON	
12046	11/25/2009	NAOMI	HUEY	
12046	11/25/2009	MAURICE	HUEY	
11588	11/15/2009	MICHELE C	HUFFMAN	
11244	11/8/2009	JAMES A	HUMMEL	
11263	11/9/2009	JEANETTE L	HUMMEL	
11255	11/7/2009	CHARLES	HUNEYCOLT	
11975	11/25/2009	KIRK B	HUNTER	
11975	11/25/2009	MONICA S	HUNTER	
12276	12/13/2009	DARCY L	HURST	
10084	10/23/2009	KATHIE M	HUSTER	
12163	12/10/2009	LARRY	HUTCHINGS	
12436	12/14/2009	DENNIS P	HUTCHINSON	
10966	10/28/2009	MARGARET	HUTCHISON	
11922	11/24/2009	DAVID W	HUTTULA	
12406	12/14/2009	WILLIAM D	HUYETTE	
12406	12/14/2009	SHIRLEY A	HUYETTE	
11600	11/16/2009	MARY C	HYLTON	
11672	11/13/2009	JUDITH	IBBS	
12069	12/3/2009	SAM M	IHRIG	
11975	11/25/2009	METZE	IKEDA	
11975	11/25/2009	NOBEO	IKEDA	
11982	11/23/2009	CHARLOTTE F	ING	
10096	10/24/2009	WILLIAM D.	INGEMANSON	
12317	12/13/2009	RANDY	INGRAM	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
12317	12/13/2009	MARIANNE	INGRAM	
12176	12/11/2009	CURT R	IRELAND	
12188	12/11/2009	NEA LYNN	IRELAND	
10192	10/29/2009	DELBERT M	IRISH	
10735	10/28/2009	SHARON	IRWIN	
11022	10/29/2009	DAVID	IRWIN	
12328	12/14/2009	CHARLES A.	ISELY	
11843	11/18/2009	KENT	IVEY	
11710	11/18/2009	KELLY D	JACKMAN	
12134	12/9/2009	JARRED L	JACKMAN	
10365	10/27/2009	GEORGIA	JACKSON	
11825	11/22/2009	LYNETTE M	JACKSON	
11975	11/25/2009	WILLIAM	JACOBS	
11975	11/25/2009	CANDICE	JACOBS	
11850	11/20/2009	STEPHEN	JACOBSON	
11975	11/25/2009	JACK	JACOLE	
11562	11/13/2009	DWAYNE	JACOX	
10023	10/15/2009	JOHN	JAMES	
11982	11/23/2009	WILLIAM T	JAMIESON	
12080	12/4/2009	DENISE	JARRELL	
11940	11/20/2009	CATHERINE	JARVIS	
11940	11/20/2009	ROGER	JARVIS	
11940	11/20/2009	ALENA	JARVIS	
12377	12/14/2009	CHRISTINE	JELVIC	
11239	11/8/2009	DANA M	JENKINS	
12048	12/3/2009	PATRICK K	JENKINS	
12349	12/14/2009	HEIDI	JENKINS	
11823	11/22/2009	VICTORIA A	JENNINGS	
10146	10/27/2009	TONY M	JOHNS	
11387	11/9/2009	LISA	JOHNS	
11388	11/9/2009	ALEX	JOHNS	
10036	10/19/2009	JOEL	JOHNSON	
11145	11/3/2009	A. WARREN	JOHNSON	
11580	11/14/2009	JOSHUA D	JOHNSON	
11633	11/17/2009	GREGG D	JOHNSON	
11754	11/19/2009	CYNTHIA	JOHNSON	
11776	11/20/2009	WALTER	JOHNSON	
11924	11/24/2009	MR. & CYNTHIA A	JOHNSON	
12096	12/5/2009	MIKE C	JOHNSON	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
12357	12/14/2009	MR. & CYNTHIA A	JOHNSON	
11925	11/24/2009	LEROY	JOHNSTON	JOHNSTON DAIRY, LLC
11925	11/24/2009	LYNN	JOHNSTON	JOHNSTON DAIRY, LLC
10218	10/30/2009	MARVIN DEAN	JONES	
10246	11/3/2009	STEVEN P	JONES	
11260	11/7/2009	MARVIN DEAN	JONES	
12013	11/25/2009	JUNE	JONES	
10135	10/27/2009	MARTHA L	JUHOLA	
11928	11/16/2009	RON	JUVE	
11982	11/23/2009	JIM	K	
12015	11/6/2009	JAMES F.	KALASKY	STONE MEADOWS SUBDIVISION
11975	11/25/2009	RANDALL	KALLIAIHEH	
10147	10/27/2009	WAYNE R	KALLIO	
10061	10/13/2009	JAMES	KAMERATH	
11372	11/10/2009	JAMES	KAMERATH	
12001	11/25/2009	CHRIS	KARLSEN	
11745	11/19/2009	ANN C	KARR	
11975	11/25/2009	ANN C	KARR	
11975	11/25/2009	DARRYL	KARR	
12196	12/11/2009	SYDNEY	KASKI	
11982	11/23/2009	KRIS	KATT	
11935	11/20/2009	VALETTA	KAYDA	
11975	11/25/2009	CONNIE	KEEN	
11360	11/7/2009	SHERRY	KEENE	
11691	11/18/2009	SHERRY	KEENE	
11691	11/18/2009	HARVEY	KEENE	
12042	11/25/2009	SHERRY	KEENE	
12042	11/25/2009	HARVEY	KEENE	
11273	11/9/2009	SARAH S	KEGLY	
11706	11/18/2009	CLIFF	KELLEY	
12017	11/25/2009	BETTY	KELLOGG	
12017	11/25/2009	RICHARD	KELLOGG	
11975	11/25/2009	SHELLY	KELLY	
11975	11/25/2009	VINCE	KELLY	
12426	12/14/2009	DAVID	KEMPER	
12426	12/14/2009	MARIEKE	KEMPER	
11564	11/14/2009	JOHN E	KENCK	
11975	11/25/2009	ROBERT	KENLINE	
10024	10/15/2009	RYAN	KERR	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10162	10/28/2009	MARK LEE	KIMMERLING	
10123	10/26/2009	KIMBERLY K	KINDIG	
11016	10/29/2009	NITA	KING	
11763	11/19/2009	SANDRA O	KING	
11956	11/27/2009	BRIAN	KING	
10073	10/22/2009	PAUL A	KINGSTON	
10073	10/22/2009	KAREN	KINGSTON	
10074	10/22/2009	KAREN	KINGSTON	
10150	10/28/2009	NICKOLE P	KINGSTON	
10770	10/28/2009	KAREN	KINGSTON	
11975	11/25/2009	VIRGINIA M	KINNAMAN	
11975	11/25/2009	MIKE	KINNAMAN	
12373	12/14/2009	VIRGINIA M	KINNAMAN	
12373	12/14/2009	MIKE	KINNAMAN	
12298	12/14/2009	GEORGE H	KINSEY	
10163	10/29/2009	DEBRA L	KIRKMAN	
11958	11/27/2009	BRADLEY J	KIRKPATRICK	
11223	11/5/2009	BRUCE	KIRSCHENBAUM	
10003	10/12/2009	AILEEN	KLAWITTER	
10056	10/15/2009	AILEEN	KLAWITTER	
12404	12/14/2009	PAMELA	KLAY	
11982	11/23/2009	KERI	KLAYUM	
11584	11/15/2009	SUSAN L	KLEMETSRUD	
11584	11/15/2009	DAVID	KLEMETSRUD	
11623	11/16/2009	RALPH	KLINE	
10183	10/27/2009	DENISE AND LARRY	KLOEPPER	
10141	10/27/2009	DAVID	KNODE	COLDWELL BANKER BARBARA SUE SEAL PROPERTIES
11206	10/29/2009	DUANE	KOEHLER	
11207	10/29/2009	DUANE	KOEHLER	
11666	11/17/2009	JOEL	KOEHLER	
11983	11/22/2009	DUANE	KOEHLER	
11985	11/22/2009	DUANE	KOEHLER	
11986	11/22/2009	DEANNA	KOEHLER	
12308	12/14/2009	CAROLYN N	KOHLBERGER	
12303	12/14/2009	JEANNE	KOJIS	
12303	12/14/2009	JOHN	KOJIS	
12061	12/3/2009	JAMES D	KOOPMANN	
10516	10/27/2009	LINDA	KORUM	
11394	11/12/2009	IVAN	KOVALCHUK	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11394	11/12/2009	NELYA A	KOVALCHUK	
11395	11/12/2009	NELYA A	KOVALCHUK	
10208	10/30/2009	KEN M	KRAISLER	
10957	10/28/2009	KEN M	KRAISLER	
11697	11/18/2009	LESLIE	KRAKE	
11014	10/29/2009	JOHN	KRAMER	
12461	12/14/2009	HEATHER	KRAMER	
12465	12/14/2009	GEORGIANA	KRAMER	
11816	11/6/2009	RANDALL	KRAUT	
12395	12/14/2009	JUDITH L	KRAVITZ	
11982	11/23/2009	JASON	KRUTSER	
11975	11/25/2009	SUE	KRYGRIEN	
11792	11/20/2009	TERESA A	KUBO	US EPA
10980	10/28/2009	LYNDA	KUNST	
10980	10/28/2009	GEORGE	KUNST	
11572	11/16/2009	RANJIT	KURUP	
10969	10/28/2009	PAUL	KUST	
12444	12/13/2009	ROBERT	KYLE	
12444	12/13/2009	CHERY	KYLE	
11029	10/29/2009	LYNN	LABRUM	
11976	11/30/2009	DENISE	LALANDE	
12104	12/7/2009	DENISE	LALANDE	
10102	10/25/2009	JOHN C	LAMB	
10325	10/27/2009	JOHN C	LAMB	
10325	10/27/2009	TERESA	LAMB	
11777	11/20/2009	JOHN	LAMB	
11975	11/25/2009	DALE	LAMBERTON	
11975	11/25/2009	H	LAMBERTON	
10084	10/23/2009	MARILYN D	LANDERS	
10085	10/23/2009	MARILYN D	LANDERS	
10103	10/26/2009	ANDREA K	LANGE	
10161	10/28/2009	ANDREA K	LANGE	
10223	11/2/2009	ANDREA K	LANGE	
11982	11/23/2009	LYNDA	LARRABEE	
11982	11/23/2009	OLIVER	LARRY	
10068	10/21/2009	CAROLE	LARSEN	
11975	11/25/2009	CINDY	LARSIN	
11695	11/16/2009	KAREN	LARSON	
11975	11/25/2009	DAVID	LARSON	
10100	10/25/2009	JOHN A	LASATER	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10124	10/26/2009	JOHN A	LASATER	
12383	12/14/2009	ANTHONY	LATHA	
12384	12/14/2009	ED K	LATHAM	
12386	12/14/2009	VICTORIA A	LATHAM	
11975	11/25/2009	ALLEN	LATOURRETTE	
11975	11/25/2009	CATHY	LATOURRETTE	
12225	12/12/2009	NOEL AND MOLLIE J	LAWFFER	
10062	10/20/2009	GILBERT	LAWRENCE	
11408	11/12/2009	TOM K	LAWRENCE	
11975	11/25/2009	TOM K	LAWRENCE	
12270	12/13/2009	TOM K	LAWRENCE	
12474	12/14/2009	MEGAN	LAWRENCE	
12475	12/14/2009	TOM K	LAWRENCE	
12478	12/14/2009	CHAD	LAWRENCE	
10948	11/4/2009	JUNIE EVELYN	LAWSON	
10948	11/4/2009	CHARLES	LAWSON	
11261	11/9/2009	JUNIE EVELYN	LAWSON	
11403	11/13/2009	REBECCA M.	LAWSON	
11406	11/13/2009	JEFF D.	LAWSON	ENDPOINT SERVICES
11574	11/15/2009	JEFF D.	LAWSON	ENDPOINT SERVICES
11604	11/16/2009	REBECCA M.	LAWSON	
11677	11/13/2009	REBECCA M.	LAWSON	
11898	11/24/2009	JEFF D.	LAWSON	ENDPOINT SERVICES
12002	11/25/2009	JEFF D.	LAWSON	ENDPOINT SERVICES
12045	11/25/2009	REBECCA M.	LAWSON	
12503	11/24/2009	JEFF D.	LAWSON	ENDPOINT SERVICES
11837	11/23/2009	MICHAEL D	LEE	
11849	11/23/2009	MIKE	LEE	
11920	11/24/2009	ANGIE	LEE	
12136	12/9/2009	SHARLEEN	LEE	
10156	10/28/2009	JULIUS	LEGGIT	
10092	10/24/2009	HELEN S.	LEHNER	
10960	10/28/2009	SUSAN	LEMOS	
11679	11/17/2009	SUSAN	LEMOS	
12379	12/14/2009	SUSAN	LEMOS	
12434	10/28/2009	LARRY	LESLEY	CAMPERS HIDEAWAY
10180	10/27/2009	MARK	LEVAUEU	
11727	11/18/2009	HALY R	LEWIS	
11975	11/25/2009	BRYAN	LEWIS	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11399	11/12/2009	BO W.	LIEBE	MILWAUKIE LUMBER COMPANY
10104	10/26/2009	JEFFREY T	LINDBERG	JONER LINDBERG PLLC
11227	11/6/2009	JEFFREY T	LINDBERG	JONER LINDBERG PLLC
12062	12/3/2009	LAND	LINDBERG	
12514	12/5/2009	LARS	LINDBERG	
12514	12/5/2009	MARTHA	LINDBERG	
10017	10/14/2009	W.O.	LINDBLAD	
10072	10/21/2009	W.O.	LINDBLAD	
10990	11/4/2009	MIKE	LINDHORST	
11032	11/5/2009	MIKE	LINDHORST	
12403	12/14/2009	MIKE	LINDHORST	
10515	10/27/2009	DAWN	LINGLE	
10515	10/27/2009	DAVID	LINGLE	
10148	10/27/2009	ANTON M	LITCHFIELD	
10098	10/23/2009	ROBERT W	LITTLETON	
10140	10/27/2009	ROBERT W	LITTLETON	
10157	10/27/2009	ROBERT W	LITTLETON	
10157	10/27/2009	BONNIE	LITTLETON	
10193	10/29/2009	ROBERT W	LITTLETON	
10210	10/30/2009	BONNIE	LITTLETON	
10219	10/30/2009	ROBERT W	LITTLETON	
10964	10/28/2009	ROBERT W	LITTLETON	
11667	10/30/2009	ROBERT W	LITTLETON	
11917	11/23/2009	ROBERT W	LITTLETON	
11276	11/10/2009	JOYCE M	LIVINGSTON	
11982	11/23/2009	ANDRE	LO	
10120	10/26/2009	HOWARD D	LOCKWOOD	
11670	11/13/2009	TIM	LOHNES	
11267	11/9/2009	JAN S	LONG	
12234	12/12/2009	MONIQUE	LONG	
12378	12/14/2009	ROBERT	LONG	
11833	11/22/2009	WILLIAM E	LONGMAN	
11592	11/15/2009	TIM E	LOOSE	
11592	11/15/2009	KARIN	LOOSE	
11980	11/25/2009	SHARON	LORENZEN	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
12375	12/14/2009	DENISE J	LUKINS	
12404	12/14/2009	SANDRA	LURECK	
10962	10/28/2009	CHARLES AND BEVERLY	LYNCH	
12350	12/14/2009	CHARLES AND BEVERLY	LYNCH	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10091	10/24/2009	ALAN R.	LYONS	
12382	12/14/2009	PAUL	MACCHIA	
12518	10/23/2009	PAUL	MACCHIA	
11897	11/24/2009	ANDREW L	MACFARLANE	
11982	11/23/2009	DENNIS	MACKEY	
12479	12/11/2009	RON	MADLER	TOWN OF YACOLT
12408	12/14/2009	MIKE W AND RITA L	MAHAFFA	
10125	10/26/2009	MARVIN ALLEN	MAIN	
11565	11/12/2009	JIM	MALINOWSKI	
11973	11/30/2009	JIM	MALINOWSKI	
12456	12/14/2009	JUDITH	MALINOWSKI	
12498	11/24/2009	JIM	MALINOWSKI	
12116	12/9/2009	AJAY K	MALLIK	SANPE, INC
11791	11/20/2009	ANITA K.	MALLORY	
11246	11/8/2009	KENNETH A	MANTHA	
12479	12/11/2009	CINDY	MARBUT	TOWN OF YACOLT
10214	10/31/2009	GARVIN E	MARCH	
11682	11/17/2009	JAMES E	MARKS	
11955	11/27/2009	DAVID P	MAROSI	
12060	12/1/2009	DAVID P	MAROSI	
12253	12/13/2009	RANDALL J	MARRS	
11023	10/29/2009	JOHN	MARTH	
11982	11/23/2009	PAT	MARTIN	
11982	11/23/2009	MOLLY	MARTIN	
11692	11/18/2009	LINDSEY S	MARTINSON	
11980	11/25/2009	LINDSEY S	MARTINSON	
12273	12/13/2009	GREG	MARTSOLF	
10118	10/26/2009	DENISE J	MASON	
11250	11/7/2009	D	MASON	
11684	11/17/2009	D	MASON	
11911	11/23/2009	DAVID W	MASON	
12346	12/14/2009	CHARLES	MASSEY	
12346	12/14/2009	GERRY LYNN	MASSEY	
12321	12/14/2009	KYLE	MASSIE	
10949	10/27/2009	TANA	MASSON	
10206	10/30/2009	JEFF S	MATHENA	
11747	11/19/2009	WILLIAM K	MATHISON	
11771	11/20/2009	DEBBRA	MATTHEWS	
12277	12/13/2009	DONALD A	MATTISON	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
12177	12/11/2009	BOB	MATTLA	
12198	12/11/2009	ERIK	MATTSON	HOCKINSON SCHOOL DISTRICT
11649	11/17/2009	ROBERT	MAUL	CITY OF BATTLE GROUND
10041	10/12/2009	PAUL M.	MCARTHUR	
10041	10/12/2009	MARILYN K.	MCARTHUR	
11947	11/26/2009	PAUL M.	MCARTHUR	
11402	11/13/2009	JEFFREY T.	MCCAFFREY	
10169	10/27/2009	DENNIS	MCCARTHY	
11699	11/17/2009	DANIELLE	MCFADDEN	
11975	11/25/2009	DANIELLE	MCFADDEN	
12447	12/14/2009	SHANE T	MCGUFFIN	DETEMPLE FARM LLC, KIMBAL LOGAN REAL
12451	12/14/2009	SHANE T	MCGUFFIN	DETEMPLE FARM LLC, KIMBAL LOGAN REAL
12452	12/14/2009	SHANE T	MCGUFFIN	DETEMPLE FARM LLC, KIMBAL LOGAN REAL
12452	12/14/2009	MELISSA	MCGUFFIN	
11268	11/9/2009	JAMES S	MCGUIRE	
11269	11/9/2009	JAMES S	MCGUIRE	
11715	11/18/2009	KRISTEN M	MCHENRY	
11715	11/18/2009	JEFF D	MCHENRY	
11756	11/19/2009	KRISTEN M	MCHENRY	
10220	10/30/2009	JENNIFER J	MCKEE	
11379	11/11/2009	JENNIFER J	MCKEE	
11618	11/16/2009	PAUL	MCKEE	
11618	11/16/2009	YVONNE	MCKEE	
11787	11/20/2009	JOANNE	MCKEE	
12254	12/13/2009	JOANNE	MCKEE	
12424	12/14/2009	JOAN DAHQUIST	MCKEE	
12509	12/14/2009	MR.	MCKEE	
12077	12/4/2009	RICHARD	MCKEEHAN	
11687	11/16/2009	KATHLEEN	MCKELLAR	
11722	11/18/2009	WILSON	MCKIBBEN	
11722	11/18/2009	KARLENE	MCKIBBEN	
12442	12/3/2009	DONNA	MCLARTY	
11632	11/17/2009	NANCY K	MCLEOD	
11713	11/18/2009	TOM G	MCLEOD	
11975	11/25/2009	TOM G	MCLEOD	
11854	11/20/2009	PETER	MCNAUGHTON	
11854	11/20/2009	BONNIE	MCNAUGHTON	
11221	11/5/2009	KERRY	MCNEAL	
10133	10/26/2009	PAUL J	MCTAVISH	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11378	11/10/2009	SCOTT E	MEANS	
10185	10/27/2009	JIM	MEEIKE	
11858	11/23/2009	DONALD R	MEEKS	
12473	12/14/2009	JUSTIN	MEENGs	
12467	12/9/2009	MARION L	MEFFORD	
11990	11/25/2009	NOLAN	MEGER	
12412	12/14/2009	RON	MEHL	
11880	11/23/2009	SONIA	MENDOZA	WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY
11948	11/20/2009		MENZA	
12111	12/8/2009	KEN	MERRILL	
12111	12/8/2009	PATRICIA G	MERRILL	
12372	12/14/2009	SHONNA L	MERRYFIELD	
10040	10/13/2009	TOM	MIELKE	BOARD OF CLARK COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
12071	12/1/2009	TOM	MIELKE	BOARD OF CLARK COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
12388	12/14/2009	TOM	MIELKE	BOARD OF CLARK COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
10242	11/3/2009	SHEILA R	MIKLOS	
11768	11/19/2009	ROHNE	MIKLOS	
12119	12/8/2009	KEN E	MILES	
11975	11/25/2009	CATHY	MILLA	
11975	11/25/2009	HOPE	MILLA	
11975	11/25/2009	GEOFF	MILLA	
11753	11/17/2009	CLAUDE NELSON	MILLARD	
11224	11/5/2009	STEVEN	MILLER	
11599	11/16/2009	TRICIA B	MILLER	
11698	11/18/2009	DAVID R	MILLER	
11962	11/28/2009	GREGORY S.	MILLER	
11982	11/23/2009	ELLA C	MILLER	
12055	12/1/2009	DAVID R	MILLER	
12055	12/1/2009	MARY LEE	MILLER	
12226	12/12/2009	LISA A	MILLER	
12228	12/12/2009	GREGORY S.	MILLER	
12495	12/1/2009	DAVID R	MILLER	
12495	12/1/2009	MARY LEE	MILLER	
11779	11/19/2009	JOHN A	MILLS	MILLS FAMILY LLC
11779	11/19/2009	MICHAEL PITTOCK	MILLS	MILLS FAMILY LLC
11889	11/23/2009	JOHN A	MILLS	MILLS FAMILY LLC
12320	12/13/2009	JOHN A	MILLS	MILLS FAMILY LLC
12320	12/13/2009	MICHAEL PITTOCK	MILLS	MILLS FAMILY LLC

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11873	11/23/2009	ALICE	MILLWARD	
11780	11/20/2009	JUDITH A.	MINIHAN	
11891	11/25/2009	CHERYLEE A	MIRCOVICH	
11982	11/23/2009	KOLENE	MISGROVE	
10243	11/3/2009	SERGEY A	MISHCHUK	
11945	11/25/2009	CELENEA L	MITCHELL	
11019	10/29/2009	GREG	MOBLEY	
12337	12/12/2009	JAMES	MOFFAT	
12337	12/12/2009	PATRICE	MOFFAT	
11051	11/3/2009	KATHLEEN	MOLINOS	
11051	11/3/2009	VINCENTE	MOLINOS	
12003	11/25/2009	KATHLEEN	MOLINOS	
12325	12/13/2009	VINCENTE	MOLINOS	
12420	12/14/2009	VINCENTE	MOLINOS	
11982	11/23/2009	DUSTIN	MOORE	
12242	12/13/2009	ANDREA M	MOORE	
12378	12/14/2009	MERLE	MOORE	
11760	11/19/2009	MIKE	MORRIS	
12165	12/11/2009	HELEN BETH	MORRIS	
11227	11/6/2009	DOUGLAS	MOSCHETTI	
11227	11/6/2009	CAROLINE	MOSCHETTI	
11989	12/1/2009	DOUGLAS	MOSCHETTI	
11989	12/1/2009	CAROLINE	MOSCHETTI	
12130	12/8/2009	DOUGLAS	MOSCHETTI	
12130	12/8/2009	CAROLINE	MOSCHETTI	
12325	12/13/2009	DONALD A	MOTANIC	
11980	11/25/2009	ALVIN	MOWREY	
11980	11/25/2009	ANDREA	MOWREY	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
12340	12/14/2009	WILLIAM E	MOYER	
12161	12/10/2009	MAURY J	MUDRICK	
11803	11/20/2009	F S	MUEGLER	
11982	11/23/2009	TOM	MUELLER	
11801	11/20/2009	JAMES E	MUIR	
11801	11/20/2009	MICHELLE J	MUIR	
12200	12/11/2009	KATHRYN A	MULDER	
11827	11/22/2009	KENNETH H	MUNGER	ADVANCED ELECTRIC INC.
11391	11/11/2009	REBECCA L	MURPHY	
12027	12/1/2009	REBECCA L	MURPHY	
12142	12/9/2009	FIONN M	MURPHY	
12142	12/9/2009	SILVERLINA E	MURPHY	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
12144	12/9/2009	ASHE M	MURPHY	
12145	12/9/2009	RA K	MURPHY	
12146	12/9/2009	FAE M	MURPHY	
12147	12/9/2009	REBECCA L	MURPHY	
12160	12/10/2009	REBECCA L	MURPHY	
12305	12/13/2009	BHRIGHA L	MURPHY	
12325	12/13/2009	BHRIGHA L	MURPHY	
11621	11/17/2009	PATTY	MURRAY	U.S. CONGRESS
10113	10/26/2009	WILLILAM	MUSGROVE	
10115	10/26/2009	JAMES	MUSICK	
10115	10/26/2009	GEORGIA	MUSICK	
11888	11/24/2009	RODRICK G	MUSSER	
11258	11/9/2009	GLORIA	MUTHE	
11872	11/23/2009	CLAY	MYERS	
11980	11/25/2009	KIM	MYERS	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
11980	11/25/2009	MIKE	MYERS	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
11936	11/20/2009	TED	NAFFIN	
11278	11/10/2009	SHERRON J	NAUMAN	
11975	11/25/2009	GERALD	NAUMAN	
11975	11/25/2009	SHERRON J	NAUMAN	
12025	11/18/2009	GERALD	NAUMAN	
12025	11/18/2009	SHERRON J	NAUMAN	
11975	11/25/2009	CHRIS	NEIBAUER	
11975	11/25/2009	KAREN K	NEIBAUER	
12186	12/11/2009	JOHN	NEIDIVER	
12186	12/11/2009	LAURIE	NEIDIVER	
12193	12/11/2009	NORMAN	NELLIS	
12193	12/11/2009	CAROL SAGE	NELLIS	
11389	11/11/2009	WILLIAM A	NELSON	
11390	11/11/2009	KAYE A	NELSON	
11820	11/19/2009	PAT	NELSON	
12421	12/14/2009	TRAVIS W	NELSON	WA DEPATMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
10052	10/20/2009	CRAIG G	NEWTON	
10077	10/23/2009	GUY E.	NEWTON	
10186	10/27/2009	CRAIG G	NEWTON	
11783	11/20/2009	GUY E.	NEWTON	
11785	11/20/2009	PEGGY K.	NEWTON	
12359	12/14/2009	PETER A	NICKOL	
11411	11/13/2009	CHERYL M.	NIEHAUS	
12092	12/4/2009	DEREK S	NIES	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11982	11/23/2009	ALAN	NISBET	
12016	11/25/2009	DUANE	NORDSTROM	
11863	11/23/2009	BILL	NORMAN	
11021	10/29/2009	BARBARA	NORRIS	
11650	11/17/2009	PAT	NORRIS	
11024	10/29/2009	TAMMY	NORRIS HILDEBRAND	
10004	10/13/2009	FRANCES	NORTHCUT	COWLITZ COUNTY CEMETERY DISTRICT 3
11874	11/23/2009	FRANCES	NORTHCUT	COWLITZ COUNTY CEMETERY DISTRICT 3
11398	11/12/2009	MELINDA	NUTE	
11681	11/17/2009	MELINDA	NUTE	
12089	12/3/2009	MELINDA	NUTE	
12089	12/3/2009	DAVID	NUTE	
12439	11/30/2009	MELINDA	NUTE	
12439	11/30/2009	DAVID	NUTE	
11859	11/23/2009	ERIC	NYLUND	
12354	12/14/2009	STEVE L	NYLUND	
12223	12/12/2009	TERRY	NYQUIST	
12237	12/13/2009	TERRY	NYQUIST	
10946	11/4/2009	PAUL	OATES	
10196	10/29/2009	DAVE W	O'BRIEN	
11987	11/30/2009	MARK A	OCHSNER	
11818	11/10/2009	SHARON	O'CONNOR	
10144	10/27/2009	DAVID J	ODELL	
12394	12/14/2009	CASEY	ODELL	
12347	12/14/2009	RYAN S	OJERIO	WASHINGTON TRAILS ASSOCIATION
11982	11/23/2009	L. FAYE	OLASON	
11982	11/23/2009	PAUL	OLIVE	
11908	11/24/2009	KRIS	OLMSTEAD	
11383	11/11/2009	WILLIAM	OLSEN	
10205	10/30/2009	TAMMY L	OLSON	
11007	11/3/2009	TAMMY L	OLSON	
11009	11/3/2009	MARK	OLSON	
11750	11/18/2009	PATTI	OLSON	
11943	11/20/2009	PATTI	OLSON	
11943	11/20/2009	JERRY	OLSON	
11975	11/25/2009	MATT	OLSON	
12312	12/14/2009	KELLY A	ONEILL	
11778	11/20/2009	ANNE E.	O'NEILL	
12352	12/14/2009	ED	ORCUTT	STATE REPRESENTATIVE

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11856	11/20/2009	MARIA	ORENDURFF	
12172	12/8/2009	CONNIE	ORI	
10994	11/5/2009	CRAIG F	ORPUT	
11929	11/18/2009	ROBERT	OSBORN	
12093	12/4/2009	PAULA K	OVERHOLTZER	
12449	12/14/2009	PAULA K	OVERHOLTZER	
10998	11/3/2009	MURIEL	OWENS	
10998	11/3/2009	TOM	OWENS	
12250	12/13/2009	C. JOANN	OWNBEY	
11035	11/5/2009	RENE K	OXFORD	
12319	12/14/2009	CHARLES E	PACE	
11616	11/12/2009	DOUG	PALIN	STONE MEADOWS SUBDIVISION
11616	11/12/2009	KRISTY	PALIN	STONE MEADOWS SUBDIVISION
11711	11/16/2009	RHONDA	PALMER	
11975	11/25/2009	KAREN	PALMER	
12036	11/22/2009	KAREN	PALMER	
10519	10/27/2009	SANDRA	PARGMAN	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
11980	11/25/2009	RICHARD	PARGMAN	
11980	11/25/2009	SANDRA	PARGMAN	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
12010	12/1/2009	SANDRA	PARGMAN	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
12152	12/8/2009	SANDRA	PARGMAN	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
12325	12/13/2009	SANDRA	PARGMAN	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
12490	12/14/2009	JOHN	PARSONS	
12404	12/14/2009	RICHARD T	PATH	
11656	11/17/2009	ROBIN M	PAUL	
11836	11/23/2009	RONNY M	PAUL	
11975	11/25/2009	JENNIFER	PAULSM	
11975	11/25/2009	RAY	PAULSM	
12248	12/13/2009	VICKI D	PAULUS	
12170	12/11/2009	FRED L	PAVEGLIO	HIGHVALLEY HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
11257	11/7/2009	RYAN	PAYNE	
12078	12/4/2009	FRANK	PEABODY	
11271	11/9/2009	RANDALL D	PEARL	
10217	11/2/2009	JULIANA L	PEARSON	
12091	12/3/2009	DOUGLAS W	PEARSON	
12471	12/14/2009	JULIANA L	PEARSON	
10985	10/28/2009	LISA	PERIGO	
11961	11/28/2009	BILL AND CINDY	PERKINS	
11804	11/21/2009	CHARLOTTE C	PERSONS	
11982	11/23/2009	CHARLOTTE C	PERSONS	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11688	11/14/2009	DARIN	PETO	
11689	11/14/2009	ERNEST	PETO	
12012	11/25/2009	JANIE	PETO	
11734	11/18/2009	JESS D	PETTY	CITIZENS FOR A HEALTY POWER SYSTEM
12249	12/13/2009	CONNIE A	PETTY	
11857	11/22/2009	ELIZABETH	PIECHOCKI	
11707	11/18/2009	CHRISTINE A	PIENKOWSKI	
12022	11/18/2009	CHRISTINE A	PIENKOWSKI	
11887	11/23/2009	ROSANN	PIEPER	
11975	11/25/2009	MARVIN	PIETILA	
11975	11/25/2009	DELORES	PIETILA	
11809	11/21/2009	SHERRY L	PINKOWSKY	
11975	11/25/2009	C TANNERT	PINNEY	
11975	11/25/2009	CHRISTINE M	PIPER	
12129	12/8/2009	ASHLEY R	PIRRONE	
10107	10/26/2009	GEORGE W	PITTENGER	
10114	10/26/2009	BONITA	PITTENGER	
10986	11/3/2009	GEORGE W	PITTENGER	
11982	11/23/2009	GEORGE W	PITTENGER	
10044	10/17/2009	KEITH R.	PLACE	
12404	12/14/2009	FAIRGO	PLECTON	
10011	10/14/2009	DAVID	PLOTZ	
11913	11/23/2009	KELLI A.K.	PLUMMER	
11916	11/23/2009	KELLI A.K.	PLUMMER	
10122	10/26/2009	STEVE	POLKOW	
10122	10/26/2009	MRS. STEVE	POLKOW	
11038	11/5/2009	JOHN A	POLOS	CITIZENS FOR A HEALTY POWER SYSTEM
11561	11/14/2009	JOHN A	POLOS	CITIZENS FOR A HEALTY POWER SYSTEM
11566	11/14/2009	JOHN A	POLOS	CITIZENS FOR A HEALTY POWER SYSTEM
11693	11/14/2009	JOHN A	POLOS	CITIZENS FOR A HEALTY POWER SYSTEM
11790	11/20/2009	JOHN A	POLOS	CITIZENS FOR A HEALTY POWER SYSTEM
12497	11/24/2009	JOHN A	POLOS	CITIZENS FOR A HEALTY POWER SYSTEM
12191	12/11/2009	SHON	PONDER	
12191	12/11/2009	KIM	PONDER	
11739	11/19/2009	ANNE M	POOLE	
12293	12/14/2009	ELLEN S	POOLE	
11717	11/18/2009	JIM	POPHAM	
11717	11/18/2009	NANCY E	POPHAM	
11729	11/18/2009	JENNIFER A	POPHAM	
12268	12/13/2009	RICHARD J	PORTER	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
12194	12/11/2009	JIM	POTTER	
12194	12/11/2009	DEBBY	POTTER	
11975	11/25/2009	DAVID	POYIN	
12472	12/14/2009	MONTY	PRICE	
11219	11/5/2009	TERRY	PRIMLEY	
10066	10/21/2009	KENNETH R	PRITCHARD	
12309	12/14/2009	SARA	PURSLEY	
12309	12/14/2009	RON	PURSLEY	
11975	11/25/2009	JAY	PURYEAR	
11975	11/25/2009	NANETTE	PURYEAR	
12056	12/1/2009	BARBARA J	QUAYLE	
12058	12/1/2009	BARBARA J	QUAYLE	
11980	11/25/2009	DARIN	QUITUGUA	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
11980	11/25/2009	LYNETTE	QUITUGUA	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
12065	11/19/2009	DARIN	QUITUGUA	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
12065	11/19/2009	LYNETTE	QUITUGUA	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
12463	12/14/2009	WILLIAM	RAIMER	
12463	12/14/2009	JERI	RAIMER	
11982	11/23/2009	KATIE	RANCH	
11975	11/25/2009	MARIA	RANDALL	
11975	11/25/2009	TROY	RANDALL	
11252	11/9/2009	ROBERT R	RANDEL	
11982	11/23/2009	JOHN	RANDOL	
10991	11/4/2009	DON K	RANDOLPH	
11277	11/10/2009	DON K	RANDOLPH	
11277	11/10/2009	KELLI	RANDOLPH	
10132	10/26/2009	STEPHEN C	RAPALUS	
10165	10/28/2009	STEPHEN C	RAPALUS	
11648	11/17/2009	STEVE	RAPALUS	
12018	11/25/2009	TERRY	RASOR	
11582	11/15/2009	CAMILLE R	RAST	
11765	11/19/2009	KEITH D	RAST	
12252	12/13/2009	DARREL R	RAST	
12283	12/13/2009	JAMES C	RAUCH	
11975	11/25/2009	FRANK	RAUNCH	
11975	11/25/2009	JENNY	RAUNCH	
11631	11/13/2009	JOANNE	RAUTH	
11631	11/13/2009	PATRICK	RAUTH	
11253	11/7/2009	DEBBIE	RAWHOUSER	
12316	12/13/2009	MARIA THOMAS	RAY	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		V		
11982	11/23/2009	MIKE	REARDON	
12246	12/13/2009	CURTIS M	REDKEY	
12247	12/13/2009	TINA D	REDKEY	
10001	10/13/2009	HARVEY	REDMOND	
12520	12/14/2009	KAREN	REELY	
12330	12/14/2009	MARIAH H	REESE	
12334	12/14/2009	MARIAH H	REESE	
11975	11/25/2009	LISA	REFERSON	
11839	11/23/2009	SANDY K	REILLY	
12155	12/9/2009	CHRISTOPHER	REIVE	
12325	12/13/2009	JIM	REKUCKI	
12325	12/13/2009	LAURIE	REKUCKI	
12483	12/14/2009	JAMES J	REKUCKI	
11975	11/25/2009	DAN	RELUM	
10744	10/28/2009	JAMES	RELYEA	
12288	12/13/2009	JANE M	REVESZ	
12419	12/14/2009	PETER	REVESZ	
11982	11/23/2009	KIM	REYNOLDS	
11902	11/24/2009	LOGAN D	RHODEHAMEL	
10099	10/25/2009	KATHRYN A.	RICCIO	
11233	11/7/2009	JAMES W	RICHARD	
10221	11/1/2009	SHARON	RICHARDS	
12454	12/11/2009	WELAYNE	RICHMOND	
12454	12/11/2009	DARMA	RICHMOND	
11040	11/3/2009	BARBARA	RIDER	
11975	11/25/2009	CARRIE P	RILEY	
10106	10/26/2009	NORMAN G	RINDAL	
10064	10/20/2009	CAROLYN J	RINTA	
11774	11/19/2009	CAROLYN J	RINTA	
11723	11/17/2009	LETTIE	RIOS	
12466	12/11/2009	BONNIE	RIPPENGALE	
12466	12/11/2009	BILL	RIPPENGALE	
11653	11/17/2009	TONYA R	RITENBURGH	
12214	12/12/2009	ARLO E	RITENBURGH	
12304	12/14/2009	SCOTT A	RITENBURGH	
11730	11/18/2009	PEGGY S	RITTER	
11736	11/19/2009	NICK T	RITTER	
12513	12/14/2009	LEO T	RIVOLI	
11555	11/13/2009	HEATHER D	ROBERTS	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
12135	12/9/2009	LAURA	ROBERTSON	
12135	12/9/2009	ED	ROBERTSON	
11590	11/15/2009	GEORGE A	ROBINSON	
11975	11/25/2009	HOLLY	ROBINSON	
11896	11/25/2009	JIM R	ROBURN	
10979	10/28/2009	CLIVE	ROCEHOENBOGER	
11901	11/24/2009	SUZANNE C	ROCK	
12410	12/14/2009	ROBERT H.	RODGERS	
12076	12/4/2009	ROBERT	ROGERS	
12090	12/3/2009	MARK	ROGERS	
12090	12/3/2009	JUDY	ROGERS	
12090	12/3/2009	MICHELLE	ROGERS	
12090	12/3/2009	NATHAN	ROGERS	
12299	12/14/2009	MICHAEL L	ROGGENKAMP	
12299	12/14/2009	MELINDA	ROGGENKAMP	
12404	12/14/2009	MARY	ROLOMSEN	
11975	11/25/2009	ANDREW	ROMANCHOCK	
11975	11/25/2009	DEBORAH	ROMANCHOCK	
11975	11/25/2009	JOHN	ROMANCHOCK	
12517	12/14/2009	DEBORAH	ROMANCHOCK	
12517	12/14/2009	JOHN	ROMANCHOCK	
11923	11/24/2009	DANIEL	RONYAK	
10037	10/19/2009	ROGER D	ROOD	
10063	10/20/2009	ROGER D	ROOD	
12019	11/25/2009	RUTH E	ROOT	
10026	10/15/2009	SUSAN D	ROSE	
12217	12/12/2009	JANINA	ROSENKRANZ	
11993	12/1/2009	CAREY A	ROSENLUND	
11996	11/25/2009	DAVE	ROSS	
10222	11/2/2009	JUNE	ROSTER	
10222	11/2/2009	PAUL	ROSTER	
11969	11/30/2009	JUNE	ROSTER	
11969	11/30/2009	PAUL	ROSTER	
10030	10/18/2009	JAMES P	ROTH	
11829	11/22/2009	JAMES P	ROTH	
11980	11/25/2009	TED	RUBINSTEIN	
11980	11/25/2009	CYNDIE	RUBINSTEIN	
12181	12/11/2009	TED	RUBINSTEIN	
12181	12/11/2009	CYNDIE	RUBINSTEIN	
10235	10/27/2009	RANDY	RUPERT	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11658	11/13/2009	MARIANNE	RUSSELL	
11256	11/9/2009	NANCY L	RUST	
11256	11/9/2009	ALAN	RUST	
11769	11/19/2009	NANCY L	RUST	
11926	11/20/2009	CHRIS	RUST	
11930	11/18/2009	CHRIS	RUST	
11392	11/11/2009	DOROTHY P	SABINO	ALDERSPUR ROAD ASSOCIATION
11806	11/21/2009	JOAN C	SAMPSON	
12339	12/14/2009	TODD A	SANDERS	
12339	12/14/2009	RITA-LYN	SANDERS	
12004	11/25/2009	JAMIE	SANTOLUCITO	
12004	11/25/2009	FRED	SANTOLUCITO	
12041	11/25/2009	LESTER	SARASOHN	
12041	11/25/2009	ERNA	SARASOHN	
12259	12/13/2009	ERNA	SARASOHN	
10432	10/27/2009	PAT AND BOB	SARKINEN	
11975	11/25/2009	MATT	SARKINEN	
12484	12/14/2009	MATT	SARKINEN	
11571	11/14/2009	DAVID S.	SAUERBREY	
12404	12/14/2009	ANNIE	SAUERBREY	
11800	11/20/2009	KATHLEEN	SAWYER	
11782	11/19/2009	VICKI M	SCHAFFER	
11248	11/8/2009	DR RAYMOMD A	SCHEIMER	
11248	11/8/2009	NANCY C	SCHEIMER	
11415	11/13/2009	DR RAYMOMD A	SCHEIMER	
11415	11/13/2009	NANCY C	SCHEIMER	
11617	11/16/2009	MONTE G	SCHIERLING	
11646	11/17/2009	MONTE G	SCHIERLING	
11611	11/16/2009	WALT	SCHILLER	
11611	11/16/2009	GRACE A	SCHILLER	
11812	11/19/2009	WALT	SCHILLER	
11813	11/18/2009	WALT	SCHILLER	
11813	11/18/2009	GRACE A	SCHILLER	
11980	11/25/2009	WALT	SCHILLER	
11980	11/25/2009	GRACE A	SCHILLER	
12239	12/13/2009	LEE A	SCHILLER	
12240	12/13/2009	AARON M	SCHILLER	
12241	12/13/2009	BRIAN G	SCHILLER	
11982	11/23/2009	KEN	SCHLEIMER	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11840	11/21/2009	MIKE	SCHMAUCH	
11840	11/21/2009	DEANN	SCHMAUCH	
12127	12/8/2009	MIKE	SCHMAUCH	
12325	12/13/2009	MIKE	SCHMAUCH	
11975	11/25/2009	MARK	SCHMIDT	
10082	10/23/2009	JOE X	SCHMOE	
11558	11/13/2009	SCOTT B	SCHNEIDER	
11830	11/22/2009	BILL R	SCHNEIDER	
12210	12/12/2009	ELISKA W	SCHNEIDER	
12464	12/14/2009	BILL R	SCHNEIDER	
11266	11/9/2009	EVELYM	SCHNOEBELEN	
11266	11/9/2009	YARO	SCHNOEBELEN	
11762	11/19/2009	JON	SCHOENBORN	
11762	11/19/2009	CATHY	SCHOENBORN	
12356	12/14/2009	CATHY	SCHOENBORN	
11369	11/10/2009	BARBETTE C	SCHOENING	
11606	11/16/2009	MARK L	SCHOENING	
11975	11/25/2009	BARBETTE C	SCHOENING	
11975	11/25/2009	MARK L	SCHOENING	
12263	12/13/2009	BARBETTE C	SCHOENING	
10231	11/2/2009	ERIK M	SCHOPP	
11405	11/13/2009	CINDI L.	SCHROEDER	BLACK HAWK ESTATES
10083	10/23/2009	DAVID J	SCHULTZ	
11045	10/28/2009	CINDY	SCHULTZ	PACIFICORP
12227	12/12/2009	RANDALL L	SCHULTZ-RATHBUN	
12235	12/12/2009	CAROLYN J	SCHULTZ-RATHBUN	
12511	12/14/2009	JACK	SCHUMACHER	
12404	12/14/2009	CARLY	SCNUMS	
11002	11/3/2009	BEN	SCOTT	
11970	11/25/2009	KEN	SCOTT	
11970	11/25/2009	LINDA	SCOTT	
11975	11/25/2009	RICHARD	SCOVILLE	
11975	11/25/2009	SHERRY	SCOVILLE	
11975	11/25/2009	STEPHEN	SCOVILLE	
12443	12/8/2009	RICHARD	SCOVILLE	
12443	12/8/2009	SHERRY	SCOVILLE	
11770	11/19/2009	DAN O	SEAL	
11770	11/19/2009	JEANETTA	SEAL	
12031	12/2/2009	MARTIN	SERING	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
12031	12/2/2009	DECEMBER	SERING	
11784	11/20/2009	DIANA M.	SERMONE	
12236	12/13/2009	SANDRA L	SERMONE	
12324	12/14/2009	ALEXANDER D	SERVICE	
11696	11/18/2009	LAINÉ D	SEVERSON	
10111	10/26/2009	HOLAHAN P	SHAUN	
12415	12/14/2009	CHRISTINA	SHAW	
12415	12/14/2009	THOMAS	SHAW	
11959	11/28/2009	JOSEPH	SHEADEL	
12074	12/4/2009	KAREN C	SHERRILL	
12404	12/14/2009	CINDY	SHEY	
12404	12/14/2009	DANIN	SHEY	
10226	10/30/2009	BECKY	SHIPLEY	
10236	10/30/2009	BECKY	SHIPLEY	
10236	10/30/2009	FRED	SHIPLEY	
11842	11/22/2009	JUDY	SILLS	
12325	12/13/2009	JUDY	SILLS	
12391	12/14/2009	JUDY	SILLS	
12413	12/14/2009	JUDY	SILLS	
12155	12/9/2009	DR JOHN	SIMMONS	
11371	11/10/2009	DAVID M	SIMMS	
12489	12/14/2009	DAVID M	SIMMS	
12489	12/14/2009	CAROLYN	SIMMS	
11975	11/25/2009	MIKE	SIMPSON	
12428	11/21/2009	MIKE	SIMPSON	
11967	11/29/2009	JAMES D	SKELTON	
10225	11/2/2009	STEVE R	SLOTTO	
11036	11/3/2009	STEVE R	SLOTTO	
10025	10/15/2009	RONDA M	SMITH	
10025	10/15/2009	TOM	SMITH	
10965	10/28/2009	SEAN P	SMITH	
10992	11/4/2009	KIM L	SMITH	
10996	10/28/2009	KIRK S	SMITH	
11028	10/29/2009	KELLEY	SMITH	
11028	10/29/2009	MIKE	SMITH	
11043	11/3/2009	ANTHONY	SMITH	
11231	11/6/2009	SEAN P	SMITH	
11254	11/9/2009	PAUL B	SMITH	
11385	11/11/2009	MICHAEL R	SMITH	
11393	11/12/2009	KIRSTEN	SMITH	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11573	11/16/2009	KAGEL E	SMITH	
11627	11/17/2009	KAREN	SMITH	
11659	11/13/2009	KAREN	SMITH	
11808	11/21/2009	TERRY L	SMITH	
11921	11/24/2009	SEAN P	SMITH	
11975	11/25/2009	TONI	SMITH	
11975	11/25/2009	DON	SMITH	
11982	11/23/2009	MELINDA L	SMITH	
12416	12/14/2009	SEAN P	SMITH	
11975	11/25/2009	ERYLL	SNOW	
11767	11/19/2009	JEFF	SNYDER	
12224	12/12/2009	JEFF	SNYDER	
11975	11/25/2009	MONICA	SOLM	
11904	11/24/2009	MAGDOLNA	SOLTI	
10945	11/4/2009	CARLOS	SOLVACEZ	
11912	11/23/2009	GEORGE J	SOMARAKIS	
11975	11/25/2009	PAM	SOMBRE	
11013	10/29/2009	GERALD	SORRELL	
11559	11/13/2009	KELLY L	SPAFFORD	
12398	12/14/2009	WILLIAM A	SPARKS	
12398	12/14/2009	KIM	SPARKS	
12469	12/14/2009	RON	SPARKS	
12469	12/14/2009	CHRISTY	SPARKS	
11975	11/25/2009	D E	SPEER	
11975	11/25/2009	DARLA	SPEER	
11975	11/25/2009	MEGAN	SPEER	
11975	11/25/2009	H	SPEER	
10020	10/14/2009	RICHARD B	SPENCE	
10153	10/28/2009	MICHAEL	SPENCE	
11597	11/13/2009	MICHAEL	SPENCE	
12050	12/2/2009	MICHAEL	SPENCE	
12050	12/2/2009	PAULA	SPENCE	
12344	12/14/2009	LAURIE J	SPENCER	
11971	11/27/2009	CHARLIE	SPIDLE	
10119	10/26/2009	TERRIE A	SPINDLE	
10126	10/26/2009	TERRIE A	SPINDLE	
11701	11/17/2009	MIKE	SPIVY	
11701	11/17/2009	MEREDITH	SPIVY	
11832	11/22/2009	TRENTON	SPOLAR	
11832	11/22/2009	LINDA	SPOLAR	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
12281	12/13/2009	JERRY	SPRAGUE	
10173	10/27/2009	PAUL	ST JAMES	
11975	11/25/2009	MICHAEL	STALY	
11975	11/25/2009	CLAY	STALY	
11948	11/20/2009	MARGARET	STAPENHORST	
10203	10/30/2009	BENJAMIN E	STARK	
10983	11/3/2009	BENJAMIN E	STARK	
11042	11/3/2009	TERRA	STARK	
12151	12/8/2009	GRETCHEN	STARKE	
12362	12/14/2009	ROBERT A	STAVIG	
12362	12/14/2009	DEBORAH A	STAVIG	
12429	12/12/2009	ROBERT A	STAVIG	
12429	12/12/2009	DEBORAH A	STAVIG	
10079	10/23/2009	ROBERT J	STEEL	
10008	10/13/2009	JOE	STELL	
10054	10/15/2009	JOE	STELL	
11052	11/6/2009	SHAWNA	STEVENS	
11634	11/17/2009	SHAWNA	STEVENS	
11982	11/23/2009	KAREN	STEVENS	
11664	11/13/2009	FREDA	STEVENSON	
12493	12/12/2009	BOB	STEVENSON	
12162	12/10/2009	LEA	STEWART	
12325	12/13/2009	LESLIE	STEWART BELL	
11725	11/18/2009	TIM M	STIEF	
12422	12/14/2009	JULIA	STOLL	
11229	11/6/2009	MATTHEW D	STONE	
12215	12/12/2009	SHERRY L	STONE	
11982	11/23/2009	DON	STOUT	
10040	10/13/2009	KAREN	STREETER	CLARK COUNTY - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
10149	10/27/2009	BRADEN S	STRICKLER	
10149	10/27/2009	NINA R	STRICKLER	
11563	11/14/2009	BRADEN S	STRICKLER	
11638	11/15/2009	BRADEN S	STRICKLER	
11802	11/20/2009	NINA R	STRICKLER	
11842	11/22/2009	NINA R	STRICKLER	
11932	11/19/2009	BRADEN S	STRICKLER	
11934	11/25/2009	COLLETTE A	STRICKLER	
12065	11/19/2009	BRADEN S	STRICKLER	
12065	11/19/2009	NINA R	STRICKLER	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
12370	12/14/2009	BRADEN S	STRICKLER	
12370	12/14/2009	NINA R	STRICKLER	
11982	11/23/2009	JIM	STRONG	
10040	10/13/2009	STEVE	STUART	BOARD OF CLARK COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
11003	10/30/2009	DON	STUART	
12071	12/1/2009	STEVE	STUART	BOARD OF CLARK COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
12388	12/14/2009	STEVE	STUART	BOARD OF CLARK COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
11614	11/6/2009	SCOTT	STUDER	STONE MEADOWS SUBDIVISION
11614	11/6/2009	LYNN	STUDER	STONE MEADOWS SUBDIVISION
11712	11/18/2009	MIKE	SULLIVAN	
11883	11/23/2009	SID	SUMMERS	
11982	11/23/2009	BARRY	SUNRISE	
12011	11/25/2009	ANDREICA	SUSANA	
10134	10/26/2009	CHRISTINE R	SUTHERLAND	
11731	11/17/2009	CHRISTINE R	SUTHERLAND	
10065	10/21/2009	CRYSTAL E	SUTTON	
11905	11/24/2009	THOMAS R	SUTTON	
12171	12/11/2009	MASON D	SWIGERT	
11380	11/11/2009	SCOTT W	SWINDELL	SCOTT W. SWINDELL, ATTORNEY AT LAW, P.C.
10743	10/28/2009	JEFF	TACK	
10071	10/22/2009	R.A.	TAFOLLA	
12261	12/13/2009	CATHERINE E	TALBOT	BALSOM ESTATES
12387	12/14/2009	STEVE	TANKE	
12387	12/14/2009	LORRAINE	TANKE	
12435	12/14/2009	LORRAINE	TANKE	
11752	11/18/2009	WILLIAM	TANNENAN	
11773	11/19/2009	LENORE A	TAPANI	
11878	11/23/2009	KEVIN D	TAPANI	
11881	11/24/2009	MICHAEL J	TAPANI	
11882	11/23/2009	TYLER J	TAPANI	
11409	11/13/2009	JULIE A.	TAYLOR	
12038	11/25/2009	STEVEN	TENDLER	
12038	11/25/2009	ANNE	TENDLER	
10248	11/3/2009	JANET M	TERVEEN	
10248	11/3/2009	DAVE	TERVEEN	
11766	11/19/2009	MICHAEL T	THEIS	
11037	11/5/2009	DONALD E	THIEMAN	
11674	11/13/2009	JOANN	THOMAS	
12432	12/14/2009	WILLIAM	THOMAS	
10131	10/26/2009	MICHAEL	THOMMES	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		RICHARD		
10984	11/3/2009	GENE	THOMPSON	
10984	11/3/2009	JUDY	THOMPSON	
12108	12/7/2009	DOUG L	THOMPSON	
12108	12/7/2009	DEBBIE	THOMPSON	
12404	12/14/2009	DIANNE	THOMSEN	
12414	12/14/2009	CARL	THOMSEN	
12219	12/12/2009	RICHARD R	THORMAHLEN	
10046	10/15/2009	EIRIK	THORSgard MAIS	CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE GRANDE RONDE
12281	12/13/2009	MAJA	TIBBLING	
11982	11/23/2009	ALICE	TIENNO	
11982	11/23/2009	SANDY	TILTON	
11417	11/13/2009	CHRISTOPHER A.	TIMBREZA	
11796	11/20/2009	CHRISTOPHER A.	TIMBREZA	
11992	11/25/2009	CHRISTOPHER A.	TIMBREZA	
11992	11/25/2009	SETA	TIMBREZA	
11264	11/9/2009	NORMA J	TIPTON	
12005	11/25/2009	ALLA	TISHCHENKO	
12005	11/25/2009	VIKTOR	TISHCHENKO	
11011	10/29/2009	DARLENE	TOMLINSON	
11251	11/7/2009	FORRCUINO	TONKE	
11982	11/23/2009	DON	TORGERSON	
10160	10/28/2009	CAMERON	TORMANEN	
11890	11/23/2009	QUINTON M	TORMANEN	
10238	10/27/2009	JEANNE	TOWN	
12407	12/14/2009	BOB	TOWNE	
10245	11/3/2009	ROLAND HENRY	TOWNSEND	
10245	11/3/2009	B.B.	TOWNSEND	
12351	12/14/2009	CHARLES A	TRACY	
12351	12/14/2009	RUTH E	TRACY	
12338	12/14/2009	ED	TRAVALIA	
12396	12/14/2009	MICHAEL E	TROXLER	
11918	11/23/2009	MONICA	TUBBERVILLE	
11918	11/23/2009	ED M	TUBBERVILLE	
11586	11/15/2009	JENNIFER L	TUCKER	
12023	12/1/2009	DAN	TUCKER	
12023	12/1/2009	KATHY	TUCKER	
11851	11/20/2009	GREGORY	TULLAR	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11982	11/23/2009	ARDITH	TURNER	
11915	11/23/2009	JANE P	TYROLER	
11981	11/30/2009	GRANT G	UHACZ	
11975	11/25/2009	WILLIAM J	UISNING	
10188	10/27/2009	CAROLYN	URBAN	
11205	10/29/2009	GERRY	URBAN	
12445	12/14/2009	ROD	U'REN	
12445	12/14/2009	SANDY	U'REN	
11602	11/16/2009	MARVIN W	VAN BLERICOM	
11602	11/16/2009	NILA	VAN BLERICOM	
11982	11/23/2009	BETH	VAN CUREN	
11651	11/17/2009	RICHARD	VAN DIJK	
12067	12/3/2009	VIVIAN	VAN DIJK	
12083	12/4/2009	RICHARD	VAN DIJK	
12084	12/4/2009	RICHARD	VAN DIJK	
12086	12/4/2009	RICHARD	VAN DIJK	
12088	12/4/2009	RICHARD	VAN DIJK	
12137	12/9/2009	RICHARD	VAN DIJK	
12159	12/10/2009	RICHARD	VAN DIJK	
12287	12/14/2009	RICHARD	VAN DIJK	
12290	12/14/2009	RICHARD	VAN DIJK	
12325	12/13/2009	RICHARD	VAN DIJK	
11690	11/18/2009	RANDY	VAN DYK	
11690	11/18/2009	WENDY	VAN DYK	
12504	11/24/2009	RICHARD	VAN DYKE	
11384	11/11/2009	JOE H	VAN ZUTPHEN	
11617	11/16/2009	MARK	VANDE VOORDE	
11617	11/16/2009	ROBIN	VANDE VOORDE	
12065	11/19/2009	MARK	VANDE VOORDE	
12065	11/19/2009	ROBIN	VANDE VOORDE	
12441	12/2/2009	ROBIN	VANDE VOORDE	
10086	10/23/2009	JON	VANDEBOUT	
10956	10/28/2009	JON	VANDEBOUT	
10968	10/28/2009	JON	VANDEBOUT	
11702	11/18/2009	BRUCE F	VANDERPLOEG	
11702	11/18/2009	CAROL	VANDERPLOEG	
12311	12/14/2009	BRUCE F	VANDERPLOEG	
12311	12/14/2009	CAROL	VANDERPLOEG	
11864	11/23/2009	DAVID	VASSAR	
11864	11/23/2009	KAREN	VASSAR	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11982	11/23/2009	ROY	VAUGHAM	
11966	11/29/2009	DOUG G	VAUGHAN	
11982	11/23/2009	JANE	VAUGHN	
12342	12/14/2009	GREGORY E	VAUGHT	
12500	11/24/2009	MICHAEL	VEELY	
11596	11/13/2009	MICHAEL	VELEY	
11845	11/19/2009	MICHAEL	VELEY	
11977	11/30/2009	MICHAEL	VELEY	
12072	12/4/2009	MICHAEL	VELEY	
11749	11/19/2009	BILL	VIDOVIC	
11749	11/19/2009	SHELLY R	VIDOVIC	
12404	12/14/2009	DON	VIDEN	
12404	12/14/2009	SHELLY	VIDEN	
11975	11/25/2009	VELMA	VILLEGOS	
12197	12/11/2009	ABRAHAM	VLADIC	
11805	11/21/2009	JANE A	VOGEL	
11805	11/21/2009	SANDERS L	VOGEL	
11838	11/23/2009	JAMES A	VOISIN	
12272	12/13/2009	KATHERINE A	VON KREISLER	
11810	11/21/2009	WYATT W	W	
10143	10/27/2009	JOY	WALDEN	
11039	11/5/2009	ROBERT D	WALKER	
11831	11/22/2009	JAMIE L	WALLACE	
10184	10/27/2009	GEORGE	WALLER	
12123	12/8/2009	DELORES M	WALLER	
12150	12/10/2009	GEORGE	WALLER	
12476	12/14/2009	ALANA	WALLS	
12485	12/14/2009	ALANA	WALLS	
11982	11/23/2009	BRENDA	WALSTEAD	
12026	12/1/2009	HAROLD	WALTON	
12026	12/1/2009	BARBARA	WALTON	
12157	12/10/2009	JOELL D	WANDLER	
11894	11/25/2009	RODNEY	WANGLER	
11894	11/25/2009	KRISTIN	WANGLER	
11975	11/25/2009	RODNEY	WANGLER	
11975	11/25/2009	KRISTIN	WANGLER	
12462	12/14/2009	DAVID E.B.	WARD	
10455	10/27/2009	SCOTT	WARREN	
12079	12/4/2009	JOE	WARREN	TOWN OF YACOLT
12479	12/11/2009	JOE	WARREN	TOWN OF YACOLT

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
12095	12/4/2009	KELLY	WARRINGTON	
12095	12/4/2009	BRYAN	WARRINGTON	
11728	11/19/2009	JOANN	WASHA	
11728	11/19/2009	ROBERT	WASHA	
10181	10/27/2009	BRUCE	WATSON	
11673	11/17/2009	GREGG	WEAKLEY	LACAMAS NORTHSHORE DEVELOPMENT
11673	11/17/2009	ELEANOR	WEAKLEY	
11794	11/20/2009	JOHN	WEBB	
12220	12/12/2009	EMILY A	WEBBER	
10213	10/30/2009	TIM E	WEIHE	
11373	11/10/2009	CHRISTOPHER I	WEINGARTNER	
12479	12/11/2009	JAMES	WELDON	TOWN OF YACOLT
12365	12/14/2009	KAREN R	WELINSKI	
12409	12/14/2009	JOHN	WELINSKI	
12057	12/1/2009	MRS. V	WELLS	
12294	12/14/2009	TINA M	WELLS	
12297	12/14/2009	ROGER D	WELLS	
10159	10/28/2009	DES	WELLSMORE	
10159	10/28/2009	JOAN A	WELLSMORE	
10955	10/28/2009	DES	WELLSMORE	
10955	10/28/2009	JOAN A	WELLSMORE	
11975	11/25/2009	DES	WELLSMORE	
11975	11/25/2009	JOAN A	WELLSMORE	
11975	11/25/2009	JENNIFER	WELLSMORE	
11975	11/25/2009	NATHAN	WELLSMORE	
11975	11/25/2009	SARAH	WELLSMORE	
12190	11/14/2009	JOAN A	WELLSMORE	
11047	11/3/2009	TRACY	WENGER	
11980	11/25/2009	B.J.	WERNER	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
11980	11/25/2009	ROBIN	WERNER	TRIPLE CREEK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
11041	11/6/2009	BARBARA L.	WESTGARTH	
11401	11/12/2009	BARBARA L.	WESTGARTH	
10171	10/27/2009	BILL	WHEELER	
10171	10/27/2009	KATHI	WHEELER	
11617	11/16/2009	BARBRA	WIDLUND	
11026	10/29/2009	ROD	WIGGINS	
11026	10/29/2009	LINDA	WIGGINS	
11657	11/13/2009	JAMES	WILDER	
11982	11/23/2009	RICHARD	WILKIE	
11669	11/17/2009	GEOFFREY C	WILLIAMS	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11758	11/19/2009	HENRY	WILLIAMS	
11807	11/21/2009	KURT C	WILLIAMS	
11975	11/25/2009	BRADLEY R	WILLIAMS	
11975	11/25/2009	B	WILLIAMS	
11975	11/25/2009	CATHERINE	WILLIAMS	
11982	11/23/2009	MATT	WILLIAMS	
10197	10/29/2009	BRUCE L	WILLIAMSON	
11982	11/23/2009	BECKY	WILLIAMSON	
10742	10/28/2009	KEVIN	WILLIS	
12341	12/14/2009	JIM E	WILLIS	
10195	10/28/2009	JEFF S	WILSON	
11027	10/29/2009	JEFF S	WILSON	
11982	11/23/2009	BARB	WILSON	
11982	11/23/2009	COLLEN R	WILSON	
11982	11/23/2009	GARY	WILSON	
11025	10/29/2009	RAY	WINTERS	
11025	10/29/2009	FAYE	WINTERS	
11931	11/19/2009	BRIAN	WISEMAN	
10199	10/29/2009	ROBERT W	WITHEE	
12149	11/10/2009	GALEN L	WITHERS	
11230	11/6/2009	BARBARA	WITT	
11230	11/6/2009	DALE	WITT	
12332	12/14/2009	BARBARA	WITT	
12182	12/11/2009	PATRICIA LEE	WITTER	
12353	12/14/2009	PATRICIA LEE	WITTER	
12187	12/11/2009	LEE	WITTER-KAHN	
10204	10/30/2009	PATRICK G	WOELFEL	
12028	12/2/2009	JO ANN	WOHLERS	
12459	12/14/2009	MIKE	WOJTOWICZ	
12515	11/25/2009	THOMAS	WOLFORD	
10078	10/23/2009	JIM B	WOOD	
11870	11/23/2009	DAVIS E	WOOD	
12389	12/14/2009	SUSAN L	WOOD	
10154	10/27/2009	MICHELLE	WOODLAND	
11609	11/16/2009	MICHAEL C	WOODY	
10982	11/3/2009	DAWN	WOOLCOTT	
11228	11/6/2009	DAWN	WOOLCOTT	
12112	12/8/2009	DAWN	WOOLCOTT	
12481	12/11/2009	DAWN	WOOLCOTT	
11004	11/3/2009	SCOTT	WOURMS	

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10005	10/12/2009	BARBARA	WRIGHT	
10057	10/15/2009	BARBARA	WRIGHT	
11615	11/7/2009	TOM	WRITT	
11615	11/7/2009	BECKY	WRITT	
11975	11/25/2009	SHANNON	WYMAN	
11975	11/25/2009	JASON	WYMAN	
12047	11/12/2009	JANET	WYMAN	
12033	11/25/2009	RICHARD	YAHRMARKT	
12033	11/25/2009	JANE	YAHRMARKT	
11716	11/17/2009	LEESE	YARBOURGH	
11914	11/23/2009	RUSSELL P	YEAROUT	
11975	11/25/2009	BRYAN L	YINGER	
11975	11/25/2009	PATRICIA	YINGER	
11975	11/25/2009	LUIS	YINGER	
11975	11/25/2009	KATHLEEN	YINGER	
12195	12/11/2009	LEONARD S	YOUNG	WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
12352	12/14/2009	JOSEPH	ZARELLI	STATE SENATOR 18TH
11012	10/29/2009	SUSAN	ZAREVICH	
11396	11/9/2009	JUDITH	ZEIDER	
11834	11/23/2009	VERA GRIGOR'EVNA	ZHELEZKIN	
11834	11/23/2009	VLADIMIR IVANOVICH	ZHELEZKIN	
11577	11/15/2009	ILYA P	ZHUKOV	
11610	11/16/2009	JOHN A	ZORA	
11744	11/19/2009	JENNIFER K	ZORA	
12141	12/9/2009	LYNETTE	ZUERCHER	
12233	12/12/2009	MICHAEL P	TRUE	
10000	10/12/2009	ROGER		
10016	10/14/2009	DAVID		
10105	*			
10139	10/27/2009	DAPHNA		
10176	*			
10190	*			
10200	*			
10249	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10250	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10251	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10252	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10253	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10254	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10255	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10256	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10257	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10258	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10259	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10260	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10261	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10262	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10263	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10264	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10265	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10266	10/27/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING AMBOY		
10267	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10268	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10269	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10270	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10271	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10272	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10273	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10274	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10275	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10276	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10277	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10278	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10279	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10280	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10281	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		AMBOY		
10282	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10283	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10284	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10285	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10286	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10287	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10288	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10289	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10290	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10291	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10292	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10293	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10294	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10295	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10296	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10297	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10298	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10299	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10300	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10301	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10302	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10303	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10304	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10305	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10306	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10307	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10308	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10309	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10310	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10311	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10312	10/27/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING AMBOY		
10313	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10314	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10315	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10316	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10317	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10318	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10319	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10320	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10321	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10322	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10323	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10324	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10325	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10326	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10327	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		AMBOY		
10328	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10329	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10330	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10331	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10332	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10333	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10334	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10335	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10336	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10337	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10338	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10339	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10340	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10341	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10342	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10343	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10344	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10345	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10346	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10347	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10348	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10349	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10350	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10351	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10352	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10353	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10354	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10355	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10356	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10357	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10358	10/27/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING AMBOY		
10359	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10360	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10361	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10362	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10363	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10364	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10365	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10366	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10367	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10368	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10369	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10370	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10371	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10372	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10373	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		AMBOY		
10374	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10375	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10376	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10377	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10378	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10379	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10380	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10381	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10382	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10383	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10384	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10385	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10386	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10387	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10388	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10389	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10390	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10391	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10392	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10393	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10394	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10395	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10396	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10397	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10398	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10399	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10400	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10401	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10402	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10403	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10404	10/27/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING AMBOY		
10405	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10406	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10407	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10408	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10409	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10410	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10411	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10412	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10413	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10414	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10415	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10416	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10417	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10418	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10419	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		AMBOY		
10420	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10421	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10422	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10423	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10424	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10425	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10426	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10427	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10428	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10429	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10430	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10431	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10432	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10433	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10434	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10435	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10436	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10437	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10438	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10439	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10440	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10441	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10442	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10443	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10444	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10445	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10446	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10447	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10448	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10449	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10450	10/27/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING AMBOY		
10451	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10452	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10453	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10454	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10455	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10456	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10457	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10458	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10459	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10460	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10461	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10462	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10463	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10464	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10465	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		AMBOY		
10466	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10467	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10468	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10469	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10470	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10471	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10472	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10473	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10474	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10475	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10476	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10477	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10478	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10479	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10480	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10481	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10482	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10483	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10484	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10485	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10486	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10487	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10488	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10489	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10490	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10491	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10492	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10493	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10494	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10495	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10496	10/27/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING AMBOY		
10497	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10498	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10499	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10500	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10501	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10502	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10503	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10504	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10505	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10506	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10507	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10508	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10509	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10510	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10511	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		AMBOY		
10512	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10513	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10514	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10515	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10516	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10517	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10518	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10519	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10520	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10521	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10522	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10523	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10524	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10525	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10526	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10527	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10528	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10529	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10530	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10531	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10532	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10533	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10534	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10535	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10536	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10537	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10538	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10539	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10540	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10541	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10542	10/27/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING AMBOY		
10543	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10544	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10545	*			
10546	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10547	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10548	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10549	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10550	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10551	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10552	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10553	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10554	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10555	10/27/2009	SCOPING MEETING AMBOY		
10556	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10557	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10558	10/28/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING VANCOUVER		
10559	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10560	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10561	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10562	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10563	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10564	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10565	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10566	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10567	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10568	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10569	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10570	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10571	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10572	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10573	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		VANCOUVER		
10574	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10575	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10576	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10577	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10578	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10579	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10580	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10581	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10582	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10583	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10584	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10585	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10586	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10587	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10588	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10589	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10590	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10591	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10592	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10593	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10594	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10595	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10596	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10597	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10598	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10599	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10600	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10601	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10602	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10603	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10604	10/28/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING VANCOUVER		
10605	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10606	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10607	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10608	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10609	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10610	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10611	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10612	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10613	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10614	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10615	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10616	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10617	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10618	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10619	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		VANCOUVER		
10620	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10621	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10622	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10623	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10624	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10625	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10626	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10627	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10628	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10629	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10630	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10631	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10632	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10633	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10634	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10635	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10636	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10637	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10638	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10639	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10640	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10641	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10642	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10643	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10644	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10645	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10646	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10647	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10648	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10649	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10650	10/28/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING VANCOUVER		
10651	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10652	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10653	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10654	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10655	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10656	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10657	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10658	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10659	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10660	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10661	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10662	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10663	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10664	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10665	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		VANCOUVER		
10666	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10667	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10668	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10669	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10670	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10671	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10672	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10673	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10674	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10675	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10676	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10677	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10678	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10679	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10680	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10681	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10682	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10683	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10684	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10685	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10686	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10687	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10688	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10689	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10690	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10691	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10692	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10693	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10694	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10695	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10696	10/28/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING VANCOUVER		
10697	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10698	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10699	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10700	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10701	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10702	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10703	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10704	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10705	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10706	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10707	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10708	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10709	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10710	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10711	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		VANCOUVER		
10712	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10713	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10714	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10715	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10716	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10717	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10718	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10719	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10720	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10721	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10722	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10723	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10724	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10725	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10726	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10727	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10728	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10729	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10730	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10731	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10732	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10733	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10734	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10735	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10736	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10737	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10738	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10739	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10740	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10741	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10742	10/28/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING VANCOUVER		
10743	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10744	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10745	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10746	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10747	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10748	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10749	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10750	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10751	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10752	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10753	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10754	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10755	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10756	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10757	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		VANCOUVER		
10758	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10759	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10760	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10761	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10762	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10763	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10764	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10765	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10766	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10767	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10768	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10769	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10770	10/28/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
10771	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10772	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10773	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10774	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10775	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10776	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10777	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10778	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10779	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10780	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10781	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10782	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10783	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10784	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10785	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10786	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10787	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10788	10/29/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING LONGVIEW		
10789	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10790	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10791	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10792	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10793	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10794	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10795	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10796	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10797	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10798	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10799	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10800	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10801	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10802	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10803	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		LONGVIEW		
10804	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10805	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10806	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10807	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10808	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10809	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10810	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10811	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10812	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10813	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10814	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10815	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10816	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10817	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10818	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10819	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10820	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10821	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10822	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10823	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10824	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10825	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10826	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10827	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10828	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10829	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10830	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10831	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10832	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10833	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10834	10/29/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING LONGVIEW		
10835	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10836	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10837	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10838	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10839	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10840	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10841	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10842	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10843	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10844	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10845	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10846	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10847	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10848	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10849	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		LONGVIEW		
10850	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10851	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10852	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10853	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10854	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10855	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10856	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10857	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10858	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10859	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10860	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10861	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10862	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10863	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10864	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10865	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10866	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10867	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10868	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10869	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10870	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10871	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10872	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10873	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10874	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10875	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10876	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10877	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10878	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10879	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10880	10/29/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING LONGVIEW		
10881	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10882	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10883	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10884	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10885	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10886	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10887	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10888	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10889	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10890	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10891	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10892	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10893	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10894	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10895	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		LONGVIEW		
10896	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10897	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10898	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10899	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10900	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10901	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10902	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10903	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10904	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10905	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10906	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10907	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10908	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10909	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10910	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
10911	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10912	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10913	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10914	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10915	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10916	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10917	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10918	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10919	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10920	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10921	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10922	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10923	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10924	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10925	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10926	10/29/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING LONGVIEW		
10927	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10928	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10929	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10930	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10931	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10932	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10933	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10934	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10935	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10936	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10937	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10938	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10939	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10940	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10941	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		LONGVIEW		
10942	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10943	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10944	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10953	10/27/2009	ANONYMOUS		
10958	10/27/2009	ANONYMOUS		
10972	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10973	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10974	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10975	10/29/2009	SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW		
10976	10/28/2009	ANONYMOUS		
10987	*			
11018	10/29/2009	ANONYMOUS		
11031	*			
11034	11/3/2009	GARY		
11048	11/3/2009	DON		
11054	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11055	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11056	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11057	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11058	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11059	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11060	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11061	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11062	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11063	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11064	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11065	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11066	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11067	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11068	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11069	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11070	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11071	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11072	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11073	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11074	11/3/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING CAMAS		
11075	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11076	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11077	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11078	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11079	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11080	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11081	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11082	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11083	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11084	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11085	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11086	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11087	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11088	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11089	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		CAMAS		
11090	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11091	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11092	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11093	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11094	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11095	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11096	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11097	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11098	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11099	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11100	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11101	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11102	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11103	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11104	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11105	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11106	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11107	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11108	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11109	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11110	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11111	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11112	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11113	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11114	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11115	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11116	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11117	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11118	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11119	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11120	11/3/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING CAMAS		
11121	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11122	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11123	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11124	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11125	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11126	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11127	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11128	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11129	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11130	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11131	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11132	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11133	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11134	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11135	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		CAMAS		
11136	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11137	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11138	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11139	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11140	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11141	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11142	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11143	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11144	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11145	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11146	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11147	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11148	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11149	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11150	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11151	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11152	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11153	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11154	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11155	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11156	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11157	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11158	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11159	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11160	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11161	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11162	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11163	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11164	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11165	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11166	11/3/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING CAMAS		
11167	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11168	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11169	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11170	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11171	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11172	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11173	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11174	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11175	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11176	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11177	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11178	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11179	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11180	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11181	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		CAMAS		
11182	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11183	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11184	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11185	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11186	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11187	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11188	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11189	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11190	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11191	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11192	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11193	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11194	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11195	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11196	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11197	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11198	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11199	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11200	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11201	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11202	11/3/2009	SCOPING MEETING CAMAS		
11204	10/29/2009	ANONYMOUS		
11208	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11209	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11210	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11211	*			
11212	*			
11213	*			
11214	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11215	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11216	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11217	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11218	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		GRESHAM		
11279	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11280	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11281	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11282	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11283	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11284	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11285	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11286	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11287	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11288	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11289	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11290	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11291	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11292	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11293	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11294	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11295	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11296	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11297	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11298	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11299	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11300	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11301	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11302	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11303	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11304	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11305	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11306	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11307	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11308	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11309	11/5/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING GRESHAM		
11310	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11311	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11312	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11313	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11314	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11315	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11316	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11317	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11318	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11319	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11320	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11321	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11322	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11323	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11324	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		GRESHAM		
11325	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11326	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11327	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11328	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11329	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11330	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11331	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11332	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11333	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11334	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11335	11/5/2009	SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM		
11336	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11337	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11338	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11339	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11340	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11341	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11342	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11343	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11344	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11345	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11346	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11347	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11348	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11349	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11350	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11351	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11352	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11353	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11354	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11355	11/7/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING VANCOUVER		
11356	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11357	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11358	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11359	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11360	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11361	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11362	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11363	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11364	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11365	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11366	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11367	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11368	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11418	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11419	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		VANCOUVER		
11420	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11421	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11422	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11423	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11424	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11425	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11426	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11427	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11428	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11429	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11430	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11431	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11432	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11433	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11434	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11435	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11436	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11437	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11438	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11439	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11440	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11441	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11442	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11443	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11444	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11445	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11446	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11447	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11448	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11449	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11450	11/7/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING VANCOUVER		
11451	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11452	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11453	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11454	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11455	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11456	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11457	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11458	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11459	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11460	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11461	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11462	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11463	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11464	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11465	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		VANCOUVER		
11466	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11467	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11468	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11469	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11470	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11471	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11472	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11473	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11474	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11475	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11476	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11477	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11478	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11479	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11480	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11481	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11482	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11483	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11484	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11485	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11486	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11487	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11488	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11489	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11490	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11491	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11492	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11493	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11494	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11495	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11496	11/7/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING VANCOUVER		
11497	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11498	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11499	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11500	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11501	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11502	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11503	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11504	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11505	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11506	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11507	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11508	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11509	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11510	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11511	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		VANCOUVER		
11512	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11513	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11514	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11515	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11516	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11517	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11518	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11519	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11520	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11521	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11522	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11523	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11524	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11525	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11526	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11527	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11528	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11529	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11530	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11531	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11532	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11533	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11534	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11535	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11536	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11537	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11538	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11539	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11540	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11541	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11542	11/7/2009	SCOPING		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
		MEETING VANCOUVER		
11543	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11544	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11545	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11546	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11547	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11548	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11549	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11550	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11551	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11552	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11553	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11554	11/7/2009	SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER		
11581	11/15/2009	ANONYMOUS		
11594	11/16/2009	ANONYMOUS		
11620	*			
11624	*			
11625	*			
11629	11/17/2009	ANONYMOUS		
11660	*			

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
11663	*			
11676	*			
11798	11/20/2009	CHERYL		
11821	11/19/2009	ANONYMOUS		
11835	*			
11862	*			
11877	*			
11879	*			
11893	*			
11954	*			
11975	11/25/2009	MONTE		
		JERRY		
11982	11/23/2009	WILLIAMSON		
11982	11/23/2009	UNKNOWN		
11995	*			
11997	*			
		SCOPING		
		MEETING		
12024	10/27/2009	AMBOY		
12043	*			
12049	*			
12070	12/3/2009	ANONYMOUS		
12073	*			
12075	12/4/2009	DAN B		
12087	*			
12105	*			
12122	*			
12125	*			
12138	12/9/2009	ANONYMOUS		
12143	*			
12154	*			
12205	*			
		RESIDENT NONE		
12208	12/12/2009	LINE #27		
12245	*			
12367	*			
12380	*			
12402	*			
12404	12/14/2009	UNKNOWN		
12404	12/14/2009	UNKNOWN		
12404	12/14/2009	UNKNOWN		

Number	Date	Name-First	Name-Last	Organization
12404	12/14/2009	UNKNOWN		
12404	12/14/2009	UNKNOWN		
12404	12/14/2009	UNKNOWN		
12404	12/14/2009	UNKNOWN		
12455	*			
12502	11/24/2009	ANONYMOUS		
12510	*			

* This communication was initially recorded as a unique communication but later determined to be a duplicate for the purposes of analysis.

Communication ID: 10000

Date: 10/12/2009

Name: ROGER

Yes, hi, I'm calling in regard to the project. I was hoping maybe there would be an online map that would have a little bit better detail. You probably have it somewhere.

My name is Roger, I'm at [Phone].

I'm on your Web site now and I don't see a better close up map. Alright, thank you and have a nice day.

Communication ID: 10001

Date: 10/13/2009

Name: HARVEY REDMOND

Hi good morning this is Harvey Redmond. I'm calling in regards to the I-5 project. What I was wondering is if I can get a better detailed map or knowledge of Section 05 and Section 08 of the proposed route segments. Specifically I was wondering how big those route segments were going to be and along what route they will follow relative to Holcomb Road. If someone could get back to me my contact information is [Phone] for phone number or you could just mail me at [Address]. Thank you very much. Bye.

Communication ID: 10002

Date: 10/12/2009

Name: LARRY BOITANO

Hello this is Larry Boitano. Say I'm just touching base with you, I just got your letter. I'm not sure exactly where this would impact me. Is this in Oregon or Washington on the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project area? I see you're adding that line or is it off 78th and 34th Avenue in Vancouver, Washington, where I own property there that's on a power grid right on the corner of 34th and 78th Street. Yeah, just let me know where that's crossing at. Or is it crossing over off of Grougar Road and the Bethany area?

[Phone] give me a call and let me know. Thanks a lot.

Communication ID: 10003

Date: 10/12/2009

Name: AILEEN KLAWITTER

Hi. My name is Aileen Klawitter. My address is [Address]. My phone number is [Phone].

I received this information packet, and from the map you know it is unclear exactly how close you are coming to my property and I guess that's my question is where, where is this going to be in relationship to my property. You know we're about 400 feet west of Pleasant Hill Road down a driveway, and I'm just wondering where this is going to be.

Anyway I'd appreciate some more information like I said I tried to go to your Web site but there were no better maps to indicate you know where exactly this is coming through. That would be my question.

Thank you. Bye.

Communication ID: 10004

Date: 10/13/2009

Name: FRANCES NORTH CUT

Yes my name is Frances Northcut. I'm with Cowlitz County Cemetery District 3 out of Woodland, Washington. Our mailing address is Cowlitz Cemetery 2,[Address]. You may reach me at home [Phone] or leave a message at [Phone].

I am requesting a more detailed map with better road coverage so that people can look at this and locate what you're talking about. You don't even have the city of Woodland on your map. Also your legend is hard to understand. Where you have segments I would like a detailed description of where the segments are going to go.

I just do not find your map conducive to be able to make comments. Because I do not feel that I can be or my commissioners can be well informed.

We have four cemeteries within our district. One is located at 3819 Lewis River Rd, the other another one is located at Darth Road. We have one in town, but I don't think looks like it is going to be involved at all. We also have one at Yale. That's why a map that actually had some towns involved or roadways that it would give us the ability to decide whether or not we need to comment or investigate further.

Hopefully that you can help us as soon as possible. It looks like the dates are coming up rather quickly. Again I gave you our mailing address and phone numbers. If you have any questions don't hesitate to call me. I would like to note our cemeteries that I have spoke about all have people buried in them.

Communication ID: 10005

Date: 10/12/2009

Name: BARBARA WRIGHT

Hello. My name is Barbara Wright. And my address is [Address], and my phone number is [Phone].

I received your mailing on the proposed new I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project Study. And I have a tower, a BP tower, at the top of my property. My property backs up to the BP area, at the top of my property, and I already have a tower. But my question is what impact - are you going to take the property? Are you just adding the lines there?

I see that it says proposed route segments, exact segment locations may change. And BP transmission lines are coming through that area. And so I - anyway my property backs up to the BP, just lost it, right-of-way, that's it, and I have a tower to the far right of my property. I wonder what impact that's going to have up there. And if you're taking property and/or evergreen trees out that are on my property and my neighbor's property to the south of me.

So, please give me a call and let me know. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10006

Date: 10/13/2009

Name: DOUG GRASSETH

This is Doug Grassette at [Address].

I have a piece of property on Mount Pleasant, [Address], which the Bonneville power line crosses. All I want to know are they going to use the existing right-of-way or is there going to be some other change. That's my only question, and you can get back at me at [Phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10007

Date: 10/13/2009

Name: MARVIN CASE

This is Marvin Case. I'm calling from the newspaper here in Battle Ground. You have mailed me maps and information about the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. And I have a question about the maps and wonder if someone can call me and help me out a little bit on the maps [Phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10008

Date: 10/13/2009

Name: JOE STELL

Hi my name is Joe Stell, my number is [Phone], and I did receive a mailing packet of the I-5 corridor segments. And what I'd like to do is get a map that shows roads so that I can see. I assume that because I got the packet at all that there was it is close to my property, but it appears that it is very close just by triangulation. So I'd like to get that map and check. It doesn't make sense that one would put such thing there. I just want to confirm that is or isn't the case. Any way, again if you could give me a call at [Phone]. I would like to get a map with roads so I can hone in on it better.

Communication ID: 10009

Date: 10/13/2009

Name: BARBARA EIGNER

Hello this is Barbara Eigner of KWIK Center LLC. I received in the mail a map concerning a proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project study. And according to the brochure there will be some meetings held in various places. The question I have: since I live in southeast Portland, is there any way I could come to a Bonneville office at the Lloyd Center and get some more information rather than going to some of these open house meetings at in Washington or wherever.

My telephone number is [Phone]. Please call me back. Goodbye.

Communication ID: 10010

Date: 10/13/2009

Name: GARY HAAG

Yes, my name is Gary Haag. And I was wondering if I could acquire a map regarding the exact route that this new line would be crossing as to whether or not it would be crossing my property, or my neighbor's property or the next neighbor's property.

My address is [Address]. My phone number is [Phone]. My cell phone is [Phone]. Hope you're having a good day. Goodbye.

Communication ID: 10011

Date: 10/14/2009

Name: DAVID PLOTZ

Hi, I'd like to be added to the mailing list. My name is David Plotz. My address is, I got look that one up, I want to send it to my office. It is, here we go, [Address]. Thank you very much. My last name is spelled Plotz.

Communication ID: 10012

Date: 10/14/2009

Name: HERRINGTON

Yes I am looking over; I live in the Salmon Creek area north of Vancouver, regarding the I-5 project. And I don't find anywhere in any of this mailing stuff, or even on the Web page you directed us to, a phone number to call other than this 800 number. So please call me.

What I'm trying to get, I'm quite disappointed that is not here unless I'm not doing something correctly, and that is a more detailed map so I can figure out where this line would go. One cannot be sure from the general map you included exactly which streets it follows or is closest to.

So I would like to get this information immediately. I don't want a bunch of run around. I don't want a bunch of waiting. I just want the phone number so I can call somebody and they can tell me how to see this more precise map.

My name is Herrington [Phone]. I'm calling Wednesday morning the 14th of October at 8:56 a.m. I'm just dying to see how long it is going to take to get the information. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10013

Date: 10/14/2009

Name: CHRISTOPHER BRAUN

Hello, my name is Christopher Braun. I have a question regarding the location of the proposed number 11 line the crossing at the Coweeman River which looks to intersect my family's property. I would need to speak to someone about that. I'd like to, I have several questions and I would like some further clarification about that map.

My telephone number is [Phone]. And again the name is Christopher Braun. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10014

Date: 10/13/2009

Name: MIKE BIELEC,KAREN J HILLER

My husband, Mike Bielec, and I would strongly object if you located new transmission lines on Ostrander Rd at a location up the hill in the residential area. I believe you have space to put lines at the bottom of the road where there is currently a utility easement of some sort (gas?). We certainly did not move to this area to live in the shadow of transmission lines.

Communication ID: 10015

Date: 10/13/2009

Name: STEVE B FAULSTICK

1. Is there a more detailed map available? 2. What do the numbers on the proposed route segments represent? 3. Are the proposed route segments options....or is this the complete plan to use all the routes outlined?

Communication ID: 10016

Date: 10/14/2009

Name: DAVID

Yeah, my name is David if you can call me in Vancouver [Phone].

I guess my question is: I live right next to the main north-south line that goes through WSU campus north and there's existing towers now. Is the new line going to be on new towers, do you know that? Or could it be suspended on existing towers that are there?

Thank you.

Communication ID: 10017

Date: 10/14/2009

Name: W.O. LINDBLAD

Please send a map of the proposed route for the new high voltage transmission line. I own property immediately north of Ross substation.

The name is Lindblad. Initials W.O. Current address [Address]. All I want is a map showing the proposed route. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10018

Date: 10/14/2009

Name: JENNIFER C HALLECK

Hello this is Jennifer Holick with the Vancouver School District. My phone number here is [Phone]. If you could please add me to your mailer and list of information for your new I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, that's a great start.

In addition to that if I could have someone give me a call back to look at a more detailed map as to where the new routes will be accessing. We are most interested in knowing if any of our properties will be impacted by the new line or areas that have not yet had right-of-way purchased.

So anyway if you can give me a jingle back at [Phone]. And my name again is Jennifer Holick, and I'm a planner with the Vancouver public school system. Thank you. Goodbye.

Communication ID: 10019

Date: 10/14/2009

Name: JACOB BOOMHOUWER

One of the alternative routes (31) looks like it goes by where we live. How do we get details on the routing to see exactly where this would go?

Communication ID: 10020

Date: 10/14/2009

Name: RICHARD B SPENCE

This new line needs to swing down through Ross sub as it will eventually need to be upgraded to 500 kV to support the Clark County region. Since most(if not all) the right away exists, it should be the best fit and minimize impact to the county. It would obviously parallel existing lines and not cross through new territory not now exposed to main grid transmission lines. Access to the new line would be better as well for maintenance purposes. The higher altitude east paths are more subject to wind, ice and snow as well, making them less reliable.

Communication ID: 10021

Date: 10/14/2009

Name: KATHY A DIETRICH

Do you have a map with street names on it? It is very difficult to figure out proposed routes from map you have on web site.

Communication ID: 10022

Date: 10/15/2009

Name: THOMAS BURKE

Hi my name is Thomas Burke. I'm with the Columbia Land Trust in Vancouver. I'm calling to request a GIS layer of the proposed corridors to see if they overlap some our conservation properties. If you could either e-mail those to me at [EMAIL] or give me a call [PHONE] to coordinate that, I would appreciate it.

Once again my name is Thomas Burke with the Columbia Land Trust.

Communication ID: 10023

Date: 10/15/2009

Name: JOHN JAMES

Hi my name is John James. Phone number is [Phone]. I live at [Address], and I got one of your fliers the other day about the reinforcement project. Wondering why I got that and my neighbors didn't. The property next to me on both sides did not get one of those fliers, and I'm wondering if one of the proposed routes will go down the natural gas pipeline which runs right through my property or if there's some other reason I got that and other people did not. So that's the information I want.

I want to know where if they are planning on, if that's one of the possible locations going through going down that natural gas pipeline. Again it is [Phone]. Bye.

Communication ID: 10024

Date: 10/15/2009

Name: RYAN KERR

My name is Ryan Kerr. My phone number is [Phone] and this will be on the I-5 Corridor project.

I was wondering what the route, segment route 31, what street or avenue that is proposed to be on. Anyways, thank you. Bye.

Communication ID: 10025

Date: 10/15/2009

Name: RONDA M SMITH,TOM SMITH

To Whom It May Concern, We recieved your mailing on this I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. With the maps provided, we could not see exactly how this will effect our property. Is it possible to send a map that shows more detail, such as roads? We would like to see how close these projected line routes may be to our property. Living in Alaska we are not able to attend any of your planned public meetings, to obtain further information. We appreciate your time in this matter. Thank You. Sincerely, Tom and Ronda Smith

Communication ID: 10026

Date: 10/15/2009

Name: SUSAN D ROSE

I recieved a packet. Does that mean my land may be affected? I live right on the river and right next to the road, with a creek bordering one of the sides. Most of my property is cliff. I don't believe it's even possible to put up lines without some sort of an impact on the environment, e.g. land slides and salmon runs. In addition, my health is already affected by magnetic frequency's, I would HAVE to move if they go in near my house. This is not o.k. What kind of compensation would WE as home owners receive so that we can move?

Communication ID: 10027

Date: 10/16/2009

Name: MACK EPPERSON

Would this affect my property located at [Address]?

Communication ID: 10028

Date: 10/16/2009

Name: DOUG GRASSETH

Hello this is Doug Grassette at [Address]. My phone number is [Phone].

Maryam was supposed, I was supposed to be able to call her. The number she left me was [Phone]. I get

no response from this number, they want to know, they want another number, her mailbox number or some [expletive] thing. Get in touch with me and see if she can straighten this out. Bonneville Power I'm on Mount Pleasant Rd. [Address]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10029

Date: 10/16/2009

Name: CHESTER HU

Hello my name is Chester Hu. I have just moved into a house in the Stony Meadows area and I'm a requesting a packet that the other members have received. I just moved in, so can you give us a call back [Phone], [Phone]. My address is [Address]. [Address], correction it is [Address].

I would like to receive one of the packets that come with the neighborhood so I can read up about it and be prepared for one of your meeting sessions. I think the next one is coming up on October 28th. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10030

Date: 10/18/2009

Name: JAMES P ROTH

My comment is very simple, we already have one behind our house interfering with our view,one's enough, put it somewhere else. Jim Roth

Communication ID: 10031

Date: 10/18/2009

Name: OLE BRAPEDERSON

Hello there my name is Ole Brapederson. I live northwest Lecenta Road. I submitted a request to be added on to your mailing list but for some reason it does not take it. My e-mail address is [e-mail]. That's [e-mail]. So please check to find out why my comment has not been submitted. I would greatly appreciate it. I think you're doing a marvelous job of keeping us all informed. Thank you very much. Hope to get information from you.

Communication ID: 10032

Date: 10/18/2009

Name: ROY CHRISTISON,MINERVA CHRISTISON,GREG R CHRISTISON

I am an executor of the estate of my parents Roy and Minerva Christison - [Address]. My parents are in receipt of documents from BPA indicating that their 272 acre farm may be on possible route for alternative leg #1 of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project. Please send me the details of where proposed segment #1 would cross at: Sec 5 and 6 Township 8N range 2W Cowlitz County Sec 31 and 32 Township 9N, range 2W Cowlitz Co. In this way I will be able to assess the impact to our farm. Our family also wants to go on record as providing input that proposed segment #1 would likely cross score of homeowners lots on Columbia Heights and be very disruptive and damaging as compared with alternative segments #2 or #3. Please remove this segment #1 divergence from route consideration.
Greg Roy Christison [Address]

Communication ID: 10033

Date: 10/19/2009

Name: GINA ANDREWS

This is Gina Andrews. We have like 3.5 miles of your lines going through our property. And I would like to be on your mailing list. It used to be Mark and Gina, but Mark passed away. Andrews, Gina Andrews [Address]. The phone number is [Phone]. I hope, I do want to get on your mailing list please. Thank you. Bye.

Communication ID: 10034

Date: 10/19/2009

Name: HOWARD FERRIS

My comments relate to the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. I'm aware of a vacant transmission line right-of-way that exists between the Swift Powerhouse on the Lewis River to Troutdale Substation in Oregon. The Study should include use of this vacant right-of-way since it would have significant reduced impacts and may only require widening rather than developing a whole new right of way. Also a double circuit 230kV line should be evaluated on this corridor as a means to accomplish the power transfer yet reduce the emf at the edge of right-of-way through cancellation of emf fields.

Communication ID: 10035

Date: 10/15/2009

Name: CHRISTOPHER BRAUN

Our property straddles the Coweeman River and it looks like segment 11 would cut right through our

property, which has been in the family for over 100 years. We have a Douglas fir tree farm that could be severely impacted by this line/right-of-way. I don't want the line here at all. We have not subdivided to keep it natural. I think our property is long enough, that no matter what, the segment would hit it. I'm concerned about the value of the property, but I am distressed about the impacts to the eagles and salmon on the property and in the river. There are some areas that have wetlands and a natural spring – don't know if they are designated.

Communication ID: 10036

Date: 10/19/2009

Name: JOEL JOHNSON

Yeah my name is Joel Johnson. I have property at [Address] and it runs from 65th Street to 63rd under the Bonneville right-of-way that goes down 63rd there.

I'm curious to know if they are going to put a new set of towers on that right-of-way. I have a cargo container parked there, and I'm just curious if I'm going to have to move it. I want to start making plans on how to clear a path for it and so forth if that's going to be necessary.

So I would like some information. I'm available at [Phone]. Please leave me a message.

Like I said if there are going to put another set of towers down that right-of-way, I'm definitely going to have to move that cargo container before they come through there. So I would like to have some information about it rather than have to do it at the last minute and get thrown into chaos here.

Anyway, appreciate your help. Joel Johnson, [Phone].

Communication ID: 10037

Date: 10/19/2009

Name: ROGER D ROOD

Yeah my name is Roger Rood and I received information about the 500 kilovolt the power line you want to put through 98606.

I need some more information about that, specifically the map does not have any of the roads in the area. It is a very vague map. I want to get some more precise information on where exactly this power line is going.

Name is Roger Rood, [Address]. So, If you can get me a map that actually has roads on it, so I can look at it so more. I'd appreciate it. Thank you so much. Bye.

Communication ID: 10038

Date: 10/19/2009

Name: BILL BRAACK

Hi good afternoon. My name is Bill Braack. I received the information in the mail today. The map however is not clear as to the placement of the new substation and the new lines. Do you have a geographical survey map where these are proposed? I'd like to see more clearly where this will flow and whether or not it traverses our property on the existing easement or if your intention is to extend the easement on our property.

I have the property at [Address]. I can't quite tell. It appears that it might be south of my location. So, if someone could return my call at [Phone] or [Phone]. Again Bill Braack, and I would like to further clarify where the substation is proposed to be located and then it appears on the map that everything is south of that location. And that will I guess tell me if it will impact my property or if I'm just in the general vicinity. I look forward to hearing from you.

Communication ID: 10039

Date: 10/19/2009

Name: CHARLES FELL

Hi I'd like to get some information concerning the I-5 Corridor Replacement Project. I got the mailing. My name is Charles Fell, by the way. My phone number is [Phone]. [Phone], my name is Charles Fell.

I'd like to get information, a better map. A better map of what the residential area that this is going nearby. I got a map that says that proposing to build, sorry the letter says they are proposing to build a new transmission line associated substations that could affect you. But I can't tell from the map, which doesn't have anything besides the freeway on there, exactly where these things are.

I assume whatever map you used to determine that it could affect me must show this in great detail. So I would like someone to call me. Maybe you can point out where on your web site or someplace that I can get a map that actually shows landmarks like streets with respect to the proposed improvements. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10040

Date: 10/13/2009

Name: MARC BOLDT,TOM MIELKE,KAREN STREETER,STEVE STUART

RE: Comments on Department of Energy I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

Dear Mr. Korsness:

Clark County is generally supportive of efforts to increase existing power transmission systems, such as the proposed project. Because the proposed project will run through Clark County, we appreciate having the opportunity to provide comment under NEPA. Given the magnitude of the project, it is important for the County to have sufficient time and information to consider and comment on the impacts of the project and to review the alternatives.

We are in receipt of your October 9, 2009 information mailing. The proposal, as shown in the map provided, will require review by Clark County Community Development, to determine if the project meets applicable county standards for development. In some cases, Clark County's code matches similar state and federal codes, but there are ordinances in which Clark County's codes are different than state or federal requirements. Additionally, if the project proposes to cross county owned property or right of way, we will need to agree upon the terms of the use of that property. We request that the Department of Energy work early and often with Clark County to ensure that all necessary reviews are completed in a timely manner.

We request to be involved with all aspects of this project that will occur within Clark County's borders. Your point of contact to coordinate/correspond with Clark County in this matter shall be Karen Streeter. Karen can be reached at (360) 397-6118 or Karen.Streeter@clark.wa.gov. Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide comment.

Communication ID: 10041

Date: 10/12/2009

Name: PAUL M. MCARTHUR,MARILYN K. MCARTHUR

There is a unique mix of wildlife in the area surrounding our residence. It includes deer, bear, bobcat, cougar, and numerous smaller animals.

It appears from the location of the stakes (pickets), placed in the right-of-way for the Power transmission lines that the habitat for these animals would be compromised.

It would also be necessary to consider the effect of the lines on the fauna in terms of exposure to the high-output lines themselves. (In terms of long-term health effects.

This is a serene environment in terms of it's un-spoiled character. The inclusion of Power Poles and the associated hardware is unthinkable from the perspective of the residents of this area.

Communication ID: 10042

Date: 10/15/2009

Name: GERALD ELLS

Run the new lines down the existing towers & right ways. Towers now have from three to six lines now. By adding lines to these tower, all these studies wouldn't be needed. Saving lots & lots of money using what you have now.

I'm sure with little engineering more lines could be added these towers. Save some money.

Communication ID: 10043

Date: 10/16/2009

Name: MACK EPPERSON

Would this affect my property located at [Address]?

Communication ID: 10044

Date: 10/17/2009

Name: KEITH R. PLACE

This is concerning the southern end of the Section 28 line: I would like to be kept in "the Loop" as our family owns about 220+ acres in that area.

Communication ID: 10045

Date: 10/16/2009

Name: JIM EYCHANER

TO: Bonneville Power Administration

FROM: Jim Eychaner, Policy and Planning

SUBJECT: I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

The Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) is a State of Washington agency responsible for grant-in-aid funding of public recreation, conservation, and habitat projects. State funds entrusted to us have been invested in parks, trails, riparian areas, wildlife habitat, and salmon habitat throughout the project's study area.

We would like to remind the Administration that RCO expects its investment to return public benefits in perpetuity. That is, any impact on a site or facility involving our grant funds must be fully mitigated. The best course of action is to avoid use of these grant-funded sites. Please have your environmental studies look not only at land use including parks, trails, and habitat, but also for any record of grant funding from RCO. Early notice of potential impacts will help us to better work with the Administration to fund alternates or appropriate mitigation solutions.

We also comment that we recognize that utility corridors can offer an opportunity to provide linear, trail-based recreation opportunities. We encourage the Administration to consider compatible trail use such as walking, cycling, and equestrian use within any corridors secured for the transmission lines.

If you have questions, please contact Jim Eychaner, Recreation and Conservation Office, PO Box 40917, Olympia, WA 98504, telephone 360-902-3011, or e-mail jim.eychaner@rco.wa.gov.

Communication ID: 10046

Date: 10/15/2009

Name: EIRIK THORSGARD MAIS

Please ensure section 106 of NHPA documents are sent to the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde:

Eirik Thorsgard Mais

9615 Grand Ronde Rd.

Grand Ronde, OR 97347

Communication ID: 10047

Date: 10/14/2009

Name: EUGENE "BUD" HARRIS

Please have your environmental studies look at: Economic design, ease of installation and access for servicing.

Proceed with all due haste. Don't get bogged down with environmental minutae. Remember these facilities are for the comfort, safety and well being of human beings.

Communication ID: 10048

Date: 10/15/2009

Name: KATHRYN M. HANSEN

I realize that you have a lot to consider. The demand for Power is increasing every day and population growing, and we need to encourage industry growth for more employment.

I have lived on my property for almost 65 years and know you may someday have to utilize your BPA right-of-way.

The map appears not to be this time. I am no help in the decision - but very interested.

Communication ID: 10049

Date: 10/15/2009

Name: BRAD HOLTEN

The impact of electromagnetic radiation on young children (5 months, 3 years, and 5 years old) living with the proposed additional power lines between I-5 and I-205.

Over the summer I noticed when I touched my children's neck close to the lines (with finger on their neck from my right and left hand) it generated a mild electric current.

Communication ID: 10050

Date: 10/20/2009

Name: JOHN "JACK" GERSTKEMPER

Yes my name is Jack Gerstkemper. Actually my legal name is John. My address is [Address]. My phone number is [Phone].

I'm looking for any written information you have on, that you're distributing to the public on this project. I have the dates for the public meetings, but usually there's some sort of document that's printed up prior to the public meetings and handed out at the public meetings. I guess what I'm asking for you to mail me a copy of that so that I can have it when I'm at the public meeting so I can give you intelligent, thoughtful feedback at the public meeting.

I, the reason I'm calling is that I believe the power line is coming within a few, within couple of 100 feet of my house. Even though I'm not a neighbor, a direct neighbor who received the initial mailing, I'm absolutely sure I'll be able to see the power line from my house and probably hear it if is big enough.

So I would appreciate any written documents you have on the environmental assessment or the proposal so I can review them before the public meetings later this month. Thank you, and call me if you have any questions at all. Bye bye.

Communication ID: 10051

Date: 10/20/2009

Name: SUSAN HILL

Hi my name is Susan Hill. I work for Nevada Power Company. And actually I'm a property owner along the existing I-5 high voltage transmission line that is one of the options through Kelso into Longview.

Because I work for a power company I have a couple of questions about the existing transmission line and what the proposal would be if you guys choose to take this route. So, I was hoping somebody could give me a call back. Someone in the development teams and talk to me a little about whether or not the existing tower is capable of also having the 500 kV line or you guys would want to put in a new tower.

If you could, give me a call [Phone]. Again my name is Susan Hill, and I work for Nevada Power Company.

Communication ID: 10052

Date: 10/20/2009

Name: CRAIG G NEWTON

This is Craig Newton. I'm not really looking to getting my comment posted online. I'm just looking for information. I have 50 acres in Yacolt, and I can't tell by your map if I'm affected or not. So I would like to know. I have two parcels up there - a 20-acre parcel, which is [Number], and a 30-acre parcel adjacent to it, which is [Number]. So my question is: are you lines going through the property, over the property, next to the property? I assuming it is somewhere close or I wouldn't have got this notice.

You can contact me by phone at area code [Phone] or e-mail at [e-mail]. That's two g's in a row - [e-mail]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10053

Date: 10/20/2009

Name: SUSAN HILL

The existing 230 kV line goes through family property and we are unable to attend the information sessions. As an engineer for a utility company, my family has asked me to review the proposal. Could someone contact me so I can ask some questions? Thanks.

Communication ID: 10054

Date: 10/15/2009

Name: JOE STELL

My property is on a peak on segment 26. If we had roads on the maps, it would help determine where the segments cross. There are a lot of alternatives that wouldn't be as high-profile. That would be a huge, huge visual impact for all of Clark County.

Communication ID: 10055

Date: 10/15/2009

Name: BARBARA EIGNER

Questions about clearing trees from her property, would like to know how the line could cross the property. Was going to be applying for forest thinning, but don't want to go through that process if we are going to clear-cut and burn. Wondering about eminent domain and vegetation maintenance under the lines. Also wondering about the impact of cutting trees on a ridge, how it could change the wind patterns. How the project would this affect the value of our property. There are some trails nearby where we have problems with ATVs and recreationist, if there was new right-of-way what would the impact be. Who would take care of the blackberries and scotchbroom?

Communication ID: 10056

Date: 10/15/2009

Name: AILEEN KLAWITTER

Our property does have wetlands – don't know if they are classified, but we get a lot of winter fowl. Railroad tracks run west of our property, if you run east of the tracks, you'll run into a pond that crosses several properties. There are some low lands that were flooded in 1996-1997.

Communication ID: 10057

Date: 10/15/2009

Name: BARBARA WRIGHT

Our property has a hill, if you took part of the property, you'd have to do something to the hill and there are some undesignated wetlands on our property and the nearby property has a large pond. Other nearby properties have designated wetlands and a church and a field. BPA has already taken two or three of the evergreens from my property. Would hope that we wouldn't take any more trees or landscape because it could destroy the ecology of the area. We have small ponds where mallards come through. The Grey Hawk Estate property nearby, their yards back up to the right-of-way, so if you had to

take more, you'd be taking their yards. I will try to attend a public meeting.

Communication ID: 10058

Date: 10/18/2009

Name: DINO FRANCHIIVO

My questions is what is this going to cost the electrical users.

Communication ID: 10059

Date: 10/13/2009

Name: RICHARD C. BOEHM

I am absolutely not interested in any transmission lines going anywhere near my property!

You should use undeveloped forest lands for this, not residential property!

I just built our life-long dream home on this property 4 years ago and am very opposed to it!

Communication ID: 10060

Date: 10/13/2009

Name: DOUG GRASSETH

My Parcel No. [Number]

The address is [Address].

I would like to know how it affects my property. If the 300 ft. right of way is enough. The area(?) that is already cleared.

Communication ID: 10061

Date: 10/13/2009

Name: JAMES KAMERATH

Please have your environmental studies look at: North and East of Lake Merwin and in the corridor that extends through Camas near Lacamas Lake and Oak Park.

Will you be using the existing ROW that extends through Camas near Oak Park and continues on over the Columbia River? I am concerned that this ROW may be widened which would encroach upon

existing housing developments.

Communication ID: 10062

Date: 10/20/2009

Name: GILBERT LAWRENCE

Yeah, this is Gilbert Lawrence. The phone number [Phone]. You have recently addressed the data on the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

We own the property at [Address] which is what the address on the envelope. However our mailing address should be [Address]. There were numbers up above, I'll repeat those - [Number] and then there's an [Number]. Hopefully you can correct the address on that. Thank you very much. Bye.

Communication ID: 10063

Date: 10/20/2009

Name: ROGER D ROOD

It has been brought to our attention that BPA is proposing running a 500-kilovolt transmission line through our neighborhood. There are several routes proposed many running on private property instead of state property. Coming through our neighborhood is not necessary. On the BPA web site it states in two different places that a 150 ft easement is the proper size for such towers and transmission lines. The easement that runs through our neighborhood is only 100 ft wide. Many homes in our neighborhood are built right on this line. The power lines being used, running directly through our neighborhood would decimate our land values. The easement that exists was conceived in 1958 before these neighborhoods existed and being only two thirds of the proper size, is simply not big enough to handle such a power line. As long as there is state land that can be used which has the proper amount of space required I see no reason for you to impact our lives in such a profound manner. For many of us our homes are by far our largest investment in our futures and this would make them unsell-able at a fair market value.

Communication ID: 10064

Date: 10/20/2009

Name: CAROLYN J RINTA

Communication ID: 10065

Date: 10/21/2009

Name: CRYSTAL E SUTTON

Communication ID: 10066

Date: 10/21/2009

Name: KENNETH R PRITCHARD

I'm interested in section 31 as shown in the Reflector on Oct. 21, 2009. What is the closest distance my property is from section 31? Your map on this website does not show Battle Ground.

Communication ID: 10067

Date: 10/21/2009

Name: SALLY E GARRIGUES

Communication ID: 10068

Date: 10/21/2009

Name: CAROLE LARSEN

Yes, my name is Carole Larsen. My phone number is [Phone]. I have received that packet for the reinforcement study. And I have looked at the map, and I can't figure out, there's nothing in there, nothing in anything that says what all these numbers are all over the map. Like, let's see, on the transmission line south of me, Numbers 48 and 50 and I don't see what they refer to. So I would appreciate if you would enlighten me, but I've looked all over it - nothing there. Thanks. Bye.

Communication ID: 10069

Date: 10/22/2009

Name: KAY HENDERSON

The map you sent out is not clear. I can't tell if the whole 09 line is going to be new, whether that's reinforcing the line that's already there. If it is a new one, then clearly it's going to block a whole lot of vision that we have. And it is bad enough having one running through the back of our property, I certainly don't want to have one running through my view corridor in addition to it.

So, if you could put out a map with regular street names and maybe links to GoogleMap or something, so we can see exactly what we're going to have to look at it sure would be helpful in planning where

these lines go.

Can't they be sent underground? This is pretty ugly. Thanks.

Communication ID: 10070

Date: 10/22/2009

Name: BILL BOATMAN

TEP-TPP-3

Is this meeting still on schedule? [Arrow to BPA letter announcing project and scoping: "We do not plan to give a formal presentation at the meetings, so come anytime between 4 and 7 p.m. We will have maps and other information available about the project and several members of the project team will be available to answer your questions, listen to your ideas, and accept your comments."]

Communication ID: 10071

Date: 10/22/2009

Name: R.A. TAFOLLA

I would like to know what impact the 500 KV line is going to have on my property. I am in segment 107. I was told that there's a chance it may not follow the same path as the now existing 230 KV line, due to large part, to system reliability concerns. But if and line is built along the Ross-McNary corridor what effect would this have on home and land values in and around the new 500 KV line? Worst case scenario, what would BPA do in the event that the line would actually be too close to our home or actually have to be built over our house? Would BPA be willing to move it? Or buy this house from us? How would the land and house be assessed? Thank you, look forward to the local meetings

Communication ID: 10072

Date: 10/21/2009

Name: W.O. LINDBLAD

I'm concerned about you cutting the trees that fill the easement down to the railroad tracks. I'm also concerned about a family of deer that come back to the area every year. We've had as many as 15 deer in some years. I know that the spot directly to the west of us would be developing an 18-lot subdivision directly north of your easement, which might be a problem for you. That easement of yours is beautiful wildlife habitat. If you cross the west side of our property and down at the corner, the survey posts are in conflict with the new survey. You may need to look at the survey conflict: may include your access to

a drain pipe.

Communication ID: 10073

Date: 10/22/2009

Name: PAUL A KINGSTON,KAREN KINGSTON

Yes please include us on your mailing list. I'm trying to do it on line and it is not accepting it for some reason.

First name is Paul. My name is Karen. Paul's middle initial is A. Our last name is Kingston. Our address is [Address]. We are private citizens. Please add us to your project mailing list. I would like a notification letter by mail. I would like a printed copy of the EIS and a printed copy of the summary EIS. Please get back to us if you can and let us know that has been verified. I appreciate it. Thank you very much. Our home number is [Phone]. Thank you. Bye-bye.

Communication ID: 10074

Date: 10/22/2009

Name: KAREN KINGSTON

The map online and map sent via ground mail does not include street/avenue information for exact location of the proposed lines. Therefore, I am unable to comply and submit valid input under the requirements for public comment. Without this information I cannot arrive at the public meetings prepared. I cannot offer information and input regarding wetlands or any other information I am privi to without detailed maps and access to exact location of your proposal. Your notification to the public is incomplete, vague, and denies process within timelines.

Communication ID: 10075

Date: 10/22/2009

Name: KATHY AYERS,ROBERT AYERS

We received notice today of a request to enter our property as part of the I-5 corridor project. In looking at the original information we received none of the proposed paths were close to our property, what has changed? Robert & Kathy Ayers

Communication ID: 10076

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: JULIANA G BUTLER,GARY BUTLER

Good morning. This is Ms. Butler, and I am on your contact list. My address is [Address]. Phone number [Phone].

I would like someone to call me back please regarding your I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project. Because I would like some clarification on your maps. I'd liked to see exactly which proposed line over is going potentially over my property. I think I understand it but I want to verify that, because on your Web site it does not allow one to even plug in their address to see where they are.

If you would be so kind to call me back. [Phone]. I would appreciate that. Today's Friday, the 23rd. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10077

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: GUY E. NEWTON

From those of us who live on proposed route 31. It has been brought to our attention that BPA is proposing running a 500-kilovolt transmission line through our neighborhood. This is not a line for neighborhood use but to connect substation to substation. There are several routes proposed many running on private property instead of state property. Coming through our neighborhood is not necessary. On the BPA web site it states that a 150 ft easement is the proper size for such towers and transmission lines. The easement that runs through our neighborhood is only 100 ft wide. As you can imagine these being the largest power lines being used, running directly through our neighborhood would decimate our land values. The easement that exists was conceived in 1958 before these neighborhoods existed and being only two thirds of the proper size, is simply not big enough to handle such a power line. Being your constituents we seek your help to ensure that our homes and nest eggs be protected from such an unnecessary calamity.

Sincerely, Guy Newton

Communication ID: 10078

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: JIM B WOOD

We are strongly voicing our vote against the proposed route of the power line through the Hockinson residential area on 147th St.

Communication ID: 10079

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: ROBERT J STEEL

Please find alternative route for 500 kilovolt transmission lines instead of our neighborhood. We can not afford de-valuation of or health and land!!!

Communication ID: 10080

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: KAY CURRIER, DAVID CURRIER

We just received a letter informing us that our home and property may be part of segment for the "I-5 Corridor Project". Our parcel was identified in the letter. We live on one treed acre north of Lacamas lake (habitat surrounds) Property and homes on both sides of us received maps ,but no letter. We received letter but no maps... does this mean we are singled out ? We are the original owners..31 years. We have spent thousands to remodel-landscape etc. We are both retired now and on Social Security. I am 74 yrs and my wife 63. Obviously we are concerned about our future ...how will we live...,loss of value to our property etc. Can we get a definitive map to show how this can impact us ? We would appreciate any information beyond the forthcoming meeting in Camas Nov.3. Are we required by law to return "permission to enter property " letter now or later ?? Wwe have concern re damage they may cause, where we would have to clean up etc. Hope you understand our concerns. Sincerely Dave and Kay Currier Cell anytime..[phone] [e-mail] [fax]

Communication ID: 10081

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: MARI C CAMPUZANO

Yesterday, I received a letter accompanied by a "Permission to Enter Property" release, urging me to release my rights and allow the US Department of Energy BPA to survey my land, cut my trees up to 2 feet in diameter, dig test holes of up to 2 yards of soil, and appraise my house. I am already distressed over the "proposed" transmission lines in our serene area. We are a close knit community of people who cannot afford to suffer the consequences of moving our homes, businesses, and children to a different area. Most of us have moved to this area to enjoy the top rated schools, country atmosphere, and small community closeness. I personally have a home business that would be destroyed, affecting my current and future income for many years should BPA decide to take my home for the purposes of imminent domain. There are many, many other routes of transmission that could totally avoid most residences in this area. I believe it to be irresponsible by the engineers planning this project to suggest that transmission line #31 even be on the radar. Transmission line #31 would wipe out hundreds of homes,

decimate property values, displace possibly hundreds of home businesses, and displace hundreds of children and families from their schools and communities. The other proposed routes seem far less irresponsible as they mainly go through land that the state already owns. Environmental impact would be minimal in these areas as they are already clearcut, have hundreds of roads and provide much access. The argument that the roads are inaccessible in the winter is illegitimate. Just ask the Clark County Sherriff or BLM how many people go to Larch mountain in the winter and drive up and down the mountain.

Communication ID: 10082

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: JOE X SCHMOE

Please publish maps with streets included. It makes it very difficult for private property owners to determine where the lines will be put.

Communication ID: 10083

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: DAVID J SCHULTZ

I am not able to see the details for your assesment of route on the map you made available to the general public. Please send me a copy of a map that shows the detail of your proposed project that will directly affect my property located at [Address] so that I can be prepared for the upcoming meetings.

Communication ID: 10084

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: KATHIE M HUSTER, MARILYN D LANDERS

To Whom it May Concern: Re: the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. My sister, Marilyn Landers and I (Kathie Huster) own approx 39.39 acres bordering an existing BPA Above Ground Power Line at [Street] - Legal Description #29 of SEC [Number] Clark County, WA. In light of the existing very large power line being unsightly and the unknown medical risks associated with such, I am not in favor of any additional above ground lines anywhere in the vicinity of our property. With limited information available at this time, permission to access our property for any reason (test soil, survey, appraise etc.) is not granted. We plan to attend mtgs.

Communication ID: 10085

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: MARILYN D LANDERS

In looking at the maps included with our notice for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, we cannot determine where exactly your proposed line is located in relationship to our property. Please send us the details of the proposed route for Parcel [Number] Sec [Number], Clark County, WA. We already have an existing transmission line the full length of our eastern property line. It is not only an eyesore, but we have health concerns about the long term exposure to the high voltage lines. Our suggestion is that these lines and future lines be buried underground. Surely the cost of burying these lines on existing right of ways would be less costly than buying more property and exposing more people to more long term high voltage lines. (Sweden comes to mind) The value of our property and others along the route would be negatively impacted with another above ground transmission line.

Communication ID: 10086

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: JON VANDERBOUT

Hi this is John Vanderbout. My number is [Phone].

We received your initial letter about the project which includes a very lovely map that has absolutely no street indicators, so you have any ideas on where it is or what you're talking about. I've now received a second mailing that says you want to come in and appraise my property. Needless to say I'm a little upset out of the clear blue that seems kind of contrary to your original letter. If someone could get back to me that would be very nice. Keep smiling.

Communication ID: 10087

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: LYNN K CHMELIR

The map for your project does not include street names, so it is impossible to see where the lines actually may go. Will you please send me a map of points 36 through 51 that includes the streets? Without that, I have no idea where you may build this thing. We got a letter asking for permission to enter our property. We live in the middle of a subdivision on a small lot. If you dig holes, will you replace the landscaping as well as fill the holes? Will you actually consider building a power line through the middle of a subdivision? If such a thing happened, do you compensate nearby homeowners for the loss in property value that occurs from living under or near a power line? Thanks, Lynn Chmelir

Communication ID: 10088

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: ANDREW C COBURN

I am on the running line, and I do not want to see the lines. But this is a project that must be done. The grid must be updated across the USA. With out these updates our ability to transmit power with out a loss and to make us more competative. The costs over time will be hundreds of times more expensive than it is now. I know this coment will not be liked by most people, but it is the only thing we can do to help ourselves. Thank You Andy Coburn

Communication ID: 10089

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: AMANDA E BELL

I just bought a new house in lexington and I feel that this project will deperciate the value of our homes becasue no one wants to live under large powerline, not to mention that it will disrupt the scenery. I think if you do have to run lines through a residentail area they should have to be required to be underground becuase you are destroying people neighborhoods and investments. I hope that you will strongly consider the residents objection to these lines in our neighborhood and thank you for your time.

Communication ID: 10090

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: BEVERLY A GOMEZ

We recieved the notice today about the possibility of a sub station in our Camping Resort which also happens to be an animal reserve. My comment is we hope you can find a location outside of the Campers Hideaway since there appears to be many open spaces in that particular area. Sincerely Beverly Gomez

Communication ID: 10091

Date: 10/24/2009

Name: ALAN R. LYONS

BPA should investigate the possible use of superconductor cables for expanding their transmission requirements. Superconductor cables would alleviate citing problems and facilitate public support since the cables would be buried and not an eyesore as overhead copper cables. Additionally superconductor cables are capable of transmitting more power without power loss.

Communication ID: 10092

Date: 10/24/2009

Name: HELEN S. LEHNER

The map I received is inadequate. Please send something that reflects the road system. I have received a letter requesting permission to access our property for various purposes. Without an accurate map, I do not have enough information to prepare an appropriate response.

Communication ID: 10093

Date: 10/24/2009

Name: ROBERT J. BOYLE

I moved to this area 18 months ago to fulfill a dream of living in the Pacific Northwest. My wife and I specifically searched for property that was not near electric power lines. I am completely opposed to this project. If you want to place these lines in existing residential areas why don't you put them underground? I received your "Fact Sheet" in the mail however, it does not explain exactly where the lines will go. I request a response stating exactly where the proposed lines would go. Thank you, Bob Boyle

Communication ID: 10094

Date: 10/24/2009

Name: ROBERT K. HICKEY

Your map is very broad, can you provide a more detailed map showing the proposed route as it pertains to our property.Parcel [Number]. I can not determine if we are involved with segments 20 / 21 / 22 or 19? Use #2 & 9, that way it will provide additional resources at Lexington Sub. bob

Communication ID: 10095

Date: 10/24/2009

Name: JOHN R. HANCOCK, JONI E. HANCOCK

Please have your environmental studies look at not destroying the pristine nature of Fargher Lake Valley (flats). Routing the Power lines so as not to be an obstruction for the many residents that live on the perimeter of the Townsend Farms blueberry operation that lies in middle of the Fargher Lake flats.

We moved here specifically because we found a property with an unobstructed view of the valley. We moved here from Nevada. Our neighbors moved here from California, others from the Portland area.

They all feel the same way. This is a bedroom resident area for commuters who work in Portland. My other neighbor is a Portland Metro police officer. I assure you we will be at your meetings and will sign as many petitions necessary for you to reroute this project to run along a more commercial corridor - many upscale residential properties will be affected by your proposed route!

Communication ID: 10096

Date: 10/24/2009

Name: WILLIAM D. INGEMANSON

I am concerned about several issues regarding the proposed power line project

Communication ID: 10097

Date: 10/25/2009

Name: KIM BISHOP

Hi, my name is Kim Bishop. I would like to be put on your mailing list for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. My address is [Address]. Phone number is [Phone].

Communication ID: 10098

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: ROBERT W LITTLETON

Today I received a short letter from BPA asking permission to enter our property for the purposes of surveying a route through my property. I did not give my permission and I do not want lose my house. Our lot is less than one acre. We are semi-retired and moved here for the setting and because it was affordable. Since we are seniors, we plan to stay here until we die.

Communication ID: 10099

Date: 10/25/2009

Name: KATHRYN A. RICCIO

Yikes, this sounds huge! I am very concerned, however I am unable to attend any of the scheduled public comment meetings since my primary place of residence is currently in Alaska. I have no plans to be in WA or OR during the meeting times. I have received correspondence that states that my WA property may be affected by this project. This is my planned retirement property, and I am dismayed to think of a 500 kilovolt transmission line being installed close by or losing my property altogether. I realize this may never come to pass, but you've got the attention of my husband and I. Please keep me

on the mailing list and informed.

Communication ID: 10100

Date: 10/25/2009

Name: JOHN A LASATER

I have been requested to submit a Permission to Enter Property for Parcel ID [Number] regarding the I5 Transmission Project. We live a hundred years or so from the edge of the current transmission lines. I don't see how our property should be "purchased" or even considered for purchase given the very large right of way for the current lines. I would like to hear from someone regarding the need for my property to be surveyed and the reason why I might have my property "purchased."

Communication ID: 10101

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: PAUL C COFFIN

The small scale map that you have provided does not provide me with adequate detail to determine where the proposed routes are actually located. I am concerned mainly about the proposed route # 31. Are more detailed maps available? Thanks for the help. Paul Coffin

Communication ID: 10102

Date: 10/25/2009

Name: JOHN C LAMB

We moved here to be away from power lines. We do understand the need for transmission lines. However it seems to us that the easterly alternate routes would have much less impact on the more populated area of the west route. The westerly route is in a more populated area which is just a few hundred feet of our home, which rather terrifies my wife and I. We understand that there are inconclusive studies at this time in regards to health and living close to these transmission lines. However they are unsightly and noisy. They will also take away everything we (us and our neighboring properties) have worked our entire lives for (property values). Bottom line is we do not want overhead transmission lines through our properties. Sincerely, John Lamb

Communication ID: 10103

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: ANDREA K LANGE

The I-5 corridor project should be done in such a way as to impact as few people as possible. If it must be done close to housing, this should be underground. This may cost more, but would be offset by helping to minimize any decrease in home values.

Communication ID: 10104

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: JEFFREY T LINDBERG

Communication ID: 10106

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: NORMAN G RINDAL

I expect this to be the first of a few of these. I live across the street from a property whose owners have received a notice/request to investigate their property for a tower base. At this time, and with no other more precise information, we are concerned with the effects to the value of our property (this was a hot topic on Saturday on the street). This, of course, led to the question of compensation for a drop in property values. Extrapolations sent many neighbors home with worried expressions, facial and vocal. See you Wednesday. Norm

Communication ID: 10107

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: GEORGE W PITTENGER

I would like to know if my property is being considered for an easement or are you planning on taking our house away from us. George Pittenger, [Address].

Communication ID: 10108

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: SCOTT J HARSHBARGER

My property appears to be the point at the edge of I-5 that poses the best perch to span from the east side of freeway to the west side. I have 2 questions. If the transmission lines go up and i am not required to move, how will the static electricity and electromagnetic effect of electric transmission affect the titanium plate in my neck? Are there health considerations for me? I am willing to consider relinquishing my place at current market rates in the future but, will you be able to preserve my financial position as we are a fixed income family?

Communication ID: 10109

Date: 10/25/2009

Name: MARYAM ASGHARIAN

Communication ID: 10110

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: ROB A DRUSHELLA

Communication ID: 10111

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: HOLAHAN P SHAUN

Hello I live in the area of route 31. Actually the lines and tower would be right next to my HOME as well as many of my neighbors. For obvious reasons I do not want the power lines and towers there. I have looked at the maps you sent and there appears to be several other less populated routes. Please do not put the lines next to my home. I have invested a lot of time, effort, and money into my home and do not want it wasted by your project Thank you for your time Shaun Holahan

Communication ID: 10112

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: ANDREW C COBURN

Dear Mr. Allen,

Please do not give up on the I-5 corridor project. I am on the running line and I really do not want to look at the lines. But this update in transition lines is necessary and must be done!

Your Cooperation is invited

Andy Coburn

Communication ID: 10113

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: WILLIAM MUSGROVE

Hi my name is William Musgrove. I live in Kelso, Cowlitz County. I have received a permission to enter property request. My parcel ID number [Parcel], and I'm just wanting more information about this project coming through our neighborhood or possibly the proposed project.

Can you please give me a call at [Phone]? Thank you. Bye.

Communication ID: 10114

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: BONITA PITTENGER

Yes this is Bonita Pittenger. My phone number is [Phone]. We live at [Address]. And we would like to know if our house is being considered for an increased easement or are you planning on taking our house and we making us move.

Please give us a call. We are very upset about this and would like to have someone talk to us. Our area code is [Phone]. Please return our call. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10115

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: GEORGIA MUSICK,JAMES MUSICK

Hi, this is Mr. Musick. I just got a letter saying you'd probably be taking some land, but you showed me a map that didn't really correspond to anything that I could make out, so anyway, I need to get more details. I wish you had it on your website so you could basically put in your, you know, tax ID , property parcel number, or just something where you could get an idea. Anyway, some of these meetings will probably will open that up. Anyway, I need to get a lot more information, hopefully I will get that at the meetings. The number is [Phone], and if I'm not there, talk to Mrs. Muzick, Georgia Muzick.

Communication ID: 10116

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: JAMES CYRILIUS

Hi, I'm James Cyrilius. I have some property off of St. Johns and Minnehaha Street. I was wondering if you are planning on increasing your existing easement or just putting stuff on the one that you have

now. My concern is that I have a building that's partially on your right-of-way or your land, but I don't know how much of it is on there and how much of it isn't. I need to know how long I have to get that off and where the boundaries are. I'd like to have somebody call me back. I really need to talk to somebody. My number, my callback number is [Phone]. My address is [Address]. Just have a lot of concerns and a lot of juices flowing right now that probably don't need to be, but I need to have closure on some of it. Thank you much. Bye.

Communication ID: 10117

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: GARY CLEMENTS

Yes, this is Gary Clemens. [Address]. Just received your information packet and I would like a lot of information on a detailed map of my area and the proposal for where your new lines are going through and would like that sent to my home to view and to look at. This is very vague, the map that you sent and it doesn't show the streets, addresses, and it's unacceptable for me to even look at. So, please send that information and your proposal about my area that's going to be impacted, or may be impacted, and I will get back to you after I see that. Thank you. Bye.

Communication ID: 10118

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: DENISE J MASON

1. The map you sent does not include streets, so it's hard to see the exact proposed route of the towers/lines. Is it possible to see the exact proposed route in a close-up of our neighborhood? 2. How big are the towers/lines and what is the voltage or amount of EMF emitted from them? 3. Who needs this power? Is it for SW WA & Oregon, or is it to sell to CA? And currently, what percentage of our power do we sell to CA? 4. Why not locate these lines to the East, through the foothills that are uninhabited? 5. Are there any alternative sources of power being considered?

Communication ID: 10119

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: TERRIE A SPINDLE

I would like a map showing exactly how route 03 might impact our land at [Address]. I see no reason to create a line over new land in this area when you can follow an existing line shown as 02 and 09 on the map. A line as shown on 03 would destroy the value of our lands, our future plans to develop our lands not to mention the environmental impact. I am dead set against this unnecessary invasion of property.

Terrie Spindle

Communication ID: 10120

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: HOWARD D LOCKWOOD

Is it possible to add a 500kV line to any of the existing towers on existing BPA right-of-way?

Communication ID: 10121

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: JULIANA G BUTLER

Number one, let it be known we do NOT want any electrical towers, power lines, or substations, etc., anywhere near or in the We do not want anyone trespassing on our property. We do not want any substations, towers or cables in or around our area. this would be a detriment to wildlife, human life, and the overall beauty of our land area of our neighborhood or homes, or property. On the other hand, I have several questions about this issue: --what about the quality of life for deer, salmon, and other wildlife? --what is the impact to our water shed? our existing streams? --what about erosion issues when they 'break up' the land? --how much of our existing property 'could' be involved? --will more roads have to be put in to accommodate your workers? --who has to pay for this project? --how does this affect our taxes? --will there be a tax break for land prime real estate, once it is considered less desirable or destroyed by this project? --why can't you expand on the existing corridor rather than breaking ground in our neighborhood? --what about electrical 'radiation' from the electrical currents and towers? --what about the impact the "constant hum" the towers emit to humans and animals? --where are the studies from other areas in the United States that show this has an impact on human and animal life? (similar to the wind turbines that have caused loss of life to eagles, hawks, and bats). --what about the increase in diseases and cancer from living under or near the towers and lines? --why can't it be placed underground rather than overhead? --if you do put in a line, why are you not putting a fiberoptic cable in while you are there rather than having to come back later? --what happens to if a tower crashes onto our property during a storm? are we going to be reimbursed for the damages for loss of life or property? --what does maintaining the corridor mean? how are they going to maintain the corridor? how often should we expect workers to cross our property? --is the new power going to be used for the pacific northwest or sent to california? --will our power/electrical rates drop if our land is compromised with the towers and lines? --if we are supporting neighboring states with power produced in our immediate area we should get a very good indefinite reduction in our power rates. --what is the BENEFIT to us living here? --would any of the BPA staff members build a home near a tower, live under one of the towers themselves, or allow their family member to live under or near one? Juliana G. Butler

Communication ID: 10122

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: STEVE POLKOW,MRS. STEVE POLKOW

How can we get a map with enough detail so that we can determine if either our business or home is involved? I think many people would appreciate more detail.

Communication ID: 10123

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: KIMBERLY K KINDIG

I am very concerned about the impact that your proposed high voltage power line that would run through Lake Merwin Campers Hideaway (LMCH). I am not just concerned about this because I have a site that is located in the path of a proposed area but because of the impact that it would have on the campground as a whole. There are very few campgrounds that are set up like LMCH and to run your high voltage power line through the campground in any location would virtually destroy the purpose for those of us who invested in the campground. The views, the quiet and peaceful tranquility, natural vegetation, the lake, the wildlife etc. would be altered forever. We urge you to put your high voltage power line down the I-5 corridor, it has already lost it's pristine nature and another power line would not deter from any of the views that one has while driving.

Communication ID: 10124

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: JOHN A LASATER

My name is John Lasater. I received some information regarding the I-5 corridor construction.

I live in the Washougal city limits. I was sent a letter stating that someone would need to come on site or needed permission to come on site, and that if there was expansion I would be paid a certain amount for my house. I would prefer to have more information on the potential for my house to be condemned or to be purchased. This is certainly something that is a surprise to me.

So I would appreciate knowing whether my particular tax lot was just included in this particular area or if there's good chance that there might actually be expansion of the current lines a few 100 yards to either side involving my home.

You can reach me at [Phone]. That's John Lasater at [Phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10125

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: SHELIA BALDWIN, MARVIN ALLEN MAIN

Hi my name is Shelia Baldwin. I'm calling for myself and Marvin Allen Main concerning this project. I believe that a mailer was missed for us.

We own two parcels involved in this quest. So if you could give me a call back at [Phone], that is my work number, or [Phone] that is my cell. All my neighbors got a follow up letter and I don't remember seeing that. I will be at the Amboy Middle School tomorrow night for the first meeting.

Again my name is Shelia Baldwin, and I would appreciate a call back. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10126

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: TERRIE A SPINDLE

This is Terrie Spindle and I am on your mailing list. What I would like is a more detailed map of the Pleasant Hill area where you went on Number 3 choice of where you're wanting to put this line.

My phone number is [Phone]. If it is mailing Terrie Spindle, [Address]. I would hope to get the information before the meeting this coming Thursday. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10127

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: KEN CHRYSLER

Yeah this is Ken Chrysler. I have questions about the I-5 Corridor Project. I want to talk to the project manager; I believe it is Mark Korsness.

You can call me back at [Phone] or at home in the evenings [Phone]. I would appreciate it. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10128

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: CHARLOTTE DANEBURG

Yes I have a question. The map you sent us, it doesn't appear that the segment is close enough to justify our receiving the mailing where you say in your literature you'll be mailing to parties within a mile and a quarter of a new right-of-way or 500 feet of an old one.

Now I want to know if there's some place I can get information as to exactly where these segments are located versus our properties.

My name is Charlotte Daneburg my number [Phone]. I would appreciate a call back. I don't want to have to go to a meeting just to ask a question. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10129

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: DENNIS GASTON

We find it very difficult to provide constructive comments with the limited information you have supplied to date. How are we to determine where our property is, in relation to your proposed routes? Your Project Study Area Map does not include Street, Ave., or Co. Rds. How are we suppose to obtain this information without being provided a complete map? We live out of state and are not able to attend the listed meetings. We will await your answer.

Communication ID: 10130

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: LARA B FOWLER

Communication ID: 10131

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: MICHAEL RICHARD THOMMES

We recently purchased property and membership at lake merwin campers hidaway and it is a great concern of mine to find out that it is under considerartion as a line route. This location is a pristine piece of property that we(1500 members use as vacation and get away to enjoy life. By running transmission lines through this property would significantly change the dynamic of this beautiful place. LMCH has been carefully maintained and controlled to be a peaceful with a wilderness feel to it. Coming on to the property and seeing transmission lines would totally ruin the "feel" of the place. We spent a lot of money on our place specifically for that "feel" and the ability to enjoy the whole area. Thank you

Communication ID: 10132

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: STEPHEN C RAPALUS

My property is at [Address]. How can I find my property location on your project map?

Communication ID: 10133

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: PAUL J MCTAVISH

My family has been associated with Lake Merwin Camper's Hideaway for nearly 30 years. Our place is in the woods, quiet and we have created our vacation escape which we want to enjoy for many years to come. I just received your letter for permission to enter my property for the proposed transmission line route. Honestly, it made me feel sick to even think that the BPA is considering going through our area! I am strongly in disagreement with this notion and will oppose any and all movement toward the placement of new lines in the Campers Hideaway.

Communication ID: 10134

Date: 10/26/2009

Name: CHRISTINE R SUTHERLAND

BPA has proposed the use of one of the two north/south routes. I ask that on behalf of the livability, safety and beauty of these close in, country homesteads please utilize the most eastern route of connection. Keep necessary but intrusive power lines far from where we all live. Christine Sutherland

Communication ID: 10135

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: MARTHA L JUHOLA

We received both the general information and a second mailing form requesting our permission for access to our property. As with other concerned citizens it seems we are potentially at risk of losing our property, portions of it along with our small business. Our land includes a year long stream, pond, vegetation, fir, alder, cedars, natural forest foilage etc. We have wildlife i.e. crawdads, NW red turtles, bass, blue herons, ducks, dear etc. that utilize our property. In addition we live and work here, we want to maintain our home/ property and have planned improvements. Hopefully your process is clear, expedient and fair. I certainly feel deeply for all other land owners affected by this news. Hopefully we will not all be "kept up in the air" since this has been a particularly and historically difficult time for all of

us. Sincerely, Martha Juhola (by the way researching the affects of EMF's is quite concerning as we have many neighbors with children, and our grandchildren vist often)

Communication ID: 10136

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: JULIE D COOP

We live near existing BPA lines. We have found the BPA to be bad neighbors at best. They tend to be a arrogant and inconsistent when managing the space below their power lines. Get statements in legally binding documents about how they will manage the space and vegetation. Personnel changes at governmental agencies have precluded our neighborhood from retaining 40-yr old trees because they decided to exercise their right-of-way with a scorched-earth policy directly through a city park. I sincerely doubt they have learned from their recent dealings in our city neighborhoods. So I, with the voice of experience, encourage all landowners and affected citizens to approach the BPA with skepticism, get deeply involved, and get everything in writing.

Communication ID: 10137

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: JOHN R. HANCOCK

Please Provide a detailed satellite map with landmarks for your proposed I-5 Corridor reinforcement..especially the Fargher lake area..I have recieved a request for you to enter my property with engineers. Your map shows NO detail..

Communication ID: 10138

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: CHARLES FELL

The area near our neighborhood, around segments 40-41 is a 100-year floodplain and wetland.

Communication ID: 10139

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: DAPHNA

Hello my name is Daphna, and I want to attend the Amboy Middle School public scoping meeting this evening. I was wondering if it is from 4-7, and I didn't know if there which times people can make

comments in that window.

If you could please give me a call back as to the schedule of what's going to be occurring between 4 and 7 that would be great. I'm at [Phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10140

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: ROBERT W LITTLETON

Yes, my name is Bob Littleton. I'm at [Phone], and I am very much opposed to the way this is being handled. I get a note asking for someone to have access to my property to cut down trees, to dig holes and so forth. And we have a one-acre parcel and I don't want it taken over. We're going to stay in this house.

I just would like someone to talk to about this to see what the heck's going on, and to send me a detailed map of the route, not the map that came in the package in the mail because that thing is useless. You can't tell where the line is going or anything. This is really poorly done.

Any way I'm at [Address]. I would appreciate someone getting back to me. I left a comment on the Web site. The day I left it, the next day I checked it, it was gone it wasn't there. And now when I went on it today the comment section is not working on the Web site, so I thought you ought to know. Any way I look forward to talking to someone please. Thanks.

Communication ID: 10141

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: DAVID KNODE

Hi my name is David Knode. I'm a branch manager with Coldwell Banker Barbara Sue Seal Properties in Vancouver. I'm curious as to what the potential line routes might be for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement, so I may let my agents know and the potentials of disclosures for clients.

So I would appreciate a call. David Knode, Coldwell Banker Barbara Sue Seal Properties. I'm the branch manager, area code [Phone]. [Phone]. Thank you very much.

Communication ID: 10142

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: PHILIP F CORDOVA

I received a letter requesting permission to enter my property at the above address. I do not wish to give permission for you to enter my property and clear brush or trees or dig holes. There doesn't appear to be any place on the forms you sent allowing me to decline access. I assume by not signing and returning the forms I am declining access. Further, if BPA personnel or anyone BPA contracts with enters my property and does damage to trees and or structures I assume I have the right to sue for damages in a Federal court. Respectfully, Philip Cordova

Communication ID: 10143

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: JOY WALDEN

I know that the federal government will do whatever it thinks is best regardless of the input from the citizens that are being affected. However, my request is that the decision be made quickly so the negative impact is stopped for those that are not going to have the transmission lines built on their personal property. The decision process dragging out is to no property owner's benefit as their property will be difficult to sell (except at a huge discount) and nobody wants to make repairs or upgrades to their property when the government will come in and buy for pennies on the dollar. Just do what you are going to do and get it over with.

Thank you!

Communication ID: 10144

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: DAVID J ODELL

The Project Study Area Map does not contain enough detail to determine a lines location. Do you have copies of more detailed maps of the proposed line location? My particular interest in in line segment 31.

Communication ID: 10145

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: KELLY J FOSTER

I am interested in detailed line routes East of Sifton to Oak Park. This map is hard to see existing routes

and what is proposed.

Communication ID: 10146

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: TONY M JOHNS

Communication ID: 10147

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: WAYNE R KALLIO

My parcel ID is [Number] on proposed route segment 31 with Pacificorp/PP&L having a 100 ft easement thru my property. A BPA Planner (Kendall) at the Amboy public meeting stated the line routes require a 150 ft easement so route segment 31 thru Brush Prairie is not a good option. Please use existing easements and right-of-ways that are large enough for this project.

Communication ID: 10148

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: ANTON M LITCHFIELD

Dear Sir/Madame, My wife and I just attended your informational meeting at Amboy Middle School. After reviewing your map it looks like we're right in the middle of one of the proposed segments. Quite honestly until today's meeting I didn't have a problem with this whole endeavor. I'm a firm believer in doing what's best for my community and country. Today's meeting has definitely caused some additional stress for me now that I've had an opportunity to think about this issue and its implications . As I understand it we won't know until the spring of 2012 what the final decision is. That is a lot of time for citizens just to be hanging out wondering what is going to happen. We have spent a lot of money on the purchase and upgrading of our home. The way I see it if for some terrible reason I lost my job (which isn't unheard of in today's economy) and was forced to relocate I think we'd have an even harder time trying to sell our house. Houses are for sale everywhere. Who would want to buy our home when the new home owner could potentially have a power line in their backyard and\or be forced to vacate in just a few years? Even if we could get a buyer I think the price would have to be significantly discounted because of this issue hanging over our house (no pun intended). I'm certain you have heard this concern and I'm certain you clearly understand it. It's hard to imagine requiring people to sit on the fence for over 2 years wondering whether they will still have their home or not. In the past few years my wife and I have spent thousands and thousands of dollars upgrading our home and property. We would like to continue to upgrade on our matrimonial home but at the same time I don't feel like we should spend an additional dollar on our home until we know what is going to happen. I'm assuming this affects thousands of residents in SW Washington. If this project is a necessity can you make some decisions

sooner? You literally hold a great number of people's lives and sanity in your hands. Thanks for the consideration. A

Communication ID: 10149

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: BRADEN S STRICKLER,NINA R STRICKLER

I live a forested area in Hockinson. Our property has a natural spring that feeds into a pond. The wooded area is home to deer and other wildlife. The 150 feet clear cut path for the right of way would devastate the aesthetics of the neighbourhood as well as home to wildlife. There are many upscale residential properties will be affected by the proposed routes. I live along proposed route 31. Please do not build this by our home. We are very worried about the health hazards to our children.

Communication ID: 10150

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: NICKOLE P KINGSTON

Landowners within one quarter mile of each project line should be required to receive BPA notification of the proposed project. Potential environmental issues, cultural issues, landuses, public health and safety, and aesthetics are impacted 1/4 mile on both sides of these types of transmission lines.

Communication ID: 10151

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: LAURIE S DESROCHERS

I attended scoping meeting in Amboy, my property on Lucia Falls Rd. (Line 30) has a conservation covenant with Clark County to protect shoreline and fish and wildlife habitat. No tree cutting or excavation allowed.

Communication ID: 10152

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: ROMAN V CHERNICHENKO

Judging by map of reinforcement project provided by mail, the lines will be very close to my property (almost on it) Obviously it will impact property values. How BPA address this issue? Also part of my property is a green belt area. What will happen with that zoning?

Communication ID: 10153

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: MICHAEL SPENCE

I've linked to your proposed transmission routes and unable to identify the longitude(Avenue)of proposed line #31(east of Brush Prairie). Can you provide additional maps which show land sections and/or cross street grids in the proposed #31 line. Thankyou Michael Spence

Communication ID: 10154

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: MICHELLE WOODLAND

Hi my name is Michelle Woodland. I own a property at [Address]. Your map that you sent of the I-5 Corridor Project, is so vague that I have no idea how this directly affects my parcel. Do they plan to put a power pole on it or transformer lines or what? I would like to know.

My phone number is [Phone number]. Again my address is [Address]in [City, State]. Please give me a call back. Thank you very much.

Communication ID: 10155

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: BARBARA EIGNER

Hello this is Barbara Eigner. My telephone number in Portland is [Phone]. And I know the meetings in various places, well there's one tonight and then there's one on Wednesday and one on Thursday and so on. The question is if a person cannot get there by 4 o'clock and the meeting lasts until 7. Call me back sometime, maybe tomorrow, so I have an idea of how long it takes. But if one can only get there at 6 o'clock, is that too late to get questions answered? That sort of thing. That's what I was wondering. Call me back when you can. My telephone number is [Phone]. Will there be additional maps and that kind of thing for people to look at? Alright. Goodbye.

Communication ID: 10156

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: JULIUS LEGGIT

Yeah, this is Julius Legitt in Kalama. I was wondering why they couldn't use the same corridor Bonneville has that goes from Oregon there crosses the river going north towards the same area and why they couldn't use the same corridor and keep everything in one spot.

Anyway, Where it crosses the power lines, major power lines cross the Columbia River just north or I guess west of Longview and crosses our property, unfortunately and I don't like to lose any more property but it sure makes more sense than taking out another big swatch of unprofitable tree growing area for another huge transmission line.

Anyway that was a thought. My name is Julius Leggit. My contact number is [Phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10157

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: ROBERT W LITTLETON,BONNIE LITTLETON

I do not want to leave my house and I will do everything I can to prevent that. I will fight it all the way. I think that all comments and requests should be posted online.

We have worked hard all our lives to be able to afford to live in our dream retirement home. Why would you want to ruin peoples' lives when there is land around that is vacant? We have discussed this with our neighbors and we will band together with an attorney if this goes any further.

Communication ID: 10158

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: BARBARA EIGNER

The idea of an easement and paying taxes in perpetuity in an area where we can't do anything disturbs me. I'm concerned about the recreational use of motorcycles and ATVs along the rights-of-way or private property. This could be a liability for the property owners and that is scary and disturbing. For current BPA lines, how much is a this a problem? Is there a way you can prevent that access. The land that we have is primarily used for timber. What does BPA do to manage blackberry and scotchbroom? Want to make sure that you do something to manage that.

Communication ID: 10159

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: JOAN A WELLSMORE,DES WELLSMORE

We are extremely concerned about the proposed I-5 project as we are right in the middle of one of the

segments that are being considered (line 31). Des built this house in 1991 and we have lived here for almost 19 years with the intention of selling within 5 years. The sale of this house has always been a big part of our retirement plan and if line 31 is chosen for this project, our house will be worthless. It's bad enough that the value of our home has decreased significantly in the current recession. How can BPA afford to purchase houses and land along this corridor? None of us would receive the full value of our homes.

Communication ID: 10160

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: CAMERON TORMANEN

To Whom It May Concern: I am very concerned about the proposed line coming thru my neighborhood. If you choose to come on my property which I am on the west side of the proposed line, or any were to the east of me you will be taking away from my territorial view which right know is unobstructed. I have spent a lot of money and time making this property into my dream home which I now have an awesome view to the east for at least 25 miles. I hope you choose another route as this will not only affect me but all my neighbors as well. Thanks and keep me posted on developments Cameron Tormanen [Address] Parcel ID [Number] Home - [Phone] Cell [Phone] Work [Phone] [Email]

Communication ID: 10161

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: ANDREA K LANGE

Segment 31 is a highly populated area and as such would be inappropriate for high voltage power wires. If it is decided that it should be the route for the I5 corridor reinforcement project, then it should be created utilizing UNDERGROUND HIGH POWER CABLES. This would: decrease the impact to property values, reduce/eliminate the EMF(electromagnetic force-while the risks of EMF remain hard to quantify, there is considerable concern about the health effects of long term exposure to these fields), decrease the size of easement necessary, decrease the risks to aircraft and wildlife, decrease the risk of death from accidental contact. UNDERGROUND HIGH POWER CABLES: are less susceptible to weather related damage and interruptions, are up to 90% cheaper to operate than overhead lines, have 30% lower power loss- they are more efficient, Efficient systems of any kind usually cost more upfront, but save money in the long term. With lower cost production methods, improved technologies and increased reliability the cost differential between UNDERGROUND HIGH POWER CABLES and overhead power lines is narrowing. Opportunity costs from lengthy planning delays due to public opinion are reduced. Expense and complexity of legal cases are minimized.

Communication ID: 10162

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: MARK LEE KIMMERLING

Washington state should allow use of its DNR land for power lines. It is minimum impact on land vs. traumatic impact on families/homes.

Communication ID: 10163

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: DEBRA L KIRKMAN

Communication ID: 10164

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SUE GOTELLI

Parcel [Number] In 1993, we purchased this property with the knowledge of the Pacific Power 100' easement. We inquired w/PP and they assured us that there was no immediate project in the works and that the size of the lines, etc., if ever, would be "poles" carrying lines. At the time of the purchase, a metal barn structure was 14' on the easement. After last night's meeting, I have learned that if the PP easement is used, an additional 50' would be needed and that the towers will be larger. Even if the 50' acquisition (25') shared with my property neighbor, my entire barn would be on the easement and my back deck connected to my home would be 27' away. That would put me clearly w/in the range of 350' safety/health area that I feel is needed to be from the lines. I am a Cancer Survivor, so this is an important issue to me. My easement is heavily treed with export size Douglas Fir. Wildlife galore!! Owls for sure! I would like your serious consideration of my concerns. I am a senior citizen, widow and any change to my current status would be a devastating impact.

Communication ID: 10165

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: STEPHEN C RAPALUS

Hi my name is Steve Rapalus. My number is [Phone]. And I can't tell by looking at your map if any of the proposed high voltage wires are going to go near property where my house is. And I'm wondering if there's a way I can get more detailed map or look at a more detailed map so I can locate the proposed routes. Thank you. Bye.

Communication ID: 10166

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: DANIEL HOLZER

I work for BPA. Just letting you know I took the picture shown on the factsheet.

Communication ID: 10167

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: LEE HAPKONSTAD

[Scoping meeting (Amboy)] This issue is totally out of my range of knowledge but you do have support. It seems that with our population growth now and in the coming years it is required and should be approved.

Communication ID: 10168

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: STEVEN D ANGLIN

[Scoping meeting (Amboy)] Please have your environmental studies look at creating no negative effects.

I want no power stations on or near my property. You/we should accept the current scope of power resources, and limit our use of those resources. Our appetites for power (energy) must be controlled, and limited to cause no further abuse of our environment.

Communication ID: 10169

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: DENNIS MCCARTHY

[Scoping meeting (Amboy)] If you can accomplish this project without condemning any private property. That would be best. I view condemnation as a taking and the bitterness it can create may last for generations, obviating cooperation between citizens and government agencies.

Communication ID: 10170

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: DAVID FORBUSH

[Scoping meeting (Amboy)] I only have one question at this time. Where will the new power lines cross

Mount Brynion Road, or will they?

Mount Brynion Road is just east of I-5 at Kelso, WA

Communication ID: 10171

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: KATHI WHEELER,BILL WHEELER

[Scoping meeting (Amboy)] Please have your environmental studies look at:

-following existing power corridors as much as possible

-avoiding critical wildlife areas

Please work closely with local residents and county officials.

Communication ID: 10172

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: KATHY HATNDEN

[Scoping meeting (Amboy)] The new transmission corridor should be aligned adjacent to the existing corridor to reduce adverse impacts on forests, streams, and the habitats they provide.

Communication ID: 10173

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: PAUL ST JAMES

[Scoping meeting (Amboy)] Set up the project so that labor is supplies by home zip code. Decide the labor, in other words, have local people do labor in their own area rather than out of town contractors. Spread the jobs for local people out of work.

Communication ID: 10174

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: NANCY ELLIFRIT

If the new line is placed in the existing corridor (#9) will additional land be needed for right of way?

Communication ID: 10175

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: LINDA CAMPBELL

In your map you supplied us, I can't tell where the proposed powerline is in relationship to my home. Is that intentional?

Use a map with streets on it as well.

Will the county expect you to pay for road diversion or widening or bike lanes. Maybe all this money should be directed towards wind generated energy. I have no idea of its feasibility. It's just a thought. East County often has a lot of wind. Maybe some other project.

How many properties are you considering that are currently zoned open space or farm, agricultural or timber. Will the county care if those deferred taxes are never paid to them can the county afford that? Do they expect you to pay the 7 years back taxes penalty and interest? Because that is what we would have to pay if we took our land out of open space.

It would be nice if you could issue weed and brush control poison again like "crosshew".

Are the surrounding properties going to be compensated for the reduced value of their home and property because the power line is now right next to their home?

Communication ID: 10177

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: LAURIE S DESROCHERS

Please have your environmental studies look at conservation covenants on property on Lucia Falls Rd.

Parcel [Number] and adjoining lot.

Communication ID: 10178

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: MARGARET BATES

Please have your environmental studies look at a riparian area on Hockinson School District parcel along segment 31, map 91

(Map 91) Should segment 31 become part of the I-5 corridor reinforcement project route, the transmission line will transverse a site purchased by the Hockinson School District for a future school.

The district purchased this parcel in 2008 from the DNR for this expressed purpose. Fears about electromagnetic fields, grounded in fact or otherwise, will render this school site unbuildable should the line run over it.

I appreciate that lines can span upwards 1000ft. However, schools intensively use 7 acres of every 10 purchased for the school construction.

Communication ID: 10179

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: ALAN BUTTERFIELD

A powerline through my property will ruin my life.

Communication ID: 10180

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: MARK LEVAUEU

Please have your environmental studies look at the route numbers 7-11-29-34-35 is by far the most feasible route after concluding first, that the existing I-5 corridor right of way will not work. There will be minimum environmental issues on the proposed Eastern most route of 7-11-29-34-35.

Please do not waste your time on the heavily populated routes.

Thank you for considering my note,

Mark Levaueu

Communication ID: 10181

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: BRUCE WATSON

[Scoping meeting (Amboy)] Please have your environmental studies look at nesting eagles along the east fork of the Lewis near the Rock Creek area.

Lucia Falls is protected steelhead waters. How would you build there without touching the water? All the signs there say that you can't even touch the water.

Communication ID: 10182

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: CHERYL CHRISTENSEN

[Scoping meeting (Amboy)] My property is located within line segment 26. I have had an equestrian business and home here for 20 years. I need new fencing and a barn. The home needs to be remodeled.

I'm afraid to obtain financing for the projects. The banks may also be reluctant. My plans are on hold now.

Please consider another route. Segment 26 is more densely populated compared to other routes.

Communication ID: 10183

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: DENISE AND LARRY KLOEPPER

Please have your environmental studies look at using state lands.

I do not want powerlines on my property or in my neighborhood. They would devalue my property. They would decrease my quality of living (at best) and cause health problems to my children (at worst). There is not a good reason to use privately owned land rather than public (state owned) land- "convenience" is not a good enough reason to devalue property I own.

Communication ID: 10184

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: GEORGE WALLER

Please explain why project cannot be routed through Burn, east of Yacolt.

Communication ID: 10185

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: JIM MEEIKE

[Scoping meeting (Amboy)] NO-use old route corridor or Federal/State land.

Communication ID: 10186

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: CRAIG G NEWTON

Please have your environmental studies look at Big Tree Creek.

These lines could potentially span over the top of the house I am building (Page 81)

I would like to be contacted about this.

Craig Newton

[Phone]

[e-mail]

Communication ID: 10187

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SANDRA FERNEDING

I am in section 23 which has a large electric line through from Merwin Dam. I am concerned for the health issue of an additional large line as well as the diminished value of my 40 acres.

Communication ID: 10188

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: CAROLYN URBAN

Please have your environmental studies look at effects on individual health/pets? And effects in relation to proximity to powerlines.

Wind power :)

This is our retirement home/property. Retirees can not start over nor lose property value!

Page 64

Communication ID: 10189

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: HOPE HAZEN

Please mail me a copy of the map section #65.

Thank you!

Communication ID: 10191

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: DAPHNA ANDREWS

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)] I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project Points countering the proposed build through 212th Street, Battle Ground, WA

- 1) Extremely intense winds occur in the hills east and north east of 212th/266th These winds occur approximately 4-5 times a year and only impact this small sub-region of Battle Ground. Trees are knocked over and extensive damage often occurs.
- 2) The area east and north east of 212th is commonly known as 'Spring Hill' since there are many springs that pop up through the ground. This makes building on the water laden ground challenging, and would most likely present a huge risk to the build of major power towers.
- 3) Battle Ground Lake and Lucia Falls are tourist attractions, and the streets around this area are part of an official historic drive in Washington. The power lines would make the area less naturally beautiful and decrease tourism.
- 4) The proposed power grid along 212th will go right through the location that lead to the meaning of 'Battle Ground'. There is also the potential for an impact to historic Indian burial grounds. Additional information: The origin of the City's name comes from a battle, which never took place. In 1855, some Klickitat Indians escaped from Fort Vancouver. Captain Strong headed up the army in charge of bringing the Indians back to the fort. Upon meeting up with the Indians, the Indian chief, Chief Umtuch, promised Captain Strong that the Indians would return to the fort. There are different versions of what happened next, but Chief Umtuch was killed. Captain Strong allowed the Indians to bury the chief. He returned to the fort with the Indians' promise to return. The Indians did return, and for not forcibly bringing them back, Captain Strong was presented a petticoat for bravery and courage. This area later became known as "Strong's Battle Ground". The first known settler to homestead the Battle Ground area was John Tuke. In 1862, he chose the area near the hill now known as Tuke's Mountain for his farm.
- 5) The recent linkage of I-5 to Battle Ground was a major investment in the population growth of this town. Building a power line through one of the fast growing sections of Battle Ground will decrease the population growth and negate the financial investment of the I-5 linkage.

Daphna Andrews

[Phone]

Visuals also #3

Communication ID: 10192

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: DELBERT M IRISH

Communication ID: 10193

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: ROBERT W LITTLETON

I think that the public interest would be better served if section 35 was routed through the DNR property. DNR already has allowed clear cut logging without replanting and allows motocross and atv's to erode the hillsides. Clearly they do not have a precedent for preserving the property as a reserve. It would be highly disruptive and expensive to displace many homeowners along Winters road when there is ample room in the DNR property.

Communication ID: 10194

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: GILLIAN L CONROY

I received a letter from DOE-BPA designated my specific land parcel, requesting permission to enter property. Many of my neighbors have received these comms, but not all. We are getting mixed messages. Per your FAQs and news coverage BPA claims there are multiple paths under consideration, yet #21 in FAQ clearly states once a route "is" selected we would be notified for survey, etc. Clearly if you have sent these notices you have an inkling of what you're thinking of when it comes to our specific parcels. We have the right to know whether you are talking about putting an actual tower in our backyards, whether this is one, or one of many proposed routes. I have already consulted a lawyer and intend to attend a public open house. In the meantime can you please be more specific re: why certain parcel owners are being contacted, and I don't mean because we're w/in x ft of proposed towers....I mean specifically how many ft away are we talking....or are we talking in our backyards? Thank you, Gillian Conroy [e-mail] 21. What is the process for defining or describing an easement for this transmission line? Once BPA selects a route, the agency would contact the property owners directly affected and request permission to conduct land surveys on the property to establish the boundaries of the easement. Easement areas would be defined and described by a registered professional land surveyor. The land surveys, referred to as "metes and bounds" surveys, are specific descriptions of the exact measurements of the land needed for the new facilities.

Communication ID: 10195

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: JEFF S WILSON

Unless some other responsible energy source is available, then the merits of improving the network along the I-5 corridor is truly the most responsible course for our society...I appreciate the opportunity to support this project...and the process BPA is going thru is immense.

Communication ID: 10196

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: DAVE W O'BRIEN

I did not receive the original mailing but it appears that a portion of one of the proposed lines run near, if not over my property. I would like to request a GIS overlay to see the actual route of proposed line 28 near Yacolt. Please mail or email this the above address. Thank you

Communication ID: 10197

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: BRUCE L WILLIAMSON

Dear Sirs, I have been asked to allow BPA employees access to my property to survey for a possible site for transmission lines. You state in your letter that you will refill any holes that you dig, but will you pay for the restoration of landscaping that is ruined? Will you replace the small trees that you say you may cut down? I have lived here for 29 years, and raised my family here. This is my home, and you say that I may have to move so you can sell more power to California? I realize that if I do not sell my property to you at the going rate, you can condemn my property and force me off. It is a very real possibility that the amount I would get from you would not cover my mortgage as the current rates are much lower than they have been. (I recently refinanced to put improvements on my home). I understand that you need to increase your capacity to handle increasing demands for power, but it really makes me angry to feel I may loose my home so you can sell power to California. I live in the Lexington subdivision. It would seem to me that putting these lines through such a heavily populated area would not be very cost effective on your part. If you must do this, send the lines through the least populated areas so fewer lives will be disrupted.

Communication ID: 10198

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: GRAHAM GLASS,ELANA D GLASS

We are just one of the many people who assert the BPA has overstepped its boundaries and threatens to ruin our neighborhood and specifically our house, clearly within the razing zone of the Highlands at

Pleasant Valley. Who does the BPA think they are to kick people out of their homes or add some sort of ugly 150ft eyesore of an electrical tower near homes with children. These voltages aren't even allowed in Europe. No matter if you purchase our property, or just allow us to live right next door to a cancer causing power line, is unjustifiable. Do you people think? I know that these plans are not near any of your own homes. I just don't know how you can sleep at night causing so much stress and anger to your fellow Vancouver residents. What ever happened to decent human beings? I guess they aren't running the BPA. Stop this madness, leave things the way they are. And if you can't desist from your greed, at least leave our homes alone and just do your bidding along the eastern route, away from homes and lives of the tax and bill paying VOTERS that your western route threatens.

Communication ID: 10199

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: ROBERT W WITHEE

As a property owner right next to one who received a letter, I wish not to have this tower near our property. I worked very hard to own what I have in the country and sure don't want to be looking at an eyesore. Despite what reviews may have been done about home values, would you buy one? Be truthful here. The home does lose value and takes a considerable time longer to sell with a considerable loss. Please go East into Yacolt burn/DNR lands as I mountain bike there quite a bit. There are no homes and even has been recently logged with new roads making accessibility easy. IF DNR won't provide you with the maps(Jessica Kimmick DNR PR representative), I sure can. Thanks for listening and I'm sure to see you at the meetings. Robert Withee

Communication ID: 10201

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

My husband lost his legs in Vietnam and our home and land is very accessible to him. Recently, we have received a grant from the VA to modify our home to make it even more accessible for him. Our home remodel is starting this winter (2009/2010). Once the remodel money is used, there is no more from the VA, ever! If the BPA decides to put these lines in our area, and if it results in us having to move, chances are high that we will not find a place as accessible as what we have created here for my handicapped husband in this home and on this land. We have invested our blood, sweat, and tears over 30 years to make our land and home more accessible to my handicapped husband. Please consider this situation in your decision about where you place these lines.

Communication ID: 10202

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: LESLIE J BROWN

Comments will be forwarded after more study.

Communication ID: 10203

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: BENJAMIN E STARK

My family and neighbors are extremely concerned about the health risks associated with power lines of this magnitude and the proximity of the proposed route to our residences. I have been researching several studies that show increased risk of various types of cancer (childhood leukemia, brain tumors, breast cancer etc.) because of electromagnetic fields created by power lines. We are also concerned that our property values will decrease as has happened to other communities where power lines have been added. There is an abundance of wildlife that will also be affected by this as stated by the other posted comments.

Communication ID: 10204

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: PATRICK G WOELFEL

I am concerned about the proposed Creekside Acres HOA (I-5 corridor project). I live within the proposed 27 segment and strongly oppose the building of this line through our neighborhood. We (neighbors) came to this area to enjoy the rural setting, with the proposal of building a power line through this area would entirely destroy all that we have worked hard to enjoy. I have seen other areas that were once beautiful transformed into an "industrial" appearance with power lines that are being proposed. Below are some other items that support my stance on objecting this project. Reasons that segment 27 is not a good route •Easement must be widened •Homes are built where they will be under the lines and must be purchased and demolished •Ugly steel towers 150' tall that destroy the views and devalue property •Loss of quiet do to powerline noise •Potential EMF exposures •256 Ave is only way in – one access, people cannot avoid the lines •airport on 256th will be shut down •historical tree will be removed •archaeological sensitive sites all along 256 Ave •wetland buffer areas •2 bus unloading zones would be under the powerlines •kids ride bikes on roads under proposed powerlines

Communication ID: 10205

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: TAMMY L OLSON

I have been notified by the BPA that a 500KV power line is being considered and that my property could

be affected. I live on route 31 as specified on your map. My husband and I moved to this area with our 3 children. We moved from the city to the country to purchase our dream home. The existing easement is not big enough to accommodate the type of tower you are proposing. This easement was put in place before there were homes constructed. It appears that our home would be in the way of a bigger easement, essentially in our front yard or where our house sits. I am concerned about what will happen to our home. We have done several improvements to our home and property,, we don't want to lose our investment. This is our dream home and our dream location. We do not want to move, nor do we want to have a power line put in our neighborhood. Our kids are established in their schools and we are established in this community. We experience many types of wildlife in our area, deer, coyotes, eagles, owls, bunnies and bees. Many of us have animals that also enjoy their homes, like chickens, cows, horses, dogs and cats. Putting the line in our neighborhood would cause many homes and outbuildings to be moved or destroyed, and for those that remain their property values will be affected and their health will be at risk. Once again, it is a residential neighborhood, a route that crosses state lands would be a better solution for everyone.

Communication ID: 10206

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: JEFF S MATHENA

Route 31 seems to be a Pacific Power Corp easement/right-of-way. How is it that BPA is going to use it? What agreements do you have with Pacific Corp with respect to this easement? Is Pacific Corp planning on co-locating their Swift to Troutdale line with your 500kv infrastructure?

I purchased my property knowing of the Pacific Corp easement, 50ft into my property; given that the other half of the 100ft wide easement is over the road in front of my house. I'm assuming you'll want to acquire at a minimum 50ft more, and possibly even more property since I doubt you will place transmission lines over the top of a road, running in the same direction of the road. This is not the understanding that was conveyed when I purchased my home. I would bet my home value has already been affected by just your announcement over and above the effect due to the existing Pacific Corp easement. Plus I will now be held hostage to this lower value for the 2 year period while you figure out what route to use. How are we to be compensated for this if we need to sell our home? Your financial responsibility started the day you publicly announced the project and affected all the properties along all of the proposed routes. Have you at least worked with the county to reduce our assessments to reflect the impact to our home values? I really don't want to pay inflated taxes for a couple years due only to your process of determining the best route. This certainly seems to be an issue you instigated, and you should take the responsibility to make sure your actions are accounted for. I will be contacting Clark County to determine their position on this. I'm sure they would be interested in knowing the impact to their tax base due to your decisions.

How close to a house will you place a 500kv transmission line? What are the effects of a 500kv line above or close to an all metal roof, or say cyclone fencing? I could imagine induced eddy currents could

be an issue. How will that be handled? Who will be responsible for any effects caused by your electromagnetic field? How long after construction of your transmission line are you liable for effects found after the fact?

I have heard it stated that you feel it isn't the best solution to use existing transmission line right of ways for this project, with one reason being the lack of redundancy. Examples given were something like, what if an airplane crashes into the transmission lines, then two or more lines would be impacted, making the system less robust. Are you expecting your transmission lines to be targets for these types of activities? If so, you better make that publicly known, and make that part of the financial compensation for everyone that will have this line running through their property. What is the financial impact of using existing transmission lines/right of ways? Does this include the benefits of maintenance and service to co-located lines? It seems like there are lots of advantages for co-locating with existing infrastructure, compared to "what if" disaster scenarios. Will the true cost of implementation and maintenance be disclosed to the public for all the proposed routes? Redundancy is nice, but at who's expense?

If you seek to purchase or take through eminent domain, property that contains buildings/structures, and it turns out that they can not be rebuilt due to lack of space, how do you financially compensate for that? What if the county won't allow the building/structure to be built even if there is room? Will you be responsible for ensuring the county will allow these, or will it be the home owner's responsibility to find that out before the sale of the right of way? Does the county have processes in place to pre-approve without applying for a building permit? I would think it would be your responsibility to work with the county on this issue, and inform those impacted. Especially since it has now been brought up as a formal question.

Communication ID: 10207

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: LESLIE J BROWN

October 30, 2009 [Address] RE: Comments Regarding I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project The BPA should select the alternative the will move electricity the most effectively, will require the least development, and have a minimal impact on the environment. Segments 9 and 25 are located closer to I-5 are more appropriate and less destructive than the eastern alternatives. Considerations: 1) Impact on Forest and Wildlife Segments 10, 11, 12, 13, 26 - 35 would have the most detrimental impacts on the forest and wildlife. The edges of the Gifford Pinchot, the Yacolt Burn, and other undeveloped lands are very important for wildlife and are heavily forested. If an alternative exists that would leave the undeveloped land intact. 2) Impact on Recreational Areas The Souixon, Canyon Creek, East Fork of the Lewis are fantastic recreational resources that are enjoyed by many for multiple uses. The East Fork is the last undammed river in the state of Washington – extremely worthy of protection and very beautiful. The Silver Star, Chinook, and Tarbell Trail Systems are amazing and provide true wilderness compared to the

hikes off the Interstate in the Columbia River Gorge. World class whitewater, fishing, hunting, hiking, mountain biking are all found here. This area would be completely degraded with one or more new high voltage/high profile transmission lines running through it. It would also thwart the efforts of current land managers to limit ATV use to certain areas by providing a virtual highway for them to access the abandoned and decommissioned roads that lace this area.

3) High risk area There is a reason why destructive wildfires have been so common here. Dole Valley and the Yacolt Burn area have a long history of catastrophic fires. Fuels have been accumulating for a couple of decades now, and the high voltage power lines would be running through this area. The heavier rains that occur here promote growth of fuels, and then the late summer winds from the east side dry out the area. A lightning strike or a person can easily touch off another catastrophic fire in this rugged area. The rough forest roads are frequently washed out. Landslides occur frequently, and this area gets a lot more rain. Closer to I-5, the terrain is flatter and is less prone to landslides.

4) Rural life People live in North Clark County to enjoy a rural life. Like most of my neighbors, I specifically bought a home outside the city, with a fantastic view of Mt. St. Helens. I do not have any issue with the few houses that now appear in my view. Some progress is inevitable, and I won't fight reasonable progress. I will lose every aspect of rural life with segments 26 – 31. High voltage power lines will be just around the corner and probably very visible from my yard. My view of St. Helens would look out over high voltage power lines instead of a wooded valley. My daily runs and commute to work would circle under these lines on Worthington Road, Amboy Road, Gabriel Road, Garner Road, Rock Creek Road, SR 503, etc. I will not be compensated for this loss of the life I love. My house will lose a lot of value when the rural setting and view is degraded. This value is critical to my retirement plans. The losses sustained in the stock market will not be recovered before I retire. The house lost some value in the recession, but still has value above what I paid for it 10 years ago. High voltage power lines will kill that value.

5) Clark County Assets There are numerous other assets that have been lovingly preserved in Clark County that will be degraded, and perhaps lost, with the segments that could ring Yacolt and Amboy. The scenic railroad and the new railroad owner will be big losers if the lines are located close to the railroad. The Chinook Trail System is an ambitious plan that just started to take shape, and is now in jeopardy. The Pomeroy House will be adversely affected.

6) Potential Energy Development I strongly suspect that the BPA is attempting to position itself for windfarms on DNR lands/Larch Mountain, a biomass plant in Chelatchie Prairie and other possible projects. I work in the wind energy business. A small biomass facility could never justify building such a big detour of a high voltage transmission line from the I-5 corridor. While I should be predisposed to supporting wind development, not all wind development is right. Large scale wind projects in the Cascades are a very long shot. It is simply dumb to cut that many trees, fracture wild areas, and build that many roads into rugged terrain for renewable energy. There are so many more suitable sites. My company is often required to pay for extending the transmission grid out to the new development. These lines would not serve a growing population. At this time, the density of development is too low in North and East Clark County to warrant such a project.

6) Stop Damaging Rural Areas I have not been a lifelong Clark County resident. I do see an area that has struggled to find its way, only to have the rug pulled out from under them as federal policies shift. The logging industry was killed. Supplemental payments to rural areas have been passed, cut, terminated, revived, and provided irregular CPR to the heartbeat of the unemployed residents. Recreation and logging was dealt a huge blow by the eruption

of Mt. St. Helens. The government tried to help by building visitor facilities and beginning to support a growing tourism industry here. However, visitor centers are now shuttered; roads to amazing recreational areas have been washed out, neglected, and decommissioned. Fees have escalated. Trails have been virtually lost. The CLEC industry bubbled with the internet boom, and favorable government regulations promoted competition. Just as suddenly, regulations were changed, the internet boom fizzled, and three major employers in Vancouver fizzled out. Now you will inadvertently irreparable damage the only thing we have left, the natural beauty of the area. The temptation is to always put undesirable development in rural areas because there are fewer voters and people to complain. It isn't right to take advantage of small towns. We have scratched out a beautiful, albeit modest, life in the far reaches of the county. Consider that value of this forested place to the air, animals, recreational users, and residents before fracturing it with high voltage lines. A dozen jobs in Chelatchie are not worth it.

Leslie Brown

Communication ID: 10208

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: KEN M KRAISLER

Attention Mark Korskness / BPA I-5 Corridor Project: Thank you for taking the time to review my comments below. My home and about 30 other homes intersect segment 30 at and around 236th way on map 86. I shall outline below why segment 30 is an all-around bad idea: 1. The terrain is mountainous and we are essentially at the top of this mountain area. The East side of segment 30 or going further East to segment 29 is much more flat with fewer homes. 2. There are many many streams and lots of wild life in this forested and hilly region. 3. A school bus route is established and travels almost directly along the Western side of segment 30. It picks up about 30 children each day. It uses Berry Road, one of the only paved roads in this area. This gives you an idea about the number of homes that will be impacted on segment 30 at 236th way. 4. Each home has a well and septic. Large construction projects have been known to cause cave-in' on existing wells. I had such an incident personally. 5 Segment 29 to the East has far fewer homes, possibly none at all. 6. There are almost no streets near segment 30, only narrow rock gravel roads for fire and logging. Construction of power lines will require new roads and be disruptive to the numerous water ways that travel from the the top of this hilly region. 7. Larch Mountain Correctional facility also "appears" to intersect segment 30. You will be subjecting this facility to the negative affects of the power lines. 8. The area along segment 30 is extremely sensitive to fire. It is a great concern to all of us in this area. Access to the forests in this area is highly limited. Placing your lines along segment 30 means that were we to have a fire, your lines might be destroyed at the very time power is required by those fighting the fires. 9. The 30 or more homes along segment 30 and 236th way will have their property values greatly affected by large visible power lines traveling through or near the properties. The visual appearance of these lines on a person's property will greatly affect the value of the types of homes in this area. Determining compensation will no doubt be tedious as people up here are motivated and highly concerned. 10. Each home will be forced to upgrade all metallic sheds, decks so that they are properly grounded. This is yet another cost for which compensation would be

necessary. 11. Possible use of herbicides to maintain lines might be necessary to keep lines clear of shrubbery due to the forest and vegetation density in this area. Such herbicides will get into existing water ways and cause up stream water damage. Some questions: 1. Why not use segment 25 to the West where well paved streets for easy maintenance are already established? 2. Why not use segments where you already have existing easements. 3. Why would you put lines in an area that is mountainous and fire prone with limited access when you have existing easements near well maintained streets? Alternates: 1. Segment 28 and Segment 29 are far less populated. 2. Segments to the West like segment 31 have existing easements and well maintained streets for access and repair. 3. You could modify segment 30 so that it is pushed Eastward by 1 mile. You would therefore impact far far fewer homes, possibly none at all. The terrain to the East is flatter and does not go over mountain tops. Current issues: 1. BPA's actions to date are already starting to impact people's financial lives as they attempt to sell their homes and refinance during already harsh economic conditions. Please contact me with any questions as to why segment 30 is a bad idea: [Phone] Respectfully, Ken Kraisler

Communication ID: 10209

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: ROBERT BRINK

Our property at [address] has a National Heritage designation. The proposed route would significantly impact the viewshed of that property.

It would appear that the eastern route proposal would have a lot less impact on private property owners. Most of that route is state, industrial, or possibly federal timberland. Perhaps an adjoining line next to the existing one could make sense, especially if the present right of way wouldn't need to be expanded.

Communication ID: 10210

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: BONNIE LITTLETON

My husband and I bought our retirement home 4 years ago. We have worked and saved all our lives to purchase the home in which we now live. I am greatly concerned that going through peoples' private property, and perhaps taking their homes, is even being considered. In our case, our lot is slightly less than 1 acre, so if power lines are routed through our property, we lose our home. Given that there is plenty of DNR land available, why would you even consider essentially ruining peoples' lives in this way? We will be at all meetings, and would not hesitate to band together with neighbors and get an attorney to fight this (which we view as a threat to our life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness).

Communication ID: 10211

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: JAMES C ENGSTROM JR

This BPA easement is going to come right threw my home and is going to become a very strong financial and mental burden for my family and I. This is planned to be my retirement home and to know that all of this is going to be ripped right out from underneath my feet. This will drop all home values in the area by a substantial amount and cause a great deal of personal health problems for others (cancer). This is going to take my garden away, chicken coop and ruin my years of hard work on my property. My wife is ill and I am unable to afford to relocate. I am very up-set over this idea of taking peoples property and lifes. I am totally against this idea. I know my neighbors and others are also and feel the same way I do. There will be no access to my property unless a phone call is made and I will escort the person(s) onto my property for any type of inspection needed. My property is fully fenced in for my dogs and if any damage is done to any of my property. There will be legal issues to deal with and this is given to whom it my concern as legal notice. There is NO TRESSPASSING signs posted and they will be adhered to or criminal charge's will be followed. James C Engstrom Jr.

Communication ID: 10212

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: EARL T FOYTACK

I have received your letters and see from you map my property is in one of the possible corridors. How soon will a decision be made as to location of the lines? Do you have anything today that shows the proposed line in relation to my property on Ball Park Dr. I can see my property on your map, but after that it is pretty gray. Why can't the power lines be installed over existing gas pipelines rather than disrupting the rest of the community. Ther are major gas r/w running north/south that seems like they could be a possibility.

Communication ID: 10213

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: TIM E WEIHE

I'm writing in regards to the proposed power line in segment 30 that would intersect my property near 236th way. This is a one of the only populated areas in this region, why would you choose to go through it? There is plentiful state land to the east and by choosing either segment 28 or 29 you would almost entirely avoid ruining private property values. I don't understand why this route was even proposed with such an obvious better choice to the east. Please dismiss segment 30 from your possibilities ASAP. You're already affecting people who have their homes listed and now will have to inform any potential buyers their land may be destroyed by unecessary power lines.

Communication ID: 10214

Date: 10/31/2009

Name: GARVIN E MARCH

Accidently sent my first email before finishing; I will end up living "under" the lines if you come down route 31. The fear of medical problems is great. My wifes mom, dam and both grandmothers all died of cancer. Her mom had 3 different types over the years. What will my wifes chances be if we live under the lines? My homes value will drop, it will be diffucult to sell in the future (yeah, I know "it is subjective"....BS, ask anyone if they would choose a house under the powerlines over one nowhere near the lines and they will either tell you "no way" or "only if the price was right".) I moved up here to the hills to enjoy a quiet, peaceful life in a custom home. I have great neighbors, one of which I've known since I was about 7 when we lived in Alaska. His house if GONE if you come down route 31. 5 or 6 of our neighbors will lose their homes. My wife won't stay here because of the lines, so our home is gone too. Go east, out to the state and/or DNR land, where you impact far fewer homes. Better yet, use the existing towers and increase their carrying capacity. Then nobody loses their homes!

Communication ID: 10215

Date: 10/31/2009

Name: DENISE L BEARD

How do I learn if you are intending to actually run lines through our small property? and what level of compensation there will be for the loss of property value. As we will want to leave if this destroys our property. Also we have concerns that this distruction of property value will leave us bankrupt.

Communication ID: 10216

Date: 11/1/2009

Name: GREG R CHRISTISON,TARYN EDWARDS

The area of North Columbia Heights Road on route maps #7 and #5 is in process of being rezoned from rural 5 acre lots to smaller lots as it is part of the Longview urban expansion area. My sister Taryn Edwards will be developing her 40 acre parcel west of my parents property, and the 80 acre northeastern block of my parents property will also be subdivided - just as the 80 acre area immediately to the west of my parents northeast block already is. My understanding is that several adjoining large land blocks immediately to east of my parents and sisters property will also be subdivided within a short time. By the time the line would be built, the entire Northeast quadrant of map #7 will be sub-divided into small home-sites. It would make no sense to locate a power line anywhere near the western 2/3rds of proposed line segment area #1, because that portion of the proposed route would cut directly though 30+ small lot home-sites in map #7 alone. Greg Christison Administrator on behalf of Christison Family

Farms [Address].

Communication ID: 10217

Date: 11/2/2009

Name: JULIANA L PEARSON

Communication ID: 10218

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: MARVIN DEAN JONES

RE: Proposed 500-kilovolt transmission line and associated substations

Dear Mr. Korsness,

My name is Marvin D. Jones.

I own the property in Clark County Washington identified as Parcel [Number]/ Parcel [Number], Section 11, Township 5N, Range 2E, Meridian WM, Clark County, Wa.

Thank you for forwarding the information and the study area maps for the proposed transmission lines.

It is very difficult, from looking at your maps, to understand if the proposed lines cross over or border my property. Would you please advise me relative to the proposed locations of the transmission lines and how close they are to my property, as soon as possible.

I am presently living in California, but intend to build my retirement home on the property in the near future.

My contact phone numbers are:

Office: [Phone]

Cell: [Phone]

My email address is in the header.

I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Thank you in advance.

Sincerely,

Dean Jones

Communication ID: 10219

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: ROBERT W LITTLETON

Yes, my name is Bob Littleton. The phone number is [Phone]. I posted a comment yesterday, which was Thursday, and it got the receipt everything in the e-mail and it said it would be posted and it is not on the Web site. My wife has also entered a comment today put it on the Web site, to put on the Web site and it isn't coming up either. We kind of feel like this isn't a transparent process and we're being flagged, and we're quite concerned about it.

Please call us back. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10220

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: JENNIFER J MCKEE

Hi this is Jennifer McKee. I tried to do this over online, but it says the verification words are incorrect and they are but I'm not getting through. My question is I have two existing lines already and I understand that the new towers need to have 150 feet total spread, 75 feet from the center. How close, how many feet can you put the new line up to the existing line? So that way we can mark it out and determine how close we will be affected by this 75 feet plus however many feet you need for clearance between the other two towers. I don't know if that is a whole other 75 feet or what that is

So if you can please call us back or e-mail us [e-mail]. Our address is [Address]. Thank you very much. And I do appreciate you guys working with the public and offering the meetings that is truly wonderful that you guys are up to that. Any way call us back and give us a heads up so we can figure out where we stand. Bye bye.

Communication ID: 10221

Date: 11/1/2009

Name: SHARON RICHARDS

This is Sharon Richards at [Address]. [Phone]. I just became aware of this potential for destroying the valley with more power lines and I am very concerned about it. I knew nothing about it, I have quite a bit of property here. And I cannot possibly understand why power lines coming from the dam that are all on

the east side of I-5 and going to Troutdale, Oregon would have any need to go on the west of I-5. I really need an explanation and I want to know where they are going and how it will affect me and my neighbors.

Communication ID: 10222

Date: 11/2/2009

Name: PAUL ROSTER,JUNE ROSTER

My name is June Roster, and yes this is about the I-5 Corridor Project. I have been sent a map and some paper work. I just want to know what that is about, and I'd like to have someone call me and explain some more about what's going on in regards to my property. I have sub-dividable plots back there, it could be divided and I don't what you guys are going to do.

So if you could call me [Phone] and talk to me. This is my third phone call to y'all. Hopefully someone will get back to me. Again June Roster and Paul Roster at [Address]. [Phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10223

Date: 11/2/2009

Name: ANDREA K LANGE

Hi my name is Andrea Lange. I'm calling because I've noticed that there haven't been any updates on the comment section for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project in a number of days. And that my comment is not listed although I did receive an e-mail response for it. I understand that it might be difficult to list all the comments, but it would seem that some should have been made since Wednesday of last week. If you wouldn't mind letting me know what the issue is that would be great. You can a number on my, rather leave a message on my home line. The phone number is [Phone]. I'll skip that. I think you have our phone number and e-mail address listed. I don't want my phone number posted on the Web site. But, thank you very much.

Communication ID: 10224

Date: 11/2/2009

Name: KATHERINE HOOD

Hello my name is Katherine Hood. I live at [Address], and I also own a home [Address]. You have requested access to my property, either you or your constituents whoever they may be, and I am refusing any access to my property. You will not set foot on my properties, either one. Thank you, if you

need to get a hold of me my number is area code [Phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10225

Date: 11/2/2009

Name: STEVE R SLOTTO

As a land owner in section 112, I am opposed to the proposal for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement. Given the massive amount of largely undeveloped forest land east of the larch mountain /silver star area and the Washougal river watershed, there seems to me to be no reason whatsoever to impact all of the residential areas identified in your study. Frankly, I'm appalled at the idea that you expect land owners to grant you permission to come onto their property and cut down trees, drill holes and remove vegetation. I will be attending the Nov 3rd meeting.

Communication ID: 10226

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: BECKY SHIPLEY

[fax didn't come through]

Communication ID: 10227

Date: 11/2/2009

Name: SCOTT BLANTON

BPA, I am voicing my concerns and issues over the I-5 corridor transmission lines proposed for Clark County. I am opposed specifically to segment 27. These lines would be passing through the community of Chelatchie Prairie in north Clark County. I realized power is needed in several areas throughout Oregon, Washington and California. I know these power lines will help meet that need. I am opposed to the segment 27 and 18 because it will have a great impact on a well established quiet rural community. I would prefer to have the lines run on existing towers (the 230kv line) or have a new route run at the fringes of civilization. You have the choice (I know money is an issue) to choose a route that will impact fewer people, please do so. Segments 18 and 27 will be visible from anywhere in our small valley (it will be on the north and south ridges and also bisect the open valley.) Please see the following list as these are some of the impacts of the segment 27 • current Pacific Corp Easement must be widened • Homes are built where they will be under the proposed lines and must be purchased and demolished • Ugly steel towers 150' tall that destroy the views and devalue property • Loss of quiet do to powerline noise • Potential EMF exposures to those living on edge of easement • 256 Ave is our only way in – one access, people cannot avoid the lines • small private airport on 256th will be shut down • historical tree will be removed (along 256th Ave) • archaeological sensitive sites all along 256 Ave • wetland buffer

areas over Chelatchie Creek (Fish First protected stream) • 2 school bus unloading zones would be under the powerlines • kids ride bikes on roads under proposed powerlines Thank you for considering. Scott Blanton [Phone]

Communication ID: 10228

Date: 11/2/2009

Name: DOROTHY A COUTSOUBOS

Please use the same corridor where you already own the right-of-way. You say you can't have both lines in the same place because they would be vulnerable. BURY the new line!!! After years of denial, scientific studies now show that cell phones can cause brain cancer. After many years of denial, eventually the power companies will have to admit that their transmission wires cause brain cancer, leukemia, and other sickness to people who live or work nearby. Then you will have trillions in dollars of lawsuits. Avoid that by acting responsibly NOW. BURY the wires. They will be safer, and the people who live in the area will be safer. You have got to step up and protect the people. Your power lines are deadly to those nearby, whether or not it has been proven at this point. BURY the LINES to protect citizens. And, if you don't care about people, bury the lines to avoid future lawsuits.

Communication ID: 10229

Date: 11/2/2009

Name: MARGO M BRYANT

Communication ID: 10230

Date: 11/2/2009

Name: KIRK CHAMBERLAIN, JUDY CHAMBERLAIN

RE: Parcel [Number] Proposed route #31 on BPA map

We attended your public meeting in Amboy and would like to offer the following comments for the proposed route #31.

We live on Allworth Road located in Allworth Valley, and we purchased this property from a 5th generation Allworth. We live on the original homestead property of the Allworth family. We purchased this property for it's unspoiled beauty and the amenities it had to offer. This property was purchased with the idea of using it's appreciating value to fund our longterm care once we can no longer care for ourselves. If you place high voltage towers and lines through our property it certainly will not appreciate to the potential we had hoped.

This is a unique piece of property and has been so for 5 generations. The property borders Rock Creek

and has a number of springs on it, including a year round spring that feeds a large pond that overflows into Rock Creek. To present we have located at least 16 homestead apple trees and one pear tree on the property, five of which we have been told were planted as early as the 1870's and they are still producing fruit. The site is made up of many boggy areas, clay deposits and Missoula flood rock deposits including agates, jasper and petrefied wood.

This property is home to Bear, a large herd of Deer, Coyotes, Bobcat, Lynx, River Otter, Racoon, Mallards, Wood Ducks, Merganzers, Great Blue Heron, King Fisher, Sharp Shinned Hawk, Red-Tailed Hawk, Coopers Hawk, Grouse, Band-Tailed Pigeon, Barred and other Owls, Morning Dove, numerous varieties of wood peckers including nesting pairs of Pileated Woodpeckers, and large flocks of various song birds, not to mention the Douglas and Gray Squirrels and chipmunks.

This is a unique watershed piece of property that is home to a wide range of wildlife and we would hate to see it disturbed by towers and high voltage lines – not knowing what potential problems would be created by these in such a populated area.

Route #31 travels through a fairly densly populated area and we really don't see it being your viable choice to place the power lines. More to the east in a lesser populated area would be preferable.

Thank you for taking our concerns into consideration,

Kirk and Judy Chamberlain

Communication ID: 10231

Date: 11/2/2009

Name: ERIK M SCHOPP

Communication ID: 10232

Date: 11/2/2009

Name: ROGER S HINTON

BPA, I live at parcel ID [Number]/parcel ID2 [Number, section 7, Township 9N Range 2W (Cowlitz County, WA)[Address] mailing address:[Address] I grant no permission to enter my property. My property is not for sale. I moved here to get away from the city. I do not want the I5-reinforcement project running through my land. The buzz of your existing powerlines are enough for me. The Damage that BPA would do to my land would be irresponsible. The damage done from de-forrestization would cause mud slides. My property borders a creek & ravine that supports much wildlife that I am steward of ie. racoon,deer(babies),woodpecker. There is a seasonal spring on my northern neighbors property as well that borders my northern property line. There are not many convenient sites to build on within my

property boundaries (that adhere to county code)and I have my own plans for that. I just drilled a well@280' depth that cost me \$20,000. I do not need soil disruption going on around me to cause my well to fail. I do not want to re-locate. I have tended to this land for many years while paying for it (and having my own dreams for it that do not include a substation, tower or powerline running through it). I encourage you to stay off my land. I pay for a security system monthly to monitor it. I do not want un-invited strangers. I have been burglarized 4 times living here. I do not need more intruders due to the BPA invites to my land. I have a right to privacy and disregarding my wishes would be in violation to this right. I prefer BPA keeps its new powerline route as far away from my land as possible. Even if it is at the expense of burying the line. I do not want to live in an "impacted" invironment. My invironment has been impacted enough throughout the process of paying for this land through many sacrifices. Please keep out & keep off and we will continue to be "good neighbors" Next time BPA is wanting my attention to their project, some form of compensation should be considered (especially if the time requested is during dinner hour). My time is as valuable as yours (probably more so since part of my time goes to pay BPA and other govt. agencies wages). This thinking needs to start with management level (project engineer left meeting in longview early due to personal engagements). What about our prior engagements as property owners? When I have a project I have to pay for people's time. We all have lives, jobs, families and had given that up one night to "give" BPA attention. Next time appreciation can be shown in cash and dinner provided as a suggestion. Please inform me if there is anything more I need to do to petition against the BPA project coming through my area. Thank you for making me aware of what your intent in the area is. Roger Hinton

Communication ID: 10233

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SANDRA L BISHOP

Hi my name is Sandra Bishop. Home phone number is [Phone]. I am directly impacted by this project. If you were to chose the 31 line through the Brush Prairie Hockinson area. Our neighborhood is currently having a meeting tomorrow night, Wednesday the 4th. It actually impacts our whole neighborhood. I have a question if there are numbers out there to give us as far as how many families or lot owners are affected in the Brush Prairie area, Hockinson school district in particular, that would be impacted if this line were to go through our area.

I know that some of our neighbors actually don't want this limited information; they want to have it all the way from Castle Rock to Troutdale on the impact of all these families. If you have that answer that would be great to present to our at our meeting. Again my home phone number is [Phone]. Thank you very much. Bye.

Communication ID: 10234

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: PERRY J CALABRESE

Why don't you use existing lines before building new ones? The lines running to the MINT FARM are more than adequate to handle the loads w/o the aluminum plants running. The lines could cross the Columbia and meet up with the towers at the now imploded Trojan plant-Those lines are also in place and run south. This is minimal impact to Washington residents and not consuming additional resources.

Communication ID: 10235

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: RANDY RUPERT

Can you tell me what this has to do with my lot? [address]. Call me Randy [phone number]

Communication ID: 10236

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: BECKY SHIPLEY, FRED SHIPLEY

Please have your environmental studies look at why residential cannot infringe on wetlands but BPA can. If locating in wetlands consider a hike & bike park much like Burnt Bridge Trail.

Our property is now in stalemate. My husband and I are senior citizens and needed to sell our home in the next two years to purchase a one-level possibly handicap friendly. Since BPA has come out with the news of their proposal, it is doubtful anyone will consider the purchase of this property.

There are concerns of visual degradation to our property and the wetlands.

We are concerned that if we are bought out that we will lose money on our property.

Located close to power facilities cause great health concerns.

Communication ID: 10237

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: DARA L. EASTHAM, DANNY C. EASTHAM

TEP-TPP-3. We assume the law covers all the important details of the "environmental impact." With that said we would ask that the people doing the work follow the intention of the law. Make sure "future planning" is covered in this review. This project really was needed 10 years ago or longer. We are behind!

We would like to see a map that has just a few more than two roads on it (i.e. I-5 & I-205). To know where the lines precisely might be located will help people like us to see the bigger picture and the individual impact. I can only imagine the pain we will be feeling if our property is taken as it is our retirement we owe a lot on it and would not have money to relocate. What a dilemma this needed project will create.

Communication ID: 10238

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: JEANNE TOWN

Please have your environmental studies look at wetlands behind and on property. Deer, coyotes, and owls, possible osprey, occupy this area and need protection. Old growth cedar trees. Deep canyon on property. Wild flowers (trillium).

Your map is very confusing. What are all the numbers on this map represent? Just what are you proposing for my land. My property is part of housing development.

Communication ID: 10239

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: THERESA CARTER

Swift power house to Columbia River existing vacant right of way; why isn't this existing BPA easement not being considered; he was quite upset at Amboy about why we were wasting money not using our own vacant corridor. He said he represented his nieces property, Theresa Carter, [Address]

Communication ID: 10240

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SANDRA L BISHOP

I am unable to attend the not so local Scoping Meetings in Clark County. Notification was not given in a timely manor, nor do I feel the lcoations provided made it easy acess for local Brush Prairie, Hockinson residents to attend. I was sad to hear that some local residents only heard about this by reading the local newspaper. many more who I have talked to were unaware of this project. My property will be directly impacted if the 31 line is chosen. I have all the concerns from your 3 previous scoping meeting summaries. From property value, to health issues. I am also concerned with the local School Districts impacts too. It would affect not only current property they own, but the tax base they survive on along with Clark Counties tax base. If the lines were to go through this area, local residents, not just thoughts in

the transmission lines proposed construction area would lose property values along with visual and possible health risks. Only thoughts on the very west end of this area would not be effected. Relocating in this community would be very limited as far as real estate is concerned. You would be forcing many families to make a life changing decision because of this proposal. My personal opinion is that the lines be placed to the east on Forest Service and DNR lands. Displacing families is not an option. I am also in agreement if such power lines are really needed, then the power should stay in the Northwest and not be sold to places like California. Please do not print this on your website for others to view. Thank You

Communication ID: 10241

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: JUDY HUDSON, GLENN HUDSON, CLARA HUDSON

Yes, I want to please request that the 500,000 volt line not go through Segment 3 in the Castle Rock area, rather choose Segment 1 and/or Segment 2. The reason is because Segment 3 is full of residences, farms, businesses. Course your existing line and the area west of that, Segments 1 and 2, there's not a population problem with all the expense and hassle of messing with people who are already established. It seems to be a lot cheaper to do that and certainly a lot less hassle all the way around to go through Segments 1 or 2 instead of Segment 3. Please do not put it through Segment 3.

And I'm already on your mailing list. My name is Glen Hudson, [Address]. Phone number [Phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10242

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SHEILA R MIKLOS

We attended the meeting in Amboy on Oct 27, 2009 and do appreciate the assistance provided by a BPA Representative. However, it is still no reassurance that BPA is looking at this project and the proposed lines in regards to what is right for the people affected by this proposed lines. We have been on 212th Ave. for 20 years now and have put A LOT of ourselves, including time and money, into developing a HOME that we are proud of and counting on being a good size portion of our "retirement". This proposed line going down 212th Ave. would "de-value" our HOME and/or hence our retirement - AND in today's economy you would think that a public entity would be more understanding of the people that actually pay for said public entity. We have watched this neighborhood develop and become a place that many of us are proud of, feel safe, and count on being a HOME - thus we are very "opposed" to these lines and towers, including the increases easements being proposed, being installed or applied to NE 212th Ave. It is understood one of the options being reviewed is taking these lines thru DNR and Timber land. Personally, I can not even understand WHY BPA would be considering any other option.

DNR is also an entity that serves the "PUBLIC" and has the least impact on home owners and tax payers. Plus the Timber industry now days seems to have more of an emphasis/goal on selling their timber and then selling the land to developers (such as the terrible waste of timber land on Mt. St. Helens and/or the Gifford Pinchot National Forest that Creagan and the associated Developers have done) - than preserving and utilizing timber land. Plus the land utilized by DNR & Timber Land has less "impact" on the environment vs. demo of already established homes and the waste of resources that have already been used to build these homes, barns, etc. Also, the DNR & Timberland can work around these lines, as they have proven to do as such in years gone by. I will follow this project and do hope that BPA will take into consider the "FAMILIES" and "HOMES" that this project affects and the destruction and loss that these families will incur if these lines are put along 212th in Battle Ground, etc. I GREATLY OPPOSE THE 15 CORRIDOR PROJECT TO CONSIDERED ALONG 212TH AVE. Respectfully submitted, Sheila Miklos

Communication ID: 10243

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SERGEY A MISHCHUK

I am absolutely not interested in any transmission lines going anywhere near my property! You should use UNDERGROUND HIGH VOLTAGE POWER CABLES! I just built our life-long dream home, value of over \$1,000,000 on this property 2 years ago and i am very opposed to it! The value of my property will decrease a lot.

Communication ID: 10244

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: KENT BURNS

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Route #18

We have national certified tree farms on this route - How is that going to be compensated for. This ground was to be farmed for generations for the benifit of the county, state and the nation. No survey crew will cut down my trees for any reason. If done, I will file criminal charges!!

This is going to take my retirement away from me - I will not tolerate that!

Communication ID: 10245

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: ROLAND HENRY TOWNSEND,B.B. TOWNSEND

Yes, this is Roland Henry Townsend and B.B. Townsend. Your line, we got mail from you there is a meeting on Garfield Street in Camas it is from 4-7 I believe. I'm not sure that we'll make it there, but I think the information we wanted to know about was, I was wondering if I should go to that meeting. And we're going to try and go, but I may be just a little bit late, because the wife doesn't get home until 4:30 pm.

Any way if you can give me a call back at [Phone]. Okay, so if you can give me a call back before, it is about a quarter to three now. If you can, give me a call back. Thank you. Bye.

Communication ID: 10246

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: STEVEN P JONES

I live adjacent to proposed Rt. 31. I have worked on my small acreage for thirty years raising my own food, trying to be self sufficient. This project I see as a threat to me and my life's work. Why can't this be either routed over state land(non-residential) or put underground. Any thing else is not acceptable to me.

Communication ID: 10247

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: DANIEL A ANDERSON

Route 31 should be placed on the public land that is available. Would you place 500 kilovolt power power lines in your neighborhood? The US National Academy of Science says the lines may increase childhood leukemia. Why take the chance? I have witnessed a child dieing of leukemia. Have you? If you have do you want to be responsible for causing such suffering? The World Health Organization warns that human exposure is a human carcinogen. Why take the chance? State land is available. Underground is an option if you can rise above "doing it on the cheap" and instead doing it right. Do the right thing! Look in the mirror tomorrow and like what you see.

Communication ID: 10248

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: DANN CHAPPELLE,JANET M TERVEEN,DAVE TERVEEN

Hi there, My name is Dann Chappelle, close neighbor of Dave Terveen. Dave is out of town and Janet is his wife. Janet asked me to look into the I5 Corridor project. Janet just got back Nov 1st, and missed the TownHall Meeting at Mark Morris. Without getting into the survey map language, she lives about 200

yds east of Columbia Hgts Road at the intersection of the existing BPA Power Line at the [Address] block of Columbia Hgts.(crosses the road) She recieved the PEP letter dated the 22nd of Oct. And the informative letter and maps dated Oct 9th. On the Map is proposed route #1 which I assume is the proposed route. Back to the Map again, on proposed route 2, there is a BPA Transmission Line about an inch south of Castle Rock, that takes off, almost west, and ties into the Alston Transmission Line. I'm also assuming that is the one that "crosses the road" at the [Address] block of Columbia Hgts. Concerning route 1, If the Map is correct then the 1 mile wide notification is probably why she got the PEP letters, even though they aren't coming to survey and take samples. Meaning the power line will be towards Lexington away from her property. If they are coming and I'm totally confused, there are some things that are important to her. 1....Jan has a registerd spring. Have access to info on this if you need it. 2....A power line lowers land value? 3....She has a locked gate? Thanks for your time, Dann Chappelle

Communication ID: 10249

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Area in map #85: Section 31

North of Ristro Road and East of 227th – the line tentatively runs up to 217th along 216th Ave

Things BPA needs to know –

Major flood plain

Broken down bridge crossing Rock Creek would need to be rebuilt by BPA in order to gain access to lines and towers or to even build lines and towers. Even local fire trucks will not use the bridge as they label it "badbridge"

Numerous homes (around 40) including recently built in path

Along or crossing 2 major creeks which become rivers in the winter

Major environmental area (i.e., bears, bobcat, blue heron, hawks, eagles, coyotes, many deer families and major fish, etc in both creeks).

Elderly population that cannot start over – financially and physically. People don't want to buy properties that have lines nearby or on property for reasons such as health, view, environment, etc. Compensation not enough to be able to relocate and pay medical bills.

Child day care center (in its own facility) with numerous young children.

People need to know as soon as possible due to stress concerns.

Communication ID: 10250

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Map 73 top left corner (solid rock) and gravel pit. Segment 26 – (center L)

Map 72 – segment 26 Ski Lake on far west side of potential segment

School planned for segment 31 (map 91), Hockinson school district

Wetland/riparian area near proposed school on map 91 (segment 31). Joint agreement with Clark County Parks and Recreation to develop ball fields. Highland Little League working in conjunction with Clark County commissioner Mark Boldt. Purchased from DNR 2 years ago.

1500 sites – Lake Merwin Campers Hideaway, boats, access to lakes

How would your transmission line affect the 600 property owners in the Lake Merwin Recreational Association?

EMF concerns: Page 59 and 60, Lake Merwin Hideaway Campsite Coop – 1500 sites (operates as a “mini city” with Board of Directors, restaurants, playgrounds.) Can accommodate up to 40’ trailers with 60x44 cover roofs with extra rooms attached to trailer).

Communication ID: 10251

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Landowner would like to see number of houses within each segment that would be directly impacted by power line.

Communication ID: 10252

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

If there is a choice between forest land (managed) and going through neighborhoods, why through

neighborhoods?

Comparison of impacts on landowners and industrial forest land

Please consider public owned property over private property

Communication ID: 10253

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Segment 30 and 31, map 79 - East Fork Lewis River, eagles, sensitive plants, park, T&E fish, cultural, Lucia Falls Park, at Bridge

Communication ID: 10254

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Page 68, segment 27 - Creekside Estates on west end 256th St - very residential and much more developed than map indicates.

Communication ID: 10255

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Why not use less populated DNR option to the east?

Communication ID: 10256

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Totally destroys beauty of the area.

I-5 corridor - why not build parallel or in the median?

Don't put on Matt and Deanna's property, put on DNR.

Realty concerns relate to non-disclosure on existing ROW

Ridge south of Moulton (map 81) that crosses segments 30 and 31 (mid-map 79-80) where significant wind occurs. Look at a wind map of this area.

Communication ID: 10257

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

There are eagles nesting on East Fork of Lewis River as well as protected steelhead where Rock Creek intersects. Route 28.

Communication ID: 10258

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Route 27. Riparian habitat forested. Creek tributaries and wetlands

Communication ID: 10259

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Reimburse for business loss?

Communication ID: 10260

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Laws for riparian areas that you follow

Communication ID: 10261

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Noise from lines

Communication ID: 10262

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

West of Larch Mountain - very, very, windy (70-80+mph)

Concerned about taking more trees

Talk to national weather people about routinely dangerous wind warnings

Communication ID: 10263

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Lewis River is a salmon spawning river. At Lucia Falls, people not allowed in river.

Communication ID: 10264

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

EMF impacts related to Ross-Lexington ROW

Communication ID: 10265

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Tone of landowner letter was very harsh. Too big brother, left us with no options.

Communication ID: 10266

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Once you decide, what is timeline to purchase homes/land? How long will we have to vacate?

Concern about homes for sale now along routes - in limbo for next 2 years.

Communication ID: 10267

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

How wide is ROW - 2 acre parcels

Communication ID: 10268

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Is the line proposed at Campers Hideaway a new line or existing

Communication ID: 10269

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Does BPA buy the whole property if the portion of the property is affected?

Communication ID: 10270

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

There is a small right-of-way (212 Ave), Battleground Ashford parcel affected.

Communication ID: 10271

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Are the maps current, possible endangered species?

Communication ID: 10272

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Is there an area in the website that will address questions? What is the response time?

Communication ID: 10273

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

PAC ROW impacts to homes. Put it on rural land 29, 34, etc.

Communication ID: 10274

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Page 74. Land is in timber tax deferral. How will the ROW affect the landowners tax deferral in Clark County?

Communication ID: 10275

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

This is a big impact to landowners with small parcels.

Communication ID: 10276

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

PEPs are too broad scope

Communication ID: 10277

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Segment 26. Our property is only 3 acres and the impact is too great for smaller landowners

Communication ID: 10278

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

I get up in morning and get my buzz from coffee. I don't need a 500 kV buzz.

Communication ID: 10279

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Why isn't this line going down the West side of I-5 and routed through Oregon?

Communication ID: 10280

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

DNR property before private property.

Communication ID: 10281

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Narrows between Lake Merwin and Lake Yake is heavily populated. So why wasn't potential routes located east more?

Communication ID: 10282

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Landowners concerned about ability to sell home at the time BPA were to decide to construct line on

their property.

Communication ID: 10283

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Tell me now! My life is put on hold b/c of this. I want to know where you will put the line.

Communication ID: 10284

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Don't go through Chelacthie Prairie - scenic route of SR 505. I would recommend easterly route.

Communication ID: 10285

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Chances of using existing ROW? When do activities begin? Will personnel be identified prior notice be given before entry?

Communication ID: 10286

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Lake Merwin's Camper's Hideaway has lots of unstable ground - have had landslides including one last year.

Communication ID: 10287

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

By residing within one of the segments for your proposed power line, a realtor just told me that my property value just dropped by half - true?

Communication ID: 10288

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

How will you address storm water runoff on your ROW you will clear - and why do you not have to comply with the same regulations that we do as private property owners?

Communication ID: 10289

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

How would you compensate landowners for the property that would be acquired for your power line?

Why don't you lease property rather than propose to buy an easement? If you buy the landowner would be compensated fairly and also be able to sell the property to others.

Communication ID: 10290

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Since corridor 9 already exists with power lines/transmission, why not just increase its capacity and leave everything else as is?

Communication ID: 10291

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

This is not a public forum, it is one-way transmission of information. You need a public forum, where questions can be asked of a panel and everyone hear the answers.

Communication ID: 10292

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Map 85 - Rock Creek - environmental issues - goes down both sides of our property

Communication ID: 10293

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Why don't you choose the easterly alternative - the one with the least impact on property owners?

Communication ID: 10294

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

I don't think so! Line 27 #68. Concerned about property value, health risks, safety of living near these with kids.

How can you site lines in a residential area?

Concern about breast cancer from electromagnetic effects

Communication ID: 10295

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

How are property values decided?

Communication ID: 10296

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Existing radio tower pg. 91 between house and ROW

Communication ID: 10297

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Lots of vacant state land on p 94 use this instead of residential areas

Communication ID: 10298

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

By Lucia Falls - segment 30 have conservation covenant with county - filed with deed signed by county - how would this be affected by line or would affect the routing?

Communication ID: 10299

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

What is the distance new line needs to be from existing 500 kV and 230 kV?

Communication ID: 10300

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Maps sent out too vague - Battle Ground not on map! Reflector map better

Communication ID: 10301

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Concern that "condemnation" mentioned so far up front before any dialogue

Communication ID: 10302

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Easement v. acquisition of property - explain

Communication ID: 10303

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Concern is having child grow up in magnetic field

Communication ID: 10304

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Lost property value from recession, now additional loss from transmission line siting.

Communication ID: 10305

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Please analyze visual impacts to whole line.

Communication ID: 10306

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Please analyze old growth

Communication ID: 10307

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

What about heavy wind across segment 31 south of east fork of Lewis River on map 79?

Communication ID: 10308

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

On 85, 91, and 96 the rural housing is about as dense as it gets (segment 31)

Communication ID: 10309

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Visual impacts are important to us in the Crawford Valley - and there is an historical compound(?) to this area - please look into it!

Communication ID: 10310

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Get Charles Nelson on mailing list (Yacolt, Gabriel Road address)

Communication ID: 10311

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

What type of towers would you use?

Communication ID: 10312

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

How many lines are you proposing?

Communication ID: 10313

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Why are proposing to locate a power line through residential areas?

Communication ID: 10314

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Why are you not proposing a power line on the Oregon side?

Communication ID: 10315

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

How about undergrounding all or a portion of the line. By doing so wouldn't you be mitigating impacts on some resources?

Communication ID: 10316

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Stay within 100-year floodplain to avoid impacting people.

Communication ID: 10317

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

How would your transmission line affect wildlife habitat and endangered species on our property. We also have old growth on our property.

Communication ID: 10318

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Do you have a preferred alternative at this time BPA?

Communication ID: 10319

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Use national forest areas!

Communication ID: 10320

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Use existing ROW

Communication ID: 10321

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

What you need is a public hearing so our voices can be heard!!

Communication ID: 10322

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

I don't like your meeting format. We want a hearing so that we can hear what others have to say.

Communication ID: 10323

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Where do you live? Would you want a 500 kV line in your yard?

Communication ID: 10324

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

At this point do you know where within these segments your power line will go?

Communication ID: 10325

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY ,JOHN C LAMB,TERESA LAMB

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

My stepdad moved to a home beside a high transmission line in good health - 57 years old. In 2 years, he developed a rare form of childhood bone cancer and died one year after diagnosis. I will never live near these lines! Teresa and John Lamb.

Communication ID: 10326

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Visual impacts to private property, land values, human existence under power line, EMF.

Communication ID: 10327

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Why do project now when property values are so low?

Communication ID: 10328

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Pg. 50 prefers the route north to stay away from Brook's Creek area, Grasshopper creek, and Schmidt Creek, North of 503 maybe across timberlands

Communication ID: 10329

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Why not go down center of I-5. Stay off of top of ridge lines to lessen visual impacts.

Communication ID: 10330

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Stay away from populated areas

Communication ID: 10331

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Stay on eastern routes

Communication ID: 10332

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Have a better "800" phone system where a person picks up the phone at BPA.

Communication ID: 10333

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Will depreciate property values - pay for depreciated value of overall property. Pay for trees that are cut by surveying.

Communication ID: 10334

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Very concerned about visual impacts to residential views.

Communication ID: 10335

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Is BPA planning to expand existing ROW next to existing 230kV line?

Communication ID: 10336

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

How big is 230kV tower compared to a new 500kV tower?

Communication ID: 10337

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Eastern routes are better to stay away from people.

Communication ID: 10338

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Utilize existing PAC ROW. It would be cheaper than buying all new 150' ROW, also would have less impact overall.

Concerned about PAC ROW - visual impacts, taking homes, aesthetic impact to Falls

Communication ID: 10339

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Plans for property are now on hold till BPA decides

Communication ID: 10340

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Stay on eastern routes

Most people recreate further east to Silverstar Mountain and in national forest

Communication ID: 10341

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Why don't you build next to the existing 230kV line along segment 09?

Communication ID: 10342

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Concerned about visual impact on segments 28 and 29, section 88 in particular on Lewis River.

Communication ID: 10343

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Segment 26, eminent domain concern. Just built dream home. New line will impact view considerably, degrade property values as a result.

Communication ID: 10344

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

EMF, childhood leukemia, run a daycare and concerned about kids health located near SR 503

Communication ID: 10345

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Move routes further towards Yale dam area to avoid residences south of south Merwin Lake eastern area

Communication ID: 10346

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Why don't you go along I-5?

Communication ID: 10347

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

What are the pros and cons of existing routes?

Communication ID: 10348

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Combinations of two with eastern and western route?

Communication ID: 10349

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Capability of existing structures

Communication ID: 10350

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Consider double-circuit

Communication ID: 10351

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Put in existing 250' ROW

Communication ID: 10352

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Prefer eastern route

Communication ID: 10353

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Inhibit ability to subdivide

Communication ID: 10354

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Advantage of eastern route for future expansion?

Communication ID: 10355

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Potential for wind farms in the area?

Communication ID: 10356

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Compromise - half western route, half eastern route

Communication ID: 10357

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Segment 28, north end. 20mW biomass plant, using slash - might want to hook up line

Communication ID: 10358

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

EMF

Communication ID: 10359

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Payment for easement

Communication ID: 10360

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Would a tower block road?

Communication ID: 10361

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Septic wells, how far away?

Communication ID: 10362

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Segment 31 - trees/streams, parks/houses.

Communication ID: 10363

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Concern about electromagnetic effects causing cancer

Communication ID: 10364

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Marketability, view - if on neighbors property or mine, monetary compensation whether I sell or stay there. With this announcement, I've lost potential buyers.

Communication ID: 10365

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY ,GEORGIA JACKSON

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

I, Georgia F. Jackson, will give BPA representatives permission to enter my property only if they (BPA) pay a fee up front for permission to enter. Signed - Georgia F. Jackson.

Communication ID: 10366

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Why not route via federal/state land where there be less impact on property owners...and less population.

Communication ID: 10367

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Just because there is less monetary to the property owner than to the federal or state government. No happy with your corridors which impact 1000s of property owners and their lives.

Communication ID: 10368

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Property values will depreciate!!! Or don't you care...we do!!!

Communication ID: 10369

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Terrible....follow the old line, less expensive and not bother so many people...

Communication ID: 10370

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

How does this impact health issues....and those with chronic conditions?

Communication ID: 10371

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

How will it effect our wetlands in our subdivision?

Communication ID: 10372

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

What about the noise level?

Communication ID: 10373

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Satellite and cell phone interference

Communication ID: 10374

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Radio reception

Communication ID: 10375

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Property values

Communication ID: 10376

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Satellite TV interference

Communication ID: 10377

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Page 21 (11-20) large residential clusters - easier to deal with Longview Timber

Communication ID: 10378

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Page 51, use existing PacifiCorp property of ROW. This would be least resistance from the community.

Communication ID: 10379

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

35 Alpacas on property in working Alpaca farm, line 27 Block 74

Line would go right through house and barn and destroy value, etc. Line 27, block 74

Concerned about affect on livestock - value of herd - genetic impacts. Can't demonstrate there will not be genetic impacts.

Individual Alpacas value is six figures.

Communication ID: 10380

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Retail nursery map 73 protect property

Communication ID: 10381

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Noise from line will affect residents

Communication ID: 10382

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Lots are for retirement (investment) not good time economically to sell.

Communication ID: 10383

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Power lines will not increase value

Communication ID: 10384

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Make more sense to go to a less developed area

Communication ID: 10385

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Would make more sense to go to Weyerhaeuser property or DNR to east - fewer v. many

Communication ID: 10386

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

People came out here to get away from power lines, etc.

Communication ID: 10387

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

People need to know as soon as possible whether or not their property will be part of actual routing alternatives (values, sales, etc.)

Communication ID: 10388

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Certainty would help

Communication ID: 10389

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Map 73, far west edge - no access into area steep hill/creek/steep incline into potential ROW

Communication ID: 10390

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Does that tie up property activities if owner signs PEP?

Communication ID: 10391

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

How is the property value of homes impacted? Does that impact weigh in the decision-making?

Communication ID: 10392

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

If the easement goes through your house, does BPA purchase that segment or the entire allotment (small landowners)?

Communication ID: 10393

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Is there a buffer between your house and the BPA ROW?

Communication ID: 10394

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

What happens if a landowner does not sign their PEP?

Communication ID: 10395

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

If my property is very close to but not on the ROW easement do I get any compensation for loss of property value? If not, why?

Communication ID: 10396

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Is undergrounding a possibility? If not, why?

Communication ID: 10397

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Concern that people have already lost value in their homes/property and this could make them lost their property. Compensation will go to the bank.

Communication ID: 10398

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Should put it over through the mountains where fewer people live.

Communication ID: 10399

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Should look at seismic issues.

Communication ID: 10400

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

This is a bad format for meeting. Everyone should hear it together and hear other's concerns

Communication ID: 10401

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Why not use I-5/205 ROW - minimize impact by using area already cleared.

Communication ID: 10402

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Property values already declined sharply - may lead to file bankruptcy

Communication ID: 10403

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

What if you have a building permit and it expires before 2012 and in the path of one of the alternatives (line 30), how do you decide what to do?

Communication ID: 10404

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

High voltage power lines cause cancer.

Communication ID: 10405

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Impact to Salmon Creek/Rock Creek watershed - will need to remove vegetation

Communication ID: 10406

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

I have a lawn, what would you need for an access road across it?

Communication ID: 10407

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Why not use existing route - less scenic - eastern route could have visual impact to Mt. St. Helens area

Communication ID: 10408

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Worried about health impacts - could cause cancer

Communication ID: 10409

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Could affect property value if you want to sell

Communication ID: 10410

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Might end up having to move when never planned to

Communication ID: 10411

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Affects to creeks and wildlife from removing vegetation

Communication ID: 10412

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Affect to fish in streams due to removal of trees - can this be mitigated

Communication ID: 10413

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Access road construction dirt can get into creeks

Communication ID: 10414

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Who pays back taxes on timberland if BPA goes through timberland?

Communication ID: 10415

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

County taxes - timber exemption and back taxes

Communication ID: 10416

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Have to be paid if land is taken out of timber

Communication ID: 10417

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Who pays back taxes on loss of use for agricultural land?

Communication ID: 10418

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Free up some route segments as soon as able to free up those property owners from further constraints - financial worries, future value, future improvements. (focus on smaller # of segments)

Communication ID: 10419

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Instinctive reaction to forms for granting access to property is to NOT sign and NOT grant access. It's not understood that it could be valuable to grant access.

Communication ID: 10420

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

What happens if property owner does not sign form granting access to property?

Communication ID: 10421

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Concerned about adverse health effects. Also, area around Merwin dam in a scenic drive area. Tree and wildlife will be affected.

Communication ID: 10422

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

We're on map 57....line 18. Could affect numerous small land owners if the line is placed south of present power line. Running north of present line effects state land or DNR land without adversely affecting private property owners.

Communication ID: 10423

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

How are homeowners compensated for ROW, access roads, trees?

Communication ID: 10424

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

What if you don't want to move?

Communication ID: 10425

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Can you put this line near existing lines near our property?

Communication ID: 10426

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

We just move there (pg 73) for the view and pristine countryside - don't want the line

Communication ID: 10427

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Wetlands on property

Communication ID: 10428

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Just remodeled home (p 73)

Communication ID: 10429

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Worried about health human and live stock

Communication ID: 10430

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Our property can be subdivided. How will this affect the value? Ability to be subdivided.

Communication ID: 10431

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Building a new shop. What happens to property investment?

Communication ID: 10432

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY ,PAT AND BOB SARKINEN

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

How can you cut trees along a creek if the loggers can't?

What/how are people compensated for taking of trees? For security purposes?

What can I use the property for after the easement is there. They are tree farmers, obviously no trees in a row. Bob Sarkinen

Communication ID: 10433

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

How long will the landowner have to leave their homes?

Communication ID: 10434

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Tree farm. Do they pay for future use?

Wetlands. What happens to them? Lots of wetlands

Communication ID: 10435

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Recreational property. Map #57.

Cabins. Powerline. Visual impact to cabins

Communication ID: 10436

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Who makes the appraisal?

Communication ID: 10437

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY ,LAURIE S DESROCHERS

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Pond and two springs?

Conservation covenant

Laurie Desrochers. Map #80 (name not listed) Parcel ID [Number]

Communication ID: 10438

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Hempwick trail and river #30 segment

Conservation contents

Communication ID: 10439

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Lynn Culbertson. Thinks she already signed PED.

Communication ID: 10440

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Study about property values?

Communication ID: 10441

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Property taxes? Change?

Communication ID: 10442

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

I-5 corridor name

Communication ID: 10443

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Aesthetically displeasing

Communication ID: 10444

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Noise problem

Communication ID: 10445

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Bury 17

Communication ID: 10446

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY ,LANCE CALSTOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Lance E. Calstoy. Did not receive any information in yellow area.

Go around me

Communication ID: 10447

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

If no permission for PEP. Then what happens?

Communication ID: 10448

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

[Address]

2 Golden eagle, one on property. One adjacent

End of Amboy

Communication ID: 10449

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY ,MARY BAKER

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Mary Baker. Send 2 livine, sapely in transmission line

[Address]

Communication ID: 10450

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY ,THERESA CARTER

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Theresa Carter

[Address]

Map 73

Concerned that surveying all the routes ill be too expensive. Survey will not be permitted, will fight in court any powerline that comes across my property.

Communication ID: 10451

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Steve and Sharon Jones

[Address]

Page 96

[Phone]

Communication ID: 10452

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Would like to know height and location of towers

Dennis Andrada and Jack Gerstkemper

Communication ID: 10453

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Going straight through neighborhood

Map 96

Communication ID: 10454

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Want us to go through state lands

Communication ID: 10455

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY ,SCOTT WARREN

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Information on a small hydro project

Waterfall drops 12 inches water year round. 120 foot

Scott Warren

[Address]

Communication ID: 10456

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Concerned about property value

Section 51. Pacific corp has been in there doing surveys. Can we use their info?

Buy my house

Communication ID: 10457

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

How often do we maintain under right of way

Communication ID: 10458

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Should have way to look up parcel by township range section or assessor's parcel number

Existing is #1choice #9. #2 is to the east on state and federal land #11 and 29

Unused right of way from swift power.

House down to Columbia River

Why not use it?

Has Clark County requested access to transmission for a cogeneration plant at Chelatchie Prairie?

Communication ID: 10459

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Concern for timberland out of production

Concern for loss of property value

When would we have a preferred route

Communication ID: 10460

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Concerned that BPA is moving to lesser populated areas

Communication ID: 10461

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Reduction of property value

Noise

Loss of timber view of line

Lot of water eagle nests Lewis and Clark River Area, segments 28 and 29

Communication ID: 10462

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Where will the towers be

Would like maps

Concerned about property values

Communication ID: 10463

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Harvestable timber, bought? Will BPA buy the timber on land

Trespassing? On land with right of way

For access ATV's tearing up the right of way

If they have a road on this land they don't want trespassers tearing up the road or hunters on their property.

Communication ID: 10464

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Please use existing right of way on the existing line.

Ross/Lexington line. Already disturbed.

Folks have built around it already. New line is more of a problem

The format is upsetting. This is not helpful

Lack of notice upsetting.

East fork of Lewis River is scenic.

Many differen bird species and wetlands and deer. This line will change this and steelhead. How do the lines affect this student come to lease

Communication ID: 10465

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Spotted owls

Communication ID: 10466

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

There is a lot of logging? What is impact.

Thunder & Lightings

DNR land

Lots if wild Alder. Hard to manage growth.

Many creeks, King Creek, Rainbow Falls, very pretty

Albino salamaders, special plants.

Communication ID: 10467

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY ,JOYCE B. BROWN

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

How is on the route, koi pond and out buildings. They have wetlands on 3 acres and only 2 acres of usable land. Don't use our 2 acres. Jim and Joyce Brown page 85. Many water drainage issues. Too steep for timber planting. We are retired and would be a hardship.

Communication ID: 10468

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Terry Rasor, this is our retirement home.

What about land owners. I don't want a line.

Moved in 12 years ago, paid off

Many existing buildings, riding arena's

Raise and sell horses. Twice Neighbors.

Communication ID: 10469

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Don't impact business'

Anderson lodge, 7 miles West of Cougar

Has many business events and weddings, meetings, reunions, etc 1000's of people

Every year have employees

have 2 lodges. 78 and 16 acres

Communication ID: 10470

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY ,CASEY DALE

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

In 70, we have a bridge 70 ft poles with wires, therapy tools for vets.

Spent \$100,000 getting this in.

Bungemaster.com. Casey Dale [Address]

Recovering vets, military study, helps

Communication ID: 10471

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Page 85, View of valley would be affected. Been here for years, property values and quality of life.
Would not have purchased if line was coming through.

Communication ID: 10472

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Wildlife? Bear, deer, others, wood ducks

Wetland issues, by Rock Creek, coyotes, lynks

Communication ID: 10473

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Should build next to existing lines. Already affected.

Communication ID: 10474

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Segment 31, view impacts.

Communication ID: 10475

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

West is more populated East is less. What about on Oregon option?

Lots of river rock and clay.

Communication ID: 10476

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Where 26 and 27 cross. Surrrounded by DNR with many drainages.

Communication ID: 10477

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Spent \$30,000 dividing into 2 pieces. 20 acres 10 & 10.

Communication ID: 10478

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Would take homes (page 85). Don't do this!

Property value, health and well being

No one will want to live there

Cost is an issue? Avoid rough terrain

Use the state lands, don't displace people!

Communication ID: 10479

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY ,RON ALLCOTT,LAUREN ALLCOTT

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Ron & Lauren Allcott

[e-mail]

Folks are very upset.

They live near the line, but off the light colored area.

Still too close. There are daycare facilities (85 page), wetlands, creeks and drainage.

Daycare near 221st?

Flood plain is also in the area Rock Creek floods

Salmon Creek also floods

Also many new homes some in the last few years.

Old bridge on 224th St., damage due to new construction and flood damage.

On private road.

Would be access problem for line maintance.

The length of the public process is so long that it is a problem. Folks will be up in the air for years. Folks worked hard for their homes!

Folks are upset.

Much wildlife: deers, bears, coyotes, etc. Eagles, owles, hawks, blue herons.

Many folks will not speak up

Many children

Property values! Who would want our land in a bad market especially. We would lose a great deal.

If it was worth \$750,000 now it would be \$250,000?

Not much flexibility in retirement, many of the households are getting older. Those of us with out children.

Communication ID: 10480

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Witton

Page 68. Thinking of building another house.

The line would be in the way.

Powerlines, create physical problem.

Being farmed right now. Raises hay, corn, and cattle

Could go over my house

Should go through the least populated area.

More people are moving in all the time.

PP & C already has an easement now.

Would BPA also need a new right of way?

I only have 5 acres and this cuts me in half.

What will PP & L do with theirs?

Why not go East to avoid folk.

Communication ID: 10481

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Prefers to see right of way used for equestrian trails, bike trails in the area if it goes through mentioned "like Vancouver". Use part of right of way for the kids

Communication ID: 10482

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Had transmission line go through family property in past had a very negative impact on property value and ability to sell property.

Communication ID: 10483

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Prefers segment 74 not used. Right on top of house

Communication ID: 10484

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Segment 74 right of way potentially goes over homes, both parents and theirs

Communication ID: 10485

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Can we still graze cattle under the line in the right of way?

Communication ID: 10486

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Can't read comments on website. Comment 29 keeps coming up.

Frequently asked questions link to comments isn't working

Communication ID: 10487

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Concerned with EMF; specifically effects to radio and tv interference

Effects to us physically

Communication ID: 10488

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

10 acres for retirement, they have no more

Communication ID: 10489

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

What effect on the Hideaway Association?

Communication ID: 10490

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Will BPA be buying/condemning houses under line? Right next to right of way

Communication ID: 10491

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Unhappy with segment 26

Communication ID: 10492

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Concerned with public health

Communication ID: 10493

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Impacts to property values

Communication ID: 10494

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Will BPA widen the right of way where existing on segment

Communication ID: 10495

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Why would BPA use segment #26 through all the houses

Communication ID: 10496

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Stream going through the top of the property is concern, along segment 26

Communication ID: 10497

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Wouldn't want to live in or around powerline; Segment 26

Health risks would move if anywhere near my property

Communication ID: 10498

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Concerned with impacts to all of the property

Concerned with proximity of residents line along North segment 31

Communication ID: 10499

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Map 68

Southern area, segment 27 would effect/close an airplane landing strip.

Communication ID: 10500

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

New substation in Amboy

How does this help local people with power outages?

What does our new line do? Transmit power?

Aesthetics of lines and towers are you willing to go over mountains? Do we just go along roads?

How will you choose where to go? What is easiest?

Cost of line: taking homes/tress

EMF-id 500 versus 115 worse?

Noise-light up at night

Maintenance timing: How many times a year on private property?

Private property owner rights

Access roads

My property is in buffer will you take house?

When completed?

How is my land purchased? easement?

Regular management

PEP and cutting trees or what is allowable when we enter property

Living on PAC easement, am I going to get line?

Why bother people when you could put the line somewhere else not by houses? Like farthest East routes (11,29, 34, 35, etc)

Communication ID: 10501

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Property values will my value be reduced? What id I live on easement? Will add and be purchased?

Aesthetics

Lower income, can we afford to move on appraisal value? Can it affect my credit rating? Appraisal valules are lower than the market!

Need to be close to work, activities, etc and won't be able to afford to get the same amenities other areas

Communication ID: 10502

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Cultural resources/Indian artifacts

Communication ID: 10503

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Possibly plans to build house. Map page 81 & 82

Buying at South East corner of map. Multiple building sites are planned at the top of the ridge.

Communication ID: 10504

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Just built a house on property, working on house

How do you site lines and decide? When will you decide?

A lot of people on 26, concerned about losing property.

We can't sell our property without disclosing the easement and the future line possibility

Does BPA buy an easement? Buy property?

Property worth

Time frame for decision

Communication ID: 10505

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Domestic water rights on stream with the right of way proposed from the home. Page 50. How do we work over water sources?

1500 foot easement is on someone else's property to get water to their home

Communication ID: 10506

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Will I be compensated for my property? Appraisal value?

PEP will you buy my entire property if you only need 100 feet?

Communication ID: 10507

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

We're all attached to this area.

We'd like property information for our neighbors around map 73. Can I get names to talk to other folks

and organize

It costs money to go to the county, if you put a money road block up, you should extend the comment period.

Communication ID: 10508

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

It will waste tax payers money to survey and study all the segments when you'll only build one

Communication ID: 10509

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Development occurring south of Waller property in square 74.

Communication ID: 10510

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Page 74 segment 27 would affect a lot of residents

Why not go east to DNR land

Didn't move here to see a powerline (74)

Communication ID: 10511

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Sean Egusa

Hockinson Elementary proximity. Concern with Hockinson school district

Option 32, 30 foot PP & L easement, cancer survivor backyard

House to be built on hold

Communication ID: 10512

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Issue: Did previous homeowners know of potential build? Purchased home without knowlegde of potential

Communication ID: 10513

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

If not here, how can information be accessed.

Communication ID: 10514

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

If new easement gets within x feet of existing structure, is recompensate considered for structure or just aquired land? James Ranch

Communication ID: 10515

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY ,DAVID LINGLE,DAWN LINGLE

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

68. Lingle. Property value/aesthetic impacts

Health risks

answer is no, large community of landowners

What is cost of burying lines

Communication ID: 10516

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY ,LINDA KORUM

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Korum. Where does DNR stand and why?

Is there a minimum setback? Up to what point could easement encroach upon an existing structure.

EMF.

How do we choose the alternatives.

Communication ID: 10517

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

County planning. Overlay of proposed work and project area (Jim Vandling). Kiren Struder in their office working in GIS

Route 28 is one of the safest routes

Tier 1, forest resource 80 zoning, FS, Weyerhaeuser, DNR (large ownership parcels)

Tier 2 (West) more residential-West of route 28

Biomass plant light under 28 near Chelatchie

31,27, 26 expect lots of comments from public

Communication ID: 10518

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY ,WALTER BUCK

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Walter Buck [Address]

Page 61

Please send a copy of map

Don't want to live under the powerline, concerns about EMF, retired, concerned about decreased property value

Communication ID: 10519

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY ,SANDRA PARGMAN

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

31, Hockinson, effect on home prices

Very expensive home

school along 31 on map 91 (East of brush prairie)

169th Street, school property (21108 NE 169th St) (across the road from school property-Hockinson, WA)

Highest tax rate in the county

Preferred route (east side) 11, 29, 34, 35

Route that will impact fewest homes

Hockinson area fastest growing

Sandra Pargman

[Address]

Map 91-100

and Map 91-100 to

Jane Hall

[Address]

Didn't receive mailings

Suggest meeting with Hockinson (near Hockinson)

send all information to Sandra and Jane

Property values will go down "High-End/Exclusive area expensive homes

Green spaces

Worried about view

Rural option best, don't affect people's homes further East

EMF/Leukemia and schools

safety concerns

Communication ID: 10520

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY ,CASEY DALE

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Northside of Tum Tum Mountain, bridge, poles/70 feet tall with wires

Casey Dale

[Address]

section 70

Forest, weyerhaeuser, 80 with exception of raspway bridge

Consider moving 100 feet west

Recreational corridor

Communication ID: 10521

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

18, Logging road/state land south of residential area, would prefer to avoid residential area

Communication ID: 10522

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Would prefer another route, health issues, resale value

Communication ID: 10523

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

85

PEP have concerns about accessing property

Dogs/horses

Horseback riding/recreation

Would prefer more rural route (section 28, 29)

Current residents have lived in the area for years

Would prefer government lands

Rock Creek tributary

4 acre property

Horse fields, cows

Families own multiple properties

Jeff & Debbie Matthews

Communication ID: 10524

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Concerns about felling trees, damage to fencing, horses

Worried about damage to property and animals

Communication ID: 10525

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Would prefer and alternate route

Neighbors are extremely upset

Francis and Mary

Frahm- House is located eastern border of property

Communication ID: 10526

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Dixie & Herb Berg- Raise show cattle

Communication ID: 10527

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Segment 9 preferred

Buried route good option

Communication ID: 10528

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Sec 5

Replacement value if home is taken, need to maintain standard of living

Concerned about impacts to families

House wasn't on map, why?

Concerned about location of houses

Communication ID: 10529

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Meeting:

No place to park

Need more maps/tables

Don't want to have to go around the perimeter

A presentation at the beginning would be good

less repetitive

Brochure:

More information, schedule

More detailed schedule past EIS

Design, how does it overlap

Easements

Cheryl Manford

Communication ID: 10530

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

More transparency, seems like not enough time has been allowed

Seems like BPA need to be more straightforward

Communication ID: 10531

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Hockinson (91, 96), East is upland on a bluff prices are high expensive homes

Communication ID: 10532

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Segment 31, concerned about proximity to house

Up to the foundation of house

Trees

Property value? Compensated fair market value

Why easement versus taking property, what is PEF of destroying property?

Communication ID: 10533

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Preferred route 11,29,34,35, less population further East

How do we select preferred alternative

Existing right of way (80 feet), what about BPA's route?

How is it affected?

Communication ID: 10534

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Pomeray Ranch, 79, living history, pumpkin patch

Communication ID: 10535

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Section 35, 5N 3E, NW corner of section 33

Building new home, not on arial map

Yacolt (1/2 mile west)

Land, segregated into 4 parcels

Would prefer an alternate route

Devalue property, it's very expensive property, at least \$800,000 in it once finished, if line come near

Vulnerable to theft

Cecil Rotschy

Son owns property on Yacolt Mountain

Does this have to do with PPNL easement

Would prefer west side of segment

Communication ID: 10536

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Royal ridges retreat, church camp

Family nearby, use backroads

So many people affected, appears to be undeveloped from road, but quite a few homes in woods

PPNL line, good op

Owned tree farm

Less disruptive to the SW (page 73) cecil's lower 80 acres

Page 79 east of Yacolt Mountain Quarry

No homes on it, access to the area

Pomery property, living history

Communication ID: 10537

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Map 74, PPNL, existing right of way corridor

Abernathy property on page 74, along PPNL existing right of way

Vote for segment 29, eastern most option

Communication ID: 10538

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Page 73. Mr. Matson and here representing Daybreak Homes 72, Mint Lake Farms

Why would BPA choose most populated segment

Why not on DNR land and/or state property (east)

Large parcels to the East, along seg 29

If it has to go through his property, ok, prefer not

Minimize impact to populated areas

Communication ID: 10539

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Olinger, 65.

Least populated area would be a preference, route on East side

Affect fewer people

Have lived in area for 20 plus years

Negative health effects value of property

Would prefer BPA would chose a route that has less of an impact on property

Want their palce to come home to

Communication ID: 10540

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Compensation, devalue property

Can BPA access my property if I don't sign a PEP?

Don't want BPA doing everything outlined in PEP

Communication ID: 10541

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Why not I-5 route?

Communication ID: 10542

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Scenic highway near Merwin Dam?

Why not combine with existing lines

EMF

McNicholas, page 81

Stick with 11 and 29 for less impact

Along existing

Use Ross-Lex on far east

Stay on north side of the existing PP & Line north of Lake Marwin to avoid houses

Communication ID: 10543

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

99% Property access road, how wide?

Right of way width

Condemning questions

Communication ID: 10544

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

EMF, cancer, anger

Property values hit hard by recession, uncertainty that will effect in next 2 years, "going to build a house"

If not my house, visual impacts

Existing lines along I-5

Natural resource impacts, streams

Couldn't find map

Not enough folks

Land not getting meaningful data windmaker/value of property

Communication ID: 10546

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Timing when property value down, not good for seniors who have retired

Communication ID: 10547

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

51, 50F 503 PAC line

Will powerline (new) help us in our area

68-Tree farm

68-Terrorism is a concern

Communication ID: 10548

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Maps not planned very well

Hard to get exact location

Needs more definite routes

Communication ID: 10549

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Health hazard with additional powerlines

Communication ID: 10550

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Map 87, state land (use 28)

Use versus personal property

Line segment 30 state property

Trenton Spolar [Phone]

Use 30 instead of 28

29 National forest

Don't build over property (personal) Cheelatchee Creek

Map 68 Creek Coho (fish first)

WA archeological site

Heffner property

well water table 20 feet

Source Amboy aquifer

Fault line Mt Tum Tum

Communication ID: 10551

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Property value, quality of life

Health hazards, aesthetics

Communication ID: 10552

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Existing property, PAC, bigger towers right of way, too close to house now

Property value decreasing

Communication ID: 10553

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Rt 26, Map 72

Property has been in family for over 100 years. Why isn't this route located farther east in forest land or along I-5?

We have contacted our attorney

Neighbors joining for class action lawsuit

Communication ID: 10554

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Compensation for near homes

PEP

Communication ID: 10555

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Compensation, value of trees when young are harvested (old enough to harvest)

Communication ID: 10556

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

For Segment 31, a large population lives along this route.

If this is chosen, the only acceptable option is an underground high voltage cable. This can: decrease impact to home values, decrease/eliminate electromagnetic field, decrease impact to aircraft/birds. Decrease risk of death due to accidental contact, decrease risk of power outages due to weather/high winds, require a narrower strip for easement. They can: offer lower maintenance costs, result in 30% lower power loss in transmission, improve system efficiency, absorb emerging power loads, take only months to install (new burial/joint techniques).

Communication ID: 10557

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

PEP questions

Communication ID: 10558

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concern that Ross-Lexington corridor is preferred due to existing easement.

Communication ID: 10559

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned about EMF, Noise, health effects.

Communication ID: 10560

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned about which way the ROW would be expanded for a new line more open fields on a

particular side.

Communication ID: 10561

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concern for renters or manufactured home parks. Do they get compensated for having to move them?
"Restrictions" on moving older homes.

Communication ID: 10562

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Landowner is NOT moving; no matter what! Me too!

Communication ID: 10563

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

NOT FAIR!

Communication ID: 10564

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Problem on Segment 25 with ATVs tearing land up. Need more gates.

Communication ID: 10565

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Studying wind turbines on Larch Mountain (Segment 29). Locating a new line close to this area would make sense.

Communication ID: 10566

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned that Washington State DNR will force BPA to put line back in landowners backyards.

Communication ID: 10567

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Will rates go up to pay for the line?

Communication ID: 10568

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

BPA needs to consider the human impact when you've got a rural verses populated options.

Communication ID: 10569

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Because of the economy, homes are valued less than when purchased. Folks can potentially be left with

big debt if BPA takes their home.

Communication ID: 10570

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

E. Fork Lewis Road and Lucia Falls Road is designated as Clark County scenic route. Transmission line would potentially span this area. Only place in Clark County that looks this pristine. (Crosses Segment 29)

Communication ID: 10571

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

3 "reservoir" ponds on property used for fire fighting near Yacolt Burn area. Wouldn't transmission lines interfere with this essential helicopter water pick up area. Segment 29

Communication ID: 10572

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Visual concerns about new line (Segment 29).

Communication ID: 10573

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

What does BPA do about large snags that have lots of wildlife living in?

Communication ID: 10574

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 29, huge east wind and snow loading.

Communication ID: 10575

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Safety issues near lines.

Communication ID: 10576

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

EMF effects near lines.

Communication ID: 10577

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Property values for homes near lines.

Communication ID: 10578

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

When will landowners hear from BPA next? Want to hear something sooner than the draft EIS!

Communication ID: 10579

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Purchasing new easements near existing ROW.

Communication ID: 10580

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Buyer-seller negotiations - eminent domain.

Communication ID: 10581

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Disclosing the new line when trying to sell house now. Who do I talk to?

Communication ID: 10582

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Why didn't I know I lived in a ROW?

Communication ID: 10583

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Where would the line go in an existing ROW?

Communication ID: 10584

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

I got a PEP. Why didn't anyone else?

Communication ID: 10585

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

What happens to lines in existing ROW if 500 kV won't fit?

Communication ID: 10586

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

I live near existing ROW with and without vacancy. Where would you build?

Communication ID: 10587

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Why 500 kV?

Communication ID: 10588

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

If BPA needs to purchase a home and they pay fair market value. What happens if the fair market value is less than the load amount?

Communication ID: 10589

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

How will another line next to our property affect our property value?

Communication ID: 10590

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

18th Street corridor is being proposed to extend eastward to Goodwin Road. This parallels existing BPA easement (Vicinity of map 110).

Communication ID: 10591

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Go with option 49 instead of option 40.

Communication ID: 10592

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned about the height of the new towers obstructing our view.

Communication ID: 10593

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Our property is on the edge of a greenway and we are not allowed to put in a chain link fence. How can BPA build a line?

Communication ID: 10594

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 43 DNR land, natural spring used by wildlife. Contact DNR for info. Do not take trees/shrubs around spring.

Communication ID: 10595

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Why did BPA not look at routes in Oregon?

Communication ID: 10596

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Why not build over I-5 lanes or any freeway or road?

Communication ID: 10597

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Impacts to Rock Creek in Segment 28.

Communication ID: 10598

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Impacts to potential home sties in Segment 28 wetlands.

Communication ID: 10599

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Route 31 runs through our neighborhood. The idea of towers this large in residential areas would make these properties unlivable. Underground is the only option for this route.

Communication ID: 10600

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Utilize existing right-of-way and expand 09 and 025.

Communication ID: 10601

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Further east 11-29 may cost a bit more bit impacts least number of current homeowners, current development.

Communication ID: 10602

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Health hazards - should be further east of 31, out of neighborhoods. New developments would have choice to move under/near power lines.

Communication ID: 10603

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Oppose line #31 as it has significant homeowners impacts; whereas proposal (11, 21, 29) or (26, 30, 33) would impact many fewer existing homeowners.

Communication ID: 10604

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Support need for power, just go further east - state/forested land. Not as developed. Future development would enable developers to decide on development where to proceed.

Communication ID: 10605

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Use existing I-5 route first.

Communication ID: 10606

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Existing easement on property doesn't show dimensions on title/property map.

Communication ID: 10607

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Live in Hockinson and is concerned about Segment 31 displacing homeowners and forcing people to move. Plus fair market value is less than their invested amount.

Communication ID: 10608

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Wetlands preserve Segment 40 - endangered waterfowl.

Communication ID: 10609

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Opportunity costs from lengthy planning delays are reduced by decreasing public outrage - expense/complexity of public legal cases are minimized.

Communication ID: 10610

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Does BPA own ROW along all the alternatives?

Communication ID: 10611

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

The PEP's asking for engineering studies. Is it realistic?

Communication ID: 10612

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

If not going through residences, then why get everyone agitated?

Communication ID: 10613

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Not enthusiastic about a tower near house - property values, serenity.

Communication ID: 10614

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Bought here for peacefulness.

Communication ID: 10615

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

How big would the towners be?

Communication ID: 10616

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Will wetlands keep line from going through this area?

Communication ID: 10617

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

If line visual (visible) from our house (section 40) do we get compensated for the visual impact?

Communication ID: 10618

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

How long will EIS process be?

Communication ID: 10619

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Where's the power going? Is it going to California or will it be used locally?

Communication ID: 10620

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned at looking at bigger, uglier towers - see from deck - planted trees to hide existing towers.

Communication ID: 10621

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned about noise and health issues.

Communication ID: 10622

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Don't notice existing - like to keep it that way.

Communication ID: 10623

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Will towers be fenced to protect children that could go under lines?

Communication ID: 10624

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

How do lines affect the health of people?

Communication ID: 10625

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Where are the areas where there is BPA unused right-of-way?

Communication ID: 10626

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Why can't the existing line be beefed up?

Communication ID: 10627

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Those who can't get bought out would have a property value hit near line.

Communication ID: 10628

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Can't you use the old trojan lines?

Communication ID: 10629

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

No one will want to buy our house now with proposal to build line (we are planning to sell).

Communication ID: 10630

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Wetlands are supposed to be protected. We can't build in wetlands. How can you?

Communication ID: 10631

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

No win-win situation.

Communication ID: 10632

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Why not go down the median of the freeway or alongside it (easement along I-5)? Not many residences along I-5. Wouldn't be bumping heads with folks.

Communication ID: 10633

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Why not replace existing 230 kV line from Alcoa that is currently not energized instead of putting new lines on vacant ROW?

Communication ID: 10634

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Barn 14 feet on PacifiCorp ROW. If additional ROW is needed it would take the entire barn.

Communication ID: 10635

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Inquired with PacifiCorp when property was purchased and was told there were no plans for the future.

Communication ID: 10636

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Does entire ROW really need to be cleared? That would take my entire backyard!

Communication ID: 10637

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Route 40 - there is vacant or farmland to the east. Why not go there instead of existing developed properties with homes?

Communication ID: 10638

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

18th Street has a proposed extension cut through east to 243rd Street. We will be impacted twice.

Communication ID: 10639

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Route 40 - If county is putting in a 4-lane road which parallels BPA's existing powerline, how is the new line going to fit in?

Communication ID: 10640

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

How will the line turn from route 36 to 40 to 46?

Communication ID: 10641

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Worried about view of big tower that turns onto 46.

Communication ID: 10642

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Worried about devaluing homes because of project.

Communication ID: 10643

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

What about being displaced from home?

Communication ID: 10644

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned about BPA needing additional ROW along the Ross-Lexington line.

Communication ID: 10645

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Lacamas Creek area there are endangered flowers and last stand of Willamette Prairie White Oak.

Communication ID: 10646

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Route 29, map 88: Rainbow Falls is located on east fork of Lewis River and considered scenic. This line would be visible up and down Dole Valley.

Communication ID: 10647

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Wildlife and plant life would be heavily impacted and never the same again and destroy temperate rain forest there.

Communication ID: 10648

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Would cause erosion and affect the east fork of Lewis River where swimming is not even allowed.

Communication ID: 10649

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Route 25, map 102; concerned if additional ROW is needed, the new line would be close to existing home or over home. If over home, would we lose our house?

Communication ID: 10650

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Can you not take away any more ROW and work with existing ROW where two 230 kV lines (N Bonneville, Lexington) are? Please don't take anymore ROW! Work with what you have.

Communication ID: 10651

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Route 25, map 95; concerned about topography and existing wetlands in the Salmon Creek area. Springs and unstable side hill areas.

Communication ID: 10652

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Route 25, map 95; concerned about tree clearing along Ross-Lexington ROW corridor.

Communication ID: 10653

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

On segments 36-39 wildlife utilize vacant ROW.

Communication ID: 10654

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Route 40 is close to my development and Lacamas Creek lowlands are protected wetlands.

Communication ID: 10655

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Landowner is forced to put life plans on hold until decision is made. This is very hard.

Communication ID: 10656

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

What will BPA pay in the appraisal process?

Communication ID: 10657

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Land use issues - width of land needed.

Communication ID: 10658

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Analysis of EMf - Impacts on animals, plants, humans.

Communication ID: 10659

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Maintenance issues.

Communication ID: 10660

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Length of process.

Communication ID: 10661

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

I can't do anything with my land for three years.

Communication ID: 10662

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

There is no PacifiCorp ROW on Segment 31. Who do I check with?

Communication ID: 10663

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Sensitive plants and animals. Look at ones that aren't listed as threatened and endangered.

Communication ID: 10664

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned about health effects.

Communication ID: 10665

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Section 9, avians preferred.

Communication ID: 10666

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

I'm right next to Section 9.

Communication ID: 10667

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Who makes the determinations whether the line is okay for people along the route?

Communication ID: 10668

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Why not beef up the existing towers?

Communication ID: 10669

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

500 kV are not pleasant - noise.

Communication ID: 10670

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Colsom renderings - sprayed toxic by-products on soil - barrels (Segment 31) illegally dumped.

Concerned - family health if stir up soil with line construction. (Columbia newspaper - search/find articles)

A lot of families would be affected. Could be a superfund site - marshy and wetlands in the area.

Communication ID: 10671

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Barn is 15 feet from easement (Segment 31). Barn would have to be removed with line.

Communication ID: 10672

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Is there a gas line in easement (Segment 31)?

Communication ID: 10673

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

My picture window would look right at line - now lots of large trees that would have to be removed.

Communication ID: 10674

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 40 (near Laenanus Creek) - wetlands, owls, all kinds of birds live in area.

Communication ID: 10675

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Hate to see construction in that area - trees, blue heron, eagles behind our house/county owned.

Communication ID: 10676

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

How does BPA value property that will be in the ROW?

Communication ID: 10677

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Does the property owner still pay taxes oN the ROW property?

Communication ID: 10678

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

How do we (property owners) disclose to potential buyers if we decide to sell our home regarding this project?

Communication ID: 10679

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned about EMF.

Communication ID: 10680

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

If we see power lines our property value will go down dramatically.

Communication ID: 10681

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

We will have more exposure to electrical effects.

Communication ID: 10682

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

If you build the line in front of my house, I would like BPA to buy me out.

Communication ID: 10683

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

How does this affect the value of your home?

Communication ID: 10684

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

What are the health hazards?

Communication ID: 10685

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

State designation of wetlands along Segment 40.

Communication ID: 10686

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Would like Project Manager to give presentation to Homeowners Association.

Communication ID: 10687

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

There is a home on the east side of an existing easement on page 24 (Bayles) - need to look at that impact. People are concerned about these proposals and it can effect their health. Why put this in a populated area when there are other options?

Communication ID: 10688

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 40, Page 110 (just north of existing line) Donald Benz

Why would BPA want to build in a subdivision? Condem houses people have been in for decades

150 foot douglas firs

Why not follow existing ROW

South of segment 40, farmland, soccer field

Would prefer easternmost option

Concern about moving

Disrupting so many people, financing, new mortgages in bad market, can't necessarily qualify

150 foot ROW, nobody wants to live in close proximity to a power line

PEP - wording BAD, concern about trees comes across heavy-handed, when will BPA compensate for damage/vandalism

Hypothetically

Re-financed two years ago, if condemned, lower value than what it's worth?

Communication ID: 10689

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Would we go double circuit on any existing lines?

Communication ID: 10690

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Near 217th and 83rd avoid cultural resources. A proposed subdivision has had problems.

Communication ID: 10691

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Homes on existing ROW - remove or ? Near ROW?

Corridor strip actual ROW width? On prop. maps

How much will new ROW add to existing?

Communication ID: 10692

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Effect on property values? Can I sell my home?

Will trees on property be cut?

Communication ID: 10693

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

How much noise will the new line make?

Communication ID: 10694

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

When will a final decision on routes be made?

Communication ID: 10695

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Why not underground?

Communication ID: 10696

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Will 150-foot trees on adjacent property be removed if line is built by existing home?

Does property owner have right to remove trees first?

Will BPA compensate for the trees?

Communication ID: 10697

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

If I sell my house, do I (or my realtor) have to disclose that there may be a line built there?

Communication ID: 10698

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Underground, impact to existing ROW

Communication ID: 10699

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

19512 NE 212 Segment #31, \$1 million homes sub-division concerned

Communication ID: 10700

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

How far from the existing line cross- N. Bonn, segments 38, 43, 39

Communication ID: 10701

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Bob Posey- cluster development in page 106 near segment 39

Communication ID: 10702

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Decisions made earlier

Communication ID: 10703

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerns about needing to sell home and must tell buyer

Communication ID: 10704

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

What about available ROW near Camas mill?

Communication ID: 10705

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Koehler, [Address], has many trees shading property, main view _____ line

Barn full of hay that is 15 feet to edge of existing easement (segment 31)

Colson rendering nearby

Communication ID: 10706

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Landowner would like to keep towers adjacent to existing

Landowners currently use the land and pay tax on it

Communication ID: 10707

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Page 110

Communication ID: 10708

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Page 51

Build on property next year or two

highly sloped except for platform

would want to use the flat platform area for their home

other area is highly sloped.

Communication ID: 10709

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Posey, Bob- Map #106 has not been notified officially

EMF concerns

Tree vulnerability from wind- need to leave buffers

Page 10, Segment 40, NW corner, bald eagle nesting wetlands, hawk habitat

Communication ID: 10710

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 31 would pose serious environmental risk, there were chemicals illegally dumped there back in 1980-90's. Check with EPA on citations given for environmental violations and illegal dumping. Until recently, there were old barrels with chemical residue. Hazardous materials also were sprayed on field directly under segment 31.

Communication ID: 10711

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

My large barn is located 15 feet from utility ROW on segment #31. I have cattle, so upstairs loft is full of hay. Tearing down would be required to meet spacing distance to existing ROW. Losing my barn would impact my family's livelihood and further erode rural way of life in rural Clark County. I think this same problem of distance to existing buildings would impact many other neighbors on segment #31.

Communication ID: 10712

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Website not working

Go through open land not house

No transparency in process

Already decided

Retired on property- don't want to leave

Communication ID: 10713

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Existing vacant ROW- is it big enough for a 500kv line? Do you put in new towers?

Vacant ROW- is it big enough? Will you need part of my property?

Why didn't I get anything in the mail? I live near ROW.

Communication ID: 10714

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Morgan Creek- high archeological/cultural value, fingerlings in stream on map #91

Near the creek, newly built dream homes. One person lost daughter and doesn't want to move. Daughter is buried nearby.

Communication ID: 10715

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

How are BPA and PacificCorp related?

Communication ID: 10716

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Who owns dams on Lewis R? If they are owned by PAC, what does that mean? Does BPA move the power off those dams? Are BPA and PAC lines tied in together? Can we build lines with PAC or PGE? Does BPA run the dams?

Communication ID: 10717

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

How do you decide? What is the best topography for lines to be built?

Communication ID: 10718

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Eminent domain- frustrating for landowners.

Communication ID: 10719

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Can you run the line down I-5? In the median? I-5 would provide double use for the freeway. Can we go underground with lines? in certain areas

Communication ID: 10720

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

How do you pick routes? Do you consider things "outside the box"? Do you have other alternatives to just putting a line?

The segment 28 goes right through my property. How do I know where it will go? If I assume it crosses my property, what happens then? Do I get compensation? Who pays for the trees to be cut down in my yard? What is the schedule? When will it be final? A line next to my house will be horrible.

Promoting solar power, alternative energy, I build my home and need minimal energy off the system. It cost a lot of money, but it is worth it. Power doesn't just need to come from hydro, wind, etc. Homes can be more self-sufficient. Why can't we offer no-interest loans to homeowners to install energy alternatives to their home.

Communication ID: 10721

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Why do we need to do all 4 nos projects? (McNary- John Day, Big Eddy-Knight, Lower Monumental-

Central Ferry).

Communication ID: 10722

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Wind generation tied into this project.

Communication ID: 10723

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Energy to California? How much?

Communication ID: 10724

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Does increased public outcry reduce the likelihood of the line being built?

Communication ID: 10725

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

I live near ROW existing and owned by BPA. Does this mean the line will go there? Eminent domain?

Communication ID: 10726

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

PEP letter says "reality specialist"

Communication ID: 10727

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Exact measurements for towers and lines- is it too close to me? EMF?

Communication ID: 10728

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Should we continue rebuilding our homes and fixing them up?

Communication ID: 10729

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Timing issues- when will we know alternatives- when do we receive information?

Communication ID: 10730

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

This is a huge project. It involves numerous homeowners. Huge impacts.

Communication ID: 10731

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Map 104- Segment 40- Stony Meadows Development wetlands- Lacamas Ck protected area. The wetlands extend beyond the development of trails, etc. On tributary, spring creek

Communication ID: 10732

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Please route the line in the more rural area near Camas and Cowlitz County so it would not impact individuals and families.

Communication ID: 10733

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Please avoid residential areas like Summer Hills. We bought our properties because of the view and pay more in taxes. If the view is impacted would our taxes go down? If so, then the county will lose income from these taxes. Also, our area is used by wildlife since much of the land is forested.

Communication ID: 10734

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Map 90, Segment 25

Doesn't sound like it's a good option to put two lines so close together?

If they selected Seg 25 on which side of the existing line would it be placed?

If route will impact our lot will BPA take the entire lot?

Communication ID: 10735

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER ,SHARON IRWIN

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Map 95, Segment 25

Sharon Irwin's property

Tributary to Salmon Creek, preserved area (NE 36th Ct)

Spring fed area, very muddy

Coyote, deer, chinese phesant, pilliated woodpeckers, horned owls, osprey, redtailed hawks, bald eagles

Bought property because of great trees

Launde Creek, mucky, not walkable

New subdivision along western boarder

Would prefer if new line could stay within existing corridor

Wouldn't want a new large line going in backyards/restrictions

Very steep property down to the creek, ravine dropping down to Salmon Creek

Why not just stick to existing easement?

Communication ID: 10736

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Map 101, Segment 25

Representing neighborhood association

Communication ID: 10737

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Map 95, Segment 25

Will BPA build lines over the houses?

So it will divide my neighborhood in half

Communication ID: 10738

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER ,BRIAN BARNES

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Map 105, Segment 31 Brian Barnes

Livingston Mountain to east

Property full of trees - old growth on property

Existing vacant ROW (Pacific)

House within proposed ROW

Communication ID: 10739

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Map 105, Segment 31

Not in our neighborhood/residential area, would prefer an alternative route

Currently building another residence

Would prefer an option that wouldn't impact residences (farmland to the north)

Communication ID: 10740

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Should choose the most open land and affect least number of homes

Tack Terrence - Segment 09 Map 24

Segment 09 crosses property. You will meet big time resistance from me. Stay off my property.

Communication ID: 10741

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

What do the people do who have a house right under the proposed line?

Communication ID: 10742

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER ,KEVIN WILLIS

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Joe Willis and Kevin Willis just completed two 2 million dollar homes within segment 09 right up to existing easement.

Putting the new line to the west of the existing easement will ruin both of the homes.

Going east will take our parents houses and their homstead. Map 24.

Communication ID: 10743

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER ,JEFF TACK

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Vehemently oppose Segment 09. Ruins property value.

Jeff Tack, Map 24.

Needs to go much further east.

Communication ID: 10744

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER ,JAMES RELYEA

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Map 100, Segment 25 (south of NE 65th St)

Billboard on property - leased to someone right now (10 year contract)

Why not power plants? Biomass line (like Clark County has been doing)

How do we protect the lines in the event of a terrorist attack?

Powerlines seem too risky, weak link in national security.

Lots of commerical property

9,000 square foot building on property

Rural property would be less expensive (farmland area, residential lots, coil(sp?) square feet)

Would prefer to not have route/segment 25

Will this make my property value go down?

Powerlines affect radio/TV

Issues with cancer? EMF

Has called help line and hasn't heard back (not user friendly)

James Relyea [Phone] Please Call

Communication ID: 10745

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Map 101

Two transmission lines already south of property, with existing easement acquired in 1940/1941

Wasn't aware of how large previous easement

If put another pole, if would be right outside back door

Communication ID: 10746

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Map 103 - Sause Family, along Segment 25

Existing easement

Why this segment?

Would they integrate with existing older line?

Take more easement to put 500kV line

If proposed route, where will subs go?

Use an alternative route that doesn't include segment 25

What about underground? Then I don't have to look at it, can put it wherever you want

What about health issues? EMF, could it enhance illnesses?

Would BPA put lines over houses?

Communication ID: 10747

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Map 103, Segment 25

Wetland at 53rd and 142nd (just south of existing line)

When do we find out?

Landowner is in the process of renovating and selling the house

How would this affect the sale?

Will BPA compensate me for my property?

Communication ID: 10748

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Map 108, Segment 35

Will they survey the property? All of the properties?

Will they (BPA) take my home?

Will I be compensated?

Communication ID: 10749

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Map 108, Segment 25 - just north of proposed route

Compensation for property?

Purchase home?

Tell me about the process/timeline?

Communication ID: 10750

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

1. Options 25/36- would prefer not to have any expansions in this area. There are more rural options to choose from. Densely populated area. Option 40- by where it connects to option 25/36- wetlands and 100 year flood plain.

2. Options 36/37- EMF issues/adverse health effects. Property values.

Homes off of 48th and 49th streets/Vancouver's (Clark County).

Effects to wildlife/endangered species

Noise effects

3. Better mail lists

Language included in letter- concerned about the language "line may be sited directly over your property."

Communication ID: 10751

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Page 85, Segment 31

Steep hill along 224th to alignment.

View issues if alignment is on ridge.

New development to east of swath. Concerned about new residents.

Battlegrounds Main Street is along 219.

Communication ID: 10752

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Page 60

PP&L lease land to Lake Merwin campers hideaway association adjacent to lake.

Communication ID: 10753

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Noise impacts, can't print names on maps, why through property

Communication ID: 10754

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Just renovated the kitchen, if house gets taken can they take appliances with them?

Communication ID: 10755

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

One neighborhood- not all got letters- how do they get on the list?

Communication ID: 10756

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Rather have a power outage than a new line

Communication ID: 10757

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Map page 104- High end 1-2 acre properties in million dollar range. Concern with view obstruction. 60

acre wetland owned by property owners with trails in area. No additional lines to destruct walking path or views.

DNR protected land to south with protected butterfly and flowering plant. Carlo Ambrusio- DNR person to talk to.

Anderson dairy opted in DNR deal

Communication ID: 10758

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Map page 91- PP&L has ROW along segment 31

Communication ID: 10759

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Map page 104- Why would you cross a wetland?

Communication ID: 10760

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Page 95- Water tower in vicinity of alignment

Communication ID: 10761

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Page 90, segment 25, East of existing ROW is open land that would be suitable since there aren't any

homes. Mill creek runs along that area too

I have a garden under the existing ROW and there are vintage apple trees there too. We have cleared the area and its an asset

Communication ID: 10762

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 25, Sherwood subdivision is stable with homeowners there 20-30 years.

3-400k homes

109th and 38th

this is the highest

Communication ID: 10763

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Steve Prickett at Clark College

Page 104

<drawing included>

49 homes in a new development will a small park

Wetland just north and east

1.5 miles from schools, near Lacous Creek

Communication ID: 10764

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Page 95

Many homes are in the way

Communication ID: 10765

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Page 101 and 102

Wetlands, racoons, hawks, big trees

Erey. Many homes in minihaba

Would rather we use single pole designs

Less footprint and looks better than lattice

Communication ID: 10766

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Page 102

Could BPA remove or combine lines? Rather than (page 102) add more lines?

Covington Middle School is next to the existing lines. Remodeling kitchen.

Communication ID: 10767

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 11

Impacts to views, environmental issues, wildlife, fish, sound impacts

Why not consider the N. Bay-Ross corridor?

Communication ID: 10768

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Sheet 91

Views, sound, DNR, Hawkenson school district has purchased new lane. Adjacent to proposed route.

Corner of 169th and 217th Ave about halfway into ROW

Also a lot of DNR next to school property

Communication ID: 10769

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Page 110

Please bypass existing homes. Also there is a flood plain to look out for.

18th Street may be extended east to 243rd from 192nd, so would conflict.

Also, the area has white Oak trees, rare willamette prairie white oak.

Have done many improvements to home and landscape

Communication ID: 10770

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER ,KAREN KINGSTON

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Karen Kingston- Segment 31- knows about toxic area on/near segment 31

Communication ID: 10771

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

John Grover, Longview - Proximity to proposed LNG line; Use of ROW for free; Use of spray on ROW; Salmon habitat improvement near confluence of Delemeter Creek and Monahan Creek; Eagle nests; Wildlife (cougar, etc.); Financial impact to landowners who have received letter regarding project. Landowners feel like they are in limbo, unwilling to invest in property due to the possibility of the line.

Communication ID: 10772

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Segment 35 – Homes on the west side, land available on the east

Communication ID: 10773

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

If BPA purchases a home they should pay more than just the market value in compensation.

Communication ID: 10774

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

What about underground?

Communication ID: 10775

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

How much of the project need is driven by serving California?

Communication ID: 10776

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Can't capacity be added to existing 500kv line?

Communication ID: 10777

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

What about higher voltage? 600 kv?

Communication ID: 10778

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Won't know for three years which route will be chosen – want to make plans sooner.

Communication ID: 10779

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Why is the line going through a small community when it is serving loads in the big cities of Portland and Vancouver?

Communication ID: 10780

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

The housing market is down now, concern about getting the full value of homes purchased.

Communication ID: 10781

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Land parcel near where Ross-Lexington line crosses I-5 – mammoth bone was found – may have other cultural artifacts too.

Communication ID: 10782

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

If the line crosses a landowner's sewer system, can they continue to use it or will they be bought out?

Communication ID: 10783

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

What will be the effect of the line on radios, satellite, electrical equipment?

Communication ID: 10784

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Why can't existing 115-kv line be replaced with 500kv line instead of building another?

Communication ID: 10785

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Salmon

Communication ID: 10786

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Subdivision near Cowlitz, Segment 3, lots have power but no houses

Communication ID: 10787

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Noise, EMF, and health issues (Norton, 161 Lenora)

Communication ID: 10788

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Weyerhaeuser selling a lot of land in Cowlitz County; Concerns about getting branded because the areas are so large.; Already making an economic impact. Any tax relief?; Make decisions quicker!; Sunrise Street, steep slopes with slides.; Earthquake concerns near Longview.; Makela Court, Segment 10 – 20+ feet of clay.

Communication ID: 10789

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Health issue concerns, Segment 3

Communication ID: 10790

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

2914 West Side Highway – dredged fill, poor soils

Communication ID: 10791

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Page 9 – wetlands on property and around

Communication ID: 10792

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Not signing PEP with horses on property

Communication ID: 10793

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

LNG, RR & power line – we live in a toxic waste?

Communication ID: 10794

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

EMF

Communication ID: 10795

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

How many more ROW do you need to make Segment 25?

Communication ID: 10796

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

New ideas for building lines? Why always overhead?

Communication ID: 10797

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Page 8 – woman lives right in front of a dike. Her yard is only about 10 feet. There isn't room for ROW.

Communication ID: 10798

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Realty – easements and appraisals on my land.

Communication ID: 10799

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Does BPA want to affect as few landowners as possible?

Communication ID: 10800

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

What is the likelihood of some segments going away?

Communication ID: 10801

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

When will we have answers? How long until we know?

Communication ID: 10802

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

There is no way someone would buy our property in the next year, knowing this is a possibility. (Page. 5)

Communication ID: 10803

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

There are severe slide zones that can't be built on – high elevation, 800+ feet.

Communication ID: 10804

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Why not go through woods to the east instead of through property owners'. Wouldn't it be cheaper?
(Page. 7)

Communication ID: 10805

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Our house has been on sale seven months, way before we knew about this. There are hundreds of children and homes along Ostrander.; I have concerns about EMF; There is a creek near our property – on Carol Walker's property – people used to pump water for wells.; Why can't you go through Weyerhaeuser land? (Pg. 10)

Communication ID: 10806

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Concerns about more EMF if a new line is next to the existing line.; I'm already unable to build on my property because of EMF. ; My property is on a hill and a new line could affect the view. (Pg. 13)

Communication ID: 10807

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Flooding once a year from Arkansas Creek, up to six feet deep in entire area. (Pg. 3, Delemeter & Wren Loop); Why not cross on the west side?; Why not move sub to Allston area or on the OR side?; Why not reclaim old Trans-Alta coal mine with substation next to it?; If wind is located east of the mountains, why not locate lines there? Isn't there more open land in eastern region?

Communication ID: 10808

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Page 9, Segment 3, Ostrander & Pleasant Hill, Collins Road. – I'm concerned about towers on my property, not lines necessarily. A tower would wipe out our entire block. There are two elderly families who would also be affected.

Communication ID: 10809

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

1.) Why are we doing this now, in a depression? 2) Why do we need a new line this bad economy? 3) Why spend the money when you just raised rates? 3) These transmission lines take too much land from people.

Communication ID: 10810

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

400-year old sequoia tree on property; gas pipeline already tried to build and went just off property.

Communication ID: 10811

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Why not build C.R. substation under existing lines?? Great flat place north of Ogden Road.

Communication ID: 10812

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Upset about fiber optic line on towers; should get royalties from them if we are leasing part of the capacity and paying taxes on property.

Communication ID: 10813

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Why not use segment 2 along the existing ROW?? There's not much up there and it would a minimal impact on landowners.

Communication ID: 10814

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Why a new route? Wouldn't it be easier to maintain and patrol the existing route? More cost-effective too? - Joe Nesbit

Communication ID: 10815

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

She wished she would have brought cookies.

Communication ID: 10816

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Zone 2 substation area off PH-10 – large gully behind properties.

Communication ID: 10817

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Concerned about EMF from a new line in Route 1 has a house in a small parcel. Concerned about house value. Has small children. Wealth is tied up in home. Does not want to see power line from house.

Communication ID: 10818

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Page 9 – North parcels have almost old growth trees that he does not want cut. Farmed for 60 years. Was parents' property (i.e. family land for many generations including has grandparents)

Communication ID: 10819

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Map 13 – lower center – a ravine runs to the east and south side, lots of wildlife – bear , elk, deer, floods

with lots of rain in the ravine, 100 year old house is sentimental value, lots of children in north area of existing ROW. The dip in the road (Allen Street) floods deeply. House on property is disabled equipped.

Communication ID: 10820

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Connie Bartold, Map 13, Segment. 9 – ravine, soft mushy ground in southwest corner; run off from creek; why was I the only one on my street to get a letter?; whole property floods during storms; very disruptive through residential area (Segment 9), school (elementary) nearby, concerned about them having to move (on Sunrise Street); high concentration of families and school children, tons of kids.

Communication ID: 10821

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Page 13, Segment 9 – Why not chose area with fewer houses?; We don't want our house taken; If taken, our house won't be reimbursed for what it's worth; for north instead of south; Segment 10 would impact fewer homes, more rural, maybe cost less; Can you live under the lines? How close to the lines can we live?

Communication ID: 10822

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

George Pittenger – called and emailed this week, haven't received a response. [Phone]

Communication ID: 10823

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Page 8, Section 1 – School present

Communication ID: 10824

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

They have senior citizens living on property and immobile. What does BPA do with these situations?

Communication ID: 10825

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Upset that BPA has been using his private road as an access road to the line (Page 25, Segment 9)

Communication ID: 10826

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Timber area, high, open; would prefer another route (possibly along I-5); why not on east side of I-5?; beautiful country, having towers would disrupt view (Larson, Segment 3, Page 9)

Communication ID: 10827

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Page 19, Segment 9 – I don't want my house to be the only remaining house if all of my neighbors' houses are taken.

Communication ID: 10828

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Should I disclose this project to a person buying my home?

Communication ID: 10829

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Segment 2 will have at the least impact on my property (Segment 2 – Leonard Tucker, Page 5)

Communication ID: 10830

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Property owner is concerned with the length of time the EIS will take which will impact his ability to sell his property (Page 13)

Communication ID: 10831

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

comment

Communication ID: 10832

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Eminent domain

Communication ID: 10833

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Letter scared people – not warm reception because unknown at this time

Communication ID: 10834

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Selling power to other states. How does this benefit the consumer?

Communication ID: 10835

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Page 9 – Olympic Natural Gas Pipeline goes through his land and fiber optic line ; Railroad is also on land with easement. His property is on Ostrander Creek which floods every year. McGearry Road bridge washes out every year 3-4 feet deep on the bridge ever since St. Helens blew out and silted the river. Many homes were moved due to flooding. His neighbor's land (Mr. Brister) gets about 8 feet. deep in winter with lots of mud.

Communication ID: 10836

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Page 8 – Buried abandoned phone line next to their property. They have a well that is producing less and less every year with long driveway. No flooding issues. Page 5 and 6 is the buried line. Okay with the

new line and understand the need.

Communication ID: 10837

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Page 7 – When Kelso had the land slide a few years back, some of those lands are part of this issue, off of N. Columbia Heights roads (Marcus Weurth)

Communication ID: 10838

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Page 9 – East side of I-5 has less impact on people since there are fewer families. Landslides are an issue in the area near the pipeline.

Communication ID: 10839

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Page 9 – Flooding in their area. Can't use dusty drive road when it floods (Jorgenson property).

Communication ID: 10840

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Page 31 – BPA doesn't have rights to the roads they are using now. BPA also locked his gate when they didn't have road rights. Would prefer we use the eastern route to stay away from private owners.

Communication ID: 10841

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Health effects from option #3 out of Castle Rock; property values.

Communication ID: 10842

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW ,NANCY FERRAN

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Page 8 – Would you really put a line through a grade school. Our property abuts the grade school on two sides. (Nancy Ferran)

Communication ID: 10843

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Page 9 – 8 acres, nowhere close to property; health issues; buy me out (Robert Beringer)

Communication ID: 10844

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Frustrated that he could not find parcel on maps (Mahoney)

Communication ID: 10845

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Page 9 – On hill and can see Kelso; scenic area; doesn't want line in; PUD is selling excess power to California, so why do we need line?; What am I as a landowner going to get from BPA if they get my land?; Fibre won't sell and my land abuts Fibre; EMF issues underneath power lines; runs a lot of cattle and horses, don't want them affected by power lines or towers. (Probst)

Communication ID: 10846

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

How long until they know more specifics?

Communication ID: 10847

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Disabled for environmental reasons – worried about magnetic fields and noise; looks of the line

Communication ID: 10848

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

If I already have lines, I shouldn't have to have others.

Communication ID: 10849

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

It's energy and we need it.

Communication ID: 10850

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Radio signals for internet signal (ADT alarm); concerned about wells on her property and locating a tower. What's the compensation if you locate on a well? Have to move it?; Concerned about views; has elk that come in and feed on property; Will large landowners be compensated more than small landowners; how long with this process take? Our lives are on hold and in limbo for no compensation. Want to be compensated for being in limbo.

Communication ID: 10851

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Parcel 632000401 – wetlands on property

Communication ID: 10852

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

BPA needs to consider that Northern Star Natural Gas has been approved by FERC. A 32" pipeline, 20" exists already (Williams pipeline) KB pipeline. There is a lot of ground movement in this area, The current people in the Lexington-Ostrander area have already been impacted by the above gas lines and now BPA has targeted them.

Communication ID: 10853

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Area 3 already had two acres taken by the County.

Communication ID: 10854

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

The CC&Rs state no less than five acres (Map 19-Broken Mountain Drive is not marked right). Concerned about creek that goes under power lines. What is going to happen to it?

Communication ID: 10855

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Properties (multiple) for sale; makes it very difficult to sell. Disclosure to buyers? Attorney said 'yes'.

Communication ID: 10856

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

How are initial survey and environment testing 'damages' compensated?

Communication ID: 10857

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Are these questions going to be responded/answered and how?

Communication ID: 10858

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Area 07 – Why not run line from Castle Rock southeast through forest area. Most would be on Weyerhaeuser and Longview Fibre Lands

Communication ID: 10859

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Why aren't you using the old Reynolds plant's existing ROW?

Communication ID: 10860

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Do not use residential areas.

Communication ID: 10861

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

How and where do I get information to take to the Assessor during this whole process to determine tax and value impacts? How will this information get responded to? (posted on website?)

Communication ID: 10862

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Decrease in property taxes; data somewhere that shows/studies already done? Where would we get that?

Communication ID: 10863

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

What are the test holes for?

Communication ID: 10864

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Why did you put a number through our subdivision (by Lexington SS)

Communication ID: 10865

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Follow the old line.

Communication ID: 10866

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Forestry tax use – how will this affect our status for this use, increase our taxes, penalties?

Communication ID: 10867

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

I may not want to live on our beautifully landscaped property anymore if you come through my property

area.

Communication ID: 10868

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

If people wouldn't have so many kids we wouldn't use so much power and need new lines.

Communication ID: 10869

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Why do we need a line if you already have existing line? Why even consider?

Communication ID: 10870

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

How would you compensate for land taken?

Communication ID: 10871

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Leave land owner with land they cannot use.

Communication ID: 10872

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Will it change my property value when I try to sell my house?

Communication ID: 10873

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Relocation of senior citizens?

Communication ID: 10874

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

What about public impact statement?

Communication ID: 10875

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Map 3 (Weiderman) – property is in a floodplain (Arkansas Creek). There is annual flooding.

Communication ID: 10876

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Why isn't there a route from Allston to Troutdale that stays west of Columbia in Oregon?

Communication ID: 10877

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Optical cable on towers (poles). BPA gets revenue, I don't. (Mr. Nichols – 4 acres of property just north of the Lexington SS)

Communication ID: 10878

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

BPA was supposed to release old access road ROWs and never did, but are using the new one.

Communication ID: 10879

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Route 11, Map 15 and 16: concerned about this route impacting the community of Rose Valley. What about the impact of spawning fish in the Coweeman River.

Communication ID: 10880

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Would towers be located in wetlands?

Communication ID: 10881

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Route 10 – Why this route? If moved ½-1 mile east it would be on Weyerhaeuser property and would not affect as many landowners.

Communication ID: 10882

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Route 10 – When will we know when routes have been eliminated? Our kids want to build in this area.

Communication ID: 10883

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Route 10 – Our timber is classified and in timber tax. What happens when the trees are removed?

Communication ID: 10884

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

In Castle Rock Substation area, Map 2 locals know of an ancient Indian burial site. (Sec 5, SE corner)

Communication ID: 10885

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Route 10, Map 20 – The property owners live in the valley and up on the hill is the Timber Company. Please stay away from the property owners.

Communication ID: 10886

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Route 10, Map 20 – Bald eagles in the area cutting timber will affect their habitat.

Communication ID: 10887

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Route 10, Map 20 – Goble Creek floods often in this area.

Communication ID: 10888

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Route 10, Map 20 – Property owner is sensitive to EMFs and is concerned about this route. Under doctor's care and has already moved once to get away from a cell tower and does not want to lose another house.

Communication ID: 10889

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Route 9, Map 24; concerned about the new line going over home.

Communication ID: 10890

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Route 9, Map 25 – Makes sense to use BPA’s existing corridor rather than tear up someone’s property.

Communication ID: 10891

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Why did we select Segment #1 when #2 appears to meet the need? Please be on east side of existing line if BPA uses #2.

Communication ID: 10892

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Why are all of the line routes in WA and none in Oregon?

Communication ID: 10893

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Why isn’t there a line alternative that follows I-5?

Communication ID: 10894

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Does environmental impact take precedence over human impact when determining line route?

Communication ID: 10895

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Route 11 goes near Merwin and goes through a designated wildlife area. Will this be allowed or rerouted?

Communication ID: 10896

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

By taking two and a half years to make a decision BPA has locked up my property. Is there any compensation?

Communication ID: 10897

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Map 8 – EMF concerns (also impacted on two other properties and LNG)

Communication ID: 10898

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Will power lines affect AM radio? (owner does not have cable, TV, etc.)

Communication ID: 10899

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

How close can a power line be to a house?

Communication ID: 10900

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Metal fence okay?

Communication ID: 10901

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Geological, timber, and erosion concerns.

Communication ID: 10902

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Indian burial grounds (section 5 in Castle Rock substation area)

Communication ID: 10903

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Will EMF hurt fish?

Communication ID: 10904

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Health concerns

Communication ID: 10905

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

How will the lines affect water tables/wells?

Communication ID: 10906

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Cancer causing?

Communication ID: 10907

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

How far out is the magnetic field?

Communication ID: 10908

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

What about the noise?

Communication ID: 10909

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

On Section 4 where Ross-Lexington crosses I-5 is an archaeological site.

Communication ID: 10910

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

I don't want this in my backyard. Please move north of 503. We have a creek through our property, fish hatchery at Speylei Bay on Lake Merwin. We have mature fir trees. Been in the family for 40 years. (Robin & Richard Owen, [Address] by Lake Merwin)

Communication ID: 10911

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Destroy value of home

Communication ID: 10912

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Concern for drop in land values

Communication ID: 10913

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Concern for health

Communication ID: 10914

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Impacts to water by Dorothy Lake

Communication ID: 10915

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Impacts to wildlife (elk, owls, bats, birds, etc.)

Communication ID: 10916

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Impacts to Beaver Hill School (physical, electrical)

Communication ID: 10917

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Disruption to wildlife and residents during construction

Communication ID: 10918

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Mammoth bones found during I-5 construction. Archaeological impact and concerns.

Communication ID: 10919

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

EMF concerns for people and animals

Communication ID: 10920

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Impact to historical sites – old homesteads, old growth timber and associated wildlife

Communication ID: 10921

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Slope stability issues

Communication ID: 10922

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

If no transmission line, then will need new power plants in NW that would have more impacts

Communication ID: 10923

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Native American (unknown sites) need to be assessed

Communication ID: 10924

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Too broad in options – land owners in limbo – economic costs!

Communication ID: 10925

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Letter to landowners not adequate! Should have had more advance notice!

Communication ID: 10926

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

What happens to a property in a lower tax bracket (timber taxation) if BPA cuts the trees for the ROW and line?

Communication ID: 10927

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Will BPA pay the taxes?

Communication ID: 10928

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Concerned about EMF and noise

Communication ID: 10929

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Effects on horses?

Communication ID: 10930

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Degradation of the water quality from our pump – Ostrander

Communication ID: 10931

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Section 11, Maps 14-15 - Surface water (potable water) degradation up Rose Valley

Communication ID: 10932

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Upper Kalama River listed primary species – wild steelhead

Communication ID: 10933

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Conservation easements along upper Kalama River riparian areas

Communication ID: 10934

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

In Lexington area (Map 8) makes more sense to go on west side of current lines otherwise will go through new subdivision.

Communication ID: 10935

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Elk on existing line (concerned about the effect on them)

Communication ID: 10936

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

TV, phone, radio, satellite, cable interferences

Communication ID: 10937

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Wells – any effects from the transmission lines?

Communication ID: 10938

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Springs throughout the foothills

Communication ID: 10939

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Landslide potential

Communication ID: 10940

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Does the land negotiations include visual compensation?

Communication ID: 10941

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Easement for timber access

Communication ID: 10942

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

What the devalue rate/figure to property owners due to transmission lines

Communication ID: 10943

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Does BPA build on wetlands

Communication ID: 10944

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Impact on electrical rates due to this project

Communication ID: 10945

Date: 11/4/2009

Name: CARLOS SOLVACEZ

Yes, my name Carlos Solvacez, my number is [Phone]. And the reason I'm calling is that a neighbor informed me that you're planning on doing some kind of a big project around this area. I live over here on Sunset Falls Road and I want to know whether or not you're planning on doing anything on my land. I have several parcels of property and I want to make sure you're not or I want to know what you folks

are up to.

Please give me a call my number is [Phone], and I would appreciate if you could contact me as soon as possible. Thank you very much.

Communication ID: 10946

Date: 11/4/2009

Name: PAUL OATES

Yes, this is Paul Oates. I live at [Address]. I'm on the corridor 31 that's just south of 99th Street, west of 212th Avenue. My concerns: I have a natural gas pipeline going through my property which impacts the usage of my property. If this line goes through it is going to impact my property also on paying taxes on property that all I can do is raise a goat on.

You have probably 8 or 10 danger trees that can fall into the line that will have to be removed off my property that's on my right-of-way or my property.

I do have some concerns. I make my living as a journeyman lineman and I'd like to have someone contact me to answer some questions about the center of the right-of-way, how far in they are going to go in to remove trees.

There's a lot of unanswered questions. I'm very much impacted by this line that goes through my property along with the existing natural gas pipeline that goes through that they're going to increase my property is being diminished, impacted greatly. Could you contact me? Again my name is Paul Oates. Address: [Address] Phone number: [Phone]. Thank you. Bye.

Communication ID: 10947

Date: 11/4/2009

Name: SHERRY DEFENBAUGH

Hi my name is Sherry Defenbaugh. My phone number is area code [Phone]. I live off of Sunset Falls Road in Yacolt, Washington. It came to my attention that there was a letter sent to us regarding some power lines wanting to go through. I personally have not seen the letter. My husband recalled seeing it, he disregarded it, and I'm interested in what the content of the letter is about. I want to know if we're directly affected by what your plans may be.

So if you could call, call me again at [Phone]. Or do another mailing at [Address] so we can be informed of what's going on with your reinforcement project. My concern is: are there going to be power lines

going across my property. I'm sure everyone's concerned. That's my main concern and question. Again my name is Sherry. You can leave a message. I'll be going to work here soon.

Communication ID: 10948

Date: 11/4/2009

Name: JUNIE EVELYN LAWSON,CHARLES LAWSON

Hi. Yes we do have some questions. Our property is rented out right now and we're living in up in Idaho, but our mailing address is in Newport, Washington. Our phone number is [Phone]. My husband's name is Charles and my name is Junie, or Evelyn, Lawson.

We want to know is how soon the route will be determined. Do we have the option not to sale if they choose to go our direction? And we have been wanting to put our place up for sale. Now we're wondering can we even put it up for now because now it is potentially in this, is this going to be eminent domain situation? Or do we have a choice in this?

Please give us a call at [Phone]. You can ask for Charles or Junie. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10949

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: TANA MASSON

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

I am in a specialty market offering a higher return to landowners for Large Leaf Maple 28" Diameter along your corridors.

Please send me your final proposed line so I may contact these owners for possible money value losses at a time when they may benefit.

Thank you

Tana Masson

[Address]

Communication ID: 10950

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: MARK AND MEGAN BERGLUND

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Proposal Area 18. Please have your environmental studies look at uninhabited property on proposal 18 to the South of our homes as potential lines or run with existing lines to the North of proposal 18

Already living with lines 1/4 mile from my house now!

Communication ID: 10951

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: NANCY BUCKBEE

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

We do not want lines on or near our home. This would effect our health, both physical and mental and would ruin our property value.

We have lived here 33 years and have our lives inversted in this home.

Communication ID: 10952

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: PAM C ASHFORD

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Please have your environmental studies look at our house values.

We have old growth trees that need to be left alone. We live in a fragile ecosystem. We have a small creek that salmon spawn in. Do not destroy our environment.

Communication ID: 10953

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: ANONYMOUS

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Use the existing line that makes the most sense environmentally and financially. Use what you've already got!!!

I do not want anyone on my property I/we have no intention of offering up any part of it to the BPA.

Page 51

Communication ID: 10954

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: HOLLY BOWER

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

[Address] is a wetlands area with 2 creeks (pup creek) and 2 ponds.

Communication ID: 10955

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: DES WELLSMORE,JOAN A WELLSMORE

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

My major concern is the effect on our property value. If we need to sell our house because of the powerline we'll not get the full value.

Health concerns with electrical lines so close to the house electrical interference with TV, computer, phonem etc. Magnetic field goes out 500 feet= health risks

Has BPA taken into consideration the number of homes that would need to be purchased.

How will this effect wildlife in the area?

Communication ID: 10956

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: JON VANDERBOUT

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Why make it so hard for people to identify where this is being considered? Maps have no street names, etc. Why no at least provide a grid on your maps so we can at least identify to you with some accuracy where we are commenting about?

Communication ID: 10957

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: KEN M KRAISLER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Please have your environmental studies look at Segment 30. My page 86, [Address] take special note of the Berry Kend. Segment 30 at about 236th impacts about 30 homes. Berry Kend picks up many many kids as it heads East. Each of these homes has a septic system, a well, as well as numerous animals, deer, streams and waterways. Segment 30 is a bad and unnecessary idea. Segment 29 would impact far far less. Segment 30 would impact 30 higher end homes. At least you should consider only the Eastern half of Segment 30.

I am happy to answer questions about how much hardship segment 30 would bring. Call me anytime with questions.

I request those answers: why would you not use existing easements along segments 31 and 27? Why would you not be more remote and choose segment 29?

Call anytime [Phone]

Communication ID: 10958

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: ANONYMOUS

[Scoping Meeting (Amboy)]

Powerlines with high voltage cause cancer and other diseases. Keep them away from residential areas.

This is the worst run "meeting" ever! We spent an hour trying to find a map of 74 and can't find it!

Communication ID: 10959

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: CHARLES FELL

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Environmental constraints for Segment 40

The area is 100 year flood plain and wetlands

The State of WA Department of Natural Resources is interested in designating segment 40 area as a conservation area.

The south edge of segment 40 goes right through densely populated neighborhoods. If segment 40 is chosen, improvements should be limited to the northeast portion of the segment, which is far more rural.

Communication ID: 10960

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SUSAN LEMOS

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Please have your environmental studies look at registration in our backgrounds. Line 31 would run in my background, on my property where my children and family live and play.

The east side of the property is a wetland in the winter months. Therefore, not a good area for new poles.

Please do not put these high voltage lines on my property. Please try to find an area that is not populated.

Communication ID: 10961

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: GARY AND RENE ECKERT

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Impact on our local wildlife deer, coyotes, bear, etc.

Impact on the wetlands near us

Concern that the rural environment and quiet atmosphere will be destroyed.

EMF impact on the health of humans and our wildlife (ie. cancer)

Drop in land values

Please forward comments received on a CD

Our email is [Email]

Communication ID: 10962

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: CHARLES AND BEVERLY LYNCH

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Please have your environmental studies look at all the homes this route will go over and will make it unliveable.

It devalues our property and makes it useless. It is too close to existing buildings and over some of them.

It is a firm belief that high powerlines of this magnitude cause cancers and they are noisy. They crackle and pop when it rains.

High powerline crews have a higher than normal rate of cancer than other jobs.

Communication ID: 10963

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: DALE ANDRING

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

The line between [Address] (Page 100) goes through my property. The new line is fine was expected.

However every time the 78th st gate is opened four wheelers, garbage dumpers, target shooter, and other vandals access a huge wildlife area. (There are deer, coyotes and other wildlife.) They make a complete mess for the next year. Sometimes they even break down the gate.

Communication ID: 10964

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: ROBERT W LITTLETON

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Use the existing right of way. Also route through the DNR already allows ATV's, logging, and motorbikes to tear up land. Logged areas are not replanted

At what point does "cost effective" trump homeownership? How many homeowners are you willing to

displace. My home is on section 35, map 108. I will not move. Retired and will die there.

Communication ID: 10965

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: SEAN P SMITH

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

I vote no on proposal of line 31! Please consider building in a less populated area. My home is directly on this line. This will negatively impact my property and home value. A line further east makes better sense as there are less homes to impact.

Communication ID: 10966

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: MARGARET HUTCHISON

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Please have your environmental studies look at the affects of living by powerlines and cancer.

We have lived at [Address] for 12 years. We have had 3 major cancers: prostate, breast and a very rare cance in an ovary, plus basil cell cancer.

No other family members on either side have had any of these cancers or any other cancer. Wife come from family of 6 children, husband from family of 5 children.

We are also concerned about what will happen to our property values.

I personally have constant ringing in my ears, of course I don't know if it is caused by the powerlines.

Communication ID: 10967

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: CHARLOTTE AKIN

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Please have your environmental studies look at Rock Creek. We have used our property for 20 years to bring classes from Evergreen School Distrit to release salmon they have raised from eggs and do water quality studies. I am hoping this will continue for years to come. Our 500 feet of the crrek is pristine to set up naturally to teach.

I have called the number given and 3 days later still no call back.

Consider using existing route or something adjacent to it. Where there's a will there's a way...to make it so that all risk wouldn't be in one place. Any chance lines could be put underground?

Communication ID: 10968

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: JON VANDERBOUT

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Please have your environmental studies look at the wetlands south of line segment 40 (Stony Meadows and Edmonds Estates wetlands)-Lower left corner of map 104. Ducks breed in pond every year, geese feed in fields, habitat for coyote, muskrat, raccoon, rabbits, deer, etc.

Cannot understand why you would even consider wetlands when so much dry land, farmland available.

Building through these wetlands would lower value of our home considerably.

Communication ID: 10969

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: PAUL KUST

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Please have your environmental studies look at wetland probability in section 40.

Instead of building a new line (section 40). Follow existing section 41 with improvements.

Communication ID: 10970

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: JERRY BOATRIGHT

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

The existing right of way crosses the SE corner of my property, expanding the right of way west would destroy my house. My house and property are worth in excess of \$500,000. I could not replace it for the current value. I hope you stay on the East side of the current right of way.

Communication ID: 10971

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: STEVE DOBBINS

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

My home is roughly 75-100 feet from the edge of the existing north south line. If BPA puts a 500 kv transmission line next to the existing 230 kv line, it puts the 500 line 100-150 feet from my back door.

I am very concerned with the health affects with having that size line so close to my house. I am also concerned with the low buffer trees that are on the fringe of the existing fir cedar trees vulnerable to prevailing SW storms. I would loose the majority of my trees from a domino effect as already happened to my neighbors trees.

Why not seriously look at putting in an additional north south line in a remote area away from the population. This would give additional power to the existing line. So a catastrophe of some kind will not completely knock power out as it may with all power running thru the same easement.

I am in favor of adding power to the grid, but I am not in favor of expanding the 09 line even though it may be the shortest and falls into an existing easement. The time is right to add additional routes and worry about upgrades to the current ones for later.

Communication ID: 10972

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[10/29/2009] - [Scoping Meeting (Longview)] - Not over my house

Communication ID: 10973

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[10/29/2009] - [Scoping Meeting (Longview)] Between Castle Rock and Toutle - go through DNR and Gifford Pinchot - outside of residential areas; just finished remodeling home - property in family for over 100 years, four generations

Communication ID: 10974

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[10/29/2009] - [Scoping Meeting (Longview)]- Segment 9 - has less land owners

Communication ID: 10975

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING LONGVIEW

[10/29/2009] - [Scoping Meeting (Longview)]- Put it where existing line is - less damage

Communication ID: 10976

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: ANONYMOUS

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Consider less populated areas than the existing Ross-Lexington line.

Communication ID: 10977

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: MARI C CAMPUZANO

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Please have your environmental studies look at:

1. Environmental and emotional impact on families and children located in Hockinson, WA
2. Probability of riparian habitat on Morgan Creek
3. Is BPA prepared to compensate for lost income of home-business?
4. Look at EMF probability in Hockinson Schools
5. How many homes exactly would have to be purchased on line 31 to complete transmission lines?
6. How much energy (percentage) will be sold to California?

Communication ID: 10978

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: JOE BOND

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

[Address]

Map 102. Would like a copy of the property owners information packet that was sent out about a month ago. He threw away the original packet and would now like a replacement

Communication ID: 10979

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: CLIVE ROCEHOENBOGER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Due to a high level of visual and scenic impacts due to a rural forested area I recommend that you locate your corridor along the existing, I-5 route.

Communication ID: 10980

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: LYNDA KUNST,GEORGE KUNST

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

I live on segment 31 (map 91) and the existing right of way that PP & L has now goes into my property by about 75 feet. I know this because when I purchased the property in 1985, PP & L surveyed it and the centerline runs parallel to my property.

I asked PP & L at that time if I should be concerned about future development and they said (in 1985) that there were too many homes on the right of way to make it financially feasible.

I can't imagine that this situation is any better now, in fact it is probably much worse!

I would think that the best option here would be to piggy-back onto an existing tower system such as #9.

Or if you must build a new tower system pick the route that is least inhabited. It makes the most financial sense and it will have less of an alienation effect on the residents of Clark County.

Communication ID: 10981

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: STEVE BRETZ

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please have your environmental studies look at the impact of all the people along section 48.

This is a major inconvenience to us as we were planning on building a home on this property starting the spring of 2010! Now we have to wait until Spring of 2012 just for you to make a decision?

Communication ID: 10982

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: DAWN WOOLCOTT

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please have your environmental studies look at Area 91 on line 31. There is a neighborhood of 22 homes on [Address]. The road runs down the center of the proposed right of way and is the only access to the houses at the end of the cul-de-sac. If most of the neighborhood is bulldozed, will there still be access to the houses left? Is it safe to drive under these powerlines? Our neighborhood association currently pays dues to cover road repairs. Will BPA take over these costs? The last 3 houses standing could not afford to maintain this private road.

Our neighborhood has deer, rabbits, coyotes, porcupine, and bobcats. A black bear was in the neighborhood a couple of years ago. The wildlife is being squeezed onto smaller and smaller areas already.

Communication ID: 10983

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: BENJAMIN E STARK

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please have your environmental studies look at placing route 35 lines along the furthest eastern point of proposed route.

This would impact zero homes if placed as far east as possible. The properties are also much larger therefore impacting fewer landowners (homeowners). City of Camas watershed as well as their access road (NE Boulder Creek Rd). Would also provide access without the need to build additional roads for this section.

We are concerned with the devaluation of our home which is currently under construction. Health concerns. Wildlife impact in this area.

Communication ID: 10984

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: GENE THOMPSON,JUDY THOMPSON

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please have your environmental studies look at the little washougal watershed-construction near water way. The effects of new high powerlines to homes within 500 feet of the new line. Health effects (people/animals).

We live against existing lines about 400 feet from our home we built less than 10 years ago and the value of our home would definitely be affected and we are also unsure of health affects by high powerlines.

We feel using an existing clear pathway such as PPL land makes more sense, however we know this too will possibly affect then landowners who like us live out away from the city as I have my entire life.

Because we love the peaceful beauty and wildlife and the ability to jump on your horse and see Gods country. We feel we will pay the price for your success.

Communication ID: 10985

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: LISA PERIGO

I am concerned about the diminished value of my property should that route be selected and hope that we will actually have some say in what happens.

Communication ID: 10986

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: GEORGE W PITTENGER

I attended the BPA informational meeting held in Longview, WA, about the I-5 corridor project to find answers to a letter that was sent to me about my property and the chance of a large 500 volt line being placed on my property. We live next to a smaller one now, (line 9), but understand that if the large one that is planned goes in we will be greatly impacted. The following are my concerns:

1. The visual impact: I moved here for the view of the hills, elk herds that roam and the quiet that country living provides. With a 110 foot tower, heavy power lines and the noise that is generated, the

view will be greatly impacted. The elk will no longer want to come around because of the loud buzzing noise and I will no longer be able to enjoy a quiet evening out on my deck appreciating the view. What are the health concerns when you live next to such powerful lines?

2. Loss of mature trees: After talking to the engineers they mentioned that the large old growth timber that keeps my bank stable could be cut and then destabilize the ground and cause my house to slide down the hill. This area is already unstable and we recently had a slide just down the road from us on the corner of Corduroy Rd. The aesthetic effect will double the impact by cutting the trees and then having the BPA add bigger and more intrusive obstructions.

3. Loss of land value: This impacts the worth of our land. Because you have said this is a maybe, it will be impossible to sell our property in an already depressed real estate environment. We can't make any improvements on our property because you may destroy our house after you condemn it under eminent domain. We own a beautiful, custom made, high end Victorian home that is above the average home costs in our area. We also own the lot next to us. If you decide to take our house, you would be in for a fight for the value of our property. Just by saying you "might" move this line here, you have already devalued our property.

4. Cost of the Line: This area has a lot of homes that would have to be compensated and bought out. The eastern routes with less population would be a more cost effective solution. Lines on Weyerhaeuser land could provide better access roads and easements. Storms, earthquakes and slides could take out the new 500 volt line if combined with or next to the existing line that could possibly shut down power to a lot more customers in case of a natural disaster.

The sooner you decide what you will do, the sooner our life can get back to normal. At the meeting we had lots of questions, but received no answers because of your uncertainty. With this weight hanging over us, it is hard to plan for the future or enjoy life knowing that our entire fortune that we have worked for our whole life may be lost.

George W. Pittenger

[ADDRESS]

Communication ID: 10988

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: LAURA BERG,KEN BERG

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please have your environmental studies look at the effect that the towers will have concerning the electro-magnetic field going out from the towers and have that could affect health of citizens nearby.

I want to see meetings that will explain the general plan, so as the public, we know what we're dealing

with. We do not want to sign permission papers to come onto our property until we know for sure ours is in a vital area.

We want to have neighborhood meetings in the areas affected.

We believe because of California's need for more power you are going to supply it at our cost namely living property and value of property if we want to keep it.

Communication ID: 10989

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: STEVE COCKRELL

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please do not place powerlines/towers on land between existing houses on see 52 Lookout Ridge and Granite Highlands to interfere with current view. We just purchased a new home in 2008 the fantastic view was one of our considerations for purchasing the house.

Communication ID: 10990

Date: 11/4/2009

Name: MIKE LINDHORST

Hi this Mike Lindhorst calling about the BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement. I got the mailer on that and do have one of your power lines that is directly behind our property. Not sure I understand what it is or what the impacts are going to be to me and that's what I'm trying to find out. My number is [Phone]. [Address]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10991

Date: 11/4/2009

Name: DON K RANDOLPH

I am very concerned about losing my land or the use of my land by this proposed project. I would like more detail about the proposed route and impact on my propaerty on Map page 105. Please contact me.

Communication ID: 10992

Date: 11/4/2009

Name: KIM L SMITH

I am in the proposed corridor for the eastern most path. I have recieved nothing in the way of a packet of information so went to the meeting at Liberty Middle School in Camas yesterday relatively unprepared and uninformed except for your website. Please send the same packet that you send to other affected property owners. I understand there is some permission document in the packet. I was disappointed that there was not a forum type meeting to publicly exchange views and comments regarding EIS. I hope that this is a modification that is made for meetings beginning in 2010.

Communication ID: 10993

Date: 11/4/2009

Name: BARRY A FINKEL

BPA's current process to select a route to increase power transmission capability in the I-5 corridor is flawed. The time line for reaching a decision is far too long at best and has likely been significantly underestimated. Hundreds, perhaps even thousands, of home owners are being held hostage while the tedious and largely unknown bureaucratic selection process grinds on. Moreover, it should be obvious that any decision will result in a lawsuit which will extend the time line even further. Meanwhile property values are dramatically impacted on all proposed routes and property owners are in limbo. BPA must significantly reduce the time required for reaching a decision by minimizing the number of options to be considered and compressing the environmental impact review time line. Some of the proposed routes can be easily eliminated. For example, proposed Route 31 is of insufficient width for a 500 KV transmission line and will require significant property acquisition costs to widen the route so that it can accommodate a 500 KV line and its towers as well as for construction and maintenance access. This easement was established over 50 years ago, in 1958, with the purpose of moving excess power from the hydroelectric dam at Swift Lake in northern Clark County, to Troutdale, Oregon. This proved not to be feasible due to a lack of surplus capacity at Swift as the population of Clark County grew. The easement is not owned by BPA and is routed through a heavily populated area, the most heavily populated of any under consideration. These issues militate for its removal from consideration as a route to increase capacity in the I-5 corridor and in fact the easement should be abandoned as it will never be used. Not all participants in the process will be treated equally in spite of BPA's assertion to the contrary. The wishes and opinions of the Washington State Department of Natural Resources and Weyerhaeuser Paper Company, both of whom are large land owners on most of the routes under consideration, will necessarily carry much more weight than that of individual homeowners. To believe otherwise is naïve. An approach that achieves BPA's goal of increasing power transmission capacity in the I-5 corridor in a timely manner is to widen the existing easement, Route 9 (which currently contains both 115 and 230 KV transmission lines), and replace the existing 115 KV line with the desired 500 KV line giving both 500 KV and 230 KV capabilities. Environmental and engineering issues are well known along this route, property acquisition requirements will be minimal, and access for both construction

and maintenance is in place. I urge you to adopt this methodology.

Communication ID: 10994

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: CRAIG F ORPUT

I am unemployed, like MANY people in SW Washington. My work search has expanded past my local area into locations that would cause me to sell my house. BPA has now put my ability to sell my house in limbo for 3 or more years (2 years for the draft EIS and one year to finalize it). I am having a hard enough time finding a job, you can't impact my (and others) livelihood like this! Make a final decision in 6 months or move the project onto unoccupied land!

Communication ID: 10995

Date: 11/4/2009

Name: DAVE BURLINGAME

RE: KEC-4 Parties Interested in the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

Dear Ms. Wittpenn:

In reference to the project stated above, the Cultural Resources Department of the Cowlitz Indian Tribe would like to state its interest.

The Cowlitz Indian Tribe requests continuing consultation regarding this project. In addition, we recommend an Inadvertent Discovery Plan be attached to the permit; we have included language for your consideration.

Please contact us with any questions or concerns you may have. We look forward to working with you on this undertaking.

Thank you for your time and attention.

All My Relations,

dAVE burlingame

Communication ID: 10996

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: KIRK S SMITH

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)] I am on line 31. I am adamantly against this proposal. It will negatively

impact the resale of my property and it is a cancer risk. Further I have a pond on my property which flows into a tributary to Salmon Creek and this is likely bad for the environment. Please consider a line that goes further east where this is less population. Thank you.

Communication ID: 10997

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: LYNN HALVORSON

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please have your environmental studies look at proposed 50 line would run very close to elementary school and high school. Though there are “no dangers from emf’s” near and under powerlines, other studies show differing results. In the early 80’s before a lot of development near and around my property, I had someone from PUD come out and test emf’s from current line that runs above corner of my property. He said at the time they were low, but didn’t recommend building within 50 yards. He also said that later on, when more development and load on the lines increased he wouldn’t recommend building near it at all. If we add another high load line I have great concerns about the schools.

Landowner rights and concerns. I’ve owned this property for 35 years looking for the future for eventually building and further, for retirement income. As a young widow I had to scrimp to make ends meet to keep up payments but was able to do it. Though I currently do not have a home on the property proposed 50 would cut it in half/diagonally, basically rendering it of little value. I’ve no doubt the “compensation” for easement would not begin to be near what the total value of property would be if it wasn’t divided by a new powerline, especially at current market values.

Giving rights to survey will also ruin my property and trees, even if decided to go another route.

Communication ID: 10998

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: TOM OWENS,MURIEL OWENS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please have your environmental studies look at another route less residential with less impact.

Do not come through page 108, section 35. The property value would be greatly depreciated and this is our only investment for the future.

Communication ID: 10999

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: KATHIE AASETH, ALLEN AASETH

Please have your environmental studies look at: Natural spring between our property and PP&L power lines. Spring provides water for year around creek on our property.

If Segment 18 is to be used, it should be located north of the existing PP&L power lines. This would avoid disturbing several small property owners. This should be a serious consideration.

Communication ID: 11000

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: MUBARIK AHMAD

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

I am in segment 25 in Vancouver. I would prefer to not have the line so then the line so then this segment, I prefer to have the line go thru 11, 29, 35

Communication ID: 11001

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: BRADLEY BRAINARD

Parcel ID [Number]

Parcel ID2 [Number]

Section 29

Township 5N

Range 3E

20 acres Clark County, WA

I attended the BPA meeting in Amboy on Oct. 27. I don't think you expected the response (it was a zoo). I did get help finding my property on the maps.

According to the map my property just touches proposed Line 26 on one corner. It is not within the

proposed corridor. My concern is that for the last year we have spent somewhere between 20 and 30 thousand dollars to dived the property into 2 10 acre parcels on which we were planning to build 2 homes, 1 for my wife and I and one for my daughters & son in law. Depending on the economy, we were hoping to start building next spring. You indicated that it would be 2 1/2 years before a final decision is made. Can we be informed earlier if Line 26 gets removed from consideration (due to NEPA or other research). We do not want to start construction if we are in or adjacent to the lines. I don't suppose you would want to purchase a 400 thousand and 250 thousand dollar homes as well as property if the lines require the property to be purchase.

Communication ID: 11002

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: BEN SCOTT

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

The Fern Prairie Airport runs below our property (48). Please don't run lines thru our property.

Communication ID: 11003

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: DON STUART

Forget about laying out new transmission lines over new ground. There is a lot of hard to reach areas on your proposals and also a lot of already permanent residences that you would be impacting.

Stick to your existing R/W from Ross sub. to Lexington and just increase your existing capacity there. People have already built as close to the existing lines as far as they care to. That was their joice at the time. The line was there first. But if you put a line somewhere else you will impact their homes which would not be right because they were there first.

Communication ID: 11004

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOTT WOURMS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please take into account reestablishment of steelhead fish spanning in little washugal river. With the city of Camas getting well rights which will result in 8 million extra gallons of water flow in the Little Washugal during the summer, and habitat improvement projects over the last several years. We are hopeful for a return of fish to this river. It would be a shame for this project to negatively affect all of these other efforts.

Communication ID: 11005

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: CHRISTIN CRIDER,ROB CRIDER

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

We are being tax high because this is a view property. We already have a tower on our property this is visable and one more tower to the east the is right in the middle of our view. So to add taller lines will take away from our property value along with our view. The tower line take up the bottom part of our 5 acres to add a second line will take up the bottom part of our property killing all property value.

Communication ID: 11006

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: YVONNE J COX,DALE COX

Please have your environmental studies look at: What is the impact of having two (2) lines run along the same corridor in close proximity?

Since we currently live along the existing 230kv line, we are able to use 1/2 of the easement right of way for standard agricultural purposes. Our vegetable garden (with soil that has been amended over 20 years), our raspberry garden, lavender beds and noble fir trees are all located on the space. The easement also contains a wide variety of apple trees that have been there for many, many years. We have been pruning and cleaning up the trees and the trees provide apples to lots of neighbors. Since I am a Master Gardener, I also have a wide variety of flowers planted in the space.

I know the old adage "not in my back yard" but it would be very difficult to lose our home at this stage of our lives. We are retired and planned to end our life in our home here on 160th Street.

Thank you,

Communication ID: 11007

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: TAMMY L OLSON

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please have your environmental studies look at soil and wildlife.

I live on route 31 that has a PP & L easement that is not big enough to put the 150 foot tower. In increasing the easement to 500 feet our house, barn and shop will be in the way. Several other homes, barns, riding arena's will also be in the way. This house is our biggest investment and we have done a lot of improvements to it. We do not want to move. We moved here from Oregon away from the City onto 5 acres. We are established in our community and our lads love their home. They are very upset and so are we. Please do not consider route 31 as an option it is a residential area and should not be disturbed.

Communication ID: 11008

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: PAT CAMPBELL

I prefer segments 52, 50, 45, 41, 36, 25 & 09 be used to least impact neighborhoods in the Vancouver area and to make security of the lines easier. I would like to avoid routes through the Yacolt Natl Forest as I believe we already have a lack of DNR enforcement resource there and want to help keep that area somewhat natural.

Communication ID: 11009

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: MARK OLSON

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

I live on route 31. It appears to me that there are many homes that will be affected if route 31 were to be selected as the route for the 500 kvolt line. It seems to me that if the routes 28, 29, 30 were selected though you would mainly have 2 entities, state of Washington and weyerhauer to negotiate with. It seems common sense to only deal with just a few rather than create undue stress with involving multiple (thousands) homeowners/property owners to complete the task or installing a new 500 kvolt

line.

Communication ID: 11010

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: C GROGGEN

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Anxiety will be the norm for two years. Could cause health issues for some.

Cannot plan to improve property because it could be taken or devalued.

Who would want to purchase property near a powerline, how to compensate

Communication ID: 11011

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: DARLENE TOMLINSON

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

We just built our house at [Address] last year and we do not want to have to move or sell our property and we do not to try to live under powerlines.

Communication ID: 11012

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: SUSAN ZAREVICH

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

How will this affect my garden and my fruit trees? How close would it be to my house?

I live in a heavy populated area in Lexington. It doesn't make sense to me to have to go through hundreds of homes when there are less populated areas to go through. Why would you do this?

Communication ID: 11013

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: GERALD SORRELL

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Please have your environmental studies look at proximity damages even though a specific property has no acquisition. IE Land value impacted due to loss of view or disruption of view. Control of undesired public access on open corridor,

Will rates increase to cover construction costs?

Request an email newsletter status report mailed to any recipient who asks to be on mail list.

Communication ID: 11014

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: JOHN KRAMER

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Please have your environmental studies look at:

- 1.Tower is close to my home. There is considerable unoccupied property available.
- 2.New gravel access road ends at my back gate inviting drug users and horny teenagers to do their thing right at my property
- 3.Maintenance of the tower allows people onto my property to spray poison which affects my animals.

I cannot use my property the way I'd like because easement restrictions. I am concerned about effects on my family, the price of electricity continues to rise, but the use of my property remains free. I believe I should be compensated in some way for the restrictions I must adhere to. Reduced electric bill for example.

Communication ID: 11015

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: JON DIETER

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

I live in a neighborhood with heavy residential density (map 12) obviously there must be routes better suited to less density of homes and impact on residents.

Communication ID: 11016

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: NITA KING

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Please let property owners know sooner rather than later where line is going. We have property for sale that will be in limbo. The bank will not understand why its not selling. No recourse for this.

Communication ID: 11017

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: JUDY HUDSON, GLENN HUDSON, CLARA HUDSON

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Please have your environmental studies look at the disruption of current and future agricultural development at the below addresses. We already have fruit and vegetable production with much more planned. These properties also provide habitat for wildlife and domestic animals, protection of valuable trees and other vegetation, and there is pure, non-salted water, an increasingly rare item. Many of the wells in this area have salt in the water which is not potable or compatible for agriculture. Therefore, we really treasure our good water and the thousands of hours, dollars, and energy we have put into developing these properties. We are at retirement ages and hate to lose all of this, not wanting to start all over again!

Please put the transmission line into segment 1 or 2 and not in segment 3 because our properties are in segment 3 and that area has the most residences. The segments 1 and 2 are largely forested and much less intrusive.

Communication ID: 11018

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: ANONYMOUS

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

I would like the line to be the most Northerly as possible of the proposed lines going through Lexington. The land by the Lexington substation is heavily populated, many children and more proposed development. The line going up by ostrander and avoiding the Lexington substation altogether would be best for the most residents of the area.

Communication ID: 11019

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: GREG MOBLEY

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Please have your environmental studies look at map to represent all utility easements presently in area of consideration!

[Phone] Please call.

Communication ID: 11020

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: JAIME GRAFF

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Please look at running a double circuit on existing lines to minimize impact to property owners.

Thank you.

Communication ID: 11021

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: BARBARA NORRIS

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)] Please have your environmental studies look at:

Look at the population that would be hardest hit and put the lines where the least # of people would be adversely affected. I believe there is danger living close to the lines and it scares me. My neighbors are also very concerned. We have lived in Mt Brynion for over 40 years and drove the distance to avoid the pollution and environmental dangers and would like to continue.

On map page #14 Rt 10 seems to have the heavier population. Rt 11 looks to be the least lived on. I think there are at least 33 families living in that one area- maybe more, many more outside the yellow area.

Communication ID: 11022

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: DAVID IRWIN

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

Please have your environmental studies look at Labonde Creek (tributary of Salmon Creek in Vancouver- map 95) This creek flows through a steep gully, many natural springs, soft hillside that is protected as a watershed/riparian area. It would be a conflict of zoning to cut line timber or otherwise disturb this area.

This is a congested area. New secondary tower construction would impact hundreds of homes. Please consider replacing existing towers with taller ones mounting old and new lines on same tower.

Communication ID: 11023

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: JOHN MARTH

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)]

I am interested in the hiring part. I feel that you should hire 10-15% local guys to join the team, starting at minimum wage and up to give everyone an equal chance and boost our unemployment rate, high income and low income.

I think this should be part of any contract if an outside company is going to come in and do work, local guys should get the work.

Communication ID: 11024

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: TAMMY NORRIS HILDEBRAND

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)] Our property, owned by my parents, is in Map 14. In looking at route 10 in that area it is evident that taking route 10 over 11 has a much higher impact on the population. We are greatly concerned about the emissions from these lines that would be in our back properties.

If you look at maps 13, 14, 20, and 21, regarding route 10, you will see there is more population affected by emissions. Compared to maps 15 and 16 along route 11, you can clearly see that fewer people are impacted by choosing that route for that particular area of the route.

Please consider the health of our community members and take the routes less populated.

Communication ID: 11025

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: FAYE WINTERS, RAY WINTERS

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)] Please have your environmental studies look at:

- Natural pond on property (2 acres): wetlands, Canadian geese, native wood duck
- Fed w/spring off of property
- Western pond turtles habitat

Communication ID: 11026

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: ROD WIGGINS, LINDA WIGGINS

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)] Please have your environmental studies look at damage to natural habitat in Coweeman River.

I have a beautiful dream home on the Coweeman River. If this is sited through or near my home it would destroy the value. In the meantime, my home value will be reduced significantly until the actual route is identified so if any can be eliminated early it would be helpful.

Communication ID: 11027

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: JEFF S WILSON

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)] This project is a responsible action that we need to actually help “preserve” the existing environment. Electricity is still, by far, the most efficient means to provide what our society wants. BPA may be hearing from the “not in my backyard” residents, but from the silent majority I support this project.

Communication ID: 11028

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: MIKE SMITH, KELLEY SMITH

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)] We have many houses lining Pleasant Hill and we would hope that the lines don't go over all these houses. We also have wetlands behind our property on Washburn and we would hope that the wetlands are not disturbed.

Communication ID: 11029

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: LYNN LABRUM

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)] My property has a wetland on it. What course can you take? Will lines follow the marsh or go over the house and if it should go over the house how is a real market value determined? I already have a wetland set back that is 200 feet and a pipeline easement on the lower corner. If the new line crosses me my land cannot be used for anything. I will not give permission to be on my property.

Communication ID: 11030

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: ALLEN FRASIER

Hi there, yes, I'm calling about I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Study area. I think you might, leg 11 of your plan here, might be going through my wife and I's property. My name is Allen Frasier and my wife's Gloria May Frasier.[Address]. Yes, I was wondering if I could get more information to see exactly where it is going and how directly it is affecting me. Alright. My phone number is [Phone]. Once again, [Phone].

Thanks. Bye.

Communication ID: 11032

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: MIKE LINDHORST

I am very concerned about the I-5 Corridor project that is under way. I have read and understand that the option you are looking at is putting a second power line directly out my back door, in fact, 30 feet from my back door. Not only am I concerned about the electro magnetic forces this additional line will generate, putting not only my family at risk, but any visitors that may come to visit our home. I am also concerned about the severe impact to the property values in our neighborhood as well. This would be a severe blow to our long term financial strength as it would render our home that we have put so much time, effort, and money into, as a worthless investment. Please note that I am against this option.

Communication ID: 11033

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: GREG FISCHER,DEBBIE L FISCHER

Communication ID: 11034

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: GARY

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

I really appreciated the organized and helpful manner this was performed. Very well done for a very difficult bit of public communications!

Communication ID: 11035

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: RENE K OXFORD

My family home was already impacted by the I-5 expansion project in the 1970's resulting in loss of property. Presently, this plan takes the family home, already moved from it's original land following the 70's. Houses here were built for the Ostrander Mill, the remaining foundation for the Ostrander school is in my backyard. The old growth cedars remain in the front yard, for over a 100 years. The fruit trees

were also moved from our original property in the 70's. Why must we once again lose our family home? This community is what remains from a rich history in this area, it should be valued.

Communication ID: 11036

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: STEVE R SLOTTO

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please have your environmental studies look at property that my only have one buildable area, and the loss of that portion would render it useless to the owner.

My property has only one buildable area. If either my house or shop is impacted by the project, it would effectively render the property useless. I think there are many more rural routes available east of the Larck Mountain/Silver Star Mountain, that would have much less impact to the residential areas in Camas/Washougal. Most of my property is a creek/wetland and can't be built on.

Communication ID: 11037

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: DONALD E THIEMAN

We are on your map #114. There is unoccupied timberland to the north and west of our neighborhood, owned by Longview Fiber and harvested for wood fiber products use. It abuts other unoccupied land owned by other agencies (state forest land and Gifford Pinchot National Forest.) We and our neighbors object to being asked for consent to allow BPA to come on our land and dig, do core samples and cut trees for survey lines, when there is such an obvious non-residential land area available within your projected corridor nearby. You are asking us to consent to an initial impact that is truly unnecessary in our particular location.

Communication ID: 11038

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: JOHN A POLOS

I live on the right of way for line 31. I have lived there since 1971. I like it here and do not plan on moving. I know something about BPA and how they conduct business. I have talked to my neighbor above me, about the proposal. She is also on/near the right of way for line 31. I can not speak for her, but am sure she will be keeping in touch with your staff. Her name is Vicki VanZant. My opinion is that you do

need to beef up the West side grid. I would like you to use a right of way that impacts the least people, regardless of cost. It probably will be some other route than 31. I am joining and advising the "Line 31 group". I am advising them to change their name from "People against the BPA 31 Line" to a more user friendly name. I will be advising them on electrical matters. My background: I am a Registered Civil and Electrical Engineer, with 30 years at BPA. I was on BPA's first shift power scheduling team and worked in Operations Planning, Power Scheduling, Seasonal Planning, and Streamflow Forecasting; all in the Division of Power Supply and Planning. Thanks, John Polos, PE

Communication ID: 11039

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: ROBERT D WALKER

Now that you've dropped this bomb on us, we are in a state of limbo: we can't sell our home and property at what should be its true value (we now don't even know what the value is), and we don't want to potentially waste money continuing to improve it. On top of that, you say it may be years before you decide which route you'll take or whether you'll even build it. We are buying a home in Phoenix, we are at retirement age, our home is an important part of our nest egg. What do you expect us to do? Will we have to continue living here for years; will we have to continue working for years? You now have a HUGE responsibility to everyone you've placed in this position. It's as though you've pointed cannons at our properties, but we don't know which cannon you plan to fire. Who wants to buy a home with a cannon pointing at it? This selection process needs to move at a real pace, not drag along for years. We aren't numbers, we're people. We've worked hard, we've invested carefully. We built homes and developed our properties to be comfortable, useful, attractive, and more valuable. How can you ruin that with one press release? How can you actually consider pushing the abomination through a residential area, when you have the choice of going across large expanses of undeveloped, government owned wilderness? I know I've written a few paragraphs, but really, I'm at a loss for words. Robert Walker

Communication ID: 11040

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: BARBARA RIDER

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please have your environmental studies look at bats. We have a lot of bats that live in trees and rock ravines near [Address]. Little grey bats.

On the positive side, this recession is limiting road maintenance, but roads adjacent to powerlines will be well maintained.

Communication ID: 11041

Date: 11/6/2009

Name: KURT J CONGER, BARBARA L. WESTGARTH

BPA's fact sheet accurately summarizes the congestion problems that are present on the South of Allston flowgate. North to South congestion has been a problem for a few years. Now South to North congestion is affecting the ability to integrate wind generation resources for load service to Seattle metropolitan areas. Also worthy of discussion in the scoping sessions is the importance of having new transmission facilities in-service when older facilities are maintained or retired. Without projects like this in the pipeline, maintenance and replacement of aging infrastructure becomes very problematic.

Communication ID: 11042

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: TERRA STARK

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please have your environmental studies look at anything that will allow us to preserve our property and view! PS. And our property value!

Please no lines in section 109/segment 35!

Dear BPA,

My family and I were so sad to receive your letter in the mail! We live in your section 109/segment 35. We bought our property/home 4 years ago for the view! We are in the process of building on to our home to create our dream home. As you might imagine, the destruction of vegetation and the presence of these lines is not desired! Please reconsider!

Communication ID: 11043

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: DENA DERR, ANTHONY SMITH

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please don't include in study existing north Bonneville/Rosline, double circuit.

It is not currently in the study and we don't want to be included in study. Already have this existing line through our property.

Communication ID: 11044

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: ALAN BUTTERFIELD

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please have your environmental studies look at routes that don't involve the confiscation of private property, and the destruction of people's lives. There is plenty of public land to the east to so your damage on.

A power line on my property would destroy my life. I have been here over 30 years protecting the natural environment. I do not cut live trees, and would never allow logging. I don't allow hunting, or even fishing on my property. This is a natural haven for a great variety of wildlife. I generate my own power with renewable resources. I could not live here with a powerline.

Communication ID: 11045

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: CINDY SCHULTZ

Cindy Schultz attended the Amboy meeting; she works safety for PacifiCorp - Merwin Dam, etc in our scoping area, but also lives nearby. She had information on the studies they've done in that area regarding cultural artifacts discovered in the river basin area. [Phone]

Communication ID: 11046

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: VALERIE HOWARD

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please have your environmental studies look at newer housing development (10-15 years), hills/trees/beauty of the area, and lawns/trees on property.

We have an electric neighborhood with many families, children, and elderly people. To be uprooted

from our home and not getting a fair price would impact the lower income persons and the unemployed. We would all have to relocate and purchase another home this is ludicrous. Run the line through an area that does not have houses. I am not signing the form you sent me.

Communication ID: 11047

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: FAITH BROCKWAY,JIM BROCKWAY,TRACY WENGER

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please have your environmental studies look at going down the existing line and stay away from recreational areas!

I live right up above Speelyia Bay Recreational area and fish hatchery on [Address]. This is a recreational area big time! I do not want you to come anywhere near our area with these lines. Our map #50, line 11. I also know that our recreational homeowners around us don't want it either!

Communication ID: 11048

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: DON

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

We have wetlands on the southwest corner of our property.

Our property is on route 26. This route goes through a large number of high value properties. Most of these properties have spectacular views and there are several wetlands, ponds directly under this route. I believe the direct northern and then directly south route is the more forested areas would be the least disruptive for the population of north county.

Communication ID: 11049

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: STEVE COCKRELL,COLLEEN COCKRELL

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Concerned about right of way expansion at line section 52. If no expansion of right of way concerned about our property value if current view of Mt Hood and Columbia Gorge obstructed. Any possibility of relocating the expansion or right of way in another location? Concerned about existing wildlife in area. Are there any health issues associated with increased power source?

Communication ID: 11050

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: ERIN E GROVER

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please have your environmental studies look at 600 year old snag in Dole Valley older than our nation's capitol. Eagle flies the east fork of the Lewis River. Historic area in Dole Valley one room school house, pioneer and Native American history. Many creeks, underground springs unique plants and animals that are rare and exist nowhere else in Clark County anymore. In a Vol Valley such as Dole Valley the lines will be visible for miles. You have given people such a short time to comment. There is so much to consider Bridge condition, loss to irreplaceable natural habitat, streams and watershed impact. East Fork would need to be lit for the search and rescue helicopters and forest fires suppression flights as well as tourism, wildlife impact. Mountain beavers, etc. You can check my blogspot for pictures.
www.highwoodshaven.blogspot.com

Attachment:

Dear Senator Maria Cantwell,

As a long time Clark County resident and registered voter I pray you hear my voice in regard to the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. It would destroy my home and the historic and scenic land that I love. There is a 600 year old snag on my property that has survived the historic Yacont Burn, The Great Depression, the Columbus Day storm of our area, the Mt St. Helens Eruption and the current economic downturn just to name a few. I understand that this project would bring money into this region it would also cost Clark County a great deal economically, and forever change the unique habitat. I was told on Wednesday October 28th, 2009 at the Clark College scoping meeting by the BPA Environmental representative that BPA would knock this snag down and considers it DEAD. A bald eagle circled this snag at the beginning of this summer, pileated woodpeckers, flickers, different types of hummingbirds, chipmunks, and many more plants, animals and insects live in this snag. It is nature's condominium. Down the road a one room school house once stood, the first in this valley that was once considered for Washington State Capitol. The Dole Valley area has a rich history that includes pioneers, loggers, and Native American activity as well as environmental beauty and significance. The Dole Valley has a rich

present and future that includes hiking, biking, horseback riding, kayaking, camping, the many parks, the Chelatchie Prairie Railroad and more. Many people come to this area for its beautiful scenery and the many parks and waterways that exist here. Power lines would ruin this area as a recreational sanctuary. PLEASE DO NOT place a huge 500 kilovolt transmission line here when there is such a deep rich history and a promising future for our country let alone Clark Count, Washington. If you want to see pictures of the snag visit my blog www.highwoodshaven.blogspot.com.

Please hear my prayer,

Erin Grover

Communication ID: 11051

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: KATHLEEN MOLINOS,VINCENTE MOLINOS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Following is a list of questions which we would like to see addressed specifically and in detail by the BPA Project team following the letter and spirit of NEPA.

1. What will be the intensity of the magnetic field created by the 500kV transmission line at mean flow and peak flow in miliGauss or micro Tesla at I meter over the ground surface at the following distances from the center axis of the powerline: 100m, 200m, 300m, 400m?
2. Which is the minimum horizontal distance the proposed 500kV line plans to keep from the existing homes when its proposed Route 11 crosses the Rose Valley Road?
3. Which is the guideline that BPA is using as minimum safe distance to minimize or prevent residential exposure to the EMF. What specific study (authors, date of publication in a refereed journal) is it based on?
4. The Coweeman River has been identified by the Washington Dept of Fish and Wildlife as a priority river in their recovery plans for wild steelhead and salmon. What is the minimum height clearance that BPA has determined is safe for the powerline crossing over the Coweernan River surface (both at low and high water flow conditions) not to affect the life cycles of the wild steelhead and the organisms in the food chain of the fish.
5. What study is the safe height in #4 based on? If there is not a study done, are you planning to conduct one?
6. The residents of Rose Valley Road upstream from the intersection with Gobble Creek Road rely on satellite communications for internet and cable television-FM radio. In some cases, such as ours, the loss

of internet signal would severely impair their daily lives and financial livelihood. What is the minimum safe distance the Project plans to keep from those satellite dish reception paths so as not to affect the normal functioning of these essential utilities.

7. Our family in the upper Rose Valley Road area has for three generations made efforts to be good stewards of the lands their ancestors homesteaded in. In our case we have been careful to cluster our newly built homes in previously cleared pasture lands so as to keep areas of very old trees which are now habitat for a diverse range of owls, flying squirrels, pileated wood peckers etc. Will there be a detailed and site specific environmental study to evaluate and preserve these habitats?

8. Some of the rural families in the Rose Valley Road area, like ours, that would be displaced by the proposed powerline rely on family gardens, orchards, chicken and subsistence animal farming and do not have the type of income or savings which would allow them to relocate debt free to more expensive localities and yet keep a comparable quality of life.

Is BPA prepared to compensate the displaced families in a way that takes into account this disparity in current real state prices and alternative relocation and living costs?

Communication ID: 11052

Date: 11/6/2009

Name: SHAWNA STEVENS

My name is Shawna Stevens. My number is [Phone]. I'm very confused how these maps show my house and I know it is nearby. I want you to call me and walk me through it so I can get the maps and see for myself. Thank you.

Communication ID: 11053

Date: 11/6/2009

Name: FLOYD COLLINS

Yes this is Floyd Collins. [Phone]. Property is [Address], and I own property at [Address]. Where it is through the maps, it goes through part of my property – line, Line 51, and just part of the property. I want to know how many feet that little green line represents. There's no scale on the map that I can see. I don't know whether it is 1 foot or 10 feet or 100 feet. Thank you.

Communication ID: 11054

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Route 52: located SE 11th Ave. – 6 homes located by Port of Camas, Washington. In 2010 WSDOT will put in a roundabout a Frontage Rd. under the existing power and frontage road under the existing power lines. Homeowners have negotiated with WSDOT to build a fence to block off Frontage Rd. and would like to make sure the fence meets BPA requirements.

Communication ID: 11055

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Our concern is where the line would go in relation to our property and what would be the impact on our property value.

Communication ID: 11056

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

What impact would the access roads have on our property?

Communication ID: 11057

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

What damage would be caused on our property by letting you access our property as indicated by your PEP form?

Communication ID: 11058

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

If you decide to drop any segment from further analysis and consideration in advance of releasing the DEIS – will you let us know by publishing a fact sheet or putting the information on your website?

Communication ID: 11059

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please avoid impacting wetlands along segment 39.

Communication ID: 11060

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Concern over not knowing for the next three years – whether you will be building the power line through Vancouver along Segment 25 (Page 95).

Communication ID: 11061

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Concern over your (today's) market value not covering the value of my home and leaving me \$40,000 left on it at the same time. Having to come up with another \$60,000 to put down on another place, in effect or resulting in my becoming homeless. Following up on this comment, can the government give us low interest, say 1% loans to solve the problem and make us whole?

Communication ID: 11062

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Will you let us know please if you drop any segments in advance of the release of the DES or you making a decision?

Communication ID: 11063

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

If you choose to take someone's home for your power line – it would be best to purchase the property and right of way and let the homeowner live in the home for a few years (rent free) so they could save up for a new home.

Communication ID: 11064

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

If you put your power line across my one acre property – will you pay for the entire property?

Communication ID: 11065

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

How would your project impact the airport at Grove Field?

Communication ID: 11066

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Your power line would have a huge impact on the Port of Camas/Washougal Marina. Let us know how you would mitigate (marina has been here since 1937 – an historic resource). Also Parker Landing Park here is on the National Register of Historic Places.

Communication ID: 11067

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Minimize disruption to community by utilizing existing ROWs.

Communication ID: 11068

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please move to Early Primary Route Identification. The longer you take the more our property is unsaleable.

Communication ID: 11069

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

What does your proposed project do to our property values now?

Communication ID: 11070

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

My home is 10 feet north of Segment 48 and my concern is EMF increase as a result of you building the new 500kv here.

Communication ID: 11071

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

What would be the environmental impacts of building your power line on the vacant right of way owned by PacifiCorp along Segment 31?

Communication ID: 11072

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Why is your Segment 31 shown on your map so wide, when if you were to build along this segment you would utilize the existing vacant right of way?

Communication ID: 11073

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

What would the impact be from a health and safety of the new line that you would build? EMF concern.

Communication ID: 11074

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Along Segment 31 (at the turn) on Map 91 we have a pair of white owls who live here along Hockinson Rd, between 159th and 176th.

Communication ID: 11075

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Concern about property values.

Communication ID: 11076

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Concern about effect on 'greenway'.

Communication ID: 11077

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Concern about ATV use and multiple us of ROWs.

Communication ID: 11078

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Why not tell us which is the way you want to go?

Communication ID: 11079

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Haven't you already made your decision?

Communication ID: 11080

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Consider new generation in Troutdale.

Communication ID: 11081

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Process will hold up land transactions for three years.

Communication ID: 11082

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Have BPA pay rent each year for easements.

Communication ID: 11083

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

NE 117th & 65th St. – Would take many business properties out and cross over 117th making it uglier than it is now! It would cost dollars to buy this property to East!

Communication ID: 11084

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

BPA should rent with yearly payments to property owners for ROW use.

Communication ID: 11085

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Hall: #106 (furthest NE property) – plans to build (breaking ground November 2009) indoor swimming pool and concerned with potential encroachment by segment 39. If structure is built, what is potential impact? Same property will have south end developed as a geothermal grid (close to surface) for pool heating.

Communication ID: 11086

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Proposed third Columbia River bridge and highway extension north to I-5.

Communication ID: 11087

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Parking at Port of Camas is severely limited. How will the proposed transmission route avoid eliminating any of it?

Communication ID: 11088

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 11 has the least amount of people on it. The 18 route is populated.

Communication ID: 11089

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

If you want the least damage to homeowners go Rte. 11. You'll avoid established homes and the related problems of having to disturb people.

Communication ID: 11090

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

The Rt. 11 area is also heavily used recreationally.

Communication ID: 11091

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 39: Even though the proposed line is not on our property, it will lower the value of our property.

Communication ID: 11092

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 39: There are wetlands near /on our property that restricts our ability to use our property.

Communication ID: 11093

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 39: Our neighbors' homes are close to the existing line.

Communication ID: 11094

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 50: If this route was chosen, landowner would prefer only having one line instead of two. Prefer triple circuit. Would like to minimize number of towers and ROW width.

Communication ID: 11095

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Route 29: concern about property value going down.

Communication ID: 11096

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 29: concerned about losing trees planted twelve years ago for future harvest.

Communication ID: 11097

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 35: Concerned about view from new home under construction and de-value of property.

Communication ID: 11098

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 35: Environmental impacts – wildlife: cougar, bears, coyote, lynx

Communication ID: 11099

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 35: concerned about the access roads to support new line will attract vandals, kids, illegal dumping.

Communication ID: 11100

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Between 38 & 43: concerned about loss of property value.

Communication ID: 11101

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 25: concerned about health issues. BPA is changing the voltage in existing corridor and adding another line.

Communication ID: 11102

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 25: would like the line as far east as possible.

Communication ID: 11103

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 39 & 49: If the power line is routed through our property, we would prefer to be bought out rather than live with the easements (towers)

Communication ID: 11104

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 39 & 49: we passed up on a home and property purchase because we could see power lines.

Communication ID: 11105

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 31: Did not see endangered species as an item under consideration for line route. Concerned about Salmon Creek.

Communication ID: 11106

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 35 near 49: Concerned about the access road in this remote area. This opens the area up to people who use it improperly or carelessly.

Communication ID: 11107

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 35 near 49: Concerned about the visual and health impacts and located outside the corridor. I have no chance of condemnation.

Communication ID: 11108

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

What will the new transmission line do to my property value?

Communication ID: 11109

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

I am on segment 48. Will there be additional right of way needed for the new line?

Communication ID: 11110

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

On Segment 52, it appears there is only one route and no options. Is that true and why no other line options?

Communication ID: 11111

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Impact on populated area is less on segment 51 and more on segment 50. Please use segment 51.

Communication ID: 11112

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

If my property is zoned open space and I lose some acreage to power lines and now I fall under the minimum required acres, do I still qualify for open space? Does BPA pay the seven years of back taxes, penalty and interest on their newly acquired acreage?

Communication ID: 11113

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Wetland concerns – [address] – space between house and lines.

Communication ID: 11114

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Segment 50 (north end) lots of wetlands.

Communication ID: 11115

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Have you thought about going on state land?

Communication ID: 11116

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Concerned about data being collected on private property. Will that be given to government and restrictions placed on our land?

Communication ID: 11117

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Check parcel maps on website; they don't look like the map I have in my hand.

Communication ID: 11118

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Segment 31, tree farms along with neighborhoods. Seems like taking timber along DNR land would be less impact than taking it along 31 since there is more of it on DNR land.

Communication ID: 11119

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Landowner took extreme offence at PEP letter. Did you expect we would sign it? Sounds like we don't have a choice.

Communication ID: 11120

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Visual impact of 80-100 ft. towers on 39. Also how does this assumed visual impact, impact property value?

Communication ID: 11121

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Does BPA compensate landowners for perceived loss of property value?

Communication ID: 11122

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Segment 35 has Yacolt Burn Plan developed with state (last 2.5 years) and now BPA wants to come through with a transmission line. How does that affect the "campground " (closed down), the Jones Creek Trail Area (ORV area).

Communication ID: 11123

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

ATV use is going to increase if new line is added on #35.

Communication ID: 11124

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Camas has its watershed in #35 just north of #39. A new line would bring more ATV use through here.

Communication ID: 11125

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Write me a check now. I want to know now.

Communication ID: 11126

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Segment 40, walking trails and watershed. Clark Co. for surface runoff from Edmonds Estates.

Communication ID: 11127

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Stony Meadows development on #40 has a 'pristine' area of walking trails for their use.

Communication ID: 11128

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Lacamas Creek 41, 44, 46,50 Boy/Girl Scout Camp (Camp Curry). Camp is in an area that is "designated" as a "reserve". No roads, no building. Area used to belong to Weyerhaeuser. They worked with the County.

Communication ID: 11129

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Use what we have (existing ROW – double circuit on one tower to take less ROW) to the best of your ability. Segment 45 (Acre +lots)

Communication ID: 11130

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Put it where there are less people.

Communication ID: 11131

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

NE 22nd St off of 232 (Seg. 47) all properties their own wells.

Communication ID: 11132

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

How much room between new line and occupied home?

Communication ID: 11133

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

How much area is recommended between line and occupied structure?

Communication ID: 11134

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

How will BPA deal with existing power line if they chose to use the existing right of way?

Communication ID: 11135

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Section 52 many more homes than shown on map.

Communication ID: 11136

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Makes sense to use existing or easternmost routes because closer to windmills.

Communication ID: 11137

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Artifacts on Route 31.

Communication ID: 11138

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Should go to less populated areas.

Communication ID: 11139

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

The longer we wait, the harder it will be to build even in the easternmost options.

Communication ID: 11140

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Quite a bit of retirement investment, particularly on Route 31.

Communication ID: 11141

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Why would BPA choose to go through settled areas instead of forested areas?

Communication ID: 11142

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Who actually makes the final decision regarding the route?

Communication ID: 11143

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Wouldn't it cost just as much to go farther east as it does to buy out existing homeowners?

Communication ID: 11144

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

What would the EMF effect be if an existing line was there and then the new line was built there also?
Would the EMF be more.

Communication ID: 11145

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS ,A. WARREN JOHNSON

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Page 108, Segment 35, A. Warren Johnson [address] – dispute about land ownership boundary along NE 94th St.; Original survey on map (boarder with state land might be incorrect); concerns – views of Mt. Hood, don't want to have view obstructed; affect on property rates; lives on private road, well maintained, would like it to remain in as good of condition as it currently is; has lived in area longest, bought property in 1950s.; has information about disputed property boundaries.

Communication ID: 11146

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Only one location for resident's drainfield.

Communication ID: 11147

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 26 – Subdevelopment of 5-acre parcels each with one house. Do not want to see power lines in the area. Approximately 100 lots. All of distribution lines are underground. Concerned about resale disclosure.

Communication ID: 11148

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 40 – Concerned about selling property and disclosure – 2.5 years is a long time to wait

Communication ID: 11149

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 48 – Northside homes – landowner does not want addition! Would rather see lines out farther than impacting homes.

Communication ID: 11150

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 50 – Has a wetland already severely impacted

Communication ID: 11151

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Rt. 39 – Landowner does not want line to go south of existing – prefers to go to north. All along Ireland Rd. is all trees. Already mailed in PEP unsigned.

Communication ID: 11152

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Vegetation, blackberries near NE 3rd St., Leadbetter

Communication ID: 11153

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Health effects, property.

Communication ID: 11154

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

How will options 34, 35 effect some recreational areas north of Camas, WA?

Communication ID: 11155

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Page114, Segment 49: Stay away from residential area, use Longview Fiber existing ROW; standard for high voltage line and proximity to homes in terms of EMF – what is BPA’s policy?

Communication ID: 11156

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Page 111: Should go through the airport on Delp Rd. off 500, 267th; Snyder

Communication ID: 11157

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

My neighbor has a million dollar home. Mine is \$750,000, so this could be very expensive for BPA (along segment #31)

Communication ID: 11158

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

The Pac ROW is supposed to be very small. Is there enough room for a 500kv line?

Communication ID: 11159

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Washougal Planning Commission: Lookout Ridge and Granite Highlands is densely populated – to expand these would go into people's homes. (Page 115, segment 52)

Communication ID: 11160

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Area of northeast Lacamas Lake (segment 50, map 111) primed for high-end development and planned community including homes, school , light industry, and retail. Specific location is current dairy and adjacent homes.

Communication ID: 11161

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Is power just going to California?

Communication ID: 11162

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Is there a way to measure current EMF from existing lines?

Communication ID: 11163

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Is Clark County aware of potential negative impact to property tax revenue base due to reaction to new lines, either property devaluation or planned exodus from area?

Communication ID: 11164

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Put on Maps - Woodland, Battle Ground

Communication ID: 11165

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Lewis River is below Merwin Dam - is obscured by County line

Communication ID: 11166

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Why not double-current lines in existing ROW?

Communication ID: 11167

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Consider Endangered and Threatened species

Communication ID: 11168

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Segment 35 – natural spring and beaver dams long term on property; creek that runs through property that feeds the beaver pond

Communication ID: 11169

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

[address]– built a new home and outbuilding for business

Communication ID: 11170

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

State owns 300 acres – Jones Creek Campground – ways to get around Segment 35

Communication ID: 11171

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Brand new homes in the area up Winters Rd.

Communication ID: 11172

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Steep terrain.

Communication ID: 11173

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Already have transmission lines.

Communication ID: 11174

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Why take out houses along Segment 31?

Communication ID: 11175

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Bob Sarkinen – Segment #32 – logger want thin. Tree farm out of question with new Segment #32 – raising of trees is the only use of property.

Communication ID: 11176

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

East boundary line is State land – less impact to the larger parcels of State land.

Communication ID: 11177

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

#51 & #52: Don't want it. Why not I-5 or I-205? Why not bury it? Retirement gone, radiation, tree farm, lease.

Communication ID: 11178

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

#20 and 21 - Mr. White – Lives in Beacon Hall Ele. Doesn't want to live near.

Communication ID: 11179

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Registered with Washington state – Archaeology site.

Communication ID: 11180

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Water table only 20 ft. deep

Communication ID: 11181

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Pg. 110, #40 – homes – 39th St. and 162nd Ave NE substation

Communication ID: 11182

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Pg. 111, #45 – been there 39 years; 74 y.o.; vegetation; structures – Dave Currier

Communication ID: 11183

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

#41 – Village at Green Mountain – 1,000 homes – City of Camas;

Communication ID: 11184

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Camp Currie – Boy Scout Camp (44, 45, 46) – expanding camp

Communication ID: 11185

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

31 – Wife’s health

Communication ID: 11186

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

29,28,34 out in middle of nowhere, less impact; compensation not fair; cell phone towers are sites leased; go across DNR land; unoccupied land; burying would be cheaper over the long run

Communication ID: 11187

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

#31 – is there enough room to replace structure (with ROW) off the ROW? If new transmission line built on #31, too much effect on property owners

Communication ID: 11188

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

#31 – wouldn't like to live near transmission line. DNR has money to fight BPA; endangered species

Communication ID: 11189

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Project proposed during Bush administration?

Communication ID: 11190

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

BPA is faced with a lot of health problems – leukemia, etc.?

Communication ID: 11191

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

How are we addressing crossing river?

Communication ID: 11192

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

If BPA could choose to go through settled areas in seated of forested area.

Communication ID: 11193

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

How would BPA deal with existing line if you choose to use existing ROW?

Communication ID: 11194

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Segment 40 is wetlands and becomes a large lake every winter. Deep enough to use a boat for duck hunting. Wildlife is also a concern in Segment 40.

Communication ID: 11195

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Segment 35 visual impact for houses looking at Mt. Hood.

Communication ID: 11196

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Expensive houses in Segment 31 – south end of Map 96 and south end of Map 85

Communication ID: 11197

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Longer public comment period – 10/9/09 – 11/23/09 is not enough time!

Communication ID: 11198

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Two acres of wild animal habitat on Johnson property and plant (co.); Map 85; worried about cold east winter wind once trees are cleared

Communication ID: 11199

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

South end of Map 85: steep hillside, underground utilities

Communication ID: 11200

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Page 107: Taxes are highly dependent on view; view will be obstructed from Mt. Hood and Portland

Communication ID: 11201

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Please take a closer look at the intersection of Segment 50 & 47. Land owner has house very close to existing ROW (DC 115kv); shop is in the existing easement. Scott and Carole Staat [address]

Communication ID: 11202

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING CAMAS

[Scoping Meeting (Camas)]

Page 13: Why not use state land just a few miles away?; This will diminish property value in an already tough economy.

Communication ID: 11203

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: PAM ALLEN

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)] We bought our property 25 years ago. BPA was there then. We have never had any problem working with BPA. However, since 1992 we have had a natural gas line on the front of our property line. And the Beaver Creek line wants to go up our back property line. If BPA does this it will be in our front yard now. We could be bought out gladly.

BPA has been one that was good to work with. However, we are losing our property to the Gas Company. They came in 1992. And in 1996 we lost 4 of our 30 acres and had to move our home.

We need help with this problem. If BPA adds 150 ft to the power line now it will be in our front yard. And 50 ft from our home. Something has to give somewhere. I don't know what is going to be done. Please remember we started out 30 acres. The power line takes up 11 now. We lost 4 to the slide of the pipeline. Not much more one can take.

Also BPA has a road manitance agreement with us. We could us some help with. Please see what this does to families who want just to live in the country quietly.

Communication ID: 11204

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: ANONYMOUS

Scoping Meeting (Longview)] Please have your environmental studies look at: a greener way!

Communication ID: 11205

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: GERRY URBAN

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)] Please have your environmental studies look at: EMI.

We want to know the effect of the power line on radio, broadcast TV and satellite TV and internet connections, what kind of effect? How broad an area around the power line? What can be done to mitigate these effects, and who pays to fix any problems?

Communication ID: 11206

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: DUANE KOEHLER

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)] The proposed segment #31 would be very close to our home, and many neighbors who live along our street (222nd Ave NE). We have hundreds of very large fir trees (>100 ft tall) that are shown to be directly under the proposed route. Removing those large trees would be needed to construct the 500 Kv line. This would destroy our quality of life; instead of hundreds of large fir trees we would look out our picture window at a barren landscape with power lines. We also have a creek (Shanghai Creek) that is bordered by many fir, cedar and alder trees. These would also need to be cut back, which would raise stream temperature and put fish and wildlife at risk. I have spent the past 10 years restoring stream bed and shoreline, and the power line would ruin all that hard work. I have also planted over 500 fir, birch, and maple trees. These would also be lost, or put at risk. I have young children who love to play in the woods, but a large power line would take that away. Another concern is the marshy wetlands that is on neighboring property to the south and west, in proposed corridor #31 as shown in map. In summary, I am strongly opposed to route #31.

Communication ID: 11207

Date: 10/29/2009

Name: DUANE KOEHLER

[Scoping Meeting (Longview)] The property that borders me to the south is owned by the Colson family. For many years, there was a rendering business there, and the by-products were dumped on their property. There were several instances when state agencies were alerted and cited them for environmental violations. Constructing a power line with large towers across that property would disturb the soil and potentially create an environmental hazard to my family and the many neighboring

homes. The rendering company violations occurred over ten years ago, when lye and other hazardous substances were dumped there. This was well- documented by the Columbian Newspaper, if you search their archives (search "Colson Rendering"). These hazardous substances are probably stable now, so long as soil is kept undisturbed. Lye and other products were dumped right where route #31 is located per the map. Please don't engage in excavation here. This would expose my family to potential health risks to air and water contamination if the hazardous products are brought to the surface. This would likely also expose BPA to environmental cleanup costs (i.e. superfund, etc).

Communication ID: 11208

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)] BPA should do yearly lease for ROWs

Communication ID: 11209

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]Maps of Page 91

concerned about being able to sell property, do they need to disclose?

Communication ID: 11210

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)] Not aesthetic. No matter how much you try to pretty up the lines. 31 segment - clay soils - very susceptible to erosion and degradation. Like the country feel - lines would ruin that feel. Concerns about EMF (don't trust current state of science). On segment many amphibians. Would remove paddock on lands. Concerns about devalued land/property. Would rather have lines next to each other on I-5 and would live without energy in case of event (terrorist attack, fire, downed tower, etc) that disrupts service.

Communication ID: 11214

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)] Concerns about environmental impacts. Why not on existing corridor?

Communication ID: 11215

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)] EMF concerns

Communication ID: 11216

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)] Line Segment 31:

- 212th Avenue area - dense forest to right with cut-in developments

- Neighborhood concern is high over the letter requesting PEP and to allow access for 3-years.

Communication ID: 11217

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)] Segment 31 - lots of homeowner concern over "nuke" of property as one owner believes a tower would be just off their deck with ROW placement and house location. 24 inch trees - don't want them to go. Concerns based on how the letter was written.

Communication ID: 11218

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)] Where does the power go?

Communication ID: 11219

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: BETTY HAUSER, TERRY PRIMLEY

Please have your environmental studies look at:

1. We are concerned with how these lines will affect our health. Has that been reviewed in your studies? We have an existing BPA line already running through our property since the 1930's. What will these additional lines do to our health since they would be placed closer yet to our homes?
2. Will there be a study done on where these lines can be placed on State and Federal lands? This would cause less impact on individual homes and property owners. Also, less risk on concerns of health issues.
3. We've heard that with these newer lines the noise level will be more. My concern is how much more and what could a home owner expect on the level of noise.
4. We have heard that these new lines are more powerful. The existing line is less powerful. What are the pro's and con's of a higher intensity line placed next to a lesser intensity line?
5. We have major concerns on property value. We currently have a high power transmission line and a natural gas line running through our property. How much more of our property do we have to give up? This will affect our opportunity to farm our property. Our profit margin will be affected if we choose to sell. It will also limit diversity in buyers.
6. Another main concern is if and when our property is selected, what time of year BPA crew's would access the property. During the rainy season the ground is real wet causing deep ruts in the ground or knocking over the hay crop in its early stage of growth. During spring, our crop is growing, and through the first couple of weeks in July, we are in the midst of harvesting our hay crop.
7. Is it possible to put towers right next to the existing towers and in the fence line like they are now if that is what is decided on?

The best solution for BPA and property owners would be to place these new towers and lines on State and Federal lands. This would impact less individuals, property owners and everyone in involved.

Communication ID: 11220

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: KATHY FRICE

About route 31: I have a blueberry farm. We are trying to go organic. No one wants berries with high voltage running through our crops. This is our income. Please find another route.

Communication ID: 11221

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: KERRY MCNEAL

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)] I am pleased with the level of study you all are doing for impact to the environment and communities. As an owner who already has a line through their place my hope is that if we get the new line on our place that it runs parallel and close to the existing line. And that my place remains buildable but I doubt that will be much of an issue.

Communication ID: 11222

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: JULIE DOLL

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)] Please have your environmental studies look at: Residential impacts to communities, property values, impacts to forests, streams and plant life. The area around Ariel, WA and Cougar, WA is recreational- a natural paradise made possible by the birds, trees, water and plant life thriving in this area. Please factor into consideration the need to preserve places like this for the enjoyment of all!

We have a 2nd home at [Address] in a small, tight knit group of homes that are located in close proximity to Yale and Merwin Lakes. This property affords access to many wonderful recreational activities, making possible a quality of life afforded by proximity to forests, streams, and the two lakes. Power lines in the vicinity of these natural wonders would degrade the recreational value afforded by the water and trees. The stream behind our home and the plant/fish/birdlife it sustains could be negatively impacted. Please do not build near this residential/recreational neighborhood.

Communication ID: 11223

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: BRUCE KIRSCHENBAUM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)] Proposed line #31, Brush Prairie (Hockinson) area. I am a land owner in the path of #31 and a Hockinson School District parent and President of the local Little League (Highlands Little League). The Hockinson School District purchased a 35 acre piece of property last year for the construction of a new school site. It is located on the corners of NE 217th Ave and NE 169th Street in Brush Prairie WA (map #91).

Recently, the school district, little league and Clark County have reached an agreement to construct a multi-use sports complex where baseball and soccer fields will be built on this school property. Over \$1.5 million will be spent in the construction of the sports complex. On any given day, more than a thousand students will populate the subject parcel with hundreds utilizing the complex after school for

recreational purposes.

The Hockinson School District and Highlands Little League respectfully request the BPA consider the alternative route 35/34/29/21 and 11, the furthest proposed line to the east. It appears from disruption of homeowners, business owners and resident parties, due to the much greater rural areas along this route, this should be strongly considered. I understand there are substantial easement, property valuation, condemnation issues with any route, but considering 31 and its modestly populated path would result in more cost and ownership contention.

As a user of electrical power, I understand the need for such infrastructure improvements. Unfortunately no one wants the power lines in their backyard. When considering the route, please take into consideration minimizing the impact to residents, schools and sports complex' wherever possible.

I am able to meet, discuss and assist the BPA with their evaluation process. Regards and good luck with the project.

(Please see circled area attached)

Communication ID: 11224

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: STEVEN MILLER

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)] 1. What are the voltages and tower height of the power lines on this map?
2. What are the likely tower heights for the 500kv line running through area 25 and 40 on this map?

Communication ID: 11225

Date: 11/6/2009

Name: PATRICIA L BOYDEN

Dear Mr. Korsness;

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project to construct a 500-kilovolt transmission line and associated substations from Castle Rock, Washington to Troutdale Oregon.

It is recommended that the environmental analysis fully consider impacts of the project on bird collisions and install appropriate deterrent devices to prevent bird injuries and fatalities.

Existing BPA lines currently cause mortalities. In 2008, the Port of Vancouver notified BPA of bird collisions with the 115 kV and 230 kV lines near the north side of Lower River Road across from the Alcoa Substation in Vancouver, Washington.

As noted by BPA staff (see attached emails) bird kills from line strikes are significant, both due to the number of bird victims, and to their significant species; e.g. bald eagle, snowy egrets, cranes, herons, mallards, etc. It appears that the birds are not seeing the conductors or static wire due to poor light conditions. Some collisions were witnessed during daylight hours.

The proposed line from Castle Rock, Washington to Troutdale Oregon needs to:

- 1) Evaluate impacts and install mitigation measures to prevent bird collisions
- 2) Once completed, perform long-term monitoring to ensure that mitigation measures are effective.

POV appreciates the good work by BPA staff in addressing this issue in the Vancouver Lake Lowlands and looks forward to continued evaluation and mitigation of bird collisions for the proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

Sincerely,

Patricia L. Boyden

Director of Environmental Services

Communication ID: 11226

Date: 11/6/2009

Name: JONATHAN ARAGORN

Thank you for the information and maps. I'm sorry I was unable to attend the public meeting in my area due to other responsibilities. I just have one piece of information to point out. It pertains to the this area of your map, between proposed routes 10 and 11, where they cross the Coweeman River (and Rose Valley Road, not shown on the map).

The square I have added is a small housing development called Clearwater Estates. It contains about 16 families, and 6 or 7 lots not yet developed. There are very few places along the Coweeman River and Rose Valley Road where such developments are located. In most places, the developed properties are just one house deep right along the road.

The proposed routes on the map both avoid Clearwater Estates, as they should. However I, a landowner in that development, have received a request from you to enter (and probably damage) my property. You will, of course, not get it. You should not even be thinking of putting a power line through a residential cluster when so many other possible routes exist that would not go through such developments.

This is not a housing area where people move in and out often. Most of the people who live here are raising families, building houses or other structures (most often with their own labor), growing gardens,

raising horses, etc. Most of us are deeply-rooted here, and have no plans of leaving.

Please continue to consider the routes shown on your map, or others that do not pass through housing developments.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Aragorn

Communication ID: 11227

Date: 11/6/2009

Name: JEFFREY T LINDBERG,CAROLINE MOSCHETTI,DOUGLAS MOSCHETTI

To Whom It May Concern:

This firm represents Douglas and Caroline Moschetti, the owners of the property at [Address] . Mr. and Mrs. Moschetti retained me to respond to your request to enter their property in connection with BPA's I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. Mr. and Mrs. Moschetti will not permit BPA or its employees, agents, contractors, or other representatives to enter their property. Additionally, all future correspondence or communication of any kind should be directed to my office. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Very Truly Yours,

JONER LINDBERG PLLC

Communication ID: 11228

Date: 11/6/2009

Name: DAWN WOOLCOTT

Please have your environmental studies look at: Loss of wildlife habitat frequented in our neighborhood. We host deer, rabbits, coyote, bobcats, porcupine, owls, many varieties of birds (year-round and migratory), salamanders, snakes and an occasional weasel and bear. These animals are already being squeezed out of Clark County and cutting down the new path would only increase the problem.

Couldn't the \$300 million allocated for this project be better spent researching ways to decrease energy consumption in the area?? If you build it, they will use it. That is backwards thinking.

The proposed route would follow the main road into our neighborhood along NE 212th Ave. This would either eliminate or damage this paved road which is the only access to my home. Our neighborhood of 22 homes pay annual dues to a road maintenance association to upkeep this private road. What

happens if this road is in your right-of-way? The 5 or 6 homes left cannot afford to upkeep this road alone. I do not want to drive and walk my children to the bus stop directly underneath their high voltage power lines.

Communication ID: 11229

Date: 11/6/2009

Name: MATTHEW D STONE

I was planning on selling my property and wanted to know when will we find out if are property is needed. Will BPA give us fare market value of property? I am willing to work with BPA and understand the importance of the new transmittion line. Thanks

Communication ID: 11230

Date: 11/6/2009

Name: DALE WITT, BARBARA WITT

Hi my name is Barbara Witt. My husband's name is Dale. Our phone number is [Phone]. I'm trying to ascertain if we're in the corridor. I'm looking at a map unfortunately it shows the lines but doesn't really show enough detail for me to see where our house would be or how close it would be. And so I would really appreciate if I could hear back. I would just like to know how close we are or if it will be going through or very near property. I'm not against electricity, but I do like to keep up with what's going on with my home. Again that's [Phone], Dale or Barbara Witt, and I'd appreciate it. Our address by the way is [Address]. Okay, thanks. Bye.

Communication ID: 11231

Date: 11/6/2009

Name: SEAN P SMITH

My home is in the direct path of transmission line 31. In today's economy, people are struggling to pay their bills, and put food on the table. Now the BPA is asking them to give their homes as well, which is to big of a price to pay for anyone, especially in today's world. As a local firefighter, I have devoted my life to helping and serving the public. Giving my home or at a minimum, devaluing my property is beyond what anyone should have to do for the service of the public. I ask you to look east where their are obviously less people being directly effected by the plan. T Sincerely, Sean Smith

Communication ID: 11232

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: CHARLENE L BRAACK

I own two different properties that currently have BPA easments AND are on the new project map for potentially MORE BPA easements and or whatever else BPA decides to use it for. FOLLOWING THE SAME ROUTE/ USING EXSISTING TOWERS , ADDING MORE TOWERS TO THESE ROUTES AS NEEDED seems to be the most cost effective way and keep TOO MANY other properties from being impacted by the BPA. I really hope you are listening to concerns regarding landvalue, hardship to the citizens as we find it hard to sell our homes and properties as the BPA takes them over. Some of us are used to the easements- TRY TO USE THOSE FIRST PLEASE!!!

Communication ID: 11233

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: JAMES W RICHARD

It seems the only logical location is on the existing easement B.P.A. already has in place.It's the straightest and most cost effective route proposed.The existing line has been in place for many years with little or no problems and there is room for a second line. If a second transmission line is really needed then this should be the only option.....James W. Richard

Communication ID: 11234

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: ORAL W CARPER

Hard to believe BPA does not have a better handle on the criteria being used to make the routing decision and the relative significance of each of these criteria. It's hard to provide any useful information when you can't be sure how it stacks up against other decision criteria. It would be nice to know what's important to the BPA and just how important that info my be.

Communication ID: 11235

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: ORAL W CARPER

Remembering how the Yaclt burn desimated the forest on the east side, it sure would be a great thing if BPA provided us a fire break when the installed the line by using the eastern most possible route. A firebreak could also provide some greater protection to wildlife if a major fire were to happen there again by giving the animals a place to escape.

Communication ID: 11236

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: ORAL W CARPER

The people want the power. They don't want an ugly sight impediment. By placing the new structure where the old structure was (09) the least amount of disruption is made to the community. If the community matters, then this should be a strong argument.

Communication ID: 11237

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: ORAL W CARPER

If cost is the most important issue here, the placing the new power structure where the old one was located (09 on west side) should be the least imposing financially.

Communication ID: 11238

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: ORAL W CARPER

Redundancy appears to already be build into the system since power also feed in from the east and south already. Redundancy should be a minor consideration in this construction

Communication ID: 11239

Date: 11/8/2009

Name: DANA M JENKINS

I realize this has been planned for over 25 years, however please consider the effects on the private sector, home values, health issues, and a direct inconvenience to say the least on those concerned. Look into BLM land or state owned property that could be used. This definately will impact alot of people so please, reconsider your plans. Thank you, Dana Jenkins

Communication ID: 11240

Date: 11/8/2009

Name: CONRAD S BOCK

Responding to BPA request for local input concerning the project. I attended the informational meeting

held on Tuesday, November 3, at Liberty Middle School in Camas, Washington. I was surprised to learn of BPA's apparent lack of knowledge regarding the long term growth plan proposal for another bridge across the Columbia River. The bridge and road way is to connect I-84, near Troutdale crossing the river near Camas and connecting I-5 North of Vancouver. The site for the proposed bridge was in fact the alternative location for the I-205 bridge. The third bridge was deferred until such time as traffic around Portland headed onto or from I-84 East is sufficient to merit construction. A more comprehensive plan, would be for BPA to include the I-5 Reinforcement project corridor with the proposed Inter-state bypass route extending from Troutdale to I-5. The reasons include: the requirement that neither project interfere with the other, particularly crossing the Columbia River. Reduced property acquisition cost and increased efficiency in planning and acquisition of property. Property easements are combined, reducing the numbers of property owners being impacted. Respectfully, Conrad Bock

Communication ID: 11241

Date: 11/8/2009

Name: MARLA B AZINGER

Dear BPA-

DO NOT BUILD POWER LINES for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project ON ROUTE 31 or 32. Secondly I do not support you building power lines on route 33, 30, 34 or 35.

If you must follow through with this project then the ONLY route I would SUPPORT is ROUTE 25 and its connected lower state route 500 requirements. DO THE RIGHT THING AND ONLY BUILD UPON THE ALREADY EXISTING I-5 AND ST. ROUTE 500 OPTIONS THAT YOU LABEL AS ROUTE 25 AND 36,41,37,50,51,48.

ROUTE 25 that is actually along the I-5 corridor as this project is titled is the only one that is logical, ethical, and the least impacting on the economy. Not only does Route 25 already have power lines running along it but it would have way less of an impact on people and the worth of real estate. In addition the towns you claim need this power should not be interfering with outlying areas that do not already have these power lines running through them. This shouldn't effect or involve them at all.

You should not consider disturbing the people of the communities living along the potential routes of 31,32,30,33,34,35,26,27,29,28 as an option. One of the main reasons a lot of us moved out to these outlying areas is because NO MAJOR POWER LINES EXIST AND WE WANT IT TO STAY THAT WAY. When I looked for land to purchase I specifically threw out many areas in SW Washington as an option because of power lines running through the areas. It was not easy to find a location such as the Hockinson area and that should not be changed. I bought land that does not threaten my well being or the value of my land and home. Yes, these power line routes you consider as options are something I consider as a viable threat to my well being. You may wish to debate the health issues however you do not know how my body feels when its close to power lines and I do. I know that it is disruptive to my health and how I feel when I am anywhere close to them and living close to power lines of any size is disruptive to me.

Please DO NOT destroy the home I found and created and install power lines along route 31, 32 and 35. In summary I do not want power lines going in anywhere other than along the already existing route along I-5 that you labled route 25.

Do the right thing and build these larger power lines along the already existing route where people who live already made the choice to live among them. Route 25, 36,37,38,41, 50 and that area already have power lines that you can follow. The people living in these areas already made the choice to live close to power lines! Do not make the wrong decision and impose this on people who chose NOT to live close to power lines.

DO THE RIGHT THING AND ONLY BUILD UPON ROUTE 25 AND 36,41,37,50,51,48.

Thank you for your services and consideration of my life.

Marla Azinger

Communication ID: 11242

Date: 11/8/2009

Name: JIM A AZINGER

DO NOT BUILD POWER LINES for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project ON ROUTE 31 or 32. Secondly I do not support you building power lines on route 33, 30, 34 or 35. Do the right thing and build these larger power lines along the already existing route where people already made the choice to live among them. Route 25, 36,37,38,41, 50 and that area already have power lines that you can follow. The people living in these areas already made the choice to live close to power lines! Do not make the wrong decision and impose this on people who chose NOT to live close to power lines. DO THE RIGHT THING AND ONLY BUILD UPON ROUTE 25 AND 36,41,37,50,51,48.

Communication ID: 11243

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: KAREN FREE,RANDALL FREE

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Please have your environmental studies look at "buffer zone" mitigation/electrical current and health risks posed to homeowners, loss of property value, unable to sell. Cancer clusters next to home neighborhoods.

We have a 4 year hold home and are horrified at this proposal. We never would have purchased this house knowing bigger electrical towers would go thru the area now used by BPA. I fear the impact and

knowledge of the electrical charge causing harm and cancer to my family first and foremost. I also fear my neighborhood will not be sellable if these mega towers go in. We need to be mitigated and compensated so we can vacate our home if your proposal uses the path next to our home. We need to know what legal avenue to choose in the event your proposal becomes a plan. I would strongly suggest you go way east, away from subdivisions and schools!

Communication ID: 11244

Date: 11/8/2009

Name: JAMES A HUMMEL

We built our retirement house here two years ago. Our neighbors throughout our small development have been here upwards of 20 years and now they find out that you are considering taking their homes and property from them for power lines. That is not right. Cost should not be an issue here. You should upgrade your existing lines or as a last resort, take the route which impacts the fewest citizens, I certainly do not want to lose my neighbors and see my property value decreased because of your power lines. It is a fact that values will decrease. Do the right thing, even though it might not be the most economical.

Communication ID: 11245

Date: 11/8/2009

Name: DOUGLAS R BROCKBANK

This is the first in what will surely be a long line of communications from me and my neighbors. You need to know that I'll do anything in my legal rights to influence BPA to choose a route OTHER than #31. And, I am discovering that many neighbors in this area feel the same way. 1. There are MANY homes along Route 31 that would be devastated by choosing that route. The homes are occupied by people who made big investments in order to be close to pristine nature, have clear views, privacy, and a healthy environment. They (we) WILL NOT let this happen without a very big fight. I can promise that people out here will do anything they can to increase the cost of building out Route 31. Why wouldn't they? Their quality of life, property values, and health are at risk. 2. Where the easement does NOT ruin people's homes, quality of life, or view, the route goes through VERY heavily wooded areas, that would be expensive to clear and devastating to the wildlife in those woods. Out our back door (in the easement area) are many coyotes, black bear, raccoons, wildcats, deer and countless rodents. They have been pushed to their limit by development and have nowhere else to go. 3. Adding 50 ft. of width to the easement will cost a BPA a lot of additional money--especially after having to buy the easement from PacifiCorp. This is money that could be spent finding and using a route far less crowded, or investing in safety measures for adding to the existing Route 09 into Vancouver. For me, everything else pales in comparison to having to leave the home where we consciously chose to raise our children 14 years ago,

and for them to have a HOME to come back to in their adult lives. We were very conscious about putting our lives and memories into this home, and intend it to be a sanctuary for the rest of our lives. I can't quantify the importance of this to us, but please be assured that it's priceless and we'll most certainly fight for it with every resource we can bring to bear. Many hundreds of neighbors who feel the same way are just waking up to this, and I have no doubt you'll be hearing from them too! Thank you.

Communication ID: 11246

Date: 11/8/2009

Name: KENNETH A MANTHA

As a property owner in the area proposed for installation of power lines, I am very disturbed and concerned. We consider this a threat not only to our health but a de-valuation of our home and community. We ask that the BPA does not consider the routes of 31,32,30,33,34,35,26,27,29,28 as an option. One of the major reasons we chose the Hockinson area was because there weren't any power lines. Along with our neighbors, we want to keep it that way . Please only consider the installation of this project along the already existing route along I-5 that you labled route 25.

Communication ID: 11247

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: MARLA BARBUR

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Please have your environmental studies look at Department of Natural Resources land for towers and power lines, segment 28.

My retirement home is not worth today what I paid 4 years ago. I cannot afford to lose my retirement if this impacts my property.

Communication ID: 11248

Date: 11/8/2009

Name: NANCY C SCHEIMER,DR RAYMOMD A SCHEIMER

Dear BPA- DO NOT BUILD POWER LINES for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project ON ROUTE 31 or 32. Secondly we do not support you building power lines on route 33, 30, 34 or 35. If you must follow through with this project then the ONLY route we would SUPPORT is ROUTE 25 and its connected lower state route 500 requirements. We FELL STRONGLY YOU SHOULD ONLY BUILD UPON THE ALREADY

EXISTING I-5 AND ST. ROUTE 500 OPTIONS THAT YOU LABEL AS ROUTE 25 AND 36,41,37,50,51,48. ROUTE 25 that is actually along the I-5 corridor as this project is titled is the only one that is logical, ethical, and the least impacting on the economy. Not only does Route 25 already have power lines running along it but it would have much less of an impact on people and the worth of real estate. In addition the towns you claim need this power should not be interfering with outlying areas that do not already have these power lines running through them. This shouldn't effect or involve them at all. You should not consider disturbing the people of the communities living along the potential routes of 31,32,30,33,34,35,26,27,29,28 as an option. One of the main reasons a lot of us moved out to these outlying areas is because NO MAJOR POWER LINES EXIST AND WE WANT IT TO STAY THAT WAY. When we looked for land to purchase we specifically threw out many areas in SW Washington as an option because of power lines running through the areas. It was not easy to find a location such as the Hockinson area and THAT SHOULD NOT BE CHANGED. We bought land that does not threaten our well being or the value of my land and home. These power line routes you consider as options are something we consider as a viable threat to our well being. You may wish to debate the health issues however there are too many health concerns related to power lines near homes. These health issues MUST be considered. Please DO NOT destroy the value of our home and our health by installing power lines along route 31, 32 and 35. In summary we do not want power lines going in anywhere other than along the already existing route along I-5 that you labeled route 25. Be proactive and be responsible for protecting the health of homeowners by building these larger power lines along the already existing route where people who live already made the choice to live among them. Route 25, 36,37,38,41, 50 already have power lines you can follow. The people living in these areas already made the choice to live close to power lines! Do not make the wrong decision and impose this on people who chose NOT to live close to power lines. DO THE RIGHT THING AND ONLY BUILD UPON ROUTE 25 AND 36,41,37,50,51,48. Thank you for your services and consideration of our health. Respectfully submitted, Dr. Raymond A. Scheimer & Nancy C. Scheimer, RN [Address]

Communication ID: 11249

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SHARON BUCHER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

The increase in homes around the old PPNL right of way in the Hockinson area has increased dramatically since the 1940's when this 100 foot corridor was considered for power lines. The severity of impact to the health, material wealth and serenity of the people living in their homes will be severe if a huge wide corridor of power lines is built in this area. It would seem prudent if there are alternatives further into the edge of wooded lands, Department of Natural Resources lands that it would be highly preferred.

Communication ID: 11250

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: D MASON

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Please have your environmental studies look at native plants and birds.

#31, 22 plus years on 1 acre, it's our investment for our future/retirement, devalued! Much money spent on native plants, returning. Western tonagers, etc. (woodpeckers, owls). Potential health issues, hearing aids. Eye sore. We now live in a beautiful treed acre, no power lines/towers in site. Please do east.

Communication ID: 11251

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: FORRCUINO TONKE

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Why would BPA buy in a down market when property values are at the lowest in history? Why aren't they following the current route for the line? It would be more cost effective. Why not go through the national forest? Why would BPA buy property from owners at prices that are lowest in history? BPA need to address this lines ASAP and not place people's lives on hold.

Communication ID: 11252

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: ROBERT R RANDEL

Proposed Lines 28 & 29 are particularly disturbing to me. The East Fork of the Lewis River is considered the recreational Jewel of Clark County. The upper River is a very popular and heavily used year round recreation area. People drive Sunset Falls road to escape the city and enjoy the natural beauty along the river. They fish along the river, kayak through the river, picnic and swim down the river. Your lines 28 and 29 would create a huge blight on this wonderful and treasured recreation area. Anyone trying to enjoy a Sunday drive along the river, camping, fishing, swimming, or kayaking the upper river would have to see these lines. Surely you do not need to place these lines in middle of Clark County's most treasured recreational resource the upper East Fork. Additionally, anyone hiking Silver Star Mountain

would then look down and see these lines. I hope you will strongly consider not using Line options 28 or 29 and creating a blight on Clark Counties heavily used and most beautiful scenic recreation area.
Sincerely, Robert Randel

Communication ID: 11253

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: DEBBIE RAWHOUSER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

We already have a line going down 39th I hope we don't have to sacrifice having more towers on the same route since we already have to bear the burden of the ones we have. Also it doesn't seem that it would solve the problem if both lines go out at the same time.

Please take care to preserve as much trees and wildlife as you can. I am also worried about the increased health risk to my family if the line is built on the existing route because of the increased current.

Communication ID: 11254

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: PAUL B SMITH

RE: Public Scoping Comments related to Leg #27

Dear Sir,

I understand that you are seeking comments on the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project to help identify potentially significant impacts that may result from the project.

If selected Leg #27 of the project would potentially have adverse environmental impacts on a 24-lot subdivision named Creekside Acres located in Clark County, Washington. The potential adverse impacts include land use, historic and archaeological resources, aesthetics, wetlands, floodplains, wildlife and water resources.

The subdivision Creekside Acres was approved by Clark County in the mid-1990s. We request that you obtain the complete subdivision approval file from Clark County and incorporate all the relevant information from this file in your EIS. The subdivision was surveyed by Robert H. Oquist PLS 21,326 in July 1994. I believe there is a later revision of this survey that shows the final subdivision road layout. Notes on the survey refer to a wetland determination prepared by A. G. Crook in July 1993. Another

note states that "Chelatchie Creek is a shoreline stream and is within a Rural Conservation Area."

We believe that locating high voltage transmission lines down Leg #27 will have a significant negative land use impact on the 24 residential properties in Creekside Acres. We also believe that building in this alignment will have significant adverse impacts on wetlands, archaeological resources, floodplains, streams, and wildlife.

The project will significantly degrade the aesthetics of the Chelatchie Prairie, a beautiful valley surrounded by hills containing residences, farmland and an airstrip. We urge you to rethink this location as an alternative for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

Also, in your Fact Sheet dated September 2009, you refer to the high concentration of industrial, commercial and residential electrical use in the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area. Would you please explain why a new 500-kilovolt transmission line is needed from Troutdale, Oregon to Castle Rock, Washington when the concentration of customers is nowhere near this corridor?

Sincerely,

Paul Smith

[Address]

Communication ID: 11255

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: CHARLES HUNEYCOLT

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

My main concern is the scenic impact affecting my property values. I own 3 building lots in section 4 of map 8 on [Address] and [Address]. By raising the height of the towers and increasing the width of the easement the property values of the building lots that I own will diminish. The view of the towers will increase and lower surrounding property values. This is an adverse affect to the neighborhood. Less people will be interested in buying new homes. This will also affect power usage and possibly decrease consumption.

Communication ID: 11256

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: NANCY L RUST,ALAN RUST

RECESSION: JOB LOSES, HOUSING PRICES TANK, RETIREMENT FUND SHRINKS, AND NOW YOU WANT TO

TAKE OUR HOME! DRAW LINES ON A MAP, THROW A DART, DISPLACE FAMILIES/DREAMS. ON MY ROAD THERE ARE TWO FAMILIES OVER 80 YEARS OLD. WHERE WILL THEY GO?? YOU HAVE ESTABLISHED LINES ALREADY, RUN PARALLEL TO THEM, SAVE YOURSELF SOME MONEY AND SAVE OUR HOMES/OUR WAY OF LIFE. ALAN & NANCY RUST

Communication ID: 11257

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: RYAN PAYNE

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

I don't want to look out at a 200 foot tower in backyard.

Communication ID: 11258

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: GLORIA MUTHE

Go east - less homes to depreciate the value. We don't want TOWERS to invade our neighborhood.

Communication ID: 11259

Date: 11/3/2009

Name: ROBERT BOYD

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Please have your environmental studies look at following already existing routes less invasive to current population. I am worried about health effects. I am worried about property values. I am worried about the views in this beautiful countryside. I moved out here 3 years ago to get away from city life. I do not want it to follow me!

Communication ID: 11260

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: MARVIN DEAN JONES

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Dear Mr. Woolson,

I have been in communication with Jill Nystrom. She has been very helpful in discussing the proposed project with me and forwarding maps, etc.

I am forwarding the letter below to you and others in hopes that someone will receive, hear, and address our concerns.

My son and I intend to be at the meeting in Vancouver on the 7th.

Our property is well within the proposed boundary study/area/right-of-way, therefore I am very concerned about health risks of your proposal to me, my family, and other residents of the State of Washington, who are in harm's way if your proposal is implemented.

Thank you for understanding and addressing some of our concerns such as:

- Proximity of our property and home site to proposed high transmission electric power lines.
- Electromagnetic fields surrounding high transmission lines.
- Resulting radiation from the high transmission power lines. (There are numerous studies on the increased incidence of various cancers, and resulting deaths, of people living on the edges of, and near, right-of-ways for high voltage transmission lines.)
- Increased levels of, and resulting exposure to, radiation where now a radiation problem does not exist.
- Constant noise pollution created by high transmission power lines.
- The unaesthetic intrusion of transmission towers and lines in what is now a very rural, sylvan and bucolic landscape setting. This property has been in our family for generations. As I have said below, we intend to build on our property within the next few years. The primary views from our property and home site are to the east and north which appears to be the proposed location of the transmission towers and lines.

Thank you for your attention to our concerns. We look forward to hearing from you and your response to our concerns,

The Jones Family.

Original letter:

Dear Mr. Korsness,

My name is [Name]. I own property in Clark County, WA [Address/Parcel].

Thank you for forwarding the information and the study area maps for the proposed transmission lines.

It is very difficult, from looking at your maps, to understand if the proposed lines cross over or border my property. Would you please advise me relative to the proposed locations of the transmission lines and how close they are to my property, as soon as possible.

I am presently living in California, but intend to build my retirement home on the property in the near future. My contact phone is [Phone]. My email is [Email].

I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Thank you in advance.

Communication ID: 11261

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: JUNIE EVELYN LAWSON

Hi, we called last week and left a message asking some questions. We don't live in the area now but we do have a property in Yacolt. We did receive a letter from you, and we have questions that we left on the previous message. The last name is Lawson, Charles or Junie, and our phone number is [Phone]. We have some renters at our property there and we're needing to find some answers. The paper said someone would call back quickly and we would appreciate that.

Communication ID: 11262

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: B.J. B CASSELL

I understand the BPA has federal stimulus money burning a hole in their pockets to build so called "redundancy" in the power network. I also understand that no event has occurred in the entire history of our nation comprising the stability of the power network in the way the BPA IS TRYING TO MAKE PRIVATE CITIZENS AFRAID of. Furthermore, a 300 foot wide EASEMENT ALREADY EXISTS along I-5, which is more than ADEQUATE to build the proposed "necessary" structures, which would NOT necessitate destroying existing residences. According to the public outcry, NOBODY is in favor of their HOMES BEING UNNECESSARILY DESTROYED BY THE BPA. Given the fact that the BPA IS UNNECESSARILY CHOOSING TO DESTROY HOMES, it only makes logical sense to expand along the existing route along I-5. In order to PROTECT the homes of one's self, their neighbors, and their community, all concerned and informed citizens should only allow the obvious route along I-5.

Communication ID: 11263

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: JEANETTE L HUMMEL

We bought our 5 acre parcel, to build our retirement home 2 1/2 years ago. One of the major reasons we picked this area was because of all the wonder neighbors we would have. Another reason was because of the natural beauty here. Rock creek runs through our property. Now one of your choices is to run your large power lines through our neighbors properties, condemning one of neighbors homes. The power lines that you possibly will be installing are very unattractive! We want our home area natural looking like when we purchased the property. We would like you to upgrade your current lines that are already in place. Please do not ruin any more of God's country! Thank you!

Communication ID: 11264

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: NORMA J TIPTON

My husband and I have lived here for the last 23 years. I have built a botanical garden on my 1 acre lot from a parcel of land with only wild blackberry vines and one full grown douglas fir tree, to a garden with 1000's of botanical species of plants. I am a garden artist and this land has been my canvas for the last 23 years. It has turned into a beautiful garden as the plants have matured. Because of my passion, I have worked 10-14hrs almost daily to the point of exhaustion and injury even having developed a disease called fibromyalgia. I continue to work those hours in my garden even though I have pain in most of my muscles, most of the time. This is an ongoing project and I hope to someday share it with the public. There are botanical societies that will buy private gardens after the owners have passed, and open them to the public. Also I am a photographic artist using different botanicals such as flowers, seeds, and leaves and float them in water. I use various foil backgrounds which cause colorful swirls in the water that makes a cohesive photograph with the botanicals. I have had three art gallery shows. I have been told this is a unique and amazing art form. These pictures would not be possible without my garden and the wide variety of botanicals in it. I have devoted my life to this garden. I have no children and work only 2 days per week as a nurse, so I can devote my time to this project. I implore you to see this beautiful garden before making a decision. This is a work of art and cannot be replaced. Sincerely,
Norma Tipton

Communication ID: 11265

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: LARRY COPLEY

Hello, this is Larry Copley. I own a parcel at [Address] in Camas right across from the easement there for the transmission line. But I did get a letter regarding the I-5 Corridor project requesting access to my

property for surveying. I just wanted to, I missed going to the open houses. I was trying to find out you know how likely it is my property would need to be acquired, or something and if that information is even available. I wasn't sure if they're planning on substation there, because there's already a right-of-way across the street for power lines. If someone could give me a call back [Phone]. I'm getting ready to do some renovating and I don't want to spend a whole bunch of money on the place if it is going to be purchased by you guys. Thanks a lot.

Communication ID: 11266

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: YARO SCHNOEBELEN,EVELYM SCHNOEBELEN

We attended the meeting on this project at the Hazel Dell Grange on November 7, 2009 and we have several comments: 1) After speaking with our other neighbors in the Highlands at Pleasant Valley who also had attended this meeting, we got different answers to the same questions. The most confusing was about the adequacy of the existing space easement of the present BPA right of way by our neighborhood, The Highlands at Pleasant Valley. Some got the answer it was wide enough to accommodate the second line and others heard it was 50 feet short. What is the current answer? 2) The use of the existing right of way will have several effects on our neighborhood. The first is loss of resale value of homes in the entire neighborhood. The second is the visual impact of 150 foot towers. A third is the impact of EMF and the buzzing noise of these high power lines if they cut across the neighborhood. 3) It seems to us that a route as far east as possible linking Castle Rock, WA to Troutdale, OR substations is the least disruptive to well established very nice neighborhoods. Respectfully, Yaro and Evelyn Schnoebelen

Communication ID: 11267

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: JAN S LONG

I am writing this to tell you about my concerns for the BPA considering putting new transmissions lines and towers near our neighbor. I live in the Highlands development off 50th Ave. First, I am extremely worried about the health risks that can occur by living close to these towers. There is much evidence to warrant these health concerns. I am also very worried for the value of our houses. There have been many studies showing how values of houses near these towers are significantly lowered. This added to what this economy has done will be devastating. You have many options that will not impact as many neighborhoods as this route would. PLEASE do not pick this route. The consequences are too big. Jan Long

Communication ID: 11268

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: JAMES S MCGUIRE

I'm a homeowner that has received a message saying that you could potentially displace our home with this project. I'm very surprised that the project would consider destroying one of what people argue is the most beautiful neighborhoods in Clark County. Although I know you face complex challenges as an organization trying to solve energy needs, we join many that feel it's worth the time and money to fight for this home and the Highlands neighborhood where our families have extraordinary memories and experiences. Please don't do this.

Communication ID: 11269

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: JAMES S MCGUIRE

I sent one note already. Some additional points we are aligned on in our neighborhood. Reliability issue – as was pointed out in the Columbian, it is against long-standing policy in the power line industry to route two high tension lines in parallel in close proximity due to reliability concerns associated with fire or other disasters where a single problem could take out both lines simultaneously. It leaves the system inappropriately vulnerable to a single point failure. It is likely that the route would need to be longer overall, thus increasing the cost of building the new line along the existing right-of-way. The existing right-of-way will require substantial expansion of the right-of-way either decreasing the value of numerous existing homes due to loss of some of the land or to loss of entire homes due to expansion of the right-of-way. Either way, taking part or all of property will not come cheap. Many of the homes in question are on increasingly scarce larger lots in premium neighborhoods whose purchase would be quite expensive and detrimental to property values throughout those neighborhoods. There will also be a loss to the county revenue in reduction of property taxes in the affected neighborhoods. Go for most direct routing to minimize number of properties affected. Whether rational or not, there is a very real psychological impact on people having to live too close to high tension power lines. The higher voltage lines will be at a higher height and will be substantially more visible to the proximate neighborhoods, which will impact resale values in what were previously desirable neighborhoods to home buyers. If the power line is necessary, it would be best installed in a less densely populated truly rural area of the county and not within the now developed areas neighboring the existing right-of-way.

Communication ID: 11270

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: KATHY L GREENBERG

The idea of running new lines along the existing lines is a bad idea for several reasons. It would increase the odds of a massive failure if there were a disaster due to the close proximity of the lines. I'm

surprised this option is even being considered. You are also considering going through a now heavily populated area where the expansion could have negative health effects from EMF radiation and would certainly lead to lower property values in the surrounding neighborhoods. Subsequently, there would certainly be a loss of property tax revenue. There is plenty of rural less densely populated property in this part of the state and it makes sense to build the lines there, impacting less of the population and reducing the chance of a single line failure.

Communication ID: 11271

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: RANDALL D PEARL

Please choose a route other than the Ross-Lex route. If the power line is necessary, it would be best installed in a less densely populated truly rural area of the county and not within the now developed areas neighboring the existing right-of-way.

Communication ID: 11272

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: MARK A FLEISCHAUER

I am strongly opposed to expansion of service lines in the existing right of way adjacent to our neighborhood. BPA would be much better served by running lines through the more rural and less populated areas of the county -- redundancy and less condemnation cost are two of the most obvious benefits. While no one wants these lines in their backyard, we already bare our share of inconvenience and stigma associated with the current lines. Any proposal to increase these lines will require the condemnation of many half million to million dollar homes and bring the added wrath of affluent taxpayers (and their counsel). I strongly urge you to chose another option. Thank you for your consideration.

Communication ID: 11273

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: SARAH S KEGLY

Please have your environmental studies look at: the value of the homes in this neighborhood. I have lived here for 28 years and would hate to see the huge power lines/towers and the trees taken down.

I believe there is an Indian burial ground in the neighborhood. It is above [Address].

Communication ID: 11274

Date: 11/10/2009

Name: DALE E HILLMAN

I strongly object to any proposal that would run a 2nd line next to the existing one. First, I really don't want more trees cut down so I can see more of the power lines which are already within a few hundred feet of my property. Second, as noted in the Columbian article, the power companies generally don't run power lines next to each other as one major event can wipe out all service. Third, why don't you place power lines in a less populated area where less people are affected? And last but not least, doing so would destroy my property value. Just what I need when I am laid off from my job with no real prospects of getting any work.

Communication ID: 11275

Date: 11/10/2009

Name: EDDIE H HINKLE

No to project 31

Communication ID: 11276

Date: 11/10/2009

Name: JOYCE M LIVINGSTON

Please do not run the power lines over the property at [Address], Uhacz Family Farm

Communication ID: 11277

Date: 11/10/2009

Name: KELLI RANDOLPH, DON K RANDOLPH

This is in reference to the proposed line between points 36 and 37 on map page 105. As you know or will discover, the placement of the new line to the North of the existing one will put the towers perilously close to the houses in the neighborhood of NE 48th Circle. I am very concerned about the additional Electro-Magnetic Forces from the new line and its possible effect on our health. In addition, the new line may detrimentally affect the existing wetlands in our neighborhood.

The placement of this new line on the North may be very costly to BPA. The houses on NE 48th Circle are considered high-end homes not only for the quality of the structures but also due to the aesthetics of the area. These new towers will greatly de-value our land and houses or necessitate the purchase of our

homes by the BPA. The other 3 line placement options would be better choices for many reasons, but mainly due to minimal impact on your customers: the residents of Clark County.

We ask you to seriously consider these concerns and the impact of this proposed line placement.

Communication ID: 11278

Date: 11/10/2009

Name: SHERRON J NAUMAN

As homeowners who will be impacted directly by the suggested route of the much needed power line. We respectfully request careful consideration to moving the proposed power line to a rout east of us that does not impact so many family homes. This area, is filled with many family dwelling of longevity.

Communication ID: 11279

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Seg 31, Salmon Creek across from his parcel. Steep down to creek. Where would roads go?

Where would towers go?

Very forested on property, clearing vegetation a concern, 40 plus year old trees

Very densely populated along segment.

My parcel is more wildlife.

No house on it. Beaver, deer, bear...

Parcel in his family for years.

Losing possibility of development

Lose natural enviroment value

Want to keep in family as nature preserve.

Visual impacts

Lots of effort to restore Salmon Creek.

Communication ID: 11280

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

This is our paradise how are you going to impact that.

Communication ID: 11281

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Concern about TV, radio, cell phone reception

Communication ID: 11282

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

How do the lines affect animals?

Communication ID: 11283

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Does the line hum and pop?

Communication ID: 11284

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

We have quite a few land restrictions now. If you put a line across we may not be able to build

Communication ID: 11285

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

What happens to my comments?

Communication ID: 11286

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Segment 31, just west of Camp Bonneville: owls, deer, moles

Communication ID: 11287

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Cost

Communication ID: 11288

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Seg. 31-Vegataion maintenance, tree clearing and management erosion

Communication ID: 11289

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Seg. 31-Securing additional easement and condemnation

Communication ID: 11290

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Seg. 31-Size of lot versus size of easement

Communication ID: 11291

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Seg. 31-Need- Who is the power for?

Communication ID: 11292

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Seg. 31-Likes open house format

Communication ID: 11293

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Can we go underground across the river

Communication ID: 11294

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Footprint of substation

Communication ID: 11295

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Recreation homes in Ariel, WA. Will you avoid residential clusters?

Communication ID: 11296

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

How close will lines be to homes?

Communication ID: 11297

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Segment 11

Quality of natural environment around Ariel, WA. Don't want to lose quality of life. Visual impacts, environment impacts (birds, trees, etc)

Bull trout in Brooks creek

Communication ID: 11298

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Seg. 31-Visual aesthetics: size/look of towers

Timing

Secure easements

Communication ID: 11299

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Seg 31, north end: wildlife area

Communication ID: 11300

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Map 91-Salmon Creek: southern bank is > 25% and densely populated with residential houses that restrict access to structures.

Communication ID: 11301

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Homeowners not "property" owners

Communication ID: 11302

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Segment 31, what will happen to homeowner, in Hockinson

Communication ID: 11303

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

If it follows current line, how would you do it?

Communication ID: 11304

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

A lot of homes that would make it hard to expand the ROW

Communication ID: 11305

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Existing ROW on 31, map 91

Communication ID: 11306

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Now has a road on it, how would residents get access to their homes?

Communication ID: 11307

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Segment Lex-Ross over to far east option N-S. Cost-wise which one is the most desirable?

Communication ID: 11308

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Cultural resources over by High School Hockinson

Communication ID: 11309

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Rumor DNR has already told BPA no

Communication ID: 11310

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

People next door need to sell.. Now have to disclose they are in a proposed path-could make it harder to sell

Communication ID: 11311

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Can you locate near existing lines

Communication ID: 11312

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Hockinson School District, no little league (Seg 31, map 91). Triple venture with Clark County to develop ball and soccer fields. If a line has to be located here how do we work together to minimize impacts to our plans.

Communication ID: 11313

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Seg 31: Line siting criteria concerns.

What is BPA thinking?

Communication ID: 11314

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Road not to HS20 standards.

How would BPA buy, maintain and build to BPA standards route 31.

Nota County Road-maintained by Homeowners association.

Communication ID: 11315

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

31 Barn adjacent to existing ROW with lean-to in existing ROW. How will barn be evaluated?

Does BPA pay replacement value of structures? (no)

Communication ID: 11316

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Lake Merwin area landslides.

Road shifted. Needs stabilization-Seg 18.

Environmental concerns (National Environment)

Lake Merwin campers hideaway (Map 59).

Communication ID: 11317

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Concerns about impacts to watersheds, impacts to homes in existing ROW-seg 31

Communication ID: 11318

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Impacts to DNR lands, where would the route go?

Communication ID: 11319

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

PEP form needs to be improved

Communication ID: 11320

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Consider deer and other animals

Communication ID: 11321

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

I have property which the easement will not be on, however a new line next to me will effect my property value. Will I be compensated?

Communication ID: 11322

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Easement, vegetation: How do you clear vegetation?

Herb/mechanical?

Section 30 and 33

Communication ID: 11323

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

North end Sec 30= very rugged and has salmon habitat.

How would you deal with vegetation?

Communication ID: 11324

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Concerned at hissing and popping of higher KV lines

Communication ID: 11325

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Line 31-Concerns at houses in the way and soccer and park development

Communication ID: 11326

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Line 31-Bells Mountain, small commuter air traffic (ie. Alaska Air) flight patterns.

Would need beacons on towers?

Communication ID: 11327

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Line 31- Use 100 foot ROW and add to reach 150 feet.

Creek at north end of line 31. See bears, wildlife being squeezed into narrow area (page 91) north 1/3 east of line.

Communication ID: 11328

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Segment 31-Lots of houses built up. Wildlife need to be saved.

Communication ID: 11329

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Can we be present when PEP allows entry?

Communication ID: 11330

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Lake Merwin Hideway campground PEP forms are brought by partial owners who don't have authority to sign them. Realty is working with campground manager.

Communication ID: 11331

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

If lines come over your land what happens?

Communication ID: 11332

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Are there height restrictions, we have a tree farm.

Communication ID: 11333

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Would our property be considered an income property (tree farm)?

Communication ID: 11334

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Property owners called Realty 3 times in week and half with no response. Frustrated by government.

Communication ID: 11335

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING GRESHAM

[Scoping Meeting (Gresham)]

Need clarification of PEP forms (language)

Communication ID: 11336

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER ,ERIN E GROVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 29, page 88

Erin Grover

[Address]

Concerned about environment, 600 year old snag and the Lewis River Lake bed.

Albino salamander

Eagle habitat

Deer, bobcat, bear

check out: www.highwoodsheaven.blogspot.com

Neighbor has 3 ponds used for fire suppression with helicopters. Also on rescue missions.

Within flight pattern

Concerned about lightening towers and effects to home views

Communication ID: 11337

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER ,RICHARD FREEDING

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Off Ross-Lex. Need relocation info:

What if you need to take money (\$) from an IRA - who pays the extra taxes?

When are monies paid in relation to time you must be out of your present property?

Richard Freeding [Phone]

Communication ID: 11338

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Route 31 Just finished customizing home. Its only 10 years old, not wanting to move. Has 30 x 48 steel building that would be hard to move. Other routes are more open in pasture.

Communication ID: 11339

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Route 25 Will send in written comments. Feels that the decision to build powerlines in an economy so down is suspect. Why do we need more power when consumption is down? Property values are down.

Communication ID: 11340

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Route 25 Concerned about property value before and after.

Communication ID: 11341

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Route 25 House purchased as retirement home; mortgage is paid off. They don't have a mortgage payment budgeted into finances.

Communication ID: 11342

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Route 36 Concerned about property values. Go through the trees out east.

Communication ID: 11343

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Are we going to compensate for the electro magnetic field effects beyond the take area?

Communication ID: 11344

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Keep this out of #31 and our neighborhood. Put this on the Department of Natural Resources or I-5 where you aren't messing with people's property, land values and lives. Also on the I-5 or Department of Natural Resources you won't have to deal with "sabotage" from unhappy land owners costing you unkown expenses and consequences.

Communication ID: 11345

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Phone line is always busy.

Communication ID: 11346

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

More cost effective not to use Segment 31 because of new houses.

Communication ID: 11347

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Home values

Communication ID: 11348

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

re: Segment 47 = concerned about this whole thing.

Communication ID: 11349

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER ,CURTIS HOGUE

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Easements 212th Street

Why did the County let me build?

My house is less than 1 year old!

Curtis Hogue

Communication ID: 11350

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

If you already have a line why do you need another?

Communication ID: 11351

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Will people lose their houses?

Communication ID: 11352

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

105th are you condemning my property?

Communication ID: 11353

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Do I need to worry about birth deffects?

(children's growth)

Communication ID: 11354

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Electronic equipment

Communication ID: 11355

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

What is the high frequency noise that come off the powerlines?

Communication ID: 11356

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Is BPA going to buy us out because you're going to harm us from electro magnetic fields?

Segment 25

Communication ID: 11357

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Understand progress but worried about the ability to re-sell our house. Segment 25

Communication ID: 11358

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Mose and Re-sell values area concern. Segment 25

Communication ID: 11359

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 25, want to know today!

Communication ID: 11360

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER ,SHERRY KEENE

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Sherry Keene - please address the issue of Scotch Broom, gates, vegetation.

[Phone] [e-mail]

Communication ID: 11361

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Don Randolph [Phone] [Address]

Electro magnetic fields is a big concern if line is built on North right of way of 36-37 on map 105. The north tower will be 12 from my house.

There are wetlands in the north part of your right of way, 100 yards east of my house.

Communication ID: 11362

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Relocation information mailed to me

[Phone][Address]

Communication ID: 11363

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned about interest rate on a 15 year loan relocated - my interest rate is real good - fixed - how would that work to get same interest rate?

Communication ID: 11364

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned about property value if on Ross-Lex.

Push the line further east.

Communication ID: 11365

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Because of valley, the view shed would be highly impacted

On back of property there is a creek that is a tributary to east fork of Lewis River.

King Creek is nearby also flows to east fork.

Ranibow Falls, very scenic

Roads on page 88 are incorrect. Please look at.

Tree farm is private and has easement to use road.

Communication ID: 11366

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

1 mile out of Ross on Lex line is highly populated

Communication ID: 11367

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Electrical effects in high density populations.

Property values going down.

Concerned about lowering land values for those that don't have the line on their property.

Be sure to look at electro magnetic fields in highly dense populations.

In the spring, try to narrow it down to 5 or 6 options.

Communication ID: 11368

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Pamphlet could have been clear about what we were planning.

Clearly stated impacts.

Communication ID: 11369

Date: 11/10/2009

Name: BARBETTE C SCHOENING

I am a resident of Hockinson Highlands which is on the proposed route segment #31 of the BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. This segment will also run within a mile to my children's primary school. I moved to this area specifically because of the scenery, wildlife and wetlands. Having a 150 foot tower in my neighborhood would decimate my property value. I am also concerned about the health hazards of a massive transmission line being so close to my home and my children's school. A report from the California Department of Health Services concluded that living in a close proximity of Electric and Magnetic Fields increases the risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease and miscarriage. What enrages me the most that BPA has an alternate route through Washington DNR land that would avoid established communities. However, this is not their preferred route. Why are we putting our families and communities at risk if they have another option? NO BPA Segment #31 The construction of route segment #31 would destroy our community, our residential investment and our lives. It is unconscionable and irresponsible to even consider this segment. The community of Hockinson would never be the same. Sincerely, Barbette Schoening

Communication ID: 11370

Date: 11/10/2009

Name: DARYL ERICKSON

Lexington is one of the fastest growing neighborhoods in the Longview area, and it already is chopped in half by segments 02 and 04. The line continues with segment 09 slicing through a growing area in East Kelso. This is really bad planning to waste such good residential areas and chop up neighborhoods.

Longview is growing north up the Cowlitz River Valley. Even segment 03 is probably too far south to avoid wasting more good development areas. Perhaps you can do a better job of anticipating future growth areas to avoid running power lines through residential and commercial areas.

Communication ID: 11371

Date: 11/10/2009

Name: DAVID M SIMMS

I am opposed to the project as proposed! Following the highway system with current right of ways makes more sense than taking private land from owners. If put underground along, or overhead along the hwy I5 and I205 and I84 you would make a lot of people happy and you would gain much more trust with goverment. You could design somthing great! It is a challenge, but it does not warrent just the same old thinking of taking more land...think it to be a great challenge to design a new type of overhead system along the current hyway system.

Communication ID: 11372

Date: 11/10/2009

Name: JAMES KAMERATH

Just a quick question...wondering why you would send out a form for property access, to those who do not appear to be in the I-5 Corridor Project's pathway? Do you send them out to all property owners within a mile radius? Thank

Communication ID: 11373

Date: 11/10/2009

Name: CHRISTOPHER I WEINGARTNER

I live next to your right-away (map 95). It looks to me like you wouldn't need more room to put another line there. A neighbor told me that she read somewhere that if another line is installed next to the existing line, BPA will need another 150 feet of right-away. Is this true? I went to your meeting in Vancouver, but no one seem to know the answer.

Communication ID: 11374

Date: 11/10/2009

Name: DONNA HARRIS

Yes, my name is Donna Harris my contact telephone number is [Phone]. I'm looking at the map I was sent and in all honesty it doesn't really appear to be accurate nor does it have an overlay of where the possible lines might be. Once again this is Donna Harris at [Phone]. Thank you. Bye.

Communication ID: 11375

Date: 11/10/2009

Name: MARY J HARRIS,JAMES HARRIS

To Whom It May Concern: We are writing to vehemently oppose building a new transmission line and associated substations along the existing BPA transmission lines. Our home in the Highlands at Pleasant Valley backs up to the existing lines. We bought our lot and had a home custom built because of the beauty and privacy of the woods. The new towers would be much taller and closer to our lot. We would be confronted with enormous, ugly industrial structures and would lose the beauty of the woods. But that is only a minor reason.

We are very 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 8000 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 next to our property. One real estate agent said that the value could easily decrease our property by \$100,000. We are close to retirement and cannot afford that amount of loss. If our home's value would decrease by \$100,000, please consider what this proposal would do to the 8000 other homes. Again, it would make more sense to build the lines in a less populated area.

Right now, we feel that we are held hostage by the BPA. We can't sell our home now without disclosing the possible building of the new transmission lines. Who is their right mind would buy our home knowing that power lines that emit EMF radiation may be built within a couple of years? If we wait to sell our home after the new lines go in, no one will want to buy it then either. If we had any idea that 500-kilovolt transmission lines and substations were going to be built next to our property, we would have NEVER bought the lot in the Highlands.

We plead with you to build the transmission lines further east in less populated areas. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, James and Mary Harris [Address] [Phone] [e-mail] ParcelID: [Number], Section: 25, Township: 3N, Range:1E, Meridian: WM, County: Clark

Communication ID: 11376

Date: 11/10/2009

Name: BILL C HARPOLE

Attended Hazel Dell I-5 power line meeting. Using existing corridor, second tower mounted on base tower resulting in much higher, environmentally ugly structures, nearer homes with tree removal. Causes line noise and radiation concerns. Result lower property values, difficulty selling homes, less tax revenue means less school and government funding. Newspaper stated power lines can't share corridor as too vulnerable--so why are you considering? If main user of power is Oregon then run line through Oregon. (Spoil the Oregon environment and home values.) If through Washington, go as far to the East as possible. My wife and I worked all our lives to finally retire and build our first new house and home values are already bad, now you threaten to wipe out what is left. This would be tragic!

Communication ID: 11377

Date: 11/10/2009

Name: JANET L GULLBERG

No, NO, NO NO NO NO on the I5 corridor expansion through Hockinson. Find another way! I will not have power lines through my kids' school! My great, great uncle was a contractor electrician and helped build the Bonneville Dam. Here's what he told me when there were "power shortages." "That's BS. I helped build that and there's enough power to power all of the U.S." Kick out the conservationalist, extremist tree hugger crap, kick out the fish and crank up the water.

Communication ID: 11378

Date: 11/10/2009

Name: SCOTT E MEANS

I am very concerned with the proposed I-5 EIS for the following reasons: The existing right-of-way will require substantial expansion of the right-of-way either decreasing the value of numerous existing homes due to loss of some of the land or to loss of entire homes due to expansion of the right-of-way. Either way, taking part or all of property will not come cheap. Many of the homes in question are on increasingly scarce larger lots in premium neighborhoods whose purchase would be quite expensive and detrimental to property values throughout those neighborhoods. There will also be a loss to the county revenue in reduction of property taxes in the affected neighborhoods. If the power line is necessary, it would be best installed in a less densely populated truly rural area of the county and not within the now developed areas neighboring the existing right-of-way.

Communication ID: 11379

Date: 11/11/2009

Name: JENNIFER J MCKEE

I would like Dawnee to contact us when she does come out this week or next when marking the for route 25. We are located along existing lines north of 63 rd street and west of to 205 freeway. We can be reached by cell phone at [Phone]. Thank you and we appreciate your cooperation with us as well. Jennifer.

Communication ID: 11380

Date: 11/11/2009

Name: SCOTT W SWINDELL

I respect the need for modifications in the existing distribution system. However, regardless of costs, any new Segments added to the system should completely avoid impacting residential neighborhood or recreational properties and the view these properties may have to lakes, mountains, or any other view whatsoever that, when such view is impacted, devalues, even in a small way, any property. Segment 31 through parts of Battle Ground, Hockinson and Camas should not even be considered, given the other substantially less impactful alternatives farther to the East. I don't even live near where this line would be placed but know many individuals who would be significantly impacted by that Segment given its proposed location. There are simply too many homes and human beings which would be negatively impacted. I do own a recreational home in the very large easement area near Merwin/Yale (proposed Segment 11). Again, Segment 11, at least as it approaches the lakes, impacts too many recreational properties where individuals have bought and built properties in newly created subdivisions or individual lots for the beautiful views and scenery, either of the lakes or of Mount St. Helens. Utilizing the existing Segment 9 (at least until reaching Segment 14) or new Segment 10 (then Segments 12 and 13) to get South of Lewis River and the lakes would be much less impactful to these recreational properties. I am thoroughly confused by why the existing line easement shouldn't be utilized for the placement of the new line. I was told at the meeting on 10/28 that any work needing to be done on one line would cause both lines to be shut down.....so what? That's the system we live with now with one line and all is well. A perfect distribution/delivery system is not necessary. We need one that works and is the least impactful to residences and human beings. It seems if we already have a line in one location where a second could be placed, why would BPA disturb other areas to place a second line elsewhere. No matter where this line is placed, no expense should be spared to keep the line away from residences and out of the views of those who have them.....even if it means the line doesn't run in a straight line. We put men on the moon over 40 years ago, engineer DNA to clone complex living organisms, etc.....we can't be comfortable placing a power distribution line where it, in any way, impacts residences.

Communication ID: 11381

Date: 11/11/2009

Name: DEBBIE H DUNHAM

I have just learned of the proposed powerline towers that are planned to run through the Hockinson community. This is horrible! This is not a freeway; this is a closeknit, scenic community and powerline towers will adversely effect not only our views and scenery, but our property values as well. PLEASE reconsider and put these horrible things in a less scenic place (along a freeway, for instance).

Communication ID: 11382

Date: 11/6/2009

Name: MARGUERITE BLACKMAN,JEFF BLACKMAN

Dear Sirs:

We are homeowners in the Stoney Meadows subdivision which is effected by the proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. We attended the October 28th public meeting at Clark College and learned that our property is located on page 104 of the BPA maps.

We understand that one of the potential routes for the proposed transmission line is to run parallel (100-125' northeast) to the existing lines on map 104. Further, one of the sub-options is to run the south line right through the wetlands to the east of us or possibly through part of the Stoney Meadows Homeowners Association (SMHOA) common area. 39 homeowners collectively own and maintain nearly 60 acres of these environmentally sensitive wetlands. We also learned the existing towers are 90'in height and the average height of new towers will be 110-150'. Therefore, the new towers will be substantially taller and even more unsightly especially if equipped with flashing red lights.

We vehemently oppose having the reinforcement lines running through or anywhere near our property or the SMHOA property for the following reasons:

1. 1,820 acres in this wetlands has been designated by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) as Natural Area Preserve to protect the following:

- a. The slender billed nuthatch - a rare bird
- b. 6 rare plant species including the endangered Bradshaw's lomatium
- c. Stands of threatened Oregon white oak forest
- d. Other native wildlife like beavers, hawks, ducks, geese, etc.

2. the SMHOA common area includes 60 acres of wetlands with trails for the exclusive use by our homeowners and we have grave concerns about the impact of power lines on our health.

3. the Green Mountain airport is nearby and the new taller towers are an increased risk for the air traffic

given the flight path.

4. Our property value will be severely and negatively impacted by the unsightly power lines.

We request that you pursue one of your other options like running the lines closer to the I-5 corridor or much further north and to the east of Green Mountain.

We understand that public comments need to be submitted by November 23rd. Please consider this letter as our formal input. Finally, we do not grant permission to you to enter our property.

Marguerite and Jeff Blackman

[address]

Communication ID: 11383

Date: 11/11/2009

Name: WILLIAM OLSEN

Hi this is William Olsen in Washougal, Washington. My address is [Address]. My mailing address is [Address]. My phone number is [Phone].

I apparently am not on the BPA power line project mailing list. According to the Camas-Washougal Post Record which is where I found about this project, notification letters were sent out to 10,000 property owners whose land was in or near the potentially impacted area. I'm directly in the potentially impacted areas. Me and my neighbors who I have contacted have not received anything from BPA regarding this project. Could you please put me on your mailing list and send me any information or notification you have regarding the project? I do not have the capability of going online.

Also, I would like to ask or make a comment concerning the right-of-way on the land located both north and south of the project at the 335th Avenue site where BPA has been asked and been told they cannot have access for the study. It is my understanding that on both sides of the power line at this time there are access easements for egress and ingress by BPA to that area. I'd like to know if you can confirm that.

Also, there was a question in the paper regarding BPA officials said that there is currently no official policy dictating how much clearance there should be between the proposed power lines and residence or other inhibited buildings. It has been my understanding that no building permits can be issued under or near the power lines I don't know exactly what that distance is but it would seem to me that would be an official policy [message ended]

Communication ID: 11384

Date: 11/11/2009

Name: JOE H VAN ZUTPHEN

I am against the towers being built because they affect residential neighborhoods in my area. Also, a new school site is directly impacted. Finally, it is curious that under the BPA online site's description of electric transmission, and in its FAQ section, the potential health damage, documented in countless studies of the power lines, is not mentioned. One study, available on the government site Pubmed.gov (US National Library of Medicine and Health) says this about the transmission lines: "Studies have shown an association between electromagnetic fields and childhood leukaemia." With this kind of evidence, why isn't the BPA exploring safer options which look toward real future sustainability (of the people)?
Joe Van Zutphen

Communication ID: 11385

Date: 11/11/2009

Name: MICHAEL R SMITH

My wife and I have two locations that will be directly in the path of the new power lines. Our addresses are [Address] and [Address] in Battleground. One address is our new home we built and the other is a rental property we own that provides us with an income. The loss of these properties will have a huge negative impact on our life. We have lived in this area since 1989 and have raised our children here. This is a gorgeous area and our plan is to retire and live here. We feel the proposed power line would greatly diminish the beautiful valley we live in. Thank you Mike and Jill Smith

Communication ID: 11386

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: CAROLYN BENJAMIN

We're already sufficiently impacted by powerlines in our area. It is unwise to have all of the critical power transmission lines concentrated in one right of way. If a catastrophic event occurred, an entire region would be without power. I proposed that this line be located in a remote area to minimize this threat. Having new lines as far away as possible from existing lines makes it more secure; one disaster couldn't take them all out. Please build the new lines as far east as possible.

I have additional concerns about the tremendous increase in high voltage lines running through neighborhoods where home-owners, families and children reside.

Communication ID: 11387

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: LISA JOHNS

We have several streams on our property.

We already live by powerlines in the city that is why we bought our 40 acres to get away from city living. We are going to build on this property and want our son to live in a safe environment, not be endangered and limited to activity because of powerlines through our property.

Put the powerlines on private land away from homeowners and landowners. Think about not effecting the small people go for Warehouse or Longview Fiber land.

Communication ID: 11388

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: ALEX JOHNS

My parents bought this property for me to grow up in a safe and sound environment. Being this close to powerlines can endanger my life and well being. I am 2 years old and am looking forward to living on quiet safe property throughout my life. Put the powerlines where they will affect as little people as possible. How would you like powerlines thru both your property and home? Keep the children in mind while you make your final decisions - do the right thing - Alex Johns

Communication ID: 11389

Date: 11/11/2009

Name: WILLIAM A NELSON

I am a resident of the Highlands at Pleasant Valley. I object to having the new transmission line along the existing line which is adjacent to our development. The new towers would be much taller and closer to our homes and we would be confronted with the sight of enormous, ugly industrial structures. In addition there is the potential of EMF radiation as well as inherent noise from the wires. To build the towers, the BPA would remove a substantial number of trees from the right-of-way area exposing us to much more freeway noise. These problems will inevitable lead to lower property values for the entire neighborhood. If the power line IS necessary, I would suggest it be installed in a less densely populated, truly rural are of the county and not within the now developed areas neighboring the existing right-of-way.

Communication ID: 11390

Date: 11/11/2009

Name: KAYE A NELSON

I am a resident of the Highlands at Pleasant Valley Development that borders the existing right-of-way and I am writing to oppose adding a new transmission line alongside the existing line. The new towers

would be taller and in closer proximity to our lots and streets. We will be confronted with visual pollution from these ugly industrial structures and the loss of trees will yield much more freeway noise. All homes in the development will suffer LOWER PROPERTY VALUES. Please minimize the number of properties affected and choose a rural sight that is less densely populated.

Communication ID: 11391

Date: 11/11/2009

Name: REBECCA L MURPHY

I received one of your 8-10,000 packets and attended the Amboy meeting and am so thoroughly disgusted with these plans/ideas to run high voltage power lines thorough my home. I am on segment 27, aerial map 74 and it looks like you want to run these lines through my home and also protected wetlands on my property, which is also a Certified Backyard Wildlife Habitat, through the National Wildlife Federation. My husband is undergoing a severe medical crisis and this is the last thing I want to deal with at this time, but I will fight this every step of the way and involve local, national, and international organizations such as the NWF to fight this as well. I am completely opposed to this or any other route that seeks to take away the homes of citizens, polluting our pristine property, exposing communities to the scientifically-proven cancer- & disease-causing effects of EMF's, decreasing our property values, and destroying our neighborhoods. I live in an area where the power lines are buried, one of the reasons I bought this property. Having those unsightly towers anywhere nearby is completely unacceptable to me. I will NOT sign your form to enter my property and if anyone from your organization sets foot on my property without permission, aka: trespassing, you will find yourselves in serious trouble. This also reeks of underhanded political dealings and I have learned is connected to the hush-hush plans to build a Biomass plant in Chelatchie Prairie to supply California and possibllly Canada with power, while sending 140,000+ tons of pollution into our environment yearly. I say No way! Find another safer, cleaner, greener, and less threatening way.

Communication ID: 11392

Date: 11/11/2009

Name: DOROTHY P SABINO

Please move section 31 which runs through our neighborhood to the east of our homes. The proposed line and necessary access easements will remove our existing private road and several of our neighbor's homes. Our home, located just east of the proposed line, is for sale due to my job relocation - this project could kill the potential market for us in an already strained area for real estate sales. Please move the project east to the less populated areas (or down interstate 5) - we don't want to lose our homes.

Communication ID: 11393

Date: 11/12/2009

Name: KIRSTEN SMITH

Hello my name is Kirsten Smith. My address [Address]. I'm calling regarding the proposed route 31. I'm calling to let you know I'm against that option and I would strongly encourage you to look further east where you will be affecting less property owners and families. The reason I'm most concerned because there are likely cancer risks associated with living underneath or very close to these high electricity lines as well as the fact it will devalue my property and it will be an eyesore. If you have any questions for me you can reach me at [Phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 11394

Date: 11/12/2009

Name: NELYA A KOVALCHUK,IVAN KOVALCHUK

Hello, our name is Ivan and Nelya Kovalchuk. We bought some land in Brash Prairie a few years ago and built our house. We have 3 little children. Now you want to build 500 kV power lines through our property (route 31). These lines would be right in front of our house and really close to our home. We are very concerned about it. Nobody wants to live by power lines and nobody should live by power lines with such magnitude. It would be so much better if you would take them out of the town away from people. Wouldn't state lands be more appropriate place for such power lines not private property where our land values and lives be directly affected. Thank you.

Communication ID: 11395

Date: 11/12/2009

Name: NELYA A KOVALCHUK

Hello my name is Nelya Kovalchuk, and I would like to comment on Route 31. We bought our house a few years ago, in Brush Prairie, built our house. We have three little children, and now you're proposing 5000 kilovolt power line through our property and we're really concerned about it. It would be right in front of our house, on our property really close to our house. We're concerned about our health, our children, being really close to it during the bad weather it is very dangerous too. And our land values would go down and I don't know if we could still live here. I would like to ask you not to build it here and use your alternative route to go away from town, from people, and build it somewhere in the mountains where less people would be endangered. So if you would please use my comment also. We are against route 31, against using route 31. You can contact us through our e-mail, it is [e-mail]. Thank you very much. Bye-bye.

Communication ID: 11396

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: JUDITH ZEIDER

RE: Alignment of existing BPA easement in Kumtux Valley - Area of intersection of NE 259th Street and NE 212th Avenue - Battle Ground, WA

Good morning!

As far as I can tell, our home is near a proposed BPA route for this project, but outside the area for which BPA has sent notices of the EIS.

However, in looking at the Project Map 85, it appears that a proposed line could go north/south along the alignment of NE 212th Avenue through a valley (locally known as "Kumtux Valley") which is reputed to have been the site of the "battle" of Battle Ground and through which Rock Creek, a tributary of Salmon Creek, flows. It is my understanding that Clark County, CPU and the Conservation District have been trying to restore the areas around these streams as salmon habitat.

From you website, it appears that if there is already an easement, only the homeowners within 500 feet of the proposed line received notice. This tells me that BPA may already have an easement through the valley.

Please provide me with information on any easements BPA has across this area. A copy of a screen shot I took of the area is enclosed for reference. A copy of any easement or maps related to it is also requested.

Please contact me if you need any additional information to be able to answer my request.

Sincerely,

Judith Zeider

[contact info]

Encl: Map/Screen shot

Communication ID: 11397

Date: 11/12/2009

Name: PAULA GALLUCCI

Regarding your recent notice to me and many of my fellow residents at the Highlands at Pleasant Valley community of your possible future plans to build new HVOTL transmission lines alongside existing lines within your right of way adjacent to our development, I have the following concerns: The new towers would be much taller and in closer proximity to our lots and streets. We would be confronted with the

visual pollution of these enormous, ugly industrial structures from the majority of our community. We will be exposed to EMF radiation. We will experience consistent noise from the wires as inherent to the transmission. The removal of substantial numbers of trees from the right-of-way area would expose us to significantly more freeway noise. These problems will certainly lead to lower property values for the entire neighborhood, some to a more serious deterioration of values depending upon the proximity of their home to this project.

Communication ID: 11398

Date: 11/12/2009

Name: MELINDA NUTE

My family's home is directly in one of the proposed routes. It looks like it would take all of our property. Can you tell me what would happen if our route is chosen? It is a wooded area on Salmon Creek with lots of wildlife including coyotes, beaver, deer, etc. How would this effect them? Please consider staying on the existing route. There are many houses and properties (not to mention families) on this route that will be dramatically effected.

Communication ID: 11399

Date: 11/12/2009

Name: BO W. LIEBE

Communication ID: 11400

Date: 11/12/2009

Name: LARRY E. HILL

The PP&L easement on Route #31 that was given 50 years ago hardly seems relevant to the situation we find today. Density in those days were 50 acres as opposed to the 1 to 2 acre lots. Then it was predominantly Farming and Tree Farms. Today it is mostly subdivisions with mini farms mixed in. One of the reasons we purchased our 5 acres some 31 years ago was the spectacular sunsets with our horses or cows in the west part of the pasture. In my business I sell Equipment to the Metal Casting Industry. I am very aware that Industry is leaving the West Coast at such a fast pace we are getting auction notices weekly. That makes it difficult to understand the the need for more power. The power that ran the Aluminum Smelter, Steel Plants, and the other mfg. plants could supply the growth in this area for years! To try and run a High Power Line with High Loading that lives on the Proposed #31 Line is poor thinking when you could easily go down I5 or to the East on 29,34, &35 and bypass the pristine area in Hockinson Hill, Finn Hill, Proebstal, East of Battle Ground, etc. Health Hazards are serious and no person would want to raise a young child near these potentially Cancer, Leukemia, etc.(above 3 miliguass at edge of Right of way) areas around this High Power Lines! No scientist that has studied the effects of EMF would say living

near these lines is safe even the ones that work for Power Companies that have done studies in England, Sweden and the USA. EPA issued a draft stating that High power Lines are a Probable Carcinogen and after the Bureaucrats reviewed it they amended it to Possible Carcinogen. The #31 Line also runs just East of my Tree Farm on N.E. 219th Street and it will effect the Value of that property also. I planned to retire in the next few years and sell one of my Properties, now we will significantly get a reduced value whether you decide to use #31 or not. As we will have to tell all potential buyers of your possible plans and what it will mean to them. Health Hazard, Property Value, Appearance, Need and use of Existing Right of ways are issues you should use to pick a better option than #31 Route.

Communication ID: 11401

Date: 11/12/2009

Name: BARBARA L. WESTGARTH

I was not aware of your plan to run electrical towers throughout our residential area. Please send us any information that pertains to our particular location of [address]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 11402

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: JEFFREY T. MCCAFFREY

I am writing to protest the consideration of proposal 31 for the I-5 corridor reinforcement project. I strongly urge you to consider alternatives that have fewer negative consequences to people, families, homes, property values and the environment. I own 5 acres of residential land just a few hundred feet west of the 31 proposal and my investment would be decimated by this power line. My losses however would pale in comparison to the families I witnessed at a town hall meeting last night whose homes, fortunes and personal health will be jeopardized. I urge you to make an early decision to remove corridor 31 from consideration.

Communication ID: 11403

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: REBECCA M. LAWSON

I would like to comment on Segment #31. This segment runs right through my property. I, like many others, am gravely concerned with the health risks such lines would pose to my family and others in my community. As well, I am very worried about the financial aspects. From what I can tell the line would be directly adjacent to me. Therefore, I would receive no compensation from BPA, but my home, which I have invested so much in, would be worth a fraction of what it should be. No one wishes to live near these types of lines. I am asking you to consider options which run through less populated areas, or

perhaps bury the lines. I know this may be more expensive, but what about the cost to all the homeowners affected by this line? Thank you for your time and consideration. Rebecca Lawson

Communication ID: 11404

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: ADRIANNA J ASFRDGDH

You people should be in jail, taking property away from innocent people that you have no right to! How do you guys sleep at night?

Communication ID: 11405

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: CINDI L. SCHROEDER

I attended the town hall meeting at Hockinson High school last night. It was very apparent to me, by the large number of attendees that attended the meeting, that this is clearly going to affect my neighborhood and my community in a negative way. The 31 route is in my neighborhood. How can BPA live with themselves knowing that they are putting homeowners at a great health risk, decreasing our property values, etc.? Obviously they don't care. We have worked very hard to maintain our home, property and neighborhood. This will clearly depreciate our property's value. Although we did not receive a letter, it will tremendously impact our neighbors' and our property values. We, at Blackhawk Estates will band together to make sure that this tower is NOT placed in our neighborhood. BPA does not have the right to destroy many lives. Whether it be financially or otherwise. Cindi Schroeder Black Hawk Estates Battle Ground

Communication ID: 11406

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: JEFF D. LAWSON

Hello, I am a homeowner directly affected by the proposed segment #31 in your I-5 reinforcement project. I strongly urge you not to consider this segment because of the direct affect it will have on everything I have built and done up to this point in my life. Six years ago I built a home and have begun raising my family. In that time I have fathered two beautiful daughters and have poured my heart and soul into our home and property. Everything I have is in it. You will absolutely destroy that. Please, do not consider this segment, it would affect more lives than you could imagine.

Communication ID: 11407

Date: 11/12/2009

Name: KATHERINE DANIELS

Hello my name is Katherine Daniels. I'm calling from the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development. This is not a comment, but rather a message. I just spoke with Angie Kinney at the Columbia River Gorge Commission and she had indicated that their agency had not received any notice to her knowledge of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project proposal and my thought was since the proposal does go to Troutdale, which is immediately adjacent to the Gorge, a National Scenic Area, that it would be a good thing if they were to get a copy of this project. In addition, if you would like any comments from them, you're going to have to request them from them because they don't provide comments unless they're specifically asked for and they do have a lot of expertise that I think would be helpful to you. So, it's a suggestion of mine that you ask them for their comments for this process. If you need to talk to me about anything, my name again is Katherine Daniels. My number is 503-373-0050, ext. 329 and that's the Department of Land Conservation and Development in Oregon. Thank you.

Communication ID: 11408

Date: 11/12/2009

Name: TOM K LAWRENCE

Yes, my name is Tom Lawrence. The address is [address]. That's in [address]. My number is [phone number] and I'm trying to figure out which maps to go from to see if we're in the, I think it's called the 'white zone' which the powerlines will go right through our house. We're trying to see exactly how our parcel is affected. Maybe I'm just interested in which map to look at to see about this and I'd appreciate a call. Thanks.

Communication ID: 11409

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: JULIE A. TAYLOR

We live in Hockinson and are very concerned about the proposed line through our community. The schools and future schools are in the scope of the EMF. We are very concerned for the childrens saftey and health. We are also concerned for the displacement of our neighbors from their homes. The enviornmental impact would also be great due to the many wetlands and pristine forest and valleys in this area. We would please implore you to consider another route for this line. Thank you

Communication ID: 11410

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: HUBERT HOMOLA,RUTH HOMOLA

We live right beside 212th Ave. off 169th St. in Brush Prairie and hope you will reconsider putting your power line on this route (#31). I believe you can go little more east to the area less populated. The impact on this area will be [ill.], not only to people, but to the schools and everyone in this general area. Its irresponsible to even consider such a highly populated area. We certainly hope you will reconsider this route. Please cancel route #31!

Communication ID: 11411

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: CHERYL M. NIEHAUS

I am writing regarding the Bonneville Power Administration's I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project and specifically the proposed route segment #31 through the Hockinson community in Clark County. This proposed route would place 150 feet tall, high power voltage towers not only through privately owned residential and farm lands, but also through school district land and beautiful wildlife areas. Not only is there concern about the devastating impact these power lines would have on property values, but also the impact such powerful lines would have on our health. Studies have shown that much less powerful Electric and Magnetic Fields are linked to an increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Alzheimer's, and Lou Gehrig's disease. Please look at other routes and options, such as a route that would primarily travel through timber company and DNR land, instead of through our residential properties. The construction of route Segment #31 would destroy our community, our residential investments and our lives. It is unconscionable and irresponsible to consider this route. Please explore other options.

Communication ID: 11412

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: DENNIS ANDRADE

Dear Sir:

As and "effected resident" of the proposed BPA 500 KVA I-5 Corridor

Reinforcement Project, I am extremely concerned. If in fact, the route 31 is selected, several adverse effects will result.

Apparently, route 31 was chosen for consideration, because an easement already

exists there. In fact, that easement was purchased decades ago by Pacific Power and Light to install a small power line. The BPA would have to purchase that easement from them and additional easements to accommodate the much larger 500 KVA line. The existing easement therefore provides no cost or

other advantage.

Environmentally, this route would be a disaster on several fronts. It's a huge line with towers 150 feet high and 1000 feet apart. In fact, this line could carry the maximum generation capacity of Bonneville Dam plus a large portion of John-Day Dam. The line would produce constant noise and a huge electromagnetic field (EMF). The California Department of Health Services concluded in 2002, that EMF of this size increases cancer risks in children. Other health risks have also been documented. The Hockinson area and my property in particular have been identified for erosion risks. We receive 60 plus

inches of rain a year and any loss of vegetation, as would be required for the right of way and access roads, could result in erosion problems here and down stream.

Many of our home sites have beautiful views, including my 1000 foot elevation

line of sight to downtown Portland, Gresham, Mt. Jefferson, etc. My wife and I paid a premium for that view; approximately 50 percent more than other lots in our area. The proposed line and towers would pass directly in front of that view. Our quality of life would be diminished and property value dramatically reduced.

Property values in our area and associated tax base are certainly above average.

Since the announcement of route 31 as a possible line site, our saleable prices have fallen dramatically. Most people interested in selling have reconsidered. Many are planning on seeking reduced property tax assessments.

Collectively, the citizens along route 31 have earned a good life style and quality of life for their families and invested it here. The proposed power line would destroy that investment and future plans for our families. My wife and I are retired and live off a fixed income. Any fiscal injury forced on us can not be regained. I can not return to work at this point. In fact, our life here could not be duplicated post line installation. I strongly oppose the use of route 31. A power line this size should not be placed in any densely populated area and certainly not in an area such as Hockinson Highlands.

Dennis Andrade

[address]

cc: Senator Patty Murray

Senator Maria Cantwell

Congressman Brian Baird

Communication ID: 11413

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: MARLA B AZINGER

Stop the ill advised Route 31. Your network already has as much diversity as it can realistically get in regards to tower lines. Invading untouched land slightly to the East of I-5 is not going to give you a wide enough geographical separation to give you a solid addition to diversity. The biggest threat to this type of network is weather. This meager separation that's proposed on route 31 and others to the East is going to be hit by the same weather system as that of I-5. The other threat would be air movement. There are private air strips in the Hockinson and Battle Ground area and these planes are known for flying below radar and NAP of the earth along the route 31 area. So add one more damaging/danger risk to route 31 opposed to following existing I-5 and Oregon routes. Now lets look at true diversity. You need to move away from building towers and plan to bury these lines if you want diversity. Everything you have so far is in the air on towers. You need to actually diversify and bury the lines not hang them and leave them vulnerable to the same risks as the current lines. This is also a more green thing to do and safer thing to do. If you are worried about the cost to do this then make it simple and increase the cost for electricity to all the users that are actually needing this additional growth. Its the right thing to do for everyone. In addition, the Hockinson area as untapped and unregistered springs. These towers would taint this beautiful thing. Also the wetlands are in abundance because of this and you would be interfering with a large population of wildlife. To invade the route 31 area would not benefit our lives or natures. Following the existing routes along I-5 and Oregon either via tower or to bury them has the least local economic impact and health impact as well. Obviously to bury them would be the best solution health wise and for general safety. Please do the right thing and take the I-5 and oregon routes. Bury them even. But please do not interfere with the health and lively hood of the people along the ill advised route 31. Thank you Marla

Communication ID: 11414

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: LEAH L. BECHTOLDT

As a homeowner in the proposed BPA Corridor Reinforcement Project, I have serious concerns about construction of BPA Segment #31. Any consideration of this entirely new path of 150 ft. high, 500 Kilovolt towers running adjacent/through our community of Hockinson, WA is irresponsible. Hockinson community taxes are among the highest in the area. For many of us, our homes represent our most valuable asset. Placing these towers throughout our neighborhood would destroy many homes, destroy the value of surrounding properties, and destroy the fabric of our proud and close-knit area. Segment #31 traverses property owned by our public school district and a new school site. Hockinson families and taxpayers have invested great amounts in the development of the best school district in the area and have planned for years to see their children educated within it. Is BPA now planning to take that away? The California Dept. of Health Svcs. (2002) concluded that living in close proximity to Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) can cause increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease, and miscarriage. The health concerns, erosion of our community fabric, loss of tax revenue and its impact of delivery of public services are all very real issues for the hundreds of families in the area of

Segment #31. Please, NO BPA SEGMENT #31.

Communication ID: 11415

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: DR RAYMOMD A SCHEIMER,NANCY C SCHEIMER

Please do not use Route 31 Your network already has as much diversity as it can realistically get in regards to tower lines. Invading untouched land slightly to the East of I-5 is not going to give you a wide enough geographical separation to give you a solid addition to diversity. The biggest threat to this type of network is weather. This meager separation thats proposed on route 31 and others to the East is going to be hit by the same weather system as that of I-5. The other threat would be air movement. There are private air strips in the Hockinson and Battle Ground area and these planes are known for flying below radar and NAP of the earth along the route 31 area. So add one more damaging/danger risk to route 31 opposed to following existing I-5 and Oregon routes. Now lets look at true diversity. You need to move away from building towers and plan to bury these lines if you want diversity. Everything you have so far is in the air on towers. You need to actually diversify and bury the lines not hang them and leave them vulnerable to the same risks as the current lines. This is also the "greener" and and safer thing to do. If you are worried about the cost to do this then make it simple and increase the cost for electricity to all the users that are actually needing this additional growth. Its the right thing to do for everyone. In addition, the Hockinson area as untapped and unregistered springs. These towers would taint this beautiful thing. Also the wetlands are in abundance and because of this you would be interferring with a large population of wildlife. To invade the route 31 area would not benefit our lives or natures. Following the existing routes along I-5 and Oregon either via tower or to bury them has the least local economic impact and health impact as well. Obviously to bury them would be the best solution health wise and for general safety. Please do not interfere with the health and lively hood of the people along the ill advised route 31. Thank you Dr. Ray Scheimer & Mrs. Nancy C. Scheimer, RN

Communication ID: 11416

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: MICHAEL A. BARRETT

I think that the proposed I-5 expansion should be moved to the east where there's a lot less development. These are very large power lines that are proposed. They should not be run right through a community where people live and have invested so much. The people of Hockinson have been very careful in their development to retain the areas natural beauty. I think there would be very little resistance to the proposed project if it was just moved east a mile or so. This is a very emotional issue for many in my community. I know we can use our minds to find a workable solution to the BPA needing to expand their power distribution capability that would be better for everyone. Thanks, Mike Barrett

Communication ID: 11417

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: CHRISTOPHER A. TIMBREZA

I am very much against the new lines going through the Hockinson area. These lines should be routed far away from homes and families.

Communication ID: 11418

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 28 (Bourn): Questions on impacts to residential property near proposed ROW; recommends going across nearby timberland to avoid impacts to homeowners; Two gates on to Weyerhaeuser land on Segment 28 off of Falls Rd.; Effects on livestock - EMF (four horses, 50 chickens (sell eggs), dogs; Concerns about their trees near property edge - sequoia, western hemlock, noble and grand fir - would they be cut? Do not want them cut.

Communication ID: 11419

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 11/21, Route 503 off Williams Rd. Wolverton Mountain Gun Club (8.5 acres). Concerned about conflict between shooting and transmission lines.

Communication ID: 11420

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 25: It would be nice if you're going to build a new line here to mitigate by developing a green space for neighbors with bike and walking trails, skate park, etc.

Communication ID: 11421

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 96: Eagles on my property

Communication ID: 11422

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 96: Easement on my property designated as a wetland.

Communication ID: 11423

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Is quality of life in terms of possible overall health issues because of inconclusive research taken into account for property value?

Communication ID: 11424

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

If you can't give me a solid answer about long-term EMF, based on protection of my family, I would seek legal counsel. That would delay the process for BPA.

Communication ID: 11425

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Long-term health issues from EMF and quality of life are not included in the real property value of a home. That's a problem.

Communication ID: 11426

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

The idea of using the transmission line easement as a natural fire break. Regarding Yacolt Burn: transmission line on DNR land (30, 33) provides the best fire break for communities east of here (34,32,25)

Communication ID: 11427

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned about adding more lines to existing lines. More noise, health concerns, EMF.

Communication ID: 11428

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Power lines and health concerns.

Communication ID: 11429

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Considering purchasing the property - need to know yes or no so we can proceed.

Communication ID: 11430

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Financial impact on property values - do they go down around?

Communication ID: 11431

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Property taxes should acknowledge area that can't be used because of ROW. BPA should work with the County on this. Would be a positive trade-off.

Communication ID: 11432

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Why would BPA buy now when property values are so low?

Communication ID: 11433

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Why aren't they following the current route for the line? It would be more cost-effective.

Communication ID: 11434

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Why not go through the national forest?

Communication ID: 11435

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

What if you owe more than the market value is?

Communication ID: 11436

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Map 107, Segment 39. Don't want it in my backyard!

Communication ID: 11437

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Make sure to contact other tribes for cultural information.

Communication ID: 11438

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Hockinson Heights, Segment 31 - new school property?

Communication ID: 11439

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Would BPA staff buy property next to a powerline?

Communication ID: 11440

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

EMF effects

Communication ID: 11441

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 31: Live close to high-voltage - lines affect hearing aid.

Communication ID: 11442

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Fault line along Cold Creek going through Section 25. Near Cold Creek, worried about pollution.

Communication ID: 11443

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Timber near Minnehaha (Section 25) - bird habitats

Communication ID: 11444

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Noise from 500kv

Communication ID: 11445

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned about property value

Communication ID: 11446

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

We hang in limbo for 1.5 years or more

Communication ID: 11447

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Affects a lot of people

Communication ID: 11448

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Why can't we go underground?

Communication ID: 11449

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Have the tribes been contacted?

Communication ID: 11450

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Contact Yakima and Umatilla, Warm Springs, Chinook, Cowlitz, Nez Perce - CRITFC, I Timber Council - Tribal

Communication ID: 11451

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Shouldn't BPA be compensating for the entire EMF field and not just the right-of-way?

Communication ID: 11452

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Will the power lines affect computers, tv, and cell phones?

Communication ID: 11453

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

It's a "no-brainer" to put the line further east where people and their home are not affected.

Communication ID: 11454

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

What effect will EMF have on animals, especially dogs?

Communication ID: 11455

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

What will the power line do to my tv reception?

Communication ID: 11456

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

I live on the side of a mountain. If BPA cuts down my trees, what will it do to water runoff?

Communication ID: 11457

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Who regulates how much EMF exposure is allowed?

Communication ID: 11458

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Did BPA or other utilities participate in the EMF studies?

Communication ID: 11459

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned about putting up more transmission lines near me.

Communication ID: 11460

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Is it more cost-effective to use the existing right-of-way?

Communication ID: 11461

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Route 25, Page 101: west NE 72nd and So. 69th Ave. Development infrastructure in place. Development not built next to ROW - Fieldstone Development - cut no trees before talking with property owners. Won't sign it, if you want on my property, talk to me first.

Communication ID: 11462

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Pg. 100, #25: Health concerns due to electric field; any transmission line in neighborhood would/could greatly affect neighborhood ; lives on lot near transmission line near 'Lifetime Fencing'

Communication ID: 11463

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Lake Merwin - spring ownership; Hideaway meeting March 10

Communication ID: 11464

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Trees would be cut and property away from transmission lines would now see transmission lines

Communication ID: 11465

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Rt. 31, Pg. 79 at 212th Ave. - Archaeological significance - artifacts

Communication ID: 11466

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Cancer rate increases!! Go through DNR land or government land versus through residential areas.

Communication ID: 11467

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Pick routes that have least impact to home owners. Concerns about electrical effects; better to work with DNR and timber companies; make decisions as soon as possible - remove routes not being considered as soon as possible and make this public.

Communication ID: 11468

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Page 108, Segment 35: Bought property way back when for investment and to serve as retirement funding - no structures on property - saves in size; in residential area

Communication ID: 11469

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Consider adding proposed line to an existing ROW.

Communication ID: 11470

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

10704 NE 65th St., Page 102, on 65th St. and 107th Ave., Segment 25: concern about loss in value of home. Near retirement, so loss in value could affect standard of living or delay retirement. Concern about EMF - health effects and noise from transmission line operation and construction.

Communication ID: 11471

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Route 30 and 31: concerns about a new line going across and near the east fork of the Lewis River. How is BPA going to minimize impacts to the river? It is scenic with no dams and would possibly have ESA issues.

Communication ID: 11472

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Any impacts from reinforcing BPA's system should be offset by a substantial increase in alternative energy and their connection to the grid.

Communication ID: 11473

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Landowner on southern end of Segment 9 near Salmon Creek - can see existing 230kv line from house. Concerned about having to wait for a decision. Not knowing about resale potential and concerned about drop in value of home.

Communication ID: 11474

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Page 88, Segment 28: concern this route goes up Rock Creek to East Fork Lewis River - beautiful pristine waterway should not be disturbed.

Communication ID: 11475

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 28: prefer on DNR land or put in existing corridor w/ existing line to minimize impacts; bought house with East Fork frontage - paid more than current value so concerned about losing more value which would impact retirement plans. Concern buy out value would result in a loss from their purchase price from October 2005. Home is their 'nest egg' and plan to reside there the rest of their lives.

Communication ID: 11476

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concern line is unnecessary - don't build line to meet California power needs - we don't need to bear the brunt of power needs outside the area.

Communication ID: 11477

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Impacts to fish habitat to Rock Creek and East Fork of Lewis River.

Communication ID: 11478

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

More cost effective to go through state DNR lands.

Communication ID: 11479

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Landowner right near Ross Substation - concern about taking houses. I-5 decisions took about five years not knowing what would happen and don't want to go through that again.

Communication ID: 11480

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concern about whether any ROW would need to be taken.

Communication ID: 11481

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Map 105 - 7422 NE 217 Ave. - not cost effective to go through residential area (1-5-acre parcels). Concerned about terms of sale - already lost value due to decreasing values and don't want to lose money (take a loss).

Communication ID: 11482

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Area (Map 105) has recent development so landowners would be affected (land values). Prefer the use of existing ROW with existing lines.

Communication ID: 11483

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Route 18: I have a home that has been there for 30 years. This proposed line will be in the way of my mountain view; BPA would take my timber crops of the future; Concerned about presence of a transmission line along Segment 18 and effect on resale of property.

Communication ID: 11484

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 31, Page 85, off of 212th Ave.: 100 ft. ROW on 267th St. many landowners near 212th Ave. did not receive notices - eleven people (at least) not notified. Concern that landowners along Segment 31 not receiving adequate notice therefore want extension of November 23 scoping comment deadline and to notify people along all of the roads that extend off 212th Ave. [attachment included]

Communication ID: 11485

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Rock Creek under proposed alignment (Segment 31)

Communication ID: 11486

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concern that County parcel map is outdated and aerial photo does not show existing homes and subdivisions within Segment 31.

Communication ID: 11487

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 31: Lots of children live in this area (K-12 age) and will catch school bus on 212th Ave. They will stand under the line and be exposed to EMF.

Communication ID: 11488

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 31: Landowner concerned about effects to residents from exposure to EMF from transmission line which they will have to cross under for driving and movement into and out of the area because 212th Ave. is the only road for ingress and egress.

Communication ID: 11489

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 31: no cable in this area so rely on satellite dish so concerned about reception interference because so many homes would be so close to the transmission line.

Communication ID: 11490

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Route 25: I don't want a second line in a neighborhood full of small children!; concerned about clearing trees to edge of ROW will make lines more visible.

Communication ID: 11491

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 31: Concern about visual effects to residents along 31 - "would be in our face". Unable to avoid seeing it from homes.

Communication ID: 11492

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 31: Concern about noise (kids stand under it for bus and residents would travel under line for ingress and egress). Lots of wind in this area - get east wind like Troutdale.

Communication ID: 11493

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 31, east of Battle Ground Lake (259th & 212th): in this area high east winds.

Communication ID: 11494

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 31: concern about property value. Their home was meant to be part of retirement plan and also to pay for their children's student loans - concern about loss in value and potential to resell.

Communication ID: 11495

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Route 31: We think BPA should consider a new route further east to get from Castle Rock to Troutdale. Go as far as Gifford Pinchot Forest.

Communication ID: 11496

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 26 and Segment 30 are along Yacolt Mountain (elev. 1,800 ft.) and Bell Mountain (2,500 ft.), so visually the proposed line would be an eyesore to the public.

Communication ID: 11497

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Landowner has a good view right now (Page 79, just west of intersection of Segments 26 and 30). Concern is that view of transmission line would be in a large portion of view for many landowners in this area.

Communication ID: 11498

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Landowner along 26 and 30 and 31 meets would prefer a more easterly route through existing timberlands (Segment 11 to 29) to avoid unsightly power lines and effects to numerous landowners.

Communication ID: 11499

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

State DNR and timberlands already gets tax break.

Communication ID: 11500

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Prefer the route goes in large land holdings (state, federal, corporate, REIT, timberlands) rather than through small private land holdings - less disruption and more efficient process to site the transmission line.

Communication ID: 11501

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segments 26, 30 and 31 intersection area: concern about steepness of terrain - erosion

Communication ID: 11502

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Along existing R-L 230kv line: existing trees within ROW; owl habitat; red tail hawks hunt in that area; numerous animals utilize the ROW; Cold Creek has a lot of timber (habitat); wetlands; fault area (unstable); would not like another line across property; concerned about noise from new line - can hear noise now from existing line (230kv)

Communication ID: 11503

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Some area within existing ROW may be labeled as a green belt area for neighborhood along Salmon Creek abd 139th/Salmon Creek St.

Communication ID: 11504

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Double circuit structures will ruin view. Worried about bird sanctuary near Ross. Ellen Davis Trail may be impacted.

Communication ID: 11505

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Why not 230kv with much larger conductor instead of 500kv to minimize visual impact?

Communication ID: 11506

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Noise and EMF are concerns for new ROW and along existing 230kv line.

Communication ID: 11507

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Can't sell property while waiting for BPA to make decision. BPA won't compensate for visual impacts.

Communication ID: 11508

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Property values are dependent on viewshed and other factors.

Communication ID: 11509

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

If line crosses property it will devalue property.

Communication ID: 11510

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Along Segment 31, many homes would need to be taken if ROW were to be expanded.

Communication ID: 11511

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

North of Merwin Lake/Yale Dam - property on top of ridge has expanded view to the north; 150-ft. ROW may/likely wipe out lots; along existing 230kv line, locate new towers for new line to minimize visual impacts to adjacent homes/properties.

Communication ID: 11512

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 31: way too many homes immediately next to ROW.

Communication ID: 11513

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 28/30/32/33 node: private land is managed for timber production. New ROW/line would destroy value of land for timber production/growing; 22yr old reprod.; 18-20% grade on hill

Communication ID: 11514

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Problem with ATV folks on roads and off of roads doing damage.

Communication ID: 11515

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Having to pay taxes on property forever and can't do anything with property.

Communication ID: 11516

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Having to pay liability insurance for public (ATV) encroachment.

Communication ID: 11517

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Opening new roads then move roads available to ATVs.

Communication ID: 11518

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Potential of blow down trees outside of ROW clearing.

Communication ID: 11519

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Line devalues property.

Communication ID: 11520

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Impacts to wildlife (all kinds) if the transmission line construction - birds, amphibians, fish, cougar, marmots, elk, deer, etc. (Husky Creek area)

Communication ID: 11521

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Really steep terrain in the area (Husky Creek)

Communication ID: 11522

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Prefer using Segment 09

Communication ID: 11523

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned about EMF and effect on children.

Communication ID: 11524

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

What criteria are you using to make your final decision?

Communication ID: 11525

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

What if you have a low fixed interest (15-year) rate on your house - can BPA match that in monthly amount rate if my house is taken? And still keep it the same for 15 years?

Communication ID: 11526

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

If BPA buys my home, will it affect my standard of living since I'm nearing retirement?

Communication ID: 11527

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

PEP form is hard to understand, needs to be rewritten.

Communication ID: 11528

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Don't care what you do on Segment 25, I don't want my house torn down.

Communication ID: 11529

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Noise from 500kv line.

Communication ID: 11530

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Segment 31 - don't tear down my house.

Communication ID: 11531

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Why is this line needed?

Communication ID: 11532

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Thanks for all your information.

Communication ID: 11533

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned about EMF.

Communication ID: 11534

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Utilize existing ROW where you can. Design lines to do this?

Communication ID: 11535

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

We should double circuit the lines to use existing ROW.

Communication ID: 11536

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Request use existing routes.

Communication ID: 11537

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned about noise and magnetic fields.

Communication ID: 11538

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

EMF - concerned about frequency; EMF - health effects

Communication ID: 11539

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned about noise - ongoing from the transmission line operation and construction

Communication ID: 11540

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Loss in value in home

Communication ID: 11541

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerned that I'm near retirement - could delay it

Communication ID: 11542

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Could affect standard of living

Communication ID: 11543

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Concerend with aesthetics, don't want line on property. If line is nearby, it will decrease value of property! EMF concerns

Communication ID: 11544

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Mobile home - effect on mobile home, tenants, and their home values (on 503).

Communication ID: 11545

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Property may not sell due to project announcement for three years? And compensation for drop in property value.

Communication ID: 11546

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

What are the compensation for landowners for new/outside thee new right of way?

Communication ID: 11547

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Impact on land values

Communication ID: 11548

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Compensation for other effects outside of the actual 150-foot wide easement (e.g. EMF effects)

Communication ID: 11549

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Property owners should know about existing right-aways (i.e. Pacific Corporation in Hockinson Heights, Section #31). When and where were the existing easements built.

Communication ID: 11550

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Proximity of well to new line.

Communication ID: 11551

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Compensation for impacts to business during construction.

Communication ID: 11552

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

In the BPA's NEPA process - will they consider a 230kv line?

Communication ID: 11553

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Is there an assessment from land owners if they request to pay a cost to have the line route in a different location?

Communication ID: 11554

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING VANCOUVER

[Scoping Meeting (Vancouver)]

Additional costs for maintenance of new corridor.

Communication ID: 11555

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: HEATHER D ROBERTS

Although this doesn't appear to directly impact my property, I feel strongly that any project of this sort should not impact private property. Home values have dropped enough as it is without having to worry that the power company is going to use your land to improve service for everyone else.

Communication ID: 11556

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: ADAM J BROOKS

I am a private land owner that has most of my property in timber tax. I would like to know how you propose to handle that issue. Secondly if you would keep your eye sore power lines predominately in corporate timber lands (weyerhaeuser, fiber ect.) most people wouldnt have a problem with your proposed project

Communication ID: 11557

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: DAVID A BUDDE

It is my belief that because of the massive impact on the area where this line might eventually be constructed every effort should be used to use public lands and pushed as far east and away from any privately held land as possible. This would best be accomplished by using the route designated 35,34,29,11 on the map sent out in your recent mailing as this uses state and federal land and has little impact on privately held land.

Communication ID: 11558

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: SCOTT B SCHNEIDER

In reviewing the possible options for the I5 Corridor reinforcement, I think that option 31 makes the least sense as it runs through more populated areas, as it is the west-most option, and will have the greatest impact upon property values of all the proposed options. This reduction in property values will likely have a significant impact on local government, school and fire districts as their tax base would be

directly affected. I firmly believe that routing this line through as much government owned land as possible would be the most sensible solution, and affect the fewest people. It seems that when deciding between placing this highly visible line through hundreds of peoples back yards or putting it out of site as much as possible, the choice is clear.

Communication ID: 11559

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: KELLY L SPAFFORD

I want to urge you to consider alternative routes for the "I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project". We recently sold our home in Camas and are moving to acreage in Hockinson. We learned of the potential construction of a transmission line through Hockinson. One of the reasons we did not consider acreage in Camas is because of all the current transmission lines. We urge you to evaluate alternatives that would avoid impacting the current beauty of the Hockinson area. Kind regards, Kelly Spafford

Communication ID: 11560

Date: 11/14/2009

Name: CONNIE J BEITEY

If for some reason you can not read this attachment, please notify me. It is important to me that you are able to read it. Thank you, Connie Beitey

To Whom It May Concern:

Before I moved to my present home I lived in a subdivision. When I looked out my window to see what the day was going to be like I would be looking into my neighbors windows. They were looking back at me. If I went outside to work in my yard or just relax in my yard my neighbors were there again. At night when I wanted to go out and enjoy star watching it was hard to see the stars because of the neighborhood lights.

I searched long and hard to find a place where I could look out my window and see trees, deer, rabbits, squirrels, eagles, owls, hawks and all those things of nature, a place where I could step out on my back porch at night and enjoy a beautiful view of the stars and moon. Not my neighbors' house.

I finally found my home. It is at the end of a dead end road in the middle of a ring of trees. I am not disturbed by traffic. We have all situated our homes out here so we can enjoy privacy, in the middle of the trees. We do not have street lights near our homes so we can enjoy the stars at night. We have planted special trees and plants. We have built barns for our animals. We have made our properties our sanctuaries. Quiet places where we can let go of the stress of our jobs, enjoy nature and remove ourselves from the rush of the city. Places where we can get away from progress, enjoy the ability to not been seen by neighbors, the ability to step outside in your hot tub naked in the middle of the day if you

feel like it and not worry about who's seeing you.

We built this home and barn and have put a lot of ourselves into every aspect of the creation of our property and of this large piece of our lives. I have raised children and grandchildren here and it is still a place that we all love and cherish and want to be. This is where all the family gatherings are held. This is where we hold our bonfires. This is where we have the holidays and family celebrations. This is where I have hopes of retiring and eventually leaving to my family. This is where even the loss of one tree is a major loss even if it is not directly a part of my specific property. We all enjoy each others trees that afford each of us our bit of privacy.

If you cut any of the trees, even one, you are destroying the beauty and serenity of this place. You are opening a window into someone's privacy. You are destroying what we have all moved here to achieve which is our privacy and view of nature.

You are diminishing our properties value and worth. You are diminishing our sense of belonging and safety. If you decide to put you lines through here anyway most of us will have to move. None of us will get the value of our homes either financially or emotionally. No one will want to buy a place where they have power lines running through or near enough to see. Not to mention the fact that they might as well be in the city because their will be no privacy or trees to look at. They will be paying taxes on land that they can't use, is stripped bare of beauty and unhealthy to live on. If indeed you do decide to put your lines through here I will never be compensated enough to replace what I now have. I will lose all that I have worked so hard to gain. I will be going backwards instead of forwards.

It is also a health concern. There are people here that have pacemakers and other health issues that the lines will affect. Our wells and septic systems will be affected.

I am not sure how you would go about missing the homes, barns, out buildings or the septic & wells involved. We are all fairly staggered among the trees and landscapes to maintain our view and privacy. A lot of us are older in years and have looked forward to our retired years here among the trees. If we are forced to find someplace else to live we will not be compensated enough to move to a comparable place. It would be a "less than" move. Or we would be stuck living on your property paying taxes for it and no longer living in our homes. It would just be a roof over our heads on your land with no hope of even getting retirement funds from it.

If you must come on to my property I want to be given enough notice that I can be here when you come. I do not want any of my trees or plants disturbed nor do I want my neighbors trees disturbed. These trees, some of which we have planted our selves, give us our privacy.

If I have a choice; a vote; a say so at all I would say no to your proposal. You will be disrupting too many lives. You can never compensate us enough for the damage you would do to our lives. For a lot of us there will not be enough time to recoup our losses.

Please reconsider your choice of routes.

Deeply concerned,

Connie Beitey

Communication ID: 11561

Date: 11/14/2009

Name: JOHN A POLOS

Dear Bonneville Power; We would like you to consider extending the deadline for comments, beyond the Nov. 23 date. We had a meeting at Hockinson High School Thursday evening, Nov. 12th. We expected 20 to 50 people , but were amazed when somewhere between 500 and 1000 showed up. Meeting was attended by State Rep. Ed Orcutt and Clark County Comissioner Mark Boldt. We recognized several BPA employees in the audience, not sure if they were on official business or not. We were careful not to identify or emabarass them. A lot of the people just found out about the proposed building of a new 500 KV transmission line, myself included. Half the people I have talked to in my neighborhood (Live less than 1/4 mile from proposed route 31), did not know anything about the power line. Further, Rep. Orcutt stated that he attended the BPA meeting held in Yacolt. He stated the the meeting seemd a little user non-frendly. No chairs were provided; people were made to stand up and move around to different spots, etc. Rep. Orcutt asked if anyone in the audience attended the same meeting and felt the same way. There was a loud YES. Channel 2 News was there; I do not know if they filmed that part of the meeting. When I arrived home from vacation on Nov. 3; I was greeted by my next door neighbor, Ken Merrill. He had received a letter from BPA, as a property owner affected by route 31. His property, but not house, is under the line. I am next to the route, but did not receive a property owner letter, to my best knowledge. FOR THESE REASONS, AND TO SHOW FAIRNESS AND OPENNESS, YOU NEED TO CONSIDER EXTENDING THE DEADLINE FOR COMMENTS. Sincerely, John Polos, PE Registered Electrical Engineer [Phone] PS: I spoke at the meeting. My comments were on: (1) how a high voltage power system works, (2) why we do need reinforcement to the West Side of the BPA transmission system, (3) how to deal effectvly and respectfully with an agency, to get them to listen.

Communication ID: 11562

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: DWAYNE JACOX

Pacificorp land surrounding my property on 3 sides has been designated "wildlife migration corridor" and is being restored to create foriging meadows for elk and deer. There is also numerous raptors that live/use this area, and a good owl population in place. I would hate to see their work destroyed by your construction project.

I attended your "town hall meeting" which was a joke, the staff you had there (appeared to be temp's you hired for the event) had very little knowledge/information to offer to the public. The info packet/map I requested is completely different than the one at the meeting in Amboy. This all appears to be just a side show, when I'm guessing you already have a different plan that you are going to implement... and this is just to make the public feel like they have a say.

Communication ID: 11563

Date: 11/14/2009

Name: BRADEN S STRICKLER

If the BPA does condemn houses under eminent domain, will the assessed value be from the time of the condemnation or from Sep 2009 (right before this project was announced). The value right before the project was announced would be a fairer value. Property values have already gone down since this project and proposed routes have been announced. Since the BPA is influencing property values via this project it should be required to use assessed values from before project announcement. To use the lesser amounts in 2012 (or when condemnation takes place) would be the equivalent of insider trading.

Communication ID: 11564

Date: 11/14/2009

Name: JOHN E KENCK

I object strongly to the proposal by the I-5 Reinforcement Project. I feel that this work will have detrimental affect on the value of my home. The removal of trees will allow more traffic noise from I-5. I am also worried that the proposed work will increase local health risks.

Communication ID: 11565

Date: 11/12/2009

Name: JIM MALINOWSKI

I am a retired electrical engineer now teaching and managin the Power Utilities Technology Program at Clark College. I support construction of the line. I know from my experience in transmission planning and operations that the planned reinforcement is needed. The routing of the line should minimize impact on residential and populated rural areas and scenic areas of Clark County. The only route that meets that crateria is the most easterly route. I urge you to select that route.

Please Contact Me

Jim Malinowski

[e-mail]

[phone]

Communication ID: 11566

Date: 11/14/2009

Name: JOHN A POLOS

Dear BPA,

I have sent in a couple of other comments. I wanted to let you know we at CHIPS (Citizens for a Healthy Power System), are doing. I recently joined the organization, formerly know as "Citizens Against BPA" or something similar. Right away we knew we needed to change our whole approach and work with BPA, not against it. I was instrumental in changing our approach to the problem. I gave a talk at the Thursday meeting at Hockinson High School, attended by between 500 and 1000 persons. I talked on "what is a high voltage power system and how does it work". I also talked on why BPA needs to reinforce the West side of the transmission system. The information I presented was based on the following: (1) My 30 years experience as an engineer in high voltage power systems, (2) a one hour meeting with Vicki VanZant, retired VP of BPA, (3) several conversations with Ed Chittester, retired BPA engineer and former head of both Data Systems Hardware and Data Systems Software Sections (System Operations), with (4) Dick Spence, retired engineer from BPA's System Operations Tech Staff, and finally (5) conversation with Darrell VanCouvering, retired chief of Division of System Operations at BPA. My goal was to explain the power system and the importance of strengthening it, to the people. Now our goal is to assist BPA in achieving the best solution for power system reliability; with the least adverse affects to the public and environment. One way to achieve this is to select a route that impacts the least number of residents. Sincerely, John Polos, PE Reg. Electrical Engineer

Communication ID: 11567

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: EVELINA H CRAWFORD

I have just received notification of the BPA Route 31 extension which does cross my property. This is the first notification I have received and have been unaware of meetings held to explain why this is being considered. I would lilke to request another meeting by BPA officials, not to just pass out info but to explain exactly why this is being considered and to give another forum and additional time for community comment. E H Crawford

Communication ID: 11568

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: GIGI A BICE

I just think it is really low that this comes up at a time when property values have dropped, people are unemployed. So what if you buy them out, what bank is going to refinance them?

Communication ID: 11569

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: SUE GOTELLI

Segment #31 [Address] I am on the PP easement. An additional 25' if my neighbor shared the other 25' that you would need, would be encroachment at its highest. My entire barn would be in your easement as well as half of my leach line. My deck attached to my home, would be 27' away. The easement is heavily treed w/export Douglas fir. Lots of wildlife. Deer, bobcat, racoons and owls galore on a regular basis. At times a bear sighting. I am a Cancer survivor, senior citizen, widow and on a fixed income. Your use of segment #31 would cause great anquish and would make a life changing impact. Please consider federal and state land and not impact this heavily populated segment #31. Thanks for your sincere consideration.

Communication ID: 11570

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

The BPA needs to provide all the property owners maps with roads included so all involved can identify exactly where the proposed line would go through their land. Keeping us in the dark about exactly where these lines may lie is just not right.

Communication ID: 11571

Date: 11/14/2009

Name: DAVID S. SAUERBREY

Re: Do not choose Route 31!!

Good day,

I am writing this to add my voice to hundreds of others opposed to the selection of Route 31 through east Clark County.

I have lived in Clark County since 1978, and Hockinson since 1992. My address is [address].

The proposed power lines will be within blocks of my home, and I adamantly oppose its development. I will not tolerate the government's intrusion on this beautiful part of the County, nor the affect the construction of the line will have on my property value.

Please do not choose a siting option that degrades my family's health, quality of life and property values.

Thank you for taking the time to read this. Please choose to do the right thing. Citizens should not be victims of their own government!!!

Sincerely,

David S. Sauerbrey

[address]

[phone number]

Communication ID: 11572

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: RANJIT KURUP

We are very concerned about the proposed power line being built near our neighborhood. The alternate routes all go through rural less populated areas and I cannot understand why you are even considering the route that goes so close to our neighborhood and other neighborhoods. Not only do pur property values go down but the perceived fear of living near power lines strike trepidation in residents. We have all been subject to plummeting real estate values with this economy and this is the last thing we need. Please reconsider your plan and remove this route from your list.

Communication ID: 11573

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: KAGEL E SMITH

We are very concerned about the proposed BPA power lines coming near our property which is right on the East fork of the Lewis River. We built our home nearly three years ago after over a year wait to get a building permit due to the environmental impact studies of the wildlife and possible Native American artifacts on the water front propety. We were forced to build our home 200 feet back from the river because of these environmental and historical issues. During our time here we have watched a bald eagle and family nest near our shore line and use the length of the river as a fly-way, catching fish, and

eating them on the rocks in the middle of the river. According the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife while the bald eagle population has increased in Washington, their habitat is still large trees near water. Their major source of adult mortality is electrocution on powerlines. Why would BPA put powerlines across a river area designated as a scenic drive and wildlife area? One other issue is the effect of E.M.F. overhead and health problems. To make this successful why not put these wires and towers to the far most east location on your proposed map? Property values would drop for all homes in the effected areas. Thank you for taking the time to read our concerns. Kagel and Patricia Smith.

Communication ID: 11574

Date: 11/15/2009

Name: JEFF D. LAWSON

The Bonneville Power Administration's Proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project has me deeply upset. I live along the proposed segment #31, in a small community near Hockinson. I am a father of two young girls, ages 2 and 5, and our family has built our life around our home. This community is safe, beautiful, and a perfect place to raise children. But the BPA could change all of that, and I cannot sit here idly. I am asking, no pleading, with you to stop this. I am not going tell you that I even care about 150' towers blocking my view or making the beautiful landscapes in this area ugly. These things are important, but I could live with it. I am going to tell you that I cannot and will not risk my family's health by living next to 500kva lines which have proven to cause health problems, especially in young children. I will not expose them, no matter the cost. And that cost could be too great. My wife and I are educated and have worked and payed taxes our whole adult lives. We built our home and have put everything we have in it, believing that it was more than a monetary investment. It was our family's place, our right. If segment #31 is chosen, my right would be stripped. I will have to move my family and sell our home. But imagine what our home value would be with those towers and lines in our back yard? Could I even give it away? Would that debt follow me everywhere? What would it be like to take away the one thing that you have invested everything in? Everything from clothing to college educations to retirement saving would be affected. Everything we have built as a family. So, how do I react? What would you do if a stranger came along one day and took everything that was important to you away? I cannot stand on my property and defend it like I should because I have children to think about. They need their father, they need their home, so I ask you to remove segment #31 from consideration. Sincerely, Jeff Lawson

Communication ID: 11575

Date: 11/15/2009

Name: FRED W HODGKINS

As a homeowner in your proposed power line route, we URGE you to extend the 11-23 deadline for comments, and to use a route that does NOT impact so many homeowners

Communication ID: 11576

Date: 11/15/2009

Name: RICHARD P "RICK" HOBLITT

I wish to comment on proposed route segment 40. I'm not sure of the exact location of route 40, because the map I received in the mail shows routes but no roads, and the map I received at the open house scoping meeting displayed roads and houses, but not the proposed routes. However, it's clear that this route crosses undeveloped land north of my home. I visited the County planning office before I purchased my home and was told that the undeveloped area was designated as wetland and floodway or floodway fringe. Therefore, it would not be developed. Like most people, I don't want to live in the shadow of a huge electrical transmission line: I don't want to look at it, I don't want to be exposed to low-level EMFs, and I don't want the inevitable loss to my property value. Had I known that a transmission line near my home was even a possibility I would have gone elsewhere. Furthermore, I'm concerned about the impact on our dwindling wetlands, and question the desirability of locating critical infrastructure in a floodway. I don't dispute the need for augmenting the transmission grid, but community disruptions should be minimized. I suggest the best way to accomplish this is to choose the easternmost proposed route, or to widen existing transmission routes, rather than expanding the lines onto new ground. Property owners along existing routes have already accommodated the proximity of the lines. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Communication ID: 11577

Date: 11/15/2009

Name: ILYA P ZHUKOV

I would like to know if my house will effected by this project? Because i got a letter from you guys explaining the project. So can you please let me know if my house will be effected. And what will i get from it. I live at [Address]. By 212th Ave

Communication ID: 11578

Date: 11/15/2009

Name: JOHN GARRETT,KAREN R GARRETT

We live in rural Clark County on property adjacent to the proposed BPA #31 option being considered for a power transmission line. The environmental impact on wildlife and to the residents of Blackhawk would be enormous. Please consider using the existing right of way in line #9. Why open a new path when the existing route would save an enormous sum of money and have far less impact on the areas wildlife and residents.

Communication ID: 11579

Date: 11/14/2009

Name: DOUGLAS W BINGHAM

I only recently learned of this I-5 project. I retired (1 year ago) and my wife and I bought a home in the Hockinson WA area. I have worked my entire life, bought my dream home, have been very busy working on it and enjoying being retired. Now I'm hearing that the BPA is thinking of disrupting the area (it is very quiet and serene) constructing this monstrous line through the area. People are up in arms about it and you've heard the term "awakening a sleeping giant"? Well, it certainly applies here. Many people like myself were unaware, but word is spreading and I think it will come to a MAJOR fight. I will be contacting ALL my government representatives and my lawyer. I am willing to commit my time, effort and wealth to stopping route 31 from negatively affecting my (as well as my neighbors) way of life. Please do NOT use route 31. Consider a route through the DNR land to our East. Any construction cost savings you think you will see by cutting through our neighborhood will certainly be negated by lawsuits. I regret the use of rather harsh wording, but I feel very threatened by this potential project. I see a huge negative impact and an unnecessary disruption of our lives. Douglas W. Bingham

Communication ID: 11580

Date: 11/14/2009

Name: JOSHUA D JOHNSON

We recently learned that our address is included in the Segment 31 study area, yet we received NO notification from you organization about this. We purchased our home at the end of July 2009 understanding the we have a PPL easement that bisects our property. It was a shock for us to learn that that easement could be turned over to BPA for use on the I-5 Corridor reinforcement project. We have serious concerns for the welfare of our young children at their exposure to EMF. We are also concerned that if the line is allowed to essentially cut our property in half and be located within feet of our house, it would render our recently purchased property completely worthless. Unable to sell and unable to live in because of health concerns would financially bankrupt our family. I cannot express enough my dissatisfaction with this proposal. Please send us the necessary information that we have not received about this project and its impact on our family and property. I also cannot stress enough my displeasure with segment 31 of the proposed route and encourage you to place the line away from populated areas or upgrade existing lines. Thank you for time. the Johnson Family Joshua, Stacie, Abigail, and James.

Communication ID: 11581

Date: 11/15/2009

Name: ANONYMOUS

PLEASE, NO TO LINE 31

TO BPA 500,000 VOLT ELECTRICAL TOWERS THROUGH RURAL NEIGHBORHOODS IN CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON!!

Communication ID: 11582

Date: 11/15/2009

Name: CAMILLE R RAST

To whom it may concern, I do not want this close to my home. We did not receive much notice for this horrendous change to our property. I believe there are other solutions that will not impact so many tax paying citizens. I do not pay taxes to have this affect my beautiful home. So please use your qualified engineers to plan this in non public places. I beleive it can be done.

Communication ID: 11583

Date: 11/15/2009

Name: BECKY A CONNOLLY

I am a homeowner in Highlander Estates in Kelso, Washington. Several of my neighbors received letters from your company regarding the proposed BPA project. I am very concerned about our residential area being ruined by BPA powerlines being routed through it. These lines would devalue our homes and put the health of our children and families at risk. It seems absurd to put powerlines through one of the few residential developments in Kelso as there are other, more rural, options available to your company. I am sure the 60+ homeowners in this development feel the same way. Please consider the value of our homes, our children's health, and the feelings of these families when making your decision.

Communication ID: 11584

Date: 11/15/2009

Name: SUSAN L KLEMETSRUD, DAVID KLEMETSRUD

I am writing in regard to the proposed BPA transmission line through Clark County. I am a property owner on proposed segment number 39. If segment 39 is chosen I will have a 500KV transmission line literally in my back yard. Most of my trees will be cut down and I will be able to sit on my deck and look upon a waste land of brush and listen to the wonderful sound of hum, crackle and pop. A local realtor has informed me that my home and land value will drop by 50 to 75% if segment 39 is installed. I expect BPA to completely pay for this loss of value before segment 39 is installed. I would like, and will legally fight for BPA to condemn my whole property and be reimbursed at the tax assessed value if segment 39

is installed. I have a laundry list of why segment 39 should not be chosen; value, aesthetics, wildlife, wetland preservation, and most of all health concerns with the proposed narrow setback. Independent studies show that being exposed to high voltage power lines, far beyond your proposed setback, causes greatly elevated risk for leukemia, lymph cancer, miscarriage, Alzheimer, and ALS. These studies show increased health risk at larger setbacks and lower voltages than the proposed 500 KV transmission line. When setback decreases and voltage increases, does the risk curve follow a straight line or does it bend upwards. I believe no one knows the answer, but can be sure it does not bend downward. I cannot believe that BPA planners discount this health risk; be assured that land owners won't. I am sure most affected landowners have the same laundry list. I believe the best solution is to move this transmission line away from heavily populated areas and increase the easement setback to an acceptable safe distance. Choose the route that affects the least number of landowners, even if it costs more. Pay the price to acquire proper setbacks that keep people safe and compensate them for their total loss. In summary, BPA should fully compensate for all financial loss – including devaluation of property, should choose a route and setback that eliminates health risk, and choose a route which effects the smallest population possible, even if the cost of the route increases. Landowners would gladly pay the increased cost on their electricity bill. Sincerely, David and Susan Klemetsrud [Address]

Communication ID: 11585

Date: 11/15/2009

Name: BRYAN S DRENDEL

Attn Mark Korsness: This letter is in reference to the proposed 500 Kv powerline that would run through our neighborhood (line 31-landowner map section D). To say that this community and I are vehemently against it is an understatement. There are a multitude of reasons. We are both furious and depressed at the repercussions of the power lines. First, it is no secret (although power companies will deny this with their own sponsored research) that electromagnetic fields in the 80-400 Kv are suspected of causing cancer, leukemia, alzheimers and hosts of other ailments. Power company sponsored studies are inconclusive about the effects of electrical transmission lines. However, "Inconclusive" is not an acceptable standard, nor a word synonomous with safety. Independent research is hard to come by and you've got to really dig for it, but a 2007 Australian team concluded that people within 600 feet of power lines in the 80-400 Kv realm showed an increased in cancer rates 3-5 times that of normal. BPA's proposed 500,000 volt (500 Kv) lines would pose an exponentially greater hazard. Second, Hockinson is a beautiful small town community. Hundreds of homes and businesses would be slated for demolition because of their alignment with the placement of the lines. This affects thousands of people, hundreds of families, and displaces us against our will. These are our homes -- some passed down through generations -- that would be leveled. Third, the 150' height of the towers is higher than most of the forests around us, not to mention the hundreds of feet of timber on either side of the lines that will have to be mowed down for fire hazard safety. Towers will cut through acreage and yards, destroying our beautiful scenic views and the trees we enjoy for views, privacy and aesthetics. They are what originally attracted us to the area. The lines will be viewable by residents miles away. Fourth, homes not

acquired through Imminent Domain will suffer catastrophic plummets in value. We bought four partially-wooded acres here in Vancouver expressly for the exceptional beauty and what it offers: affordable country homes, an incredible community, and the chance to build our retirement portfolio by investing in land. Realtors in the area have stated that we can expect anywhere from 50-80% decline in home values from the proposed lines. BPA is, in essence, crushing our future. We don't want to sell, and we can't afford to lose our home investment. There is little hope to sell now in this depressed volatile market before the erecting of towers, nor hope in the future with 150' high lines radiating electromagnetic energy throughout our home and neighborhood and killing the natural beauty right out our front door. We appreciate the opportunity to voice our opinion on the proposed lines. However the location of line #31 is completely unacceptable to us and our community. With every problem there should be a chance to review solutions, and it is here that we propose you relocate your lines several miles east in the DNR land where it is safer for all of us, health-wise and financially. Respectfully, Bryan Drendel

Communication ID: 11586

Date: 11/15/2009

Name: JENNIFER L TUCKER

Proposal to run the new BPA power line parallel to the existing right-of-way; Vancouver, WA As a citizen and home owner I am strongly opposed to running BPA power lines in non-rural areas where there are existing neighborhoods, schools, hospital. Reliability issue – as was pointed out in the Columbian, it is against long-standing policy in the power line industry to route two high tension lines in parallel in close proximity due to reliability concerns associated with fire or other disasters where a single problem could take out both lines simultaneously. It leaves the system inappropriately vulnerable to a single point failure. It is likely that the route would need to be longer overall, thus increasing the cost of building the new line along the existing right-of-way. The existing right-of-way will require substantial expansion of the right-of-way either decreasing the value of numerous existing homes due to loss of some of the land or to loss of entire homes due to expansion of the right-of-way. Either way, taking part or all of property will not come cheap. Many of the homes in question are on increasingly scarce larger lots in premium neighborhoods whose purchase would be quite expensive and detrimental to property values throughout those neighborhoods. There will also be a loss to the county revenue in reduction of property taxes in the affected neighborhoods. Go for most direct routing to minimize number of properties affected. Whether rational or not, there is a very real psychological impact on people having to live too close to high tension power lines. The higher voltage lines will be at a higher height and will be substantially more visible to the proximate neighborhoods, which will impact resale values in what were previously desirable neighborhoods to home buyers. If the power line is necessary, it would be best installed in a less densely populated truly rural area of the county and not within the now developed areas neighboring the existing right-of-way.

Communication ID: 11587

Date: 11/15/2009

Name: SHAWN S CRABTREE

Keep your transmission lines away from my property. In these tough economic times you are proposing a project that would completely kill the value of my already devaluating property. There are better routes for your proposed transmission line, i.e. through state or federal lands. It's despicable that you would even propose to condemn private property in order to secure the route you choose. How do you sleep at night?

Communication ID: 11588

Date: 11/15/2009

Name: MICHELE C HUFFMAN

One of the corridors currently under consideration is on my property next to my home. I am concerned about potential health affects of ambient exposure to the additional electro-magnetic radiation (EMR) from a higher voltage powerline added to the corridor running through my property. I want to know statistics on the current levels of EMR that radiate from the current lines, what additional levels are likely to occur (by distance from the lines), and what technological options could reduce the exposure. I also want to know when BPA is likely to select a preferred corridor, and would like to be notified as soon as possible when that determination has been made. I would also like to know what the spacing of towers is likely to be, where they are likely to be placed in relation to existing towers, what vegetation would be removed for construction, and what BPA would do to minimize impact on neighbors during construction as well as in the design of the transmission lines. Our Westwood Estates Homowner's association would like to schedule a visit by BPA to discuss how this proposal might impact our neighborhood if the corridor running through our property is chosen.

Communication ID: 11589

Date: 11/14/2009

Name: APRIL ANDERSON

Please have your environmental studies look at:

1. Impact on human health (physical or mental)
2. Impact on watershed
3. Impact on wildlife
4. Impact on quality of life

1. As the parent of a leukemia survivor, I am very sensitive to situations I place my child in that might contribute to a potential health threat. Though scientific research to date is inconclusive about the damaging effects of electromagnetic radiation on a the human body - the fact that there is a great deal of question is cause for alarm. Had our family known of this plan - we would've never purchased this property!
2. I am negatively affected by loud, monotonous noise - one of the reasons we live here is the quiet, peaceful surroundings. We know for fact that high voltage power line make a loud humming noise and also crackle on wet days - which is 75% of a Pacific Northwest year.
3. I have heard that technically the value of our property would only be reduced by a small percentage. Explain to me how saleability would be affected. I believe the saleability would be reduced dramatically. If a person is considering two similar properties and one is near high voltage power lines - they would pick the other hands down.
4. I think the whole building process of this monstrosity would adversely affect our neighbors in noise, congestion, hassles with our daily lives (road blockage, etc.). By putting the line here, you cause more problems than you solve.

Communication ID: 11590

Date: 11/15/2009

Name: GEORGE A ROBINSON

Dear BPA,

I have learned that BPA is proposing to build an electricity transmission line with a few hundred feet of the housing development where I live, as part of BPA's "I5 Corridor Reinforcement Project." As an impacted property owner, I am writing to voice opposition to the "Route 31" option.

I live in the Cedar Glen neighborhood in the Hockinson area. This is a beautiful area of large homes on large lots. The homes in this immediate area have some of the highest property valuations in this part of Clark County. The construction of massive, ugly transmission towers adjacent to our neighborhood would not only result in the destruction of many homes, but would have a horrible impact on the market value of all nearby homes.

The "Route 31" option would be an irresponsible choice, given that alternate routes have already been identified to the east, through public lands, which would avoid impacting neighborhoods like mine. Maybe "Route 31" would save BPA some money, but at what cost to the lives of all the people in the residential areas that would be compromised by "Route 31?"

Then there is the matter of the potential health impact of living in close proximity to high voltage power lines. In 2002, the California Dept. of Health Services concluded that living in close proximity to EMF can increase the risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease and miscarriage.

Studies in Sweden and Taiwan have found elevated incidence rates of childhood leukemia.

I understand that the health impact question is controversial, but one thing is certain: many people are aware of the issue, and therefore are leery of living in close proximity to high voltage transmission lines. Again, the resulting adverse impact on property values can be ruinous to families that have made big investments in their residences and neighborhoods.

Finally, I must take issue with the way that BPA is conducting this project. My understanding is that BPA has only contacted property owners who's property falls within BPA easements. I only found out about the project today, through word of mouth. It is callous and negligent of BPA to purposefully exclude many parties who are legitimate stakeholders in this decision.

I hereby ask that BPA do the right thing for the residents of Clark County and select an alternate option to "Route 31" that would route the planned transmission lines through unpopulated public lands to the east, and avoid residential neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

George Robinson

[Address]

[e-mail]

Communication ID: 11591

Date: 11/15/2009

Name: REBECCA BLICK

I strongly oppose the placement of BPA transmission lines on corridor 31, due to environmental, health and personal reasons. This area is filled with native vegetation and an abundance of wildlife. On our 2 1/2 acre property we see many bird species, squirrel, flying squirrel, deer, porcupine, coyote, even bobcats, bear and mountain lion. Most all our neighbors and other people living out here have left large portions of our land untouched to remain a habitat for these animals. That is in addition to the trees and other vegetation that has been here for long before anyone ever started building homes around here. The health issue is a very strong concern. Being a cancer survivor myself, I take this very seriously. There are forty homes just in this neighborhood in the corridor's path, not to mention homes right on the edges. This corridor also would run too close to a school for health safety's sake. The studies are too inconclusive about cancer, Alzheimer's and other diseases which may be caused by living in too close a proximity to these lines. I believe BPA should look closer at using existing lines and paths that would not have such a great effect on the environment and the people who live here. Sincerely yours, Rebecca A. Blick [Address]

Communication ID: 11592

Date: 11/15/2009

Name: TIM E LOOSE,KARIN LOOSE

Our family lives 2 properties over from one of the proposed routes (Route 31) for the BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. (well within our visual range) We were extremely surprised to find out that our government is proposing to condemn houses along the route chosen and force families to sell their property at "fair market value" to put up power lines.

Being so close to the proposed route, we know many of those whom would lose their house and land. Land they have spent years making their home. We would not lose our home however, given the proximity of the power lines we stand to lose substantial market value; a value that is already down 30-40% due to the economic recession. We, like many, have put a great deal of blood, sweat and tears into building our home here in Battle Ground. You are not offering, nor can you replace the home value we will lose if Route 31 is chosen.

We strongly urge BPA reconsider locations further east as well as evaluating the scope of this project. This project does not justify taking away someone's home. It does not justify taking away the value those of us have built with hard work. If the expansion needs to happen, it needs to be routed through government-owned land. (forest lands, replace/upgrade existing power lines and towers, etc)

You cite there are no studies "proving" any negative affects on health. We would disagree. There are as many studies suggesting negative effects as there are ones that suggest there are no effects. We made the choice 9 years ago NOT to build a house on property with surrounding power lines. You are taking that CHOICE away from our family if you follow Route 31. (last we knew that particular freedom of choice was our right in the United States of America)

We are also curious how BPA (or Oregon/Washington) can afford a project of this magnitude. Route 31 forces a significant number of people from their homes, taking away property tax income (Including state sales tax income if those forced from their homes relocate outside our state). Given the financial mess the State of Washington is in, this seems to reinforce what is already a bad decision.

Sincerely,

Tim & Karin Loose

Home Owners along Route 31

Communication ID: 11593

Date: 11/15/2009

Name: GARY K BECHTOLDT

I am writing to you to voice my concerns regarding the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. I am asking

you to stop the construction of BPA Segment #31. As a homeowner in the proposed BPA Corridor Reinforcement Project, I have serious concerns about construction of BPA Segment #31. Any consideration of this entirely new path of 150 ft. high, 500 Kilovolt towers running adjacent and through our beautiful community of Hockinson, Washington is extremely irresponsible. Hockinson community taxes are among the highest in the area. For many of us, our homes represent our most valuable asset. Placing these towers throughout our neighborhood would destroy many homes, destroy the value of surrounding properties, and destroy the fabric of our proud and close-knit area. Segment #31 traverses property owned by our public school district and a new school site. Hockinson families and taxpayers have invested great amounts in the development of the best school district in the area and have planned for years to see their children educated within it. Is BPA now planning to take that away? The California Dept. of Health Services (2002) concluded that living in close proximity to Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) can cause increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease, and miscarriage. The health concerns, erosion of our community fabric, loss of tax revenue and its impact on delivery of public services are all very real issues for the hundreds of families in the area of Segment #31. There are other options east of Segment #31 that run north/south and go through public, forested land. If BPA used segments 28-30 or 32-34, fewer individuals' lives will be disrupted and/or their health threatened. These may not be the cheapest routes, but they do not affect as many individuals' health, property values, and living conditions. Please, NO BPA SEGMENT #31. Sincerely, Gary K. Bechtoldt

Communication ID: 11594

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: ANONYMOUS

I need to point out that in Lexington (Kelso), WA (Page 9) you have a numbered segment running through a brand new residential neighborhood. It is labeled Segment #1 in the lower left hand corner.

Communication ID: 11595

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: BARBARA EIGNER

Hello this is Barbara Eigner. My telephone number is [Phone]. Please have Sandra Billings call me back at [Phone]. Goodbye.

Communication ID: 11596

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: MICHAEL VELEY

Hi. My name is Michael Veley and I live in Brush Prairie. The BPA proposed route 31 would run directly through our neighborhood. I am writing to express my extreme opposition to this route as well as the length of time allowed for public comment.

I understand the public comment portion closes November 23rd. What is the rush? Why not allow this issue to be discussed fully and provide for news coverage, etc?

This route would cut through the middle of our neighborhood affecting livability, property values and expose numerous people to the affects of long-term EMF and the "undetermined" health risks.

Please, please DO NOT consider route 31 as a viable option. It would destroy our neighborhood and many others. There are other options.

thank you.

Michael Veley

[Phone]

Communication ID: 11597

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: MICHAEL SPENCE

We certainly APPRECIATE the power supply provided by the BPA and associated grids. Our residential property is between proposed route 31 and 30 33 34 35... 5 acres and resident/owner since 1978. The route along 31 is absolutely insane(Hockinson 212th Ave). The 30 33 34 35 route is more residential user friendly(extremely rural and will connect with Merwin/Chelatchie Prairie(BioMassGenerator). To dislodge 8,000 residential properties on route 31 is creating a residential uprising during a period when we are regaining trust in our government....there is still hope. As a vereran(VietNam) I thought I was fighting for democracy although political values effectively stopped that...."Don't shoot unless they shoot first" As a gunnersmate Turret 1 Battleship New Jersey BB62 we fired all night to stop VC from over running a Marine camp....that worked. We value our rural life and if we wanted to live under the power grids already in place we'd move to town....but NOT. Do the right thing and eliminate the \$\$ related to "STUDIES" and build the line on the least residential impact route....be part of our community....not the enemy. We're rebuilding AMERICA not destroying property value tax income. I'm recently layed off but fortunate enough to grasp@ retirement and available to work with BPA doing any work associated with line studies.

Respectfully

Michael Spence

Communication ID: 11598

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: DOUGLAS R BROCKBANK

Greetings Mark,

We met in Camas, and again briefly in Gresham.

I wanted to alert you to a groundswell of anger in the Hockinson area of Clark County--due of course to the possibility of using Segment 31. But the outrage goes much further due to the following:

1. The scope of BPA's communication: Of the 500 angry residents, elected officials and community leaders in attendance at an impromptu meeting last night, very few of them even heard about this from BPA. Only a tiny fraction of the people affected got notifications, and indeed, the angry group last night still represents only a small portion of the residents affected.
2. The timing of the public comment period: Small numbers contacted, and a very short time to comment before the EIS process begins... This has created a big trust gap with the community. Most still do not even know about this, the community meetings are "over", and we have barely a week remaining to comment??? If BPA plans to use the "mild response" from the community as a data point in the segment 31 decision making process, I shudder to think of the repercussions.
3. The format of the community meetings: A few of the attendees were at one or more of the community meetings. Deep frustration was expressed about the format, which did not allow for residents to hear comments from other informed residents who have different interests than BPA. Nor did it allow for Q&A in a group format, so that all participants could hear the same information. While your chosen format would certainly make it more convenient for BPA, it did not serve the needs of the community. The irony is that the more BPA tries to minimize residents banding together, the stronger they'll do it on their own--US Representatives in tow--separate from BPA's ability to influence the dialogue.
4. The sloppiness and open-ended nature of the contract asking for access to property. We discussed this in person. It sends a message about assumptions of BPA management vis a vis the homeowners along segment 31.

Mark, certainly no one at BPA expects segment 31 to be welcomed by residents. But I do wonder if BPA has any idea how deeply the anger is running, and how badly trust is compromised. Seems a shame, given how exhausting it must have been for you and your colleagues to stay calm and professional through the long hours of those meetings--only to have that effort wiped away by decisions related to 1-4 above.

Much could be gained by rethinking each of these items. (1) Communicate with everyone affected. That is a large number. (2) Extend the public comment period significantly. This simply must happen. I overheard you saying that BPA welcomes input from community anytime over next several years, but if

up-front input is of greater importance, allow time for it! If it is not more important, what was the point of such a short deadline to begin with? (3) Hold more meetings that allow residents to speak their mind publicly, especially since many are just beginning to hear about it, and (4) If you need to understand EIS issues "on the ground", call and ask to visit where we can show you what you are looking to destroy. But honestly, even that would be difficult at this point, given the current direction of trust.

Finally we've not even spoken of the trust erosion created by poor communication around the issues themselves. The "glossing over" of health issues is just one example. Most studies on this are done by power companies, so certainly health risks are "inconclusive". The few independent studies that have been done show frightening health effects within 200 ft. of the lines. Childhood leukemia and adult lymph cancer are well documented, but Lou Gehrig's disease, and Alzheimers--among others--also deserve further study. By the way, almost all studies are done with 150-300 KV lines. BPA is in uncharted health territory with these 500KV lines, and it wouldn't hurt to acknowledge these things with the citizens whose lives you put at risk.

Obviously, I could go on. But I urge you to re-consider the approach, particularly with regard to your scope of communications and the timing and format of public input.

I look forward to further conversations Mark, as I've appreciated--at least individually--your open and straightforward style. And I still trust you are in a deep listening mode, because you'll be hearing a lot in the coming days and weeks.

Thanks again,

Doug

--

Douglas R. Brockbank

[Phone]

Communication ID: 11599

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: TRICIA B MILLER

I wasn't able to attend the public meeting in Hockinson, WA on November 12. I live in the proposed site for one of the transmission lines. I want to know how close this proposed transmission line would come to my property. Nearest cross streets [Address]. My husband has accepted a job in New Jersey and we will be listing our property soon. I don't want to lose money or be unable to sell my house due to this proposal. I looked at your website but it doesn't detail this. Thank you for your assistance.

Communication ID: 11600

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: MARY C HYLTON

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the scope of the EIS for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. As a life-long resident of the small, rural community of Hockinson, I have enjoyed a lifestyle that few people can appreciate. The magnitude of this proposed project would devastate the Hockinson Community, both physically and financially. Hockinson Schools are funded primarily by residential property taxes, as there is no other major tax base to draw from. By taking out existing residences and reducing the current property values in the area, the schools would suffer immensely. In 2003, Hockinson High School was opened and has since graduated some of the top scholars in the nation. Funding for this very building would be drastically reduced and students would exit in mass numbers. With the tax base being knocked out from under us, there would be no way to compensate for the hard costs that a school district requires to remain solvent from year to year. Dare I ask, would the federal government feel differently if it was their homes and businesses that were being destroyed to make room for this atrocity? Would they not find an alternative route? I think I can answer that myself! Cost should be a consideration, but even more importantly, people's livelihoods and homes should be at the forefront. In these incredibly difficult economic times, I find it absolutely unacceptable to displace a thousand people by destroying the very homes they spent a lifetime to attain. There has to be a better way. Please, reconsider your route, by putting yourself and your family in our shoes. Sincerely, Mary C. Hylton

Communication ID: 11601

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: PRISCILA DARAKJIAN

We in Salmon Creek are very concerned about the available option of having the power line corridor near our homes. We don't understand the logic of considering our area as one of the possible routes for this corridor given it is so densely populated, relatively to the other proposed routes. As a result of the economy downturn our property values have already gone down. The proposed project near our neighborhoods would be certainly disastrous not only bringing down our property values even more but increasing our exposure to the possible health risks of living close to high voltage power lines. Please, reconsider your plan and remove this route from your list.

Communication ID: 11602

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: NILA VAN BLERICOM, MARVIN W VAN BLERICOM

We are writing this letter to voice our opinion concerning the proposed I-5 Corridor project on 212 Ave,

specifically route #31. Needless to say we are totally against this proposed route, due to the destruction of our property, home and auto shop, possible relocation issues, declined property value and serious health risks to ourselves and our pets. We designed and had our home built and have lived here for 25 years. We have invested a Great deal of ourselves, time and money to create our paradise in this crazy world! Made crazier with this issue. To be at risk of having our home condemned is absurd! We are too old to be evicted, forced to relocate at today's prices and start our lives all over again. Especially when there are two other proposed routes #28 and #29, that do not impact so many homes, people and their lives. We encourage you to strongly consider one of the two alternate routes further east and leave our country hillside alone. Sincerely, Marvin and Nila Van Blericom [Address] [Phone] [e-mail]

Communication ID: 11603

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: BETHE N FERGUSON

I cannot begin to describe how distressed my husband and I are over the consideration of these power lines in our area. Many years ago, we made the decision to move to this area because of the ABSENCE of power lines compared to other properties we looked at. We are terribly concerned about EMF's and of course, the devaluation of a property in a time when we are struggling to keep a business afloat in a bad economy and send three kids to college. Additionally, because most citizens in this area were not allowed the luxury of knowing about your plans, I ask that additional time be allowed for the comment period so that my neighbors can weigh in on this situation. To impact all of these families without notification is troubling, at best. I will be writing to our elected officials to become involved in this for that reason, and others. Please extend the comment period and please consider the alternate routes for these lines. Beth Ferguson [Address]

Communication ID: 11604

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: REBECCA M. LAWSON

I want to voice my opposition to segment #31. This line affects too many people; either by taking their homes or leaving them to live right next to these dangerous lines, with their home values decimated. Our community should not be asked to pay the price for this. Place these lines further east through less populated areas. Even if this is more expensive, what is the health of our community worth? NO ON SEGMENT #31!!!!

Communication ID: 11605

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: RICHARD R GILLHOOVER

To Whom It May Concern: I am writing to voice my concerns regarding the Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. I live in the Hockinson area of Clark County and as a concerned citizen for my family, community, and county, I would request your support to stop the proposed a high voltage, 150-foot tower power line in our neighborhood, Segment #31. Any consideration of this new path of 150-foot high, 500 Kilovolt (KV) towers to adjacent and through our neighborhoods is irresponsible and not the best use of public resources. BPA's Segment #31 planned path running through our community of Hockinson, Washington; a community where taxes are among the highest in Clark County. Is this the best route to be considered? A review of BPA's proposal shows it will negatively affect over 8000 properties within the easement boundaries. For most of us, our homes and land represent our most valuable assets. If Segment #31 was to be constructed, these towers running through our neighborhoods would destroy many homes, destroy the value of surrounding properties, destroy sensitive and scenic forest and open lands, and destroy the fabric of our proud and close-knit area. There are health risks to be considered as well. In 2002, the California Department of Health Services concluded living in close proximity to Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) can increase risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease and miscarriage. In 2007 an independent study on power lines 88KV to 220KV showed cancer risks increased by 5 times for children ages 0-5. In addition, cancer risks increase as adult by 3 times for children ages 0-15 when exposed by these power lines. Keep in mind there are no studies for lines of 500KV which are proposed along Segment #31. Constructing Segment #31 traverses property owned by Hockinson School District which has been set aside for a future school site to accommodate future growth in our area. Hockinson families and taxpayers have invested great amounts in the development of the best school district in the area and they have planned for years to see their children educated within it. Does BPA have the right to take that away? Given the health risks outlined above, does it make sense to have 500KV power lines over a future school site? Segment #31 also runs through areas with geologic, seismic, and erosion hazards identified by Clark County GIS records. Please consider less disruptive options than Segment #31! If BPA used Segments 28-30 or 32-34 further to the east, these segments run along less populated areas and would not affect as many individuals health, property values, and living conditions. I am asking for your support to prevent BPA's Segment #31 and to help protect our Hockinson community! Thank you. Sincerely, Richard Gillhoover Hockinson Resident

Communication ID: 11606

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: MARK L SCHOENING

I live in the Hockinson area of southwest Washington very near a route for a new transmission line that Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) has proposed under their "I-5 Reinforcement" project. The BPA have done the bare minimum to notify anyone in the community about the impact of these 150 foot towers and the 500 Kilovolt lines that they want to run through our school yards, backyards and in many cases through existing home sites. Some of our neighbors would in fact have their homes that they've

lived in for almost 20 years condemned and razed to the ground. The BPA has presented three different routes, one of which follows the existing transmission lines through Vancouver, and is clearly not their first choice if they are trying to diversify the risk to their lines. The second route proposed (referred to as "Segment #31) passes through our neighborhood, and would destroy several multi-generational farms, condemn dozens of homes and expose our families to the unknown health risks, property devaluations and visual blight of the largest towers used in our state. The BPA has offered little reassurance as to the health impact of sending this range of power over the lines and they have, by their own admission, never run this type of line through developed residential neighborhoods. Most of the families in our neighborhood have children, the group that medical studies have linked to 3-fold increases in leukemia cases due to exposure to high tension lines, and most of these children travel on school busses that will follow these lines to and from school every day, in addition to having to pass under and along these lines for every trip to the grocery store, doctors office or anywhere else outside our own neighborhood. The local school district, one of the reasons we chose to buy our house in this area, has already purchased land in anticipation of building new schools, which now fall directly in the path of the BPA route. As a taxpayer, I'm concerned that the school district is now stuck with an investment that they will no longer be able to use. I for one don't want to send my child to a school standing under a high tension line, nor will they ever be able to sell the land to recover some of our investment in the community, if the BPA chooses to build the towers along this corridor. Obviously the towers would also severely depress our own property values, as well as all the properties along the entire route and I've heard that those families unlucky enough to have their houses razed, or just having the easement pass through their properties will continue to have to pay property taxes on that land, even though they will never be able to sell it. Several of my neighbors have insisted that they will simply abandon the property rather than continue to pay mortgages and property taxes on land and structures that have been rendered worthless by the decision of the BPA. There is a third route that the BPA has presented which seems to avoid the risks of the "all their eggs in one basket" scenario of their existing route, and doesn't threaten homes, farms and families as the Segment #31 route would, but it is a longer route and touches some state property managed by the Department of Natural Resources. I can well imagine that the price tag for running the line along this third route will be higher simply due to the longer path, but it would seem to me that if the fairness doctrine were to be applied here, that both the BPA and their direct customers (which do not appear to be the citizens of Segment 31, or the greater Vancouver area) should bear the cost for what they hope will be a profit-gaining expansion, and that allowing the home owners, farmers, school districts and counties along Segment #31 to bear this cost alone would be drastically unfair. I ask, respectfully, to encourage you to place as much emphasis on the human impact in the environmental impact study as possible when considering Segment #31. Thank you for your time. Mark Schoening

Communication ID: 11607

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: JAMES H CRAWFORD

In regards to the proposed I-5 corridor power line expansion, in specific relation to the study route 31. •

East Clark County has unique attributes regarding historical land use. There is a history among most of the population in supporting preservation of rural values and open land. Use of route 31 will disrupt and damage the area in terms of aesthetics and cultural attributes. • The area is characterized by numerous patches of mature woodlands. In contrast to many of our public forests, these woodlands have re-grown from original logging operations in a natural manner and represent greater biodiversity than afforded by monoculture replanting practices. It is my hope that the EIS efforts will take these unique properties into account. • It is recognized that exercise of eminent domain to acquire right-of-way will require that land owners be compensated at fair market value for their losses. However, land and property adjacent to the right of way will be negatively impacted as well, and those losses will not be compensated. According to real estate professionals this effect is already in evidence even at sites several miles from the proposed route. • This collateral damage to adjacent property values will be exacerbated in the east county area due to the unique attributes of our setting. The truth is that our property values are influenced to some extent by the special ambience of the surrounding countryside and our environment. The negative impact to the residents here will be far greater, than for example, an urban setting where these special attributes are non-existent. • There is a significant (and growing) local concern regarding the potential health effects of these systems. My neighbors have expressed doubts regarding: o The accuracy of the studies- (It is our understanding that no studies were independent, but were all sponsored and paid for by power companies/authorities. Given the poor track record of health studies in other industrial arenas these are perceived as being highly suspect.) o There is justifiable concern regarding the fact that the studies are all based on lower voltage systems; no published data exists for the proposed 550 KVA system. o Given the historical difficulty in assessing cancer causing factors it would seem prudent to err on the side of caution. The proposed width may be inadequate in populated areas and may require an expansion of needed space. This need would increase the negative impacts listed above regarding property values, environmental damage, etc.

Communication ID: 11608

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: WENDY BLANTON

To whom it concern, I-5 corridor project affecting Amboy – proposed line 27. This is Wendy Blanton, age 31, mother of 3 young boys, proud wife a “Officer of the Year”- Captain Scott Blanton from the City of Vancouver Fire Department and owner of 5 acres in the Prairie. The “Little House in the Prairie” is what I call it? I write you today to share my heart and my deep concern for my family and our future. If this line goes through this land as proposed, our community and recreating guest stand to loose SO much. The prairie would lose its romantic and historic simplicity that we all love and the towers WOULD BE the main focal point you see as you drive the several mile stretch of flat land! The line would cut over both mountain ranges on either side you look. The privilege of driving under a loved and cherished, old, historic, Indian landmark would be gone, as that beautiful tree on 256th would have to be taken down! The delight of parking your car and standing in the drive way hearing nothing but crickets and birds and far off frogs and coyotes, or eagles, or hawks, the way its always been.... Would be replaced with the

buzzing and snapping lines that never rest. The local airport that blesses our community would be unusable. The road many walk on for stress relief and rejuvenation (256th) would be avoided. If this was just about property... I would not care and would sell and move, but this is more than that.... It's a lifestyle, a dream, with history and future held in respect. If it was just about living somewhere... I would move, but this is our handprint and it's where I want my kids to grow up. This is a healthy, safe, and peaceful spot in the world, with more natural beauty at our fingertips than I could take time to write about. If this line goes through our property as proposed, my family stands to lose SO much. Because the line would take the first half of our property, we would lose many of the beautiful trees I have planted over the years and the front of our property would go from 300+ to 150+! My boys would have to ride motorcycles under the lines, our animals would feed under the lines, and the towers would be right next to our house! I have fought the fight back to health after chemotherapy at age 23 and emotional upheaval at age 26 and while then my home and property was my sanctuary and place of quiet and rest and safety, that all would change if the lines came here. I would not feel that way about my home any more. Although many argue that there is no PROVEN data that states EMF as being dangerous to live near or be under..... There is NO PROVEN data that says it IS SAFE and WILL NOT HARM ME, MY FAMILY, OR MY ANIMALS. Although I knew there was a utility easement on my property, we NEVER signed up for a project like this! PP&L 's double wooden poles would be devastating, but the towers you are proposing and the lines you need to use are a WHOLE different set of things to consider. I would NEVER have purchased this land, even though it was what we could afford 13 years ago.... If I had ANY idea this would be possible! Our property is my dream. I remember purchasing it, just before Scott asked me to marry him. I remember the long days of designing our own, affordable, dream house.... Staying our first summer in a RV as we worked long hours at our jobs and then came home to put more work in on our home. Because of Scott's job as a fireman, our budget is such that we needed to put our personal labor in to make our dreams come true. I remember being pregnant with our first baby and planting baby fir trees on the edges of our property. I remember planting Dedor Cedar trees for each of our boys after they were born.... So if you stopped by they could show you "their trees". They frame the view we have of Mt St Helens from our "almost all windows" dining room where we have watched the mountain 'talk' with its puffing of steam and ash. We have taken this field in the prairie and built a HOME for us. We just finished a little barn and I love to garden organic vegetables. I want to raise organic meat and get our own chickens. We live WAY OUT THERE, 20 minutes North of Battle Ground, because we want this land, the views, the scenery driving HOME, the history and everything it represents. I love the wildlife! The gift of being able to watch eagles, hawks, falcons nearly every day! Then there are the coyotes, cougar, and deer! A beautiful seasonal creek that lets the boys play under huge, old growth trees that have shared this land with the Indians. The wide open sky with nothing but stars..... held in by the mountain ranges on both sides of the prairie. The fog slips down low, blessing us often with a spectacular, peaceful dance across the land in front of us. It's our land of the free and the home of the brave! I ask you to consider us not as a piece of property and a \$ sign, but as so much more than that. It's our "little house on the prairie", it's our home land... it's what it means to "live in the country". It's why those who live in the city put the top down on their car to drive away from it all and "go to the hills". We may not all have lots of money, but our land is very important to us. Our homes may not look like much sometimes, but we are the hard working Americans. Many may think we are too

simple a people out here, but it's that simplicity and peace that money can't pay you back for. I have great fear that BPA lines would go in and that it would be considered safe for us to continue to live here. I have fear that we would only be paid for the 50 ft of property you would need to extend the existing 100ft PP&L easement and that we would be forced to stay here due to lack of our budget to do otherwise. Because of the sweat labor my husband and I have put into this home over 13 years.... The cost of us rebuilding would be SO much more then what we could afford. Our property would be unsellable at the price we would need to get out of it to relocate. If this line goes though, I would ask that we be paid off in full to start over and relocate with the standard we NOW have. My husband's job is to risk his own personal safety and comfort to protect, rescue and bring to safety those who are in need. Who will protect us now? I understand if you need to put the lines through somewhere... please help us by finding a way that does not destroy history, scenery, dreams, retirements, little boys playgrounds and race tracks, future college funds and the spirit of this entire community. Thank you for your time and concern. I know this project is massive and i value that you have asked us to share our opinion. Thank you for listening. Sincerely, Mrs. Wendy Blanton

Communication ID: 11609

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: MICHAEL C WOODY

Dear Sirs, See line 29, area 88 The High Voltage line you are proposing for future installation, which may possibly run across my property, is not something I desire. I know that I am not alone when I say that the power line will have a very negative effect on my property. My wife and I bought our rural property in the spring of 1991. The property was part of a clear cut that layed all mangled and ugly. I knew that mother nature and with our help the land would be beautiful again in a few years. My wife and I developed the property, and we both grabbed our hammers and saws and built our home here and raised our children here. We created every square inch of flat land on this hill side. We now have 25 acres of 17 year old fir trees we replanted to use for us and our childrens retirement needs. The sad part about making a home and developing memories and dreams is we all want to hold onto what we have, because it took so much hard work and money spent to get it to where we wanted it to be. Power lines running through and over our property will destroy our little paradise we call home. I know we need more power lines to improve the power grid around our country. I appreciate you going through the legal steps to make a new line happen. I also know that in no way will you be able to build a line that won't impact people. * Please note - I have looked over the planned route of line # 29. On page 88 and 89 you can see that if you build the line on the eastern most edge of your proposed line installation area, you will be on DNR land and will impact no private land owners in this area. If you should have to take/buy land from me I want to know how will you pay for the loss of our trees ? I would expect you to pay us as if the trees were fully grown. You would be taking away our investment into our future security. Please feel free to contact me at anytime to discuss any issues. Thank You, Michael C. Woody

Communication ID: 11610

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: JOHN A ZORA

To whom it may concern: Construction of a high voltage power line through our community (corridor 31) would have a direct impact on the value of our property, degrade the landscape surrounding our house, and raise serious concerns over the potential adverse health effects of EMI on our four children. Our family of six moved to Hockinson 3 years ago because of excellent schools and a unique, close-knit community. This was a stretch for us, financially, however, we were willing to make the sacrifice to provide a better place to raise our children. Unlike most districts which rely on an industrial tax base to support schools, Hockinson families have committed to top notch schools (K-12) by paying higher taxes. With this in mind, consider the scenario of a high voltage power line dissecting this community: 1. Families uprooted and displaced. Considering the small size of this community, the loss of these families would have a disproportionately negative impact on a thriving community. 2. Property values drop sharply for adjacent homes, forcing some into foreclosure. 3. Overall desirability of the Hockinson community diminished, further reducing valuations and associated tax revenues for schools. 4. Families less likely to locate near the power lines. Those that are forced to live by the power lines would have lingering concerns over EMI. Independent studies on effects of EMI, for lines of this size (500 KVA), are deficient and inconclusive. On a personal level, the value of our property would drop \$100-150K, I would look out at the power lines 1/8 to 1/4 miles away, and I would be concerned about the health effects on my kids and neighbor kids who would play near the lines. I would also personally miss the families displaced by these lines. A viable power grid is in the best interest of the state and region, however, I implore the BPA to investigate alternate routes which would have less impact on established communities and personal lives. Certainly, a route further to the east would be much less disruptive. Sincerely, John Zora [Address]

Communication ID: 11611

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: GRACE A SCHILLER, WALT SCHILLER

Attached is a copy of a letter sent to all our public officials that summarizes our concerns as it pertains to the i5 Corridor Reinforcement Project and specifically to route 31. The letter went to the following: Rep. Brian Baird Senator Patty Murray Senator Maria Cantwell Clark County Commissioners Governor Chris Gregoire Office of Public Lands Senator Joseph Zarelli Our State Representatives

Communication ID: 11612

Date: 11/12/2009

Name: JENNIFER C HALLECK

Hi Mark - you must be very busy.

Since I have not heard from you - maybe you could send me some times you can meet. I'm out the following days:

Monday 16th

Thurs and Fri 19-20

I'd like to meet prior to the date your NEPA comments are due - thus, we can go on record of our needs.

Please let me know -

Jennifer C. Halleck

Vancouver School District

Facilities Planning Manager

[Phone}

Communication ID: 11613

Date: 11/9/2009

Name: JENNIFER C HALLECK

Good morning Mark,

It was good to meet you at the Hazel Dell open house on Saturday. As I mentioned, I am the facilities planner for Vancouver Public Schools and would like to meet with you regarding the I-5 corridor reinforcement project related to current school sites, current non-schools sites owned and operated by the district and planned undeveloped sites.

This week I'm available during any of these times:

Tuesday Nov. 10th from 1:00 - 3:00

Friday Nov. 13th from 8:00 - 3:30

Does this week work for you?

Jennifer C. Halleck

Vancouver School District

Facilities Planning Manager

[Phone]

Communication ID: 11614

Date: 11/6/2009

Name: SCOTT STUDER,LYNN STUDER

Dear Sirs:

We are homeowners in the Stoney Meadows subdivision which is effected by the proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. We learned that our property is located on page 104 of the BPA maps.

We understand that one of the potential routes for the proposed transmission line is to run parallel (100-125' northeast) to the existing lines on map 104. Further, one of the sub-options is to run the south line right through the wetlands to the east of us or possibly through part of the Stoney Meadows Homeowners Association (SMHOA) common area. 39 homeowners collectively own and maintain nearly 60 acres of these environmentally sensitive wetlands. We also learned the existing towers are 90' in height and the average height of new towers will be 110-150'. Therefore, the new towers will be substantially taller and even more unsightly especially if equipped with flashing red lights.

We vehemently oppose having the reinforcement lines running through or anywhere near our property or the SMHOA property for the following reasons:

1. 1,820 acres in this wetlands has been designated by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) as Natural Area Preserve to protect the following:

- a. The slender billed nuthatch - a rare bird
- b. 6 rare plant species including the endangered Bradshaw's lomatium
- c. Stands of threatened Oregon white oak forest
- d. Other native wildlife like beavers, hawks, ducks, geese, etc.

2. The SMHOA common area includes 60 acres of wetlands with trails for the exclusive use by our homeowners and we have grave concerns about the impact of power lines on our health.

3. The Green Mountain airport is nearby and the new taller towers are an increased risk for the air traffic given the flight path.

4. Our property value will be severely and negatively impacted by the unsightly power lines.

We request that you pursue one of your other options like running the lines closer to the I-5 corridor or much further north and to the east of Green Mountain.

We understand that public comments need to be submitted by November 23rd,2009. Please consider

this letter as our formal input. Finally, we do not grant permission to you to enter our property.

Sincerely,

Scott and Lynn Studer

[address]

[phone]

Communication ID: 11615

Date: 11/7/2009

Name: BECKY WRITT,TOM WRITT

Dear Sirs:

We are homeowners in the Stone Meadows subdivision which is effected by the proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. We attended the November 3rd public meeting in Camas and learned our property is located on page 104 of the BPA maps.

It is our understanding that one of the potential routes for the proposed transmission line is to run parallel to the existing lines on map 104. Further, one of the sub-options is to run the south line right through the wetlands to the east of us or possibly through part of the Stoney Meadows Homeowners Associations common area. We are a group of thirty-nine homeowners who collectively own and maintain approximately 60 acres of environmentally sensitive wetlands.

We strongly oppose having the proposed transmission lines running through or anywhere near our property or the SMHOA property for the following reasons:

1. Almost two-thousand acres in this wetlands has been designated by the

Department of Natural Resources as natural area preserve to protect the

following:

a. The Slender Billed Nuthatch - a rare bird

b. Six rare plant species, including the endangered Bradshaw's lomatium

c. Stands of threatened Oregon White Oak forest

d. Other native wildlife like beavers, hawks, ducks, geese, etc.

2. The SMHOA common area includes 60 acres of wetlands with trails for the

exclusive use by our homeowners and we have significant concerns about the impact of the power lines to our health and that of our children.

3. The Green Mountain airport is nearby and the new taller towers are an increased risk for the air traffic.

4. Our property value will be severely and negatively impacted by the unsightly power lines.

We request that you pursue one of your other options which have less impact on the public. Please consider this letter as our formal input to your request for comments.

Thomas & Rebecca Witt

[address]

[phone]

Communication ID: 11616

Date: 11/12/2009

Name: KRISTY PALIN, DOUG PALIN

Dear Sirs:

We are homeowners in the Stoney Meadows subdivision which is effected by the proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. We attended the October 28th public meeting at Clark College and learned that our property is located on page 104 of the BPA maps.

We understand that one of the potential routes for the proposed transmission line is to run parallel (100-125' northeast) to the existing lines on map 104. Further, one of the sub-options is to run the south line right through the wetlands to the east of us or possibly through part of the Stoney Meadows Homeowners Association (SMHOA) common area. 39 homeowners collectively own and maintain nearly 60 acres of these environmentally sensitive wetlands. We also learned the existing towers are 90' in height and the average height of new towers will be 110-150'. Therefore, the new towers will be substantially taller and even more unsightly especially if equipped with flashing red lights.

We vehemently oppose having the reinforcement lines running through or anywhere near our property or the SMHOA property for the following reasons:

1. 1,820 acres in this wetlands has been designated by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) as Natural Area Preserve to protect the following:

-
- a. The slender billed nuthatch - a rare bird
 - b. 6 rare plant species including the endangered Bradshaw's lomatium
 - c. Stands of threatened Oregon white oak forest
 - d. Other native wildlife like beavers, hawks, ducks, geese, etc.
2. the SMHOA common area includes 60 acres of wetlands with trails for the exclusive use by our homeowners and we have grave concerns about the impact of power lines on our health.
3. Our property values will be severely and negatively impacted by the unsightly power lines.

We request that you pursue one of your other options like running the lines closer to the I-5 corridor or much further north and to the east of Green Mountain. We understand that public comments need to be submitted by November 23rd. Please consider this letter as our formal input. Finally, we do not grant permission to you to enter our property.

Sincerely,

Doug and Kristy Palin

[address]

[phone]

Communication ID: 11617

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: FRED DEUCHAN, JERRI DEUCHAN, JUDITH A EDWARDS, THOMAS EDWARDS, MIKE GINTER, SALLY GINTER, MONTE G SCHIERLING, MARK VANDE VOORDE, ROBIN VANDE VOORDE, BARBRA WIDLUND

I am writing you to voice my concerns regarding the BPA (Bonneville Power Administration) I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. I am asking you to stop the construction of BPA Segment #31.

Any consideration of this entirely new path of 150-foot high, 500 Kilovolt towers adjacent and through our neighborhoods is irresponsible. BPA Segment #31 is a planned path running through our community of Hockinson, Washington. Hockinson community taxes are among the highest in the area.

For many of us, our homes represent our most valuable asset. Placing these towers through our neighborhood would destroy many homes, destroy the value of surrounding properties, and destroy the fabric of our proud and close-knit area.

Some residents may have the resources to take a loss, and move away. For those left in the shadow of these towers, the razed land will bring a constant reminder of lost friends and lost community. The social and emotional impacts will be compounded by the legitimate health concerns that BPA will

readily dismiss.

The California Department of Health Services (2002) concluded that living in close proximity to Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) can cause increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease and miscarriage.

Segment #31 traverses property owned by our public school district and a new school site. Hockinson families and taxpayers have invested great amounts in the development of the best school district in the area. They have planned for years to see their children educated within it. Is BPA now able to take that away?

Segment #31 runs through areas with geologic seismic and erosion hazards (identified in Clark Counties GIS records.)

The required "notification process" is a sham. If a property borders or is within 500 feet of the potential Right-of-Way (ROW) the owners are notified. Beyond that, it is left to the neighbors to notify each other. The narrow time period for public comment leaves community members no time to go-door to-door. Parents must scramble and sacrifice, take time away from their families to attempt to stop a legal framework that is structured against them.

There is no doubt that, as BPA authors their own Environment Impact Assessment, this behemoth agency will tout their expertise and argue "the greater good" in their effort. But make no mistake, the Real Bottom Line is that Segment #31 represents the most direct route option for BPA with considerable construction savings.

Basically BPA wants a new route. They want more! There are other options in this north/south latitude. One is through public lands to the east using segments 28-30 & 32-34.

They will argue they need route diversity, but their existing network already has diversity. Their best options are to upgrade their Existing facilities within existing Right-of-Way. in Segment #9 and in their northern Oregon routes between Allstun and Keeler or St Johns.

The health concerns, the erosion of our community fabric, the loss of tax revenue and its impact of delivery of public services are all very real issue for the hundreds of families in the area you represent.

As our elected representative we look to you to support us and fight for us!

No BPA Segment #31.

Communication ID: 11618

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: PAUL MCKEE,YVONNE MCKEE

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Stronger wind velocity at our elevation

Proximity to Kennedy Creek

I drilled a well, at a 4 foot depth I hit solid rock. My well depth is 333 feet deep, the water is great and I get 20 gal. a minute.

Lots of wildlife from deer and elk to a bear this year.

Secluded area on a dead end street. Lots of large trees and hillsides have been cleaned. View property of the Columbia River when trees are maintained.

I, (we) would rather sell our 9 acres (and home) which has been in the family since 1955 than to remain here and see the wildlife disappear and/or witness the destruction and ruin of all I've worked on. (I built my own house and barn.)

My wife is from Ohio. We are planning to move back there after I retire from WeyCo. I am currently looking at a 2+ year plan (approx.) If the power lines come this way or near enough to us to diminish our selling potential we would appreciate speaking with a realty specialist.

Communication ID: 11619

Date: 11/12/2009

Name: BARBARA EIGNER

Dear I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project Team

[Business] owns property pictured on page 89 of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. The assessed tax numbers for this Clark County Tract are:

Parcel 1, [Number]

Parcel 2, [Number]

Parcel 3, [Number]

The number 29 is stamped on the photo I have, suggesting yellow corridor route

proposal 29. In order to get a better perspective of this territory, I am requesting that you send me two aerial photo copies of the following territory:

1. which is located immediately to the west of map page 89
2. which is located immediately to the south of map page 89
3. which is located immediately to the south west of map page 89.

[Business] owns another tract. This is pictured on page 93 of the I-5 Corridor

Reinforcement Project. The assessed tax numbers for this Clark County Tract are:

Parcel [Number]

Parcel [Number]

And [Number]

The numbers 28.30 and 32 are stamped on this photo. suggesting yellow corridor routes. I am requesting that you send me two aerial photo copies of the following territory:

1. which is located immediately west of map page 93.
2. which is located immediately to the northwest of map page 93 ,
3. which is located immediately to the north of page 93.

Because this is a very complicated area at the crossroads of different routes, I need these additional maps to study both the topography of the land as well as existing roads and streams.

Thank you.

[Name]

Manager.

Communication ID: 11621

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: BRIAN N BAIRD,MARIA CANTWELL,PATTY MURRAY

Dear Stephen:

RE: Corridor Reinforcement Project

We write to request that the Bonneville Power Administration extend the public comment period to allow constituents more time in which to comment on the corridor reinforcement project.

We have received many inquiries from constituents who are concerned by the project's potential impacts on their property. Given the size and scope of the project we believe additional time is warranted.

Respectfully,

Patty Murray

U.S. Senator

Maria Cantwell

U.S. Senator

Brian N. Baird

Member of Congress

Communication ID: 11622

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: NANCY BARNES,CAROL CURTIS,BYRON HANKE

RE: Comments on BPA I-5 Corridor Transmission Reinforcement Project

Dear BPA staff,

The Clark Public Utilities board of commissioners appreciates the information you provided at our October 27 commission meeting, as well as the briefings you provided our staff related to the proposed I-5 Corridor Transmission Reinforcement Project and this opportunity to respond.

The power generation facilities in our region, including the development of additional renewables, use the transmission system to deliver electricity to our customers and others.

Reinforcing the transmission system in our region will provide the transmission capacity needed to allow our customers access to existing and new forms of electricity -- including renewable electricity, and maintain the reliable delivery system our customers depend on.

We recognize today's transmission system is approaching its limits and is presenting challenges to the reliable delivery of the electricity necessary for our customers and this region.

On behalf of our customers we recognize it is important for BPA to develop and implement a solution.

Sincerely,

Clark Public Utilities Board of Commissioners

Carol Curtis

President

Nancy Barnes

Vice President

Byron Hanke

Secretary

Communication ID: 11623

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: RALPH KLINE

I own [parcel]. Would you closer show if the proposed line #21 would actually go over or close to my property. The map line is a small scale to really determine the above location. Thanks.

Communication ID: 11626

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: K. D. CHRISTIANSON

We received the notice that our home and property may be affected by the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. We live very close to the Ross substation and already deal with the daily view of transmission lines, their support structures and their impact on our property and community. Constructing a second, parallel line and its support structures near the existing lines might seem logical to the property owners that don't already have (and don't want) these eyesores looming nearby, but doing so would double the burden on existing nearby properties, forcing them to shoulder the responsibility for and impact of the reinforcement lines as well as the existing power lines. The increased impact caused by the Reinforcement Project should be more evenly shared by a larger base of property owners that also benefit from the power the lines transmit.

Communication ID: 11627

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: KAREN SMITH

It has come to our attention that along with disrupting and endangering hundreds of families along Proposed Route 31, the towers are scheduled to pass directly over property already purchased by the Hockinson School District for their new school. Conflicting reports on the dangers of the emissions do

little to assuage concern. Even the smallest chance of possible links to childhood leukemia is too great a risk. Please choose a route, other than 31! Thank you for your consideration.

Communication ID: 11628

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: LISA M BUSCH,GEOFF BUSCH

November 16, 2009 Geoff & Lisa Busch [Address] RE: BPA-I5 Corridor Reinforcement Project – Route 31
To: Governor Gregoire, Senator Murray, Senator Cantwell, Congressman Baird, Representative Orcott, Representative Herrera, Mr. Grubb, and Mr. Goldmark, Please do not allow BPA to develop Route 31. Our property sits on the corner of 212th Ave. and 269th St. We chose this property 12 years ago because we could see that it and the surrounding properties were as developed as they would ever be and our home would keep its scenic beauty. Transmission lines cutting down this valley would have a negative impact on the quality of rural life many of us choose to call home. Please work with BPA to determine if these lines are necessary, and if so, please have them go out to the public lands to our east as to impact as few homes as possible. Thank you for your time to hear our concerns. Sincerely, Geoff & Lisa Busch

Communication ID: 11629

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: ANONYMOUS

Yeah, I'm calling in opposition of the route 31 you have it runs right directly behind my house. I have some property value concerns and also some health concerns. I'm 75 years old, and I have a pace maker defibrillator and I can't be that close to the power line. I'm definitely opposed to this Segment 31. If you want any more information contact me at [Phone].

Communication ID: 11630

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: JODIE M GILMORE

If you choose the eastern-most route, I would encourage you to run the new north-south line west of Ammeter Rd., where it will impact very few private residences. Longview Fiber Co. owns most of the land west of Ammeter Rd., and there are hardly any houses -- just trees. East of Ammeter Rd., there are multiple private residences that would make acquiring the new right-of-way very expensive for the BPA, not to mention disruptive for the homeowners. Plus, existing logging roads on Longview Fiber property would make building and accessing the new line easier and less expensive than building new roads. Another consideration is topography. The land west of Ammeter Rd. (Longview Fiber) is relatively flat in

many places, although there are some hills. East of Ammeter Rd., close to the existing east-west transmission line, the topography is VERY steep, with multiple creeks. I would be very concerned about erosion, mud slides, and watershed damage if the new line is run east of Ammeter Rd.

Communication ID: 11631

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: JOANNE RAUTH,PATRICK RAUTH

Area 15

My property fronts apx 1600' of Coweeman River. This river is the only spawning river for wild native Chinook salmon on the lower Columbia region it is also a lice steelhead river. We have a steelhead rearing operation that has release 10-18 thousand steelhead into the Coweeman for the past 20 yrs.

I have a domestic well that serves my home and also a water right on the creeks intersecting the land. This surface water supports our steelhead rearing and supplies my livestock tanks and bard.

Several neighbors rely on the surface and spring water for their homes. Construction could easily destroy their water sources as well as those with wells.

We have a resident elk herd of apx 30-40 animals that we enjoy watching in our field as well as numerous deer, occasional bobcats, beavers, and Bald eagles that frequent our property.

I pray that you choose to cross unpopulated forest areas where your accesses would render fire protections to these large landowners such as Fibre/Weyerhauser instead of destroying small lives and dreams and habitat.

Attachment:

FIX BPA-i5

The proposed routes for the new BPA-i5 power line through Washington and Oregon should be moved further away from existing homes both in cities and rural areas. Yes, to exercise these options BPA will have to deal with larger and more powerful industrial forestry and public landowners rather than weaker individual homeowners and the proposed transmission line could have a marginally higher cost to be shared by all consumers in the West Coast, including California.

BPA must take precautions to minimize the well-documented higher risk of cancer to children living close to high voltage power lines. This is not only morally right, it also makes good public policy. Beyond the heartache and financial ruin of displaced and cancer-stricken families, the Washington-Oregon public at large, for generations to come, will pay higher health premiums for the more than tripling of blood cancer rates of children and adults who grew up too close to a super high voltage power line. It should be a clear wake up call that, despite all the scientific information withheld and distorted about

the effects of electromagnetic fields, the California Department of Education now requires that any new school built must be at least 350 feet away from the edge of the right of way of a 500 kV power line. Make BPA do the right thing! Attend the public meetings and participate!

Temporary contact: fixbpa@gmail.com

Sources:

1. Electric and Magnetic Fields Associated with Electrical Currents. June 2002, 65 page booklet published by National Institutes of Health Sciences and Dept of Energy. Basic definitions and on page 37, intensities of magnetic fields for different size power lines, by BPA.
<http://www.niehs.nih.gov/health/docs/emf-02.pdf>
2. EMF Health report and factsheets. California Dept of Health. Go to Topics and select Electromagnetic Fields. <http://www.ehib.org/emf/>
3. Results of Australian epidemiological Study by Prof. Ray Lowenthal. Documents triple delayed lymph cancer rates on adults who lived within 328 yards of power lines EMF as children or adolescents. Lowenthal, RM and Tuck, DM and Bray, IC*, 'Residential exposure to electric power transmission lines and risk of lymphoproliferative and myeloproliferative disorders: a case-control study, Internal Medicine Journal, 37 (9) pp. 614-619. ISSN 0918-2918 (2007) [Refereed Article]
<http://www.physorg.com/news107180850.html>
4. Powerwatch, is a non-governmental U.K. entity dedicated for many years to EMF effects. Includes summaries for several studies and other links. <http://www.powerwatch.org.uk/contents.asp>

Communication ID: 11632

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: NANCY K MCLEOD

I would urge you to consider the route that would be farthest to the east, out of more populated areas. Route 31 would totally destroy property values and could eventually displace hundreds of families. Many of us along that segment are getting near retirement age and have been counting on the sale of our homes to help fund our retirement. If the line goes through this area no one will want to purchase homes or property because the whole idea of living out in a rural setting is to enjoy the beauty of nature which will be destroyed by these monstrous towers. Health issues are also of great concern to us. Scientific literature conclusively links many negative health outcomes with EMF exposure over an extended period of time: A variety of childhood and adult cancers Alzheimer's disease Tumor growths Genetic defects Immune system deficiencies..... just to name a few. Please don't destroy us!

Communication ID: 11633

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: GREGG D JOHNSON

Route 32 & 31 are poor routes go east and run thur state forset lands, not thur neighborhoods. BPA should take a close look at the damage they will do to family and coummunities. Alot more money to spend on land; removal of specit sys, and homes. We will have are voices heard. Would you like this route thur your backyard?????

Communication ID: 11634

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: SHAWNA STEVENS

I strongly oppose this segment (31) for several reasons: it will devalue a great community when it should clearly go further east. I am majorly concerned about how the school will be affected.

Communication ID: 11635

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: HERRINGTON

In future letters, please be more specific about how people could be affected by the proposed segments, so that people don't panic when there is no need. We were disturbed by the haphazard nature of how people were notified. It didn't seem that all affected property owners were notified equally. The meeting at Clark College was well organized and the staff was polite and knowledge. We liked being able to arrive at any time and get our specific questions answered. Please keep this format, it worked very well for us.

Communication ID: 11636

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: DIANE M BUDDEN

November 11, 2009

To: Whom it may concern

Re: Proposed BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

I am writing as a concerned citizen of Hockinson, WA., part of Clark County. I only found out about this proposal when contacted by another concerned citizen. I am a few feet from the easement but not in

the direct path of the towers so apparently the decision was made that there would be no impact to me or my family if you ran a 500kV line only few feet from my property. No notification was received. It is appalling, though not surprising, that you'd be that sneaky. We will indeed be greatly impacted by the decision to use segment #31 for the towers. The property devaluation associated with 500kV overhead lines has a great effect just because of the sheer size of the towers. Their size is visible from a greater distance and would affect all of the Hockinson area not just the immediate surrounding area.

Hockinson is valued for its views, rolling hills, good schools, and peaceful living. Placing towers in our community will damage wildlife areas, destroy property values (typically 15-40% in towns that have had the towers erected), jeopardize the health of our community members, and compromise the safety of those near the lines and towers.

It is very well documented that the Pacific Northwest is one of the areas that is most often hit by ice storms. Overhead cabling and towers are vulnerable to the ice and wind. Although the initial outlay for installing cables underground is more expensive it is less expensive during the life of the cable. Underground cables are more reliable, affect the environment less, greatly reduces the magnetic field and obviously is more aesthetically pleasing to the eye and property values. It is much more expensive to replace downed lines, collapsing towers and restoring power to the thousands of homes and businesses that would be without electricity should an ice storm occur. Just look at what happened to Quebec in 1998. That ice storm cost the utility company \$800 million plus another \$2 billion in upgrades. Wouldn't spending the money on underground cables be more cost efficient and safer?

We also know of the negative impacts of EMFs on people and animals. There are many studies that conclude that living next to these towers increases the risk of childhood leukemia by five times, increases the risk of Lou Gehrig's disease, miscarriage, adult brain cancer, tumor growth, birth defects, sleep disturbances and on and on. It even increases lymphoma in dogs by 6.8 times and reduces the amount of milk production in cows. How could you even consider placing these lines in a populated area? How could you even consider doing anything OTHER than burying the lines? Japan, Germany, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Sweden, Italy, France, the UK and several other countries have large-scale underground high voltage power lines because they care about their citizens. Please care about us too.

I am asking you to choose a less populated area to erect your towers or put the cables underground.

With great concern,

Diane MW Budden

Communication ID: 11637

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: DENNIS E DUBOIS

We are in route 31 of the proposed new transmission line. We are registering our complaint of this

proposed route. We know that there are alternate routes that would have less impact on property owners and neighboring property owners. It does not make sense to ruin whole neighborhoods, displacing families, removing people from the homes that they have chosen and work so hard to maintain. The towers would be a blight to an area that can not take such an addition without ruining the landscape. First we would have the landscape altered in such a way as to totally ruin the rural look and feel that we all love and should be maintained for the next generation. The high voltage lines cause constant buzzing and crackling. And we are NOT convinced that there is no evidence of ill effects from living practically underneath such a powerful transmission line. People would be forced from their homes that want nothing more than to stay where they have chosen. The remainder of the people not physically removed would suffer the visual blight that the towers, lines and clearing of large trees and plant life wiped out in a 150 foot swath, sometimes right up an entire street and neighborhood. We would suffer the noise, negative health impact and devastating plummeting property values. Not only are these are beloved homes but in most cases our properties are our ONLY financial investments for our future and our children's future. We have put in a lifetime of blood, sweat and tears into something that can either be totally taken away or grossly devalued at someone's stroke of the pen. Please reconsider this possible course of action. We cannot and will not quietly go along with this proposition. We will all do everything in our power to change BPA's thinking on this matter. Please extend the deadline for comments beyond Nov. 23. Thank you for your consideration.

Communication ID: 11638

Date: 11/15/2009

Name: BRADEN S STRICKLER

Greetings Mark,

My home is in the Hockinson area and is on route segment 31 of the proposed I5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. The 500 KV line would take out the entire upper road of the neighborhood at 212th Avenue and Kristen Circle. Our neighborhood is very peaceful and scenic with forest, creeks, springs, ponds and wetlands. There is a variety of wildlife in the area such as coyotes, deer, hawks, eagles, blue heron, wood ducks, raccoons, woodpecker, etc.

Using the Clark County GIS property website, I can tell you that many properties in our neighborhood (Kristen Circle, 212th, and 197th) have geological hazards listed as sloped areas (>15%) and severe erosion hazard areas. Several properties nearer the proposed line have an earthquake hazard rating as high. Adding such large infrastructure to this area is

not a good idea. Please don't allow BPA to use route segment #31.

The visual impact of both the 150 foot ROW and 150 foot high towers would negatively impact property values for not just people directly affected but the entire upper portion of Hockinson in the area known as "Finn Hill". The Hockinson area has some of the highest tax rates in Clark County. I doubt Clark County would want to lose property tax money for people forced out of their homes, or reduce tax money since

property values would be decimated.

Hockinson School District recently purchased 35 acres for a new school.

Segment 31 would go through this property and may render this property unfit for a school. The current primary/intermediate school at the corner of 159th and 164th is within a mile from the proposed route segment. If this were to go in, parents may pull children from the school because of health issues.

I am very concerned about the health hazards of a 500 KV electric line being so close to my home. Electric and magnetic fields (EMF) are thought to cause some cancers. A report from the California Department of Health Services in 2002 concluded that EMFs can cause some degree of increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease, and miscarriage.

Route segment 31 would destroy many homes along 212th Avenue. It is not just property that will be destroyed, it is people's lives, their homes, their community which will be destroyed. It is unconscientious and irresponsible to even consider this segment. The community of Hockinson would never be the same. A good chunk of the property tax base would be gone forever. Please think about it.

The route should go on DNR land where no residential homes are impacted.

It may cost less as

less homes/properties would have to be bought by BPA. It would save Clark County in the long run by retaining the tax base and good will of the people who would have been affected along route 31. Why aren't any routes even being considered for Oregon? Who is the consumer of the power that will be transmitted on the new line? California?

If you absolutely cannot do the DNR route, then use the existing ROW (segment #9 and #25).

NO BPA Segment #31.

Sincerely,

Braden Strickler

Communication ID: 11639

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: BARBARA EIGNER

Hello this is Barbara Eigner and I have some questions. It's a 70 mile, approximately 70 miles trip between Castle Rock and Troutdale. Will a new substation be needed halfway in between maybe some 35 miles from one to the other?

Would a substation be located at the base of one of these towers? Do the substations require more than 150 foot wide easement strip or do they need a wider easement strip? Are all the grounding wires for the towers parallel to the towers lines or do they spread out at right angles? How near the edge of a 150 foot easement are the grounding wires buried? How deep are grounding wires buried? One can't dig or plant within the right-of-way without contacting BPA. Okay.

Since transmission lines sag between the towers, what's the lowest elevation one of those bare wires off the ground? What's the distance between towers for this project? What is the minimum distance between the top of the ground vegetation and the conductive wire? If the height of a single-circuit 500 kV tower is 110 to 150 ft tall how wide does that tower at the widest point? What's the life expectancy of such a tower? Those are basically my engineering questions.

My surveying questions are a little different. Okay, is BPA requesting permission from all the landowners right now or will they wait a while until they have a better idea on what routes they want to select? It appears that requests for permission to enter the property were sent to everyone who owned property within the yellow strip, how wide will the brusher crew of a surveyor make trails into neighboring property outside the marked corridor strip to locate where section monuments and that sort of thing?

How does the surveyor brusher group document and record the need for BPA to reimburse [end of message]

Communication ID: 11640

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: BARBARA EIGNER

Hello this is Barbara Eigner. My telephone number in Portland, OR is [Phone]. I have some engineering questions. In the approximately 70 mile strip between Castle Rock and Troutdale will an additional substation be needed somewhere in between maybe 35 miles between one end or the other? Would a substation be located at the base of a tower? Do substations require more than 150 foot wide easement strip or a much wider easement strip? Are all the grounding wires for the towers parallel to the tower lines or are some at right angles? How near the edge of a 150 foot easement are the grounding wires buried? How deep are the grounding wires buried, if you can't plant or dig within the right of way without contacting BPA. Since transmission wires sag between the towers what's the lowest elevation of one of those bare wires from the ground? What's the distance between towers for this proposed project? What is the minimum distance between the top of the ground vegetation and the conductor wire? If the height of a single circuit 500 kv is 110 to 150 feet tall how wide is that tower at the widest point? What is the life expectancy of such a tower? My telephone number in Portland is [Phone].

Communication ID: 11641

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: BARBARA EIGNER

Hello this is Barbara Eigner in Portland, OR. My telephone number is [Phone]. I have some questions about the surveying. Does Bonneville Power Administration need to enter properties right now or how long will it be before they start entering properties? How wide will the surveyor brusher crew make trails into neighboring properties outside the yellow marked corridor strip in order to locate quarter section monuments and that sort of thing? How does the surveyor brusher crew document and record the need for BPA to reimburse the landowner for trees that lie in the direct survey line? What is the minimum brush height measurement for young trees that need to be slashed by the brusher crew for which BPA will reimburse the landowner? Since building access roads in forest areas is expensive in the process of determining transmission line routes will surrounding territory outside the yellow corridor be searched for old logging routes that could potentially provide some access routes for a tower. Are access routes designed to be driven in a two wheel or a four wheel drive tower? My telephone number is [Phone]. Call me back when you can. Goodbye.

Communication ID: 11642

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: BARBARA EIGNER

Hello this is Barbara Eigner. My telephone number in Portland is [Phone]. I have some questions concerning an appraisal of property. How much time is anticipated between the time surveyors finish their work and the time appraisers begin appraising property? Will the entire 70 mile corridor need to be surveyed before the appraisers begin appraising property segment? Currently stumpage prices are low and small woodland owners dread to have their forest land appraised when stumpage prices are low. How will the appraiser determine the value of a young timber tree, the commercial value or the pre-commercial value of the tree? Can you explain how an appraiser takes into account the devaluation of property immediately beyond the edge of easement property? The assessor wants taxes and perpetuity. A private small woodland owner doesn't want to pay taxes and perpetuity on a land that a farmer can't use for anything. Liability for daredevil stunt ATV's and motorcycle riders on private property creates a problem. A land owner would need BPA to list the property owner on it as additional insured concerning liability insurance. How will an appraiser compensate for expensive foliage management such as planting, herbicide application, inter-planting, spraying, pre-commercial venting and etc. that have been done to a stand of young timber trees that later stands in the way of a transmission tower or access right of way. How is an independent appraiser selected? Would the independent appraiser the real estate value of the tax valuation?

Communication ID: 11643

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: BARBARA EIGNER

Hello this is Barbara Eigner at [Phone]. I have a question concerning appraisal. Suppose someone bought some forest property 5 years ago when the stumpage prices were higher and the valuation now because of the economy is less, could a landowner be forced to accept whatever the appraiser figured the appraisal comes up even though it is much less than what the people paid for the property just a few years ago? This is a question people wonder.

Communication ID: 11644

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: BARBARA EIGNER

Hello this is Barbara Eigner. My telephone in Portland is [Phone]. [Company] has a rock pit perhaps two acres in size located in the southeast quarter of section 28. Parcel [number], tax lot [number]. This private rock pit has been utilized by many former owners of the property as a source of gravel for forest roads for many years and in the future will need to be utilized as a source of gravel for the forest roads on the owner's property. Since no explosives would be allowed in an easement right of way to break up rock to obtain gravel. The members of [Company] request that BPA right of way be located on other land than [Company] ownership.

Communication ID: 11645

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: BARBARA EIGNER

Hello this is Barbara Eigner at [Phone]. Currently on our property we have a problem with unauthorized daredevil stunt ATV and motorcycle traffic and we have a real concern that BPA right of way could expose small farmers to an increase exposure from such traffic. I wish to make this comment. I don't know what can be done to block this kind of traffic on powerline right of ways. If BPA normally removes all trees on the transmission line and access roads easements when constructing a new transmission line. They will want to remove danger trees outside the transmission line easement. Trees or logs stacked within the right of way are not public property. What does BPA do with the wooded material that is removed from the right of way or on an access road before building a tower. The information presented so far has avoided any reference to management and control of invasive species and weeds on BPA right of way. No reference is given concerning manual chopping or spraying or the frequency

with which it is done. The materials stated that BPA owns timber within the right of way does it mean that any plant or saline tree that somehow grows in the right of way, belongs to the landowner until it reaches 14 feet and then it belongs to BPA? Does BPA consider any tree less than 14 feet in height growing to be the individual landowners responsibility as far as chopping or spraying. In past history, many years ago it seemed that BPA was a little laid back concerning the management of vegetation under powerlines. To what extent has BPA changed its management so vegetation under powerlines is kept at a much lower height. These are some questions. I have some questions about roads. A 60 foot easement is needed [Message cut off]

Communication ID: 11646

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: MONTE G SCHIERLING

See Communication 11617. Commenter requested action items.

Communication ID: 11647

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: BARBARA EIGNER

Hello this is Barbara Eigner. My telephone number in Portland is [Phone]. I have some questions about access roads. I understand they are about 60 feet wide. Is there a reason why they need to be that wide? In that 60 foot width does all vegetation need to be kept under 14 feet tall. If a tall timber tree blows down access part of the access road, who is responsible for the clean up to open the route? Is the radius of a curve for an access equivalent of a radius of a curve for a logging truck road or do you need a larger curve for your equipment. My number is [Phone].

Communication ID: 11648

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: STEVE RAPALUS

The lines should run over uninhabited land or should be put next to existing lines.

Defacing more residential property or exposing more people to EMF is irresponsible.

Communication ID: 11649

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: ROBERT MAUL

Hi my name is Robert Maul, I am the Community Development Director for the City of Battle Ground, WA. Calling with regards to this proposed project, I would like a moment to speak with Mark Korsness. My number [Phone] and it is November 17. Again Robert Maul, City of Battle Ground, [Phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 11650

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: PAT NORRIS

Hello my name is Pat Norris. My telephone number is [Phone], that's my home number. I received one letter quite some time ago, regarding the I-5 route. I did not know or receive any information that there were some public comment times, I understand now, I'm calling you on the 17 of November that the public comment time is over on the 23. I'm trying to find some information out on what is planned and what it would look like, what you are planning. I would certainly appreciate a call back to [Phone] to give me some information about this. Thank you very much. Bye.

Communication ID: 11651

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: RICHARD VAN DIJK

BPA has not provided a common forum for ALL the affected parties to be able to attend and ask questions in a town hall style meeting with an open mike. This way EVERYBODY will hear the same questions and BPA's response. I feel that these separate meetings were designed to minimize the public's awareness and hopefully not create too much push back. That and the extremely short comment window of less than 30 days gives the impression that BPA is trying to get beyond this with minimum attention and feedback. BPA needs to make this project very public as it affects property values, neighborhoods, views and environment beyond those than the home/property owners that received your letter BPA needs to allow more time for ALL the affected parties to fully understand the all the issues before any route is selected. I strongly propose the following:

- Have a town hall style meeting with an open mike at the Clark county fairgrounds which should be able to accommodate the expected turnout.
- Advertise the meeting in various news media to get the wide coverage of the meeting and the project.
- Allow an additional period of time after this meeting for feedback from folks

that did not attend or ask questions at the meeting. Richard van Dijk [Address]

Communication ID: 11652

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: LOU J BINTZ

Running massive towers of 500KV through Camas is not serving the public of Camas and will bring hardship to our town, cancer to our children and is completely without merit as Camas does not need the power or the lines. Run them with the existing lines. The "airplane" hitting them story is baseless and ludicrous. The Camas city council will be the first line of defense against this government excess and unwarranted invasion of our small town. lawsuits and civil disobedience will be the next defense, be prepared for long and hard fought battle

Communication ID: 11653

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: TONYA R RITENBURGH

We are sickened to think this proposed route will succeed. We moved to the beauty of the rurals to get away from the eyesores of the city like power lines and cell towers. Are there really no other routes possible through unpopulated areas or main thoroughfares that are already polluted with power lines and traffic lights? So now instead of the birds filling our afternoons with their song we will 'enjoy' the humm of lines. Maybe you could humor us and paint them green. Would you want them in your front yard? Do you want your children exposed to the emittance of high voltage lines day and night? What a great idea.

Communication ID: 11654

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: REBECCA BLICK, MICHAEL BLICK

We are homeowners directly affected by the proposed BPA corridor segment #31.

We have lived in our home for over twenty years and had planned on never moving from this beautiful area. In our neighborhood alone there are seventy homes on 2 1/2 acres each. Most people have been in their homes for a long time and plan on retiring here. Most home owners here have left an average of half their land as natural habitat and home to a wide variety of animals including deer, coyote, many bird species, squirrels, flying squirrels, bear, owls,

bobcats, cougar, porcupine and many others. There is an abundance of natural vegetation and many large, old trees. We feel this is not an appropriate area to clear the land when so much wildlife has been

displaced already. And we are a small portion of the 8,000 homes directly in the path of segment #31 (which probably affects another 16,000 at least, both health risk and in property values).

We are very concerned with the health hazards of living near these high voltage power lines. There are many ongoing studies demonstrating health risks to children and adults of cancer, Alzheimer's and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. Being a cancer survivor already, this is especially a concern to our family. Even if our home were not demolished, we feel we would have to move to avoid the risks. There are so many homes along this corridor and it is also too

close to Hockinson School and proposed developments there which involve children.

We feel other options should be reconsidered such as expanding the existing lines or using corridors that are more industrial and do not involve demolishing homes, running through wildlife areas and affecting so many people; aesthetically, health-wise and financially.

Communication ID: 11655

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: LINDA K BARRY,RICHARD BARRY

We are outraged that BPA is even considering Route 31 for 500-KV transmission lines. Route 31 dissects the Venersborg and Hockinson communities near Battle Ground. This area is fully developed with homes on small acreage plots. Many families moved to this area because of the safe environment for children and excellent Hockinson schools. Much of the area is wooded with abundant wildlife. Like many of our neighbors, we have worked our entire lives to be able to purchase a home and small piece of property. Proposed Route 31 cuts into our property and is literally right at our front door. It is our understanding that BPA intends to purchase rights of way, not properties. If proposed Route 31 is selected, our property which is currently valued at \$500,000+ (along with hundreds of others in the area) would become virtually worthless and unmarketable. If BPA purchases the rights of way needed for the high-voltage transmission lines and clear cuts everything, how can they fairly compensate a homeowner? The only fair way, if this route is selected, is to purchase all the properties affected at a fair market value so families can leave the area and start new lives (there are very few remaining plots of land to purchase in this area). If BPA acquires a right of way through our property and does not fairly compensate us, we will be left with two choices: 1) live under the high-voltage power lines and face certain health problems, or 2) abandon what we have worked our entire lives for and start over, giving up our plan to retire in two years. One of our family members is a Type I, insulin-dependent, diabetic and wears an insulin pump. The literature for this medical device states that high levels of electrostatic discharge can cause problems with the pump's programming and could result in under or over delivery of insulin. This could be life threatening for an insulin-dependent diabetic! How many others would be similarly affected in this populated area? Several proposed routes cross DNR land east of highly populated Route 31 (Routes 30, 32, 33, 34) and should be considered instead. These routes are more appropriate for transmission

lines. If Route 31 is eliminated, as it should be, we would like to be notified as soon as possible. It is not fair to hold so many families' lives and futures hostage. We can't plan to retire, invest in our home and property, or even sell and move somewhere else. Robert and Linda Barry [Address].

Communication ID: 11656

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: ROBIN M PAUL

I am opposed to the I-5 corridor reinforcement project. If the people of Oregon need more power, then it shouldn't adversely affect homeowners in Southwest Washington. Bring the line down the Columbia River Gorge from power plants and wind turbines from Eastern Oregon. Why should we suffer without benefit?

Communication ID: 11657

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: JAMES WILDER

If new power lines need to be built, they should be placed on the easternmost option. The other proposed routes would affect thousands of property owners lives. The placement of power lines in the more developed areas of Clark County would devalue homes and render hundreds of acres useless, and I don't believe property owners would be fairly compensated. Waiting until 2012 to make a decision only makes this worse because it puts everybody's plans in limbo. I do not understand why Bonneville Power did not have the foresight for future power needs. Easements could and should have been acquired 30 years ago when Clark County was still rural and property owners could have planned accordingly.

James Wilder

[Address]

Communication ID: 11658

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: MARIANNE RUSSELL

Owners want a copy of survey plot and results of survey within 30 days of the survey.

Communication ID: 11659

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: KAREN SMITH

Route plan 31. Please have your environmental studies look at:

1. Wetlands in the area of Shanghai Creek- feeding watersheds
2. Emissions from towers
3. Routing through DNR forest rather than people's homes
4. Underground lines rather than above ground

I am very concerned about emissions. I have had cancer and do not wish to risk even a chance of reoccurrence.

I would have to tell my grandchildren they cannot visit me due to the increased chance of childhood leukemia.

I have environmental concern about the wetlands around our properties.

I am a special education teacher, close to retirement, and I invested in my farm for my retirement. It's all I have, I can't afford to have its value cut in half because of power lines.

It makes much more sense to have lines running along a path of least disruption to people's lives- through the forest, not people's backyards.

Communication ID: 11661

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: PAUL CAMPBELL

Please have your environmental studies look at migratory routes, grazing sites and nesting areas for the bald eagle, blue heron, hawks, white tailed deer, elk, black bear, cougar, porcupine, and coyotes that are commonly found in this area. As well as the woodpecker and a multitude of additional wildlife. All animals would be affected by the proposed BPA project, most in a negative way.

To minimize the environmental impact as well as disrupting personal property I would recommend that this transmission line be routed near Larch Mountain Correctional, then toward Jones Creek ORV Park Recreational Area. This would minimize the visual, financial, and environmental impacts on the individuals that call this beautiful country home.

Communication ID: 11662

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: ANAMARIA CAMPBELL

Please have your environmental studies look at other options. Do not build power lines anywhere near our property or our neighbor's property. We moved to Camas for a peaceful, nature forest view. I don't even want to see a power line let alone have it buzzing over my head.

You have no right to decrease our property value with your "project," nor endanger my family's lives with you EMF emissions. Go far, far away!

Communication ID: 11664

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: FREDA STEVENSON

I already have LGN pipeline saying they are going across my property. I do not want transmission lines also! From the map you sent there should be a better alternative. Do not come on my property!

Communication ID: 11665

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: MAX AND MELISSA HALBERG

We are granting your permission to access our property for your studies on the I-5 Corridor Project.

Communication ID: 11666

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: JOEL KOEHLER

RE: Proposed Transmission lines Route #31

Dear BPA Members,

My name is Joel Koehler, I am 10 years old, and I live beside the property you're trying to put the power lines on. I want you to know that this is me speaking and my Mom is typing for me, but I choose what I want to say,

no one's forcing me to say anything.

Please don't put power lines beside our property. My mom said that's Route #31. I want you to know

that it's going to make the scenery look very ugly. My brother and I go down to our field all the time and build forts. We like the feeling of being closed in by trees so we can't see anyone else's property, and if you take out the trees we'll see this giant metal thing sticking out from the ground twice as tall as the tallest tree we have. And if you put that in, every time we go down to the field we'll see this giant metal object sticking up

from the ground. Plus, all the work that we've done planting trees on that side and trying to cover up anything that might possibly be built will be destroyed.

There's no way possible to cover up the power line even if you don't cut down any trees at all. I love the view of our property, but if you put in the power lines it won't seem in the country. If you put them in there will be construction here all the time and it will be a major disturbance to us. It just happens to be that the place you're going to put the power lines is on the side of our house that has the most windows... 12! Also, we can see it from our swimming pool. And in the summer, we eat on our wooden deck and we hang out and we also have a spa on that deck and they're all facing toward where the power lines would be. Right now we are typing this in our dining room and if you put the power lines in, right now we could see our field and then many giant metal things that would make all the trees look tiny compared to them.

My Mom also told me about yet another possible route you could put it on, near Interstate 5, where another power line is already built. Since there is already a power line there, you can't make people's view much worse because there's already power lines there. So really, you wouldn't be changing their view much.

My mom also told me that the closer you live to a power line, the greater your chance is of getting cancer...and that would change my life forever. There's no way to go back.

Please consider other possible routes for the power lines, it would keep the landscape pretty, as it should be. Also, my mom told me about another strip of land that is in a natural resource area, a great place to put it, but

they won't let you. Yet you can build power lines on private property and there's no way we can stop you from building the monstrous metal power lines in our view. Here's what I am asking you to do: consider putting the power lines somewhere where it wouldn't ruin ours, and hundreds of other people's views.

Thank you for thinking about changing the power line's location.

Communication ID: 11667

Date: 10/30/2009

Name: ROBERT W LITTLETON

Project Staff,

I understand that BPA would like to update its transmission grid and that acquiring land and/or easements is part of this process. I attended the informational meeting October 28, 2009 at Clark College in Vancouver. In speaking with BPA representatives, I discovered that no one could tell me what this project was going to cost, since routes are not yet decided upon. Residents should not be required to give up their homes if open state land is nearby. Proposed route 35, the segment nearest Winters Rd., is near DNR property. Since the DNR already allows atv, motocross riders, and clear-cut logging on their land and since the DNR is a trust of state residents, any potential power transmission lines should run through state property. Clear-cut logging without replanting and established eroded atv trails are allowed and not considered disruptive to the environment of the DNR land. It seems that power transmission towers would be less invasive than logging or recreational vehicle trails.

Private home acquisitions would be far more disruptive to the human environment of residents of Winters Rd. and would be very expensive compared to utilizing public DNR land or existing power easements.

Sincerely,

Robert W Littleton

Communication ID: 11668

Date: 11/5/2009

Name: DENNIS ANDRADE,DONNA ANDRADE

As a possible "affected resident" by the proposed I-5 power line project, I'd like to state my case against route 31. This route's easement encompasses approximately two thirds of my wife and my five-acre home sight. I estimate the easement boarder overlaps my vineyard and our separate garage/shop. Of more importance, this route would front our homes spectacular view. Our view is of extreme importance to our property's value and includes a thousand foot elevation line of sight to down town Portland, Gresham, Mr. Jefferson, etc. The original purchase price of our lot included a significant premium for that view. Its value has certainly increased during our near twenty-years of occupancy. We had planned on selling and moving when house prices improved, and the proposed power line would certainly affect our fiscal calculation. As a retired couple on a fixed income, significant loses in property value and therefore our net worth is not recoverable.

We are certainly not alone since this route transits several similar residential areas. I ask that alternate routes be adopted in light of our potential injury.

Communication ID: 11669

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: GEOFFREY C WILLIAMS

I am very much opposed to using our area for your I-5 Reinforcement project. The corridor you propose cuts through millions of dollars of pristine rural neighborhood. It also encroaches on the little Washougal River and would affect our property values significantly. You could easily move the line further East on State Forrest lands which would affect no one or to the East on already established easements. I will protest this any way possible if you bring this through our neighborhood.

Communication ID: 11670

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: TIM LOHNES

I am 100% opposed to your project. Please use your existing infrastructure.

Communication ID: 11671

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: DARREL F DIXON

It seems to me that sticking to existing rights of way as much as possible, as well as simplicity of design, would not only minimize the base cost of the project but ease maintenance cost and difficulty. Certainly sections 10 & 11 would require their own infrastructure, as well as present access difficulties. I would look into routing them along sections 9, 14, 18 to reduce duplicating infrastructure needs. Other areas might benefit from the same thinking. (The 19, 20, 21, 22 intersection is...silly at best).

Communication ID: 11672

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: JUDITH IBBS

First, I do not believe you. We all know that this I-5 corridor does not need the power line in this area. We do not need more power lines and substations.

It is corporate greed and corporate greed alone that is driving this project.

Both newspaper and internet headlines tell us about California's thirst for our water and power.

You are pretending you care about the environmental impact- but you don't. Your weed control is deadly to animals both small and large.

There are far less intrusive ways you can find to sell power to California than stealing people's property.

Communication ID: 11673

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: GREGG WEAKLEY,ELEANOR WEAKLEY

November 17, 2009 BPA via Email RE: I-5 Corridor Project

This letter is to inform you that we own 40 acres of land that is partially traversed by the single tower line just north of LaCamas Lake. You should also be aware that our property is part of LaCamas NorthShore which has recently been annexed into the City of Camas. LaCamas NorthShore is comprised of approximately 500 acres with multiple ownerships that have come together with the cooperation from the City of Camas to develop multi-zoned business park, retail and job center. The group has been collaboratively working on this development for the past two and half years. Whereas the tower only passes a corner of our property it does have a larger impact on our development as a whole. It does traverse property that is owned by the [Company] which is also part of our development. We would request that you consider the full impact on the future job base in the City of Camas IF the line extension was to be expanded through the LaCamas NorthShore. This would not only eliminate a multitude of jobs that will be located within our business park but the cost to acquire the Rights of Way will be considerably higher than an alternate location. Thank you for your consideration, Eleanor M. Weakley, Trustee for Fred H. Weakley Estate

Communication ID: 11674

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: JOANN THOMAS

Attached is Environmental Constraints from Clark County regarding my property which is located on route 28. Most of the property in this area is a severe erosion hazard and bedrock. This would certainly not seem to be a route that would ever be considered.

Communication ID: 11675

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: RON D CAMPOS

as a utility hopefully the citizens opinion is of value and not just the generation of profits. I am a resident of the area that the line 31 is an option and i am vehemently opposed to this action. there is plenty of open space that can be utilized perhaps at a higher cost but not at the expense of the residents. My intention is to retire in my home and not have to sell it due to these overhead wires that I am fearful of

and convinced are unhealthy and an impairment to my property value. sincerely Ron Campos

Communication ID: 11677

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: REBECCA M. LAWSON

Please have your environmental studies look at:

plant & animal habitat - segment #31 - negatively impacted geologic & seismic erosion hazards in Segment #31 are a health risks to people living so near these lines!!

I am very concerned with segment #31. I feel this segment cuts right through our community & poses great health risks. Also dramatically impacts - negatively - property values in our area. Could an alternate route be used that does not have such social & community impact? These lines would be good in the eastern areas with less impact on established communities! Or perhaps on the already existing line - could it be upgraded?

No to Segment #31

Communication ID: 11678

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: JULIE BERGE,FRANK BERGE

There are a lot of wetland area to consider. We have on our land a pond, creek, and low area that supports: ducks, trout, geese, and other woods animals. The area is park like and these lines and poles are going to wreck the beauty.

I have lived on this property 45 years and had hoped to raise grandkids, but the electromagnetic field will be too close and will cause health matters. Our property value is going to plummet. Even if we wanted to move now we won't be able to. No one wants to live in the shadow of these lines. Please consider a line location east where less people and homes are affected Hockinson with never be the same if this happens.

Communication ID: 11679

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: SUSAN LEMOS

When deciding where to place the new power lines, please consider the amount of homes and people that will be displaced. I live where the proposed lines would be in my back yard about 100 feet from my back deck. This would destroy my mature timber as well as the mature landscaping. From my deck I see

wildlife like, deer, bobcats, bear, raccoons, skunk, to mention the most common. Placing the 150 foot tall power lines on my property and in my back yard would not only destroy the wildlife, but cause possible harm to my children. Thank you for considering another option other than placing lines on section 31. Susan Lemos

Communication ID: 11680

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: JANE HALL, RONALD HALL

We pray you make the right decision about protecting our children. You are proposing a 500 KVT line through the community of Hockinson. If you had ever experienced the suffering of a child with leukemia you would certainly reconsider this proposed route where so many young children could be affected. The suffering a child must endure with this hideous cancer is indescribable.

There are research studies which contradict studies done by the large power companies about the medical effects to children and adults from exposure to EMF. Why take a chance on our children when a more easterly route is so much more sensible. A total right-of-way of only 150 ft for a 500KVolt line ignores newer and more independent studies in California, Australia and Britain that document two to fivefold increases in blood cancer rates for children and adults with long-term residential exposures to electromagnetic fields within 900 feet of the edge of large power lines.

We have an unbelievable beautiful community. We have abundant wildlife. We particularly love seeing the migrating geese fly over. We have two ponds in our area for them to land. Last week a neighbor saw a black bear. I have had deer in our yard and hear coyotes at night.

We appreciate the fact that more power will be needed but why ruin a community like ours. The towers are so high that they will be seen by most of our community. Home values, of course, will plummet and sale of homes would be nearly impossible. Should residents let their homes go into foreclosure? Please don't make us wait two years for your decision. We strongly recommend the most easterly route.

Communication ID: 11681

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: MELINDA NUTE

To Whom it May Concern:

We were notified by Bonneville Power about a proposed line that would run through our property. We live [Address], Battle Ground, which proposed line 3 I runs through. Our property is 3/4 of an acre right on Salmon Creek. It looks as though if this route were chosen we would be forced to move. Our property

is not wide enough to have enough of a buffer zone.

I am very concerned about being forced out of our family home. Our family has made many sacrifices and worked very hard to be able to live in this rural area. Our home was a bank repo in 2005 and we have spent all of our free time since fixing it up. The possibility of losing it has caused us a great deal of stress. We planned to raise our family and retire here. There is abundant wildlife in the area including beaver, salmon, deer, coyotes, and bear.

I understand the importance of the lines and I am sure that nobody wants them in their back yard. That said, I think that all options need to be considered. The proposed area east of 31 runs through government property and is not as populated. There are so many hard working families that will be effected in one way or another. In our case, we are now self employed and probably wouldn't be able to get another mortgage. It would be a significant hardship for us. I know that these are not things you would normally consider when planning this project, but I hope you will look at the human side.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Communication ID: 11682

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: JAMES E MARKS

The I5 Corridor Project should keep to public lands, DNR lands, and Timberland Co (Fibre, Weyco) land to minimize private land owner problems.

Communication ID: 11683

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: DEAN BREMER

I think the best way is to go with underground power cable or put it on state land.

Communication ID: 11684

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: D MASON

Please have your environmental studies look at the beauty & natural setting here. We have tall Douglas Firs and native Dogwoods. There are hemlocks & cedar. We've added more native rhodies, huckleberries, snowberries, kinnickinnick and more. Many birds migrate through our lovely forested setting. We have a semi-dwarf orchard of apples, pears, and prune plums. We also grow blueberries,

raspberries & strawberries, and have 8 raised beds for our vegetables.

We've lived on our 1 wooded acre for more than 20 years. We grow a lot of our own food. We conserve and recycle and do our best to keep our carbon footprint small. This place is our investment for our future. We know someday we'll have to move into town but we're not ready yet. And there's no way we would live near towers or lines nor want to look at them from our home.

Please consider the route that already exists so that your impact is least on this community.

Thank you!

Communication ID: 11685

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: CHRIS BENJAMIN

I strongly urge that the 500 kilovolt transmission line be routed through a new route rather than existing right of ways. The critical nature of ensuring uninterrupted power to our region deems the necessity of dispersing the new line to an alternate location rather than the existing critical path route. Were a disaster, either manmade or natural to occur, wiping out all three transmission lines at once, the impact would be catastrophic. Please ensure the safety of our power supply by routing any and all new lines through areas other than existing transmission line right of ways. Thank you.

Communication ID: 11686

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: LAVERN DAHLIN

I am writing you to voice my concerns regarding the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. I am asking you to stop the construction of BPA segment #31

Any consideration of this entirely new path of 150 foot high, 500 Kilovolt towers adjacent and through our neighborhoods is irresponsible. BPA Segment #31 is a planned path running through our community of Hockinson, Washington and surrounding communities. Our Taxes are among the highest in the area.

For most of us, our homes represent our most valuable asset. Placing these towers through our neighborhood would destroy many homes, destroy the value of surrounding properties, destroy the fabric of our proud and close-knit area. This does not even mention the abundance of wild life of all kinds in this area.

Some residents may have the resources to take a heavy loss and move away. For those left in the shadow of these power lines, the razed land will bring a reminder of lost friends and community. The

social and emotional impacts will be compounded by legitimate health concerns like childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's disease, miscarriages and only God knows what else. Of course BPA will readily dismiss this. Even though the California Department of Health Services (2002) concluded that living in close proximity to Electric and Magnet Fields (EMF) increases the risk of all of the above conditions. Segment #31 traverses property owned by our public school district and a new school site. The area tax payers have invested great amounts in the development of the best school district in the area. They have planned for years to see their children educated within it. Is BPA now able to take it all away?

Segment #31 runs through areas with seismic and erosion hazards (identified in Clark Counties GIS records).

The required "notification process" is a sham. If a property borders or is within 500 feet of the potential Right-Of-Way (ROW) the owners are notified. Beyond that, it is left to the neighbors to notify each other. The narrow time period for public comment leaves community members no time to go-door-to-door. Parents must scramble and sacrifice, take time away from their families to attempt to stop a legal framework that is structured against them.

There is no doubt in our minds that, as BPA authors their own Environment Impact Assessment, this behemoth agency will tout their expertise and argue "the greater good" in their effort. But make no mistake, the Real Bottom Line is that Segment #31 represents the most direct route option for BPA with considerable construction savings. As for the people, "Where they fall, they fall".

Basically BPA wants a new route. They want More! There are other options in this north/south latitude. One simple one, is to go east (less people) on several other proposed routes. In fact a little further east would put this MONSTER through public lands, where it would inflict far less pain on far less people. It may well cost a little more momentarily, so what, we rate payers, tax payers, will end up paying for it anyway.

They will argue they need route diversity, but their existing network already has diversity. Their best options are to upgrade their Existing facilities within Existing Right-of-Way #i9 and in their northern Oregon routes between Alls ton and Keeler or St. Johns.

The health concerns, the erosion of our community fabric, the loss of tax revenue and its impact of delivery of public services are all very real issues for the hundreds of families in the area you represent.

NO Segment #31.

Sincerely,

Mr. Lavern L. Dahlin

[Address]

Communication ID: 11687

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: KATHLEEN MCKELLAR

I live in the Hockinson neighborhood in Clark County, Washington. I am writing to ask you to stop the Bonneville Power Administration from building segment #31 of their proposed 500 kilovolt power line corridor through our neighborhood. Hockinson has some of the most beautiful, pastoral scenery in this county. It is enjoyed by a large community of visitors and residents. Many homeowners have preserved their open space for farming and wildlife as opposed to selling parcels for development. These 150 foot towers will not only be a visual blight for much if not all of our area, but they also pose health risks which need further study before they are placed in proximity to communities.

The social and economic impact of this project is already being felt in this community. Anyone trying to sell their home has to disclose the possibility of this corridor whether or not it is ever built. Our neighborhood will be destroyed as the path of the lines cuts down its center. Land will be cleared, homes and out buildings removed and GIANT towers emitting electromagnetic fields will replace this neighborhood. I ask that you help us to stop BPA segment #31 and encourage them to use more modern technologies in existing high power corridors and alternative routes through less densely populated areas.

Thank you,

Kathleen McKellar

[Address]

Communication ID: 11688

Date: 11/14/2009

Name: DARIN PETO

About Route 31. Please have your environmental studies look at underground line placement. Explain why lines can't share a single corridor. Explain why the lines are sensitive to river crossing but not to destroying private lands and timber.

Surely a more reasonable route would be one that disrupts the fewest lives and provides the greatest safety. We are fortunate to live in a beautiful area where our children and grandchildren can feel safe and enjoy the outdoors and they would not be able for health reasons if these power lines run through our properties.

Communication ID: 11689

Date: 11/14/2009

Name: ERNEST PETO

About Route 31. Please have your environmental studies look at another route to minimize the number or property owners affected and put line through a more remote area.

This would cause a great hardship to so many families. We would not be able to do improvements to our properties and be in limbo for over 2 years. We would not be able to use our back pasture for grazing for our animals.

Communication ID: 11690

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: WENDY VAN DYK,RANDY VAN DYK

My most concern would be for losing my home to BPA's plan or plans. I am told by John Grover and Mark Korsness that should the plan involve the existing power line and corridor behind my house, that there is enough space existing to build a new line next to the existing line, and that my home would not be affected as to removal. For this, I am very happy and confident on their word of "non-need to assume my property." However, I agree with what they told me as to a separate big line going out east of me and then down to Troutdale would be more productive for power availability, and that the risks involved having two lines next to one another would be very significantly diminished. We think that would be the better alternative for supply sufficient future power needs.

I also think it is very important for BPA to mail out updates on this project regularly and inform all concerned openly and with frequent notification as to progress of the planning process.

Communication ID: 11691

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: HARVEY KEENE,SHERRY KEENE

Please have your environmental studies look at erosion and damage by heavy equipment to topsoil. Failure to grade and replant, conditions left that encourage growth of Scotch Broom- an invasive, non-native plant. Piles of branches left that were up to 10 feet tall and 75 feet long and we are not able to

burn them. Large rocks and boulders have been brought to the surface of the land.

Our property taxes are assessed as though we have full use of our land, but these power lines dramatically restrict development on it. Additional lines will render half our property limited to no development- can't farm it because your equipment tears up land, opens fences, has to be accessible, can't build on it. Also, the general public seems to think power line land is public property. We constantly battle trespassers, especially people driving RVs.

Communication ID: 11692

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: LINDSEY S MARTINSON

I urge you to eliminate segment 31 as a potential route. As a physician, I am aware that current knowledge regarding the health effects of these 500KV high voltage lines on humans is incomplete and largely unknown given the lack of adequate studies. Thus, logically it would be preferable to avoid exposing humans in this manner given the significant likelihood of adverse health effects. The viable alternative of placing the line through the most eastern and largely unpopulated route rather than segment 31 would avoid potential adverse health consequences with their associated future litigation costs and negative public relations exposure. Lindsey Martinson, MD

Communication ID: 11693

Date: 11/14/2009

Name: JOHN A POLOS

Dear Bonneville Power Project Manager;

I am John Polos, PE. I recently joined the public group dealing with BPA, on the I5 reinforcement issue. I sent in a couple of emails, but wanted to also send in paper versions. Since joining, we have changed our approach. Gone is the name "Citizen's Against BPA" but rather "Citizens for a Healthy Power System" (This name could change again.) Our approach will be one of working with BPA to find the best solution(s). Also, we are asking for a small extension of the Nov. 23rd deadline for comments. All of the above is explained in more detail, in the two included emails that were sent to BPA.

Communication ID: 11694

Date: 11/13/2009

Name: BARBARA FUNK,RUSSELL FUNK

Social and Economic Impact to the Community:

We are opposed to running a 500kV power line down path 31. The community along this path has grown over the years and much of the property has been divided into small residential parcels. This means that the impact of running a power line across a these parcels has a much more detrimental social and economic effect than a path run through large parcels. To make matters worse, many of the property owners along path 31 have homes and farm buildings that have been built very close to the existing 100' easement. If this easement is expanded to 150' as is being proposed, the livability and sustainability of many of these small parcels will be irreparably damaged.

Noise Levels, Human Health and Safety:

For the same reasons described above (small parcels and structures built near the easement), property owners will be exposed to the noise and negative health effects of this power line to a greater degree than if the power line were to cross large size parcels or cross forest land that isn't near human habitation.

In Conclusion:

We would like to request that BPA consider running this power line further to the east through forest land to minimize the impacts to home and farm owners.

Communication ID: 11695

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: KAREN LARSON

This area, like much of north Clark County, is some of the last remaining functioning wildlife habitat in the populated areas. We and our neighbors are part of a timbered riparian habitat centered around numerous tributaries of Yacolt Creek. Much of the area has numerous springs, creating seasonal wetlands and boggy soil.

I find it hard to believe BPA would propose to route a line of this size through heavily populated areas of Clark County. My area (route 27) consists mainly of small acreage parcels where families would be devastated by the impact of such a project. Given the high population of members of the apostolic faith in these communities, there is most likely a higher percentage of children per square mile than any other area of the state. The potential negative health effects of EMF's on children and pregnant women could expose BPA to years of ongoing liability if it willfully chooses to disregard these hazards in determining placement of a high voltage line.

If it is not possible to upgrade the existing line and corridor, surely BPA could route the new line in areas causing the least impact to homeowners and families by placing it on large uninhabited parcels to the greatest extent possible.

Moreover, it is reprehensible that BPA feels it is acceptable to leave thousands of people with uncertainty about the future of their homes and property for 2+ years. Homes and parcels within the routes will not get sold, new construction will come to a halt, and improvements will not be made as the public speculates about the future location of this line. This community is already in economic decline and this uncertainty is sure to cause further upheaval. Please consider eliminating as many routes as possible as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Karen E. Larson

Communication ID: 11696

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: LAINE D SEVERSON

I oppose the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project being placed in my neighborhood. Why not use the DNR land which there would not be inhabited properties and school issues. My daughter is epileptic and multidisabled, the exposure to the magnetic field is a health risk to her and others with medical conditions.

Communication ID: 11697

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: LESLIE KRAKE

I am a Hockinson WA resident. I am concerned about the scope of the I5 corridor reinforcement project, and how it will negatively affect our community. We have strict building regulations because we are part of the Yacolt Burn area. I fail to understand how placing a power line of the magnitude you propose would be safe or beneficial to our town. The loss of our unspoiled vistas and property values would be devastating, especially at this time when people are already reeling from diminished values. The fact that you are doing this study with no decision for over 2 years during a time when the housing market is already in a depressed state seems cruel. The suspected health impacts are another reason to not put this power line anywhere near residences. There should be a better way to transmit power to those who need it, without such a negative impact on those who are not going to benefit from it.

Communication ID: 11698

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: DAVID R MILLER

My home is less than half a mile from proposed route #31. Route #31 will displace hundreds of homeowners and decimate property values of thousands in the Hockinson area. The scenic forests and natural beauty of the area will be destroyed by 100 foot high towers and a clearcut corridor. Route #31 may be the shortest route, but ALTERNATIVE ROUTES TO THE EAST WOULD AFFECT FAR LESS HOMEOWNERS SINCE THEY ARE ON DNR LAND. Existing right of ways in Segment #9 and northern Oregon routes between Allston and Keeler could be upgraded. Isn't the sensible solution to not decimate established neighborhoods like Hockinson?

Communication ID: 11699

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: FLORIAN DEISENHOFER,DANIELLE MCFADDEN

To Whom It May Concern,

We are writing as concerned parents of two children, ages 1 and 3, and as citizens of our community. We live in Hockinson, Washington, part of Clark County. The proposed high voltage line segment #31 with 150' towers and 500 KV voltage would run only a few hundred feet from our house. Siting such a huge line through our neighborhood greatly concerns us on several fronts. The most important issues for us are:

Health Concerns

Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMFs) have known health effects on humans, in particular on small children. Studies have shown increased risks of childhood leukemia, adult lymph cancer, Alzheimer, Lou Gehrig's disease and miscarriage. An independent Australian study published in 2007 in the peer reviewed journal "Internal Medicine Journal" found that within 328 yards of lines sized from 88 to 220 KV risk of cancer increased five-fold in children age 0 to 5 and that it increased adult cancer three-fold when exposed at ages of 0-15 years.

Studies looking at health impacts are generally based on voltages of 88-400 KV. The proposed Reinforcement Project would carry 500 KV. Health impacts are likely considerable more severe and far reaching than previous studies have shown and the voltages are tremendously higher than in the cited Australian study.

Aesthetics

The high voltage lines not only raise health concerns but would also lower the quality of life as we know it. The proposed 150-foot towers would have severe impacts on the scenic beauty of our neighborhood

and the greater area. Segment #31 is a highly visible corridor that would not only disrupt the views and scenic beauty for the people who live along it but would also impact the views of the greater Vancouver and Portland area. When looking towards the mountains (east) from most locations in Clark County as well as North Portland (i.e. St. John's Bridge), the corridor would be highly visible and disrupt the scenic beauty of the entire area.

Property Values

As a result of the proximity to power lines, property values are decreased without any compensation. Like most middle income families, most of our net worth is in our home. Without compensation, home owners within close proximity to the proposed power lines are asked to bear the social cost of the improved electric network for the greater good. There should be no disproportionate burden.

Invasive Species

As a professional forest scientist, I know that right-of-ways, in particular power line right-of-ways are notorious for the invasion of noxious weeds and exotic and invasive species such as Himalayan blackberry, scotch broom and Japanese knotweed. Invasive species not only contribute to the poor aesthetics of power line right-of-ways, they also create additional impacts to homeowners in the vicinity and to native plants and animals. Due to the rural setting of Hockinson and Brush Prairie, the impact of a power line corridor would be significantly higher than in a forestry setting, where trees are managed on longer time horizons with less frequent disturbances and therefore less opportunity for invasive species to expand.

Land Use, Plants and Animals, Riparian Areas

Although a power line right-of-way will impact plants and animals wherever it is created, the impact of Segment #31 seems considerably higher than the alternatives to the east. Segment #31 cuts through some of the last native, valley fringe forests and through agricultural land with many options for land use. Alternatives to the east are in higher elevations, on less productive soils with mostly forestry use.

Segment #31 would cross many fish-bearing, east-to-west running streams or important tributaries to fish streams including Lacamas Creek, Shangai Creek, Fifth Plain Creek, Morgan Creek, Rock Creek and Salmon Creek. The proposed routes to the east appear to be located mostly on ridges, avoiding frequent crossings of water resources.

Alternatives for Consideration

Due to the outlined concerns, we urge the BPA I-5 Reinforcement Project to consider other alternatives:

1. Maximum use of existing lines
2. Modernizing the transmission and distribution concept and its existing line sizes
3. Bury lines in populated areas

If the BPA forges ahead with the I-5 Reinforcement Project, the proposed alternatives to the east appear to have a much smaller social and environmental impact than Segment #31. The segments to the east are mainly on forested lands, public lands, with considerably less impacts to human health and welfare. The lines would be aesthetically less damaging as they would not be seen from greater Clark County and the Portland area, the land is generally considerably less productive and the prudent location of the lines could also avoid or minimize impacts to water and other sensitive resources.

Thank you for considering our comments.

Communication ID: 11700

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: LORI L ANDERSON-BENSON

I am awe struck at the thought of huge power transmission lines running through Battleground, Hockinson and Camas. This is a huge mistake on the part of the BPA. The towns will be greatly affected, the homes will lose much of their value. I live in a large (122) home subdivision that will boarder the power lines and it will greatly diminish the value of our homes. We bought in Hockinson for the clean, quiet lifestyle, great schools, and wildlife. Had we known that in a few years, huge power transmission lines would be tearing up the landscape and creating possible health problems, we would never have bought here. We, along with many other families have a lot invested in the community, schools and property in this area. Our life savings is invested in land here. How can you choose to run these lines through towns and communities when you can move them 5 miles over into DNR land that would not disturb 1/1000th of the people? It makes no sense to me. And the fact that we have learned of this through word of mouth seems beyond the realm of reality! There was no mention of this until Oct. 13th, 2009 but I have found out that the plans have been in the works for years. I am a realtor and have sold hundreds of homes in the areas that are going to be affected by these lines. I have had past clients calling me and telling me that I should have known about these lines, that they will not only ruin their properties, but the health consequences alone will be devastating. I urge you to strongly rethink what you are doing to this community in SW Washington. Please, make a good decision that will enhance the livability of SW Washington, not destroy it.

Communication ID: 11701

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: MIKE SPIVY, MEREDITH SPIVY

Re: BPA Segment #31 (OPPOSED)

I am writing to you today to ask that you not continue with the efforts on BPA segment 31.

This project brings a completely new power line path to the area - and not just small poles, but 150 foot

tall, 500 kilovolt towers. These lines will run through an area of private homes, farm land and possibly the most disturbing aspect is that it will be less than a mile from our community's ONLY primary school meaning that every child in the community will spend a several years of their lives sitting at desks very near these high voltage lines. The health risks of this have not been evaluated and I suspect you would not allow your own children to spend their days at a school knowing this to be the case.

So you tell me that the school may need to look at building another facility....well, that's a great idea, but the proposed power lines run directly through the middle of the land that Hockinson School District purchased years back for this very reason. So not only will the power lines run very close to the school that all our children sit inside of, it also will run right through the middle of the land that was intended for future school development -likely rendering it virtually un-useable.

Aside from the health risks of living near, attending school near, going to church near and doing the various functions of our daily lives near untested power lines there are other impacts to our community that you need to consider strongly.

- The visual impact of these towers/lines is extremely detrimental to our community. This is largely a rural community that prides itself in open spaces for farmlands and many acres of forested land surrounding homes. Both of those areas (and lots of watershed areas) will be destroyed by the completion of this project.
- Many houses will have to be destroyed in this area which will bring to an end the many years that some of these people have lived on the same plot of land. Some of those homesteads dating back to the early days of Washington State's history, no doubt - you do recall a couple of gentlemen named Lewis and Clark that came to this part of the country quite a few years back. Hockinson is not a newly built community
- Another result of removing all those houses (I've heard estimates of needing to condemn more than 1,000 homes and associated property... not to mention the proximity to our community's ONLY primary school) is that we are going to lose the property tax revenue base from all this land. You may not be considering that not only are you going to uproot thousands of people from their land and homes, but those same people are no longer going to be paying property taxes on that land. As a result either we suffer with that loss of property tax (which also directly impacts our schools funding) or everyone else has to pick up the burden of a higher tax amount to offset that loss.
- What is the cost going to be to purchase all this land? I don't have a figure on that, but can't imagine you getting away for under \$20million dollars (1,000 homes at \$200,000 each),which seems like a steep price to pay just to start the project.
- The last item I want to point out here is that you have other options. Not completing Segment 31 doesn't mean that the project stops....it just means you move the lines to an area that doesn't affect so many families, so much precious open space and forest, and our communities ONLY primary school. The option exists to put these towers/lines through public lands to the east using segments32-34. Or, even better, why not spend the time and resources to upgrade the existing lines in Segment 9?? The health

concerns are significant to this community. The loss of aesthetic value is significant as are the loss of many people's homes, and the county's loss of property tax revenues. And for what benefit where is this additional power being demanded from? Is this power generation being demanded to keep the lights on in this community or even this county and state....or is the additional demand coming from the desire to sell the new supply of power to other states? I suspect very strongly that the desire for selling the supply to other states is a key driver here...so why ruin my community to do that - use the public land to our east (Segments 32-34) for this purpose and do not uproot the many families in this community that would be affected by these lines. I'm asking that you support the Hockinson Community and not allow 150 foot tall, 500 kilovolt towers to run through our area. Either upgrade Segment 9 or use the public land to our east (Segments 32-34) to build in this new power supply. Hockinson doesn't want it!

Mike and Meredith Spivy (plus two kids - 8yrs old and 9 yrs old)

[Address]

Communication ID: 11702

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: BRUCE F VANDERPLOEG,CAROL VANDERPLOEG

Bonneville Power Administration I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

PO Box 9250

Portland, OR

Bruce & Carol VanderPloeg

[address]

[phone]

This letter is being written to express strong opposition to using routes 31, 37 & 38 for construction of this project. Construction on these routes would destroy our Tranquavilla Neighborhood. Several of the homes in this neighborhood would possibly require condemnation, and value of the remaining homes would plummet. Additionally, construction activity uphill of our property on the steep slopes of Green Mountain would probably cause severe environmental impact - erosion and landslides. Water quality may also be affected. We would think that using the Eastern alternative would have much less impact on the residents of Clark County. Or, better yet, why not cross the Columbia River closer to Longview and tie into the Oregon power grid where the Trojan Power Plant was located At your earliest convenience, we would appreciate hearing that you have ruled out routes 31, 37 or 38 for consideration. Hopefully, you could tell us this in the next year.

Regards, Bruce & Carol VanderPloeg

11/18/2009

Communication ID: 11703

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: MARITES CASTRO

US Senator Maria Cantwell

Dear Senator:

This is to inform you that we are opposed to the proposed BPA Link #31 in our neighborhood. It is not good for our health or the environment. Our neighborhood is a subdivision of two and ½ to 5 acres homes surrounded by beautiful nature. It is called Black Hawk Estate.

There's wildlife like raccoons, deer, bears, hawks, owls etc. in our area which will also be affected by the BPA Line.

Battle Ground is a small town and it needs to preserve its natural and beautiful surrounding.

Please help us to stop BPA Line #31.

Sincerely,

Marites Castro

Communication ID: 11704

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: GARY BUTLER,JULIANA G BUTLER

Sir or Madam,

We would like it to be known that we do NOT want the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project to come through the section labeled 31 on your public map (and section #85 on your individual maps).

We believe it would not only devalue our personal property, but affect the natural beauty of the area that we call home, The destruction of public property and the homes of many wildlife species would create a negative impact on our area of the county.

The changing landscape would cause undue erosion to an already fragile area. Winter storms create raging rivers in current low flowing streams, The destruction of the natural surrounding areas would impact the salmon runs, the summer deer meadows and winter grazing sites for all animals. With the

ebb and flow of ground waters we do not see how this could possibly support massive metal structures that would most likely shift not only with a frost heave effect, but with the intense wind storms we regularly have.

Putting in new roads for your project would negatively impact our life's long desire for peace, quiet and solitude. We do not want additional traffic in our county neighborhoods. Looking at and having a humming tower near ones home is not our idea of living side by side with nature. We have spent years working on our current tree farm and have anticipated many years of quiet for the future. We cannot imagine, sipping lemonade or a glass of wine, staring at high metal towers from our deck. The constant hum from towers is not only destructive to wildlife, (similar to the wind turbines that have caused loss of life to eagles and hawks) but to the human population as well. Medical studies have shown exposure to high voltage wires increases the risk of cancer and other chronic disorders.

Currently we can find no benefit of your project for our community, I am sure that BPA employees would not want an unsightly, unsafe tower near their homes.

Please do NOT place the towers anywhere near our neighbors or our property, We are speaking to you also, for the wildlife that does not have someone to speak for them.

Thank you,

Gary and Juliana Butler

Communication ID: 11705

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: ROGER J COLBY

Please locate these transmission lines alongside existing lines. We do not need to clutter our woods, lakes, streams and neighborhoods with unsightly infrastructure. We have grown used to the existing facilities so beefing up those routes seems the most logical route. I for one will be joining any pushback on newly proposed routes. Considering the power of the BPA (no pun intended, I do not imagine this is a big concern. I do believe that people like myself, that is people who have never been that involved in activism, will come out in droves. You are attempting to put 15 story towers as a backdrop to peoples homes. It will not go unnoticed.

Communication ID: 11706

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: CLIFF KELLEY

I would like to state that I do not wish to raise my family near a high voltage power line. Please use the route that is further from populated areas. Thank you, Cliff Kelley.

Communication ID: 11707

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: CHRISTINE A PIENKOWSKI

Please consider a less environmentally invasive alternative to the high power line corridor through the Crawford/Heisson area of unincorporated Clark County. This project will effect the environment, wild life, health of individuals who live nearby and property values. Sincerely, Christine Pienkowski

Communication ID: 11708

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: JENNIFER BROWN,RICHARD BROWN

Re: Proposed BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

I am writing as a concerned citizen for my family, community and county at large. I live in Hockinson, WA part of Clark County. I was informed a few weeks ago that BPA has proposed a high voltage, 150-foot tower power line right through my neighborhood (Segment #31). We were NOT notified of this proposed project via mail because our property line is only 5 blocks from the easement. Therefore, this proposal not only affects the 8000+ properties within the easement boundaries, but many others who border it.

Each property owner has invested their life savings into homes and property that will be taken away or greatly depreciated. In addition, with the construction of these lines, a significant decrease in the tax base for the community schools and other Clark county governmental services will occur (fire and sheriff).

These 150-foot high, 500 kilovolt towers will become a part of my children's play yard and segment line #31 runs right through property that is a proposed new Hockinson school site. In 2002, the California Department of Health Services performed a study that concluded that living in close proximity to electric and magnetic fields (EMF) can cause an increase risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's disease and miscarriage. Having these lines over a school site can certainly affect the children in our community. So both adults and children's health are affected which adds up to a lot of citizens.

Additionally, the Clark County GIS property website has identified Segment #31 ROW parcels as having geological, seismic and erosion hazard areas.

There are other options east of Segment #31, than run north/south and go through public forested land. If BPA used segments 28-30 or 32-34 not as many individual's lives will be disrupted or their health

threatened. These may not be the cheapest routes, but they do not affect as many individuals health, property values and living conditions. I am asking for your support to prevent BPA Segment #31 to be used as a viable path for the high voltage power lines. Please support us and our community.

NO BPA Segment #31.

Thank you,

Richard and Jennifer Brown

[Address]

Communication ID: 11709

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: PATRICK ALLEN

My home is on one of the proposed routes. The only thing that I personally have a problem with is the time frame of the project. I do feel that PBA should be pushing this a little faster than the two years proposed. It does put a hold on home projects, weather or not to stay, and the possibility of lowering home values more than they already are. My personal opinion is this needs to happen and I know some people are uppset and it seems more from the people on the East side than the straight route up 15. Maybe you should narrow this down sooner than later and come up with a proposal ASAP to the families this will affect and get the ball rolling. The sooner people know what will happen to their home the better they can plan for the future. Maybe you should think about that.

Communication ID: 11710

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: KELLY D JACKMAN

My name is Kelly Jackman and I live close to the proposed route 31. I was not notified at all concerning this project and I live only 600 ft from the proposed transmission lines. I would like more information concerning this project with a more detailed map so I can see exactly where the lines will end up. I also ask that you consider extending the deadline for comments because most people have no idea about the project and how it affects them. I would also hope you consider relocating the transmission lines to a better location that affects less homeowners than the proposed route 31 which transverses throught too many residential areas. I am very concerned that this project will affect my property values and I cannot afford to move and do not wish to move. Seems to me that there is a better route that would be more remote that would affect less hownowners. PLEASE EXTEND THE DEADLINE!

Communication ID: 11711

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: RHONDA PALMER

I am writing you to voice my concerns regarding the Bonneville Power Authority (BPA) I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. I am asking you to stop the construction of BPA Segment #31.

Any consideration of this entirely new path of 150-foot high, 500 Kilovolt towers adjacent and through our neighborhoods is irresponsible. BPA Segment #31 is a planned path running through our community of Hockinson,

Washington. Hockinson community taxes are among the highest in the area.

For many of us, our homes represent our most valuable asset. Placing these towers through our neighborhood would destroy many homes, destroy the value of surrounding properties and destroy the fabric of our proud and close-knit area.

Some residents may have the resources to take a loss and move away. For those left in shadow of these towers, the razed land will bring a constant reminder of lost friends and lost community. The social and emotional impacts of will be compounded by the legitimate health concerns that BPA will readily dismiss.

The California Department of Health Services (2002) concluded that living in close proximity to Electric and

Magnetic Fields (EMF) can cause increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease and miscarriage.

Segment #31 traverses property owned by our public school district and a new school site. Hockinson families & taxpayers have invested great amounts in the development of the best school district in the area. They have planned for years to see their children educated within it. Is BPA now able to take that away?

Segment #31 runs through areas with geologic seismic and erosion hazards (identified in Clark Counties GIS records.)

The required "notification process" is a sham. If a property borders or is within 500 feet of the potential Right-of-Way (ROW) the owners are notified. Beyond that, it is left to the neighbors to notify each other. The narrow time period for public comment leaves community members no time to go-door to-door. Parents must scramble and sacrifice, take time away from their families to attempt to stop a legal framework that is structured against them.

There is no doubt that, as BPA authors their own Environment Impact Assessment, this behemoth agency will tout their expertise and argue "the greater good" in their effort. But make no mistake, the

Real Bottom Line is that Segment #31 represents the most direct route option for BPA with considerable construction savings.

Basically BPA wants a new route. They want more! There are other options in this north/south latitude. One is through public lands to the east using segments 28-30 & 32-34.

They will argue they need route diversity, but their existing network already has diversity. Their best options are to upgrade their Existing facilities within Existing Right-of-Way in Segment #9 and in their northern Oregon routes between Allston and Keeler or St. Johns.

The health concerns, the erosion of our community fabric, the loss of tax revenue and its impact of delivery of public services are all very real issue for the hundreds of families in the area you represent.

As our elected representative we look to you to support us and fight for us!

No BPA Segment #31.

Please halt (31) immediately along this route and keep our children safe.

Sincerely,

Rhonda Palmer

Communication ID: 11712

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: MIKE SULLIVAN

I'm a homeowner that has been notified my home/property is in a potential route of the new transmission lines. While I think the reinforcement of the grid is probably necessary to continue to provide uninterrupted electrical service in this area, I believe property owners should be fairly compensated for giving up their property to condemnation. I have lived in my home 22 years and have no issue giving it up in the name of progress provided I am treated fairly. We pay taxes based on an assessed value and I believe the compensation should be at a minimum the assessed value if not more for the disruption to our lives. The government has been known to lowball properties and leave the property owner feeling they were just bent over for the good of the public. Well, if it's good for the public then let the public share in my pain. The fact that this whole process is going to take 2 years just doesn't seem right. We are now stuck in properties that we cannot sell without disclosing this condition. This in itself is a burden on the homeowners affected. We can no longer make long term plans until this is resolved. On the whole, a very unfair situation.

Communication ID: 11713

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: TOM G MCLEOD

I understand the need to update energy needs, but using segment 31 would be detrimental to thousands of people. I propose underground, preferable, or a more eastern route. Also putting us in limbo for 2-3 years while you make a decision will be very costly real estate wise for those of us who would like to sell our property, and of course even worse if you choose this route. Health issues from EMF are also a very real concern, please do not put us at risk!

Communication ID: 11714

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: KRISTEN M ANDERSON

November 18, 2009

To Whom It May Concern:

My husband and I just purchased our first home on 206th Ave in Battle Ground, in September of this year, after an exhaustive, year-long search for the perfect home. On November 15 we learned of the Route 31 proposal. Rest assured we would not have purchased this particular piece of property had we known about the Route 31 proposal.

We purchased this property as our permanent residence, not an investment, a place to raise our 4 kids with our 3 horses. Our intent is to raise a few cows for beef, as well as chickens and an organic vegetable garden. This is our "American dream". We were devastated to learn of this plan for maximum capacity power lines so close to our home.

The information we received stated that BPA has no knowledge of health risks associated with living in proximity to these high voltage lines, but do they have knowledge that there definitely are none? How can families in our community feel safe living under that exposure, let alone eating from crops and livestock grown under such exposure? Our youngest daughter is autistic. There is no known cause for her condition, and there is no "cure". She has made great strides in school and is thriving in our new environment. Can BPA, in good conscience, expose children to possible serious health conditions, especially when there are alternative routes that can be taken?

The constant electrical noise is another concern. People living in our area live there to escape the constant noise of the city. It's peaceful out here. It's relaxing, soothing. The quality of life is better, that's why we chose to move off the beaten path. It takes a little longer to get where we're going, but it's worth it. We don't want the constant buzz and crackle of 500,000 kilowatts traveling overhead.

It is my understanding that there are alternate routes, that already exist, that are capable of carrying these wires. Please consider the thousands of people this will affect; the loss of property and property

value, the potential health dangers, and the loss of quality of life that Route 31 creates. There are other options, please utilize them.

Sincerely,

Kristen Anderson

[address]

Communication ID: 11715

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: KRISTEN M MCHENRY,JEFF D MCHENRY

Hello my name is [names]. I live on 212th Avenue in Battle Ground, WA (proposed route #31). We purchased our dream property 9 years ago and built the home we planned to raise our family in. We chose our property because of the location. We were aware of an old easement that Pacific Power had in place on 212th Avenue. We were told at the time that it was too small for large lines to run across and that easement would likely never be used even for smaller lines. We have learned in the last month that the BPA could take our land or diminish its' value and create an unsafe environment for my family. As a parent of small children I would be forced to move (and lose a large chunk of my investment as values will drop dramatically) if my house is spared. How could I stay here with the knowledge that the lines could possibly harm my children. There have not been enough studies to assure me that my family is safe. This line will harm our community. Friends will be forced to move and our children will be uprooted from their schools. This line will not harm just a few it will change the entire area. I hope that you will consider a route that will create less impact our community. It is also very sad that you believe it is OK to allow thousands of people to live in "limbo" as you make these decisions. For the next 18 months we will not make improvements to our home as we had planned as it may not be a wise investment. This alone will have an impact on an already economically hard hit community. Please choose another route. DNR land is available to our east and I do hope that you will look at this option. I wake up every morning with this on my mind and go to sleep every night thinking about our future here.

Communication ID: 11716

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: LEESE YARBOURGH

There are several species of tree frogs that inhabit our property year around. Although the creek on our property is not a year around creek the frogs survive. I feel the electro-magnetic fields (EMF) created by high voltage power transmission lines will kill the frogs and other sensitive wildlife here. I am also very concerned about the large number of trees a power transmission line would destroy. We are in a high air quality neighborhood. Removing the thousands of trees for Route # 31 would adversely affect our

uality of life and that of all of Clark County.

I spoke with BPA's Richard Stearns at your public meeting at Clark College a week ago. I was astounded he is the ONLY BPA employee charged with meeting the public's concerns about the health aspects of EMF's. Further, Mr. Stearns said "There is no credible evidence which can be put forth proving the safety of the public exposed to EMF's produced by power transmission lines. \$300,000,000 and over 7 years were spent by the U.S. government to confirm the safety of the public when exposed to EMF's from power lines. No credible evidence was found to confirm the public's safety." I don't want this power

line in my neighborhood. I believe it will be a health hazard to my family. I know it would adversely affect the re-sale value of my property. Further this "Corridor Reinforcement Project" would allow private real estate developers to profit at the expense of the health and property values of my neighborhood. There is already a right of way along I-5 that could be used for this project -- 300 feet I believe. Use that instead.

Communication ID: 11717

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: JIM POPHAM,NANCY E POPHAM

ROUTE 31 will pass directly adjacent to our property. It will be visible to us. I am not in favor of being exposed to high voltage power lines, not do I wish it upon my neighborhood. It is a rural area with many related families settled next to each other. The property has been in the family for generations. Our son and his family live two houses away from us and very close to the proposed route 31. They have a 2 year old son and 2 month old daughter. They have 2 acres that no longer may be safe for the children. It seems better to put this transmission line in a forested area. East of us is Camp Bonneville and the Gifford Pinchot Natl forest. Camp Bonneville is not fit to develop for housing....seems like it could facilitate a power line. It would save many families from relocation. Thank you for your consideration of my opinion. Please do not choose Route 31! Jim and Nancy Popham

Communication ID: 11718

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: DAVID DAWSON

The proposed power transmission lines through Hockinson and surrounding areas (Route 31), directly affect hundreds of families, and poses health risks and reduced values for thousands of other families. Specifically health affects are lymph node cancer and increased risk of childhood leukemia (this does not include the high stress thousands of people are going through as a result of your proposal.) There are other less populated possible routes either along the oregon side of the river, or far eastern route

through state forest land past Larch Mountain, which will affect the quality of life for many less individuals. Better yet, keep it with existing lines. There is no coherent reason to put this through neighborhoods, school lands, and next to thousands of homes. It's a visual nightmare, destroys communities, affecting health and financial standing through reduced values. Please remove from consideration route 31. Sincerely, Dave Dawson

Communication ID: 11719

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: RICHARD D BEMM

This will be a major project with implications that are going to be viewed as negatively impacting the quality of life for many citizens. There are others though who are going to see this as an opportunity to enhance the quality of life for many citizens. If the BPA is going to garnish much support for this project they will need to develop as many beneficial factors as possible. My purpose for writing is to offer a request that will be viewed by most as a regional benefit. This will be a perfect opportunity to include in the corridor a multi use, non motorized trail system. This would be a tremendous asset for safe recreational and commuter travel. It opens an opportunity for horse, bicycle, rollerblade, and foot traffic. It would add an opportunity for enhancing healthy lifestyles and decrease our dependency on motor vehicles. My request is that you give this option serious consideration. Similar projects have proven to be extremely beneficial to the communities they serve. Thank you for your consideration.

Communication ID: 11720

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: JIM HILL

Please have your environmental studies look at the Rock Creek watershed for salmon habitat. The proposed power line of route 31 (ne 212th ave) would have a negative impact through out of control run-off and soil erosion. The strip of deforested area would offer little resistance during the heavy rain and/or snow conditions of the winter and spring season as the soil is shallow over much rock and boulders as well as layers of lava strata. The road gains over 400 feet in elevation over a short distance creating wayward streams thus being identified by the local people as "spring-hill road". The Clark County land management has worked very hard for the past number of years to achieve a balance for this area. This project would destroy all that has been accomplished. Other comments: Clark County would be devastated economically as to the number of land owners affected by your proposals. The displacement and loss in property acreage, property value, need for additional roads, water and sewer lines to accommodate would take years to straighten out legally and logistically.

Communication ID: 11721

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: DEBBIE N HOZACK,ROBERT HOZACK

Our home lies in proposed Segment 31. Our backyard backs up against the existing BPA transmission lines in section 37. We have lived in this home for 21 years. This neighborhood is unique with its country setting, animal and plant life, and the great aesthetic appeal that made us decide to move here to raise our family so many years ago. Green Mountain is behind our home and our property is part of existing section 37. We are concerned with soil erosion if work was to be done on the land. We are AGAINST the taking of our homes in this most unique of neighborhoods in Vancouver!

Communication ID: 11722

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: KARLENE MCKIBBEN,WILSON MCKIBBEN

Our house is within your proposed line buffer area; yet we were not notified and would have attended one of the meetings. The scoping meeting summaries were very disappointing in that they were regurgitations of the first one without any detail other than mentioning differed segments. What were the questions and more importantly what were your answers. What were the health questions and what were your answers? Or was there no one from your agency that could answer questions? Our preference, of course, would be that the transmission lines impact as few property owners as possible by using the most eastern route.

Communication ID: 11723

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: LETTIE RIOS

1. I am concerned about Electro Magnetic Frequency Health effect.
2. Concerned about ongoing noise from transmission line operation.
3. Concerned the construction will come too close to the house.
4. Loss in value in the home
5. NEAR retirement- may have to work longer because of this.
6. Could affect standard of living
7. Relocation concerns- at my age (67 yrs)

I would like to know, when you know, whether my location has been declined or is one that you're still,

likely, to be accepted. I am at the back of Covington Middle School on [Address].

Communication ID: 11724

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: CANDICE D ANDERSON

I have sat down to write this many times since I first received my letter informing me of the I-5 corridor project. I have tried to figure out how I can put down in words how this may impact me and the thousands of other people that are faced with this information. How can I possibly convey to you the anger, sadness and frustration of having to wait for over 2 years while someone else decides if the home and property you have dreamt of your entire life, will be taken away from you, or defaced, or devalued. The plans for home improvements halted. If the landscape, wildlife, waterways, trees and peaceful way of life will be forever altered. The simple fact is that it can not be properly expressed. I live in your map area 26. I urge you to consider alternate routes that will not impact the thousands of families that the proposed routes will.

Communication ID: 11725

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: TIM M STIEF

Put the transmission lines in the ground. I am sure this would cost more, but would impact the environment much less. Not to mention the health issues involved.

Communication ID: 11726

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: STEVEN D ANGLIN

10/30/09

U.S. Dept. of Energy

BPA

Re: I5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

My wife, [Name] and I own 3.7 acres on [Address] in Castle Rock, WA, on which our home is located, our children were raised, and we keep livestock. This is our property, which is dear and sacred to us. DO NOT trespass on our property to do anything. DO NOT build more power lines or power stations. We are

completely against this project, as it is bad for the environment and robs the security of property from citizens. We citizens of Washington do not need more power. We live within our means, as Californians, Oregonians and all citizens must do, particularly if we are to save earth's environment. Our family will fight against this project all the way.

CANCEL THIS PROJECT

DO NOT TRESSPASS

DO NOT STEAL PROPERTY FROM CITIZENS

Sincerely,

[Name]

Communication ID: 11727

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: HALY R LEWIS

Please choose a different route for your 150 ft tall transmission lines. Segment 31 is a terrible choice. It runs through a beautiful community, next to our school, through land set aside for school expansion and will cause our property values to plummet. Hockinson is such a lovely place. We've made it our home and this community embraced us. We're very close knit and we cannot let this happen. I realize that going farther east, in a more rural area, will cost the BPA more money but it is SOOOOOO worth it. Thanks! Haly Lewis

Communication ID: 11728

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: ROBERT WASHA,JOANN WASHA

Please address these issues in the path 31 alternative:

Visual Pollution Damage

We currently look out our windows and see 100' established fir trees in all four directions. Our house is at the top of the ridge and we look out and see beautiful Mt. St. Helens. Cutting down trees will cause irreparable visual damage, and drastically lower property values. Who would want to purchase a house at the price we paid to have it custom built, only to see a 150' swath of bare dirt outside their kitchen and bedroom windows? How is property owners compensated for this loss of home value?

Engineering should plan on an underground installation of the line from 259th Street & 212th Ave thru and beyond 281st street & 212th Ave; from the bottom of the hill and over the top of the hill to

eliminate this damage. Carefully take out only those trees to allow for the trench to bury the cables.

Noise Pollution Damage

Our property is situated at 1000'. It is common to be fogged in, cloudy, misty, rainy – even when the weather in downtown Battle Ground situated at the lower elevation levels are sunny.

High voltage power lines are known to create noise – buzzing and snapping noises – especially under wet weather conditions. It is understood that engineering and materials cannot eliminate this noise pollution. As stated earlier, this will result in a significant loss in property value. Who would want to live within 75' of a tower that is randomly generating noise and where the homeowner has no control over the noise? How is property owners compensated for this loss of home value?

How much more noise is generated from the transmission equipment above what there was on the natural land over the period of a year? What upper level of increased noise does BPA commit to maintain? What monitoring equipment will be provided to homeowners to ensure the noise levels are not exceeded? What is the BPA response time to return noise levels to below the commitment upon homeowner notice that there is a problem?

Noise pollution should be eliminated thru on an underground installation of the line from 259th Street & 212th Ave thru and beyond 281st street & 212th Ave; from the bottom of the hill and over the top of the hill to eliminate this damage. Carefully take out only those trees that minimally provide a narrow trench bury the cables.

Construction Noise

Our neighborhood is out in the country where it is quiet and peaceful – that's why people choose to live in the country. It is expected that during construction, there will be heavy construction equipment and noise for full days and that construction will go on for months. How will the noise be eliminated? If not, how much noise will be generated and for how long? How can the noise be controlled to a tight window so that homeowners can plan their day, e.g. have guests over, BBQs when the equipment is not running? How will the neighborhood be informed of the construction plan and level of noise and duration? Who do homeowners contact when the noise gets unreasonable so the site foreman can have it reduced or eliminated? Rotate work across the construction sites so that construction activities to occur no more than 2 days per week at any single site.

Construction Safety

The road from 259th Street & 212th Ave thru beyond 281st street & 212th Ave rises from sea level to 1,000' in a relatively short distance. The road is narrow with no shoulders. Heavy construction equipment will effectively take up the entire road. At spots, the road is so steep you cannot see oncoming traffic. During construction and the post construction maintenance period, vehicle traffic would naturally increase significantly with work crews. Speed going down the hill can increase quickly to unsafe speeds. How can residents be guaranteed that residents, especially children, will not become fatalities by crews unfamiliar with the terrain? How will residents be guaranteed that they can safety

egress the hill without running into construction equipment using the narrow road?

Property Values

People along line 31 have paid significantly for quiet, peaceful and tree-scaped country property with many custom built homes; “the retirement home of their dreams”. Cutting down trees along a 150’ wide path for miles will irreparably change the landscape. This results in a significant and perpetual loss of property value. In addition, in down markets like the present there are more homes for sale than buyers. People who once had beautiful saleable homes will now be at a competitive disadvantage thru loss of ability to sell a house and/or to sell the house at what they paid for it. How are residents compensated for the permanent loss of home values? And how are residents needing to sell homes now and the next few years be compensated while the uncertainty exists over the path to be selected? Buyers are not going to purchase an existing home with the uncertainty that their home may be condemned or property easement imposed on them, or the landscape irreparably altered.

Global Warming

The public needs to understand the number of trees cut down per route and the negative impact it will have on carbon emission cleansing. Route alternatives need to be added that results in a zero loss in carbon emission cleansing or more lines installed below the surface that run thru the more heavily treed geographies.

Property Taxes for easements

For owners that are forced to sell easements via a court order, or otherwise, how are they compensated for the annual property taxes associated with the easement? Just paying for the market value of the easement does not address the added property tax expenses. Especially since the homeowner would not be able to replant trees and/or landscape the property the way they choose.

Condemned Property

For condemned properties, how are owners compensated for custom built homes? Owners in this category have spent \$1000s on architects and unique construction materials. It would be impossible to find an equivalent home to establish a market price. How are owners “kept whole”? Namely, compensation so the homeowner will be able to reconstruct an identical home on a reasonable similar property, e.g. similar views, acreage? How are residents compensated for having to find temporary housing while their custom home is being rebuilt on another property?

New Routes

Line 31 is one set in natural beauty, is peaceful, and in many sections populated with expensive country homes. Clearing land and erecting huge structures do not naturally fit with the landscape or country setting that is residential in character. New alternatives in more remote eastern geographies need to be added and evaluated as a better fit for the transmission system.

Existing Infrastructure Safety Concerns (during construction transmission testing and ongoing)

Your “Living and Working Safely” brochure indicates that “under some circumstances, voltages and currents from power lines and electrical devices can interfere with the operation of some implanted cardiac pacemakers” – how will friends/family members visiting our home recognize they are in jeopardy (we have friends with implanted pacemakers and family members on experimental heart monitoring equipment)? How will we be compensated for doctors’ appointments and possible surgeries to consult with a physician or find alternative medical implants if needed?

Based upon your BPA document, significant shock hazards and general safe practices must be considered within the rights-of-way. How will you ensure proper positioning/grounding of existing above and underground utilities piping or cables within the rights-of-way?

The road from 259th Street & 212th Ave thru beyond 281st street & 212th Ave rises from sea level to 1,000’ in a relatively short distance. The road is narrow with no shoulders. Private access roads also follow this path. How will you ensure safety (during transmission line testing and after power is turned on), that vehicles using those roads do not raise any metal objects more than 14 feet in the air and/or will not encroach on the right-of-way – thus, generating a safety hazard (spark/fire generation) for those living next to the road and/or legal liabilities for the homeowner?

Your “living and Working Safely” brochure indicates that vehicles parked on asphalt or dry rock can collect an induced voltage, how will we be compensated for having to always “attach a chain that reaches the ground or by leaning a metal bar against your vehicle” while parking at our home?

How will a family, whose home is located at a top of the ridge immediately next to the right-of-way, be able “to stay away from towers and lines during extreme windstorms, thunderstorms, ice storms and under other extreme conditions” as stated in your “living and working safely” brochure “. It also indicates “building located off rights-of-way may collect an induced voltage...and recommends grounding”. As part of the construction process, what will BPA do to address this issue?

Tower Location

Exactly where on our property or adjacent property is the line and towers placed? How many evergreen trees would be taken out – on our property and adjacent property? If the tower structure is not exactly on our property, but within the 150’ path how many trees on my property will be removed? How can a homeowner participate in selecting the exact location of the tower on their property?

Project Budget

How much repair funding is in the budget to restore damage to private property during the construction? What is the range – best case, likely case, worst case – that is expected with the project being proposed?

What is the range – best case, likely case, and worst case – number of fatalities that will ultimately be attributable to equipment and procedure safety failures during construction? Use comparable industry

projects completed over the past 5 years.

Damage Claims

What is the process for correcting damage done to homeowner's property? For example, when heavy equipment damages a private road crown and puts ruts in the road, who do we call to get it repaired? How do we get the vendor purchase order approved by BPA? How does the billing get to BPA? How fast does BPA commit to responding to repairing the damage? If mature trees are inaccurately cut down outside the easement, how is the compensation determined? How are replacement trees replanted? How close to the original tree size will the replacement be?

What are the top 10 types of damage – frequency and cost – that are normally caused by the 500KV project being undertaken? What is BPA's past documented record in resolving damage claims?

Design Phase

How do the homeowners participate in design reviews for the portions of the transmission equipment placed on their land and adjacent land? How do homeowners get the detail designs modified to address homeowner concerns?

Project Team

What are the goals and objectives of the project team? How is individual performance assessed and rewarded? What is the disciplinary process for behaviors counter to the project's stated standards? How do homeowners get contacted to provide input to the assessment and compensation/rewards for the project team members working on their project? What are the minimally acceptable employee / contractor performance standards for project team members? Under what conditions are employee's / contractors removed from the project team?

What training do project team members get in building effective relationships with homeowners?

How and whom do homeowners report unacceptable behaviors associated with onsite construction crews? What is the committed response time to remediate unacceptable behaviors? How do homeowners get a construction worker removed and replaced from their property for irreconcilable differences in behavior?

Transmission Technology

It has been reported that new technologies exist, based on superconductor science that are minimally disruptive to the natural environment, compared to the technology being proposed? Why isn't BPA piloting and considering this technology to minimize the environmental impact? This technology should be incorporated into the more sensitive environmental areas and to alleviate private property impacts.

Based upon current technologies being used, what is the process to eliminate/minimize transmission interference and disruptions to existing residence? How quickly will BPA respond to concerns of such

interference (cell phone, satellite, amateur radio, etc.)?

Communication ID: 11729

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: JENNIFER A POPHAM

Please do not use route 31, we live on it and have 2 babies I do not want them exposed to any potential hazards the transformers may cause. This would also lower our home and property value in an already declined home value market. The transformers would also ruin this beautiful natural landscape. Please use underground lines or place the transformers in an already existing route that already has transformers in it.

Communication ID: 11730

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: PEGGY S RITTER

We live in the Venersborg area, and are very concerned about the health risks from these power lines. Not to mention the eye sore from the lines themselves. It seems like you could find a better route away from existing houses. There is a lot of land that doesn't have neighborhoods. This wasn't very well publicized. I just heard about this today, and missed all of the meetings. Please consider more meetings. Thank you for your time. Peggy Ritter

Communication ID: 11731

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: CHRISTINE R SUTHERLAND

1. I would like the BPA to look at the human element as they decide which route to take. Route 31 has an established lifestyle that has great value to the livability of Clark County.

2. The path necessary for route 31 is wider than what was established long ago with BPA rights. Intentions of capacity were underestimated, so I ask on behalf of what life I am trying to provide for raising my children, choose the forest route to run your necessary line.

3. For the sake of the people, do not install the lines on route 31.

4. Adverse impact on property values and potential health impact.

Thank you for your consideration.

Communication ID: 11732

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: SHAUNA N CHAVEZ

I am writing to strongly discourage you from displacing so many people from their homes. My husband and I and our daughter sold our home in Southern California and moved to Vancouver, WA in November 2005 buying our house site unseen (when the housing market was crazy). We chose to move so that I could be a stay at home mom, we couldn't afford to do that in CA, for a better job for my husband and for a better upbringing for our daughter. We chose Vancouver because we would come here to visit family and fell in love with the area. I never moved here with the thought that my home could be sold out from under me, who would ever think that could happen? I'm just so distraught about the whole thing. We've had a little bit of a financial struggle and we almost lost our home, but we managed to modify the loan to be able to keep it and then I get this news. With the housing market turning the way it did, we owe more than our house is worth, and I'm sure we are not alone. So if my house is sold for fair market value, it's not enough to pay off the loan. I understand we are talking a few years out for this to even happen, but nevertheless I don't foresee the market changing that much. That worries me...where will we live? I'm sure everyone has a story and concerns, thank you for listening to mine.

Communication ID: 11733

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: MARK R HOWARD

I'm most concerned about the proposed I5 corridor project, although I understand the need for a larger power distribution; it is most upsetting to see some of the routes you are proposing. I live on the segment 31 route although this is only one of several very populated routes you are proposing. I know PPL has an easement albeit it is only for 100 feet not the 150 feet that is needed for your proposal. This easement goes back to the 1950's when there was close to no private residences/lands in the ROW. Since that time there has been a significant population growth out here. When PPL surveyed this easement back in the 1980's they left us with the understanding that because of the growth on this ROW it would not be economically feasible to put in high voltage transmission lines anymore. Many of the larger plots of ground have been subdivided especially since the I-205 Bridge was completed this has become a living/retirement bedroom community for much of the metro area. The announcement of this proposal has caused a tremendous stressful situation for many of us. It is not only the lost of our property values (when the market already is in such turmoil) but possibly loss of our homes. There is also the lost of this beautiful area when so few are left this close in. There is the impact on nature and our wildlife too. Not to mention the health risks of people living next to high voltage lines. There is the

EMF interference to phone, radio, TV, satellite etc. Potential for lightning strikes to the towers causing harm to people or livestock I had the discussion that you still can use the land in the ROW but your own publication "Living and working around high voltage power lines" has several disturbing facts. Some examples from your publication are the effect on underground utilities the possibility of an electrical arc from the tower to ground, recommendation of not having fences in the ROW, grounding needs to prevent shocks to persons or livestock from buildings, fences, cars etc. There are many considerations in this document that persons living in the ROW should know. This document is located on the BPA web site <http://www.bpa.gov/corporate/pubs/> scroll down to Landowner Use and Safety Information. I asked why you don't plan to build the additional distribution lines along the existing corridor (ROW). You already have the additional 150 feet easement needed along the existing ROW. The issues of scenic value, health issues, private and public use, infrastructure of access, etc. are already there. Seems to me this has to be more economical then the undertaking you are taking, it definitely would be a lot less stress then you have subjected yourselves and the rest of us too. I heard one argument against this because of reliability; ruling out human factors and maintenance issues which are a probability no matter where the lines are. How many times have you actually had a line fail from uncontrollable situations for example weather on the existing I5 corridor and of these times was the total distribution feed down? Aren't, many of these parallel 250 kV feeds so there is a redundancy? In closing my hope would be that you would decide to follow the existing ROW and that this decision would be made soon so the rest of us may go on with our lives. If you we're to decide to use the populated routes then underground lines would be the best solution. Your initial cost would be higher but in the long term your cost to maintain the distribution would offset this cost. In time nature would restore the scars and there wouldn't be all the negatives.

Communication ID: 11734

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: JESS D PETTY

I would like to add my support to those who are voicing outrage at the proposed BPA powerline project (specifically Sec. 31) that will run up 212th Ave. My wife and I have recently completed building a new 3500 sq. ft. home on 212th Ave., and your project will destroy our brand new home. It has taken us 17 years to save enough money to build our dream home and your project will destroy our dreams along with our home. Please consider building your power line project where it has less impact on honest, hardworking, tax paying citizens. Do you BPA people realize how much tax money is collected from this neighborhood (On 212th Ave.) for schools, road repair, emergency services, etc.? Putting your power lines through an established neighborhood, in my opinion, is irresponsible and, quite frankly, insane!
Jess D. Petty, RM1, USN(Ret.)

Communication ID: 11735

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: MARY L DUNN,MICHAEL DUNN

We are considering selling our home. During the site selection process we do not know how to disclose the possibility of the new transmission line going in. Also, would you be buying all or part of our property considering if only part is sold the remainder would be difficult if not impossible to sell considering the obvious deminished value of our home due to health concerns, appearance & etc. If we sell our property we only want to get a fair reasonable price for it and not be left with scraps of land to get rid of.

Communication ID: 11736

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: NICK T RITTER

I would really like to have a chance to attend one of the group meetings. I was unaware of the proposed project and didn't know that there were meetings schedule. I think that this is an important enough of a topic to schedule a few more of the meetings for the public.

Communication ID: 11737

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: JOHN FALLON,ANITA FALLON

This letter is to let you know we do not want BPA to consider Route 31 for the new power lines.

Going through such a populated private neighborhood and exposing so many residents to the frequency field is not the best option. As you already know of all the health risk associated with the high voltage lines. The state property to the east of Route 31 would be a more suitable path. It would disturb less people and their property. It would be even more preferable to use underground cables.

We do not want this Route 31 to ruin our neighborhood, financially and health wise.

We have lived here for 30 years and can not understand why BPA would want to take one of their power lines thru such a populated area. We have all worked hard on our land and homes. Just to have the value reduced because of your lines.

There is less populated property to the east of Route 31. Please consider the state lands for your BPA project.

We do not want our property value decreased when there is a more suitable option. We will fight this Route 31 with every option we have.

Communication ID: 11738

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: RICHARD DALTON

Nov. 18, 2009

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to voice my concern and dismay regarding the BPA I5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. I am asking you to stop construction of BPA Segment #31.

Segment #31 is a planned path running through our community of Hockinson, WA. For myself and many of our neighbors, our homes represent our most valuable asset. Placing these towers through our neighborhood would destroy many homes and seriously devalue the surrounding properties. The more I think about it the more enraged I become.

Segment 31 traverses property owned by our school district and a new school site. Hockinson area families and taxpayers have invested great amounts of time and money to develop our school district. I don't understand how some entity like the BPA can come in arbitrarily and ruin this.

Your notification process, such as it is, is a travesty and an outrage. Your proposed segment 31 would run within 5 blocks of my house but I found out about it from a neighbor, at almost the last minute. I can't express my sense of surprise, disappointment and outrage at this whole thing. Let me assure you that I will be one of many citizens of this area that will be fighting this, by legal means through the courts if necessary. I strongly urge you to reconsider segment #31. There are apparently other, optional routes, for these lines and I strongly urge you to consider them.

Outraged but Sincere,

Richard Dalton

Communication ID: 11739

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: ANNE M POOLE

Why here? Please use your common sense and good judgment. Put these power transmission lines in an area that is not in the middle of schools, family neighborhoods, shops and medical facilities.

I urge you to reconsider and find a location that is more isolated, away from growth. These lines will do nothing except decrease property values even more than they are now. This really scares me.

Communication ID: 11740

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: CAROLYN BENJAMIN

We're already sufficiently impacted by powerlines in our area. It is unwise to have all of the critical power transmission lines concentrated in one right of way. If a catastrophic event occurred, an entire region would be without power. I propose that this line be located in a remote area to minimize this threat. Having new lines as far away as possible from the existing lines makes it more secure; one disaster couldn't take them all out. Please build the new lines as far east as possible.

I have additional concerns about tremendous increase in high voltage lines running through neighborhoods where home owners, families, and children reside.

Communication ID: 11741

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: DR HEATHER L CRUMBAKER

I am against all land grabs by BPA for new transmission lines. I strongly feel that you need to use the existing corridors to run your transmission lines. I have the transmission towers about 800 feet behind my property in the middle of the city of Vancouver. They are a freeway for animals (especially coyotes) and homeless, especially homeless criminals. Last summer I discovered many homeless camps. The City of Vancouver refused to do anything, so I called your office. You made the City of Vancouver clean out the camps, some of which had temporary buildings and large fire pits. But I later talked to the supervisor of the clean-up and he told me that although they dislodged a great many homeless camps, they only cleared out the 3 miles near the walking path (which is 3 miles long), "because the homeless need to live somewhere". Do not grab any more land to put up power lines, restrict yourself to the right of ways that you already use and own. You allow the City of Vancouver to have soccer field and other types of sports and recreational activity happening in these paths. There is plenty of room to run more lines. The cost of disruption to people and their land, the spread of disease with wildlife running into new areas and through urban areas is egregious, and the strong likelihood of having remote homeless villages of criminals is more than we can financially bear. And you at BPA don't have the resource to keep problems at bay, and some problems are without solutions. STOP THIS ENTIRE PLAN!

Communication ID: 11742

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: FARZAM ESHRAGH

I own a 5 AC piece of property on the Route 31. I bought that property 17 years ago with the dream of building a dream home on it. It is a beautiful piece of property with a view of Portland on a clear day.

This has been a lifetime dream and I the construction of this powerline will eliminate that dream. A consideration for one of the other routes to the east of route 31 would be appreciated. A less populated area would be a better choice than route 31. Thank-you for you consideration Farzam Eshragh

Communication ID: 11743

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: RALPH HAMM,SHARON L HAMM

The logging thru the years has put a lot of birds and animals on our property because we have older timbers that they need to survive in. like flying squirrels, owls, piliated woodpeckers, western gray squirrels, and honey bees.

Why don't you put your power line alongside of the existing line #9 instead of destroying more property, it makes more sense because it would be better security and access is already there.

It would seem also like it would be more cost effective to widen out a little instead of taking over more property.

The bottom line is, we don't want your power line and keep off our property.

Communication ID: 11744

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: JENNIFER K ZORA

November 19, 2009 Jennifer Zora [Address]

To Whom it May Concern: I am writing in response to the proposed BPA powerline that will cut through 700 homes--many in the small Hockinson School District. I strongly oppose this possible route for the following reasons:

1. Our property will be affected by the close proximity of the 150 ft tall and 150 foot wide electrical towers.
 2. We will have adverse financial hardship for the next 2 1/2 years if we needed to sell our home due to a mandated disclosure of a proposed powerline. No one will purchase our home due to the sight interference or worst yet, the cancer probability of small children.
 3. Our neighbors may not be failry compensated for their property loss in the current housing market.
 4. Our neighbors, who are self-employed, may not be able to receive a loan for a new home in the
-

current economic and banking climate.

5. Loss of property values will negatively affect our small Hockinson School District. Our entire school budget falls on individual property owners and not from a commercial tax base. Ultimately loss of school revenue hurts kids, including our 4 school age children.

6. \$1 million dollars spent by the Hockinson School District for a new school site will have powerlines dissect this land. Could our school district build a K-8 school knowing the health risks? Will they lose this \$1 million investment? It is completely obvious that the route needs to be on DNR land, private and public forest land to the east as it lessens the burden on property owners, working families, and a small Hockinson School District. Please make the right decision. Sincerely, Jennifer K. Zora

Communication ID: 11745

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: ANN C KARR

I am very concerned about the proposed power lines, and am asking you to stop the construction of BPA segment 31. My home is all I have! The power line will destroy any value I have left after the recession, I know of two families that will let their homes go into foreclosure if this line is built. You will be destroying a community. Some of these people have lived here for forty or more years, they are elderly and have no place to go. I know there is an easement available on DNR land - that has got to be where this power line goes. The social and emotional impacts of this power line in our community is huge, and that does not even consider the health concerns! My husband and I will do everything we can to stop this line going in Hockinson. I plan on writing my two senators next! Sincerely, Ann Karr

Communication ID: 11746

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: RICHARD CHANEY

Yey, my name is, Richard Chaney and I'm trying to find out, you mailed me a map and the map really doesn't show any roads or intersections, so it's real vague and I'd like to know exactly where your power line is going. Can you give me a call at [phone] and I'd like to see where it's goin? Anyway, give me a shout. Parcel number is [parcel number] and I appreciate it.

Communication ID: 11747

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: WILLIAM K MATHISON

First of all I appreciate the need to improve the power grid from a quality of life and security standpoint.

We all enjoy the benefits of electricity. I hope BPA runs their new line through DNR forestland for several reasons...

- 1) It would create a natural fire break. The Yacolt burn is "history past", and a natural fire break created by the setbacks of a new BPA transmission line would help the fire department fight a firestorm effecting Clark County.
- 2) BPA has easement rights to run a line through developed areas, which may be the easiest thing to do, but why effect so many lives when forestland is available nearby?
- 3) Uncertainty about health effects. Uncertainty is the same as certainty so it will negatively effect property values. After more than 100 years of using electricity I think any uncertainty should be cleared up once and for all before running new lines through developed areas when alternative DNR forestland is available.
- 4)Hockinson is one of treasured rural living areas in Clark County, and the proposed line would split this area in half; greatly effecting the scenic beauty of the Area.. so what is the harm in moving the line just a few miles east into the forestland? That is my two cents.

Communication ID: 11748

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: LINDA J HARTWELL

It is very important for us all, including BPA, to "go green". This is the best answer for our future and all future generations. My objections echo those of many others: devaluation of property, health issues for all, losing natural resources, not to mention the unsightliness of the lines strung through our property and neighborhoods. It's time we progress and stop operating as as though today is all that matters. We should have all learned by now that if we do not become forward thinkers and care for our environment we have NO future.

Communication ID: 11749

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: BILL VIDOVIC,SHELLY R VIDOVIC

How do you do, We have read many comments about the I-5 corridor reinforcement project. The main theme is that it is not clear where theses towers will physically be in the proximity of private homes. The bottom line; Are the towers going to be placed far enough away from the lifelong investments people have made in their homes and families, and far enough away that there are no long term physical damages to the quality and health of life?? Will we be seeing and feeling and hearing these massive towers right outside our back or front windows, or at the end of our driveways, or towering over our rooflines? If this could be the case, we strongly voice our objection in not wanting this intrusion of

towers invading and jeopardizing our life and devaluing our property and invading and robbing us of our quality of life. We thank you for this opportunity to voice our concerns.

Communication ID: 11750

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: PATTI OLSON

Yes, I'm sending in a written comment sheet and I'm puzzled because I have found that of the different packages we've gotten from you there are two different post office boxes. I've spend quite a bit of time on my comments and I also want very much to make sure they're received by the right people. So the one that I got on the latest forms was PO Box 9250, Portland, Oregon, 97207. So I guess that's who I'm going to send it to and I will be extremely upset if that isn't the one that means they are going to get to where they need to go. My name is Patty Olsen, area code [phone]. Thank you. Bye

Communication ID: 11751

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: JACOB BOOMHOUWER

My wife Susan and I are very upset that you are even considering option 31 for routing your high voltage line. We will protest that option in court should you select it. The route is through some of the highest income parts of Clark County and we have the resources to go to court to uphold our property values. First, your new line is to benefit Oregon. Why would you then make all the negative impacts be on residents of Washington? This line should be located in the State whose residents will benefit, Oregon. Second, why would you even consider a route through developed parts of Clark County. There are houses all along the route, including ours, and this project will have a detrimental impact. Third, if you must locate the line in Washington, why not go through the national forest where no one lives. Fourth, route 31 is pretty much on uphill slopes. That means folks in the valley will all see the line in addition to those directly impacted. It will be like a multi mile scar on the landscape. Finally, any EIR that you produce without including routes through Oregon will be flawed because of the cost benefit disconnect and our attorneys will challenge it

Communication ID: 11752

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: WILLIAM TANNENAN

Hello, I'm calling concerning my property. [address]. My name's William Tannenan and my e-mail address is [e-mail] and I am wondering how much of my property you will be taking up if you go that

route. Thank you.

Communication ID: 11753

Date: 11/17/2009

Name: CLAUDE NELSON MILLARD

Because of poor surveys from years past, I lost 2.5 acres to a neighbor [Name] in 2000-2001 from an adverse possession law suit.

I am currently in the process of closing an adverse possession suit with another neighbor [Name]. This suit cost thousands of dollars in attorney fees.

Also, the Cowlitz Co Transportation Dept has through intement Domain taken 8 tenths of an acre due to a substandard offer, still pending

So as you can see We've had enough. Please keep of my land- its not up for grabs.

Communication ID: 11754

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: CYNTHIA JOHNSON

Yes, this is the Johnson's on [Address], Battle Ground. I am calling about route 31. I and our neighbors do not want this in our neighborhood. We would urge you to use alternative routes to the east of us or don't do anything in Clark County. But the fact that we were never notified and I just found out about this last weekend. I am irate so I am also asking you to extend the comment period past the 23rd. And I think that was a very very sneaky rotten thing to do. I can be reached at [Phone]. Respectfully, Cynthia Johnson .

Communication ID: 11755

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: CHRISTY L FREEMAN

I am wrting to voice my concern regarding the I-5 Carridor Reinforcenment Project. in particular segment #31. I live in the Hockingson area and would be greatly effected by the power lines you are considering running through our community. These lines would be devastating to our community. The value of our homes, our ability to support our schools, and our health are a few of the major concerns. It angers me that you would even consider doing such a thing to provide power intended for other states. Use what you already have, improve the lines that are already out there. Last don't spend money you

don't have. We would all be better off if the "stimulus" money went unspent

Communication ID: 11756

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: KRISTEN M MCHENRY

Please consider another route. I live on Route 31 and I do not want to see my property values drop. I could not even sell my home now for what it was worth a month ago as I must disclose what may happen to my property. We also have an apiary (honey bee hives) located on our property. I have invested in my equipment and my bees and now I am told (by a BPA Rep) that honey bees can not be kept near the lines as they do not survive. Does this also mean that my garden (which we grow for our family food) will suffer due to lack of pollination?????? Will you pay me for my loss of investment and the time I have taken to learn about bee keeping? This is also my sons 4-H project.

Communication ID: 11757

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: PAM C ASHFORD

I live on 212th avenue and 267th Street (Segment 31). Rock Creek is on the corner across from my house. This creek is part of the larger Salmon Creek Watershed and is considered environmentally sensitive by Clark County. The trees, grass and shrubs must not be removed from this creek. This creek is within the 100' PPL easement. It will be impossible for BPA to clearcut Line 31 due to status of the creeks and salmon runs. Further down the line, there is a major salmon run, again on the easement.

Communication ID: 11758

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: HENRY WILLIAMS

Hi this is Henry Williams. I am a resident of southwest Washington and I strongly oppose route 31. I believe that there are other options that are less invasive and they should be considered over the proposed route 31. Number is [Phone]. Thanks.

Communication ID: 11759

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: RICHARD A DAVIS

Transmission towers of the size proposed would seem out of place almost anywhere that's not heavily

industrialized. The most appropriate place visually would be along the I5 corridor. If that location pushes people from their homes, as it would if it paralleled Fern Road then a route east of the most eastern route, through DNR property could be taken. This route could aim for the east end of Yale lake, and thereby miss small family acreages. I realize that this may add 4-8 miles to the length, money well spent. DNR is state land, and we are citizens of the state, they (DNR) should not be pushing this thing towards private properties. Again 1st choice would be I5 corridor 2nd choice east on DNR land and the worst choice would be one that would force my neighbors or my family from our property.

Communication ID: 11760

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: MIKE MORRIS

Hi my name is Mike Morris and I received some information about someone at work about the proposed project and I never got anything in the mail so I'm not sure if it is going to affect me or not but you do have an easement through my property for a current line and I like in the Park Prairie area, so I thought I would call and see if I could get some information about it. Home phone number for me is [Phone]. My mailing address is [Address]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 11761

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: PAM C ASHFORD

I am a homeowner (AKA "sucker") directly affected by your proposal to use Segment 31. I STRONGLY urge BPA to REMOVE segment 31 from your plans NOW. I STRONGLY urge BPA to move further EAST beyond lines 11, 21, 29, 34 and 35 into public timber land where NO RESIDENCES OR PRIVATE PROPERTY exists. I STRONGLY URGE BPA to go UNDERGROUND with the power line as you have placed other 500Kv lines. The technology exists. I am in your 500' "buffer" which would place me right next to the line after my neighbors house is condemned. One of your representatives agreed with me at the Hazel Dell meeting that I would be a "sucker" as a result because I would have a house that I would be unable to sell or sell at substantially less than it was worth before BPA announced this project. I guess he was trying to be empathic to my situation, agreeing that I would be a sucker to remain in my house..a sucker to let you victimize me....a sucker to believe what I am hearing from BPA. If I choose to live in the house rather than go bankrupt I face a significantly higher risk for brain cancer, ALS or Alzheimer's. Is this any way to treat people? I have never allowed myself to be victimized by anyone. I will not allow BPA to victimize me or my neighbors. Clark County residents do not deserve to be bulldozed by an uncaring group who pretends to care. MOVE THE LINE away from ALL residences and private land. MOVE THE LINE further east beyond Lines 11, 21, 29, 34 and 35. REMOVE LINE 31 FROM CONSIDERATION. And stop calling us "suckers"

Communication ID: 11762

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: JON SCHOENBORN,CATHY SCHOENBORN

Dear Bonneville Power Administration,

We are writing you concerning the unthinkable option of running 500 Kv BPA power lines through your proposed Route Segment 31.

This route personally affects us in several devastating ways. Our property is situated in such a way that it is much longer in the North-South direction than it is wide (East-West direction) and these power lines would run along the full length of our property a full ¼ mile (North-South). Since our property is narrow, power lines would have to be within as little as 75-100 feet of the side of our house, and ALL of our property would be near the power lines. Even worse, over ½ mile of power lines would be running directly in the middle of our properties' scenic view. This would not only drastically affect the long-term value of our land, but crush our dreams of building our dream home on this pristine and beautiful valley property. A dream that we have been working hard at achieving for over 5 years, and that has involved 1000's of hours of work to improve our land, build fences, build a large garden area, improve our soil, and plant trees.

Even just having this route on the table as an option severely limits any plans we can make for our family's future and makes proceeding with our building plans impossible for years. Because you have this route segment as a possibility, it is also now impossible to sell or trade properties for an equal property. At this point, who would buy this property for any fair value, with the proposal of such large power lines going through the property? Our lives have been put on hold, and we are living in a manufactured home that is not large enough for our growing family. We had plans to build a permanent home, but now it is inconceivable to build, when the eyesore and negative effects of the power lines would put us at a great financial loss, and no one would ever be willing to pay us for the value of a new home if we built our home on this property, much less the price we have already paid for this land.

And as you know we are not alone in our individual situation along this route. We were outraged to find out that this Route Segment 31, goes through many farms and country estates, through some of the most beautiful land in our county, and affects literally 100's (if not 1000's) of people's lives. We were also extremely alarmed that you would even propose a route where so many homes would have to be outright condemned and destroyed. As you know, you would have to purchase the current 100 foot right-of-way from Pacific Power, and you would have to also purchase an additional fifty foot right-of-way on properties all along the route. Just because there is an existing 100 foot right-of-way, doesn't mean it makes any sense to turn it into a 150 foot right-of-way; especially when that additional 50 feet means destroyed homes, demoralized families, and devastated dreams.

Additionally Route 31, runs right across unspoiled areas of the Lewis River, runs close to beautiful Lucia Falls Park (with protected salmon runs and regular Bald Eagle sightings), and runs right across the North

Clark County Scenic Drive. The proposed route will ruin the aesthetics of a unique and wild natural resource, which should be preserved in its undeveloped state for the enjoyment of future generations.

The added absurdity of Route Segment 31 even being on the table, is that there are a number of other options available that do not affect so many citizens and private property owners, and do not affect a widely used and pristine area of land. Either the use of the existing power line route near I-5 (route segment 9), or the addition of a power line route through existing state lands and private forest land (such as 28, 29, 32, 34, 35), are much more desirable options.

The advantages of a route through the DNR land and private forest land (such as routes 28, 29, 32, 34, and 35) are obvious:

- Would not put 500 Kv lines where people live
- Almost no one will even see or notice the lines
- Is not scenic land, but is land that is clear cut logged every 40-50 years on a rotation
- If people want to enjoy scenic forest land, they recreate further east in the National Forest Land- NOT in the DNR land.
- Would establish a future corridor- enabling future expansion without affecting even more people down the road.
- Would not disrupt 1000's of peoples lives, ruin Millions and Millions of dollars of people's life's savings, or destroy peoples homes and plans for homes.

Because of the devastating effect on so many people's lives, we urge you to do the right thing and immediately remove Route 31 from your list of options. Doing this now would free 1000's of people from the hold that this route option has put on their lives, plans, and dreams. We think that decision makers at the BPA might not fully realize what kind of land they would be affecting when only looking at GIS maps or Google Earth. Because of this- we have include with this letter pictures of our pristine valley property, as well as snapshots taken from the Lewis River, Lucia Falls Park, and the North Clark County Scenic Drive right near where Route Segment 31 would place power lines overhead. Please enter these photos, as well as this letter, into the record as comments against the proposed Bonneville Power lines running through this beautiful portion of Clark County.

Sincerely,

Jon and Cathy Schoenborn

[Address]

[Phone]

Communication ID: 11763

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: SANDRA O KING

I would like to encourage the BPA to reconsider putting the 500,000 volt transmission line in the Segment 3 area (Castle Rock to Longview). This is an area with farms, homes, businesses which could be compromised by having this line installed. Rather, I would like to see either Segment 1 or 2 chosen. I live in the Seg 3 area and do not want this line here. Since you have other options, I encourage you to use those. Thank you. Sandra King Kelsosauer George

Communication ID: 11764

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: DON D COX

I am writing to voice my concern regarding the Bonneville Power Administration's I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. I am asking you to stop the consideration and possible construction of BPA Segment #31. Two reasons to eliminate proposed Segment #31: 1. Reports from the World Health Organization (2007), the International Agency for Research on Cancer (2002), the National Radiological Protection Board (2001), the California Department of Health Services (2002), the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (2001), the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (1999), and the National Academy of Sciences / National Research Council (1997) all conclude certain health hazards exist in areas where electric and magnetic fields are present. Childhood leukemia and various types of adult cancers are the most noted. Each report acknowledges these risks are legitimate concerns and that further research is underway. 2. Massive 150 foot, unsightly steel towers and high-voltage overhead power lines carrying 500,000 volts would permanently destroy property values. This has been the result wherever these crude and potentially dangerous towers have been erected. After studying the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Study Area Map, it is quite evident that the easternmost segments have the least social impact and health concerns. Hundreds fewer lives would be disrupted. Sincerely Don Cox

Communication ID: 11765

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: KEITH D RAST

I don't want these monster towers, humming, popping, snapping anywhere near my property or my neighbors. There is plenty of state land to the east where this could be run.

Communication ID: 11766

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: MICHAEL T THEIS

To consider putting a line of this size through residential property in Clark County is foolish! This is the mother of all power lines. These towers would be taller than the tallest fir trees. Proposing this line where people live is simply asking for problems. If this line must be built, do the right thing and put it far away from people's homes. Your far eastern route (if it goes through state and federal lands) would be a good choice. Hockinson has been a desirable area to live for many years. Don't trash people's lives by putting a line through route 31.

Communication ID: 11767

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: JEFF SNYDER

The line segment identified on your map as #27 not only appears to go extremely close to several houses, but also appears to go directly through a Great Blue Heron nesting habitat. This is a designated wetlands area. All of us in the area would prefer that segment #27 NOT be considered as part of the new line.

Communication ID: 11768

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: ROHNE MIKLOS

Hello- I am a very concerned resident along the line 31 corridor and one that would be severely impacted as the old existing PP&L ROW is already 50' into my property. We were told when we bought this property that the ROW was for a 15kv max powerline. My wife and I have lived at this property for almost twenty years and have been constantly improving it as equine property including a covered riding arena. We have had our hopes and dreams set on being able to sell our home for a tidy sum at retirement time to help with finances at that time. The addition of 500kv lines and a monstrous tower will effectively make our property utterly worthless and virtually un-sellable, and half of our planned retirement funds would be gone. A full condemnation of our property would be a lot less of a financial hardship. It is curious that BPA mentions a total ROW width of 150 feet for a line of this size. Isn't it standard practice to have a much larger ROW for 500kv lines? Are you making up new standards with no regard to the health of people who will be stuck living beside these powerlines, just to keep BPA's costs down? As more and more studies show increased health risks, why does BPA want a smaller buffer zone? Existing alignment of 212th Avenue is at the center of the existing PP&L ROW. Is BPA planning on moving roads, or is the new ROW going to be shifted off to one side. It seems to me that line 31 is the least cost effective, most disruptive alternative listed. Please use a different route.

Communication ID: 11769

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: NANCY L RUST

You may not know but there are old caves, thought to belong to tribes that once lived in this area at the top of Green Mountain. Years ago when they put the electrical lines running east to west across the top, they bulldozed the entrances to them. I am talking to old timers out here that know the location. Nancy Rust

Communication ID: 11770

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: DAN O SEAL,JEANETTA SEAL

This letter is concerning Route 31 that is being considered by BPA. I am concerned that if BPA proceeds with Route 31, our small community would be impacted financially and its members would have major health issues. Our future, which is our children, would be impacted the most. They would lose school support, lose school sites and sit in classrooms where the electromagnetic fields would impact their developing brains and bodies. The proposed power lines will run within a ½ mile of the existing Hockinson Primary and Hockinson Intermediate Schools. Is there any concern about the health and well-being of these kindergarten through fifth grade children who would be impacted by the electromagnetic fields of high powered electric lines? Not only would our existing schools be impacted by these high voltage power lines, Hockinson School District has purchased a school site that is directly under the proposed power lines. Therefore, the newly purchased Hockinson School site would become useless property. Hockinson Schools currently has no industrial or commercial business tax base that helps fund the schools. The school district is supported solely by the families that live here. The tax base would be decimated by shrinking property values because of the power lines. Hockinson Schools are the primary reason people move into the community. It would be a huge blow to an outstanding school district. Please do not harm our children or destroy our community, please say NO to Route 31! Sincerely, Jeanetta Seal with Dan Seal and our four children – Dominic, Whitney, Kendra, and Connor ages 3-18

Communication ID: 11771

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: DEBBRA MATTHEWS

Jeffrey I. Matthews and Debbra L. Matthews currently own [parcel ID]. Our physical address is [address], our property is located on the 212th corridor, proposed line 31. The environmental concerns we have, if only 150 ft. of our property is used for your power lines, what are the health risks and safety of having this high of voltage ran next to our home? We currently have a farm, what are the risks to

livestock? The 150 ft. that would be needed is timbered and has a tributary of Rock Creek located on it. According to Clark County we are not allowed to disturb water ways, I would think this would be a concern for BPA, since Clark County does issue hefty fines for disturbing creek banks. My question to BPA is why would you even consider running a 500,000 volt power line through areas that are populated, when you have the option of running it through DNR land, where less people would be affected and/or displaced? I know DNR land is used for the timber sales for school districts and that this would effect the timber sales scheduled. I am Trail Boss for Washington Trail Riders and at our last meeting we had Jessica Kimmick speak about DNR and it was discussed that the BPA lines would not only affect timber sales, but also our current system of trails located on your proposed lines through the Yacolt Burn area. The best bet according to me is to have timber sales affected and re-route trails than to have to re-home over 1,000 people on line 31. My neighbor, Jerry Neuman and I, attended the meeting for Citizens for a Healthy Power System, (for those of us located on your proposed route 31),last thursday and learned a lot at this meeting. Including how voltage this high can cause health issues, due to the magnetic field projected,(Cited from an Australian Study), the effect on our poperty values,(Keller-Williams agent presented issues), and Representative Ed Orcutt informed us of who to contact at state and federal levels to voice our concerns and spoke of the impact on DNR and the public (raised taxes for schools). We also learned at this meeting that you (BPA) have already went for Emminent Domain against PPL for the Easement on our properties, it seems you should at least have the decency to pay PPL the proper amount owed for the easement. Our property is shown on map page 85 as one of the properties that is completley wanted by BPA, if you want our whole property, as shown on your map, are we going to get the value that it would have went for before your lines went in? We worked hard for what we have, our property is almost paid off, my husband plans to retire in 2 yrs. and purchasing a new home was not on our agenda. We love the area we live in, we have good neighbors-- they are family. We are also lucky enough to have John Polos, retired BPA Engineer to help guide us through this mess. Debra L. Matthews

Communication ID: 11772

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: PATRICIA L BLACK

SR-500 is the BPA project area. Our whole block of houses on 67th st will have to go. We already measured and the line will come to the center of our living rooms. We are against this because: We are in our late 50's and due to retire in 7 years. We bought this home based on the location, having a green space behind us (with low voltage power lines)convenient to stores in case we can no longer drive.Since being here for 4 years we have invested about 90,000 in improvements. We remodeled the entire inside as this was a rental home,we brought new furniture to fit the wall space we have put ramping cement sidewalks all around the perimeter of the house because I have degenerative disc disease and will likely be in a wheelchair down the road, we added on a 16X23 covered patio so we can enjoy the outside even if raining. People said to find an "endangered species" and report it. Well, our neighborhood is an endangered species. We are all older, watch out for one another, if someone has a surgery, others assist

by cooking meals, mowing lawns, grocery shopping, etc. We care about one another. We celebrate with potlucks a few times a year and really care about each other. That is something to protect. PLEASE DON'T DESTROY a beautiful environment in which to live out our lives in

Communication ID: 11773

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: LENORE A TAPANI

I am protesting Line 31 as it passes through neighborhoods heavily populated with little children. If it is not safe to have this line near a daycare, I suggest someone take a count of children in the homes bordering this easement.

Communication ID: 11774

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: CAROLYN J RINTA

We are well aware that additional lines are a necessity for our region. However, those lines should be constructed to have the least impact on families, business and wildlife. The maps show two possible new lines going right over our new (metal) retirement home on our farm. also crossing two wetland sites on the family farms. Any project for the improvement of the populace should be done with the least detrimental impact on that society. We request that the lines should be placed over the areas without development.

Communication ID: 11775

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: KELLY B CLARK

Having lived in rural Clark County for most of my life - up until moving across the river about three years ago - I can say without hesitation that taking over wildlife and rural land for the sake of this project is inexcusable. People and animal are already using this property. It's not available for your use. Try again elsewhere in a place that isn't already being used.

Communication ID: 11776

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: WALTER JOHNSON

Any additional or replacement capacity should be built underground in large enough channels to enable

easy conversion to future room temperature superconductors. What is wrong with 15 story towers is: 1) The towers require a lot of steel which mostly is imported and undermines the value of the US dollar globally. 2) Above ground towers are vulnerable to downed lines at every point along the line in ice storms and the downed lines are dangerous and represent major service outages. 3) Underground cement tunnels or large conduits can later be reuse to install ever closer room temperature superconductors, but they will never be available for above ground use. Only underground is the temperature stable year around. Resources consumed in towers cannot be reused in place for anything else and required constant pruning and weed control along the 150 foot wide right of way. 4) Underground construction can allow even surface use of the land for expansion of road capacity, or at least for temporary detours. Grazing fenced in livestock rather than paying for mowing can contain the fire hazard of surface right of way. 5) It may take longer to make permanent repairs in the event of earthquakes, but in the case of most landslides and earthquakes, no high power transmission lines will require repair underground and no service disruptions will occur. Customers will not be put at risk by the explosion of strategically positioned transformers either since large enough chambers underground can contain expected failure explosions and the related sound. 6) Underground lines are much less vulnerable to terrorist attacks on infrastructure. Periodically high tension power line towers have been destroyed primarily in the Western US by domestic terrorists even without foreign ones and they are easy targets because the rights of way don't grow over with trees or get covered in other ways and the towers are obvious and easy to find. That would not be the case with underground installations. Others just resent the blight on the scenic vistas or the lowering of their own property values. 7) Power lines buried at least six feet deep provide a radiation barrier that even a fifteen story tower does not provide against EM emissions, and I for one firmly believe, based on the cancer cases along my father-in-law and mother-in-law's street adjacent to a high tension line that they do cause cancer, and we excluded in buying a home any house within distant sight even of a high tension power line.

Communication ID: 11777

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: JOHN LAMB

We request that you review the salmon and steelhead spawning grounds of the Washougal river system. Your preliminary easemnt studies indicate a direct overhead route down the Little Washougal River and tributary system. The State of Washington has just recently restored some locations; and has as recently as last year received mature spawning Chinook salmon in the system. I would hardly think that the State of Washington would endorse the current proposed route. In addition, by this letter we are notifying CCA (Coastal Conservation Association) to explore your future plans that would endanger river waterways that flow directly into the Columbia River. CCA has been very helpful in the restoration and conservation of river systems that are and will be impacted by ill thought plans.

Other Comments

Please review your maps 108/109. It appears that the line will bisect a neighborhood community (Little

Washougal River Homeowner's Estates). If I'm not mistaken the line appears to border the river, cross our private drivelines and make a right turn to intersect existing transmission lines near Stauffer Road. Why cannot BPA look for the best route; move the program up hill to the east on logged and non-inhabitated land and a direct route to the existing tie in? The neighborhood of Little Washougal River Estates will strenuously object and confront the existing route, plans and attempts to push the ill fated attempt to dump inefficient wind generated power onto the grid in this manner. Not to mention the endangered bird act that you skirt when taking the lower route to obscure the towers and lines from migratory bird routes and such.

Communication ID: 11778

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: ANNE E. O'NEILL

The "not in my backyard" voice I am sure you have heard over and over. I am another voice. Moving here from Las Vegas over 10 years ago under less than ideal circumstances. My family was very lucky to have been able to purchase my little piece of heaven here in Yacolt. The idea of having my wildlife and my family life disrupted or forced out is too much. Consider the lives of those you are invading.

Communication ID: 11779

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: JOHN A MILLS, MICHAEL PITTOCK MILLS

To: Bonneville Power Administration

Date: THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2009

RE: Scope of EIS, I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, Route Segment #50, northeast of Lacamas Lake

To avoid power blackouts, the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project promises reliable energy for economic development and growth. It would be ironic and counterproductive if the project caused a "blackout" of master planning for hundreds of contiguous acres known as Lacamas Northshore - an area uniquely suited to provide hundreds of new jobs and smart growth in northeast Camas (WA).

The Mills Family LLC - one of a dozen property owners within Lacamas Northshore - wishes to register our objection that any right-of-way (ROW) increase along route segment #50 for the BPA's additional 500-KV line critically endangers the future of a roughly 500-acre block that's far down the track to becoming a "Green" urban setting where families can live, work and play in one place.

The master plan and negotiated development agreement for Lacamas Northshore - incorporated into the city limits of Camas in April 2008 - cannot coexist with expanded BPA easements and ROW condemnation for an added 500-KV transmission line. As a result, the EIS scope with segment #50

introduces irresolvable conflicts with public/private investments targeted to make Lacamas Northshore a hub for employment growth in east Clark County and a landmark, mixed-use community with an elementary/middle school and public center.

Years of public hearings and decision-making by Clark County and the City of Camas - going back to September 2004 - have culminated in comprehensive plan designations for light industrial and mixed-use development to meet the City's growth needs for the next 20 years. Segment #50 also unravels efforts to: 1) abandon Leadbetter Road and reroute vehicle traffic to a new, eastern bluff

arterial in order to finish a multi-use, round-the-lake trail, 2) protect the historic Leadbetter House (National Register, added 1979 - #79003148) and, 3) protect wetlands that are fully mapped and integrated into the master planning for Lacamas Northshore.

These plan designations and urban growth boundary have withstood significant and extensive legal challenges before the state Growth Management Hearings Board. Job-based zoning for the Lacamas Northshore area has been recommended by the Camas Planning Commission and was adopted by City Council - with broad public input and concurrent planning/budgeting for the needed public infrastructure to support urban-level growth.

This is not a NIMBY-filled, rural subdivision with backyards that abut the BPA's right-of-way.

Route segment #50, if included in the scope of work, would directly conflict with the interests of Lacamas Northshore landowners, City and County elected officials, and the citizens of Camas because sharp limitations on a principal jobs-producing area within city limits would cancel out years of civic effort to set aside this area for future employment options. Every weekday, 60,000

people commute across the Columbia River to work - when polled, nearly 80% said they would take a Clark County job if available.

As noted by others at the public scoping meeting held at Liberty Middle School in Camas on Nov. 3, we are alarmed that just two alternative segments are proffered for a route from northeast of Lacamas Lake to Oak Park substation - and one segment (#50) is already committed to urban living.

We urge you to eliminate route segment #50 from the scope of work and to explore other routes.

Sincerely,

Mills Family LLC

Camas, Washington

Michael Pittock Mills, President

John A Mills, Vice-President

Communication ID: 11780

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: JUDITH A. MINIHAN

The usual comment not in my backyard does not apply here as you will be taking my house, barn and 20 acres. (If you follow the route of NE 212th Ave). We have lived here about 2+ years and we are under water, so to speak, with the current economy. We are retired! Just after moving here my husband went on chemotherapy for his cancer. So you can see what a hardship this would be for us. Plus several of our neighbors will lose their houses, too. Please find a route that will not displace us and our neighbors. Thank you.

Communication ID: 11781

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: RONALD F BLEHM

As President of the Summer Hills Home Owners Association (HOA), located in Brush Prairie, representing 126 owners, we would like to voice our concerns, questions and suggestions for your consideration.

- Potential and /or perceived health hazards. o With regard to potential adverse health effects, although no epidemiologic studies have demonstrated a cause-and-effect relationship between long-term exposure to power line electric and magnetic fields (EMF), some studies have suggested an association with such exposure to an increased risk of childhood leukemia. This assuredly will cause alarm and concern amongst the Hockinson community, given the proposed location of the towers in relative proximity to the Primary/Intermediate schools and numerous developments and scattered residences.
- Land Values in Summer Hills. o We have 126 Lots with homes complete on 121 lots with current values from approximately \$700,000 and up. A negative impact on property values is a valid concern, even for properties not in close proximity. One could foresee a decline in assessed property values and tax base, affecting revenues for local and state schools and other public and safety services.
- Use of cleared easement. o ATVs and motorcycles would see the easement as a playground for their activities. Community and essential services would have to deal with more issues if the power lines were near people.
- Suggestions. o Put it off as far possible to the east and it will create a firebreak for greater protection to homes west of the firebreak and possibly for wildlife east of the firebreak depending on where the fire start. The eastern most routes would be the least disruptive to the Clark County population in terms of construction and maintenance. o Do not use the easement that runs north to south near Hockinson because it is not cleared and is not currently wide enough (50ft too narrow) for the power line. Much more time and costly negotiations would need to take place before that area could be used. Many, many landowners would be involved and that would not be the case if the western easement were used (already owned by the BPA) or if the eastern easement were purchased by the BPA from the government.
- Questions o Is the need for more grids due to local demand or to facilitate sale of power to other areas? o Has consideration been given to small generating facilities close to the end

user?

Communication ID: 11782

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: VICKI M SCHAFFER

We live near the existing BPA transmission line near the end of Walker rd. in Kelso, WA. It would make sense to me if you used that existing route. This area is remote and properties out here are already used to the transmission line. It would also make the area less attractive to land developers. The existing route traverses steep terrain which must have been hard to build on. The proposed route to the west of Longview is going to generate a lot of expense and anger because new properties will be affected and you are having to build a whole new route.

Communication ID: 11783

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: GUY E. NEWTON

I am on line segment 31 map page 96. I am writing you because you are proposing to build a 500 kV power line in my neighborhood along my property line. Currently there is a 100 foot easement along my eastern property line on my neighbor's side. You will need 150 feet to build these power lines. Will you be taking my property to accomplish this? I have attended your public scoping meetings and they have no answers for me. So I am assuming that my house could be 4 feet from the easement. I have 2 ½ acres here in Hokinson. I do not want to live that close to high voltage power lines. I have an outdoor antenna for my TV reception and also a wireless computer network in my home will they work? What about my cell phone and AM/FM radio reception? I have read about possible health effects and there are 2 sides to the story, you say there are no health effects to worry about, others say it causes cancer; I don't want to take that chance, would you? My house would have to be grounded to live here without getting shocked every time you turned on the water, do you want to live like that? What about my property value? This is my nest egg; we have already taken a big hit because of the economy, now this? I couldn't sell my house; no one would want to live here. My wife and I bought this property in 1994 and raised 2 children. We have horses, dogs and cats, this is a beautiful piece of property as well as the whole Hockinson community is. Please don't ruin my property, my retirement and my nest egg! Thank you, Guy Newton

Communication ID: 11784

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: DIANA M. SERMONE

I am opposed to the proposed route through Brush Prairie. This is a beautiful neighborhood these proposed lines will be a health hazard and visually unsightly they will drive down the prices of the homes in this area. We chose this area for its beauty and safe rural environment. This project is every person's nightmare.

Communication ID: 11785

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: PEGGY K. NEWTON

I am on line segment 31 map page 96 My husband and I have lived here on this beautiful property for 15 years. We raised our children here and also have horses, dogs and cats here. We have worked very hard over the years to maintain and improve our property. We plan on retiring here and living out our lives here on this property. Having power lines between 4 and 50 feet front my front door is very upsetting to me. I will not be able to live like this. Our property value will nose dive and we won't be able to sell out. If you must build these lines please use the most eastern route through state and federal forest land, on routes 29, 34, 35 Thank you, Peggy Newton

Communication ID: 11786

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: CHRIS BORDELON

Yes, my name is Chris Bordelon. I live at [address]. My phone number is [phone number]. I have a request that someone send me the map of where the proposed lines are going in my area of Hockinson. I've tried to view it online but it's kind of confusing and I'm not really sure I'm understanding if it's going to be to the east or the west of me. Um, I live off of 109th and 212th, and I live further up from 212th, but anyway, if somebody could please send that to me or contact me about that I would greatly appreciate it. Thank you.

Communication ID: 11787

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: JOANNE MCKEE

My name is Joanne McKee. I'm on your mailing list as "Cressie E. Dahlquist Trust" My phone number is [phone number]. I would like to talk with someone, um, and, uh about the topics I want to. I would appreciate a call back. Thank you.

Communication ID: 11788

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: GARY BOCK

Please have your environmental studies look at:

-Impacts of 500 kilovolt lines on human health

-Impacts of locating lines in stream headwater areas vs. slightly more urbanized areas in lower watersheds [including]

-fish impacts

-riparian vegetation

-water quality

-steep slopes

I have these other comments:

-Coordinate with other agencies so so BPA corridors can double as regional trails

-In general I would prefer transmission lines to be located in areas that are already urbanizing.

Communication ID: 11789

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: HORNE FAMILY TREE FARM, LLC C/O ERNEST HORNE

I would like for you to send me, a copy of your map where with, where the power line is going to go with the street maps or the names of the streets or not just the lines, like it was in the paper. And my address is- it will be for the Horne Family Tree Farm, LLC in care of Ernest Horne at [Address]. We live in Ridgefield but our property is in Hockinson and my address is - maybe I just gave it to you- [Address]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 11790

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: JOHN A POLOS

Mark, Thanks for extending the deadline to Dec. 14th. I have received lots of positive feedback and no negatives, on extension. I have not been able to log on to the web site:

groups.google.com/group/property-owners-against-bpa. I understand a couple of my emails or comments are on this site. Eventually this site will die on its own, but it is still around. We do not have

another site yet, as far as I know. If I ever email you anything personally, I will use blind cc, and will not give out your personal email to anyone. (I do not have your email.) Thanks again, John Polos, PE, BPA Engineer, retired

Communication ID: 11791

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: ANITA K. MALLORY

To Whom it May Concern: I live in grid #39 of the proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. I am very upset that this proposal is even being considered in an area that is so populated and is continuing to grow. Every dime that I have is sunk into my property, home and barn. My neighbors and I have livestock that would have to be displaced. It would be very difficult to recreate what we have here. I moved out to the country for the peace and quiet and to enjoy the wildlife. Not to have power lines engulf my property. There are plenty of areas to the East of here where not as many homeowners would be affected. I appreciate your consideration in moving this project somewhere else where it will not be as damaging. Sincerely, Anita Mallory

Communication ID: 11792

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: TERESA A KUBO

Nancy Wittpenn, Environmental Project Lead

I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

PO Box 9250,

Portland, OR 97207

RE: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) scoping comments on the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), Department of Energy (DOE) Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Transmission Project. EPA Project Number: 09-059-BPA.

Dear Ms. Wittpenn:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Notice of Intent (NOI) dated October 13, 2009, regarding the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project in Cowlitz and Clark Counties, Washington, and Multnomah County, Oregon. Our review of the NOI was conducted in accordance with our responsibilities under National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.

Section 309 specifically directs the EPA to review and comment in writing on the environmental impacts

associated with all major federal actions. Under our Section 309 authority, our review of the draft EIS prepared for the proposed project will consider the expected environmental impacts, and the adequacy of the EIS in meeting procedural and public disclosure requirements of NEPA. The NOI states that the Proposed Action would construct a new 500-kilovolt (kV) transmission line and associated substations. The new line would extend generally southeast from a new substation proposed near Castle Rock in Washington, to a new substation proposed near BPA's existing Troutdale Substation near the city of Troutdale in Oregon. The new line would be approximately 70 miles in length.

The scoping comments that follow are provided to inform the BPA of issues that EPA believes to be significant and warrant treatment during the NEPA process. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments at this stage of the EIS development process. If you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact me at (503) 326-2859 or by electronic mail at kubo.teresa@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/

Teresa Kubo, Acting Manager

Environmental Review and Sediment Management Unit

EPA scoping comments on the BPA Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

November 20, 2009

NEPA Issues

Purpose and Need

The EIS should specify the underlying purpose and need for the proposed transmission line, including discussion of the planning process, power needs, power markets, customer bases, power transmission technologies, cost-effectiveness, financing, energy conservation, and any other power transmission issues that may be appropriate.

The EIS should also include an adequate explanation of the rationale for the establishment of the analysis area boundary. An appropriate analysis area should encompass the potentially affected environment, and should be able to function as an appropriate unit of analysis for projecting anticipated impacts and for measuring actual effects.

Alternatives

We encourage the BPA to develop and evaluate alternatives that avoid as much as possible streams, riparian areas and wetlands and other environmentally sensitive areas, and that avoid fragmentation of wildlife habitat, as well as adverse social and economic impacts, including impacts to established farm and ranch operations. Use of existing right-of-way corridors are generally preferred to avoid disturbance

to previously undisturbed areas, although potential routings to reduce impacts to environmentally sensitive areas or other significant environmental, social or economic impacts may need to be considered. Disturbance to soils and vegetation during construction, and impacts to rivers, streams, water quality, fish, wildlife and scenic, recreation, or cultural resources should be avoided and/or minimized as much as possible.

Burial of the transmission lines should be considered in areas with scenic values to reduce visual impacts, though we recognize that transmission line burial could result in additional impacts to soils and vegetation as well as increased construction costs.

We recommend that tables, maps, figures, charts, photos, etc., be used as much as possible and wherever appropriate to present and display specific features of alternatives so that features of the different alternatives can be clearly understood, and then evaluated in a comparative manner. We recommend that an alternatives matrix table that summarizes major features and significant environmental impacts of alternatives be provided to facilitate understanding of the alternatives, particularly distinctions between alternatives, and provide comparative evaluation of alternatives in a manner that sharply defines issues for the decision maker and the public to make in regard to a reasoned choice among alternatives.

Affected Environment/Existing Conditions

The EIS should succinctly describe the affected environment and existing conditions using appropriate scales within the analysis area (e.g., watershed analysis where applicable).

The EIS should identify and discuss:

- Power line right-of-way, power needs, customer bases, power markets, power transmission technologies, the likely present and future energy generation units to be served by the transmission line, energy conservation, cost-effectiveness, financing, and any other appropriate power transmission issues.
- Environmental conditions along alternative transmission line routes should be described (i.e., characterize aquatic, biological and other environmental resources which have a potentially greater importance or sensitivity to impacts). Resources where existing knowledge of the resource or its sensitivity is currently lacking should be identified, and efforts should be made to collect needed information (e.g., conduct field surveys), and/or explain why such information is unavailable and cannot be obtained.
- Land uses and social and economic conditions along potential transmission line corridor routes and potential conflicts and controversies in regard to land use, social and economic issues should be described.

Baseline resources information should characterize the biological and physical environment and the social and economic conditions sufficient to determine adequacy of data and information for evaluating potential environmental, social and economic impacts. This is needed to support transmission line

construction and operation recommendations relative to resource protection, disclosure of mitigation measures, cumulative impact analysis, and to provide a reference for subsequent monitoring. Resources for which existing knowledge of the resource or its sensitivity is currently lacking should be identified, and efforts should be made to collect needed information (e.g., conduct field surveys), and/or explain why such information is unavailable and cannot be obtained.

Environmental Consequences

The EIS should comprehensively analyze and disclose the environmental, social and economic impacts of the transmission line construction and operation alternatives, and the likelihood of success and effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures. The analysis of environmental consequences should include the effect of implementing the alternative on the physical, chemical and biological resources such as air and water quality, biologic components or ecosystems, and include impacts within the entire analysis area resulting from activities on all land ownerships.

We believe the environmental consequences section should include evaluations of potential impacts on water quality, fisheries, river/stream hydrology, wetlands, ground water aquifers, vegetation, wildlife, biodiversity, air quality, public health, historic and cultural resources, social and economic effects, and connectivity to other projects. It should also discuss unavoidable adverse environmental effects, short-term and long-term environmental considerations, and any irreversible or irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved with the alternatives should they be implemented. This section should address (40 CFR 1502.16):

- a. Direct effects and their significance.
- b. Indirect effects and their significance.
- c. Possible conflicts between the proposed action and the objectives of Federal, regional, State, and local (and in the case of a reservation, Indian tribe) land use plans, policies and controls for the area concerned.
- d. The environmental effects of alternatives including the proposed action.
- e. Energy requirements and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures.
- f. Natural or depletable resource requirements and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures.
- g. Urban quality, historic and cultural resources, and the design of the built environment, including the reuse and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures.
- h. Means to mitigate adverse environmental impacts.

It is also important that environmental analysis conducted during the EIS process be integrated with other planning and environmental review procedures (e.g., permitting requirements) so that all such procedures run concurrently rather than consecutively (40 CFR 1500.2(c)). The DEIS should list all

Federal permits, licenses and other entitlements which must be obtained in implementing the proposal (40 CFR 1502.25).

Cumulative Impacts

EPA has issued guidance on how we are to provide comments on the assessment of cumulative impacts, Consideration of Cumulative Impacts in EPA Review of NEPA Documents, which can be found on EPA's Office of Federal Activities home page at: <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/resources/nepa.html>. The guidance states that in order to assess the adequacy of the cumulative impacts assessment, five key areas should be considered. EPA tries to assess whether the cumulative effects analysis:

1. Identifies resources if any, that are being cumulatively impacted;
2. Determines the appropriate geographic (within natural ecological boundaries) area and the time period over which the effects have occurred and will occur;
3. Looks at all past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions that have affected, are affecting, or would affect resources of concern;
4. Describes a benchmark or baseline;
5. Includes scientifically defensible threshold levels.

Resource Issues

Water Resources

The EIS should clearly describe water bodies in the analysis area that may be impacted by project activities, and describe relationships between local waters and proposed transmission line construction activities. Identifying affected watersheds and streams and aquifer areas on maps of the various alternatives helps convey their relationship with project activities.

The EIS should identify the existing uses (type, amount and location) of waters potentially impacted by proposed transmission line construction and operation activities, and the applicable water quality standards (WQS) for such waters. Existing baseline watershed and water quality conditions should be summarized where water quality impacts may be expected, since baseline water quality data and beneficial use support are key in the evaluation of impacts.

Water quality impacts include chemical, physical and biological effects. The EIS must demonstrate that impacts to surface and ground water, riparian areas, wetlands, and aquatic species will be adequately mitigated, and that applicable WQS will be maintained.

The EIS should discuss the capability of surface and ground water resources to assimilate point and non-point pollution from the project. A discussion of relevant project area geology, topography, soils and stream stability in terms of erosion and mass failure potential may be necessary to adequately portray the potential risk to water quality, aquatic habitat and other resources from the implementation of

specific transmission line construction alternatives. In particular erosion concerns during construction should be addressed. EPA recommends that areas of high erosion risk should be avoided.

The EIS should indicate whether any streams in the area have particular fisheries issues and values (e.g., aquatic species habitat, condition, productivity, and quality of habitat, connectivity, spawning or nursery area, or a conservation priority or population stronghold for a listed or sensitive species; identify presence of any threatened and endangered species or species of special concern, barriers to fish migration). The EIS should identify if fisheries could be impaired by transmission line construction activities, including access roads.

303 (d) listed Waters and Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs)

The EIS should identify any water bodies listed on Washington State's CWA 303(d) list along the transmission line corridor that may be affected by transmission line construction and operation, as well as the magnitude and sources of impairment. We suggest contacting the Washington Department of Ecology to identify and validate waterbodies that are listed by the States as impaired or threatened. It is important that proposed transmission line construction and operation activities be carried out in a manner that avoids further degradation of 303(d) listed waters, and consistent with TMDLs and Water Quality Restoration Plans prepared, or being prepared, by the State to restore water quality.

Wetlands

Transmission line construction activities should avoid or minimize impacts to streams and wetlands. Wetlands that may be affected by proposed transmission line construction and operation should be identified, and potential impacts on wetland functions should be assessed.

We recommend establishment of wetland and riparian habitat buffer zones to avoid adverse impacts to streams, wetlands, and riparian areas.

Wildlife

The EIS should evaluate impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat from transmission line construction and operation. Affected environment sections should include current quality and capacity of wildlife habitat and usage near the proposed project, and known wildlife corridors/trails that may be affected. Wildlife habitat characteristics, security, displacement, fragmentation, connectivity, and wildlife movement corridors should be assessed and disclosed.

Wildlife habitats should be maintained, and degraded habitats restored. Measures to mitigate adverse impacts to wildlife should be described.

There may be particular concerns regarding power line impacts upon avian species.

Standards for transmission line support structures should conform to Practices for Raptor Protection on Power Lines. Monitoring may need to be considered to determine if bird strikes or electrocutions of birds occur as a result of this project. Field surveys are recommended to locate birds which have been

electrocuted or have struck transmission lines to aid in identifying and modifying problem structures. We note that shield wires are often struck by birds in flight and efforts should be made to include design and mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to birds.

The EIS should describe coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the Washington and Oregon Departments of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW and ODFW) to assess whether any aspect of the proposed project may affect listed threatened or endangered species or their designated and proposed critical habitat.

Other Resource Issues and Concerns

Noxious Weeds

Among the greatest threats to biodiversity is the spread of noxious weeds. Many noxious weeds can out-compete native plants and produce a monoculture that has little or no botanic diversity or benefit to wildlife. The EIS should identify the noxious weeds/exotic plants that occur along the transmission line routes; discuss the magnitude and occurrence of the weed infestations; and control measures and strategies for weed management, prevention, and early detection of invasion along transmission line right-of-way corridors.

Potential mitigation measures for preventing the spread of noxious weeds include the following:

1. Clean equipment tracks and tires prior to transportation to an uninfested site
2. Reseed and renegotiate disturbed sites early
3. Use only weed free certified seed

Electromagnetic Field /Public Health

There can be public health concerns regarding electric fields created by a high-voltage transmission lines. Potential electromagnetic fields (EMF) field effects can include induced currents, steady-state current shocks, spark discharge shocks, and in some cases field perception and neurobehavioral responses. The DEIS should disclose any concerns regarding public health or environmental effects from EMF generated by the transmission line. Potential EMF buffer needs for the transmission line must be evaluated if the transmission line would be located near residences or other public facilities.

Social and Economic Effects

The EIS should also discuss the social and economic consequences of proposed power line construction, including effects on the local economy, job additions and losses, tax base and funding, public uses and recreation, local development, etc. The effects of the proposed facility and alternatives on community facilities, programs, systems, infrastructure of communities, and local agricultural operations along the alternative transmission line routes should be assessed and disclosed.

Historic and Cultural Resources

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), 16 U.S.C. § 470f, requires that federal agencies consider the effects of a Federal action on historic properties and determine whether the undertaking has the potential to affect historic properties. Historic properties include the archaeological, paleontological, native religious and other cultural resources in an area. If there is a potential to affect historic or cultural resources from construction of this transmission line, BPA should coordinate and consult with the State Historic Preservation Officers and other appropriate entities. The EIS should identify historical, archaeological, paleontological, native religious, sacred or other cultural resources that may be affected. Knowledge of the presence or absence of significant cultural resources in the project area and along alternative sites may be important for a reasoned choice among alternatives. All possible efforts should be made to avoid impacts to significant historic and cultural resources.

Environmental Justice

Consistent with E.O. 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations," Federal agencies are required to make environmental justice part of their missions by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations (e.g. Native American) and low-income populations. Environmental justice issues may encompass a broad range of impacts covered by NEPA, including impacts on the natural or physical environment and interrelated social, cultural, and economic impacts.

The BPA should develop a strategy for effective public involvement of minority and low income populations in power line considerations, analyzing environmental, social, cultural and economic effects, and developing mitigation measures.

Consultation with Tribes

If the proposed action will impact Tribes in the area, then the EIS should identify the impacts, and provide assurance that the tribes' treaty rights and privileges have been addressed appropriately. Consultation with all affected tribal governments is stipulated in the Executive Order (EO) 13175 (Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments). This order states that the U.S. government will continue "to work with Indian tribes on a government-to government basis to address issues concerning Indian tribal self-government, trust resources, and Indian tribal treaty and other rights." The CEQ also strongly urges federal agencies to consider inviting affected tribal governments to participate in proposed projects' development process as cooperating agencies. This would establish a mechanism for addressing intergovernmental issues throughout the project development process.

Communication ID: 11793

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: R. GREGORY

My home is on [Street] in Vancouver, near the Green Meadows golf course. It's situated approximately 250 feet north of the existing BPA right of way that contains two large power lines. On the "I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project Study Area Map", my home is adjacent to the segment labeled 25.

My family is concerned about the effects of exposure to electro-magnetic fields (EMF). Years ago, we had BPA produce a report which showed us the level of EMF exposure emanating from the BPA power lines near our house. We've studied and followed the research about the human health consequences of EMF exposure.

While the studies of the effects of EMF exposure by the US Government, the World Health Organization and private institutions have not yet shown a strong risk to health, we and these organizations have concluded that EMF exposure cannot be recognized as completely safe.

Consequently more study has and is being done to answer the question of safety.

Routing the new power line on new separate towers along segment 25 would expose a large number of people to increased EMF. The per capita EMF exposure cost along this segment would be significantly higher than the alternatives. Consider what the consequences would be for BPA if an unequivocal EMF health risk was found.

Does the BPA have a policy of minimizing or reducing EMF exposure? If the decision is made to run the new power line along segment 25, will BPA take steps to reduce the EMF exposure? I understand that technology exists to run two separate power lines on a single tower and phase the electricity running through the lines to cancel out EMF radiation. I would suggest that BPA consider replacing the towers of one of the existing power lines that run through the right of way with single towers that hold the existing power line and the new power line. By implementing the appropriate phasing BPA could then reduce EMF exposure along segment 25.

Richard Gregory

[Email address]

Communication ID: 11794

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: LYNN K CHMELIR,JOHN WEBB

Dear BPA: Thank you for mailing me maps of the area near my home, although they are very difficult to read. If I understand correctly, the light area is included in the possible route for the new transmission lines. We live at [address]. (NW corner of page 110). This is a developed subdivision on the very border of your swath. We ask you to redraw the boundary of your project so that our subdivision is no longer

included in the possible route for the power line. There is plenty of undeveloped property directly to the east of our subdivision. If our property continues to be within the boundary, we will not be able to sell our house and the value will disappear. Since it is unlikely that you will choose to put power lines in our subdivision, it makes sense to eliminate these homes from consideration so we are not in limbo for the next five years. We are not giving permission for you to enter our property. If that is necessary, please contact us at the time and we will consider your request to enter our yard. I hope you will continue to keep us informed about your progress. Lynn Chmelir John Webb

Communication ID: 11795

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: MARY V. FROLICH

This addition in our neighbor will alter my family's life negatively. It has been suggested that this will not "possibly" cause a health risk. That is NOT true. There is cause and effect with health issues. Your department has also frozen our assets at a time we need them. We've been in contact with realtors who will say the house now will be hard to sell because of this. We need to sell soon, desperately. In addition to health risks, the view will lower our house value to the point that it may not sell ever. Are you ready to buy this home? We already have an autistic spectrum child and need money for medical bills. We can't risk his health or the value of the house. I truly don't understand why alternate routes are the only ones being considered since this route affects loads of people and homes. We will not sit quiet. We will make our points loud and clear through the media, these letters, representation and more. Please make a quick decision to take this route out of your options and give us our freedom back. Every moment you sit on this hurts us. Thank you for your time. Mary Frohlich

Communication ID: 11796

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: CHRISTOPHER A. TIMBREZA

From: Chris Timbreza []

Sent: Friday, November 20, 2009 12:51 PM

To: Korsness, Mark A - TEP-TPP-2

Subject: I-5 Corridor Project

Hi Mark,

I can imagine that you have received quite a bit of emails and faxes regarding opposition to segment 31. The residents living near or around segment 31 (myself included) have a right to be upset. The building of segment 31 would devastate our community. I strongly urge you to consider other routes through

state forest land that would not have such a huge impact on a community. I urge BPA to do the right thing and not base the decision solely on the bottom line.

Christopher Timbreza

Hockinson, WA

Communication ID: 11797

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: RICHARD D BOSLAUGH

I am interested in all information relating to the BPA Route 31 project.

Communication ID: 11798

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: CHERYL

From: Cheryl [E-mail]

Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2009 7:00 PM

To: Korsness,Mark A - TEP-TPP-2

Subject: Proposed Power line in Hockinson

I will make it simple. Please do not put the power line in our back yards. Family's have been here for generations. Our property values have already plummeted. We can't afford to lose any more. Please consider a less populated area. Move trees not people. Thank You

Communication ID: 11799

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: CONRAD S BOCK

Regarding the route selected. There are two routes that should be first considered before deciding to expropriate private homes. (1), The proposed route for the third bridge crossing the Columbia and inter state bypass extending from I-5 North of Vancouver to Troutdale. This proposal was first made 20 years ago as and alternative site to the present I-205 bridge, to utilize this route would simplify acquiring more property. (2), To select the route through the state owned timber areas, reducing the impact on private property owners. The argument would also be that private property owners collectively pay more in

taxes than the state receives as royalty. Furthermore the access to this area would provide for multi use for public hiking, nature observation and as a firebreak providing forest protection. Fire brakes are usually put in by the forest service at the departments expense.

Communication ID: 11800

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: KATHLEEN SAWYER

NO,NO,No on I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project No BPA

Communication ID: 11801

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: JAMES E MUIR,MICHELLE J MUIR

As a citizen of Clark County living in Hockinson I am totally against the BPA Segment 31 proposed route for your 500kv powerlines. Even though my home is not in the direct line it is within a 1/4 mile. Those of us realize a need for power and the ability to provide it but there are other less intrusive routes which could be taken. The existing line through Fruit Valley for one. Or on public land east of Hockinson. The wildlife that abounds in this area would be dealt a setback as far as the amount of room available to them and the disturbance to them that would be created by this type of project. We have owls, deer, coyote, bear and other smaller creatures that make living out here a true blessing. I am AGAINST SEGMENT 31 in its entirety.

Communication ID: 11802

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: NINA R STRICKLER

Do you have an example of a 500KV line, 150 foot towers going through residential neighborhoods. How has this worked out? Please provide the public information about instances where this size of transmission towers and lines have been placed into an already existing residential neighborhood. I am opposed to route #31 that will bisect the community of Hockinson into the "above the line" and "below the line" sections. This would destroy this community and the unique rural setting that exist. Please remove segment 31 from any further consideration. Thank you for your time. Nina Strickler

Communication ID: 11803

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: F S MUEGLER

Communication ID: 11804

Date: 11/21/2009

Name: CHARLOTTE C PERSONS

Dear sirs: I live along the part of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project that is proposed segment 9. Building the new transmission line along the segment 9 route through Kelso would affect my neighborhood, along Sunrise Street/Behshel Heights Road on the eastern border of Kelso in Cowlitz County. I urge you NOT to choose segment 9 for the new 500-volt transmission line from Troutdale to Castle Rock. Property Values: The loss of aesthetic values will affect the property values of nearby homes and thus the property values of the entire neighborhood. • Visual impact: --Tower height: The new towers will be 30 feet taller than the existing 75—80 foot towers. This means that the new towers will be high above existing screening trees and also will be much more visible from neighboring residences. In addition, the taller towers will impact the current lovely sweeping view from my house. --Loss of trees: Because a new transmission line will need a larger easement area, our neighborhood will suffer from the loss of many mature trees. These trees add to the general aesthetic value of our neighborhood, and specifically screen the existing towers from the view of my residence. Without these trees, our neighborhood's property values will be diminished. • Noise impact: The new transmission lines will be noisier than the existing lines because they will carry more electricity. While this noise may be within existing federal guidelines, it will be heard at ground level. This distracting noise will affect property value of my residence and my neighbors' residences. In addition, it is possible that with the addition of the new power lines, the total noise level, when combined with the noise from traffic on I-5, will exceed existing federal guidelines. Slide Danger: Many of the residences that border the existing power line are on steep land or hillsides. In fact some of the land is classified as "unstable soils" on the Kelso "Critical Areas" map. This kind of terrain is prone to mud slides, as is shown by the recent slide on Corduroy Road, near where it intersects Sunrise Street, only a quarter mile from the current power lines. Another recent slide is near the power line on the upper part of Behshel Heights Road. New, heavier power-line towers, or their construction, may cause even more slides. Avoiding this kind of land disturbance in a residential neighborhood should be of highest priority when considering the route for the new 500-volt line. Please consider the visual and auditory impacts of building the new transmission line on our property values in our neighborhood, and the special dangers presented by building in unstable, hilly terrain in our neighborhood. I urge you to choose an alternative route for the Proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, not segment 9 through Kelso, Washington. Sincerely, Charlotte Persons [Phone] [e-mail]

P.S. Problems with My Property: There are three particulars about my property that you should know before you begin excavation on or near it: • The backyard of my 50-year-old house has three seventy-foot long terraces supported by hand-laid rock that is not reinforced by concrete. • The property line between my lot and my northern neighbors consists of a 75-foot retaining wall 4.5 feet high. On my side this wall is free of earth, but the other side supports the weight of the earth of their yard. • A drainage

pipe under my property empties into the street in front of my house beside my mailbox on the western edge of my property. This pipe runs almost all year long, and I suspect that it might be part of a diverted creek.

Communication ID: 11805

Date: 11/21/2009

Name: JANE A VOGEL,SANDERS L VOGEL

NO ON SEGMENT #31 FOR BPA I-5 CORRIDOR REINFORCEMENT PROJECT. If the BPA must follow through with their I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, they should consider the addressing their options in the following order: 1) Modernize their distribution process to eliminate the need for the huge 500 KV power lines 2) Upgrade or replace existing lines in their current right of ways 3) Select either line #28 or #29 which runs through forest lands and almost no developed areas 4) Select line #30 which runs through forest land and some developed residential areas 5) Line #31 should not be considered because of its dangerous and disruptive affect on many families, their homes, schools and communities. I have read most of the research regarding 500 KV power lines and believe that if they are needed, they should not be placed anywhere near existing homes or neighborhoods. The 150 foot easement is nowhere big enough, when you consider it would allow a home to be only 75 feet from these huge, dangerous 150 foot monstrous towers. I say absolutely NO on Line #31. Sincerely, Jane Vogel [Address]

Communication ID: 11806

Date: 11/21/2009

Name: JOAN C SAMPSON

Please send me a map of any proposed transmission lines for the Probestal area in Clark County. [Address]. All area north and south from this location. Thank you,

Communication ID: 11807

Date: 11/21/2009

Name: KURT C WILLIAMS

My family lives near the proposed rout #31 that would run along 212th ave in battle ground. I am strongly opposed to this route. we have all taken a severe blow to our property values from the recession. The additional drop in value from nearby power lines would compromise many of us financially. Home value is a primary savings vehicle for many Americans. Additionally, I do not believe that 75 feet is a safe distance. The health effects of EMF have not been studied thoroughly enough to conclude that this distance is safe. I have read studies indicating a link between long-term exposure to EMF and childhood leukemia. I have a 6-month old child and if this route is used We will have to sell our

home at a loss and move. I will not risk my son's life. There must be some compromise that uses existing right of ways or existing power routes to satisfy future power demands. Thank you Kurt Williams

Communication ID: 11808

Date: 11/21/2009

Name: TERRY L SMITH

Dear Paul Woolson, BPA Representative:

Subject: I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

I would like to voice my concerns about BPA's plans for the I-5 corridor project. I live on the south side of NE 48th Circle, located on your map 105 points 36 and 37 are located just to the south. Eight years ago my wife and I started looking for a new home we were out growing our other house because of starting a family. With our young two kids in mind we searched for nearly a year before we decided to buy the house on NE 48th circle. One of our concerns was how much Electro Magnetic Forces was being thrown out by the large towers behind the house. We asked Clark Public Utilities to come out do some measurements. According to PUD the numbers were not too high by the house, averaging 2.6mlg. But each step you took towards the towers the numbers went up until reaching a reading of 60mlg under the lines. After talking with the PUD representative we decided to buy the house.

We also purchased the house impart because we knew that there would be no building going on behind us (BPA Power Lines and Wetlands), looking ahead for the future and that the property value would most likely go up, because it is hard to find a one acre lot close to town. Buying a home is a great investment to pass along to your children.

When we moved in we were the only family with kids (2) and there was still four lots not built on yet. As mentioned that was eight years ago all four lots were taken and another lot was added at the top of the street. There are now five families living on NE 48th circle for a total of thirteen children, not to mention many grand kids.

I understand the need for more power as the area has grown in the last 25 years that my wife and I have lived in Vancouver. But I can not understand the reasoning to put these new large lines right across the middle of Vancouver which would have an effect on many families and businesses, and even schools could be. One that comes to mind is Harmony elementary. I work for the Evergreen School District Food Service, and I manage the feeding of ten thousand students everyday. My wife is a Teacher in the Vancouver School District and is the recipient of the Golden Apple Award this year which makes her one of the top seven Teachers in the state of Washington. Other careers in our small community are a National Guard Pilot, Emergency Room Doctor, Bankers, Developer, and Retirees. I want to say we help build this community, protect it, teach the kids in it, care for there health and more.

When we bought our house we had no idea this could happen. If we were to sell the value would drop

because the next buyer would know about the project. If we were to stay and the project was planned for our area we would have a large tower in the middle of our backyard right next to our house and the EMF's would be off the charts.

I hope BPA will realize what a impact this would have on the Environment, we enjoy seeing Deer, Bald Eagles, Raccoons, Osprey and many other members of nature that have lived here far before us.

Communication ID: 11809

Date: 11/21/2009

Name: SHERRY L PINKOWSKY

I have received a letter requesting access to our propert for evaluation. I have heard that if I received that letter that meant that we are in the line of the project and our house would have to be removed. We just paid \$11,000.00 for a new septic and drainfield and we had more upgrades planned. How are we supposed to live meanwhile not knowing if our house is to be purchased from us without our control? please respond.

Communication ID: 11810

Date: 11/21/2009

Name: WYATT W W

Opposition to the I-5 Reinforcement Project from land owner in area considered for one or more lines to cross trough. Due to my preferences, knowledge, and beliefs, I chose to buy inconveniently located, but beautifully pristine wilderness property. I highly value that I am nearly off-grid. There are many others who hold this same preference, knowledge, and belief structure. If High-Voltage overhead transmission lines run near, or through my property, it would make this land unusable to me, and to many others. Effectively taking the land's usefulness from me, significantly reducing the pool of possible buyers, thereby causing the value of the property to plummet! I strongly oppose this Massive increase in electrical pollution coming anywhere near the area that I chose specifically to avoid exactly this type of interference. I will not consider granting any easement without very significant compensation, preferring outright purchasing of the entire property at fair market value. Purchaser of 20 acres of mountainous beauty, Wyatt [e-mail]

Communication ID: 11811

Date: 11/21/2009

Name: MRS. BRAUN, THEODORE BRAUN

Re: The proposed new 500KV power line that could or would come through our Clark County neighborhood. We adamantly oppose it, for numerous reasons. We and our neighbors have worked hard for many years to care for and improve our property. We've already taken a hit on our property values due to the economic down turn. As you know property values go down when high voltage power lines are present or even nearby. Not just for aesthetic reasons but also for health reasons. Studies show that children from 0-5 years old have higher incidence of childhood leukemia when forced to live under or near such powerful electro-magnetic flows. Until existing facilities have been upgraded to capacity it does not seem prudent to uproot or destroy so many homes and livelihoods and risk the health of our children and grandchildren. Instead, shouldn't the already existing right of ways be used for your new lines? In the event that this is not possible, would it not be wiser to put the new lines on the public lands located just east of here, where no one would be endangered and homes and property could be left intact. The end does not justify the means. Children's lives and all our futures are at stake. Sincerely, Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Braun

Communication ID: 11812

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: WALT SCHILLER

Dear Anita Decker:

I wanted to try and get my letter directly to you but also wanted to let you know how this will affect our family. It is not just about physical things but rather real lives.

If route 31 is selected we will be forced to live very close to the transmission line. Our home is on page 91 of the map and we are on 215th Pl which is just east of the proposed right away and line.

My wife has cancer and multiple sclerosis. Just the thought of the line and what it will do to our lives are causing her great stress and that is not good for her illnesses. If route 31 was chosen the stress would be even greater. Due to the progress of her MS we will eventually need to sell our home and move to a facility that can assist her. Selling our home would be very difficult at best and probably at a much reduced price which would eat into our ability to get her suitable care.

These are people's lives you are dealing with. Your decision to use route 31 or a less disruptive route will make a big difference. It has to be more than dollars and sense.

Please do not select route 31.

Sincerely,

Walt Schiller

Communication ID: 11813

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: WALT SCHILLER, GRACE A SCHILLER

Hi, Maryam. We met the other night at the BPA meeting in Camas.

Since then we have written many letters to our elected officials both locally and in Washington as well as to your organization concerning the proposed segment 31. We wanted to communicate directly with your Chief Operating Officer, Anita J. Decker but could not locate her direct e mail.

As a Public Affairs Specialist with the Bonneville Power Administration I thought perhaps you could get my letter (attached) directly to her.

Hope your day is going well.

Regards,

Walt and Grace Schiller

Dear Anita Decker:

I am asking you to stop the destruction of many neighborhoods, communities, lives and natural treasures in Clark County.

BPA's proposed segment 31 of the i5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would: (a) threaten the health of many hundreds—especially children, (b) ruin the quality of life of tens of thousands, and (c) dramatically shrink the property tax base for Clark County. This segment must not be allowed to go forward. BPA has other alternatives, including adding to existing lines to the west, as well as segments farther east that are entirely uninhabited. Although BPA explained that the alternatives are also problematic, the disadvantages pale in comparison to segment 31. For the reasons listed below, we desperately need you to choose another segment.

A Human Health Catastrophe: BPA will be building 150-ft. towers and 500 KV power lines for the project. Many studies of health effects from proximity to power lines are funded by power companies, and show "inconclusive" results. The few independent studies [CA 2002, UK 2005 and AUS 2007] are based on the typical 80KV to 230KV lines, and show terrifying increases in occurrence of childhood leukemia (twofold to fivefold, depending on exposure and type of study). There are also cancer increases in adults and risks to pregnant women. I'll provide references at the conclusion of this letter.

Please remember that BPA's lines are at least two to three times more powerful than the lines used in these frightening studies. When asked, BPA has brushed off health effects entirely, simply citing examples where homes are already adjacent to power lines. Wow.

Some additional facts:

- California, on precautionary grounds, now requires that any new school building be set back at least 350 ft from 500KV power lines. The total width of the easement for BPA's lines: 150 ft.
- Connecticut overwhelmingly passed a law in 2004, requiring power lines to be buried if they pass near homes, schools, or other sensitive facilities.
- High voltage power lines have been curtailed or stopped entirely in Northern California, Pennsylvania, Delaware and New Jersey.
- Arizona is currently battling safety issues presented by 138KV lines. Ours: 500KV.

Destruction of a Way of Life: While the health risk (more like a death sentence) affects several hundred residents within 25 to 250 yards of the lines, the destruction of quality of life will affect tens of thousands. Many, many properties and views would be ruined, taking away the primary attraction of the area to homeowners. These are very quiet and private neighborhoods in bucolic and serene settings. The residents here made much larger-than-average investments in this area for those reasons. Vibrant communities and developments comprising the most valuable properties in the county would become "ghost towns". In addition to the massive clear-cutting, existing residential access roads would be compromised and many new maintenance roads built to accommodate the towers. At least one school site and several business sites would also be ruined.

In addition to homes and schools, there are berry and tree farms, natural preserves, wetlands, and high-cost forested areas spanning the length of segment 31. The abundant wildlife is in a precarious balance, due to their greatly reduced habitat from existing development. This project could also leave many large forest mammals with no place to go.

Decimation of Property Values and the Property Tax Base for the County: Segment 31 would reduce the value of thousands of expensive homes to pennies on the dollar. In addition to ruining the community, it shrinks dramatically the tax revenue from areas with the highest property values. This compromises Clark County's ability to fund schools and infrastructure for the rest of the county. Although the direct human costs of segment 31 are unconscionable, the "ripple effect" for the rest of the county must also be considered.

One of the most difficult aspects to this has been the process employed by BPA thus far to involve the citizens affected:

1. Communication: A very small number of letters were sent to homeowners about a month ago—only those whose homes sit directly in the path of the towers—to ask for property access to help with their environmental studies. They also provided times and locations for a series of 4 community meetings in the area. The vast majority of the homeowners affected by this were not even notified.
2. Timing: The community meetings all took place within 3 weeks of distribution of the letters. By the time most residents began to hear about this, the meetings were over, with BPA satisfied that they had

“involved” the community. Worse, they provided less than two additional weeks for a “public comment period”, ending November 23rd. Residents are only now beginning to hear about the project, must understand the details, location and the complex issues involved, and they have one week left to comment??

3. Meeting Format: For the few that did know about and attended the meetings, there was no “meeting” at all. Simply a series of stations set up with BPA employees to answer questions. We waited in lines to talk to someone, only to be passed to another—to wait again. There was no opportunity for all concerned citizens to hear the same messages, to ask questions publicly and hear answers. It was clearly a “divide and conquer” strategy intended to keep concerned citizens from hearing the same message or expressing an aligned point of view.

Frankly, the process has been manipulative and underhanded, calling into question BPA’s stated desire to hear from those whose health and lives could be ruined. This must change. We understand that our elected Federal officials are in a unique position to influence the BPA, which is part of the Dept. of Energy, but not funded directly by taxpayer dollars. As such we have asked for their support in this gravely important matter.

Thank you in advance for your concern and support in this gravely important matter.

Most sincerely,

Walter and Grace Schiller

[Address]

References:

EMF Info: NIH an DOE

<http://www.niehs.nih.gov/health/docs/emf-02.pdf>

EMF Health Report: CA Dept. of Health

<http://www.ehib.org/emf/>

Residential Exposure to Power Lines

<http://www.physorg.com/news107180850.html>

Powerwatch, UK: EMF Effects

www.powerwatch.org.uk/contents.asp

Citizens or Safe Power Lines (AZ)

<http://www.safepowerlines.org>

Communication ID: 11814

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: BARBARA EIGNER

Hello this is Barabara Eigner at [Phone]. I would like more information on what BPA response and management plan for dealing with vegetation under the powerlines, when do they spray and chop? Are they aggressive? My impression is that years ago they were sort of laid back until the brush got to be 12 feet high and then they went in. Can you explain there dealings with blackberry briars and stochbroom? Also, I'm concerned about trespassing and being held liable for activities that take place on the right-of-way or my property because of a line being built there. Please call me back at [Phone]. Goodbye.

Communication ID: 11815

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: CHRIS FERGUSON

Hi my name is Chris Ferguson. My phone number is [Phone]. I am within site of the proposed 31 line, of course I don't want the line near my home. I actually choose my home because it wasn't close to powerlines. It not only will decrease our property values, but in addition I really care about the magnetic field, I recognize you guys have arguments against that but there is proof for that too. At any rate, at least please extend the comment period, people like me who were not affected by condemnation, were not told and that's quite disgusting and not very fair playing field for comment. It is going to impact my property values, it will impact perhaps my families health. I have three kids to put through college and I am trying to keep a business afloat in a bad economy. This isn't cool and for you guys to ignore everybody else because you guys don't want to hear from us. Is really quite unfair. So please extend the comment period so my 86 year old neighbor who will live next door to this will have an ability to respond since he doesn't do email. So I thank you very much and please consider a different route.

Communication ID: 11816

Date: 11/6/2009

Name: RANDALL KRAUT

Would you please tell me how close the proposed new power line will be to my property - [Address]? I have looked online and cannot get a clear idea. I know it is close, but I would like to know how close.

Thank you,

Randall E. Kraut

Communication ID: 11817

Date: 11/2/2009

Name: RON GOLD

I would like to know if my home is in area 31 and just exactly where this power line would go how about a map

Communication ID: 11818

Date: 11/10/2009

Name: SHARON O'CONNOR

Communication ID: 11819

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: SIDNEY COLE

I have two pieces of property that this could go through and if you build there, I would lose a big chunk of that 20 acres and it would hurt the resale value depending on how it would cross the property. This would affect me financially.

Communication ID: 11820

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: PAT NELSON

Please have your environmental studies look at Coweeman River- Rose Valley. Fish spawn here. Fish also go up little creek that flows into Coweeman in 4400 block, and most likely other Rose Valley streams. Elk herd in this area. Occasional bears and deer varieties, salamanders/lizards. Everyone in Rose Valley depends on wells on streams- no public water system- construction could cause problems with wells- already difficult to get good water in Rose Valley is salt water.

Unique community- people take care of each other, hub of community is church, county school, grange and grocery. People work together to preserve lifestyle of this little country community. Please don't spoil it. I am so pleased that my grandchildren can grow up in this environment and worried about what

BPA might do to change that. The future of this rural community is so important.

Communication ID: 11821

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: ANONYMOUS

The least impact it seems would be to use existing corridors or to expand the width of those corridors where needed. Perhaps run your lines next to or through place like Wal-Mart instead of people's precious homes?

My son in laws ancestors lived on the banks of the Coweeman just beyond his property- there are photos of them with the bear hide stretched out from recent hunting- their camp consisting of tents by the river- how special to live where his ancestors lived- how unfortunate if that is ruined by BPA. Area: Rose Valley.

Communication ID: 11822

Date: 11/21/2009

Name: JAMES F. FARBER

BPA's very existence, indeed, your existence, depends entirely on the people you serve. Without those people there would be no need for a BPA. It therefore follows that your primary responsibility is to those people, to their health and well-being. Not some project even though that project is, in a broader long- term sense, in their best interest financially. Likewise the lands under DNR and the National Forest are property belonging to the people and should be used in the people's best interest not simply the environment. Environmental studies do not include the effects of electronic-fields ercated by appliances, machinery and power transmission lines on the health of people and livestock alike. And while current engineering design relative to thc projected load

may deem the lines safe now there is nothing written anywhere to prevent future

overloading; of these lines creating the health problems observed in Wisconsin some years back.-

If one considers for a moment the fact that cancer, in any form, is but an abnormal cell, according to the medical profession, and that all it takes to produce an abnormal cell is the movement of one electron in the outer ring of an atom and that can be accomplished by electricity and an ionic liquid. In other words given the right combination of harmonic wave activity and liquid might it not be possible that chemicals alone are not responsible for these cell changes but merely the catalyst? Unfortunately the jury is still

out on the effects of EMF, but it was the same for effects of asbestos too.

The proposed lines thru heavily inhabited areas is simply not a responsible risk I would like to see our BPA take when there is plenty of room further cast thru our property(state and federal) as well as a minimum of private property. Be responsible to your customers, the people, even if it hurts.

Communication ID: 11823

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: VICTORIA A JENNINGS

I live in the direct path of the proposed BPA Line #31. In fact, if you look at the BPA maps, our house id directly under one of the yellow lines. When we first received the information about this porposal to add towers and lines to our area, my first reation was that these things need to happen to help with the progress of our growing world. That is pretty obvious. After reviewing the proposal and the site of the lines, I was shocked to find out that our property is so completely effected by this. I have made may home in the Northwest after growing up in California. I moved here in 1980 with a new family to help log after the destruction on Mt. St. Helens, We have lived in various locations in Oregon and Washington. Two years ago I moved to my dream home and am lanning on getting married in 2010 and living out a wonderful retirement in this home. Now to find out about this proposal. My heart is sickened to hear of the health problems these things cause people. To also think about how I very carefully chose this land and house so that I could one day profit from those choices to leave a legacy for myt 3 children. Please hear my plead to say NO to the location of line #31. My address is: [Address].Please note where that is on the map and take what I have to say to heart. Respectfully, Victoria Jennings

Communication ID: 11824

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: GEORGE T. DILL

Dear BPA , Clark County is well known to have elevated naturally occuring arsenic which enters the drinking water system. Some private citizens'wells have been shut down by the US gov. Recent well drilling has been subject to heightened arsenic testing. The internet suggests increased worldwide attention to disruption of surface layers ,introduction of oxygen as activating agents in arsenic dispersal into gound water. Do not contribute to such risks for citizens living in the area of segment 30 and 28 by construction of voltage transmission towers. Please consult the vast literatue of Wahington state , Clark County WA and numerous other sources, and advise of your findings and decision. Yours truly, George T. Dill, citizen water consumer.

Communication ID: 11825

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: LYNETTE M JACKSON

BPA really needs to consider using a route that will affect the least amount of homeowners. Route segment 31 is a very populated area. At the information meetings, home owners were advised BPA would pay fair market value for their property. With the dramatic economic changes, many families own more on their mortgage than their property is currently worth. It would be a shame for BPA to force 100's of families out of their homes and them not getting enough to pay off their current mortgages.

Communication ID: 11826

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: KEN L EDWARDS

I am on line 18 of your proposal. Currently I have the PP&I 115kva power lines across my property with an easement that was given for their intent only! I have managed and cared for my tree farm for twenty years now with the intention of making my childrens and their childrens lifes a little better in the future. The BPA has not shown me the need for upgrading the power grid in this area, and proves it daily with there statements saying that "we don't even know if this project is going to happen". As far as I am concerned this project isn't happening on my property. I'm paying my dues now with the existing powerlines. No on private lands for your I-5 cooridor project!

Communication ID: 11827

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: KENNETH H MUNGER

As a property owner greatly affected by line 31, from looking at the map about 60 acres of the nearly 80 acres that I owne is shaded. This property has been in the family since 1939. I feel that line 35 would effect fewer property owners, since most of the state owned or timber land. I do not want anyone crossing the property without permission or setting a price on my property

Communication ID: 11828

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: DOROTHY A COUTSOUBOS

November 22, 2009 I've written before to protest building these lines where people live. I stated that they should be buried underground no matter what route you use. I read in the paper that "...they are too hot to be buried." That says it all. If they are too hot to be buried, they are too hot to run over people's heads. They cause cancer, birth defects, miscarriages, damage to DNA, and other health

problems. When organizations poisoned the citizens in Love Canal, New York, and in California where Erin Brokovich helped expose the truth, and in every dry cleaning establishment and leaky underground gasoline tank - EVENTUALLY the perpetrators were exposed and punished. For now, you can pretend that these wires and their electro-magnetic fields are safe, but we all know that they are NOT safe. It's just a matter of time until this is proven. Then your company will go bankrupt paying off the class action lawsuits. Sometimes the officers of the company even go to jail. To protect your company's financial bottom line, to keep yourselves out of prison, and JUST BECAUSE IT IS THE RIGHT THING TO DO, you need to bury these lines. Engineers can invent the necessary technology. When they built the Alaska oil pipeline, engineers ran into unbelievable "impossible situations," but each time, they invented their way out of it. American engineers are very clever. They can create a way to bury these lines and make them safe. Please do not pollute the environment and sicken and kill our citizens by going ahead with this plan as currently proposed. Thank you.

Communication ID: 11829

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: JAMES P ROTH

My home is on page 84 of the maps. The map shows a yellow line and a fogged area on each side of power line. Does this fogged area indicate the possible land that would be taken by you? What about the value of my home???? We have one power line already, one is enough!!!! Build the new one on Government land.

Communication ID: 11830

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: BILL R SCHNEIDER

I would like to express my opposition to use of segment 31 in the proposal. This segment cuts through a populated area and will greatly impact our community. There will be loss of property value (has already occurred by the announcement of the proposed project), loss of peoples homes, detrimental enviornmental impacts and possible hazards to those of us near any 500Kv lines. Please drop segment 31 from consideration. If you must build lines then the proposed segments 28-30 would result in less impact to the community and citizens of Clark county. There would be loss of forest lands but this is perfered to loss of homeowners land and property and the potnetial hazards of lines near our homes and young children. Thank you for your consideration Bill

Communication ID: 11831

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: JAMIE L WALLACE

I DO NOT AGREE WITH THIS PROJECT!!! i do not want this on or near my home or property. we are ready to fight NOT to allow this project.

Communication ID: 11832

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: TRENTON SPOLAR,LINDA SPOLAR

Our great concern when viewing the blow-up maps with the proposed routes was that No. 28 comes directly over our home. We were advised that those yellow proposed routes are a mile wide. There are four lots that No. 28 covers just prior to entering DNR land that are over 300 feet in width. It would be hard to miss going over someone's house or at least very near to it since that is over half a mile. It also crosses the confluence of Rock Creek, the largest tributary of the East Fork of the Lewis River, and the main East Fork of the Lewis. It would seem much more reasonable if an eastern route is used, i.e. 29, 28, or 30, that 32,33, and 34 would be almost entirely over DNR land. No. 32 could also be placed in that grouping. The most obvious route would be the one you already have in place, route 09. Having two lines so close together might have some theoretical disadvantage in time of a major disaster but the cost factor could seem to be much more reasonable than winding the route through mountainous terrain where access and maintenance would be difficult.

Trenton and Linda Spolar

Parcel ID [numbers]

Parcel [number]. Parcel [number] is

solely owned by Trenton Spolar.

These properties appear on your map No. 87.

Communication ID: 11833

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: WILLIAM E LONGMAN

Hello, Thank you for extending the scoping comment period for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project. It invites a more balanced set of voices when the general population is able to comment, rather than the initial focused groups. I have worked as a technical consultant for BPA for the past two and a half years. In that time, I've seen how BPA makes it a point to work with the public. I've also seen first-hand, however, how BPA likes to have its cake and eat it too. I would hope that in this instance, though, BPA would listen to the public on routing its transmission lines for this project. The area of SW Washington, specifically Vancouver, one of the largest cities in the state, is densely populated, relatively speaking. Routing transmission through this area is far from simple. But one thing that needs to be figured into the equation of routes is the cost of the route when it goes in compared with the overall impact on those displaced in the route for the next hundred years. The proposed segment 31 goes through some of the most highly valued properties in Clark county. I am very familiar with its route - I drove up and down it for several years in my commute between my home in Hockinson and my work Camas. Nowadays, on Wednesdays, I pick up vegetables from our Community Supported Agriculture farm - Purple Rain Vineyard - directly off the planned route. In summertime evenings, I marvel at the sunsets as I watch the sun sink behind the peaks of the Cascade range. However, the vista of the future would require me to look directly through those transmission lines. The wonders of living in this area can often be taken for granted -- we are blessed to be able to take part in the bounty and beauty of God's awesome creation. Many people who live along this corridor understand and deeply appreciate this. Many days, on the way home from picking up my daughter at school, I follow the Hockinson school bus down 109th Street. I'm never so busy to be upset at waiting behind the bus when I get to watch the glee of the children running down the lane when they get off the bus. One of those spots is directly on the planned route of segment 31. Please HEAVILY RECONSIDER the requirement for 500kV transmission lines on segment 31. If indeed a route is required, please look to routes along the river or to the east. Yours truly, William Longman

Communication ID: 11834

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: VERA GRIGOR'EVNA ZHELEZKIN, VLADIMIR IVANOVICH ZHELEZKIN

As we became informed regarding this subject we wouldn't like to be involved in this Corridor Reinforcement Project. So as you said that we were on your list, we don't want to be added to that particular list. Thank you for attention. Regards, Owners of [Address].

Communication ID: 11836

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: RONNY M PAUL

While I am fairly sure you not pick the path MOST populated to put your new lines, I would just like to state for the records that our property taxes dropped this year at a significant rate. If you decide to kick us off our property, there would be a very big stink about possible collusion between BPA and our Cowlitz county tax assessor. Also a great financial loss to we the property owners. Please don't uproot whole communities when there are other options. Sincerely, Ronny M. Paul

Communication ID: 11837

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: MICHAEL D LEE

I'm writing to state my dissatisfaction with BPA31 through Hockinson. The other routes that you have to choose from are a better choice for this community and our quality of life. I also wish to state that I am frustrated with BPA's lack of communication with me. I live just a few hundred yards from the proposed area. Open communication is a much more honorable way to live and carry on business.

Communication ID: 11838

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: JAMES A VOISIN

I would like to add my comments regarding concerns and issues that my family has with BPA using a proposed route that passes very close to our home and neighborhood. Although a "NIMBY" is how everyone approaches these issues, we understand that this cannot always be the case. However, as the proposed right of ways for such lines near us were considered valid perhaps as few as 25 years ago, the growth of residential establishments and entire neighborhoods now make this impractical regarding section 31 here in Hockinson. It seems obvious and practical to avoid as many people and homes that would be affected emotionally and financially. Please consider a route further east where the impact to the communities would be lessened. Regards James Voisin & family.

Communication ID: 11839

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: SANDY K REILLY

Please register this writing as a protest to BPA's I-5 corridor project. I find it appalling that a utility is able to hold 2 counties "hostage" for over 2 years while a study is completed- a study that includes a huge quantity of variables and that impacts thousands of families. Elected officials should be held accountable for allowing BPA to conduct business in this manner. I would challenge the root cause of the issue: Are these new lines needed? If the 500KV lines are truly needed and there is no other alternative, BPA should use their current power line routes or new routes through UNOCCUPIED OR BLM land. Homeowners that have chosen to live in a rural setting do not want a 500KV power line constructed through or adjacent to their homes. Even the potential has decreased the value of our homes. Section 30 will affect my property which is inaccurately represented as BLM land on the BPA Area map. BPA should provide more than maps with potential routes. BPA should reveal the study criteria and the "scorecard" that will finalize the selection.

Communication ID: 11840

Date: 11/21/2009

Name: MIKE SCHMAUCH, DEANN SCHMAUCH

This is in regards to the proposed Route #31 of the BPA High (around 150 feet high) 500KV Tower Transmission line which would bisect the Hockinson and surrounding area. Of course no one in the area wants it for a variety of reasons. I even doubt that the BPA wants to put the Line on Route #31. Probably you feel obligated to study #31 because of the NEPA requirements you operate under and the existence of a utility easement BPA can obtain. My main concern is that the BPA does not plan to make their selection until sometime in 2012 and the tax consequences of that delay.

I don't think BPA cares much about what the people in the area really want. My hope is that other government agencies might have enough influence on BPA to quickly remove route #31 from consideration. Because of NEPA requirements, I know it is not easy for the BPA to declare #31 as being "out of consideration" earlier than 2012 (although there seems to be some wiggle room). There seems to be a NEP provision (loophole) BPA can use to stop #31 right away. I found the following: "NEPA §1021.211 Interim actions: Limitations on actions during the NEPA process. While DOE is preparing an EIS that is required under §1021.300(a) of this part, DOE shall take no action concerning the proposal that is the subject of the EIS before issuing an ROD (decision), except as provided at 40 CFR 1506.1. Actions that are covered by, or are a part of, a DOE proposal for which an EIS is being prepared shall not be categorically excluded under subpart D of these regulations unless they qualify as interim actions under 40 CFR 1506.1." This web link provides an explanation of 40 CFR 1506:

http://gc.energy.gov/NEPA/nepa_documents/TOOLS/GUIDANCE/Volume2/5-5-interimactionguid.pdf

If BPA doesn't quickly remove #31 from consideration, this is what I see happening:

1) The law now requires the seller of any property to honestly list all the potential “negative factors” associated with their home and its property value. Therefore property owners will necessarily need to divulge that there is a potential 150 foot tall Power Line being considered on or near their property. This is done of course since such factors need to be considered by the buyer as the property value will likely be affected by items on this list and if not disclosed, become the seller’s liability. Of course if 150 foot tall Power Lines were an enhancement to one’s property value, they would be listed as a feature on the seller’s brochure, so we can safely assume 150 foot Power Lines would decrease one’s property value. As we know, for tax purposes, the appraisal date in Washington is January 1st of each year.

2) As of today (just after the BPA extended the deadline for comments), BPA has received 6,000 comments (according to their web site). Certainly not everybody affected has commented yet, hence the extension. Conservatively, 10,000 property owners could be affected to some degree. These people live in one of the highest valued “single family dwelling” segments of Clark County. Just by BPA announcing that Route #31 is being considered, all of these people’s property value will have been devalued effective 1/1/2010 and their assessed taxed value should decrease accordingly. The question is by how much. It will vary as to how close the Power Line is to their property, but for many, it could be a 50% reduction according to some real-estate appraisers I’ve talked to! Let’s assume it’s only a 25% reduction on average and only 5,000 properties are affected (both numbers being half of what is reasonable). I don’t know the exact County tax data, but the typical property owner that I know, pays about \$4000 per year or more in property taxes. If their property value goes down by 25%, so does their taxes. That’s about \$1,000 per property owner lost from the property tax base or 5,000 properties times \$1,000 which is \$5,000,000 off the property tax base!

3) The \$5 million loss is not just for 2010 because the issue will still be “pending” on Jan 1st of 2011 and of 2012 unless BPA makes a decision before midnight on New Year’s Day of 2012—usually a work holiday. So now we’ve lost \$15 million! Could BPA miss their 2012 decision goal and decide in 2013 because of some unforeseen event like lawsuits, etc? If so, another \$5 million would be lost. Of course that loss has no affect on the BPA. If the BPA should select #31, increase the loss per property owner some amount and multiply that annual loss by forever!!

4) Not only is that a lot of money to loose from the tax base, but it’s likely a conservative estimate. How busy are the property appraisers in today’s housing market? With virtually nothing to appraise because nothing’s being sold, how aggressive and willing will they be to help property owners prepare a case for reduced property taxes based on these “proposed Power Lines”? Does the County even have the staff to handle the case load?

5) The Hockinson School District recently bought property intended for a future school and it is directly under the proposed route #31, and if selected, they say it would mean a \$1,000,000 loss for the District.

6) I have not yet accounted for the property owners who actually want or need to sell their property during this time. They will incur a real “forever” loss and have no recourse in any form—except to find a replacement property also under a Power line, so the values match.

I don’t know how the \$5 million loss for 2010 can be avoided at this late date (the 1-1-2010 “Tax

Evaluation Day” being only a month away), but it all depends on how fast BPA can publish the fact that #31 is no longer being actively considered.

The citizens of this affected area are generally not tax dodgers. The Hockinson School District has passed every school levee that I can remember. On the other hand, none of us asked for the Power Lines to be considered in our area either—things like this make us mad. Times are tough. If property owners can reduce their tax burden by \$1,000 (more likely by \$3,000 over 3 years) many will pursue it.

The sad fact is that obviously the BPA could care less what the people want no matter how many letters we write (if they did, #31 would not even exist today because even they could have predicted the people’s reaction to this proposal well before now), and we the people cannot muster a technical/engineering reason for refuting route #31 (can you imagine a BPA engineer reading any of our letters and saying, “Wow, there’s a reason #31 won’t work that we never thought of before”?). We realize that nobody in the BPA is elected either, so they have no need to respond to the people—not even if all the people in the Hockinson area say no. Also, the BPA is not beholding to Clark County or the State of Washington for funding so the loss of revenue in our tax base is of no concern to the BPA at all.

All I can hope is that local governments have enough “influence” with some “Federal powers” such that the BPA damage to our tax base and property values can be undone ASAP.

Respectfully,

Michael and DeAnn Schmauch

[Phone]

[Address]

Communication ID: 11841

Date: 11/21/2009

Name: PAT BARBER

Mr. Korsness,

Of the many years I've owned a small business and lived in Clark County, I don't recall ever seeing such a ridiculous proposal with little or no forethought in the BPA's study to run a power line grid at 500KV (!!!) through a populated area ... being route 31 through Hockinson. Health issues alone are a major concern affecting the quality of life that we currently enjoy in this community, let alone the significant impact on property values that create the tax revenue to support the infrastructure for schools, fire protection, and other critical services that Washington state coffers are no longer able to support.

With viable alternatives such as route 35 to 29 to 21 to 11 north into Longview makes much more common sense by avoiding the more populated areas with the least impact on our communities. Are

other states that far ahead of us in technology and common sense that they require by law for this type of power grid to be buried underground if passing within occupied homes and schools, and other related facilities in everyday use by human beings? And, the BPA is proposing power lines carrying over 3 times the voltage that other states consider to be adequate around populated areas?

Our elected representatives need to apply pressure to the BPA for such an absurd proposal that is being manipulated through the "system" without proper due diligence within our community. If an additional power grid is necessary ... so be it. But it needs to be done right, and shouldn't be rammed down our throats in the manner that is currently being implemented by BPA management.

Respectfully,

Mike & Pat Barber

Concerned small business person and Hockinson resident

Cc: Rep. Brian Baird

Senator Patty Murray

Communication ID: 11842

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: JUDY SILLS,NINA R STRICKLER

Dear Mr. Korsness,

I oppose the use of segment #31 for the purpose of carrying 500 KV power lines connecting the proposed substations at Castle Rock, WA and Troutdale, OR. It is unsuitable for the reasons outlined below.

1. HOUSES: Segment #31 is highly populated with homes. Compensation at fair market value, will be offset by the negotiated 100 foot easement rights, lowering the compensation received by home/landowners directly in the path of the expanded (150 foot) easement. Adjacent properties will also see plummeting home values without any compensation.

2. EMF/PUBLIC HEALTH RISK: There are well-documented health concerns with long-term EMF exposure, especially related to children under the age of 15. Reports recognize but minimize the established link between childhood leukemia and living near high-voltage power lines. A lack of collaborative data from biological or biophysical studies is used to discount findings of epidemiological studies. Associations between EMF and various childhood/delayed adult onset cancers would not necessarily be found with laboratory-centered research but may require epidemiological studies to identify the risk. A further limitation is the fact the proposed power lines will carry voltage far in excess

of that analyzed to date. If a 3-5X greater risk for leukemia has already been identified at lower voltages, it seems logical a stronger link would be found at higher voltages. Would you want your children to take that risk?

3. SOCIO-ECONOMIC and PUBLIC SERVICES: Many families moved to the Hockinson area because of the school district's reputation and performance. We are now faced with exposing our children to the unknown effects of these inadequately researched high-voltage power lines, and many have already voiced their intent to relocate should these lines be built as proposed. In addition to falling enrollment bringing in fewer state dollars, the Hockinson School District faces another challenge, a huge financial hit if these lines are built through land already purchased for future school expansion (217th Avenue and 169th Street). Building a new school under high voltage power lines would no longer be feasible/supported by the public. A sinking tax base fueled by some of the highest property taxes in Clark County will adversely affect not only the school, but the fire district as well.

4. AESTHETICS: Families have moved to this area precisely for the country beauty found in this semi-rural area. The visual effects of 150 feet towering power lines next to our homes, obstructing the beautiful views of the valley to the west or impacting our enjoyment of the foothills to the east, can not be underestimated.

5. SENSITIVE PLANTS and ANIMALS: On my and adjacent properties, I have witnessed a golden eagle, great horned owl, cougar, bear, deer, wild turkeys, coyote, porcupine, opossum and raccoon, to name several. The unique micro-habitats evident here have great biodiversity rivaling or exceeding that of nearby state and federal forest lands utilizing cyclical timber production cycles. Many open spaces exist along proposed segment 31, and dedicated property owners along this route are committed to preserving them.

In closing, I have the following requests:

1. Please hold a widely publicized open mike meeting at a large venue to present the rationale for current proposals, listen to suggestions for alternate routes and/or solutions and work in partnership with us. Due to the public meeting formats used by BPA to date, many have questioned the true intent of this public process and whether there really is an opportunity to impact decisions or if this process is simply a formality to give that impression. Eroding public confidence in the process itself will negatively affect future relationships between BPA and the people it serves.

2. Please announce decisions regarding elimination of particular segments from further consideration as soon as possible. Consider the market effect that has already occurred with depressed home values, loss of potential sales, and negative economic impact by homeowners putting any home repair or improvement projects on hold until a decision is reached.

3. Please choose a route/solution impacting the least populated areas (most eastward route, perhaps even beyond those currently proposed), embrace innovative technology and creative ideas, and/or find ways to better utilize existing corridors.

Sincerely,

Judy Sills

[Address] (Hockinson)

Communication ID: 11843

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: KENT IVEY

Our residence is within the affected area of proposed new I-5 Corridor power lines to be built. I attended the open house in Camas but have had conversations with others and get conflicting information regarding BPA policy. Here is the scenario: A property owner is within the final power line path and they own a home on for example, 10 acres, but only home and 5 acres are affected. Is the home and 5 acres purchased or home and all 10 acres? I've also, heard that only home values are paid and land is just taken by the BPA. I don't believe that is true is it? Thanks.

Communication ID: 11844

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: PHIL BOURQUIN

The City of Camas Urban Growth Area was expanded in 2007 to include approximately 2,000 acres located on the north side of Lacamas Lake. Maps of BPA alternatives include some lands recently annexed. It is unclear how the proposal would impact planned urban development within this area. Is additional BPA rights of way proposed within these areas? What types of uses would be precluded and within what distances of these existing rights of way? The economic impact to areas within the City of Camas UGB planned for employment purposes is of specific concern to the City of Camas and should be addressed through the E.I.S..

Communication ID: 11845

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: MICHAEL VELEY

Greetings.

My name is Mike Veley and I live in Brush Prairie, WA. I'm asking that you PLEASE do not consider route 31 as a viable route. The environmental, economic and livability factors, along with the valid health concerns, makes this route disastrous to our beautiful rural land.

Please, disregard route 31. I understand that in February you'll announce the routes you have abandon. I

pray rout 31 is the one you announce.

Respectfully.

Michael Veley

[Address]

Communication ID: 11846

Date: 11/21/2009

Name: JANET GRANT

Dear Mr. Korsness -

I own property on 212th Ave. (yes, on the East side of the road). I was informed last night (November 20), by a neighbor, of your proposed Route 31. My question to you is why was I not informed of this by BPA? Then I find out that the public comment period was to end on November 23rd! Your lack of communication is unacceptable!

COUNT ME AS A PROPERTY OWNER WHO IS OPPOSED TO ROUTE 31 !!

I chose to purchase property in the Hockinson area because of the country atmosphere and the views of forested hills. I do not want to look out on large towers with high voltage power lines! I don't want them running through my property. I don't want to be forced to sell you a single foot of property. I have tried to determine where exactly your power lines will run but find that BPA has been very evasive in their description. Just where is East of 212th Ave?

I want to thank you in advance for taking the time to answer my questions. I hope to hear from you.

Janet Grant

Communication ID: 11847

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: JANET GRANT

Thank you Mr. Korsness for your reply. Please do place me on your mailing list.

Janet Grant

Communication ID: 11848

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: RICHARD BOUSLAUGH

Dear Mr. Korsness,

It has recently come to my attention that the BPA is proposing running massive towers and power lines through our area in the I5 Corridor project. More importantly, from what I can tell by the maps on the BPA website, these towers and power lines will be within a mile west of my home.

This area is an area of peaceful serenity which is a safe haven for not only the deer, raccoons, rabbits, bears, owls, blue heron, red tail hawks and many other small animals and birds but it is a safe haven for those living in it. My wife and I purchased our land/home because of the quiet serenity of the area, the beautiful view and the safety/security of country living. The proposed Route 31 threatens to destroy that besides affecting property values and unknown health risks to us, our children, our grandchildren and our pets.

After reviewing the meeting summaries for meetings that have been held to discuss this proposal with area landowners I strongly urge you to rethink putting these towers and power lines through private property. If they must go up please put them up through the state and/or federal land that doesn't have to impact our homes and livelihood which we pay dearly for through our taxes each year. If the proposed Route 31 goes through can you guarantee it won't affect our property value, our livelihood, our children, and our health? Would you want to look out your front window and see them instead of the view of the peaceful countryside and spectacular sunsets?

In addition to our concerns we feel that the BPA has intentionally kept this information from us because we are not in the "line of intent". We are just now hearing about this through a group of concerned neighbors. If this proposal is a fair and decent proposal why wasn't everyone in the area made aware of it and given the opportunity to participate in one of the meetings that were held? Instead we had to learn about this second hand and are being forced to try and figure out what is going on and how it will affect us through investigating the situation online and not truly having the same opportunity as our neighbors in seeing the information that was provided at these meetings.

Please try and put yourself in our situation. If you did I'm a certain you would try to find "a better way". Thank you for your time and consideration of our request.

Sincerely,

Richard Bouslaugh

[Address]

Communication ID: 11849

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: MIKE LEE

I'm writing to state my dissatisfaction with BPA31 through Hockinson. The other routes that you have to choose from are a better choice for this community and our quality of life.

I also wish to state that I am frustrated with BPA's lack of communication with me. I live just a few hundred yards from the proposed area. Open communication is a much more honorable way to live and carry on business.

Mike Lee

[Phone]

Communication ID: 11850

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: STEPHEN JACOBSON

Please have your environmental studies look at:

1. An eastern route that avoids populated, developed land and minimizes encroachment on park land and state forest land. Even a cursory observations shows this is very possible.
 2. Doing a complete, unbiased assessment of using the abandoned PP&L route which will disrupt homes & families, result in expensive land purchases, lower property values as well as associated health risks.
 3. An Independent study of the health issues associated with high tension, high voltage power lines (can you say no risk?). See EO 12898.
-
1. It is obvious that a more alternative could have been chosen that avoided park land & minimized encroachment on state lands. The two easterly routes appear to have been chosen so that they would be disqualified.
 2. The abandoned PP&L easement will require more expensive residential land to be purchased. Loss of value of the remainder will also be expensive. This alignment would make the portion of my property that was to be sold off for our retirement worthless to me.

Communication ID: 11851

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: GREGORY TULLAR

Consider the Social Impact. Destroying the livability of thousands of residents is dumb. Show us your moral responsibility. Powering California TV's is not for any local benefit. This short cheap route is unacceptable. Do the right thing and improve your existing routes or put it in the most eastern route.

No route segment #31.

Communication ID: 11852

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: PEGGY HOUSE, DAVID HOUSE

We understand the probable need for additional capacity to transmit power to other areas as long as it is meant for the local homes and businesses of the northwest and not California. If it's just a conduit from Canada to California, it could just as well go through the plains of Eastern Washington and not our pristine areas.

We also believe in common sense solutions for any need or problem which takes into account the everyday lives of people as affected by those solutions. In your case many of us are not in favor of separated lands with homes on one side and other important activities on the other with a "high-tensioned" zone in between. The sensible solution would be to use public lands and open lands belonging to timber companies as well as existing right of ways as much as possible such as Routes 29, 14-18, and 09. This would allow the two dams to be included and still miss dozens of homes.

Many of us too will be concerned about the effect of high voltage lines on cell phone use as well as any antenna usage. EMF is not dead yet either.

The greatest impact for us even now is that just because the project possibility has been announced, a property that is for sale automatically takes a turn for the worst based on the above concerns by anyone that shows an interest. In fact, it puts the lives of people who had hoped to sell, even in this downturned economy, on hold. For how long? Two and a half years? It's pretty difficult to be thankful for or in favor of this sort of action or project.

If biomass energy is a part of this picture at all, I believe that along with the fossil fuel fiasco it will cause more environmental damage and long term costs than we had to begin with. The most basic study will show this to be true.

Bottom line: Select the route that has the fewest number of homes and businesses affected by it. Use existing R/W where possible as well as public lands, etc. Think of people not politics or money.

Sincerely,

Peggy M. House, Trustee

David B. House, Etal

Communication ID: 11853

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: JAMES COURTNEY

I am totally against this project as it is going to disrupt so many homes and business in the places you are going with it. The maps you have sent out are wholly unacceptable and hard to read. There have to be better ways than by this type of high voltage line to pass through populated areas. Go with wind power or other methods.

Communication ID: 11854

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: BONNIE MCNAUGHTON,PETER MCNAUGHTON

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Groundwater contamination from the herbicides around the towers leaching into the wells we ALL use for our water supply.

Many large families with young children, and many retired folk with health concerns that could POSSIBLY be harmed by EMFs: contradictory studies, possible cumulative effects. "Better SAFE than sorry!" Potential harm!

Audible discomfort/pollution of "humming" from transmission.

CONCERNS!

Disruption of satellite reception? (TV & phones) (no cable access)

Negative effect on property values, of course!

Choose corridors through forestry/state/federal reserves instead of sending serpentine danger snaking through populated areas

Future increase in power transmitted

Unwise attempt to alienate voters who are being urged by the media to rebel against government

interference/control

Interference with radio reception as well: incommunicado!

Law suits brought because of these concerns!

Communication ID: 11855

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: PHIL AKELY

I do not understand why you are looking at routes that will impact the lives of so many property owners v/s running the line further east over more uninhabited land. Timber companies are more important than thousands of people I suppose. You will destroy peoples lives, their future plans for their properties.

You destroy property values, views and I am sure you do not adequately compensate property owners for what you destroy. I just bought my home for the view I have and paid for that view. What is it going to be worth with transmission lines and towers in it.

Communication ID: 11856

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: MARIA ORENDURFF

I oppose additional transmission lines to our neighborhood. I feel unsafe every time walking to the stores close by with the swazing noise over me.

We live in "The Sunshine Division" between [address]. I feel it is unwise to have more transformers and high powered voltage lines & wires added to this area which is densely populated with families. We are home owners, paying taxes and deserve to live save without this worry. I suggest this study should have been done before all the building permits were issues in the last reasoned years. Please build in more remote areas further east, where more building is done. Thank you!

Communication ID: 11857

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: ELIZABETH PIECHOCKI

November 18, 2009

To Whom It May Concern:

I wish to add my voice and concerns about your proposed project that is considering building a new power line through my neighborhood.

Specifically I am speaking of route segment 31. I would ask you to consider an alternate route, as segment 31 is the most heavily populated of all of the routes up for consideration. It would greatly impact our community (Hockinson WA) and permanently downgrade our neighborhoods and property values. Much of the area has numerous wetlands with building restrictions that would certainly be an environmental issue you would have to face.

There has been nothing said in your literature about the danger to humans from the electro magnetic field these powerlines create, and the size of the proposed lines (500-kV) is to be larger than any yet built in the area, so I ask you why has this not been addressed?

I would also like to ask who the "eligible customers" are that are requesting transmission service, that would put my neighborhood at risk?

In studying your literature I see that one route under consideration would take you through DNR lands a good portion of the way. An UNPOPULATED area. Why are we (the route 31 people) even being considered for this upheaval?

You also stated that these needs exist because residents in Portland used so much electricity this last summer..... Well I believe there is a nice route up highway 30 in OREGON, most of it through industrial area that could take you straight up to Castle Rock.

Please give me your assurance that you will select a less disruptive route than #31.

Regards,

Elizabeth Piechocki

[Address]

Communication ID: 11858

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: DONALD R MEEKS

Dear Bonneville Power Administration, I recently learned of your intention to meet current power demands by upgrading the power grid in the Pacific Northwest. Your plan, the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project directly affects my property. Therefore I offer the following comment. This program, unadjusted, will severely impact our neighborhood in many aspects. Property value, way of life, disruption of routines when under construction; and the constant clicking and humming of the overhead lines. While the powerlines don't cut directly through all parcels; I can't imagine someone wanting to have the lines directly in front. The towers needed to carry the power lines could be moved slightly West with the easements already in place. I recommned running these lines up the mountain a few hundred yards and put them on the DNR land that makes up the east border boundary. Please see attached for a visual representation. Thank you, Major Don Meeks

Communication ID: 11859

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: ERIC NYLUND

I'd like to tell you about Route 31.

Please have your environmental studies look at:

The overall impact of a community when a 150' swath of trees and vegetation are removed, when a few trees will be left around the developed homes, what happens to our cooling runoff and erosion protection, oxygen, Noise buffers, privacy and wildlife habitat.

What impact will a cleared 150' swath with huge power lines in our backyards (or front) have on our wells + septic systems.

We live in Hockinson partly for the schools, of course, as our neighbors, we have many small children, I'm very worried about the most recent EMF studies about dangers of exposure to children.

Keep in mind that many home sites along route 31 are 2 ½ acres and some smaller. We do not have public water and sewer. We need much more useable land for our wells and septic systems (100 feet apart) and a backup area for drain field when we need to replace an old one. I worry that many homes will be made worthless if more land is lost.

Do you know how hard or impossible it would be to have hundreds or thousands of families to find land to rebuild homes, or how extremely expensive it would be. For someone to simply sell me 5 acres, they now have to subdivide (approx 90 thousand dollars) just to sell off one 5 acre piece.

I sincerely believe that a major nation grid power line link should be located as far from suburban homes as possible. This is for the benefit of the whole NW and Washington. Our state needs to cooperate and place this power line on state lands as much as possible. Then we can continue to tree farm and pay

timber taxes for our schools, on our properties here instead of looking at ugly huge power lines.

Communication ID: 11860

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: WILLIAM ATKINS

20 November 2009

To Whom It May Concern,

I hope by now you have received a zillion reply's from our community giving reasons why the BPA should not choose Segment 31 - but an alternate path for the construction of your high voltage towers and lines. Here's a couple more thoughts that might not have been written. Our community is in a lovely natural setting. It's a place where you'll see neighbors who care so much for the beauty of the area to be out picking up trash along scenic 212th. Avenue. (the 150 foot tower route) rather than wait for the county to do the job. On the week-ends you'll often see bicycle groups, most from Portland, but some from as far away as the Seattle area, pumping away enjoying the clean air without health concerns of electromagnetic radiation. The BPA has other choices - that may be more expensive - but do not impact so many lives, property, tax base and citizen's health. Routes 35, 34, 29, and 11 passing through Washington's Dept of Natural Resource land for example. I believe in your hearts - if you had a choice - you would not subject your family to the fate you may soon impose on us. Hoping you will think beyond monetary costs,

William Atkins

[Address]

Communication ID: 11861

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: BILL HANLEY,HILDE HANLEY

Please have your environmental studies look at:

1. Building a new transmission line on the most eastern edge- lines 03, 07, 11, 29, 24, 35 from castle rock to troutdale-population is less dense and cost is minimized.
2. Transmission lines through Columbia county following along the Columbia river.

3. Build the transmission lines underground, thus eliminating EMF radiation effects, describing property vacancies, keeps the beauty of our natural resources.

4. Put a stop on population on growth – put a cap on building permits.

I have these other comments:

1. EMF radiation

2. Decrease of property values

3. Financial & personal hardships especially since we are senior citizens on a fixed income.

Communication ID: 11863

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: BILL NORMAN

I have these other comments:

-One of these locations proposed for the 500-kilovolt transmissison line is along the existing east-west right-of-way to the south of this neighborhood.

-To add a third line in the same location would create a significant vulnerability in a catastrophic event. It would result in a loss of regional power should some form of disaster occur.

The potential impact of a disaster is a very real concern. Potential disasters include historically proven and expected earthquakes, tornadoes and storms, as well as the possibility of attack by home grown or international extremists.

-An altogether differing location of these new lines is critical to provide greater security and protection of the entire region's power.

-I strongly urge any new lines not be placed in existing right-of-ways. Instead I support one of the more easterly remote locations proposed. To do so would reduce the likelihood of vulnerability and create greater security for the entire region.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bill Norman

[Address]

Communication ID: 11864

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: DAVID VASSAR,KAREN VASSAR

In answer to your letter sent Oct. 22 proposing to build a 500 kilovolt transmission line #31 on P.P.L Right of way and to widen right of way 50' I am opposed!

1. I am battling cancer at age 61. I was going to sell my property to retire. But due to your letter dropping my property value, I am financially unable to do so until BPA makes its decision approximately 2 1/2 years from now. Hope I am still alive to be able to retire.
2. You can't enter my property without me (David Vassar) being present.
3. Due to health risks- we have 12 grandchildren who are here very often. 1 grandchild 4 yrs old [Name] born with Goldenhar syndrome. Has 8 major surgeries 2 of them being brain surgery. He has seizures. These power lines will cause more severe seizures and other health problems for him.
4. Due to property values going down in the area Evergreen-Hockinson-Camas-and Battle Ground schools will suffer.

Thank you,

David Vassar

Karen Vassar

Communication ID: 11865

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: JOHN HAMILTON

Subject: I-5 Corridor Through Hockinson Line 31

I am writing this letter to express my opposition to B.P.A.'s proposed power line route through my neighborhood. We invested eighty thousand dollars in materials to improve our home in 2005. All of our savings went into this project to improve our lives.

My thoughts are that we will loose everything we have worked for all of our lives. Won't it cost more money to buy all of our homes and properties than to use government timberland? Also won't it severely affect the Clark County Tax base revenue, leaving a large budget deficit causing program cuts for our citizens?

This proposal, line 31 will affect many homeowners by making their property unsaleable. Our homes will be unlivable and demolished. These neighbors and us would not be able to purchase another home due to limited income. Many of us are retired. Some of us provide for our grandchildren living with us. For us

this is a hopeless situation.

Sincerely,

John Hamilton

[Address]

Communication ID: 11866

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: JACK CGRAGGEN,CATHY CGRAGGEN

Equitable property reimbursement, compensation for degradation of property value, negative economic impact in Cowlitz County, alternative routes

According to the New York Times, February 23, 2009, \$7.7 billion in borrowing authority (borrowing from the U.S. treasury) is being granted through the Federal Stimulus plan for the "shovel ready" I-5 Corridor Project and other BPA projects. This seems an unwise decision in light of our current economic condition. Our government would need to print more money to benefit whom? Would it be the many new housing developments near Vancouver, or perhaps used to heat the swimming pools of California? We in the northwest would have an increase in our energy rates just to pay for the project. It would be better to spend such huge Federal stimulus funds to encourage energy efficiency, such as solar panels for every home. Large walls of solar panels could provide for the many oversized energy hungry homes people seem to want and could provide heat for the swimming pool. This would prevent the future blight of thousands of 150-250 ft. towers and the noise and water pollution from thirty to forty acre substations with lines running like spider webs all over the northwest. It could also prevent the taking of private property from those of us in rural areas or small communities all across Washington State.

If citizens must have their lives disrupted forever to provide millions with electricity they need to be generously compensated. Fair market value, especially in a depressed market, can never replace our mountain views or rural settings. Many have lived in this area for generations and would never expect to be forcibly moved. Our homes and our views are priceless to us. There must also be generous compensation for those who have property devalued by the blight of power lines and substation. Homes such as our own, with rural views or a view of the lights of Castle rock, Mt. St. Helens and Mt. Rainier could never be sold for fair value if power lines or the 35 acre substation is within sight or sound. Sound carries for a long distance when you live at a high elevation.

The proposed plans cover many acres in Cowlitz County. Not only will this be a cause of great anxiety to everyone along the various proposed routes during the next several years, but the project will soon negatively affect the economy of this area as well. This is a huge burden for a county already economically depressed. People will be reluctant to build, improve, buy and sell in all the areas affected

by the plans. It seems as if BPA has given no thought to the impact they will have on all the people in our county through the next several years.

The Delameter Valley with its many streams feeding the Cowlitz River does not seem a likely spot for a 35 acre substation. There surely are areas north of here with more suitable flat land, and less drainage for the substation. According to the BPA representative, the substation and new lines apparently could be located anywhere along the original power line and not necessarily in the Delameter where the lines intersect. A great place for a substation would be the area already devastated by the former Trans Alta Coal Mine in the Hanaford Valley north of Centralia. Lines could be run south east avoiding many rural or populated areas.

Water and noise pollution, wildlife corridor, site of the substation, flooding, traffic/roads, cemetery.

1. How will you keep the surface, subsurface water, or underground aquifers from contamination from any level of PCB's or oils which are still used in small amounts in transformers. What other contaminants may be used at the site? How will heavy metals or other known contaminants such as those found at the BPA Ross Substation Complex in Vancouver, a National Priorities List Cleanup site, be prevented? There are many streams in the area draining to the Cowlitz River which provides water to the cities of Longview and Kelso.
 2. What noise levels, electrical interference or power surges will the area be subjected to from the substation?
 3. The planned substation will cover a site of about 35 acres. How can wildlife possibly survive this intrusion in the small Delameter valley?
 4. When will you provide maps with the actual proposed substation sites to those located within the substation area? (this was not released to those of us in the substation area, but there was a map of it at the meeting in Longview)
 5. Why isn't the area (many acres) closet to the intersection of power lines considered for a location of the substation? It is not even listed within the boundaries of the substation map. Why is the planned substation area north of the intersection of power lines when all the lines will be running south? If the intersection truly makes no difference, find an alternative route avoiding private property owners and this small valley.
 6. Will BPA upgrade, improve and maintain the Delameter road for access to the large substation area with such things as a traffic light at the intersection of West Side Hwy and Delameter and other roads that will experience increased travel by maintenance workers?
 7. The valley is flooded each year and inaccessible for several days. How will the substation or power lines crossing the valley be accessed or maintained? Bridges and boats?
 8. Is the BPA aware of a pioneer cemetery located in the Delameter valley in the path of one of the
-

proposed lines?

9. Where will all the new energy from the BPA wind farms be used?

Jack and Cathy Cgaggen

Communication ID: 11867

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: KAREN J HILLER

Have your environmental studies look at:

- We rely on a well that has recently been laboratory tested for quality, we do not want your operations to add PCB's or other pollutants to our only source of drinking water.
- We are on a septic system that must not be compromised.
- There are 2 or more buildings on logging company property directly behind our property line that store large amounts of dynamite and/or other explosives.
- There are large tracts of recently logged (clear cut) land at the top of Ostrander that would a better location for your lines and be less impactful to the environment and our neighborhood. This logging activity is not reflected on the satellite photos you used at the public meetings.
- Lots on our side of Ostrander (south) have a year round stream (part of Ostrander Creek) that is covered under the Federal Navigable Waterway designation
- Our property has a steep grade coming down off Ostrander Road (over 30%) down to our house and the stream, then another steep hill behind the house with a 30% grade.
- Because of the steep grade and the stream we are concerned about flooding and soil erosion if you cut down trees on our property. This has the potential to compromise foundations of buildings on our property as well as causing other property damage.
- Our neighborhood enjoys a high level of bio diversity that includes: owls, bats, deer, elk, raccoons, coyotes & wolves, frogs, bear and bald eagles. The presence of your lines will compromise this bio diversity.

I have these other comments:

- There are 2 elderly people living on this property who are in ill health and in their late 80's. They are under the care of a visiting nurse and several specialists. Not only can they not be without power during construction activity but power lines near our home have the potential to disrupt medical equipment

that they rely on.

- There is already an utility easement on Ostrander that would not require disruption of homes and neighborhoods.

Our attorney has advised us to sign nothing at this time however we will provide you a guided tour of our property if you make an appointment at least 2 weeks in advance.

Communication ID: 11868

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: DEANNA FUNKHOUSER, DAVID FUNKHOUSER

My home is in the Hockinson area and is on the proposed route segment #31 of the BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. Your proposed line would go along 212th Ave and 122nd St and would run across wetlands and homes with children. Your proposed line would risk health of those living in the area, decrease property values and for some take away their views.

Our neighborhood is quiet and with the wetlands we have wildlife coming through daily. We would most likely lose the natural setting of our area. I am concerned that families living in the proximity of Electric and Magnetic Fields are at a higher risk of cancers and other medical problems.

With the school district having purchased property in this area we do not want to lose the availability of that land for another school due to the BPA line.

People I know living with power lines going through their property are limited to what they can do with the property under the lines. It greatly reduces any potential you thought you had for your property.

It seems to me if you already have an existing right of way why not upgrade it, or take a route that has a smaller amount of homes that would be affected.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would look at some other location/ existing location for the BPA line and not add potential health problems and other concerns to our area.

Thank you for reading and considering our plea to locate this line somewhere else.

Sincerely

David and Deanna Funkhouser

[Address]

Please have you environmental studies look at:

Existing #09 or possibly #34, 35, 29, 11

I have these other comments:

Why put in a new line and disruo more areas when you could upgrade an existing line (#9)

Communication ID: 11869

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: ERIC EDWARDS,MARY HEFT-EDWARDS

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Alternative routes in East County. The proposed area that runs parallel to 63rd street is too close to neighborhoods. Adding increased lines in not acceptable when areas that have little to no human inhabitants remain a possibility. Why would BPA risk litigation when the risk is known? If litigation is a real risk then building where risk is high seems like a poor business decision.

I have these other comments:

The only reason BPA would even consider the 63rd Street corridor would be to keep costs down by running less lines or less actual length. Is it really worth the negative coverage BPA would receive in addition to the potential litigation risk now & possibly in the future, for the adverse medical effects high voltage may pose??? I get it, let's just propose this route through the 63rd st corridor & if we get little or no opposition we will build it, despite the fact that we know it's not the right thing to do for the community, the environment, for man. How much money does BPA stand to gain by selling electricity to California in the middle of summer when usage in the northwest is way down? Why not share the profits like Alaska does w/oil?

Communication ID: 11870

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: DAVIS E WOOD

Reviewing the possible routes proposed, it appears that the easternmost route provides for the most economical and least disruptive possibility. I would urge that action as well as encourage that the EIS be scoped to make sure that the impact on humans be considered at least on par with any other animal species. Thank you.

Communication ID: 11871

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: KEVIN J COX

No for Route #31 We are not in favor of the possible extension of the power lines as we live along route #31. Hockinson school district just purchased some property through a bond measure near the corner of NE 169th street and NE 217th avenue not too long ago. This property will be used in the future for the school district to expand. Route #31 will run right through the middle of the school districts property! Also, there are many homes with acreage scattered along this route that enjoy the wildlife, territorial views and quietness of living in the Hockinson/Brush Prairie area. The people that live along Route #31 choose to live here for a reason – and that reason did not include having to be affected by the EMF or to have the high-voltage lines destroy the beauty that we all enjoy or impact the wildlife, our surroundings and our property value.

Communication ID: 11872

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: CLAY MYERS

My name is Clay Myers. I live at [Address] in Kelso. I am on the border of one of your areas under consideration for the power line. I have a 5 acre lot. My feeling is that if the power line comes through my property it will completely destroy my property value. I am very concerned about that there is a whole swath of what I believe is forest land just south of where I live and if it comes through my property it will have to go through several other residential properties. I hope that is not the case. My phone number is [Phone]. Again my name is Clay Myers, [Address]. If someone will call me back and or I guess I will have to just kinda watch the paper and see what the next step of all this is. Again I have 5 acres which is the minimum amount of property in this area and if there is a service road put through my property I don't know how people will go in and out and it will completely ruin the property value of my home and I will end up losing tens of thousands of dollars and I don't think anyone would want to see that happen. So thanks for your time, bye.

Communication ID: 11873

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: ALICE MILLWARD

Communication ID: 11874

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: FRANCES NORTHCUT

Lone Pine Cemetery Located at 115 Dart, Rd. Ariel, WA

Frank Abel Cemetery located at 3819 Lewis River Rd. Woodland, WA

loof Cemetery Located at 197 East Seatt ave. woodland, WA

I have these other comments:

Historic cemeteries

Communication ID: 11875

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: TOM CROSS,NOLA CROSS

Dear BPA Project Folks: We are adding our voices to those in our Hockinson neighborhood who are opposed to the BPA's proposed route 31. Although the lines would not cross our three acres, the impact on this lovely hill community would be devastating. Our home has already plunged in value almost 25% in the last year according to the assessment statement we received yesterday. Having the lines run through this area would put many of us in even more of a negative position in our mortgages, ruin the beautiful landscape and views, and create untold health issues. We moved here 14 years ago from the city in order to enjoy the peaceful country life, and to give our special needs son the best chance for health. We urge you to cite the new power lines on a path with the least impact on homes and families. Thank you for your reconsideration! The Cross Family

Communication ID: 11876

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: TRACY BURGESS

Not only will your project completely destroy my lovely, idyllic neighborhood in Battle Ground, WA, you will take out a corner of my Uncle's property in Camas, as well. You will be ruining the lovely look of nature of our community and you will diminish whatever little property value I have left. And let's not even talk about the possible health consequences! In addition, my business will suffer because no one will want to improve these homes with giant towers obliterating the beautiful sunsets peeking through the firs - they will not see the value (for there is none) in improving a home whose curb appeal lies in the shadow of a massive buzzing tower. These once vital, safe and beautiful FAMILY neighborhoods will be transformed by your transformers into lower value residences at a time when we just can't take any more hits. Have a heart! Have some mercy! This is so wrong, I can't beleive it. I simply can't beleive you would do this to so many families? What the he--? How much more can I lose?

Communication ID: 11878

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: KEVIN D TAPANI

I am concerned about the high voltage power lines so close to my property, and the affects to property values and my family's health.

Communication ID: 11880

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: SONIA MENDOZA

Dear Ms. Wittpenn:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project. This letter acts as the Department of Ecology's (Ecology) response to the BPA's Notice of Intent and request for comments in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). As an agency with jurisdiction and special expertise with respect to environmental issues, we offer the following information that should be addressed in the development of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The BPA should identify all probable significant adverse impacts related to the I-5 Corridor project in the EIS. Impacts described and analyzed in the EIS should include, but should not be limited to the following activities:

-

Temporal staging areas;

-

Access roads;

-

Construction;

-

Operations; and

-

Maintenance and repairs.

State Environmental Policy Act

The proposal is subject to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), 43.21C RCW. The SEPA process evaluates proposed activities within Washington State to avoid environmental degradation and mitigate for impacts to both the natural and anthropogenically influenced features of the landscape. It is unclear what agency will act as Lead Agency for the SEPA process; However, Ecology encourages the BPA to apply diligence in meeting SEPA standards in the proposed NEPA EIS in an effort to produce a standalone document for the proposed transmission corridor. In doing so, BPA may not be required to supplement the document to meet requirements under SEPA.

In order to be consistent with SEPA requirements, the BPA should identify and evaluate reasonable alternatives, including a no-action alternative, as well as viable mitigation measures for unavoidable impacts.

The BPA should propose compensatory mitigation measures for all impacts related to this proposal and the EIS should also document the compensatory mitigation sequence required by Washington State. The mitigation sequence first requires the applicant to avoid impacts, then secondly to minimize impacts. The third step requires mitigation of unavoidable impacts by identifying appropriate measures of compensation.

If there is incomplete or unavailable information concerning significant impacts, BPA should clearly identify the scientific uncertainty. Rationale should be provided as to why the information is unattainable. If the information is found to be unattainable, the BPA should analyze the probable

November 23, 2009

Page 2

impacts to the worst case scenario and determine the likelihood of occurrence to ensure a documented comprehensive study.

Regulations

The Draft EIS should provide a table of all applicable regulations and permits that the project will trigger. From prior meetings with BPA, it is Ecology's understanding, that BPA will not be seeking any local or state permits, but will provide a consistency analysis to demonstrate that the proposed activity is consistent as possible with local and state regulations. The table should disclose under what authority the permit will be preempted and how the proposal is consistent with the underlying local or state regulation(s). The table should also include a tentative permitting schedule identifying proposed timelines for acquiring authorizations.

Ecology has jurisdictional authority over several of the proposed impacts both through federal and state regulations. Ecology encourages the BPA to contact individuals within Ecology to proactively discuss the

permitting process in order to prevent delays associated to permitting with our agency.

Air Quality

New construction is a potential source of particulate matter and fugitive dust. The Washington State Clean Air Act requires the use of all known, available, and reasonable means of controlling air pollution, including dust. The EIS should be supplemented with a site-specific Fugitive Dust Control Plan (FDCP) to control potential dust pollution. The FDCP should include, but is not limited to, the following components:

- Identify all potential fugitive dust emission points.
- Assign dust control methods.
- Determine the frequency of application.
- Record all dust control activities.
- Train personnel on FDCP implementation.
- Plan for stopping work during windy conditions.
- Follow the FDCP and monitor dust control efforts.

Unless the emissions unit or activity is exempt under WAC 173-400-110(4) or the source meets the exemptions based on emissions thresholds in WAC 173-400-110(5), a Notice of Construction (NOC) Air Quality Permit is required prior to the establishment of any new or modified source of particulate matter, carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), volatile organic compounds (VOC), or lead. For information, please contact the Southwest Clean Air Authority (SWCAA) at 1-800-633-0709, or visit the website at <http://swapca.org>.

Noise

Noise impacts related to construction, maintenance, and survey activities should be disclosed. A

discussion of noise generation should include noise levels, duration, and timing.

Climate Change

Washington State is committed to reducing fossil fuel emissions through both an executive order, Executive Order 09-05, and state legislation, RCW 70.235.020. The BPA should include mitigation measures to avoid, minimize and compensate for any climate change impacts. State approvals for this proposal must consider these impacts and possible mitigation in order to be consistent with climate change policy.

The EIS should include a discussion of cumulative impacts of Green House Gases (GHG) emissions and probable effects on climate change. The analysis of GHG emissions should be provided in carbon dioxide equivalents to provide an analysis relevant to standards used in Washington State.

Water Quality

The EIS should identify how the proposed transmission line corridor will meet Washington State Water Quality Standards. This should include consistency with Surface Waterbody Standards, WAC

November 23, 2009

Page 3

173-201A, Sediment Management Standards, WAC 173-204, and Groundwater Quality Standards WAC 173-200. Potential to exceed water quality standards should be included, as well as how potential exceedence of the standard will be avoided and minimized. Appropriate mitigation measures for exceeded standards should be proposed.

The BPA should identify all surface waters of the state that will be impacted by the proposed transmission corridor including wetlands, streams, and rivers. The discussion should include existing beneficial uses, habitat for fish and wildlife with special attention to endangered or listed species, and existing water impairments to water quality standards. The BPA should analyze impacts on these existing features and consider how impacts to waterbody crossing can be minimized.

Construction corridor widths within river and stream channels and riparian areas should be evaluated to determine if impacts can be reduced or eliminated by reducing the area of impact. Proposed crossing locations should be established for each waterbody, as well as a contingency plan identifying a secondary location. Rationale for the primary crossing location should be discussed and site specific conditions including water impairment on impacted stream reaches should be disclosed. If there is potential to further degrade existing water quality impairments, rationale will be required as to why this reach cannot be avoided.

A mitigation proposal for impacts to waters of the state will be required for the 401 water quality certification. Information on items to consider within a mitigation plan can be found in a mitigation guidance document co-authored by Ecology, the Corps of Engineers and EPA: "Wetland Mitigation in

Washington State – Part 2: Developing Mitigation Plans”, publication # 06-06-011b. This document, as updated periodically, is available on-line at Ecology’s website at: <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/wetlands/mitigation/guidance/index.html>. If BPA has questions regarding 401 Water Quality Certification, I recommend contacting Mark Cline, Wetlands and Shoreline Specialist at (360) 407-7273.

For upland construction activities a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required by Ecology for the issuance of the state National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit (NPDES). Thorough preparation and implementation of a SWPPP will avoid immediate and long-term environmental loss and degradation typically caused by poorly managed construction sites.

The EIS should include specific measures to reduce impacts during construction activities, including access roads and staging areas. Adverse impacts on downstream resources and water quality from stormwater during construction can be avoided through proper planning, phasing, timing and proper application of Best Management Practices (BMPs). To discuss appropriate BMP’s and SWPPP requirements, please contact Sheila Pendleton-Orme, Construction Stormwater Inspector at (360) 690-4787.

Further information on permit requirements, coverage and application can be downloaded from Ecology’s website at <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/stormwater/construction/#Application>, or you can contact Joyce Smith at (360) 407-6858 for an application form.

Shorelines of the State

The Shoreline Management Act, 90.58 RCW, regulates activities within shoreline areas in Washington. Each community has a unique Shoreline Master Program (SMP) that identifies specific regulations applicable to that community’s goals for development within shorelines of the state. The EIS should provide a consistency analysis with each SMP and identify the applicable shoreline permits triggered by the transmission line proposal.

The Shoreline Management Act provides consideration of impacts to aesthetic views within shoreline jurisdictions. The permanent impacts associated to the establishment of a transmission line corridor in vicinity of shoreline areas should be evaluated. Alterations to views within the vicinity of the project and measures to reduce and control the loss of view corridors should be identified.

November 23, 2009

Page 4

Floodplains

Areas of the proposed transmission corridor route are mapped as a Special Flood Hazard Area, or 100-year floodplain, on Federal Emergency Management Agency maps in all participating communities. The general standards that apply to the placement of utilities in floodplains should be followed per local ordinances. Temporal and long-term impacts should be identified and measures to avoid and minimize

these impacts should be proposed.

The Channel Migration Zone (CMZ) should be mapped within each stream and river reach and this area should be avoided. Analysis of extreme flood events where evulsions in the riverbanks may occur should be disclosed and the likelihood of transmission line becoming damaged during these events determined. The EIS should identify how the proposed transmission line corridor will not fill, alter, or block the migration of any stream and river channel within the proposed route.

Hazardous Waste

Several known contaminated areas lay within the vicinity of the proposed transmission line routes. The Ecology website: <http://apps.ecy.wa.gov/website/facsite/viewer.htm> contains facility site information of known contaminated areas. Ecology recommends incorporating this information into the EIS to determine potential impacts associated to disturbance during construction and maintenance activities. If the BPA has questions concerning toxic substances and clean-up procedures, please contact Scott Rose in the Toxic Clean-up Program at (360) 407-6347.

Failure Scenarios and Human Safety

Failure Scenarios including human influenced and natural disasters should be analyzed. The EIS should discuss measures of emergency preparedness that will be taken as a result of volcanism, earthquakes, and floods, as well as failures related to human. Site specific information detailing the boundaries, intensity, duration, and extent of a failure should be discussed in relation to impacts of the built and natural environments. Emergency response plans should be established for each community along the proposed transmission line route and should include the responsible parties for emergency response.

Geological Hazards

Analysis of existing seismic stability should be provided along the proposed route. Existing soil structures should be mapped along the transmission line route and high erosion and landslide areas should be avoided to the highest extent possible. In the case of unavoidable high erosion areas minimization measures and further safety contingencies should be proposed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. We hope our comments will ensure a complete analysis of the probable adverse impacts that may result from the propose transmission corridor project. Ecology's comments are based upon information provided by the lead agency. As such, they may not constitute an exhaustive list of the various authorizations that must be obtained or legal requirements that must be fulfilled in order to carry out the proposed action.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Sarah Lukas at (360) 407-7459.

Department of Ecology

Southwest Regional Office

Communication ID: 11881

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: MICHAEL J TAPANI

We are very concerned about the health issues this proposed Power line would create. Our home sits about 400' from the Proposed line. Our property value will plummet along with the entire neighborhood. This is not the route to take.

Communication ID: 11882

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: TYLER J TAPANI

I have concerns with the power line going through 212th area. I live in the area and my homes value is going to be effected and my family's health is a concern to me. The area is also affected by large east winds that could damage the power lines. Tyler

Communication ID: 11883

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: SID SUMMERS

Yeah my name is Sid Summers I reside at [Address]. I am kinda looking at your map here your I-5 corridor reinforcement. You guys do a pretty good job in the Meadow Glade, Brush Prairie, Yacolt that area, and Amboy putting little landmarks such as what area that is but as far as from La Center to Kalamit is pretty much the maps void, which would be east of I-5 then you got Kalamit. Anyway, I live above Rose Valley, you know it would be nice if you guys like you know but what river it is or Carrolls or Rose Valley so you could look in relation to where this line is going to run, because the way it is right now it's like printing a map of Seattle and not putting Seattle on the map so, anyway if you give me a call at [Phone] or you can email me at [e-mail]. I'd just like to get a little better map and see where this baby is going to lay. So anyways, appreciate it thank you bye bye.

Communication ID: 11884

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: TERRY CONSTANCE

After speaking to your project mgr. at a meeting he indicated the goal was to "take no homes" therefore the Minnehaha route would be out. I wrote to my congressman and he indicated that thousands of homes would be affected if Minnehaha route is chozen. If thousands of homes are in danger, then

would this not be the most expensive direction to go ? Would you like to read his response ?

Communication ID: 11885

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: KAREN D GARRETT

I live adjacent to the proposed BPA # 31 line. I can't understand why this route has been proposed; it would leave a huge scar in the heart of Clark County, displace thousands of residents as well as diminish the quality of life for many more. The BPA has better options, an existing right of way (line #9) or thru the Department of Natural Resources land to the east. In these tough economic times why would you select the most expensive and disruptive route? As a taxpayer I can't support line # 31.

Communication ID: 11886

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: JACOB R HARKER

We bought our house a little under a year ago and have seen our property values diminish by almost 20% in that year. The section of our land the proposed line runs through is classified as wetlands which I currently can do nothing with besides clear a 4ft wide path. Apparently BPA can put a giant tower on it though with no problems. Not only will the BPA be able to buy our property for a fraction of its real value but it will be able to do what common homeowners can not and should not do, destroy a wetland. Congratulations on being the biggest bully around BPA. Grow up, use State land to bring Oregon their power or else play by the rules everyone else has to.

Communication ID: 11887

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: MITCHELL R HAMMITT, ROSANN PIEPER

I am sending my comments in through e-mail 11/23 since I was unable to get through on the fax line provided on the form, it was always busy. Much to my surprise the comment period has been extended to 12/14 as per the web site. I was unaware and was not notified, even though I did attend one of the informational meetings, confirmed my address and said I wanted to be included on all mailings. The busy fax makes me think I was not alone about being kept informed. Please see my comments attached.

Please have your environmental studies look at:

We live in the rural environment intentionally to enjoy and support the flora and fauna of the area. To further reflect our dedication we have certified our property with the Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife and the National Wildlife Federation. We intentionally leave the natural growth on the majority of

our property for the native wildlife to live in; including evergreens and other tall trees that would interfere with your lines, new power lines would force the destruction of those trees. Since 1995 when Rosann bought this property we have made a conscientious effort to buy and plant more trees. We believe that our efforts have helped to repair/improve our property and within the last year we have even noticed the return of a Piliated woodpecker to the area. We don't allow any off road vehicles or destruction of these wild areas.

Much of the proposed path runs along a slope that without proper plant life is prone to top soil erosion. A new access road and line work could damage not only the local natural watershed but also the local wells. All houses in this area are on well water and are dependent on the trees and brush to impede the flow of water to allow absorption into the local aquifer. There is even a small pond down the road from our property along the proposed line.

I have these other comments:

I would like a formal survey done confirming property lines and public availability of those surveys. There is a small tower on our property now and I am unsure about room for more towers or lines.

My other concern is does the BPA pay the property tax for the property that they control and can take with very little if any owner recourse? We have been paying tax on this property for a long time, yet we cannot use it as we desire.

The first notification of this came to our home in the letter dated 10/22. With the weekend we did not even receive this notice in our mail until 10/27, the same day the informational meetings started. An inadequate amount of time was given for home owners to study this issue. There were only 15 days from the time of the last meeting for home owners to the compile and submit comments.

Communication ID: 11888

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: RODRICK G MUSSER

In regards to the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, I do not support the plans for segment 31. Of all the available routes, it displaces the most people on private property. I do not support disrupting so many local families to only benefit others who do not live in our state.

Communication ID: 11889

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: JOHN A MILLS

Every weekday, 60,000 people commute across the Columbia River to work — when polled, nearly 80% said they would take a Clark County job if available. A bi-state endeavor known as the Columbia River Crossing is underway to plan and build a new Interstate-5 bridge at Vancouver.

If this massive, \$2.6 to \$3.6 billion project is to be any kind of a lasting solution for the region, we must also change the fundamental philosophy of economic development for the region – replacing a "more people" approach to

a "more jobs" strategy. Otherwise, an additional 60,000 people will be commuting across the river with no viable job options in Clark County.

This major change in economic strategy was launched by Mr. Bart Phillips, CEO of the Columbia River Economic Development Council. Please see the attached editorial from our Vancouver-based newspaper, The Columbian.

Route segment #50, if included in the scope of work, would directly conflict with the interests of Lacamas Northshore landowners, City and County elected officials, and the citizens of Camas because sharp limitations on a principal jobs--producing area within city limits would cancel out years of civic effort to set aside this area for major employment options.

Any right-of-way (ROW) increase along route segment #50 for the BPA's additional 500-KV line critically endangers the future of a roughly 500-acre block where families can live, work and play in one place. Its job-producing impact is estimated as 20 jobs-per-acre.

We urge you to eliminate route segment #50 from the scope of work and to explore other routes.

Sincerely,

Mills Family LLC Camas, Washington John A Mills, Vice-President

Communication ID: 11890

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: QUINTON M TORMANEN

I live along the path of proposed segment #31 and am baffled as to why this segment would be under consideration for such a major powerline, when there are uninhabited alternatives to the east (30, 32-35). My home lies in the valley centered on [Address]along this segment. The valley is gorgeous as is, and has a fairly high number of homes along the proposed line segment.

Communication ID: 11891

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: CHERYLEE A MIRCOVICH

I would like to be kept in the loop as this progresses. thank you

Communication ID: 11892

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: PATRICIA L BLACK

Please choose another route or option. I live in a retirement community and all of us bought these homes to retire in and put a lot of money into them to make them ready for w/c accessibility and general old age. We also have nesting red tail hawks that have lived here for years in the large pines. They sit on the current towers and hunt the green space. We've watched them for 4 yrs now and their babies are now being seen. Don't destroy this habitat

Communication ID: 11894

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: KRISTIN WANGLER,RODNEY WANGLER

Our family has lived in Hockinson (an unincorporated town in Brush Prairie Washington) for the past 6 years, we moved to this community for its beauty, it's schools and its people. We have three children in the Hockinson school system right now and do not want to relocate them. Our family plan was to chose the most desirable area, and allow our children to grow up there. We could have chosen to live anywhere and if the proposed towers were already in place, Hockinson would not have been our first choice. We are asking you to immediately seek an alternative route for your project, I know that there are several options that would not disrupt so many lives and communities, the following are just a few of our serious concerns:

Safety- The proposed towers would deliver to our area and our children, increased risk of leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gerhig's Disease and miscarriage. The buffer size projected is less than the buffer size in other areas carrying much less voltage, why doesn't our area warrant the same protection. How can you guarantee Our protection?

Economics- The Current condition of our economy and housing industry should be

enough to table this project until residents have a choice to relocate. Families that are

effected by your lines but unable to leave for financial reasons would most definitely create opportunities for litigation. Your project is actually cutting through an area that has held property values better than most places, the towers aesthetics and danger would decrease the number of residents, lowering the tax base, reducing the quality of the school etc... destroying a beautiful and valuable

community. Our area is very desirable, and we have paid to be here. Most of our community pays higher than the median tax rate, your project would be destroying a very desirable place to live and very desirable revenue source.

Environmental- The proposed towers are going to dominate the once beautiful landscape with ominous towers that certainly don't belong here. The noise emitted from the towers increases in rainy days (we do live in the Northwest) so that would be most days. Interference will occur with radios, Televisions, and other electronic equipment. The Aesthetics and quality of our community will be destroyed.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and in closing I leave you with this question: Would you raise your family near one of these high voltage power lines?

Communication ID: 11895

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: DAVID K GUTSCHMIDT

In reviewing the proposed routes for the new transmission line I was surprised to see route #31 that runs through our community. I do not think that this is a good location for the line as it affects so many people. I believe that you would be better served selecting a route farther east as it would impact significantly fewer people. I would like to go on record opposing route #31.

Communication ID: 11896

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: JIM R ROBURN

Stop the madness! Remove segment 31 from your project! Stop destroying families. Look at the damage you have already done.

Communication ID: 11897

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: ANDREW L MACFARLANE

WILL SOMEONE PLEASE CONTACT ME AT [phone].

Communication ID: 11898

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: JEFF D. LAWSON

The people have spoken and it is time to listen. It is sad that a tragedy like you are proposing is what it takes to really bring communities together, but we are here and we are fighting! You will not take our homes, destroy families, and turn our communities upside-down. Segment 31 is fighting! Segment 31 will continue the fight until you take us off the proposal. Today we are meeting with the Clark County Commissioners (BOCC) making sure we are heard. We have called, faxed, and mailed our senators and representatives asking them for help and have found support in places we least expected. It is time to remove segment #31. Do it before this gets any uglier.

Communication ID: 11899

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: STEFEN J BOYD

Hi, I'm very concerned with the route 31 as it takes the power lines right through a fairly dense residential area. This has the same effect in many ways as putting a freeway through the neighborhood, except that homes impacted are not bought at market price, but instead are destroyed for normal use without any compensation. We bought in that area because of the natural beauty and freedom from utility lines and freeways. Building on route 31 rather than a much less populated route will have a detrimental effect on the monetary and experiential value of our purchase.

Communication ID: 11900

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: DAVID ALLEN

You should not build the power lines along proposed route 1. I live at [Address]at parcel[number]. To the north of my house, there is a Clark Creek and Leckler Creek. There is also new building zones as of next year that will allow property owners to sub-divide their acreage to 2 acre plots. There will be many new residences in the area and to run power lines through corridor 1 will significantly decrease the property value and reduce the amount of home construction which will inturn reduce revenue to the county. Corridor 2 already has easements in place and makes much more sense.

Communication ID: 11901

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: SUZANNE C ROCK

Our property is a small excluded island. (area 69) My concern is will it always be an excluded area and what affect will the closeness of these lines have on our property values and mainly our health. I have been maaping in arcinfo or 20 years mainly endangered secies habitat and my husband dennis is a wildlife biologist

Communication ID: 11902

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: LOGAN D RHODEHAMEL

I can sum up my concern with the proposed line in a single character: \$. Just the fact that my property is within a route being considered drives down the "fair market value". If it comes down to it I'd be happy to move for a power line. But for that BPA needs to pay me enough that I can establish a comparable household elsewhere in a similar neighborhood. I don't think the "fair market value" is going to do that, because it's already been pushed down too far. At the current value, I'd either have to purchase a smaller house or take out a larger loan! So it's not a case of NIMBY, it's a case of I shouldn't have to lose something I've worked hard for. Fair compensation for relocation please - and my objections disappear.

Communication ID: 11903

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: GARY HAAG

Do we really have a choice? Go East, less population- We don't need caner causing towers over our homes that are supossed to protect us and our loved ones. Go East. Don't force down our thoats!

Communication ID: 11904

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: MAGDOLNA SOLTI

In response to the proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project we submit the following observations. One of the proposed power routes in Salmon Creek crosses through a significant urban area. This segment affects our property and many neighbor families with children. A number of scientific publications recently addressed the role of electromagnetic fields on the immune system (see articles below). A significant increase in cancers and cardiovascular diseases was noted. In response to public concerns the World Health Organization (WHO) established the International EMF project and continues to report on health and environmental effects (www.who.int/peh-emf/project/en). Electromagnetic fields due to electrical magnetic interference may also lead to aircraft accidents and pose fire hazards. Being a researcher and cancer physician we strongly urge you to consider alternative routes for the TEP-TPP-3 project through less populated areas. Sincerely, Magdolna Solti, MD Imre Solti, MD Addendum: 1.

Pokorný J. Biophysical cancer transformation pathway. *Electromagn Biol Med*. 2009;28(2):105-23. 2. Fazzo L, Tancioni V, Polichetti A, et al. Morbidity experience in populations residentially exposed to 50 Hz magnetic fields: methodology and preliminary findings of a cohort study. *Int J Occup Environ Health*. 2009 Apr-Jun;15(2):133-42. 3. Johansson O. Disturbance of the immune system by electromagnetic fields-A potentially underlying cause for cellular damage and tissue repair reduction which could lead to disease and impairment. *Pathophysiology*. 2009 Aug;16(2-3):157-77. Epub 2009 Apr 23. 4. Phillips JL, Singh NP, Lai H. Electromagnetic fields and DNA damage. *Pathophysiology*. 2009 Aug;16(2-3):79-88. Epub 2009 Mar 4. 5. Yang Y, Jin X, Yan C, et al. Case-only study of interactions between DNA repair genes (hMLH1, APEX1, MGMT, XRCC1 and XPD) and low-frequency electromagnetic fields in childhood acute leukemia. *Leuk Lymphoma*. 2008 Dec;49(12):2344-50. 6. Carpenter DO, Sage C. Setting prudent public health policy for electromagnetic field exposures. *Rev Environ Health*. 2008 Apr-Jun;23(2):91-117. Review. 7. Di Nallo AM, Strigari L, Giliberti C et al. 109. Monitoring of people and workers exposure to the electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields in an Italian National Cancer Institute. *J Exp Clin Cancer Res*. 2008 Jul 3;27:16.

Communication ID: 11905

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: THOMAS R SUTTON

Please incorporate these scoping pre-decisional comments into consideration regarding the proposed new 500-kV between Castle Rock and Troutdale. These comments are submitted by route, and effects. Questions are in parentheses. Route: A). I believe it was premature to disregard the Oregon route into Pearl instead of Troutdale. The publically stated obstacle to the Oregon route was that it would require a Columbia river crossing necessitating tall towers with airway marking. This objection is nonsensical as all routes to Troutdale also require a new river crossing with the same tall towers and airway marking of some kind. There are already very tall towers with strobe lighting/airway hazard painting at Long View and between Vancouver and Swan Island. Adding a crossing into Oregon at these locations would be at worst, an incremental addition to existing crossings. A new river crossing between Camas and Troutdale would be no less impacting than a river crossing elsewhere on the Columbia. (Why does the Oregon alternative route into Pearl no longer even show up on the proposed route maps?). B). By virtue of proposing the several routes from Castle Rock to Troutdale through SW Washington, a negative economic impact has been created for thousands of property owners both public and private. For the entire multi-year period of planning up until the record of decision is signed, property owners along all of the routes will suffer uncertainty in devalued property worth, and may not be able to sell, or if they do at a huge loss. Clark County is already in the grip of a severe economic downturn, depressed property values and declining tax base. BPA's actions to acquire a federally-owned easement will be another major negative impact to land values, tax base and future land use. Public and private property owners will be held hostage in limbo for a long period of time when they can least afford it. (Will BPA make whole all property owners who suffer monetary loss because of the project route proposals?). C). The Hockinson route alternative should be a non-starter. This route affects the most property owners, a

local school district and is closest to the populous east county. BPA should drop this alternative and only consider routes well to the east in sparsely populated areas. (Will BPA acknowledge the highest impact is the Hockinson route and eliminate it early so property owners do not suffer unnecessary land devaluation?). Short-term Effects: A). (Prior to the record of decision being signed, will BPA announce and advertise in advance to the general public the release of both the draft and final EIS's?). B). (Since the Obama administration job-creation stimulus program funding is part of the increased BPA borrowing authority being used to capitalize this project, will BPA commit, in advance in writing, that all labor and materials to be used on this project will be solely sourced from US companies, and be domestically produced?). C). This project will take many, many years to go from initial scoping to completion. During this time, there will inevitably be turn-over (retirement, changing jobs, etc.) among the BPA key decision makers, project personnel and staff. BPA has a bad history of using project personnel changes to conveniently renege on promises, commitments, agreements and understandings made early in a major project. (What process will BPA use to guarantee such agreements made early in the project are carried through notwithstanding any changes in project personnel?). Long-term Effects: BPA has a track record of offering some mitigation during the planning, design and construction phases of a project like this just to quiet public objections, but has been far less attentive to concerns after a line is built. I have three post-construction concerns regarding this proposed project; 1). Creating, clearing and opening a long, very wide right-of-way through forested areas where none exist now is of major negative effect to the environment and land use. All of the proposed routes are in sensitive water shed areas. Once built, the R/W will have to be maintained clear of any vegetation that may impair electrical clearances to the line. BPA has used highly toxic, powerful and persistent herbicides in their R/W maintenance practices. (Will BPA commit to never using any chemical or synthetic herbicides in maintaining the right-of-way?). 2). An extensive system of all-weather, permanent access roads will be necessary along the R/W to O&M this new line. Building such an access road system in an area where none exist opens undisturbed land to all sorts of problems including trespassing, vandalism, criminal activity, drug operations, transient camps, trash dumping, game poaching, etc. Installing gates across access roads does little or nothing to deter such activity. (What measures will BPA take to ensure the security of any new access roads from misuse and protect private property along their access roads?). 3). (What measures will BPA take to mitigate down to zero the degradation of TV and radio signals to the rural, fringe areas that result from the radio frequency interference (RFI) generated by a 500-kV transmission line?).

Communication ID: 11906

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: ROB CRIDER,CHRISTIN CRIDER

To whom it may concern, I am writing in reference to the I-5 corridor reinforcement project. I am one of the property owners within the boundaries of a purposed route along segment 39. If this proposal goes through as stated it will greatly impact our home in ways of resale, value and loss of use. As our property sits now we already have a tower on the bottom third of our property that is visible. When we purchased this home 4 years ago the current tower was a concern because of health, visibility and the

lack of ability to use that part of our property. We were able to work through this concern feeling that a small area of our property to give up would be ok and the distance of the tower on our 5 acres might not be to much of a health concern and on our unobstructed view lot the tower on our lot sat much lower then our neighbors tower that already partially obstructs our view that we are taxed so highly for. Our concern for these towers are now being revisited through this new proposal. It is said that there will now be a second line running through our property and that the towers will be substantially higher then the current. We would end up with a second tower with 500 kilovolt lines further up my property putting it closer to my home which puts my family at a higher health risk. My property is also on a hill side so the placement of these towers will make it even taller on my property (not to mention the already very tall tower that my neighbor has on their property that affects my view currently) further taking away from my view that I again pay a higher tax for and bases of home value. I moved out to this property for the view, country living and quietness. The current 240kilovolt lines create a constant hum or crackling noise that seems to irritate live stock and now we are going to have to worry about the noise of 500 kilovolt lines. With this also creates less area that we are able to use within our property. We are also concerned about the electromagnetic field that these lines put out that can increase risk of serious health issues. I am very upset as a cancer survivor I am going to be forced to remove myself from my country home so that I am not knowingly putting myself at and increased risk of reoccurrence along with risking the future of my children. This leaves me with the last problem of resale. It is no secret that these lines create health issues so having these lines on my property and running through our neighborhood will destroy the value. Then we are adding to it the fact that our view will no longer be unobstructed because you will now have to search for the view through many power lines and towers lines and last it leaves our property completely unusable. There were many alternative routes as shown by the BPA on project study maps that we have received. Theses alternative routes would have less impact on the public by taking them through less populated areas that don't currently house any lines. By looking at the map it doesn't seem to make sense to cut back through our highly populated area. We do not feels it is right to make one small neighborhood carry the entire burden of these power lines. These new lines will force many families out of their homes destroying many dreams and lifestyles. We are asking for your help in routing these power lines into areas that will less impact our community and helping us keep our homes .Thank you for taking the time to read and helping to come to a resolve on this important issue. Sincerely, Rob & Christin Crider

Communication ID: 11907

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: ROBERT HILBRECHT

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Electrical and magnetic field effects on wildlife and humans you indicate this would be a 500KV line, which is significantly higher voltage than commonly used for transmission lines. You did not indicate whether it will be and AC or DC voltage. The effects will be different depending on which type voltage is used. Do you have scientific studies to support your findings regarding effects? Will these studies be

made available to the public so we can review your judgment and make an informed decision? When Googling 500KV lines I found there are a lot of agencies like you proposing these lines but few lines in operation. How do you know the effects with virtually no history or data?

I have these other comments:

I have concerns about how this transmission line could impact property values. I also have concerns about the value that will be offered for the property, if needed for transmission line. Some property was purchased at the peak of the real estate market a few years ago. Now if purchased for the transmission line will BPS cover losses due to lower property values? Forcing a sale now in this low market will cause hardship on people who otherwise could weather this downturn and force many individual owners into bankruptcy.

As a rental property the uncertainty of whether the property will be taken will scare renters away and make the property unrentable until the location has been settled. Is BPA prepared to make restitution for lost rental income?

You say this is to bring power to local area along I-5, but you have another line proposed along the Columbia River heading east from a location not far from the Troutdale substation. Aren't you just keeping these projects separate so the public will not see that you actually intend to send power east out of the area?

Communication ID: 11908

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: KRIS OLMSTEAD

Please have your environmental studies look at: The potential Health Risks posed by the Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA's) construction of a 500KV transmission line in our neighborhood.

I am concerned about the potential health risks posed by the Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA's) construction of a 500 kilovolt transmission line in our neighborhood. The health effects of high voltage lines cannot be understated. Epidemiological studies have focused on cancer incidence in children and cancer as a result of occupational exposure to Electromagnetic Fields (EMF). I have read that several case-control studies have evaluated the potential association between childhood cancer and homes near relatively high-voltage distribution lines. For example, one study conducted in Denver in 1979 found that children living near high-voltage distribution lines doubled their annual risk of cancer death, from 1 in 10,000 to 2 in 10,000. Similar follow-up studies led to mixed results. Probably the most important of these was a 1987 analysis funded by the New York State Power Lines Project, which was designed specifically to correct for weaknesses in the 1979 study. But, in addition to increasing the understanding of EMF exposure, the New York investigation essentially corroborated the 1979 results.

More recently, researchers at Johns Hopkins University discovered that telephone workers exposed to low levels of EMF had a greater incidence of leukemia than a control group. Currently, there is a 115-230 kilovolt line within one block of our home. We presume that the proposed 500 kilovolt transmission line would run adjacent to the current line. The potential health risks upon the children and their families in this neighborhood cannot be understated. Furthermore, there is an elementary school within two blocks of the current and proposed transmission lines. For these reasons, I strongly oppose the construction of another high voltage transmission line in our neighborhood. The potential negative health effects are simply too great.

Communication ID: 11909

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: DEANNA ADAMS

Dear Mr. Johnston:

PacifiCorp is the owner of certain real property around the Lewis River, which PacifiCorp owns in conjunction with its hydroelectric projects under Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Project License Numbers 935, 2071, and 2111 (hereinafter, collectively, the "Project"). This letter is to identify FERC license requirements regarding transmission line crossings of Project lands, and provide input on project line route alternatives as identified in BPA's proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. Several segments of the alternative line routes pass through Project lands, which are within the FERC boundary and therefore subject to various requirements and regulations mandated

by FERC within each project license (see attached - Article 413 Use and Occupancy of the Merwin license). Subsection (d) of Article 413 notes "the licensee may convey fee title to, easements or rights-of-way across, or leases of project lands for :...(4) non-project overhead electric transmission lines that require erection of support structures within the project boundary, for which all necessary federal and state approvals have been obtained." The section goes on to describe the process for seeking FERC's approval. The license also notes in subsection (e) the following: (1) Before conveying the interest, the licensee shall consult with federal and state fish and wildlife or recreation agencies, as appropriate, and the State Historic Preservation Officer. (2) Before conveying the interests, the licensee shall determine that the proposed use of the lands to be conveyed is not inconsistent with any approved Exhibit R or approved report on recreational resources of an Exhibit E; or, if the project does not have an approved Exhibit R or approved report on recreational resources, that the lands to be conveyed do not have recreational value. (3) The instrument of conveyance must include the following covenants running with the land: (i) the use of the lands conveyed shall not endanger health, create nuisance, or otherwise be incompatible with overall project recreational use; (ii) grantee shall take all reasonable precautions to ensure that the construction, operation, and maintenance of structures or facilities on the conveyed lands will occur in a manner that will protect the scenic, recreational, and environmental values of the project; and (iii) the grantee shall not unduly restrict public access to project waters. (4) The Commission reserves the right to require the licensee to take reasonable remedial action to correct any violation of

the terms and conditions of this article, for the protection and enhancement of the project's scenic, recreational, and other environmental values. Please note the level of effort PacifiCorp must undertake for FERC approval of acceptable conveyances of interest in project lands, Given this is BPA's project, we request that should you desire to cross Project lands, you lead an necessary consultation to meet license requirements, implement PacifiCorp approved actions that best protect the scenic, recreational, and environmental values of resources within the FERC project boundaries, and work closely with the company to complete other requirements as noted in the above subsection (c) language. In essence, PacifiCorp will look to BPA to comply with all PERC requirements that could be imposed on PacifiCorp as Licensee associated with the conveyance of interest in project lands, and PacifiCorp will establish its position on whether

the proposed transmission alignment is consistent with the requirements of its FERC licenses, in particular, Article 413 as noted above. While PacifiCorp will facilitate coordination of certain License requirements, please also

note that for those items requiring additional PacifiCorp staff involvement, PacifiCorp will seek reimbursement of its administrative costs in addition to any other reimbursement or mitigation requirement for disposition of PacifiCorp property. To eliminate such process and expense, BPA could avoid Project property by choosing segment 9 from Lexington to Ross. In our preliminary evaluation of other proposed routes, a route that crosses downstream of

Merwin dam would have less potential adverse impacts to our recreation and wildlife lands than routes that cross near Yale dam. Routes near Yale dam may have significant adverse impact to project resources and values in that local area.

Please feel free to contact me at [Phone] or Todd Olson at [Phone] if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Deanna Adams

Manager, Property Management

PacifiCorp Real Estate Management

Communication ID: 11910

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: JENNIFER C HALLECK

Regarding~ Proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project NEPA response

Vancouver Public Schools (VPS), would like to comment on the reinforcement project as it relates to

location of substations and power lines on or near school district operated property. Our properties include both school and work place sites currently in operation and property owned by VPS for future education or work sites. We urge Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) to ensure that any new substations are not located within the designated neighborhood walking areas to our sites as the high-voltage equipment is very

dangerous. We also urge BPA to choose route segments that do not run through or along any district property and are a mutually agreed upon distance from these sites. We understand that significant research has been done on the cause and effects of electric/magnetic fields generated from power lines and studies have proven both safe and hazardous. Because the reports and studies over the years have been contradictory and inconclusive we want to ensure that the distance separating our children from the route segments is appropriate. VPS operates through the needs and desires of the public we serve, thus the public safety perception is of great concern to the district. Our sites and buildings are public facilities and are to continue to be safe environments both physically and perceptually for all of the citizens we serve. Mark, although I am meeting with you on Tuesday November 24, 2009 to further review and discuss the reinforcement project, we felt this letter was an important step in vocalizing our position on the proposed routes in your NEPA and we look forward to working together to resolve our concerns.

Thank you,

Communication ID: 11911

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: DAVID W MASON

RE: SCOPE OF EIS, BPA'S I-5 CORRIDOR REINFORCEMENT PROJECT, ROUTE SEGMENT #50, NORTHEAST OF LACAMAS LAKE WE STRONGLY URGE YOU TO HELP US ELIMINATE ROUTE SEGMENT #50 FROM THE BPA'S SCOPE OF WORK AND TO EXPLORE OTHER ROUTES. We, Dave and Alexis Mason, ONE OF A DOZEN PROPERTY OWNERS WITHIN LACAMAS NORTHSORE – WISH TO REGISTER OUR OBJECTION THAT ANY RIGHT-OF-WAY (ROW) INCREASE ALONG ROUTE SEGMENT #50 FOR THE BPA'S ADDITIONAL 500-KV LINE CRITICALLY ENDANGERS THE FUTURE OF A ROUGHLY 500-ACRE BLOCK THAT'S MASTER PLANNED TO BE A JOBS-PRODUCING COMMUNITY WHERE HUNDREDS OF FAMILIES CAN LIVE, WORK AND PLAY IN ONE PLACE. ROUTE SEGMENT #50, IF INCLUDED IN THE SCOPE OF WORK, WILL DIRECTLY CONFLICT WITH THE INTERESTS OF LACAMAS NORTHSORE LANDOWNERS, CITY AND COUNTY ELECTED OFFICIALS, AND THE CITIZENS OF CAMAS BECAUSE SHARP LIMITATIONS ON A PRINCIPAL JOBS-PRODUCING AREA WITHIN THE CITY LIMITS OF CAMAS WOULD CANCEL OUT YEARS OF CIVIC EFFORT TO SET ASIDE THIS AREA FOR FUTURE EMPLOYMENT OPTIONS. WE ARE ALARMED THAT JUST TWO ALTERNATIVE SEGMENTS ARE BEING CONSIDERED FROM NORTHEAST OF LACAMAS LAKE TO OAK PARK SUBSTATION – AND ONE SEGMENT (#50) IS ALREADY COMMITTED TO CREATING HUNDREDS OF NEW JOBS FOR SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON.

Communication ID: 11912

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: GEORGE J SOMARAKIS

My family and I would appreciate BPA not using route #31. It appears to be running right through our property. We do not want the effects, hazards and complications that the power lines will bring to us and our neighbors. We would hope that BPA considers seriously choosing the most eastern route. Thank you for your consideration, George Somarakis

Communication ID: 11913

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: KELLI A.K. PLUMMER

I am strongly opposed to any new power lines being constructed in any areas where homes exist! I will be so close that I will hear the construction and see the distorted landscape afterwards. Please find another route that does not affect so many landowners and wildlife.

Communication ID: 11914

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: RUSSELL P YEAROUT

Based on my close-up observations of towers in the Klickitat County area, I feel that these MUST be routed through the national forest rather than our backyards. They are eyesores, require a huge amount of timber to be removed from the vicinity, as well as condemning my friends and neighbors properties. My property value will be significantly diminished, both from the visual aspect as well as the perception (real or not) that high voltage power lines CAUSE CANCER. Do not be hasty or selfish in choosing the proper location, which routes them through the national forest.

Communication ID: 11915

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: JANE P TYROLER

The I-5 Corridor Project route should and must be placed away from the human population and the potentially physically destructive and psychologically damaging, as well as life altering effects of any other decision.

We have attended your town meetings and our community meetings regarding the proposed I-5

Project. After all the rhetoric, all the diagrams and charts and all the furor from the communities directly involved, several things are clear and paramount in this proposed project.

Although the data sets from the latest EMF health research are apparently not large enough to be considered statistically relevant by BPA, they never the less indicate distinct adverse health trends.

The 2002 California study identifying childhood Leukemia, Alzheimer's Disease and ALS is just the tip of the iceberg. The Oxford Cancer Research Group Study findings, reported in 2003 and spanning thirty-three years of data, significantly adds to the veracity of the earlier study, as well as indicating additional health affects which include adult cancers, miscarriages, headaches, insomnia, depression and suicide.

It is inconceivable that you would disregard the health effects that are real, perhaps waiting for the statistical significance to rise to epidemic proportions. However, there is no ignoring the psychological trauma and accompanying daily implications in the lives of all the residents involved. The public fear engendered by these studies and their results clearly demonstrates the concern and importance people place on the use of High Voltage Transmission lines within populated areas. This public concern must not be ignored by the BPA, regardless of whatever outdated 10 year old "guidelines" the BPA is currently following.

Would you want these towers and lines in your yard, your children's yard or your parents' yard? How many of your employees are in a position to influence the outcome of the location of these lines to be sure that none of their friends or loved ones are subjected to the risks involved?

Rather than allowing these concerns to foster a social environment that pits neighbor against neighbor, each attempting to foist the feared project in someone else's back yard, BPA has a social and moral responsibility to apply significant weight to the viable and feasible alternatives that remove the controversial and potentially dangerous EMF from immediate human proximity.

A standard engineering cost/benefit ratio analysis is not appropriate to this type of project as the human cost, in potentially devastating quality of life issues, is incalculable and far outweighs any other cost considerations. Your charts and words state that cost is at the bottom of the list of considerations in the siting of this project. Is this true, or just put out there to mollify the masses? Anywhere the proposed route would directly impact residents, these lines should be put under ground, thereby providing as much safety and as many safeguards as can be brought to bear on this potentially health threatening situation.

It would be ethically corrupt and morally reprehensible to choose any path which further endangers the lives and welfare of the human population. When all is said and done, the risks are too great and too life threatening to excuse or condone inflicting the I-5 Project and its real and documented health effects, on human beings. Put these transmission lines beyond the immediate proximity of the human population and where not possible, bury the lines underground, putting the physical, psychological and emotional welfare of all of us ahead of any other considerations or influences.

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: KELLI A.K. PLUMMER

I am strongly opposed to any new power lines being constructed in any areas where homes exist. We moved out to the country where we had privacy and a beautiful view. I do not want this view obstructed by a huge tower. I do not want the electrical charge running around where I am raising my children and horses. You have obviously not thought about the impact on the community. I hope this comment option is not just a way to let us vent and you don't plan on reading any of it! Please do not close your mind to all of the citizens paying for their own land and life. We will not be silent!

Communication ID: 11917

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: ROBERT W LITTLETON

I live above Camas along Winters Rd. I think that transmission towers should be located along existing transmission right-of-ways. The Camas Washougal area has many existing transition lines. When I drive into town I pass by three different sections within 6 miles. We should not give up more land to transmission lines. Houses should not be condemned when we already have land for these towers. Perhaps this would involve a design change or new engineering. If we can send astronauts into space we should be able existing right of way for power lines. No houses should be condemned.

Communication ID: 11918

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: ED M TUBBERVILLE, MONICA TUBBERVILLE

Previous submittal not showing in comment search. Please delete previous submittal if this is a duplication.

RE: BPA I-5 Corridor Project

Unfortunately, I have been unable to attend your informational meetings to more fully understand your proposal. Based upon the level of the local outcry, I would hope that you would schedule more meetings with more specific answers to those questions that cannot be answered by the on-line information, and have not been addressed in the public meetings provided.

I reside on a property that borders your line 39 alignment in the Mt. Livingston area. I have read many of the comments submitted and think you can hear the common theme throughout. This proposal will devastate the property values of every property owner along its route, but those that includes a residence even more severely. Our community, our nation for that matter, has been devastated by the

economic recession. We have already lost a high percentage of our property values; many of us have lost jobs and are already struggling financially. Your proposal will literally rob thousands of homeowners of a significant portion of the remaining property value of our homes, further magnifying our local economic conditions.

Our home is assessed higher because of the beautiful view, a view that other property owners are not allowed to invade at the structure heights that you are proposing. With the proposed tree removal and the 100 foot higher towers, you would likely destroy not only the value of my home financially, but the aesthetic beauty and serenity of my home. Other allowable land uses within these rural zoning classifications are prescribed to protect our inherent property rights from neighboring incompatible uses, including health and safety. Why should BPA be exempt from the same? The resulting reduced market value will not be reflected in my property assessment, nor do I see any proposed compensation for the 'taking' that your proposal will be creating.

Even more alarming in this proposal are the undefined health risks associated with such close proximity to high EMF emissions. This issue is highly controversial and unanswered, and federal processes must acknowledge this health risk and the resultant liability. You can find data that supports both sides of this story. But, until there are unquestionable data studies to prove that there are NO health risks, you are putting our families at unnecessary risk in the name of saving project costs. These undefined health risks only further exacerbated our property value situation in that no one would likely consider purchasing our homes just in case the suggested risks are validated at a later date.

If the NEPA process is truly purposed to identify the impacts of this proposal and the alternatives, the impact upon the residential land uses along these transmission lines would be devastating financially, physically as well as emotionally to thousands of families.

Other thoughts and questions: What are the impacts to the homes for their computers, phone and television reception? Are there increased fire risks, or explosions due to technical failures or lightning? Can these monstrosities tumble in an earthquake and what is their line of destruction? What are the increased risks to air traffic with our local airport? How will it affect the already notable wind pattern through these cleared swaths? What are the effects to the streams, wetlands, and wildlife? How will it affect our local community's economy due to reduced aesthetics and overall reduced property values? How will that affect our local schools and other tax base issues? What other capacity and energy saving ideas could be pursued? Who is benefiting most from the increased capacity?

As a final thought, the legal litigation could cost the project far more in time and money than is hoped to be saved by taking a short cut through heavily developed rural residential properties. Choose the route that affects the least number of residences and compensate all property owners for the real financial loss.

Respectfully,

Monica Tubberville

Communication ID: 11919

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: CORDELIA CHEN

1) We would like to know what is the distance of the effect of radiation waves of the transmission towers/lines.

2) We want to know how far away the radiation has effected, what is the radius of the radiation?

Communication ID: 11920

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: ANGIE LEE

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Wonderful steelhead fishing

Deer and Elk

Many crystals are found in the rocks in the river

I have these other comments:

I own 12 of the prettiest acres on the cowman river. My property is right in the middle of the #11 swath and it is on a bend in the river. The steelhead fishing is awesome in the winter and in the summer it is true heaven away from the heat and hustle/bustle of life. We have a rope swing and people are always sneaking in to play there. Not only would it be a shame to have an ugly power line go through there, but opening it up will make trespassing even more of a problem.

Along with trespassing we have to deal with people leaving their garbage everywhere, vandalizing the gates constantly, and stealing the firewood we have stacked for our use.

This powerline will make it easier for people to see what we have there and more people will be trespassing.

We always planned on building a small house on the bend and retiring there. Please don't deface and ruin such a gorgeous piece of "God's country".

Communication ID: 11921

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: SEAN P SMITH

The following is a copy of an email I drafted and sent to all of my local Senators and State Representatives. Dear Elected Officials, I am a very concerned citizen and am pleading for your help. I live just outside of Hockinson, WA and am in the direct path of the BPA's proposed transmission line route 31. I purchased my home in 2005 when the markets were good with no intentions on selling for 25 to 30 years. I bought my home which is located in a nice quiet neighborhood in the country with the intentions of raising a family here. This is a good area, with good schools and good people; an area I would consider represents what living in the United States is all about. I currently still have a job; thankfully, but I could not afford to start over nor would I want to. No matter what kind of compensation people would get for their homes, it still costs money to relocate; money which I do not believe many people have right now. People are struggling to pay their bills and take care of their families, and now the BPA wants to burden them with taking their homes. This is not the time to ask people to give any more than they already are; I am appalled by their request. I am begging you to tell the BPA "NO" to transmission line route 31. It affects way too many people as it goes through a fairly populated area. They need to reconsider sending it east on less populated lands. With concern, Sean Smith

Communication ID: 11922

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: DAVID W HUTTULA

My comment on the proposed transmission line expansion in SW Washington. I understand the need for more power lines. I am frustrated by the fact that you refuse to communicate with motorized recreation users in the forests. Responsible offroad users are available to help solve your security and vandalism and erosion problems in the power line corridor. Your transmission lines will likely cross areas that are legal for offroad users and if you want us to support your proposal you need to open communication with responsible offroad groups. Responsible groups can adopt sections of the corridor, make and maintain a legal trail system and discourage harmful use of the corridor. Examples as close as the Tillamook Burn and Browns Camp area are proof that the power lines can be a challenging offroad trail system and the offroad club will solve your security and vandalism problems. Your problems are obvious in SW Washington and your present methods will never solve your problems.. please consider meeting with the groups that have been responsible for the Yacolt Burn Trail Project and the DNR in the Yacolt Burn. Feel free to contact me for more information. Thank you for your consideration of this matter. David Huttula

Communication ID: 11923

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: DANIEL RONYAK

You should send your newest high power transmissions in the most unencumbered route to the lines that are already in place at the retired Trojan Nuclear Power Plant, because those lines are ready for more power. The most direct route is in the water at the bed of the Columbia River, or on the rail lines. In addition, your transmission towers should be augmented to carry future technology such as high speed rail, and wind towers should be aligned along corridors where high speed rail is a necessity. The combination of power line, wind tower, and high speed rail is an infrastructure necessity and you need to plan for it now. It will involve securing simple promisory contracts with existing railroads and building towers over or near the existing railroad beds, and securing contracts with wind tower builders and suggesting locations that are closest to existing railroads. Cheers. Dan Ronyak

Communication ID: 11924

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: MR. & CYNTHIA A JOHNSON

BPA route 31 Power Line we have just learned about this proposed line. We are against BPA route 31 and believe you should use one of the 2 alternate routes miles East of us. Also because of just finding out about this BPA should extend the deadline for comments. We bought our homes in this area to be in the country not to have giant power lines in our backyard. Besides the fact BPA will be condemning some homes which is unconstitutional again BPA should use alternate routes.

Communication ID: 11925

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: LYNN JOHNSTON, LEROY JOHNSTON

The Johnston family, primary landholder within the Lacamas Northshore group of

Property owners, wishes to register our objection that any right-of-way (ROW)

Increase along route segment #50 for the BPA's additional 500KV line critically

Endangers the future of a roughly 500-acre block that is far down the track to

becoming an extremely unique urban setting where families can live, work and

recreate without the need for vehicular transportation. The master plan and negotiated development

agreement for Lacamas Northshore, incorporated into the city limits of Camas in May 2008, cannot

coexist with the expanded BPA easements and ROW condemnation for an added 500KV transmission

line, As a result, the EIS scope with segment #50 introduces irresolvable conflicts with public/private

investments targeted to make Lacamas Northshore a hub for employment growth in east Clark County

and a landmark, mixed-use community with an elementary/middle school and public center. Years of public hearings and decision making by Clark County and the City of Camas, going back to September 2004, have culminated in comprehensive plan designations for light industrial and mixed-use development to meet the City's growth needs for decades to come, These planning designations and urban growth boundary have withstood significant and extensive legal challenges before the State Growth Management Hearings Board. Job-based zoning for the Lacamas North shore area has been recommended by the Camas Planning Commission and was adopted by City Council with broad public input and concurrent planning budgeting for the needed public infrastructure to support urban-level growth, We urge you to eliminate route segment #50 from the scope of work and to explore other routes.

Sincerely,

Communication ID: 11926

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: CHRIS RUST

Thank you for your assistance. Message below.

While improvement to the infrastructure is certainly overdue, route 31 will be more costly due to the number of high value properties that will need to be condemned. This is unnecessary in light of the two alternatives to the east of route 31 that move through forest lands. While this will decrease tax revenues, it will not displace families or reduce the investment value of properties that many of us have counted on for retirement, college tuition and savings.

Our home is near the proposed route 31. When we purchased this property, we did so believing that the area to our east could not be developed and with the belief that the view and serenity would enhance the property values. This project will severely decrease our property value and impair our ability to sell the property at a time when we need to do so to pay for our two children in college.

I urge the BPA to consider the costs in both dollars and human terms when making the decision of where to locate this transmission line.

Sincerely,

Chris Rust

Communication ID: 11927

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: MARY JO COUSENS

I am writing in response to the Bonneville Power Administration. I've lived here for 23 and a half years of my life. I'm about to be 25 next month. I was absolutely devastated to hear about the new transmission lines that are going to be put up in Hockinson. I am also fearful for lasting affects of it being in such a tightly-close nit community such as Hockinson. This affects so many families, much of who I know and care about, and am deeply sadden to see something like this to happen to my home, my community, my friends, and my life.

Hockinson, to me, is home. I grew up in what I called the "country" and what the city folk called the "real country." My parents thought this was a good area to raise four children in a healthy environment; specifically to get out of the city. Especially being raised in Hockinson, my brothers and I all grew up to be children with respect, honesty, and are hard working. This is an area I still deem as "beautiful" and "enlightening." It still has its blissful appearance, daunting but gorgeous think forests, and luscious green fields filled with trees, animals, and warm inviting country homes and people.

I'm not saying that these transmission lines do not provide energy, they do, and are very beneficial for hurtling huge amounts of energy. I am simply just asking you to move it in an area where it does not affect my hometown people. Please do not take my love for my home and many other's homes in such a central area where I appreciate such impacting beauty and where I am proud to call my one and only home.

Thank you for your time,

Mary Jo Cousens

Communication ID: 11928

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: RON JUVE

I am writing you in regards to the proposed I-5 Reinforcement Project route 31 . As a resident of Hockinson I am very concerned about the negative impact this power line will have on our area of the county. Route 31 would affect MANY households. Primarily, the thought of living near a 500 KV line is scary! Both the electric and magnetic fields of such large magnitude are a health concern to me. The appearance of the power lines and towers through my friends properties and out my back windows will be terrible. I know you have access from a partial easement setup many years ago. Well, since then, many homes have been built along this route which will be profoundly impacted by this power line. Have you driven along route 31 to see number of homes that would be affected?

I hope that you will drop your consideration of route 31 and find a more isolated route for the power line.

Best Regards,

Ron Juve

Communication ID: 11929

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: ROBERT OSBORN

My name is Robert Osborn and I live in Brush Prairie. The BPA proposed route 31 would run directly through my neighborhood. I am writing to express my extreme opposition to this route as well as the length of time allowed for public comment.

I understand the public comment portion closes November 23rd. What is the rush? Why not allow this issue to be discussed fully and provide for news coverage, etc?

This route would cut through the middle of my neighborhood affecting livability, property values and expose numerous people to the affects of long-term EMF and the "undetermined" health risks.

Please, please DO NOT consider route 31 as a viable option. It would destroy our neighborhood and many others. There are other options.

Thank you.

Robert Osborn

Communication ID: 11930

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: CHRIS RUST

My comment is related to the EIS on the BPA I-5 project and is as follows: My home is located near proposed route #31. My reading of the proposed routes indicates that BPA has two routes to the east of this route which would not impact the property values of so many homes in the area of NE 212th Ave. and would not be as costly to BPA to condemn. I urge BPA to choose a route that does not adversely impact the property values of homes that will already decline due to current market conditions.

Chris Rust

Communication ID: 11931

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: BRIAN WISEMAN

EMR on a project this size cannot be contained within a 150 foot easement. Who will compensate neighbors for flooding their properties with radiation? Who will compensate them for disrupting their radio and TV reception? Who will compensate them for having to live with the incessant buzzing, sizzling, and humming sounds emitted by these lines? Either locate this line far away from private property or abandon the project.

Communication ID: 11932

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: BRADEN S STRICKLER

I am writing you to voice my concerns regarding the Bonneville Power

Authority (BPA) I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. I am asking you to remove BPA Segment #31 from further consideration.

Any consideration of this entirely new path of 150-foot high, 500 Kilovolt

towers adjacent and through our neighborhoods is irresponsible. BPA Segment #31 is a planned path running through our community of Hockinson, Washington. Hockinson community taxes are among the highest in the area.

For many of us, our homes represent our most valuable asset. Placing these

towers through our neighborhood would destroy many homes, destroy the value of surrounding properties and destroy the fabric of our proud and close-knit area.

Some residents may have the resources to take a loss and move away. For

those left in shadow of these towers, the razed land will bring a constant reminder of lost friends and lost community. The social and emotional impacts of will be compounded by the legitimate health concerns that BPA will readily dismiss.

The California Department of Health Services (2002) concluded that living

in close proximity to Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) can cause increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease and miscarriage.

Segment #31 traverses property owned by our public school district and a new school site. The current primary/intermediate school at the corner of 159th and 164th is within a mile from the proposed route segment. If Segment #31 is constructed, many families will be forced to relocate and others may pull children from the school because of health concerns.

Hockinson families & taxpayers have invested great amounts in the development of the best school district in the area. They have planned for years to see their children educated within it. Is BPA now able to take that away?

Segment #31 runs through areas with geologic seismic and erosion hazards (identified in Clark Counties GIS records.)

Segment #31 is viewed by BPA as the desired route. It's short length would minimize their construction cost. Other options would traverse Washington DNR land, with less social impact, avoiding established communities. Why aren't they upgrading their Existing Facilities within Existing Right-of-Way in Segment #9 and in their northern Oregon routes between Allston and Keeler or St. Johns? Any of these options provide the route & network diversity they are after.

Regards,

Braden Strickler

Communication ID: 11933

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: KAREN FREE,RANDALL FREE

Comments for I-5 Corridor Project

Please confirm you rec'd this at [e-mail] Thank you!

We live a block and a half away from existing power towers & one of the proposed paths to add the mega watt towers. The impact of having additional towers exceeds the normal easement capacity for our residential neighborhood. Our neighborhood would be exposed to unacceptable levels of electrical power & condemn the property values & resale values of hundreds of homes in this area. Our neighborhood is composed of hundreds of homes on small lots. We are already at our limit of exposure with the existing power lines so close by. Our neighborhoods were not planned with the intent of having much larger, major power towers running through them. A more rural route, away from congested neighborhoods and schools is appropriate. Too many homeowners will be impacted by adding these additional towers to what is there now. We would never have purchased our homes knowing of a possibility that mega towers would be added to the existing tower easement. The added concerns of

extremely soggy and leads to many falling trees which interfere with power lines and poles and road access.

Map 20 line 10 is also the area, weather permitting, where my neighbor and his friends fly experimental aircraft. He has a landing strip on his property. Those experimental planes fly directly over the proposed line 10 site when taking off and landing. These experimental planes frequently crash, as is attested to by the fact that 2 of the 3 planes housed on his property today are in need of major repairs due to crashes. The EMFs from line 10 would not be safe for people living in the area. See my comments in the next section for more on this.

I have these other comments: Current research by non-industry researchers clearly shows electromagnetic fields long-term health effects can include: the development of certain brain tumors, DNA and cellular damage, adverse changes to the immune system, the production of free radicals, the development of cancer, and increases in memory disturbances, headache, depression, sleeplessness, difficulty concentrating, difficulty attending, dizziness, visual disturbances, fatigue, etc. The safety standards in place for EMFs are inadequate. When I was a child my family lived near high voltage electric towers for 8 years. My brother was diagnosed by medical doctors as developing early stage leukemia and I was diagnosed as developing a blood disorder. Luckily at the time these diagnoses were made my father received a job transfer. Following our move over the years our health improved and we no longer had those problems. However, studies have shown that those exposed to high voltage electric towers in youth, even for less than a year's time, have higher incidences of adult leukemia and cancer. As an adult my brother now has cancer and I have had 2 brain tumors. I also now have a severe hypersensitivity to EMFs. I am for these reasons opposed to the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project in general and to propose line 10 map page 20 in particular, which would be in close proximity to my property and many other property owners. Due to my EMFs Hypersensitivity I have already had to move away from my first home where a cell phone tower was erected across the street. I don't have another option but to move again if line 10 goes through and lose a second home. This home was specifically chosen to be far away from existing cell phone towers and high voltage electric towers to limit my EMFs exposure. I and my family are actively involved in trying to make the public more aware of the danger of EMFs to their health and the health of future generations. Many of the people I have spoken with say they will not remain on property near line 10 if it is approved. Eventually the dangers of non-ionizing radiation will be widely recognized and its use more restricted, but currently EMFs bombard our bodies and no safe haven exists.

Communication ID: 11936

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: TED NAFFIN

On the line #48, why don't you double up your lines on the towers already there. That or move it south so you don't wipe out the Fern Prairie Market which is very convenient for the people in this area. The Fern Prairie Market is also important for contractors working in the area as they can get their lunch and

a porta potty is available. Also getting gas close by for area residents is also important. Maybe you should consider a line further north that runs east-west between Brush Prairie and Ridgefield as that is where development will be happening.

Communication ID: 11937

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: JOHN W DUSH

Please have your environmental studies look at wetlands- corridor #31.

I have these other comments: Corridor #31 is not acceptable for any number of reasons. Go east of corridor #31, or down I-5!

Communication ID: 11938

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: ALAN HOVEN,CINDY HOVEN

To BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project:

My house and steel shop are both about 150' from today's easement. I live down the hill from the easement. A line possible 200' above my place would be too close for comfort. You can't tell me that living within 150' of a 500kv line wouldn't hurt our health or my property value.

A 100' easement should never have anymore than a 50' tower on it, so when the tower or line fall, they fall in the safety zone not on a house. The house on the other side of the easement is even closer, as is the 4 houses on either side of us. The aerial map (photo) you gave are old. 3 houses aren't even in the photo. WE have worked very hard getting this place built up for my needs and have a million \$ view, so I have no desire to move. A 150' tower is not acceptable.

Communication ID: 11939

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: SANDRA L BISHOP

Bonneville Power Administration

BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement

P.O. Box 9250

Portland, Oregon 97207

November 18 ,2009

RE: BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

[Parcel information]

Dear Bonneville power Administration;

On Friday, October 23rd. 2009 I received a notice from Bonneville Power Administration in the mail, notifying me as a property owner of your proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project and that my property is located on one of the segments that is under consideration as a route for 500 kilovolt transmission line and associated substations. Listed on the document were six scheduled meeting to attend in various locations in Southwest Washington and Oregon for the public to attend to answer any questions we may have. Also included in this mailing was 2 "Permission To Enter Property" Forms to be filled out.

I glanced at the documents when I picked up the mail. Personally, I had out of town plans that weekend. Much to my dismay, while heading out my road for my weekend plans, I was flagged down by one of my neighbors. He had also received the same BPA documents. Needless to say, he had read them and was quite upset about the information he read and was looking to see if other neighbors had received the same mailing. When I got back into town, Sunday evening I read the information closely. As soon as I could, I got on the BPA website and read the proposed plans, I looked up the map and it's possible routes, read about EMF fields etc. As neighbors talked, I realized if this route were chosen I would possibly not have a home, or at least be sitting either very near or under high voltage power lines trying to raise my family. I also heard and was alarmed to find out not all neighbors were contacted in my direct neighborhood and then found out the community wasn't notified.

Due to scheduling conflicts and the locations and times of the BPA scheduled meeting, I was only able to attend the Gresham meeting which was located 28.86 miles from my home. As listed on the BPA website only 47 people attended this open house. I found this location a very poor choice as it was not in the direct path of this project. Maybe that's why the low turnout. Let it be noted, no meeting was anywhere near my home, the closest location was 15.57 miles away. During the time I attended, I had the full attention of the BPA staff (No one else from the public was there at this time). I found some of the staff ill informed about this process and about area's to be impacted. While pointing out my specific concerns about where these lines may be placed along segment 31, and the private road I use daily as an access road in and out of my home, the gentleman I was talking to was unaware that each of the highlighted properties actually had homes on them. At another station, I discussed the permission to enter form and was told that the document was poorly written. This document (see attached copy) would give BPA the right to clear brush and trees up to a 5 foot width, cut trees up to 24 inches, drill holes up to 6 inches in width on my property using their discretion, without any consideration that this route may not be chosen and the damage would have already been done destroying the existing landscape all in the name of a survey. This document if signed, would hold up in court is someone did not read the fine print and had just signed it. Inquiring about a natural gas line, again no direct answer was given, it all depends on the size was the answer. As a very large business working under the

Department of Energy I couldn't believe what I was hearing. Needless to say, I left the meeting realizing that the 6 scheduled meeting were set up to satisfy Bonneville's obligation to inform the property owners. They were set up in a short time span, made it difficult for the area I live in to attend and I left with no clear concrete answers to most of my questions. The November 23rd deadline to submit comments, I felt was also intended to shut down the public quickly. Sorry, I just wanted to give some background on my concerns and frustrations. To address the November 23rd comment deadline, I first want to say, the EIS study (Environmental Impact Study) should be a human impact study. I am not just a property owner, I have a home and family that live here along with many others along most of the proposed lines. I am no expert on transmission lines, substations and what all this involves. I do agree, as with any business, upgrades and future planning is necessary. All these proposed routes are going to have an environmental impact no matter where they are located. We are not talking about a small area of consideration, but a long distance crossing many miles of properties. Let's face it, this is the Northwest, no matter where you live, there is going to be a spring, river, creek, animals, birds and plants etc. One spotted owl or endangered plant is not going to make much of a difference. The health risks involved with people should be a top priority. These are no small residential power lines, but huge 100 to 150 high voltage towers. Displacing families and what these lines going through a community could do should have an impact. Crossing school property should have an impact. Segment 31 as you know does have a current PP&L easement. We in this area know this is a very easy choice for BPA to want to acquire and then extend for another 50 feet in width or so. I, nor my neighbors chose this area to live in, invest in, knowing this small current PP& L easement could be turned into gigantic high voltage lines destroying this community and posing health risks the BPA will not acknowledge. For the BPA EIS, my personal property listed above should be noted as having the following:

-A residential house and family with a detached shed

-A child's play structure

-A fruit and vegetable garden

-A well as our source of water

-Open lawn area's front and back of home which are surrounded by wooded areas of Alder, Cherry, Vine Maple and a variety of Evergreen trees.

-Variety of ferns, rhododendron, azalea, and wild blackberries plants

-We are located just above the Salmon Creek Watershed

-Animals and birds living in and around the property are: Deer, coyote, bobcats, bear, porcupine, raccoons, squirrels, chipmunks, owls, bald eagles, variety of hawks, blue jays, chickadees, crows, to name a few.

-Except for the garden area, all areas are open (Not fenced in) so wildlife has access to travel through the property, bed down, and feed on natural plants for food 11 years invested in sweat equity to make

improvements on the property.

As with creating energy itself and advancing into the future with wind power and other alternatives, BPA should look into other alternatives for this upgrade in their system. These 100 to 150 foot towers and 500 kilovolt high power transmission lines that need 150 foot easement or more plus access roads seem an archaic way to transport electricity in this day and age, basically wiping out anything in their path. And don't forget again the 500 foot EMF (Electromagnetic Field) on either side of these lines that cause health risks. Please consider going underground, upgrading and condensing if possible current lines, and if no other alternative is available than take these lines and put them in an unpopulated area. The cost of human lives, whether it is to displace people, pose a health risk, or even as it may seem insignificant as devaluing a homeowners property because the line is on or close to it, should be a consideration. It's hard enough in these economic times for most families to get by, now you are forcing unnecessary stresses on families because of poor management. Please read your own reports and studies, read studies from other states and countries, read newer laws on placement of these transmission lines because of their EMF dangers. The choice to live here was an investment for my family and our future. We chose this area because of the schools and the community and the lifestyle it provides. Taking the easy way out for BPA is not an answer for the future, planning and providing SAFE and reliable power for the future is what they should be concentrating on. Leaving property owners with their hands tied until 2012 to make a decision should not be an option. BPA should put a hold on this project, reconsider these proposed routes and make an informed decision with substantial and logical studies and statistics, showing all of Clark County residents why their project should go through this area. Again, putting a hold on peoples lives is not the way to so business. There is enough information through the State of Washington, Clark County, Cowlitz County and the Municipalities along these routes to at the very least for BPA to come up with a basic and comprehensive EIS to justify where this project should go.

Thank you for your support and consideration in the matter and hopefully with your help, the safe and right choices will be made.

Sandra Bishop

[Address]

Brush Prairie, WA

CC: US Senator Maria Cantwell

US Senator Patty Murray

State Senator Joseph Zarelli

State Representative Jaime Herrera

Governor Chris Gregoire

Hockinson School Superintendent Michael Grubbs.

Peter Goldmark, Comm, Public lands

Pacific Power and Light

Department of Energy

Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR)

Communication ID: 11940

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: CATHERINE JARVIS,ALENA JARVIS,ROGER JARVIS

November 17,2009

TO: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

Dear Sir,

I have tried my best to study and understand the proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project and I do understand the need for and the requirement to build such projects which in the long run will benefit everyone in Clark County, etc. What I don't understand is why a route can not be chosen or produced that would not have such a drastic impact on homeowners, families, and people's properties? The rumor exists that Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) does not want to take the easier route "over the mountains and through the trees" because they do not want to have to cut away forest land (trees) and make new roads. I have been told that BPA is fearful of the "Conservationists" and that they (BPA) would rather fight home and land owners than the environmentalist lobby. Surely this can not be true? My neighbors and my Family want to recommend that BPA use one of the two alternate routes, miles east of us. Our Route, 31, runs from Chelatchie, to a point about a mile North of the East Fork of the Lewis River. It then proceeds South, approximately 20 miles, following the Westside of NE 212th Avenue. The BPA needs a 150 foot right of way, starting on the West side of NE 212th Avenue, thence going West 150 feet. We have been told that any homes or properties in that range will be condemned. We are also told that BPA will pay a fair market price but will discount the value since it is now located near a power line. If our homes are near but not under or close to the power line, we receive nothing. There is no way to tell how much property values have already dropped or how much they will continue to drop as soon as the route is approved. But make no mistake, the property values and homes near the Power line will become worthless and will have no value to anyone.

My family and I have studied the several proposed routes and we just can't understand why BPA would even want to consider cutting right through a populated area when other possible routes are available. The alternate routes would gain the same result while not displacing human beings or destroying property values. If chosen, the proposed route up NE 212th Avenue, would have a "drastic" effect on hundreds of people who live in and near that area. Along NE 212th Avenue there are many, many homes and properties that would be affected. On both sides of 2121" Avenue people have their homes

and folks have labored for decades to exist and maintain a family life on their properties. Even with just these proposals out there, property values in my whole neighborhood have plummeted. No one, even if they wanted to, could sale their home or property right now with this black cloud hanging over their headsAND.... if the NE 212th Avenue route is the final choice, then the hundreds of folks who own property and live here in my area will be devastated financially and economically, and many will (may) lose their homes. Even if homes am not taken away, the existence of "Giant Power Lines and Towers" running across properties and along roads in a family neighborhood would destroy property and home values and the real estate upon which each home sits will become pretty much worthless. I do not care nor trust what the Government says about human beings living close to "High Power Lines".....it is dangerous and no one in their right mind would raise their families anywhere near such a potential health threat. I have to ask only one question here....."Would you buy a home, raise a family, and live under or close by any High Power Line?" I know the answer to that question and it is an easy answer. Of course you wouldn't! The paperwork we have been sent indicates there is no proof that high power lines cause any health problems but like I said..... no one wants to live under or near them. Once such lines are built, the property anywhere near them goes to in the toilet.

I am asking those in Command to please re-evaluate this situation and please do your very best to build this project using the route that will be the most less likely to impact people, families, personal property, and the health and well being of folks who would be along the eventual route. I retired from the Military about 5 years and my Family and I moved to Clark County and purchased our dream home here at [Address]. We saved all our lives just to do this one thing. We have ten acres at the top of [Street]. We have slaved over the last 5 years to cut out a beautiful and scenic area surrounding our home. We have beautiful views to the North (Mt St Helens) and to the South (all the way to Camas). We spent our whole life savings on our home and subsequently spent many more thousands on the landscape, upkeep and maintenance of our investment. This is our home and we have sank all of our retirement savings into it... and the thought of losing it or having the property greatly devalued or condemned, is having a very hard and adverse impact on myself and my family. All my neighbors up and down [Street] feel the same way. I want to encourage/ask BPA to please consider use of one of the two alternate routes so our families, properties, and homes will remain as they are, safe and secure.

Sincerely.

Roger, Katie and Alena Jarvis

CC TO:

Governor Chris Gregoire

US Senator Paw Murray

US Senator Maria Cantwell

US Representative Brian Baird

State Representative Ed Orcutt

State Representative Jamie Herrera

Signature

Communication ID: 11941

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: JACK R FOSTER,MAE J FOSTER

We're already impacted by power lines in our area. I don't feel it is wise to have all the lines in one area. If we were to have a critical situation such as a large earthquake, and we all were without power, we would be in sad shape. And knowing there is another area that could be used further east, that wouldn't interfere with so many residences, why not use that area. There are home owners, families, and children in this area that should be taken into consideration.

Communication ID: 11942

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: DONNA M BAILEY,JOSEPH R BAILEY,STEPHEN M. BAILEY

BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement,

P.O. Box 9250

Portland, OR 97207

November 12, 2009

Re: Bonneville Power Administration's plan to install power lines.

Dear Sir,

This is to respond to your letter of October 9, 2009. We strongly oppose the plan to install power lines across or in the vicinity of our property along the East Fork of the Lewis River just upriver from Lucia Falls County Park, WA. We oppose installing lines across the river at any point between Lucia Falls and Moulton Falls, WA.

Our property, which consists of [tax lot information] is located just to the north of the historic Chelatchie Railroad (est. in 1888) and between three historic sites: the Lucia train stop just to the south of us and the historic railroad trestle and the Lucia

Mill Ponds to the southeast. Our property has been in our family for nearly eighty-five years. Grandfather Knepper recognized the beauty of the river, its waterfalls and volcanic rock canyons when he purchased the property in about 1925. He also chose the property because it had groves of old growth firs and cedars. Many of the big trees managed to survive logging and four forest fires, the Yacolt Burns of 1902, 1910 and 1929 and the Moulton Falls Mill Fire of about 1932. This beautiful and historic property should not be disturbed by a power lines project.

During the early years of our ownership we had numerous opportunities to capitalize on the economic value of our land. But we recognized that selling off house lots or trees would only diminish the priceless beauty of the property as a whole. We felt we had a duty to keep Lewis River in a natural and pristine state for the benefit of future generations and for the long term health of the various species of native plants and animals.

Our property is rich in its fauna and flora. We have identified and compiled notes on many interesting species of native plants. Many of these plants would be adversely affected by a power lines project. Our property is home to woodducks, grouse and pheasants. Bald eagles nest on our property and regularly fly up and down the river in front of our home. Recently we've seen mountain lions and elk. This summer we saw more deer than we have in several years. We have even had reports of a bear in our area.

We suspect we're seeing more birds and land animals on our property because much of the surrounding forest has been cut down. Much of this logging has occurred within the last ten years. Our property has become a place of refuge for many animals. This habitat should not be disturbed. The rare birds should not be endangered by high voltage lines.

Our stretch of the Lewis River is an important spawning ground for trout, steelhead and salmon. In many cases the fish spawn in sandy basins and potholes in the calmer and shallower waters of rock shelves. Fingerlings become trapped in the basins when the river recedes in July and August. We recently found one basin which had about fifty trapped fingerlings and a small salamander. Although our region had just suffered one of its longest and hottest periods of heat on record, the basin did not look like it was drying up. The small pool was being replenished by ground water seeping from the nearby bank. The fish in this pool as well as others in many similar pools would have to wait until the river rises from significant rain. Clearcutting forested banks on our section of the Lewis River could cause the seeping ground water to dry up and the fish to die.

We feel we've been fairly good stewards of our stretch of the scenic and wild East Fork of the Lewis River. Recently Clark County and the State of Washington have increased their efforts to protect this beautiful area. Both the county and the state have enacted rules and regulations designed to protect the scenery and fish and wildlife habitat. New fishing rules made our stretch of the Lewis River a catch-and-release zone. New zoning laws reduced our right to build on our property. When we replaced our old cabin (built in 1937) with our country home in 1997, we were required to adhere to increased setbacks. Our old cabin was about sixty feet from the river. Our new one had to be one hundred and fifty feet from the river. Other new environmental laws prohibit us from clearing vegetation along the river, in

wetlands and along Lucia Falls Road. Under the new law this road is considered a scenic highway. We have complied with the new laws. We feel that the Bonneville Power Administration, an agency working under the auspices of the federal government, should likewise be supportive of the effort to protect this magnificent area.

We urge the Bonneville Power Administration to abandon proposed routes 30 and 31 from its I-5 corridor project.

Sincerely,

Stephen M. Bailey, Donna M. Bailey, and Joseph R. Bailey

Communication ID: 11943

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: JERRY OLSON,PATTI OLSON

Please reference attached copy of maps "61"and "62" ("Line 21").

[Property location information]

(B) Several hundred thousands of dollars of "habitat improvement" was done by PacifiCorp in the summer and fall of 2009 to satisfy relicensing requirements.

(C) High very steep rock cliff along much of the south line of Sec. 20 6N 4E. Note on photo how much of a setback DNR had to observe when they logged to protect this cliff habitat.

(D) Large marsh/wetland. Logging roads shown were built and used when the property was logged on in 1981. I can't imagine anyone being allowed to log, build roads or create other disturbances anywhere near this wetland area under current environmental regulations. any consideration of a construction route should be to the west of this large wetlands/habitat area!

(E) Deer and elk habitat, grazing area.

(F) Saddle Dam campground and boat launch. This is a very popular recreational spot- always full during summer months.

(G) Canyon Creek- a treasured and popular white water kyaking destination. Potential "Natural River" designation.

(H) Our neighbors, charter members of "1000 Friends of Washington" (now "FutureWise) and still fervent environmentalists.

Other comments: As is very clear on your maps, Yale Valley, to the North and West of our home, has

undergone extensive parcelization in recent years, with accompanying financial and emotional investment.

We have spent our whole lives working on our beloved property and always planned to spend the rest of our lives here. We will fight to the death to keep you from ruining our entire future.

Sincerely,

Jerri and Patti Olson

Communication ID: 11944

Date: 11/26/2009

Name: ROBERT T BARRY

ROUTE 31 SHOULD NOT BE SELECTED for 500-KV transmission lines. Route 31 dissects the Venersborg and Hockinson communities near Battle Ground. This area is fully developed with homes on small acreage plots. Many families moved to this area because of the safe environment for children and excellent Hockinson schools. Like many of our neighbors, we have worked our entire lives to be able to purchase a home and small piece of property. We chose this home 22 years ago because of the privacy the trees surrounding our home provide, the peace and quiet, and the wildlife. It is our private sanctuary. Proposed Route 31 cuts into our property and is literally right at our front door. It is our understanding that BPA intends to purchase rights of way, not properties. If proposed Route 31 is selected, our property will be virtually worthless and unmarketable. One of our family members is a Type I, insulin-dependent, diabetic and wears an insulin pump and glucose sensor. The literature for this medical device states that high levels of electrostatic discharge can cause problems with the pump's programming. This could potentially be life threatening for an insulin-dependent diabetic! BPA's own literature discusses electrical shock hazards that can occur near high-voltage wires. QUESTION FOR BPA: Have you studied the impact that nearby 500-KV transmission lines have on medical devices such as insulin pumps and glucose sensors? If BPA acquires a right of way through our property and does not fairly compensate us, we will be left with two choices: 1) live under the high-voltage power lines and face certain health problems, or 2) abandon what we have worked our entire lives for and start over, giving up our plan to retire in two years. Several proposed routes cross DNR land east of highly populated Route 31 (Routes 30, 32, 33, 34) and should be considered instead. These routes are more appropriate for transmission lines. If Route 31 is eliminated, we would like to be notified as soon as possible. It is not fair to hold so many families' lives and futures hostage. We can't plan to retire, invest in our home and property, or even sell and move somewhere else. Robert and Linda Barry

Communication ID: 11945

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: CELENEA L MITCHELL

We have worked very hard to make our house a home. We have wonderful neighbors and we all take very good care of our property. It would be very devastating to uproot so many wonderful, stable families. Please let us stay in our homes. My Children are safe and have order in their lives. That is one of the reasons we moved here. To give them safety and consistency. Having to move and change schools would be very sad for them and many, many other children. Thank you for your time, Celenea Mitchell

Communication ID: 11946

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: DAVID A BUDDE

Mr. Korsness,

While I hate to be just another not in my backyard response to the proposed route 31 for the proposed power lines I have to protest. While the route comes within a mile of my property I honestly think it is the wrong route as it goes within a quarter mile of the elementary and middle school. I would ask that the lines go on government land as far east as possible. If this means taking the line up the Columbia river gorge and then north away from any population base it would be better. My wife is a cancer survivor and while there are statistics to show these lines safe there are also those that suggest they are dangerous. We shouldn't take chances and the line should be positioned away from people. If individuals choose to live by an existing line that is one thing but to ask people to live by one because it is being forced through an area is completely different.

Sincerely,

David

Communication ID: 11947

Date: 11/26/2009

Name: PAUL M. MCARTHUR

It would appear that BPA have already concluded that the route selected for the I5 "reinforcement Project", will be selected by BPA with or without public approval. The most appropriate route for these transmission lines is under ground, after they cross the Columbia river close to their point of origin. This alternative, (to creating another assault on the relatively pristine environment of the pro[posed routes]).

Communication ID: 11948

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: MENZA, MARGARET STAPENHORST

Please have your environmental studies look at: Existing I-5 R.O.W. items:

Clearing wooded ROW will disrupt current wildlife corridor (deer, raccoons, coyotes, hawks, eagles, songbirds, owls) through a populated area.

Clearing wooded ROW will increase run-off into Salmon Creek, possibly affecting salmon habitat, flood levels, etc.

Clearing wooded ROW for second tower will increase freeway noise (I-5 + I-205), increase noise level + EMF from lines- disruptive to wildlife + not to mention us humans!

I have these other comments:

Negative effects of above items on nearby Pleasant Valley Elementary and Middle Schools.

We would prefer new lines to follow route segments that avoid more populated areas.

Adding a second tower along existing I-5 corridor ROW concentrates 730kV in one area and does not address reliability issues. Please select route options that do.

We live in an upscale 1/2 acre lot size neighborhood (since 1993). If putting a second tower along existing I-5 Corridor ROW is selected, it will negatively affect our property and property values: (+ other property owners along ROW)

- 1) Wooded ROW would be cleared- we back up to this ROW. Our land assessment is higher for backing up to this greenbelt.
- 2) We have 5-6 large Western Red Cedars on our property. The trees may have to be removed if they were to interfere with the second towers' lines.
- 3) Our backyard would be unusable with a second tower looming over our property. Noise levels would be unbearable, kVs would be tripled. Too close of a proximity to tower to do any "screening".
- 4) Health issues a MAJOR concern. We've had 2 unrelated incidences of cancer with 230 kV- what's in store for us if it's 730kV?
- 5) We won't be able to give our home away let alone sell for a profit.

Communication ID: 11949

Date: 11/28/2009

Name: KATHY A DIETRICH

Is constructing a new transmission line the right solution for the future? Consider the ideal

infrastructure for the 21st Century. Investigate use of advanced Smart Grid technologies and integrated systems. An analysis by the Electric Power Research Institute estimates that implementing Smart Grid technologies could reduce electricity use by more than 4% by 2030. Look at the use of streamlined communication technologies that allow different parts of the grid to “talk” to each other in real time; sensing and control devices that help grid operators monitor and control the flow of electricity to avoid disruptions and outages; smart meters and in-home systems that empower consumers to reduce their energy use and save money; energy storage options; and on-site and renewable energy sources that can be integrated onto the electrical grid. Improved energy storage technologies such as advanced battery systems (including flow batteries), flywheels, and compressed air energy systems can allow for expanded integration of renewable energy resources like wind and photovoltaic systems and improve frequency regulation and peak energy management.

Do we really need additional transmission capacity? Buildings are the largest single contributor to production of greenhouse gases and almost half of the total annual production. In the United States there is currently a new focus on sustainable building design – which can significantly reduce the energy use by all types of buildings. This year, the American Institute of Architects implemented a policy requiring all members to take four hours of continuing education courses in sustainable design every year. The requirement, which extends through 2012, represents a response to a rapidly changing field and a recognition that architects must continue to refresh their knowledge of sustainable construction methods and building materials.

Sustainably-designed commercial buildings can routinely see a 30-35% reduction in operating costs over buildings designed to minimum code standards. While sustainable design used to come at a premium, costs are coming down as environmentally friendly materials become more common. In addition, people are increasingly willing to pay more to live and work in a green building. Design options are now available such as optimizing building form, or how the shape of a building responds to the environment; energy modeling, including how much energy it takes to operate a building and ways to reduce the carbon footprint; reducing heat gain from sunlight; energy-efficient ways to position buildings relative to the sun, wind and other elements; use of natural light to reducing electricity consumption; and the preservation and reuse of existing buildings.

Look at the option of de-centralized power generation. Does power generation need to be centralized and transmitted over many miles? Rather than centralized power generation, consider the option of de-centralized facilities. Solar panels, roof wind turbans and other energy saving and energy generating features can be incorporated into individual buildings – either new or on a retrofit basis. Residential neighborhoods, urban blocks, building complexes, could each have their own power generation facilities.

Consider competitive use of existing power lines. Why build more transmission lines and towers that will degrade the visual and physical environment of our community? There could be a competition for use of existing power lines or other innovative strategies to focus on reduced power consumption.

If construction of additional capacity can not be avoided, the existing corridor should be the preferred

route, rather than creating a new 150 feet wide corridor through rural home sites and forested natural areas. This proposed routes will cause great and irreparable damage and harm what is left of rural Clark County.

Communication ID: 11950

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: BRIAN HARPER,LETISHA HARPER

Stay off my land. Proposal 9 would be less damaging to people's lives!!!!

I love where I live it is beautiful this is what I bought not a house a home full of love in country that is a safe place to live.

Communication ID: 11951

Date: 11/27/2009

Name: LARRY K BAIR

I am a resident of the Stoney Meadows neighborhood and wish to register my objection to the option of having the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project affect land owned by our neighborhood association. Thanks for registering my objection. Larry Bair

Communication ID: 11952

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: BRIAN HARPER

My family of 5 just built a new home in the summer of 2008. On family land less than 300 feet from where my children's Great Great Grandma lived. This land has been in our family since the 1890's. My wife's Grandparents both lived less than 800 feet from BPA powerlines. Neither drank, smoked, they raised their own cattle, chickens, garden, fruit, and nut trees. Put their own food up for winter, etc. Her Grandma dies from brain cancer and her Grandpa died from liver cancer. So when we built here, under no circumstances would my wife wanted to build anywhere near BPA powerlines. We have a beautiful setting in this area it would be a crime to destroy the absolute beauty of this area. I've fished and hunted this area all my life and see first hand the deer, elk, grouse, turkey, woodpecker, toads, owls of every species. We have timber on this property that has been put into deceased relatives wills, to never be touched. To get a letter in the mail of the threat of this ugly unhealthy site is very disturbing. Why not use the existing Route people that have built around them know that they are there. Stay out. Private property.

[Parcel information]

Sincerely, Brian Harper

Communication ID: 11953

Date: 11/27/2009

Name: MARGARET CREIGHTON GRAY

This is a big project that shouldnt be considered at this economic disaster stage . The people you are impacting by this proposal are hard working people, who have their lives invested in their property. The value of our property has already decreased, yet the taxes remain the same. Personally for me, my home is my RETIREMENT. Other places need to be considered in less populated areas, rather than in areas where so many people will be impacted and will lose their homes,property and freedom. Now is not a good time for this project, it wont be a good time for many years ...It needs to be postponed or placed in less populated areas..

Communication ID: 11955

Date: 11/27/2009

Name: DAVID P MAROSI

Destroying the Brush Prairie community by using a previously undisclosed easement is insanity.

Communication ID: 11956

Date: 11/27/2009

Name: BRIAN KING

Please place your 500,000 transmission line going through the Castle Rock/Longview area in Segment 1 or 2 to minimize major life disruptions for the citizens of our county. Do not place it in Segment 3! Thank you for your consideration. Brian Pat King

Communication ID: 11957

Date: 11/27/2009

Name: LEE R DAVIS

I am writing to express my displeasure with BPA alternative route 30 for the I-5 Corridor Replacement Transmission Lines. This line will impact my home, my neighborhood, and many friends, negatively. Please do not consider this a viable option.

Communication ID: 11958

Date: 11/27/2009

Name: BRADLEY J KIRKPATRICK

Line 31 is not located in an appropriate setting. The line is located in a rural residential area. Regardless of the cost this line needs to be moved east. Running the line in peoples front yards is inexcusable.

Communication ID: 11959

Date: 11/28/2009

Name: JOSEPH SHEADEL

Re: I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, Segment 26 Please have your environmental studies Look at: 1. The number of people impacted by segment 26: I drew in the line for segment 26 like I would at work. It may be possible, but the cost to residents is extremely high. So many people get impacted that this alone should sway one toward a different route. 2. The average size of lots being crossed: The lots being crossed by segment 26 are so small that the 500kV line would render most of them essentially useless for any other purpose. 3. The picturesque beauty of North Clark County: I've been many places around the world, and North Clark County is one of the most picturesque places I've seen. The 26 segment would leave such a large scar that the entire area would be forever changed in an extremely negative way. This is particularly true since this area is already so heavily populated. The only way to get through without going over an existing house is to hit high points that are visible for many miles in every direction. 4. The width of right-of-way needed for a 500kV line: I used to be a radiation protection officer in the USAF. I'm wondering if 150 feet is really a wide enough right-of-way for a 500kV line. Especially on the steep side slopes, it seems like this doesn't provide enough protection to nearby residents. I've talked to others who have worked around high power; and they wouldn't put their house that close.

Communication ID: 11960

Date: 11/28/2009

Name: BRUCE A FURMAN

It would seem most practical to run the new lines through less populated areas. Time will tell. The sooner all is decided the better so that we know where our property sits in the route. It is difficult to make plans for our property till the final decision. Plans such as property development or property sale are all affected.

Communication ID: 11961

Date: 11/28/2009

Name: BILL AND CINDY PERKINS

We live in the Yale valley just off of 503 near speelyai creek. There are many homeowners in this area that are retired or as in our case approaching retirement age. We are getting too old to be uprooted and having to start again. It is back breaking work to build and landscape at our age! Some of these wonderful people have been born and raised here as their ancestors settled here more than a century ago! It seems to me to be a simple solution to use existing routes! I also feel that it is damaging to the health of seniors especially to put all of this worry upon them!

Communication ID: 11962

Date: 11/28/2009

Name: GREGORY S. MILLER

Thank you for informing me on the loss of my property value. I have received no notification by mail until today 11/26, way past the date of the letter 10/22/09. Past the public meetings, this is just typical for a Government agency! I could go on and on about the reasons you should put it somewhere else but the fact is everyone that is affected feels the same. I don't understand why you would not build this through an area that is unaffected by people but that would make way to much sense for a government agency to even consider. If you show up on my property expect to be greeted with a high powered rifle, I am dead serious! Greg Miller

Communication ID: 11963

Date: 11/29/2009

Name: TOM W ERKERT, VON ERKERT

Dear Ms. Wittpenn:

We are landowners in [Address], Brush Prairie, WA. The land around our home is generally zoned in either 2.5 or 5 acres parcels. We bought our land and built our dream home here because of the scenic character, quiet, clean air, and rural atmosphere. We are very concerned about the impacts to private landowners, in particular near segment 31 of the proposed routes.

We have reviewed several routing alternatives for a new 500 kV transmission line from Castle Rock, WA to Troutdale, OR. While we understand the need for the additional transmission capacity, we have the following concerns:

1. Several of the routing alternatives cross a large amount of private land. We suggest you drop these from further study and only consider alternatives that largely cross public land. This will impact the fewest private land owners, who like us, bought their land for aesthetic and rural qualities which a

transmission line will severely impact.

2. We are concerned about health effects to land owners and neighbors whose land the transmission lines would cross. Dropping from consideration those routes which cross mostly private land will minimize that effect.

3. If you need to cross private land, we suggest you set a minimum size parcel of at least 40 acres under one land owner as a minimum threshold. This would allow homes to be constructed far enough away from the lines to minimize health effects to the majority of land owners.

4. We prefer the route that uses mostly public land for the new line. Specifically, segments 3-7-11-21-29-34-35-49-51-52 should involve the least amount of private land (As shown on the Project Study Area Map posted at http://www.bpa.gov/corporate/pubs/fact_sheets/09fs/factsheet_-_I-5_Corridor_Reinforcement_Project.pdf)

5. We are very opposed to segment 31 which is closest to our home. It crosses a large number of smaller parcels and will impact many families in our community. Specifically, we are concerned about the negative public health effects and destroying the aesthetics that we value so deeply.

We believe that moving the new transmission line onto as much public land as possible will minimize public health and aesthetic concerns for the majority of people that live in the local area.

Please add us to your mailing list for this project and notify us of the Draft EIS when ready.

Sincerely,

Tom and Von Erkert

Communication ID: 11964

Date: 11/29/2009

Name: MONTY L CENTER

To Whom It May Concern: My concern is the time it is going to take for you to make a decision on where exactly you intend on running this line. It appears that you propose to run it directly over my house. If so I need to know now not one or two years from now. We just built this home and I have a guest home on this property with an elderly disabled parent and she just would not make it through another move or disruption in her life. The property directly to the east of me is vacant and would be the logical path for this line as it appears that it would not effect as many residences by looking at Google aerial map view. How far out from the lines does the electrical magnetic energy reach until there is 0 increase in the electrical magnetic energy.

Communication ID: 11965

Date: 11/30/2009

Name: DESIREE DAMICO,GREG DAMICO

This is Desire Damico, my husband is Greg. Yes, we already went to one of the information sessions about the new reinforcement project. We back up to one of the segments that is already on line. You already have lines behind us and they were saying that the new lines would be on the north side, which is even closer to my property and I started driving around following some of those lines and I am appalled that you would even pick the original lines even though you have an easement because you need to drive it. There are so many homes that are just right on those lines and on the north side. You'd be taking a lot of property if you made that decision to stay with the original plan. When I look at your map it makes so much more sense to me to take one of those new routes that go, steers way out to the Merwin Dam and Amboy area. From Longview go east and south, but anyways that was my comment. I would just be shocked if you did our line that runs right through lots of development, that runs right through Vancouver. Just wanted to make that comment and if someone would call me back and say, you know, what percentage chance will it be behind us here, because unfortunately our big plan was to sell our home this year. And now, you know, we're gonna need to know and it'd be really great if we could say there's only a 10 percent chance that it will be our line being here. So you won't have to worry about it blah blah. So we would appreciate a call at [Phone]. That's Greg and Desire Damico [Address]. Hope to hear from you. Thank you, bye.

Communication ID: 11966

Date: 11/29/2009

Name: DOUG G VAUGHAN

What does the yellow represent in the maps. Our property is within the yellow, although we are a couple hundred yards from the current transmission lines. Can someone please explain it -- there are a lot of rumors within our neighborhood and I would like to get the facts.

Communication ID: 11967

Date: 11/29/2009

Name: JAMES D SKELTON

As a property owner just to the east of segment 31. I note that the proposed ROW crosses that of the large diameter gas pipeline that was buried here 10-12 years ago. Is there need to be concerned about having this electrical build cross such a potentially volatile installation? I should think that with the concern stated by BPA about survivability from earthquake or other natural disaster, that having these two utilities sharing such a crossing would fall into the category of an avoidable risk, even though a small one. As a homeowner, we already bear the burden of the explosion potential of the gas line and

while my property would be out of eyeshot of the proposed transmission line, there are many who live closer whose concerns should be addressed.

Communication ID: 11968

Date: 11/20/2009

Name: THOMAS HEFFNER, JUDITH HEFFNER

PROPOSED I-5 CORRIDOR REINFORCEMENT PROJECT

Reference: - Segment #27 - (Area of N.E. 256th Ave.)

(Page 68 of "Land Owner Parcel Mapbook")

#1 - VISUAL IMPACT :

The visual impact of a power line would be over whelming should lines be constructed within Segment #27 through this area. This is the most densely concentrated area of newer homes in the Chelatchie Prairie valley. This is a rural community of newer and very nice homes, some developed as a 5 acre parcels in a recorded subdivision. All are located along or have small arterials off of N.E. 256th Ave.. The outlined area of Segment #27 goes right through the middle of this community, directly impacting not only property but actual houses. Visually there are no tree lines or topography to mask the impact of a 500 KW transmission line through here. The beauty of this area, the open valley countryside, and the view of Mt St. Helens are just a small part of what endeared us to this area. We could find nothing that compared. We knew that this is where our retirement home must be built.

Hwy SR 503 (N.E. 419th St) passes East and West through this valley.

Segment # 27 would intersect Hwy 503 at N.E. 256th Ave. This is the most direct access to North Clark County. The highway is heavily traveled. It is the route taken to the beautiful highly used recreational areas of mountains, lakes, rivers, forests and trails.

A high voltage power transmission line intersecting Hwy 503 at (N.E. 256th Ave) would have an immense impact on the visual aesthetics of this open and flat valley countryside. There is no place to blend those lines into the view or out of view here.

An excellent example of the aesthetics of this area, is a beautiful view of

Mt. St Helens. When the mountain is showing activity we have had lines of cars and people parking along N.E. 256th Ave. in order to watch and take pictures of Mt St Helens.

Areas just to the East or West of this segment are far less populated and have more trees lines or topography to mask or hide line placement.

#2 ELECTRIC AND MAGNETIC FIELDS CONCERNS:

As mentioned above this is a very populated community of homes for being in a rural area.

While the general medical health problems associated with constant exposure to high voltage lines aren't yet a matter of fact, my husband and I are very familiar with the electromagnetic fields they produce. The extreme electric shock you can receive when touching metal in the general vicinity of high power lines, this is fact. This couldn't be good for a person's health. It's something we wish not to experience again.

This little community of homes has many families with children that catch their school bus on N.E. 256th Ave.

#3 PRIVATE AIRSTRIP:

Located on property on N.E. 256th Ave (within Segment #27), there is a private airport. It is Registered WA79 per FFA as a private airport. There has been occasions, as a public service, it has been used to land emergency medical helicopters when serious accidents or emergencies have occurred in North Clark County or the recreational areas north of here. (i.e. lakes, rivers, forests and highway accidents, etc.)

By placing high voltage lines on or near Segment #27, it would definitely have an adverse impact on the safe usage of this private airport. It could mean that there would be no safe place for "life flight" helicopters and our North County ambulance to meet to transport injured, not to mention the interference it might cause with medical equipment being used to save a life. Plus seriously affect the owners usage and enjoyment.

#4 PROPERTY VALUES :

This is a given

The property values of homes, in particular, those located anywhere near high voltage lines, much less 500KV lines, are very greatly and adversely affected. BPA's announcement of this study has already seriously affected property values and markets for those homes for sale or those who plan to sell in the near future.

Real Estate agents have already requested where they might find the maps and information on this study.

Yes, this is very much a concern to us as we are retired and this is our life's investment and our children and grandchildren future.

#5 ARCHAEOLOGICAL PREDICTABILITY:

Per the State of Washington Archaeology and Historic Preservation Office Registered Archaeological site #45CL438 is located on our property.

Archeological predictability for this area is scaled as Moderate to High predictability with most in the High range.

This area is a very well known as a sensitive area archeologically. The properties are all listed as being in a archeological buffer zone. Construction in some cases has been held up for a year or more because of the high incidence of an archeological finds.

As an example:

There is a tall pine tree that borders our property located in the right of way on N.E. 256th Ave.. When the county went to pave N.E. 256th Ave. they were going to cut the tree down. They had to have a state archeologist come out to the site of the tree and it was determined that the tree could not be cut down as it had archeological significance. The road was paved but was re-routed around the tree.

I was told by a neighbor that they had requested & received from the Washington State Archaeological and Historic Preservation office a full historical, cultural, and archaeological report under the "Right to Know Act", when they built their home - and it consisted of volumes. This is an example of the magnitude of history and cultural importance there is in this immediate area. It was this neighbor who was aware of the significance of the tree mentioned earlier.

#6 HISTORICAL & CULTURAL:

Historically and culturally, this area is of great Native American cultural and historical significance. I have been told that in this area, there was a major Indian encampment. Every year it is celebrated by surrounding tribes congregating here for "Encampment Days" in July.

As mentioned previously, the Washington State Archaeological and Historic Preservation department has the history and cultural documented for this area.

#7 WETLAND, SENSITIVE AREA AND RIPARIAN CONSERVATION DISTRICT:

There is presence of a county wetland area on the north end of our property running East to West. This is in the area of hydric soil (Type MoA). During the winter, water comes under N.E. 256th Ave. from the properties on the East side of the road as a seasonal creek and on to our property. While it follows a creek line it tends to spread out because of the hydric soil that is in this area. Water covers the surface in this area.

Hydric Soil - (Type MoA) Defined):

This soil type has a risk of corrosion to uncoated steel and concrete when placed in this soil. Drainage can only be effected to the depth of the hardpan or other impervious layer. Water can be expected at or over the surface of the ground during the winter months. The shrink-swell characteristics of this soil require extra design precautions for structures. Excavation is limited by bedrock in the lower profile. The

bedrock formation prevents downward movement of water resulting in
accumulated lateral water movement which will surface - high water table.

Area of Major Concern:

The locating of Segment #27 at the south end of N.E. 256th Ave., on both sides of Chelatchie Creek, is of major concern. In this area, there is approximately 18 acres of wooded wetlands, including a fresh water pond.

This area was originally a 110 acres dairy farm (Diamond Dairy owned by the Price family) sitting on both sides of Chelatchie Creek. It was later subdivided into parcels of which our property is one of those subdivided parcels. A conservation study and plan was done dated November 1998.

Diamond Dairy (Price Family) - FARM CONSERVATION PLAN

BY

RICHARD BACHERT

USDA NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE

CLARK COUNTY CONSERVATION DISTRICT

IN PARTICIPATION WITH

FISH FIRST ORGANIZATION

WASHINGTON STATE DEPT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

UNITED STATE DEPT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER FISH ENHANCEMENT GROUP

AND HABITAT PARTNERS.

An excerpts from that report:

SENSITIVE AREA: Pg 6 Sec. 2.6

"In the wooded wetlands and the fresh water pond of Chelatchie Creek in this area, it has a run of both Steelhead and Coho Salmon and the adjacent wetland provide rearing habitat for juvenile salmonid"

RIPARIAN ZONE: Pg 12 Sec. 3.4

" In areas adjacent to Chelatchie Creek and around the fresh water pond, native trees and shrubs will be established in those locations lacking woody vegetation. Fencing will be installed to exclude livestock

from these areas. The purpose of the vegetation is to restore native riparian characteristics which have been impacted by cattle. Woody vegetation will stabilize soil and provide shade to help lower water temperatures. "

From information on the internet, to implement and complete this conservation plan the costs to these agencies were in the tens of thousands of dollars and a lot of man hours to make repairs to this sensitive area. This is a designated riparian habitat and shown as a Riparian Conservation District. This district designation is one of the most biologically significant wildlife habitats and in this case protects a fish bearing stream and spawning area. From the property information profile several of the parcels in this area are also in the National Wetlands Inventory Database. The residence of the old dairy has a NWID # of PFOW.

All of Segment #27 is shown to cross Chelatchie Creek in this area. Across Chelatchie Creek, there are more wetlands. The topography shows that the elevation begins to climb the hillside here. This is designated as a Severe Erosion Hazard Area (1). The soil changes to Cinebar silt loam. This soil type is very much a concern for runoff and erosion. There has been some small slides in this area. Maps will also show that several small water streams off the hillside all come in rather closely at this point. There is no vehicle access to this sensitive and wet area.

#8 GEOLOGY OF AREA, SOIL COMPOSITION AND WATER TABLE:

We are farming our property and have irrigation rights from our well.

When filing for rights, The State of Washington Dept of Ecology did a study of our use for the water and the geology and hydrology of our property and the surrounding properties. This report may be of utmost interest and concern to this proposed project. It relates to the areas geological formation, and how water may be a detriment to the sound and safe placement of transmission lines through this area of the Chelatchie Prairie valley.

The Washington State Hydro-Geologist Dave Nazy reported:

"The Heffner well was drilled to the depth of 35 feet. The static water level was 13 feet".

REGIONAL SETTING (as reported):

"The Chelatchie Prairie is an East-West valley that was formed by NE-SW trending fault. Surface elevation in Chelatchie Prairie valley range

between approximately 400 feet (our location) on the Southwest and 600 feet on the Northeast end of the prairie. The prairie is currently drained by Chelatchie Creek, which flows west into Cedar Creek at Amboy."

"During the Pleistocene, Chelatchie Prairie and the surrounding area were modified by alpine glaciations. The glaciers moved down the Lewis River Valley from the area around Mount St Helens.

Prior to glaciations, the Lewis River likely flowed through the Chelatchie Prairie. (Mundorff, 1964)

"Chelatchie Prairie alpine glacial drift makes up the surface geology in the prairie. This alpine alacial drift has been mapped as the AMBOY DRIFT. The AMBOY DRIFT is described as glacial till, silt and clay and outwash sand and gravel."

Note:

Excerpt from the Diamond Dairy Conservation Plan: (Soil Analysis):

"This "deep", well drained soil occurs on the low terraces (of the Chelatchie Prairie) valley floor and was formed from materials derived from volcanic ash, pumice, and weathered lava rock. Water capacity is "high" - water moves very readily through this soil. "

State Hydro-Geologist (Report Continues):

"Conceptually the around water flow system is made up of an "UNCONFINED AQUIFER" composed of the unconsolidated sands and gravels of the AMBOY DRIFT overlaying a fractured bedrock aquifer. Recharge to this surface aquifer likely occurs as direct precipitation as well as downward percolation and lateral flow from the surrounding hills. Ground water flow directions likely mimic surface topography with a downstream east to west component. The AMBOY DRIFT ranges in thickness from 0 to over 100 feet in the valley where it was deposited by melt waters from an alpine glacier. This "UNCONFINED AQUIFER" can be highly transmissive and is likely hydraulically connected with Chelatchie Creek. This aquifer is tamed by the wells in this area."

"The wells in this area (N.E. 256th Ave./Chelatchie Prairie) are located in the AMBOY DRIFT. Wells in the AMBOY DRIFT are typically less than 80 feet deep. Static water levels in this UNCONFINED AQUIFER range between 4 and 61 feet below land surface with an average depth to water being approximately 17 feet.

Our well is 13 feet to water and pumps up to 225 gpm. The old dairy well is 4.75 feet to water and pumps 800 gpm. Our neighbors (Stone's) well is 9 feet to water and pumps 125 gpm. The municipal well across N.E. 256th Ave. from us pumps 300 (plus) gpm and services all of Amboy and Yacolt.

This may be a real concern placing 500KV transmission lines with immense volumes of water running through the ground at such shallow levels in and above an uncontained aquifer. Also, the soil types are of concern.

Just as a side note, speaking of the geology of this area, we are required to have a special volcano endorsement on our homeowners insurance.

SUMMARY

We have a beautiful custom home built on this beautiful piece of property. We are in retirement and this is where we chose to spend the rest of our lives. We have excellent fertile soil for growing crops, and an abundance of water to make the land a real prize as prime agricultural land. I know that my voice is only one in many and our future, as well as others have been disrupted by the announcement of this project. I must agree with the majority that this project should be taken through the least populated areas out of view and minimize the impact to people and their homes.

I appreciate your time.

Thank you for asking our input

Thomas & Judith Heffner

[Address]

Communication ID: 11969

Date: 11/30/2009

Name: PAUL ROSTER, JUNE ROSTER

Hi Yes, My name is June Roster I live at [Address]. And we've received a packet concerning the I5 corridor, or whatever it's called, and we are very willing to rent out, lease, or whatever we have to do, if you want to put a power line back on our property. We bill from [Address] to [Address] is our land. Part of it is a wooded area that's unused but I unfortunately don't, I unfortunately haven't retained the letter for signature where you can enter the property, or you can come on and see the property, so if I could have that sent back out and so I could send it back in to you with signatures and a description etc I would be so thankful. My address is [Address]. And the name on the property is Paul Roster. Thank you. If there is a way I can come in and pick it up if that is easier I would be willing to do that. My name is June O'Brien, I am Paul's wife and live on the property. Thank you very much.

Communication ID: 11970

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: LINDA SCOTT, KEN SCOTT

We are in agreement with these landowners! We do not want your power lines near our home nor in our area.

Communication ID: 11971

Date: 11/27/2009

Name: CHARLIE SPIDLE

Stop the Route 31 Invasion

Please help us to stop the BPA from taking our land away without our permission or approval. We have had this land for over 100 years without governmental or commercial intrusion. We are appaled at the way the BPA is taking land without the consideration or concern of the people who own it or the enviromnemtal impact it is having on animals, fish and aquatic life forms.

Please help us stop the intrusion NOW.

The People of Washinton have spoken

Communication ID: 11972

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: CASEY DALE

With regard to our ropes/challenge course in the potential path of the BPA Project, I am attaching links to article and video file that showcases the US Army's Warrior Adventure Quest (WAQ) as part of the Pentagon's Morale, Welfare and Recreation (MWR) program. Bungee.com, LLC has been assisting returning Iraq and Afghanistan combat veterans with reintegration therapy. Please enter this URL into your browser so you can view the article and video:http://old.armymwr.com/lportallnews/display.asp?NEWS_ID=884 as the article and video explains these soldiers from both the Iraq and Afghanistan campaigns have been suffering from the same PTSD as soldiers from Vietnam, Korea and WWII (where it was once known as battle fatigue). Bungee.com at the request of the Armed Services has been offering bungee jumping as an adrenaline therapy experience for these military men and women for the past number of years. Recently Bungee.com had been asked by the Pentagon if we could offer the soldiers additional therapeutic experiences to assist with this specific PTSD Pentagon designed program. We at Bungee.com have always had the attitude, when asked it is our duty to help where we are able. . A little catch-up back ground on Casey Dale the founder of Bungee.com: Casey attended University of Oregon in Eugene and obtained my degrees in Psychology/Criminology. He worked as a counselor and director of a program for at-risk youth (chronic offenders) for over ten-year through the Lane County Juvenile Department (Skipworth). While working in this capacity for Lane County Casey specifically focused on using the "Outward Bound" therapeutic model for sustained behavior change. It was in this capacity Casey was fortunate to start working with Dr. Mark Havens from Cambridge, Mass. and Erik Marter from Portland, Ore. on the use of ropes

challenge courses as a therapeutic tool. These outdoor adventure therapy programs "challenge courses" proved to be extremely beneficial to the youth and their families who participated. Additionally, these experiential educational programs were successful in offering a therapy model that helped to keep the kids out of the state institutions. Ever since this experience Casey and his company bungee has been a believer in using the out of doors as a tool to help people in a multiplicity of venues. As of 2010 it will be 19 years that bungee.com has been offering these high adventure experiences at Canyon Creek. Bungee.com had planned of setting up a ropes course at the Canyon Creek property outside of Amboy (Chelatchie Prairie) similar to the one Mark Havens, Erik Marter and Casey Dale designed and built for the City of Eugene Parks & Recreation Department and Lane County Youth Services. This challenge course was planned to ultimately serve both able bodied and alter-able populations but it wasn't until this summer that Casey decided to move forward with the installation of the challenge course. At the request of the Ft, Lewis Army Outdoor Program Manager Rick Kivett, Casey laid out the first part of this ropes/challenge course which was a series of zip-lines between seventeen 70' utility poles covering a distance of approximately quarter mile. Casey chose to install the pole instead of using trees because he liked the fact that one knows what the engineered load capacity of planted poles are vs. trees with unique root systems. The bungee.com experience and bridge is inspected and permitted through the State of Washington's Department of Labor and Industries (L and I) to date bungee.com has invested approximately \$250,000.00 in the development of the Ropes/Challenge Course. Additionally, we are getting a professional assessment of the value of our bridge. (Which should be between \$9.5 Million and \$15 Million, since the cost to construct the bridge in 1950 was \$450,000.00, Therefore based off the time value of money it means that significant increase of market value has taken place.) But more importantly bungee.com wants to continue offering our experiential education and high adventure programs to the military and general public as we have for the past 22 years.

If you have any questions please contact

Casey Dale

Communication ID: 11973

Date: 11/30/2009

Name: JIM MALINOWSKI

Mr. Korsness,

I am one of the citizens concerned about the routing of the I-5 Corridor Project 500 kV line. I am a retired PG&E electrical engineer who moved back home to the property near Amboy where I grew up. While I am convinced there is a need for NW network reinforcement I want to do everything I can to insure the selected route minimizes impact on Clark County citizens, scenic and historic resources.

As a former Transmission Planning Manager for PG&E it appears clear to me that the easterly route

(35,34,29, 21 & 11) would best meet the objectives stated above. Am I missing anything related to those routes? I have seen statements that DNR, for example, would refuse to grant easements through DNR property. That does not seem plausible to me but if true those of us supporting the easterly route need to put pressure on that agency to do the right thing. Has DNR stated in any way opposition to the easterly route?

You should be aware that route 27 passes through Chelatchie Prairie which is one of the earliest settled areas of the county and the route passes very close to the oldest house remaining on the prairie which was built in the late 1800s. Given the scenic and historic values of the prairie that route should, I believe, be eliminated from the available options.

Finally, what is the decision process BPA follows to make the routing decision? Who has the authority to make the final routing decision?

At PG&E we needed to convince our Management Committee of the need for a particular network reinforcement project and have that committee authorize us to proceed with necessary project approval processes. For lines 230 kV and above we also needed to get CPUC and Energy Commission approval for the preferred route (which was not always given). Many of us in North County are concerned that in some way the December 14th deadline for public comments will be our last chance to influence your agency on this issue. I hope you can show me that is not the case.

Jim Malinowski

[Address]

[Phone]

Communication ID: 11974

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: DOUG ARNDT

The above-referenced proposed BPA project includes route segment 31. This route segment would cross, among others, rural residential properties along 212th Ave and 219th St. the proposed transmission towers and lines would have huge negative impacts on our environment, health, aesthetics and economics. Accordingly, I strongly request that this route segment be dropped from further consideration. I further request any further consideration by BPA of this proposed route segment be comprehensively addressed in your Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The EIS must include but not be limited to:

1. Environmental impacts of construction and operation of the route segment on the endangered salmon/steelhead in the Salmon Creek drainage and all of its tributaries in the project scope, including

the small seasonal stream on my property. The EIS should also consider soil erosion, shade tree and brush removal and loss of forest habitat/fragmentation on resident plants and animals.

2. Negative health impacts associated with transmission line electric/magnetic fields including stray voltage effects on people and pets, documented correlated increases in childhood leukemia and effects on implanted medical devices such as pacemakers (which I have).
3. Reduced aesthetics to include disruption of scenic views, high voltage noise, cleared treed properties and transmission line/tower incompatibility with natural, agricultural and neighborhood landscapes.
4. Negative economic impacts to include reduced TV and radio reception, loss of trees, electro corrosion of buried metal infrastructures, loss of property use and reduced property resale value (studies suggest up to 15% reduction).

The current public meeting schedule and locations are insufficient. The first public meetings were held only 2 weeks after the BPA announcement was prepared. Further, the public meeting locations did not include Battle Ground. Any further public meeting schedule should be made widely available at least 2 months in advance to allow participants adequate preparation time and should include a public meeting in Battle Ground. Included in your recent mailings was a form requesting permission for BPA representatives to enter my property for the purpose of surveying, testing, analyzing resources, appraising and doing recon work. Please be advised that I do not intend to give any such permission. To do so would, in my view, condone potential construction of a Federal project that I strongly view as harmful to my neighborhood.

Communication ID: 11975

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: MONTE ,LISA ABBOTT,WANDA A AHO,CAL AHO,ANDREY AHO,LINDSAY AHO,SUSAN ALLISON,ANN ANDERSON,DENNIS ANDROCK,DONNA ANDROCK,CARLOS ARTEAGA,DOUG AULT,LU BECKETT,JEFF BECKLEY,PATRICIA BERKETT,SANDRA L BISHOP,RIC BISHOP,ALAN BLOCH,JANE BROCKBANK,ANGELA BROSIUS,RAN

To: The Bonneville Power Administration

Re: The I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

We are residents living along the southern portion of Segment #31 of BPA's proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project in Hockinson. We are united in opposition to the devastating effects of a 500 KV power line in our neighborhood, are most concerned about the following issues:

Existing Corridors: The easement along Segment 31 was acquired in 1957 by Pacific Power and Light as a 100-foot easement through an undeveloped portion of Clark County. Clark County permitted numerous

developments immediately adjacent to this narrow easement. Many large, beautiful homes were built near the corridor with the understanding that a small power line might someday be constructed within the existing 100-foot easement. BPA's proposal to condemn land outside this easement and erect massive 150-foot towers is a betrayal of the trust homeowners placed in PP&L and Clark County to stay within their existing easement.

Houses and Other Structures: Clearing a 150-foot corridor will require involuntary condemnation and removal of homes and outbuildings. This will displace hundreds of Clark County residents who built homes adjacent to the PP&L easement.

Health effects from Electro Magnetic Fields: The California Department of Health Services concluded in 2002 that persons living in close proximity to Electro-Magnetic Fields were at increased risk for childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's disease and miscarriage. A 2007 study led by R.M. Lowenthal of the University of Tasmania School of Medicine in Australia further concluded that living within 328 yards of high voltage power lines puts adults at over 2x increased risk and children at 5x greater risk of developing cancer than those who do not live near high voltage power lines. Bear in mind, neither of these studies considered transmission lines as powerful as the 500 KV lines proposed for Segment 31.

Visual Impacts: Residents living 75 feet from the centerline will have 150-foot towers looming over their homes. BPA representatives have told us at public meetings that the tower spacing will be a maximum of 1250' on flat ground. This equates to no less than 21 towers within the 5-mile span between Powell Road and Green Mountain. The proposed line of 150-foot towers will become the dominant visual feature in our neighborhood, dramatically altering the existing landscape.

Noise: Clearly audible noise is emitted from 500 KV power lines. This noise increases on wet days and decreases with distance from the lines, but it will be a disturbing background noise for residents living in our currently quiet, rural setting.

EMF Interference with Electronic Devices: Sensitive electronic equipment, including radios and televisions, will be effected by the electro-magnetic field of this 500 KV line.

Aesthetics: Our neighborhood is characterized by homes on spacious lots in a country setting. These homes represent the American Dream, Our environment will be irreparably degraded by a row of 150-foot towers bisecting the neighborhood and stretching from one horizon to the next.

Economic Takings: The proposed corridor devalues our homes and property. This corridor will cost millions to compensate. There is a home on 128th Circle currently listed for sale at \$2.9 million. The mere proposal of 150-foot towers through our neighborhood will impact us in the interim by decreasing the sale price of homes such as this one. For this reason, we will immediately request the Clark County Board of Commissioners and County Appraiser reduce our property tax valuations and assessments until such time as BPA announces a decision on Segment 31. We will have a reputable real estate appraiser determine how much value we have lost.

Costs: All of the above effects will significantly reduce property values along Seg #31. 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 that must be included when comparing Segment 31 with other alternative routes.

Socio-economic and Public Services: Decreasing our quality of life and our property values will decrease the socio-economic environment of our neighborhood. Your economic analysis should include the cost to society of degrading an idyllic, rural neighborhood, including the increased cost of public services.

Site-specific Concerns: The above concerns will affect everyone along Segment 31. Additional site-specific impacts on Fish and Wildlife Resources, Soil Erosion, Sensitive Habitat and Cultural Resources will be addressed by letters from individual neighbors.

Land Use: We know of no examples of a 500 KV power line constructed through a populated area similar to Segment 31. All 500 KV projects in our region were constructed on open land, not through existing neighborhoods. Despite repeated requests from us, BPA has been unwilling or unable to show us an example where they successfully accomplished what they propose to do to the landowners along Segment 31. We do not want to be BPA's guinea pig for this type of project. All impacts listed above would be reduced or eliminated by locating the I-5 Reinforcement Project to an alternative route 5 miles east of Segment 31. Large portions of these eastern routes have already been roaded and clear-cut for timber management. The distance along Segment 31 between Yacolt Mountain and the Camas Meadows Golf Course is approximately 15 miles. The predominant vegetative cover along this 15-mile stretch of Segment 31 is a second-growth douglas fir forest. Douglas firs can easily grow to 200 feet tall. Protecting the proposed power line from windfall will require clearing the douglas firs for a distance of 200 feet on either side of the power line. This will create a 744-acre clearcut, 15 miles long and 400 feet wide. Why should BPA be allowed to clear-cut 744 acres through a neighborhood that has conscientiously protected its wetlands and wildlife? BPA should be required to place their 744-acre clear-cut on commercial timber land 5 miles east of segment 31 where clear-cutting is the predominant land use. Even Segment 9 along I-5 through Hazel Dell would be a preferable alternative in this regard. The corridor along Segment 9 has already been clear-cut in a swath 300 feet wide for BPA's existing 230 KV power line.

Safety: Please explain why BPA cleared a 300-foot easement along Segment 9 for their existing 230 KV line, yet proposes to clear only 150 feet for the 500 KV line through our neighborhood. Why were homes in Hazel Dell buffered from a 230 KV line by a 300-foot cleared area along Segment 9 while homes near Hockinson will be buffered from a 500 KV line by a meager 150-foot cleared area? Double the voltage, Half the protection? BPA has shown us many pictures of 500 KV and 230 KV lines. None of these pictures show homes 75 feet from the power lines. The cleared area in these pictures is much larger. We want BPA to prove to us that our children will be safe living 75 feet from a 500 KV line capable of transmitting 1400 mega-watts of power: a quantity of power that exceeds the production of Bonneville Dam.

Bearing the Cost of Benefiting Society. The environmental impacts of a project intended to benefit

American taxpayers from Seattle to Portland should be borne by public lands if such lands are available. Public lands should be the first priority for locating this project. Open lands should be the second priority. Involuntary condemnation of neighborhoods should be the very lowest priority. The negative impacts of this project should not be shouldered by a few residents when other, less impactful routes are available. When evaluated in terms of direct environmental and financial impacts on rate-payers, (the people who will ultimately pay the cost of this project), Segment 31 appears to be the most impactful of all the north-south corridor alternatives under consideration.

Conclusion: For all of the reasons listed above, we urge the BPA to eliminate Segment 31 from further consideration in their analysis of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

Contact: If the BPA has any questions regarding this letter or would like our assistance in their analysis, please contact John Doe at [Phone]. We have many talented, experienced professionals in our neighborhood willing to assist the BPA in their analysis.

Citizens against Segment 31

Communication ID: 11976

Date: 11/30/2009

Name: DENISE LALANDE

Yes, my name is Denise LaLande and I went to the November 7th Public meeting at the Hazeldell Grange and along with some neighbors. I am on map 95 where the current corridor already has power lines. I am on [Address]. The house most closest to the current green belt that has the power line in it. The question that I have is: that some of the neighbor and I, November 7th a gentleman from BPA told us that it would depend on whether the decision for that route was on the east or west side of the line. But that if for example the property were acquired on the east side of the line what was in white on map 95 would be acquired which includes my house. Interestingly about an hour later, a different neighbor went to the same meeting, spoke with somebody else who told him that BPA already has adequate space to, in that area, to add a second line and did not need to acquire any neighbor's property on either side of the line where the houses properties are outlined in white. Those are two completely opposite responses to what could eventually happen. I would like some calcification. My work number until 3:15 is [Phone]. My extension is [Phone]. My home number in the evening is [Phone]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 11977

Date: 11/30/2009

Name: MICHAEL VELEY

Greetings and thank you for taking the time to read this. I am very concerned regarding proposed Line

31. I live just off 212th Ave. and these enormous towers will be plainly visible out my front window. They will plow a 150 ft. wide swath behind my neighbors house along his property line and we will hear the lines 24/7. The quality of life all along route 31 will be destroyed. Property values will plummet (and the need for disclosure of the "possibility") has already affected one of my neighbors attempting to sell his house. Please, please come up with an alternative to line 31. Hundreds of family's will be effected. Thank you. Mike Veley

Communication ID: 11978

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: ROBERT AND CECELIA BLODGETTE,KATIE L DIAZ,LOUIS V DIAZ,SUSAN L DIAZ,LINDSEY M DIAZ

To: The Bonneville Power Administration - Mark Korsness, PE

From: Louis V. Diaz, Susan L. Diaz, Lindsey M. Diaz, and Katie L. Diaz

ParcelID -[Number], ParcelID[Number]

Re: BPA's I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

We are residents living along the southern portion of the segment # 31,37 and 38 of the BPA's proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project. My home as well as ten other on located on a private development on [Address]. The Development is referred to as the Tranquavilla property development. As a member of the Tranquavilla Homeowners association we are united in opposition to the devastating effects of a 500 KV power line in our neighborhood. Here are several of our concerns that we have discussed as a group:

Existing Corridors: The easements along segment #31, 37 and 38 were acquired in 1957 by Pacific Power and Light (PPL) as a 100' easement through undeveloped portions of Clark County. Clark County permitted numerous developments immediately adjacent to this narrow easement. Many large and beautiful homes were built near the corridor with the understanding that a small power line might someday be constructed within the existing 100' foot easement.

The BPA's proposal to condemn land outside this easement and erect massive 150' towers is a betrayal of the trust homeowners placed in the PP&L and d Clark County to stay within their existing easement.

Houses & Other Structures: The potential clearing of a 150' corridor will require involuntary condemnation and removal of homes, other structures, and outbuildings. This will displace hundreds of Clark county residents who have built their homes adjacent to the PP&L easement. Our development is a rarity in Clark Country. It is entered by a private half mile road that extends a full mile; each home is situated on a rare one acre lots at the base of Green Mountain.

Site Specific Concerns: The impact of the I-5 Corridor will impact several Clark County residents. The impact will also habitat for numerous deer, coyote, bobcat, red tailed hawks, owl, turkey vultures,

pheasant, and black bear. In addition, with in segment 31 there is a pond that flows into LaCamas creek and maintains and sustains year round habitat for ducks, geese and Blue Herons.

Health Effects from Electro-Magnetic Fields: In a recent study conduct by the California Department of health Services in 2002. The study concluded that individuals living in close proximity to Electro-magnetic Fields were at a higher risk for childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's disease and miscarriages. In addition, a 2007 study led by R.M. Lowenthal of the University of Tasmania School of medicine in Australia concluded that living within 328 yards of a high voltage power line puts adults at over 2x the increased risk and children 5x greater risk of developing cancer than those who do not live near high voltage power lines. It should also be noted that in neither of these studies did the study use transmission lines as powerful as the current proposed 500KV lines for the proposed Segment 31.

EMF: Interference with Electronic Devices: This will have a direct impact on all homes with in segment 31 and will affect the ability for many households who support a home based business. Sensitive equipment such as radios, televisions, and computers will be effected by the electromagnetic field of a 500KV line.

Economic Impacts: Residents living 75' from the centerline will have 150' towers looming over their homes. BPA representatives have told us at public meetings that the tower spacing will be a maximum of 1250' on flat ground. The proposed line of 150' towers will become the dominant visual feature in our neighborhood and will dramatically affect the visual appearance and valuation of our proprieties. The effects of the proposed towers will devalue our homes and property. Segment 31 will cost millions to compensation to homeowners affected by the BPA's I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. The proposal of the 150' towers though our neighbor hood will impact us by decreasing the sales price of homes. This will impact the tax revenues back to Clark County. We will ask for immediatly from the Clark County Board of Commissioners and the County Appraiser for a reduction in our property taxes and assessments until the BPA announces a decision on Segment 31. We have requested that our properties be appraised by a certified real estate appraiser to determine how much value we will loose due to proposed construction of the 150' towers. In addition, fair market cost must be used when determining the current cost of

everyone's homes.

Questions that need to be addressed: There are hundreds of questions that have been asked in the meetings that I have attended. And there will be future questions that will be raised on this subject. Here are a few that I want addressed.

1. Why in the DEIS does the BPA clear a 300' easement along segment 9 for their existing 230 KV line, yet proposes to clear only 150' for a 500' KV line though our neighborhood?
2. Homes in the Hazel Dell area were buffered from a 230KV line with 300' cleared in segment 9, is this the appropriate buffering to prevent potential health risks?
3. Can the BPA provide a solid explanation as to why one area should be protected with a larger

buffered area over another? It would make sense that if you double the KV you should double the buffering area.

Quality of Life: Our quality of life will be dramatically affected with the construction of the BPA 150' Towers. In our development everyone has spent thousands of dollars and hours to develop the quality of life that we all dream about! The uniqueness of our private 1 plus acre homes proves that individuals from different areas of county, different backgrounds, different social

economic backgrounds and different values can live together.

Summary: In closing we ask that the BPA eliminate Segment 31 from any further consideration as part of their proposed I-5 Corridor reinforcement Project based upon some of the reasons I have listed above. In addition, we request that the BPA revise this plan to further reduce the financial and environmental burden Segment 31 will place upon thousands of Clark County residents should additional information or questions regarding this letter be required, I can be contacted directly.

Louis V Diaz

[Address]

[Address]

[Phone]

Communication ID: 11979

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: KEN S BERG

To Whom It May Concern:

Subject: NOI for Floodplain and Wetlands Involvement I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project (ER 09/1061)

The Washington Office of Fish and Wildlife has reviewed the Notice of Intent for Floodplain and Wetlands Involvement I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. We have the following comments regarding the proposed project.

1. The alternatives evaluated should include upgrading the current transmission system rather than constructing a new transmission corridor. The analysis should clearly address the technical feasibility and environmental benefits associated with this alternative, as well, as cost and other factors.

2. The alternatives that are evaluated should include installation of any new transmission lines underground, especially in sensitive environmental areas. The analysis should clearly address the technical feasibility and environmental benefits associated with this alternative, as well, as cost and

other factors.

3. The document should provide information on how impacts to fish and wildlife, including their habitat, will be avoided, minimized, and compensated for, including the following:

a) An evaluation of opportunities to avoid listed species and sensitive habitats by way of micrositing and other measures.

b) An evaluation of the effectiveness of minimization measures and opportunities to enhance the effectiveness of those measures.

c) A plan to avoid and minimize effects to migratory birds.

d) A comprehensive mitigation proposal for unavoidable impacts to fish and wildlife, and their habitats. If compensatory mitigation is proposed, especially for wetlands, a watershed approach to their compensation should be considered.

4. The document should provide information on the location and amount of anticipated growth that will be provided for as a result of the proposed action. Although the action is proposed to meet existing needs, it is also proposed for new service requests. The indirect effects associated with this future development on wetlands, floodplain development, and fish and wildlife, including federally listed species should be discussed. Thank you for the opportunity to provide preliminary comments on the proposed action.

Please feel free to contact Nancy Brennan-Dubbs, at [Phone] or Martha Jensen, at [Phone], of my staff, if you have any questions regarding our comments.

Communication ID: 11980

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: BRYAN BELL,CATHY BELL,DENNIS EDISON,KAY EDISON,JOHN GRIES,SUZANNE GRIES,SHARON LORENZEN,LINDSEY S MARTINSON,ALVIN MOWREY,ANDREA MOWREY,MIKE MYERS,KIM MYERS,SANDRA PARGMAN,RICHARD PARGMAN,LYNETTE QUITUGUA,DARIN QUITUGUA,CYNDIE RUBINSTEIN,TED RUBINSTEIN,GRA

Mr. Korsness:

We are writing to you in regards to the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project proposed by the BPA through 70 miles of Clark County, Washington. Although we may agree that future power will probably be needed, we know that almost all of the new power generated will be used outside Clark County. Since the homeowners will have to suffer the consequences of this new Power Grid, we would like to express our concerns for BPA proposed route #31.

1) In Hockinson, Washington, high-end homes have already been built along the #31 route. Hockinson has one of the highest tax rates in the county because we care about our homes, wilderness areas, fire protection, and schools. Clark County also has the highest unemployment rate in the state and now you propose to take away the most valuable asset we have – our homes. Property values would plummet or homes would become impossible to sell. Current homes in Hockinson range from around \$500k to over \$2 million, and this is one of the premiere home site locations in Clark County for future growth. This could all end with the addition of this power line.

2) Homeowners have Open Space Agreements with the county for the preservation of land for economic and agriculture reasons. These agreements were designed to promote the conservation and beauty of open land, green spaces, streams, and wildlife. Homeowners have followed these agreements to maintain these open spaces through enlarged acreage of our single homes and open spaces even though it would be more profitable not to. The towers would destroy these open spaces and this community.

3) There are studies of known health hazards for children, including leukemia, from the electromagnetic fields (EMF) of high voltage lines and minimum restriction spaces are required. No studies have been done on adults, but it is strongly possible that EMF is linked to adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's disease, Alzheimers, and miscarriages. No studies have been done on the 500 kilovolt massive towers in this proposal, only on smaller towers. Future testing of these fields could easily prove these risks are increased exponentially based on the size of the tower. However, we do not wish to become human guinea pigs and of course by then it will be too late for thousands of homeowners and their children.

We strongly urge you to eliminate route #31 as a location - there are just too many landowners adversely affected in this route. Priority should be to ensure the safety of all involved. You have two other location choices - either of which will have minimum impact on property owners. One is to enhance the current I-5 (#09) route and the second (and probably the best) is through the current public land east of all the affected towns (#11, 29, 34, & 35). Towers could be placed just below the tree line to minimize any environmental impact. We strongly urge you to err on the side of safety and reduce the potential health risks, not increase them by placing lines close to human habitation. We suggest use of the current lines be maximized, smart grids employed to manage energy, and look into renewable. Although more costly initially, it may well prove less costly to bury these lines. We strongly urge you to work with homeowners in a coalition group including the Commissioner of Public Lands for a more viable and safer solution and eliminate Route #31 as a potential route. We hope to hear that action on your part has resulted in changing the route to a more appropriate location.

Sincerely,

Triple Creek Homeowners Association Members

Communication ID: 11981

Date: 11/30/2009

Name: GRANT G UHACZ

My family has land on 217th. Running power lines thru our land will greatly reduce the value of our property, and with the current economic climate we cannot afford this. Thank you for your consideration. Grant Uhacz

Communication ID: 11982

Date: 11/23/2009

Name: JERRY WILLIAMSON ,UNKNOWN ,JENNIFER AARON,LARRY ARLINT,NICHOLE L BAILEY,RONALD BAKER,BECKY BERRY,ADRIAN BERRY,ANAMAE BLACKSTONE,MIRIAM BLONDIN,RICHARD Q BOHLIEY,JOSEPH BOHLIG,LARRY BROOKS,RONALD BURCHAR,MAY L CAUGH,JAMES A CLAY,STEVE COCHTS,LISA CRUZ,VALE

Dear sirs:

We live along the part of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project that is proposed segment 9. This route is a particularly poor choice for the new 500-volt transmission line, whether the new line is built in the same area as the existing power line or is built alongside it, because it will affect the maximum number of residences due to the high density of city development in Vancouver, Kelso, and Lexington.

In particular, building the new transmission line along the segment 9 route through Kelso would affect our neighborhood, along Sunrise Street/Behshel Heights Road on the eastern border of Kelso in Cowlitz County.

There is an existing Bonneville Power Administration power line through our neighborhood. Property owners along the existing transmission line have received letters from BPA asking permission to come onto their property. Not just those property owners, but other residential land owners and residents in our neighborhood as well, will be affected by building the new 500-volt transmission line along proposed segment 9.

We, the residents of Kelso's Sunset Street/Behshel Heights Road neighborhood, urge you NOT to choose segment 9 for the new 500-volt transmission line from Troutdale to Castle Rock.

Property Values: The loss of aesthetic values will affect the property values of nearby homes and thus the property values of our entire neighborhood.

- Visual impact:

--Tower height: The new towers will be 30 feet taller than the existing 75-80 foot towers. This means that the new towers will be high above existing screening trees and also will be much more visible from neighboring residences. In addition, the taller towers will impact the current lovely sweeping view from

many hillside houses.

-- Loss of trees: Because a new transmission line will need a larger easement area, our neighborhood will suffer from the loss of many mature trees. These trees add to the general aesthetic value of our neighborhood, and specifically often screen the existing towers from the view of nearby residences. Without these trees, our neighborhood's property values will be diminished.

- Noise impact: The new transmission lines will be noisier than the existing lines because they will carry more electricity. While this noise may be within existing federal guidelines, it will be heard at ground level. This distracting noise will affect property values of nearby residences, and thus those of the entire neighborhood.

In addition, it is possible that with the addition of the new power lines, the total noise level, when combined with the noise from traffic on I-5, will exceed existing federal guidelines.

Slide Danger: While each residence's situation is unique, many of those that border the existing power line are on steep land or hillsides. In fact some of the land is classified as "unstable soils" on the Kelso "Critical Areas" map. This kind of terrain is prone to mud slides, as is shown by the recent slide on Corduroy Road, near where it intersects Sunrise Street, only a quarter mile from the current power lines.

New, heavier power-line towers, or their construction, may cause even more slides. Avoiding this kind of land disturbance in a residential neighborhood should be of highest priority when considering the route for the new 500-volt line.

We ask that you consider the visual and auditory impacts of building the new transmission line on our property values in our neighborhood, and the special dangers presented by building in hilly terrain in a residential neighborhood.

Choose an alternative route for the Proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, not segment 9.

Sincerely,

Neighbors in Sunrise Street/Behshel Heights Road, Kelso

JERRY WILLIAMSON ,JENNIFER AARON,LARRY ARLINT,NICHOLE L BAILEY,RONALD BAKER,BECKY BERRY,ADRIAN BERRY,ANAMAE BLACKSTONE,MIRIAM BLONDIN,RICHARD Q BOHLIEY,JOSEPH BOHLIG,LARRY BROOKS,RONALD BURCHAR,MAY L CAUGH,JAMES A CLAY,STEVE COCHTS,LISA CRUZ,VALERIE CUMMING,MONTE CUMMING,PHILIP A DANIELS,JAY DAVIES,GABRIEL GIBERSON,BUCK HARMAN,PAM HELLEN,PHYLLIS HEUETT,MIKE HOLE,CHARLOTTE F ING,WILLIAM T JAMIESON,KRIS KATT,KERI KLAYUM,JASON KRUTSER,LYNDA LARRABEE,OLIVER LARRY,ANDRE LO,DENNIS MACKAY,MOLLY MARTIN,PAT MARTIN,ELLA C MILLER,KOLENE MISGROVE,DUSTIN MOORE,TOM MUELLER,ALAN NISBET,L. FAYE OLASON,PAUL OLIVE,CHARLOTTE C PERSONS,GEORGE W PITTENGER,KATIE RANCH,JOHN RANDOL,MIKE REARDON,KIM REYNOLDS,KEN SCHLEIMER,MELINDA L SMITH,KAREN STEVENS,DON STOUT,JIM STRONG,BARRY SUNRISE,ALICE TIENNO,SANDY TILTON,DON TORGERSON,ARDITH TURNER,ROY VAUGHAM,JANE VAUGHN,BRENDA WALSTEAD,RICHARD

Communication ID: 11983

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: DUANE KOEHLER

My family lives along segment #31 and I am deeply concerned about the possibility that this route might be chosen for the new 500KV power line. I am not opposed to necessary infrastructure projects, but I am very opposed to routing a project of such a massive scale through existing neighborhoods.

When interviewed by the local newspaper (Columbian, October 27th) you stated "One of our main goals was to try to develop routes that avoided taking any homes...we're trying very hard to avoid that." Mr. Korsness, if you take that goal seriously, segment #31 should be immediately removed from consideration. Using this route would take homes from many, many families.

Some homes directly under the line would be physically taken; these families are the lucky ones. They can take the BPA's money, buy a house in a different neighborhood, and get on with their lives. Thousands of other will not be so fortunate. Their homes will effectively be taken too, although they will continue living in them. Instead of being forced to move, they will be forced to stay. With property values reduced by 30-50%, most can't afford to just sell and move on. They will stay and live in shadow of 150' tall towers and the inherent health risks. In many cases these homes represent a family's life-savings, which will effectively be taken by government fiat. Views destroyed, large trees felled, life never the same again.

This is very personal for me. Although BPA has no legal claim to my property, my neighbor has an unused utility easement from the 1950s. Since it was never intended for a utility project of such a massive scale, it isn't wide enough for a 500KV transmission line. To create the required 150' right of way, I am told that a 50-foot-wide swath will be taken from me. Since no structure can be within the right-of-way, my barn will need to be removed or altered in a way that will make it difficult to use(I raise cattle). This will all be done by "eminent domain", thus without my consent.

For my family, the changes will be painful. The play structure and swimming pool that my three children use will be less than 100' from the lines. Large towers will dominate the view from our large south and west-facing windows. We will no longer be able to enjoy summer evenings sitting on the deck. Instead of a stand of towering fir trees to admire, there will be a landscape that is naked of all else except massive towers and power lines. My children will be exposed to high levels of electromagnetic energy. Studies conclude (California DHS, 2002) that exposure will increase their risk of leukemia, brain cancer, and other future health problems. I can stay and accept the health risks and lower quality of life, or try to sell at a substantial loss.

If a new interstate power line is needed, then I agree with your public statement (Columbian, October 27) that it should be constructed away from populated areas, so that people's homes are not taken. A

better route for such a massive project would be to go across public forested land to the east, avoiding existing neighborhoods. Although there is likely no perfect solution, it is irresponsible for the BPA to take people's homes when alternative routes exist. Large 150' towers and a 500KV interstate transmission line are simply not compatible with existing residential neighborhoods. Segment #31 should be immediately removed from consideration by the BPA.

In addition, I strongly urge you to extend the public comment period. Many of the neighbors I have talked to are not aware of what is being proposed. Since it will have a large impact on them, I believe they need the right to be informed and given an opportunity to share their concerns.

Sincerely, Duane Koehler

Communication ID: 11984

Date: 11/30/2009

Name: ANNE BRAY

Yes my name is Anne Brey, my address is [address] Battle Ground I am very much against line 31 being put in, it is extremely close to my property. We drive over that line every day, I am not looking forward all to the electromagnetic field that will be effecting our families health and the property values of our property I strongly erg you to find a much less populated area to put this line please do not disrupt our way of life and our health status by putting in line 31. My number is [Phone]. Thank you

Communication ID: 11985

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: DUANE KOEHLER

My family lives along segment #31 and I am deeply concerned about the possibility that this route might be chosen for the new 500KV power line. I am not opposed to necessary infrastructure projects, but I am very opposed to routing a project of such a massive scale through existing neighborhoods.

When interviewed by the local newspaper (Columbian, October 27) project manager Mark Korsness of BPA stated "One of our main goals was to try to develop routes that avoided taking any homes...we're trying very hard to avoid that." If Mr. Korsness takes that goal seriously, segment #31 should be immediately removed from consideration. Using this route would take homes from many, many families.

Some homes directly under the line would be physically taken; these families are the lucky ones. They

can take the BPA's money, buy a house in a different neighborhood, and get on with their lives. Thousands of other will not be so fortunate. Their homes will effectively be taken too, although they will continue living in them. Instead of being forced to move, they will be forced to stay. With property values reduced by 30-50%, most can't afford to just sell and move on. They will stay and live in shadow of 150' tall towers and the inherent health risks. In many cases these homes represent a family's life-savings, which will effectively be taken by government fiat. Views destroyed, large trees felled, life never the same again.

This is very personal for me. Although BPA has no legal claim to my property, my neighbor has an unused utility easement from the 1950s. Since it was never intended for a utility project of such a massive scale, it isn't wide enough for a 500KV transmission line. To create the required 150' right of way, I am told that a 50-foot-wide swath will be taken from me. Since no structure can be within the right-of-way, my barn will need to be removed or altered in a way that will make it difficult to use (I raise cattle). This will all be done by "eminent domain", thus without my consent.

For my family, the changes will be painful. The play structure and swimming pool that my three children use will be less than 100' from the lines. Large towers will dominate the view from our large south and west-facing windows. We will no longer be able to enjoy summer evenings sitting on the deck. Instead of a stand of towering fir trees to admire, there will be a landscape that is naked of all else except massive towers and power lines. My children will be exposed to high levels of electromagnetic energy. Studies conclude (California OHS, 2002) that exposure will increase their risk of leukemia, brain cancer, and other future health problems. I can stay and accept the health risks and lower quality of life, or try to sell at a substantial loss.

If a new interstate power line is needed, then I agree with Mr. Korsness that it should be constructed away from populated areas, so that people's homes are not taken. A better route for such a massive project would be to go across public forested land to the east, avoiding existing neighborhoods. Although there is likely no perfect solution, it is irresponsible for the BPA to take people's homes when alternative routes exist. Large 150' towers and a 500KV interstate transmission line are simply not compatible with existing residential neighborhoods. Segment #31 should be immediately removed from consideration by the BPA.

I also strongly urge that the public comment period be extended. Many of my neighbors, who are directly impacted by this project, are still not aware of the nature of this project. They deserve to be informed so they can share their concerns.

Sincerely, Duane Koehler

Communication ID: 11986

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: DEANNA KOEHLER

We live along along Segment #31 and are deeply concerned about the possibility that this route might be chosen for the new 500KV power line. I am greatly opposed to the power line being built near so many homes, so many people, and so many children. The wood-pole power lines are compatible near houses. However, the massive 500 kV lines should not be built near residential areas. Such massive lines should be put away from the population on government land, not private land. These lines should be built further east, away from the large populations.

Segment #31 should not be up for consideration since so many homes and families would be negatively affected. Thousands of homeowners will be negatively affected by these lines. Homeowners with children, babies, and homeowners who, in our case, have young children who plan to grow up and raise their OWN children in the home in which they grew up-not anymore if the power lines go in. Even if we wanted to sell our home, we can't, our property would be reduced by up to 50% with these massive lines right next to our house. Would YOU want to buy a house next to a 500KV power line? Would you want your children to be forced to live in a house next to a power line?

If you put Segment #31 through, you are forcing children to have to live with both the ugliness and health risks associated with these power lines. My children are very sad and are now concerned about getting cancer. The cancer risks associated with these lines are real, and you can't debate the facts. The government-funded EMF studies say there is no cancer risk, yet the NON-government studies show substantial health risks: cancer, leukemia, brain cancer, and several other diseases caused by living next to such large voltage power lines.

The Segment #31 power lines would take away thousands, even millions of trees. We have 12 windows that face toward the proposed power line segment. That view would forever be taken away and replaced by a massive, ugly, metal monster. Our entire west side of our home is where we live, our children swim in the pool, play on the swingset, jump on the trampoline, roast marshmallows in the fire pit-all of these activities would be negatively affected by the ugliness of those monstrous power poles. The hum that goes along with those lines will definitely be heard and irritating. Even though we currently have no utility easement on our property, we are told that this massive line won't fit on the existing easement on neighboring property. As a result, they will need to extend the easement onto our property, which will mean that our two-story barn will need to be removed to provide clearance for the power line.

All without our consent, even though we have never had an easement on our property.

It is irresponsible for BPA to take people's homes and force people to live next to such monstrosities when alternate routes exist. Again, a better route for the power lines would be further east, on government land for a quasi-government project. That's the right thing to do. Segment #31 should be immediately removed from consideration by the BPA.

Sincerely,

Deanna Koehler

[Address]

Communication ID: 11987

Date: 11/30/2009

Name: MARK A OCHSNER

I am not in favor of this. I have many people that live around me that are over seventy years old. This not only places a hard ship on them but also myself. Just compensating for property is not enough. I don't want to move. I have lived here for 22 years. I don't want to buy more property. Bpa can move this to the east with no problem. What pisses me off is you are still making pay for this.

Communication ID: 11988

Date: 11/30/2009

Name: DAVID CHAMBERS

COMMENTS OF CONCERN REGARDING I-5 ROUTE # 31 By: PROPERTY OWNERS: David & Shelley Chambers PARCELLD: [Number] After attending the Scoping Open House Meeting, in Camas, WA on November 3, 2009, we are deeply concerned about the negative impact this project will have upon our property, local area, environment and economy. Specific concerns are:

- IRREVERSIBLE ECONOMIC IMPACT ON AREA PROPERTY AND COUNTY TAX COLLECTIONS:

- o Homes on LINE 31 will be devalued killing any equity have built in their homes and represents people's #1 personal asset

- o Clark County will suffer huge losses in tax revenue collections as there are an estimated 7000 homes on/near line 31

- o This couldn't come as a worse time given:

- Record Unemployment in Washington (+14 %)

- Stock Market crash reduced average retirement savings by 35-50 %

- Those employed have flat incomes so can't keep up with rising costs/inflation

- School District's loss of property revenue and land loss compounded by line #31 - NET-- THIS REPRESENTS A TRIPLE NEGATIVE FINANCIAL TSNAMI FOR ROUTE # 31 HOMEOWNERS!

- EARTH QUAKE RISK IN HEAVILY POPULATED ROUTE # 31: o Towers on this route would be built on

unstable soils vs. bedrock found on the far east path (Nos. 29, 34, 35).

o Safer to place in low populated area to the east in case an earthquake occurs and a tower(s) fall.

- HIGHER HEALTH RISK IN HEAVILY POPULATED ROUTE # 31

o Recent reports from the California Department of Health Services (2002 study) concluded that living in close proximity to Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) can increase the risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's disease and higher miscarriages in pregnant women..

o Those who live near the route will literally hear and feel the electro-magnetic pulsations which adds a physical impact/distraction to the high health risk.

- HARM TO LOCAL ENDANGERED SPECIES: o We have two couples of White Spotted Owls nesting in this neighborhood and these power lines and/or loss of natural habitat pose a health and safety risk to these species

o The removal of trees will further increase our erosion on environment; eliminate the natural bio-filtering of ground water; and create Electro Magnetic Field noise (where none exists today here) with the Helicopter inspections and Construction.

o The SE portion of the aforementioned Hockinson School land contains a pristine wet area (a micro canyon ecological zone that is endemic to many species of protected birds) that would be corrupted by the installation/impact of line #31

- HARM TO ENDANGERED FISH & SALMON CREEK:

o Route # 31 closely follows the upper reaches of Salmon Creek posing a danger to them from change to their habitat, and potential risks associated with Electro Magnetic Fields

- HARM TO HOCKINSON SCHOOL PROPERTY:

o Route #31 goes right through a 35 acre Hockinson School District Property intended to be a new Middle School located at NE 169th & NE 217th Avenue. loHockinson School District will lose \$ 1mm on a 35 acre property located at NE 169th & NE 217th Avenue.

o Michael Grubbs, Hockinson School Superintendent has been notified that the District will lose over \$ 1,000,000 in unrecoverable property values should line # 31 be chosen. Schools are already strapped financially, this would be a devastating economic hit to the Schools.

- BPA & INDUSTRY STUDIES STATING ELECTRO MAGNETIC FIELDS ARE "QUESTIONABLE" AT BEST

o The inherent problem with all the industry studies is that they are paid for BPA/Industry looking for a positive result. They are not truly "Independent". For example, Tobacco Companies (and even their Executives) allege that there is no proof that second hand smoking causes cancer (or even certain health risks associated with smoking) when it is generally accepted in the Scientific community that

smoking/second hand smoke has a direct linkage to cancer. Net, it goes without saying that you can't pay the wolf to be in the henhouse allegedly guarding the hens and yet expect none to be eaten? Further, BPA also can't prove that Electro Magnetic Fields are 'safe' either!

• CONCLUSION — THE MOST EASTERN ROUTES (# 29, # 34 & 35) ARE THE MOST LOGICAL CHOICE BECAUSE:

1. LOWER COST TO BPA: East route is far less expensive DNR land and will cost much less than heavily populated Route # 31.
2. LOWER ECONOMIC IMPACT ON AREA HOMES AND TAXES: DNR land will not decrease like higher end homes on Route # 31 and not negatively impact Clark County Tax Assessments.
3. DISTANCE IN LINE COST IS THE SAME FOR BPA: I have measured the lines in question and the length is the same even with the eastern route.
4. HEALTH & SAFETY ISSUES: Less population to be impacted. Safer location if a line were to fall in a natural disaster like an Earth Quake
5. SAFER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT: Less disruption on the land, Salmon Creek, and White Spotted Owl habitat
6. NO NEGATIVE IMPACT ON HOCKINSON MIDDLE SCHOOL LAND: New school can be built and not have health and safety concerns that would be there is power route # 31 is built

Communication ID: 11989

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: CAROLINE MOSCHETTI, DOUGLAS MOSCHETTI

We are submitting this email to ask that BPA explore alternative options before moving forward with the I-5 Corridor Project. My husband and I built our home 18 years ago on property that has been in my family since 1912 in the Fargher Lake area. I am third generation to live and work our land. If this project goes forward our property will be ruined both aesthetically and in real estate value. My family has developed and maintained not only our land but neighboring sites as well. We have been active members of the north county community for the last 100 years. My husband and I are both nearing retirement and look forward to having the opportunity to pass along our property to our children and grandchildren. In an age when we as a society should be looking to use less and conserve more, this monstrous project seems not only wasteful but deceitful as well. I am finding it hard to believe that with most industry shut down in Clark County and home sales and construction on the decline, that suddenly we need more power sources. Why was this project not proposed four years ago when the economy was booming and new home sales and construction were at an all time high? I can only be led to believe

that power is needed somewhere other than here locally and that BPA sees the opportunity to acquire right of ways at a much reduced cost. I would like to think that my government agencies are exploring all alternative sources to expanded government at the cost of the individual homeowner. I know this probably does not mean much to you or the people making the decisions on this project, but it means everything to us and the thousands of individuals it will affect. I ask that you explore combining with existing utility right of ways, alternative sources of power transmission and conservation incentives rather than increased usage. Respectfully submitted, Douglas and Caroline Moschetti

Communication ID: 11990

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: NOLAN MEGER

I have these other comments:

1. Make sure all mail is sent to me at this address. This mail was sent to the previous owners forwarding address. I would like to receive the mail.
2. Keep me informed. I was unable to attend any of the meetings because I did not know about them because I did not receive this mail.

Communication ID: 11991

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: DAVID CURRIER,KAY CURRIER

Hello Paul

Thanks for calling me....thanks for speaking to me at the Camas meeting. I gave you some notes about our area on map# III I mentioned the proposed "Village at Green Mountain 1000 homes at site of Golf course... This just across the road from us and about 1/4 mile to the west. (Contact city planners in Camas)

In addition, our property and surrounding area to the north and west were designed this year as in the new "urban growth boundry" We are now zoned R12 or up to 12 town houses per acre.

Not only should it enhance our home and acre value, but will increase the population in the area. We are original owners. (32 years). and have invested thousands in upgrades. Please consider these factors.....

Sincerely

Dave and Kay Currier

Communication ID: 11992

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: CHRISTOPHER A. TIMBREZA, SETA TIMBREZA

NO BPA Segment #31,

I am very concerned about the health hazards of a massive transmission line being so close to my home. A report from the California Department of Health Services (2002) concluded that living in close proximity to Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) can cause increased risk of Childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease, and miscarriage.

Hockinson School District recently purchased 35 acres for a new school. Segment #31 would go through this property and may render this property unfit for a school. The current primary/intermediate school at the corner of 159th and 164th is within a mile from the proposed route segment. If Segment #31 is constructed, many families will be forced to relocate and others may pull children from the school because of health concerns.

Segment #31 is viewed by BPA as the desired route. Its short length would minimize their construction cost. Other options would traverse Washington DNR land, with less social impact, avoiding established communities. Why aren't they upgrading their Existing Facilities within Existing Right-at-Way in Segment #9 and in their northern Oregon routes between Allston and Keeler or St. Johns? Any of these options provide the route & network diversity they are after.

Where are the Consumers of this the power? In California?

The Clark County GIS property website identifies Segment #31 ROW parcels as having geological, seismic and erosion hazard areas. Adding such large infrastructure to this area is not a good idea. Please don't allow BPA to use route segment #31.

The public comment period ends November 23, 2009. Only some residents received letters from BPA around October 24th, less than the 30 days required for public input. Less time to comment equals less publicity. Narrow notification requirements and compressed comment windows may be "the law". A law that is structured against our citizens, not in support of them.

The construction of route Segment #31 would destroy our community, our residential investment and our lives, It is unconscionable and irresponsible to even consider this segment. The community of Hockinson would never be the same. Support us, support our community.

Sincerely,

Christopher Timbreza

Communication ID: 11993

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: CAREY A ROSENLUND

We purchased this beautiful piece of property in August of 2009 with no idea this was in store. We are currently living on the land while our new home is under construction in the framing phase. If BPA puts in line route 26, we will have one huge tower just off the corner of our property and lines strung along our property line where will sit in our new living room and see them. We have four small children who love to play outdoors, but this will cause fear for their health and well being, not to mention their safety. Please consider all our home lives that will be turned upside down if something so drastic as route 26 takes place. Doesn't it make sense to go a less populated route? We have such beautiful views to see and green feids and forests for children and animals to play. How scary to think all this could be changed in a few years! Route 26 will affect many lives, homes and property. Please consider another way to accomplish what you need. Thank you for you time.

Communication ID: 11994

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

The comment period needs to be extended to give all involved a chance to give their comments. There are numerous homeowners who need this extension as the BPA dropped this like a bombshell onto our area and these homeowners are not prepared to voice their opinions yet.

Communication ID: 11996

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: DAVE ROSS

RE: BPA Power Lines

At the recent meeting at the Amboy School we gave you our names and e-mail address as we are interested (as you are) in fighting the BPA's proposal. Since that meeting, my wife has developed some information showing the harmful problems that result when living close to these high power lines. She found the information in a website "www.reta.ca". I am enclosing copy of the information previously mentioned in case you do not have same.

As you probably are aware, there is an existing power line that comes from the power station in Buncombe Hollow and goes up the hill to the Weyerhauser timber land and then directly east. They should follow the path of these lines (i.e. east and then south to Troutdale). Such a path would avoid habitated areas and although possibly more cost would be involved, it makes no sense endangering the local population in taking the power lines in a straight line down to Troutdale. When we were at the meeting, we were talking to one of the BPA representatives. We asked this gentleman whether he would like such power lines going through his property, he had to admit he would not like the idea. In addition to the harmful effects that these power lines have on people, if they go east with the lines and then take them south to Troutdale, they would avoid running into a designated (and posted) Scenic Highway that comes out of Amboy and then down to Woodland. My neighbor (Dick Canton) who lives across the road from me has stated that he is also interested in fighting this matter. In order that he get on your e-mail list, I am (by copy of this letter) suggesting that he contact you, furnishing his e-mail address, ect.

Best regards,

David Ross

Communication ID: 11998

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: SUSAN M BARROWS

I would like the BPA to look at using existing transmission lines and utilizing the same routes, as the existing transmission lines, for additional power. I am strongly opposed to putting new transmission lines up in the I-5 corridor as described in the documentation. It seems like this not only negatively effects those who live in this area, but also the wildlife. As a taxpayer and concerned citizen I don't support this proposal which would negatively affect both myself and my neighbors and friends. This is frightening proposition and am planning to attend the December 14th meeting to express these sentiments. Sincerely, Susan Barrows

Communication ID: 11999

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: MONIQUE A AKERLEY

My family home is very close to the proposed rout Segment#31 of the BPA I-5 reinforcement project. We built our home about 6yrs ago. We put everything we had financially and emotionally into it. this is where we planned to live out our lives, and raise our children. If this segment #31 goes through we will have to walk away from all of it. This power line runs the huge risk of causing Childhood Leukemia, Adult

brain cancer,also miscarriages. I know there is other routs for you to consider. I beg you on behalf of my family and the families of my neighbors to reconsider and say no to Segment #31.

Communication ID: 12000

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: JEFF CONDON

Go on federal land, don't come through our area because of all the development. There are tons of homes here. You should find a rural area on state or federal public lands. I want my taxes to go to people who deserve it. Right now that is medical care. People have died for this country for people here to own their own lands and live here. This is the last thing that I can take, if you take my land. I am a veteran and my uncle died in World War II. We shouldn't build these electronic transmission lines that could cause more health risks. We should be working on individual solar or wind energy for homes and businesses. We shouldn't keep building more to rely on later. People are suffering now and have enough pressure to keep their homes without worrying about this project. The government is bleeding us to death.

Communication ID: 12001

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: CHRIS KARLSEN

I have these other Comments:

I had purchased my 20 acre parcel 3 yrs ago in hopes of building a home and raise my family. I have now seen my hopes dashed by the BPA in considering my property of the proposed properties to run their new/high voltage lines. My investment I worked hard for is now possibly going to be taken from me or de-valued to the point of not being able to sell it.

Also by attending public hearings on this there is a high risk of health effects by living close to these transmission lines.

I strongly oppose the I-5 corridor reinforcement project and would like to see BPA make improvements to existing lines.

My property at [Address] is right @ the crossing of the projected lines of # 30/33 and 28/32 on the BPA map.

Communication ID: 12002

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: JEFF D. LAWSON

I have these other comments:

Please look at the impact these lines will have to the families that live near them. You will be taking away homes, destroying values, forcing families to start over or go broke. Any homes near these lines will be worth nothing. Many people put everything they own into them. I live along segment #31, please stop this madness.

Communication ID: 12003

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: FRANCES A HAMM,KATHLEEN MOLINOS

PERMISSION TO ENTER IS DENIED

Our family is opposed to BPA's possible proposal of Route 11. We are not willing to grant permission for entrance to our properties.

Our grandfather, his children, their children and grandchildren have lived and farmed this land for over 120 years. Many parts of this land have very mature trees that are well over 100 years old and provide homes for certain protected species of birds and animals. We know that EMF affects surface water such as ours and well water used by our son, next door. EMF would compromise the satellite internet and television which are the only ways we are able to keep abreast with current events. The internet is the primary communication mode for our employment which could be affected by electromagnetic interference. We do not want to be concerned that our children, grandchildren, or ourselves could contract some form of cancer from the EMF transmissions. Short-term human health effects from exposure to elevated levels of EMFs are well established, such as effects on the central nervous system and heating of the body.

Choosing another path outside residential areas (through State lands and plantation forests) would relieve many families from the stress and sleepless nights incurred by this dreaded project. BPA cannot use the terrorist excuse as a rational reason for putting another line since we all know terrorists can go to any substation or power line they choose.

If this project is a "Must Do", BPA should remember the taxpayers and add or replace the towers it already has along the Interstate 5 corridor.

Communication ID: 12004

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: JAMIE SANTOLUCITO,FRED SANTOLUCITO

We border Clark public utility.

Dear Mr. Korsness,

Please have your environmental studies look at:

There is natural wildlife in this area. Hawks fly close by and are sighted daily in the trees that border the Clark public facility. Deer and fox are also present.

With the slope on the property line, erosion is likely to occur with tree removal.

Also the powerline "noise" is blocked by these same trees.

We are personally concerned about the radiation that will be emitted with new higher towers and increased voltage.

I have these other comments:

We are planning to sell our home in the very near future. Uncertainty of which plan you will eventually decide on could count heavily on what we can receive (\$) for our home and jeopardize the fair value – even the sale could likely be affected. Your expediting your decision should be given heavy consideration i.e.: a month! Not 2 years. Why so long to decide! On the appropriate plan & inform us of it?

Also, this is a pleasant little area in the middle of development called "cedar highlands" please don't take this away from the owners who purchased their homes here for this reason.

Communication ID: 12005

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: VIKTOR TISHCHENKO,ALLA TISHCHENKO

Proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project-Route 31

We live along the projected Route 31 and our property will be affected by this project. We are strongly opposing this project and are opposing to have high voltage power lines run through our property and neighborhood. BPA needs to explore other options and have alternative plan like putting in Underground high voltage power cables or to use State land instead of land that runs through residential communities. This might cost more money but it would be better for everyone and will eliminate peoples fear for their health and fear of losing their homes. Our first concern is our health and

our children's health if these power lines were to be put in on our property. We refuse to live next to high voltage power lines and do believe that they have a strong impact on human health. Even though people in charge of this project will try to state otherwise and try to convince that they do not cause health issues, we would still strongly stand by our belief. High Voltage Power lines have impact on health. Our second concern is that the home value will decrease drastically. We will not live next to power lines so we will have to relocate somewhere. If the power lines will be put on our property we will be unable to sell our property because no one wants to buy properties where there are high voltage power lines. We will also not be able to sell our home for what we owe on it because we bought the land in 2006 and built a house on it when the prices were at their highest. We will have no option but to lose our house, be left with a huge debt due the high loan but decreased property value and will have nowhere to go with our four children. We believe that there are other options that BPA could look at that have least impact on our community instead of high voltage power lines in our residential area.

Viktor and Alia Tishchenko

Communication ID: 12006

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: MARGUERITE M BROWN

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Any harmful effects of power lines through property.

I have these other comments:

Concern it would devalue price of property.

Communication ID: 12007

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: VALERI BARDINI

Please have your environmental studies look at:

If ponds feed directly into Cedar Creek

I have these other comments:

No entrance onto property – I have 2 large dogs. You must call 1st, give several days notice

[Phone] home

[Phone] cell

I prefer not to have these elect towers on or near my property. I'm afraid of them.

Communication ID: 12008

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: TAMI CONGLETON, JUDITH A EDWARDS, THOMAS EDWARDS, SALLY GINTER, MIKE GINTER, DAVID & CINDEE HORSCH

Re: No BPA Segment #31

Proposed BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

I strongly urge you to take action and notify the Bonneville Power Administration that segment #31 should NOT be considered as an option for the route of their new high voltage power lines. Also, the BPA gave homeowners 40 days to respond with comments by November 23, 2009. Forty days is not a reasonable period given that the BPA will take 2 years to make a decision that will affect many homeowners and families. Please push to extend the comment period.

The proposed segment #31 routes high voltage towers directly through populated areas of Clark County. Homeowners and families in Battle Ground, Hockinson, Camas and other areas are directly affected. The BPA notified over 8,000 property owners in the right-of-way of their proposed route, however they did not notify homeowners abutting the right-of-way which would add at least another 16,000 homes. Abutted homeowners and families may be only a few feet away from the right-of-way but will be affected by electromagnetic fields particularly if the families have health related issues.

There are many arguments against having a high voltage power line run through an existing community:

Families:

- Loss of homes and out-buildings (barns, sheds, arenas, etc) in right-of-way
- Financial loss from plummeting home resale market values in the area due

to:

- location near the power line
- loss of scenic views
- Health risks of living in the shadow of the electromagnetic fields

-
- Loss of satellite TV/computer service, radio and cell phone reception
 - Reduction in children's education quality due to less property tax collections
 - Loss of small communities and reduction in quality of life

Local Schools:

- Loss of property tax revenue due to:
- Loss of tax base from destruction of houses/buildings
- Devaluation of market values of remaining houses in the area
- Loss of use of land already purchased for future schools

Destruction of sensitive plants and wildlife habitat in the area

Negative visual impact to the area whether in local communities or surrounding hills

There must be better options than running a line through existing communities. There is already an existing I-5 corridor. Populated areas should be off the table as an option. The destruction to homes and families is too great. I strongly urge you to notify the BPA that segment

31 should NOT be considered. Citizens shouldn't have to wait 2 years for them to study this. They should remove it from consideration now.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this letter. I hope to hear that action on your part has resulted in changing the route to a more appropriate location.

Sincerely,

Communication ID: 12009

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: DAVID DAWSON

Message: I've never written to you before. With all respect I ask that you represent the citizens of Clark County in pushing back on BPA to find alternative to routing 500kV power transmissions lines through Hockinson, Battle Ground, and other residential areas- specifically route 31. Mr.

Boldt indicated that you are passing on the letters sent to you to the BPA, but I ask that you become more engaged in this issue. These lines cause health effects (Lymph node cancer and Lukemia in children) and will affect hundreds of families and thousands of individuals. It does not help establish long term local jobs or taxes (in addition to lower values, many high earners will move out of the area.)

These lines are not in the interest of Clark County. This is a major issue before you and ask that you use your influence and connections to other political leaders to move BPA away from route 31.

Best Regards,

Dave Dawson.

Communication ID: 12010

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: SANDRA PARGMAN

Subject: BPA Proposal - please read

Message: Commissioners:

I'm sure you are aware of the BPA proposal to install 500 kilovolt power lines through Clark County. One of their proposed routes is through Hockinson (#31). I'm sure you will agree this is not the best route.

We need your help. Although we realize you are not empowered to direct BPA, you are elected officials and your opinions are more powerful. We, therefore, request that you send a letter on your letterhead indicating your support of home owners requesting BPA to seriously consider selecting a route that is not through any neighborhood, but through the public land east of all towns.

We supported you at election time, now we need you to support us.

Respectfully,

Sandra Pargman

Communication ID: 12011

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: ANDREICA SUSANA

Please have you environmental studies look at: I am concerned about the following dangers:

1. Fires from downed power lines.
2. EMF radiation and its effects on plants and animals

3. Destroyed natural habitats for the local animal population. (deer, bears, birds, ect...)
4. Contaminating and destroying creeks and streams due to clear cutting forests. (70 miles x 150 ft wide path for power lines)
5. Reduced property values and livability factor.

I have these other comments:

I purchased my 20 acres forest land five years ago, on which to build my dream home. I've cleared and leveled my lot and planted over 60 fir trees and 10 red woods. With the driveway and retaining wall complete, the next step is to start building the house, install the septic system and drill the well. I don't want to do this until I know exactly what BPA project intends to do and where it will occur I refuse to live under or near high voltage power lines. In fact the primary reason for choosing this area is to move away from the industrialized city and get back to nature I do not want to even see power lines much less have them on my property. Please let me know where you intend to put your lines.

Communication ID: 12012

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: JANIE PETO

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Exposure to extremely low frequency fields as possible human carcinogen. Having had a bout with cancer + being cancer free for over 10 years. I cannot accept the risk of exposure

I am very concerned for family, friends + neighbors

I have these other Comments:

High voltage power lines have been shown to decrease property values by up to 50%. These power lines going down proposed route 31 will affect hundreds of families and be very disruptive

I urge you to find another route

Communication ID: 12013

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: JUNE JONES

Dear Mr. Woolson:

Permission is denied. Our property is encumbered by an existing easement and we will not allow any further access or entry on to our property other than what contained in the easement now of record. The property is gated, fenced and posted "No Trespassing" any unauthorized access will be reported to the Cowlitz County Sheriff and prosecuted to the full extent of the law. It is our opinion that the requested "Permission to Enter Property" is unreasonable and excessive. It is shocking to receive a communication from a government licensed organization that is so disrespectful our property rights.; no you may not enter at will, no you may not cause damage and leave it to be compensated at a future date, no you may not cut trees or clear brush, no you may not use our road, no you may not dig holes, drill nor excavate nor test for soil analysis or prehistoric evidence, no you may not complete environmental studies, and no appraiser/Realty Specialist shall inspect the property as a part of a valuation process. If you would like to discuss the possibility of a more limited permission please do not hesitate to contact me. In the meantime do not assume that any permission to enter the property.

Best regards,

June Jones

Communication ID: 12014

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: LARRY E. HILL

Please have your environment studies look at:

EMF related to health hazard: limit exposure to less than 3 milligrams at edge of easement.

Health concerns to animals + horses that graze nearby.

Eagles, hawks, ducks, owls, deer, other animals that frequent properties

I have these other comments:

Property values are falling since your announcement of your intention whether you make #31 your choice 3 years of decreased values will limit my option to sell my property. You should compensate all property owners on all planned routes until decision is made! You should not be allowed to use eminent domain to take over easement that is 50 yrs old. The PP+L easement was established when the environmental, health hazard, appearance, land value, + ect. That it is today.

The I 5 route and the eastern route have the least effect on humans and should be your first choice over #31.

Remember: mans three most important priorities (will Die For) Family, Country + Property.

Communication ID: 12015

Date: 11/6/2009

Name: JAMES F. KALASKY

Dear Sirs:

I am a homeowner in the Stoney Meadows subdivision which is effected by the proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. I attended the October 28th public meeting at Clark College and learned that our property is located on page 104 of the BPA maps.

I understand that one of the potential routes for the proposed transmission line is to run parallel (100-125' northeast) to the existing lines on map 104. Further, one of the sub-options is to run the south line right through the wetlands to the east of my property, and possibly through part of the Stoney Meadows Homeowners Association (SMHOA) common area. 39 homeowners collectively own and maintain nearly 60 acres of these environmentally sensitive wetlands. I also learned the existing towers are some 90' in height and the average height of new towers will be 110-150'. Therefore, the new towers will be substantially taller and even more unsightly especially if equipped with flashing red lights, as well as a detriment to the many species of wildlife that live there.

I vehemently oppose having the reinforcement lines running through or anywhere near our property or the SMHOA property for the following reasons:

1. 1,820 acres in this wetlands has been designated by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) as Natural Area Preserve to protect the following:

- a. The slender billed nuthatch - a rare bird
- b. 6 rare plant species including the endangered Bradshaw's lomatium
- c. Stands of threatened Oregon white oak forest
- d. Other native wildlife like beavers, hawks, ducks, geese, occasional bald eagles, etc.

2. The SMHOA common area includes 60 acres of wetlands with trails for the exclusive use by our homeowners and we have grave concerns about the impact of power lines on our health.

3. The Green Mountain airport is nearby and the new taller towers are an increased risk for the air traffic given the flight path.

4. Our property value will be severely and negatively impacted by the unsightly power lines.

We request that you pursue one of your other options like running the lines closer to the I-5 corridor or much further north and to the east of Green Mountain.

I understand that public comments need to be submitted by November 23rd . Please consider this letter as our formal input. Thank you in advance for your positive consideration of our concerns.

Sincerely,

James F. & Barbara Kalasky

[Address]

[Phone]

Communication ID: 12016

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: DUANE NORDSTROM

I have these other comment:

Please avoid using private residential property where possible.

This should not be difficult in our area, an area predominately containing public lands and large forest areas.

Communication ID: 12017

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: BETTY KELLOGG,RICHARD KELLOGG

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Raising section 11 line higher into unpopulated area and taking section 21 three are less dense populated areas dispose of route 20 completely.

I have these other comments:

I have a hard time understanding why you would choose to go through a densely populated area instead of choosing the least populated you would choose to go through our area you are uprooting lots of retired people who are physically unable to pack up & move and you would be going through campus headway the only facility of its kind on Merwen Lake 75% of the homes on Elk Lane are retired people who came to the area for calm country living that could not replace their homes at today's market

values. The environmental impact on the Hatcher & speelyai bay should also be considered this is the only boat launch available all year. I am very upset about you NOT taking the familys into consideration with your plans. You do NOT have permission to dig-cut down trees or do any such thing on our property.

I also have to add that I think the way your first meetings on this subject were handled were very unorganized and incompetent. There were no enlarged maps available for us, you could not get close to anyone to get questions really answered. I did notice from TV coverage that (Battle Ground-Brush Prairie had a meeting forum and had maps for their area. Also they weren't included on my meeting list. Why is that?? This not bode well as to how things will go for your actions and fairness.

Communication ID: 12018

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: TERRY RASOR

Please have you environmental studies look at:

Other routes and let us alone

I have these other comments:

Clark county is robbing us with these property taxes – Federal government is taking our money with fed taxes messing with our medical – BPA is trying to devalue our property – it is not a free country anymore

Communication ID: 12019

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: RUTH E ROOT

I have these other comments:

My property lies in line with one of the proposed routes. My property already lies in an area where B.P. has an easement. This easement already reduces the market value of my property (not assessed value).

I would prefer a buy out of my property at fair market value, to additional easements, towers etc. Either of these would further erode the value of my property!

Communication ID: 12020

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: CHARLES W BENNETT, BARBARA BENNETT

Our PROPERTY PARCELL is [Number] Clark County WA. We chose this location for the purpose of staying and to enjoy this location for a long time into the future, and the neighbors in our subdivision feel the same.

We have attended the Public Meeting for our area and have submitted comments and ideas with various individuals there. Now I am writing you to let your department know that we are very concerned as to what impact this 500-Kilovolt Transmission Line Project will have on our developed property as well as our neighbors properties in our subdivision.

At the public Meeting we obtained a copy of the Google Map, Page 140, which shows our properties Westerly in Section 40 therein. If you would refer to that page, you would see that there is an abundance of undeveloped land to the East which would be sufficient to run the Transmission Line Project. It makes no practical sense to take developed properties such as ours, when there is open undeveloped land to choose located to the East.

We oppose running this project through properties that have already been developed and that have had expensive improvements through the years.

Has anyone considered existing Line Sites to run this project? If these existing sites need improvements, then make improvements and leave as much of the already developed lands and properties undisturbed. Please consider protecting the developed properties when planning your route for this 500-Kilovolt Project.

Your response would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Charles W. Bennett

Barbara A. Bennett

Communication ID: 12021

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: KATHLEEN HAYENGA, JOHN HAYENGA

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Our house is approximately 45 feet away from existing BPA right of way. Bases on where the existing tower is a new tower would be probably put right outside our living room window. Existing tower placement is due to road being in front of our house add new tower would probably be placed similarly to keep wires high for road.

EMF would also be drastically increased with a new tower being placed so close to our house. The old existing tower placement is on the other side of the right of way from our house.

I have these other comments:

Our records show that our septic leach lines run into right of way. Moving them due to new tower placement would be quite costly and burdensome as I am unemployed.

A new tower being placed so close to our house would result in a much decreased property value for us. This would be in addition to the loss of value we have suffered due to the Wall Street and bank breed – the recent financial debacle! Please help in any way you can by not placing new line in this right of way.

Thank you.

Communication ID: 12022

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: CHRISTINE A PIENKOWSKI

I have contacted the BPA and my state representatives.

I am not aware of the scope of the powers of the Clark County Commissioners, but I do want to be a voice of objection to the proposal of high power lines being built in the unincorporated area of Clark County.

What an incredibly short sighted decision that would be as it would impact wildlife, the heath of residents and property values.

Sincerely, Christine Pienkowski

Communication ID: 12023

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: DAN TUCKER,KATHY TUCKER

This morning I watched two bald eagles arguing over territory above my trout pond. Their white heads glisened in the sun as they squawked and circled each other. We have lived on this property for 20 years. Please do not put these transmission lines over our homes. BPA can go into the national forest east of us and avoid causing the people who love living in this area the health problems and loss of property value that comes with these lines.

Communication ID: 12024

Date: 10/27/2009

Name: SCOPING MEETING AMBOY

4N3E, Section 29 - opposed to line

Communication ID: 12025

Date: 11/18/2009

Name: GERALD NAUMAN,SHERRON J NAUMAN

November 13, 2009

RE: The Proposed 1-5 Corridor Reinforcement Proiect through Hockinson. WA

Clark County Commissioners

Mark Boldt, Chair, Steve Stuart, Tom Mielke:

As our family is a part of the impacted area of the current Right of Way for the above noted project, we felt it important that we contact you regarding the proposed route and alternative sites available.

We would like to see the corridor moved to the east of the proposed route, away from

populated areas. Our concern is the impact on the environment, families and domestic animals.

I'm sure you are aware that residential exposure to the magnetic fields around the proposed conductors increases with intensity of the electrical load and is not blocked by most materials? The risk to children under age 5 to exposure is increased 5 times for Cancer and 2 times for Childhood Leukemia with a EMF of 4mGauss.Adults don't miss out, studies show Lou Gehrig's, miscarriage and Alzheimer increased in Sweden (2004 study) and in California at 14mG peak loads brought double the miscarriages and Alzheimer. (1991, 2002 &2007 Studies)

While we can see the need for the additional energy for the future, we are concerned that the data used is up to date and includes independent research, not just studies funded by the owners of BPA. Also, are

there no alternate was to accomplish this goal? Could the lines be buried in populated areas? Could the existing lines be modernized to share more of the need?

Your careful attention is greatly appreciated.

Cordially,

Gerald D. Nauman

Sherron J Nauman

Communication ID: 12026

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: HAROLD WALTON, BARBARA WALTON

Please have your environmental studies look at:

A portion of this property is a designated wet land. The forest section is home to elk who cross the property to access drinking water from the creek.

I have these other comments:

This property is in the process of being sub divided. One owner plans on building a large warehouse and two story home in 2010.

The second owner plans to build a residence in 2010.

Communication ID: 12027

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: REBECCA L MURPHY

December 1 2009 To: BPA Re: NO BPA SEGMENT 26 & 27 Proposed BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project I strongly urge you to take action and notify the Bonneville Power Administration that segment #26 & 27 should NOT be considered as an option for the route of their new high voltage/500,000 volt power lines/towers. Also, the BPA gave homeowners 40 days to respond with comments by November 23, 2009. Forty days is not a reasonable period given that the BPA will take 2 years to make a decision that will affect many homeowners and families. Thankfully, they have extended their comment period to December 14, but this is still a very limited time to inform all affected parties and hear comments from them. So I suggest that you extend the deadline to March 30, 2010 & push for an open mike town

hall style meeting with BPA officials someplace like the Clark County Fairgrounds, where our voices and concerns can be heard and where we can hear some answers directly from the BPA. The proposed segment #26 & 27 routes high voltage towers directly through populated areas of Clark County and destroying historic and scenic areas that should be preserved. Homeowners and families in Battle Ground, Yacolt, Amboy and other areas are directly affected. The BPA notified over 8,000 property owners in the right-of-way of their proposed route, however they did NOT notify homeowners abutting the right-of-way, which would add at least another 16,000 homes. Abutted homeowners and families may be only a few feet away from the right-of-way but will be affected by electro-magnetic fields particularly if the families have health related issues. There are many arguments against having a high voltage power line run through an existing community:

- Families: - Loss of homes and out-buildings (barns, sheds, arenas, etc) in right-of-way - Financial loss from plummeting home resale market values in the area due to: - location near the power line - loss of scenic views - Health risks of living in the shadow of the electromagnetic fields - Loss of satellite TV/computer service, radio and cell phone reception - Reduction in children's education quality due to less property tax collections - Loss of small communities and reduction in quality of life
- Local Schools: - Loss of property tax revenue due to: - Loss of tax base from destruction of houses/buildings - Devaluation of market values of remaining houses in the area - Loss of use of land already purchased for future schools
- Destruction of sensitive plants and wildlife habitat in the area
- Negative visual impact to the area whether in local communities or surrounding hills

There must be better options than running a line through existing communities. There is already an existing I-5 corridor. There is also a route through largely unpopulated DNR/public lands to the east that could be used instead. Populated areas should be off the table as an option. The destruction to homes and families and lives is too great. I strongly urge you that segment 26 & 27 should NOT be considered. Citizens shouldn't have to wait two years for them to study this issue. Lines 26 & 27 should be removed from consideration and they should inform us now. It is also a travesty that stimulus money - from us tax payers - is being used to essentially evict us from our homes and destroy our lives. Thank you for taking the time to consider this letter. I hope to hear that action on your part has resulted in changing the route to a more appropriate location. Sincerely, RLM

Communication ID: 12028

Date: 12/2/2009

Name: JO ANN WOHLERS

We do not want the more power lines coming through our property. Our property is at [Address] Wa. Route the line through an area that is not populated with children and citizens please.

Communication ID: 12029

Date: 12/2/2009

Name: CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

Hi my name is Cheryl Brantley my [Address]. I am requesting a map for page 73, I would like to get 2 my neighbors on Linberge road, some of them received a the first package that was sent with the information and maps about laying lines in our area and some of them did not, most of them did not up that road, so I am trying to get in contact with them to get them this information and be able to make comments to you. Which leads me to the comment section; some people do not know about your project other than getting the second letter that asks for permission to come on their land. The first packet did not come with your information, and that's not right and the comment period right now is to short for these neighbors I would like you to get back to me, my number is [Phone] and my area code is 360 thank you again this is Cheryl Brantley, Bye.

Communication ID: 12030

Date: 12/2/2009

Name: CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY

Making rounds to my neighbors on Lindberg Lane in Yacolt yesterday, I discovered only one household received the initial packet that the BPA sent out with the maps and pamphlets explaining the I-5 Corridor project. The only thing they received was the second letter asking for permission to enter their land. There are several homes on that road and that information needs to get to them. I am asking for an extension of the comment period as these families do not have time to respond due to their lack of information.

Communication ID: 12031

Date: 12/2/2009

Name: DECEMBER SERING, MARTIN SERING

To: Bonneville Power Administration

Re: I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

My husband & I live along the area where you are proposing to install the 500,000 volt transmission lines. Specifically between [Address]. Battle Ground. We are very concerned that it will greatly reduce our property value. We have lived here for several years. We originally built a shop with living quarters for all 5 of our family members. We lived in this tiny area for 3 years until we could afford to build our dream home. We were finally able to do that, but now are worried that our dream home will be ruined by these power lines. My favorite thing to do is to sit on my porch swing & listen to the birds sing. I do not want to hear the hum of these lines nor do I want to see them. In this economy we cannot afford to try to sell our dream home, especially now when potential buyers would be scared away because of the BPA plan! We are worried about fire hazard on our ridge filled with trees. If a line were to come down, the fire would rapidly spread through this area. Also, we are concerned with health issues. The California Dept. of Health concluded that persons living in close proximity to electro magnetic fields were at

increased risk for childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's disease and miscarriage. Also, a 2001 study led by R.M. Lowenthal of the Univ. of Tasmania School of Medicine In Australia further concluded that living within 326 yards of high Voltage power lines puts adults at over 2x increased risk and children at 5x greater risk of developing cancer than those who do not live near high voltage power lines. Have you thought about the impact this will have on the Wildlife & the wetlands in this area? We have to be good land stewards, how about you? Would you guys want 10 live under these lines? Finally, I have heard that BPA cleared a 300 foot easement along segment 9 for their existing 230 KV line, yet only want to clear a 150 foot easement for a 500 KV line through our neighborhood. There is something wrong with that picture!

Sincerely,

December & Martin Sering

Communication ID: 12032

Date: 12/2/2009

Name: MARITES CASTRO

Ladies and Gentlemen: I am opposed to BPA Line 31. This route will go through our neighborhood which has about 70 home as well as many neighborhoods in Clark County. I appeal to BPA to use a non-residential route which is a solution that is more humane instead of exercising its rights of eminent domain. Sincerely, Marites Castro Sincerely, Marites Castro

Communication ID: 12033

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: JANE YAHRMARKT,RICHARD YAHRMARKT

Dear Sirs,

November 18, 2009

I am in receipt of your documents regarding the I-5 corridor project. The information provided is sufficient for my wife and me to make only one conclusion regarding your intentions on our property. We view the " permission to enter" documents as simply carte blanche to perform whatever destructive deeds you desire on our property. Therefore, we DENY the BPA access to our property for any purpose whatsoever. We have worked very hard to reclaim this land filling many large holes and planting over 200 trees. We will not allow the BPA to dig holes or cut trees on our land for any reason.

I have studied the proposed transmission line map provided and tried to correlate the proposed path of

the #10 transmission line to the geography of this area. It seems to me that not including the known roads in our area in the map is irresponsible. It is quite difficult to determine just where you intend to be working. We are trying to correlate the twists and turns of the Kalama River from a good map to your poor map. I regard BPA to be a competent organization and am puzzled about the deliberate omission of this important and freely available information.

I regret that we were unable to attend your public meetings. We were out of the country during these dates. Are there any proposed meetings in the future?

Please provide a map that includes the roadways of this area so that I can better assess your intentions. I am looking forward to receipt of this document.

Sincerely,

Richard and Jane Yahrmarkt

Communication ID: 12034

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: DAVID BILLINGER

Re: I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

Bonneville Power Administration:

The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) staff has reviewed some of the preliminary scoping materials for the above mentioned project. WSDOT would like to address our concerns and offer the following comments.

While the specific right of way for the proposed transmission line has not been determined, it is clear that it may cross several highways under the jurisdiction of WSDOT. These highways are Interstate 5, Interstate 205, SR 500, SR 502, SR 503 and SR 411.

All utility crossings of State highways must be permitted by WSDOT. The applicant will need to contact WSDOT directly to obtain any easements, Utility Permits or Franchise Agreements for all utility crossings.

It is imperative that the areas within WSDOT's right of way are included in the environmental documentation for this project. WSDOT will require the following documentation and permits to be submitted for review prior to granting any permits for work within the right of way:

- Section 404 - US Army Corps of Engineers Permit and NEPA documentation completed for it by the US Army Corps of Engineers

-
- Endangered Species Act documentation and concurrence
 - Section 106 concurrence from the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
 - Section 401 - Washington Department of Ecology Certification
 - Hydraulic Project Approval (HPA) - Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

This conceptual review does not constitute final WSDOT approval. Additional information, more detailed analysis, changes in the development proposal, or changes in the existing or planned operational characteristics of the State Highway System may necessitate modification in our preliminary assessment of this development. WSDOT's comments prior to final approval are meant to alert the applicant to areas of WSDOT's concern.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Jeff Barsness, Southwest Region Development Services Engineer, at 360-905-2059.

Sincerely,

Dave Bellinger

Communication ID: 12035

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: JANE BARIL

Please have your environmental studies look at:

A large portion (southern) of my property borders speelyai creek. (see attached) There are lots of wetlands, ponds and wildlife habitat used by elk, deer, fish, duck, native frogs, grouse, otter, beaver, owls, all kinds of birds and many more kinds of wildlife.

I have these other comments:

I have broken my wrist and can't write or I would say more. I am retired, live on a low fixed income and moved here because it was what I could afford. I can't afford to move. This would be a real hardship.

Communication ID: 12036

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: KAREN PALMER

The Bonneville Power Administration

I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

PO Box 9250

Portland, OR 97207

As a resident of Hockinson along segment #31, I am writing you regarding your proposal to build a 500 KV power line from Castle Rock, WA to Troutdale, OR. As a user of electric power every day, I understand the need for reliable distribution of power throughout the Pacific Northwest. I am not opposed to strengthening the power infrastructure in general. However, I believe that whenever possible, it should be done with the least impact on individual homeowners and communities.

The route of segment 31 is highly populated with a contiguous string of close-knit communities interspersed by small Community Sponsored Agriculture (CSA) farms, small orchards, and carefully managed small stands of mature trees to enhance the environment for all residents and a variety of wildlife.

My neighborhood outside of Hockinson would be devastated by a string of 150 foot towers and the felling of at least a 150 foot corridor of trees. Several homes would be condemned, we would lose good neighbors and friends, and we would lose the cohesiveness of our neighborhood. We look out for each other: taking care of a neighbor's children when necessary. helping a family with a medical emergency, watching each other's property when something looks amiss, etc.

My husband and I have worked hard all of our lives, lived frugally, and saved our money in order to live on a little acreage in a rural area and build a home with enough space for all of our children and grandchildren to visit at the same time. Our home is our major investment and we expect the value of our home to carry us through the rest of our lives. Your proposal to build a 500 KV power line in close proximity to our home will destroy this investment.

I am requesting that you factor the loss of property values into your cost analysis of the DEIS when comparing the different proposed routes.

Our rural area is also populated by a variety of wildlife. In addition to deer and coyotes, we have bobcats, black bear, and mountain lions. [watch a nesting pair of red-tailed hawks as they raise their offspring each summer. They rely on the old growth large trees for their nesting site that you will cut down. We see bald eagles exactly in the corridor you will clear. Other large birds such as turkey vultures that would certainly be harmed if they landed on the power lines live in the area. Living close to wildlife was one of the reasons we chose an area like this in which to live. Replacing wildlife with a high voltage power line is not a good trade off. I request that you address the loss of habitat for wildlife in your impact analysis of the DEIS.

I am particularly concerned about the corona noise that is emitted by a high voltage power line. I am especially sensitive to constant noise and thus chose an area with quiet and solitude. I have consulted with a licensed transmission power engineer and he has indicated that I would most certainly hear the noise any time I step outside. As an orchardist and avid gardener I spend a great deal of my time outdoors. As part of the many hundreds of hours I put into community service each year, some of that time is spent growing extra produce in my own yard for local food banks and soup kitchens. With the constant buzzing from a high voltage power line nearby, it may be necessary to curtail my time outdoors, thus ruining my quality of life.

I request that you analyze how many residents will be affected by the noise from this 500 KV power line and include the cost in the DEIS of compensating those homeowners for the value of their property. Some homeowners may choose to stay and some, like me, may find it to be an unlivable situation.

Finally, I am concerned about the health effects of a 500 KV transmission line in a residential area. One can find studies that disprove any negative effects. And one can find studies that show a strong correlation between power lines and, most importantly, childhood leukemia. We have many families in our neighborhood with small children. Some of these families will be within 75 feet of your power line. Can you guarantee with 100% certainty there are no adverse affects to children living at least 18 hours a day within 75 feet of a 500 KV power line? Can you sleep at night with this uncertainty? Would you willingly put your family that close? Some of these families will choose to move away because there is no certainty on this issue, taking a loss on their property at a point in their lives when they can least afford it. This will further deteriorate our neighborhood and depress all of our property values. A neighborhood without children is not very friendly or attractive. I request that you fully study the short-term and long-term health effects on children and adults living in close proximity to a 500 KV power line and include this information in the DEIS. I believe there are reasonable alternative options to gain the needed power transmission capabilities. One obvious option is to choose a route just east of segment 31. This route goes through federal timberlands and DNR properties. Much of this route has already been clear cut so there would be no further loss of wildlife habitat or timber revenue. It would not affect homeowners or children. Since this power transmission is not just for the residents of segment 31 but rather for the good of the entire region, it makes sense to use public lands where possible.

Another option is to use underground superconductor lines. This is a relatively new technology but it has been implemented in several states and will most likely become the wave of the future in power transmissions as more and more municipalities and entire states pass laws that forbid the use of overhead power lines in populated areas. An underground implementation would be much less intrusive and thus would meet much less resistance. This would give you the option of choosing the best and most cost effective route. Superconductor lines are capable of much more capacity and thus would negate the need to add yet more overhead lines in the near future. Although the cost would be higher initially, it could pay for itself over the long haul and the cost spread out over all ratepayers in the entire area would most likely be minimal. Why not embrace this new technology and get ahead of the curve leading to the future?

I request that you include an analysis and cost estimate of underground superconductor transmission

lines in the DEIS.

Please consider the thousands of homeowners and hundreds of communities you will impact by running a 500 KV power line down segment 31. The Hockinson School District alone will lose a large investment on property that was purchased for a new school. This property would be bisected by your power line and become unusable. Since it will also be unsalable, all citizens of the Hockinson School District, who paid for this purchase through our property taxes, will lose. Since our property values will now be lower, the taxes will be lower, and the school district will have a hard time purchasing new property for a school. We suffer as individuals, we suffer as a community, we suffer as a society. Please think about it!

Sincerely,

Karen Palmer

CC:

Senator Patty Murray

Senator Maria Cantwell

Congressman Brian Baird

Communication ID: 12037

Date: 11/22/2009

Name: JOHN L EMMETT

The Bonneville Power Administration

I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

PO Box 9250

Portland, OR 97207

Subject: The I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, Segment 31

I choose to take this opportunity to make input to your draft EIS process for this project. I live adjacent to the corridor marked Segment 31. I understand the necessity of infrastructure upgrades and support such projects. However, being impacted by this one and thus having the opportunity to study it in detail, and having personally run very large technical projects for the Department of Energy, I find the whole process to be poorly conceived and poorly executed.

I have attended two BPA sponsored sessions, one at Clark College, and one in Hazel Dell where I spoke

to Richard D. Stearns. In addition I have hosted a meeting in my home for the whole neighborhood which was attended by BPA personnel Richard D. Stearns and Maryam Asgharian.

I would like to comment on two aspects of your project: 1) Your methodology for approaching the Draft EIS and, 2) Design aspects of the project. I formally request your careful study and reconsideration of the specific issues that I raise below concerning both aspects of the project.

Draft EIS Methodology

The notification for the project was profoundly inadequate, raising significant questions as to whether BPA is approaching the Draft EIS with candor and integrity. BPA chose only to directly notify those landowners whose property contained or was bordered by the 100 foot Pacific Power and Light easement, originally sized for 115KV lines. Since BPA envisions widening this easement, installing 150 foot tall towers with lines operating at 500KV, in relatively high density neighborhoods, I have to question your decision making process that so limited notification. Segment 31 is characterized by contiguous string, relatively high density neighborhoods, not unlike high end urban communities, separated by small farms and orchards. Each of these neighborhoods is profoundly impacted by the sheer magnitude of power transmission and voltage levels involved. Each of these neighborhoods deserved to be fully notified.

Many of these contiguous neighborhoods are characterized by spectacular views of the surrounding Pacific Northwest - mountains, forests, valleys – ours included. Many of us have saved for years to be able to buy property in this semirural area and build homes with the expectation that it would be our last home. The magnitude of the power corridor you plan will literally trash many of these views and property values, ours included. Many people will not be able to live with the fear of living as little as 75 feet from a 150 foot tall tower carrying half a megavolt, or be able to tolerate the corona induced acoustic noise from these lines which you also know to be excessive in our damp, Pacific Northwest climate. While I can't speak for all the neighborhoods, I know that in ours we will lose good friends and good neighbors which are not easily replaced, and we will experience a substantial reduction in our quality of life.

I have discussed our personal financial impacts of this project with real estate experts. What we are told is that we can expect anything from a 25 to 60% reduction in our real estate values depending on such factors as closeness of the power lines or the impact on particularly spectacular views (our situation). I am also told by BPA Staff that reduction of property values is not a cost factor that BPA considers in its EIS. I am sorry to say that I consider that policy simply irresponsible in the extreme. In any major project, the Total Project Cost must be determined whether or not it is considered a direct cost (paid by BPA), or an indirect cost (paid by others). While the courts will ultimately decide what fraction of these indirect costs that you will be required to pay, it is exceedingly irresponsible project management not to calculate and include them as part of the Total Project Cost for the purpose of comparing alternatives.

For the forgoing reasons, I formally request that, 1) The Draft EIS process for Segment 31 be restarted with formal notification to all affected by this project, and 2) That the Total Project Cost, which must include the reduction in real estate values, be used as the cost basis of comparison of corridor

alternatives.

Further, under the heading of methodology I must comment on the information being made available to stakeholders in this project and, on the candor of your staff. For example, I asked Richard D. Stearns several times in meetings on two different days how much power the line was being designed to carry. He adamantly declined to make that information available. Why? I finally was able to pose that question to Mark Korsness, Project Manager. I asked three times and was

blown off each time. On the fourth time (I am persistent) he said "1400 megawatts". I further asked what the 1400 megawatts represented, was it the maximum anticipated in the long term, an annual average, or initial average in the near term, but received no additional information. Again, why?

And finally, under the heading of methodology I must raise another issue of notification. We have been told by BPA personnel that BPA has been negotiating over a year with the Department of Natural Resources on a corridor for this line five miles to the East of segment 31 through a largely uninhabited area. Clearly the project has been under consideration for an extended period of time and yet we are told only recently with only 30 days to make comment. Again, why? And thus why do you expect our trust and support?

Project Design Aspects

I question the wisdom of running a 500KV line down through a contiguous string of relatively high density neighborhoods. Perhaps BPA is only considering an average housing density down segment 31 rather than the actual density distribution. If so, I think that the actual density distribution must be taken into account as I don't think BPA would normally choose to run a 500KV line down through existing communities, if there was any other realistic alternative.

In order to assess the impact on our neighborhoods, we asked BPA personnel Richard D. Stearns and Maryam Asgharian, where BPA had previously run 500KV transmission lines through existing residential areas. We were assured that it had been done several times particularly in and around Seattle and also near Salem, Oregon. We wanted to go and look at such a transmission project to assess for ourselves the reality of the impact, rather than be driven by half truths or rumor. In spite of many requests, both verbal and in writing, we have not yet been given a single location where 500KV line had been run through an existing residential neighborhood. Why? Clearly there are only two possible reasons: 1) The impact is so negative that BPA did not want us to see it, or 2) BPA has never attempted to run such a high voltage line through existing residential areas. Which is it? Either way, it would appear that even BPA considers this course of action to be less than desirable.

Thus I insist that the Draft EIS must contain a detailed study of the impact of new 500KV transmission lines installed through existing residential neighborhoods both in the Pacific Northwest and elsewhere in the U.S. or Canada. The analysis must include the number of residents that left the community as a result, interviews with those currently living near these lines, and a study of the impact on real estate values. It is common sense that one would not choose to run such a line down through existing relatively high density neighborhoods if there were an alternative. Clearly you have more than one such

alternative in segments 28 through 35.

Carefully examining those routes with Google Earth, it is clear that a path can be chosen that will have nearly zero impact on residences. Why then are these not the routes of choice? A cynic might suggest that you find it easier to push around a lot of individual home owners than to fight the political and legal clout of the Department of Natural Resources and the timber companies which control part of the land along these alternate routes.

Thus I insist that the Draft EIS analyze the financial impact to the ratepayers themselves (in cents per kilowatt hour) of paying the differential right of way fees that DNR and other land holders on routes 28-35 will demand.

From our discussions with BPA personnel, it appears that combinations of the various routes are not under consideration. For example, what about the possibility of running a lower voltage line down through Segment 31 combined with a current capacity upgrade of the 230 KV lines down through Segment 9?

Thus I request that BPA's Draft EIS provide an analysis of options which would allow a lower voltage line through Segment 31 combined with capacity upgrades on other segments. What I want to see is not just the gross cost differential, but the actual cost increase to ratepayers in cents per kilowatt hour.

Finally, I note that a 500 KV line down through a populated area is really an anachronism. As population density increases and the power requirements increase similarly, you cannot continue indefinitely to spread steel towers and very high voltage transmission lines all over the land. Already jurisdictions are legislating undergrounding such lines, and that will be the wave of the future. Instead of being dragged kicking and screaming into the future, why doesn't BPA lead the way? A single buried superconducting line down Segment 31 would carry probably two or three times the power of the 500KV overhead line, would be supported by the residents, would give BPA much needed experience in advanced power transmission technologies, and though expensive as compared with the overhead lines, would result in a nearly negligible cost increase to the ratepayers.

Thus I request that BPA analyze this alternative in detail with both cost and cost/benefit analyses that take into the fact that there will be essentially no reduction in real estate values with this option. BPA needs to embrace the future. If not now, when?

Sincerely,

John L. Emmett

cc:

Senator Patty Murray

Senator Maria Cantwell

Communication ID: 12038

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: STEVEN TENDLER, ANNE TENDLER

To Whom It May Concern:

We are writing concerning the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

We are strongly opposed to BPA's proposal to nm new transmission lines along route proposals #35, #49 and #39, as shown on map #108 that you provided us with during the November 3rd Camas open house. This route directly impacts nearly all properties within our Rushing River Estates neighborhood, situated off Stauffer Rd in Camas, not to mention many other families residing along that route. It seems nonsensical that BPA would consider impacting/uprooting so many families when there is DNR land directly to the east of us.

We purchased our property in 1998. What attracted us to it was the wildlife, the forest, the tranquility. We daily enjoy the parade of deer, rabbits, squirrels, raccoons, coyotes, bobcat, pileated woodpeckers, Stellar Jays, hummingbirds and finches, and the occasional bear and cougar. Our neighborhood also has a beautiful stream running through it; it empties into the Washougal River, which eventually feeds into the Columbia River.

Except for the residence and accompanying goat pen and storage sheds, we have left the majority of our property in a natural state so that the impact on the fauna's habitat is minimal. Our neighbors live as good stewards of their lands, as well. At the risk of using hyperbole, the project, if sited along this proposed route, would be an environmental tragedy.

On a more personal level, we are in our 60's. We have spent our lives living conservatively and working toward finding and moving into our dream home. Now we are facing the possibility of being uprooted from this beautiful place that we worked SO HARD for. Should we lose our home, the financial consequences would be devastating for us. Not only would our world be turned upside down because we lose the paradise we love; but because of the severe impact on our property value, we would be left with little to start our lives all over again. Again, I use the word "tragedy" to describe this event, ESPECIALLY for people in their "golden years".

We know we are not the only ones in this situation. You must seriously consider the impact on the lives of all of us. We are just not parcel numbers in your study. You are dealing with living; breathing human beings who only want to be left alone to live out the rest of our lives in peace and comfort and serenity, while continuing to steward the land.

Of course the BPA has to provide a reliable source of energy to the West Coast. We understand and accept that. What we don't understand is why you would even consider uprooting so many lives and destroying so much habitat when you have vast expanses of DNR land (much of which has already been clear cut.. .so the wildlife has already been impacted) to work on. You may label us as the "not-in-my-backyard set". But again, consider our point of view. Our "backyard" is DNR land. Put the lines in the State's backyard, not the backyard that is our property.

We appreciate your serious and respectful evaluation of our comments. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Steven and Anne Tendler

Communication ID: 12039

Date: 12/2/2009

Name: ORVILLE D ESTEB

My name is Orville Esteb and I own , along with my neighbor David Evans , a legal airport / landing strip and hangers approximately 1/4 mi. east of your proposed route 31 . If you were to put towers and suspend lines out over the valley to the south it would prevent us from safely operating our airpark . I know the FAA has strict guidelines for placement of obstructions within the safe operating boundaries of an airport and I fully intend to explore the restrictions should you decide to use route 31 .

Communication ID: 12040

Date: 12/2/2009

Name: ERIN E GROVER

I live on line 29 near the East Fork of the Lewis River with a 600 year old fir snag and creek bed that contains at least 4 endangered medicinal botanical plants used to treat Diabetes, Cancer, Heart disease and other illnesses. This property is listed Riparian Protected by Clark County. The BPA Environmental Rep. at the Clark College meeting told me this is a dead tree and would be knocked down and spoke to me with disregard. Many plants, animals, birds, and insects live in this tree. It has survived the Yacolt Burn, Mt. Saint Helen's Eruption, The Columbus Day Storm and was standing in the same place since before The Declaration of Independence was signed. I attended the 4 Clark County Meetings to learn and honestly share information with BPA in regard to this project. I hope you will listen and honor the value of the Dole Valley Area it's history, citizen's, plants and animals, scenic and recreational importance not only to Clark County but to the well being of the United States. The plants on my property grow very few places in this County anymore, they need specific conditions to grow such as the 50 year Alder canopy that surrounds our creek bed. It would be a shame to lose plants that could help

with the current Health Care crisis. This area is also populated with homes that contain as many as 18 children and older people who have spent their whole lives here and would not survive being uprooted. At the Camas Fire station Meeting I attended Mark Korsness said BPA would need to know who has Pacemaker's and what type. This statement suggests to me these lines do effect health in some ways. If this line must go in I hope you will make every effort to avoid homes and sensitive properties. Currently line 29 is drawn in an area containing many creeks, wetlands and underground springs. Just a short distance further East the land is flatter and does not cross such a large number of creeks that feed the East Fork of the Lewis or irreplaceable waterfalls as it does now, plus it would effect less or no homes. It has been suggested that this line could be used as a firebreak. My prayer is for the most positive and least invasive solution to this project. I hope listen. Sincerely, Erin Grover

Communication ID: 12041

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: ERNA SARASOHN,LESTER SARASOHN

Department of Energy

Bonneville Power Administration

P.O.Box 491

Vancouver, WA 98666-0491

Re: I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

To Whom It May Concern:

We are writing to you regarding our concern about the possible building of a new transmission line and necessary substations along the existing BPA transmission lines, bordering several communities, including ours (The Highlands).

It is my understanding that it is against and established policy in the power line industry, to construct two high tension power lines parallel to one another and in close proximity. The danger of fire or any other occurrence of a disaster could jeopardize both lines and take them out together.

It also makes very little sense to destroy all or part of the property bordering this line. Even if you take none of the homes, the exposure to a new power line and its towers, would not only be a health hazard, but the unsightly equipment would seriously effect the value of our homes (an estimated decrease of 20%) and make the sales of these homes difficult and reduce the much needed property tax revenue to the county.

In addition, I believe that excess power is already being sold to California, which makes me wonder what motivates the need for additional power.

If it is indeed necessary to construct an additional line, doesn't it make more sense to avoid destroying several of Vancouver's more attractive communities and run this line through a less populated or rural area?

In our case, we worked very hard to provide ourselves with a comfortable retirement. Part of that plan was to payoff our mortgage and enjoy our home for the rest of our lives. Now, in addition to the decrease in our income, due to the poor economy's effect on our investment income, you are proposing to devalue our major asset, our home.

We hope that you will build this line further east, in a less populated area.

Sincerely,

Lester and Erna Saraso

[address]

[address]

[address]

[address]

Communication ID: 12042

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: HARVEY KEENE, SHERRY KEENE

Re: I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

To whom it may concern:

We own the property at the above return address. We've read the recent literature that you've provided about the proposed power line expansion. We understand and support the need to improve the energy grid and are hopeful that this work will meet design and construction standards necessary for now and the future. We are very concerned, however, about the adverse impact that this expansion will have on our property.

We've lived on our property for about 17 years. During this time the land on which the current BPA easement crosses our land has been repetitively degraded by access of BPA maintenance equipment. Our trees have been cut and left in a condition in which we've been unable to use them. Piles of branches were left that were over 10 feet tall and 75 feet long with no ability on our part to burn, chip, or otherwise incorporate them into our land. Large boulders and many rocks were brought to the

surface destroying and limiting our ability to use our land as we would like.

Now you are proposing addition destruction of the value and use of our land. You can imagine our anxiety.

Your environmental studies should examine the damage to the land as we've indicated above. You should look at the erosion to topsoil caused by your failure to properly regrade and replant in any manner, let alone one of standards the government requires of private industry and developers. Your study should also suggest ways in which our land could be alternatively developed and used given the impact and restrictions caused by your power line.

Other comments we have include that the current transmission line and your poor maintenance negatively impact the resale value of our property. We pay high taxes and try to maintain our land in an environmentally healthy manner. Despite the general degradation of our land by the BPA, the county and state fail to recognize this and charge us as if the land were in a completely normal state. You should pay for the loss in value to our property. You should assist with annual taxes since you receive greater value for land usage than we ever could.

Another concern we have is unscheduled access by your BPA observation crews. We've seen BPA trucks drive across the easement with no prior contact to us. You can observe the bent black poly pipe on our easement caused when trucks hooked the lines as they drove across our property. I had the lines laid out on our fields in order to begin irrigation of this property.

In addition to the access your crews take at any time desired, you've opened up the easement line without providing controllable barriers such as fencing and gates. So, in addition to your crews driving across our land, we deal with 4-wheeler and other off-road vehicle operators who believe the right of way is open to anyone. How are you going to address this now, let alone in the future?

We are often frustrated by the restrictions you make on our property usage. We own 6 acres in which your existing line restricts free usage of our land such as most property owners have. We're restricted from building in your right of way. We have height restrictions for trees. You provide no equipment for us to use in maintenance and took away our access to free herbicides to assist with vegetation control. At my expense and my time I've fought invasive Scotch Broom which would not grow under normal forest conditions if we allowed natural forestation. We can't burn under you lines to help control excess brush.

As you may determine, we are concerned about additional land being taken from our control. A new line will leave us with our land cut in two. The northern portion of our land, the most level and potentially valuable land we own will have very restricted use by us. Because we pay the taxes and struggle to deal with your right of eminent domain and destruction, what is it you will do to make up for this inequity?

Sincerely,

Harvey S. and Sherry L. Keene

Communication ID: 12044

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: LORI BRUCHER

Please have your environmental Studies look at:

More important than the effect upon the environment, is the effect upon the people living in that environment! Your towers + lines would cause cancer in children and adults, put families w/in the easement into financial ruin and destroy a community bought out for its pristine beauty.

I have these other comments:

I live along the so called "Route 31" and do not want to see these power lines build in the hockinson community. We are a rural community chosen as home by countless families because of the country views, solitude, and safer environment for our children (who spend hours playing outside). Your monstrous powerlines would in fact, be a health hazard to my family – to hundreds of families – and THAT should be your main concern! Bury those lines, or use government/federal or state lands.

Communication ID: 12045

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: REBECCA M. LAWSON

November 12, 2009

Dear Project Managers of the Proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project,

I am writing to voice my concerns for my family, community, and county in regards to the BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. I live in the Hockinson area of Clark County Washington. I was informed a few weeks ago that BPA has proposed a high voltage, 150-foot tower power line path that goes directly through, or adjacent to my property (Segment #31).

I am concerned for the safety of my family and other community members. The California Department of Health and Services (2002) concluded that living in close proximity to Electric and Magnetic Fields can cause an increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease and miscarriage. I have two young daughters. I have worked very hard and put all my resources into my home. Having

these lines in my yard, or even right next to my yard, would put my family at risk.

Therefore I would feel the need to move. But who would want my house? No one else wants these risks. The home I have worked so hard for would be worth a fraction of what it should be! This segment also traverses property owned by the Hockinson school district and new school site. How safe is it to have our children in school near these lines?

The Hockinson area has some of the highest tax rates in Clark County. The proposed Segment #31 would force many people from their homes, many others would move due to the fear of health hazards, and the ones that stay would have their home values destroyed. This would undermine an important tax base in this area. The education of the children in the area would suffer due to a reduction in property tax collection.

Additionally, Segment #31 runs through areas with geologic seismic and erosion hazards as identified in Clark Counties GIS records. Adding such large infrastructure to this area is not a good idea.

The negative impact to our community, the destruction to our homes and families is too great. I strongly urge that Segment #31 should not be considered. I realize that electricity is important and that these towers have to go somewhere, but there must be a better option than running through existing communities. There is already an existing I-5 corridor, could it be upgraded? If they are needing diversity, there is an option that goes through public lands to the east using Segments 28-30 and 32-34.

These other options would traverse Washington DNR land, with less social impact, avoiding established communities. I have heard that Segment #31 represents the most direct route option for BPA with considerable construction cost savings to them, but at what cost to the whole community?

Thank you for taking the time to consider this letter.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Lawson

[address]

[address]

[Phone]

Communication ID: 12046

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: NAOMI HUEY, MAURICE HUEY

RE: PROPOSED BPA I-CORRIDOR REINFORCEMENT PROJECT

I strongly urge you to take action and notify the Bonneville Power Administration that segment #31 should NOT be considered as an option for the route of their new high voltage power lines. An eastern segment would not disrupt 24,000 homes and schools. The proposed segment #31 routes high voltage towers directly through populated areas of Clark County. Homeowners and families in Battle Ground, Hockinson, Camas and other areas are directly affected. The BPA notified over 8,000 property owners in the right-of way of their proposed route, however they did not notify homeowners abutting the right of-way which would add at least another 16,000 homes. Abutted homeowners and families may be only a few feet away from the right-of-way but will be affected by electromagnetic fields particularly if the families have health related issues. There are many arguments against having a high voltage power line run through an existing community: --Families: Loss of homes and out-buildings Financial loss from plummeting home resale market values due to location near the power line and loss of scenic views Health risks Loss of satellite TVI computer service, radio and cell phone reception Loss of small communities and reduction in quality of life

--Local Schools: Loss of property tax revenue due to: -Loss of tax base from destruction of houses/buildings -Devaluation of market values of remaining houses in area -Loss of use of land already purchased for future schools --Destruction of sensitive plants and wildlife habitat in area

--Negative visual impact to the area in local communities and surrounding hills --There is already an existing IS corridor. Thank you for taking the time to consider this letter. I hope to hear that action on your part has resulted in changing the route to a more appropriate location.

Sincerely,

Maurice L. Huey

Naomi Hohensee Huey

Communication ID: 12047

Date: 11/12/2009

Name: JANET WYMAN

Nancy had contacted me to say that Janet needed a call back, Realty related: I called and talked with Janet, who is a real estate agent and lives in the Hockinson area, was at the recent Monday night meeting; has to "speak" at a meeting tonight about these things. Her neighbors are asking her these questions:

Janet kept referencing that our towers are going to be 150' x 150'; I suggested that the towers would not be 150' at the base but she was certain that was what she was told. She referenced the 500'

easement area and I corrected her in that the 500' is a study/notification area, the easement itself would be 150 feet wide. She wanted to know if the wires are put in, how far out they have to be, in the 150x150 area before we are required to relocate houses, too. I told her there is no county set back from the edge of the right-of-way easements and that you could see that in lots of places in the county where homes are built right up to the right of way edge (she knew that, as she had shown some of those). She also wanted to know how far out from the wires is the safe distance from a 500-kV line, like the emf and humming, etc of the line. I told her I would pass these along as we were simply collecting comments and concerns at this part of the process and did not think anyone would be getting back with her. She explained the density of the homes in this area of nice homes, very concentrated. I believe she is on the 100' existing PP&L easement from the discussion)

Communication ID: 12048

Date: 12/3/2009

Name: PATRICK K JENKINS

Please consider running your line 31 farther east as to not impact families and property values in a negative way. Pat Jenkins

Communication ID: 12050

Date: 12/2/2009

Name: MICHAEL SPENCE, PAULA SPENCE

CLARK COUNTY POWER LINE TO TROUTDALE, OR Our property is NOT directly in any right of way of the proposed line. It is however between proposed lines. We OPPOSE route 31 which is a 19401s PPL (PacificPower) 100' easement to be purchased by the BPA if this route is chosen + 50 more feet. Alternate routes 30 33 34 and 35 have the least impact on residential properties (rural Federal, DNR lands and private). Route 31 DIRECTLY cut's through 8,000 residential properties (16,000 next to the line) 150' wide x 150' tall towers @500KV with a 25% EMF power loss radiating directly into resident tax payers, occupied school properties, communications VHF-UHF-Microwave signals, radar and radio. The California Dept of Health services conducted a 2002 study documenting increased cases of leukemia, cancer, miscarriage and Lou Gehrigs disease with 300KV lines.....proposed is 500 KV line! Line 31 route will devastate affected properties and cause county/state tax income to decrease and taxes bases to increase on all other properties. Route 31 also has major geological, seismic and erosion hazards as outlined in Clark county GIS studies. The problem has been presented, a solution offered. Lets move forward to build our economy not wasting \$\$ and time stopping government waste.

Respectfully

Communication ID: 12051

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: LINDA J CHAN,SIDNEY CHAN

Dear Mr. Baird:

I am asking you to help us stop the destruction of our Hockinson community in rural Clark County.

BPA's proposed segment 31 of the 15 Corridor Reinforcement Project would ruin the quality of life for thousands of homeowners and dramatically shrink the property tax base for Clark County. This segment must not be allowed to go forward. BPA has other alternatives, including adding to existing lines to the west, as well as segments further east that are entirely uninhabited. Although BPA explained that the alternatives are also problematic, the disadvantages of the alternatives pale in comparison to segment 31. We desperately need your support in influencing BPA officials to choose another segment. Many properties and views would be ruined, taking away one of the primary attractions of the area to homeowners. These are very quiet and private neighborhoods that value the rural life. Not only will there be massive clear-cutting, existing residential access roads would be compromised and many new maintenance roads built to accommodate the towers. At least one school site and several business sites would also be ruined. In addition to homes and schools, there are berry and tree farms, natural preserves, wetlands, and high cost forested areas spanning the length of segment 31.

Segment 31 would significantly reduce the value of thousands of homes in the Hockinson community. Not only will it reduce the property values in the area, the lower property values will prevent homeowners from selling and moving to another area. This project will dramatically shrink the tax revenue from areas with the highest property values in the county and will compromise Clark County's ability to fund schools and infrastructure for the rest of the county. Although the direct human costs of segment 31 are unconscionable, this "ripple effect" for the rest of the county must also be considered. One of the most frustrating aspects to the process employed by BPA is the lack of citizen involvement. A very small number of letters were sent to homeowners about a month ago. Only those whose homes that sit directly in the path of the towers were asked for property access to help with their environmental studies. BPA only provided times and locations for four community meetings in the area. The vast majority of the homeowners affected by this project were not even notified. We personally did not hear about segment 31 until less than two weeks ago as our property is not directly in the path of the towers. The community meetings all took place within 3 weeks of distribution of the letters. By the time most residents began to hear about this, the meetings were over, with BPA satisfied that they had "involved" the community. Worse, they provided less than two additional weeks for a "public comment period", ending November 23rd Residents are only now beginning to hear about the project, but we have only one week left for comments. We understand that our elected Federal and State officials are in

a unique position to influence the BPA. We desperately need points of influence to help stop this project which will destroy our treasured community. Thank you in advance for your concern and support in this very important matter.

Sincerely,

Sidney & Linda Chan

Communication ID: 12052

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: NEAL CORRY

Please have your environmental studies look at:

My 3 acres is heavily forested and the power lines would take out most of these trees leaving a small patch & several large tree around my house I'm very worried about stand stability if some trees were removed. There is an owl living in trees on my & my neighbors parcel also a raptor built a nest and hatch young birds this past year. There is a small seep or wetland with false will of the valley there is also red columbine which you don't see a lot of & trilliums, which are a sensitive species. I wondered when you're doing your surveys and are you doing more then one round to make sure you won't miss anything.

I have these other comments:

I am very concerned with my family's health we have young children. You can not tell me these lines don't cause health problems. I think it's absurd to even suggest going thise close to homes. It will impact our lives in a very large & negative way.

Why hasn't BPA try to primote local energy production (I-E solar) on neighborhood or individual house. I don't think this line is all about helping the local infrastructure as much about selling energy to other areas for profit. We love our home and would be sad to leave, but we won't stay with a line in our back yard.

And that's my other concern out property value these lines would destroy it.

Communication ID: 12053

Date: 12/3/2009

Name: JAMES GIPE

Hi my name is James Gipe [Address], and I guess I am on your line 31 here we have the sings that mark the center line and I am pretty concerned about it because our house is actually right next to your current right of way and if you expand it, it would probably take our house right through the middle it looks like, so anyway I would like to talk to somebody if you could give me a call. Our number here in Washington is [Phone] and I would like to talk to somebody and get more answerers please send any information that come up to this address. Thank you very much.

Communication ID: 12054

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: JAMES BARTON

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Canadian Geese use the powerline area at my location [Address]. Flocks fly in every day in the winter + spring

I have these other comments:

Please take the most easterly route with the powerlines, the route located in the most unpopulated area.

Going through the most populated area will have the most harmful effects to the greatest # of people in Clark Co.

? Neg property value effects

? Neg aesthetic effects

? Neg health effects

Please take this line on a route with the least impact to the population.

Communication ID: 12055

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: DAVID R MILLER, MARY LEE MILLER

Dear Sirs:

My home is less than half a mile from proposed route #31. Route #31 will displace hundreds of

homeowners and decimate property values of thousands in the Hockinson area. Route #31 may be the shortest and possibly least expensive route, but alternative routes to the east would affect far less homeowners since they are on DNR land. Hockinson school district purchased 35 acres for a future school site that would also be destroyed by route #31.

The short response period and direct notification only to those in the proposed corridor leads one to wonder if the BPA intends to steamroller homeowner objections and proceed with route #31 regardless. Why disrupt the lives of thousands of residents when the two alternative routes to the east on public land could be used?

Sincerely,

David and Mary Lee Miller

Communication ID: 12056

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: BARBARA J QUAYLE

I am asking you to help stop the destruction of many neighborhoods and communities in Clark County, Washington.

The Bonneville Power Administration may have begun the planning process for a new 500-kilovolt transmission line in committees as early as the beginning of the 1980's. However, during the latter part of the 1980's and all through the 1990's, the land in Southwest Washington and Clark County in particular was sub-divided from what were farms and large tracts of property into an explosion of developments and homes. I have attended one of the scheduled "community meetings" by the Bonneville Power Administration and when I asked a badge-wearing BPA representative at the Hazel Dell session if this proposed project process would put a legal stop on sale of property (assuming a buyer could be found) - I was told I should ask the advice of my personal attorney. It is not logical to disrupt the homes and lives of hundreds of people in established neighborhoods now in 2009 based on how the land was used and appeared in the 1980's. I believe a more logical plan for the BPA is to cross the forested, but much less populated, land to the east on the study area map and the Bonneville Power Administration should immediately remove Segment 31 from consideration as a possible routing of a 500-kilovolt power line from Castle Rock, WA to Troutdale, OR. Thank you in advance for your consideration and concern.

Sincerely,

Barbara J. Quayle

Communication ID: 12057

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: MRS. V WELLS

To whom it may concern:

I am writing regarding the 500KV electric transmission line proposed to be build within a few hundred feet of my property. The proposed line, route #31, running through Chelatie and Hockinson will condemn homes and drop property values belonging to many of my relatives and friends. So many people in this area are very "shook-up" over this proposal.

I urge you to consider building your gigantic lines using one of the two alternate routes, several miles east of this area. This would ruin a lot less "backyards", and makes a lot more sense... a better, more ethical way!

Thankyou for listening to all of us who oppose this route #31. We appreciate it.

Mrs. V. Wells

[Address]

Communication ID: 12058

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: BARBARA J QUAYLE

It has occurred to me to wonder what might happen to revenue totals from the property taxes in Washington should (?)how-many (?) properties along 70 miles of Southwest Washington from Castle Rock, WA to Troutdale, OR be devalued due to the Bonneville Power Administration crossing that land with a 500 kilovolt transmission line? Should all the members of the Washington State legislature be questioning this too?

Sincerely,

Barbara J. Quayle

Communication ID: 12059

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: HARVEY HAVEN,DEBRA HAVEN

Dear Administrator,

The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is proposing to build a new 500 KV transmission line between Troutdale, OR and Castle Rock, WA. Several proposed routes have been identified, but the final route selection has not yet been made.

In the meantime, hundreds of letters have been sent by BPA to landowners, including my family, along each of the proposed routes. The public meetings that BPA has sponsored in various locations have been well attended by concerned property owners, including me.

The first letter I received from BPA called the new transmission line proposal the "I-5 Reinforcement Project". From that I gather that BPA sees the need to transmit more electrical energy to the Castle Rock, WA vicinity. If this is the case, I believe there are ways to accomplish this without building a line from Troutdale, OR.

For example:

**Existing BPA high-voltage substations are located just a few miles south of Castle Rock, WA along the I-5 corridor. They are the Lexington Substation and the Longview Substation.

**A few miles south and west from Longview, WA is BPA's extra-high-voltage Allston Substation-a 500 kV station.

**Portland General Electric (PGE) has a high-voltage substation at the Trojan Plant, near Rainier, OR. These substations are all located just a few miles south and southwest of Castle Rock, WA.

Farther north along the I-5 corridor is BPA's Chehalis Substation, and a few miles from there lies BPA's Paul Substation. If BPA feels that the Troutdale, OR area also needs "reinforcing", their existing 500 kV Ostrander Substation is not that far away. Before BPA builds the new proposed transmission line, the following considerations should be given:

**Reinforce the existing lines and substations. They are physically closer to the Castle Rock and Troutdale locations.

**Methods of increasing the ability to transmit more energy over existing transmission lines and associated rights-of-way include, but are not limited to:

1. Reconductor existing lines with state-of-the-art high ampacity conductors.
2. Strengthen existing line towers and convert from single conductor phases to bundled conductor phases.

3. Retire existing lower voltage lines and replace them with 500 kV lines on the same right-of-way.

I urge you to ensure that the BPA fully explores all options before endorsing a new line between Troutdale, OR and Castle Rock, WA.

Sincerely,

Harvey and Debra Haven

Communication ID: 12060

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: DAVID P MAROSI

To: The Bonneville Power Administration

Re: The I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

We are residents living along the southern portion of Segment #31 of BPA's proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project in Hockinson. We are united in opposition to the devastating effects of a 500 KV power line in our neighborhood, are most concerned about the following issues:

Existing Corridors: The easement along Segment 31 was acquired in 1957 by Pacific Power and Light as a 100-foot easement through an undeveloped portion of Clark County. Clark County permitted numerous developments immediately adjacent to this narrow easement. Many large, beautiful homes were built near the corridor with the understanding that a small power line might someday be constructed within the existing 100-foot easement. BPA's proposal to condemn land outside this easement and erect massive 150-foot towers is a betrayal of the trust homeowners placed in PP&L and Clark County to stay within their existing easement.

Houses and Other Structures: Clearing a 150-foot corridor will require involuntary condemnation and removal of homes and outbuildings. This will displace hundreds of Clark County residents who built homes adjacent to the PP&L easement.

Health effects from Electro Magnetic Fields: The California Department of Health Services concluded in 2002 that persons living in close proximity to Electro-Magnetic Fields were at increased risk for childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's disease and miscarriage. A 2007 study led by R.M. Lowenthal of the University of Tasmania School of Medicine in Australia further concluded that living within 328 yards of high voltage power lines puts adults at over 2x increased risk and children at 5x greater risk of developing cancer than those who do not live near high voltage power lines. Bear in mind, neither of these studies considered transmission lines as powerful as the 500 KV lines proposed for Segment 31.

Visual Impacts: Residents living 75 feet from the centerline will have 150-foot towers looming over their homes. BPA representatives have told us at public meetings that the tower spacing will be a maximum of 1250' on flat ground. This equates to no less than 21 towers within the 5-mile span between Powell Road and Green Mountain. The proposed line of 150-foot towers will become the dominant visual feature in our neighborhood, dramatically altering the existing landscape.

Noise: Clearly audible noise is emitted from 500 KV power lines. This noise increases on wet days and decreases with distance from the lines, but it will be a disturbing background noise for residents living in our currently quiet, rural setting.

EMF Interference with Electronic Devices: Sensitive electronic equipment, including radios and televisions, will be effected by the electro-magnetic field of this 500 KV line.

Aesthetics: Our neighborhood is characterized by homes on spacious lots in a country setting. These homes represent the American Dream, Our environment will be irreparably degraded by a row of 150-foot towers bisecting the neighborhood and stretching from one horizon to the next.

Economic Takings: The proposed corridor devalues our homes and property. This corridor will cost millions to compensate. There is a home on 128th Circle currently listed for sale at \$2.9 million. The mere proposal of 150-foot towers through our neighborhood will impact us in the interim by decreasing the sale price of homes such as this one. For this reason, we will immediately request the Clark County Board of Commissioners and County Appraiser reduce our property tax valuations and assessments until such time as BPA announces a decision on Segment 31. We will have a reputable real estate appraiser determine how much value we have lost.

Costs: All of the above effects will significantly reduce property values along Seg #31. 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 that must be included when comparing Segment 31 with other alternative routes. Socio-economic and

Public Services: Decreasing our quality of life and our property values will decrease the socio-economic environment of our neighborhood. Your economic analysis should include the cost to society of degrading an idyllic, rural neighborhood, including the increased cost of public services.

Site-specific Concerns: The above concerns will affect everyone along Segment 31. Additional site-specific impacts on Fish and Wildlife Resources, Soil Erosion, Sensitive Habitat and Cultural Resources will be addressed by letters from individual neighbors.

Land Use: We know of no examples of a 500 KV power line constructed through a populated area similar to Segment 31. All 500 KV projects in our region were constructed on open land, not through existing neighborhoods. Despite repeated requests from us, BPA has been unwilling or unable to show us an example where they successfully accomplished what they propose to do to the landowners along Segment 31. We do not want to be BPA's guinea pig for this type of project. All impacts listed above

would be reduced or eliminated by locating the I-5 Reinforcement Project to an alternative route 5 miles east of Segment 31. Large portions of these eastern routes have already been roaded and clear-cut for timber management. The distance along Segment 31 between Yacolt Mountain and the Camas Meadows Golf Course is approximately 15 miles. The predominant vegetative cover along this 15-mile stretch of Segment 31 is a second-growth Douglas fir forest. Douglas firs can easily grow to 200 feet tall.

Protecting the proposed power line from windfall will require clearing the Douglas firs for a distance of 200 feet on either side of the power line. This will create a 744-acre clearcut, 15 miles long and 400 feet wide. Why should BPA be allowed to clear-cut 744 acres through a neighborhood that has conscientiously protected its wetlands and wildlife? BPA should be required to place their 744-acre clear-cut on commercial timber land 5 miles east of Segment 31 where clear-cutting is the predominant land use. Even Segment 9 along I-5 through Hazel Dell would be a preferable alternative in this regard. The corridor along Segment 9 has already been clear-cut in a swath 300 feet wide for BPA's existing 230 KV power line.

Safety: Please explain why BPA cleared a 300-foot easement along Segment 9 for their existing 230 KV line, yet proposes to clear only 150 feet for the 500 KV line through our neighborhood. Why were homes in Hazel Dell buffered from a 230 KV line by a 300-foot cleared area along Segment 9 while homes near Hockinson will be buffered from a 500 KV line by a meager 150-foot cleared area? Double the voltage, Half the protection? BPA has shown us many pictures of 500 KV and 230 KV lines. None of these pictures show homes 75 feet from the power lines. The cleared area in these pictures is much larger. We want BPA to prove to us that our children will be safe living 75 feet from a 500 KV line capable of transmitting 1400 mega-watts of power: a quantity of power that exceeds the production of Bonneville Dam.

Bearing the Cost of Benefiting Society. The environmental impacts of a project intended to benefit American taxpayers from Seattle to Portland should be borne by public lands if such lands are available. Public lands should be the first priority for locating this project. Open lands should be the second priority. Involuntary condemnation of neighborhoods should be the very lowest priority. The negative impacts of this project should not be shouldered by a few residents when other, less impactful routes are available. When evaluated in terms of direct environmental and financial impacts on rate-payers, (the people who will ultimately pay the cost of this project), Segment 31 appears to be the most impactful of all the north-south corridor alternatives under consideration.

Conclusion: For all of the reasons listed above, we urge the BPA to eliminate Segment 31 from further consideration in their analysis of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

Contact: If the BPA has any questions regarding this letter or would like our assistance in their analysis, please contact John Doe at [Phone]. We have many talented, experienced professionals in our neighborhood willing to assist the BPA in their analysis.

Signatories to the attached Nov 16, 2009 letter from Citizens Against Segment 31

Communication ID: 12061

Date: 12/3/2009

Name: JAMES D KOOPMANN

I am very strongly opposed to the line 31 option of the proposed 1-5 corridor reinforcement project. This line would be a very obtrusive and costly option. The path line 31 is proposed to cut thru would have a huge negative impact on hundreds of homeowners not just in direct line but in the miles to the east. It will greatly decrease home values, which will affect property taxes, and a massive affect on the local economy. most homeowners that live out there enjoy the natural landscape and do not want something like this running inbetween the beauty that nature has provided. I implore you to reject the line 31 option from the project. far too many lives will be affected. Thank you.

Communication ID: 12062

Date: 12/3/2009

Name: LAND LINDBERG

I own property situated in the proposed lines 26&27. I want to go on record as being against this line running primarily through residential property. I believe there are plenty of "open space" options without creating a visual and physical "scar" through existing homesites and potential homesite in the future. Sincerly Land Lindberg

Communication ID: 12063

Date: 12/3/2009

Name: RICHARD A DAVIS

Regarding segment 18 This segment parallels dnr property and wipes out families.They would be forced to move because on most properties there is not an alternte place that a new house could be built.If you build along Fern road, would you expect people to move their homes from a view location to a location without a view, and where the ground is steep,or near the creek?.Like section 29 there is dnr or timber co. property very close by.As per the meeting Dec. 2 in Yacolt aim for not pushing people from there properties.We heard this from project manager Mark at the meeting,thank you.We look forward to segment 18, 19, and 22 being taken off the proposed route list. segment 18 also adds length to the line, its east to west!!

Communication ID: 12064

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: MIKE GINTER,SALLY GINTER

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Impact on human lives, views, fire hazards ect.

I have these other comments:

A) Use existing lines, not route segment #31.

B) Protect Hockinson school, kids, property values, Health etc by re-routing thru DNR land that could be used for future wind generation & your line transmission.

Communication ID: 12065

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: IRENE GINTER,DON GINTER,MIKE GINTER,SALLY GINTER,LYNETTE QUITUGUA,DARIN QUITUGUA,BRADEN S STRICKLER,NINA R STRICKLER,MARK VANDE VOORDE,ROBIN VANDE VOORDE

My home is in the Hockinson area and is on proposed route segment #31 of the BPA (Bonneville Power Association) I-5 Conidor Reinforcement Project. The 500 KV line would take out the entire access road for this neighborhood at 212th Avenue and Kristen Circle. Our neighborhood is very peaceful and scenic with creeks, wildlife and wetlands. The visual impact of 150 foot high towers and 150 ROW (Right-of-Way) will decimate property values for the entire upper portion of Hockinson known as "Finn Hill". The Hockinson area has some of the highest tax rates in Clark County. This path will force many residents out of their homes and destroy the value of so many others, undermining an important segment of the tax base in this area.

NO BPA Segment #31,

I am very concerned about the health hazards of a massive transmission line being so close to my home. A report from the California Department of Health Services (2002) concluded that living in close proximity to Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) can cause increased risk of Childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease, and miscarriage.

Hockinson School District recently purchased 35 acres for a new school. Segment #31 would go through this property and may render this property unfit for a school. The current primary/intermediate school at the corner of 159th and 164th is within a mile from the proposed route segment. If Segment #31 is constructed, many families will be forced to relocate and others may pull children from the school because of health concerns.

Segment #31 is viewed by BPA as the desired route. Its short length would minimize their construction cost. Other options would traverse Washington DNR land, with less social impact, avoiding established

communities. Why aren't they upgrading their Existing Facilities within Existing Right-at-Way in Segment #9 and in their northern Oregon routes between Allston and Keeler or St. Johns? Any of these options provide the route & network diversity they are after.

Where are the Consumers of this the power? In California?

The Clark County GIS property website identifies Segment #31 ROW parcels as having geological, seismic and erosion hazard areas. Adding such large infrastructure to this area is not a good idea. Please don't allow BPA to use route segment #31.

The public comment period ends November 23, 2009. Only some residents received letters from BPA around October 24th, less that the 30 days required for public input. Less time to comment equals less publicity. Narrow notification requirements and compressed comment windows may be "the law". A law that is structured against our citizens, not in support of them.

The construction of route Segment #31 would destroy our community, our residential investment and our lives, It is unconscionable and irresponsible to even consider this segment. The community of Hockinson would never be the same. Support us, support our community.

Communication ID: 12066

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: IRENE GINTER,DON GINTER

Dear Sirs:

Please have your environmental studies look at:

1. Health risks
2. Financial loss of our properties
3. Lower value of loans
4. Possible harm to animals + crops
5. Scenic views destroyed
6. Effects on childrens minds + health

I have these other comments:

Please use existing lines near I5 + please out use section 31 near Hockinson. You could use alternative lines to the east of 31 at Hockinsons.

I have lived on a farm in Hockinson for 44 years + do not want my environment ruined. I have grandchildren that go to Hockinson + do not want young minds to be affected by high powered lines.

Most of us moved in the countryside to be away from environmental hazards.

Communication ID: 12067

Date: 12/3/2009

Name: VIVIAN VAN DIJK

My husband submitted these comments over the weekend and so far hasn't shown up, so her it is again..... The BPA should immediately recognize that the very legitimate concerns of the residents of Clark County are clearly not adequately addressed in the current process, and therefore the BPA should withdraw the entire project from public scoping while it considers its possible future actions. Having terminated the current process and prior to reopening a revised public scoping process we ask that: 1) The BPA remove all routes for the proposed 500 kV transmission lines from consideration except for that shown as segments 2, 9 and 25 that follows existing transmission lines. 2) The BPA will perform first-stage evaluation of both: a) A route several miles further east than any of the currently-proposed segments that avoids all and every habitat, natural, scenic and recreational resource and remains exclusively on public or state lands; and b) A route from the proposed Castle Rock substation along existing transmission rights of way to Ross via Keeler and then along the segments already identified along existing transmission lines; c) A route from the proposed Castle Rock substation along existing transmission rights of way to Pearl/Oregon City via Keeler and then along existing transmission lines. and then to commence a completely new public Scoping process in lieu of the present one. In any Scoping process: 3) The BPA to demonstrate in the course of the Scoping process and then in the course of its EIS that: a) The stated need for these transmission lines are: i) in the public interest in general, ii) in the interests of the residents of the Pacific Northwest in general, and iii) specifically in the interests of the electric ratepayers whose utilities are served by BPA under the terms of the Pacific Northwest Power Act and related legislation; 4) The BPA to demonstrate explicitly and individually which existing, planned, or proposed generation projects are or would be enabled by these lines, and to describe the fuel source of those projects, commencing with all those projects identified in the BPA's generation interconnection queue whose projects either already employ the affected paths from North to South or would employ them if constructed and connected; and a) To demonstrate for each of those projects separately how it meets the criteria defined in 3 above; and b) To demonstrate how each such project: i) meets or exceeds the goals for renewable energy generation resources in the Pacific Northwest specifically excluding California; and ii) advances the declared goals of the government of the United States to address Global Warming and/or Climate Change; and iii) reduces the Northwest's emissions of greenhouse gases. 5) The BPA to demonstrate, in complete technical detail accompanied by a layman's summary: a) how and why the transmission power flows of power generated in Canada and being sold in California constrain the existing transmission system and underlie and cause the assumed need for these proposed lines;

and further how the system is constrained when such power is sold in markets, if any, outside the Northwest and California; b) how and why the existence and administration of a market-driven transmission request queue that provides access to the transmission system of the BPA can justify the need for the condemnation of private property in North and East Clark County in particular, and in Washington and Oregon States in general; c) the economics for power and energy marketing and trading companies that use a great part of the transmission capacity of the high-voltage lines in the region, with specific reference to any increase to their revenues and profits that might be enabled by these lines. 6) The BPA to commit that: a) all labor and materials used for the proposed lines are solely sourced from US companies based in Washington State and domestically produced. b) the degradation of all electronic signals such as TV, radio and cell phone signals to the rural fringe areas will be mitigated to zero as a result of radio frequency interference (RFI) generated by these proposed lines. This to apply to any other commonly used electrical or electronic household appliances/gadgets as well. c) there will be no audible noise pollution (Corona) that can be heard from the outside of any home adjacent to the right of way of the proposed lines. d) that all buildings, fences, pipes and other metallic items adjacent to the right of way that can be affected by spurious currents are safeguarded as necessary to protect humans and animals from any shock. This to be done at the expense of BPA. e) no chemical or synthetic herbicides will be used to maintain the right of way due to the potential of leeching into the groundwater and contaminating the water supply which is generally from wells in rural Clark County. 7) The BPA to provide study data specifically relating to 500KV lines on the health effects of long term exposure to LF EMF (Low Frequency Electromagnetic Fields). This data to be no older than three years and provided by reputable health research organizations with no ties to any company or industry directly or indirectly associated with or funded by either the energy or power industries, or any other special interest. 8) The BPA to consult with every tribe, whether recognized by the Federal Government or not, historically associated with any part of the lands impacted or affected by any of the proposed line routes, and those routes not yet identified; to learn and share from them the history of the lands across which the lines are planned to run; and to accept and implement whatever recommended mitigation is required, including the absolute and unconditional non-disturbance of any areas designated by any tribe as being of particular historic or religious significance. 9) BPA to explore, identify and investigate all available sources that may assist in locating, identifying, and making public, every site where native American artifacts, graves or habitation or use have been identified since the first white man's records were begun in what is now known as the Pacific Northwest; and to ensure that none of those sites is disturbed or in any way affected; the available sources to include without limitation: all appropriate Tribal organizations and entities; the National Park Service; the Washington State Parks; Clark County Museum; the Oregon Historical Society; the Oregon Archeological Society; the Clark County Museum; the Museum of North Clark County; and each and every other tribal, historical and cultural heritage association, organization or entity with identifiable links to or knowledge of or documentation describing any part of the history of Clark and/or Cowlitz and/or Columbia Counties. 10) The BPA will recognize that many of the communities through which their proposed routes would run have previously been economically devastated by the efforts to protect and preserve the habitat of the Northern Spotted Owl and other species. Therefore, BPA will take extraordinary measures to do no further social or economic harm to those communities; and will, within the scope of its EIS, perform an

in-depth examination of the impacts, both social and economic, on the individuals, and separately on the communities, affected by, or possibly affected by, the proposed lines; this to be conducted by a reputable, independent social research organization with no ties to any company or industry directly or indirectly associated with or funded by either the logging or timber industries, the energy or power industries, or any other special interest; and the BPA will undertake to give predominant importance to the findings of the studies in weighing its decisions; 11) The BPA will recognize that any reduction it causes in the timber harvest from local public lands may have an economic impact on the funding of the public school system, and include a study of both the short and the long-term effects of that economic impact on the fabric and infrastructure of the whole of Clark County in its overall assessment of the impacts of these lines; which impact to be studied and estimated through a minimum of two human generations; 12) The BPA will cause to be conducted a thorough and complete survey of the habitats and migratory patterns of all fauna and wildlife, whether native or not, the survey to include no less than two complete migratory cycles; and then to engage a separate review of the findings of those studies and an assessment of the impact of all proposed line routes on the fauna and wildlife, species by species; these surveys and assessments to be conducted separately by two or more qualified independent reputable, wildlife and environmental research organizations with no ties to any company or industry directly or indirectly associated with or funded by either the logging or timber industries, the energy or power industries, or any other special interest. 13) The BPA to undertake within the scope of its EIS a detailed economic study whose findings will indicate: a) How many new long-term jobs will be created in the region from Olympia in the north to Salem in the south, and from Cathlamet in the west to White Salmon and The Dalles in the east, by the construction of these lines, and how long it is expected these jobs will last; b) How many jobs in the same area that would have been lost without these lines would be preserved by their construction? c) The number and scale of new specifically industrial or manufacturing jobs that will be created within the area of Clark County and the Portland Metro area as a direct and immediate result of the construction of these lines; d) A calculation of at least the same level of quality and detail as of those made in the BPA's routine Rate Case showing the impact, whether positive or negative, of the construction of the proposed new lines on the transmission costs of both Network and Point-to-Point Transmission contracts, and thus on ratepayers in the region. 14) The BPA will use the 'Take No Action' alternative as its benchmark against which all other alternatives are tested and compared individually and in isolation, rather than all possible alternatives being compared with each other and the 'preferred' winner then tested against the Take No Action alternative. 15) The BPA will not confine its assessment of impacts only to those property owners whose land or property might or will be immediately and directly affected, whether by construction, proximity, acquisition or easement; it will also include in its assessment all and every individual and class of individual, as well as every other entity or organization that can meet any definition of 'person' within state or federal law; and will include indirect impacts as well as direct.

Communication ID: 12068

Date: 12/3/2009

Name: WILLIAM M ELLIOTT

Sirs: I will be submitting written comments either before the end of the comment period, or during the draft EIS comment period. I have a special concern about the 'Reliability' of the subject project. Lackamas Fault There is an important fault that could impact the segment 31 portion. The fault is known as the Lackamas Lake Fault. If you view the bed of Lackamas lake you will see the strike of the fault. It extends north west and south east, crossing the Columbia River. Northerly it crosses the Hockinson segment along with the splays of the fault. The reliability of these 500 KV towers will be compromised since they will be subject to these ground motions. Further, the substation at Troutdale could be impacted also. Meeting of SSA in April There will be a national meeting of the Seismological Society of America (SSA) April 21-23, 2010 in Portland, Oregon. I would urge you to have staff attend to learn more about seismic matters affecting BPA. Refer to web site: seismosoc.org/meetings/2010/index.php Gas Transmission Line There already is a major gas transmission line passing near my property. It also passes quite near Hockinson High School. This facility impacts our area presently. Another major facility is an unfair intrusion. The best routes are easterly in the undeveloped areas. Fault situations there are unexplored at present. You may be able to contact the Oregon Department of Geology and inquire about contracting with them and USGS for Lidar flights that will show the best route. This new technology allows imaging through the vegetative cover, and will reveal areas of seismic and landslide concern. Project Support I full support the goals of the project to bring reliable bulk electricity to the entire area. I will be looking closely at the documents that will follow. I know a more reliable route can be found. Respectfully, William M. Elliott Elliott Consultants, [Address][Phone] [Email] end

Communication ID: 12069

Date: 12/3/2009

Name: SAM M IHRIG

My son who served his country for six years was notified his house is in the line of towers. He just bought his house in Feb. 09 GI bill Zero down. He will LOOSE everything if you go down the West side Highway in Lexington.(Balboa Loop) In fact he will owe his mortgage company money. Here's another Big Thank you for protecting our country.Change to route to follow the freeway south bound easement.

Communication ID: 12070

Date: 12/3/2009

Name: ANONYMOUS

Yes, I am trying to submit comments online and I'm getting a message that says the verification words are incorrect and its shows the asterisk where my name is and my name has been entered, I'm not sure what to do.

Thank you,

Bye

Communication ID: 12071

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: MARC BOLDT,TOM MIELKE,STEVE STUART

Dear Mr. Korsness:

The Clark County Board of Commissioners has received a number of comments and questions over the last few weeks regarding BPA's proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project through Clark County, from Castle Rock, Washington to Troutdale, Oregon.

The home/property owners and cities who find themselves in proximity to the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project need an outlet to ask questions, acquire additional information and, if needed, vent their frustration regarding their perception about the lack of a credible process. For more information, please find enclosed a copy of our Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) that is posted on the Clark County Web Site.

The Clark County Board of Commissioners respectfully asks the BPA to organize and implement a community meeting for the potentially affected residents and cities at its earliest convenience. We also ask that the BPA invite representatives from both our southwest Washington legislative delegation and our United States congressional delegation.

Clark County will go out of its way to assist BPA with an appropriate venue. If given enough advanced notice, we will do all we can to make available a portion of the Clark County Exhibition Hall. For information regarding available space size and associated costs, please find enclosed a copy of our rates. For more information, please contact our Director of General Services Mark McCauley at 360.397.4960.

At your earliest convenience, please reply and confirm the direction BPA is planning regarding providing an open community meeting for our home/property owners and cities. Thank you for considering this request.

Sincerely,

Marc Boldt, Chair

Steve Stuart

Tom Mielke

Attachment:

What is the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposing?

BPA is in the early stages of selecting a route for a new 70-mile-long 500-kilovolt transmission line through Clark County, from Castle Rock, Washington, to Troutdale, Oregon. The federal agency wants to improve its transmission grid to meet future electricity needs and provide greater reliability.

What is the Board of Clark County Commissioners' position on the project?

Although commissioners generally support efforts to increase power transmission systems, they also have heard from many county residents who have understandable concerns about this project.

What are county commissioners doing?

Commissioners intend to participate in the federal process and advocate on behalf of county residents.

Specifically, the county will ask to become a "party of record" under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), which will require the BPA to notify the county of major developments every step of the way. Commissioners also will ask BPA to:

- Include a new alignment alternative located to the east in the project's current scoping effort. This new alignment would be primarily on public lands and away from private property and rural population areas.
- Evaluate power transmission options that would be installed below the ground (versus overhead power lines)
- Study the effect power lines can have on property values and public health.
- Form a BPA citizen advisory committee, consisting primarily of county residents, to provide continuous input to the federal agency through this process.
- Extend comment periods and provide enhanced opportunities for citizen input as this process unfolds.

Why is BPA reluctant to use the existing power corridor east of Interstate 5?

BPA worries that placing a second line adjacent to the existing 230-kilovolt line would place both lines at risk in case of a forest fire, plane crash or other disaster and could disrupt power transmission to a large area.

What can I do?

Get involved in the process and make your thoughts known to the BPA. It's a good idea to become familiar with the National Environmental Policy Act since the federal law will guide BPA's alignment selection process. You can also contact your congressional delegation to voice your concerns about this

federal process.

The Honorable Patty Murray

United States Senator

173 Russell Senate Office Building

Washington, D.C. 20510

murray.senate.gov

Washington, DC: (202) 224-2621

Vancouver: (360) 696-7797

The Honorable Brian Baird

United States Congressman

2350 Rayburn House Office Building

Washington, DC 20515

baird.house.gov

Washington, DC: (202) 225-3536

Vancouver: (360) 695-6292

The Honorable Maria Cantwell

United States Senator

511 Dirksen Senate Office Building

Washington, DC 20510

cantwell.senate.gov

Washington, DC: (202) 224-3441

Vancouver: (360) 696-7838

Where can I get more information?

Visit the project's Web site, www.bpa.gov/go/i5. You can review more "Question and Answers" there, as well as a guide to the National Environmental Policy Act. Click on the "Get Involved" link to find out more about how you can make your voice heard.

Communication ID: 12072

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: MICHAEL VELEY

Greetings. I am writing about proposed Line 31. I understand the need for a stable power-delivery system. I DO NOT believe that it is necessary to virtually destroy numerous neighborhoods in rural areas to accomplish this. Line 31 would cut through the heart of my neighborhood, Honeywood. I just can't believe this. Please, please find a different way. All property values have already been effected due to the need to disclose the Possibility of this line. Please, put line 31 on the short list I've heard about that will take this route off the table and allow us to get on with our lives. thank you. Mike Veley

Communication ID: 12074

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: KAREN C SHERRILL

TESTING THIS PAGE. HAD PHONE CALL THAT IT WAS NOT WORKING RIGHT.

Communication ID: 12075

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: DAN B

I would like to voice my strong oppositoin to the "line 31" BPA project. My wife and I are very concerned for a verity of reasons, one of which is health. We feel that other good options under review wouldn't change for ever a unique area of the county like this will. Please listen to the people and do the right thing. Respectfully Dan McCarty

Communication ID: 12076

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: ROBERT ROGERS

Yes, I need for the I-5 corridor project I need, I'm requesting to be placed on the project mailing list for information, Robert Rogers [Address]. I need all the information I need all the study information and maps and plans details documents studies anything you have done with that I need that mailed to that address I want a hard copy of everything.

Communication ID: 12077

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: RICHARD MCKEEHAN

Please have your environmental Studies look at:

1. Look into relocating line to top of ostrand road at the logging area.
2. Impact to our year round stream, pollution, runoff ect.
3. Impact on wildlife on our property deer, elk, raccoons ect.
4. Damage to our septic system from grading, runoff.
5. Cutting of trees that line our property & provide privacy.

I have these other comments:

Our Property has a steep & narrow driveway down to the house. We have plans to build a garage/shop in the future because there isn't one now and only limited space to build one. To create an easement through my property would destroy an chance to build a garage. My wife and I plan to retire there, after looking for a beautiful place like this for 10 years we finally found this one about 1.5 years ago and have been remodeling it since we purchased it. We live in California so making it to meeting is difficult and expensive. If you need to see our property, I will need to be contacted to arrange this with my son in Vancouver to meet you.

Richard McKeehn [Phone] [email]

Communication ID: 12078

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: FRANK PEABODY

test note cannot submit my own comment

Communication ID: 12079

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: JOE WARREN

BPA

Re: The Mayor's Comments on the BPA " I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project"

Meeting held at Yacolt Primary School: 12/02/09

The Town of Yacolt has in the county's current Growth Management Plan 320 acres of urban reserve which encompasses the current Growth Boundary for the town. Most of this reserve area lies Northeast, East, and Southeast of our town in the Yacolt Valley. The Town's governing body has worked countless hours to ensure that the Town of Yacolt has a viable and sustainable future of growth and economic prosperity. However, we feel that the proposed I-5 Corridor lines may jeopardize the work that the town has done to this point.

The Town of Yacolt's governing body has received concerns from citizens from our town and surrounding areas. The concerns range from decreased property values, health concerns, environmental concerns, and the concerns of general livability. The town's concerns, also, include but are not limited to the deterrent of future growth and residential sustainability in the valley, reduced economic viability, reduction in current property values leading to reduced revenues and interference to current commercial stake holdings.

The Town of Yacolt strongly encourages the Bonneville Power Administration to consider the most easterly line to place its easements and high voltage lines or to remain true to the projects given name of "I-5 Corridor" in order to minimize impacts of the County's rural resident's, stake holders, and its scenery. So I, again, encourage you to consider the most easterly line or even consider a line that may be placed one-half to one mile even further east. This line would run through an undeveloped and uninhabited area that would not disturb residents in the Yacolt area. It would, also, be beneficial to the safety of North and East Clark County by providing a pre-established man-made fire brake that would prove to be an asset in fire fighting if the County ever had to face another devastating fire like those that scarred our region in the early 1900's. We ask that you, please, take the time to consider all options while planning for your future as we have for ours.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Joe Warren

Mayor

Town of Yacolt, WA

Communication ID: 12080

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: DENISE JARRELL

Please DO NOT build the Hi-Power lines through our quiet, beautiful neighborhood in Hockinson. The 500KV effects have not even been studied so close to a community. That property was purchased in 1957, before these folks had built their homes and settled here, and now it is no longer appropriate to build here now. Please consider an area east of here that is less populated. Thank you.

Communication ID: 12081

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: JANE BLICKENSTAFF

High voltage power lines should be place under ground. The high voltage power lines are not safe for families to live under or around. You must consider the families safety, the loss of property values and the future of our city before placing high power lines in Clark County. Please rethink you placement of power lines. Thank you for your time.

Communication ID: 12082

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: MARITES CASTRO

Ladies and Gentlemen: I am opposed to the BPA Line 31. I am opposed to BPA line 31 which cutes thru many neighborhoods in Clark County--including my neighborhood. I appeal to BPA to use a non-residential route which is a solution that is more humane instead of exercising its right of eminent domain. Our neighborhood will be adversely affected. There's wildlife like bears, raccoons, deer, hawks, owls, etc. which will be affected as well. Battle Ground is a small town and it needs to preserve as much of its natural and beautiful surrounding. Please reconsider and stop BPA Line 31. Sincerely, Marites Castro

Communication ID: 12083

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: RICHARD VAN DIJK

test

Communication ID: 12084

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: RICHARD VAN DIJK

test again

Communication ID: 12085

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: BARBARA R HOUSER

At the Camas, WA meeting a BPA employee stated that you already have a right-of-way to place the new transmission lines--which is not in our area. I asked why BPA was trying to disrupt other property owners with this new line and his reponse was that the current right-of-way contained some possible terrain that might make the project a little difficult. With that in mind it clearly shows that BPA wants to take (steal) property that is already cleared and developed so BPA doesnt't have to do any work. I am deeply concerned about the notification process and the so-called meetings. At the Camas, WA meeting we were moved around and taken to map areas and then told to wait at tables to discuss any questions we have with the BPA individuals. The was not a meeting -- BPA was just handing out maps and general information. We were encouraged in write down our comments and submit them on a form. I consider a meeting to be were information is presented in a group format and the public can ask questions and voice concerns. That did not happen at Camas. I don't even think many of our neighbors knew about the proposed power lines and meetings because a couple of them seemed surprised. A couple of individuals neighboring the proposed study area were upset that they were not notified because of sensitive areas for wildlife habitats. As property owners we have worked hard, especially over the past two years, to develop our property and have lived in our new home for just over a year now. We have planned this home so we can live in it for the rest of our lives. We love the unblemished countryside. We have grandchildren who play on the land and do not want power lines on or near our property. Despite what your research, power lines are harmful and disruptive to the environment and humans. We do not want our natural spring (which is registered) disturbed and do not want trees cut down on our property. Use the exsiting right-of-way you already have.

Communication ID: 12086

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: RICHARD VAN DIJK

Unable to submit the test in this box, so comments in attahced file

Ms Decker,

I made a request for the Draft Planning Report for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project from the Study Request group on November 19th with a follow up to Mark Korsness on 22nd requesting him to help

expedite this. On the 23rd Mark called and asked what document I needed and why. He offered to answer any questions I might have, I responded that I probably would have once I had reviewed the document. A follow up email was sent the same day. On the 30th I again asked when this document would be forthcoming with a response that it is forthcoming. Met Mark at the Yacolt meeting on December 2nd and again said it was forthcoming.

Why is it taking so long to get a publically available document and why the Study Request group contacted me and if advised when this would be available or that a non disclosure for certain aspect of the report would be required?

Why is the BPA dragging their feet to provide this document?

Emails attached – personal contact information removed for privacy as this is being submitted as a comment for the record.

From: Richard van Dijk

Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2009 09:11

To: 'studyrequest@bpa.gov'

Subject: Draft Planning Report for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

Please provide a copy of this report.

Preferably in a .pdf or .doc format.

Thanks,

Richard van Dijk

From: Richard van Dijk

Sent: Sunday, November 22, 2009 23:16

To: 'makorsness@bpa.gov'

Subject: Draft Planning Report for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

Mark,

I requested this last week, please ask your project team to expedite

this request (.pdf or .doc)

Sincerely

Richard van Dijk

From: Richard van Dijk [e-mail]

Sent: Monday, November 23, 2009 09:06

To: 'makorsness@bpa.gov'

Subject: Draft Planning Report I-5 Corridor

Mark,

Thanks for you call this morning. Below is the link and the Report title of which I am referring to.

Look forward to receiving it and the base cases. As mentioned previously, preferred format is .doc or .pdf

Sincerely,

Richard van Dijk

http://www.transmission.bpa.gov/system_planning/planning_studies/netplanning.cfm?Archive=0&page=144#studyb

Draft Planning Report for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

<http://www.transmission.bpa.gov/system_planning/planning_studies/netplanning.cfm?Archive=0#studyb> 9/07/2007

This report describes the planning studies and alternative solutions which were developed to reinforce the transmission system along the I-5 Corridor between Southwest Washington and Northwest Oregon. The report describes the analysis that was done to support the recommended plan of service. This project is presently going through the WECC Regional Planning Review process facilitated by ColumbiaGrid. This report and the accompanying base cases are available upon request subject to a non-disclosure agreement when required. September 7, 2007

From: Richard van Dijk

Sent: Monday, November 30, 2009 10:38

To: 'studyrequest@bpa.gov'

Cc: 'jadecker@bpa.gov'; 'makorsness@bpa.gov'

Subject: FW: Draft Planning Report for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

How long do this take to get approved and when will I get a response?

Mark, when we spoke you agreed to get this expedited.....

Richard van Dijk

From: Korsness,Mark A - TEP-TPP-2 [makorsness@bpa.gov]

Sent: Monday, November 30, 2009 10:40

To: 'Richard van Dijk'; studyrequest

Cc: jadecker@bpa.gov

Subject: RE: Draft Planning Report for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

We are nearly complete with our request review and will let you know soon.

Thanks.....Mark

Communication ID: 12088

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: RICHARD VAN DIJK

Unable to submit the test in this box, so comments in attached file. resubmit with email to get a response

Communication ID: 12089

Date: 12/3/2009

Name: MELINDA NUTE,DAVID NUTE

Please have your environmental studies look at:

No on BPA line #31

I have these other comments:

This project runs directly over our house and we surely would be forced to move. We have made great sacrifices as a family to be able to live in this beautiful rural area and this proposal has caused us great stress.

Please consider another route. East of us is not as populated.. This would tremendously affect our whole community.

We did give permission for our property to be entered only because we thought they were replacing the current power lines we don't want to willingly give access for this project.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter

Communication ID: 12090

Date: 12/3/2009

Name: MARK ROGERS,JUDY ROGERS,MICHELLE ROGERS,NATHAN ROGERS

We are Clark County residents living along the southern portion of the segment #31, 37 and 38 of the BPA's proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project. We purchased our home 15 years ago after a careful search for the right balance of rural environment and proximity to schools and services. Our home is located with 10 other neighbors in an upscale private development known as Tranquivilla, which is nestled in the woods along the northern foot of Green Mountain on N.E. 49" Circle. We all are on 1+ acre lots and our unique neighborhood is unanimously opposed to the massive 500 KV lines BPA has surprised us with.

The Existing Easement: The easements along segment #31, 37 and 38 were acquired in 1957 by Pacific Power and Light (PPL) as a 100' easement through undeveloped portions of Clark County. Clark County permitted numerous developments immediately adjacent to this narrow easement and our 1/2 mile access road crosses that easement at a tributary creek to Lacamas Lake, which is at the eastern edges of our development. Many large and beautiful homes were built near this corridor with the understanding that one day a small power line might be constructed within that existing 100' foot easement. The BPA's proposal to condemn land outside this easement and erect massive 150' towers not only is a betrayal of the trust homeowners placed when we purchased and maintained our community, it also raises the demand that BPA and Clark County stay within their existing easement and not ruin our neighborhood.

Effects on Neighborhoods: The potential clearing of a 150' corridor will require involuntary condemnation and removal of homes and outbuildings, and will have an undermining effect in accessing our property should we not ultimately be condemned. The overall effect of widening the 100 foot easement into a wider swath will displace hundreds of Clark county residents who have built their homes adjacent to the PP&L easement. Even though the existing easement is 100', we are highly

doubtful that a mere 150' clearing would be adequate to address health concerns that a massive 500 KV line, especially in light that BPA is requesting a 300' easement for the 230 KV line in segment 9, and indeed homes in the Hazel Dell area were also buffered from a 230 KV line with a 300' clearing. Does it make sense that a much higher voltage transmission line will have a smaller buffer zone to protect from electro-magnetic field concerns? Let's be serious, the answer is no - planning such a huge undertaking on such a narrow clearing is very doubtful and indeed would be irresponsible in the end.

Tranquivilla Neighborhood:

Our Tranquivilla Association development is a rarity in Clark County and we have a strong desire to maintain the life we have built together to accomplish it. In our neighborhood, we value the existing habitat for numerous deer, coyote, bobcat, red tailed hawks, owl, turkey vultures, pheasant, black bear, and yes, even the silly rabbits. In addition, with in segment 31 there is a pond that flows into LaCamas creek and maintains and sustains year round habitat for ducks, geese, and other water fowl. We have a wide variety of residences who also carefully selected and spent thousands of dollars and hundreds of hours to maintain the tranquility we prized so much when we arrived.

Economic Impacts: As we currently understand it, if these new massive towers are built in our neighborhood, residents living 75' (minimum) from the centerline will have these 150' towers looming over their homes and suddenly the rural private neighborhood becomes a BPA wire-hood and therefore transmission wires will be the new visual norm for our few remaining families. Segment 31 will cost millions in compensation to homeowners affected by the BPA's I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, especially when the corridor is determined to need additional width to address concerns for a 500 KV line. The proposal of the 150' towers though our neighborhood will impact us by decreasing the valuation not only of the homes immediately adjacent to the transmission lines, but to all the homes located in this particular serene spot. We as an Association have requested that our properties be appraised by a certified real estate appraiser to determine how much value we will lose due to proposed construction of the 150' towers, and in these difficult economic times every disruption to normality and every dollar counts even more than in previous years. Our quality of life will be dramatically affected with the construction of the BPA 150' Towers, even worse if a more appropriate easement is allowed to support the more likely 300' buffer.

In Summary: In closing we ask that the BPA eliminate Segment 31, and in particular our small segment, from any further consideration as part of their proposed I-5 Corridor reinforcement Project. In addition, we request that the BPA revise this plan to further reduce the financial and environmental burden Segment 31 will place upon thousands of Clark County residents. Since something is likely to occur, it would make the most sense to use the far eastern routes (ending with route 35) past Camp Bonneville where it really is rural and affects significantly fewer residences in the meantime.

Should you have any additional questions or desire information regarding this letter, please feel free to contact us, and thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Communication ID: 12091

Date: 12/3/2009

Name: DOUGLAS W PEARSON

Re: BPA's I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, Segment 31

Dear BPA Staff:

We are residents living along the middle/southern portion of Segment No. 31 of BPA's proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. Our home is located east [street]. (aka [street]) on a parcel that has been our family home since the early 1960s. When we first learned about BPA's proposal, we thought the location through this area seemed highly implausible and not well conceived considering the numerous limitations placed on land development in the area (noted below) as well as the high concentration of homes in the immediate area. Along with our neighbors in all directions of proximity to Segment No. 31, we are in opposition to the installation of a 500 KV power line across our property and near our home. We are most concerned about the following issues:

I. Site-specific Considerations

County and State laws and regulations have put in place many restrictions and limitations to developing our property. Specifically, our property in or near the proposed 150 right-of- way includes a 200 foot habitat wetlands buffer for an existing creek (tributary to Rock Creek), as well as a documented archeological site (see state archeological records for [address]) This area is well documented to include Native American artifacts even including the reported burial of important Native American leaders, such as Chief Umtuch (reported to be somewhere in the area near where 212th Ave bisects 259th St.)

In addition to these concerns, 21ihAve was aptly named "Spring Hill" Road for the existence of extensive above ground springs and waterways. These conditions offer particular challenges as the specific area is also classified as a high erosion/geo hazard zone. In fact, we have recently experienced significant slide activity on our own property following the winter storms of 2008/2009. Also, it goes without saying, that any development you do up slope in an area with such limitations will undoubtedly impact those individuals living down slope from the development. I think you will find that most of the properties in this area share similar limitations, as well as similar cultural attributes. County, State, and Federal guidelines have required landowners to be good stewards of their properties and they have developed specific laws and regulations to insure that stewardship. BPA should join the effort to ensure that these areas remain defined as important resources as other government entities define them to be.

II. Houses and Other Structures

Clearing a 150-foot corridor will require involuntary condemnation and removal of several homes and/or outbuildings along 212'h Ave. Many of these homes were constructed within the past 5 to 10 years and are; therefore, some of the most highly valued homes in the area. This will displace numerous families from their homes.

III. Health Impacts and Safety Considerations BPA's own experts certainly know that the science related to high voltage EMFs existing in residential areas is weak at best. The fact that no studies exist contemplating lines in the range of 500KV is certainly troubling to the citizens who will be living potentially as close as 75 feet to such lines. Specifically, our concerns relate to the increase risks of childhood leukemia, brain cancer, and other forms of cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease, and pregnancy complications. Please explain in your DEIS why BPA cleared a 300-foot easement along Segment 9 for their existing 230 KV line, yet proposes to clear only 150 feet for the 500 KV line through our neighborhood. Why were homes in Hazel Dell buffered from a 230 KV line by a 300 foot cleared area along Segment 9 while homes along Segment 31 will be buffered from a 500 KV line by a meager 150-foot cleared area? Double the voltage, half the protection? BPA has shown us many pictures of 500 KV and 230 KV lines. None of these pictures show homes 75 feet from the power lines. The cleared area in these pictures is much larger. We want BPA to prove to us that our children will be safe living 75 feet from a 500 KV line capable of transmitting 1400 mega-watts of power: a quantity of power that exceeds the production of Bonneville Dam.

IV. Visual and Noise Impacts

Really, this goes without saying. 500 KV lines should not be located in residential areas, period. Would anyone ever chose to live in the presence of such lines but for having no other choice? Residents living 75 feet from the centerline will have 150-foot towers looming over their homes. Can you imagine that site? BPA representatives have indicated that the tower spacing will be a maximum of 1250' on flat ground. This equates to no less than 21 towers within the 5-mile span between Powell Road and Green Mountain. Obviously, as concerns the specific terrain traversing the East Fork of the Lewis River valley, across Basket Flats, and over Spring Hill Road/21th Ave, there will certainly be a higher concentration of towers. The proposed line of 150-foot towers will become the dominant visual feature in our neighborhood, dramatically altering the existing landscape. Clearly audible noise is emitted from 500 KV power lines. This noise increases on wet days and decreases with distance from the lines, but it will be a disturbing background noise for residents living in our currently quiet, rural setting. Having spent significant time hiking in areas in the Gorge including high voltage lines, I can myself bear witness to the fact that the lines are noisy and disconcerting.

V. EMF Interference

Interference with Electronic Devices: Sensitive electronic equipment, including radios and televisions, will be effected by the electro-magnetic field of a 500 KV line. Again, do we really need to even mention this fact? The idea of livable residential homes located 75 feet from 500 KV lines is a ludicrous proposition.

VI. Aesthetic Impact

Our neighborhoods are not industrial/commercial, nor characterized by vast expanses of wide-open agricultural or land. Rather, instead, our homes are found in natural areas of dense timber and underbrush. If this were not intentional, land owners would have simply clear-cut all the timber, planted no trees, and been content to stare at their neighbor's homes. We have spent substantial sums putting all lines (electrical, telephone, etc) underground to preserve our natural environment-in fact we have been required to do so. Also, we have attempted to maintain our privacy and that of our neighbors' by not decimating the natural undergrowth and timber. That environment will be irreparably degraded by a row of ISO-foot towers traversing a many mile long clear cut.

VII. Economic Impact and Costs

The proposed corridor devalues our homes and property. Segment 31 will cost millions to compensate homeowners. There are many homes of high value along the entire Segment. In fact, our home was newly constructed in spring of 2009. The mere proposal of ISO-foot towers through our neighborhood is already driving down property values as it requires sellers to disclose the proposal. Again, who would chose to live under or next to 500 KV power lines? How many BPA engineers live under 500 KV lines? Another interesting dynamic to this project is that BPA seems more then willing to devalue private property timber and home values, but less willing to propose such devaluation on proposed routes traversing public lands located east of Segment 31. I'm certain that private land owners along Segment 31 would gladly pay more in taxes for schools to offset the fair value of state timber sacrificed if it meant that 500 KV lines would not hang over their homes. All of the above effects will significantly reduce property values along Segment 31. We have been told that BPA does not include decreased property values as a "cost" when comparing alternative routes. However, there 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 when comparing Segment 31 with other segments. Obviously, reducing the value of uninhabited public lands has less direct human economic impact then does permanently devaluing actual homes existing in residential areas. We may scorn paying higher taxes as a result of less state DNR timber land being available, but the comparable situation to actually living under 500 KV lines is not even comparable.

VIII. Socio-economic and Public Services

Decreasing our quality of life and our property values will decrease the socio-economic environment of our neighborhood. Your economic analysis should include the cost to society of degrading an idyllic, rural residential area with true historical value, including the increased cost of public services. Again, who wants to live or work in the presence of 500 KV lines?

IX. Land Use Considerations

I know of no examples of a 500 KV power line constructed through a populated area similar to Segment 31. All 500 KV projects in our region were constructed on open land, not through existing neighborhoods. BPA has been unable to show us an example where they successfully accomplished

what they propose to do to the landowners along Segment 31. We do not want to be BPA's guinea pig for this type of project. All impacts listed above would be reduced or eliminated by locating the I-5 Reinforcement Project to an alternative route 5 miles east of Segment 31. Large portions of these eastern routes have already been roaded and clear-cut for timber management. The distance along Segment 31 between Yacolt Mountain and the Camas Meadows Golf Course is approximately 15 miles. The predominant vegetative cover along this 15-mile stretch of Segment 31 is a second-growth douglas fir forest. Douglas firs can easily grow to 200 feet tall. Protecting the proposed power line from windfall will require clearing the douglas firs for a distance of 200 feet on either side of the power line. This will create a 744-acre clear-cut, 15 miles long and 400 feet wide. Why should BPA be allowed to clear-cut 744 acres through a neighborhood that has conscientiously protected its wetlands and wildlife? BPA should be required to place their 744-acre clear-cut on commercial timber land 5 miles east of segment 31 where clear-cutting is the predominant land use. Even Segment 9 along I-5 through Hazel Dell would be a preferable alternative in this regard. The corridor along Segment 9 has already been clear-cut in a swath 300 feet wide for BPA's existing 230 KV power line.

X. Bearing the Cost of Benefiting Society

The environmental impacts of a project intended to benefit American taxpayers from Seattle to Portland should be borne by public lands if such lands are available. Public lands should be the first priority for locating this project. Open lands should be the second priority. Involuntary condemnation of neighborhoods should be the very lowest priority. The negative impacts of this project should not be shouldered by a few residents when other, less draconian routes are available. When evaluated in terms of direct environmental and financial impacts on rate-payers (the people who will ultimately pay the cost of this project), Segment 31 appears to have the most impact of all the north south corridor alterative under consideration.

XI. Conclusion

For all the reasons listed above, we ask BPA to eliminate Segment 31 from further consideration as part of their Draft Environmental Impact Statement. We request BPA lift, at the earliest possible date, the financial and environmental burden Segment 31 has placed upon thousands of Clark County residents. If you have any questions related to this letter, please feel free to contact me directly at [Phone].

Sincerely,

Douglas W. Pearson

Communication ID: 12092

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: DEREK S NIES

Route 28 and 29 is a horrible idea. Push 29 out into Gifford National and leave the private property owners alone. Or better yet just use the existing route 9 where you already have easements and access.

Communication ID: 12093

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: PAULA K OVERHOLTZER

Dole Valley, near Yacolt, WA December 4, 2009 To Whom It Should Concern: My husband, my son, and I attended the informational meeting regarding BPA's proposed power line through Clark County on Wednesday evening, December 2. Thank you for providing a representative to field some of my friends' and neighbors' questions about your plans. My husband and I are planning for a year of teaching English in Chongqing, China, beginning in August. In preparation for that adventure, we have been reading MANY books about Communist China, and the tactics of their government, especially during the "Cultural Revolution" era. I couldn't help but feel that the meeting Wednesday evening was somehow similar to the nightly meetings required of the population back in the 1950's and 60's in China. Hours and hours of futile negotiations, reports, accusations, and plans were the agenda, while resources could have been better spent working in fields and applying technology to help supply food for the 43 million people who soon died from the famine. Your proposals are having the effect of causing people to spend exorbitant amounts of energy fighting in their defense. People (and you, Bonneville staff) are spending huge amounts of time and resources on this problem. Why? With the impending "studies" on all the different possible routes for the power line, an incredible amount of money and time and energy will be spent. Why? Many citizens will lie awake at night, anguishing over their situations. Why? You are causing neighborhoods to be pitted against one another.....Dole Valley against Hockinson.....West Clark County against East.....Washington against Oregon. Why? If you do take over people's homes and land, you'll spend even more money and energy confiscating property and relocating people. And, our government will spend money for years to come trying to "fix" the damage to humans living too close to the humming lines. The price in anguish and turmoil is too high. There are more important issues that a group of concerned citizens meeting in a school gym should be discussing.....Such a power line down through existing homes and neighborhoods should not even have been proposed! There is no doubt that we need electric power. (I do commend you, BPA, for your use of renewable resources: Hydro-electric power from dams, wind turbines, etc. Thank you for turning toward "green" resources.) And, so, a new mega-line does indeed need to be built through Clark County, or Oregon I will concede this reality. But, the densely populated portion of Clark County is simply an inappropriate place to have something as disruptive as a mega-power line passing through. I see no other way around this but to move the proposed line further east.....into more state and private company forest land. Will not the loss of property tax revenue from so many land-and-home-owners far out-weigh the costs of having some DNR and forestry lands prematurely harvested, and taking those lands out of production? Bonneville Power Administration, you seem to be living up to people's expectations of how government is run: spending huge money on non-rational proposals. Considering the human factors, the emotion-charged atmosphere of the meeting, and the incredible proposed costs, please reconsider running such

a power line through ANY populated area. Why even spend the money studying "crazy" proposals?
Thank you for your consideration, Paula (Larwick) Overholtzer [Address] phone: [Phone] e-mail: [Email]

Communication ID: 12094

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: APRIL ANDERSON

Our property is located in the area of 216th Ave. near the proposed line 31. We are very concerned about the effects of this decision on our family and neighborhood. One of our children is a leukemia survivor. It is maddening to consider being forced to live in a situation that poses that kind of health risk to our child. Even if we wanted to move because of this situation, our chances of selling for a reasonable price would be greatly diminished. I don't personally know of anybody that would choose to buy a home close to high voltage power lines. Many people depend on the value of their property to help them in their senior years. This power line would permanently reduce the value of our property and our neighbor's property. Not only that, the saleability would drop sharply. With the economy as it is now, this could provide real hardship for many. One of the reasons we enjoy living here is the peace and quiet. The humming and crackling of a high voltage power line would put an end to that. I truly do not see how placing a line in this populated area would be the best choice. You have better options elsewhere.

Communication ID: 12095

Date: 12/4/2009

Name: BRYAN WARRINGTON, KELLY WARRINGTON

To Whom It May Concern, We are currently one of the residents that are potentially going to be impacted by the larger than life 500 kilovolt towers. We are on route 26, a route that looks most possible as it is a straight line from Castle Rock to Troutdale. We moved out to this area to raise our children and have some space. When we went to the public meeting in Camas, WA we were under the impression that you were not wanting to go over any homes or outbuildings. Well the proposed path on 26 will do just that, specifically the grid on page 73. As well as any route that is currently proposed. I understand that there is a need to supply power to other cities, but it seems unfair to anyone on these proposed routes to listen to 24 hour a day - 365 days a year "humming and cracking" from the power lines that are going to be built. In our little community, we have built relationships with other families and their children. It seems unfair that we should have to move away and start all over just because of some power lines. I am no different from anyone else who has posted a comment on this board, but I think that should sent the message to BPA that NO ONE is in favor of having power lines put on their property. Thank you for your time, Bryan and Kelly Warrington

Communication ID: 12096

Date: 12/5/2009

Name: MIKE C JOHNSON

PLEASE do not select proposed route 31 for the new BPA line. It will either be on my property or adjacent to it. I'm four years from retirement having worked hard my whole life. This will destroy the value of the only thing I have of value, my home. My retirement plans will disappear. This will ruin everything I've worked so hard for, for so long. Put the line adjacent to the current one and don't destroy people's lives and dreams. PLEASE!

Communication ID: 12097

Date: 12/5/2009

Name: STEPHEN X BURINSKY

I am opposed to any new development of transmission line corridors in East Clark County near Yacolt, Washington. Corridors 26-28 and 30-33. We moved to Yacolt to get away from your transmission lines. The only way we will support your proposal is if you are going to bury the transmission lines. In Arizona, school districts servicing neighborhoods located under and close to these transmission lines have higher behavioral problems with their students and higher incident of miscarriage. This is a known fact. We do not want to live or work near your utilities. BPA has already destroyed the gorge, we don't want to see the health of our community or our health compromised.

Communication ID: 12098

Date: 12/6/2009

Name: DONALD BENZ

Proposed 1-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project-Speaking for my entire family and neighbors. I will not be redundant in my comments. You have heard very clearly the concerns of citizens along proposed routes 31 and 9. Their concerns are magnified due to the density of housing along routes 40, 41, and 42. Just a 2 mile segment through route 40 would condemn hundreds of homes and property. We built our home 25 years ago after a careful search for the right balance of rural environment and proximity to schools and services, and a line though here would devastate entire neighborhoods. Your timing could not be worse for citizens. Why was this project not proposed four years ago when the economy was booming and new home sales and construction were at an all time high? I can only be led to believe that BPA sees the opportunity to acquire right of ways at a much reduced cost. I have spoken with Federal biologists, and placing the line through DNR property (ie 11, 21, 29, 34, 35, and 49 would actually have other benefits. Specifically, the clearing would serve as a fire break from the (non)-managed forest. In addition, wildlife can adapt and flourish in cleared areas. Specifically, deer and elk are browsers and thrive on open space. When we don't cut forest, we deprive elk of browsing habitat, and facilitate

starvation. Remember a few winters ago when the government was airlifting hay to starving elk around Mt St Helens? You have heard overwhelmingly that the best route for residents of the affected counties is as far east as possible. (ie 11, 21, 29, 34, 35, 49) If it is true, as a previous commenter said, that DNR will not agree to this, then you government agencies need to settle your squabbles, and do what is best for the people paying for your agencies. Remember, you are a government FOR the people, not TO the people.

Communication ID: 12099

Date: 12/6/2009

Name: DANICE JO FOSTER

Lexington, Kelso, Washington State. There is a new bridge across the Cowlitz River accessing the housing areas along the Cowlitz River and those newer houses on the west banks up to the existing power lines. If you build there it will diminish the traffic on Westside Hwy for those who live north of the area proposed for the new power lines and it will be beneficial for BPA to buy the existing houses so the landowners who do live there don't have to continue to live under the existing power lines. There is controversial data suspecting brain cancer and birth defects to those who live under power lines and I for one believe there is detriment living under those lines so if you build there and I don't think most of the people in Lexington care if you pay them for their houses (but be fair and balanced please. Don't steal their houses.) the folks can move into the already existing homes that have been foreclosed on as we in Cowlitz County have a glut of them. Also, DO USE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES LANDS to build in the 18th district. Those people who are in charge of DNR lands don't believe that is not their own personal playground and think they are in a SACRED COW situation. They are not. Get Obama on board. He will GIVE you the lands to rent for \$1.00 a year. Sincerely and Respectfully, Danice Foster

Communication ID: 12100

Date: 12/6/2009

Name: CHARLES HOUGHTEN, JACQUIE J HOUGHTEN

Attn: I-5 Corridor Project Managers

We are writing to provide our comments for consideration during the development of the I-5 Corridor Power Line Project Plans and Environmental Impact Statement and to request analysis of our comments during the project planning, analysis and decision making for this project. Please make sure that we are added to any mailing list or other notification means so that we can stay aware of this project through all phases.

1) Limited outreach and information was provided during the onset of this project. Thank you for extending the scoping comment period so that more people may become aware of this project and get involved in the planning and analysis associated with the decision making process. We certainly hope

that there will be better outreach and information sharing during the planning, design and study phases, as well as the decision making process.

2) We understand that BPA has identified a series of possible routes to expand the power capacity within Southwest Washington.

3) The plan and EIS for this project should clearly define the purpose and need for the power lines as well as the power needs. What options exist as alternatives to power transmission lines?

4) The plan and EIS for the I-5 corridor project should evaluate the impacts and benefits of state of the art technologies and design for power transmission.

5) The plan and EIS for the I-5 corridor project should analyze all possible and feasible routes and thoroughly analyze criteria in determining the best routes including:

a. Environmental impacts to wildlife, including migratory birds, mammals, plants and other species

b. Environmental impacts to water quality and quantity, soils, erosion, and other factors

c. Social and Economic impacts to individual citizens, neighborhoods and communities

d. Visual impacts to the local communities and neighborhoods

e. Relationship to short and long term growth of the lands and communities which intersect or are nearby to the project

f. Relationship to other transmission lines, corridors for other communities' services, existing, planned and potential for and for which there may be benefits in collaborating on the planning, design and development of project and others.

g. Relationship to existing, planned and potential highway corridors which could be impacted, or which there may be benefits in collaborating on the design and development of systematic corridor system, including power.

6) Of the currently proposed routes, use of the existing corridor (primarily route #9 – between Vancouver and Castle Rock) – seems to have the most merit and the least impact to the environment, neighborhoods and communities.

7) The Route 29 and 11 linkages also seem to have good merit in terms of minimal impacts to local land owners and the communities.

8) Route 31 through the Hockinson area seems to have a number of problems including its location directly through numerous residential and rural neighborhoods, causing serious disruption to the livelihood of many citizens, as well as serious environmental, visual and socio-economic impacts.

9) We seriously urge coordination with the local, State and Federal governments that may also be planning, or have future plans for other transportation systems in this area. It seems most logical to link

power transmission lines (of the current design state – as well as future designs) with local and regional highway systems, water and or sewer conveyance systems, etc. We also note that such needs are more likely closer to the urbanized areas than the more rural areas.

10) While these power lines will cause impacts wherever they are built, properly designed with other urban transportation systems for automobile, transit, rail, water, sewer, other line or cable systems, bikeways and pedestrian walkway can all be designed to work together in a combined and coordinated system, versus many independent systems being planned, designed and built separate, at greater cost to both the community and our environment.

11) Communities that are impacted by BPA projects should be provided opportunities for mitigation of those impacts, and be involved in helping to determine the appropriate and adequate types of mitigation.

Thank you for consideration of our comments. We look forward to getting new and updated information, as well as being kept informed of the timing and steps of the detailed planning, analysis and decision making process.

Sincerely,

/s/

Charles J. Houghten

Communication ID: 12101

Date: 12/7/2009

Name: CHRISTINE M DAWSON

I oppose the proposed 500 kilovolt transmission lines, in particular, route 31 and 32. The line should not run through the populated areas of Southwest Washington and Clark County. People under the path of this line will need to leave their homes or risk serious health effects associated with long-term exposure to electromagnetic fields. Such lines are unhealthy, unsightly, and noisy. Neither homes, nor schools, nor parks belong within 400 meters of these lines. And even if my home should lie outside of a supposed safe distance, I do not want to see my neighbor's homes effected, or the beauty of the community compromised. I moved to the rural Hockinson area of Clark County, for its beauty and serenity. I moved here to raise my family, live a healthy lifestyle, and spend time outdoors. If new lines are necessary, they need to be as far away from people's homes as possible. The I-5 corridor should not use route 31 or 32.

Communication ID: 12102

Date: 12/7/2009

Name: EVELINA H CRAWFORD

I am opposed to running these lines through private home owner areas and would like these issues addressed in future planning: 1) There are no independent studies on this high of a voltage current on humans and animals. However lower rates have shown indications of causing cancer in children....independent studies must be done. 2) Over a 1000 homeowners are affected. Many of these people have already suffered job losses, relationship troubles and even divorce because of economic problems driven by those in charge of our political and banking interests. Now, while home prices are deflated, this notice by BPA has limited their ability to sell and the threat of losing their home value and going upside down in their mortgages threatens more foreclosures in an already unbearable situation. 3) Our counties and state are managing our affairs with little, compared to other states, help from the federal government. This project however will tear at our property tax base that supports our schools, and overall citizen services by removing homes and home owners from our base. 4) The need for the lines has not been significantly explained to citizens and requests for the planning document has been refused. These would help citizens understand the direction and bring about an atmosphere of open problem solving between state, federal and private citizens. There seems to be the possibility of a win win solution....if we can get all the facts together. The fire department has been requesting a fire break through state forest land for several years. This is needed to protect citizens, the state's revenue base from state timber and firemen fighting to save both of these. Our state uses the timber off these lands to support schools so there is a reluctance to take away any of this timber/revenue producing area. But this fire break actually protects that revenue base. and needs to seriously be considered. If we remove private home owners from our tax base within our state we will reduce the need for school support provided through these lands anyway. If individual property taxes have to go up to support schools in individual areas then at least the home owners in that area would be the ones impacted by the service need. I know you have a lot on your plate but this issue needs some attention also.

Communication ID: 12103

Date: 12/7/2009

Name: CHRIS L CLARK,LYNETTE CLARK

I am writing you to voice my concerns regarding the Bonneville Power Authority (BPA) I-S Corridor Reinforcement Proj ect. I am asking you to stop the construction of BP A Segment #31.

Any consideration of this entirely new path of ISO-foot high, 500 Kilovolt towers adjacent and through our neighborhoods is irresponsible. BPA Segment #31 is a planned path running through our Community of Hockinson, Washington. Hockinson community taxes are among the highest in the area.

For many of us, our homes represent our most valuable asset. Placing these towers through our neighborhood would destroy many homes, destroy the value of surrounding properties and destroy the fabric of our proud and close-knit area.

California Department of Health Services (2002) concluded that living in close proximity to Electric and

Magnetic Fields (EMF) can cause increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease and miscarriage.

Segment #31 traverses property owned by our public school district and a new school site. Hockinson families & taxpayers have invested great amounts in the development of the best school district in the area. They have planned for years to see their children educated within it. Is BPA now able to take that away?

Segment #31 runs through areas with geologic seismic and erosion hazards (identified in Clark Counties GIS records.)

Thank you for your time,

Chris & Lynnette Clark

Communication ID: 12104

Date: 12/7/2009

Name: DENISE LALANDE

My home is the [Address], bordering BPA property, map #95. I attended the Nov. 7 open house & received conflicting information recently clarified by your public relations officer. Your proposal to site a new line on the east side of the present line, leaves open the very real possibility some if not all of the mature woods that currently shield our view of the one line, would be removed and we would have full view of both lines. I strongly protest this proposed route for multiple reasons. One: The potential for fire or plane crash disabling both power lines at the same time. Two: The obvious further decrease in value to my property. I have already suffered a \$194,000 devalue in my property since Jan. 2006 due to the declining real estate market, of which \$100,000 is in the last year alone. I have had my house on the market 3 consecutive years and of 78 showings, 4 commented my current proximity to the power line influenced their decision not to buy. I can currently only see 1 tower 3 months of the year when the deciduous trees lose their leaves. A second line and no trees would be complete disaster to my property's value. Three: This proposed route is still considerably west of the Troutdale terminus and would also require an west-east connector, further disturbing property owners. My strongest recommendation is that this line be sited at the most eastern option with the least inhabitants that also runs most directly to the Troutdale terminus.

Communication ID: 12106

Date: 12/7/2009

Name: MARY CUMMINGS COSBROW

Hello my name is Mary Cummings Cosbrow my address is [Address] and I am interested in knowing how close power line 31 comes to my home and you can reach me at my home at [Phone] or at my cell

phone at [Phone] or my email address is [Email] thank you so much for your information. Bye

Communication ID: 12107

Date: 12/7/2009

Name: JAMES B DAVIDSON

NO to BPA Line 31 segment. A better way is needed without laying waste to a community of people and their property!

Communication ID: 12108

Date: 12/7/2009

Name: DOUG L THOMPSON,DEBBIE THOMPSON

I would like to express my desire for not using proposed section 31. I feel this option would too adversely affect many property owners in this area. Thank you, Doug and Debbie Thompsn

Communication ID: 12109

Date: 12/7/2009

Name: GEORGE HAMILTON

Regarding I-5 corridor project: I would encourage the East side proposal on DNR land as opposed to the route currently being considered East of Battle Ground and Dole Valley. I believe it would impact fewer homes and DNR always wants to cut down trees anyway. Thank You George Hamilton

Communication ID: 12110

Date: 12/7/2009

Name: EVELINA H CRAWFORD

mY HUSBAND AND i ARE RETIRED BUT USE OUR PROPERTY TO GROW AND SELL BOTH NATIVE PLANTS (FERNS AND RHODENDRON) AND EARTHWORMS FOR ADDED INCOME. i HAVE HEARD THAT EARTHWORMS ARE VERY SENSITIVE TO ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELDS. tHIS ISSUE NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED AS WELL AS THE LOSS OF INCOME IF THE LINE SHOULD COME OVER OUR PROPERTY OR IN NEAR VINCINITY.

Communication ID: 12111

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: KEN MERRILL,PATRICIA G MERRILL

To: Mark Korsness, Sr. Program Manager 08 December 2009 BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Program Manager
From: Ken Merrill [Address] [Phone] [Email]
Subject: Bonneville Power Administration I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project OPPOSITION to PROPOSED ROUTE 31
Concerns:

- Proposed Route 31 would put the line & tower directly over/on our specific parcel which is adjacent to 212th Avenue in Battle Ground. When we moved here a year ago we were so grateful to have finally found our dream property with a view of nature for our retirement years. The view from our home faces south and down the mountain for a spectacular stretch of natural beauty. We also felt especially fortunate to have moved into a development which requires that all power lines be buried. Of course if Route 31 is chosen all these dreams are crushed.
- We purchased our home when the property values in Clark County were at a high peak. Since we would not be able to tolerate living under and next to a 15-story-high eye sore we would have to move and suffer an extremely severe economic loss to our assets. BPA would only need a 150-foot easement of our 5-acre parcel and therefore would not even buy us out. I seriously doubt we'd be left with a marketable house at all. Who would want to knowingly buy into it? What options would we possibly be left with except to abandon our home and lose our entire purchase price?
- In the process of settling into Clark County and meeting new people, the one common thread they have expressed is their love of living amongst such magically natural beauty that we are all surrounded by.
- I am also very concerned about the health hazards of a massive transmission line being so close to my home. A report from the California Department of Health Services (2002) concluded that living in close proximity to Electric and Magnetic Fields can cause increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease, and miscarriage.
- We recognize the necessity of BPA providing sufficient power to the communities. A more modern and acceptable approach to the demand needed would be to hire a company with the technology and ability to bury these lines, hence solving the potential problems of aesthetics, health risks, and property values. Such a company exists: American Superconductor Corporation. They have the capability of transporting high-voltage power in underground passageways requiring only a 25-foot easement. They have a project underway in Tres Amigas, New Mexico, as recently stated by Governor Bill Richardson. He was pleased to announce that "New Mexico leads the way in green and renewable energy development." The contracted company can be viewed and contacted at www.amsc.com. They are interested in discussing their technology with BPA.
- We strongly urge BPA to thoroughly investigate the option of burying the power lines. However BPA chooses, the choice should logically be made to place these lines in a route that is the least populated, impacting the communities with the least amount of disruption. Route 31 is extremely dense in population compared to alternate choices such as DNR forestlands to the east.
- Runway safety – a neighbor just east of 212th Ave. has an existing runway approximately 400 feet east of proposed route 31. Construction of towers would create safety hazards for pilots and nearby residents.
- Clark County tax base. Of all Proposed Routes # 31 appears to be the most densely populated and would have the greatest detrimental effect on county property tax revenue.

Alternate Solutions to Route 31 :

- Use existing right of way which are Routes 39 and 09.
- Move entire project east of proposed routes 29, 34 & 35 to DNR lands to minimize population and parcel disruptions.
- Use 21st century modern technology. Construct 500 kv line underground which only requires 25 ft. right of way. Reference endorsement from Governor Bill Richardson for Tres Amigas project using a high temperature superconductor wire core

technology developed by New Mexico's Los Alamos National Laboratory. Contact Gilbert Gallegos from Governor Richardson's office at [Phone]. Sincerely, Ken Merrill Cc: U.S Senator Maria Cantwell U.S Senator Patty Murray U.S. Representative Brian Baird Governor Christine Gregoire State Senator Joseph Zarelli State Representative Jaime Herrera State Representative Ed Orcutt Tom Mielke Clark County Commissioner Troy Rayburn Clark County Land Use & Development The Reflector Newspaper The Columbian Newspaper The Oregonian Newspaper KATU Channel 2 KOIN Channel 6 KGW Channel 8 FOX Channel 12

Communication ID: 12112

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: DAWN WOOLCOTT

I strongly oppose the BPA siting their power lines through existing populated areas. Their proposed line 31 will go through the town of Hockinson, destroying my entire neighborhood, and many more neighborhoods. This route will disrupt, destroy, or harm over 10,000 people and it is unacceptable. Their notification of 8,000 homes were just the homes directly in their path, including mine. But neighbors that are just feet from their notification zone will also be severely affected. If you count every property that adjoins those that were notified, the numbers of HOMES affected could well be over 16,000. These numbers are not acceptable. Already our home values are lowered because of this impending BPA project. If it goes through, the value of our homes will plummet. No one wants to live underneath these giant towers emitting their toxic EMF emissions. I will not raise my two children in our home and will be forced to leave. These EMF emissions have been shown to cause cancer, Lou Gehrig's disease, miscarriages, and who knows what else, in children living in the shadow of these electrical towers. Do not allow this to happen! It is morally wrong to force this upon so many people. I would rather pay more for electricity than ruin so many lives. I would like to see BPA put this \$300-400 million dollars towards research on better ways to transport electricity. They are still using the same basic power lines that were invented 100 years ago. Have they truly researched the alternatives? I don't believe so.

Communication ID: 12113

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: ALAINA R BEZOLD

To Whom it may concern, If the BPA does decide to installed the 500-kilovolt transmission line in our area, please move the tentative line # 29 further east from its proposed location. By moving the line further east it will be located on Washington State's DNR land and large tracts of forest lands which have very few home sites which would be affected by the installation of the power lines. My parents have 28 acres in the Yaolt area and the proposed #29 line will go directly through their property. This will force them to have to abandon their home and land. We moved there in December of 1991 after spending the summer and fall building our home ourselves. We also planted the majority of the land in trees. My

parents have maintained their land according to the tree farmers specifications all these years. They have put tens of thousands of dollars and hard work into this land. All this they would not get back if they were forced from their home. Please seriously consider moving the #29 line east onto government land. Thank you, Alaina Bezold

Communication ID: 12114

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: FLORIAN DEISENHOFER

Communication ID: 12115

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: SUSAN M BARTH

We currently live in Yacolt and we are on Line 27. If this line goes through this could cause us to loose our home and I provide care to an elderly couple that live on their property therefore this elderly couple would not be able to stay in their own home and I would be out of a job. If this is built it should be on a route that will have a less impact on homes and property.

Communication ID: 12116

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: AJAY K MALLIK

What is the construction schedule?

Communication ID: 12117

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: JAMES D HOWSLEY

Communication ID: 12118

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: GREG R CHRISTISON

Hello Mark,

This is followup to the conversation we had at the Mark Morris HS public project forum last Thursday. As we discussed, the area of North Columbia Heights Road on maps #7 and #5 is in process of being

rezoned from rural 5 acre lots to 2.5 acre lots as it is part of the Longview urban expansion area. My sister Taryn Edwards will be developing her 40 acre parcel next to my parents parcel, and the 80 acre northeastern block of my parents property will also be subdivided - just as the 80 acre block immediately to the west of that parcel already is. My understanding is that several adjoining large land blocks immediately to east of my parents and sisters property will also be subdivided within a short time. By the time the line would be built, the entire Northeast quadrant of map section #7 will be subdivided into small home-sites.

It would make no sense to locate a line anywhere near the western 2/3 or segment area #1, because that portion of the proposed route would cut directly through 30+ small lot home-sites in area #7 alone.

Greg Christison

Communication ID: 12119

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: KEN E MILES

Sirs, While I recognize the need to accommodate growth in the region, I believe that the most cost effective solution that minimizes environmental impact will involve locating the new transmission line segment as far east as possible. I have a particular concern regarding the "route segment 31" option which routes the new power lines through a number of rural neighborhoods including ours (we are county parcel [number]). In our case, our home is situated on a hill with open space immediately below us and a view towards Portland. We would appreciate not having our view compromised. More importantly, we believe that you should locate the new line segment well away from these neighborhoods to minimize the impact on them. We understand that there have been discussions with the BLM regarding siting the new line segment on BLM land to the east of our neighborhoods, but that some obstacles have been encountered in working out a plan. If this is true, then I want to urge you to make a priority of resolving the issues with the BLM. I am certain that utilizing BLM land would be much more cost effective and have less environmental impact than routing through our neighborhoods. Best Regards, Ken Miles Homeowner

Communication ID: 12120

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: VIVKIE L DAVIDSON

We are against putting the power line in proposed line #31. This goes directly through the Hockinson/Brush Prairie area, upsetting many more homeowners and families unnecessarily. Using any of the proposed areas further east would be much more realistic. Or, possibly, updating the existing I-5

corridor would be the most logical of all decisions. Also, coming through Hockinson there is a natural gas line that this power line would cross over. I feel using line #31 will be more harmful to the many families that live in and near the line and updating the current line would be a better financial choice (just think how many taxpayers you would be removing from this area).

Communication ID: 12121

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: SIDNEY CHAN,LINDA J CHAN

BPA

I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project Team

To whom it may concern:

BPA's proposed segment 31 of the I5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would ruin the quality of life for thousands of homeowners and dramatically shrink the property tax base for Clark County. This segment must not be allowed to go forward. BPA has other alternatives, including adding to existing lines to the west, as well as segments further east that are entirely uninhabited. Although BPA explained that the alternatives are also problematic, the disadvantages of the alternatives pale in comparison to segment 31.

Many properties and views would be ruined, taking away one of the primary attractions of the area to homeowners. These are very quiet and private neighborhoods that value the rural life. Not only will there be massive clear-cutting, existing residential access roads would be compromised and many new maintenance roads built to accommodate the towers. At least one school site and several business sites would also be ruined. In addition to homes and schools, there are berry and tree farms, natural preserves, wetlands, and high-cost forested areas spanning the length of segment 31.

Segment 31 would significantly reduce the value of thousands of homes in the Hockinson community. Not only will it reduce the property values in the area, the lower property values will prevent homeowners from selling and moving to another area. This project will dramatically shrink the tax revenue from areas with the highest property values in the county and will compromise Clark County's ability to fund schools and infrastructure for the rest of the county. Although the direct human costs of segment 31 are unconscionable, this "ripple effect" for the rest of the county must also be considered. Please stop this project before it destroys our treasured community.

Sincerely,

Sidney & Linda Chan

Communication ID: 12123

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: DELORES M WALLER

I am opposed to lines 27 and 30. The combination of these lines would cause many people to lose their homes and bring our property values down. I am an elderly woman who receives 24 hour care by my caregiver who also lives on our property with her four children and husband. This would cause them and us to lose our homes and if not lose it we could all be faced with health problems as a result of living next to these high voltage power lines. I urge you to find a better route to go in which to build the power lines such as going out in the burn. Also many homes have been built in the general area in the last few years and would cause many homeowners to lose homes and property. I urge you to reevaluate the placement of where these lines must go. Also we have a lot of exotic trees and home to a family of deer and other wild life on our property and this would be devastating to all.

Communication ID: 12124

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: BARBARA J BARNARD

Route 31 is unacceptable for health, economic and ethical reasons. More logical alternative locations for this project exist. Please identify an alternative that negatively impacts far fewer people. Health risks to hundreds of families and school children along Route 31 are too great. Life and health are very precious. Never accept that risk to the safety of our school children or families. Equally significant is the severe negative impact to many individual homeowners along Route 31. It's unconscionable that the financial interests of these land owners can be destroyed by a project that serves all people throughout the region. Please place the power lines where individual land owners do not unfairly bear the brunt of the financial impact. It is wrong to destroy property values of so many people. If possible, build this project under ground where there is minimal risk of damage from fire and wind and snow storms. It's the right thing to do. The devastating financial impact to Hockinson School district through diminished tax funding and loss of land use is unacceptable. As a taxpayer and parent of students in Hockinson I am very concerned about the negative financial impact of Route 31 on Hockinson School District. I respectfully and strongly urge you to build the new power lines further East on government land, under ground or co-located with existing power lines where far fewer people will be impacted.

Communication ID: 12126

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: DALE E BARNARD

I am a Hockinson Resident adamantly opposed to the proposed line/segment/route #31. In this day of advanced technology, energy conservation, sustainable resources and limiting our industrial & residential "footprint" the proposed line fails on all counts. Specifically, I am against this ill conceived

destruction of our East County Resources for the following reasons: • Undue Danger to Emergency Response: Line #31 will create an elevated obstruction that effectively limits HEMS Pre Hospital Medevac in the entire grid in the event of an emergency. This makes the entire footprint a Danger Zone to HEMS & ground personnel dependent upon LifeFlight medevac for rural emergencies. • Health & Public Safety as it relates to direct & indirect effects of EMF's & Above Ground High Voltage Lines. Negative impact upon School District & residents. • Try harder to create more transmission capacity amongst existing routes. Don't take the easy way out. This present technology is obsolete. • No underground transmission alternatives have been proposed that would follow existing routes. • Compromising the highest value asset most Hockinson Area residents have, their home & property. And doing so while most resident struggle to survive financially. • Destroy a rural way of life that most of us have worked hard to achieve all our lives. • Negative economic impact on area farmers & ranchers by destroying much of the last remaining arable & grazing land left in Clark County. • Negative impact to property & housing values and the resultant lowered tax base. • Negative economic impact to Clark County proper as those forced to relocate, do so outside of the county since most of the counties remaining rural land is being developed. • Danger to General Aviation: Public & private airparks. Adding an elevated obstruction above the valley floor creates undue hazards for the few remaining grass & paved public and private airports in that exist in East Clark County. • Detrimental to School District: Reduced values means reduced tax revenue. Adjacent School District land will be devalued further (negative economic impact) . These are merely 11 reasons that I see as ample evidence to encourage all residents, local, state and federal officials to oppose Line #31. Respectfully submitted, Dale Barnard Hockinson Resident

Communication ID: 12127

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: MIKE SCHMAUCH

Date: December 8, 2009

Regarding: I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

I (or we) are asking BPA to extend the 500kV Power Line "Scoping period" to allow BPA to willingly add 2-3 more alternatives or to allow us to gather enough information to force BPA to provide such alternatives. In either case, we need a longer scoping period because BPA is not legally required to consider anything in the EIS that's not brought up during the scoping period! We have been seeking adequate information from BPA to show the viability of these additional alternate routes, both by asking, and by using FOIA requests, but BPA has not been responsive to either approach and it does not seem that they will be before December 14, 2009.

These are summaries of the additional alternatives we want BPA to consider although we know more technical information would be needed concerning each. We do know that there are 3 reasonable alternatives—every bit as viable as the current BPA alternatives, and much more palatable to the

citizens:

1. We know a “Paul-Pearl” alternative was on the planning boards of BPA up until recently. “Paul” refers to the start of this project near the Centralia Coal Power Plant and “Pearl” refers to an ending point near Wilsonville (it makes little difference electrically as to whether it ends in Troutdale or Pearl). This line would mostly follow an existing path of 3 existing High Voltage Power lines and would cross the Columbia at or near “Lord Island” and then pass through Alston and Keeler. Most of the land impacted on the Oregon side is industrial, or non-residential/private, or highly disturbed land. The right-of-way would simply need to be widened, but all the support services such as access roads etc would already be there. This would not create an additional safety issue for planes flying along the Columbia since 3 lines already cross there and the required FAA precautions already exist. This should be the cheapest, and fastest, and least disruptive alternative by far. We know that BPA had, for the last eight years or so, assumed internally that this would be the route they would use once they figured out where to get the money for the project. How come it disappeared at this late date—at least as an alternative?

2. There is a more easterly route that is quite feasible too. This would start at “Paul” and end near Bonneville dam to cross the Columbia there, or tie into the lines running parallel to the Columbia on the Washington side at a convenient place (the same line they are currently proposing to tie into except further east). By going some distance (2-5 miles or so) further east than segment #29 (one of the current proposals), there would be only about 6 land owners to deal with and no private citizens. There would then be no EMF risk to large numbers of people; less potential for lawsuits; no impact on assessed property values; it would be built on mostly bedrock; and the value of the timber to be cut would offset significant costs in case the line would be slightly longer. The sale of timber should increase County revenues some too.

3. Use HTS superconducting technology for the line following segment #31. This is new, but not untested technology. Such lines have been installed for six years and the technology is improving all the time. This could be designated as a “test of concept” line for BPA. This technology eliminates EMF concerns and the unsightly aspect of the other proposals, especially of those citizens concerned along segment #31, a suburban high-end residential area valued for its scenic views. Here’s a Brochure on it: http://www.amsc.com/pdf/HTSC_AN_0109_A4_FINAL.pdf . We feel it should at least be considered at this time and have its pros on cons weighed publically relative to the existing proposals.

The need for this line is not related to the needs of Clark County, nor Portland, or the State of Washington or Oregon or any “local loads” in the Pacific Northwest. It is needed to more easily meet the needs of California because they have “self-mandated” that their electrical power, sometime in the near future, must have a 25% “green” component and they cannot produce that green amount themselves. Canada is willing and capable of providing it provided the BPA 500-kV main grid is beefed up to carry it. It is not fair for the Clark county citizens to be so “put upon” by the BPA just to provide CA power when reasonable alternatives are available which would hardly be noticed by any citizens.

If we had adequate access to BPA’s internal documents and an extended scoping period, we feel confident that these 3 additional alternatives (at least) could be justifiably shown to be viable

alternatives, and from the citizens' viewpoint, each would be much more preferable than those currently offered by BPA. The facade that BPA dresses itself with, that they are just a bunch of neutral technical engineers led by the facts that show the "best way", is losing it credibility. Where has "Government of the people, by the people FOR the people" gone? It seems to have gone to CA.

Sincerely,

Michael Schmauch (Smock)

President of the Sunny Hill Home Owners' Association in Hockinson

Member of the Steering Committee to Fight the BPA Power Line Proposal

Communication ID: 12128

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: JUDY L DRIVER

We received your letter regarding the I-5 project. We are in section 31, page 85. For us personally it wouldn't necessarily be a bad deal since we were already planning to sell our home. However, we did want to sell it before the spring 2012, but now we must postpone our plans until you make your decision. In spite of that, there are several things that seriously disturb us: 1. The proposed line crosses large residential areas that would disrupt many, many families and communities. A number of people would never financially recoup from the loss of property value. Land values next to these lines are considerably lower than other areas and many people will not even consider purchasing property next to one of these towers. Esthetically, who wants a tower anywhere within their view? The BPA should also consider the impact upon families whose lives would be strongly, negatively, impacted and the impact upon these families should be included in the EIS. 2. The line in the Hockinson area is too close to a school and crosses property which the school district owns with future plans to build a new school. 3. It seems that it would be wiser, if the BPA would plan to place overhead lines in areas that have a lower population impact. A line placed further east and, as much as possible, on federal or forest service lands would be better choice. The line would also create a natural and maintained fire break thus limiting wildfires. Why not use public lands as much as possible? There is no easy solution, I realize. Some animal, person, or habitat will be disrupted forever. There is no way around it. But the proposed routes seem like they would have too many negative impacts. Please consider moving the line further east.

Communication ID: 12129

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: ASHLEY R PIRRONE

I have grown up in my home located on the east fork of the Lewis River. It was there that my brother and I learned how to fish, hike, survive in the forest, but most of all we learned how to respect nature. Also spending some of my childhood in Long Beach California I know that many people around the United States never obtain the privilege of experiencing nature at its greatest. Many of my friends from California have never seen the snow, a forest, or even had the experience of seeing wildlife. They are amazed at my pictures and of my knowledge of plant names and animal habitats and tendencies. To truly understand something to the fullest a person must be immersed in it, and have their surroundings be their teacher. Without another large section of these mountains, valleys, forests, and rivers an extremely important value in my life and the life of many Americans would be missing. The understanding and respect for nature that is needed to keep this planet healthy and working to our full advantage. Where will America be in the future if it is missing the majority of its natural wildlife and habitats. Where will the youth and families of America be in the future without these resources to educate and bond with each other. Many times in the past my brother and I have sat by the river, listening to the water gurgling gently on the rocks, basking in the warm sun and blue sky overhead, and feeling the presence of life all around us. It's times like these that we told ourselves that we would always keep the house that we were raised in. We would keep it to ensure that our children would gain the same wisdom and respect of nature that is so valuable and necessary for each generation. If these power lines are installed taking all the houses, all the habitats, and all the wildlife and displacing them, where in this state, or country, or world will we find all the things that this area holds. Where else will we be able to ensure the future that we want for our children. The truth is grim, there are very few places like this left in this country. If places, that are so few in number, like this keep getting ruined like this, there will not be anywhere left to fulfill the dreams that we all have had of this special place giving as great a childhood to our children as it did us. It is not only that but the destruction of thousands of habitats and endangered wildlife that return to this place every year to reproduce. How can we stand by and watch the destruction of things that there are laws to protect. Is this also a question of justice, I say it most certainly is. Many people will scoff and say it's just one area, it's just some houses, it's what needs to be done. I say in return, is it only our lives, is it only our children's lives, is it only our future, is it only our children's future that is at stake? I say again, isn't that what matters in this world is your children, and their children, and their children's children well being. Is that not what matters. I say that is what matters most in this world, and I most certainly can't stand by and watch everything that I, my parents, and grandparents worked for go to waste.

Communication ID: 12130

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: DOUGLAS MOSCHETTI, CAROLINE MOSCHETTI

We are submitting this email to ask that BPA explore alternative options and extend the scoping period to at least six months before moving forward with the I-5 Corridor Project. My husband and I built our home 18 years ago on property that has been in my family since 1912. I am third generation to live and work our land. If this project goes forward our property will be ruined both aesthetically and in real

estate value. My family has developed and maintained not only our land but neighboring sites as well. We have been active members of the north county community for the last 100 years. My husband and I are both nearing retirement and look forward to having the opportunity to pass along our property to our children and grandchildren. In an age when we as a society should be looking to use less and conserve more, this monstrous project seems not only wasteful but deceitful as well. I am finding it hard to believe that with most industry shut down in Clark County and home sales and construction on the decline, that suddenly we need more power sources. Why was this project not proposed four years ago when the economy was booming and new home sales and construction were at an all time high? I can only be led to believe that power is needed somewhere other than here locally and that BPA sees the opportunity to acquire right of ways at a much reduced cost. I would like to think that my government agencies are exploring all alternative sources to expanded government at the cost of the individual homeowner. I know this probably does not mean much to you or the people making the decisions on this project, but it means everything to us and the thousands of individuals it will affect. I ask that you explore combining with existing utility right of ways crossing at Longview, alternative sources of power transmission i.e. The Juan de Fuca Cable ("JDF Cable") a 550 megawatt High Voltage Direct Current ("HVDC") Light® submarine electric transmission line that will connect the Greater Victoria area of British Columbia with Port Angeles in Washington State, conservation incentives rather than increased usage and not building any more transmission lines at all. I attended the meeting last week at Yacolt Primary School and came away more discouraged than before. I would greatly appreciate truthful answers from BPA to the following questions, which I am quite certain I did not get at the meeting: Who really benefits from the new line? Explain in detail what the causes are of the problems it will supposedly relieve. Demonstrate the truth of the assertion that it is not a case of Canadian power going south to California. Why are no Oregon routes on the table and are not included in the EIS in the same detail as any of the Washington routes? A full an explanation of why and how no Oregon routes were included from the start. Explain in detail who would finance this, who would benefit, and how the funding would be repaid, and by whom. Respectfully submitted, Douglas and Caroline Moschetti

Communication ID: 12131

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: RICHARD BRANTLEY

As a satisfied user of electricity, I can see the probable need for new powerlines for additional transmission capability. What I cannot comprehend is the notion of placing them over the homes of my neighbors and my own family. A quick glance at the map shows a direct route running nearly straight south in the vicinity of legs 29,34,35 or slightly further east so as to miss as many homes as possible. This route places the line almost entirely through uninhabited timberland. The potential loss of timber revenue would likely be more than offset by the potential loss of property taxes. Despite having lost both legs in Vietnam, I've crawled over every inch of my land and swam the acre or so of pond/swamp in the 30 something years I've been taking care of it. Please rethink locating this powerline further to the east.

Communication ID: 12132

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: JAMES M DAVIDSON

Bonneville Power Administration is a large, amoral federal organization that has no specific concern for Clark County citizens yet they have the power to ruin their lives and may be on a course to do so. The "I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project" is planned to augment future needed power supplies of the region, mostly Tacoma. The best option for this new line is within the current I-5 corridor. BPA's claims a common mode failure, such as an airplane crash, forest fire, or a landslide is a reason not to consider this perfectly adequate corridor. That is nonsense. The present corridor has no landslide hazards over its length, there is no significant forest for a serious fire, and protecting against a plane crash is stretching credulity. It is clear that BPA has not seriously attempted to promote selection of the existing corridor and/or develop adequate justification to authorities for doing so. That is inexcusable. There clearly was provision for a second line in the existing I-5 corridor – Google Earth overhead shows the existing power lines hugging the west-most side of the corridor for its entire length. The original planners envisioned providing for a second line on the other side. That is what the current planners should be doing as well. Of the other corridors, Corridor 31 would unconscionably lay wreck to Clark County. Not only would it be an eyesore throughout the most beautiful part of Clark County, it would displace the largest number of people of any new corridor while condemning their properties at current depression prices. Corridor 31 would forever change the character of Clark County. Other corridors to the far west (35, 24, and 29) seem satisfactory, running through forests and undeveloped land for the most part. If the BPA must use a second corridor instead of the existing one, the 35, 24, and 29 route on the far east should be selected.

Communication ID: 12133

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: LUCY GILLINGHAM

Hello this is Lucy Gillingham I live at [Address]. I don't think that I will be affected by the lines but I am a realtor and would like to know exactly where those proposed lines will be I've checked the web site and cannot find exact addresses so please either mail me or email me at [Email] call me at [Phone] or mail me a packet. Thank you, thats [Address]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 12134

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: JARRED L JACKMAN

Hello, I am an avid mountain biker. I have long thought the SW Washington area needed more off road

cycling opportunities, and specifically more singletrack. Many great opportunities exist outside of the towns, in the counties. But on a daily basis there are very few good opportunities to ride singletrack close to home. This opportunity in the Yacolt Burn area, for more quality trails, is essential to the growth of a sport that will help build communities, families, public health, and positive land stewardship. I hope that you will find a suitable place to route the new power lines that will not inhibit or interrupt the experience recreationists within or around the Yacolt Burn. Thank You Jarred Jackman

Communication ID: 12135

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: ED ROBERTSON,LAURA ROBERTSON

Please take our concerns seriously regarding this BPA project. My husband and I have lived at this home in Hockinson since 1983. Our home and adjoining property (that being two parcels) are affected by this. I am concerned about my property values (!) health issues, and our longtime investment that we had here. The depreciation on the value of our properties will certainly diminish our quality of retirement that we have been so carefully banking on for so many years.

Our community is fighting segment 31 vigorously and I sincerley hope other options are being explored with minimal impact to homeowners like ourselves.

Thank you.

Laura and Ed Robertson

Communication ID: 12136

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: SHARLEEN LEE

My name is Sharleen lee and our phone number is [Phone] and it appears that we will be somewhere near line 31 and we would really appreciate if you would take under consideration all of the people that will be affected by your lines and if you could please move them to a different area to the east away from us, and we are looking forward to a spoken period being extended to march 31st. thank you.

Communication ID: 12137

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: RICHARD VAN DIJK

Fish, Wildlife and People. As residents of the Pacific Northwest who pay the costs of the BPA's power

operations, we also pay for the massive costs of the environmental stewardship that the BPA proudly proclaims on its corporate website. (See <http://www.efw.bpa.gov/> and BPA's Strategic Objectives noted below). I submit that while it is entirely proper that the BPA should arrange for the people who use the electricity to pay to mitigate the damage caused by generating it, it should be at least an equal priority for the BPA to protect the human environment with as much care and consideration - or more. A targeted \$800 million per year in 2010/2011, funded by everyone who pays in any way for power bought from the BPA, seems significant enough to me that, as human beings, we might expect some similar budget to be spent on non-Fish., non-wildlife human environmental preservation. Seizing property and destroying the lives of hundreds of residents to construct a 70-mile clear-cut blight across the most beautiful, and scenic part of our county does not feel like responsible environmental stewardship, and we must ask what it would take for the BPA to realign the proposed line to where it disturbs the human and natural environments the least, and charge the incremental cost of doing so to the marketing companies that will be using it? We fund the fish, we fund the wildlife; let someone fund the humans. 1: <http://www.perc.org/articles/article232.php> The GAO attempted to quantify the costs of recovery. In the five years between 1997 and 2001, federal agencies, including the Bonneville Power Administration, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, various branches of the Department of the Interior, and the Environmental Protection Agency have spent \$968 million of federal money, plus an additional \$537 million given by the federal government to States and Native American tribes on salmon recovery in the Columbia and Snake rivers (GAO 2002, 3). By this accounting, federal agencies spent \$1.505 billion over the five years or about \$301 million per year. My (author's) independent effort to quantify the costs of salmon recovery (Landry 2003) suggests that the costs are much higher-approximately \$2.879 billion over five years, or \$575.7 million per year. The table provides a summary of this federal spending on salmon recovery from 1998 to 2002, as identified by direct communication with departments and agencies heavily involved in salmon recovery. It avoids or at least minimizes double counting by considering various cost reimbursement agreements between agencies. Unlike the GAO report, this study includes the cost of reduced power generation (the amount of hydropower forgone) due to salmon recovery efforts. Most agencies do a poor job of accounting for salmon recovery expenditures. Thus, the most accurate figures are those of the BPA and the Corps, but they must be carefully tracked. The BPA records expenditures as a salmon recovery-related project when it allocates money to the Corps for cost reimbursement. The Corps records the same money as a salmon-related expenditure when funds are allocated. The end result would be an overstatement of expenditures unless the funds are tracked. In 1998, the BPA (including money it allocated to the Corps) spent \$342 million on salmon and steelhead recovery. With 856,000 of these fish entering the mouth of the Columbia River in 1998, the average cost per salmon was \$399.14. 2: <http://www.lcpud.org/notices.html> ; April 2007 BPA Rates and Control Costs – Rising Costs for Fish Since 1978 Northwest ratepayers have spent more than \$7 billion on fish and wildlife programs. Today BPA spends an average of \$690 million each year on such programs. BPA fish spending amounts to approximately 21% of its power costs. Lewis PUD purchases nearly all its power from BPA and for calendar year 2006, paid BPA approximately \$25 million for power. As a result Lewis PUD ratepayers in 2006 paid \$5 million or approximately 13% for fish. A typical Lewis PUD residential customer that purchases 2,100 kilowatt hours every two months pays \$100 for power of which \$13 is for BPA fish programs. 3:

www.cnr.uidaho.edu/for235/pdf/Fall%202009/Columbia%20Basin%20Economics%20IV.pdf BPA Spending on Fish & Wildlife in 2007 Total BPA spending -\$716 million F&W program budget --\$140 million Hatcheries operation; Habitat improvements; Predator control ;Monitoring, evaluation & research Interest & amortization of capital spending -\$113 million Dam passage structures; Hatcheries; Fish-related dam operations by Corps & BOR -\$60 million Cost reimbursed by BPA Hydropower operations; Lost hydropower from spill --\$283 million Power purchases --\$121 million Other costs paid by other federal & state agencies: Other hatchery costs Other habitat costs Costs passed on to electricity users & taxpayers 4: http://www.agforestry.org/ilac_index.html Balancing the Demands of fish and Water Go to the PowerPoint presentation by Mike Normandeau of the BPA Or go to the Direct link below

<http://www.agforestry.org/images/ILAC%20Pics/ILAC%20powerpoints/Balancing%20the%20Demands%20for%20Energy%20and%20Water%20-%20Mike%20Normandeau%20-%20BPA%20Presentation.ppt> The whole presentation is interesting, but...see slide 16, BPA's Fish and Wildlife Program. I understand this as saying that the BPA ratepayers (and not the Transmission Customers) will be paying \$800 million per year for Fish and Wildlife conservation. Notes:

www.bpa.gov/corporate/about_BPA/StratDocs/Strategic_Objectives_Paper_2010-2016.pdf Vision BPA will be an engine of the Northwest's economic prosperity and environmental sustainability. BPA's actions advance a Northwest power and transmission system that is a national leader in providing: • High reliability; • Low rates consistent with sound business principles; • Responsible environmental stewardship; and • Accountability to the region. We deliver on these public responsibilities* through a commercially successful business. * The four characteristics listed above define BPA's public responsibilities and are the "four pillars" of BPA's vision.

Communication ID: 12138

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: ANONYMOUS

I am just calling, I live in Hankinson Washington its up in brush prairie Washington I am a resident there I can't remember the line 31 I think whatever line was supposed to go in there. The community of Hankinson it's a, you know I lived in Portland OR for a while and I moved up there you can't be seriously thinking about putting the lines through Hankinson its too close to families and kids and school and what not, there has got to be another way to do it. That is all I am calling for, thanks.

Communication ID: 12139

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: MICHAEL CIRAULO

Re: City of Battle Ground Comments on I-5 Reinforcement project

Dear Mr. Korsness:

As the Bonneville Power Administration prepares an environmental impact statement to evaluate the impacts of a proposed 500-kilovolt transmission line and associated substations in BPA's service area, the City of Battle Ground would like to provide comment on the transmission lines that are proposed to be placed in the southwestern Washington area.

The City of Battle Ground would like to strongly urge that the BPA not install proposed transmission lines identified as 26, 27, 28, 30 and 31 on the BPA's I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project Study Area Map dated September 24, 2009. After consideration of public testimony and reviewing the information that has been provided from the BPA, the City has found that installation of the aforementioned lines would greatly impact the quality of living for the residents of the affected area. As such, the City would encourage that the BPA explore alternative transmission lines towards the east of the transmission line identified as 29 on the Study Area Map. The City believes that, by moving transmission lines to the eastern portion of the County, the amount of residents impacted by the transmission lines would be reduced as this area is less populated.

If the BPA is unable to accommodate this request, the City would respectfully request that the BPA explore alternative methods to electrical transmission instead of the proposed overhead power lines. In this case, the City would suggest that the BPA consider transmission through underground power cables in order to maintain the value of the land in the area and aesthetics. Furthermore, the City understands that underground power cables greatly reduce the emission of electromagnetic fields and require a narrower surrounding area for installation versus overhead lines. Lastly, underground cables pose no hazard to low flying aircraft and Wildlife which are both located in the proposed transmission line area.

The City is certainly not against progress and certainly realizes that the Bonneville Power Administration plays an integral part in meeting future electricity demands which will, in turn, allow the City to grow and prosper. However, the City believes that this can be in a manner that is less obtrusive to the community's existing residents and that can appease all parties.

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project and look forward to continuing dialogue with the Bonneville Power Administration in order to determine an amicable resolution.

With Regards,

Michael J. Ciraulo

Mayor

Communication ID: 12140

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: BARRY A FINKEL

Dear Mark,

I just finished reading the article entitled "Power Line Comment Period Extended" in the latest edition of the Battle Ground Reflector. The wording used made it sound like BPA has already made the decision not to add capacity to the existing route 9. Is that what you intended?

BTW, when we met I recall that you said adding a 500 KV line to route 9 would require derating the power handling capacity of both the 230 and 500 KV lines. While I'm familiar with derating criteria for electronic parts it never occurred to me that a power line might be subject to derating only because it was in proximity to another. At the time I thought nothing of it but later it tweaked my (former) engineering interest. I searched the Internet for power line derating criteria and came up empty. Is there a web site you can point me to that gives guidelines?

Have a great Thanksgiving.

Regards,

Barry

Communication ID: 12141

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: LYNETTE ZUERCHER

Before making a comment I have a question. That is on the map the various yellow lines..do they represent possible routes and only one will get selected or are they all going to be used for the lines?

Communication ID: 12142

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: FIONN M MURPHY,SILVERLINA E MURPHY

Please don't take my home. I love it here.

Communication ID: 12144

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: ASHE M MURPHY

Please don't take our home! Our daddy left us and this home is all we have left. Please do not run your

new line through anywhere families live. Sincerely, Ashe Age 9

Communication ID: 12145

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: RA K MURPHY

Please son't run the lines over or near our home! Since our daddy left, it is all we have. It will break my mom's heart. Please don't. Ra Age 5

Communication ID: 12146

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: FAE M MURPHY

Please don't take our home or build the line anywhere near it! We love it here. Fae age 5

Communication ID: 12147

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: REBECCA L MURPHY

Not only is the "scoping period" too short - we are still finding people who don't know about these plans, so please extend it to March 30, 2010, but these lines through populated areas are just downright wrong! Some people, like me, weren't even sure what line they were on until recently. Your scoping meetings were a joke - I learned more at the Dec. 2 Yacolt meeting, than at all of the others you organized. You have the capability to use the existing line through Allston to Keeler. Use that route - it will impact fewer people. Or find a much more easterly route past line 29 in DNR land. It is a travesty that this is now being touted as "green power" when putting in these lines and maintaining them with harmful herbicides is so far from green! Not to mention putting so many people's lives in limbo while you dicker around before deciding on a path. Stop the insanity and give us our lives back! My home is all I have left. I am on line 26 and have a young organic orchard that is just starting to produce, protected wetlands teeming with wildlife, and my dream home - minus a husband. My life has been disrupted enough this year - I don't need to be fighting the BPA too, but I will to protect my home and my kids.

Communication ID: 12148

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: MICHAEL D BURDICK

While I can understand the need for increased electrical coverage, It makes no sense to uproot up to

10000 homes to do so. There is plenty of unused forest land that would be less of an impact on the electric "users". I bought my house in Battle Ground 5 years ago for, at the time, a great price. Now I could'nt sell it for close to what I bought it. And BPA would offer me "market value"? I'd still owe \$100K and not have a house. I moved my disabled parents and my grandmother in with me because they couldnt make it on their own. Now what? This is both scary, and disappointing to me.

Communication ID: 12149

Date: 11/10/2009

Name: GALEN L WITHERS

12/8/2009 To Whom It May Apply: My home is in the Hockinson area and is on the proposed route segment #31of the BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. The 5 KV line would take out the entire access road for this neighborhood at 212th Avenue and Kristen Circle. There are not enough obscenities I can say about this proposal. Build a nuclear power plant. That will have less impact. But, they did not do a very good job in Oregon, especially when paying \$150 to bore ½ inch hole. But, they did well knocking it down. Or, move the one from Zion, Illinois, they don't use it any more. I do not want to look at a tower from my front porch. I would rather see the wild life! I do not want it nor need it. My property value will go down which is my retirement. You will screw up the esthetic view of my home site. If it is needed that bad, put it under ground. My service to my home is. The only thing positive about this project is, the tweakers will get fried when they try to steal the alminum wire. Respectfully, Galen L Withers [Address]

Communication ID: 12150

Date: 12/10/2009

Name: GEORGE WALLER

I want to express my objection to line 27. If adopted, this line would occupy about one half of my property. I am aware of at least seven homes living within the right of way for this route. Obviously, there are many more along the length of this route. Both my wife and I are over 80 years of age and not in the best of health. Our long-term caregiver, Mrs. Susan Barth lives on our property with her family, including small children. Her home is in the proposed right of way and it would have to go. We cannot live here without her services, thus we too would have to leave. I do not understand why the power line cannot be routed east of Yacolt through largely uninhabited land. This would accomplish BPA's objective and would avoid damaging so many lives.

Communication ID: 12151

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: GRETCHEN STARKE

Dear Mr. Korsness:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scoping for the EIS for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. Vancouver Audubon's concern about this project is the effect it might have on birds and wildlife and their habitat. The biggest problem we see is where the line might cross forest habitat or wetland habitat. We are particularly concerned about the area near Lacamas Creek where it looks as if the lines from #40 north to #36 seem to be over the creek's riparian area. The problem is that vegetation management under the power lines would destroy or greatly modify habitat under and near the lines. The EIS should thoroughly analyze the impacts of vegetation management on birds, especially songbirds, in or near Lacamas Creek and in any forested area. Should any forest wetlands be present, these should be considered with special care.

Another bird-related impact that should be carefully considered is any possibly that birds would be killed or injured by striking the power lines. This is a particular issue with raptors and other large birds. Bald eagles are known to fly long distances and, at a membership meeting we had in the 1090s, a biologist from PPL told us that the same bird was found near the PPL reservoirs on the upper Lewis River and on Sauvies Island. The research for the EIS should determine flight patterns of these large birds. Descriptions of mitigation measures that would deter birds from flying near power lines should be a part of the EIS.

Sincerely,

Gretchen Starke

Conservation Chair,

Vancouver Audubon Society

Communication ID: 12152

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: SANDRA PARGMAN

Mr. Korsness:

I am writing in regards to the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project through Clark County, Washington. Although I realize that power will be needed for future development, I believe the expansion proposal for Clark County needs serious review and would like to voice both my concerns and ideas for further consideration. You already know the feelings of most of the homeowners, but I would like to add a few additional comments for consideration:

1] In the BPA information you provided, you indicated your number one priority was to avoid homes whenever possible. Yet, most of your proposed routes go through neighborhoods and green spaces. These towers would have the most serious repercussions on neighborhoods and would actually divide the county in half. Here in Hockinson, your route #31 crosses over 215th Place. The homes here are high end homes and the entire western and southern portions of this neighborhood are green spaces, streams, and wetlands. Placing towers along this road would destroy the ecological balance we have established for our neighborhood.

2) The proposed route on the far eastern side of the county would, it's true, require the removal of trees from Public Land. Since our county has the highest unemployment rate in the state, selection of this route could have a positive effect as well as a monetary benefit. Putting some of our loggers back to work and possibly opening a mill could greatly enhance the county, not to mention the additional revenue reaped from the sale of the timber. This would be a very positive cost/benefit for everyone.

3) Cutting the trees along the eastern side would also provide a natural fire break. This would add additional fire protection for the public land and home sites.

4) The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) states there is no known barrier that will stop the Electromagnetic Field (EMF). Studies performed on smaller kilovolt lines suggest 150 feet or more for a safe distance, but this is still questionable. No studies have been conducted to determine the exact safe distance for your proposed 500 kilovolt lines. The EPA states "people concerned about possible health risks from power lines can reduce their exposure by: increasing the distance between you and the source and limiting the time spent around the source." Since our homes are already built, these directives from EPA cannot be followed. The only solution is to place these lines away from homes at much greater distances than you propose. The only route with this ability is the one to the far east on public land. This should be the route of choice to ensure the safety of thousands of home owners.

We strongly urge you to seriously consider the eastern route. It meets all the criteria of your intent, has the least effect on homeowners, and has some positive benefits as well. I would also suggest the development of a coalition homeowners group to work with you during this process to help address serious issues. We would all benefit and produce a better outcome for everyone.

Sincerely,

Sandra Pargman,

Clark County Home Owner, Biologist and Safety Manager

Communication ID: 12153

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: CLIFFORD HOMOLA, HELEN HOMOLA

We would like to put in our request that instead of Route 31, you would move the line farther East

where there are not so many homes. Our retirement home was built a couple hundred feet from the power easement which follows 212th Ave. We have a small family tree farm with the largest trees following that easement, so if route 31 is used, it would surely ruin our place. We would greatly appreciate any consideration you give this.

Sincerely,

Clifford and Helen Homola

Communication ID: 12155

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: CHRISTOPHER REIVE,DR JOHN SIMMONS

I represent and write on behalf of Dr. John Simmons and his family, who own property located adjacent to and potentially within a portion of the projected path of the proposed Segment #50 of the BPA's proposed 500-kilovolt transmission line. Dr. Simmons recognizes that the BPA is soliciting at this time only "scoping comments" limited to the planned Environmental Impact Study (EIS) from the public. In that regard, his comments are directly to the planned EIS as a whole, and are not limited solely to that proposed segment which would impact his property.

Dr. Simmons hereby reserves his right to supplement these comments, as appropriate, and to comment on and appeal, as necessary, any final decision of the BPA as it prepares and issues the draft and final EIS and the Record of Decision for this proposed expansion and/or extension of its transmission system.

EIS Scoping Comments

1: The proposed scope of the Environmental Impact Study for this project appears to be limited to considering only one Columbia River crossing alignment that is located in or near heavily populated areas in Camas.

Alternative alignments located east of that proposed crossing are not considered. There is no explanation for that limitation in alternatives, and

the EIS proposal is thus deficient in that regard.

2: The EIS should consider the use of underground or DC transmission cables, as an alternative to the proposed aerial transmission line(s). Any failure to consider such alternatives inappropriately limits consideration of technologies that could minimize or eliminate EMF hazards and also fails to

address emerging "smart grid" designs that are better suited to DC systems.

3: The proposed alignment appears to incorporate segments that are limited to 150 foot rights of way. The EIS should address this issue, as in our experience there is little or no precedent for such a narrow

alignment.

We are informed that 500KV power lines require at least a 200 foot right of way, and in some cases can be located no closer than 250 feet from the nearest occupied building. The EIS should specifically address this issue. See Comment 5, below.

4: Some of the land lying under the proposed power line is used by grazing animals. The impact of EMF should be assessed Within the EIS. In that regard, Dr. Simmons offers the following information as a starting point, but other such credible studies exist and the EIS should not be limited in this regard. (c). <http://www.nextuD.org/pdf/AFPjudgmentElectromagneticRadiationPowerlineDiseaseAnimal514112008.pdf>. See, <http://www.stop-tht.org/Citizen-s-Survev-Living-witha.html> with the English version of the survey at http://www.stoptht.org/IMG/pdf/090219_living_with_a_very_high_voltage_power_line.pdf.

http://www.stoptht.org/IMG/pdf/090219_living_with_a_very_high_voltage_power_line.pdf.

See, <http://www.stop-tht.org/Citizen-s-Survev-Living-witha.html> with the English version of the survey at http://www.stoptht.org/IMG/pdf/090219_living_with_a_very_high_voltage_power_line.pdf.

with the English version of the survey at http://www.stoptht.org/IMG/pdf/090219_living_with_a_very_high_voltage_power_line.pdf.

http://www.stoptht.org/IMG/pdf/090219_living_with_a_very_high_voltage_power_line.pdf.

Also see. <http://www.stoptanc.com>)

5: With regard to proposed segment #50, it appears that only a 100 foot right of way is proposed, and it is proposed to tranverse a portion of a section of land planned to be annexed by the city of Camas for commercial use. Other sections of that area include areas that are densely populated and the proposed alignment passes within 500 feet of the new Camas High School. For all of the reasons listed above as legitimate areas needing further inquiry, the EIS should address the above issues in light of other less intrusive and safer alternative alignments.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully submitted.

Christopher L Reive

cc: Dr. John Simmons

Communication ID: 12156

Date: 12/10/2009

Name: DAVID P ANDERSON

As the President and a representative of the Tranquavilla Homeowners Association I would like to take this opportunity to express the association's opposition to the construction of the I-5 Corridor Power Line Reinforcement project. Specifically, we oppose lines 31, 37 and 38. Our opposition to this project is based on a number of factors which are noted below. Line 31 which follows an existing Pacific Corp 100 foot right of way would span over at least two, and potentially four, of the lots and houses in our

neighborhood. If chosen line 31 would require the removal of at least two of these homes. It would also severely impact the value of the remaining homes in the neighborhood. Our sub division is a rarity in Clark County. It is essentially a village of 11 secluded homes at the end of a half mile private drive next to forested portions of property belonging to Clark County. The homes are situated on rare one acre lots at the base of Green Mountain. The immediate area near our neighborhood is the habitat for numerous deer, coyote, bobcat, red tailed hawks, owl, turkey vultures and the occasional black bear. Our neighborhood includes a pond that is the source of small unnamed creek that eventually flows into LaCamas Lake. The pond and creek are adjacent to the Pacific Corp right of way and is a year round riparian zone inhabited by ducks, geese and Blue Heron. The proposed alignment of line 31 connects to line 37 and 38 just south of our neighborhood on the steep slopes of Green Mountain. This poses a real threat of landslides to our neighborhood. Any disturbance of the hillside could potentially trigger slides and sloughing of the hillside. The soil in the area is composed of very damp clay overlying the older basalt formation of Green Mountain, very similar to the Portland West Hills where slides are common. Each of the 11 homes in our neighborhood is serviced by well water. This water comes from water that flows off of Green Mountain and is trapped in-between the top layer of thick clay and the lower basalt rock layer. Our water source is sensitive to any changes or clearing of the type needed for line 37 and 38 on the hillside above the homes. This same issue could affect the septic systems at each home as the systems are dependant and react to changing ground water levels. It is my understanding that the 100 foot Pacific Corp Right of way was purchased in 1958 from the small number of landowners who lived in the area at that time. 50 years later much has changed in the area of line 31. There are a vastly greater number of people, structures and homes located close to the right of way compared to when the right of way was established. Line 31 seems to be inconsistent with the current denser concentration of homes along the route. Our understanding is that the State of California recommends that a line of this size use a 300 foot wide right of way to limit electro magnetic interference. We believe the 100 right of way is not wide enough and that the proposed power lines will adversely affect cell phone, wireless phone, wireless internet and other digital age devices in our homes, devices unforeseen years ago when the Pacific Corp right of way was established. We believe that other proposed routes for this project will have less of an impact on our particular neighborhood as well as other homeowners in Clark County. Several of the potential routes either use existing power line routes or are located in the remote woodlands of the county in the area of the Yacolt Burn. These other routes are either longer or reduce the desire for redundancy in the BPA system. However, we believe that the line routings that the BPA eventually chooses should consider the effect on property owners first and foremost. Please consider this input in your decision making regarding this project. Sincerely, David Anderson President Tranquavilla Homeowners Association [Adress],[Email],[Phone]

Communication ID: 12157

Date: 12/10/2009

Name: JOELL D WANDLER

I want to someday live in the area where the lines are proposed. Do not want power lines in my back

yard. I also know folks whose property value will plummet and the quality of life will suffer.

Communication ID: 12158

Date: 12/10/2009

Name: BENJAMIN T CHAMBERS

To whom it may concern

Please give serious consideration to not erecting the proposed power lines through East Clark County. As a homeowner adjacent to properties along a proposed route, I am deeply concerned about this project on numerous levels. I bought my first home precisely because of its location in a community invested in underground utilities, extensive tree canopy, and traffic deterrents. This is a serene neighborhood blessed with wildlife and a dear view of the evening sky. The proposed powerline would be taller than the trees on my land, looming large in my backyard as the stars come out each evening. Construction traffic would disrupt the beautiful jays and other animals that grace the woods here. The associated noise would destroy our neighborhood peace and quiet. The maintenance of the easements would require herbicide use that is especially unhealthy to developing children, those suffering from lung disease such as asthma, and our many local watersheds. "Adding additional 115- and 230-KV transmission lines and Substations would add more total miles of transmission line upgrades than are being proposed with the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project." Cost effectiveness is an admirable goal, but it is not worthwhile at the cost of public health and local economic loss. Property values and tax assessments would be negatively affected. Local farmers, campgrounds, and parks are along the proposed routes. Only those landowners required to move or provide easements would receive monetary compensation. "BPA warns that placing a second line adjacent to the existing 230-kilowolt line would place both lines at risk in case of a forest fire, plane crash or other disaster and could disrupt power transmission to a large area." I ask you, can what might happen be balanced by such an irreconcilable destruction that would happen if this proposal is manifested? There must be a better way than destroying land and homes. East Clark County would forever be irreconcilably damaged by these lines ripping through the heart of our communities.

Please consider placing your new power grid on already publicly-owned land east of inhabited areas or retrofitting the existing grid to carry the increases in power demand.

Benjamin T. Chambers

Communication ID: 12159

Date: 12/10/2009

Name: RICHARD VAN DIJK

when hitting submit, it takes me to a weird page with a lady sitting with a clip board and says we are unable to submit your request

Please Contact Me

richard vna dijk

[email]

[Phone]

Communication ID: 12160

Date: 12/10/2009

Name: REBECCA L MURPHY

December 10, 2009 RE: BPA's I-5 Corridor reinforcement Project We are asking for another longer extension, enough to allow BPA to include in their proposal, as an additional alternative(s), at least one of our 3 viable, suggested alternative routes for the needed power line. We are not suggesting a "no-build" option. We need the additional "scoping period" extension to allow, from a legal standpoint, enough "scoping period" time for BPA to receive their required citizen feedback relative to all their proposed routes that are being considered before they enter into their EIS phase. I understand that if BPA really would allow any of our alternatives to be considered, a comment period extension would be needed. This is not a stalling tactic on our part. In essence, without your help, and therefore without an extension, our "alternative routes" could not be considered by BPA, BPA again gets their way, and a lawsuit would be our only alternative and we know BPA has on staff many, many more lawyers than we could afford hire. Where has "government of the people, by the people, FOR the people gone"? To the courts I guess. ALL three of our viable suggested alternative routes or methodologies would have zero negative citizen impact and we believe would still adequately meet the power needs BPA is addressing. How can BPA be so unresponsive as to not allow even one alternative, of such low citizen impact, be considered. I can send our "alternatives overview letter" (sent to BPA and others) for your review. Even if our alternatives are a little more expensive (we don't know if they are or not), do not people's property and lifestyle have some value that could offset some costs—after all, it's people's money being spent? I also have two BPA maps showing one route we suggest, known as "Paul-Pearl" (favored by BPA for the last 8 years internally), where the new line would follow almost entirely the path of 3 existing power lines, therefore needing only an expansion of right-of-way affecting virtually no citizens and requiring a minimal Environmental Impact Statement. All the support systems are already there like access roads, etc. This should be the most acceptable by citizens, least expensive, and quickest to bring on-line to meet the BPA Power needs. Frankly, we believe that our "slightly more eastern path" alternative would be the one of ours that BPA would select. Our feeling is that BPA sees citizen objections all the time with their "not in my back yard" concerns and they just laugh at us saying, "It's gotta go somewhere and we know best", end of story. Basically, I think they've never really had to actually respond to citizens before by implementing changes relative to their concerns (even though

they collect much citizen input), so why should they start now. I'm not even very optimistic that they will respond to our senators/congressmen etc because you are not electrical engineers. Collecting citizen input, and giving it serious consideration, are two completely different things. BPA is good at collecting—seriously responding, not so much. We have presented serious, known viable alternatives and want them to be given appropriate consideration by BPA. Sincerely, Rebecca L. Murphy Citizen's Steering Committee <http://www.abetterwayforbpa.ning.com> Line 26 Yacolt

Communication ID: 12161

Date: 12/10/2009

Name: MAURY J MUDRICK

To Whom It May Concern: Regarding: Proposed Route 31 I'm writing this letter to express my concern regarding the BPA's proposed route 31. I'm a resident who lives directly west of NE 212th Avenue on 273rd Street. I was disappointed that I was not notified of BPA's proposed plans and had to hear of these plans through neighbors. I can not effectively express how angry I am to hear about the potential loss of homes on 212th Avenue. Many of these homes are raising families in their "dream home." Now a large corporation might possibly condemn these homes and disrupt the lives of so many people. In today's world when times are so difficult economically and otherwise, I'm just amazed that BPA would flex their muscle and kick families out of their homes where they have worked so hard for their accomplishments. You can not just say, "We will pay fair market value," and everything will be okay and go out and purchase another home somewhere. I would challenge you to be put in their position. How would you feel if you were in the same situation? BPA knows the home market is at an all time low and purchasing properties at this time would be to their advantage but would financially devastate the working class. How could you even fathom such of an idea? How can BPA treat people so harshly? BPA's proposal is inhumane and can not be supported in any way. Not only do I feel so bad for the people along NE 212th Street and the many other affected areas, the rest of us nearby will have our homes depreciated by the eyesore of the large electrical towers that will be in view of us. Our home values have already hit rock bottom over the last several years due to the poor economy, and now BPA wants to add insult to injury. Then there are the safety concerns. Sure BPA says there is not a safety risk of the 500 KV lines but they don't show supporting evidence of this. How can we believe the word of an organization who is attempting to destroy the homes of so many people and inflict such hardship? A retired BPA engineer lives nearby and is actively heading the fight against this proposal due to possible safety hazards. I have to believe in this person's concerns more than just the word of BPA. In conclusion, I strongly suggest that BPA find an alternate route other than the much populated route 31. This is a chance for BPA to show they have compassion, values, and morals. Sincerely, Maury Mudrick

Communication ID: 12162

Date: 12/10/2009

Name: LEA STEWART

Hi I'm Lea Stewart I'm the managing editor for the [school] newspaper the talon and I was wondering if I could have a moment of your time so I can discuss the transmission line you guys are planning to put up in our area, I would like to get your perspective on it so we can get all the facts straight and you can call me at [Phone] and please if you could get back to me as soon as possible that would be great. Thank you bye.

Communication ID: 12163

Date: 12/10/2009

Name: LARRY HUTCHINGS

Please have your environmental studies look at BPA routes on Government land only!

I have these other comments:

My house and property sit on the venter line of BPA route 27. BPA has already affected hundreds of home and property owners like me, without as much as turning a spade.

Tell me... Who in their right mind would buy my home and property with this proposal hanging in the wind? I'll answer for you... Nobody. How many people have been trying to sell? BPA has insured those trying will not be able to until this threat is eliminated. Luckily im not one of those unfortunates, as my anger would be worse.

What about property values of homes near power lines? Do you expect us to let BPA reach into our pockets and steal out equity, or worse yet take our homes for some "independent" appraisal amount?

I say no! this is repugnant.

*Extend the scoping period to 3/31/10

Communication ID: 12164

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: FRANK E DEATHELL

We live next to the current #09 line in La Center, WA., For many years we have had a good neighbor relationship with the BPA. Not so good these days. We don't feel that we are being given all the information we need to understand our rights. NO, we don't want any more TOWERS-O-POWER in our backyard, we have enough! Can't get good phone service or T.V. signal. Still wondering about health concerns. And then there's the FISH LADDER, that was built several years back, alot of money and time

was spent, installing this fish ladder, on Riley Creek. The fish are just now starting to make there come back. This is our home, we have been good stewards to our land, and the BPA's land.(Watching illegal dumping, & also, People trying to live, and or camp on the BPA's land) We have been good to the land, and the land has been good to us. We don't feel this is going to be in the best interest of our neighborhood. We have worked very hard to create our little slice of paradise. If more power lines come thru our area, what will that do for our property values? (that have already dropped recently due to bad economy) Now BPA wants to use our property for new TOWERS-O-POWER, Real Estate appraisers will come and apprasie our property at the lowest value. It doesn't seem right, or fair. Thank You for the opportunity to comment

Communication ID: 12165

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: HELEN BETH MORRIS

I want to state my thoughts on the BPA transmission line (Line 31) running through Hockinson area of Clark County Washington. I am hopeful that BPA will see that it isn't always about the money. I am hopeful that BPA will look at the much larger picture of the effects their decision will make. There are people's lives, hopes and dreams wrapped up in these properties.

I understand that there are various routes that are being considered, one of the routes is much further to the east in more of a forested area, not so much residential. In any of the routes that BPA chooses, the environment is going to be adversely affected. But if the transmission lines were to be placed in more of the forested area, there will be fewer people and their properties affected.

If Line 31 is chosen, because of the number of properties you will affect is so large, I would guess it would have a ripple effect in property values of the surrounding area. This would cause much lower tax base to the County and schools that are already hurting financially. Your gain, will be a devastating loss to our area.

Suggestion: Why not see if you can get some TARP funds to help in the job creation that would occur if you were to have the transmission lines go further east. It is my understanding that maybe there would need to be some roads and other infrastructure needed if you chose a route more to the east.

Sincerely,

Helen Beth Morris

[Address]

Communication ID: 12166

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: DOUG ARNDT

This comment is to be appended to my earlier comments to BPA on this proposed action. "The public has not been given BPA's detailed schedule for preparation of this EIS. Specific internal and public decision points and milestones, including comment/review periods, should be made available to public interests immediately. Further, the actions and decisions resulting from BPA's consultations with Federal, tribal, state and local entities as required under NEPA should be made available to the public."

Communication ID: 12167

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: CHRISTOPHER BRAUN

FISH/COWEEMAN FALL CHINOOK RUNS

We are concerned about the impact of proposed segments 10 and 11 on the native salmon in the Coweeman River in Cowlitz County. How can the BPA be certain that any proposed power line, especially a 500kV line, will not threaten this species? Segments 10 and 11 would place at risk the habitat of the Coweeman River fall Chinook. This is a genetically distinct stock (Myers et al., 2003) listed as threatened since 1998 by the U.S Endangered Species Act and actively researched and monitored by the WDFW in collaboration with local volunteer groups. The stock is used as an indicator stock by NOAA fisheries for the management of over twenty naturally produced Tule fall Chinook populations in the lower Columbia River.

There is research suggesting EMF interferes with the migrating instincts of fish. Is this a consideration? Despite whatever mitigation efforts are taken, there is risk from erosion, landslide, and disruption of streams that feed the Coweeman River along segment 11. The proposed segment 11 will cross several fish-bearing creeks on our family's property that feed into the Coweeman River. The WA DNR has required buffer zones to protect the fish in these streams. If BPA removes the trees along the segment 11 ROW won't this have a detrimental effect as well as increase the potential for soil erosion? Is the need for this line worth the risk of irreversible damage to these fish? This is especially true given the history of damage done to other salmon runs in the Northwest by BPA.

EXISTING LINE/RECONDUCTORING

Why is BPA not upgrading the existing 230kV line or using the existing ROW? This would seem to be the most logical and less environmental impacting approach. We understand that using the existing ROW is possible and would require only minimal, if any, additional land use. It would require a minimum of property loss (especially forest lands) and property devaluation for existing land owners. BPA has admitted that the existing ROW is under-utilized. The existing ROW already has access roads and would require very little removal of existing vegetation. If there isn't sufficient room on the existing ROW, then how many additional feet would be required? Since segment 9 (the existing ROW) is included on the maps sent by BPA for public notification, will the EA include this segment and won't use of this segment

be less of an environmental impact? Will the environmental impact of segment 9 be addressed in the draft EA and its following revisions? If not, why not? It is shown as a proposed route segment on the Project Study Area Map released to the public.

SECURITY

If the 500kV line is located adjacent to the existing 230kV line on segment 9, BPA has stated concern over a plane crash that would disrupt service from both lines. The existing line has been there for 30+ years without incident. The terrorist attack argument is simply a use of rhetoric without merit. A serious terrorist threat is going to attack both lines whatever their location, especially a segment in a remote area. And the current segment 9 is not in proximity to airports or landing strips. Also, if separate lines are such an important security concern, why isn't segment 52 being duplicated? A terrorist attack on segment 52 where it crosses the Columbia River would close the river as well as interrupt electrical service to Southwest Washington and Portland. What are the FAA rules for approach to PDX relative to segment 52? Whichever proposed segment is selected for the long run, according to the overview Project Study Area Map the lines converge onto existing segments 50, 51, and 52 and appear to be planned to use the existing ROW. If 50, 51, and 52 are upgraded to 500kV, where is the redundancy?

SOIL

It would be safer to use the existing line from a geo-hazard standpoint because soil conditions are already known. There would be no additional risk. BPA already has the survey, soil and terrain conditions to be addressed and other pertinent data on all existing segments that are available for upgrade.

FINANCIAL

From a financial standpoint, utilizing the existing ROW would not impact any new property owners, and would therefore require less acquisition costs for the easement. Also since BPA already has the data on the soils and terrain on the existing ROW, won't there be a cost savings because less survey, ROW clearing, preparation, and engineering and construction time/costs will be required? Is the BPA considering this financial impact of each segment? Is the BPA going to release the financial impact of each proposed segment? If not, does this mean that cost is not a consideration? If cost is not a consideration, will alternate possibly more expensive solutions/technologies be considered? Obviously, a total cost can only be determined once the final route is selected, but does the BPA have an estimate of the cost of each segment now? If not, that would seem to be poor management. What weight is given to cost in evaluating the viability of each segment? As a public agency, isn't cost a valid consideration? Which is more important, cost or environmental impact? How will this be addressed in the EA?

WILDLIFE

We are also concerned about the affect of the proposed Line 11 on migratory birds including the protected bald eagle at the intersection of the proposed Line 11 and the Coweeman River. There are wetlands and naturally occurring springs adjacent to the river in this area. Both are used by migratory

birds. Will the BPA take this potential disruption of these areas by the proposed easement into consideration?

Nesting Bald Eagles are nearby that routinely fish and hunt along the banks of the Coweeman near the proposed Line 11. This would seem to be an important consideration. Can the BPA guarantee that the proposed line will not interfere with the feeding and nesting habits of these birds? This area of riverfront is currently undisturbed and in a natural state. The proposed easement will open access to this area and that could disrupt the habitat of migratory birds and eagles. Is this a consideration?

COMPENSATION

We own 8.5 acres along the Coweeman River adjacent to the proposed segment 11. Assuming that BPA intends to build Line 11 along the centerline of the proposed route, our property would be adjacent and in the line of sight. Why is the BPA not responsible for compensating us for the inevitable devaluation of our property? Any rational individual would agree that a new freeway built adjacent to an existing house or structure devalues that property. Why is this any different? We had intended to use this property for a residence. The river view which is an integral part of the value of this property will be spoiled. Why are we not entitled to compensation for this loss?

TRESPASS/FIRE DANGER

We are very concerned about the location of proposed Line 11 relative to the fact that the center of the proposed ROW will cross Rose Valley Road within several hundred feet of the Coweeman River. This will provide an open access to both our neighbors and to our property that currently has controlled access. There is very real potential for property damage, theft, and vandalism due to access via the proposed BPA ROW. What measures can BPA take to ensure that the ROW is not used as a means to gain access to adjacent properties and to the Coweeman River? Trespassing along the river will be detrimental to birds and wildlife. Trespass aided by access from the BPA ROW, will also increase fire danger to the surrounding forest lands and neighboring homes. Trespassing is already a problem in this area and this proposed ROW will only make it easier for trespassers.. Is it possible for BPA to secure access to their ROW? Also, the fire danger will increase as the current forest land will be replaced with low vegetation which will be a permanent danger. The closest volunteer fire station is six miles away.

If the BPA is using forest fire as an argument for a separate line, how does BPA justify segment 10 or segment 11 which would primarily be located though forest land? Statistically there are more forest fires today due to climate change. Locating new lines in forest land would seem to be inherently risky.

GENERAL

We own 80 acres of timberland that is a part of the larger family-owned tree farm located in the path of proposed segment 11 in Cowlitz County, WA.

Our farm is a small business, not a large corporation like Weyerhaeuser. The overall impact of the segment 11 on our total family property is at a minimum of 5% with the 150' ROW and greater depending on the ability of BPA to dictate to us relative to "danger trees". The impact on our 80 acres is

approximately 8%. This land cannot be used for any other purpose but growing trees which means economic sacrifice for our family as we depend on this property for our economic well-being.

It appears that BPA will be dictating the use of our property, far in excess of the 150' ROW and that they deliberately understate the impact that the lines will have on timberland. According to information from the BPA, a 15 acre right-of-way near Shelton, WA required removal of 10 additional acres of timber designated as "danger trees". This would mean that BPA would take acreage from our use. There is mature timber currently along the proposed ROW. Who determines which trees adjacent to the ROW will be removed as "danger trees"? How and when will determination be made about compensation? What about trees that are too young to constitute a danger but that will mature in the future and become a potential danger?

We also have a working rock pit on the property. Why should the proposed line be allowed to interfere with our use of this resource? The ROW also has the potential to disrupt our logging operations and increase our operating costs. How will the BPA compensate us in this case?

The prospect of increased trespassing along the proposed ROW will also expose our family to increased liability, vandalism, and theft on our property. Why should we be forced to bear the costs that result from trespassing on the proposed ROW?

Finally, this is forest land, not ranch or farmland. How can BPA compensate us for the loss of the use of our property and the fact that this property can be harvested literally for perpetuity?

SUMMARY

Why do the property owners in the path of the proposed I-5 Corridor program have only 2 months to comment and organize a response to an effort that has been scheduled and planned for quite some time? In the interest of fairness, individuals without the resources and finances available to BPA should be given a longer period of time to comment and formulate a response.

This whole project and the process is stacked in BPA's favor against small property owners. How does a small property owner know that he/she is being treated fairly with respect to the other landowners and especially large landowners such as Weyerhaeuser?

Why should my family be forced to make such a sacrifice, with minimal and inadequate compensation so that power can be sent between California and British Columbia?

Finally, the way this project is being conducted is entirely wrong. The process is not open or transparent. It may be legal through the use of eminent domain but it is not moral. Especially because, in this case, eminent domain is being used to the ultimate benefit of private utility companies that will be selling the power sent along the proposed line. This is a misuse of federal power for the common good. When does the supposed need of the many justify trampling the rights of the few? This property has been in our family for five generations. It was acquired and has been maintained through hard work and sacrifice. We have diligently tried to protect it from environmental damage and development. The proposed ROW will undue all that hard work. - In this case, no amount of money can compensate us for the damage to

our farm, our financial security or for the mental anguish caused by this process. The BPA should do the environmentally, fiscally, and morally responsible thing and either locate this proposed line along the existing ROW or on public land.

Communication ID: 12168

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: WILLIAM A. BRAUN

Will forest land be an environmental factor assessed as a separate topic in the I-5 Corridor Transmission Line Environmental Assessment Document? What permits will be required from both state and federal agencies? What legislation regarding forest lands must be addressed? A large portion of the proposed 70 mile I-5 Corridor Reinforcement passes through private large and small landowners as well as public property. What percentage of this proposed line is expected to require removal of timber vegetation? This is an environmental impact that can possibly take away many acres of trees and render many acres useless for reforestation. Property owners will not be allowed to re-forest under a transmission line. The land in the ROW isn't range or agricultural land where grazing and crop growing can be sustained under the lines.

"The Washington State Legislature has found that the total acreage of forest land owned and managed by small forest landowners is diminishing at an alarming rate. Approximately one hundred thousand acres of private working forest land is lost annually to conversion of the land to a non-forestry land use. The loss of forest land has a direct negative impact on fish, wildlife, water quality, water resources, and the ecology of the state's watersheds and near shore marine environments. Conversion of working lands out of forestry also directly effects the livability of the state's rural and urban communities and limits the state's ability to restore the ecology of 14 Puget Sound and address the environmental effects of climate change." This paragraph can be found in the original text of proposed WA state legislature bills SB 5690 and HB 1665.

How much forest land (small landowner, large land owner and public owned) will be required to build either segment 10 or segment 11 as part of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project? Will there be a trade study in the EA which addresses the loss of all forest land which will be required by the ROW for the I-5 Corridor Project? Why will building this line have less of an environmental impact than the Paul-Pearl line that was discarded in part because of environmental issues? To truly evaluate the environmental impact on forest lands of the final line chosen the EA should contain the details of all options that were considered by the project in the early and current design stages. This would give a true EA assessment and will help the public understand why certain lines were included into the final ROW.

If segment 10 or segment 11 is selected as part of the project, to what extent will BPA have to follow the Washington Department of Natural Resources Forest Practices manual? If BPA is required to follow the WA DNR, will the required response be included in the EA document? If not in the EA document, why

not? Private landowners must adhere to these requirements when harvesting, building roads and other property activities. Reforestation is also a requirement following harvesting but in the case of the ROW there cannot be true reforestation. There are also requirements for non-logged strips beside fish bearing streams and trees are often required for habitat.

For the entire 70 mile line, can you make an estimate of how much the ground and soil disturbance will be? What effect will this have on erosion as mature trees are removed to accommodate the line?

How many pads are going to be required by the 70 mile line? What do you estimate will be the acreage of the ground disturbance by these pads?

On forest property how is it possible for BPA to minimize impacts of vegetation? There is no short-term impact on existing forest land on the ROW. Will BPA contractors be following the WA DNR requirements when soil is being disturbed?

What are the noise levels of the proposed 500kV line? Will the noise from the 500kV line expose areas of ecological concern to harmful noise levels?

How many, if any, sensitive noise receptors (residences, hospitals, schools, or areas of ecological concern) will be exposed to possibly harmful noise levels?

What design requirements will in place to reduce or eliminate electrocution of large birds? Eagles are known to inhabit areas along some of the proposed segments. There are nesting Bald Eagles that hunt adjacent to the proposed line. Recently an American Kestrel was photographed in the area of segment 11. Several species of migratory birds inhabit this area.

Will the green windmill power generated in British Columbia create any operating issues? Will the lines be at capacity so that the dams on the Columbia River will release more water? Will this release contain bubbles that are not healthy for fish? Why does the Pacific Northwest have to pay a burden so that California can meet its legislatively directed use of "green" power? Will we kill Northwest fish in order to keep Californians cool and so that they can meet their legal requirements? Why don't they consider alternate sources that do not impact us? Why is a state asking for Regional and Federal support when this is a state/local issue?

Why can't the existing line be upgraded to 500kV? Where is the technical and projected power consumption data to support the need to create a new line? Isn't this line really part of the grid to support winter power flow to British Columbia for heating and summer power flow to California to supply "green" power to California for cooling in summer and to satisfy their "green" power requirements?

What age technology (obsolete?) is the proposed 500kV line taking advantage of? Are there new or proposed technologies that would have a longer and more efficient life cycle? Will the technical trade-offs for these decisions be available and will they be included in the EA? If not, why not? How much maintenance will be required for the new 500kV line? Is underground an option? If it is considered too expensive where is the cost data to support that statement? What is the cost per mile ratio of the tower

line to an underground line? Even if the underground is more expensive, what is its footprint for the I-5 corridor compared to the above ground? Isn't underground more secure? If underground lines or other alternate solutions are more environmentally friendly will there be a trade/cost analysis that provides the basis for your decision to use the technology that you intend to use for the 500kV line? For example, if there is little or no environmental impact due to underground, would it be worth the additional cost to save the environment? Will the EA present a life cycle impact on the line for the 500kV and other possible solutions? Will there be a trade study included in the EA for alternate sources that are more environmentally friendly?

Will there be any connectivity to this line north of the substation in Castle Rock? If there is a 500kV line to the new substation and there is anticipated growth in the Chehalis/Centralia area, will there be a further extension (and new substations) of 500 kV lines into that area to support anticipated requests for service? Isn't this line planned to ultimately extend through Lewis, Pierce and King Counties to provide a 500 kV line to Seattle? If this project is a portion of a long range plan for additional 500kV lines how much of final design will be addressed in the EA? Or is this part of a plan to isolate a number of projects environmentally? Will the EA contain an overall environmental impact of the final design or will it just address in this case one element of the final design?

Communication ID: 12169

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: ERIN E GROVER

Dear Mr. Mark Korsness, and the BPA, Please move the currently proposed line further East than Line #29. As much of the property further East has been logged for many years already and a route could be mapped that does not effect homes or as much sensitive wetland as the current proposed Line#29 & #28 do. There are so many homes and history(please check documents at the North Clark County Historic Museum for detail on Dole Valley History) all along Line #29 and Line #28. Everyone in this area has WELL WATER and SEPTIC TANKS. We are an important part of the East Fork of the Lewis River Watershed. My property contains a tributary to the East Fork of the Lewis River and contains Cimicifuga elata(tall bugbane), Corydalis aquae-gelidae, Lomatium bradshawii (Bradshaw's lomatium), Larch Mountain Salamander, White Breasted Nuthatch, Grey Squirrel, Bald Eagle, frogs and toads that are on the Clark County endangered species list via <http://www.fws.gov/wafwo/speciesmap/CLARK.html>. Owls and water howellia need to be identified and researched as well as albino salamanders. All this is contained under and around a 50 year old Alder Canopy that is irreplaceable during the lifetime of my children or I. We also have access road issues since there are 27 homes and other properties that are part of a legal and binding road agreement and many of these properties have not been notified by BPA about this project, and this is only my private road, many others exist in this area. Many of the homeowners in these areas make a living from their properties and homes including myself(organic Botanical Medicine and Flowers). If this project goes thru this area it will not only take away peoples

homes but many jobs, and incomes as well. Some people in this area rely on Computer and Cell Phone for a living. What will these people do if these lines disrupt their communication??? How will BPA address these issues? Will the Intent to Enter Property document be redefined and resent as discussed at the Yacolt Primary Meeting? Cutting down 2 foot diameter trees, and holes would be detrimental to most Clark County property owners. BPA has requested grants of \$2 million from DOE to study pumped storage for wind shouldn't it be possible to do what is right financially and morally for Clark County property owners?

Communication ID: 12170

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: LONNIE HELTZEL,FRED L PAVEGLIO

December 11, 2009 BPA Administrators: At a recent Board meeting of the High Valley Home Owners Association (HVHA), the Board voted unanimously to request that the BPA drop from further consideration the proposed EIS Alternative for Line 31 associated with the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. The Board represents 65 landowners who collectively own over 225 acres within approximately 1 mile of the proposed Line 31 Corridor. For over 30 years the HVHA has worked to maintain its Covenants which have as their foundation the maintenance of the natural sylvan landscape. The location of the proposed Line 31 Alternative would have a significant effect on the human environment for hundreds of families that live under or immediately adjacent to the corridor for this line. Because the effects of high powered transmission lines on human health is still being debated by the scientific community, locating this line using one of the Alternatives that transverses mostly forested state and federal land is more appropriate and will avoid any potential health issues that could arise from locating a high powered transmission line through a populated area. In addition, the physical presence of a 500 KV line will impact the overall scenic quality of our community which would negatively affect the quality of our lives as well as reduce our property values. In summary, the Board requests that the HVHA is on record as being opposed to further consideration of the Line 31 Corridor as an alternative for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. Please add my email to your list to receive additional information on this project as it becomes available. Respectfully, Lonnie Heltzel HVHA Board President

Communication ID: 12171

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: MASON D SWIGERT

My name is Mason D. Swigert. I live on Lot 8 in the [Address]. My home sits on a 1-acre lot which lies abreast and just north of BPA's east-west power line between segments 36 and 37, on Map 105. The existing line's right-of-way extends onto my property. At present the electro-magnetic (EM) level in my house is approximately 3.5 milligauss (as measured by a Tri-Field electronic meter). I know this is purely a function of the presence of the power line nearby (i.e. not the EM emitted by internal house wiring),

as the same figure is observed outside the house at the same distance from the line. There is plenty of literature on the potential health risks of prolonged exposure to these levels of EM. I'm not an alarmist: I've lived with these EM levels for 10 years, during which time, had I been especially concerned, I could have relocated. However I am very concerned about the potential of one of the proposed 500KV routings. Should BPA decide to utilize the existing alignment for the new 500KV line, the present 3.5 milligauss readings in my house will be greatly exceeded. One of the proposals has this new 500KV line running 125 feet north of the existing line, which would put the much higher EM output that much closer to my house. In order to estimate the EM level (inside my house) of a new alignment 125 feet north of the existing centerline, I measured the EM level at a distance 125 feet closer to the existing 230KV line than my house. That figure is 45 - 50 milligauss. In practice the figure would be even higher, given that the proposed new line would be 500KV. The essential point here is that if the new line were situated 125 feet north of the existing east-west line, I would then be living in a climate of EM levels that are at least an order of magnitude higher than exists today, with the attendant (but unknown) impacts to the health of the home's occupants. I have chosen to live with 3.5 milligauss; at levels far higher the only prudent choice would be to vacate my home. In addition to the potential health effects of a vastly higher level of EM, I would be faced with the radical alteration of my physical living environment. The clearing of trees that would be required, and the crowding of my house by the line, would have me living in the literal shadow of the new line. The value of my home and property, as well as the quality of life, would be ruined if this routing is chosen by BPA. I would add that BPA's purchase of a new easement across my property, as compensation (as the BPA website describes), would do nothing to mitigate the virtual uninhabitability of the residence once the new transmission lines are in place. Unless fairly compensated for the total loss of home and property, the adoption by BPA of the routing behind my house would constitute a "taking" of huge proportions. I, and my similarly situated neighbors, would be forced to bear a wildly disproportionate burden. I appeal to BPA to utilize a different routing, one that does not have the profound impacts on people and property that this one would.

Mason D. Swigert

Communication ID: 12172

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: CONNIE ORI

Subject: I-5 corridor reinforcement project #31

I am 100% against this project!

I moved to Hockinson 35 years ago seeking health and tranquility. This will hugely impact that lifestyle. I don't want your excessive electromagnetic energy around me nor the visual ugliness. Your propaganda

says it is needed define needed! It is not needed. What is needed is controlling conspicuous consumption. My guess is this is more about greed. I feel powerless. You will do whatever you want because you have the power to, and it looks like Hockinson will get slammed no matter what. If this does happen ... please put this where nobody lives WHY DO YOU HAVE TO PUT IT RIGHT IN THE MIDDLE OF NEIGHBORHOODS????????? I am convinced you could also put this underground if it truly was "needed"!

Again, NO, NO, NO on this project!

Connie Ori

[Address]

P.S. I could not get your online communication to work! Very difficult!

Communication ID: 12173

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: MIKE BORGE

Please have your environmental studies look at:

The number of homes which will be adversely affected both directly and indirectly by power lines that are proposed to be installed in the Hackinson area. The health risks to the community which has many young children and older adults which studies have shown are subject to increased risk of getting cancer.

I have these other comments:

Running the power lines through a well established and productive community will be devastating. Running power lines through land designated for school would be equally devastating to the Hockinson community. Hockinson is a vibrant, energetic community and is growing rapidly. It will not be long before more grade schools, elementary schools, and middle schools will be needed the power lines would take away a site for such educational expansion for the Hockinson school district and would hurt the growth of the community.

Communication ID: 12174

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: BARBARA EIGNER

"I would like to tell you"

I would like to tell you about the realities of growing a crop of timber trees. The growing of a crop of timber trees constitutes a very risky business, one of the most risky of all businesses. It takes a long, long time to grow a seedling timber tree from the time it is planted until the tree reaches economic maturity at age 45 or 55. What risk, trees just grow don't they? Some of the risks include fire, theft, disease, winter storms, summer drought, taxes, inappropriate regulations, liability, and development.

Fire An owner of forest property can buy fire insurance on a house, but cannot get fire insurance to cover wildfire losses on their own property. If an insurance company would consider insuring an individual property owner against the loss of timber on their own property, the premiums would be so high they would amount to gifting the entire property over to the insurance company, which is not a viable option.

Theft The west is still wild. Cattle rustling did not end in the 1800's, neither did timber theft.

Disease There are reference books which identify with a color photo and a description over 30 different diseases that can attack timber conifers in the Pacific North West.

Winter Storms Winter storms can damage timber trees with frost, winds of force strong enough to knock down trees, heavy saturation rains which cause trees to fall, as well as flooding which over time can suffocate tree roots.

Summer Drought Prolonged drought weakens trees resistance to disease and fire. Sun scald can cause premature needle drop.

Taxes When growing timber there are many periods of years at a time when property taxes are due on the property when there is no income from the forest. Yes, there is such a provision as forest tax deferral, but deferral does not reduce eventual tax. In addition there are different kinds of taxes. Estate taxes can come due during a time period when there is no income from the forest. Forest landowners do not want BPA to expect the property owners of transmission easement corridors to pay taxes on that property in perpetuity with no hope of gaining income from that easement area over the years to pay the taxes. The growing of Christmas trees under power lines is not a viable alternative for the vast majority of woodland owners. It is not feasible to grow greenery for the florist industry in power line easement strips because there isn't enough shade to protect ferns, salal and other shrubs from sunscald and other elements which can cause product blemishes the forest industry doesn't want. Most businesses that forage for florist greenery tend to be unstable and unreliable.

Inappropriate Regulations In the past 25 years forest woodland owners have faced a dramatic increase in rules and regulations to the point that there is less incentive to own forest property in the States of Washington and Oregon.

Development Property development increases the need for bond issues for public goods and services.

There is no get rich quick story for forest woodland owners. Forest woodland owners can't expect to get

rich at all. Indeed, if a small woodland owner can realize during an entire lifetime enough money from timber to help pay for the college education of their offspring, and provide supplemental income for retirement in senior and elder years, they are extremely fortunate. This presupposes that the family can hold onto the property for the period of a lifetime considering all the risks. Forest owner families face all the problems other families face such as death, disease, divorce, disinterest, distance, disability and dissolution. Cash flow issues are a major problem for forest property owners. It is tremendous challenge to plan to have enough contingency reserve finding to pay for taxes, insurance, maintenance, accounting, consulting fees, and sometimes legal fees for estate planning when the property produces no income. Growing timber means growing a crop in the slow lane. Growing timber requires site preparation before the seedlings are planted by hand. Herbicide spraying during the first 3 or 4 years is needed to help the seedlings survive vegetative competition. Interplanting may be needed because some of the planted seedlings may not survive. Mice, mountain beavers, and other rodents chew small seedlings, deer and elk feed on them as well, porcupine and bear go after the sap under tree bark. Pre-commercial thinning is needed to improve the quality of the stand. Pre-commercial thinning doesn't pay for itself at the time it is done. One has to wait several years before pre-commercial thinning pays for itself.

Liability. Forest owners often face a problem with "dare devil stunt" ATV and motorcycle riders who want to invade forest property for thrills, all the while expecting that if one of these riders gets hurt performing one of their thrills that the courts will expect the forest property owner to pay damages in court for the accident. A recreation technician for the Pacific Crest District, Pacific Cascade Region, told me he knows of a forest landowner who faced a serious loss because of this. Forest landowners face the problem that opening up easement corridors in a forested area provide more accessible opportunities for "dare devil stunt" ATV and motorcycle riders to invade the area. In addition to the liability insurance the property owner needs to pay, BPA needs list the property owner as "additional insured" on BPA liability insurance. Not only is it too easy to take forest property for granted, it happens on a regular basis. Forests provide scenic beauty, wildlife habitat, clean drinking water, in addition to the fact that trees absorb carbon dioxide and give off oxygen. Forests provide raw material that provides a chain of employment, in addition to providing material that has a vast number of uses. This raw material is very conservative concerning the amount of energy needed to process the material into a finished product. It takes a lot more energy to process metal, concrete and plastic. Forest material is a renewable source, fossil related energy isn't.

Maintenance One maintenance issue that is conspicuous by its absence in the BPA publications presented at the meetings is the issue of responsibility for vegetation management under transmission easement lines. The statement is made that BPA is responsible for seeing that the vegetation under the power lines does not exceed 14 feet in height. No mention what so ever is made concerning who has the responsibility to deal with vegetation growing under power lines that is less than 14 feet in height. Is BPA trying to assume that the easement landowner is to be responsible for the maintenance issues concerning all vegetation less than 14 feet in height? Who is to provide the work and who is to provide the funding for the work? 1bis involves manual chopping and herbicide spraying. A lot of small woodland forest land is owned by senior citizens who don't have the physical ability to do many kinds of

work in the woodlands, and because of trying to live on limited and fixed incomes, cannot afford to assume the responsibility to be responsible for managing vegetation growing less than 14 feet in height. The three members of KWIK Center LLC are senior citizens in this position. What is the position BPA takes on invasive species and weeds such as Scotch Broom and tall blackberry vines? Invasive species may not be present on the ground at one time, but because of the tendency to spread anywhere, may become a significant problem in the future. Forest property owners who own property near transmission lines don't want these invasive species to take advantage of the additional sunlight in the easement areas in spreading their growth. "I'd like to tell you that" because I sent you detailed maps concerning alternative routes for a transmission line, do not get the idea I am recommending the construction of the transmission lines at all. By now you have some idea of my love and dedication to forests. I dread seeing any more forest land taken out of forest production in perpetuity. I request that you reply to my comments.

[Address]

[Phone]

Barbara Eigner

Manager

Dear Members of the I-5 Reinforcement Project

KWIK Center LLC also owns the property in the N.E. V. of Section 6, and a small portion of the N.W. V. of Section 5 Township 3 North, Range 4 East. The Assessor's Tax Numbers are marked on Aerial Photo Page 93 as well as on the Department of Natural Resources Map. Aerial Photo Page 93 appears to show that yellow routes 28, 30 and 33 could impact the KWIK Center LLC Tract. Enclosed are copies of the Department of Natural Resources Maps for the purpose of presenting a modification of proposed yellow routes 28, 30 and 33. It is easy to see when looking at the DNR Contour Maps that the property owned by KWIK Center LLC is an inappropriate area for a transmission tower line because the contour lines are obviously tighter than the contour lines in the west 1/2 of Section 6. A much better alternative route is marked in red in the western portion of Section 6, however, road access to this general area can get snowed in at times during the winter. . The eastern edge of this KWIK Center Property follows the center line of Cedar Creek. The Bells Mountain Trail, an easement public recreational trail, follows through a sensitive and scenic riparian area of KWIK Center Property. It would be a serious mistake to disrupt this area with a transmission tower route. There is no road access bridge in this general area that crosses Cedar Creek for trucks. All truck access to KWIK Center LLC property must come through the high hills to the west which sometimes get snowed in during winter.

Sincerely,

Barbara Eigner

Manager

Dear Members of the I-5 Reinforcement Project

KWIK Center LLC owns the property in the S. E. 1/4. of Sec.28 outlined in red. The assessor's tax numbers are indicated on the aerial photo of page 89. Enclosed are copies of Department of Natural Resources Maps for the purpose of presenting a modification of Route 29 based on general topography. Map page 89 shows more than one half of the property owned by KWIK Center LLC as a potential route for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. It is easy to see when looking at the maps that the property owned by KWIK Center LLC is a very inappropriate area for a transmission tower line because a large portion of it is in the range of 1600 feet in elevation, and the closeness of the contour bars indicate some fairly steep areas in the vicinity. For example there are some extremely steep areas in section 21 on the south side of the East Fork of the Lewis River. The contour map indicates drainage draws in the N E 1/4. of Section 28 continuing through the S.E. 1/4. of Section 21. Constructing a transmission line quite some distance through these drainage areas could constitute more nuisance and hassle than BPA needs. The map of the property immediately south of KWIK Center Property in the East 1/2, of Section 33 still shows a higher elevation than necessary and a steeper terrain than necessary for a transmission line. There is a much better alternative. Granted, there is no perfect route for a transmission line. However I have indicated with red ink an alternative route passing through Section 29 which will eventually lead south into the Dole Valley Area Two major advantages of this alternative route are the lower elevation, (in the range of 1000' instead of in the range of 1600'), plus the map contours indicate ground which is less steep. This alternative route would eventually lead south into the Dole Valley Area west of Dole and east of

Rock Creek.

Sincerely,

Barbara Eigner

Manager

Communication ID: 12175

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: JOANNE FAGALY

Please have your environmental studies look at:

The impact on flora + fauna such as removal of vast amount of trees + other plants – denuding the area

The impact on different animals, birds and fish, such as area ponds-beavers ect

The infinite number of negative effects on individuals related to health health

The resale value plummeting. Who would want to buy? People, whole families unprotected, having to

relocate.

I have these other comments:

As a citizen of the United States of America it is my constitutional right to expect my government, which you represent, to guide, lead, and PROTECT the rights of the individual, such as myself. One government (my) was set up to serve the people, and not to take away our individual rights, such as invading our property and taking our privately owned property

Further issues are adorned above.

If you were placed in a situation such as you have placed on us; what would be your response? I strongly ask you to study this matter greatly and a different route reached out!

Thank you for considering our rights on this

Communication ID: 12176

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: CURT R IRELAND

While I am all for strengthening the electrical transmission grid, I am adamantly opposed to constructing new high voltage power line corridors through existing populated areas. The homeowners and residents along the rights-of-way will bear the brunt of the adverse health effects and negative visual impacts. They will experience sharp declines in the value of their properties and receive little if any compensation by the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA). In particular, I am opposed to Segment # 31 as it negatively impacts my property and those of my neighbors. We live in a quiet scenic rural neighborhood of moderately expensive homes. Construction of a high voltage transmission line would cut a 150-foot wide swath right down the middle that would irrevocably alter the scenic and rural character of our neighborhood. It has been well documented that the public's fear of adverse health effects and the visual impact of large electric transmission lines negatively affect property values. This pertains to just my immediate neighborhood. Consider the cumulative negative impacts to those homeowners and residents all along the proposed right-of-way. Attached is a letter that outlines my concerns in greater detail. Hard copy of this letter will sent under separate cover. In summary, I must urge BPA in the strongest possible terms to remove Segment # 31 from further consideration. There are other alternatives available to BPA that would not create as large a negative impact on local communities as Segment # 31. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on this project.

Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

PO Box 9250

Portland, OR 97207

Subject: Scoping Comments - Environmental Impact Statement for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

Given the growth in the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area over the past 20 years, I can fully appreciate the need to strengthen the electrical transmission grid to ensure that there is adequate power to meet future demand for this area. I would prefer that BPA utilize its own existing facilities and rights-of-way to the maximum extent possible to accomplish this goal, even if it costs considerably more. There are a number of severe adverse impacts to residents living near high voltage transmission lines. If any new transmission lines were required, they should be sited away from populated areas.

My wife and I own a home located near Hockinson in a quiet scenic rural neighborhood. The centerline of the right-of-way for proposed Segment #31 is approximately 275 feet from our western property line. Unfortunately, our situation is not unique. There are a large number of homes close to and even within the proposed right-of way along the length of Segment #31. I have a number of concerns about constructing a high voltage transmission line on this alignment.

- Adverse health effects,
- Aesthetics and quality of life issues,
- Reduced property values,
- Loss of property tax revenue for the county and other local districts,
- Access issues,
- Site for a future school, and
- Public involvement process to date

As I will elaborate on below, the negative impacts to residents and homeowners along the proposed right-of-way are significant. For this reason, I must urge BPA in the strongest possible terms to remove Segment #31 from consideration. There are other options and routes available.

Health Effects:

The NIEHS study available on BPA's website concludes that the scientific evidence for electromagnetic fields (EMF) posing any health risk is weak. It does say that the strongest evidence for adverse health effects comes from associations with childhood leukemia and chronic lymphocytic leukemia. Based on these associations, the study concludes that EMF exposure cannot be recognized as entirely safe. This study was completed in 1998. There have since been additional studies performed on the health effects of EMF.

A study performed by the California Department of Health Services in 2002 concluded that living in near proximity to sources of EMF could cause an increased risk of childhood leukemia, Alzheimer's, brain cancer, Lou Gering's Disease, and miscarriages. Another study published in Australia by R. M. Lowenthal et.al. in 2007 concluded that there is an increased risk of lymphoproliferative disorders and myeloproliferative disorders later in life due to childhood exposure to EMF from living within 300 meters of high voltage power lines.

In addition, it has been documented that EMF can interfere with normal operation of implanted medical devices such as pacemakers and cardioverter defibrillators. EMF can cause inappropriate triggering of a device or inhibit the device from responding appropriately.

There is enough scientific evidence of adverse effects due to EMF from high voltage transmission lines to warrant significant concern. For this reason, high voltage power lines should never be constructed in populated areas.

Aesthetics and Quality of Life:

Our immediate neighborhood is in a very quiet and scenic area. A high voltage transmission line would cut a 150-foot wide swath right down the middle that would irrevocably alter the rural character of our neighborhood. At least two homes in the neighborhood are within the proposed right-of-way. One of those homes belongs to our next-door neighbors and if the line were built, they would likely be forced to move. They are good neighbors and we would be sad to see them leave. Looking at the maps of the right-of-way, there appears to be a fair number of homeowners along Segment #31 that may be forced to move as well.

Transmission towers are typically 110 – 150 feet high, and create a significant visual impact. No electrical transmission tower I have ever seen could be described as aesthetically pleasing. At least one if not two of these towers would be clearly visible from our property. These towers combined with a 150-foot wide swath of cleared land would forever alter the scenic nature of this neighborhood. This is just one small area along the proposed right-of-way. Consider the cumulative adverse visual and aesthetic impacts for homeowners all along Segment #31. Property owners for some distance from the transmission lines and towers would be adversely affected, not just those within the narrow 1000 foot corridor that were notified of this project.

Construction of the high-voltage line has some rather annoying negative impacts on the quality of life for residents immediately adjacent to the proposed right-of-way. Due to induced voltage, people and animals near the transmission lines can receive shocks from touching metal objects. Metal buildings and fences have to be grounded.

Stray voltage is not usually felt by humans, but it can affect the behavior of animals. Noise from transmission lines can be another minor annoyance. In addition to vibration and humming sounds, there can be crackling or hissing noises during periods of high humidity.

Property Values:

Recently, we received our property tax assessment. The assessed fair-market valuation for our home and property declined 21.4 percent from the previous year. Neighbors I have talked to also experienced similar declines in assessed valuation. This was no doubt due to the dramatic fall in real estate prices attributable to the bust in the housing market.

It has been well documented that the public's fear of adverse health effects and the visual impact of large electric transmission lines negatively affect property values. The exact reduction in property values varies considerably, but it would be reasonable to expect that construction of this proposed transmission line would bring about at least an additional 15 to 20 percent reduction in value to the homes in this neighborhood. For those of us where the right-of-way does not cross our property, we will receive no compensation from BPA for the loss of property value to our homes.

Loss of Tax Revenue:

Loss of property value directly results in a loss of property tax revenue for Clark County, Fire District # 3, the Hockinson School District, and other local agencies. If our recent decline in property values due to the recession is any indicator, then these agencies will be taking a big hit in their budgets. The loss of tax revenue from reduced property values due to construction of this transmission line along Segment # 31 will only make matters worse for these agencies. The services they provide to our communities will continue to erode.

Access Issues:

The access to our property and two of our next-door neighbors is via NE 212th Place. There is approximately 800 feet of this road immediately adjacent to the centerline of the proposed right-of-way. Judging by the local topography, there will likely be a tower constructed somewhere within that 800 foot stretch that would require re-routing our current access road. NE 212th Avenue is also within the right-of-way and is only access for an additional 25 homes in the neighborhood. How will BPA address access to our homes within the right-of-way?

I have one small comment about Map # 91. The map shows NE 212th Place at NE 189th Street about 200 feet further to the east than it actually is located. It is only 20 feet or so east of NE 212th Ave. at that point.

Future school site:

The Hockinson School District recently purchased a 35-acre parcel for future school construction. Although the centerline of the right-of-way is on the edge of the property, parental and community concerns over the potential adverse health effects from EMF would probably preclude ever building a school there. Purchase of the property represents a rather large investment by the school district that could be wasted if the transmission line were to be constructed along Segment # 31.

The recent loss in property tax revenues and potential for additional revenue losses attributable to Segment # 31 leaves the school district in a real bind. Although the school district could sell the future school site, it probably would not get enough for the property to enable it to purchase another site

without having to use other funds. Those other funds may not be available due to the decline in tax revenues and already strained budgets.

Public Involvement Process:

I am also deeply concerned about the public involvement process for this project. Project notification letters were only sent out to those property owners within 500 feet of the centerline of the proposed right-of-way for Segment # 31. Property owners within half a mile of either side of the proposed right-of-way are likely to experience negative impacts from construction of this proposed high voltage power line. Many people outside of the 1000-foot wide "notification" corridor had to learn about this project from their neighbors. These people should have been notified by BPA.

In mid October we received our project notification letter from BPA dated October 9, 2009. Nowhere in this letter did it mention that our property was within 500 feet of the centerline of the proposed right-of-way. It was impossible to tell from the map accompanying the letter where our property was relative to Segment # 31. I thought this material was going out to everyone in Clark County until I received another letter in late October from BPA dated October 22, 2009 that asked for permission to access our property.

By the time I received that letter, the 30-day public comment period had already begun. The public meetings were held from October 27, 2009 to November 7, 2009. The deadline for submitting comments was November 23, 2009. That was not nearly enough time for people to respond to something that would impact them so significantly. Fortunately, the public comment period was extended until December 14, 2009. As I understand it, the extension was granted only because of public outrage and pressure from our federal elected officials. I would hope that the process of gathering public input on this project would improve from this point on.

This concludes my comments. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this project.

Sincerely,

Curt Ireland

[Address]

cc: George Kunst (via e-mail)

Allen LaTourette (via e-mail)

Paul Macchia (via e-mail)

Michael Grubb, Director Hockinson School District

Communication ID: 12177

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: BOB MATTLA

I have these other comments:

BPA-

It seems to me that putting the new transmission line alongside the existing line in the existing corridor would make more sense than disrupting people's lives + property values with a new creation the small possibility that both lines could be damaged at the same time is so small that the big problems with a new location far outweigh it, in my opinion,

Thank you.

Communication ID: 12178

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: VIVKIE L DAVIDSON

I am opposed to BPA Line 31. This avenue does not benefit the area, it actually hinders the community. This path destroys neighborhoods. This will impact the Hockinson area for schools (tax basis etc) negatively. The existing I-5 corridor can be upgraded to safely transport electricity without the major disruption in this area. Also, further east is also a better avenue to pursue, due to not affecting so many families and communities. Please choose another path that will work with the community rather than destroy it.

Communication ID: 12179

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: PRISCILLA GIBSON

PROPOSED I-5 CORRIDOR REINFORCEMENT PROJECT

"I'd like to tell you"

Please have your environmental studies look at:

#1 Line #27 goes through a very populated area. What few wooded areas there are, are inhabited by many wild birds and animals Yacolt Creek is home to a clan of beavers. We believe that both the fauna and flora will be adversely affected by this line.

#2 Children walk to meet the School Bus on the driveway and roads that are involved with this route. The health of the residents that live or walk within the area affected by the electromagnetic force of the lines will be jeopardized.

#3 some residents along the proposed lines have businesses that will be inundated because of the electro-magnetic effect of the high voltage power lines.

#4 People have moved to this area believing that their property deed gave them a true picture of what to expect in the future, and that their rights would be respected. There are areas to the east of us that are very sparsely populated and property rights could be respected.

Other Comments:

Some people will move away in order to escape the harmful effects of the power lines, and they will sustain a great loss because of the drop in property value due to the lines, We urge you to look for other routes that will not be so damaging to the environment and the people living in this area (both economical and physical). We strongly request that the scoping period be extended to March 31, 2010. Thank-you in advance for your kind consideration of these matters.

Priscilla Gibson

Communication ID: 12180

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: SANONA CAMPBELL,ERNIE CAMPBELL

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Mill Creek on environments

I have these other comments:

If you have to put the lines parallel – go slight by east – we are at [Address] there isn't much east of us but a valley which runs along Mill Creek – they already have a road of sorts there – would be cheaper than buying houses to the west – + would be separate from the line that's near our house – would involve a farm + part of WSU but they aren't using that land any way of course I don't know whats further north.

Communication ID: 12181

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: TED RUBINSTEIN,CYNDIE RUBINSTEIN

Tom

Thank you for your concerns in finding the best route for the I-5 corridor power lines. With our changing needs I can see the importance for this project. Our concern is the possible location of route 31 and the lines going over part of mine and thousands of others property. I have paid for my house and if the line goes in route 31, I will be stuck with a house on a piece of property with little value, impossible to recover our hard earned money out of, and a half million volt power lines destroying our lifelong dream. As one of the thousands of your constituents in the possible effected area, this route goes through thousands of very expensive properties where our much needed Wa State tax dollars will be reduced due to plummeted property values. Many studies have shown the health dangers of living with even lesser voltage power lines through your property including Leukemia, and Cancer. These studies are not only at much lower voltages, but at much greater distances than the 75 foot from center B.P.A. proposes. B.P.A. seems to ignore any health studies that conflict with any of their projects. I myself will not be able to afford to sell my devalued place and re locate so I will be sentenced to its effects. We are looking forward to your help in the efforts to move this needed project to the more remote location so you can leave your legacy to your peers, your children, and grandchildren as the one to keep this project in a more remote location, and protect your constituents instead of one to cause so much damage to the health, finances, and dreams to the lives of thousands in the area you serve. Thank you very much for your help and concerns,

Ted & Cyndie Rubinstein

Communication ID: 12182

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: PATRICIA LEE WITTER

Our Witter-Revesz-Brady family owns a certified family tree farm comprising the SE quarter of [Address]. Our management plan for sustained, long-rotation forestry includes small harvests combined with maintenance of wildlife habitat and protecting water quality. A Light Footprint on the Land is our intent. However, PacificCorp's Yale Merwin powerline transects our property. Our family's 55-year experience with this powerline crossing our property has led us to conclude that POWERLINES ARE A DISASTER FOR PRIVATE LANDOWNERS. The list of unnecessary harm done to our roads, to wet areas and steep areas the powerline crosses, the careless killing of our trees from prime merchantable size down to seedlings, the number of times we've had to hire legal help to get PacificCorp to adhere to the terms of their easement, PacificCorp's interference with public county road access routes to our own property,----all of these problems and more lead us to conclude that powerlines should be sited on public lands to the

fullest extent possible.

Communication ID: 12183

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: LINDA CANFIELD

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Using the area east of 29. In areas 27 and 28 there is a creek (Cedar) that is well known and winds through a lot of the properties giving wells to families, buisnesses, and schools.

We have tour buses that come through to visit Mt. St. Helens a lot with the museum that is Amboy Redistered homes build in 1800's.

I have these other comments:

We have a Refe flight air strip that picks up emergency patients and takes them to Vancouver Hosipitals. There are lands that indan artifacts on them and permits have been hard to aquire to build homes. They have now been given those permits to build. A new school is being planned to start building soon we have lake Merwer on the other side of Mts surrounding Chelalchi Prairie.

Communication ID: 12184

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: MARK S BAYLES

I live within the Segment 39 right of way. I oppose any expansion of line 39. I support the replacement of existing towers on existing lines to accomodate the additional capacity. This will not cause a negative impact of quality of life issues.

Communication ID: 12185

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: TERRY CONSTANCE,TRISH CONSTANCE

Text from my letter to all affected residents. _____

Dear residents and officials, After review of the letter from our Congressman Brian Baird I and my wife received, it appears the BPA project manager is underestimating the impact the reinforcement project will have on the residents in the area and expense that will be incurred by BPA to take the route through the populated Vancouver area. The BPA project manager explained to me at a meeting that the "goal"

was to take no homes. Brian Baird in his letter, indicates thousands of residents could be affected ! So, given the goal the project manager indicated, the route through Vancouver could not be taken at all. The extension request until March 2010 is a good idea as it will allow the time to review all of the complaints and concerns from home owners to be reviewed before a decision is made. The attorney who has been contacted in this matter is: Donald A. Esau in Vancouver, WA. email: [Email] He explained part of the eminent domain law relating to public use and necessity, compensation and award payments which is the first step to adjudication in a letter to one of the residents. My 2 cents: At this point I would discourage any affected resident from giving permission to enter their property until the BPA mgr. has addressed your specific issue related to the impact the project will have on you with indication of the amount of money you are due for possible relocation. A survey in our area is not necessary to determine this, and may not be necessary at all if the proper route is taken East through the unpopulated area. Once you agree to start the adjudication, eminent domain is just a gavel drop away. Sincerely, Terry & Trish Constance [Address][Phone]

Communication ID: 12186

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: LAURIE NEIDIVER,JOHN NEIDIVER

To Whom It May Concern:

This action will definitely impact our property values in the negative. We are NOT for the proposed # 31 route.

John and Laurie Neidiver

[Address]

Communication ID: 12187

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: LEE WITTER-KAHN

I am a Small Forest Landowner in Clark County. My family for a couple of generations has conducted self-sustaining, small-harvest forestry, stressing a Light Footprint on the Land plus the maintenance of wildlife habitat and water quality. The greatest difficulty we have encountered in this family endeavor is the fact that PacificCorp's Yale-Merwin power line crosses our Dunegan Mountain Tree Farm which comprises the SE quarter of Section 35 T6N R3EWM south of Lake Merwin. After nearly 60 years of trying to work with PacificCorp, we have concluded that POWERLINES SHOULD NEVER BE SITED ON PRIVATE PROPERTY IF A PUBLIC PROPERTY LOCATION IS POSSIBLE. If the public wants more and more electric power, the public should bear the costs of that lifestyle choice by accepting the construction ON PUBLIC LAND of the necessary facilities to provide the additional power. It is unjust that the inevitable

costs associated with making more power available to all should be born by a relatively few individuals. And it is unjust that those individuals are then in such a weak position in trying to deal with the power company involved. Our experience has been that even with the help of a good local lawyer, we have found it very hard to get PacificCorp to quit harming our timber trees, tearing up our private roads, obstructing our legal access to our property and disrespecting such environmental considerations as steep slopes and wet areas on our land. We seem to have hammered out a more business-like relationship lately with PacificCorp but the basic problem caused by one power pole being sited in such a steep location that access for maintenance is not achievable, remains a dilemma. Such problems should not be dumped on individual small property owners who happen to lose the powerline location lottery. Siting the powerline on public land wherever possible is a more just solution.

Communication ID: 12188

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: NEA LYNN IRELAND

Subject: Opposition to Route Alternative No. 31

I am writing in opposition to the potential siting of a 500-kilovolt transmission line and substations along the proposed route number 31. My husband and I own property adjacent to this proposed alignment.

My opposition stems from five very major concerns:

1. The extremely negative impact that this line would have on basic community services because of huge decreases to property values along the proposed alignment. These services depend on property tax for their already strained budgets. Decreasing property values decreases property taxes-the impact from this alignment, given the current value of properties within and adjacent to it, would be significant.
2. Crossing of land purchased for a new school by the Hockinson School District. The district was far-sighted enough to purchase land in advance for growing needs. It will be unusable for their stated purpose if the line is built and the district will experience a tremendous loss on their investment.
3. Decimation of natural areas, waterways and the overall rural character of the area within and adjacent to the proposed alignment. Impacts to wildlife habitat would be enormous. These impacts, given the very nature of the proposed facility (a 150-foot swath from the landscape) are not subject to mitigation.
4. Personal impacts to private life and property. We worked hard to improve our property and build a home, as have our neighbors and other residents I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project December 9, 2009 Page 2 along the proposed alignment. We do not want to lose our homes or parts of them or a huge percentage of their value because of this alignment.
5. While I realize that the research is inconclusive, health issues are a concern to many people. Given the alternative I doubt that anyone would choose to live next to a large power line and I certainly add my

voice of concern with regard to potential negative health impacts. I would hope that your research, particularly with regard to the "no action" alternative, will include alternative energy sources and climate as well as environmental impacts. In any event, I strongly urge you to eliminate Segment Number 31 from the planning process.

Very truly yours,

Nea Lynn Ireland

Communication ID: 12189

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: MARK BOTTOMLY

To Whom It May Concern:

As property owners and residents living along the southern portion of Segment #31 of BPA's proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, we are adamantly opposed to the construction of a 500 KV power line in our neighborhood.

On a local TV news show after one of the first public meetings held in the Longview area, a reporter asked the BPA spokesperson about public reaction to the routes proposed by the BPA. His response was that some people were in support and some were not. While this may, on the surface, be true, it is also misleading. How many of the so-called

"Supporters" actually live within the proposed corridor routes and are at risk of having their homes destroyed? If the BPA is going to make such statements in the future, I respectfully request that they clarify exactly who these "supporters" are. To do otherwise is disingenuous at best. Should Segment 31 be chosen for this new power line, many currently valuable properties will be drastically devalued, resulting in a substantial loss of property tax income. One of our state representatives was recently asked what impact the loss of this tax revenue will have on the state. His answer was that the state would be forced to raise taxes in other areas to compensate for the loss. Would the "supporters" mentioned above change their minds if they knew they would have to share in an increased tax burden even if they lived miles away from the actual power lines?

The BPA has a clear choice in this matter, but appears hesitant to make that choice based on financial concerns. Don't let the potential lost income from future timber harvests in the eastern-most route outweigh both the human and local economic costs associated with choosing a route in an area as populated as Segment 31 actually is. It would be a terrible wrong if, in order to better serve the public, the BPA were to choose to ruin lives, destroy homes, devalue property and threaten the health of that same public in the process. We will do everything legally possible to protect our home. We will join some of the local groups now being organized as a result of the threat presented by this BPA proposal.

We will work to arrange media events. We will work with local and national property rights groups. We will work with local politicians who are also concerned about the negative impact this will have on their constituents. We would rather not have to, but will until and unless the BPA realizes that Segment 31 is not an "economical" option. Make the right choice now and drop Segment 31 from consideration. The sooner this decision is reached the better.

Sincerely,

Mark and Lisa Bottomly

[Address]

Communication ID: 12190

Date: 11/14/2009

Name: JOAN A WELLSMORE

Our home is in Hockinson on the proposed segment #31 of this I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. The 500 KV line would take out the entire access road for this neighborhood at 212th ave and Kirsten Circle. The visual impact of 150' high towers and 150 ROW will decimate property values for the entire upper portion of Hockinson known as "Finn Hill" This area has some of the highest tax rates in Clark County and this path will force many residents out of their (our) homes and destroy the value of so many others undermining an important segment of the tax basis in this area NO BPA Segment #31 Hockinson School District recently purchased 35 acres for future growth. Segment #31 would go through this property and render it unfit for a school. The current primary/intermediate school is within a mile from the proposed segment #31, and if constructed, many families will be forced to relocate and others may pull their children from the school because of health concerns. Segment #31 is viewed by BPA as a desired route because it's shorter length will minimize construction costs. Other options would traverse WA DNR land, with less social impact, avoiding established communities. Where are the consumers of this power? California? The Clark County GIS property website identifies Seg. #31 ROW parcels as having geological, seismic and erosion hazard areas (we can vouch for that having lived here 20 years!). Adding such large infrastructure to this area is not a good idea, please do not use Segment #31!! The public comment period ends November 23, 2009. Only some residents received letters from BPA around October 24th, less than 30 days required for public input. Less time to comment equals less publicity. Narrow notification requirements and compressed comment windows may be "the law." A law that is structured against our citizens not in support of them (us). The construction of Segment #31 would destroy our community, our residential investment and our lives. It is unconscionable and irresponsible to even consider this segment. The community of Hockinson would cease to exist! NO BPA Segment #31 Thank you for listening. Joan Wellsmore Home owner whose home would be condemned!

Communication ID: 12191

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: SHON PONDER,KIM PONDER

After attending the meeting and looking at the maps, we feel that staying to the east of Lake Merwin would affect less homes. Even though our home is to the east, we are in great hope that acquiring state land and staying as far east as possible would be the best route to take.

Communication ID: 12192

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: JOSEPH R BAILEY,DONNA M BAILEY

Department of Energy

Bonneville Power Administration

P.O. Box 491

Vancouver, WA 98666-0491

re: TEP-TPP-3

I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

Gentlemen:

The undersigned are owners of the property described herein:

JOSEPH R. BAILEY

DONNA M. BAILEY

Trustees of the Bailey Family Trust dated August 25, 1993.

The property is commonly known as [address]

The property is further identified as Clark County Tax parcels:

[number];[number]; and [number]

abbreviated legal descriptions are:

[legal description]

[legal description]

[legal description]

all in Tax area [number].

Our property is situated on the south bank of the East Fork of the Lewis River and on a portion of the north side of the river.

It is improved with a house, well, and storage building.

The property was acquired by the owner's family in 1925 and three cabins were erected in 1937 and 1939. Two cabins have been destroyed, but the County acknowledges the owner's right to reestablish the cabins.

The county has imposed zoning restrictions and use limitations in order to preserve the East Fork of the Lewis River as a wild and scenic river. The owner has protected and preserved the property in its pristine and natural state.

Objections are hereby made to contemplated transmission lines being installed on our property or in the vicinity of said river on the following grounds:

1. River banks will be denuded of protective trees and other vegetation allowing the fish, plant and animal habitats to be impacted.
 - a. Steelhead, trout, salmon, and cutthroat trout use areas of the river for spawning.
 - b. Bald eagles nest in trees along the river.
 - c. Deer forage on the banks of the river.
 - d. Game birds are also found along the river.
2. Aesthetic considerations are violated by the erection of transmission towers.

Clark County has sought to protect the habitat and recognizes the East Fork of the Lewis River as "the largest undammed river that flows through Clark County," according to Bill Dygert of the Conservation Futures Program.

The U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals recognized that a local government agency could pay heed to the aesthetic benefits of landscape unmarred by the accoutrements of modern public utilities.

Palos Verdes Estates vs Sprint (October 2009).

3. Demand for additional power has not been demonstrated. The Battleground, Amboy and Yacolt areas have not been developed with manufacturing sites. Residential use is nominal.
4. The major corridors of development are located to the west of the I-5 Highway, and these areas should bear the burden of the new transmission lines and distribution of power.

Submitted November 4, 2009 by Joseph R. Bailey, Donna M. Bailey, trustees of the Bailey Family Trust.

Communication ID: 12193

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: CAROL SAGE NELLIS,NORMAN NELLIS

Please have your environmental studies look at Small Creek on south property line.

You know and I know you already know where your line is going to be put. Your meetings are required by law. So why are we being left hanging ten for two years.

If you're coming anywhere near us please, please buy us out lock stock and barrel. We are 70 years old. Look at our place, and tell me if we have enough years left to replace what we have accomplished here.

The east route would be the cheapest and disrupt the least amount of people. Also the state could bring in money from the sale or rent. The state always needs money so why disrupt people's lives when you can put a smile on a whole lot of politicians' faces.

Communication ID: 12194

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: DEBBY POTTER,JIM POTTER

Put the line where there are no houses or don't do it.

You are proposing to go through a 30 year old sub-division that has many original owners- most of the rest have lived here 20-25 years. This is criminal to even think of uprooting that type of neighborhood. Furthermore, we have all remodeled the homes because we like it here- large lots, mature trees- "fair market value"- will NOT purchase houses of this caliber anywhere close in Clark County.

We were planning to retire in this house- we are afraid to retire now- because if you force us to move, we will need income to help defray what we are certain you won't pay for. Your rep assured us even if we don't lose our home BPA will not pay for the devaluation of our property if the line is adjacent to our property- that is also criminal.

When you survey- If you have to cut down trees in this neighborhood and then don't use the property- the trees are not replaceable- they are 100' trees. You have just changed the climate of our neighborhood- also criminal.

Communication ID: 12195

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: LEONARD S YOUNG

Dear Mr. Wright:

Please find the attached scoping comments and concerns for the Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) I-5 Corridor Project prepared by the Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR). We appreciate the opportunity, at this early stage in the scoping process, to provide important information to BPA about Washington State authorities administered by DNR and matters that must be addressed in the NEPA process, and to lay the groundwork for future constructive discussions and decision making for this project. Our comments focus on the following:

- Establishing clearly articulated objectives and developing a reasonable range of alternatives
- DNR-managed state lands
- Conservation Easements
- State and private forest lands subject to the Washington State Forest Practices Act, and
- Unimproved lands subject to state fire protection and suppression DNR's fundamental interest in making these scoping comments is to articulate the range of significant issues, concerns, and objectives required to develop a reasonable range of alternatives that is informed by a thorough, hard-look environmental analysis. We believe this to be essential to eventual federal and state decisions for this project that meet each of our responsibilities for the public benefit and environmental stewardship and state trust land beneficiaries. In so doing, we are also mindful of the range of state and federal policy goals relevant to this project and are coordinating with Governor Gregoire's office and other state agencies. We welcome the opportunity to continue to bring critical state interests into discussions with BPA and others as the NEPA process proceeds.

Objectives and Alternatives

One of the significant issues for DNR is the impact of the proposal on DNR-managed state lands and programs. Although BPA has identified a need for this proposal, the purposes and objectives to be met in developing this proposal and alternatives are not clearly stated. Clearly stated objectives are critical to establishing a reasonable range of alternatives. DNR, as an affected agency with multiple program authorities, should be involved and included as these objectives are finalized in order to ensure that an adequate range of alternatives and impacts are evaluated in the Environmental Impact Statement. Potential objectives are identified in the attached comments. We look forward to further discussions at appropriate levels to ensure that these objectives are incorporated and that DNR's responsibilities are met. DNR-managed State Lands Washington is a land grant state entrusted with ownership and stewardship of state trust lands and aquatic lands since statehood. These lands provide revenue for

state educational and other institutions, ensure commerce, and provide public recreation and wildlife habitat. Washington substantially increased its trust uplands following the Great Depression by adding forest lands subject to tax foreclosure. The revenue from those lands benefits Washington counties. There are 3 million acres of trust uplands and 2.6 million acres of aquatic lands. Last year these lands generated over \$293 million in revenue to legal beneficiaries. Originally trust lands were primarily viewed solely as a source of revenue, but as Washington State has experienced growth, these lands have become important to the state's ecological health as well as for the recreation opportunities they provide. For example, in 1972 DNR was tasked with identifying, creating and managing the state's Natural Area Preserves and in 1987, Natural Resource Conservation Areas. These now encompass 126,000 acres of some of the most ecologically unique and important lands in the state.

I am concerned that state trust lands and other state lands will be harmed by federal projects, especially insofar as there is any appearance that project locations focus on state lands and conflict with trust land management mandates. BPA is proposing four new large transmission projects. The I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project alternatives cross broad areas of state lands. All of the potential routes have at least some impact and several have severe impacts to state land. These alternative routes avoid lands in the state of Oregon, federal Department of Defense lands, USDA-Forest Service lands and even Pacific Power and Light lands. DNR believes a reasonable range will include alternatives that mitigate, minimize and avoid disproportionate impacts to DNR- managed state lands, including not only near-term, but also long-term effects on trust land management and environmental stewardship.

Existing BPA Encumbrances

In addition to concerns with the proposed corridors, there are already over 800 BPA easements encumbering state lands. In DNR's experience, existing BPA corridors often experience poor road maintenance, conversion to invasive species and unauthorized uses that damage state forest lands and public resources. From our perspective, large-scale removal of danger trees, right-of way corridor expansion without adequate compensation to the state, and/or conflicts with the state's long-term forest land management obligations and in some cases contractual obligations in our federally-approved Habitat Conservation Plan. Based on these very real past and current experiences, DNR is seeking a commitment from BPA to develop an agreement with DNR that addresses management of existing corridors to reduce environmental damage, assures state forest land productivity, and provides for appropriate compensation to the legal beneficiaries of the state trust lands when those lands are used by BPA. This broader agreement should then form the basis for mutually beneficial agreements associated with the I-5 Corridor project.

Conservation Easements

The BPA I-5 Project has proposed segment routes which have the potential to impact four conservation easements. DNR purchases conservation easements on private forestlands throughout the state under the Forestry Riparian Easement Program. The purpose of these easements is for the protection of aquatic resources in important riparian areas. If BPA's corridors were to be placed on these conservation easements, it would severely impact the ability for these easements to achieve the purpose for which

they were purchased and the state's investment in the conservation easement would be lost. If this were to occur DNR will pursue compensation for the conservation easements impacted by the transmission line.

Washington State Forest Practices Act

Washington's Forest Practices Act provides among the highest standards in the nation for environmental protections placed on non-federal forest. The states' legislature found that forest land resources are one of the most valuable resources in the state. The Act provides for the management of forest lands and the maintenance of a viable forest products industry and its importance to protect forest soils, fisheries, wildlife, water quality and quantity, air quality, recreation and scenic beauty. The Forest Practices Act provides permitting obligations on a forest landowner, timber owner and operator who conducts forest practices activities on forestland. DNR would like a commitment from BPA to meet the intent of the Forest Practices Act and Rules within BPA's ownership or easement corridors. 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. It is incumbent upon BPA to notify DNR when a particular proposal is going to take place within an area under BPA

ownership. Absent BPA assertion of ownership, all Forest Practices obligations exist, which include obtaining an approved Forest Practices Application and complying with the rules. In this case the underlying landowner is ultimately responsible for the activities that take place on their property. This may include enforcement actions for activities that are conducted by another party, such as a BPA contractor. Project alternatives should be evaluated individually regarding the impact to riparian function throughout the construction phase and during future maintenance. Providing environmental protection should receive similar priority as providing reliable service to the public. I encourage BPA's project staff to meet with DNR's Forest Practices Program staff to discuss mitigation measures which could address environmental protection and demonstrate how our agencies can work together to achieve common goals, including furthering the goals of Washington's Forest Practices Act.

State Fire Protection and Suppression DNR is responsible for fire protection and suppression on over 12 million acres of state and private wild lands. Unfortunately, BPA power lines inherently constitute a wildfire concern both because of their susceptibility to fire, and also because of the safety concerns and limitations they place on firefighting efforts. Please make a commitment to work with DNR to reduce the negative impacts of BPA corridors for fire suppression. BPA's recent emphasis on falling danger trees is leading to concerns that new extreme fire hazards may be created on transmission corridors. BPA must assume responsibility for the creation and abatement of these hazards. I would like assurance that BPA will follow state extreme hazard abatement laws. As you can see, DNR has an important range of concerns about the impacts of BPA's I-5 proposal. I know Commissioner Goldmark is looking forward to his meeting with you January 8th to discuss these concerns and further a cooperative approach to their resolution. Please also feel free to contact me at [Number].

I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project NEPA Scoping Comments Introduction

Please accept these as National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) scoping comments prepared by the Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR). These comments delineate the significant issues necessary to be included in an analysis that fulfills a "hard look" assessment of the impacts to DNR-managed state lands from Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. In addition, DNR has included comments related to its nonproprietary responsibilities. These responsibilities include assessing geologic hazards, providing geologic information to the public, regulating activities on forest lands, providing recreational opportunities, and preventing and suppressing fires on undeveloped lands. DNR's mailing address is PO Box 47000, Olympia, Washington 98504-7000. State lands managed by DNR are significantly impacted by several of the currently identified alternative routes proposed for the I-5 Corridor Project. We have been working with BPA staff on these impacts and we encourage BPA to continue working with DNR staff to seek alternatives with fewer impacts to state lands, recognizing DNR's constitutional obligation to manage these lands for the benefit of the trust beneficiaries, including K-12 school construction and county services.

Format of Comments

DNR's comments on the I-5 Corridor Project are arranged under the following topics: • Types of State Lands • Additional Alternatives • Trust Uplands • Aquatic Lands • Conservation Easements • Liability • Geologic Hazards • Forest Fire Prevention and Suppression • Forest Practices • Other Concerns Under each topic is a short discussion of DNR's concerns relating to significant issues and a list of Additional Analysis DNR believes necessary for the EIS to include, or Requests DNR is making of BPA in the project design criteria and mitigation measures. The comments end by including Future Coordination needed between BPA and DNR, including the need for BPA to obtain a Right of entry permit for activities during the NEPA process and to obtain a final easement.

Types of State Lands Impacted

DNR manages many different types of lands for diverse objectives and with unique statutory authority. The lands and property interests impacted by this project include: • Trust Uplands consisting of lands granted at statehood by the federal government. Revenue from these lands benefits specific state institutions and school construction. • Trust Uplands purchased by the state and transferred from the counties. Revenue from these lands benefits the counties and their junior taxing districts. • Aquatic Lands granted at statehood for commerce and the benefit of the general public. • Conservation easements, which are partial interests in land and not full fee title, are managed for their short-term (50 year term) environmental benefit to the general public. DNR manages approximately 75,200 acres of trust uplands that may be impacted by the I-5 proposal. These acres primarily fall into one of five DNR management "blocks": Wild Horse, Davis Peak, Merwin, Speelyai and Larch which includes the Yacolt Burn State Forest (See Exhibit A. "DNR Management Blocks" and Table I. "BPA Corridor Segment Acres by DNR- Upland Management Block and DNR Upland Management Block Acres"). DNR's Aquatic Lands Division manages the Columbia River and the navigable lakes and rivers shown on Exhibit B. "Washington State Owned-DNR Managed Aquatic Lands". There are also four Forest Riparian Easement Program² conservation easements managed by DNR Forest Practices impacted by the proposal (See

Exhibit C. "Conservation Easements").

DNR Block	BPA Segment(s)	Corridor Acres	Total Acres in Block
Wild Horse	10, 11	29	3,140
Davis Peak	12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 23, 25	206	12,048
Merwin	17, 18, 19, 24	87	5,861
Speelyai	11	34	13,731
Larch (Yacolt)	28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 39, 43, 49	409	39,575

Additional Alternatives

The alternatives currently under consideration appear to disproportionately focus on state lands, lands which directly benefit the residents of Washington State. DNR would like the following options and considerations to be incorporated with additional alternatives: 1. Route(s) that do not impact state trust lands or conservation easements held by the state. 2. Route(s) that avoid lands that have medium to high wind power potential. 3. Route(s) that include significant federal lands such as Forest Service lands and Department of Defense land (Camp Bonneville). 4. Route(s) in Oregon. 5. Route(s) that include Pacific Power and Light lands, such as those around Lake Merwin, that are already dedicated to the production of power.

Trust Uplands Revenue

All of the trust uplands are managed for timber production in addition to other sources of revenue. The proposed segments will remove mature timber, reduce the value received from merchantable timber that has not yet reached its economic maturity, and negate the investment made by DNR in trees that have not yet reached merchantable size. (See Table 2. "Estimated Timber Volume and Value by Segment".)

Segment	Trust Upland Acres	MBF	Est. Value ³
10	26	335	\$107,200
11	38	626	\$200,320
12	59	1,413	\$452,160
13	64	729	\$233,280
14	23	38	\$12,160
15	25	291	\$93,120

16	17	157	\$50,240
17	7	74	\$23,680
18	71	1,193	\$381,760
19	8	109	\$34,880
23	12	88	\$28,160
24	1	10	\$3,200
25	6	172	\$55,040
28	33	1009	\$322,880
29	67	1,754	\$561,280
30	63	1,348	\$431,360
31	5	12	\$3,840
32	104	2,616	\$837,120
33	58	2,401	\$768,320
34	46	1,516	\$485,120
35	12	185	\$59,200
39	1	1	\$320
43	10	59	\$18,880
49	10	390	\$124,800

In addition, BPA's corridor will affect, restrict or threaten trust management activities that occur outside the right-of-way. Based upon BPA's pamphlet "Living and Working Safely Around Highvoltage Power Lines," restricted activities include some timber harvest activities, location of buildings and parking lots, recreation facilities, trails and fencing. DNR considers these restrictions to constitute a negative easement⁴ that prevents DNR from fully managing state lands and the extent of these restrictions must be more fully defined in order to prepare a complete evaluation of environmental effects.

There are five communication sites on DNR lands impacted by this proposal (Exhibit D. Communications Sites and Potential Wind Power Sites.) These include Davis Peak and Bells Mountain which have substantial short and long term value to DNR and the community. At our Davis Peak site there are eight sub-lessees that are governmental agencies. They provide public services to the surrounding community. The corridor may also disrupt a Remote Automated Weather Station (RAWS) which provides real time weather information for public use. DNR does not want the corridor to interfere with the current use or future development of any communication site.

Recently DNR has begun planning for wind power leases in DNR's Pacific Cascade Region (Exhibit D. Communications Sites and Potential Wind Power Sites.) There are many acres of viable land that may be rendered unusable or more expensive to develop because of the proposed power line (See Table 3. Impacted Suitable Wind Power Acres by Segment.) Locating the corridors through potential wind power sites may take away the State's ability to generate revenue for trust beneficiaries in the future.

DNR is also exploring future revenue from biomass production, carbon credits and development rights that may be impacted by the proposed corridor and requires analysis.

Table 3. Impacted Wind Power Suitable Acres by Segments	
Segment	Acres on DNR Land
10	34.7
11	1.2
12	27.2
13	40.2
14	0
15	0
16	0
17	0
18	0
19	0
23	0
24	0
25	0
28	0
29	0
30	20.2
31	0
32	93.2
33	0
34	22.7
35	0
39	0
43	0
49	0

DNR's road system is a valuable asset to the trusts. Use of the roads by the project proponent contributes to increased road maintenance and replacement needs; these are significant ongoing costs, not one-time expenditures. DNR wants to ensure BPA contributes fairly to maintenance. The State Forest Practices Act and rules requires roads DNR uses to be included in its Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan and for those roads to meet Forest Practices standards. DNR is concerned that roads built or used by BPA will not comply with state regulation. DNR would incur additional costs upgrading those roads for uses associated with adjoining state lands.

Additional Analysis Requested: I. An Economic Impact Study of the short and long-term impacts of each

segment on revenue to trust beneficiaries. 2. An Economic Impact Study of the short and long-term impacts to the local economy caused by impacts to the timber industry and recreation. 3. Define restrictions on current and reasonably foreseeable activities outside the right-of-way, particularly areas 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. 4. Impacts to communications systems used by governmental entities including interruptions in service during construction and any retro-fitting to the buildings that might be required to ensure safety near the power lines. 5. A complete listing and map showing all existing roads BPA will use and construct on state lands. Include a reasonable prediction of the amount of use they will sustain and whether that use will be joint or exclusive. Also include a description of the design standards to be used and how they differ from Forest Practices and DNR road standards. 6. Analysis of the cumulative loss of manageable acres and revenue attributable to BPA's existing easements and all proposed easements/projects. 7. Cruised volume (using DNR cruising standards), species and grade of trees located outside the proposed right-of-way that will be considered danger trees and removed immediately and over time by BPA. 8. Determine the economic impacts to DNR from adjusting for BPA's activities in current and future contracts. 9. Compare the expenditure of time and money of crossing state lands versus federal lands given the October 23, 2009 MOU between multiple federal agencies that expedites the siting and construction of qualified electric transmission infrastructure on federal lands.

Environment

This project is on DNR trust lands covered by the State Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) including the 2006 Riparian Forest Restoration Strategy. The HCP is a legally binding agreement and an alternate plan under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and covers DNR-managed trust lands in the range of the northern spotted owl. The HCP has resulted in DNR obtaining incidental take permits issued by the US Fish and Wildlife Service and NOAA-Fisheries Service which allow DNR to manage habitat on the landscape level. DNR consults with the Services under Section 10 of the ESA whereas BPA consults under Section 7. DNR's HCP includes protection for species that are not on the federal threatened and endangered species list such as state threatened and endangered species, and species of concern. It also provides protection for unique habitats such as talus slopes, caves and balds. The Riparian Forest Restoration Strategy outlines a higher level of protection of riparian areas located on DNR managed lands. DNR is concerned that BPA, as a federal agency, is not required to protect these additional species and habitats in the same manner and to the same degree. DNR is particularly concerned about BPA corridors and roads fragmenting habitat, introducing noxious and invasive weeds, impacting water quality, increasing slides on unstable slopes, creating or failing to remove fish barriers, inviting unregulated public use and generally providing a lesser standard of environmental protection.

Additional Analysis Requested: 1. Analyze the difference in impacts between DNR environmental protection and BPA environmental protection under the Endangered Species Act taking into consideration DNR's Habitat Conservation Plan and Riparian Forest Restoration Strategy. Evaluate the short and long-term impacts of the project on the species and habitats not requiring protection by BPA under federal statute. 2. Include in the description of the affected environment/existing conditions a survey of existing road systems servicing current BPA corridors. Analyze environmental impacts

including sedimentation and fish blockage. Use this data to predict impacts from proposed road systems. 3. Assess unstable slopes using DNR's Landslide Hazard Zonation. 4. Survey existing BPA corridors on state lands for noxious weeds and invasive species and use as a predictor of impacts from the current proposal. 5. Reconsider corridor locations by using GIS modeling to identify the least sensitive lands. 6. Perform a Cultural Resource Assessment - Section 106 consultation 7. Formally consult with US Fish & Wildlife Service under Section 10 of the Endangered Species Act in cooperation with DNR. 8. Formally consult with the National Marine Fisheries Service under Section 10 of the Endangered Species Act in cooperation with DNR. 9. Review BPA's May 2000 Transmission System Vegetation Management Program Final Environmental Impact Statement DOE/EIS-0285 and supplements and clearly identify the vegetation management activities that will occur within and outside of the right-of-way. 10. Determine the impacts on DNR's harvest from removal of these lands from each Watershed Analysis Unit (WAU). 11. 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. Recreation DNR is near completion of a new recreation plan for the Larch (Yacolt) block, the Yacolt Bum Recreation Plan.

Recreation

The BPA alternatives proposed in this block will have very significant effects on the proposed and existing trails and campgrounds (See Exhibit E: Impacts to DNR Recreation of Proposed Corridor.) The proposed corridors intersect DNR's current and planned trails approximately 53 times. In addition, the proposed corridors either are over the top of trails or parallel to trails for extended distances. DNR's trail system serves hikers, horse riders and mountain bikers, as well as motorized recreation. It appears the proposed power line R/W corridor would significantly impact DNR's Rock Creek campground and trailhead. This is DNR's largest and most heavily used recreation site in the Yacolt Bum State Forest. In addition, the planned 4-Corners campground and trailhead would be significantly impacted. The Cold Creek Campground and Cold Creek Day Use Area are adjacent to two proposed corridors. Either corridor would significantly impact the integrity of those sites and the type of recreation experience for the public.

Additional Analysis Requested: 1. Define impacts to current and planned DNR-provided recreation opportunities. Include a projection of the cost to re-create the Yacolt Burn Recreation Plan to account for BPA's impacts.

Unauthorized Use

If built as proposed, the power line infrastructure would be highly accessible by the general public and will contribute to unauthorized use and damage to state lands and public resources. Unauthorized use is already occurring on BPA power lines that exist on these DNR lands.

Additional Analysis Requested:

1. Survey existing power lines on DNR-managed lands and document unauthorized use and damage to state lands and public resources. Use this survey to prepare a quantitative prediction of unauthorized use on each proposed corridor segment. Include costs to repair or mitigate predicted damage.

Land Transactions

In an ongoing effort to block up lands and reduce the amount of difficult to manage lands, DNR regularly sells, purchases and exchanges land. This project impacts lands that DNR has intended to sell or exchange in the long-te=. These lands would be appraised as development lands as opposed to forest land. DNR is concerned that BPA will value those lands as forest lands. In addition, DNR lands can be significantly devalued by BPA transmission line corridors. DNR has general concerns that the appraisal methods used by BPA do not fully compensate DNR for its loss.

Additional Analysis Requested: 1. For those isolated parcels that will become significantly unusable by DNR for resource management compare the difference between appraisals based on developed land versus forest land values, and encumbered versus unencumbered values. 2. Clearly define the appraisal methodology proposed for valuation of state trust lands where compensation is required.

Aquatic Lands

All alternatives will cross State-owned aquatic lands (SOAL) and must be authorized by DNR. Aquatic crossings have the potential to negatively impact critical habitat including threatened and endangered salmon spawning and rearing habitat. DNR also has concerns that improperly managed rights-of-way may result in the removal of excessive amounts of riparian vegetation and habitat near the shoreline, thereby increasing the potential for erosion, sedimentation and turbidity in the aquatic environment. (See Table 4. Segments with Navigable River Crossings.) These crossings also act as attractive nuisances for Off Road Vehicles and 4 Wheel Drive Vehicles. DNR has multiple licenses, leases, easements and material sales on the proposed corridors which provide revenue to the state to fund aquatic land management and aquatic land enhancement projects.

Segment	River Name	Navigable Water Description	DNR Uplands?
3	Cowlitz River	Watercourse definitely navigable	No
4	Cowlitz River	Watercourse definitely navigable	No
9	Coweeman River	Watercourse possibly navigable	No
9	Kalama River	Watercourse possibly navigable	No
10	Coweeman River	Watercourse navigability unknown	Yes
11	Coweeman River	Watercourse navigability unknown	Yes
17	Lewis River	Watercourse definitely navigable	Yes
20	Lewis River	Watercourse probably navigable	No
21	Lewis River	Watercourse probably navigable	No
23	Lewis River	Watercourse definitely navigable	Yes
25	Lewis River	Watercourse definitely navigable	Yes

52	Columbia River	Watercourse definitely navigable	No
52	Washougal River	Watercourse possibly navigable	No
52	Washougal River	Watercourse definitely navigable	No

Additional Analysis Requested: 1. Confirm state-ownership of aquatic lands 2. Perform a Cultural Resource Assessment - Section 106 consultation for all crossing locations. 3. Consult with affected tribes. 4. Identify impacted DNR aquatic licenses, leases, easements and sales; and calculate lost revenue to the state over the next fifty years. 5. Define BPA's proposed Best Management Practices for vegetation management in its rights-of-way near any water body where State Owned Aquatic Lands are located.

Conservation Easements:

The BPA 1-5 corridor has proposed segment routes which will impact four Forest Riparian Easement Program conservation easements. DNR purchases conservation easements on private forestlands throughout the state under the Forestry Riparian Easement Program. The purpose of these easements is for the protection of aquatic resources in important riparian areas. If BPA's corridors were to be placed on these conservation easements, it would severely impact the ability for these easements to achieve the purpose for which they were purchased and the states investment in the conservation easement would be lost. If this were to occur, DNR will require compensation and/or mitigation for the riparian area impacted by the transmission line. Requests: 1. BPA obtain consent from DNR on the impacted easement prior to obtaining an easement from the landowner 2. BPA reimburse DNR at the pro-rated purchase price of the impacted conservation easement as a result of BPA operations in the area.

Liability Washington State has joint and several liability laws that result in DNR being more likely to be named in, and damages collected from, a third party lawsuit than BPA.

Additional Analysis Requested: 1. Identify the BPA contracts where contractors could provide DNR liability protection through the addition of insurance and indemnity requirements.

Geologic Hazards This project crosses several geologic hazards, including landslides, potentially active faults, and areas vulnerable to liquefaction. Seven proposed segments cross eighteen known deep-seated landslides, one of which is on DNR lands (Table I and Exhibit F. Deep-seated Landslides). These areas are considered unstable and activities, such as vegetation removal, construction, or slope modification could increase the instability of the landslide, reactivating portions or the entire landslide.

Segment	River Name	Navigable Water Description	DNR Uplands?
3	Cowlitz River	Watercourse definitely navigable	No
4	Cowlitz River	Watercourse definitely navigable	No
9	Coweeman River	Watercourse possibly navigable	No
9	Kalama River	Watercourse possibly navigable	No
10	Coweeman River	Watercourse navigability unknown	Yes
11	Coweeman River	Watercourse navigability unknown	Yes

17	Lewis River	Watercourse definitely navigable	Yes
20	Lewis River	Watercourse probably navigable	No
21	Lewis River	Watercourse probably navigable	No
23	Lewis River	Watercourse definitely navigable	Yes
25	Lewis River	Watercourse definitely navigable	Yes
52	Columbia River	Watercourse definitely navigable	No
52	Washougal River	Watercourse possibly navigable	No
52	Washougal River	Watercourse definitely navigable	No

Four proposed segments cross the potentially active Lacamas Lake Fault (Table 2 and Exhibit G Faults). Surface ruptures or movement along this fault could disrupt power lines and towers. Areas near the fault that contain steep slopes might be vulnerable to failure during seismic shaking from future earthquakes along the fault.

Segment	Fault Name	DNR Uplands?
36	Lacamas Lake fault	No
44	Lacamas Lake fault	No
46	Lacamas Lake fault	No
52	Lacamas Lake fault	No

Seismic shaking can also cause liquefaction, which eleven proposed segments cross areas of low to moderate and moderate to high liquefaction susceptibility (Table 3 and Exhibit H Liquefaction). Structures built within areas of liquefaction potential could be at risk of failure from settlement or lateral movement.

Segment	Liquefaction Susceptibility	DNR Uplands?
1	Moderate to High	No
2	Moderate to High	No
3	Moderate to High	No
4	Moderate to High	No
9	Moderate to High	No
11	Low to Moderate	No
20	Low to Moderate	No
21	Low to Moderate	No
25	Moderate to High	No
51	Moderate to High	No

52	Moderate to High	No
----	------------------	----

Additional Analysis Requested: 1. Identify landslide hazards using DNR's GIS Statewide Landslide database and then create a site-specific geologic map. 2. Identify unstable slopes using DNR's Shalstab model or through landforms in the Landslide Hazard Zonation projects where available data exists. 3. Identify unstable slope hazards associated with slope modification or vegetation removal at construction areas. 4. Identify seismic shaking potential on the Lacarnas Lake Fault as well as movement potential 5. Reconsider corridor locations in moderate to high liquefaction sensitive areas by using GIS modeling to identify the least sensitive lands.

Fire Prevention and Suppression

DNR is responsible for preventing and suppressing wildfires on 12 million acres of public and private forest land, including the area the I-5 Corridor Project passes through. The project is in an area that has historically experienced catastrophic wildfires. To prevent unnecessary risk to life and natural resources it is critical that all fire prevention laws and rules of the state be adhered to by BPA and their contractors during corridor construction, maintenance or use. The presence of the corridor creates increased risk of wildfire both through the use and maintenance of the corridor by BPA and through increased public access to the corridor. It is in BPA's interest to take reasonable actions to prevent wildfires that may occur within and adjacent to power line corridors.

Requests: 1. BPA agree that its actions and those of its contractors comply with RCW 76.04 and WAC 332-24. 2. BPA reimburse DNR 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.

Forest Practices

DNR's Forest Practices Program is responsible for the implementation of the state's Forest Practices Act and rules. The rules provide the framework for the protection of public resources and are a responsibility forest landowners, timber owners and operators have when conducting forest practices activities. The Forest Practices rules and regulations provide cumulative protection to public resources. These resources include fish, water, wildlife and capital improvements of the state. The rules limit harvest adjacent to streams, wetlands and unstable slopes in addition to the construction and maintenance of roads. Maintaining long term large woody debris, shade producing tree species, bank stability and sediment filtering, collectively known as riparian function, immediately adjacent to fish bearing waters and perennial waters is extremely important. All forest landowners, timber owners and operators are required to follow the rules when conducting forest practices activities on forest land. 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. It is incumbent upon BPA to notify DNR Forest Practices when a particular proposal is going to take place within an area under BPA ownership. Absent BPA assertion of ownership, all Forest Practices obligations exist, which include obtaining an approved Forest Practices Application and complying with the rules. In this case the underlying landowner is ultimately responsible for the activities that take place on their property. This may include

enforcement actions for activities that are conducted by another party, in this case a BPA contractor. The Forest Practices program encourages BPA to be cognizant of these facts and make choices that do not have a negative impact on surrounding landowners.

Requests:

1. Agree to implement the 2002 agreement between DNR and BPA regarding forest practices. OR Agree to work with the neighboring landowners to obtain Forest Practices Applications and comply with the Forest Practices Act and rules. 2. Evaluate the project alternatives based on the impacts that they will have on Threatened and Endangered fish species, and water quality concerns. 3. Limit the impacts to potentially unstable slopes as defined in WAC 222-16-050(1)(d)(i). 4. BPA conduct an environmental analysis of the impacts to unstable slopes, riparian function and water quality for all stream crossings that will be impacted. A mitigation plan is provided for the project to specifically guide the removal and manipulation of vegetation near stream crossings. 5. BPA consider replacing existing tree species within the corridor with a species that will provide riparian function while limiting the hazards to the lines and providing reliable service to the customer.

Other Concerns

- DNR has established scientific Research Plots and areas with Genetically Selected trees within or near the proposed segments as follows:

CONTRACT TYPE	Segment												
	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	23	27	30
90 -Research Permanent Plots	2	2		2			1	1	1		2		1
91 -Genetic Selected Trees	1	2	2		1	1			2	1		1	

- Existing contracts represent a contractual obligation for DNR and revenue for the trusts. BPA's easement will require adjustment of some of these contracts. Additional Analysis Requested: 1. Define impacts to established research plots and genetically selected tree areas and propose measures to mitigate impacts.

Future Coordination

Requests: An application must be submitted and a Right-of-entry permit obtained prior to entering onto DNR-managed lands or using DNR-managed roads for any purpose. This will help ensure the safety of BPA employees and contractors. There are industrial activities taking place on DNR lands that BPA may not be aware of. If an easement across DNR-managed lands is determined to be required, BPA must recognize that: 1. An application and a survey are required prior to the granting of any easement. 2. BPA may be asked to provide an appraisal that meets DNR's requirements 3. DNR has environmental impact assessment responsibilities associated with granting easements under the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (Chapter 43.21C RCW) (SEPA). Failure to involve DNR in a timely manner in the NEPA and/or SEPA process could lead to delays in processing your easement application and third party

appeals. 4. DNR has a Habitat Conservation Plan that applies to these areas. 5. DNR managed trust uplands and aquatic lands are managed by different divisions and under different regulations. If easements are required over both, DNR will treat them as separate easement grants. 6. BPA will need to coordinate with DNR to ensure any pre-construction, construction, post construction activities, and ongoing maintenance, complies with any relevant standards for fish, wildlife, and aquatic vegetation located in the proposed project area. DNR has been severely impacted by budget reductions. Our ability to respond quickly to requests for easements and to participate in the necessary review and permitting processes is limited. For the best available service relating to process questions, reviews or permits BPA is encouraged to contact; Dan Walters at 360-902-1646 for trust uplands Zoanne Thomas at 360-767-7005 for aquatic lands Dan Pomerenk at 360-902-1427 for Conservation Easements Patricia Betts at 360-902-1633 for comments related to compliance with NEPA and SEPA.

Communication ID: 12196

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: SYDNEY KASKI

Received phone call from Sydney Kaski [Phone]. She does not live on any of the routes, but is near route 27 between Yacolt and Amboy. She does not want the new line in this part of the county because of visual and health concerns. She would rather see it go on the western most route, or the eastern most route.

Communication ID: 12197

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: ABRAHAM VLADIC

I was shocked to learn that you guys are actually considering running a couple of 500 Kv power lines along what your map calls route 31. Not only does that area have some of the most beautiful country land in Clark County, but the idea that you would put power lines near so many people's homes and private property and even demolish something like 30 homes is outrageous! I'm wondering what you must have been thinking by even proposing this kind of route? Why would you devalue all that nice land and harm hundreds of people's lives when you could easily run the lines out to the east, where almost no one lives? State forest land, afterall, is land that is clear cut all the time, and no one lives there. So I'm following route 31 and on top of that I find out that route 31 runs right next to the Lucia Falls park-ruining the beauty of that secluded part of the Lewis river. Right across the street the lines would run right over the historic Pomeroy Farm. You might as well have just invented a route designed to screw with as many people's lives as possible, and purposefully destroy the most useful and gorgeous land in the county. In conclusion I do hope that something is done about removing route 31 from the list of possible routes as soon as possible.

Communication ID: 12198

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: MICHAEL GRUBBS,ERIK MATTSON

Dear Mr. Korness:

I am writing you to respectfully express the concerns of the Hockinson School District regarding the proposed route #31 of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. As you know, this project is projected to cross the Hockinson community area and specifically Hockinson School District property located at [address].

The district purchased a 35 acre parcel at that location approximately two years ago from the DNR for \$1,040,000. The intent of the school district is to hold the property for a future school location because of its suitability for construction and feasibility for full school use.

We have also entered into a partnership for the immediate development of that property with Clark County and the Highland Little League, both of whom have committed significant resources to the project. The intent will be to locate much needed ball fields for recreational use in the East County area. Such development would ultimately enhance the natural placement of a full school facility on that site.

The following issues define our concerns should the potential placement of high voltage transmission lines over the property become a reality:

- Projected Use of the Property: The property will not be a suitable site for the location of a school and/or ball fields;
- Property Values: There will be a downward impact on property value both on the school site and on the properties along the corridor thus negatively impacting revenue generation capacity for the school district;
- Sensitive Habitat: The SE portion of the property where the line is projected to run contains a pristine wet area (a micro canyon ecological zone that is endemic to many species of birds) that would be corrupted by route #31. The district can foresee use of that zone as a wonderful instructional area and would protect and preserve the area;
- Electric and Magnetic Fields: The widespread perception of inherent health risks and dangers would severely marginalize any school district use of its property;
- Visual Impact: Again, corridor property values will drop because of this aspect thus negatively impacting the district; and,
- Costs: as you know, insuring fiscal stability is a prime directive for all governmental agencies. In a time of severely declining revenues for schools, the district would have to locate another site for school

placement thus incurring additional costs of land acquisition and likely wetlands mitigation.

The Hockinson School District, for the above reasons and those expressed by thousands of our constituents and patrons, urges you to abandon the proposed route #31 through the Hockinson Community and relocate the corridor to a more suitable location with less negative impact on the existing community.

Please call the school district office if you have any questions.

We would also like to extend an invitation to you to come and walk the property if you wish, and to appear before our School Board. The School Board and our patrons would very much enjoy hearing from you regarding the BPA's decision making process.

Please know that we understand the need for power reinforcement; we respectfully do not understand the need to place a transmission corridor through a projected school site and its surrounding, and wonderful, bucolic community.

Communication ID: 12199

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: A M CANDEE

There has to be a different placement for the lines- bisecting so many places in our community that are things to look at and enjoy and are places of beauty- that is a tragedy. Taking a place we go to get away from things like that! Private food farms? Private horse farms? Private community areas? Public areas? the falls? The scenic drive??!! (Hey come drive along our scenic drive!! Check out our ugly power lines!!) I understand that power lines are important. I get that. I also understand that running them will bring up anger wherever you run them, but there has to be a place where it does not ruin so many people's homes/views/value/ etc. Please do not run them in a place that will ruin being there or lower the surrounding property values and PLEASE do not ruin my falls and the beautiful places in our community.

Communication ID: 12200

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: KATHRYN A MULDER

Please have your environmental studies look at: 1)Independent studies (no conflict of interest) on the health effects of Electromagnetic Fields ("EMF") on people, animals, plants, land and water. 2)The value of an aesthetically pleasing community to quality of life. This includes properties outside the direct path of line 31 such as ours, but still visually directly affected and possibly EMF affected. 3)The decline in quality of life for the entire of community of Hockinson, due to the above mentioned aesthetics, decline

in property values adding to already lower values in a bad economy, lower tax revenues leaving less money for schools, the disruption of a rare and beautiful area that is pastoral, wild, peaceful and agricultural. I have these other comments: 1) Our family would see huge towers right out our front door, instead of trees, farms, open space and the foothills in the distance. It would ruin our beautiful neighborhood. 2) We have already lost value in our property due to the economy and this could potentially make it much worse. 3) Finally, we also have a family member with Type 1 insulin-dependent diabetes who plans in the future to start using an insulin pump and this is a huge concern about the effects of EMF. Conclusion: There must be a better way to handle increased demand for capacity, especially capacity for areas other than SW Washington that would not negatively affect so many people. Perhaps there is a solution no one has even thought of yet. I hope this scoping period will lead to a new approach.

Communication ID: 12201

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: MARY A ANDRADE

Re: Route 31-Proposed Power Line Project thru Hockinson To whom it may concern, I am a concerned citizen who owns a home approximately 1000 feet from where one of the new proposed power projects is being considered. A new power line is not necessary; the existing route should be expanded since it is a better use of resources. This would eliminate the need to plow down entirely new areas, some that are highly populated, with not only people and their homes but businesses, churches, schools, and parks as well. Health impact studies are still unknown for people living too close to the power lines. So again, why expose more of the population to the higher effects of the unknown risk of people living in close proximity to high power lines? The alternative routes are less populated and incorporate state lands which are more easily accessible and would cost the taxpayers less. Additionally, property values would be impacted very severely for those homes too close to the high power lines. For me, my home is the only asset I have and rely on it for my retirement as well. If the property values are reduced, sometimes substantially in these cases, then my ability to finance my retirement is substantially reduced. If I wanted to sell my house and downsize when I get older, my ability to purchase something else is also reduced. If I wanted to live next to a power line, then I would have chosen a home close to an existing one. If this power comes from Oregon, why not impact Oregon citizens rather than Clark County citizens? Does anyone responsible for making this decision own a home in these proposed areas? Ask yourself the question, how would you like your family to be living next to this proposed high power line? In this time of economic hardship we need to use our resources wisely. It makes more common sense to use our existing high power areas to expand services. It is your civic responsibility to look at the route with the least impact on the entire population as well as the least costly route as well. Sincerely, Mary Ann Andrade [Address][Phone]

Communication ID: 12202

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: SIDNEY COWSKI

Hi this is Sidney Cowski, I live out in Clark County between Yacolt and Amboy, and I am totally against your BPA power lines that you want to run through our area you need to find a better way not over the top of houses and not where people are. Anyway, that's all bye.

Communication ID: 12203

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: MATTHEW A BOLSOY

Word that the BPA is planning to install enormous utility towers and a 500-kV transmission line in my own back yard, or possibly in my front yard has me very upset. I will provide at least three important reasons why the BPA needs to use an alternate route than proposed lines 26 & 27: 1. Erection of proposed towers will significantly increase the risk of mudslides in this area with steep hillsides and lead to significant erosion concerns. 2. Presence of towers will expose a populated area to unwanted electromagnetic fields. 3. Loss of property value will detrimentally affect future education monies for an already stressed education system. These reasons and many more need to be considered as evidence and justification for removing lines 26 & 27 from the BPA's proposed 500-kV transmission lines.

Communication ID: 12204

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: MICHAEL J HAMPEL

I would not like to see a new power line ran through my neighborhood. I support the BPA and recommend that a less intrusive route be considered. Thank You, Michael J. Hampel

Communication ID: 12206

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: MARY K HOIME

My name is Kathy Hoime. My husband, Tom, and I recently moved to WA from out of state. We have family in the Vancouver area and have been trying to get here for many years. We gave up waiting for the housing market to turn around, sold our house below it's value and made our move. We stayed with our daughter all summer while searching for the "perfect home" in which to spend the rest of our lives. We looked in Vancouver, LaCenter, Brush Prairie, Battle Ground, Ridgefield and Hockinson, among others. There were many beautiful homes; some out of our price range, some needing more work than we could accomplish and others just not "the one." In mid October of this year, we found a terrific place

in Amboy - it had everything we hoped for: five acres, a shop for my husband, a wonderful house for me and the most awesome view of Mt. St. Helens one could imagine. There was even a creek running through the property! For previous city-dwellers, it was a dream come true. We put most of our life savings into what we thought would be our forever home. Then, in late October, after the close of escrow, we heard about the BPA project. We were blind-sided. Nothing in the disclosures or title search alerted us to the possibility of losing everything we had just acquired. We haven't even unpacked many of our moving boxes yet - should we? Do I plant the trees I bought? Do we set up the winter garden we planned? Do we dare hope we will be able to enjoy our new home for more than a few short years? We are seniors and starting over is not really a viable option. My husband and I are so disillusioned, saddened and worried. We thought Washington State cared about it's citizens more than this. We know we are not the only ones affected; we've met a few of our neighbors and they are as upset as we are. Obviously, additional power line construction is important for everyone - just not at the expense of real people living in and around proposed BPA sites. Thank you for taking time to consider my input.

Communication ID: 12207

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: THOMAS R HOIME

Hello. I am writing to you in regards to Line 27. My name is Tom Hoime. My wife, Kathy, and I recently moved to the Amboy, WA, area from another state. We were unaware of a 500-kilovolt power line potentially being erected right over the home we just bought. We looked in several areas before choosing Amboy as our residence. We especially liked the small-town feeling of the community while still having space for privacy, animals, a workshop, etc. The views of Mt. St. Helens, plus the surrounding hillsides and forests were everything we hoped for. The historical and archeological significance of the area were equally enticing. We were told that Native Americans used an ancient pine tree, just down the road from our house, as a landmark. When the County paved the road, rather than cut down this magnificent tree, they actually paved around it. A government and community that cared about preserving its history and landscape - that was what we were looking for. Now we learn BPA is considering putting a power line near or over the very place we and several other families live. In addition to ruining the value of all the homes in the area, it would decimate miles of land. More importantly, what are the health issues involved? In my opinion, not enough research has been conducted to fully alleviate my concerns. We've been told there is "no significant health issue" - that the power lines are no more dangerous than cell phones or microwave ovens. We can chose to use, or not use, a cell phone or microwave oven - we have no choice if the power line is built here. And what kinds of herbicides would be used to clear the land for the building of the towers and ongoing maintenance of the easements? We are hearing that exposure to even a so-called safe product such as Round Up is now suspect. What will become of the clear water and habitat in our creek? Please, we did not move to such a beautiful place less than two months ago to have it taken away from us by the building of a power line.

Communication ID: 12208

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: RESIDENT NONE LINE #27

Dear Mr. Korsness, I would like to take this opportunity to express my opposition to the placement of a 500 Kv power line through our area. It is in this beautiful(Chelatchie)valley we chose to live. * The impact of a 500 Kv transmission line running anywhere near an area of homes, people, children and animals, such as ours, is appalling. The thought that BPA would even consider placing people and their families and homes in such harms way. The dangers of EMF fields are a fact. Would you and your family live in the vicinity of a 500 Kv line? Especially if you had no choice in the matter. * We live off a very heavily travel route (SR 503). It's the only highway through Clark County to the large recreational areas of Southwestern Washington. Line #27 would cross this highway out in the open, in plain view and where it could be seen for miles in all four directions. * This countryside is prime agricultural property. Which needs to be preserved by law. We are farmers here and some have been for centuries. * A portion of Line #27 consist of a subdivision of 5+ acres farms. This is a very densely populated area of many homes. * Chelatchie Creek transverses Line #27. The creek at this point is on the National Wetlands Inventory Database. It's being preserved as a steelhead and coho salmon spawning area, making it a sensitive area and riparian conservation district. Some years ago government agencies went in and enhanced this area planting vegetation, trees and fencing it off. * Line #27 also transverses a long section of railroad track that is used by the Chelatchie Railroad who operate an excursion train through this scenic area of Clark County. A 500 KV transmission line, how aesthetically beautiful could that be? Has the rail line been notified of your scoping? * Also, of major importance is the fact that there is a private airstrip located within Line #27. When emergencies have occurred it has been used to land emergency flights to take injured to hospitals. Please be reminded that we are on a very heavily traveled highway and have heavily used recreational areas not far from us and the nearest hospital is more than an hours driving time away. Any high voltage lines anywhere near this airstrip would cause major problems. * This is an area of high archeological finds and historicial sensitivity. Has the State Archaeology and Historic department been notified of your scoping? Construction is extremely monitored and must be reviewed by this state department. * Also, of concern is that several of our neighbors, who are also on Line #27 have wells. Their wells are only 12 or so feet deep. They told us that they were on an unconfined aquifer and that the average depth to water according to the State was about 17 feet in this area. * Line #27 is within a few miles of a volcanic cindercone. * It also is an area that gets very high winds. I'm sure that I have probably omitted something that might be of importance, but of major importance is what this has done and will do to property values in this area. I'm sure that everyone that has commented is in firm agreement no matter what line they might be on that this is catastrophic to property values and peoples lives and will be for an indefinite period of time. We are in our sixties and this is our home and our life investment. There are more appropriate areas to the East on unpopulated public lands. A 500 Kv line should not be placed any where near populated areas. *** Put the 500 Kv Transmission line farthest east! ***

Communication ID: 12209

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: CYNTHIA A BAYLES

December 12, 2009 To: BPA From: Cynthia Bayles Re: NO to the BPA 500kV Power Line Proposal on Segment 39 The material deterioration or in some cases the complete loss of property values to those of us impacted by this poorly thought out proposal of the BPA to expand its power lines over highly populated areas of Clark County needs to be recognized and the expansion stopped. There is no logical reason to have the expansion through populated areas when alternatives are available whereby the lines could be placed in non-populated areas that would result in minimal economic impact. In our case, we have lived at our current location for nearly 20 years and have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars into our residence, outbuildings and property. The proposed location of the power lines would result in the direct loss of use of nearly one third of our property. Large fir trees on our property that are healthy and over 50 years old would have to be clear cut. Then from our residence, our current privacy and views would be replaced with dead open space, a view of ugly power lines and the constant buzzing and popping of the sounds the power lines create. Not to mention the negative health impacts caused by being in such close proximity to the power lines. Any potential proposed compensation from the BPA for the taking of our land would not come close to compensating us for the loss of use, let alone the material decline in value of the remaining useful portion of our property. Any appraised value on which the compensation might be based would surely be one-sided in the favor of BPA and based on the lower value resulting from both the presence of the power lines and the recent economic decline impacting current values. There is no way we could ever recover financially from the loss of equity in our property caused by this BPA power line expansion. In the meantime, due to the uncertainty of the location of the lines, we are unable to sell our property for its current value (which is already depressed value due to the current economic conditions), so we don't even have the opportunity to avoid the negative impact of this BPA proposal by selling and moving now. Clark County currently has one of the highest foreclosure rates in the State of Washington. This BPA expansion proposal will further accelerate foreclosures in the county, resulting in additional financial losses to homeowners, lenders, taxpayers and would lead to a material loss of tax revenues in the County and State. Why? If homeowners directly impacted by this proposal are already under water in terms of loan to value on their properties/residences, the additional loss in value as a result of the proposed BPA expansion could easily cause the homeowners to simply decide to stop making payments on their loans (after all, why bother to throw good money after bad?). Ultimately this would cause lenders to have to foreclose and the snowball effect of losses to already distressed lenders who are having to write off millions of dollars of bad loans (local example being the failed former Bank of Clark County - and we have other troubled banks in our County that are barely hanging on that this could impact!) and the spiral of further economic losses impacting individuals and the entire community would continue to be caught in this vicious cycle with no end in sight. Thousands of property owners in Clark County are impacted by this idiotic BPA expansion proposal. The potential loss of tax revenues to Clark County is staggering. The BPA proposal could easily turn Clark County into one of the poorest/weakest counties in the State of Washington as the tax base becomes decimated by those of us directly and indirectly impacted. The loss

of tax revenues would have a negative impact on everything from the education system to the quality of roads and public services. If the county tries to increase taxes on the remaining residents, they'll just move out of the county as they're already stretched thin. Many of these residents currently have high-income jobs and highly valued properties and support the tax base. When they move, the impact from these losses would drive other people out of the county in search of better schools etc. As a result – the cycle of ongoing economic decline would surely continue for Clark County. Too bad – it used to be a really nice place to live and people actually moved here because of the schools and other services which created a high quality of life. The BPA proposal would kill this quality of life for all Clark County residents. Again, I say NO to the BPA 500kV Power Line Proposal on Segment 39 or anywhere else in Clark County!

Communication ID: 12210

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: ELISKA W SCHNEIDER

The proposed route through Clark county segment #31 for the Bonneville Power line would impact the communities it crosses profoundly. The Hockinson School District will have loose 35 acres for its future expansion, in a time of teacher layoff and reduced budgets. It will cost them more time and money that they can ill afford to find replacement of those acres in this area. The burden put upon the individuals adjacent and under the route is extreme. In these times of economic challenges it may not be even possible for them to not only to be unable to sell their homes but to get a loan to buy a new one. All this for a power line which doesn't even add jobs to the communities imposed upon. The jobs and energy will go to other areas of the country which will reap the benefits of this intrusion into our lives. With other viable options available it makes no moral or ethical sense to plow through several communities when there is lands less inhabited to choose from.

Communication ID: 12211

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: DIANE S BROWN

I am requesting that you re-route the power line farther east. There is no need to disrupt neighborhoods with power lines when another option is available to the east with much less impact. I do not want the high voltage near my home or want the huge towers running next to the road. Please don't come down route #31 there are too many people impacted by this choice. Thank you, Diane S. Brown

Communication ID: 12212

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: CAROL P GOETZ

Please stop the gigantic power lines that BPA is trying to put through our growing rural community in Brush Prairie, Washington. The proposed power lines are massive, the largest of their kind, these 150-foot tall towers are 30 feet taller than the oldest trees in the area. These power lines were not intended for neighborhoods, and may carry health implications as well as property value devastation. The proposed lines will pass adjacent to the local primary school. We only recently found out about this project and were given very little time to find out more, or respond. Someone is ignoring the very high costs to the community in trying to reduce line costs. There is another proposed route possible through the government-owned land in the mountains. Please stop this line through our community.

Communication ID: 12213

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: MARILYN J ANDERSON

This is my physical address and my mailing address. Please change my address it is not [Address] I do not want the power lines in my neighborhood, because of the known possibility of human carcinogen. I have small children living at this address and fear the increased risk of childhood leukemia. These power lines should go on state land and not my land. The lines would make my property unusable and unlivable!

Marilyn

Communication ID: 12214

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: ARLO E RITENBURGH

This property is my life-long dream. The proposed route of the new power line is placed right outside my front door. Considering the health risks and decreased property value, please don't take my dream away.

Communication ID: 12215

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: SHERRY L STONE

My husband and I live on a piece of property that is on one of the proposed lines. We looked long and hard for the property that we plan to spend the rest of our life on. We enjoy living in a natural area surrounded by wildlife that would be directly effected by your proposed powerline. There is a creek on the back of our property that we must treat as a wetland what gives you the right to treat it differently? I have no desire to be exposed to your transmission line and ask that you find a better way. I believe that you should use your existing easement or build on State or Federal Land where people won't be

impacted and the impact on animals can be minimized. Sherry Stone

Communication ID: 12216

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: CHARLES E DUKE

I realize and support the fact that progress has to exist in our country. But, does progress have to be at the expense of Middle Class Americans, the group of people who don't have millions of dollars to spend on big name attorneys to fight for us?

It seems to me, that the route for this new line would be better served going through the National Forest and/or state land.....because , come on, we know that if a route to the east were really an option that you were considering, it would have been proposed already.

A line through the forest would , of course, have its own set of problems. But a line here would not cause as much upset to the people who would otherwise be affected..... people who have stories, and faces, and lives here.... the human part of this equation.

I have to question.....is the reason the line probably will NOT go through the National Forest because BLM & Weyerhaeuser both have the millions of dollars needed to fight, and you know that they would?

Is it just easier to take advantage of us, the people who live here, because we cannot afford to fight on a large scale way?

It seems to me that our community and other communities that will enjoy the benefits of this proposed line would be better served if the line went through property that is jointly owned by We, The People...i.e. the government...state and federal lands. This way the burden would be shared by The People and not just by select individuals.

Understanding that daily BLM has to battle between people and progress, I ask that this time, please consider the human factor. Let us be stories, and faces, and lives not numbers on a piece of paper.

Charles Duke

Communication ID: 12217

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: JANINA ROSENKRANZ

My home lies within Hockinson community and school district south of [Street] and north of [Street] and I am very much opposed to the proposed transmission line (31). This runs through the heart of the Hockinson community and school district. It would not only have severe financial impact on the property tax valuation basis for the already struggling financially school district which relies levy money which

assessed primarily from private homeowners, it would have devastating financial impact on the homeowners themselves with loss of value of homes and property. It would severely impact the beauty and natural resources of the area. If this line was built through our community we would be assaulted with noise and visual pollution. Additionally, of great concern is the dangerous health effects to the children and adults living in this residential community. In addition, this line would prevent our school district from building a school on 35 acre parcel of land that the district owns since the line (31) would run through this property. As well this area is environmentally sensitive and contains many forests of douglas firs, wetlands, and creeks which would have to be cleared in order to accomodate this transmission line. Please seek an alternative line to line 31 which would drastically impact this community and the land in a very negative way. Respectfully, Janina, Eric, Leah, and Hannah Rosenkranz

Communication ID: 12218

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: AARON GARNER

My wife, two children, and I own a house in the middle of proposed route 26 (between Fargher Lake and Amboy). Both of us are teachers, but my wife is staying home to raise our two children. We are adamantly opposed to BPA constructing a power line anywhere near our property. There are many reasons for this and I will highlight the most significant. First, my wife and I were relocated three years ago when the government took the family home (which had been in the family for over 60 years) we were renting near Duluth. We were forced to accelerate our plans and the result was our dream home we are living in today and plan to live in the rest of our lives. To be dispossessed again would be a tragedy I will not tolerate. Like I said above, my wife is a former teacher who is staying home. To supplement my pay she is running a daycare from our home for other teacher's kids. I have read many studies about a significantly high correlation between electric/magnetic fields and childhood leukemia. There is no way I want to raise my kids around the transmission lines or expose our clients' children to any electric/magnetic field. Our clients have expressed great concern about a transmission line being run in close proximity to our property and may pull their children from my wife's daycare. Without her pay we would quickly go under financially. Our home has a view of St Helens, Adams, Chelatchie Prairie, and Cedar Creek valley. A power line run through route 26 (or any of the routes near Amboy or Yacolt) would ruin our view and decrease our home's value. I want to stress that these are only my family's most significant issues with BPA running a transmission line near our property on route 26. We have many of the same concerns others in the community have. Route 26 is one of the most densely populated sections in the proposal. As a suggestion, BPA should greatly consider running the transmission line through the existing right of way or at least to the far east where there are less private property owners effected. Much of the land to the east is owned by DNR and the government should appropriate from their own before they seize land from private citizens.

Communication ID: 12219

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: RICHARD R THORMAHLEN

No 500 kva line on segment 39. If it is so very important to the population for the construction of this line the population can reimburse me for the decrease in the value of my property. How much of a rate increase would it take of the many to reimburse the few. It's the only fair thing to do. Rick Thormahlen

Communication ID: 12220

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: EMILY A WEBBER

I know that you have received many letters concerning the proposed new line for BPA. There are so many people that will be hugely affected by this. But I want to put a face, a human aspect, to one family that could be affected. My family.

My husband and I bought our home and property a year and a half ago with the intentions of retiring here in the beautiful Northwest. My husband is a paraplegic, in a wheelchair. We have spent many dollars in renovating our home so that it is handicap accessible for him....dollars that we spent to make life easier for my husband.

There are many other things like outside walkways, concrete floors for the outbuildings, and ramps that we need to build in order that he be able to get around on the property.

We have to put all these things on hold and wait because we don't know if our property will be taken for the right of way. His life, his ease, especially, is limited here. We cannot put more money into our property if there is a right of way coming through that will lower our property values.

I am asking that you please consider taking the line through the state land so that not only my family will be able to live safely and comfortably, but also so that all the other families that have their homes here be able to do the same.

Please count families and their situations as priority.

Emily Webber

Communication ID: 12221

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: RALPH AKIN

Please have your environmental studies look at:

#1 – the least impactful route- running dual lines or upgrade in current corridor. This makes sense environmentally, economically & is least disruptive to the people... who are also part of the environment!

#2 – Far eastern route – even if it runs through forest & wildlife habitat, a clear corridor will also enhance some wildlife & plant environments and again - be least disruptive to the people who also are part of our great NW environment.

I have these other comments:

In this current economic & political climate it seems unconscionable that any governmental agency would consider disrupting people while spending borrowed monies common sense, even with so-called stimulus money, tells me that virtual never events should be consuming precious resources. Upgraded & dual line corridors already provide excellent service in other parts of the country and can do so here as well. My first vote is not to spend any monies that are not banked/saved/properly allocated from existing revenues. Then & only then is any route deserving of consideration.

Communication ID: 12222

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: TED R BARRETT

Though I have not personally attended any of the meetings regarding the I5 project, I have been informed of the outcomes. I understand perfectly the need to upgrade the system to keep up with demand. However.. the excuses that were given for not wanting to go along existing powerline easements is LAME at best. You don't want to use these routes because there might be a fire, or plane crash, or whatever would put us at risk of loosing the entire system. PUULEEEZE!!! We would be at no more risk then than we are RIGHT NOW!!! And have been for 40 years!!! I can honestly say that I don't recall loosing a single nights sleep worrying about that happening. Unlike the sleep I have been loosing worrying about what you fools might end up deciding, and me possibly loosing my home over this. I do not believe that this has so much to do with your concern about risk as you are with having possible strings attached to the Stimulus dollars you received. In order to have been first in line for this, there had to be promises of creating jobs.. A LOT of JOBS. And I'm sure that way more jobs would be created plowing through the forest and demolishing homes than by simply going down an existing path. I implore you, please make the right decision. Make the simple decision. Don't let the Feds make you tear down hundreds of homes and ruin 1000s of lifes just to satisfy their demands.

Communication ID: 12223

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: TERRY NYQUIST

I am writing to protest the proposed BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. The proposed line 27 will not only endanger humans, livestock and wildlife—including eagles, cougars, bears, salmon, many species of birds, deer, elk, and more—as extensive impact studies have proven due to the dangerous electromagnetic field, noise pollution, and herbicides, but will literally destroy our home and every parcel adjoining it since the proposed line 27 would go directly through and spans every one of our five parcels on the BPA's aerial photograph, page 74. Our home of twenty years and lifetime investment will have to be purchased and razed by the BPA. We were told this by a BPA representative at the information forum in October at the Amboy Middle School. As alarmed home and property owners and concerned community members, we demand that 1) the scoping period be extended to March 31, 2010. And 2) if built, we expect a route that minimizes the impact on homes and property in North Clark County, which this route does not. Thank you for your attention and consideration. Sincerely, Terry Nyquist [Address]

Communication ID: 12224

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: JEFF SNYDER

BPA has informed residents in our area of Clark County that some of their proposed routes for high power transmission lines will go right through our homes. Mine is on line #27, which would go right next to my house, through my pasture, which is a designated wetlands area, and directly through a Great Blue Heron nesting site on a creek. My neighbors and I are accumulating medical and environmental data in preparation for a court battle if necessary. We would all much prefer that you recommend to BPA that they use routes that do not go through peoples' homes. Thanks for any assistance you can provide residents of our area.

Communication ID: 12225

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: NOEL AND MOLLIE J LAWFFER

We would like to comment about the proposed 500k transmissions lines that are to run through Clark County. The 20 and 21 lines (which turn into lines 28 & 29) would both run through the property we live on. We are concerned not only for the impact that it would have on the value of the property but it also brings up many health concerns. We have small children and are not sure what effects the lines would have on their health. Would it up the rates of childhood and even adult illnesses, etc.? We also have a hard time keeping people off of our property already and if the BPA were to have an easement onto it that would make it even more difficult to patrol. To top off all the concerns we do have; The BPA DOES NOT NEED more POWER in the Clark County/Portland area. A lot of the power that would be generated from these lines would be sold to people down in California. Now why would we want to reduce our

property values, put our children at risk, and be subject to dealing with the BPA if all that would happen is more power could be sold to CA? I think the BPA needs to consider the people of Clark County and figure out a better and SMARTER way.

Communication ID: 12226

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: LISA A MILLER

We vehemently oppose BPA's plan to put any transmission lines on private land! There is plenty of public land available to the east. We were not notified of this plan nor were we supplied any information or maps. The letter we received was for permission to enter our property, dated October 22nd and postmarked November 19th. We weren't notified in a timely manner and because of this, we were unable to attend the town hall meetings. We already have 60+ foot tall towers along the back of our property. The new towers would be practically at our back door presenting us with an ugly view and potential health hazards. You will not receive permission to enter my property nor will I ever agree to a paid easement. I intend to fight this, organizing and informing my neighbors, whatever it takes!

Communication ID: 12227

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: RANDALL L SCHULTZ-RATHBUN

Mr Korsness:

I am writing to oppose the proposed routing of a 500KV power line on segment 31. While I understand the need to expand the electrical infrastructure in the Pacific Northwest to handle the transmission of additional energy, I oppose the proposed routing of segment 31 for the following reasons;

1. The severe economic loss to communities such as Hockinson will be devastating. While homeowners directly in the path of the proposed power line would be compensated, those adjacent to it would see a significant drop in their property values with no compensation. 20 years ago, when I moved into Clark County, I rejected purchasing one bargain-priced property because it was near an existing high voltage power line. Segment 31 will have the same effect on anyone interested in purchasing property near its path.
2. The line would cross the property at 217th Avenue and 169th Street, previously purchased as a site for a new school. Putting the line through that property would preclude its intended use, and the taxpayers would not be properly compensated for its loss.
3. The potential health risks of putting a 500KV power line through populated areas are significant. Some reports indicate the risk of childhood leukemia is three to five times higher for children under 15 living near high voltage power lines. While these studies are still the subject of debate, it seems

unconscionable to build another power line in a populated area until it there is definite proof that there is no health risk.

4. There are alternative routes available that will not have a significant impact on existing communities. Instead of causing economic loss and risking the health of existing communities, rout the power line further east through Washington Department on Natural Resources land.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Randall Schultz-Rathbun

[Address]

Communication ID: 12228

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: GREGORY S. MILLER

1. I demand that the public scoping period be extended to March 31st 2010 2. If built, we expect a route that does not impact the homes or property ON ANY of the proposed lines... Locate it to the EAST, away from us all. I vehemently oppose BPA's I-5 reinforcement project plan to put any power transmission lines on private land! There is plenty of public land available to the east. We were not notified of this plan nor were we supplied any information or maps. The letter we received was for permission to enter property, dated October 22nd and postmarked November 19th, after all the public meetings had already been held. We weren't notified in a timely manner and because of this, we were unable to attend the town hall meetings. We already have 60+ foot tall towers along the back of our property. The new towers would be practically at our back door presenting us with an ugly view and potential health hazards not to mention these are proposed to be 100-150 tall. I will never agree to a paid easement. I intend to fight this, organizing and informing my neighbors, whatever it takes! We are the people that own homes and built our dreams around private property, there are better ways to go about this. By BPA pushing through the public comment period in a very short time frame it shows a deceptive way of dealing with the people most effected. (affected by, Proposed route 9) Sincerely, Greg Miller

Communication ID: 12229

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: PATRICK BORUNDA

Economically this boondoggle will deprive Cowlitz and Clark Counties of tax revenues by reducing property values along a 76 mile scar. Co-extensive tax districts (e.g., Ft. Vancouver Regional Library or Battleground School Districts) will also suffer. And the power carried will not even serve our counties! I

demand an answer to my question: "Why should these two Southwestern Washington Counties take a huge hit on their tax revenues to benefit power producers in Canada and power retailers in California?"

Communication ID: 12230

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: PATRICK BORUNDA

Fiscally, this is a waste of money. The purported safety and economic benefits cited by the BPA for this project can be achieved at a far lower cost by crossing the Columbia River at Longview and hooking to the transmission line from Trojan to Rivergate. Even if BPA wants to avoid linking to Ross substation for security reasons, less than four miles of new line would link St. Johns to Vancouver Shipyard. I demand an answer to my question: "Why should we squander millions of taxpayer dollars to create dubious 'benefits' which, if real, could be had for less?"

Communication ID: 12231

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: PATRICK BORUNDA

Environmentally, BPA is pushing blight and calling it "green." Currently proposed routes slash willy-nilly through both pristine forest and established residential areas. BPA will have to keep the right-of-way clear by using tons of herbicides annually. The chemicals will pollute ground and surface waters alike, threatening wildlife and residents. Line 27 will dump herbicide literally on top of my wellhead! I demand an answer to my question: "What confirmed "green benefits" create a net gain from despoiling eighteen acres per mile ((almost 1,400 acres total) of Cascades foothills?"

Communication ID: 12232

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: PATRICK BORUNDA

Responsible public stewardship demands anticipation, transparency and evenhanded treatment of stakeholders. By negligence or design BPA has failed these tests. Far more stakeholders were left out than were included. Public meeting were limited to just six compressed into twelve calendar days. Interests of power generators and retailers have been more carefully considered than those of citizens. I demand an answer to my question: "What possible public benefit is there to denying a responsible extension of the scoping period for 60-90 days, allowing resident (vs. non-resident) stakeholders' issues to be considered?"

Communication ID: 12233

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: MICHAEL P TRUE

Based on the information provided, we do not support alterations in Segment 39. The obvious negative impacts would be to significant. Thank you.

Communication ID: 12234

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: MONIQUE LONG

My husband and I bought our current house after approximately 5 years of looking in the area. When we came upon this house we thought we had found everything we wanted, a nice neighborhood, a greenspace in the back yard, etc. I can tell you with 100% certainty we would not have made the purchase had there been power lines running within view or close proximity to the property. Not only does the thought of having power lines as a daily view not sit well, so does the thought of loss of value in an already depressed market. We had passed on otherwise desirable properties during our search for that very reason, how many people would not consider our house if we were in a position of having to sell? I am yet to find a person who says they would not mind having power lines in their backyard/view. All agree that power lines would decrease value of any property. That being said, there is also the health concern involved. At one of the public meetings, I was told the risk can be compared to that of drinking Diet Coke. IF that IS true, I for one, do not like the idea of being FORCED to take that risk. When GIVEN THE CHOICE of living in a house near power lines or not, my husband and I chose NOT! We did not take the health risk for ourselves or our family and I do not like having that freedom taken from me. When we did buy the house we KNEW we would be guided by the rules of having a green space for a back yard. Though limiting, the trade off has been a beautiful, natural view as well as frequent visits from wildlife. We get everything from deer and herons to three majestic bald eagles. I don't want that taken from me as well.

Communication ID: 12235

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: CAROLYN J SCHULTZ-RATHBUN

I am writing in opposition to the proposed Segment 31 power line route. Huge health, safety and fairness issues make it wrong to run the towers through populated areas. 1. Studies done in both Sweden and Australia have found a correlation between the magnetic field created by high voltage power lines and increased rates of Alzheimers, ALS (Lou Gehrig's Disease) and childhood leukemia. Running high voltage lines through neighborhoods is unconscionable. 2. Segment 31 would run through the historic Yacolt Burn area, which has a much higher than average risk of devastating wildfires. The

increased risk of loss of life and property caused by downed lines in the Yacolt Burn area make Segment 31 a bad choice. 3. Running the towers through populated areas would result in a loss of property values, causing hardship for thousands of people up and down the proposed corridor. In my community (Hockinson), we've purchased property on which to build a school, which would be in the power line's path, and thus unusable as a school site. The need to sell the property at a loss and purchase other property would work a hardship on our school district, which is already struggling terribly to make ends meet. Alternate routes exist through sparsely populated land to the east, that will not have a significant impact on existing communities. It is wrong to not only bring economic loss to, but to endanger the health and safety of thousands of people along the route of Segment 31. Route the high voltage power line through DNR land further east.

Communication ID: 12236

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: SANDRA L SERMONE

I would like to submit my comment regarding the I-5 Corridor Project route 31 that is proposed to go through Hockinson. I strongly urge you to consider other routes. There are thousands of citizens who will be living too close to these lines and I am fearful of the health concerns, I have a special needs baby, as well as two other small children. Also, this would be a great hardship to thousands as this will lower our home values, ruin our spectacular views, and will basically cause one of the schools future sites to be worthless. Please take your power lines through the forest sites. NOT through Hockinson! Sandra Sermone

Communication ID: 12237

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: DAVID GARCIA, TERRY NYQUIST

To Whom It May Concern: I am writing to protest the proposed BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. The proposed line 27 will gravely endanger the health and well being of humans, livestock, and wildlife as extensive impact studies have proven due to the dangerous electromagnetic field, noise pollution, and herbicides. This area is a fragile habitat for wildlife, including cougars, bears, many species of birds, deer, elk, and some threatened and endangered species, such as owls, pileated woodpeckers, eagles, and salmon. Moreover, the proposed line 27 will literally destroy our home and every parcel adjoining it since the proposed line 27 would go directly through and spans every one of our five parcels on the BPA's aerial photograph, page 74. When we purchased this property twenty years ago, we were aware of an existing PP&L easement established in the 1950s. This proposed BPA line 27 is not this easement but an act of eminent domain, proposing to seize a mile-wide swath through our property. Our home of twenty years and lifetime investment will have to be purchased and razed by the BPA. We were told this by a BPA representative at the information forum in October at the Amboy Middle School. Furthermore, the proposed line 27 has already devalued our property. Should we choose to sell any parcel of our land

or home at this time, we will now have to disclose this proposal, whether or not it is to be enacted in the future, thus rendering our property much less valuable. As alarmed home and property owners and outraged community members, we demand that 1) the scoping period be extended to March 31, 2010. And 2) if built, we expect a route that minimizes the impact on homes and property in North Clark County, which this route does not. Thank you for your attention and consideration. Sincerely, David Garcia

Communication ID: 12238

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: LEEANNE K GOETZ

I am against the proposed plan "Route 31" through Hockinson. It would negatively affect too many households and local schools, possibly causing health issues and would significantly reduce property values in this wonderful community.

Communication ID: 12239

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: LEE A SCHILLER

I am totally against the proposed plan "Route 31" through Hockinson. It will ruin property values, downgrade our quality of life and have unending consequences into the future for our children. Please don't do this...

Communication ID: 12240

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: AARON M SCHILLER

I am totally against the proposed plan "Route 31" through Hockinson

Communication ID: 12241

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: BRIAN G SCHILLER

you are against the proposed plan "Route 31" through Hockinson

Communication ID: 12242

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: ANDREA M MOORE

We are against the proposed Route 31 through Hockinson.

Communication ID: 12243

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: JENNIFER D BRINKMAN

I am a homeowner in Hockinson and do not believe that the proposed route 31 for the new transmission towers will be favorable for BPA. The proposed route further east would mean less financial commitment and maintenance for the BPA and seems to make more sense since it will not displace as many homeowners. I am against the Route 31 proposal for other reasons. As a parent of three school-aged children aged 9, 6, and 4, I have strong concerns regarding the EMF transmissions being placed so near the primary and intermediate schools in Hockinson. The loss of school property will hurt our ever-growing student population and leave no room for expansion and well-needed new structures. The greatly depreciated value of homes is a major concern for our area. Property taxes will decrease and the county will be hurt by the economic loss. Please do not proceed with the proposed route 31. It will greatly hurt our community.

Communication ID: 12244

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: DIANA M DELAY

We are against the proposed plan "Route 31" through Hockinson. Please find a better route. Do not destroy our land and power lines affect our children.

Communication ID: 12246

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: CURTIS M REDKEY

I am opposed to the large bundles of cables passing in front of my house. The value of my property will be diminished and I am not interested in increasing my family's exposure to additional health risks.

Communication ID: 12247

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: TINA D REDKEY

I am not interested in increasing my family's exposure to additional health risks. I am opposed to the visual impact of the large unsightly bundles of cables passing in front of my house. The value of my property will go down significantly if the segment 39 500kV power line is located in front of my property.

Communication ID: 12248

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: VICKI D PAULUS

I would like you to know how BPA's proposed line #31 would affect my life. I am a single mom of a disabled 20 yr old daughter. We live on 3.5 acres that includes 4 horses. Proposed line #31 is planned to run through the back part of my property where my barn is located. This means my barn would need to be torn down and my horses would have nowhere to live. These horse provide a great source of joy for my disabled daughter and would be a great loss in her life. I find it very upsetting that BPA can announce 3 years in advance their proposed routes, disrupt peoples lives, and then not make a decision for 3 years. How are we suppose to proceed with our lives not knowing how our families, homes and financial security will be negatively impacted? Think about how it would affect your emotional status if you and your families future was on hold and had no control over its outcome? I am sure you would not like it but you expect us to live this way. The very least you could do is to give us an answer within the next 6 months so people can proceed with their lives accordingly.

Communication ID: 12249

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: CONNIE A PETTY

I would like to open this correspondence by quoting the Columbian newspaper dated Friday Nov. 20th, business section. "With one out of every 547 houses in Clark county in some stage of foreclosure, the county has the 3rd highest ranking for foreclosures of Washington's 39 counties." Now, with that having been said, why do you purposely want to throw people out of their homes? As I'm sure many of you have lost some of your retirement money, like most of us. Some of us have even lost our jobs, now you want us to also lose our homes? How much more do you think we can withstand? My husband and I have lived on N.E. 212th Ave., our present location, for 18 years. We started with a trailer and in the last 2 years have built a 3500 sq ft home (see attached photo). This home is the dream home that I have awaited all my life. Now, you people want to tear it down and put up a massive power line. I understand the need for power, and with all the alternatives we have to augment our power transmission lines, it seems to me there is a more acceptable alternative than throwing hundreds of people out of their homes. Many of the residents you want to dislodge are longstanding members of their communities, with ties to their homes and properties. I am sure you have heard the expression "shoot me and put me out of my misery". I feel you people have already decided where your power lines are going to be built,

and my question is, why drag out the "decision" making process two years? Do you BPA people think we in the communities you propose to dislodge are stupid? Well, we are NOT! Thank you for your perfunctory attention in this matter. Connie A. Petty

Communication ID: 12250

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: C. JOANN OWNBEY

My parents recently moved to Washington from California. They worked their whole lives to be able to afford a "place in the country" as they called it. They stayed with me while they were looking for just the right place - they knew this would be their last move. They were very excited to find a place out in Amboy about 45 minutes from my home here in Vancouver. They followed all the rules: they sold their house in CA, they engaged a realtor here in WA, they inspected several homes to ensure they were getting what would suit them best and they reviewed all the paperwork supplied to them. They had barely moved into their dream home when they were confronted with the BPA's proposed plan to build a 500-kilovolt power line directly over their house! I feel awful because I kept pressuring them to move to WA. I told them things were different in WA - they would love it so much more than CA. Now what shall I tell them?? Please don't do this to my parents. I cannot believe there isn't another place to put the power line that won't impact not only my parents, but their neighbors as well. Thank you for your consideration of my appeal. C. JoAnn Ownbey

Communication ID: 12251

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: MOLLY E HARDER

My name is Molly and I am 14 years old. I have been trying for over five years to get my grandparents, Tom and Kathy Hoime, to move to Washington to be near me and my brother and sister. They finally came this summer. They looked at a bunch of houses to buy (I went with them lots of times) and found a very special place in Amboy. It had a big shop for the grandpa to work on his projects and a house with an upstairs that my grandma could use for her sewing room (and my little brother and sister could use as their play room when we visited). They moved in right before Halloween - I helped them bring part of their stuff from our garage. They were so happy, but now they are not. I don't understand everything they are saying, but if a big power line is built near their house, my mom won't let us go visit them anymore because she doesn't want us to chance getting sick. My Grandma and Grandpa are old and have waited for such a long time to get here. Please don't build a power line near their house in Amboy. Thank you.

Communication ID: 12252

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: DARREL R RAST

You can add my name to the long list of those strongly opposed to your monster power line anywhere near private property, especially along route 31. I object to the EMF, the buzzing, humming, and crackling, the unsightly visual aspects, the disturbance of soil, the cutting of trees, and the acquisition of easement from unwilling property owners. Videos are all over the web showing fluorescent tubes lit up by the EMF from lines with lower voltage than those you are proposing. Whether or not this poses a health hazard, the public's perception that it does significantly diminishes property values over a large area and not just in your 150 foot easement. Your mailings attempt to whitewash a very ugly proposal and it doesn't take a rocket scientist to know that BPA hasn't made any friends through this. Many people's homes and land represent a lifetime of work. And here you are with this nice letter saying, "We're going to trash your home and land and your neighbors' homes and land and we hope you're OK with that". Well I'm not OK with that. You need to abandon those route proposals that go anywhere near private property. If you can't build this line on state and federal lands, perhaps you need to send your engineers back to the drawing board to figure out another way to do this. Your organization exists to serve the people of this region. You need us on your side. Proposing this line through private properties is not the way to make that happen.

Communication ID: 12253

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: RANDALL J MARRS

When my wife and I purchased the property we now live on, one of our first considerations was that no high power lines were near or even visible from the location we were looking at. We accomplished this purchase and have been very satisfied with our selection. Now you are considering putting a high power line close to our property and we are adamantly opposed to this. Our property value has recently dropped by over \$90,000.00 due to the adverse economy. Your plans would not only endanger us, but would also limit the percentage of people that would even consider purchasing our land when and if we ever decide to sell it. The value of our land will most likely drop even further if these power lines do become a reality. I am very concerned about the location of the transmission lines proposed by BPA. The existing lines should be used to increase the transmission capabilities before any other options are used. This should be done to limit the cost to utility customers, and to limit the effects to the property of private landowners. This will also limit the proven adverse effects to the physical health of the people near the high power lines. Of course, the existing lines can be upgraded to accommodate the increased power needs no matter how you decry that as not possible. If you do not want to listen to your utility customers and must create a new cancer (and other illness) causing high power line, the next best option would be to route the power lines to the furthest point east. This would be via proposed line 35 to line 34 to line 29 to line 11. This will use limited residential land as much as possible and use forest lands that have a minimum of population. This would have the least adverse effect to the population of

the areas you are considering destroying by your new lines.

Communication ID: 12254

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: ED DAHLQUIST II,PAT FLIPPEN,JOANNE MCKEE

SUBJECT: proposed route 03, Castle Rock to Ostrander-OUR MAJOROBJECTIONS & CONCERNS.

This lovely, narrow corridor, only 5 minutes to the Kelso city limits, has too many environmental impacts already. To the West is the Cowlitz River, so changed by the Mt. St. Helen's eruption, then going Eastward, alongside the river is the Railroad, then the wetlands and floodplains, the Old Pacific Hwy., more wetlands, utility lines, the frontage road, then, of course, I-5. All have Right of Way impacts, as well. Property owners in this corridor have had so much land taken from them, that there's not much left. Our family-owned parcel, [number], a pristine, sloping 18 acres has had nearly half declared wetlands, already. This land has been in our family for future generations, yet we are under rigid restrictions for use of what's left. We have an appraisal which states that noise & congestion from the two highways & the railroad are a negative. As for access for "studies," haven't these already been done? We have ours, available from the Cowlitz Co. Courthouse. Why spend so much time and tax payers' money on such an unsuitable and populated route? We urge you to choose a more remote route, or existing 02 or 09 routes. It does not seem right or fair that because of your actions & timetable, this large pioneer community of property owners will be unable to market, or refinance their property until after spring of 2012, if then! Some will lose everything they've worked for. Also, in this suffering economy, do you really think you will find comparables of "solds" for a true estimate of value? Better words, in these times, would be, compared to "Give-aways." People are trying to stay calm In the face of this disastrous intrusion into their lives but, quite frankly, we're all "Mad as Hell." Wouldn't it have been a little more thoughtful to, at least, let us enjoy the holidays before you declared "your rights" to our property. Merry Christmas to all at Bonneville Power. (none of whom, we're sure, live under any high power lines.)

Pleasant Hill property owners

Joan Dahlquist Mckee

Pat Dahlquist Flippen

Ed Dahlquist II

Communication ID: 12255

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: CHRIS ESCOLA,MARIA ESCOLA

To Whom It May Concern at BPA, We'd like to express our concern and disappointment in the recent plans by BPA to run power line No. 31 through Hockinson and Battle Ground. We are residents of Hockinson and attended the recent community awareness meeting at the local High School. We were encouraged by the large turnout there. Although we understand BPA's need to improve the power distribution network in southwest Washington, the negative impact this will have on a large scale is immeasurable. Displacing families, lowering property values, and affecting the existing community atmosphere are just some of the tangible repercussions from this proposal. Less known and yet somewhat predictable for our community's future is how many families will choose not to make Hockinson their home due to these power lines. Not to mention the long term health affects of the community. This is not only about property values, unsightly power lines, or poor views. This is about a small community and BPA's obligations to make responsible decision for those citizens. We hope that a large corporation, such as BPA, will have the integrity and ethics to look past the "bottom line" of cost and see the broader impact of this industry. We would appreciate anything you can do to see that BPA power line No. 31 does not run through Hockinson and Battle Ground. Thank you for your time and interest. Sincerely, Christopher and Maria Escola

Communication ID: 12256

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: ANTHONY C CHARLES

As a resident whose subdivision sits adjacent to the proposed Line 31, I am very concerned about this project as it affects so many families and their homes. My five kids all play in the fields where Line 31 is being proposed(west side of 212th). I am still confused as to why BPA would even consider a line so close to so many families given the controversy of health hazards posed by EMF, especially to children. Why would BPA put the citizens of our country at risk and themselves in the way of potential litigation, especially when viable alternate routes exist? In addition, these high voltage lines will significantly impact the property values of my home and the homes of countless others. While monetary value loss is one thing, any significant drop in values may make it impossible for many of us to ever sell our homes leaving us to live with the potential risk of EMF induced health risks. To render such a verdict on the lives of thousands of innocent bystanders is unfair and painful, especially when alternate routes in unpopulated areas exist. Please consider the devastating impact Line 31 will have on so many families and eliminate this line from the current plan. Thank you. Tony Charles Very concerned private citizen and father of five affected kids.

Communication ID: 12257

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: COLLEEN BRIGGS

As Hockinson community members, our family is against any new power lines crossing our community.

No one wants to have enormous power line towers littering our views and sending radiation into our air space.

Communication ID: 12258

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: MARIT FEDERCELL

Please have your environmental studies look at:

1. Our wellhead will be directly inside of the proposed Rowan Segment 27. We are concerned about pesticide run off seepage on the safety of our well water. Please determine, backed with hard science, the effects of strong poisons continually sprayed on top of our water supply and on the ground water around it.
2. We have an alpaca farm, There is at least one other alpaca farm located on Segment 26. Please determine, based on hard science, what effects EMFs will have on the general health, breeding, and birthing viability of these very valuable and unique animals. Our maternity pasture will be roughly 100 feet from the ROW. Further, the aforementioned pesticides will run off into our pastures, making them unsafe as feed.
- 3, Our 82 year old neighbor has just had a pacemaker put in. She is unable to speak for herself at this point. I am concerned that you know that she lives on Segment 27. The ROW will go right through her home.

I have these other comments:

If Segment 27 is utilized, our garage, driveway, an acre of wooded land, will be obliterated. The ROW will come within 30 feet of our front door. We built this place from the woods up, using old fashioned methods (logging with horses) so as to impact the land as little as possible. There is no way that we will ever be convinced that living so near this line will not be harmful to us or our breeding stock. If you truly believe this to be a safe environment we invite you to purchase what remains of our property and live here yourself! I want to add my voice to those of my neighbors on sister segments in demanding that you do the following:

- 1 As Mark Korsness promised at the meeting in Yacolt, on December 2, develop an alternative eastern route for this project, away from populated areas.
2. And/or put the Pearl/Paul route back on the table.
3. Evaluate the use of new technologies,
4. Extend the scoping period for at least 60 more days. There are many people who did not receive notification of this project, and have not had a chance to comment. This puts you in violation of NEPA.

Marit Federcell

[Address]

Communication ID: 12259

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: ERNA SARASOHN

I would like to know where you stand on putting another tower near the Highlands. I find it so difficult to understand adding a second tower when that is not the industry standard. What if there is a fire, etc and it knocks out both towers and service to thousands of homes and business? It seems so much better to put it in a less populated area so why are you even thinking about the Highlands?

Communication ID: 12260

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: JENNIFER L HEINE-WITHEE

I am very concerned about the BPA's plan to run high capacity power lines through the north county. I live on Lakeview drive on the border of where the lines would run. I am extremely concerned about the possible health hazards associated with living in close proximity to these type of power lines. I have children and studies have shown that children are at an increased risk for developing leukemia when they live under high capacity power lines. I am also a cancer survivor and am conscience about maintaining good health so I can avoid a recurrence. Living under these lines would greatly increase my chances of getting cancer again. I feel it is unconscionable to even consider running these lines in an area that is populated by families and individuals especially when there is an alternative such as is the case here. I ask you to do the right thing and change your proposed site to a part of the county that is not populated by people.

Communication ID: 12261

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: CATHERINE E TALBOT

We already have lines running through our neighborhood. Increasing the size and scope would devalue our property; possibly cause serious health problems to those living near the lines. There has to be a lower impact area that would be feasible.

Communication ID: 12262

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: ALYSSA B GROVER

The BPA has yet to propose a suitable placement for the 500 KV power line of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. I believe in the planning of line 29 that the impact to the private citizens and the environmental stability of the area were underestimated. We constantly disregard the truth that the environment is fragile. Though capable of many great things: birth, death, regeneration, these changes and cycles are greatly affected by human action. I believe the unique habitat of line 29 would suffer irreversible damage if an enormous 500 KV power line were to be erected in the area. The irreplaceable beauty and harmony of this area are enjoyed by not only private citizens but also countless tourists that frequent the many parks and waterfalls of the area. This project also raises health concerns as living in close proximity to high voltage power lines has been linked to an increase in cancer rates and can significantly compromise the immune system. I know that many believe line 29 will be a more attractive solution as it runs through less urban areas than some of the other proposed lines, but I urge you to find another route. I believe serious reconsiderations should be made in the location of this project. A route should be sought that is better suited to the concerns of the citizens; placed further east, crossing less private land, and without such a great risk to the plants, animals, waterways, and citizens of the area.

Communication ID: 12263

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: BARBETTE C SCHOENING

I am a resident of Hockinson Highlands which is on the proposed route segment #31 of the BPA (Bonneville Power Administration) I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. This segment will also run within a mile to my children's primary school. I moved to this area specifically because of the scenery, wildlife and wetlands. Having a 150 foot tower in my neighborhood would decimate my property value. I am also concerned about the health hazards of a massive transmission line being so close to my home and my children's school. A report from the California Department of Health Services concluded that living in a close proximity of Electric and Magnetic Fields increases the risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease and miscarriage. What enrages me the most that BPA has an alternate route through Washington DNR land that would avoid established communities. However, this is not their preferred route. Why are we putting our families and communities at risk if they have another option? NO BPA Segment #31 The construction of route segment #31 would destroy our community, our residential investment and our lives. It is unconscionable and irresponsible to even consider this segment. The community of Hockinson would never be the same. Support us, support our community. Sincerely, Barbette Schoening

Communication ID: 12264

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: JULIE K ATCHLEY

I am against the proposed plan "Route 31" through Hockinson.

Communication ID: 12265

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: PAUL M BOUDREAUX

I live in Hockinson and I am deeply concerned about BPA's proposed segment 31 route of the I-5 corridor project. I just returned from an extended trip to find out the comment period is all but over, with hardly any opportunity for those of us most effected to speak out. How can we consider this line, which will run very close to my home, near my children's school and directly through the property our school district purchased for a new school? There are other options. I know they are more expensive. The segment 31 route may be cheap in dollar terms, but at what human cost? When did it get PC for the environment to trump people? Please help our community. Please know that while this issue is getting pushed through and we can not impact it, it's impact will be here long after. Please find a way you can provide energy to people, without hurting people in the process.

Communication ID: 12266

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: JUSTIN M BLETH

To BPA and whomever else it may concern: First, I would like to tell you that I am currently a student at Washington State University in Pullman, Washington. I reside in Vancouver, Washington while school is not in session. In addition, I would tell you that I am not even living within the area that is to be affected by this project. However, I must object strongly to the proposed power line plans. I voice my objection because of the irrevocable and adverse effects that this proposed project would have for the area, not only on the environment, but for the citizens living there as well. Even though I am not directly affected by the project, I cannot in good conscience, yield my agreement to a project that puts a strain on fellow citizens. As much as I support a strong infrastructure, in this case, I am referring to the electrical grid to provide power; I find it difficult to believe that there is not an acceptable alternative. Perhaps there is another way to make the proposed reinforcements, one that will not call for so much displacement on both the environment and its citizens. I do understand that many things come into play when developing these plans, yet I feel that this is not the optimal choice for a proposed reinforcement. From what I have read in other comments about this project, it certainly sounds like alternative locations for this project would be a much better compromise, as they would not so greatly affect citizens or the environment. I must iterate that my greatest concern in this matter is for the homeowners and their families that will be affected by the proposed project. As these citizens are honest, hardworking

taxpayers who will be footing the bill for this project with the rest of us, I urge you to hear their voices, our voices and reconsider your plans for this project. With the resourcefulness and ingenuity that I know your organization is capable of, please find an alternative to your proposal and keep in mind the citizens whose lives may be needlessly interrupted without having your consideration.

Communication ID: 12267

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: GREG M GOSPE

As a private citizen, property owner and elected official, I am writing to express my concern from all three perspectives over the potential routing of transmission lines through Hockinson, my community.

I do appreciate the fact that BPA is taking steps to facilitate the transmission of electrical power from the south to the North and I do understand that construction of these lines is appears to be part of a wholesale upgrade process for BPA.

As a private citizen

What I do not understand is why routes that are illogical, divisive and filled with contention are even on the list of alternatives. Route 31 is all of the above three and as an educated, common sense oriented person, I do not understand why BPA would chose a route that would cut through the middle of a very pristine community, deprive more than 1,000 citizens of their homes (or being able to safely remain in them) at a time where real estate values have plummeted significantly and create a scenario where thousands of legal challenges would be filed against the BPA. I certainly understand that BPA has virtually unlimited resources and can outlast any individual and ultimately few within BPA have any personal stake in this decision. Ultimately there are boxes on a checklist and our community just happens to be in the middle of this project's footprint.

Clearly there are alternative routes for this project through land that is already publicly owned with ample space for towers of the size that are prescribed for a project of this magnitude. When the easements were provided to PacifiCorp, the intended use was for power structures with significantly less impact and significantly less size. The additional cost of routing the project away from Hockinson would be more than made up for by the lack of legal challenges from the hundreds of impacted landowners who could conceivably tie the project up in court for years. BPA has an opportunity to make a quick, smart decision to rule out routes such as route 31 and by making a choice such as this, there would be some excellent PR that would accrue to the BPA. Even though quickness might not be a part of your process, BPA should very strongly consider ruling out the contentious routes in a rapid fashion. Hockinson is on the edge of the urban growth boundary and this area is only going to become more populated over the coming years as the growth is coming from the West.

As a property owner

My family's largest personal investment is in our house. Knowing about this project means that if I have to ever sell my house, I am now in a position of needing to disclose what I know about your proposed project. To many prospective buyers, the issue of high power electrical transmission lines in close proximity to any community causes a great deal of fear and uncertainty in the mind of a given buyer. In addition to that, it also has a tendency to cause property values to decline in contrast to areas with homes of similar size and quality where transmission lines do not currently exist.

Since Hockinson is an area with real estate values significantly above the mean in Clark County due in part to the quality of our school system, one could expect a choice to follow route 31 to have a very negative impact on values in our community. There are already a significant number of homes whose owners are facing economic hardship. Choosing this route would potentially cause a number of these homeowners to be in a more precarious financial position in terms of their equity in their homes and their ability to remain in their homes. Ultimately the choice to follow route 31 is akin to kicking Hockinson when it is already down. The alternative routes for this project would be considerably less disruptive and detrimental and would make considerably more sense from my perspective.

As an elected official, speaking only for myself

I have been a member of the Hockinson School District board of directors since 2003. When we passed our last bond issue to build our high school, we promised our voters that we would use 1 million dollars of the proceeds to purchase land for a future school site.

We looked extensively for land over my first 4 years on the board and finally settled on a site that was very ideal for our school district. Needless to say, we were pleased to have found a piece of land that had minimal issues from a wetlands mitigation perspective and that it was large enough to be useable for a school of just about any configuration.

During our search for land, we came across a number of land options that were simply either too costly or had too many wetland issues in order to be suitable. The whole issue of wetlands and the shifting rules around wetland usage was significant for the school district so our choice of the property that we purchased was a significant hurdle for us to clear. There is only one problem, the piece of property that we purchased is in the path of the proposed transmission line and any decision to build this line effectively condemns or makes useless our 1 million dollar purchase of land. This would be devastating for the school district to endure as our land would be practically worthless and certainly never appropriate for a school site.

There is an abundance of hysteria and emotion around electromagnetic fields resulting from electrical transmission lines and their potential for impact on human health. I am sure you can appreciate that it would be impossible for us to ever consider constructing any sort of school on this land. Therefore, a choice for route 31 not only severely denigrates a great deal of valuable real estate and real estate value within the Hockinson School District but it would also saddle our school district with a piece of unsalable, unusable property that cannot be easily or quickly replaced.

Ultimately my goal in writing this appeal was to focus on facts that I know to be true and to appeal of a

sense of pragmatism within the BPA. There are numerous reasons that a route other than route 31 through the heart of Hockinson would make the most sense for your decision. The most notable reason is to help preserve and ensure our school district's ability to plan and build a future school on the land that we purchased. In addition, it would also seem most sensible for the BPA to choose a path for the transmission line that has the smallest possible impact on the residents of this region. There are choices that would make this a tenable goal and it is my hope that BPA, being experts in electricity, will follow the same path that is taken by power itself—the path of least resistance rather than one that flows through the heart of our community.

Thank you

Greg Gospe

Communication ID: 12268

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: RICHARD J PORTER

Your proposal is arrogant. To even consider the condemnation of private homes indicates your practices are not in the public good (we are the public). Incompetence is obvious to even waste a single dollar in study of proposal #31. The negative reaction regarding losing a family home will be repeated a thousand times over. You have a weak case to support option 31. Drop it and cut your losses. You have greatly underestimated the opposition to this action.

Communication ID: 12269

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: RICK J DAVIS

I recently heard that my in-law's home was in the path of one the proposed routes for the new 500-kilovolt power line. I am appalled at the thought of BPA even considering running a line over areas that will impact so many families. If, indeed an additional power line is necessary, please re-evaluate the current choices and locate the line in an unpopulated area.

Communication ID: 12270

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: TOM K LAWRENCE

You have better routes to run the line than 31. Segment 31 goes through a large number of homes and

affects even more. The is state forest land to the east that would be better. We will do everything legal, political and good old American heart rendering to stop this line from going through people areas.

Communication ID: 12271

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: JEFF A CROPPER

As a citizen that moved to Battle Ground in 1991, I hoped for a quiet, private, safe and scenic rural place to live and raise a family. Now in the past 2 years I am faced with falling property values, growing traffic concerns and much much more population. And now we are also looking at the possibilty of looking across the scenic valley to see 70 foot power towers ? This is not what we need to bring our property values down even further, I please urge you to use routes farther east that would not adversely effect homeowners property and keep the possible danger of 500 KV lines far from homes as well as not effecting property values. In closing, I am strongly opposed to line 31 Thank you, Jeff Cropperf

Communication ID: 12272

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: KATHERINE A VON KREISLER

I would like to voice my opinion on and concern with line #31, as well as other line proposals that effect the public. It makes no sense to disrupt lives, put at risk the health of so many, and financially harm families and communities, when there is another option...PUBLIC LAND. Please take into concideration moving your project east, east, east until you hit public land away from the population. Please take into consideration doing the "right thing" even if it may cost more (in dollars). Going through populated land and taking away homes, property values (and as a result school funding), and personal well being cost people, families, and communities more than just dollars. Please do what is right for the people...not what is most convenient (or financially appealing) to BPA.

Communication ID: 12273

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: GREG MARTSOLF

Please have your environmental studies look at:

- NOT USING SEGMENT #31
 - The Clark County GIS property website has identified segment #31 ROW parcels as having geological, seismic and erosion hazard areas.
-

-
- Using existing line #9
 - Using segments 28-25, through public, forested land where the fewest homes and families would be disrupted
 - Putting lines underground even though it would be more expensive
 - Not putting the 500 kilovolt lines up at all

Communication ID: 12274

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: MARK GROVER

To whom it may concern at BPA-

I am writing this letter to voice my concerns over the placement of your proposed new transmission lines. First let me say I am a pragmatist as to the need for power to the masses as I use and enjoy power and energy you supply. How can I be against this? Let me list

a few objections.

First- I read an article in the Columbian newspaper stating you can not or will not run

your line next to the already established line. Is this a new policy? There are plenty of examples up and down the I-5 corridor of BPA doing this.

Second- Most of your proposed line routes are through or next to human habitations and

I am sure you are aware of health issues induced by high voltage lines through EMF radiation.

Even if your own extensive and costly studies have shown inconclusive findings, there are a plethora of studies that show there are deadly consequences to the human populace.

Third- The esthetics involved. Power lines can take a beautiful and peaceful area and scar the face of it forever, let alone the disrupted flora and fauna. As an example of man made structures I give you the wind farms of the Gorge, in particular the ones around the Mary Hill area. Take a look, at first they are an amazing site. Then as one becomes used to seeing them and actually see them, they are ugly monoliths and blights on the land. Where once

a person could go and hear the calm and peace, it is no more, it is gone forever. Even if one would remove them someday, the land has been scraped and changed and can never be the same.

Fourth- From the business side of this. You say this is for the peoples good. While it may be for the consumers of the export states this power is going to. How can it be for the people of the Northwest who will bear the cost and damage caused by these lines. Example of California who can not or will not have the political will to develop their own supply of power. They have their environmental lobby they cannot overcome, so they say, We have an idea lets draw our power needs from outside the area, it will be costly but it will not cause harm to our land, and our people will be willing to pay. Let us ask the Northwest for this power. They will supply it for a cost, and there populace is small enough. Their objections and concerns can be dismissed, after all it is for the good of the people! Again I ask is it for their good,for the good of BPA? undoubtedly. But for the long term good of the local populace? I think not! Sure for the short term it creates short term jobs, maybe? But like the strip mining of West Virginia for coal. It created jobs for a time. It supplied power for other people and then its gone. The land is scarred, the people who depended on these jobs are without jobs. The local government who made tax money temporarily on them, find their coffers are empty, and their people are poor once more.

I was told by one of your representatives that you are a private organization, with no ties to the government. While this may be true as to your charter, it really makes little difference. The fact is you are tied to the apron strings of government, and have close alliances with the Corps of Engineers, Department of Energy, BLM and other agencies. Otherwise you would not have the ability to manipulate government officials and use eminent domain so easily.

Five- I have no doubt that you will do what you will. Remember our future generations will have to live with the decisions made, and ultimately God and the earth will judge us

for our choices. If you must place these lines, please run them away from people. With a thought to them and the land you must ultimately cross, as it will make a difference if not now, to the future. Our children will need places to go to: to reflect in calm and quiet; for their legacies and history, as we need to be doing. Thank you and God bless all!

Communication ID: 12275

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: LYNSEY J GROVER

To whom it may concern at BPA,

I live in North Clark County on the proposed line 29 of the BPA I-5 corridor reinforcement project. This is the farthest East line but still involves the extremely large 500 kilovolt power line going over people's property and homes. If the BPA absolutely has to go through with this project and create a power line it would be better for the people if the line was placed on the existing line 9 or a new line even farther East than line 29, where there are NO people's homes, lives, or futures to destroy.

These power lines are a major health concern to the people living in the area; a majority of them elderly and small children who are more susceptible to the cancers, ms, and other diseases that are associated with the EMF radiation that the power lines bring right to their homes and backyards.

The geographical layout of this area is such that the power lines would be visible in all directions for many miles. These power lines are unsightly, and would cause a significant decrease in the recreational traffic that is common to the East Fork of the Lewis River, and the many state and county parks and campgrounds in this area. Their existence would also be detrimental to the businesses and towns that depend on that traffic for their existence. The area along the river is designated a North Clark County scenic route, but would certainly lose that designation with the instillation of these huge power lines. The ecosystem of this river is very fragile, so much so that at the Lucia Falls Park any contact with the water is strictly forbidden. If human contact with the water is that detrimental to the habitat I can only conjecture what 500 kilovolts of electricity constantly coursing over the river and the deadly pesticides used to eliminate ground cover will do.

My property, and my neighbors' properties are listed Riparian priority habitat, or irreplaceable habitat, by the government. Riparian property is labeled the most biologically significant by the Clark County government site. Our property is in the process of becoming a botanical sanctuary and contains numerous rare and endangered plant and animal species living on it. Most of the properties along these Eastern lines (26,27,28, and 29) have wells as our only source of water and have many surface and underground creeks, as well as wetland areas that the pesticide used by the BPA will seep into and

poison our plants, animals, and families. Our property and those surrounding it are built on land with severe erosion hazards and slopes in excess of 15%, which according to a BPA engineer I spoke with would make it very difficult for them to get the necessary equipment to the areas it would need to be to make the power line viable.

The people these proposed lines will effect see no need to have these power lines put in and according to everything I have heard from your BPA representatives, these lines would not directly benefit them. These people, their children, and future generations will be paying the price for them. Our views, recreation, wildlife, property and home values, property, homes, and lives are much too precious a price to ask for a few more hours of television or electricity. If the lines must be put in put them where they will do no harm to people: on the existing line 9 or farther east than line 29, where there are no people.

Communication ID: 12276

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: DARCY L HURST

NO to the BPA line #31. Please look at the amount of homes and families you will destroy if this proposal goes through. In 1972 I grew up under BPA powerlines in from 99th street to 94th St and while my father bought that property because the lines were 150' from the house and no one else could build behind us we did not know of the health concerns from the power lines. I was the only child from our family that played more than anyone else under those lines and I can't help but feel that it contributed to my diagnosis of cancer in Feb 07. I don't want these power lines, which are even larger than the ones I grew up by, in our backyard and I don't want my neighbors homes torn down. We live out here and away from huge power lines for a reason, to have a quality of life. Find another route!

Communication ID: 12277

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: DONALD A MATTISON

Date: December 12, 2009

To: BPA Project i5 Project Managers and Planners

Subject: Opposition to the Proposed i5 Route 31 Project

My family and I are very strongly opposed to the BPA's proposed Segment 31 of the i5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. We strongly and urgently request that Segment 31 be immediately abandoned as part of an unnecessarily ambitious electric power transmission project.

I have worked in the electric power generating business (General Electric Nuclear Power Division) for many years, which included power transmission operations and safety. I absolutely believe that the power lines that are proposed – especially Segment 31 -- do present a serious health threat to any persons living near the power lines. If you doubt this, you have not studied the Electric Power Research Institute (Palo Alto, CA, where I also worked for several years) research into the deleterious effects of very high voltage transmission lines.

This proposed Segment 31 would result in severe negative effects on our family's homes in the east Hockinson area. BPA has no business or moral imperative to threaten people's health and well being with such a high voltage power line transmission project location. This Project Segment would at the very least endanger my family's health plus cause great economic damage. My wife was born here. Our family has live here since 1990. And our grown children live here. This is the area BPA was created to serve, not harm or destroy.

I came here to work at a local electronics company and to teach at a local State College. I am now retired and have planned to live out my life here. Our children have married and have families in this area also. For the BPA to imperiously and arrogantly attempt to locate this type of ultra high voltage project that is clearly detrimental to the health and economic survival of my family and many other of my neighbors and friends is an outrageous attempt to harm the health and well being of all of the people in the path of Segment 31.

I have worked with electric power transmission projects in California, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and other states. These states have either stopped or curtailed 500 KV transmission projects because of health and safety reasons. I know that BPA has access to all this type of information. I also have friends who have worked in the BPA Environmental and Safety areas. Without exception, these experienced people state that BPA can do a better job of increasing the power availability without endangering people's health and well being.

BPA can surely do a better job of providing power to the Pacific Northwest and the people and industries that the BPA was created to serve. I have consulted in Norway and Sweden on power projects. That have been and responsive to the growing power needs and also to the health and environmental concerns of the areas, people, and industries they serve. I am confident that BPA can resolve power, health, environmental, and economic concerns of this area – if it has the mind set and goal to accomplish that. BPA has the potential to be as great as any other power generating facility.

I strongly suggest that the BPA examine carefully the reasons it is so willing to endanger and destroy people's health, long-established neighborhoods, communities and the environment. I further suggest that a process of open communication, listening to all people and business involved, consideration of communities, neighborhoods and the environment be developed as the key elements of any increase in electric power needs from generation to transmission. Force, threats, and domination are never part of an equitable and successful relationship with those for whom an entity was created.

Sincerely,

Communication ID: 12278

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: LYNN C CULBERTSON

I believe that too many people will be affected if you choose to run the suggested routes. I attended the meeting at Yacolt School. I was saddened by the confusion-many people were asking the same questions repeatedly-some of us did not understand the answers-some of the answers were not pertinent to the questioned asked. The most profound thing about the meeting to me was when the gentleman from the DNR listed the concerns he had should the route go through DNR supervised territory. He was able to voice what they would address in a concise manner. Almost all of his concerns are ours. The land DNR would sacrifice is a much smaller percentage in proportion to their total area than the percentage each person along a 70 mile route is being asked to give up. Add to that, I know of no elk or deer with a pacemaker-or a permanent address. I am not a conspiracy minded person, but what am I missing-go east of us please!

Communication ID: 12279

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: KIRSTEN W ELSON

As an affected homeowner and local citizen, I am including my comments on the I-5 Corridor Improvement Project, and namely on segment #31.

My first concern lies with the Bonneville Power Administration's notification of "affected" citizens. Apparently from the view of the BPA, I am not considered to be affected by this situation; however, my property touches one that lies within the existing easement. I received NO mailings on the I-5 Corridor Improvement Plan. When I heard about the Segment #31 option, all BPA meetings were finished. How is that possible? To think that people only within 75 feet either side of the line need to know about this is astonishing!

Should segment #31 become a route for the power lines, my small child and my teenager will live within 200 yards. Should segment #31 become a route for the power lines, my property value will be affected...in fact, it already has been affected by the situation. If I decided to pick up and get out of the way of BPA, and accept the loss of equity in my home, I am affected. Should I choose to remain in the area, my children would go to school just over a half-mile of the 500kV lines, along with hundreds of other children.

My secondary concern is the proximity of the line to any residents who remain, especially small children.

Children who don't live immediately along the line will still be affected if they go to Hockinson Elementary or Hockinson Intermediate School. Certainly, the amount of exposure is less than one would receive right next to the easement, but studies available have cited lines with lower voltages too. Is it really worth endangering the kids? Is it really worth endangering those who can't afford to get out of the way of the BPA? If there is ever a definite connection between adult lymphoma and power lines, or between leukemia and power lines, you can bet at least some people will show up at your doorstep. Is it worth that?

There are other concerns as well, and I've seen my neighbors cite these; environmental concerns, endangered species, eroding the local tax base, taking property the schools have recently acquired and planned to use to generate revenue. I won't go into these issues ad nauseum. You know the arguments.

In a perfect world, this is how I would have liked to see things go:

- Better notification of as many residents that would be affected as possible.
- Plenty of time for residents to educate themselves on all aspects of the project, including time for residents to gather information via FOIA
- Plenty of time for emotions to settle and logic to kick in; let the potentially affected residents work with, not against, the BPA

My hope is that BPA wanted to keep this quiet because it really isn't a viable option, and you have to go through the motions. If that isn't the case, public notification has been horribly mishandled.

You at the BPA have other options for this route, and you have cited reasons that make those options less desirable. I hope that the reasons thousands of residents of this area give you will sway you from choosing Segment #31.

If the line goes in, there's no way I could raise my kids here. If I am going to lose my current home, I want to be able to listen to your reasons, look at your figures and say..."They're right, that makes sense." I may be frustrated and upset with my luck, but I want to be resigned to the fact that BPA is making the best choice, and has researched every option. I don't feel that way now.

Communication ID: 12280

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: JOHN L EMMETT

To: BPA

From: John L. Emmett

Subject: Alternatives for the I5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

While I support the upgrading of the power grid in the U.S. in general, and the Pacific Northwest in particular, I find your proposed options inconsistent with the existing and rapidly increasing population density of the area. The concept of running a 500KV overhead line through a contiguous set of high density neighborhoods (route 31) is, to me, very poor technical and social policy. If an overhead line were the only option (which it is not) the only routes that would make sense at all are those far to the East of populated areas such as routes 28-32-35 and 29-34-35. Additionally, routes farther to the East should also be considered.

We are told that the primary use of the new line is to wheel power both North and South. If this is indeed the case, a D.C. superconducting underground line would provide BPA far more flexibility and far more capacity (5 GW) than an overhead 500KV A.C. line at 1.5 GW. While the cost of the underground superconducting line is probably 5 – 10 times the cost of the lower capacity overhead line, the benefits to BPA and the community are far greater also. As the population density continues to increase, and the power consumption per capita increases also, we cannot continue to string higher and higher voltage lines overhead, blighting existing neighborhoods and raising the not unreasonable fears in the citizenry of their children contracting leukemia . So what is your next step, triple 765 KV overhead lines through populated areas? It is time to step back from this approach.

It is time to move to the future. Underground superconducting D.C. transmission requires only very minimal environmental impact and nearly eliminates any EMF concerns. Given the very minimal easement requirements, there are many more options for the route, as even many existing highway right of ways can be used.

As I understand it BPA is not a for profit enterprise. What then could be the excuse for not embracing the underground superconducting approach? It is, after all, we the rate payers that will pay the cost of this approach, and it is what we want.

Given the forgoing, I would like to specifically request that the Draft EIS specifically analyze the following issues:

- 1) The comparative cost of building an underground D.C. superconducting line for all or part of the route from Castle Rock to Troutdale. This analysis should take into account the potential for much lower right of way costs for this technology, using existing right of ways and existing roadways rather than just the routes currently proposed for the overhead line. The cost analysis must not be made just on the basis of the initial capital cost, but on the increased cost to the ratepayers in cents per-kilowatt-hour. The assumptions should be that the cost of the line is amortized over the capital depreciation schedule for BPA capital projects.

- 2) Given a high capacity superconducting line as the next capacity increment, the cost analysis should also analyze the cost benefit to the community of replacing the existing 235 KV lines that run down through high density housing in Hazel Dell with a second underground superconducting line. This second

step would allow return to the tax roles of most of the existing 300-foot right of way.

3) The overall cost analysis must take into account the total costs, not just the BPA capital costs. These costs include the reduction in real estate values to the homeowners along the overhead line path, the concomitant reduction of property tax income to the County.

Thank you for your consideration and analyses of these important issues.

Communication ID: 12281

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: JERRY SPRAGUE, MAJA TIBBLING

Comment on the Scope of the EIS for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

To Whom It May Concern:

I can document a number of reasons why my husband and I strongly oppose routing the new transmission lines through or near our property. Many of these points apply to all the homeowners impacted by this initiative.

- We are still in the throes of an economic downturn which has left many of us in this area out of work and at the brink of foreclosure. With the already depressed market values, parcels have been very difficult to sell without many ending up under water.

- o It can't be lost on the BPA that high power lines on your property do not increase market value. In fact, it would make the property completely unsellable as most people do not want to live near them and believe that there are adverse health effects.

- o This project will create undue hardships on many of the impacted property owners.

- o Note that my husband and I are not in the position of unemployment or foreclosure noted above. He is, however, in seriously poor health with emphysema and terminal metastasized prostate cancer. Even with my decent corporate health insurance, we are spending many thousands in health care. We could not afford to move to another place without selling this one. There is some evidence that properties are already getting harder to sell because of the BPA project until the decisions are made.

- It was our intent to stay on this land through the rest of my work years and into retirement. We have a quality of life here that would be destroyed by high power lines coming through without any hope or finances to reestablish somewhere else.

- o We often take in people who are in transition in their lives and need a place to stay for some time.

- o We also are a gathering place for our religious community. The peace and serenity that we have here

is an essential part of that. It is entirely incompatible with high power lines.

o My husband is comfortable here, even with the suffering that he experiences as a result of his cancer, this place provides him with some happiness.

- Our pond system and green spaces provide wetlands for many birds that use our property during their migrations and other just to feed themselves. We grow organic fruit, berries and vegetables on this property that feed us and many friends as well.

o High tension systems are known to interfere with the well-being of wildlife and plants.

o Organic certifying authorities will often decline to approve when there are high-tension lines present as it affects the growth.

- Public works projects are considered part of the financial recovery, but it defeats the purpose if they are done to the detriment of the public! Of course there would be some benefits to some people, but it is my understanding that making this detour into this part of the state is because of the Chelatchie biomass facility. It is also our understanding the customers for the output of that plant will be neither in Washington nor Oregon, but in California. This is not a good use of the public works money, if any of that is being used to fund this process...

- There are existing pathways that have already impacted people. Expand the capacity of those swaths of land instead for general increases required. It is not worth impacting so many people in these times to try to pick up the small biomass facility output.

o If that is considered vital, then hooking it up to the grid should take shortest path to an existing pathway. I know this is simplistic, but in essence the Chelatchie plant should have lines travel due east to the PacifiCorp lines and have them transport the payload to the high volume BPA line that already runs north and south along the I5 corridor.

o It is unconscionable to consider impacting so many people at this time.

Thank you for your attention.

Respectfully,

Maja Tibbling and Jerry Sprague

Communication ID: 12282

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: HARRY J HARPER

As per my prior phone conversation with your office "no" permission is granted to enter my property for

any reason, surveying, etc. This land represents an environmentally sensitive wetlands ecosystem with a great deal of biodiversity of plants, trees, animals and various organisms. This area includes multiple creeks, a very large pond and aquifers that feed the Camas watershed, located just a short distance from this property. It is well documented in the literature the negative and adverse affects of high voltage towers and their effect on the human as well as other fauna nervous systems. No easements currently exist on this piece of property and no permission will be granted to enter for any reason at all. I have looked at your proposed project plans and possible routes for construction of your high voltage towers and it becomes abundantly clear that better passage routes exist that do not utilize such biologically sensitive areas. I, and countless others, suggest you look elsewhere to construct your high voltage transmission towers. My background includes multiply degrees in the biological sciences, physical geography/geology, and also includes extensive experience in construction/civil engineering and natural resources, as well I have a DPM degree and I am very knowledgeable on the impacts and existence of N,E,P,A. I will not sit idly by and have you destroy all the work that I put into developing and preserving the fauna and flora that inhabit this property. I insist that we be removed from your list of possible sites for these high voltage transmission lines. In summary, I have no intention of allowing you to trespass or disturb this property that I have so carefully cultivated to destroy with impunity. So again, I insist that you remove us from your list, otherwise I will take ever step necessary to halt any possible utilization of your for profit efforts and violate my constitutional rights. I insist that I receive any preliminary EIS summaries as soon as they become available. Again, I cannot emphasize enough of my intolerance to your proposed usage of my personal private property. Please immediately produce proof that I have been removed from your list of sites.

Communication ID: 12283

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: JAMES C RAUCH

We are concerned with how the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project will affect our community. The health risks associated with High Voltage transmission lines, property values or in our case a possibility of our home being condemned. We believe that there are better options to the east that may minimize the impact on local communities. BPA has not provided the means for our community to debate these concerns and must publicly divulge all the facts.

Communication ID: 12284

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: PATRICK J BROWN

This comment is in regard to the I-5 Corridor Project, Rt. #31. I live on 212th Ave and I believe it is not just to move so many people and devalue the property of those who will be left to live along the power line. Please use a route that will impact the least amount of people.

Communication ID: 12285

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: MARILEE I DONOVAN

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this project. Given the growth in the metropolitan area over the past 20 years, I understand the need to strengthen the electrical transmission grid to ensure that there is adequate power to meet future demand for this area. While I am all for strengthening the electrical transmission grid, I am adamantly opposed to constructing new high voltage power line corridors through existing populated areas; specifically Segment #31. When BPA obtained this right of way, this was a very rural area with few homes. The impact would have been significantly less than it will now be. There are three major impacts that are of concern to me: decreased property values, decreased tax base for local governments and adverse health consequences. My husband and I own a 25-acre farm the value of which has already been adversely effected by the moratorium on cluster development. Though it was impossible to tell from the map accompanying the letter sent out by BPA exactly where our property was relative to Segment # 31, it is possible that the proposed segment #31 goes directly though our property. If this is the case, we could lose everything we have worked for over our entire lives as we would never be reimbursed adequately for all that we have put into developing this property. Our situation is not unique. Consider the cumulative negative impacts to those homeowners and residents all along the proposed right-of-way. I have personal experience with the negative effects of high voltage towers on property values. The entire neighborhood where my grandparents lived in Seattle ceased to be desirable and declined over the years after high voltage lines were erected on their farm. The decrease in property values will result in reduced tax revenue to local budgets at a time when they are already having significant problems fulfilling their commitments to the population of the area. Many of the areas in Hockinson are high end homes which contribute a major portion of the tax base of the area. I understand that a future site of a Hockinson school would also be adversely affected and that with reduced tax revenue, the ability to purchase another comparable site would be questionable. There are reports of adverse health effects on animals as well as humans from living near high voltage lines. Even the studies reported on the BPA website acknowledge that this exposure cannot be considered entirely safe – especially for children. Studies done in California and Australia warn more strongly of the risks associated with childhood exposure to high voltage lines. There is enough scientific evidence of adverse effects due from high voltage transmission lines to warrant significant concern. For this reason, high voltage power lines should never be constructed in populated areas. There are other options and routes available. we urge BPA to remove Segment #31 from consideration and to utilize existing rights-of-way or the options through the forested areas east of Segment #31. Marilee and Mike Donovan

Communication ID: 12286

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: LORENE T HENDERSON

I am a concerned homeowner in the Hockinson area. Our community would be drastically impacted by Segment 31 if it were chosen for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. I am vehemently opposed to BPA using Segment 31 because it would significantly deteriorate the quality of life for hundreds, if not thousands of local citizens. My concerns include the negative impact on the local school district, decreased property values and health issues. I recently received my annual tax assessment and the value of my home nose-dived 23%. If BPA is allowed to site the new 500 KV towers through Hockinson, my property values will fall much further. We had a decent amount of equity in our home and had plans to use that equity in the future. We will be unable to do so if our values fall even more. Furthermore, Hockinson is a rural community and has very few local businesses. The school district relies heavily upon residential property taxes to fund their operations. My child's school has already been hard hit by the economic woes of the state. The effects of decreased state funding directly impacted my kids' class sizes; last year my youngest child had 20 students in his class and this it increased drastically to 28. Hockinson has always prided itself on offering the children of the community a high quality education and it was a difficult decision for them to increase class size. The decisions it will have to make will become much more difficult if they cannot rely on the residential tax base due to the fact that the bottom has dropped out of our real estate market. More importantly, I am concerned over the health issues of living near Electro Magnetic Fields. The California Department of Health Services (2002) concluded that living near EMF increases the risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's disease and miscarriage of pregnancies. These studies were conducted with regards to 230 KV power lines and not the 500 KV lines that BPA is currently proposing. The effects of living in close proximity of 500 KV are as of yet, unknown and I strongly prefer not to find out the negative health effects it could potentially have on myself and my family. The impact to the citizens of our community is wholly and completely unacceptable and I strongly urge you to remove Segment 31 from your consideration immediately.

Communication ID: 12287

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: RICHARD VAN DIJK

How can you legally close the scoping process when you have agreed to looking at alternative routes further East of segment 29. How and when will those affected there be notified and have an opportunity to comment?

Communication ID: 12288

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: JANE M REVESZ

I have received the requests and materials from BPA for my 20 acre lot which is part of our family's 160

acre tree farm in Section 35 T6 R3E WM . Warning! The steepness and erodibility of the terrain make it an unsatisfactory location for a power line. Our family knows this way too well due to the crossing of our tree farm by the PacifiCorp Yale-Merwin power line. My lot has had repeated damage from PacifiCorp's contractors and subcontractors entering without notification or permission in wet weather with oversized and inappropriate equipment for vegetation control and pole maintenance. PacifiCorp has no easement on my lot.

Why all the damage? One of the reasons and one of the hazards of a power line on what appears to be backcountry to a power company is a lack of respect for giving timely notification and seeking permission and orientation to the site specific requirements. After countless hours and encounters, we have achieved some damage control. However, an unfixable problem remains: the terrain of our tree farm is too steep and erodible for year around all weather vehicular access. The slope has been judged to be excessive by forest practice criteria. The amount of time and money spent on our part recovering and attempting to avoid damage is something we will do our best to avoid in the future. The steep hills on this tree farm make it an inappropriate site for the current line and pole placement, much less a much larger KV system.

Communication ID: 12289

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: LISA A ANDERSON

Dear Mr. Mark Korsness, Our property has the ppl line on it, on segment 31. This 10 acre property, with 100 year old barn and homestead on it is characterized as Timberland by the County and Federal Government. It is a category 2 recharge area under Cara Statutes. It is part of the Lacamas Creek Watershed. Since the neighborhood relies on excellent well water, we are highly concerned about disruption of the land, by having natural vegetation and trees bulldozes off. Also we don't want BPA herbicides or chemicals used to maintain transmission lines on our property. According to Cara law with the County both category I and II areas are required to implement best management practices (BMP). The ordinance applies to the following activities- below ground transformers and capacitors. We don't want the line on our property, because we have nurtured the land for the past 40 years as a nature preserve. Most of our land is a natural wetland. It is a breeding ground for amphibians, both newts and frogs. For the last five years, I have augmented the natural water that covers our land most of the year, with in ground pools in the wetland area to insure many of the amphibians will come to maturity each year. I have lots of video of the frogs which I will be posting on the citizens websites in the coming weeks. There is a wide variety of native animals and plants on our property. Grey and Red Squirrels, hawks, screech owls, deer, many birds, dragonflies, butterflies inhabit our lands. We have native grasses and rushes, pine, evergreen, cedar, alder, birch, salal, deer brush, red huckleberries, ferns, trilliums, and mosses. My biggest concern about having a 500kv transmission line on our property is the EMF threat, to both people and our sensitive native creatures. I understand that people should minimize their

exposure to anything above 2 milligauss of EMF, and increase their distance from power lines. I know from using an emf meter by the high voltage lines at Falk Rd and 4th plain in Vancouver, that many of the contiguous residences to these lines are impacted by very high EMF. I imagine since its an invisible force many of those residents may be totally unaware of the threat in their homes. I would like a study done on all perspective segments, on how many homes would be impacted by above 2Mg readings on this project. I would like to know how many feet these high emf fields are likely to stretch beyond the 150' you say you need to build. In California ordinances have been passed to demand the 500kv lines not be built closer than 350' to any schools. Shouldn't the zone required to build be as large as the build, plus the size of the EMF field, as no human or animal species will live in that area safely? The ppl easement is only 100ft. I'd like to know how you intend to acquire the other 50 ft, because I don't know any homeowner that would sell it to you. The 100 foot easement as I understand it was designed for a small power line from Merwin Dam, that was never deemed to be cost effective. It was never intended for a massive project like this. Thus the County has allowed expensive houses and neighborhoods to be built right next to the easement. Segment 31 is the worst most damaging place to put this project, because of the many homes and people, and the friendly habitat areas for wildlife, close to an urban area. It would change and destroy what many believe is the best neighborhood in Clark County FOREVER. The BOCC has compared the damage and the scope to some of the Hydro Projects on the Columbia River or interstate freeways. But in speaking to many of our neighbors on other lines, there are many people living in areas such as 29, and many sensitive environments there, so I would like you to go further east of all the proposed lines if you must build, or use one of the alternative routes like the Oregon Paul, Pearl, or use new technology like under ocean. The project should not ruin any ones home or livelihood, or what's left of the beauty of Clark County. Two other questions are do we need the project and how will it be funded? Will this be used to send power from burning shale oil in Canada to California? If so how will that effect the over- all environment? What will it be used for? And where will the power go-North, South? We understand from the WPUA that these upgrades to the Columbia grid are not primarily for renewable power, so what are they for? Is it just a reinforcement for the 500KV line that goes through Oregon, or does it have a distinctly different purpose? It seems very expensive, and devastating to homeowners and the environment, and for the character of Clark County as a whole, just for a reinforcement for another line. How much will this project cost and who will pay for it? I've seen the figure of 500 million. Is there money already to pay for this project from stimulus or other savings, or will it be bought on credit? If it is bought on credit will it be with high interest paying bonds(junk bonds) like WPPSS, or with low interest federal treasuries? How will this liability effect BPA ratepayers? We need to know because we are in a recession. People are struggling to pay their electric bills now. In short, do we really need this project? If we do it needs to be put in unpopulated areas, which will need to be an alternative route to what you have on your proposed sites. What is going to be the financial strain on ratepayers for this project? I hope that you act as good stewards of the environment in your decision making as you say you are.

Communication ID: 12290

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: RICHARD VAN DIJK

From a 5/15/2007 NWPP presentation given by BPA, it was stated that it was due to 'potential environmental issues, higher cost of land and longer alternate route' I would like to know how the analysis was done the criteria and the comparisons to validate that conclusion \$2-3M per mile is peanuts to protest people's health when the BPA will spend \$1.6B in 2010/2011 to protect fish and wildlife.

Communication ID: 12291

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: SUSAN R GIDEON,TOM GIDEON

Subject: Stop BPA I-5 Corridor Segment 31 Power Lines through Hockinson

Dear Mr. Fiksdal,

The purpose of this letter is to voice our very strong opposition to the proposed BPA Segment 31 extension through the Hockinson area. We are Hockinson residents living in the area where BPA is proposing to build a new route of 150 foot transmission towers (clearing a 150 foot corridor) through a pristine area inhabited by many rural families, working farms, stables, abundant wildlife and beautiful views.

This proposal will uproot many families and will cause our property values to plummet. As you know, the greatest component of most individual's net worth is the value of their home. We have seen home values decline due to the current economy over the past few years. But the proposal of building 150' towers will greatly impact property values – both for families living near the towers and for those who paid for view property and would be “viewing” the towers. It goes without saying that many people fear living near towers for founded health hazards. Properties values would never fully recover if this BPA Segment 31 is permitted through the Hockinson area.

The beautiful scenic environment would be permanently altered, families uprooted from their homes, other families being forced to live next to the towers because of lack of options and resources to move, diminished property values and direct negative impact to wildlife.

We strongly request BPA to consider alternative means or alternative routes and avoid erecting towers in the Hockinson area. A few apparent options include:

1. Upgrade existing lines where towers already exist and avoid building new towers
2. Move route of towers farther East of Hockinson, into uninhabited forest lands, avoiding the impact to so many Hockinson citizens.
3. Place new transmission lines underground

One of the great things about the state of Washington is the natural beauty of its natural resources as well as the vistas that one can enjoy. Whenever possible, we need to protect the natural beauty, wildlife and resources. There are fewer and fewer of these areas available and we need to protect and preserve what we have left. This pristine area will be forever unfavorably altered and spoiled if BPA is allowed to construct these towers.

We ask BPA to eliminate Segment 31 from further consideration as part of their Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please help us preserve our beautiful area and lessen the impact on many families.

Kindest regards,

Sue and Tom Gideon

[Address]

Brushh Prairie WA 98606

Communication ID: 12292

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: R L FISHER

When will there be a final decision on the locations of the reinforcement project?

Communication ID: 12293

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: ELLEN S POOLE

December 14, 2009 To: BPA Re: No BPA Segment #31 I am a Hockinson resident writing to express my opposition to the proposed #31 route for the new 500 KV electric transmission lines. Although our own property is not on the proposed route for the new high voltage power lines, we have several close friends who live within the 150-foot right-of-way, and would lose their homes when properties within that range are condemned. Other friends -- who live next to, but not underneath the proposed power lines -- may escape condemnation of their homes, but will face significant financial loss due to a drop in property values with no monetary compensation. But perhaps worse than these material losses, are the unknown health risks of living near high voltage power lines. A report from the California Department of Health Services (2002) revealed disturbing findings about the consequences of living in close proximity to Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF). The study showed increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult cancer, Lou Gehrig's disease, and miscarriage. There are also concerns about increased incidence of Alzheimer's disease. One would expect the rates to be magnified with the higher voltages of these

massive towers and lines. And who knows what other negative impacts may emerge to individuals with pre-existing medical conditions. As someone who worked in health care for two decades as an occupational therapist, I am gravely concerned about these health risks. The proposed power line route affects our whole community. In addition to health and financial consequences, there are environmental concerns. The Clark County GIS property website identifies the Segment #31 parcels as having geological, seismic and erosion hazard areas. It would seem unwise to add a large infrastructure to this area. I realize that BPA prefers the segment #31 route to keep its construction costs down, but I implore you to look beyond the easy solution and make the right moral choice. Please abandon this proposed segment route and choose one of the alternate routes which go through less populated areas, and would not affect as many individuals' homes, health and property values. What about using public lands to the east of us? Or burying the lines in populated areas? Or zig-zagging around isolated homes in more remote areas? Our community stands together and will fight the current proposal. Citizens shouldn't have to wait two years for the outcome of a study on this issue. Please abandon the segment #31 route now and pursue a more appropriate location. Sincerely, Ellen Poole Hockinson, WA

Communication ID: 12294

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: TINA M WELLS

Bonneville Power Administration I am writing in response to the proposed transmission line 31 with great concern. This would directly affect the life of my family as it would go right through the edge our backyard. We have always valued the country style life here in the foot-heals of the lovely Cascades Mountain Range. This is well developed neighborhood with many old farm houses and buildings. We were lucky to aquire our piece of land 21 years ago with an old barn and large old chicken building which are preserved and in use today, as a shop and woodshed. We built our home to look as if it has always been here and have raised a large family of nine children, and we still have two young children at home to raise. So, we have many memories here and would like to add to them with our growing family which includes seven grandchildren. This proposed line puts all of that in jeopardy. I have listened to the concerns of others who would be affected and have learned from studies that this size of line may also produce a health risk, especially for children. Please hear and consider the concerns and feelings I have conveyed and of all the others who would be affected. I urge you to please find a better way. Sincerely, Tina Wells

Communication ID: 12295

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: TAMRRA J BOWIE

I am against the proposed route 31 through Hockinson, WA

Communication ID: 12296

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: GAIL GREISZ, MARK H GREISZ

My family and I live within the scope of Segment 39 of the proposed 500kV power line. We are greatly concerned about the many negative effects this may have on our family's quality of life, including health, and on our home and its value. We wish to express our opposition to any expansion along segment 39, or any of the other new routes for that matter. We only support and believe the right thing is the replacement of existing towers on existing lines to accommodate the additional capacity. This is the only solution to not cause a negative impact of quality of life issues. We believe this matter should be looked at not only through financial or convenience aspects, but based upon what is best for the human lives it impacts. Thank you for your considerations.

Communication ID: 12297

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: ROGER D WELLS

THIS IS NOT SOMETHING I WOULD LIKE TO LOOK AT OR HEAR AS I 'AM SURE YOU WOULD NOT LIKE IT IN YOUR YARD AS WELL . MAYBE YOU SHOULD LOOK WHAT WOULD HAPPEN TO YOUR HOME VALUE IF THIS WAS IN YOUR AREA . THANK YOU FOR THINKING OF OTHERS .

Communication ID: 12298

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: GEORGE H KINSEY

In response to the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, our comments are annotated below. For formation purposes, our home is located on Map #108, about 1/4 of the way down from the top center just above where you have printed "Little Washougal River". Several questions were raised at the November 7 Hazel Dell open house that were never completely/satisfactorily answered. 1) What technologies have been developed over the past fifty plus years to more efficiently transmit electricity? 2) Why cannot existing 230kv lines be upgraded to 500kv lines? 3) Would the expense of putting the new lines underground on an existing or even a new right-of-way actually cost more in the long run? From all the literature that has been presented, it seems the BPA is only looking at the present (2012 when a decision will be made) and not the future. 500kv is what has been determined will be needed by 2014/2015. What will be needed by 2030 or 2050? If, for example, an underground facility is built now, even at additional expense, the infrastructure will be in place for future expansion at very little cost. There would even be a possibility of eliminating some current high tension lines/towers and restoring much of the natural beauty to the region. Additionally, much of the initial construction costs could be

recovered over time from lower maintenance costs since the new lines would not be exposed to the elements. Ten years ago, my wife and I built our dream home on the east side of Livingston Mountain. We look out over the Little Washougal Valley, the Columbia River Gorge and directly at Mount Hood. Under current BPA proposals, the view that we enjoy has the potential of being destroyed by a new power line -if not during the proposed expansion, then a future one. Our view is already partially impeded by the east/west power lines shown at the bottom of Map #108. The homeowners in our area do not need to see any more "airborne spaghetti". The BPA's proposal for a new above ground powerline is the easy way to resolve the current expansion need. However, with a little forethought, alternative measures to a new proposed powerline can be incorporated. If done correctly, the project could be used as a prototype for future projects around the country. The citizens of southwest Washington urge the BPA to re-evaluate the proposed new right-of-way and use those that already exist. If a new right-of-way is the only alternative, then it should be underground and built with provisions for future expansion.

Communication ID: 12299

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MICHAEL L ROGGENKAMP, MELINDA ROGGENKAMP

We have recently received documentation of the proposed New 500-kilovolt Electrical Transmission Line and various proposed routes that could be used. Our home at [address], is one of the routes that could be effected. So naturally you can understand that we have some major concerns on how this could impact our lives. First we have health concerns related to having high power electrical lines next to our home and family. What effects will it have on our land, the live stock, (horses, cows, and chickens), vegetables gardens, wildlife, and physical effects on us? Second, what impacts will this have on the current value of our home and property and will there be restrictions and limitations imposed on the current land use and building regulations? How will it effect our small family business ran from there? Third, is there compensation provisions in place for the loss of property use, small business use, or at its worse, if we lose the ability to live at our home completely? Our home and property is a testament to what a family can accomplish with love and hard work. We do not wish to relinquish any part or use of it, just for the sake of a new power line. We would appreciate more information regarding this project and answers to our concerns. Sincerely, Michael & Melinda Roggenkamp

Communication ID: 12300

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: SUSAN R HENDRICKSON

My areas of concern are: 1. BPA's apparent disregard for property owners affected by the expansion decision. This is evidenced by the short time frame provided for comments. Even with the time frame expanded to 12-14-09, this is too brief a time for private citizens to fully equip themselves with adequate information. My skeptic mind suspicions the BPA will go through the motions to make it look

as if they will listen to the public, when they most likely have a decision and route already pre-selected. With no regard for those of us in your target area. Benefit the many and heck with the few? Showing options for those in the upper quadrant of the map is an optimistic offer, but for those of us directly across from Troutdale, there is no choice in the matter. It does appear that BPA timed this when property values fell. Your multi-years of preparation compared to our two months to respond is certain evidence of a bully mentality. 2. According to your direction in this comment area = you don't want to hear our No vote. But that is exactly what most of us want to tell you. You are correct, we have no option to vote on this, BUT we do not want this expanded in our neighborhood. We do not want our property values affected. We do not want new unsightly, unhealthy, giant towers near our homes. Or worse, wires over our houses. We do not want a long wait to know what you are doing. We who purchased homes within any sight of the existing towers certainly viewed them as a neighborhood fixture. Yes, buyer beware... but living near an ogre doesn't mean being willing to accept a worse one. 3. Why no talk of buying those of us out at a fair market value? Buy our homes and property and let us move on. You state you will utilize eminent domain if necessary. The BPA will pay a paltry amount to take over what ever portion of our land that is needed? Individual home owners are held in limbo, not knowing how this will personally affect their property. Having knowledge the high towers will be near your neighborhood is not the same as knowing they will hum over your garage. 4. Let me get this right = project manager Mark Korsness is more concerned with marker balls showing in a wildlife refuge??? (the Columbian 10-29-09) That is why the route can't be across the Columbia??? Hmmmmm. Let it cross the river by Longview if indeed it is Oregon that needs this. Granted, no matter where this route is placed it will be unsightly, I understand this. I also understand no one really wants it in their line of sight or front door. Oh yeah, now I get it.... a raccoon's home is more important. ??? 5. It seems to me a case of Shame On You. I know nothing I think or say will change what the BPA will do. I can look on the map and see those of us in Camas are screwed. Regardless of a pep rally, or hire an attorney, or whine to the public, it is evident we are limited on how to fight this. I want to say Go Away. You won't. 6. I am aware my comments come from a provincial viewpoint and lack an informed foundation but make no mistake.... I am not a happy customer. 7. Wire slices sky Steel bolts jolt and rivet eyes Beauty grieves great loss suzanne hendrickson

Communication ID: 12301

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: HEIDI E HAHN-TROXLER

I have read on your website that you have a concern about locating a new power line within a close proximity to an existing power line, due to the potential to attract terrorist attack. I would like BPA to explain to me, why you think it is acceptable to put the proposed 500kv power line anywhere near a populated area, if you believe that it has the potential to become a terrorist target.

Communication ID: 12302

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: HEIDI E HAHN-TROXLER

As a homeowner who lives within 600 feet of a proposed line, I am extremely concerned about the health effects of a 500kv high power line. I have a family member who developed thyroid cancer at the age of 30, after living in a neighborhood very close to power lines that were lower kv. She is now 34 and will live the rest of her life on various cancer medications/treatments and with regular doctor visits and tests. Three other neighbors (also in their 30's) also developed thyroid cancer and two have them have already died. What you cite as "inconclusive evidence" for any harmful effects of electromagnetic fields (EMFs) by living in the proximity of a high voltage line, does not mean that it is not so. Living with this fear will be stifling and the fact that it is a real possibility to develop cancer due to these power lines would leave me with no choice but to leave a home that my husband and I have poured our hearts into for the past 8 years....in addition to all of our retirement dollars. This is time and money that we would never recover, if forced to make the unthinkable choice of leaving our home that we expected to live out our final days in. We chose our home over another that was close to the power lines in Vancouver, because we did not want to risk our health. Prevention magazine has just published an extensive article (attached), citing many studies by epidemiologists that indicate very serious issues with exposure to EMFs. It is unthinkable to me, that BPA would consider putting in a 500kv line anywhere near a populated area. Displacing a single family should not be an option, when there is vacant land further East of the current options that would not carry the following adverse affects: health risks, safety risks (wind, fire, ice, terrorist attacks, etc.), damage to sensitive environmental areas, displacement of families, devastating damage to the value of thousands of homes/properties in an already sinking economy (in addition to the devaluation of the Clark County tax base) and complete destruction of some of the most scenic and historic areas in Clark County. If constructed through our proposed section (31), these lines would be taller than my home (which sits on top of Spring Hill). I can't even imagine losing our unobstructed view of the Cascade foothills; which stretches out to the Columbia River. If we are forced to sell (to safeguard our health); there is no way that we would be able to sell our home for even 50% of what it is currently worth. We would literally lose 8 years of hard work and hundreds of thousands of dollars of our retirement funds that were put into renovating our home. I am very upset that we were not "officially" notified of this project by the BPA, because our property is 600' away from [address]. I can not understand the logic that indicates my home, my health, my concerns, my view and the effects of this on me personally, are not worthy of being notified of your project. I learned about this from my neighbor who was notified. I have recently been told that you were not "required" to notify property owners beyond 500', if that 500' was on an existing easement or right of way; however, the "existing easement" is NOT owned by BPA and I would like to know if this is a violation of NEPA requirements for notification. Another major concern that I have, is that this line is being proposed to assist in the transfer of power from Canada to California. The United States should not, under any circumstances, sacrifice the health, homes, retirements, livelihoods, taxes of any US citizen....for the benefit of another country. Likewise, as Washingtonians, we should not be forced into this devastating sacrifice for the benefit of another state. With newer alternative technologies available that would allow BPA to place these high voltage lines underground (American Superconductor and Sea Breeze Pacific),

there should be no question that this should be a serious consideration. I recognize that cost for this type of option is an issue; however, sacrificing our health and homes should be considered a greater cost. This should also be a serious option, due to the fact that you can use existing easements (owned by BPA) that would allow you to bury the new lines underground and within only a 25' easement; which would eliminate any cost of acquiring new property or easements. I want to request copies of all current and future analysis, reports, communications (internal and external) that evaluate underground options. I feel sick to my stomach every day, thinking about losing my home and I know that most other people who are aware of this project feel the same way. We do not want to have to live with this fear and anxiety for the next 2 years, while waiting for BPA to make their "official" announcement of the EIS results. We would like to be notified (personally and publically) whenever there are sections that are being dropped from consideration or other routes are being added into consideration. Finally, as I talk to friends, neighbors, local business owners, etc., about this project, I am still finding on a daily basis, people who are not aware of what is being proposed. There has not been adequate public notification and the timeline to provide BPA with comments has been too short and offered to us at a time of year when most families have their focus on holidays, travel and completion of vital year-end business. I believe that due to the extreme nature of the potential detrimental effects of this project on tens of thousands of families and business owners, it is imperative for BPA to extend the Scoping period by another 60 days and for BPA to hold a large open public meeting, so that ALL affected will know about it and have an adequate timeframe to respond in. If you do ever mail me any correspondence, it must be addressed to my PO Box (the USPS will not deliver to my physical address); which is [address] Sincerely, Heidi Hahn-Troxler

Communication ID: 12303

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JEANNE KOJIS,JOHN KOJIS

December 13, 2009 From the BPA website: The Bonneville Power Administration's core values are Trustworthy Stewardship As stewards of the FCRPS, we are entrusted with the responsibility to manage resources of great value for the benefit of others. We are trusted when others believe in and are willing to rely upon our integrity and ability. To be worthy of trust we must: Consistently adhere to the highest ethical and professional standards Obtain the greatest value from the FCRPS for the people of the region Collaborate with those we serve as we make our decisions Communicate clearly, forthrightly and fully Hold ourselves accountable for performance on our commitments by aligning our words and actions. Collaborative Relationships Trustworthiness grows out of a collaborative approach to relationships. Internally we must collaborate across organizational lines to maximize the value we bring to the region. Externally we work with many stakeholders who have conflicting needs and interests. Through collaboration we discover and implement the best possible long-term solutions. This approach of creating together requires: Taking time to listen and understand each other's viewpoints, issues, and concerns Searching respectfully for mutually beneficial solutions Sharing and explaining decisions in a timely fashion Operational Excellence Operational excellence is a cornerstone of delivering on the four

pillars of our strategic objectives (system reliability, low rates, environmental stewardship and regional accountability) and will place us among the best electric utilities in the nation. Operational excellence requires: Continual review and improvement of standardized systems, processes and controls
Measurement of our accomplishments against clearly-defined and benchmarked performance standards
Investment in our people
Focus on ease of doing business with customers and with each other
We are very concerned that the process of development and decisions up to this point in the I-5 Corridor Power Line Project Plans fly in the face of these values. The consequence of that discord puts the homes, health, and finances of hundreds if not thousands of Clark County residents at risk of possible ruin. The infrastructure of our energy transmission system is clearly important. It can however be strengthened without endangering the communities the BPA exists to serve. There are more than dollars at stake here if we actually live by our values. Personally, our property, our investment, our HOME, would be directly and irreversibly devastated by the development of segment 31. We have lived here for 20 years. Our concerns however, are also for every neighbor, and their neighbors, on every route.

PURPOSE OF COMMENTS The comments here are issues we want to see addressed directly in the development of the I-5 Corridor Power Line Project Plans and Environmental Impact Statement. Please note our concerns are not limited to proposed segment 31 which would severely impact our property. We reserve the right to supplement these comments, as appropriate, and to comment on and appeal, as necessary, any final decision of the BPA as it prepares and issues the draft and final EIS and the Record of Decision for this proposed expansion and/or extension of its transmission system Please make sure that we are added to any mailing list or other notification means so that we can stay aware of this project through all phases.

ISSUES MAKING THE CASE The plan and EIS should clearly document the need for the power. • What are all of the markets to be served by these new lines? • What are the current and projected needs (5, 10 and 20 years out from completion) for electric power for each of those markets? • What is the status of the current grid system; are there good, better, best scenarios for meeting need? • Explain in detail how this will be financed. • Explain the track record of the BPA on such funding. • Explain how the funding would be repaid, and by whom. • Explain who would benefit and specifically how. To get this far, the BPA obviously has this information. Requests for the planning document have been refused local residents. The public you exist to serve needs that information. The people you are asking to sacrifice their homes, and possibly their health, for the common good deserve to know what exactly why.

HEALTH The 1998 NIEHS study on BPA's website states that there is some scientific evidence for electromagnetic fields (EMF) having adverse health effects from associations with childhood leukemia and chronic lymphocytic leukemia concluding that EMF exposure cannot be recognized as entirely safe. A 2002 study (not on the BPA site) performed by the California Department of Health Services concluded that persons living in close proximity to EMF were at increased risk for childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's disease and miscarriage. A 2007 study (also not on the BPA site) published in Australia by R. M. Lowenthal further concluded that living within 328 yards of high voltage power lines puts adults at over 2x increased risk and children at 5x greater risk of developing cancer than those who do not live near high voltage power lines. *It is critical to recognize that neither of these studies considered transmission lines as powerful as the 500 KV lines proposed. There is also scientific evidence of adverse effects on normal operation of implanted medical devices such as pacemakers and defibrillators due to EMF from high voltage transmission lines to warrant significant concern. High

voltage power lines should never be constructed in populated areas. According to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) there is no known barrier to stop the EMF. The EPA states "people concerned about possible health risks from power lines can reduce their exposure by: increasing the distance between you and the source and limiting the time spent around the source." Living in the shadow of the towers, they will have no protection. All photos provided by the BPA are of projects constructed on open land, not through existing neighborhoods. What other neighborhoods or densely occupied areas have such lines? We do not want to be BPA's guinea pig for this type of project. It is an experiment with great risk. We are appalled, angry and deeply saddened that this is even suggested. This is how our government acts in service to the public? • The BPA needs to prove children, seniors, and healthy adults will be safe living 75 feet from a 500 KV line capable of transmitting 1400 mega-watts of power as they suggest. The burden of proof needs to be on the BPA. No one questioning putting these lines through populated areas wants to be proved 'right' but the death of a child. The only responsible and ethical decision on the part of the BPA is to locate the lines as far from populated areas as possible – on public land. HERBICIDES Please clarify in detail: • What are the plans for vegetation management under transmission easement lines? • Who has the responsibility to deal with vegetation growing under power lines that is less than 14 feet in height? • More than 14 feet in height? • In the plan – who does the work? Who pays for the work? What about instances where land is owned by senior citizens or others unable to do the physical labor? • What is the position BPA takes on invasive species and weeds such as Scotch Broom and tall blackberry vines? These invasive species take advantage of the additional sunlight in the easement areas in spreading their growth. • What herbicides will be used? • What independent testing has been done to ensure wells will not be contaminated? • Will the BPA pay for annual (or more frequent) well testing and remediation of issues including new wells or providing other water supplies? We have taken great care to not use pesticides or herbicides on our property for the 20 years we have lived here. The prior residents had an organic garden and likewise eschewed the use of such products. Any change will be a radical departure from the way we have heretofore stewarded our land. PROPERTY VALUES Clark County is at 13.7% unemployment, with the highest foreclosure rate in the State of Washington. To have the BPA step in at this time with yet another threat to the financial and emotional health and stability of our community borders on predatory. • We have been told that BPA does not include decreased property values as a "cost" when comparing alternative routes. Why and how was this decision made? • Decreased values for properties directly affected as well as neighboring areas has a very tangible cost to individual homeowners as well as to the community tax base. County assessors and real estate studies can likely provide cost estimate numbers which should be taken into account as part of the real cost of a line. • In an age of telecommuting and small home entrepreneurs, many people in the potentially affected areas work at home, depending on reliable Internet access for their livelihood. Internet access and cell phone coverage are regularly disrupted by the presence of transmission lines. Is the BPA prepared to compensate those individuals and families for the loss of their income? This is a hidden, but very real cost on populated lines. • Please explain how each component of a socio-economic analysis is considered. • Also include the numbers of people who move away from an area in such a situation and the demographic profile of an area both before and after similar situations. What are the BPA's ethical considerations if the majority of remaining residents subject to environmental degradation, and toxic exposure are low income? We believe that particularly in a very

tough economy, these decisions have social justice implications. ENVIRONMENT Creating the equivalent of a 6-lane freeway populated with 15-story towers will decimate our populated natural areas, including vegetation, wildlife and waterways. The overall rural character of the area within and adjacent to many of the proposed lines is exactly what makes Clark County a desirable place to live. o We expect the EIS will itemize the current and anticipated impacts on vegetation, wildlife and waterways for all proposed lines. TRANSPARENCY AND PUBLIC PROCESS Although we appreciate the extension of the scoping comment period, we are not encouraged that it took two senators and a congressman to make that happen. Limited outreach and information was provided during the onset of this project. Because requests for public information are not responded to, and due to the hurried nature of this public process, we ask that the BPA extend the public comment period to March 31, 2010. (Re-read those values statements before telling me why you cannot do so.) Please provide us with the cut-off date for others providing comments and what groups of individuals, interests or public officials that includes. We further request that the BPA resend letters to all of the original recipients and additionally include all property owners in at least a one-mile radius for all proposed lines. • We ask that the BPA comply with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) by sharing with the public the actions and decisions resulting from BPA's consultations with federal, tribal, state and local entities. • Why is all of this more current information on health studies not included on the BPA site? • If you are considering all the information to make a neutral decision based on the best interest of area residents – why are not all the facts available to us as well? • The proposed scope of the EIS appears to be limited to only one Columbia River crossing alignment that is located in or near heavily populated areas in Camas. Please explain why there are no alternative alignments located east of that proposed crossing. There is no explanation for that limitation in alternatives, and the EIS proposal is thus deficient in that regard. • The EIS should include study of an underground transmission system, as an alternative to the proposed towers. Failing to consider this or other alternatives technologies that could minimize or eliminate EMF hazards poses the BPA as reckless inconsideration of the public's health. There is a project in New Mexico using such lines. Governor Bill Richardson heralds it as a great advance for energy and the environment. • Failure to document a thorough study of such options further relegates Washington residents to living with 100-year old technology in perpetuity. • The EIS should specifically address this issue of the 100 or 150-foot rights of way – how this was arrived at and why with an increase in voltage they are seeking to set a precedent rather than less intrusive and safer alternative alignments. • Please note that we do not consider even 300 feet right of way 'safe' and so are incredulous that half of that be acceptable to a government agency responsible to the residents of four states. • Explain in detail what happens when the lines cross the Columbia River. Are there Oregon alternatives or are the Washington options limited by a prior decision affecting Oregon? o If so, how was the decision made about Oregon options, and what public comment was considered? O If the Oregon route was set first, please explain how this should not be interpreted as the needs of Oregonians having more weight than those of Washington residents. It would seem that the options of all should be fit together to achieve the least intrusive outcome. O Note: at times some of our children have resided in Portland; do not interpret this as a 'us' versus 'them' request – but an effort to understand your process and priorities. ALTERNATIVES I could not believe it when I read that the reasons given for not using the present corridor were landslides, forest fires and plane crashes. Please document: • Landslide hazards on the section of the corridor in

question • The forests on the section of the corridor in question that are significant enough to pose a threat and estimated response times • The numbers of plane crashed along that corridor over the last 10 years that would have potentially impacted such lines • Studies from local airports that these lines are an issue. • By what information and decision making process was the original inclusion of this same-corridor alternative route scrapped? • Was an eastern option primarily through public lands ever considered? By what information and decision making process was it removed? • We are aware the state uses the timber from DNR lands to provide some support for schools. We seriously doubt educators would trade the health of children for a building. The timber sales are not sacred. Human life is. The firebreak provided by the transmission easement may provide better management for those lands. It is my understanding some fire departments have requested a firebreak. What has been done to explore this option? What is the percentage of timber sales that might be affected in any given year? Is it greater or less than the amount the BPA will set aside to deal with lawsuits? • Removing private homeowners from the tax base also reduces school support. Giving schools as a reason for not selecting the DNR lands would likely result in a backlash for area districts that already struggle to pass bonds and levies. To truly prioritize our state's children – put them as far as possible from the lines. Both Hockinson and Camas schools are adversely affected by potential line placement. • Is underground an option? Is underground more secure? • If underground is considered too expensive where is the cost data to support that statement? What is the cost per mile ratio of the tower line to an underground line? Does the cost data include ALL of the costs to the community – not just directly invoiced to the BPA? • The 100-foot Pacific Corp right of way on Line 31 was purchased in 1958 from the small number of landowners then in the area. The population, the number of homes and the infrastructure investment in schools, etc. are much greater 50 years later. The original 100 yards, intended for telephone or neighborhood utility poles are nowhere near the right of way needed to limit electro magnetic interference (The State of CA recommends a line use a 300-wide right of way). The 50-year old easements were made in good faith with a utility they could trust. Finally, please provide a schedule of when and where such lines will be considered in other parts of the BPA's territory. I ask forgiveness of my colleagues across the community from whom I borrowed a particularly well-said phrase or two. Of the BPA -- we ask that you truly take your values to heart and action. Jeanne and John Kojis

Communication ID: 12304

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: SCOTT A RITENBURGH

To whom it may concern, According to the maps of the proposed power line route, the lines will run directly over the 2 acres in the front of my home, the home we purchased so that our now 8 year old son could be free from other environmental hazards. Given there are so many other possible routes that have less private citizen impact, it's clear that BPA is just another big business that is ONLY concerned about the \$\$, and not the individuals that make up this great part of the country. A bit more install \$\$ might actually preserve our dreams. BPA's 'easement or evict' policy is literally legal robbery! Proof in point is the lack of reimbursement for declining property value because of this project. Just another big

business that steals value/money from private citizens. My home will be worth less if I go to sell after the projects completion than when I purchased several years ago! So much for the American dream. FYI, seems to quiet the consensus that private citizens won't be signing easements as individuals I know from Portland up to Kalama will be doing everything they can legally to prevent #31 from getting started. I know that I've worked so hard to provide for my family to let big business crush our dreams. Scott Ritenburgh

Communication ID: 12305

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: CONCERNED CITIZENS, BHRIGHA L MURPHY

December 14, 2009 To: Mark Korsness, Project Manager for the BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project
This letter is being written on behalf of thousands of concerned citizens in Clark and Cowlitz Counties in Washington State. We are strongly opposed to the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project route segments as currently proposed. The official Public Comment Period that is scheduled to end on 12/14/09 must be extended an additional 60 days to allow consideration of our viable routes, all with non-populated paths. The following is an outline of our grave serious concerns and we demand that the BPA make a winning case for the necessity and viability of their proposed project. California is currently bankrupt and the Federal Government is deeply in debt. If the alternative energy-marketing concept collapses, who pays for the new grid? The Washington State Ratepayers and the Bond Holders paid for the WPPSS (Washington Public Power Supply System) fiasco. WPPSS was the last grand scheme to send massive new amounts of power to California. WPPSS was an utter disaster and ended as the largest municipal bond failure in history. Washington Ratepayers are still paying for it. Part of the definition of going "Green" is that power is to be produced where it is used. Explain why ravaging homes, small farms, and timberlands with towers and transmission lines in the State of Washington to send "Green" power to California makes "Green" sense? We are extremely concerned about the health risks associated with High Voltage transmission lines. A series of epidemiological studies worldwide have documented a doubling of the risk of childhood leukemia for children 0-5 years old that lived within 600 ft of high voltage power lines. The most current independent scientific information available continues to reinforce these results and identifies a tripled rate of delayed lymph cancer for adults who were exposed as children 0-15 years old. It is important to note that the proposed transmission lines of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would carry electrical loads twice as large as those used for most of the available studies worldwide. California and Connecticut have long adopted precautionary approaches to reduce possible EMF health risks. The BPA is proposing to place a 500 KV transmission line within 150 feet of many homes. The BPA does at least express concern for individuals with pacemakers which, to a minimal degree, acknowledges that human health is compromised by living within the proximity of high levels of EMF. Power line construction, operation and maintenance on the proposed segments would adversely impact plant and animal biodiversity in the region. For example, in Cowlitz County, segments 11 and 10 would place at risk the habitat of the Coweeman River fall Chinook. This is a genetically distinct stock listed as threatened since 1998 by the U.S Endangered Species Act. This salmon run is used

as stock by NOAA fisheries for the management of over twenty naturally produced "Tule" fall Chinook populations in the lower Columbia River. All of the proposed project segments of east Clark County represent models of the kind of timberland, small farm, and wetlands protection, close to an urban area, that is idealized in the most forward looking environmental policies. BPA has a track record of offering some mitigation during the planning, design and construction phases of a project like this, primarily to quiet public objections, but they have been far less attentive to such concerns after the line is built. We have three post-construction concerns regarding this proposed project regardless of the path that is chosen: 1) Creating, clearing and opening a long, very wide right-of-way through forested areas, where none exist now, creates a major negative affect concerning the environment. Each of the proposed routes pass through sensitive water shed areas. Once built, the ROW will have to be maintained by the clearing of any vegetation that may impair electrical clearances to the line. BPA has typically used highly toxic, powerful, and persistent herbicides in their ROW maintenance practices. Will BPA commit in writing, to never using any such chemical or synthetic herbicides in maintaining the right-of-way? 2) An extensive system of new all-weather, permanent access roads will be necessary along the ROW to operate and maintain this new line. Building such an access road system in an area where none exist opens undisturbed land to all sorts of problems including trespassing, vandalism, criminal activity, drug operations, transient camps, trash dumping, game poaching, etc. Installing gates across access roads does little or nothing to deter such activity. What measures will BPA take to ensure the security of any new access roads from misuse and protect private property along their access roads? 3) What measures will BPA take to mitigate, down to zero, the degradation of TV and radio signals to the rural, fringe areas that result from the radio frequency interference (RFI) generated by a 500-kV transmission line? The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) has all but ignored NEPA directives for the I-5 project. Many people along the PP&L ROW were not provided with proper notification, given the fact that BPA does not yet own that ROW. To effectively follow NEPA, BPA needs to extend the comment period, notify the many affected owners who have not been properly notified, and collaborate with local entities, governments and citizens groups to come up with reasonable alternatives before the EIS begins. BPA has gone through the motions of public comments, using staged open houses instead of public meetings, and has never met with any representative(s) of the citizenry to get their input. BPA has withheld information requested in writing (e.g. on the strength of the Electromagnetic Field (EMF) of the very powerful proposed 500 kV lines, other alternatives once considered, and other topics), thereby keeping affected and interested citizens from fully participating. In addition, BPA committed, and then reneged on providing even preliminary disclosure forms required for public review of the "Draft Planning Report" for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement (9/07/2007), and more recent drafts or amendments explaining the elimination of facility upgrades involving existing BPA right-of-ways (ROW's). In addition, BPA attempted to levy a \$3,000 surcharge to provide documents requested under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), BPA is thus denying information access to the homeowners & ratepayers who will eventually fund this project. We demand that BPA, explore alternative paths for the transmission line. The BPA must remove all existing proposed routes for the proposed 500 KV transmission line from consideration, and construction must be considered either: 1) further east of any the currently proposed segments and remain exclusively on public or state lands; or 2) BPA must include an evaluation of a route roughly paralleling existing corridors between "Paul, Alston and Pearl" and then

commence a completely new public scoping process. This route disrupts virtually no citizenry and would be quickest to build. In addition, we demand that the BPA evaluate the alternative of using new technologies that would run superconductor cables underground or under the ocean and allow public comment/input into that analysis. These newer technologies (American Superconductor and Sea Breeze Pacific) are available now, have been in use for over 6 years, and would potentially mitigate the following concerns: 1) The need to condemn properties through eminent domain and/or to leave homes in the shadow of the 150' high-voltage towers; 2) Safety and security concerns over becoming a terrorist target and/or the safety risks of high-voltage power lines that are damaged by fire or an ice or windstorm; 3) Health risks that are believed to cause various cancers due to extended exposure to EMFs. In conclusion, the public comment period must be extended for at least an additional 60 days. The requested information must be made available free of charge under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). The BPA must consider alternative paths especially further east of the proposed Line 29. The BPA must consider alternative new technologies that would not be harmful to humans, animals and the environment. Sincerely, Bhrigha Murphy

Communication ID: 12306

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: MICHELE BLACK,TOM BLACK

My husband and I live in The Highlands at Pleasant Valley neighborhood and are one of the homes that are within a few feet from the existing and proposed towers and lines. First, we are disgusted that the PBA has put homeowners in the position of effectively tying up there assets for the next 18 months until the final routing decision is made. In this terrible economy, you have prevented many of us from being able to sale our homes with this looming over us. With that said, please know that we are strongly opposed to the BPA placing high voltage power lines and towers in the proposed route along Interstate 5 in the most highly populated area of Clark County. We attended one of the public forums and were not convinced that there would not be potential health issues associated with living next to the lines and that our property values would not be significantly negatively impacted. If you put these lines along side of our neighborhood, we feel that we have no choice but to move because the risk to the health of our children is not worth it to us. We contacted a real estate professional and she estimates that our home value would be reduced by as much as \$100,000. It stands to reason that the logical route would be to put the lines away from heavily populated ares; running through east Clark County. When there is an alternative route that would impact fewer people, then why not use it? Tom and Michele Black [address]

Communication ID: 12307

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: LOU DOCKENFRICKEL

Yes my name is Lou Dockenfrickel, I live on [address]. Regarding that new power line, I am against that I think it's going to reduce our property value. I receive your mail and it's about segment 39. That's all I have to say right now. Thank you.

Communication ID: 12308

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: CAROLYN N KOHLENBERGER

As a resident of Northern Clark County living near two proposed routes for transmission lines, I would like to state my objection to their placement in populated areas east of Battle Ground Lake and going through Hockinson. The area you have delineated is filled with private homes and properties, many of which are home-based businesses, as well (we have a home-based business). In addition, one of the lines to our west will go through an area where the battle took place where Chief Umtuch was killed. This was the battle after which Battle Ground was named. We have been residents of this area for over 10 years. We purchased our home believing we were making an investment in a peaceful, healing lifestyle (my husband has treatable, but incurable, cancer). We worked hard and sacrificed for 25 years to be able to buy a property in a beautiful valley that you are now proposing to destroy. Powerlines are essential, but they have usually been constructed on more sparsely populated lands before established development took place. Please take another route rather than destroying the homes and livelihood of thousands of Clark County residents.

Communication ID: 12309

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: SARA PURSLEY, RON PURSLEY

Comments on the BPA I-5 Corridor Project This project has the potential to negatively impact our business. We have a tree farm that is in the zone marked for a possible transmission line. Any land under a transmission line is unusable for growing timber and has little other potential uses, especially if it is not level. All our timber land is intensively managed with Precommercial thinning and other activities which are expensive and time consuming. You should expect to pay at least twice as much to disturb one of these stands than an unmanaged stand. Many of the WFFA (Washington Farm Forestry Association) members have intensively managed stands as well. Because of some of your danger tree rules, the easement has the potential to affect a larger swath than what is directly under the power line. If you should take out part of our larger timber, we would expect top of the market price since we only cut on a very good market. Several comments have already been made by others regarding the ill health effects of emfs. Switzerland University studies show double of the risk of having Alzheimer's Disease by living within 50 meters of a high voltage overhead line for fifteen years. Also, there have been studies linking high voltage power lines to childhood leukemia. Land that is the buffer area on either side of the transmission line needs to be purchased by the BPA to prevent someone from unwitting living close to a

power line. The ill health effects, restrictions on land use make the property and surrounding area undesirable for many people. Sincerely, Ron and Sara Pursley [address]

Communication ID: 12310

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MIKE J BOWIE

I'm against the proposed route 31 through Hockinson. Thank you

Communication ID: 12311

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: BRUCE F VANDERPLOEG,CAROL VANDERPLOEG

We have commented previously, and would like to add following: We will hold you responsible for any damages caused to our property or water supply by investigation of, or construction of segment 37 and adjacent segments of this project at or near the South end of our property. Will you assure us that any damages will be fully compensated?

Communication ID: 12312

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: KELLY A ONEILL

This proposal is outrageous!! I did not receive anything in the mail from you! We live in the Black Hawks Subdivision, an upper end neighborhood of Battle Ground. The project you propose will skirt the area just a couple blocks from our home. Our home is our retirement investment. We bought this house because of its location; the surrounding landscape, its trees and overall scenery!! You will not be able to hide or blend a 500 Kv line a few blocks from our home, in our subdivision!! You will not meet scenery management laws!! Keep your alternative routes close to I-5. I am so angry. First, the fact that I just found out about it today, and second that this route is proposed behind our home. I use to work for a planning company in Phoenix; I worked solely on 500 Kv transmission corridors and visuals. So get ready for a real fight! (I wrote this from my work e-mail-please respond to my personal e-mail

Communication ID: 12313

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: ADAM I HASPIEL

Powerline #31 You scoping process is horrible, and until just today I found legible maps showing the

power line within 1000 feet of my house. This is too close to rural residents. I bought this property specifically to avoid cancer causing high voltage powerlines. Other issues include: Loss of property value; noise; electrical fields, A report shows EMFs can disturb the production of the hormone melatonin, which is linked with sleep patterns. It said there was strong evidence that children exposed to EMFs had a higher risk of leukemia. This follows on the heels of three epidemiological reports released in 1994. One indicated a tie between occupational exposure to EMFs and Alzheimer' s disease. Another suggested a link with Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (SIDS). The third study indicated a tie with Amyotrophic lateralsclerosis. I DO NOT WANT THIS POWERLINE ANYWHERE NEAR ME. I VOTE NO ACTION. This power line does not even provide power for our area. You should move this power line far to the east where there are less people affected. Still I vote NO ACTION.

Communication ID: 12314

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: LYLE L ABERTNATHY

When I bought the property we live on I knew and acknowledged that there was a PP&L easement on the west side of our property. But the line BP it is proposing is 150 ft. wide. The current easement is 100ft. This new line is totally unacceptable. I'm very worried about the health hazards i.e. The large amount of electricity that will be going through our place, also the herbicides that will be used to keep all vegetation down.

The only logical path for the powerline project be to the east through Weyerhaeuser and state lands. They would be hardly any impact on the citizens of Clark county.

Communication ID: 12315

Date: 11/16/2009

Name: MIKE GINTER,SALLY GINTER

Re: Proposed BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

I am writing as a concerned citizen for my family, community and county at large. I live in Hockinson, WA part of Clark County. I was informed a few weeks ago that BPA has proposed a high voltage, 150-foot tower power line right through my neighborhood (Segment #31). We were NOT notified of this proposed project via mail because our property line is only a few feet from the easement. Therefore, this proposal not only affects the 8000+ properties within the easement boundaries, but many others who border it. Each property owner has invested their life savings into homes & property that will be taken away or greatly depreciated. In addition, with the construction of these lines, a significant decrease in the tax base for the community schools and other Clark county governmental services will

occur (fire and sheriff). It is shocking that a branch of MY government has the right to harm fellow citizens.

These 150-foot high, 500 kilovolt towers will become part of my children's play yard and segment line #31 runs right through property that is a proposed new Hockinson school site. In 2002, the California Department of Health Services performed a study that concluded that living in close proximity to electric and magnetic fields (EMF) can cause an increase risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's disease and miscarriage. Having these lines over a school site can certainly affect the children in our community. So both adults and children's health are affected which adds up to a lot of citizens.

Additionally, the Clark County GIS property website has identified Segment #31 ROW parcels as having geological, seismic and erosion hazard areas.

There are other options east of Segment #31, that run north/south and go through public, forested land. If BPA used segments 28-30 or 32-34 not as many individual's lives will be disrupted or their health threatened. These may not be the cheapest routes, but they do not affect as many individuals health, property values and living conditions.

What is most disturbing about all the power line proposals is that we understand the power generated and transmitted along these lines is for Oregon and California, not for our county or state. Why is our life, health and property being threatened for the benefit of another state?

I am asking for your support to prevent BPA Segment #31 to be used as viable path for the high voltage power lines. Support us! Support our community!

NO BPA Segment #31.

Thanks,

Communication ID: 12316

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: MARIA THOMAS V RAY

I represent and write on behalf of Dr. John Simmons and his family, who own property located adjacent to and potentially within a portion of the projected path of the proposed Segment #50 of the BPA's proposed 500kilovolt transmission line. Dr. Simmons recognizes that the BPA is soliciting at this time only "scoping comments" limited to the planned Environmental Impact Study (EIS) from the public. In that regard, his comments are directly to the planned EIS as a whole, and are not limited solely to that proposed segment which would impact his property. Dr. Simmons hereby reserves his right to supplement these comments, as appropriate, and to comment on and appeal, as necessary, any final decision of the BPA as it prepares and issues the draft and final EIS and the Record of Decision for this proposed expansion and/or extension of its transmission system.

EIS Scoping Comments

1: The proposed scope of the Environmental Impact Study for this project appears to be limited to considering only one Columbia River crossing alignment that is located in or near heavily populated areas in Camas. Alternative alignments located east of that proposed crossing are not considered. There is no explanation for that limitation in alternatives, and the EIS proposal is thus deficient in that regard.

2: The EIS should consider the use of underground or DC transmission cables, as an alternative to the proposed aerial transmission line(s). Any failure to consider such alternatives inappropriately limits consideration of technologies that could minimize or eliminate EMF hazards and also fails to address emerging "smart grid" designs that are better suited to DC systems.

3: The proposed alignment appears to incorporate segments that are limited to 150 foot rights of way. The EIS should address this issue, as in our experience there is little or no precedent for such a narrow alignment. We are informed that 500KV power lines require at least a 200 foot right of way, and in some cases can be located no closer than 250 feet from the nearest occupied building. The EIS should specifically address this issue. See Comment 5, below.

4: Some of the land lying under the proposed power line is used by grazing animals. The impact of EMF should be assessed within the EIS. In that regard, Dr. Simmons offers the following information as a starting point, but other such credible studies exist and the EIS should not be limited in this regard. (c.f.<http://www.nextup.org/pdf/AFPjudgmentElectromagneticRadiationPowerLineDiseaseAnimals14112008.pdf>.. See, <http://www.stop-tht.org/Citizen-s-Survey-Living-witha.html> with the English version of the survey at:http://www.stoptht.org/IMG/pdf/090219_living_with_a_very_high_voltage_power_line.pdf Also see <http://www.stoptanc.com>)

5: With regard to proposed segment #50, it appears that only a 100 foot right of way is proposed, and it is proposed to traverse a portion of a section of land planned to be annexed by the city of Camas for commercial use. Other sections of that area include areas that are densely populated and the proposed alignment passes within 500 feet of the new Camas High School. For all of the reasons listed above as legitimate areas needing further inquiry, the EIS should address the above issues in light of other less intrusive and safer alternative alignments.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully submitted.

Christopher L. Reive

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: RANDY INGRAM, MARIANNE INGRAM

To: Bonneville Power Administration

Re: No on segment #31

This letter is being written to make a plea to BPA to select a route other than route 31 for the I-5 Corridor project.

My wife, 3 children and I have lived in our current home for the past 19 years.

When we purchased this property in 1990, we thoroughly investigated the possibility of high-voltage transmission line construction on PP&L's Swift-Troutdale easement.

After numerous interviews with PP&L employees, (all documented) we determined that:

- a. The original easement was granted specifically to transport power from the Swift hydro project on the Lewis River in Washington to Troutdale Oregon. Since the amount of power generated by the Swift project was so small, it could be transported via service lines to existing infrastructure, negating the need for the easement.
- b. Since the easement was only 100' wide, the maximum line that could be built was a single pole, 3-wire system for transporting 115kVA. The PP&L engineer at that time indicated that a minimum easement of 200' would be necessary to carry a 500 KVA high voltage line. (now we understand that 150' is required)
- c. The easement was granted in 1958. According to our attorney at the time, if an easement of this type is not built upon in 50 years, there is a strong legal argument for abandonment.

We did this investigation to satisfy our selves that lines would not be built because;

- a. We were concerned with health risks of high voltage transmissions lines. Health concerns have not been disproven, and research evidence strongly suggests a linkage to many health issues. See References*.
- b. We did not want the obnoxious visual and auditory pollution of a high voltage power line on our property.

Today, our three children are grown. They have left our house and are in the process of completing college. My employer has indicated that in the near future, they will be closing the local site. These factors have contributed to our desire to sell our property.

Unfortunately, the BPA process is presently resulting in the inability to obtain reasonable market value for our home. Nobody wants to purchase a home where a high-voltage line will cover over ½ of the 2.5 acre property. Also, our beautiful sweeping eastern view is an aesthetically pleasing asset to the value of

our land. A 150 ft 500KVA high-voltage tower more than negates the positives of this view. Instead of a pleasant summer evening on our deck with friends with the wind blowing through a beautiful stand of large fir trees, the trees will be cut down and we will have the hum, crackle and pop of high voltage lines, mere feet from our deck. The expanded easement would end up on our septic system and be approximately 10' from our home.

BPA is holding tax-paying homeowners hostage to the process. Home values are decimated and we will be unable to get fair value for our homes until at least 2 and ½ years from now, when hopefully, the process will conclude that the new route should;

a. (most logical) Be located as far away from the greatest population as possible, impacting the least number of homeowners.

Or

b. Utilize BPA's current easement along the I-5 corridor, thus impacting the least number of people. (This option replaces an existing 115 KVA line with a 500 KVA line)

The people whose homes are under the expansion of BPA's easement are the lucky ones. They can take BPA's money, buy a house in a new neighborhood and move on with their lives. Homeowners such as us whose homes are not directly under the easement will effectively lose their homes as well. Home values will be reduced by 30-50%. This represents much of our life's savings. Not to mention the health risks.

BPA does not own this easement. If they choose route 31, they will have to:

- a. Purchase the easement from PacifiCorp/Rocky Mountain Power
- b. Expand the easement by 50 feet
- c. Purchase homes that are now within the new easement boundaries
- d. Address the numerous lawsuits that will be brought forth by negatively impacted taxpayers.

Property values decimated

Homeowner families significantly impacted

Neighborhoods destroyed

There must be a better way.

Please choose another route that impacts fewer homes and make this choice in a timely fashion

Sincerely,

Randy and Marianne Ingram

Communication ID: 12318

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: PATRICK BORUNDA

Please have your environmental studies look at:

My wellhead is directly under what will be the westernmost line of a transmission tower centered in the right-of-way of Line 27. We are at the top of a hill, so I assume the base of one tower will actually be about thirty feet from my front door. We recognize the need to keep brush and other vegetation from creating a fire hazard in the ROW and acknowledge that the most cost-effective way to control growth will be with herbicides. Given that you will be spraying toxic substances over and around my well, and given that runoff from rains contaminated with the herbicides will flow downhill into my pastures (where I keep very valuable livestock) I urgently need good, scientific studies which answer the following questions:

What steps will BPA be taking to ensure that long-term spraying will not cause an accumulation of toxic residues in my family's drinking water? Where have the proposed steps been demonstrated to be efficacious?

What is the long term effect of dilute herbicides washing over my pastures? Will they kill my pastures over time or accumulate in the tissues of my livestock that graze on the grass?

Given that I have painstakingly established terraced garden plots down my hillside sloping to the pasture, how will BPA compensate me for herbicide drift destroying my corn, squash, chilies, tomatoes, eggplants, cucumbers, potatoes and strawberries? Will the losses be re-calculated at market rates since I will have to purchase replacement foodstuffs?

I have these other comments:

Patrick Borunda

Communication ID: 12319

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: CHARLES E PACE

Please see attached file for I-5 Corridor Project.

Date: December 14, 2009

To: BPA Administrator and CEO

(by fax: [fax])

From: Charles Pace, Ph.D.

Re: Scoping for the I-5 Corridor Project

The following comments re scoping for the I-5 Corridor Replacement Project are provided for your consideration and to help identify significant impacts and issues that will result from the proposed action. To facilitate your review, I've grouped my comments under four headings. I look forward to assisting in strengthening the environmental compliance process for this project. To that end, please notify me of all further developments.

By way of overview, there are a number of alternatives and measures available that Bonneville can take to reduce congestion on the system without the need for major federal investments in transmission facilities serving the Portland/Vancouver area. There are also numerous significant issues that must be addressed for this project to move forward. Given the need to assess a wide range of alternatives and comply with applicable law, the timeline Bonneville has offered for completion of the environmental compliance documents is woefully inadequate. It simply does not provide sufficient time for Bonneville to conduct the analysis required. Moreover, it does not appear that Bonneville yet recognizes the need to consult regarding the impacts of this and interrelated actions on survival, recovery, or critical habitat for listed species.

1. Tiered compliance to "relationship" analyses are neither appropriate nor sufficient for this major federal action

Construction of a new 500-kilovolt transmission line and substation in southwest Washington and Northwest Oregon is a major federal action that will have a significant impact on the natural and socio-economic environment. These impacts, coupled with recent structural changes in the regional economy, and an inevitable decline in the capability of the hydro system as Bonneville begins to meet its obligations to listed species, suggest that the EIS for this project must be current. More specifically, it should not be tiered to any previous documents or environmental analyses Bonneville has prepared in the past for related or unrelated actions. And it must not be based upon a "relationship analysis" that improperly segregates Bonneville's marketing/transmission actions from their environmental impacts. See related comments under heading #2.

Bonneville should also understand that the environmental compliance process—particularly the assessment of the need for the project and the development of suitable alternatives—is further complicated by (at least) three factors of considerable import. First, Bonneville's estimate of the energy and products that may be expected from the hydro system is not realistic. Thus, for assessing the environmental impacts of the proposed I-5 corridor project and alternatives, Bonneville should not assume that the hydroelectric dams that currently serve loads will provide the amount of energy or the

range of products that Bonneville currently provides. This is unfortunate from a planning perspective, but it is the result of the Bonneville's failure to consult regarding the adverse impacts of the power interface (or the effects of day-to-day operation of generating and transmission assets) on critical habitat or the likelihood that species listed under the Endangered Species Act will survive and recover in the wild.

Second, the evaluation of how much conservation is able to contribute to meeting loads in the Portland/Vancouver area is made much more difficult by misaligned incentives Bonneville provides that benefit urban areas at the expense of small, rural utilities. This is a regional issue. Essentially, Bonneville rewards utilities that have engaged in aggressive conservation between 2007 and 2010 by increasing their relative share (reflected in their contract high water marks) of the federal base system. For utilities in the I-5 corridor, conservation is a "no brainer" and the incentive Bonneville provides is unnecessary. Conservation is politically popular and the enhanced access to the federal base system is icing on the cake. However, for smaller utilities serving rural areas outside the I-5 corridor, conservation is much more difficult to achieve. The fixed costs of implementing conservation programs, which are substantial, have been particularly prohibitive for Bonneville's smallest regional preference customers. As a result, the role that conservation can or should play in the region is a very divisive issue. To the extent that Bonneville continues to provide incentives for conservation that benefit urban consumers at the expense of rural interests, the analysis of the ability of conservation to contribute to meeting loads in the Portland/Vancouver area will be distorted and difficult to assess.

Third, the integration of wind power is problematic. It is not clear that wind-powered generating assets located to the east of the Portland/Vancouver area are more desirable than other assets or that wind-powered generators can or should play a role in "reinforcing" the transmission system in the I-5 corridor. It appears that the "flexibility" Bonneville seeks is a result of the costs it imposes to integrate wind-powered generators rather than the characteristics of the energy produced by the generating assets themselves. Also, wind-powered generation has benefitted from significant tax incentives and subsidies which, in retrospect, were misguided and caused distortions in resource acquisitions. It appears that the enthusiasm for wind generation has led to approval of projects that are never brought online, as well as a failure to control costs to the point that governments that agreed to provide such incentives and subsidies are unable to cope with the drain on revenues.

2. A "hard look" at impacts on fish, wildlife and plants, as well as consultation, are non-optional legal requirements for proceeding with this and other projects

As a general matter, Bonneville must take a hard look at the environmental consequences of its actions. This includes the impacts on land use, cultural resources, scenic values, plants, fish and animals, soils, wetlands, floodplains, and surface and groundwater. Here, Bonneville must look at the full range of activities that will occur, i.e., everything from say vegetation management (e.g., chemical application) to regional marketing/transmission activities. In the past, Bonneville has insisted that its marketing/transmission decisions have no "direct effects" on the natural or socioeconomic environment. As a result, Bonneville has never completed any environmental analysis that can be tiered to or serve as a foundation for evaluating the I-5 corridor project. To proceed, Bonneville must provide

an analysis not only of the on-site impacts in the transmission rights-of-way serving the Portland/Vancouver areas, it must also address the environmental impacts of such facilities within the context of an analysis of its operation of the transmission system as a whole.

Completion of a proper environmental analysis will disclose that the environmental impacts of the proposed I-5 project are incapable of being assessed using Bonneville's prior approach, which is based on alternative financial structures for conducting business. Bonneville has used such analyses in the past in lieu of conducting a suitable or proper environmental compliance process. Instead, Bonneville has adopted an approach that is flawed on its face, extremely limited in the scope of application and seriously outdated. Additionally, the "bookends" Bonneville has used in its prior analyses to describe possible hydro operations for business planning purposes are incapable of addressing a range of environmental impacts of, and reasonable alternatives for, the I-5 corridor project. As a result, none of Bonneville's prior analyses (or more-recently completed supplemental analyses) are suitable to tier to or rely upon for analysis of the I-5 project. To do so would disregard the requirements of practice and flaunt the constraints imposed by applicable law, which require that Bonneville disclose the impacts of its actions to the public.

I have four overarching suggestions/concerns in this respect. First, the EIS must address the full range of impacts of construction and day-to-day operation of the proposed facilities, e.g., on existing populations of fish, wildlife and plants within the transmission corridors. And Bonneville also must address the environmental impacts of its marketing activities which, in large part, determine how such transmission facilities will be operated. With respect to the hydro system, the analysis must examine the power interface, i.e., the interaction between the I-5 corridor project, BPA marketing decisions, and impacts on the river system. This analysis must necessarily include (though not be limited to) a careful assessment of the impacts of the proposal and closely related actions on survival and recovery of species listed pursuant to the Endangered Species Act, as well as the natural habitats and natural communities, which such species depend upon.

Second, in the past, Bonneville has proceeded on the tacit assumption that the Administrator is so suffused with discretion that for all practical purposes his/her decisions are beyond review. Hopefully, recent decisions by the Ninth Circuit Court regarding Bonneville's illegal dilution of long-standing regional preference benefits illustrate the weakness of such an approach. Even so, the region will continue to suffer from the agency's distinction between Bonneville's decisions and the corresponding day-to-day impacts of its business operations on the natural and socioeconomic environment, which are the direct result of such decisions. Instead, Bonneville has attributed all environmental impacts of its day-to-day marketing and transmission operations to its business partners, i.e., to its customers. This thinly veiled and indefensible attempt by the agency to skirt its responsibilities under law is untenable, poses an unnecessary risk to ratepayers, and should play no part in the environmental analysis of the I-5 corridor project.

For the I-5 corridor project, the impacts on the natural and socioeconomic environment will depend upon Bonneville's actions and upon the decisions by its customers. And such decisions, when they are proposed (and before they are implemented), must be evaluated in terms of the full range of related

actions by public and private entities. It would be a serious mistake for Bonneville to attempt to unlawfully limit the scope of its environmental analysis by once again making an arbitrary and capricious distinctions between actions taken jointly by Bonneville and its customers regarding resource development, resource operations, and operation and development of the transmission system. Following construction, the day-to-day operation of the transmission assets will depend upon marketing and transmission actions taken by Bonneville with respect to such facilities and its customers' responses thereto. They are inextricably intertwined. And the responsibility for the adverse (and cumulative) environmental impacts of such joint actions and decision-making is shared between Bonneville and its customers.

Third, and drilling down even further, Bonneville cannot continue to avoid its environmental compliance responsibilities by exploiting what it has (for want of a better termed) deemed a "relationship" analysis. This approach is obviously unsuitable for application here, provides no basis for the agency's decision making, and invites legal challenges. In particular, Bonneville's prior assessment(s) of "market driven" alternatives—which are part of or derived from Bonneville's business planning processes conducted over a decade in the past—does not encompass or fall within or address the scope of the decision required for this action. And, notwithstanding the inexplicable lack of challenges to the adoption and use of a "relationship" analysis in the past, it would be a serious mistake for Bonneville to assume that such an approach will remain unchallenged if applied to the I-5 corridor project. And, even if it remains unchallenged, use of this approach by Bonneville in the future will continue to disserve the region and result in unnecessary, self-inflicted risks for the agency.

Fourth, Bonneville's continuing failure to meet the consultation requirements under the Endangered Species Act or the Magnuson-Stevens Act is, at best, problematic. To date, Bonneville has not consulted regarding ANY of the adverse impacts of its marketing and transmission activities, even though there is ample evidence that such activities adversely modify or destroy shoreline habitat. Specifically, it is a fact that the agency has not addressed or consulted regarding the impacts of its marketing and transmission activities on the survival (in the wild) and recovery of species that are listed for protection under the ESA. This is the case for species of anadromous fish (salmon and steelhead) in the Columbia River basin, from which the public derives iconic and other values. Also, Bonneville has yet to comply with the consultation requirements for impacts of its marketing and transmission activities on fish habitat as required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act. But this is just the tip of the problem. Bonneville has never assessed the impacts of its action on a much greater number of plants, animals and resident fish that are found in the agency's control areas. The I-5 corridor replacement project presents an opportunity for Bonneville to correct this history of non-compliance.

3. Cogeneration, demand management and "smart" grid alternatives are preferred to hanging more wire to serve demands in the Portland/Vancouver area

It is simplistic and misleading for Bonneville to assert that "more and more electricity is needed" for use in the Portland/Vancouver area. This overlooks several key facts: that the quantity of electricity demanded is a function of rates; Bonneville continues to offer rates that are subsidized by sales of surplus power outside the region; and, within the region, Bonneville sets rates below market for many

customers who are neither entitled to nor assured regional preference under law. Rather than simply stringing more and more wire, Bonneville should assess alternatives for serving highly concentrated industrial, commercial and residential loads in the Portland/Vancouver and surrounding area through cogeneration projects and other measures. For example, there are many demand management measures available that Bonneville has been reluctant to consider or even acknowledge.

As part of (and in addition to) assessing these demand management strategies, Bonneville should also develop and incorporate in its analysis what are sometimes labeled as “smart grid” alternatives, e.g., better coordination, transparent scheduling and allocation, with the goal of designing more efficient usage of existing transmission assets. And such measures should be combined with strategies that reduce transmission losses, especially losses that occur during peak use, which increase exponentially in relation to loads in the Portland/Vancouver area. See related comments under heading #4.

4. Bonneville’s forecasts of future demands should not be based on long-term transmission requests, and serious reliability concerns are systemic to the system with or without this project

Bonneville should evaluate whether this project is really necessary and, if completed, whether it will be sufficient to allow Bonneville to meet future electricity demands in the Portland/Vancouver area safely or reliably. The analysis should include a “hard look” at the relationship between the I-5 transmission project and serious reliability concerns that are systemic in the region but not addressed by the project. In substantial part, these vulnerabilities are the result of a combination of Bonneville’s aggressive acquisition of additional transmission assets combined with neglect and deferred maintenance of existing facilities, as well as failures to correct for known problems in the transmission system.

The evaluation of the need for this project should not be based on requests for long-term service submitted by Bonneville’s customers as these are not a reliable basis for forecasting future demands in the Portland/Vancouver area or elsewhere in the system. Such requests are, instead, akin to “placeholders” submitted by utilities in the event they MIGHT need to secure transmission services at some future date. Other things equal, such contingent requests do not indicate (or even necessarily suggest) that the likelihood of demand exceeding capacity will materialize anytime soon or, more generally, by a specific point in time.

An objective assessment of the need for the project and existing weaknesses in the transmission system should demonstrate that reliability will continue to be a serious concern with or without construction of the proposed facilities in the I-5 corridor. It should also disclose that, given recent downturns in economic activity, it is not in accord with sound business principles for Bonneville to engage in (or base its acquisition decisions upon) unproductive speculation, e.g., whether the power system can generate and deliver sufficient power to “keep air conditioning units running” no matter the cost. Similarly, a proper environmental analysis should reveal that peak demands experienced during unusual summer/winter temperatures, e.g., those the region experienced in July, 2009, are not a reliable (or particularly relevant) indicator of whether the region will or will not enjoy a stable, reliable or efficient or cost-effective electric system. And finally, the environmental analysis should clarify that the potential for blackouts cannot be eliminated, but this is no justification for Bonneville making bad business

decisions that dilute the value of regional preference, saddle the region with unnecessary risks, and irreversibly commit Bonneville to a range of actions, which are neither lawful nor in the region's interest.

Communication ID: 12320

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: MICHAEL PITTOCK MILLS,JOHN A MILLS

Opposed: BPA's Scope of EIS, I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, Route Segment #50, northeast of Lacamas Lake Every weekday, 60,000 people commute across the Columbia River to work – when polled, nearly 80% said they would take a Clark County job if available. As you know, a bi-state endeavor known as the Columbia River Crossing is underway to plan and build a new Interstate-5 bridge at Vancouver. If this massive, \$2.6 to \$3.6 billion project is to be any kind of a lasting solution for the region, we must follow CREDC's lead and change the basic philosophy of economic development for the region – replacing a "more people" approach to a "more jobs" strategy. Otherwise, an additional 60,000 people will be commuting across the river with no viable job options in Clark County. This major change in economic strategy was launched by Mr. Bart Phillips, CEO of the Columbia River Economic Development Council. Please see the attached editorial from our Vancouver-based newspaper, The Columbian. Go to: <http://columbian.com/article/20091120/OPINION02/711209974/-1/opinion> Any right-of-way (ROW) increase along route segment #50 for the BPA's additional 500-KV line critically endangers the future of a roughly 500-acre block where families can live, work and play in one place. For the employment area, its job-producing impact is estimated as 20 jobs-per-acre. Route segment #50, if included in the scope of work, would directly conflict with the interests of Lacamas Northshore landowners, City and County elected officials, and the citizens of Camas because sharp limitations on a principal jobs-producing area within city limits would cancel out years of civic effort to set aside this area for major employment options. We urge you not to use federal stimulus dollars for a transmission line segment that cripples a primary jobs-producing area. We strongly urge you to eliminate route segment #50 from the scope of work and to explore other routes. Sincerely, Michael P Mills, President John A Mills, VP Mills Family

Communication ID: 12321

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: KYLE MASSIE

Dear Mr. Korsness,

This letter is to let you know that we don't want the new lines to go through our property. They should go over on the east side of the county where they they don't affect people. The cleared easments through the forrest don't harm wildlife if they are done responsibly and give small animals as well as

dear and elk grass and small plant life to eat.

Thanks for reading my opinion,

Kyle Massie

[address]

[address]

Communication ID: 12322

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: LIANNA DELYANIS

I am concerned about the location of proposed line 11 due to the location as it crosses Rose Valley Road within several hundred feet of the Coweeman River. This will provide increased open access to areas that are currently privately owned with controlled access. This will open the door to trespassing which then increases the likelihood of property damage, theft, and vandalism all due to the BPA ROW. What measures will you provide to protect these open accesses? We already struggle on a regular basis trying to keep ATV's off the property. During the Summer months fire danger is greatly increased in the surrounding forest lands and neighboring homes. If there is open access to the BPA Row it will make it harder for the land owners to protect their property from trespassers and increase the risk of potential fires. It only takes one spark off an ATV going over the uneven terrain with low brush to start a fire. There is a small "Volunteer" fire department six miles but this would be of little help as they have limited amount of equipment and may not even be able to reach the area given the forest roads. A forest fire, as we all know, spreads quickly hitting homes and could sweep down to the town of Kelso from the top of Mount Brynion. How does the BPA justify segment 10 or 11 through forest land given the high risk of fire potential? I am concerned about the impact of proposed segments 10 and 11 may have on the native salmon run. There has been research that EMF may interfere with migrating instincts of fish. How can the BPA justify putting in a 500kV line that could potentially threaten this species? In addition, the open access to the BPA ROW in this area will increase the traffic and cause potential damage, and pollution of the Coweeman River thus impacting the salmon run. What will the BPA due to mitigate this damage? I also have a concern regarding migratory birds and wildlife and how the proposed line 11 may affect them. This is the home of Bald Eagles at the intersection of the proposed line 11 and Coweeman River. How does the BPA propose to protect these migratory birds to include the protected Bald Eagle and other wildlife so as to not interfere with the nesting and feeding habitat? Again as noted the open access to the BPA ROW in this area will increase traffic and cause potential damage and pollution along the Coweeman River thus impacting the habitat of migratory birds and wildlife. What will the BPA due to mitigate this damage? Do you care? Why is BPA not upgrading the existing 230kV line or adding the proposed 500kV along the existing ROW? This makes the most sense as the

environmental impact is already known and the access is already there. Using the existing ROW would not impact any new property owner which would then reduce the cost for BPA. It would reduce property loss and property devaluation for existing land owners. What weight is given to cost in evaluating each proposed segment? Reconsideration needs to be made by the BPA to use the existing ROW as this will mitigate costs to them, damage to private landowners, and the environment.

Communication ID: 12323

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MARIT FEDERCELL

We on line 27, join with our neighbors on all segments, to demand that you and your team do the following:

1 As you promised at the meeting in Yacolt, on December 2, develop an alternative eastern route for this project, away from populated areas.

1. Put the Pearl/Paul route back on the table.
2. Evaluate the use of new technologies.
3. Extend the scoping period for at least 60 more days.

These are not frivolous demands, based on the "Not In MY Back Yard" syndrome, but grow out of a real and united concern for the impact your proposed segments will have on all of the citizens of Clark and Cowlitz Counties.

Communication ID: 12324

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: ALEXANDER D SERVICE

Please read the attached file.

Freedom of speech in the United States is protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution and by many state constitutions and state and federal laws.

Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), Western Electricity Coordinating Council (WECC), Energy Regulatory Organization (ERO), Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and the Department of Energy (DOE).

Environmental Protection Agency makes statements such as "THE THREAT IS REAL", and "THERE IS

REASON FOR CONCERN". The United States Department of Energy reported that "It has now become generally accepted that there are, indeed, biological effects due to field exposure." HUD (Housing and Urban Development) Will not Issue Federal Housing Administration Insured mortgages near transmission Power lines. Health's National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) found that power line magnetic fields are a possible cause of cancer. EPA.GOV states " Limit the time you spend near power lines to reduce your exposure." Environmental protection Agency Recommended in March of 1990 that EMF's (Electromotive force) be classified as CLASS B CARCINOGENS, "probable human carcinogen and joined the ranks of formaldehyde, DDT, dioxins and PCBs.

As a concerned private citizen and a newer home owner; I am deeply concerned on the proposed transmission lines planning to be set in SW Washington and NW Oregon. This area ranges from Portland, OR stretching North to Castle Rock, WA and as far East towards Yale Dam, WA and South at Troutdale, OR next to BPA and the proposed Substation. Within this mass of land the proposed 150 ft (see the diagram 1 below) power lines have a lot of Clark & Cowlitz residents concerned. These proposed power lines will have adverse effects on communities struggling with the economic decline, property values will plummet, fish and wildlife will be effected and health issues will most likely arise due to EMF sources and residential exposures.

(Example of the power lines height and what to expect to see. Diagram 1)

HEALTH CONCERNS

There have been many health studies concern Extremely Low Frequency Electro Magnetic Fields (ELF-EMF). A small dosage of EMF's are expected in the technical advancement of the human race, they are everywhere in the home, at the workplace and in the community. High Voltage transmission lines are NOT everyday EMF's.

During the 20th century, environmental exposure to man-made electromagnetic fields has been steadily increasing as growing electricity demand, ever-advancing technologies and changes in social behavior have created more and more artificial sources. Everyone is exposed to a complex mix of weak electric and magnetic fields, both at home and at work, from the generation and transmission of electricity, domestic appliances and industrial equipment, to telecommunications and broadcasting.

Tiny electrical currents exist in the human body due to the chemical reactions that occur as part of the normal bodily functions, even in the absence of external electric fields. For example, nerves relay signals by transmitting electric impulses. Most biochemical reactions from digestion to brain activities go along with the rearrangement of charged particles. Even the heart is electrically active - an activity that your doctor can trace with the help of an electrocardiogram.

Low-frequency electric fields influence the human body just as they influence any other material made up of charged particles. When electric fields act on conductive materials, they influence the distribution of electric charges at their surface. They cause current to flow through the body to the ground.

Low-frequency magnetic fields induce circulating currents within the human body. The strength of these

currents depends on the intensity of the outside magnetic field. If sufficiently large, these currents could cause stimulation of nerves and muscles or affect other biological processes. (See diagram 2.)

Both electric and magnetic fields induce voltages and currents in the body but even directly beneath a high voltage transmission line, the induced currents are very small compared to thresholds for producing shock and other electrical effects.

Diagram 2. ELF - EMF, currents through the body from high voltage transmission lines.

Heating is the main biological effect of the electromagnetic fields of radiofrequency fields. In microwave ovens this fact is employed to warm up food. The levels of radiofrequency fields to which people are normally exposed are very much lower than those needed to produce significant heating. The heating effect of radio waves forms the underlying basis for current guidelines. Scientists are also investigating the possibility that effects below the threshold level for body heating occur as a result of long-term exposure. To date, no adverse health effects from low level, long-term exposure to radiofrequency or power frequency fields have been confirmed, but scientists are actively continuing to research this area.

Some experts are convinced that the threat is real regarding EMF's. Dr. David Carpenter, Dean at the School of Public Health, State University of New York believes it is likely that up to 30% of all childhood cancers come from exposure to EMF's. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) warns "There is reason for concern" and advises prudent avoidance".

Martin Halper, the EPA's Director of Analysis and Support says "I have never seen a set of epidemiological studies that remotely approached the weight of evidence that we're seeing with EMF's. Clearly there is something here."

Concern over EMF's exploded after Paul Brodeur wrote a series of articles in the New Yorker Magazine in June 1989. Because of Paul Brodeur's reputation and articles had a catalytic effect on scientists, reporters and concerned people throughout the world.

In November 1989, the Department of Energy reported that "It has now become generally accepted that there are, indeed, biological effects due to field exposure."

In addition to the long-term health concerns, buying a house with high fields will be an economic disaster. In a few years, when power line radiation is as well known as asbestos and radon, a house with high fields will be practically impossible to sell. Already there are hundreds of lawsuits regarding EMF's and property devaluation.

Effects on pregnancy outcome

Many different sources and exposures to electromagnetic fields in the living and working environment, including computer screens, water beds and electric blankets, radiofrequency welding machines, diathermy equipment and radar, have been evaluated by the WHO and other organizations. The overall weight of evidence shows that exposure to fields at typical environmental levels does not increase the risk of any adverse outcome such as spontaneous abortions, malformations, low birth weight, and

congenital diseases. There have been occasional reports of associations between health problems and presumed exposure to electromagnetic fields, such as reports of prematurity and low birth weight in children of workers in the electronics industry, but these have not been regarded by the scientific community as being necessarily caused by the field exposures (as opposed to factors such as exposure to solvents).

Cataracts

General eye irritation and cataracts have sometimes been reported in workers exposed to high levels of radiofrequency and microwave radiation, but animal studies do not support the idea that such forms of eye damage can be produced at levels that are not thermally hazardous. There is no evidence that these effects occur at levels experienced by the general public.

Electromagnetic fields and cancer

Despite many studies, the evidence for any effect remains highly controversial. However, it is clear that if electromagnetic fields do have an effect on cancer, then any increase in risk will be extremely small. The results to date contain many inconsistencies, but no large increases in risk have been found for any cancer in children or adults.

A number of epidemiological studies suggest small increases in risk of childhood leukemia with exposure to low frequency magnetic fields in the home. However, scientists have not generally concluded that these results indicate a cause-effect relation between exposure to the fields and disease (as opposed to artifacts in the study or effects unrelated to field exposure). In part, this conclusion has been reached because animal and laboratory studies fail to demonstrate any reproducible effects that are consistent with the hypothesis that fields cause or promote cancer. Large-scale studies are currently underway in several countries and may help resolve these issues.

Electromagnetic hypersensitivity and depression

Some individuals report "hypersensitivity" to electric or magnetic fields. They ask whether aches and pains, headaches, depression, lethargy, sleeping disorders, and even convulsions and epileptic seizures could be associated with electromagnetic field exposure.

There is little scientific evidence to support the idea of electromagnetic hypersensitivity. Recent Scandinavian studies found that individuals do not show consistent reactions under properly controlled conditions of electromagnetic field exposure. Nor is there any accepted biological mechanism to explain hypersensitivity. Research on this subject is difficult because many other subjective responses may be involved, apart from direct effects of fields themselves. More studies are continuing on the subject.

The focus of current and future research

Much effort is currently being directed towards the study of electromagnetic fields in relation to cancer. Studies in search for possible carcinogenic (cancer-producing) effects of power frequency fields is

continuing, although at a reduced level compared to that of the late 1990's.

The long-term health effects of mobile telephone use is another topic of much current research. No obvious adverse effect of exposure to low level radiofrequency fields has been discovered. However, given public concerns regarding the safety of cellular telephones, further research aims to determine whether any less obvious effects might occur at very low exposure levels.

EPA Says the Threat Is Real

By 1990, over one hundred studies had been conducted worldwide. Of these, at least two dozen epidemiological studies on humans indicated a link between EMF's and serious health problems. In response to public pressure, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) began reviewing and evaluating the available literature.

In a draft report issued in March 1990, the EPA recommended that EMF's be classified as a Class B carcinogen -- a "probable human carcinogen and joined the ranks of formaldehyde, DDT, dioxins and PCBs.

After the EPA draft report was released, utility, military and computer lobbyists came down hard on the EPA. The EPA's final revision did NOT classify EMF's as a Class B carcinogen. Rather, the following explanation was added:"

At this time such a characterization regarding the link between cancer and exposure to EMF's is not appropriate because the basic nature of the interaction between EMF's and biological processes leading to cancer is not understood."

Key points

- A wide range of environmental influences causes biological effects. 'Biological effect' does not equal 'health hazard'. Special research is needed to identify and measure health hazards.
- At low frequencies, external electric and magnetic fields induce small circulating currents within the body. In virtually all ordinary environments, the levels of induced currents inside the body are too small to produce obvious effects.
- The main effect of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields is heating of body tissues.
- There is no doubt that short-term exposure to very high levels of electromagnetic fields can be harmful to health. Current public concern focuses on possible long-term health effects caused by exposure to electromagnetic fields at levels below those required to trigger acute biological responses.
- WHO's International EMF Project was launched to provide scientifically sound and objective answers to public concerns about possible hazards of low level electromagnetic fields.
- Despite extensive research, to date there is no evidence to conclude that exposure to low level

electromagnetic fields is harmful to human health.

- The focus of international research is the investigation of possible links between cancer and electromagnetic fields, at power line and radiofrequencies.

COMMUNITIES, PROPERTY VALUES AND TAXES

Sections 2 & 9 should be built upon; Use what resources you have. Proposed lines 35-26, 24-10, 8-3 and 1. These sections will ruin communities by dividing what small towns are out there by 150 foot towers. Communities/Towns will dissipate, and fall. No resident of Clark or Cowlitz county wants these running through their back yard or their community they take pride in.

Some housing facts:

1. HUD will NOT issue FHA insured mortgages for houses near transmission power lines.
2. Property Decline Example. The Wisconsin Environmental Impact Statement suggests that the value of property near power lines will decline by between 0% and 14%.
3. Real Estate Agents agree on decline in property values.

Consider this, in the month of November Clark County home owners were issued a new tax assessment value, most people property values decreased dramatically. Some I know have dropped one third of their house mortgage. The Columbian, Friday December 11th 2009 has reported that Clark County Taxes are to hike another 1%. People who may have to deal with these proposed Transmission Lines now also have the added pressure of lower tax assessment of their property (now with transmission lines) and increased property taxes.

ENVIRONMENTAL FLORA & FAUNA

Studies of EMF effects in animals have been conducted to investigate possible adverse health effects in humans. These are usually performed on standard laboratory animals used in toxicological studies, e.g. rats and mice, but some studies have also included other species such as like short-living flies for the investigation of genotoxic effects whether EMF's can have harmful impacts on species of wild and domestic animals. Under consideration are:

- Species, in particular certain fish, reptiles, mammals and migratory birds, which rely on the natural (geomagnetic) static magnetic field as one of a number of parameters believed to be used for orientation and navigational cues
- Farm animals (e.g. swine, sheep or cattle) grazing under power lines (50/60 Hz) or in the vicinity of broadcasting antennas
- Flying fauna, such as birds and insects, which may pass through the main beam of high power radio-frequency antennas and radar beams or through high intensity ELF fields near power lines.

Un-insulated un-earthed conductors placed in an electric field can become charged and cause injury or disrupt the activity of animals, birds and insects.

Damage to trees is well known to occur at electric field strengths far above (ICNIRP) 's levels due to corona discharge at the tips of the leaves. Such field levels are found only close to the conductors of very high voltage power lines. The levels of exposure are up to 300 gigahertz. Clark & Cowlitz County will be dealing with 500kilovolts.

RESOURCES

<http://retasite.wordpress.com/your-health/> - Responsible Electricity Transmission for Albertans (RETA)

<http://www.projectcensored.org/static/1978/1978-story17.htm> - Health Issues with ELF-EMF

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/High_voltage - Information on High Voltage

<http://www.arcfault.org/video.htm> -Video footage

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Federal_Energy_Regulatory_Commission - FERC

<http://www.bpa.gov/corporate/I-5-EIS/maps/I-5project08-18parcels.pdf> - Parcel Maps

<http://www.eia.doe.gov/fuelectric.html> - State usage of electricity

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Environmental_impact_statement - EIS Environmental Impact Statement

<http://www.piercelaw.edu/risk/vol5/winter/abt.htm> - Children living near power lines

<http://www.solarstorms.org/Spower.html> - Solar Storms & Power lines

<http://www.solcomhouse.com/uspowergrid.htm> - US Power Grids

http://www.allcountries.org/health/electromagnetic_fields_and_public_health.html - Health Issues with ELF-EMF

<http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs205/en/> - World Health Organization (WHO) Health Issues

<http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs322/en/index.html> - WHO - Health Issues

http://www.cadesertco.org/why_we_oppose.html - California's Desert

http://www.who.int/peh-emf/publications/facts/envimpactemf_infosheet.pdf - EMF on the Environment

<http://compliance.wecc.biz/Application/ContentPageView.aspx?ContentId=79> - WECC

<http://www.wecc.biz/library/WECC%20Documents/Business%20and%20Governance%20Documents/W>

[ECC%20Bylaws%202009.pdf](#) - WECC Bylaws

http://www.powerlinefacts.com/Power_Lines_and_Property_Values.htm - Power lines and Property Values

http://realestate.al.com/?classification=real+estate&temp_type=search&tp=RE_bama&tl=42&guid=108482 - Real Estate values with Power lines

<http://www.powerlinefacts.com/Property%20values%20discussion%20from%20Wisconsin%20EIS.htm> - Property Values Decrease

http://www.powerlinefacts.com/Property_values.htm - Property Values

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=749805243339986964#> - Video - Electromagnetic Fields late Dr. Theodore Litovitz

<http://www.icnirp.de/documents/emfgdl.pdf> - Electromagnetic Fields and Exposure

http://www.unitconversion.org/unit_converter/power.html - Frequency Conversion Charts

Communication ID: 12325

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: JOHN ANDERSON,LISA A ANDERSON,PAM C ASHFORD,PATRICK BORUNDA,CHERYL KAY BRANTLEY,BILL BRAUN,CAROLYN BRAUN,DOUGLAS R BROCKBANK,JANE BROCKBANK,MARIT FEDERCELL,ERIN E GROVER,HEIDI E HAHN-TROXLER,JANE HALL,RONALD HALL,VINCENTE MOLINOS,DONALD A MOTANIC,BHRIGHA

Dear Mr. Korsness,

This letter is being written to the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) on behalf of thousands of concerned citizens in Clark and Cowlitz Counties in Washington State. We are strongly opposed to the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project as currently proposed. The official Public Comment Period which is scheduled to end on December 14, 2009 must be extended an additional 60 days. The following is an outline of our grave concerns.

California is currently bankrupt and the Federal Government is deeply in debt. If the alternative energy marketing concept collapses, who pays for the new grid? The Washington State Ratepayers and the Bond Holders paid for the WPPSS (Washington Public Power Supply System) fiasco. WPPSS was the last grand scheme to send massive new amounts of power to California. WPPSS was an utter disaster and ended as the largest municipal bond failure in history. Washington Ratepayers are still paying for it.

We are extremely concerned about the health risks associated with High Voltage transmission lines. A

series of epidemiological studies worldwide have documented a doubling of the risk of childhood leukemia for children 0-5 years old that lived within 600 feet of high voltage power lines. The most current independent scientific information available continues to reinforce these results and identifies a tripled rate of delayed lymph cancer for adults who were exposed as children 0-15 years old. It is important to note that the proposed transmission lines of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project would carry electrical loads twice as large as those used for most of the available studies worldwide.

California and Connecticut have long adopted precautionary approaches to reduce possible electromagnetic field (EMF) health risks. The BPA is proposing to place a 500 KV transmission line within 150 feet of many homes. The BPA's concern for individuals with pacemakers acknowledges that human health can be compromised by living in proximity to high levels of EMF.

Power line construction, operation and maintenance on the proposed segments would adversely impact plant and animal biodiversity in the region. For example, in Cowlitz County, segments 11 and 10 would place at risk the habitat of the Coweeman River fall Chinook. This is a genetically distinct stock listed as threatened since 1998 by the U.S Endangered Species Act. This salmon run is used as stock by NOAA fisheries for the management of over twenty naturally produced "Tule" fall Chinook populations in the lower Columbia River.

The BPA has all but ignored NEPA directives for the I-5 project. To effectively follow NEPA, the BPA needs to notify the many affected owners who have not been notified, and collaborate with local entities, governments and citizens groups to come up with reasonable alternatives before the EIS begins. The BPA has gone through the motions of public comments using staged open houses instead of public meetings.

The BPA has withheld information, despite written requests, regarding the strength of the EMF on proposed segments and other topics, thereby keeping affected and interested citizens from fully participating. In addition, the BPA committed, but to date has refused to provide, even preliminary disclosure forms required for public review of the Draft Planning Report for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement (9/07/2007).

We demand the BPA explore alternative paths for the transmission line. The BPA must remove all publicly proposed routes for the 500 KV transmission line from consideration, and any new construction must either 1) be further east of these proposed segments, remaining exclusively on public or state lands, or 2) utilize a route roughly paralleling existing corridors between Paul, Allston and Pearl.

We request that the BPA evaluate the use of new technologies that would run superconductor cables underground or via ocean routes, and allow public comment/input into that analysis. These newer technologies (American Superconductor and Sea Breeze Pacific) are available now and would potentially mitigate the following concerns: 1) the need to condemn properties through eminent domain and/or to leave homes in the shadow of 150 foot high-voltage towers, 2) safety and security concerns including damage from natural causes (e.g., fire, ice, and wind), vandalism and/or terrorist attacks, and 3) health risks that are believed to cause various cancers due to extended exposure to electromagnetic fields.

In conclusion, the public comment period must be extended for an additional 60 days. The requested information must be made available free of charge under the Freedom of Information Act. The BPA must consider alternative paths further east of the proposed Segment 29 or utilize routes roughly paralleling existing corridors. The BPA must consider alternative new technologies that would not be harmful to humans, animals and the environment.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Schmauch

Richard Van Dijk

Communication ID: 12326

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JUDITH A ANDERSON

I have four very important questions to be answered in the EIS Scoping process. 1. Assess the environmental cost of tearing up East Clark County to send power from Canada to California. 2. California is currently bankrupt and the Federal Government is deeply in debt. If the alternative energy marketing concept collapses, who pays for the new grid? The Washington State Ratepayers and the Bond Holders paid for the WPPSS (Washington Public Power Supply System) fiasco. WPPSS was the last grand scheme to send massive new amounts of power to California. WPPSS was a complete failure and Washington Ratepayers are still paying for it. 3. The definition of going "Green" is that power is to be produced where it is used. Explain why ravaging homes, small farms, and timberlands with towers and transmission lines in the State of Washington to send "Green" power to California makes "Green" sense? 4. An August 14, 2007 meeting of the Northwest Transmission Assessment Committee (NTAC) was tasked to identify the preferred plan of service for the construction of a transmission path from Canada to a terminal in Northern California – Is the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project part of this transmission path? Judith Anderson Segment 31 Resident

Communication ID: 12327

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: CAROLYN BLAIN

My home is in the Hockinson area and in a neighborhood is very peaceful and scenic. We chose to live here for that reason. The visual impact of 150 foot high towers will decimate property values. We basically have no businesses in Hockinson for a tax base for our schools. The schools receive money from taxes of homes. If line #31 goes through Hockinson it will have an impact on our schools. I am also very concerned about the health hazards of a massive transmission line being close to my home and

thousands of others. At best studies say evidence of health issues are inconclusive. At the worst studies say there is an increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease and miscarriages. Please consider the impact these lines will have on the children of our community. Choose a route to the east. It may cause a lost of trees, but it will save the lives of people.

Communication ID: 12328

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: CHARLES A. ISELY

To Whom it May Concern:

I write on behalf of Creekside Acres Homeowners Association ("Creekside"), a twenty-four lot development, located in Amboy, Wk Creekside is a quiet, family-friendly subdivision that will be irreparably damaged by Segment 27 of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project ("Project") and, therefore. Creekside must voice its strong opposition to Segment 27.

Creekside presents the following objections to Segment 27:

1. Condemnation and Destruction of Homes. If the Bonneville Power

Administration ("BBA") proceeds with Segment 27, BPA will have no choice but to widen the pre-existent easement which will necessary result in the condemnation and demotion of Creekside homes. This is unnecessary. BPA has alternative routes, which already have the requisite easement area, and which will not require the condemnation of residential properties.

2. Reduction in Property Values. If BPA proceeds with Segment27, the remaining homes within Creekside will suffer a diminution in property values, as owners will have their views ruined by ugly, one hundred fifty-foot (150) tall steel towers; and power line noise will intrude upon an otherwise quiet and tranquil landscape.

3. Safety Concerns: The power lines will result in the creation of electromagnetic fields (EMFs). EMFs have been linked to depression, memory loss, depressed immune systems, and other adverse health effects, Unfortunately, since Creekside can only be accessed by 256th Ave., resident and visitors have no choice but to drive near power lines, if BPA proceeds with Segment 27. Creekside is full of children, and two bus stops would be under the lines. Children may be particularly susceptible to EMFs Furthermore, Segment 27 would require the condemnation of a small airport located near 256" Ave.

4. Environmental and Archaeological Impacts. Segment 27 would ruin wetland buffer areas along Chelatchie Creek, and result in the removal of an historic tree. Segment 27 would also impact buried Native American artifacts as determined by the Army Corps of Engineers. Since BPA can build its power line through some other corridor that does not have the same concerns as Segment 27, Creekside again

voices its strong objections to this portion of the Project.

I thank you for your time and consideration, and if you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at [phone]. Finally, please send any Environmental Impact Statement ("EISs") related to the Project to:

Mr. Scott Blanton

[address]

[address]

and to my office at:

Christel & Isely, LLP

c/o Mr. Charles A. Isely

[address]

[address]

Sincerely,

Charles A Isely

Communication ID: 12329

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: DAVID B ELSON

Dear Mr. Korsness,

As a homeowner adjacent to Segment 31 of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, I'd like to voice my opposition to this project as proposed.

As segment 31 runs through Clark County WA, it potentially affects thousands of homes. As I understand it, other than not expanding line capacity, only two other alternatives were identified to segment 31, one along existing lines to the west, and the second along largely unpopulated state DNR land to the west. I understand the concerns and potential vulnerabilities with locating the new lines next to the old lines.

I have heard that a primary concern with using the DNR land to the east stems from revenue concerns for the state. As valuable timberland, would the state not be able to sell off the timber in the path of this segment? Would they not also be given a fair market value for the land? If so, then any monetary

concerns could not possibly affect the state for another hundred years. Surely that would not rate above the concerns of the thousands of people living along segment 31.

It is not my intent here to detail all the health, financial and legal concerns that I know others have written of, but I would like to comment on some of those that are of particular interest to me:

- Living within 100 yards of the proposed line, I have been given no official notification of your plans, as though it would have no effect on me and my family.

- Independent studies have found disturbing correlations between high voltage transmission lines and serious illnesses for people living in close proximity. Given alternatives to segment 31 that would not place anywhere near as many people at risk, is it worth exposing the BPA to potential costly litigation for future health problems?

- As segment 31 is one of, if not the most densely populated proposed segment, why are there so few alternatives segments proposed?

- The right of way that segment 31 would follow through the Hockinson area, was laid out long ago when the area was sparsely populated. I don't believe the intent of the right of way was to allow for the destruction of whole neighborhoods with 500 kV lines.

- Just the proposal of these power lines through the area has adversely affected property values and sell-ability, not just to those whose homes would be taken away, but also to those nearby. Independently funded studies have found that property values near such high voltage lines are diminished.

The concerns and options available here go beyond the "not in my backyard" arguments. The health concerns themselves could be almost wholly mitigated with either of the other two proposed alternatives. I understand BPA feels a need to build such a line. I fail to believe that other more viable alternatives do not exist, either proposed or un-proposed...ones that would have considerably less affect on the populace, cost the BPA less, and give the BPA a much better public image. Do the responsible thing. Remove segment 31 from the list of options to the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

Respectfully,

David Elson

[Address]

Communication ID: 12330

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MARIAH H REESE

The location of the Lelooska Cultural Center is not one that could be replicated or moved. This property

has served as a cultural resource to our region and community for the last 5 decades. Over the last 49 years the masks, dances, stories and songs of the Kwakwaka'wakw have come to life in the glimmering firelight of our ceremonial house in Ariel, Washington. These crests and privileges have been shared by the Lelooska Family since 1960, and since 1977 have been sponsored by the non-profit Lelooska Foundation. The living history program has provided a visually stunning, educational experience for thousands of children, parents, teachers and the general public. They have the rare opportunity to see, hear, smell and feel what it would be like to be a guest during the ceremonial dances of the First Nations of the Northwest Coast. After being immersed in the Kwakwaka'wakw culture, visitors are then taken to the Lelooska Museum. The museum collection shares over 600 pieces of art and artifacts that span the many Native cultures of North America. Attendance at our cultural center has a lasting impact on the lives of the many children who visit, most often in the third or fourth grade. We meet them as they return with their children and their classrooms every year. In addition, the Lelooska Foundation sponsors classes, workshops and other educational programs. Each year, over 13,000 students, parents, teachers and adults come to the Lelooska Cultural Center. We urge you to bypass this property and maintain this resource for future generations.

Communication ID: 12331

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JAMES ANDERSON

I am opposed to the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project because some things just don't make sense. As a taxpayer I want to know why Washington is going to be torn up to provide Canadian electricity to California? What happens when California's demand for energy drops? Will the Pacific Northwest rate payers end up having to pick-up the tab like they had to with WPPSS creditors? I want to know why at this time of economic downturn the Washington State Public Utility Commission are willing to guarantee a rate of return of 10 to 14 percent to investors. Why the high interest rate? Does it have to do with high risk? What is the risk? We are not building any new nuclear plants, hydroelectric dams, and coal fired generation is not going to be economically feasible with all the environmental costs. Where is the power coming from that would demand 500KV lines? Is there new generation on line? James Anderson
Homeowner and rate payer

Communication ID: 12332

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: BARBARA WITT

Hi my name is Barbara Witt, address is [address]. I'm calling because I am against the idea of putting huge electrical wires down 212th all the way to Hopkinson. I don't think it's right when you have other options going over states lands to ruin people's property and cause health issues for people. And the health issues are well known. Many of us have already lost our 401ks and a lot of other, we've lost

\$100,000 in house value and now you want to you know ruin it the rest of the way. Nobody wants to live anywhere near those high power lines. So I think you should consider doing the right thing and putting it over state lands. Thanks.

Communication ID: 12333

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: PATRICK BORUNDA

Please have your environmental studies look at:

We understand that there are trade-offs required in siting infrastructure. Presumably part of the calculus is balancing costs and benefits for every set of stakeholders. As a resident and tax payer in Clark County, Washington I need to have an answer to my questions:

What is the algorithm SPA is using to measure costs and benefits of "green investments" for stakeholders in Clark and Cowlitz Counties of Washington state? What confirmed "green benefits" create a net gain for us after despoiling eighteen acres per mile (almost 1,400 acres total) of Cascades foothills when we will not be consuming the power transmitted across our lands? How do we know if there is a "net gain" in the Western Power Grid? Why don't you know?

I have these other comments:

Environmentally, BPA is pushing blight and calling it "green." Currently proposed routes slash willy-nilly through both pristine forest and established residential areas. Herbicides and little understood electromagnetic effects will threaten wildlife and residents in Washington State so that producers of power in Canada and consumers of power in California can enjoy the benefits of Californians not having to conserve.

Patrick Borunda

[Address]

Communication ID: 12334

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MARIAH H REESE

Placing this line through the Yale Valley would be devastating to this small close-knit community. Many of the people that live in this valley have had their property in their family for several generations, some homesteaders, and others who came later. The property that we live on is one of those pieces of property, rich in history and wildlife. As property owners of one of the only remaining "old time" buildings (c1930's) in the valley, we are concerned that an important part of history could be destroyed

by the placement of these lines. In addition this piece of property has been lived on by four generations of the same family. The location of this property, as most of the valley is an essential corridor for wildlife traveling from the hills to the river. I urge you to factor into your consideration the impact of this project on not only the terrestrial and aquatic inhabitants but what it will also do to the socio-economic and recreation opportunities in this area. Residents are part of this environment and should be taken seriously and treated fairly. There may not be a huge population where we are located, but culturally this community has something unique that is rarely found elsewhere. The environmental impact of this project in the big picture is much farther reaching than most impact statements reflect.

Communication ID: 12335

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: DAVID GARCIA

Dear Mr. Korsness:

I am writing to protest the proposed BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

The proposed line 27 will gravely endanger the health and well being of humans, livestock, and wildlife as extensive impact studies have proven due to the dangerous electromagnetic field, noise pollution, and herbicides. This area is a fragile habitat for wildlife, including cougars, bears, many species of birds, deer, elk, and some threatened and endangered species, such as owls, pileated woodpeckers, eagles, and salmon.

Moreover, the proposed line 27 will literally destroy our home and every parcel adjoining it since the proposed line 27 would go directly through and spans every one of our five parcels on the BPA's aerial photograph, page 74. When we purchased this property twenty years ago, we were aware of an existing PP&L easement established in the 1950s.

This proposed BPA line 27 is not this easement but an act of eminent domain, proposing to seize a mile-wide swath through our property. Our home of twenty years and lifetime investment will have to be purchased and razed by the BPA. We were told this by a BPA representative at the information forum in October at the Amboy Middle School.

Furthermore, the proposed line 27 has already devalued our property.

Should we choose to sell any parcel of our land or home at this time, we will now have to disclose this proposal, whether or not it is to be enacted in the future, thus rendering our property much less valuable.

As alarmed home and property owners and outraged community members, we

demand that 1) the scoping period be extended to March 31, 2010. And

2) if built, we expect a route that minimizes the impact on homes and property in North Clark County, which this route does not.

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Sincerely,

David Garcia

[address]

Communication ID: 12336

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: MARIT FEDERCELL

There are at least three endangered plant species on my property. These include:

1. Trillium
2. Cascara
3. Oregon Grape

Marit Federcell

Communication ID: 12337

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: JAMES MOFFAT,PATRICE MOFFAT

December 12, 2009

To whom it may concern,

Our family lives in the Hockinson area. We are contacting you to voice our concerns over the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project proposed BPA Line 31 that may traverse our neighborhood. Please let it be known we are strongly opposed to the proposed route of Line 31.

We moved to this area for the schools, country life, and beautiful scenery. If Line 31 is selected, all of it will be gone. Home values in the area will plummet seriously reducing the support of our small school district, not to mention that Line 31 will be directly above property the school district recently acquired

for expansion. Not only will our local school district be impacted but other county services as well - hospital, emergency services, roads, etc. - all as a result of decreased tax valuations. Homeowners affected by Line 31 will be ruined financially. Home values will be reduced to nothing, and homeowners will be unable to sell their property. Bankruptcies and foreclosures will be "the norm."

Not only is the financial impact for property owners along Line 31 a serious concern, but there are health issues that need to be addressed as well. The BPA may have data alleging that the installation of 150', 500 KV towers is not detrimental to one's health, but there is also evidence to show that is NOT case. Gambling with people's health is not an option. The Hanford Reservation is an example of this. For decades, area residents were convinced living near a nuclear reservation was "safe." Now the Federal Government is involved in a massive clean-up and many former employees and residents have died from cancer as a result of working at or living near Hanford. Similarly, the residents living under or near the proposed transmission towers face the same unknown future. What will happen to their health in the decades to come? There is no current answer to that question.

A viable alternative is available. The BPA should select the proposed line through the Department of Natural Resources land (Line 29). That route would impact considerably fewer families because a good portion of it would go through DNR land. Trees are more expendable than humans.

We respectfully request that when the time comes for the BPA to make its final determination that Line 31 is NOT selected.

Thank you.

James and Patrice Moffat

[address]

Communication ID: 12338

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: ED TRAVALIA

The Rock Creek Canyon Estates HOA objects to segment 31 because it would destroy the beautiful valley and would destroy views from Battle Ground Lake State Park. It would go through fairly populated areas in Hockinson and Brush Prairie. This growing area doesn't need this line. I think our property values and quality of life are threatened by the proposed segment.

Ed Travalia

Communication ID: 12339

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: RITA-LYN SANDERS,TODD A SANDERS

BPA I-5 Corridor Project PO Box 9250 Portland, OR 97207 Sir or Madam, We do NOT want the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project to come through the section labeled 31 on your public map (and section #85 on your individual maps). We believe the transmission lines and towers could not only harm our health and cause irreparable harm to our children's growth and development, but also would decrease the value of our personal property, which is located within a few blocks of the proposed power lines, and negatively impact the natural beauty of the area we call home. Studies have linked living near high-voltage power lines to increased risks of cancers and chronic disorders in human health and childhood development. Having high-powered electric transmission lines within close proximity to our personal property would not only decrease the value of the property, but would also make it much more difficult to sell the property when we put it on the market. The unsightly towers and lines would blemish the landscape and create unnecessary noise pollution in a densely populated rural area. The destruction of public property and the homes of many wildlife species would create a negative impact on our area of the county. The changing landscape would cause undue erosion to an already fragile area. Putting in new roads for your project would negatively impact our life's long desire for peace, quiet and solitude. We do not want additional traffic on our private road. Please do NOT place the towers anywhere near our neighbors or our property. The best alternative is to take the lines through public land (Washington Division of Natural Resources)—sections 30, 33-34, 32. Thank you, Todd A. Sanders, Ph.D. Rita-Lyn Sanders, M.S. [address]

Communication ID: 12340

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: WILLIAM E MOYER

No comment.

Communication ID: 12341

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JIM E WILLIS

I think that the Line 31 project is a total disregard for the homeowners who live in the areas that will be affected. I live only 10 acres away from the proposed project and know nothing about it until just this weekend. How can you justify seriously affecting the homes and health of people in this area. As you well know the Hockison areas has been one of the hardest hit areas of Oregon and Washington in regards to home values and this project would devastate the area. Most people are just hanging on to their homes for a couple of reasons: they love the beauty of the area, the schools and they believe the home values will rebound to a reasonable point. With Line 31 you would smash everyone of those

hopes. I would be very interested to know how many people are going to lose their homes and property due to eminent domain? Can you answer that question for me? Is power really worth putting peoples lives in danger both medically and financially? I think not!!!! Why can this not be moved to the backside of Summer Hill which is much less populated and would cause less loss?

Communication ID: 12342

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: GREGORY E VAUGHT

Please utilize existing right of ways for the I-5 Reinforcement Project. Obviously those who live and work along an existing right of way have already felt the negative impact of such structures. Those of us who live along the proposed "new route" are deeply concerned about several negatives for which we have little recourse than to go to court. The most obvious negative is that a 500 Kv line can run right next to my property and I will receive absolutely NO compensation for the diminished value of my property. The loss of up to 54% of the value of my property would be devastating. I am also an advocate for dark skies. I moved to a remote part of Clark County for the dark sky. Segment 30 would go up and over Bells Mountain. This will be in the path of descending aircraft flying into PDX and require navigation beacons on the towers. Another un-compensated for eyesore. My last concern is that a transmission line on segment 30 will cross the Lewis River. The Lewis River is one of the most scenic parts of Clark County. A buzzing hissing popping 500 Kv transmission line would take away a significant amount of charm from Moulton Falls, Lucia Falls, and Pomeroy Farm. The terrain through the canyon is steep and rugged. The necessary vegetation mitigation could possibly cause needless runoff into the river and damage Salmon habitat along one of remaining wild rivers along the Columbia. Again, I urge you to consider the upgrade of an existing right of way. Sincerely Gregory Vaught

Communication ID: 12343

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: CARLA M. GISH

To whom it may concern: To begin, it is hard to believe that everyone was not notified about this! This has an impact to our entire community not just the people who are directly impacted. There are major health issues related to these electrical wires. How many of us will be driving by on a daily basis and be exposed to possible health hazards. Second, there appears to be other options that do not impact nearly as many people as line 31 does. I realize that this is a necessary evil but it seems that there are options that would impact fewer people and possibly be less expensive. Finally, are there new technologies that could be used to be less of an impact, or green methods? Many of us moved to Clark County to be in the country and now this could ruin our beautiful environment, not to mention, negative health issues. PLEASE do not use line 31! Thank you for listening! Sincerely, Carla M. Gish

Communication ID: 12344

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: LAURIE J SPENCER

The scoping period for this project needs to be extended. I am doing research on the ill health effects on humans. I have found law suits found in favor of the plaintiff in Santa Barbara, CA regarding 9 children who were diagnosed with leukemia after these lines were installed near their homes. As a health care professional, I have serious concerns about the location of these lines. They should be placed as far away from humans as possible. I refuse to have a line near my home or my neighbors. (line 31). Move these proposed lines away from our homes. Laurie Spencer, R.N.

Communication ID: 12345

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: KINARD E HADEN

As I understand things there are three potential corridors for I-5 reinforcement project. It seems to reason that the western-most option is highly unlikely due to the proximity of the existing lines (it would put both lines very susceptible to potentially being taken out at the same time ... hence not much reinforcement). That leaves the middle corridor that drops down through Brush Prairie and the eastern-most corridor. It is also my understanding that the eastern-most corridor would primarily pass through DNR property and not displace or affect that many human residents. There is the possibility that it might affect some wildlife species ... I guess we won't know for sure until your analysis is done in 2012. It is my understanding that the eastern-most corridor adds considerable length to the overall length of the corridor (compared to the middle corridor or western-most corridor) ... though this doesn't affect the capability of the lines it certainly does add significant cost. Lastly there is the middle corridor that passes through a populated area. This corridor stands to directly affect the most humans. Obviously I would implore you to choose the eastern-most corridor as it affects the least number of humans. As it is more expensive initially, those costs will eventually be recouped. This says nothing of the unknown potential affects of the high transmission lines and tall towers on humans (that live in close preximity). So please look at the issue long term and consider the potential risks and affects it might have on a populated community. Thank you

Communication ID: 12346

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: CHARLES MASSEY,GERRY LYNN MASSEY

While we can appreciate the impossibility of selecting a route that makes everyone happy, we would like you to seriously consider not using the proposed #31 route. That route would use an existing easement

that is on our property. We own approximately 5 acres at [address], Vancouver, WA. Our property is less than 300 feet wide. Because of the rectangular shape of the property, a 75' easement would take over 1/4 of our property. Most of our west property line is heavily timbered and would have to be clear cut to allow the installation of this line. So besides losing more than 1/4 of our property, the remainder would be considerably less attractive- making it less liveable and greatly reducing its value. Many of the properties in this area are similarly shaped. I would hope you would reconsider to avoid making many of these properties much less valuable. Choosing this route will create an additional hardship on our family. My wife's elderly mother lives with us and cannot be in the vicinity of high tension power lines because of her pacemaker. If this route is selected, we will have no choice but to move in order to continue to provide care for her. Having to sell this property at greatly reduced value and move would create a very difficult situation for our family. Please use another route for the proposed power transmission line.

Sincerely, Chuck & Gerry Lynn Massey

Communication ID: 12347

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: RYAN S OJERIO

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. The possible routes identified in the project map include routes that, if chosen, would significantly impact the western half of the Yacolt Burn State Forest. As the closest public forest to the Vancouver Metropolitan area, this forest has outstanding current value and future potential as a recreation site for thousands of people. Washington Trails Association (WTA) represents over 7,000 members who place a high value on hiking trails. We value trails for the pleasure of walking and hiking, but also for the health benefits that come from being active outdoors. WTA also engages members and volunteers through trail maintenance projects; in 2009 WTA volunteers completed over 9,000 hours on projects just in SW Washington. We look forward to engaging our volunteers in stewardship activities on the Yacolt Burn State Forest once the DNR has completed their forthcoming recreation plan for the area. The Western Yacolt Burn Recreation Plan seeks to meet a rapidly increasing demand for recreation in the region by doubling the number of miles of hiking trails in the area and increasing camping facilities for hikers, mountain bikers, equestrians, and OHV riders. These improvements would compliment the existing trail through the area which is a designated National Recreation Trail constructed primarily by local volunteers. Transmission line corridor segments #30, 32, 33 and 34 would cut through the heart of this popular recreation area drastically reducing its appeal as a recreation destination as it would intersect trails in numerous locations. In addition to the aesthetic impact, transmission line easements in remote areas are also magnets for many undesirable activities including dumping, shooting, off-roading ("mudding") and illegal OHV riding. Such nuisance activities further deter healthy, quiet, human powered recreation that has proven public health benefits. To some, these impacts may seem trivial, but we feel that preserving near-to-town recreation opportunities should be a high priority. We live in a time when our youth lack a connection to the natural world. Our young adults have shortened life expectancies due to an epidemic of obesity and type II diabetes. And our retiring baby boomers are less

likely to seek the rugged high country where they once went hiking and backpacking. As our population grows and transportation costs rise beyond \$4/gallon the Yacolt Burn State Forest will be an even more important asset to the areas residents. Thank you for the opportunity to voice our concerns over this project. We hope the project is successful at meeting our needs for reliable energy as well as our need for healthy recreation. Sincerely, Ryan Ryan Ojerio SW Washington Regional Coordinator Washington Trails Association

Communication ID: 12348

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MATTHEW E BEZOLD

If the BPA does decide to installed the 500-kilovolt transmission line in our area, please move the tentative line # 29 further east from its proposed location. By moving the line further east it will be located on Washington State's DNR land and large tracts of forest lands which have very few home sites which would be affected by the installation of the power lines.

Communication ID: 12349

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: HEIDI JENKINS

To whom it may concern, I am very concerned and upset about the proposed BPA powerlines, specifically Line #31. I moved to Battle Ground only 2 years ago. My husband and I have been saving money for a house with some property, and finally reached our dream 2 years ago. We have a modest home on 2 acres. We are really enjoying fixing it up and creating a beautiful, peaceful environment in which to raise our children. The proposed powerline would be approximately 100 yards from our home. We are not considered one of the families that this powerline will affect. While it is true that the powerline will not cross our property, it will definitely negatively impact us. Our property value will decrease. Our health could be affected. And our enjoyment of the environment, that we moved out to the country for, will be gone. BPA has stated that this line will affect only 8,000 families. You must know that you are affecting 8,000 families property, but that you will forever affect many thousand more families that live near the proposed line. Please move this line farther east, in Forest Service Property, so that you do not affect individual home owners and their lives. Thank you for your consideration. Heidi Jenkins

Communication ID: 12350

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: CHARLES AND BEVERLY LYNCH

Please have your environmental studies look at: A route that minimizes the impact on homes and property where people live, raise livestock, and plan that the property we live on be our retirement fund.

They need to extend the scoping period to as least March 31 2010 to give people more time.

I have these other comments:

I feel that living that close to high power lines that are proposed are a health issue to us and animals.

I am concerned about the devaluation of the property. I would never have bought this property if these lines were in existence at that time.

I am concerned about the noise these power lines would emit.

Charles and Beverly Lynch

Communication ID: 12351

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: CHARLES A TRACY,RUTH E TRACY

RE: Scoping comments on BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the development of the EIS for the I-5 corridor project. I request that BPA include alternatives for line 31 routing other than that currently presented.

Specifically

- 1) at least one alternative that sites line 31 further east, roughly corresponding to the routes for lines 30, 32, 33, 34, and 35
- 2) at least one alternative that sites line 31 in the vicinity of lines 28 and 29.
- 3) 3) at least one alternative that sites line 31 along the corridor for line 25.

The benefits of this project will be broad based, and so the costs should also be as broadly based as possible. By siting line 31 further east a larger portion of impacts will occur in public lands, and therefore be borne by more of the beneficiaries.

We request that when evaluating the social effects BPA consider the lost tax revenue of the various alternatives. Local governments and schools depend on property tax revenues, and these are legitimate costs associated with developments of all types. In particular, Hockinson school district is a small district that will be significantly affected by tax revenues lost as a result of implementing the currently proposed

siting for line 31. As a result, the rest of the district will likely have to compensate for such losses. The EIS should include alternatives that consider long term economic effects of transferring tax burdens to other properties and the loss of property values to the affected properties in Hockinson.

We request when evaluating the effects to the environment BPA include the loss of the carbon stored in the forested and semi forested properties that occur along the current location of line 31 and compare the amount of carbon loss to lines along areas that are not forested, or semi forested.

We are also concerned about the illegal or non-controlled use that may occur along line 31 such as All Terrain Vehicles which would introduce noise currently not in the area, and result in erosion and sediment delivery to streams, including Salmon Creek, which supports several ESA listed salmon populations..

Lastly, we would like to see an alternative that proposes to bury all or a majority of line 31, including a detailed cost assessment thus partially mitigating the social effects from lost tax revenue and/or the decline in property values. The cost assessment should include long-term maintenance of the power lines.

Mitigation for effects of line 31 could include establishing compatible use within the cleared areas such as Christmas Tree Farms, Bike Trails or Walking Paths.

Sincerely,

Charles A. Tracy

Ruth E. Tracy

[Address]

[Phone]

[Email]

Communication ID: 12352

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JAIME HERRERA,ED ORCUTT,JOSEPH ZARELLI

December 14, 2009

Bonneville Power Administration

Attn: Mark Korsheness

I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

PO Box 9250

Portland, OR 97207

Dear Mr. Korsheness,

Over the last several weeks we have attended BPA sponsored 'open-house' meetings; constituent sponsored meetings, meetings with individual constituents and with state agency officials regarding the BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project. It is those meetings and what we have learned at those meetings that are prompting this letter to request that BPA develop and pursue construction of the needed transmission on routes not identified in the current scoping process such as:

- a. Further east on public (DNR, USFS, etc) lands; and
- b. Through industrial areas along the Columbia River in Oregon.

Such routes would put the transmission lines away from residential areas and either locate them close to those who use the most power or in rural areas where few or no homes exist. Either of these options would reduce the impacts on homeowners, residential homes values, and concerns regarding health hazards which may be posed by the proximity to such high voltage lines. It is also possible that easements/ ROW's do or have existed in the past to enable transmission of power from the now deactivated Trojan Nuclear Power Plant in Rainier, Oregon and to transmit power to the now closed Reynolds Metals aluminum facility in Longview, WA.

We believe these options need further consideration and request that BPA enter serious talks with DNR and USFS to explore the public lands option and to discuss the Oregon option with current owners of transmission to the Trojan and Reynolds sites.

We also feel that BPA needs to look more closely at new and emerging technologies to enable transmission to be put underground wherever possible. Since this project will not be constructed for many years, we believe BPA has the ability to benefit from emerging technology to reduce impacts to homeowners along whichever route is ultimately chosen. Technology which enables BPA to go underground for any portion of the project would also reduce the potential of damage to transmission lines that could affect overhead lines – such as terrorist attack or weather related damage.

Because evidence exists that there is already negative impacts to home values along many of the proposed routes, we call upon BPA to quickly eliminate from public consideration routes that are eliminated from internal consideration. This would allow homes values – and the area's housing market – to rebound quickly with the least impact to homeowners.

Finally, we believe that our constituents are very intelligent and innovative. In order for BPA to benefit from this previously untapped resource, we believe BPA needs to hold additional meetings – but do so in a town hall style format. This will enable citizens to express their concerns and offer potential solutions in a forum where others can add ideas or offer alternative ideas which can give BPA access to the most innovative technology and options possible to be certain that everyone continues to have the

reliable electricity supply they demand without the negative impacts which now seem imminent to many homeowners in Southwest Washington. This would necessitate an additional extension of the comment period but is vital to BPA conducting a truly effective scoping process.

We look forward to working with you to further explore new options and make this project beneficial to all.

Sincerely,

Rep. Ed Orcutt

Rep. Jaime Herrera S

Sen. Joseph Zarelli

18th District 18th

EO/JH/JZ

ady

Communication ID: 12353

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: PATRICIA LEE WITTER

With my sister Jane Revesz, I jointly own tax parcels [#],[#],[#] and [#] in Section 18 T5N R4EWM which are part of a family tree farm established by our parents nearly 70 years ago. Segment 28 on your Project Study Map would likely cross these parcels. I urge you to recognize two dominant physical aspects of this property which strongly speak against its use as part of a powerline route. First, the climb from Chelatchie Prairie up to our property is extremely steep. Our family's experience on another timbered property crossed by a PacificCorp powerline has been that powerline maintenance on steep slopes is a terrible headache for the power company and for the property owner. Second, as page 69 of your aerial photo book shows, our tree farm is crossed diagonally by an important wildlife corridor formed by a creek running through a steep ravine along which a series of natural ponds create important habitat for beaver, wildfowl and other wildlife. Our family has always given top priority to keeping this riparian corridor untouched so that it will remain the amazing wildlife sanctuary that it was in the mid-1940's when we acquired it, and is still today. A powerline easement slicing through this steep ravine would forever degrade its riparian function. If the public wants more power, then the facilities that must be built to provide that additional power should be placed whenever possible on land owned by the public. It is fair and just, and also sound in the market-efficiency sense, that the User Bears the Costs---"The Cost-Causer Pays".

Communication ID: 12354

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: STEVE L NYLUND

December 14, 2009 I-5 Reinforcement Project PO Box 9250 Portland, OR 97207 RE: BPA Segment 31 I was surprised and disappointed to learn that BPA is apparently seriously considering running a very high voltage line through residential areas here in Hockinson. The Segment 31 easement is too narrow and too close to too many residences. Segment 31 seems an unnecessary option considering that alternatives are available that would cause much less impact. The disruption to individuals and damage to everything from environment to property values would be sufficient to warrant removal of this segment. Hockinson schools would be particularly hard hit—not only would this wipe out the value of some of the school property, but also the value of many of the tax base properties in the district would be reduced. And when the potential health hazards are factored in, this makes Segment 31 a dangerous risk not only for those whose health may be destroyed, but also for BPA, ratepayers, and taxpayers who will ultimately bear the cost of compensation. I strongly urge you to work to remove segment 31 from consideration as soon as possible. This will save considerable money immediately as efforts can be focused on preferable routes to the East as well as the existing corridor to the West. Removing Segment 31 quickly will prevent property values from continuing to plummet and we will all rest easier knowing that the long term health risks are eliminated. Thank you for listening and I hope we can count on your support on this important issue. Sincerely, Steve Nylund [address]

Communication ID: 12355

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: SHEREE R CASSELL

We have lived in one of the world's best neighborhoods for sixteen years. People try to not move from this neighborhood because it is that special. We don't get as much sun as the rest of the area, and it's certainly out of the way. But we love the beauty, the wildlife, the quiet. Our children were raised here. They've all become productive members of society. As have all of our neighbors' children. We attribute a good deal of that to our neighborhood. This neighborhood is an extraordinary place. We ask that you don't defile it with power lines that would completely disintegrate what we've all worked so hard to achieve. Power lines like these do not belong where people live.

Communication ID: 12356

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: CATHY SCHOENBORN

Thursday, December 10th, 2009 Copy of letter written to our Congressional Members: We are writing you concerning the unthinkable option of running 500 Kv BPA power lines through what the BPA calls

“Route Segment 31” in Clark County, WA (see attached map). The choice of this possible route by the BPA, demonstrates either a huge lack of judgment, or else a callousness towards the lives of everyday hardworking Americans, especially in these difficult economic times. It would directly affect many 100’s of landowners. If this route were chosen, as many as 30 homes would actually have to be destroyed, and millions of dollars of land value and life’s savings, from 100’s and 100’s of people’s land, would be lost forever, and never compensated for. It would be a travesty if this were to happen, especially when it is completely unnecessary to choose such a populated and privately-owned route, when the WA State DNR and private forest land is available for use only a little bit to the East. This route personally affects us in several devastating ways. Our property is situated in such a way that it is much longer in the North-South direction than it is wide (East-West direction) and these power lines would run along the full length of our property a full ¼ mile (North-South). Since our property is narrow, power lines would have to be within as little as 75-100 feet of the side of our house, and ALL of our property would be near the power lines. The BPA states in their information booklets, that a strong magnetic field will exist even out 200 feet from the lines. The magnetic field is so strong from a 500 Kv line, that electric current can develop on metal surfaces, and when your house is close to the lines, you have to carefully ground everything that is metal (such as plumbing, fences, and electric wiring). Research has also shown a strong link between transmission lines and Leukemia in small children, and we are a family with 4 children ages 2, 6, 8, and 11. In addition to those concerns, over ½ mile of power lines would be running directly in the middle of our properties’ scenic view. This would not only drastically affect the long-term value of our land, but crush our dreams of building our dream home on this pristine and beautiful valley property. A dream that we have been working hard at achieving for over 5 years, and that has involved 1000’s of hours of work to improve our land, build fences, build a large garden area, improve our soil, and plant trees. Since so much of the value of our property is simply its scenic setting, it is possible that the street/market value for our property could fall by as much as 30%- 35%, a loss of more than \$100,000 of our hard earned life’s savings that the BPA will never compensate for. Even just having this route on the table as an option severely limits any plans we can make for our family’s future and makes proceeding with our building plans impossible for years. Because the BPA has this route segment as a possibility, it is also now impossible to sell or trade properties for an equal property. At this point, who would buy this property for any fair value, with the proposal of such large power lines going through the property? Our lives have been put on hold, and we are living in a manufactured home that is not large enough for our growing family. We had plans to build a permanent home, but now it is inconceivable to build, when the eyesore and negative effects of the power lines would put us at a great financial loss, and no one would ever be willing to pay us for the value of a new home if we built our home on this property, much less the price we have already paid for this land. We are not alone in our individual situation along this route. We were outraged to find out that this Route Segment 31, goes through many farms and country estates, through some of the most beautiful land in our county (including the Hockinson Hills), and affects literally 100’s (if not 1000’s) of people’s lives. We were also extremely alarmed that the BPA would even propose a route where so many homes would have to be outright condemned and destroyed. We are all completely at the mercy of a Federal agency that by choosing this route, would destroy homes, demoralize families, and devastate lifelong dreams. Additionally Route 31, runs right across unspoiled areas of the Lewis River, runs close to beautiful Lucia Falls Park (with

protected salmon runs and regular Bald Eagle sightings), runs right across the North Clark County Scenic Drive, and the Historic Pomeroy Farm. The proposed route will ruin the aesthetics of a unique and wild natural resource, which should be preserved in its undeveloped state for the enjoyment of future generations. The added absurdity of Route Segment 31 even being on the table, is that there are a number of other options available that do not affect so many citizens and private property owners, and do not affect a widely used and pristine area of land. Either the use of the existing power line route near I-5 (route segment 9), or the addition of a power line route through existing state lands and private forest land (such as 28, 29, 32, 34, 35), are much more desirable options. The advantages of a route through the DNR land and private forest land (such as routes 28, 29, 32, 34, and 35) are obvious: - Would not put 500 Kv lines where people live - Almost no one will even see or notice the lines - Is not scenic land, but is land that is clear cut logged every 40-50 years on a rotation - If people want to enjoy scenic forest land, they recreate further east in the National Forest Land- NOT in the DNR land. - Would establish a future corridor- enabling future expansion without affecting even more people down the road. - Would not disrupt 1000's of peoples' lives, ruin Millions and Millions of dollars of people's life's savings, or destroy peoples' homes and plans for homes. Because of the devastating effect on so many people's lives, we strongly urge you to contact the BPA and ask them to remove Route 31 from their list of options in favor of routes that do not harm so many people's lives. Doing this now would free 1000's of people from the hold that this route option has put on their lives, plans, and dreams. We think that decision makers at the BPA might not fully realize what kind of land they would be affecting when only looking at GIS maps or Google Earth. Because of this- we have include with this letter pictures of our pristine valley property, as well as snapshots taken from the Lewis River, Lucia Falls Park, and the North Clark County Scenic Drive right near where Route Segment 31 would place power lines overhead. ***(I was unable to attach these) Sincerely, Cathy Schoenborn

Communication ID: 12357

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MR. & CYNTHIA A JOHNSON

As a precinct commitee officer for Battle Ground, 595 precinct those in this area would like route 31 to be removed. Alernate routes East of us or route 9 should be the routes used.

Communication ID: 12358

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: HARRY C GORDON

Cordon & Associates

[address]

December 13, 2009

Subject: BPA Line 31 Proposal

I write to provide comments on the Proposed BPA Section 31 Project and feedback on the public input process. I have several comments that I want you to address:

1) Our home and 2.3 acres are on the ridge just a few blocks from NE 212th.

Clearly this proposal affects homeowners like us, but we and many of our neighbors did not receive the written notice of the project. The need for public input and in particular input from those most affected by the proposal is obvious. It appears that the noticing process was haphazard and inconsistent which was detrimental to the public input process. Why were we and so many others not noticed?

2) We have spent considerable time and effort, as have many of our neighbors, in educating ourselves and discussing the issues related to the Proposed Section 31 Project as well as the other options being considered. To proceed with the Section 31 Proposal cuts a swath 200 feet wide through established single family residential neighborhoods and causes extreme disruption to families and the community in general. Needless destruction of trees and habitat will forever affect the neighborhoods. Protection of the residential community and family homes should be the primary factor and a core value when moving forward with this type of project. We urge you to not proceed with the Section 31 Proposal and instead proceed with an option that maximizes the use of the Interstate 5 corridor or undeveloped public or private land as the primary path, not paths that consume single family homes and neighborhoods.

3) It is clear from our research and the various meetings we have attended that there is a potential public health risk to residents living in close proximity to high capacity power lines. There is credible evidence on both sides of the argument about the detrimental effects of living close to high capacity power lines; however, it will be decades before adequate scientific studies can prove the issue one way or the other. We urge you to err on the side of being very conservative in the placement of any high capacity power lines running in the middle of established neighborhoods, which will occur if the Proposed Section 31 Project proceeds.

4) We are also concerned about the detrimental effect on the value of property in our neighborhoods if the Section 31 Project Proposal proceeds. Every Real Estate expert we have spoken to clearly indicates that property values in proximity to the project will decline by a material amount. This is just one of many reasons that you should not proceed with the Section 31 Proposal and instead proceed with an option that maximizes the use of the Interstate 5

corridor and/or undeveloped public land as the primary path, not paths that consume single family homes and neighborhoods.

I would appreciate an answer to the questions and concerns that I have brought to your attention.

Respectfully,

Harry C. Cordon

Principal, Cordon & Associates

Communication ID: 12359

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: PETER A NICKOL

I am against running high voltage BPA power lines along East Hockinson, Battle Ground, and Yacolt (route 31). I believe that land to be some of the prettiest in Clark County. Those lines run through the Hockinson Hills, across the Clark Country Scenic Drive, by Pomeroy Farms, and by Lucia Falls Park, just to name a few places. More than that, I personally know several people whose home and land would be effected by the lines. I have heard that 30 homes on that route would have to be outright destroyed. That doesn't even include those that would have to suffer the negative consequences of dealing with high voltage issues and whose land values would suffer because of the lines. There are other options available, such as running the lines through state forest lands or doubling up existing routes.

Communication ID: 12360

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: SUSAN M BARROWS

I do not support the proposed power lines through my area. I want the BPA to look at utilizing routes that are already in use. I think many people in the area (31) are unaware of where these power lines would be put, if the BPA's proposal is accepted. I believe you would hear from more people in the community who are opposed to the BPA's proposed route if there were actually streets included in the documentation, without having to use Google Earth to see this level of detail.

Communication ID: 12361

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: ANNE ANDERSON

We are very concerned about BPA building the 500KV transmission line near or on our private property. Attached is an article I wrote for the Columbian about our own situation.

It is imperative that the BPA choose a route that affects the least amount of people. The most obvious is the western most one that is in an existing easement which currently has one 240 KV power line and is wide enough to accommodate the new 500 KV line. The BPA needs to realistically look at this issue,

without resorting to vague arguments such as the risk of a forest fire, landslide or plane crash taking out both lines. Has this ever happened? If one line goes out then the power will be automatically re-routed. If two lines go down in one event – which is highly unlikely- then there could be a short power outage. The BPA talks about meeting NERC reliability standards and having to face fines of up to \$1 million a day. Has this type of fine ever been levied? If two lines went down, wouldn't the power outage likely be minutes and not days? The risk of being fined for the unlikely event of two power lines going down sure beats condemning people's homes. I would like the BPA to study this route and provide statistics of the various failure modes that are mentioned and also provide information on the length of the possible power outages and the true consequences. What are the specific NERC standards that must be met? Can the BPA work with NERC to make this route more acceptable?

Another option, which is the eastern most route, goes through Department of Natural Resources land. If the BPA can adequately prove that the western route is too risky, then this route should be the next obvious one. It goes through publically owned land and would affect fewer people. I have flown over this land and it is not old growth pristine forest. It is forested land that has clear cuts and logging roads all over it. I would like the BPA to study this route and provide information on the true costs of cutting a 150' path through state owned land as compared to the costs of cutting a path through privately owned land. I would also like to see documentation of any past and future meetings between the BPA and DNR on this topic.

I would like the BPA to address how they are going to mitigate the effects of the 500 KV transmission line on the habitat of the people living directly in the path of this line as well as those living nearby. This habitat will be damaged due to the construction of the 150' tall towers as well as the deforestation of 150 feet of right of way and the existence of the high voltage 500 KV power lines overhead. Some people will have their homes condemned and others will have to live in close proximity to these very large towers and high voltage lines. How does the BPA plan on lessening the damage to those of us whose habitats are affected?

Local view: American dream under threat

Sunday, December 6 | 1:00 a.m.

BY ANNE ANDERSON

In 1993, the year our first child was born, my husband went for a flight in his 1968 Piper Cherokee. He took off from Pearson Field Airport and headed east toward Green Mountain. That is when he spotted a secluded neighborhood of a dozen homes nestled among tall trees at the base of Green Mountain. When he came home, he described the neighborhood to me. It seemed like a perfect location, our vision of the American Dream.

The next year a house went up for sale. We could barely afford it, but we knew this was "the house," the one in which we would raise our family. It was a nice one-story ranch on a 1-acre lot, surrounded by Douglas fir trees. We could hear coyotes barking from the backyard and frogs in the creek behind us.

Nearby was Green Mountain, which had trails that the young boys in the neighborhood explored.

We moved in and started to get to know the neighbors. Our first visitor was the little girl from next door and her mom. It was her second birthday. I can vividly picture her at our doorstep in her pretty dress and long curly dark brown hair — what a cutie! Our son was now a year and a half old and they became bosom buddies.

We had a second son in 1997 and added a bedroom. Then in 2000, I decided I had had enough of working outside of the home and started my own consulting engineering firm. It took off pretty well and we decided to build an office in the backyard. We "hired" my dad, who had recently retired and is a great craftsman. He built me a charming bungalow style building; a place I can work and yet be with my children; a place I can look out of the windows and see the trees on the mountain; a place that makes being a mom with a career a whole lot easier to manage than working outside of my house.

Complicated issue

The first time I heard about the "Power Line Issue" was in a letter with a small-scale, unreadable map from the Bonneville Power Administration. Apparently, there is a need to build a new transmission line from Castle Rock to Troutdale, Ore. When the BPA published more detailed maps, it was not good news for us. One of the routes, Line 31, could take out my office and potentially our house. It could also directly affect two other neighborhood homes. Another possible route runs immediately behind our subdivision, which could potentially affect the eight homes that back up to Green Mountain.

This is a 500-kilovolt line, which is some pretty serious electricity transmission. It would require 150-foot-high towers and a 150-foot-wide right of way. Even if they condemned our property, it would significantly devalue the rest of the neighborhood.

The BPA sees this as a pretty black-and-white issue. If they decide the best route is through our property, they will simply give us "fair market value" for our home and be done with it. Obviously it is not as simple as that. There is not a numerical dollar value that can be given for this home we have made, the bonds we have formed with our neighbors, the feelings we have for this land and the surrounding mountain. My husband and I have worked hard and achieved the quintessential "American Dream". For it to be threatened in this way really has shaken my belief in this country and its founding principles.

If this power line really is essential, then it is the duty of the BPA to choose a route that will affect the fewest number of private property owners. That should be the only option considered.

All of us in the path of this project have a piece of the American Dream at stake.

Communication ID: 12362

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: DEBORAH A STAVIG,ROBERT A STAVIG

Mr. Korsness,

My wife and I are home owners in east Clark County Washington and will be negatively impacted by the BPA Segment 31 power line. Placing high voltage transmission lines through the middle of prime real estate and existing homes makes no sense. Electrical transmission lines running near houses will create a safety issue for children and is completely irresponsible. The health concerns for children should be your primary concern.

Studies by California Department of Health Series (2002) and a 2007 Independent Study have concluded living near Eclectic and Magnetic Fields can increase the likelihood of childhood leukemia, Lou Gehrig's Disease, miscarriage, and adult brain cancer. The Independent Study was done on power lines of 88KV to 220KV (much lower than the proposed 500KV of this project.)

Segments to the east (28, 29, and 30) would have significantly less safety issues for children and we request that these routes be seriously considered. In addition to the risks from EMF, pesticides used

to maintain the surrounding areas near the towers can enter the ground water causing additional health risk through drinking water drawn from household ground wells.

Segments 28, 29, and 30, which run through forested land, will have significantly lower health risks and impact to home owners. We have sent a letter to the board of the Washington Department of National Resources and Chairman Goldmark and explicitly requested that the DNR support the use Of DNR land for consideration of a BPA line. Any of these lines will be much better for the citizens of Clark County over that of Segment 31. We request that the BPA actively consider these routes over that of Segment 31.

Lastly, any cost increases due to the choice of Segments 28, 29, 30 etc., should be absorbed by those that will benefit from this power, specifically Seattle and California. East Clark County residents should not be forced to fund cheap power to others.

Regards,

Robert N. Stavig and Deborah A. Stavig

Communication ID: 12363

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: DANA J BROWN

I am writing to express my concern about BPA's proposed "Route 31" segment the the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. This segment would run through my Brush Prairie neighborhood, negatively impacting this beautiful rural area. In an effort to improve my quality of life, I decided to leave California in 2006 and bought a home in Brush Prairie. Due to the economic climate, I've already seen my property value decrease and this project would certainly further decrease its value. In addition, the potential environmental and health dangers cannot be ignored. I lived in the Los Angeles suburb of Simi Valley where the effects of Rocketdyne's Santa Susana facility was an ongoing worry. I'm discouraged I could be in another situation where my health may be in danger. Thank you for taking the time to listen. I would appreciate a response to my concern.

Communication ID: 12364

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JAMES ANDERSON

I am opposed to the proposed I-5 Reinforcement project for many reasons. My family and I have lived on the land, targeted as a site for the 150', 500KV lines, for decades. We have been grateful everyday we wake up in this healthy, beautiful environment. As a family we have attempted to be good stewards of the land. Our family has cultivated, replanted our acreage with trees, weeded by hand, avoiding pesticides that do damage to the natural habitat and generally doing what we can to enhance the land we call home. We have avoided any destructive practices. (No pesticides or water erosion practices) We have observed through the years many species of life that have returned to the land. It is very common to see owls, hawks and multitudes of smaller birds. They not only come through our property, they hatch their young here. We also maintain a natural habitat for many mammals and amphibians. Over 30 years ago we contracted with the county to not develop the land and use it for open space and raising trees. We have held up our part of the contract. Hopefully, BPA won't override our contract with the county. I am asking you to not destroy our home and property. James W. Anderson Section 31 Family

Communication ID: 12365

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: KAREN R WELINSKI

I am a home owner on Segment 39. I am deeply concerned about the 500kv lines being proposed by BP. It not only lowers property values of many that work hard for their homes, it also increases health concerns to everyone near a powerline structure. BP needs to use the south side of the Columbia River for this project. They also need to research other forms of getting power to other areas, such as underwater, which is being used in other parts of the world (Japan, Key West, FL and the San Juan Island). I do not want anymore power structures or lines around my home!

Communication ID: 12366

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: ALLAN HAMM

It is very ironic that with a recent, significant power cost increase, BPA now has millions of dollars to spend on a new power line. With the financial hurt that many people are already experiencing from the current economic depression, it seems that BPA could have delayed this sort of project for a future time and not have hiked our power rates.

Additionally, if another line or set of lines are needed for current(?) or future industrial expansion, why not use the existing right-of-way #9 rather than spend millions to build something new? Does BPA have a "use it or lose it" budget?

The upper Rose Valley #11 route which is being considered has older timber which is the last area habitat for wildlife which prefer and/or require older timber stands for survival including the threatened western gray squirrel, pileated woodpeckers, flying squirrels, various owls and other species. The area is enhanced by some of the last old-growth timber stands in the region. Besides a detrimental impact upon these creatures and the timber, the considered routes would destroy the timberland of some of us who only have small acreages which have been passed down from previous family generations.

Let's not start another WPPSS (oops!) project which might be extremely expensive and turn out to be a boondoggle to the taxpayer. Allan S. Hamm

Communication ID: 12368

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MICHAEL J ALLISON

I and my neighbors are very concerned about the possibility of the BPA putting a high voltage power line through the heart of our beautiful Clark County community, Hockinson. My family and I have lived in the Hockinson area for over 20 years and love our community. Great people, great schools and lovely countryside, the reasons that we moved here in the first place. The proposed segment 31 would pass within a few 100 yards of our home, directly impacting some of our longtime neighbors and our property values. The value of our home would be decimated and that has been a key piece of our retirement plan. We would also have to drive under those dangerous towers everyday to leave our home, we have no route to bypass them. The BPA needs to choose a different route; one that would primarily travel through timber company and DNR land, instead of through our residential properties. It isn't logical to disrupt established communities when timber company and PUBLIC land is already available! You shouldn't allow BPA to ruin people's lives and communities. Michael, Susan, Jessica & Emily Allison

Communication ID: 12369

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JONATHON J BEST

What the BPA is proposing doing along segment 31 really stinks. Obviously we need more transmission lines from time-to-time to keep up with growth, but shouldn't the BPA try and put new lines away from where people live, if at all possible? This route 31 looks like about the worst pick for a place to put new lines they could possibly come up with. Harms more property value and people's land per mile of probably any route they could pick. The economic downturn may have hurt people's property values, but eventually they will recover from that. But the BPA can inflict permanent damage to land values, and doesn't even have to pay for the real cost of the loss to the property owners. Just living nearby to the lines can substantially hurt your value. The BPA needs to do the right thing and avoid this route 31 and instead put the lines out in the state forest land where it will harm absolutely no one.

Communication ID: 12370

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: BRADEN S STRICKLER,NINA R STRICKLER

12/13/2009.

On the eve of the last day that BPA will accept public comments, we are sending this letter. On the BPA website, there are over 2400 comments in total; over 500 comments explicitly mention route 31. There is much opposition to route 31. Clearly, route 31 is the route with the most negative impact to the communities near Battle Ground and Hockinson.

Please help the BPA find alternatives rather than destroying people's homes and lives.

My home is in the Hockinson area and is on route segment 31 of the proposed I5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. The 500 KV line would take out the entire upper road of the neighborhood at 212th Avenue and Kristen Circle. Our neighborhood is very peaceful and scenic with forest, creeks, springs, ponds and wetlands. There is a variety of wildlife in the area such as coyotes, deer, hawks, eagles, blue heron, wood ducks, raccoons, woodpecker, etc.

Using the Clark County GIS property website, I can tell you that many properties in our neighborhood (Kristen Circle, 212th, and 197th) have geological hazards listed as sloped areas (>15%) and severe erosion hazard areas. Several properties nearer the proposed line have an earthquake hazard rating as high. Adding such large infrastructure to this area is

not a good idea. Please don't allow BPA to use route segment #31.

The visual impact of both the 150 foot ROW and 150 foot high towers would negatively impact property

values for not just people directly affected but the entire upper portion of Hockinson in the area known as "Finn Hill". The Hockinson area has some of the highest tax rates in Clark County. I doubt Clark County would want to lose property tax money for people forced out of their homes, or reduce tax money since property values would be decimated.

Hockinson School District recently purchased 35 acres for a new school.

Segment 31 would go through this property and may render this property unfit for a school. The current primary/intermediate school at the corner of 159th and 164th is within a mile from the proposed route segment. If this were to go in, parents may pull children from the school because of health issues.

NO BPA Segment #31.

I am very concerned about the health hazards of a 500 KV electric line being so close to my home. Electric and magnetic fields (EMF) are thought to cause some cancers. A report from the California Department of Health Services in 2002 concluded that EMFs can cause some degree of increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease, and miscarriage.

Route segment 31 would destroy many homes along 212th Avenue. It is not just property that will be destroyed, it is people's lives, their homes, their community which will be destroyed. It is unconscientious and irresponsible to even consider this segment. The community of Hockinson would never be the same. A good chunk of the property tax base would be gone forever. Please think about it.

The route should go on DNR land where no residential homes are impacted.

It may cost less as

less homes/properties would have to be bought by BPA. It would save Clark County in the long run by retaining the tax base and good will of the people who would have been affected along route 31. Why aren't any routes even being considered for Oregon? Who is the consumer of the power that will be transmitted on the new line? California?

If you absolutely cannot do the DNR route, then use the existing ROW (segment #9 and #25).

NO BPA Segment #31.

Sincerely,

Braden and Nina Strickler

[address]

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JOHN W DUSH

I live immediately east of the route proposed, and have serious concerns about the impact of the project on the relatively large areas of wetlands directly west of my residence. Considering the current concerns about wetlands, an alternate route appears to be the best choice.

Communication ID: 12372

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: SHONNA L MERRYFIELD

BPA, Do not build these towers/lines in our community. I have recently bought a home in Hockinson from the NE Portland area. I bought a home here because this is where I plan to raise my family and retire. Had there been huge towers and massive power lines running through the elementary school and this beautiful land I certainly would have chose a different location or simply stayed in the city. Please do not destroy the American dream and put our children at risk by building your astetic and environmental nightmares through our community. Thank you, Concerned Citezen

Communication ID: 12373

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MIKE KINNAMAN,VIRGINIA M KINNAMAN

Please help us on getting the the BPA Line 31 further East. Our homes are our biggest financial investment. Putting these lines up would destroy their value & our quality of living. I don't understand why the lines have to go thru WA for OR customers but if it must be, please locate them further East so that it does not impact as many homes & FAMILIES. Thank you. Very sincerely, Virginia & Mike Kinnaman [Address] [Phone]

Communication ID: 12374

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: WALTER C BENDER

I am 1/4 mile down the hill from proposed siting #31. We have lived here for 15 years and do like our view west. From my walking and biking throughout the area, I am shocked to think that this right of way would be activated for this project. From a people and resources perspective, my wife and I support using the existing transmission line route, reasoning that while it may be best to have separate routes for emergency purposes, we believe this is not realistic in such a densely populated area at this time. For health risks and property values both, please place this in the least populated channel (forest land to the

east).

Communication ID: 12375

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: DENISE J LUKINS

I wanted to comment on the proposed segment that goes through the Yacolt Burn State Forest, through the Jones Creek Area. I recognize that it appeals to a lot of people for the line to go here, assuming this will affect the least number of people. However, lots of beautiful homes are out here, and the area is heavily used recreationally, as one of the last "wild" place in Clark County. This is one of the worst areas where a new line could possibly be. Opening up new roads in this forested area is a security nightmare. Not only would it be difficult to protect the line, but more access means more chances of fire, vandalism and misuse of the forest resource. I already live near one of these lines, and from what I can tell, there is no attempt made by BPA to address any of these issues. It is also pretty objectionable to take state forest land out of production in this way, since these lands support schools. A 150 foot wide swath through the whole area would make these lands unproductive. The people of this state benefit from these forests. Along those lines, one of the things that BPA is claiming as a reason to build this line in a new area is better chances that service will not be interrupted in the event of a fire. It makes no sense then to build so close to the existing line in this area. All of this area was part of the Yacolt Burn. At one point, the proposed line will nearly intersect the existing line. How does that provide protection during fires? This line needs to go in an existing easement. That is more in keeping with the expectations of the owners of property in the area where the easement is located. Better yet, BPA needs to reconsider the need for this project or other ways of delivering power, such as underground. These lines are health hazards and eyesores.

Communication ID: 12376

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JOHN ANDERSON

As an effected resident and ratepayer subject to destruction of my property value and quality of life as well as eminent domain taking if the I-5 Reinforcement Project proceeds, I need three questions answered: 1. Do we need it? WPPSS was going to bring 5 to 7 new nuclear plants online in the 70's and 80's using the existing power grid. They never got built. Why do we need enhancement of the grid now? What is the major new source of energy now that requires such a dramatic expansion of transmission capacity? Renewables aren't that plentiful or reliable according to a WPUDA (2/1/09) Issue Brief. Apparently we didn't need the WPPSS projects and we couldn't afford them. Investors were paid as much as 15% to buy bonds. BPA and PUD's lost public support all over the state. We ratepayers are still paying for this dead horse. 2. Can we afford the I-5 Reinforcement Project? California is currently bankrupt and the Federal Government is deeply in debt. If the alternative energy marketing concept

collapses, who pays for the new grid? The Washington State Ratepayers and the Bond Holders paid for the WPPSS (Washington Public Power Supply System) fiasco. WPPSS was the last grand scheme to send massive new amounts of power to California. WPPSS was an utter disaster and ended as the largest municipal bond failure in history. Washington Ratepayers are still paying for it. According to the WPUDA Issue Brief referenced above, FERC is approving rates of return for investors in the transmission upgrades of 10 to 14%. Does that mean that the BPA will be paying that rate of interest on money they borrow to do this project? Please clarify how BPA's borrowing authority has been increased for purposes of building a new transmission grid. How can any of this be done without raising utility rates? Normally a project that has to pay a 10 to 14% return on bonds to borrow money is seen as too good to be true or very shakey – both were certainly true of the WPPSS financing. 3. How are you going to pay for this project? How much will it really cost? Any realistic estimates? Can a grid be built now in the State of Washington without massive collateral environmental damage? We do not want our Evergreen State covered in wind turbines, solar panels or methane plants to send power to California. Neither do we want our state to be a conduit for power from burning oil shale in Canada to send to California. This is the rumor that is circulating. Can you guarantee that the reinforcement project won't make power from Canada available to California? Green power is decentralized power and should be produced where it is used. Can you guarantee that the new grid or old grid won't be used to send Washington's green energy including hydro-electric out of the state if our power needs have increased. Explain why ravaging homes, small farms, and timberlands with towers and transmission lines in the State of Washington to send "Green" power to California makes "Green" sense? East Clark County is a model of the kind of timberland, small farm, and wetlands protection close to an urban area that is idealized in all the most forward looking environmental policies. We supply local farmers markets and urban friends and neighbors with fresh produce. Through maintenance of our small lot tree farms we help clean and protect air and water sheds and provide wild life habitat. By agreement with the county, we agree to forego residential development of our land to aid in the preservation of the environmental quality of the greater metropolitan area. We get a tax break to facilitate this policy. If you run the grid through my land, the trees would be cut down, wildlife habitat destroyed and my family would have to abandon our home and our faithful old hand hewn barn. This sad result would be replicated by the thousands of other families who received your ominous notification. Hopefully, you will remove the threat of this project as soon as possible. Property values are already under pressure due to recession. The prospect of these very tall towers and power lines looming over our neighborhoods is putting unconscionable stress on effected property owners at the worst possible time. Summary: You will have to prove to me that the project is not another dinosaur: Too expensive – Too dangerous – hopelessly representative of more poor planning and ignorance of contemporary energy thinking as it relates to human and wildlife habitat. A Segment 31 Family

Communication ID: 12377

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: CHRISTINE JELVIC

Yes, I'd just like to comment. I live at [address]. And I would, I haven't written a letter but, I have concern about the power lines going behind my house. Due to the fact that I'm on a hillside I'm on septic and well service. So if you do cut the trees down it would affect my household greatly. Let alone the property value and my children's health due to the EMFs. My name Christine Jelvic phone number is [Phone]. I hope that you chose an alternative route, as does everyone else.

Communication ID: 12378

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: ROBERT LONG, MERLE MOORE

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Potential for well water contamination

Earthquake fault lines

Potential for and dangers of electro-magnetic fields. Also, provide solid data on all studies, past and on-going.

Impact to water tables

Potential for run-off and flooding as a result of defoliation under and near the towers and lines.

I have these other comments:

We live in the new proposed route 26 and as so many property owners have already testified, your plans are grotesque, obscene, and morally wrong. We are adamantly opposed to bringing these routes through existing populated areas. A plan to sweep through the middle of Clark County, running thousands of lines in the process is nearly impossible to fathom.

Health issues related to living near 500 Kil-volt lines is well documented. So, you would: destroy our lives & ruin our investments, put our health at great risk, destroy the environment, decimate eco-systems; and kill flora and fauna??

Well, not in our back yard, BPA. We'er not interested.

Communication ID: 12379

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: SUSAN LEMOS

Before BPA continues the proposed I-5 project they must 1) REMOVE segment 31 from the proposed

project. 2) The BPA will perform first-stage evaluation of both: a) A route several miles further east than any of the currently-proposed segments that avoids all and every habitat, natural, scenic and recreational resource and remains exclusively on public or state lands; and b) A route from the proposed Castle Rock substation along existing transmission rights of way to Ross via Keeler and then along the segments already identified along existing transmission lines; c) A route from the proposed Castle Rock substation along existing transmission rights of way to Pearl/Oregon City via Keeler and then along existing transmission lines. and then to commence a completely new public Scoping process in lieu of the present one. In any Scoping process: 3) The BPA to demonstrate in the course of the Scoping process and then in the course of its EIS that: a) The stated need for these transmission lines are: i) in the public interest in general, ii) in the interests of the residents of the Pacific Northwest in general, and iii) specifically in the interests of the electric ratepayers whose utilities are served by BPA under the terms of the Pacific Northwest Power Act and related legislation; 4) The BPA to demonstrate explicitly and individually which existing, planned, or proposed generation projects are or would be enabled by these lines, and to describe the fuel source of those projects, commencing with all those projects identified in the BPA's generation interconnection queue whose projects either already employ the affected paths from North to South or would employ them if constructed and connected; and a) To demonstrate for each of those projects separately how it meets the criteria defined in 3 above; and b) To demonstrate how each such project: i) meets or exceeds the goals for renewable energy generation resources in the Pacific Northwest specifically excluding California; and ii) advances the declared goals of the government of the United States to address Global Warming and/or Climate Change; and iii) reduces the Northwest's emissions of greenhouse gases. 5) The BPA to demonstrate, in complete technical detail accompanied by a layman's summary: a) how and why the transmission power flows of power generated in Canada and being sold in California constrain the existing transmission system and underlie and cause the assumed need for these proposed lines; and further how the system is constrained when such power is sold in markets, if any, outside the Northwest and California; b) how and why the existence and administration of a market-driven transmission request queue that provides access to the transmission system of the BPA can justify the need for the condemnation of private property in North and East Clark County in particular, and in Washington and Oregon States in general; c) the economics for power and energy marketing and trading companies that use a great part of the transmission capacity of the high-voltage lines in the region, with specific reference to any increase to their revenues and profits that might be enabled by these lines. 6) The BPA to commit that: a) all labor and materials used for the proposed lines are solely sourced from US companies based in Washington State and domestically produced. b) the degradation of all electronic signals such as TV, radio and cell phone signals to the rural fringe areas will be mitigated to zero as a result of radio frequency interference (RFI) generated by these proposed lines. This to apply to any other commonly used electrical or electronic household appliances/gadgets as well. c) there will be no audible noise pollution (Corona) that can be heard from the outside of any home adjacent to the right of way of the proposed lines. d) that all buildings, fences, pipes and other metallic items adjacent to the right of way that can be affected by spurious currents are safeguarded as necessary to protect humans and animals from any shock. This to be done at the expense of BPA. e) no chemical or synthetic herbicides will be used to maintain the right of way due to the potential of leeching into the groundwater and contaminating the water supply which is generally

from wells in rural Clark County. 7) The BPA to provide study data specifically relating to 500KV lines on the health effects of long term exposure to LF EMF (Low Frequency Electromagnetic Fields). This data to be no older than three years and provided by reputable health research organizations with no ties to any company or industry directly or indirectly associated with or funded by either the energy or power industries, or any other special interest. 8) The BPA to consult with every tribe, whether recognized by the Federal Government or not, historically associated with any part of the lands impacted or affected by any of the proposed line routes, and those routes not yet identified; to learn and share from them the history of the lands across which the lines are planned to run; and to accept and implement whatever recommended mitigation is required, including the absolute and unconditional non-disturbance of any areas designated by any tribe as being of particular historic or religious significance. 9) BPA to explore, identify and investigate all available sources that may assist in locating, identifying, and making public, every site where native American artifacts, graves or habitation or use have been identified since the first white man's records were begun in what is now known as the Pacific Northwest; and to ensure that none of those sites is disturbed or in any way affected; the available sources to include without limitation: all appropriate Tribal organizations and entities; the National Park Service; the Washington State Parks; Clark County Museum; the Oregon Historical Society; the Oregon Archeological Society; the Clark County Museum; the Museum of North Clark County; and each and every other tribal, historical and cultural heritage association, organization or entity with identifiable links to or knowledge of or documentation describing any part of the history of Clark and/or Cowlitz and/or Columbia Counties. 10) The BPA will recognize that many of the communities through which their proposed routes would run have previously been economically devastated by the efforts to protect and preserve the habitat of the Northern Spotted Owl and other species. Therefore, BPA will take extraordinary measures to do no further social or economic harm to those communities; and will, within the scope of its EIS, perform an in-depth examination of the impacts, both social and economic, on the individuals, and separately on the communities, affected by, or possibly affected by, the proposed lines; this to be conducted by a reputable, independent social research organization with no ties to any company or industry directly or indirectly associated with or funded by either the logging or timber industries, the energy or power industries, or any other special interest; and the BPA will undertake to give predominant importance to the findings of the studies in weighing its decisions; 11) The BPA will recognize that any reduction it causes in the timber harvest from local public lands may have an economic impact on the funding of the public school system, and include a study of both the short and the long-term effects of that economic impact on the fabric and infrastructure of the whole of Clark County in its overall assessment of the impacts of these lines; which impact to be studied and estimated through a minimum of two human generations; 12) The BPA will cause to be conducted a thorough and complete survey of the habitats and migratory patterns of all fauna and wildlife, whether native or not, the survey to include no less than two complete migratory cycles; and then to engage a separate review of the findings of those studies and an assessment of the impact of all proposed line routes on the fauna and wildlife, species by species; these surveys and assessments to be conducted separately by two or more qualified independent reputable, wildlife and environmental research organizations with no ties to any company or industry directly or indirectly associated with or funded by either the logging or timber industries, the energy or power industries, or any other special interest. 13) The BPA to undertake

within the scope of its EIS a detailed economic study whose findings will indicate: a) How many new long-term jobs will be created in the region from Olympia in the north to Salem in the south, and from Cathlamet in the west to White Salmon and The Dalles in the east, by the construction of these lines, and how long it is expected these jobs will last; b) How many jobs in the same area that would have been lost without these lines would be preserved by their construction? c) The number and scale of new specifically industrial or manufacturing jobs that will be created within the area of Clark County and the Portland Metro area as a direct and immediate result of the construction of these lines; d) A calculation of at least the same level of quality and detail as of those made in the BPA's routine Rate Case showing the impact, whether positive or negative, of the construction of the proposed new lines on the transmission costs of both Network and Point-to-Point Transmission contracts, and thus on ratepayers in the region. 14) The BPA will use the 'Take No Action' alternative as its benchmark against which all other alternatives are tested and compared individually and in isolation, rather than all possible alternatives being compared with each other and the 'preferred' winner then tested against the Take No Action alternative. 15) The BPA will not confine its assessment of impacts only to those property owners whose land or property might or will be immediately and directly affected, whether by construction, proximity, acquisition or easement; it will also include in its assessment all and every individual and class of individual, as well as every other entity or organization that can meet any definition of 'person' within state or federal law; and will include indirect impacts as well as direct. Once again, I urge BPA to remove segment 31 from the proposed I-5 project.

Communication ID: 12381

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MARGARET BOYLE

I live within the notification area of line 26. I strongly oppose using this route, along with any route west of Amboy/Yacolt/Hockinson. There are too many property owners who have put so much sweat equity into developing their land that can never be truly compensated by BPA. Add to that the general decline in property values this area has experienced, and you'll have many owners simply giving up and going into foreclosure. Even if 'compensated' by the BPA, many owners will still owe more than they can then sell their property for. I urge BPA to move the proposed line east of these areas, utilizing public lands and the large tracts of private land that are not nearly as populated as those to the west. Better yet, bury the transmission lines or use the existing routes. Yes, it will be more expensive, but amortized over the life of the lines and the amount of energy sold off them, the cost is not so prohibitive. Let's have us all pay for our energy needs, not the the unlucky few who happened to find a beautiful place to live and sacrificed to make it possible. Thank you, Margaret Boyle

Communication ID: 12382

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: PAUL MACCHIA

The construction and the footprint of segment #31 will destroy and block any access to over twenty (20) homes and parcels in the Alderspur Road Association neighborhood comprising of NE 212th Av., NE 197th Circle and NE Kristen Circle and the adjoining NE 212th Place. If BPA is not required to compensate homeowners for seizure of land outside of the immediate Right-of-Way area, how does BPA compensate affected home and property owners. Several parcels bordering or within the segment #31 Right-of-Way area of NE 212th Av., NE 197th Ave and NE Kristen Circle are determined by Clark County geologists to have a "high" damage probability rating if a seismic event were to impact this area. What additional steps will BPA take in the area planning, construction and maintenance of these facilities to avoid facility damage and insure public safety and property access if such an event occurs? Construction of, and the footprint for segment #31 will destroy a ravine and "no name" creek at the NW corner of NE 212th Av. & NE Kristen Circle. This creek and another further north (that crosses NE Kristen Circle) flow approx ½ mile north before reaching Salmon Creek. This area is in BPA's specified Right-of-Way requirements. What will be done to protect this area and the watershed? What is BPA's weed control plan prevent the migration of chemicals to this watershed and local wells which are only source of water for these homeowners. You will destroy this and other neighborhoods in our area, causing immeasurable financial and emotional hardship. BPA's reckless strategy of throwing multiple, ill-considered options on the table may be a fine political tactic, but the opportunity cost is already being felt, both socially and economically within the areas fielded. Those problems and hardships will grow exponentially in your so called "scoping," EIS periods and beyond. Most importantly this "project," with the multiple options you are supposedly evaluating, once again illustrates the Gross Management Incompetence and Total Lack of Planning within your organization, and the U.S. Dept. of Energy

Communication ID: 12383

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: ANTHONY LATHA

I'm against the proposed BPA lines through Clark County (Dole Valley)!!!!!!!

Communication ID: 12384

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: ED K LATHAM

I'm against the proposed BPA lines through Clark County (Dole Valley).

Communication ID: 12385

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: ERIN E GROVER

Dear Maryam Asgharian and BPA, As per our conversation at the rally today here are comments made at Clark County scoping meetings that I did not find listed online. There are ponds in Dole Valley for use by helicopters to help with possible fires in the surrounding forests. These ponds would be blocked if the current line #29 is used. Helicopters also fly the river bed, and valley for search and rescue. Lines crossing the East Fork will need to be lit. One of your engineers said due to the cut of this valley these towers would be 200' crossing the river and would bow over the river. Making them visible for a long distance. This river is used for kayak competitions in these areas as well as swimming, and fishing. The river is sensitive Steelhead habitat including the creeks that are tributaries to the river so avoiding wetland and adjoining creeks would be preferable for the future well being Clark County's main watershed. Current Line#29 crosses the river at Rainbow Falls a spectacular Waterfall, and properties listed Riparian Priority Habitat containing plants and animals listed on the Clark County Endangered Species List including Eagle, and Larch Mountain salamanders I will be mailing a 2 page list of the plants and animals I am aware of. Line #28 is the site of a one room school house. Line #28 & #29 have many households with as many as 18 children and many older people who deserve to be notified. These areas are more inhabited than they look on a map. This is the main recreational area for Vancouver and Portland so please consider the impact to occasional visitors as well. Tarbell Horse Camp, Biking Competitions, Sunset Falls Road is lined with cars in the Summer from people seeking natural air conditioning. Lightening follows the River bed here, 1996 brought some slide activity in this area, clearing current #29 could cause River contamination from slide and pesticide. Ground further East has fewer creeks, and underground springs than #28 or #29 which also have long historic and cultural significance. Tom Tom Mountain has long standing Native American importance. Dole Valley, Yacolt, Chelatchie, and Amboy will be economically affected in a negative way by these lines due to the recreational nature of these towns. This area will never look the same again. It is one of the few places in Clark County you can still see massive amounts of stars at night and hear coyotes echo the canyon. Losing the beauty this valley currently has will be a great loss to the County and our Country. I hope some of you get to enjoy the beauty of this river and valley this Summer. Thank You for taking all these things into consideration. Many Blessings, Erin

Communication ID: 12386

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: VICTORIA A LATHAM

I'm strongly against the proposed BPA lines through Clark County (Dole Valley). How can Bonneville Power put a 150 foot tower on my sisters property and take her land and home from her. How can you put a value on 20 years of sweat and tears of building your property up and your home you thought you would have for retirement. How do you put value in the silence of not hearing traffic and the enjoyment of having wildlife in your backyard. How can Bonneville Power just take what you have worked so hard for and say hey we needed it and there is nothing you can do about it. I feel for my sister and the 50 other family's in the Dole Valley that will be losing there homes & property they all worked so hard for.

Victoria Latham

Communication ID: 12387

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: LORRAINE TANKE,STEVE TANKE

From: Steve & Lorraine Tanke

[Address]

Battle Ground, WASH 98604

[Phone]

December 14,2009-12-14

Proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

Please have your environmental studies look at:

If you were concerned about the ENVIRONMENT you would use the existing Right of Way.

Comment about putting two lines together is ridiculous and moronic. Example: If a plane is going to go through the original line, you would have to build this NEW line hundreds of miles away as the plane would hit both lines in its flight path.

LINE 31 is not RURAL FARM land, it is heavily treed with Multi Million Dollar Homes.

This will RUIN MY Property and View. If the trees are cut down this will not be a desirable place to live and raise a family. This will also misplace all natures' animals.

We moved here to escape the City Life.

This project would cut down our Beautiful Trees/Forest of which bring Beauty, Peace, Tranquility and of course Oxygen.

Do we REALLY know what DANGERS this will cause for the Human Being?

I have these other comments:

- Scoping Process should be extended for the following reasons:
- You have been working on this project for years and the property owners get less than two months
- Adjacent property owners were not notified and others affected were not notified as well
- Maps to homeowners were DECEPTIVE, Battle Ground Population 16,000 and NOT ON MAP. BUT you

send all this information to SOME Battle Ground Residents

- Significant number of people still do not know about this I-5 Corridor Reinforcement
- Very little NEWS COVERAGE/MEDIA COVERAGE/NEWSPAPER AND TV. NO IN DEPTH COVERAGE OR ANSWERS ON WEBSITE
- Meetings held supplied or offered - NO Answers to "QUESTIONS"
- If this Line/Project should be built, build it as far away as possible from the POPULATION
- We cannot sell or improve our property and be compensated if the property goes to hell
- What right do you have to put our lives on hold and/or jeopardy while you TAKE take 2 PLUS years on whether you decide to build or not build this LINE
- THIS IS GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!!!!

Communication ID: 12388

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MARC BOLDT,TOM MIELKE,STEVE STUART

Dear Mr. Korsness:

We are writing to elaborate on our earlier request for BPA to design and conduct a more complete and effective public involvement effort in connection with the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. In addition, we are asking for Clark County to be treated as a "party of record" according to the National Environmental Policy Act.

Public Involvement

At the request of property owners and other stakeholders, we urge you to establish a BPA citizen advisory committee, to be fully informed and to provide input on all aspects of this project, beginning immediately and continuing through any construction. We also ask that you extend the comment period for the "scoping" phase by 30 days in light of the project's potential impacts, the pressures people face in November and December during the best of times, and the extraordinary challenges our residents are confronting during the

worst recession in many decades, including widespread joblessness and financial turmoil at home and at work.

Scoping

By any measure, this project could have monumental and historic impacts on our area, not unlike the impacts from major hydroelectric projects on Northwest waterways or the construction and expansion of interstate freeways bisecting the Columbia River, Vancouver, and Portland. Therefore, it is of utmost importance that you do not "underscope" this project.

Specifically, we ask BPA to:

- Thoroughly study the prospects for a new alignment alternative to the east of the current scoping effort. It is essential to consider an alignment on public lands to reduce the potential impact on private property and populated areas.
- Conduct and disseminate definitive information on public health impacts.
- Conduct a definitive evaluation on how many proposed alignment would affect property values, including existing improvements and the potential for new construction on affected properties.
- Evaluate options for underground installation, especially in private residential areas.

Clark County Assistance

A good deal of county staff time and resources have been and will be spent to acknowledge these concerned citizens and assist them with their questions. We will appreciate your inclusion of reimbursement for Clark County for these expenses as you plan future budgetary needs.

We would further request BPA organize and implement a community meeting for the potentially affected residents and cities at your earliest convenience. We would ask that you specifically invite representatives from both our southwest Washington State legislative delegation and our United States congressional delegation. You may wish to consider using the Clark County Event Center in this regard. For information regarding available space size and associated costs, please find enclosed a copy of our rates. For more information, please contact our Director of General Services Mark McCauley at 360.397.4960.

We appreciate your consideration and look forward to your response. If you have an immediate need for dialogue, please contact Karen Streeter at (360) 397-6118 or Karen.Streeter@clark.wa.gov.

Marc Boldt, Commissioner

Steve Stuart, Commissioner

Tom Mielke, Commissioner

cc: The Honorable Brain Baird

The Honorable Patty Murray

The Honorable Maria Cantwell

Ms. Elizabeth Klumpp, BPA Regional Relations

Bill Barron, County Administrator

Karen Streeter, Department of Public Works

Communication ID: 12389

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: SUSAN L WOOD

I AND ALL OF HOCKINSON ARE UPSET ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF THE POWER LINE COMING THROUGH THE HEART OF OUR COMMUNITY. IT WILL RUIN THE BEAUTY AND SERENITY OF OUR PROPERTIES THAT WE MOVED OUT OF THE CITY TO HAVE. OF COURSE IT WILL ALSO DESTROY THE TAX BASE AND OUR LARGE INVESTMENTS IN OUR PROPERTY AND HOMES. MANY PEOPLE HERE HAVE ACREAGE THAT WAS TO BE SOLD FOR RETIREMENT, THE LINE WILL VASTLY REDUCE THAT, IF IT CAN BE SOLD AT ALL. THIS LINE WILL IMPACT EVERYONE IN HOCKINSON BY HAVING THE TOWERS LOOMING OVER OUR SCHOOL, HOMES AND ANIMALS. THE HEALTH STUDIES DONE BY CALIFORINA ARE VERY DISTURBING. I DO NOT TRUST THE INFORMATION PUT OUT BY BPA REGARDING THIS HEALTH ISSUE. THE CALIFORINA STUDY WAS NOT EVEN WITH THE CURRENT AS HIGH AS LINE 31 WILL BE. LINE 31 WOULD GO THROUGH THE PRIVATE RD. TO MY HOME. I WOULD SEE IT FROM EVERY WINDOW ON THE SOUTH WEST SIDE OF MY HOUSE, WHICH NOW WE ENJOY A PICTURE OF PORTLAND AND EVERYTHING BEFORE IT. I AND ALL OF HOCKINSON ARE UPSET ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF THE POWER LINE COMING THROUGH THE HEART OF OUR COMMUNITY. IT WILL RUIN THE BEAUTY AND SERENITY OF OUR PROPERTIES THAT WE MOVED OUT OF THE CITY TO HAVE. OF COURSE IT WILL ALSO DESTROY THE TAX BASE AND OUR LARGE INVESTMENTS IN OUR PROPERTY AND HOMES. MANY PEOPLE HERE HAVE ACREAGE THAT WAS TO BE SOLD FOR RETIREMENT, THE LINE WILL VASTLY REDUCE THAT, IF IT CAN BE SOLD AT ALL. THIS LINE WILL IMPACT EVERYONE IN HOCKINSON BY HAVING THE TOWERS LOOMING OVER OUR SCHOOL, HOMES AND ANIMALS. THE HEALTH STUDIES DONE BY CALIFORINA ARE VERY DISTURBING. I DO NOT TRUST THE INFORMATION PUT OUT BY BPA REGARDING THIS HEALTH ISSUE. THE CALIFORINA STUDY WAS NOT EVEN WITH THE CURRENT AS HIGH AS LINE 31 WILL BE. LINE 31 WOULD GO THROUGH THE PRIVATE RD. TO MY HOME. I WOULD SEE IT FROM EVERY WINDOW ON THE SOUTH WEST SIDE OF MY HOUSE, WHICH NOW WE ENJOY A PICTURE OF PORTLAND AND EVERYTHING BEFORE IT.

Communication ID: 12390

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: DIRELLE R. CALICA

RE: Comments on the Bonneville Power Administration I-5 Corridor Reinforcement

Project

The Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians (ATNI) appreciates this opportunity to provide comments on Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. We support BPA's efforts to upgrade the region's transmission infrastructure and efforts to include the tribes in these decisions and processes. So as BPA begins to prepare its environmental impact statement evaluating the impacts of the proposed project, we ask for BPA's consideration of the interests and potential impacts to Tribes in the region.

Trust Responsibility: Through treaties the Federal Government is obligated to provide those services required to protect and enhance Indian lands, resources, and self government. As a consequence of these unique obligations BPA, as a federal agency, must seek to consult with, coordinate with and to exercise any trust responsibilities to Indian Tribes. Although this project may not directly impact any tribal lands or trust property interest, the area of this proposed project in southwest Washington and northwest Oregon is in within the tribal traditional and aboriginal lands once occupied and used by various tribes in the region. Therefore we ask in your decision making process that BPA make reasonable efforts to notify potentially impacted tribes of its decision or its work.

Cultural & Historical Properties: Northwest Tribes continue to maintain an interest in tribal traditional and aboriginal lands particularly in terms of protecting and managing cultural and historic properties and interests. We ask for your consideration of any impacts to cultural and historic properties and interest in accordance with the laws and to actively engage any potentially affected tribes in consultation and coordination on such matters.

BPA & Tribal Project Coordination: Northwest Tribes are actively involved in the management, protection, and development of their valued natural, cultural, and energy resources,

Moreover we appreciate BPA and Transmission Services' efforts to coordinate with Northwest Tribes on any potential impacts to those resources. So we would like to invite BPA's I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project team and other BPA representatives to present at an upcoming ATNI conference and to share information about this project with our interested member Tribes. Our next conference will be taking place on February 8-11, 2009 in Grand Mound, Washington. We hope with continued and ongoing coordination we can help further BPA's ability to create better plans and to implement those plans with enhanced tribal cooperation.

In closing, ATNI appreciates this opportunity to provide input into the decision making process regarding this project. We look forward to continuing our work with you. Should you have any questions or comments please contact either myself at [phone], or Ms. Margaret Schaff at [phone].

Sincerely,

Direlle R Calica

Energy Program

Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians

Communication ID: 12391

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JUDY SILLS

Dear Mark,

By now, you have received numerous comments conveying widespread public opposition to the flawed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project proposals. Concerned citizens have been given inadequate notice of proposed routes and their proximity to them, or no notice at all, depending on where their homes are located. A multitude of requests, including those for another public comment period extension and access to the Draft Planning Report for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project (9/7/2007) have been ignored.

Similar requests from state legislators Joseph Zarelli, Ed Orcutt and Jaime Herrera, and the Board of Clark County Commissioners for transparency and responsiveness seem to have fallen on deaf ears. The BOCC has spent significant county resources to acknowledge and assist citizens with their concerns due to BPA's mismanagement of the public notification and comment period, and has asked for reimbursement of its expenses.

Washington citizens are sending a clear message. Take a step back. Extend the public comment period until adequate public dialogue has occurred with BPA in open-forum meetings. Consider alternatives to the current proposal that utilize new technologies (e.g., underground superconductor cables) that would minimize public health and safety issues, as well as socioeconomic impact. Although the cost would be greater in the short-term, lower maintenance costs and other factors will mitigate expenses in the long-term.

There are yet other choices that minimize or remove the effects on individuals and families: 1) a route east of the current scoping effort that keeps transmission lines on public lands and off private properties, and 2) routes paralleling existing corridors to the west.

Public concerns about living near electromagnetic fields generated by 500KV lines, are being discounted as there is no published report that will unequivocally state an individual's health is negatively impacted by long-term EMF exposure. However, there is a well-documented association between EMF and the incidence of childhood leukemia, as well as delayed adult onset cancers and other medical conditions, through epidemiological studies. It makes sense that these results are not necessarily supported in the laboratory setting, yet the BPA persists in holding on to this flawed understanding of how long term health impacts are detected. The burden of proof must be on the BPA to ensure there is no public health

risk, not the other way around. Given what we already know, if it cannot be proven the health risks are zero, then individuals (especially children!) should not be exposed to this potential risk.

In conclusion, it is imperative that the BPA address the public's real and perceived concerns with thorough research of all alternatives to the current proposal. The BPA can be a leader in innovative and creative solutions, with the resources at its disposal. There is great potential for a win-win solution. The public expects and deserves no less.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Sills

Communication ID: 12392

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: KEVIN G BOYLE

Comment to EIS scoping I am concerned for the health, safety and home values of the proposed project. Alternate routes and or contingency plans need to be scoped and evaluated as the power and right away greatly impact the Granite Neighborhood homes and provide less than adequate distances from the nearest occupied buildings/residence. Please note comment to proposed scope of EIS (DOE/EIS-0436) letter on behalf of Dr. John Simmons.

Communication ID: 12393

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: KAMIE CHRISTIANSEN

BPA As a customer and a resident, I am concerned about the BPA proposed plans to run the power lines through residential areas. With the concerns from the residences on property values and possible concerns on health issues in relationship of the power lines, I ask that you consider the alternative location you have option to. Realizing that the other option is most likely more costly and will require more time, it is a difficult decision. But it is felt by many that it would be the better decision in the long run. Sometimes companies and individuals in the decision making positions, need to do things because it is The Right Thing to Do for it's customers. In this case, not putting the power lines in the path's of so many homes and property values of it's customers, would be the Right Thing to Do. We ask that you reconsider and take a stand in this day and age to Do The Right Thing. Thank You

Communication ID: 12394

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: CASEY ODELL

Dear BPA Coordinator,

My family and I have lived at the above referenced address for 15 years. We are adjacent to the proposed BPA Route Segment #50.

We wish to register our objection to any right-of-way increase along segment #50 for the BPA's additional 500-KV line.

Our property has recently been brought into the City of Camas' Urban Growth Boundary. Any expansion of the existing right-of-way would eliminate any opportunity for future development of our property.

We strongly encourage BPA to consider alternate routes that do not destroy any owner's rights to personal enjoyment and benefit of their property.

Thank You,

Casey O'Dell

Communication ID: 12395

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JUDITH L KRAVITZ

I am a resident of Hockinson and would like to request that the proposed High Voltage Tower lines be placed further east on route 28 or other through DNA and timber company land. The effect this line would have on our community would be immense. Our School district has purchased land for a new school and this is in the path of the proposed segment 31. Too many families would be negatively impacted. Not only will the property values be destroyed, but there are health risks with these lines so close to the many homes. I AM OPPOSED TO SEGMENT 31 !

Communication ID: 12396

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MICHAEL E TROXLER

Mr. Mark Korsness Senior Program Manager BPA I-5 Reinforcement Program December 14, 2009 Dear Mr. Korsness: I am writing this letter to state my strong opposition to the proposed route 31 for the I-5 reinforcement project. The key points of my opposition are: • Health concerns associated with living

next to a 500 kV transmission line's EMF. • Living with the fear of fallen lines, tower collapse, electrocution and fire hazard due to high winds and icing events. • Living with the fear of a potential terrorist attack brought right to my front door. • Permanent loss of enjoyment of my property from having the majestic view scarred and overwhelmed by a 150' transmission tower. • The unthinkable sacrifice and destruction of well developed neighborhood communities for the convenience of a power line. • The unbelievably myopic patchwork proposal presented that this I-5 Reinforcement Program represents. • The undeniable injustice of a public entity forcing itself upon the lives of those it purports to be 'serving'.

HEALTH CONCERNS There is a growing body of research correlating numerous maladies including cancer clusters in children with exposure to electric fields and EMF. The January 2009 issue of Prevention magazine elucidates the issues and the cited research. Andrew Marino, PhD, JD was cited in the article. He is considered to be one of the foremost experts in this arena. Some of his previous research showed a direct correlation between reduced brain electrical activities after exposure to EMF. One of the direct links that is evolving from the current studies is between EMF and sickness is the concept of "electrosmog" caused by transients in the electrical grid. BPA forcing homeowners to a direct and chronic exposure to a large, adverse EMF near a 500 kV transmission lines would be nothing short of criminal. Having knowledge yet continuing down a path of calculated disregard for monetary reasons is similar to Ford's decision to continue production of the Pinto.

FALLING LINES AND COLLAPSING TOWERS The winds along our ridgeline are well known and documented. 80+ mph gusts are not unusual from the fall through spring months of the year. Icing is always a threat during the winter months. These types of events are typical and expected. They will constantly expose the residents near the proposed route 31 to an eminent danger of electrocution and fire.

POTENTIAL TERRORIST ATTACK The argument for not utilizing current right-of-ways because of too much exposure to terrorist is weak. There is no more exposure to terrorist than is already there. I chose not to live by the current power lines to limit my exposure to risk. Your "spreading the risk" by moving the power line to my front door is not the solution. Burying the power lines is the answer to limiting the risk from terrorist attack.

PERMANENT LOSS OF ENJOYMENT After serving in the U.S. Navy and a career as an airline pilot and 22 relocations, my wife and I chose to settle on top of a ridgeline in Battle Ground, WA. We believe it is piece of paradise. We have worked continuously for 8 years to build and improve our home. The Section 31 line would simply remove the incredible view that we purchased this property for and destroy our retirement dream.

DESTRUCTION OF NEIGHBORHOODS Furthermore, we have connected with some of the finest people in the country...our neighbors, who will also be permanently affected by Section 31. This removes the whole reason for not living in the city. And for what I ask? To balance out the power load between Seattle and Portland? To sell additional "Green power" to California? Well then, let the good people of power hungry California, Seattle and Portland collectively purchase all of our homes at a premium price to allow them the pleasure of turning on another plasma television and Xbox without unfettered constraint.

MYOPIC PATCHWORK The choices that are being presented to the citizens of Clark and Cowlitz counties are unacceptable. It is nothing more than a band-aid approach to current needs. This will follow in the future with people living in areas away from electrical lines only to have their life disrupted with the next BPA project. There is a greater national solution to this whole issue. BPA could take the lead on this by installing its part of a superconductor pipe underground between Vancouver, BC and San Diego, CA. This pipe could be 5MW or 10MW or greater with only a 25' right-of-way along

Interstate 5. Off ramps to various communities either supplying to or taking from the line could be built. Connections via the along highway mountain passes along the Cascade Range would create a ladder to balance the production and load requirements. All of this would require is 25' of right-of-way for the pipeline, be built underground and produce no EMF. This project could be interconnected throughout the production areas and the load areas on a national basis. Steady constant loads for converting excess electrical production to Hydrogen reserves during off peak periods would act as a reservoir to balance the system. All of this with "Shovel Ready" project dollars for American workers, with American technology (American Superconductor). INJUSTICE OF THE CURRENT I-5 PROJECT PROPOSAL Is the right to the enjoyment of property greater for someone who lives in a metropolitan city over the same right of someone who lives in a rural community? This is the essence of what is being tested here. People who have chosen to live outside the city for personal reasons should not be harmed by the BPA in order to better serve those that have chosen to live within the city. We have the technology to retain the beauty of our beloved Northwest and maintain the health of our citizens. Please choose wisely. Sincerely, Michael E. Troxler [phone]

Communication ID: 12397

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: PATRICK BORUNDA

Please have your environmental studies look at:

We raise alpaca blood-stock on Line 27. The value of blood-stock is predictable, reliable transmission of desirable genetic characteristics from parents to their (in the case of alpacas, single, annual) offspring. The edge of the right-of-way will be approximately 100 feet from my maternity pasture; we already know that it is close enough that my steel mesh fences and metal barn will have to be grounded.

Given that proximity, I need reliable, scientific evidence answering this question:

"What is the effect of the EMF on in utero and neonate camelids?"

Each of these babies (crias) will be valued at a minimum of \$10,000 by the time they are weaned at six months of age. We produced a dozen babies this year with zero mortality.

So the answer to this question is of enormous importance to the future of our business.

I have these other comments:

Responsible public stewardship demands anticipation, transparency and evenhanded treatment of stakeholders. By negligence or design BPA has failed these tests. Far more stakeholders were left out than were included. Public meeting were limited to just six compressed into twelve calendar days. Interests of power generators and retailers have been more carefully considered than those of Washington citizens.

I demand an answer to my question:

"What possible public benefit is there to denying a responsible extension of the scoping period for 60-90 days, allowing resident (vs. non-resident) stakeholders' issues to be considered?"

Patrick Borunda

[address]

Communication ID: 12398

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: KIM SPARKS, WILLIAM A SPARKS

December 14, 2009

Re: NO BPA SEGMENT #31

Proposed BPA I•5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

I strongly urge you to take action and notify the Bonneville Power Administration that segment #31 should NOT be considered as an option for the route of their new high voltage power lines. Also, the BPA gave homeowners 40 days to respond with comments by November 23, 2009. Forty days is not a reasonable period given that the BPA will take 2 years to make a decision that will affect many homeowners and families. Please push to extend the comment period.

The proposed segment #31 routes high voltage towers directly through populated areas of Clark County. Homeowner and families in Battle Ground, Hockinson, Camas and other areas are directly affected. The BPA notified over 8,000 property owners in the right-of-way of their proposed route, however they did not notify homeowners abutting the right-of-way which would add at least another 16,000 homes. Abutted homeowners and families may be only a few feet away from the right-of-way but will be affected by electromagnetic fields particularly if the families have health related issues.

There are many arguments against having a high voltage power line run through an existing

community:

- Families:
- Loss of homes and out-buildings (barns, sheds, arenas, etc) in right-of-way
- Financial loss from plummeting home resale market values in the area due to:
 - location near the power line
 - loss of scenic views
 - Health risks of living in the shadow of the electromagnetic fields
 - Loss of satellite TV/computer service, radio and cell phone reception
 - Reduction in children's education quality due to less property tax collections
 - Loss of small communities and reduction in quality of life
- Local Schools:
 - Loss of property tax revenue due to:
 - Loss of tax base from destruction of houses/buildings
 - Devaluation of market values of remaining houses in the area
 - Loss of use of land already purchased for future schools
 - Destruction of sensitive plants and wildlife habitat in the area
 - Negative visual impact to the area whether in local communities or surrounding hills

There must be better options than running a line through existing communities. There is already an existing I5 corridor. Populated areas should be off the table as an option. The destruction to homes and families is too great. I strongly urge you to notify BPA that segment 31 should NOT be considered. Citizens shouldn't have to wait two years for them to study this They should remove it from consideration now.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this letter. I hope to hear that action on your part has resulted in changing the route to a more appropriate location,

Sincerely,

William A. Sparks

Communication ID: 12399

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: DOUG CROUCH

Regarding: BPA Segments 31 and 37-39

Dear Sirs,

I am against the installation of the power lines along Segment 31, and 37-39 because of the effect It would have on my home and the surrounding area. I am part of the Tranquilvilla subdivision that sits on the north side of Green Mountain. Installation of the power lines will damage not only our properties and their value, but the Riparian habitats around us. Can you guarantee us that your Installation won't damage a terrain that already has a high probability of land slides? The right of way was purchased in 1958 before the area was populated and the installation of and of these lines will cause harm to hundreds if not thousands of home owners.

Sincerely yours,

Doug Crouch

Communication ID: 12400

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JAMES D HOWSLEY

Bonneville Power Administration

I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

P.O. Box 0250

Portland, OR 97207

Subject: Lacamas Northshore Properties and I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project Scoping Comments (DOE-EIS-0436)

To Whom It May Concern,

Our office represents a group of property owners, see Attachment "A" for a map with tax parcels, commonly and collectively known as Lacamas Northshore. It recently came to our attention that one of the current proposed routes for the I-5 Corridor project would run across our client's properties. We would like to state our vehement opposition to the alternative. And furthermore, would like to

specifically request that the following items be addressed in the scoping for the EIS.

History of Properties

In 2004, our client's approached our office to represent them in Clark County's effort to open up its Comprehensive Plan in accordance with the Growth Management Act. At this time, we engaged vigorously in the public process, simultaneously with the City of Camas and Clark County in order to pursue a collective vision around the premise of providing additional jobs land to the City of Camas and Clark County. We have included as Attachment "B" the initial site specific request filed with Clark County on June 19, 2006.

From the very beginning of the County's Comprehensive Planning Process, Lacamas Northshore promoted the properties for a mix of employment and mixed-use development centered on jobs. The City of Camas supported the property owners and along with the Lacamas Northshore promoted this vision to the Clark County Board of Commissioners who ultimately agreed and brought the properties into the Camas Urban Growth Area on January 1, 2008.

In April 2008, these properties, along with several others totaling about 1000 acres, were annexed to the City of Camas. And since that time, Lacamas Northshore continues to pursue with the City of Camas a collective strategy to develop employment and mixed use development on the properties.

Our client's will vigorously fight any attempt by BPA to place new transmission lines through their properties. We would like to make BPA aware of some site specific considerations as well as some general considerations that need to be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Areas of Scoping

First of all, the impact on the present property value is not adequate. BPA needs to examine what the potential value is under the current zoning and evaluate whether or not other alternative might lead to less conflicting uses in the future. And BPA should evaluate whether or not potential uses exist given the current zoning that provide a much greater value to the public at large.

Second, we are very much aware of the specific site conditions on these properties and any scoping at a minimum needs to look at impacts to wetlands habitat, shorelines, public vistas, archaeological, critical aquifer recharge areas, steep sloped and a myriad of other regulated areas under state and local code. Specifically as it relates to the Northshore properties, wetlands, shorelines and habitat areas exist that preclude development in certain areas, including in the proposed alignment of alternative number 50. We might be willing to share specific information with the BPA at some point in the future on these matters.

Third, Grove Field is located due east of the Lacamas Northshore properties. And the Port of Camas-Washougal recently approved an expansion of the runway to the west in order to comply with any FAA regulations. An overlay will be established limiting the heights of the structures on the Lacamas Northshore properties in order to protect the Grove Field flight path. BPA needs to consider this given the fact that the proposed transmission towers will be much larger than the current transmission

towers.

Finally, there are numerous City of Camas and Clark County Comprehensive Plan policies that should be addressed in the scoping to address any conflicts that arise with the vision for these jurisdictions. In Attachment "B", several of the policies are referred to in that letter as it relates to the benefits that the Lacamas Northshore properties bring to the City of Camas and Clark County. BPA must analyze these policies to ascertain the impact that new transmission line will have on the fulfillment of these policies.

BPA will be receiving several other comments specifically from our client's in regards to this area. Should you have any questions or a request for specific information regarding these properties, please do not hesitate to contact our office. We thank you in advance for the careful consideration of our comments and request for scoping areas.

Very truly yours,

James D. Howsley, P.C.

Communication ID: 12401

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: SHIRLEY BOEHM

Please have your environmental studies look at:

1. Routes that have no impact on home owners
2. Current routes that already have power lines or right-of-ways
3. Alternate methods of collecting energy
4. Wind energy from the gorge/Troutdale would make more sense and would have less impact
5. Current news broadcasts indicated that there was no shortage of power with the recent record-breaking cold weather
6. Forest land in the Cascade foothills that is not populated

I have these other comments:

We owned our property for over thirty years before we were could

afford to build on it just four years ago. We purposely built our home over a thousand feet from the road to ensure a quiet, country ambiance. We have no desire to have our peace intruded upon by the project you have proposed.

Shirley Boehm

[address]

Communication ID: 12403

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MIKE LINDHORST

I live along section 39 of the proposed 500kV line. I am concerned not only for the value of my home if this line were to be added, but for the safety and health of my wife and children. Please consider this line improvement to take place further east away from the vast public. Thanks for your consideration to do so.

Communication ID: 12404

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: UNKNOWN ,UNKNOWN ,UNKNOWN ,UNKNOWN ,UNKNOWN ,UNKNOWN ,UNKNOWN ,CARL ARMY,KAREN BECKER,WHITANY BEN,JENNIFER BROWN,RICHARD BRUM,MARY CHARLES,JERRI DEUCHAN,BREANE L FLUMSEN,PAMELA KLAY,SANDRA LURECK,RICHARD T PATH,FAIRGO PLECTON,MARY ROLOMSEN,ANNIE SAUERBREY

Dear BPA & BPA Board Members,

Re: NO BPA SEGMENT #31

Proposed BPA (Bonneville Power Association) I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

Our Cedar Glen Neighborhood is directly adjacent to property owners who were notified of the possibility of a 500 KV high voltage line passing through their premises. Although these owners were directly notified we were not. Instead many of us did find out about the details of this proposal until we went to a packed emergency community meeting held at the Hockinson High School. We were appalled.

The Hockinson area is currently very quiet, peaceful and scenic with and includes creeks, wildlife and wetlands. All this will be severely impacted by 150 foot high towers and a 150 foot Right Of Way tearing directly through it, the likes of which we have only seen before in desert country. Not only is this hard

on the eyes studies have shown that the Electrical and Magnetic Fields (EMF) from power lines can cause increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease, and miscarriage.

The results of the studies are conclusive with the main point of contention being what is considered a "safe" distance. How can we be certain that our children will not venture too close at any time? In addition these Australian studies were done concerning lower voltage lines, how can we be sure the effects of these higher voltage lines won't be worse?

The Hockinson School District has purchased 35 acres of land using our tax money to be ready to build a new school when needed. Segment #31 would go through this property and in my opinion would render the property unfit for a school and many other potential uses. Hockinson as a whole would have to fund the purchase of an alternate piece of property at a less desirable location. The Hockinson area already has some of the highest tax rates in Clark County.

The Clark County GIS property website identifies Segment #31 ROW parcels as having geological, seismic and erosion areas. Adding such large infrastructure with all the attendant access roads will have detrimental impact. Such an undertaking should not be considered at all.

There are much better lower impact alternatives which could be pursued. One option would transverse Washington DNR land, avoiding established communities and minimizing impact. Another option is to upgrade existing facilities with existing Right-of-Ways. There has not even been a proposal to use the existing Trojan property which today sits unused. This in itself reflects on bad choices made by officials while ignoring the impact to the community.

The public comment period ends Dec 14, 2009. After the December date this community would have to endure two years of waiting to hear the final verdict. During this time there are significant impacts to real-estate sales as no one will purchase in the area without knowing where these power lines will be.

The construction of route Segment #31 would destroy our neighborhood, our community, our residential investment and our livelihood. The community of Hockinson would never be the same.

Route Segment #31 cannot be allowed when there are clearly lower impact alternatives.

Sincerely,

Dianne Thomsen

Communication ID: 12405

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: CAROL R GREENLEE

I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed route segment #31 of the BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. Not only is my home in the Battle Ground area of Clark County, just adjacent to the proposed route, but thousands of others are as well. The majority of us, like myself, would not even have known of the proposal if our concerned neighbors had not informed us. Route segment #31 would destroy our beautiful views and decimate our already depressed property values. If the 500 Kilovolt power lines need to be added, they should be placed on the most unobtrusive and unpopulated routes possible. The California Department of Health Services (2002) concluded that living in close proximity to Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) can cause increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's disease and miscarriages. This is a huge concern for not only my family, but my entire community. I strongly urge you to abandon proposed route #31 and consider placing the 500 Kilovolt power lines where they will impact the fewest lives, families, and communities. Sincerely, Carol R. Greenlee

Communication ID: 12406

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: SHIRLEY A HUYETTE,WILLIAM D HUYETTE

RE: Comments relating to proposal

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. My wife and I own and live on lot 12 of Mountain Glen Subdivision (see map).

We understand the need for infrastructure upgrades but also understand the quality of life impacts that can occur and as such would like BPA to consider the following.

The McNary Ross line - passing east to west through our property - is 345 kilovolt having an existing right of way of 250 feet - 87.5 feet from the center to the south right of way boundary and 162.5 feet to the north boundary plus an additional 50 feet on the north boundary - totaling 125 feet of unused Lexington right of way on the north boundary. It is this 125 feet of right of way - if used - that will have a tremendous impact on the homes/folks who own and live on lots 5 through 12 of Mountain Glen Subdivision.

Should BPA elect to use the corridor indicated as 39, 38 & 37 - on map/page 105 - to make an additional Ross Substation connection, we ask the BPA to consider moving the entire right of way starting at tower 3 of the McNary Ross line to the south. Lot 12 has an additional 100 feet plus or minus adjoining the existing BPA easement. We will trade/do what's necessary to facilitate shifting to the south. The shift will require relocating tower 4 and tower 5 of the McNary Ross line working with the property owners (Baxter, LLC) to acquire an additional easement and potentially moving a tower on the Bonneville/Alcoa line. The requested shift does have an upside; the topograph to the north of towers 3 and 4 of the McNary Ross line is extremely steep declining from

south to north, moving the easement south may have tower site construction savings.

To be very clear, construction of a new 500 kilovolt line in the existing right of way is not favored by us or any of our neighbors. We will work with the BPA and the other siting agencies to minimize impact.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment.

William D. & Shirley A. Huyette

Owners of lot [##], Mountain Glen Subdivision.

map/drawing accompanying

Communication ID: 12407

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: BOB TOWNE

To Mark Korsness:

Please respect our request to use an alternative route which does not involve route 31 through Hockinson, Washington.

Hockinson is a young and thriving community with families who are attracted to Hockinson for its beauty and top schools. The transmission lines will negatively affect our schools, our children, and our community. I chose to live in Hockinson over a different community specifically because the other community had high power transmission lines running through it. I was concerned at that time about the long-term safety risks that would pose to our children. I am still very concerned about the effects of the lines on our children.

I avoided buying a property with transmission lines nearby, and I believe others have a tendency to do the same. This would destroy property values for this area, along with the significant lowering of taxes which are paid on the higher property values.

I am strongly against the routing of transmission lines along route 31 through Hockinson, and I am watching closely for how this decision is handled. There are other routes which can be used that pose much lower health and financial risks to the area chosen.

Regards,

Bob Towne

Hockinson Homeowner

[email]

Communication ID: 12408

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MIKE W AND RITA L MAHAFFA

RE: ULTRA HIGH VOLTAGE TRANSMISSION UNE #31

We, as Landowners directly affected by ultra high voltage transmission line

31, take extreme exception to the placing of very large towers and high voltage wires to be located in an area of rural home sites where the average age of residency is at least 15 years per home.

We built our home to be away from a more urban area such as the proposed transmission lines. And have seen a proportional increase in our home values as people move to our small rural area for the lifestyle and to be removed from more urban ways. This is our neighborhood choice and now the BPA is considering a major change to our visual and environmental landscape. Specifically, our neighborhood of 7 homes on 5 to 6 acres as owners, we paid extra to have underground wiring to our homes without telephone poles and that form of visual pollution. BPA is considering changing the "rules of the game" so to speak now that we are all settled into a comfortable and enjoyable visual and physical environment.

As our community of Hockinson is established with fixed zoning laws of a minimum of 5 acres for BPA to come in and change the character and visual esthetics of our community is the ultimate in high minded meddling in our rural character.

Not only will the proposed high voltage transmission towers and wires be a potential health hazard in our community, a significant decrease in our property values established over many years, a visual and noise making environmental issue and in general, a clearly not supported concept in our area proposal.

This action is what gives government agencies such as the BPA a bad public image to just step on our citizen local desires.

That desire has been made quite clear to the BPA during the citizen input time. Move the transmission towers and wires, if absolutely needed, to a less, populated area and just supply us with electricity in a non polluting, visual and environmental way. By doing so, BPA will merely pass along its increased costs to its users. You will find most Hockinson, Washington residents to support that opinion.

Communication ID: 12409

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JOHN WELINSKI

As a home owner on Segment 39 of the proposed new lines I am vehemently opposed to any additional power lines on or near my property. Besides the negative impact on property values and future health risks associated with additional lines, I feel that the direct customers for the new line should have the burden of having the new lines go through their property (i.e. Oregon). BPA needs to research routes along the South side of the Columbia River for this project. Placing additional lines on existing structures needs to be considered before running new lines with new towers. Also, the BPA engineers need to investigate the possibility of underwater lines as are used in the San Juan Islands, Key West, and in Japan for alternate power supply route segments. Clearing land and putting up towers is not the only way to run power...

Communication ID: 12410

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: ROBERT H. RODGERS

We have reviewed the information posted on the BPA web site and received in the mail as well as the County site for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. These

Scoping Comments are for your review and expansion of your current scope for the I-5 project. These are some of my comments about potential adverse environmental impacts that should be considered in the EIS for the proposed project, as well as comments on preliminary transmission line route segments and the proposed substations. The BPA alternatives alignments for the power lines is incomplete and not reasonable since it excluded potential reasonable issues and alternatives that need to be included in the scope of the EIS. I have identified these new alternatives to those drafted on your I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project Study Area Map. Some Major Issues that should be evaluated are as follows: who and what locations will benefit from this project. Each of these areas will need the percentages and economic analysis. What land will they provide for the proposed transmission corridors and how will they provide mitigation for the severe potential adverse impacts from this proposed project. What is the funding for this proposed project. How did you pick the present alternatives, where is the analysis and documentation for these alternative routes. How can we provide better scoping comments without this information? Where are your planning documents, budget documents, cost analysis, and support document on why this is needed, what it will do for this area, why only one part of your system is being targeted?

Apparently, as part of yours effort to keep pace with increasing demand, please identify all demands present and projected over a time period such as ten years, BPA is proposing to build the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, a new 500-kilovolt transmission line that would run between Castle Rock, Wash., and Troutdale, Ore_ Why these locations and how do these pieces fit into the whole system. Reinforcing the transmission system along the I-5 corridor also would provide the transmission flexibility required to bring more highly desirable renewable wind power from the east to the population centers along I-5

(which population center and their demands, need to quantify your general statements). It appears a notice of intent (NOI) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and notice of floodplain and wetlands involvement is part of this process. All wetlands and flood plains will need to be delineated so the impacts and mitigation efforts can be derived. Since BPA right of way will generate increased storm water runoff volumes and may increase discharge to these flood plains and wetlands. Therefore, Federal, State and Local permits will be needed. EPA and Department of Ecology's Active NPDES Permits over these proposed right of way corridors will need to be addressed. The Federal Clean Water Act will need to be adhered to for this project. CORP of Engineers Section 404 permit will need to be addressed. The Existing drainage systems above and below the proposed ROW will need to be addressed. The developed ROW may cause a change in drainage system that would require mitigation, permits, permission from owners of those drainage systems. The DOE and EPA "Storm Water Management Manual for Western Washington" requirements will need to be met. The development may impact private lands and public or government lands. It may cause property damage, adverse impacts to wells and water supply systems, flooding, pollution, contamination of groundwater, drainage problems, slides, and loss of fish and wildlife habitat.

It has been stated that BPA intends to prepare an EIS in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) on the construction, operation, and maintenance of a proposed 500-kilovolt (kV) transmission line and Associated substations. The development would be located in Cowlitz and Clark counties, Washington, and Multnomah County, Oregon.

Why does the new BPA transmission line that extend generally southeast from a new substation proposed near Castle Rock in Cowlitz County, Washington (referred to as Castle Rock Substation) stop there and not go further north? Why does the project have a new substation proposed near BPA's existing Troutdale Substation near the City of Troutdale in Multnomah County, Oregon?

I recommend that the BPA multiple preliminary transmission line route segments that have been identified be combined with new alternative routes either side of I-5 Freeway. This would result in new transmission line routing alternatives which may have less environmental impacts. These proposed transmission line and substations could connect into Ross Complex which

may result in a project which would have less construction, maintenance and operation cost.

What are the new BPA's transmission service requests for existing and new generation?

It was stated that BPA proposes a 500-kV transmission line that would extend from a new substation near Castle Rock, Washington, to a new substation near Troutdale, Oregon. How were these substations chosen and why. The proposal needs analysis and documentation. What

criteria was used? What is the cost. How will it be financed? Who is responsible for these decisions?

All potential transmission line routes generally extend southeast from Castle Rock through Cowlitz County, Washington, and then generally south through Clark County, Washington, to a proposed crossing of the Columbia River near the City of Camas, Washington. Just south of this river crossing, all

potential line routes would connect back into the existing system.

What transmission line design work was used to develop route segments into transmission line alternatives and is it available for review and comment? What Project Plans have been completed?

It has been stated that BPA will also consider the No Action Alternative, that is, not building the transmission line and substations, in the draft EIS_ The no action alternative may be the best solution and use the funds for micro power generation from residential and commercial sources in each county near the lines. BPA's macro power generation proposal needs to consider using micro power generation and incorporating this power into a local network of transmission lines.

BPA has identified potential environmental issues for most transmission line projects which involve land use, recreation, transportation and aviation, socioeconomics, cultural resources, visual resources, public health and safety, noise, electric and magnetic field effects, sensitive plants and animals and their habitats, soil erosion, wetlands, floodplains, and fish and water resources. All these issues should be addressed in detail with studies, analysis, reports, and how existing laws at the local, state and federal level will be satisfied.

A proposed route or sub-route on the Oregon side needs to be considered in the scope of the project. Areas that benefit from the line should participate in providing land and mitigation for this proposed project. What are all the areas which will benefit from this project?

Routes in the Urban/rural areas instead of all the alternative routes being in rural areas need to be investigated and documented in the EIS as an alternative.

A proposed route only in the national forest needs to be an alternative route that needs to be studied and part of the EIS alternatives.

An alternative route between I-5 freeway and the Columbia River needs to be included in the Scope of the project. Either side of I-5 freeway have long reaches of low population. This would make the project study area map not have all the solutions in one area. Presently, the proposed routes are all east of the existing line and through approximately the same area. It appears the routes have all been predetermined without looking at all the alternatives.

Another route that needs to be included in the scope is a line just east of Route 09 and before you get to line 10, 12, 26 and 31. It appears you left this area out of the scope. There are many areas of low population, even around 1~5_ If you do not want to put a line in this area you need to include it in the EIS and give relevant reasons why it would impact the environment significantly greater. The routes you have proposed already have large areas you have left out All potential routes need to be considered. The potential route that needs to be studied is just west of route 09 and east of I-5 freeway coming down near La Center. This route would be the shortest.

The proposed 150' easement is too small. If the tower fell over it may fall outside the ROW area. In addition, is the 150' ROW enough area to provide for all the mitigation your project will be responsible for. Is the proposed 150' ROW feasible for what you are proposing? The proposal needs your

documentation before we can provide more reasonable relevant scoping comments!

Transmission lines in the rural area will have potential negative impacts from disasters, since the lines will not be able to be maintained and operated and protected as they could be in an rural or urban areas near I-5 Freeway. This is where they are close to resources and people.

Your environmental studies and document should address potential significant negative impacts to fish and wildlife habitat Rivers, streams and creeks have a high probability to be significantly impacted with increased runoff volumes and peak flows, and increased pollutants being discharged to these streams from your proposed development.

Clark County administers the Clean Water Program to safeguard the quality of our water and complies with the Federal Clean Water Act. BPA will need to document how you will meet all these federal laws and regulations. How you will relate and coordinate with the County Clean Water Program. This will require BPA to address the County Storm Water Ordinance which is part of the Clean Water Program that is trying to meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act (EPA and DOE).

The Feasibility of the project needs to be studied to determine if the project is viable.

A NPDES permit from DOE and EPA needs to be obtained for the Proposed Project. The project is being proposed in very steep terrain (mountainous areas) and thick forest conditions. Thousands of wetlands, flood plains, creeks, rivers, springs, seeps, unstable slopes, shorelines areas, groundwater sensitive areas probably may be significantly impacted. An approved erosion control plan is needed for the total project. This plan needs to address the mass clearing, grading, filling, and discharge to streams and wetlands, floodplains, and canyons. These areas have high potential to flood, be polluted and send mud flows into the most high quality water and fish habitat in the pacific NW.

BPA has stated Substations vary in size and configuration but may cover several acres, and are cleared of vegetation and surfaced with gravel. In general, substations include a variety of structures, conductors, fencing, lighting, and other features that result in an "industrial" appearance. These facilities should require a building permit and other permits such as Storm Water Management.

Also stated by BPA is generally the following: The right of-way for a transmission corridor includes the land set aside for the transmission line and associated facilities, and land set aside for a safety margin between the line and nearby structures and vegetation. Having the safety margin helps avoid the risk of fire and other accidents. The right-of-way width needed for the proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement transmission line is 150 feet. The right-of-way is also used for access roads. We need plans of these facilities for review and the basis of comments. How will the drainage be addressed. How will increased runoff be mitigated? Vegetation that could pose a danger to a transmission line or tower is removed inside the right-of-way, and outside the right-of-way if it could come too close to lines and towers. On the right-of- way, low-growing vegetation is allowed to grow after construction and disturbed areas are reseeded with native vegetation to prevent the spread of noxious weeds. Access is needed to the transmission tower sites for both line construction and maintenance. Grading and clearing vegetation may be required for access road construction. Roads are usually graveled. Access roads can be

permanent or temporary depending on the need during construction and land use. On most rights-of-way, permanent access roads provide a way to repair and maintain the towers and line and are available for emergencies.

This type of development will remove significant amounts of existing vegetation in the 150' easement and other areas needed to construct, maintain and operate the proposed system, by clearing, constructing, grading, building roads, constructing Substations, constructing tower and transmission lines and providing fire safety, stream crossing, canyon crossing, constructing drainage improvements and etc. This clearing of vegetation and proposed improvements will Substantially increase the runoff volumes and peak flows from rainfall storms for the BPA proposed site. The run off curve number RCN for the pre-developed forested condition to a cleared area condition will significantly increase runoff volumes, therefore the surface and ground water flows may significantly increase. This increase runoff volume from the proposed development may discharge onto private and public property creating severe erosion, flooding, drainage problems, diversion of storm water, and increased pollution discharge. This increased runoff may be discharged to creeks, rivers, flood plains, drainage systems, and wetlands. The proposal needs to address county codes, city ordinances, State Laws and Federal Laws. It is highly probable that this discharge will cause adverse impacts to fish and wildlife. National

Marine Fisheries should be consulted and opinions provided for this proposed project. A JARPA needs to be completed for the Proposed Project. This JARPA should address NMF, Fish and Wildlife, CORPS of Engineers, EPA and DOE (Dept. Of Ecology) requirements. The potential project area that could be impacted may be approximately 1400 acres. This project may need to obtain permits from Clark, Multnomah and Cowlitz Counties for Shorelines, Wetlands, Flood Plain, Storm water Management, Grading and Clearing_ This increased runoff (adverse significant potential environmental impacts) may need to be mitigated by storm water control and treatment to meet County, DOE and EPA requirements and regulations.

Evaluate power transmission options that would be installed below the ground (versus overhead power lines). Study the effect power lines can have on property values and public health. Extend comment periods after appropriate materials and documents are provided to all needing this and provide enhanced opportunities for citizen input as this process unfolds. (Part From Clark County comments) Study an alternative route between I-5 and Alternative route 09. This route could use parts of route 09 and the Ross Substation or the new I-5 Bridge. This route may be more secure from disaster, easier to construct, maintain and operate (cost less). Another alternative route is between I-5 freeway and the Columbia River. This route would be near the I-5 corridor (transportation and power) and could provide power to our industrial area around Vancouver Lake where other transmission lines are. It could connect back into the Ross Complex Area. In Addition, the Oregon side of the Columbia River needs to be studied for parts of the proposed power transmission route. All of these routes have significant amount of area in rural and low population areas.

BPA worries that placing a second line adjacent to the existing 230-kilovolt line would place both lines at risk in case of a forest fire, plane crash or other disaster and could disrupt power transmission to a large area. However, This alternative of proposed adjacent line to existing line may provide the following

positive reason to choose this alternative: easier to access for construction, maintenance and operations; easier to access in emergencies; easier to observe so problem do not happen in the first place; cost less to build and maintain; less impacts to the environment and more. It appears that this second line adjacent to the existing 230 kilovolt line alternative would be further out of the mountains and heavily forested and vegetated areas with less forest fire risk. With the line being a greater distance to the west, it may be less risk for higher winds disaster, forest fires, and may be less difficult to construct, maintain and operate the power transmission system.

Evidently BPA, wants to improve its transmission grid to meet future electricity needs and provide greater reliability. What are the future electricity needs, list by area location and amount of electricity needed. Who will this line benefit (please list?) What is the financing for the proposed Improvements list all sources). Need the cost estimate for each alternative. Need cost for underground pipe alternative. The Proposed Project has many River crossings such

as the following rivers: (Columbia, Salmon, East Fork and North Fork of Lewis River, Lacamas, Cedar creek, Kalama River, Coweeman, Cowlitz, Washougal River). Hundred of Rivers and creek will need to be crossed with this developed corridor. What is the cost of these crossings including impact and mitigation cost. How will you avoid crossings of these rivers or use existing crossing of these River instead of having new crossing with highly potential adverse impacts to Fish and Fish habitat. How will you avoid fish spawning reach on the streams (these are in the upper reaches of the river where you are proposing transmission lines for example alternative line # 30 and 31 of your plan crosses the East Fork River). What is the cost for the impacts and mitigation for unstable slopes and steep slopes. How does this compare to flatter slopes and stable slopes. We request the above information. How will sensitive areas be avoided so that there are less adverse impacts to the environment.

The following Permits need to be obtained because of the Potential Severe Adverse Environmental Impacts this project may generate possibly thousands of wetlands, flood plains, rivers, creeks, wells and drainage systems that will be impacted: National Marine Fisheries because of endangered species that could be impacted; CORP 404 Permit (impacts to wetlands, discharge of material into Public waters, discharge of pollution into theses water bodies); Flood Plain Permit (Need to address no change in 100-year flood storage); Wetlands Permit; Habitat Permit; Stormwater Permit; and NPDES. The Dept of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual needs to be met to address the generation of more runoff. A detailed Stormwater and Drainage Report and Study needs to be completed that would address impacts and mitigation (Quantity Control and Water Quality Treatment and existing drainage patterns and systems). Existing drainage pattern either side of the 150' easement need to be analyzed to assure this system function as they did before development and need to analyze downstream impacts to property owners and fish and wildlife. The predeveloped stormwater runoff volumes and water quality should not be increased nor water quality derogated by the proposed development. Hundreds of surface water drainage system cross these proposed routes. These should be identified and addressed. Stormwater discharge of increased runoff and potentially polluted waters generated from your development to private and public water ways and surface runoff to private and public lands as well as State Water may require mitigation and permits and permission form numerous agencies and private owners. Some of

the proposed crossing of streams may discharge increased runoff and increased pollution load into Steel Head and Salmon spawning areas. This may result in loss of fish and wildlife habitat and fish kills. This would be caused by the developed 150' Corridor coming down the steep canyons and discharging into these sensitive streams and spawning areas.

The 150' Corridor is not wide enough to sustain operation and maintenance of the 150' Steel Towers. If the tower would fall over towards the easement line from a natural disaster then it may not be able to be repaired. The tower would fall outside the easement area (150' is greater than 75'). This would situate part of the tower on private or public property where it could not be maintained nor operated. Would you evaluate this situation.

The issues in this letter need to be evaluated and documented. The new alternatives listed above need to be considered to make this environmental document reasonable. All of the potential environmental impacts stated in this document should be analyzed along with mitigation for these impacts. We would like to be a party of record and put on the mailing list to receive hard copies of every document involved with this proposed project. Please mail us your list of identified significant or potentially significant impacts that may result from the proposed project.

The Washington Department of Ecology has environmental data on the streams and is responsible for streams - East Fork Lewis River TMDL information. "The East Fork Lewis River and its tributaries are listed on the 303(d) list of impaired water bodies for high instream temperatures and fecal coliform bacteria problems. Waterbodies placed on the 303(d) list require the preparation of a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) to identify and quantify sources of the impairments and to recommend implementation strategies for reducing point and nonpoint source loads. Would you address the above issues.

The East Fork near the ROW crossings of route 31 and 30 is a sensitive spawning ground for fish living in these waters. This reach of the East Fork of The Lewis River where you propose Transmission System crossing has high quality riparian habitat water features and is a holding area for salmon and steelhead.

Section 303(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act requires the state of Washington to prepare a list of all surface waters in the state for which beneficial uses of the water are impaired by pollutants. Waterbodies placed on the 303(d) list require the preparation of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) to identify and quantify sources of the impairments and to recommend implementation strategies for reducing point and nonpoint source loads. Need you to study and address this major issue. Evidently, The East Fork Lewis River and its tributaries are listed

on the 303(d) list of impaired waterbodies for high instream temperatures and fecal coliform bacteria problems. A Quality Assurance (QA) Project Plan describes the technical study that will evaluate pollutants in those impaired waterbodies and builds on previous data collection efforts conducted by a variety of governmental and private organizations. The study may have been conducted by the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) Environmental

Assessment (EA) Program.

This proposed project will have highly probable severe adverse impacts to the environment. These impacts may have devastating impacts to our environment that many public and private groups and agencies have worked on many years to protect and improve. There are many groups and agencies that need to be involved in this proposed project from the very start. Open Public Hearings need to be scheduled as soon as possible so that the agencies that have jurisdiction

and regulate these sensitive environmental areas can help protect and avoid sensitive areas. Funding has been provided for groups and agencies to protect and improve these valuable natural resources. The counties may have to run these Hearings where the people of the counties and state can be heard on cable TV.

Communication ID: 12411

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JERRY S. HENDERSON

I am a homeowner along route 31 for one of the proposed new power line routes BPA is considering. Although the proposed route would not cross my property directly, it would cross the neighboring property, and the towers would certainly be visible and audible from my home. Obviously, this will impact the value of my property. In fact, it probably already has just knowing there is a possibility of the line being installed on this route. However, since it does not cross my property, I would get no compensation to offset this devaluation. Now, I understand that critical infrastructure for the whole of the area must at times take precedence over some individual property owners' desires. But, if BPA's actions will directly impact the value of my property, there should be some compensation. It's my understanding that the law does not require BPA to make that compensation. I don't like it. It isn't right. But if it's the law, it's the law. What I am extremely frustrated by is that this is even a route under consideration. There are two other routes that make significantly more sense. The more westerly route uses existing right of ways along the route of existing power lines. The impact upon citizens along that route would be minimal since they already have the lines there. The more easterly route goes through open timber land for the most part. In the vast undeveloped parcels that this route crosses, property owners would all be fairly compensated. There would be very little impact on nearby property owners because the area is sparsely populated. I've heard the arguments against both of these alternate routes. The westerly route may potentially have capacity limitations, and some greater reliability issues. The easterly route is longer and crosses rougher terrain, therefore more expensive. It is my belief that the key issues to be compared here are cost versus how many in the populace are impacted. I feel very strongly that a top priority in the selection process should be to minimize the impact on property owners. Obviously, it would be cost prohibitive to try to address this infrastructure vulnerability with the goal of having zero impact on individual property owners. What I ask is that there be a significant effort

to minimize this impact and a willingness to look beyond what could be the low cost alternative and choose the best alternative.

Communication ID: 12412

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: RON MEHL

Dear BPA, My home is in the Hockinson area and is near the proposed route segment #31 of the I5 Corridor Project. Putting the 150ft towers in this area will decrease the value of my home and many other along the route you have chosen to investigate. You have other options available to you that I will hope you will consider instead of this route. I have contacted my senators as well as other agencies to state my objection to the building of these towers though our neighborhood. Please consider dropping this route. Sincerely, Ron Mehl

Communication ID: 12413

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JUDY SILLS

December 13, 2009 To the Decision Makers for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, By now, you have received numerous comments conveying widespread public opposition to the flawed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project proposals. Concerned citizens have been given inadequate or no notice at all, depending on where their homes are in proximity to the proposed segments connecting Castle Rock and Troutdale. A multitude of requests, including requests for another public comment period extension and access to the Draft Planning Report for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project (9/7/2007) have been ignored. Similar requests from state legislators Joseph Zarelli, Ed Orcutt and Jaime Herrera, and the Board of Clark County Commissioners for transparency and responsiveness seem to have fallen on deaf ears. The BOCC has spent significant county resources to acknowledge and assist citizens with their concerns due to BPA's mismanagement of the public notification and comment period, and has asked for reimbursement of its expenses. Washington citizens are sending a clear message. Take a step back. Extend the public comment period until adequate public dialogue has occurred with BPA in open-forum meetings. Consider alternatives to the current proposal that utilize new technologies (e.g., underground superconductor cables) that would minimize public health and safety issues, as well as socioeconomic impact. Although the cost would be greater in the short-term, lower maintenance costs and other factors will mitigate expenses in the long-term. There are yet other choices that minimize or remove the effects on individuals and families: 1) a route east of the current scoping effort that keeps transmission lines on public lands and off private properties, and 2) routes paralleling existing corridors to the West. Public concerns about living near electromagnetic fields generated by 500KV lines, are being discounted as there is no published report that will unequivocally state an individual's health is negatively impacted by long-term EMF exposure. However, there is a well-documented association between EMF and the

incidence of childhood leukemia, as well as delayed adult onset cancers and other medical conditions, through epidemiological studies. It makes sense that these results are not necessarily supported in the laboratory setting, yet the BPA persists in holding on to this flawed understanding of how long term health impacts are detected. The burden of proof must be on the BPA to ensure there is no public health risk, not the other way around. Given what we already know, if it cannot be proven the health risks are zero, then individuals (especially children)! should not be exposed to this potential risk. In conclusion, it is imperative that the BPA address the public's real and perceived concerns with thorough research of all alternatives to the current proposal. The BPA can be a leader in innovative and creative solutions, with the resources at its disposal. There is great potential for a win-win solution. The public expects and deserves no less. Respectfully submitted, Judy Sills

Communication ID: 12414

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: CARL THOMSEN

Dear BPA and BPA Board Members,

Re: NO BPA SEGMENT#31

Proposed BPA (Bonneville Power Association) I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

My property is adjacent to property owners who were notified of the possibility of a 500 KV high voltage line passing through their premises. Although these owners were directly notified I was not. Instead many of us did find out about the details of this proposal until we went to a packed emergency community meeting held at the Hockinson High School.

The Hockinson area is currently very quiet, peaceful and scenic with and includes creeks, wildlife and wetlands. All this will be severely impacted by 150 foot high towers and a 150 foot Right Of Way tearing directly through it, the likes of which we have only seen before in desert country. Not only is this hard on the eyes studies have shown that the Electrical and Magnetic Fields (EMF) from power lines can cause increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease, and miscarriage. The results of the studies are conclusive with the main point of contention being what is considered a "safe" distance. How can we be certain that our children will not venture too close at any time? In addition these Australian studies were done concerning lower voltage lines, how can we be sure the effects of these higher voltage lines won't be worse?

The Hockinson School District has purchased 35 acres of land using our tax money to be ready to build a new school when needed. Segment #31 would go through this property and in my opinion would render the property unfit for a school and many other potential uses. Hockinson as a whole would have to fund the purchase of an alternate piece of property at a less desirable location. The Hockinson area already has some of the highest tax rates in Clark County.

There are much better lower impact alternatives which could be pursued. One option would transverse Washington DNR land, avoiding established communities and minimizing impact. Another option is to upgrade existing facilities with existing Right-of-Ways. There has not even been a proposal to use the existing Trojan property which today sits unused and had power lines running to it. This in itself reflects on bad choices made by officials while ignoring the impact to the community.

The public comment period ends Dec 14, 2009. After the December date this community would have to endure two years of waiting to hear the final verdict. During this time there are significant impacts to real-estate sales as no one will purchase in the area without knowing where these power lines will be. In fact in talking to friends we found several who were looking to buy and will now rule out the Hockinson area as a possibility due to this new information. The degradation of property values has begun already!

The construction of route Segment #31 would destroy my neighborhood, my community, my residential investment and my livelihood. The community of Hockinson would never be the same. Route Segment #31 cannot be allowed when there are clearly lower impact alternatives.

Sincerely,

Carl Thomsen

Communication ID: 12415

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: CHRISTINA SHAW, THOMAS SHAW

Dear Mr. Korsness,

As a member of the Hockinson community I would like to express my strong opposition to the use of Segment 31 for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project and urge you to remove this option from further consideration. My reasons are as follows:

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY: I am extremely concerned regarding the health effects of EMFs. The California Department of Health Services concluded in 2002 that persons living in close proximity to Electro-Magnetic Fields were at increased risk for childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease and miscarriage. A 2007 study led by R.M. Lowenthal of the University of Tasmania School of Medicine in Australia further concluded that living within 328 yards of high voltage power lines puts adults at over 2x increased risk and children at 5x greater risk of developing cancer than those who do not live near high voltage power lines. Neither of these studies considered transmission lines as powerful as the 500 KV lines proposed for Segment 31. Would you want your children at risk of such exposure?

AESTHETICS: My family searched for months to discover the incredibly beautiful property we built our

home on in the community of Hockinson and designed our home with the view in mind. The visual effects of 150 feet of towering power lines near our home and obstructing the beautiful views of the valley and surrounding areas would be devastating.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC and PUBLIC SERVICES: My family and numerous other families moved to the Hockinson area because of the school district's reputation and performance. Hockinson School District recently purchased 35 acres for a new school. Segment #31 would go through this property and may render this property unfit for a school. The current primary/intermediate school at the corner of 159th and 164th is within a mile from the proposed route segment. If Segment #31 is constructed, many families will be forced to relocate and others may pull children from the school because of health concerns. A sinking tax base fueled by some of the highest property taxes in Clark County will adversely affect not only the school, but the fire district as well.

HOMES AND PROPERTY VALUES: Segment #31 is highly populated with homes. Compensation at fair market value will be offset by the negotiated 100 foot easement rights, lowering the compensation received by home/landowners directly in the path of the expanded (150 foot) easement. Adjacent properties will also experience decreased home values without any compensation.

For these reasons, I ask that you select an alternative route that has less impact, possibly one that travels through a less populated area.

Sincerely,

Christina Shaw

[Address]

[Phone]

Thomas Shaw

[Address]

[Phone]

Communication ID: 12416

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: SEAN P SMITH

12-7-2009

Anita Decker, COO

BPA

I am a very concerned citizen and am pleading for your consideration. I live just outside of Hockinson, WA and am in the direct path of the BPA's proposed transmission line route 31. I purchased my home in 2005 when the markets were good with no intentions on selling for 25 to 30 years. I bought my home which is located in a nice quiet neighborhood in the country with the intentions of raising a family here. This is a good area, with good schools and good people; an area I would consider represents what living in the United States is all about.

I currently still have a job; thankfully, but I could not afford to start over nor would I want to. No matter what kind of compensation people would get for their homes, it still costs money to relocate; money which I do not believe many people have right now. People are struggling to pay their bills and take care of their families, and now the BPA wants to burden them with taking their homes and forcing them to relocate. This is not the time to ask people to give any more than they already are; I am appalled by the request.

I am begging you to choose a different route other than route 31. It affects way too many people as it goes through a fairly populated area. The BPA needs to consider sending it east on less populated lands.

With concern,

Sean Smith

[address]

[phone]

Communication ID: 12417

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: GARY AND RENE ECKERT

I am concerned with routing points 36 and 37. This route will be very close to existing homes and impact the liveability of the area. --Electro-magnetic Force --Property Values --Wetlands, and --Environmental Impact, could directly impact the quality of life we currently enjoy. I encourage you to route the new lines in the most Easterly route having the least impact on community residents. Thank you, Gary Eckert

Communication ID: 12418

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: PHIL BOURQUIN

RB: City of Camas; Comment to pl'Opposed scope of E.I.S (DOE/EIS -0436)

To: BPA Comment Coordination

The following scoping comments, submitted on behalf of the City of Camas, are intended to raise awareness of issues to those segments of the potential project path that are currently being considered within the City of Camas and its Urban Growth Area (UGA):

1. The City of Camas includes significant lands dedicated to employment, parks and recreational uses, residential uses and enjoys significant scenic views of Lacamas Lake, Mount Hood and the Columbia River Gorge. Several of the proposed BPA alignment alternatives would have impact on lands within the City of Camas [BPA Maps page III, 112, 113, 115, 116. Segments 40, 41, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52]- Camas requests that any portion of the project path be carefully evaluated with a full breadth of understanding as to the existing and planned developments for these areas.

2. The City of Camas passed Ordinance 2030 in 1995, regulating Electrical Transmission Lines and Distribution Facilities through Camas Municipal Code CMC, Chapter 8.52. CMC Section 8.52.010 includes findings adopted by the City relating to distribution lines and impacts within the City.

Generally, the Camas Municipal Code requires transmission lines to be underground and away from child sensitive locations, parks and recreation areas and other areas designed for prolonged human presence.

It is the expectation of the City that BPA will include an environmental justice evaluation in their EIS and that alternatives will also include an analysis of different means of energy distribution, not just geography but also smart grid technologies, AC vs, DC, etc..

3. The City of Camas has identified the following areas as areas of concern that should be evaluated under any E.I.S. for this area.

- Segment 41 runs through what is referred to locally as the Green Mountain annexation areas and include land that is currently subject to development pursuant to a development agreement. This area includes lands planned for single family high density use, multi-family densities, commercial and recreational uses.
 - Segment 40, 44 and 46 appear to run through sensitive environmental areas. Section 40 appears to include areas of protected Bradshaw Lomatia.
 - Segment 47 and 50 extends through another area recently annexed into the City that is designated for employment and residential uses. Employment within this area may include high technology uses that are sensitive to electric and magnetic fields, schools, day care facilities, recreational facilities, and residential uses. The existing Camas High School is currently in proximity to Segment 50 and additional residential land within the UGA would be impacted by development of Segment 50.
 - Segment 52 runs through: 1) the Washougal River Greenway which includes a significant regional trail
-

system and linkage, 2) lands purchased in recent years by the City of Camas for development of recreational uses (west of Yale Street and adjacent to Goot Park), 3) Lady Island which is owned by Georgia Pacific and likely include environmental considerations as well as redevelopment opportunities.

4. The Camas City Council held a workshop on November 2, 2009. BPA representatives Mark Korsness and Elizabeth Klump were present. Mr. Korsness explained the potential routes and stated it is his belief that BPA will be able to complete the segment through Camas by using existing R/W and that they will not have to negotiate the purchase of additional R/W1. The City is interested in reviewing an analysis of any needed right-of-way through Camas for impacts from the proposed 500Kv transmission line on not only existing uses but impacts to currently available lands for the siting of new employment, housing and recreation uses.

The City of Camas looks forward to providing you information to assist you in evaluating any proposed alignment through Camas and encourages BPA to fully study the economic, social, recreational and environmental impacts any alignment would have to the community of Camas.

Sincerely,

Phil Bourquin

Community Development Director

c. Mayor Paul Dennis

Communication ID: 12419

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: PETER REVESZ

My comments are in the uploaded file under Choose File below. The attachments referred to in the file are in a complete packet sent by express mail on December 13th. We were assured at the Amboy meeting that comments would be considered that were submitted beyond today, 12/14. Thank you.

COMMENTS TO BPA ON I-5 CORRIDOR REPLACEMENT PROJECT

Peter T. and Jane M. Revesz

[address]

12/13/2009

SPECIFIC COMMENTS FOR THE WITTER AND REVESZ FAMILY TREE FARM LOCATED AT Section 18, T5N R4E WM under Route Segment 28

Powerlines are incompatible with tree farming. As you write in your materials, trees and power lines don't mix. This north Clark County soil and climate grow the best timber in the world, in fact, the native conifers grow to 200 feet and higher. A power line is incompatible with tree farming. In reality, limiting growth of trees is incompatible with tree farming. A 300+ foot swath for half a mile eliminates something like 20 acres from tree growing; access roads are additional. Attachment 1 illustrates the area a power line effects. The BPA stated 150 foot easement is only about half of the area from which mature trees may fall on the power line and, therefore, these trees outside the easement may be removed under BPA control. Consequently, this adjacent strip of another 75 feet on both sides of the easement is not available for ordinary forest management. Since this property is zoned for forest only that is confiscation of all use of the land. We have grown those trees for generations and even more importantly, growing timber is among the most health promoting activities available for our planet.

Our tree farm is unique in the site-specific management, sensitive areas and rugged terrain. They contribute substantially to the ecology, biology, silviculture, scenery, and wildness of the area.

We have protected this tree farm in its beauty and desirability by its isolation. The power line would open it to the public in a way it has never been. The Creek with its pond, is a major fish-bearing tributary to Cedar Creek south of Chelatchie Prairie. It is a remarkable jewel, mostly accessed only by a few neighbors and, therefore, has retained its pristine quality, supports fish and wildlife, and preserves water quality. (See Photo 1.) The Creek above and below the pond is fully functioning and is loaded with freshwater shellfish and large woody debris. These are portions of creek that are thoroughly healthy with buffers and cover, ideal for fish and wildlife. The pond is a winter refuge for hundreds of waterfowl. Douglas Fir and Western Red Cedar trees of 100+ feet in height surround the pond and grow in the canyons of the creek which makes this a spectacular, aesthetic place—not to be sacrificed to defoliation and use of pesticides as a power line easement. A large power line over or near the Pond would interrupt the free flight in and out of the waterfowl. It would also introduce access roads for large machinery (and everything else) that do not currently exist.

Steepness on the Tree Farm and adjacent lands. (See Attachment 2 for location.) The topography of this tree farm was described by our forester in our Management Plan: "The terrain is benchy with some steep slopes between benches and adjacent to the creek." Very steep slopes need special treatment. As shown on the attached DNR map (Attachment 3) there are steep, erodible slopes (pink areas) 1) coming up from (historic) Chelatchie Prairie to the bench with our tree farm and, then, 2) another slope rising steeply up to the high bench that extends south until it descends into the valley of the East Fork of the Lewis River. This second slope on the south side of our tree farm is a steep mountainside of over 96% slope and is impossible to access and ascend by any kind of vehicle. An additional concern is that line segment 28 appears to cross the sensitive, lovely area of Cedar Creek Falls. (See location on Attachment 2.) Maintaining an easement and power line up these slopes seems impossible and severely damaging to irreplaceable scenic spots.

Loss of functioning tree farm. Riparian buffers have already removed 30 acres from economic use for the owners. If we additionally lose 20+ acres on a power line, at some point one is forced out of business. This property is zoned Forest Tier I; it is not available to be used for anything else. This tree

farm is blessed with cinebar soil and an ideal climate for tree farming. It is a real jewel and should not be shaved off for the power line, which can go elsewhere.

CONCLUSION:

The multiple steep segments and sensitive areas under BPA's route segment 28 render this route ill suited for power lines and their destructive easements.

Communication ID: 12420

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: VINCENTE MOLINOS

December 14, 2009

Mr. Mark Korsness

Project Manager BPA I-5

Dear Mark,

Thanks for patiently listening to our questions and suggestions today at the rally.

As promised, I have attached copies of my literature review on EMF's health effects and copies of the 2005 British study and the 2007 Australian study quoted there. Based on that information, I seriously doubt that you or anyone else with children or grandchildren, well informed and given a choice, would accept to live any closer than 900 ft from a 500kv line.

As discussed, I believe that it is in everyone's best interest to get the EMF issue in the open. I do understand the potential liability implications. However, this snowball will only get bigger.

With organized citizen support and good legislative and regulatory foot work at the right levels, precautionary maximum residential exposure values could be defined and perhaps phased-in over time.

The additional transmission investment costs resulting from these precautionary measures would be paid by all ratepayers and they should be weighed against all other economic and environmental costs. Citizens who pay for the electrical rates also pay for the indirect effects such as lost property tax revenues and higher health insurance rates.

I realize that your practical side may see this endeavour as beyond the scope of your duties. However, I am convinced that defining the precautionary parameters, even internally, will greatly strengthen the planning criteria and facilitate the definition and evaluation of the new alternatives. Having read about the major transmission challenges facing the eastern regions of this great country of ours, the PNW has

an opportunity to establish a trend.

If this is something you wish to discuss further, please let me know and I will see if and how I can get our group's support.

Vicente A. Molinos

Member, Steering Committee A better way for BPA

Communication ID: 12421

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: TRAVIS W NELSON

SUBJECT: Public Scoping: I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Transmission Project, Clark
and Cowlitz County, Washington

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) has reviewed the transmission line alternatives identified in the September 2009 Fact Sheet for the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project and offers the following comments to scoping the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for this proposal at this time. Comments provided here are limited to considerations for scoping the DEIS as the project relates to impacts to fish and wildlife and related habitats. Additional comments may be provided in the future as the proposal is refined and developed.

The BPA Route Segment Areas (RSA) illustrated in the Fact Sheet represent varying degrees of risk and impact to fish and wildlife resources. WDFW recommends that BPA consider the WDFW Wind Power Guidelines (WPG) when developing the DEIS and associated mitigation strategy. The WPG are a stakeholder driven wind energy development standard for evaluating potential effects of large scale energy construction on the landscape. WDFW recommends a focused evaluation and consideration of potential habitat impacts to the following: existing mitigation parcels for hydroelectric facilities, stream crossings, riparian habitats, forested habitat impacts, elk winter range, and wildlife migration corridors.

Existing Mitigation Parcels

WDFW has participated in the negotiation of the mitigation settlement agreements for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) licensing of the hydroelectric facilities on the Lewis River system. WDFW is a partner in managing the mitigation lands and fisheries resources associated with these agreements and recommend that the DEIS evaluates the consistency of the existing proposal with the objectives outlined in the mitigation agreements.

Stream Crossings and Riparian Habitat

WDFW manages for the protection of fish life through riparian habitat protection and fish passage, for the purposes of perpetuating the fish species found in the state of Washington, and providing fishing opportunities to the citizens of the State. These goals and objectives are met through habitat protection measures that include managing for functional riparian habitats that provide Large Woody Debris contribution and fish passage. WDFW recommends the DEIS evaluates the consistency of the RSAs with these goals and objectives.

Forested Habitats

Forested habitat areas are essential to several wildlife species that require thermal protection from the elements (elk and deer), platform and cavity nest trees (murrelets, spotted owls, etc.) which are typically found in mature forests and old growth forests. WDFW recommends the DEIS evaluates the consistency of the RSAs with these goals and objectives.

Elk Winter Range

Winter range for elk is essential to the survival of this species. Elements that are included in healthy elk winter range habitat include abundant forage species of herbs and forbs as well as thermal protection from winter time elements. WDFW recommends the DEIS evaluates the consistency of the RSAs with these goals and objectives.

WDFW will continue to be engaged in the review process of this proposal, and looks forward to working with BPA on the development of this project.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. If you have any questions, please contact me directly at [phone] or e-mail at Travis.Nelson@dfw.wa.gov

Sincerely,

Travis Nelson

Renewable Energy Section – Manager

cc; Allen Fiksdal, EFSEC

Liz Klumpp, BPA

Guy Norman, WDFW Vancouver

Mike Ritter, WDFW Pasco

Communication ID: 12422

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JULIA STOLL

Hi, my name is Julia Stoll and my husband's name is Fearon Smith F E A R O N Smith. We're on the mailings list for the corridor project. We're very concerned about the corridor possibly going through the area where we live and where we've been involved in and have had property since 1971. And in facilitating really fine regional art and artists being involved in response to the landscape. Our Contact information our phone number is [phone]. Our address is [address]. I'm not sure about what the adjusted end of the comment period is, today is Monday Dec 14th and we would like to have you receive written comments. Our computer isn't functioning in a way that we could send you them by computer. Could you please send us the correct place to send the information? That's [address]. And we understand that you work with a balance of issues but we've invested decades of work in trying to enhance the wonderful natural resources of this area and the artistry and response to it and the economy through the art and the travel people had made in order to reach this area and celebrate the beauty, we're concerned about that being decimated by the project. Thank you, this is Julia Stoll

Communication ID: 12423

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: STEVEN BRATT

It is obvious in the I5 corridor planning documents that route 31 would have a much greater impact on residential homeowners than the other proposed routes that run further East. There is a lot of information on this site, and yet it says very little about the types of criteria that could cause BPA to choose Route 31 over the other eastern alternatives (or make it less suitable). Without this information, residents in the area have only fear and doubt as motivators to drive their actions!

I'm sure the draft EIS due in 2011 will address specific strengths and weaknesses of various route proposals, but the public needs real information about selection criteria NOW that we can use to make reasoned decisions about our actions with respect to the project. It is unreasonable to expect that the residents impacted by route 31 should wait until 2011 for answers about why BPA may or may not select that route!

Communication ID: 12424

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: ED DAHLQUIST II,PAT FLIPPEN,JOAN DAHQUIST MCKEE

This lovely, narrow corridor, only 5 minutes to the Kelso city limits, has too many environmental impacts already. To the West is the Cowlitz River, so changed by the Mt. St. Helen's eruption, then going

Eastward, alongside the river is the Railroad, then the wetlands and floodplains, the Old Pacific Hwy., more wetlands, utility lines, the frontage road, then, of course I-5. All have right of Way Impacts as well. Property owners in this corridor have had so much land taken from them, that there's not much left. Our family-owned parcel, [number], a pristine, sloping 18 acres has had nearly half declared wetlands, already, this land has been in our family for our generations, yet we are under rigid restrictions for use of what's left. We have an appraisal which states that noise & congestion from the two highways & the railroad are a negative. As for access for "studies," haven't these already been done? We have ours available from the Cowlitz Co. Courthouse. Why spend so much time and tax payers' money on such an unsuitable and populated route? We urge you to choose a more remote route on existing 02 or 09 routes.

It does not seem right or fair that because of your actions & timetable, this large pioneer community of property owners will be unable to market or refinance their property until after Spring of 2012, if then! Some will lose everything they've worked for. Also, in this suffering economy, do you really think you will find comparables of "solds" for a true estimate of value? Better words, in these times, would be, compared to "Give-aways." People are trying to stay calm in the face of this disastrous intrusion into their lives but, quite frankly, we're all mad as hell."

Wouldn't it have been a little more thoughtful to, at least, let us enjoy the holidays before you declared "your rights" to our property.

Merry Christmas to all at Bonneville Power. (none of whom, we're sure, live under any high power lines.)

Pleasant Hill property owners

Joan Dahquist McKee

Pat Dahlquist Flippen

Ed Dahlquist II

Communication ID: 12425

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: DOUGLAS R BROCKBANK

Greetings Anita:

I remember you well from the Leadership In Action work we did together at PacifiCorp in 2002, and am not the least bit surprised by the trajectory of your career in the years since. A belated congratulations to you, if that is the appropriate sentiment. I can only imagine the complexity of your job today, as balancing the needs of stakeholders must feel like a "high wire" circus act of extraordinary difficulty.

With your i5 Reinforcement Project, I represent one of those stakeholders. I sit in a firestorm of public outcry over Segment 31, running from Camas north to just east of Battle Ground. And, I'm appealing to you directly to take this option off the table as soon as possible.

Much as I would want the opportunity, I'll not waste your time with arguments about health, lifestyle, culture, environment, and property values. But I would like to appeal to you from a leadership perspective, as that is where you have clearly excelled, and where I've devoted the 33 years of my career. Although I'll not pretend to remember your comments on this specific topic, I have to believe that as a leader, you put real value on "doing the right thing".

"For whom in this case?", you may ask, thinking about the aforementioned high wire act.

I also don't pretend to be objective. My life, my family's life and the home we chose 14 years ago for the rest of our lives would be decimated by Segment 31. But there are hundreds similarly affected, and thousands more to a lesser, but still significant degree.

So in my view, doing the right thing would fully consider the gravity of such a decision on people's lives, as compared to the difficult (or more expensive), but very different nature of the factors on alternative segments.

I also met and spoke at length with Mark Korsness and Mike Johns (on Mark's team and 30+ years with BPA). They were both top-notch professionals, and wonderful ambassadors for BPA during the recent community meetings. When I think of you, and the two of them as representing the kind of people making these decisions, I can only feel hopeful. That, as you weigh options amidst hundreds of competing dynamics and decision factors, there are some considerations that cut directly to the most basic human values, and truly stand apart. This in one of them. Please take Segment 31 off the table.

Yours very sincerely,

Doug

Douglas R. Brockbank

Leadership Frontiers

[phone]

Communication ID: 12426

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: DAVID KEMPER, MARIEKE KEMPER

There has been few if any comments on the proposed BPA routes that say, "Bring it on into my

neighborhood next to my dream home in paradise.” I would love to hear the snap, crackle, and pop of cancer beginning in my brain. I could get free electricity by putting batteries under the 150’ right-of-way because I have seen pictures of a man holding up a fluorescent light fixture brilliantly lit with no wires attached.

What is the cost of habitat destruction, of human dreams lost, and visual blight to natural splendor? What is the cost in dollars of a 2 year EIS study that can only measure a few of the lost flora, fauna, and human lives? Could it be possible that the cost of this 2 year study would pay for a large portion of the already existing I-5 route beefed up with another 500 KV line? That the build-out in the existing I-5 corridor would be much more cost effective because of no need to purchase right of ways, no in-depth EIS, no new destruction of homes, human lives, and habitats. What would be the cost in dollars in construction of new routes that cross homes, mountains, rivers, and streams versus a route that is flat and already exists (great comment: use Trojans lines).

The plot thickens like some China Town movie. Why do we want to send power to California (a BPA rationale)? Do we want to cut down a 150’ swath a 100 miles long to Californicate our beautiful state? Do we want to help the already heavily federally subsidized wind farms in the gorge get a free ride for their transmission in their Enron-like power grab scam?

I have heard the BPA play the terrorist card, the earthquake card and the ice storm card, using these arguments for the new routes. These are not cogent reasons. The BPA would have to monitor/patrol these new routes in addition to the old established route. Any terrorist would attack both lines and it would cost a lot more to fix any of the alternate routes. Also, the alternate routes are much more likely to be affected by ice storms because of the higher altitudes and the greater rates of precipitation versus the warmer I-5 river route. The close proximities of the existing route to new alternate routes makes the “big one” quake seem to not be any reason at all. The new towers I hope will be built to present earthquake- proof standards.

We want the BPA to tell us (forget the cost of human grief and degradation of nature) how much their projected/estimated cost difference in dollars is between the EIS and I-5 route build-out versus the alternate routes EIS and build-outs. I have been to a lot of public meetings that discuss routes, but I have not seen any ultimate cost estimates of this project, or what it will do to Northwest power costs or to the already indebtedness of the BPA power system. This is still America, the will of the people can make a difference--contact all of your representatives to oppose this bureaucratic power tower to their own BPA legacy. Roll on Columbia, but Don’t Roll over Us

David Kemper

Battle Ground, Wa

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: ELANA D GLASS

Hello Tim,

My name is Elana and I as well as 8,000 other home owners have received a letter from BPA siting eminent domain, to take our homes from us. I live in the Salmon Creek neighborhood the Highlands near Pleasant Valley School and was shocked to learn that they want to remove half of my neighborhood including my home in order to put up 150ft electrical conductors. My family as well as many others are in a terrible position. Who wants to be near these cancer causing currents? I can't sleep or eat. We don't know where to turn or what

we can do to fight this. These are our homes and I am in shock to find out how us tax payers and good people deserve this kind of treatment.

Please help us,

Thanks so much,

Elana

Communication ID: 12428

Date: 11/21/2009

Name: MIKE SIMPSON

I am writing to the County Commissioners to solicit your help to convince the BPA to move their proposed new power line to the farthest east option. I am sure you are aware of BPA's current proposal to build a new 500 KV power line through Clark County. I would hope that the Commissioners have considered the financial impact to the County if this line runs through the Hockinson and Brush Prairie route. Not only would hundreds of residences be removed but property values in general would be decreased. This has to effect property taxes and County revenue. I would like to see the potential fiscal impact to the County.

In light of the current state of the real estate market this BPA proposal could not come at a worse time. Is it possible the BPA timed this to be able to purchase the necessary real estate at the lowest cost? Just the possibility of the power lines coming through our neighborhoods have reduced values. And yet, we are told the BPA has at least two years before they will decide where the line will go. So our lives and our property values are on hold until then.

We would appreciate any help you could provide to influence the BPA to either move this line to the

east or stop the project altogether. And the sooner a decision is made the better for all of Clark County.

Thank you.

Mike Simpson

[address]

Communication ID: 12429

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: DEBORAH A STAVIG,ROBERT A STAVIG

Subject: Copies of letters to Washington State leaders concerning

No BPA - Segment 31.

Mr. Korsness,

Attached are copies of three letters sent to Washington State leaders from my wife and I concerning serious safety and quality of life issues with Segment 31. Please include these in the formal feedback process BPA is holding for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

Regards,

Robert N. Stavig

Attachments:

Letter to: Washington Department of Natural Resources, Honorable Peter Goldmark

Subject: No BPA Segment 31 - Alternate route of Segment 30 through DNR lands.

Honorable Peter Goldmark,

My wife and I are home owners in Clark County and will be negatively impacted by the BPA Segment 31 power line, (as part of the I-5 Corridor Project). We are requesting the DNR to actively support Segment 30 (or other routes) over that of Segment 31. (Segment 31 transmission line would require the placement of 150 foot towers every 900 feet through the center of East Clark County.)

Segment 31 will travel directly through prime residential and rural land. Segment 31 will directly impact hundreds of homes and indirectly effect many many more. (Ironically Hockinson School District purchased DNR land in March 2008 to specifically build an elementary school. If Segment 31 is built, it will eliminate this land as a site for a school.)

The health concerns for children should be your primary concern. Additionally, impact to property values, a reduction in the tax base, and impacts in livability will negatively effect the lives of children. Any long term losses of timber profits can be dealt with. However, the placement of power transmission lines over the homes of children will be in place for many decades to come.

As a parent, taxpayer, and outdoorsman, I very much appreciate the purpose of the DNR and directly benefit from its work. Managing public lands is critical and in this case I believe that the best choice for the citizens of Washington (both present and future) would be to utilize DNR land to eliminate the negative choice of putting high voltage transmission lines over the homes of children.

Finally, we request that this item be a discussion item as part of your January board meeting.

Regards,

Robert N. Stavig and Deborah A. Stavig

Letter to: US Senators Patty Murray and Maria Cantrell and US Representative Brian Baird.

Subject: No BPA Segment 31 - Alternate route of Segment 30 through DNR lands.

Senator Murray, Senator Cantwell, and Representative Baird, My wife and I are home owners in Clark County and will be negatively impacted by the BPA Segment 31 power line, (as part of the I-5 Corridor Project). Segment 31 will travel directly through prime residential and rural land. Segment 31 will directly impact hundreds of homes and indirectly effect many many more. Segment 31 transmission line would requirement the placement of 150 foot towers every 900 feet, north to south, through the center of East Clark County. These transmission lines have no benefit to Clark County. Their purpose is to move power to Seattle and California. It is not appropriate to negatively impact a so densely populated portion of the state. SW WA has been one of the fast growing portion of the state and Segment 31 will negatively effect both our current quality of life and future growth and specifically health concerns. Studies by California Department of Health Series (2002) and a 2007 Independent Study have concluded living near Eclectic and Magnetic Fields (EMF) can increase the likelihood of childhood leukemia, Lou Gehrigh's Disease, miscarriage, and adult brain cancer. The Independent Study was done on power lines of 88KV to 220KV (much lower than the proposed 500KV of this project.) Segments to the east (28, 29, and 30) would have significantly less safety issues for children and we request that these routes be seriously considered. In addition to the risks from EMF, pesticides used to maintain the surrounding areas near the towers can enter the ground water causing additional health risk through drinking water drawn from household ground wells. We have requested that the WA Department of Natural Resource actively support the use of more easterly routes (Segments 28, 29, 30 etc.) over that of Segment 31. We request that you support those routes. If those routes are more expensive we would expect the receivers of this power to fund the difference. Clark County should not have to fund cheap power to others - specifically through a reduced standard of living.

Regards,

Robert N. Stavig and Deborah A. Stavig

Letter to: Washington Sate Reps Jamei Herrera and Ed Orcott, and WA Senator Joseph Zarelli

Subject: No BPA Segment 31 - Alternate route of Segment 30 through DNR lands.

Representative Herrera, Representative Orcott, and Senator Zarelli, My wife and I are home owners in east Clark County Washington and will be negatively impacted by the BPA Segment 31 power line. We believe that you play a critical roll to ensure that the quality of life in SW Washington, and specifically east Clark County, is appropriately maintained. I am sure you are well aware of the negative impact that BPA Segment 31 would have on a significant number of home owners in your district. Specifically we want to ensure that the Department of Natural Resources actively supports the use of Segments 28, 29, 30, 32-34, over that of Segment 31. Segment 31 will have devastating effect on central east Clark County. As a tax payer, I would like to know what policies or laws would prevent DNR from supporting a segment through the lands they manage on behalf of the citizens of Washington. If there are financial issues, such as long term loss of timber revenue then that should be addressed by the BPA. If unresolved financial issues create issues for the DNR to support segments through their lands then the state as a whole should deal with that. It is not appropriate that a small group of taxpayers should be forced to bear the brunt of a financial decision that in no way benefits them. If there are specific laws or policies that prevent DNR from supporting segments through their land please address those laws or policies. Clark County should not have to live with a bad decision for decades to come because of poor policies or law. Lastly, I am also sure you are well aware of the health issues associated with high voltage power lines. Studies by California Department of Health Series (2002) and a 2007 Independent Study have concluded living near Eclectic and Magnetic Fields (EMF) can increase the likelihood of childhood leukemia, Lou Gehrig's Disease, miscarriage, and adult brain cancer. Putting these lines in areas with virtually no homes (e.g. DNR land) is a much less risky path. I would very much appreciate knowing what you think you can do to help.

Regards,

Robert N. Stavig and Deborah A. Stavig

Communication ID: 12430

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: THERESA CARTER

Sirs:

I am a small forest landowner in Clark County. I and my predecessors for more than 50 years have nurtured the family tree farm, planting trees, protecting the forest, wildlife

habitat, and water quality.

Our past experience with the local public electric utility, which has repeatedly failed to abide by the agreed contract terms, has proven to us that PUBLIC POWER

TRANSMISSION LINES SHOULD NEVER BE LOCATED ON PRIVATE PROPERTY WHEN A PUBLIC PROPERTY LOCATION IS AVAILABLE OR POSSIBLE. I vehemently oppose having any BPA power transmission towers or lines running through, over, or anywhere near my property.

I have commercial timber, planted Western red cedar, Douglas fir trees, Western hemlock trees, a Pacific yew tree, a historic apple tree, and other trees which would be damaged or cut down by BPA employees, agents, contractors, or other BPA representatives, if BPA employees, agents, contractors, or other BPA representatives were to enter my property. I will not allow BPA, nor its employees, agents, contractors, or any other BPA representatives to enter my property. BPA is hereby notified not to trespass nor make entry upon my property. BPA is hereby notified that if such entry is made, I shall treat such trespass as criminal trespass, and seek financial compensation of triple damages. I will not agree to the BPA PEP request.

Communication ID: 12431

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: THERESA CARTER

RE: Scoping Comments Proposed Segments #26 and #27.

From: Teresa H. Carter (PO Box 227/ Heisson, WA 98622)

Sirs:

I am a small forest landowner in Clark County. I and my predecessors for more than 50 years have nurtured the family tree farm, planting trees, protecting the forest, wildlife habitat, and water quality.

Our past experience with the local public electric utility, which has repeatedly failed to abide by the agreed contract terms, has proven to us that PUBLIC POWER TRANSMISSION LINES SHOULD NEVER BE LOCATED ON PRIVATE PROPERTY WHEN A PUBLIC PROPERTY LOCATION IS AVAILABLE OR POSSIBLE. I vehemently oppose having any BPA power transmission towers or lines running through, over, or anywhere near my property.

Please have BPA environmental studies examine the following relative to proposed Segments #26 and #27 in general and also specifically Within 1 mile East and South of my property.

Existing Corridors

No existing BPA right of ways on segment #26

Existing Roads

General: Many on Segment #26

Sepecific: County Road at my East property line which could be negatively impacted by construction of towers and lines.

Residential Houses and Other Structures:

General: The BPA 500 kv transmission line proposed as Segment #26 and #27 routes high voltage towers and lines directly through populated areas of Clark County which would destroy historic and scenic areas that should be preserved. Hundreds of homeowners and families in Battle Ground, Yacolt, Amboy and other areas would be severely economically damaged.

Specific: At least 20 residential houses and other structures in my neighborhood would either have transmission towers or transmission lines upon or over the house, or property, or be adversely affected by such proposed construction of towers and lines. Clearing a 150-foot corridor will require involuntary condemnation and removal of homes and outbuildings. This will displace Clark County residents who built valuable homes.

Existing Land Uses

General and Specific: Residential Housing, Crop Production: Douglas Fir, Western Red Cedar, Western Hemlock, Western Red Alder, fl.laple, by Family Tree Farming on my and neighbors property for the commerical growth of timber

Terrain, Potential Erosion and Soils:

Steep slopes near Yacolt Mountain. The Clark County GIS property website identifies Segment #26 ROW parcels near my land which are East and also South of my land as having geological and erosion hazard areas.

Visual Impacts

The BPA 500 kv transmission line proposed as Segment #26 and #27 routes high voltage towers and lines directly through populated areas of Clark County which would destroy historic and scenic areas that should be preserved. Homeowners and families in Yacolt, Amboy, Battle Ground, and other areas would be severely economically damaged. Residents living near the right of way will have 150-200 foot towers looming over their homes. The proposed line of 150-200 foot towers will become the dominant visual feature in the neighborhood, dramatically altering the existing landscape.

The new power transmission towers could be as tall as 200 feet and visable for 10 miles or more. If the line is constructed on the summit or on the West or South side of Yacolt Mountain, some towers may be

required to be equipped With red lights, or flashing red lights, increasing visibility to 15-20 miles.

Enviromental Considerations

The number of people impacted by Segment 26, 27: The loss and cost to residents is extremely high. So many people get impacted that this alone should move BPA toward a different route. The small average size of lots being crossed by Segment 26 are so small that the 500kV line would render most of them essentially useless for any other use.

Sensitive Plants and Animals

Specific: Pacific yew tree, historic homestead apple tree

Fish and Water Resources

Specific: Numerous local ponds and streams

Electric and Magnetic Fields

Health effects from Electro Magnetic Fields: The California Department of Health Services concluded in 2002 that persons living in close proximity to Electro-Magnetic Fields were at increased risk for childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease and miscarriage. A 2007 study led by R.M. Lowenthal of the University of Tasmania School of Medicine in Australia further concluded that living within 328 yards of high voltage power lines puts adults at over 2x increased risk and children at 5x greater risk of developing cancer than those who do not live near high voltage power lines. These studies did not considered transmission lines as powerful as the 500 KV lines proposed for Segments 26 and 27.

Other Issues

Noise: Clearly audible noise is emitted from 500 KV power lines. This noise increases on wet days and decreases with distance from tne lines, but it will be a disturbing background noise for residents living in our currently quiet, rural setting. EMF Interference with Electronic Devices: Sensitive electronic eqUipment, including radios and televisions, will be effected by the electro-magnetic field of this 500 KV line.

Aesthetics: Our neighborhood is characterized by homes on spacious lots in a country setting. We have spent substantial sums putting all lines (electrical, telephone, etc) underground to preserve our very special environment. That environment will be irreparably degraded by a line of 150-200 foot towers bisecting the neighborhood and stretching from one horizon to the next.

Economic Takings: The proposed corridor devalues our homes and property. This corridor will cost millions to compensate. The proposal of 150-200 foot towers through our neighborhood will impact us by decreasing the sale price of homes.

Costs: All of the above effects will significantly reduce property values along Segments 26, 27. 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 that must be included when comparing Segments 26, 27 with alternative routes on public land.

Socio-economic and Public Services: Decreasing our quality of life and our property values will decrease the socio-economic environment of our neighborhood. Your economic analysis should include the cost to society of degrading an idyllic, rural neighborhood, including the increased cost of public services.

Site-specific Concerns: The above concerns will affect everyone along Segments 26, 27.

On my property the predominant vegetative cover is second-growth Douglas fir forest. Douglas firs can grow to 200 feet tall. Protecting the proposed power line from Windfall could require clearing the Douglas firs for a distance of 200 feet on either side of the power line. BPA MUST compensate us small timber owners for the value of the highest and best use or value of such timber taken from us. There is mature timber currently along the proposed ROW. I do not want BPA to determine which trees adjacent to the ROW will be removed as "danger trees". I want to determine compensation. BPA should not be allowed to remove trees that are too young to constitute a danger.

Safety: I want BPA to prove to us that our children will be safe living 75 feet from a 500 KV line capable of transmitting 1400 mega-watts of power.

Bearing the Cost of Benefitting Society: The environmental impacts of a project intended to benefit American taxpayers from Seattle to Portland should be borne by public lands if such lands are available. Public lands should be the first priority for locating this project. Open or timbered lands owned by "Large Landowners" as defined by the Washington State Department of Revenue as landowners of 1000 acres or more should be the second priority. The negative impacts of this project should not be shouldered by a few residents when other, less impactful routes are available

Trespass/Fire: There is very real potential for property damage, theft, and vandalism due to access via the proposed BPA ROW. Trespass aided by access from the BPA ROW, will also increase fire danger to the surrounding forest lands and neighboring homes.

Segments 26, 27 seem to have a number of problems including locations directly through numerous residential and rural neighborhoods, causing serious disruption to the livelihood of many citizens, as well as serious environmental, visual and socio-economic impacts. For all of the reasons listed above, we urge the BPA to eliminate Segments 26 and 27 from further consideration in their analysis of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

Alternatives:

BPA should take the environmentally, fiscally, and morally responsible action and either locate this proposed line on public land or along the existing unused ROW from Swift Power House South to the Columbia River. PLEASE EXAMINE UNUSED right of way from Swift Hydro Electric dam South through

Federal and State land East of Silver Star Mountain to the Columbia River as a possible route.

PLEASE USE PUBLIC LANDS, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES LANDS, and/or large timber land owners lands, which is defined by the State of Washington Department of Revenue as land owners who own 1000 acres or more of timber land by either placing the line through these public or corporate properties by use of land EAST of Segments 3,7,11, 21, 29, 34, 35, 49, 51, 52 or use these Segments. BPA has heard overwhelmingly from the public that the best route for residents of the affected counties is as far East as possible.

OR BPA Consider Also: Use of the existing corridor (primarily route #9 – between Vancouver and Castle Rock) - seems to have less impact to the environment, neighborhoods and communities.

BPA Consider that:

1) all labor and materials used for the proposed lines are solely sourced from US companies based in Washington State and domestically produced.

2) the degradation of all electronic signals such as TV, radio and cell phone signals to the rural fringe areas will be mitigated to zero as a result of radio frequency interference (RFI) generated by these proposed lines. This to apply to any other commonly used electrical or electronic household appliances/gadgets as well.

3) there will be no audible noise pollution (Corona) that can be heard from the outside of any home adjacent to the right of way of the proposed lines.

4) that all buildings, fences, pipes and other metallic items adjacent to the right of way that can be affected by spurious currents are safeguarded as necessary to protect humans and animals from any shock. This to be done at the expense of BPA.

5) that no chemical or synthetic herbicides will be used to maintain the right of way due to the potential of leeching into the groundwater and contaminating the water supply which is generally from wells in rural Clark County.

Communication ID: 12432

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: WILLIAM THOMAS

Please have your environmental studies look at:

ROUTING THIS LINE EITHER IN THE EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY AND EASEMENT ON THE VANCOUVER-TO-LONGVIEW LINE

RUN THIS LINE AS FAR EAST AS POSSIBLE ON FOREST PROPERTY

AVOID RUNNING THIS LINE THOROUGH EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY

I have these other comments:

I AM DISSAPOINTED IN THE LOUSY MAP PROVIDED – I HAD NO IDEA MY HOUSE WAS IMPACTED TILL I GOT THE SECOND LETTER.

THE DECISION PROCESS IS TOO LONG. I DO NOT KNOW IF I DARE MAKE NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS ON MY HOME.

I WANT MORE FACE-TO-FACE MEETINGS WITH B.P.A.

PROPERTY VALUES WILL SUFFER AS A RESULT OF THIS LINE-LOCATE IT IN THE FURTHEST CORRIDOR TO AVOID RUINING LIVES AND HOMES.

Communication ID: 12433

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: BRIAN HARPER

This is Brian Harper [address] Kelso WA 98626 Phone number [phone number] Upper Kalamam River I think the proposal of your transmission lines through here is absolutely environmentally criminal. This is a native salmon rearing river, every side creek that goes in the river all produce salmon and steelhead and trout and so on and so forth. I just think it's completely wrong. You ought to run them right down the middle of I-5 if you want to put them somewhere.

Communication ID: 12434

Date: 10/28/2009

Name: LARRY LESLEY

add to mailing list

Communication ID: 12435

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: LORRAINE TANKE

December 14,2009-12-14

Proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

Please have your environmental studies look at the attached outline.

Thank You, Lorraine Tanke

Proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

I have these other comments:

- Scoping Process should be extended for the following reasons:
- You have been working on this project for years and the property owners get less than two months
- Adjacent property owners were not notified and others affected were not notified as well
- Maps to homeowners were DECEPTIVE, Battle Ground Population 16,000 and NOT ON MAP. BUT you send all this information to SOME Battle Ground Residents
- Significant number of people still do not know about this I-5 Corridor Reinforcement
- Very little NEWS COVERAGE/MEDIA COVERAGE/NEWSPAPER AND TV. NO IN DEPTH COVERAGE OR ANSWERS ON WEBSITE
- Meetings held supplied or offered - NO Answers to "QUESTIONS"
- If this Line Project should be built, build it as far away as possible from the POPULATION
- We cannot sell or improve our property and be compensated if the property goes to hell
- What right do you have to put our lives on hold and/or jeopardy while you
TAKE take 2 PLUS years on whether you decide to build or not build this LINE
- THIS IS GOVERNMENT AT ITS WORST!!!!

Communication ID: 12436

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: DENNIS P HUTCHINSON

I-5 corridor route I would like for the BPA to consider a different route other than routes 28 or 29. At a meeting in the Yacolt school we made a proposal to have the BPA take a look at a different route further to the east in an area way less populated to run their new line. Besides taking away land use and lowering land value from lots of individuals we feel there is a health risk involved also, which needs to be looked

at.

Communication ID: 12437

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: SUSAN R GIDEON

Subject: Stop BPA I-5 Corridor Segment 31 Power Lines through Hockinson The purpose of this letter is to voice our very strong opposition to the proposed BPA Segment 31 extension through the Hockinson area. We are Hockinson residents living in the area where BPA is proposing to build a new route of 150 foot transmission towers (clearing a 150 foot corridor) through a pristine area inhabited by many rural families, working farms, stables, abundant wildlife and beautiful views. This proposal will uproot many families and will cause our property values to plummet. As you know, the greatest component of most individual's net worth is the value of their home. We have seen home values decline due to the current economy over the past few years. But the proposal of building 150' towers will greatly impact property values – both for families living near the towers and for those who paid for view property and would be “viewing” the towers. It goes without saying that many people fear living near towers for founded health hazards. Properties values would never fully recover if this BPA Segment 31 is permitted through the Hockinson area. The beautiful scenic environment would be permanently altered, families uprooted from their homes, other families being forced to live next to the towers because of lack of options and resources to move, diminished property values and direct negative impact to wildlife. We strongly request BPA to consider alternative means or alternative routes and avoid erecting towers in the Hockinson area. A few apparent options include: 1. Upgrade existing lines where towers already exist and avoid building new towers 2. Move route of towers farther East of Hockinson, into uninhabited forest lands, avoiding the impact to so many Hockinson citizens. 3. Place new transmission lines underground 4. One of the great things about the state of Washington is the natural beauty of its natural resources as well as the vistas that one can enjoy. Whenever possible, we need to protect the natural beauty, wildlife and resources. There are fewer and fewer of these areas available and we need to protect and preserve what we have left. This pristine area will be forever unfavorably altered and spoiled if BPA is allowed to construct these towers. We ask BPA to eliminate Segment 31 from further consideration as part of their Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please help us preserve our beautiful area.

Communication ID: 12438

Date: 11/29/2009

Name: LEE R DAVIS

Regarding the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project of Bonneville Power (BPA), I wish to express my hope that you will fight proposed routes 30 and 31. Please support doubling the lines where they now are, or alternative routes 28 and 29, as they are much more rural. I live in a neighborhood that will be adversely

affected by route 30. I have written both Washington US Senators, Congressman Brian Baird, as well as the BPA. Please advise if there are other interests that you know of that we can turn to for assistance in stopping proposed routes 30 and 31.

Communication ID: 12439

Date: 11/30/2009

Name: DAVID NUTE,MELINDA NUTE

Mr. Fiksdal,

My home falls directly in the path of BPA's Line #31 and I am very concerned for my family's well being. My property is at [address], Battle Ground. We have lived here for about 4 years and have worked very hard to put a "sweat equity" into what was a run down repossessed house. We have made years of sacrifices to be able to live here and we plan to raise our family and retire in this house.

You can imagine our distress at finding out we may be forced to move for a power line. Our property is only about .64 of an acre, so surely we would not be able to stay. We are recently self-employed and don't think we would be able even qualify for a mortgage to move. It would cause significant harm to what we have built up over 15 years. Hockinson is a small community and this line running through the heart of it would forever change it's appeal.

I understand that it is needed and I'm sure no one wants it to run through their backyard, but please consider all options as you research this project.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

David and Melinda Nute

[address]

[phone]

Communication ID: 12440

Date: 12/2/2009

Name: RICHARD CARSON

Subject: State of Washington

I understand that there is a state energy siting committee that will review

this project. What is their contact information and what is their role?

Dear Congressman Baird:

The members of the CASE31 steering committee want to express our appreciation for having Kimberly Blake Pincheira meet with us today. Segment 31 is 14 miles long, currently has about 500 properties in the immediate scoping area and could impact thousands of residents if built.

I wanted to discuss my specific concerns. I am against Segment 31 being included in the environmental impact statement process. I am hoping that you will encourage BPA to drop further consideration of this corridor based on what they learned from the scoping process. The basis for this request is:

1. Our group met with an attorney who specializes in land use, property and environmental law. We believe that BPA has not established a prima facie case in terms of the burden of proof needed to establish public use and necessity. They have an existing corridor and have corridors with fewer residents. The guiding principle should be to minimize the impact on people, not BPA's rates!
2. There are about 500 properties in the Segment 31 study area. The cost of pursuing "inverse condemnation" through "eminent domain" would be very expensive. By expensive I mean not only the land purchases, but also the litigation needed to condemn so many properties. Building the new BPA east of us through DNR lands or utilizing the existing Hazel Dell corridor is much cheaper in terms of time and money. The property owners of Segment 31 will fight this, both individually and collectively, in the courts to the bitter end.
3. BPA has not even looked at the cost efficiency of building an underground line in Segment 31. This technology is used elsewhere in the county. BPA response is that it is too expensive. The facts are that such a line can carry three times the power and the true cost would be cheaper. I am talking about the cost to state and local governments, not just to BPA. The cost is minimal when you spread it across the entire BPA rate-base and amortize it over the life of the facility.
4. The expense of putting the corridor through DNR lands is actually a money-maker because state and local governments will get the timber revenues from the trees cut.
5. The health impact, let alone the socio-economic impacts, to the residents of Segment 31 are tremendous – especially when compared to the other corridors.

Sincerely,

Richard H. Carson

c: Bonneville Power Administration

CASE31 Steering Committee

Communication ID: 12441

Date: 12/2/2009

Name: ROBIN VANDE VOORDE

December 1, 2009

To: Tom Mielke,

Re: The I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

We are residents living along the central portion of Segment #31 of BPA's proposed I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. Our home is in Section 8, T3N, R3E, WM near the unincorporated town of Hockinson. We are united in opposition to the devastating effects of a 500 KV power line in our neighborhood. We are most concerned about the following issues:

Existing Corridors: The easement along Segment 31 was acquired in 1957 by Pacific Power and Light as a 100-foot easement through an undeveloped portion of Clark County. Clark County permitted numerous developments immediately adjacent to this narrow easement. Many large, beautiful homes were built near the corridor with the understanding that a small power line might someday be constructed within the existing 100-foot easement. BPA's proposal to condemn land outside this easement and erect massive 150-foot towers is a betrayal of the trust homeowners placed in PP&L and Clark County to stay within their existing easement.

Houses and Other Structures: Clearing a 150-foot corridor will require involuntary condemnation and removal of homes and outbuildings. This will displace hundreds of homeowners.

Health effects from Electro Magnetic Fields: The California Department of Health Services concluded in 2002 that persons living in close proximity to Electro-Magnetic Fields were at increased risk for childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease and miscarriage. A 2007 study led by R.M. Lowenthal of the University of Tasmania School of Medicine in Australia further concluded that living within 328 yards of high voltage power lines puts adults at over 2x increased risk and children at 5x greater risk of developing cancer than those who do not live near high voltage power lines. Bear in mind, neither of these studies considered transmission lines as powerful as the 500 KV lines proposed for Segment 31.

Visual Impacts: Residents living 75 feet from the centerline will have 150-foot towers looming over their homes. BPA representatives have told us at public meetings that the tower spacing will be a maximum of 1250' on flat ground. This equates to no less than 21 towers within the 5-mile span between Powell Road and Green Mountain. The proposed line of 150-foot towers will become the dominant visual feature in our neighborhood, dramatically altering the existing landscape.

Noise: Clearly audible noise is emitted from 500 KV power lines. This noise increases on wet days and

decreases with distance from the lines, but it will be a disturbing background noise for residents living in our currently quiet, rural setting.

EMF Interference with Electronic Devices: Sensitive electronic equipment, including radios and televisions, will be effected by the electro-magnetic field of this 500 KV line.

Aesthetics: Our neighborhood is characterized by homes on spacious lots in a country setting. These homes represent the American Dream. We have spent

substantial sums putting all lines (electrical, telephone, etc) underground to preserve our very special environment. That environment will be irreparably degraded by a row of 150-foot towers bisecting the neighborhood and stretching from one horizon to the next.

Economic Takings: The proposed corridor devalues our homes and property. This corridor will cost millions to compensate. There is a home on 128th Circle

currently corridor will cost millions to compensate. There is a home on 128th Circle listed for sale at \$2.9 million. The mere proposal of 150-foot towers through our neighborhood will impact us in the interim by decreasing the sale price of homes such as this one. For this reason, we will immediately request the Clark County Board of Commissioners and County Appraiser reduce our property tax valuations and assessments until such time as BPA announces a decision on Segment 31. We will have a reputable real estate appraiser determine how much value we have lost.

Costs: All of the above effects will significantly reduce property values along Segment 31. 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 that must be included when comparing Segment 31 with other alternative routes.

Socio-economic and Public Services: Decreasing our quality of life and our property values will decrease the socio-economic environment of our neighborhood. Your economic analysis should include the cost to society of degrading an idyllic, rural neighborhood, including the increased cost of public services.

Site-specific Concerns: The above concerns will affect everyone along Segment 31. Additional site-specific impacts on Fish and Wildlife Resources, Soil Erosion,

Sensitive Habitat and Cultural Resources will be addressed by letters from individual neighbors.

Land Use: We know of no examples of a 500 KV power line constructed through a populated area similar to Segment 31. All 500 KV projects in our region were

constructed on open land, not through existing neighborhoods. Despite repeated requests from us, BPA

has been unwilling or unable to show us an example where they successfully accomplished what they propose to do to the landowners along Segment 31. We do not want to be BPA's guinea pig for this type of project. All impacts listed above would be reduced or eliminated by locating the I-5 Reinforcement Project to an alternative route 5 miles east of Segment 31. Large portions of these eastern routes have already been roaded and clear-cut for timber management. The distance along Segment 31 between Yacolt

Mountain and the Camas Meadows Golf Course is approximately 15 miles. The predominant vegetative cover along this 15-mile stretch of Segment 31 is a second-growth

douglas fir forest. Douglas firs can easily grow to 200 feet tall. Protecting the proposed power line from windfall will require clearing the Douglas firs for a distance of 200 feet on either side of the power line. This will create a 744-acre clear-cut, 15 miles long and 400 feet wide. Why should BPA be allowed to clear-cut 744 acres through a neighborhood that has conscientiously protected its wetlands and wildlife? BPA should be required to place their 744-acre clear-cut on commercial timber land 5 miles east of segment 31 where clear-cutting is the predominant land use. Even Segment 9 along I-5 through Hazel Dell would be a preferable alternative in this regard. The corridor

along Segment 9 has already been clear-cut in a swath 300 feet wide for BPA's

existing 230 KV power line.

Safety: Please explain why BPA cleared a 300-foot easement along Segment 9 for their existing 230 KV line, yet proposes to clear only 150 feet for the 500 KV line through our neighborhood. Why were homes in Hazel Dell buffered from a 230 KV line by a 300-foot cleared area along Segment 9 while homes near Hockinson will be buffered from a 500 KV line by a meager 150-foot cleared area? Double the voltage. Half the

protection? BPA has shown us many pictures of 500 KV and 230 KV lines. None of these pictures show homes 75 feet from the power lines. The cleared area in these pictures is much larger. We want BPA to prove to us that our children will be safe living 75 feet from a 500 KV line capable of transmitting 1400 mega-watts of power: A quantity of power that exceeds the production of Bonneville Dam.

Bearing the Cost of Benefitting Society: The environmental impacts of a project intended to benefit American taxpayers from Seattle to Portland should be borne by public lands if such lands are available. Public lands should be the first priority for locating this project. Open lands should be the second priority. Involuntary condemnation of neighborhoods should be the very lowest priority. The negative impacts of this project should not be shouldered by a few residents when other, less impactful routes are available. When evaluated in terms of direct environmental and financial impacts on rate-payers, (the people who will ultimately pay the cost of this project), Segment 31 appears to be the most impactful of all the north-south corridor alternatives under consideration.

Conclusion: For all of the reasons listed above, we urge the BPA to eliminate Segment 31 from further consideration in their analysis of the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

Please BPA, find a better way! No on Segment 31!

Sincerely,

Robn Vande Voorde

[address]

Communication ID: 12442

Date: 12/3/2009

Name: DONNA MCLARTY

Dear Commissioner Mielke,

Something smells fishy at Bonneville Power Association (BPA) and it's not in the water!

On October 27th, we attended an open house where BPA announced The I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, providing safe, reliable energy for the future (handing out a 3 page brochure and unreadable aerial maps). No presentations were made. No question-answer session was facilitated.

The brochure is extremely vague and contains no specific proposal, but lots and lots of alternatives that might become reality. In explaining why the new lines are needed, they talk about long term planning for additional capacity needed in Portland, Vancouver and Longview and wanting to increase transmission capacity along the I-5 corridor. (Longview? Really?) To reach Portland/Vancouver, which is directly west of Bonneville, they are proposing a new transmission corridor that runs some 70 miles north. I am not an engineer, but I think they are going in the wrong direction.

We live east of Battle Ground and are surrounded by possible routes. One reason we live where we do is to enjoy the beauty of the wooded hills, rivers and waterfalls. Do we need to destroy some of the most beautiful land in Washington when there is existing rights of way along the already over industrialized I-5 valley? I've never considered myself a strong environmentalist, but will certainly join that battle at the earliest opportunity.

The brochure explains they don't want to own the land, just the rights to use it. Obviously this will destroy property values that are already very depressed. I guess that's another legal battle for later.

It would be nice to know what they are really up to, but I don't think we're getting a very straight story. They explain that the addition of new wind farms has increased capacity and they are replacing generators at the dam with higher efficiency ones to increase capacity even more. The news reported Seattle Power had increased capacity in this time of continued efficiency in consumption using the argument that the increased capacity would enable them to increase revenue and actually lower rates.

Later, they report they are unable to sell the excess capacity and now, because they have increased operating costs, they need to raise rates. Is this the vision of the green economy? We won't be burning fossil fuels, but nobody will be able to afford to heat their homes. This is the same I-5 corridor BPA says is the reason for increased demand. Do the population growth statistics really support that? No details are provided.

What kind of business model is this? Where are our government regulators? Specifically, who is not doing their job that allows this to happen and how do we get them replaced with people who will represent the interests of the people?

In addition to a lot of talk that this feels a lot like Enron, the rumors are that despite their charter to provide wholesale electrical power to the Pacific Northwest, BPA can sell excess power at higher rates to Canada. Canada, I am told, has more power than they need and export it to California at a nice profit. Is this really just a scheme to sell power to California via Canada? This could be Enron II.

I've noticed there is a lot of open space around the capital in Olympia and believe the same is true for Salem. Let's run these lines right over both state capitals. It would save a lot of the environment and be less of an impact on citizens. I'm sure everyone would get used to the hum. Don't worry about that prickly feeling and your hair standing on-end, BPA also provided a 64 page brochure documenting that it is perfectly safe. Why don't power generators and government regulators build their office buildings near high-power transmission lines? Land is a lot cheaper. Maybe regulators, legislators and executive above a certain pay grade should be required to live within these areas. What's that phrase about "do unto others...?"

Even if all my suspicions are unfounded, a few miles further to the east there is a national forest and vast amounts of state land along its border. Both appear to be managed use (logged). How about if we ran a corridor along the periphery? Minimizing environmental impact; allowing the timber industry to bid for the privilege of clear cutting and building access roads; and impacting far fewer private land owners. This would reduce construction costs significantly, protect private land value and may even create some jobs.

Please help in getting to the bottom of this and let us know what is really going on and why. If they are really just trying to spend money where there is no need or justification, why not pay their bonds off early? Better yet, let's drop rates, stimulate the economy and create jobs by lowering costs for business and industry, contributing to an American competitive advantage. Maybe we could even bring back the aluminum industry we lost to high power costs.

Thank you for listening.

Sincerely,

Roland McLarty, Donna McLarty

Communication ID: 12443

Date: 12/8/2009

Name: RICHARD SCOVILLE,SHERRY SCOVILLE

December 8, 2009

To: Maryam Asgharian

Bonneville Power Administration

I-5@bpa.gov

cc: Marc Boldt, TomMielke, and Steve Stuart (boardcom@clark.wa.gov)

U.S. Senator Maria Cantwell (via website)

U.S. Senator Patty Murray (via website)

U.S. Representative Brian Baird (via website)

Governor Christine Gregoire (via website)

This letter will not be another "angry voice" over the proposed Segment 31 on the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. I do believe, however, that BPA will have a very hard time politically and logistically if the route along 212th Ave. is chosen. I want to offer my perspective on why so many of the area residents are fuming, and fuming so loudly.

A great number of area residents have chosen this area as their home precisely because it's a refuge from the sights and sounds of city life. They have consciously chosen this area, in spite of its relative remoteness, because it's relatively unspoiled and undeveloped, and it offers the opportunity to live in a peaceful and natural setting. Its residents have deliberately sought this area a high quality place to live and raise their families, away from the tell-tale signs of civilization, and yet not too far from the necessities of work and shopping.

As you drive out Ward Rd., past the Walgreens, and then past the last traffic light at China Ditch, you undergo an immediate and dramatic transition to unspoiled farmland. This is the de facto urban growth boundary and the people who live beyond it choose to do so because it's one of the last great places to live in Clark County. If you haven't driven the stretch I'm talking about, please do so. The transition is unmistakably dramatic, and the people that live beyond the boundary live there for a reason.

My wife and I understand the NIMBY principle, and we understand that someone must pay the price for a growing population with growing needs. We think, however, that the area along Segment 31 is simply too populated, requiring a large number of condemnations and causing a large number of families to become angry with, and then remain angry with, BPA for the rest of their lives and maybe into the next

generation. We see a lot of ill will and bad press being generated due to the great number of intelligent and resourceful people who feel affected. Many of the people in the area are skilled and connected professionals. I fear an ugly confrontation.

My wife and I urge BPA to consider other possibilities such as the relatively unpopulated timber land to the east. We know that, as BPA seeks to responsibly serve a growing population in this great region, BPA is also sensitive to landowners and area residents. We also know that economic realities weigh heavily in any decision like this. In this regard, we hope that BPA will remain mindful of the intangible costs in addition to the tangible dollars. In today's world we have seen government and private business alike narrowly focused on the tangible costs. Intangible costs surrounding bad press, unpredictable politics, and the impact on BPA's reputation are, by definition, difficult to quantify but clearly very important.

This is not an easy job that you have, caught between competing objectives, and it's hard to imagine a win-win. We wish you well with the project, whatever the outcome.

Sincerely,

Richard and Sherry Scoville

[address]

Communication ID: 12444

Date: 12/13/2009

Name: CHERY KYLE,ROBERT KYLE

Gentlemen:

We are asking that you please don't put the power line in our neighborhood. We just got our tax assessments and our property value has gone down \$105,000.00 due to the failing housing market. As it stands now we owe 100% of our tax assessment. I called the bank and they informed me it is even worse than that because the assessors have not caught up to the market yet. We can't afford to loose any more.

Also have you considered that many homes have now gone to wireless phones & computers? I believe that the power lines will affect the wireless as well as the satellite TV's and so on. It will be very expensive to change thing back if we can even do that. Were we live there is no cable and if the satellites don't work we won't have anything. This doesn't sound like a big deal to most but my aunt lives with us, she is handicapped and TV is what she does.

Please put the lines in the woods where it doesn't affect so many families. Or better yet actually up the middle of I-5 where no one lives.

Why can't the lines be put underground? Wouldn't that affect less people?

Thank you for listening.

Robert & Chery Kyle

Communication ID: 12445

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: SANDY U'REN,ROD U'REN

My family's home is on the proposed BPA route 31.

A persons home is the biggest investment of their lives. I feel an alternative route that doesn't destroy so many people's investment should be considered. Is this the most economical choice for the State of Washington to chose?; destroying an abundance of peoples lives and investment?

PLEASE CONSIDER A ROUTE THAT DOES NOT IMPACT SO MANY HOMES!

Rod and Sandy U'Ren

[address]

Communication ID: 12446

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: MARGARET HOLAHAN

Dear Mr. Korsness

I'm very certain you have been informed of the lives that will be affected in many ways if you use "Segment 31", so I won't reiterate those very real concerns.

Having been born in the 1930's I have seen strife and challenges in the lives of people and our country.

But we strived to maintain courtesy, respect, integrity and character amongst us. Unfortunately, over the years these attributes have been eroding and in some instances, lost completely.

There has developed, among our governments, a continuing peril that is eroding the will of the people that this country was founded on.

Putting these power lines through "Segment 31" would further give credence to the eroding of "the will of the people."

Please rekindle your integrity and respect for others and their properties, and use an alternate route that would be less disruptive to so many people and their future.

Thank you for your time

Margaret Holahan

Communication ID: 12447

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: SHANE T MCGUFFIN

We are a sustainable 20 acre farm that is planned to have future improvements for community farming business operations. Our farm planning started in 2005 and will include a facility for farm school with a venue to teach children about sustainable farming. These plans for improvements would be adversely affected by any new power line addition. The Environmental Impact Study (EIS) should address the affects of EMF on children and persons near 500 kv lines during prolonged periods of the day at a farm school setting.

In addition, there are grazing animals currently on the property and will continue to graze the pasture in the future farm plans. There is concern about the impact of EMF on the livestock and that should be addressed by the EIS.

DeTemple Farm supports and agrees with the written comment letter from Christopher Reive, attorney for Dr. John Simmons, dated December 8, 2009 concerning objections to Segment #50. The points made by Mr. Reive and Dr. Simmons, including EMF impact on livestock, are valid and should be included in the EIS for Segments #43 and #48.

We have discussed our concerns in depth with our land use attorney, James Howsley with Miller Nash LLP, and will have further comment in the future coming from his office. Mr. Howsley also represents several property owners along Segment #50 and is very involved in commenting on the EIS scoping in the greater Clark County area.

We appreciate your attention to this matter.

Respectively,

Shane T. McGuffin

DeTemple Farm LLC

Communication ID: 12448

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: CHARLES R. DE TEMPLE

We live on and farm 20 acres, parcel [Number], and are strongly opposed to any new power lines along Segments #43 and #48. We support and agree with the attached letter from DeTemple Farm LLC. In addition, we agree with the comment letter from Christopher Reive, attorney for Dr. John Simmons, dated December 8, 2009, concerning objections to Segment #50. Thank you for your attention to our concerns. Charles L. DeTemple

Communication ID: 12449

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: PAULA K OVERHOLTZER

Paula Overholtzer

I oppose a line coming through our community, small property owners and residences.

[Phone]

[Email]

Communication ID: 12450

Date: 11/19/2009

Name: RAMONA ARNOLD

Ramona Arnold

[Phone]

[Address]

Vancouver, WA 98663

I hope that you will not put the line where there are some already, we already face the inconvenience of these lines as well as the freeways. I am concerned that this new line will be sited here on the west side because we are economically disadvantaged compared to the east side.

Communication ID: 12451

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: SHANE T MCGUFFIN

We own 5 acres in the Lacamas Northshore master planned development, parcel[Number], and are strongly opposed to any new power lines along Segments #50, #48, and #43. We support and agree with the attached comment letter from the Mills Family LLC. In addition, we are represented by James Howsley, with Miller Nash, our land use attorney for the Lacamas Northshore master planned development. Please attach Mr. Howsley's EIS comment letter submitted December 14, 2009 on behalf of the Lacamas Northshore property owners to this comment, as we are in full agreement. We appreciate your attention to this matter. Shane McGuffin Kimbal Logan Real Estate

Communication ID: 12452

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: SHANE T MCGUFFIN,MELISSA MCGUFFIN

We own and reside on 5 acres, parcel [number], and are strongly opposed to any new power lines along Segments #43, #48, and #50. We support and agree with the attached comment to Proposed Scope of EIS from Christopher Reive, attorney for Dr. John Simmons, dated December 8, 2009 concerning objections to Segment #50. We have discussed our concerns in depth with our land use attorney, James Howsley with Miller Nash LLP, and will have further comment in the future coming from his office. Mr. Howsley also represents several property owners including ourselves in the Lacamas Northshore master planned development along Segment #50 and submitted comment to proposed scope of EIS, dated December 14, 2009, for which we are in full agreement...especially with the EIS scoping to address the compliance with the Clark County Comprehensive Plan policies. We appreciate your attention to this matter. Sincerely, Shane & Melissa McGuffin

Communication ID: 12453

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: RICHARD C. BOEHM

Dear Sir or Madam:

It is distressing to me to learn of your desire to place a large transmission line (#26) in the proximity of my property. We purchased this property over 30 years ago with the hope of building our home here. Finally after years of saving - and even borrowing - we were able to build our dream home on this

property. It is our intent to retire and live here the rest of our lives in the tranquil, pastoral setting of north Clark County. Our home is more than a house to us; we have invested our sweat, desires, and soul into it. This proposed transmission would totally destroy much of the peace and tranquility that we strove to embrace with our move here. Additionally, our home is built with the vision of reducing our footprint on the environment: It is a solar home with many cutting-edge features to meet the goal of a zero-net-energy home. Every year we have been featured on the Solar Home Tour. (See attached informative handout from this year's tour.) We have also strived to preserve our 10 acres as habitat for flora and fauna. It was placed in protected and sustainable forest management plan a year ago in order to maintain natural sensitive habitat of mixed deciduous and conifer woodlands and wetlands found on this site. Again, this transmission line would not only visually and esthetically be revolting but would put our few acres in jeopardy of not qualifying for the timberlands designation since it just barely met the minimum qualification (by acreage) initially. Lastly, it would slash our close to million-dollar investment of land and structures at this site - capital that may ultimately be needed in our latter years of retirement. Please put yourselves in our shoes! Would you be willing for such a presence on your home-site property?! Some alternative suggestions to consider (listed in order of what I advocate for): 1) I understand the need of more and more power for the masses of metropolitan areas. Unfortunately, it is a very sad product of years of energy gluttony from the American way. As our home is a model of better ways of conservation (in construction, in waste, maintenance, and energy usage), it is my strong direction to BPA to consider alternative measures to supplying more from other than large-scale energy production. Let me explain. Current energy production in the U.S. is large-scale - power plants (coal, nuclear, natural gas, etc.), hydro dams, wind farms, etc. - which can be problematic to the environment in many ways - especially on the large scale. Granted, some are less so than others. But, all cause issues that are manifest by their huge size, but which is required to produce energy for an ever increasing greater-energy-demanding populous. In many counties of the world this is not the only way that energy is produced. Rather, the multitude is more conservation conscience and share in the production of the energy. That is, many households produce some energy - thus, much energy is produced. Two of those countries come to mind, Germany and Japan, which, by the way, are the two largest solar energy producing countries in the world. Many are quick to say that solar is great for the sunny Southwest USA but not in the cloudy Northwest. I partly agree with this statement - that is, the Southwest should be producing huge amount of solar since it is indeed perfect for it! But, what is important to note is that those two largest solar nations in world have exactly the same number of solar days as Portland, OR! Therefore, that brings me to my first recommendation: Rather than BPA putting up more large-scale transmission lines (which I might add local utilities ultimately have a vested interest in supporting since it supports their livelihood), they should be promoting and supporting a multitude of small-scale energy production and an even greater emphasis instilling energy conservation by the multitude. This vision would have many households having PV panels on roofs, small wind turbines, solar hot water heaters, etc. This would reduce load demand through many households producing their share - especially during summer demand such as last summer - which, I was informed by BPA spokesperson was what originally precipitated this situation for more/greater transmission lines. 2) Why not think outside the box further? Since something has always been done one way does make it easier to reproduce, but if issues/constraints arise, must it only be what is considered? The problem seems to be right-of-way and

impact on the environment to transmit power from Castle Rock to Troutdale. There seems to already be a very clear and always accessible path already existing between those two points - our interstate highways! The path could easily be down I-5 to I-205 to either SR14 or I-84. Almost the entire path has a wide median that would serve as a close-to-ideal placement for the lines. Granted, you may need to put some "guard rails" protecting the girders, but that seems to be a miniscule problem to the others that are faced by the other paths. Overpasses may be a concern, but height of the girders can compensate for the situation. Also, in the few situations where there is populated or limited area in the medians, short sections of underground cable may be an option. Several years ago when I traveled to southern Florida, I noted a similar situation down through the Keys - there they also needed to make them hurricane-proof! 3) What about the transmission lines that were serving the non-existent Trojan Nuclear Reactor? When I asked a BPA spokesman about them, he said that they are at capacity! How can this be since what they were created for - a major energy producing facility no longer exists?! If, that is true, maybe the burden of need should be placed on what used that capacity - not us. 4) If Troutdale needs the energy, why not put several wind farms in that area? It is often very windy coming out of the gorge. 5) If none of the above is feasible - which I find very difficult to accept - then I feel that the lines should be sent through the back woods of the Cascade foothills using forestlands. I normally would not be an advocate of this use of nature, but again, there are not many viable options that don't severely impact a multitude of citizen's largest financial investment (their property) and their personal peace of mind. BPA already has many thousands of miles of lines through such lands. Unfortunately, a hundred or so more won't make that much difference. This situation would be a very easterly route that would use corporate, state, and federal timberlands that are far from private landowner's residences. 6) The next most desirable route recommendation for me would be to use and widen the existing transmission lines. It was stated that this is not desirable because of "catastrophic" situations that would wipe out both the existing and new lines simultaneously. Well, okay, but it seems that the precedent is already in existence all over the U.S. with many major double runs coming from dams, etc. Also, in the last fifty years, how many times has there been a catastrophic situation that would wipe out a double run in this area? Yes, there have been a few, but then Columbus Day type events wipe out more than just those double lines! 7) If it is feasible that a major biomass energy-producing source may someday be located in Chelatchie Prairie, the lines should probably go by it. 8) Lastly, existing right-of-ways should be used rather than new runs that confiscate private lands. In closing, it would seem that the huge amount of taxpayer's hard-earned dollars that are being spent on this project - especially potentially taking it through a new route - could be drastically saved by pursuing the several suggestions listed in order above. Sadly this cost to the populous is dwarfed by the individual loss to each property owner financially, emotionally, and ethically.

Sincerely,

Richard C. Boehm

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: WELAYNE RICHMOND,DARMA RICHMOND

Gentlemen:

We object to the proposed installation of 500 kilivolt transmission line on route #31.It would create an environmental condition which is hazardous to the health. Of all the people where this line #31 is proposed to go. We will not be able to sell our property without disclosing the 500 kilivolt power lines. The value of our homes will decrease. We think going further east of the proposed transmission lines would be better so less people and their property would be involved.

Please give this your utmost attention on this matter.

Sincerely,

Welayne Richmond

Darma Richmond

Communication ID: 12456

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JUDITH MALINOWSKI

Gentleman:

The North Clark Historical Museum Board at its December 10, 2009 meeting voted to submit historical information on the Chelatchie Prairie section of segment 27 of the proposed I-5 Corridor 500,000 Volt transmission line project. Line segment 27 crosses Chelatchie Prairie. The prairie was a gathering place for Native Americans and part of the route of the main Native American trail from the Columbia River to east of the mountains. It also was one of the first areas settled in North Clark County before statehood was established. In addition, the segment 27 route passes over or very near the Hein Kuiper house built in 1876. President US Grant in 1871 issued the homestead certificate to Mr. Kuiper when Washington was still a territory. Many of the early settlers on the prairie were veterans of the Civil War who homesteaded on the fertile soils of this beautiful mountain valley. Given the rich history of the prairie and its relatively unspoiled character the board believes that it is an inappropriate location for a major transmission line. We urge you to eliminate segment 27 from further consideration in your study of alternative routes for the proposed transmission facility.

[Signature]

NCHM Board

Sincerely

Judith Malinowski

Communication ID: 12457

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JAMES COURTNEY

Gentleman:

The Mt Valley Grange at its December 2, 2009 meeting voted to submit comments on the proposed I-5 Corridor 500 kV transmission line project.

We are particularly concerned about the line segment crossing Chelatchie Prairie. The prairie is on the SR 503 scenic route. It has a rich history including being a gathering place for native Americans, part of the route of the main native American trail from the Columbia River to east of the mountains, and one of the areas settled before statehood was established.

We urge you to route the line to minimize impact on the populated areas of the county and minimize impact on the scenic and historical resources of Clark County.

James Courtney

Secretary

Communication ID: 12458

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: BARBARA HAGEDORN

Gentleman:

The Clark County Pomona Grange at its December 9, 2009 meeting voted to submit comments on the proposed I-5 Corridor 500 kV transmission line project. We don't dispute the need for the line but urge you to route the line to minimize impact on the populated areas of the county and minimize impact on the scenic and historical resources of Clark County.

Barbara Hagedorn

Secretary

Communication ID: 12459

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MIKE WOJTOWICZ

Dear Mr. Korsness:

Cowlitz County appreciates having the opportunity to provide initial comment under this NEPA scoping process. As it appears from the information provided in the October 9, 2009 mailing, a new substation and potential new transmission routes are proposed within Cowlitz County. The size and location of the substation facility, as well as location of any new transmissions corridors within the County's shorelines, critical areas, and rural and urbanizing communities are of concern. Thus it is important for the County to have sufficient information to consider, review the proposed alternatives, and time to comment on potential impacts the project may have. The proposal, as shown in the map provided, will require review, at a minimum, by the Cowlitz County Building and Planning Department to determine if the project meets applicable county land use, shoreline, environmental and other development regulations. We request that the Department of Energy provide the County with the consideration of early notification of the project's progress when feasible. Ensuring that open communication between the Department of Energy, all participating Cowlitz County departments, and its citizens will be key to timely, and informed decisions made by the County. Your point of contact to coordinate/correspond with Cowlitz County in this matter shall be Mike Wojtowicz, Director of Building and Planning. Mr. Wojtowicz can be reached at [Phone] or [Email].

Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide comment.

Communication ID: 12460

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: LEWIS HOUCK,LINDA M HOUCK

I'd like to tell you...

Please have your environmental studies look at routes farther east through state and federal lands, rather than through neighborhoods, schools, and tree farms. We, along with our neighbors, chose to live in the country, surrounded by trees and wildlife. Through our "working years", we did without many luxuries to be able to afford acreage with a comfortable home for retirement. If you must build new lines with new routes, you need to find a route that doesn't impact homes or property as you are

showing us on any of the proposed lines.

Thank you.

Lewis and Linda M. Houck

[Address]

Communication ID: 12461

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: HEATHER KRAMER

Please have your environmental studies look at:

I have major concerns for proposed powerline #27. The powerlines would run directly in front of my house and all of my neighbors as well. I am raising young children not to mention operating a licensed daycare. It is just too dangerous. I have very realistic and proven concerns for the health issues that arise from radiation. A portion of our income relies on the sale of organically raised livestock, the growth of plants and trees as well as our future intentions of operating a produce farm. Put the powerlines as far from people's homes as possible. NOT in their immediate front yards.

I have these other comments:

Another legit concern is that life flight regularly lands and takes off from Suttons air strip located on NE 256th Ave. Powerline #27 would interfere with this life saving operation. There are also concerns for all the aircraft that fly in and out of there very often. Why put a major hazard in the way of an airport if there are alternate routes available? It would be very dangerous.

We also intend to build another house on this property that we purchased for our children when they are grown. PL #27 would crush our chances of putting a house where we intended.

Communication ID: 12462

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: DAVID E.B. WARD

Please have your environmental studies look at:

BPA segment #27 is planned to pass just to the west of our property and on an elevation above our winegrape vineyard. Foliage maintenance will require harsh herbicides that would be very harmful to

wine grapes. The topography and microclimate conditions in the area as observed from fog formation and freeze patterns within the vineyard demonstrate that herbicides or defoliant applications would settle in the vineyard and be destructive to the crop and probably the vines themselves.

Masons rivers and numerous creeks and streams traverse the area including spawning grounds for salmon and steelhead which could be disturbed by the tower construction. Aquifers which supply water numerous households and businesses could be contaminated by construction and herbicides.

I have these other comments:

The prime values to real estate in the affected area the vista mountain and forest views. Real estate prices in the area have already plunged due to the recession, perhaps the highest declines in the southwest Worthington area. The construction of the power grid through the area will undoubtedly depress value further in fact values probably are already being depressed by the very prospect of a power grid being constructed in this region. These power grids will present real visual pollution, therefore they should be constructed to the east in DNR and Federal timberlands.

Communication ID: 12463

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JERI RAIMER,WILLIAM RAIMER

Dear BPA:

Please excuse the handwritten letter. We are retired seniors with no computer.

We live in our retirement home on a dead-end private road... as do 12 other families. 100 years ago the property was part of the "Bell Mt. Mining Co." who engaged in gold mining – (hence the "Gold Nugget Dr" street name.)

BPA proposed segment 31 runs through our property – indeed right thru the home we designed and build to live in for the remainder of our lives.

We find it unbelievable that BPA might prefer to use segment 31 and destroy so many homes (and lives) and so much property when Public Land is available just to east!

We can only assume that DNR and timber companies have a considerably louder voice.

How sad!

DNR wishes to keep its land pristine! I invite you and them to come inspect the well maintained wooded properties along Gold Nugget Drive! It is a veritable wildlife sanctuary. Every year one or two fawns are born (and nursed) outside our diningroom window. As I write this two deer are browsing out there.

I won't bore you with all the additional wildlife here – nor will I comment on the timber companies obvious motives.

Please decide NO on segment 31.

Sincerely,

William & Jeri Raimer

Communication ID: 12464

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: BILL R SCHNEIDER

Subject: Segment 31 of Proposed BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

To Whom it May Concern,

I am opposed to the use of segment 31 in the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project. As a resident and homeowner of the Hockinson community for 15 years I am very concerned that this route of a 150Kv transmission line would devastate our community without providing any benefit to the local area. Segment 31 is the segment with the most direct and widespread impact on individual properties and people in this proposed project and should not be used for this purpose.

Alternate routes exist which would have much less impact on properties and citizens of Clark county. If a new transmission line must be establish I urge you to give the highest consideration to these other routes, such as those to the east on Washington DNR land and drop segment 31 from consideration. I also urge you to provide better notification to property owners and citizens who would be impacted by the proposed segment 31 by providing written notification to all residents who would be in sight of the transmission lines and towers, not just those within the proposed right-of-way. I found out about the proposed tower lines from word of mouth even though our development is only 5 blocks from the right-of-way. Fifteen years ago I moved here because of the wonderful views of the hills to the east and the great rural/urban community environment I had no knowledge that a right-of-way even existed a few weeks ago. Our family is concerned about the impacts to our community, including the loss of or friends and neighbors homes and property use, loss of Hockinson School district property for construction of a future school, loss of property value, loss of ascetic value, loss of viewscapes, loss of Clark county tax base as property values decrease, unknown effects on us and our young children by electromagnetic fields emitted by such high voltage power lines and potential dangers of falling towers under high wind stress.

From you web site I have found little information on the reason lines for expanding the power grid from Castle Rock Washington to Troutdale Oregon. I have heard that this expansion project is to meet power

demands in California or Idaho and Montana. Clark County should not be made to suffer for providing power to other distant states with not benefit to the state of Washington or local area. There are environmental and safety concerns that should be considered. Many of the geologic, wetland, wildlife concerns have already been expressed by others but I would like to point out that there is potential impact from strong downslope wind storms that infrequently impact the Hockinson area. A downslope wind is a meteorological phenomenon that can produce damaging east winds in the Hockinson area. This phenomenon has a recurrence interval of about 4 years and can produce surface winds gusts in excess of 70 mph. Mountain wave conditions that contribute to downslope winds provide a cascade of energy such that winds near the surface can greatly exceed the winds at mountain top levels. For reference, other examples of well know mountain wave conditions exist in Boulder Colorado. Since the proposed towers will be nearly 50 meters there would be times that these towers could be under the force of 130 mph winds. Since the proposed right-of-way for the segment 31 towers is only 75 feet on each side a falling tower could land on a home or structure or damage other assets. For these reasons I urge you to drop segment 31 from consideration for addition of new transmission lines. At a minimum the scoping period should be extended to explore other alternatives. The potential damage to the Hockinson community and environmental impacts do not justify the gains when the alternate routes to are available.

Sincerely

William R. Schneider

Communication ID: 12465

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: GEORGIANA KRAMER

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Effects on human health from overhead high voltage lines the effect on property devaluation. Sprays used under towers to kill vegetation, how it effects our well watter. Safety issues with high- voltage transmission lines ranging from 69,000 volts to 500,000 volts. Effects on scenic and historical chelatchie prairie, views of Mt. St. Helen. Effects on pets and livestoct to high voltage power lines.

I have these other comments:

Mr. Mark Korsness,

I am proud to be an American where you listen to our voices. As a citizen I want to say thank you for taking into consideration the adverse impacts a 500-kilovolt transmission line would have on our beautiful scenic and historical Chelatchie Prairie, Route 27. My property [Number] is a historical site the house was built in 1876. President U.S. Grant gave Hein Kulper a homestead certicicate making him the

first owner. Paper enclosed you may find of interest. My property [Number] we have plans to build a new house on this property along [street]. Route 27 goes on both pieces of property.

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Negative effects with birds from collisions with overhead high-voltage transmission lines. I have bald eagles and owls who sit in the trees north of my 1876 year old home.

I have these other comments: continued from page 1

I believe route 35, 34, 29, 21 and all 11 would be a route to consider, even better easterly there of through DNR and Forest Service property, this alternative route would have less adverse impacts on Clark county Citizens, and would preserve our scenic and historical sites, and would have less impact on property devaluation, health and aesthetics.

The most serious concern we have on route 27 is the extended exposure to electro-magnetic radiation. The 500 kilovolts is the 2nd highest voltage in U.S.A Scientific research Shows cancer as one negative health outcome. I understand all the power companies banded together forming a research company EDRI and spent over a hundred million. We the people on route 27 do not have millions of dollars to tell the truth, radiation is a serious threat, cancer to children, women and men.

Communication ID: 12466

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: BILL RIPPENGALE, BONNIE RIPPENGALE

Date: December 10, 2009

Subject: BPA I-5 Corridor Project, Segment #31

Dear Ms. Decker,

We are asking for your help to stop the placement of a 500,000 volt power line in our neighborhood. Our main concerns about Segment #31 are the health hazards imposed on us and our neighbors, the esthetics of our beautiful rural surroundings, and the decline of our property values. We're sure by now that you've heard many other reasons why these high voltage lines should not be placed in our backyards and neighborhood, but these issues are our main concerns. We would like to offer a couple of alternatives for the location and placement of these power lines.

The BPA labeled this project the "The 1-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project" and yet, we are located more than 10 miles from I-5. The placement of the power lines on towers located in the median of 1-5 would be a much better location than the currently proposed Segment #31. A second alternative would be to locate the lines in the Gifford-Pinchot National Forest which is to the east of the populated areas of

Clark County. This land is also owned by the government and would be cheaper than having to acquire many parcels of property with homes that are occupied.

Any assistance you can give us in voicing our concerns to the persons that will be making the decision will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

William and Bonnie Rippengale

[Address]

Battle Ground, WA 98604

[Phone]

[Email]

Communication ID: 12467

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: MARION L MEFFORD

[Address]

Battle Ground, WA 98604

December 8, 2009

Bonneville Power Administration

Communications - DK-7

P.O. Box 14428

Portland, OR 97293-4428

Dear Bonneville Power Administration Representatives:

Please add my name to the list of those urging BPA to alter the current plans for power lines to be erected near 21th Avenue and through Hockinson, WA. The alternatives of an eastern, less populated route or along the established I-5 corridor would be a wiser choice, when you consider the countless justified objections of those in our community.

I could reiterate the list of reasons so clearly put forth regarding health hazards, the school property, the

depreciation of home values, and the like. What I want to emphasize, however, is what you stress in your Vision Statement: "responsible environmental stewardship and accountability to the region," and in your Core Values: "To be worthy of trust we must: Collaborate with those we serve as we make our decisions."

We must collaborate, working as a team, for the good of the citizens of Hockinson and the adjoining areas, such as Venersborg, where I reside. Everyone's best interest would be served by a change in your plans. This would be a win-win situation for all of us.

Marion L. Mefford

[Phone number]

Communication ID: 12468

Date: 12/9/2009

Name: GREGORY L HODGES-TINNER,MARGOT Y HODGES-TINNER

December 8, 2009

[Address]

Brush Prairie,WA 98606

Bonneville Power Administration

Communications - DK-7

P.O. Box 14428

Portland, OR 97293-4428

Dear Representatives of Bonneville Power Administration:

It is with much pride that we read the letters printed almost daily in the Columbian and weekly in The Reflector, written thoughtfully and without sensationalism, by our neighbors here in Hockinson. The writers have really done their homework with respect to the potential negative impact of the proposed power lines through our community. Residents have not had enough time allotted at public meetings to voice concerns. Their letters are concise and to the point, however, and we agree with them: Use an alternate route for the power lines!

The established I-5 corridor would seem to be the most logical route, be most cost effective as far as construction, and even with a lower volume of power transmitted, would serve its purpose well. The benefits far outweigh the speculations of problems, accidents or conflict. An eastern route would be an

acceptable alternative, despite our concern for displacing forests and wildlife.

We have not only much wildlife in Hockinson, but human life, as well. Too many unanswered questions exist to warrant jeopardizing our health and property.

We would promote BPA taking the "high road" and easing the public's growing concerns, by announcing selection of a different route for the power lines. This would encompass your efforts to implement the best possible long-term solutions, as stated in your Core Values (Collaborative Relationships). Please help us preserve the healthy family values and the future of quality education for which Hockinson is known.

Sincerely,

Gregory L. Hodges-Tinner

Margot Y. Hodges-Tinner

Communication ID: 12469

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: RON SPARKS,CHRISTY SPARKS

To those it may concern:

Thank you for extending the date for public expression regarding the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. When we moved here from Pierce County in Jan 2000, we did a lot of research. We were happy to find property with beautiful scenery and open spaces, a school district with strong academics and a caring, supportive community. Now we are concerned that proposed route #31 will have an extremely negative impact on the entire community of Hockinson. Hockinson is truly a community that cares. We care about conserving the land around us, living healthy, helping others in need, having a safe community and educating our children. For example, Hockinson has very little business tax base for our community (2 mini-marts and 1 part-time cafe), so the burden of supporting the schools (2A level) falls on local home owners. Because we do care about educating our children, we consistently pass school levies. We now have one of the highest tax rates in Clark County, but we do this because we are happy to support our schools, the true basis of our community. Currently, Hockinson students have success in academics, music, sports and community service. This compassion and spirit is learned through the schools and community and later, spreads wherever these students go. We want this to continue, not end. If route #31 comes to pass, property values will obviously decrease. Some people will be forced to move; some will choose to move; others will need to foreclose; yet others will be upside-down in their mortgages, stuck, unable to afford a move. And would new families really chose to move to a residential area with power lines? Probably not. The reality is that with a decreasing population and no local businesses, the community and schools would become a skeleton of their potential. The school district even owns

property directly under the proposed line, which would be another setback for our community. Another fear besides the decline of community spirit and home values, includes potential health risks. These power lines would go through many housing communities. Studies on electromagnetic fields show links to leukemia, brain cancer, Alzheimer's disease and miscarriages. Plus, the voltage in route #31 will be much higher than the voltage in any study ever done before. Please don't let our population be guinea pigs to something that will later, be deemed as very dangerous. We are aware that there are some additional options. We have heard current route (#9) may be reinforced. With this, no lands would be destroyed and no new homeowners would be forced to relinquish their lands and financial stability. (less impact on everyone!) We also are aware of more eastern routes (#11, #29, #34 and #35), where less human population would be affected. In any case, we thank you for taking the time to acknowledge our concerns. We close this letter in hopes that we can save the caring, prideful and scenic community of Hockinson... by eliminating route #31 as an option in the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

Sincerely,

Ron and Christy Sparks

Communication ID: 12470

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JEANNE FOSTER

Dear Project Managers:

I live along the I-5 corridor referred to on your BPA aerial page 95, route 25, at [address], Vancouver. If you chose this route, not only will my property value take an irreversible nose dive, but also I will look at a 15 story tower from my front yard. Currently, the existing lines and towers are hidden by tall trees which will be removed if the BPA chooses the existing easement. I realize that the BPA owns the existing right-of-way; however, I feel that there are more negative reasons than positive against using the current easement to expand the power system. Some negative reasons include:

1. The BPA will need to expand substantially the existing right-of-way which will decrease the value of many existing homes due to loss of some of the land or to the loss of entire homes as a result of the expansion. Taking part or all of the property will not come cheap as many of the homes in question are on larger lots in premium neighborhoods.
2. Property values in Clark County have already dropped significantly this past year. Using the existing right-of-way would diminish values even more along this heavily populated area. Besides the value loss of a significant personal asset, the state and county would suffer additional revenue loss from decreased property taxes.
3. With the new towers being taller and closer to homes, residents would be confronted with enormous,

ugly industrial structures and exposed to EMF radiation as well as inherent noise from the wires.

4. A substantial numbers of trees would be removed from the right-of-way area thus exposing residents to much more freeway noise.

5. Placing two high tension lines parallel to one another and in close proximity goes against the long-standing policy in the power line industry. To do so creates reliability and safety concerns associated with fire, plane crashes or other disasters where a single problem could take out both lines simultaneously thus leaving the system inappropriately vulnerable to a single point failure.

6. In order to minimize safety and other risk factors by using the existing easement, the BPA may need to de-rate the new line. Considering the cost (largely federal dollars) to build a new transmission line, it seems foolish to make such a huge investment and not operate at full capacity. Relocating the new towers and lines to a remote, eastern area would eliminate this situation.

7. Meeting the required North American Reliability Corporation reliability standards would

be questionable. During the public meeting held in Hazel Dell, I asked a BPA representative why more emphasis was not being placed on consideration of the route to the east, which goes mostly through forest land owned by the state. The gentleman indicated that the state-owned trees were needed as a source of revenue for Washington to generate money for schools and that the wildlife must be protected. First of all, I pay taxes...not the wildlife. I need my assets in order to survive. While I appreciate protecting the animals including endangered species, I feel that my life and well being are still more important. I do not think that the owls or Bambi will be harmed by these lines passing through the forest nor will their food chain be compromised. Secondly, the state would be paid for the trees. If the revenue received by the state was saved or invested wisely, the interest earned would be available for school needs. I realize that asking the state of Washington to spend revenues wisely is next to impossible, but the state does have the capacity to rise to the occasion. I left the Hazel Dell meeting feeling as if the decision has already been made and that the BPA would select the existing right-of-way as their choice. I felt that there was no way that the state of Washington would allow the BPA to buy any of their forest land, that the state has more concern for birds than tax payers, and that the BPA could get around the legal, environmental and safety issues at hand much quicker and easier by selecting the current easement. I sincerely hope I am wrong not only for my well being but also for the thousands of others that would be affected should the existing route be selected. If the high voltage power lines are truly a necessity, please consider installing them through a less densely populated and truly rural area of the county and not within developed areas. Thank you for listening and hopefully hearing my concerns.

Yours very truly,

Jeanne Foster

Communication ID: 12471

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JULIANA L PEARSON

BPA Segment 31 Letter

Juliana Pearson

[Address]

[Phone number]

December 11, 2009

[FAX}

I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

PO Box 9250

Portland, OR 97207

Re: BPA's 1-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project, Segment 31

Dear BPA Staff:

I am in opposition to Segment 31 of BPA's proposed 1-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

My family has lived on [Street] (along middle/southern portion of Segment No. 31) since the 1960s. A place such as this is priceless in its beauty and serenity. However, your proposal of Segment 31 puts all that we value about our land in jeopardy.

Upon initially hearing of your proposal of Segment 31, I was surprised that BPA would take this route under serious consideration given the site-specific conditions along this route. Speaking only of our immediate area, you would be faced with extensive above ground springs, waterways, Rock Creek tributary, documented Native American archeological sites, and high erosion/geo hazard zones with recent slide activity.

Outside of the significant land disturbance you would cause to an area that is both complex and culturally rich, you would be negatively impacting the lives and property of thousands of Clark County residents. Is this the legacy you will choose?

If you have any questions related to this letter, please feel free to contact me directly at [phone number].

Sincerely,

Juliana Le Pearson

pc: Clark County Commissioners

State Representatives

US Congressional & Senate Representatives

Communication ID: 12472

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MONTY PRICE

Please have you environmental studies look at:

Slide areas, spring used for home, creek, 2 existing pipelines

I have these other comments:

We have a tree farm, motocross track, and 2 proposed homesites, family picnic area.

Communication ID: 12473

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JUSTIN MEENGs

Dear BPA,

With the proposal of the new power line that will cut across southwest Washington I thought it was right to voice my opinion. I think that it is a very unintelligent decision to run the power line across the Hockinson area when you have two other routes that would not displace nearly as many home owners. Also the Hockinson area is a very nice area where people have paid lots of money to buy homes due to the good school system among other things. If the power line was to be installed though this region you would crush the values of so many peoples dream homes.

The worst part of this whole thing is that you are destroying Washington by putting this huge power line though it. The majority of the power being supplied by this line is not going to even be used by the people of Washington; it will be moved down south to the people in Oregon and California when they don't have to view these lines. I think that a smarter route would be to place these lines to the east,

leading though rural undeveloped government land where you are not going to decimate the dream homes which people have invested so much time and money in . But I feel that the best route would be to run the lines up 1-5 considering that this area is so developed it will not stick out like a sore thumb like it would in more rural parts of the county.

If you are going to take the power into Oregon any way why not save money and instead of installing lines headed north just to back track south, install the substation in Oregon. Oregon has a lot of undeveloped farm land not far out of the city that would make a great location for this power station. It would probably even save money by not having to waste over seventy miles of lines when the power is going to Oregon. Make Oregon step up and donate their land to support this project if they want the power, the burden should be placed on their shoulders.

From,

A resident whom cares for the well being of his state

Justin Meengs

Communication ID: 12474

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MEGAN LAWRENCE

Dear BPA,

I write this letter with concern over the I-5 corridor project. As the plan for the project runs now, the part of the line going through Hockinson would make it so that my house would be torn down. My family and I have lived in that house for the last twenty years; my dad was even the one who built it. Losing our house would be a great loss for my family, one which I believe is avoidable.

Both being school teachers, my parents had our home as their savings which they would use in the future when needed. Now however if they were forced to sell our house, they would lose a great deal. Because the economy is so bad our house value has dropped \$100,000 dollars within the last year. It would be incredibly wrong and cheap of you to force my parents to sell their house during such an economic downturn.

Not only does the I-5 corridor project affect my family but it affects our whole community.

Anyone's house that is within range of the project will greatly depreciate in value, which would be a great loss to our community. We are a community that has worked so hard to get to where we are, only to have it taken by the I-5 corridor project. While house values are important, the safety involved in also a concern. Living next to huge power lines cannot be good for anyone's health. Now I know that you

probably have the information saying that it's all safe and good, but no one wants to live next to a power line.

In the end I hope you make the choice to change the path of the I-5 corridor project. You will face great amounts of conflict with the home owners if you choose to come out this way, and it will be an extreme hassle for you. I don't see how you have the right to force people to sell their homes at such a low point in the economy, I would be ashamed if a where you.

A concerned Hockinson resident,

Megan Lawrence

Communication ID: 12475

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: TOM K LAWRENCE

December 10, 2009

BPA 1-5 Corridor Reinforcement

PO Box 9250

Portland, Oregon

I am another homeowner that is asking you to find a different route for your 500KV power lines. Segment 31 goes through too many homes. The areas east of 31 would affect a great deal fewer people.

There is no way that you or any of your staff would live near one of these power lines. It doesn't make sense to put people in the proximity of this huge amount of electricity. BPA would put the lines as close as 75 feet. We would be less than 150 feet away and have no doubts that physically our family will be hurt from the magnetic field. If you stand near a large power line you can hear the energy emitting from them. Think what that is doing to you.

Our home is our retirement. We bought the land twenty years ago and built our family's future here. This is the only home our kids have had. We did all the work ourselves; it wasn't hiring contractors to do the work. Much of the money came from my wife's inheritance when her folks died. This house has helped keep their memory going. But there is no way that we could stay here if the power line is put in

Section 31. Property value has already started to drop; I do not believe that we could even sell the borne now with the possibility of the line.

It makes sense to run the line further to the east. There is a lot of state forest land in that area. You say

the power line will benefit the American people; let public land be used for most of it and leave the private land alone. Do not use Segment 31.

Sincerely,

Tom Lawrence

Cc: Senator Patty Murray

Senator Maria Cantwell

Rep. Brian Baird

Gov. Chris Gregoire

Communication ID: 12476

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: ALANA WALLS

Dear Sirs:

I agree with the view expressed by Mr. Davidson. Life is hard enough these days without worrying about an invasion of 150' towers in the back yard.

Please don't ruin our neighborhoods and scalp our countryside.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Alana Walls

PS. Going through Hockinson is a bad idea.

Attachment:

Our readers' views

Use power corridor that's available

How ridiculous can the modern-day, risk adverse Bonneville Power Administration get? Years ago it acquired enough corridor width for two major power lines, and now BPA is gagging at gnats to find a reason not to use that existing corridor and instead is eagerly planning to lay waste to Clark County with a new corridor. The only common mode failure initiation overlooked was an asteroid hitting both lines.

BPA should work diligently to justify and defend using the existing corridor as the clear choice, far better than any other. All over the US and the world, there are many places with two major power lines in a common corridor. Give us a break and use some common sense: If there is a place for a landslide hazard, fix it, if there is a place for a forest fire, cut down a few more trees, if there is a place the corridor is too narrow, widen it. But, BPA, don't wreck Clark Country for your lack of imagination and trying.

James M. Davidson

Brush Prairie

"The Columbian"

12/9/09

Communication ID: 12477

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MIKE BOSTER,JULIE BOSTER

12-12-2009

.Dear US Dept. of Energy, BPA

Enclosed are our concerns and comments about the proposed I-5 corridor transmission line route.

As property owners we are understandably very concerned about the possibility of a 500kV transmission line coming through private property, be it ours or others. We would like to know why it cannot be routed more to the east on less populated property. I believe that publically owned or privately owned forest land or agricultural land would be a cheaper alternative to buying many easements from individual property owners. This route should not disrupt any homeowners/property owners. thereby easing the public tension this project has already created.

There is already a cloud of distrust for anything that is government related due to the economic woes this country is going through and in many cases it appears that government and its related agencies care naught for the general populace. Please listen to what most of the taxpayers are asking you, as the US Dept. of Energy, BPA to find a route that will be the least painful to the taxpayers who are already being asked to foot the bill through taxes and eventually higher electric rates that completion of this project will undoubtedly bring. Thank-you.

Mike & Julie Boster

[Address]

Communication ID: 12478

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: CHAD LAWRENCE

December 12, 2009

BPA,

Please don't build your power line on Segment 31. It will come really close to my house and I do not want to live near the line. I plan soccer on a field that has some power lines that are not as big as these will be and you can hear the lines snapping and crackling on wet days. This can't be good for you.

This is the only home that I have lived in and hoped that our family could stay here always. I could see bringing my kids to enjoy the same area that I played in. The research that we have been shown; shows that there is an increase in cancer in young kids where exposed to high magnetic forces. Would I bring my kids to my folk's home when there is a chance of that? My parents are teachers; can they sell this house and start over again?

You are causing a great deal of problems when you don't need to. There is forest land to the east of our home, it would be better for everyone.

Chad Lawrence

Communication ID: 12479

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: DAVE HANCOCK,KAREN HOLYK,RON MADLER,CINDY MARBUT,JOE WARREN,JAMES WELDON

Dear Bonneville Power Administration,

In regards to your proposition to run a 500,000-volt power line, complete with lattice steel towers between 80 and 150 feet in height, across the corridor between Castle Rock, Washington and Troutdale, Oregon, we ask that you keep the lines as far east as possible. We do not wish to have these large towers and lines running through our Town. We understand the need for more power in the area. There are many acres of unpopulated forest land to the east that would be better suited for such large towers and power lines. Many of our residents are concerned about the lines running through their property and what that would do to their property value and such. Also in order to install the lines there would be

many trees that would be clear cut, which would affect the wildlife in the area. On behalf of the governing body of Yacolt, we would really like you to consider moving this project east and not ruin our beautiful scenery in our quiet Town.

Best Regards,

Yacolt Town Council

Ron Madler, James Weldon, Karen Holyk, Dave Hancock, and Cindy Marbut

Communication ID: 12480

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: DEBBIE L FISCHER,GREG FISCHER

Dear Sirs at BPA

We oppose BPA plans to build a 500 power line in the proposed corridor's 28 + 29 due to possible health issues and devaluation of property's.

A meeting we attended in Yacolt proposed a corridor for his power line further East more onto DNR land which would be more acceptable.

Thanks you!

Greg Fischer

Debbie Fischer

Communication ID: 12481

Date: 12/11/2009

Name: DAWN WOOLCOTT

Re: NO BPA SEGMENT #31 on Proposed BPA I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

I strongly urge you that segment #31 should NOT be considered as an option for the route of your new high voltage power lines. The short window of public input is not acceptable. Many people in the affected areas are still unaware of this project we are doing our best to let the community know about this proposal. Your letters notified only those properties that you needed access for survey purposes, including mine. My next door neighbor did not receive notice, although this severely impacts their home

as well. This project if it goes through Hockinson will wipe my neighborhood off the map. Your route would follow the street into my neighborhood and eliminate the access to my house. Take these problems into consideration for building in my neighborhood:

- The plan would eliminate the privately paved road of 212th Ave. north of 189th St. This would eliminate the road to access four properties on 197th Circle and nine homes on Kirsten Circle and possibly three homes on 212th Ave. Two new roads would have to be built and paved to replace the existing one. This would include removing, replacing, and relocating two mailbox stands and one fire hydrant.
- Digging/construction in this area involves dealing with currently used wells, septic tanks, and phone lines currently underground. The moment you announced line 31 as a potential site for your power lines, our property values have gone down. For the next two years while you make up your minds which route you will take, our properties must disclose this potential threat to any potential homebuyers. No one will want to buy our homes with this threat hanging over the property. If we have to move due to job transfers or other reason out of our control, we would be forced to try and sell for well below the actual value and lose more money than we can afford to lose. We are not wealthy people here... we are just hanging on and you are potentially destroying our lives. Nothing that your publicity department has said has convinced me that these power lines are necessary and are the only option. People have been stringing power lines since the day electricity was invented over 100 years ago. I can't believe that there isn't a better alternative available. If there isn't, perhaps the 300 million dollar budget of yours would be better spent in researching better ways to transport electricity. I have two children I'm trying very hard to raise in a healthy environment. I will not stay and live in the shadow of 500 kv transmission lines with their poisonous magnetic emissions, putting my children at risk for cancer, leukemia, and ALS. Put yourself in my shoes... would you want this to happen in your neighborhood?

Signed,

Dawn Woolcott

Address

Communication ID: 12482

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: LINDA GENTUGUA

Dear Mr. Korness,

Please, Please, Please find another way to run power other than the proposed BPA I-5 corridor project other than segment 31. The current proposal would decastate so many lived in so many ways. Please

have a heart.

Sincerely,

Linda Gentugua

Communication ID: 12483

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JAMES J REKUCKI

Re: Proposed BPA 500kv line through Clark County

Mr. Korsness,

As suggested by BPA, I am writing this letter to voice my concerns regarding the proposed power line through Clark County. I am aware of the saying "the shortest distance between two points is a straight line" but in the case of your proposed power line, I do not believe it holds to be true. My observation of the process, the meetings, the overhead, and the negative reaction of the citizens tells me you are taking the longest route possible. My first impression of you is a man of character and intelligence and I assume you have surrounded yourself with individuals who have similar traits. I am not familiar with the politics that may be involved with this type of project so I apologize if in reality you and your design team are being dictated to by some upper level individual management, who may lack those traits. Please consider our suggestion that you give the highest possible priority to moving the line east into the forest. The Clark County area will continue to grow over the next 50 years. People will look back and comment one of two ways. Either "those individuals who designed and installed that power line were on the ball" and or "who were the idiots that designed and installed that power line?". From a very personal standpoint, I can't imagine that you or any member of your design team would want to be (even indirectly) responsible for the serious illness of another human being, especially a child! You just seem like too good a man to let that happen. I have no desire to fight BPA on your final design, but would rather contribute to some intelligent discussion and then put my trust in you and your design team to do the right thing. Thank you for your time and consideration. May the LORD bless you and your design team and may HE grant you great wisdom on this project. HE always has and always will generate the greatest power!

James J. Rekucki

Communication ID: 12484

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MATT SARKINEN

Please have your environmental studies look at: Using only the easternmost Route through the state forest.

Communication ID: 12485

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: ALANA WALLS

Dear Mr. Korsness:

Please use whatever authority you have to keep BPA from scalping Clark County near Hockinson. This proposed route is a bad idea. I agree with this letter life is hard enough these days without worrying about the invasion of 150' towers in the backyard.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Alana Walls

Communication ID: 12486

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JANE HALL

Gentlemen:

God help us if this monster goes through our community or the communities further north and south. My two young grandchildren live next to the proposed line. I have witnessed children with leukemia and it is an unbelievably devastating disease. I can't imagine any power company putting so many families in harms way. I know you say no research has proved this but CA certainly has made progress in their thinking about large transmission lines. I quote from an article in the January 2010 issue of Prevention magazine:

"In 1990, the city of La Quinta, CA proudly opened the doors of its sparkling new middle school. Gayle Cohen, then a sixth-grade teacher, recalls the sense of excitement everyone felt: "We had been in temporary facilities for 2 years, and the change was exhilarating." But the glow soon dimmed. One teacher developed vague symptoms--weakness, dizziness--and didn't return after the Christmas break. A

couple of years later, another developed cancer and died; the teacher who took over his classroom was later diagnosed with throat cancer. More instructors continued to fall ill, and then, in 2003, on her 50th birthday, Cohen received her own bad news: breast cancer. "That's when I sat down with another teacher, and we remarked on all the cancers we'd seen," she says. "We immediately thought of a dozen colleagues who had either gotten sick or passed away." By 2005, 16 staffers among the 137 who'd worked at the new school had been diagnosed with 18 cancers, a ratio nearly 3 times the expected number. Nor were the children spared: About a dozen cancers have been detected so far among former students. A couple of them have died." I would encourage you to purchase the January 2010 issue of Prevention Magazine and see for yourself what experts in the field have to report. What would you do if a 500 KV transmission line was going through or next to your property? I would think you also would be very upset about the health risks. Of course there is also the issue of decreased property values, the effects on wildlife, wetlands, quality of life, home businesses and farms, and the fact that the transmission line would go through school property.

Please do the right thing for all people.

Sincerely,

Jane Hall

Communication ID: 12487

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: SANDI HIGGINS

Dear Mr Korsness,

I was unable to speak at that that meeting in Yacolt due to time constraints; however I have several concerns. Agreeing to study a route even farther to the east and away from more populated areas is a good start. But I do not understand why these route studies are even necessary. There is a line from Castle Rock to Troutdale already. I have heard no logical explanation about why this line cannot be upgraded to meet the new energy needs. Even if the existing lines could not be upgraded, it is my understanding that the right of way was originally planned so that it could accommodate two lines. This certainly has been done in other areas so why is this not the best solution. I heard the explanations that terrorists, floods, slides and fires would threaten the lines if they were placed in the same right of way. It seems that having two lines there is no more threat than having one line there as we currently have.

The money that would be saved studying other routes, then buying up property for new right of ways could be spent to better secure lines on the existing right of way. At the Clark County Commissioners meeting where the BPA issue was discussed, information was presented that putting transmission lines underground is now more feasible. If there are areas of particular concern, transmission lines could be

placed underground since you would be saving so much money by not studying other routes or paying for crossing people's property. Why are you even considering going through neighborhoods? The residents of North and East Clark County chose their homes for the life style, desiring to live on rural lands away from health hazards such as transmissions lines, away from the visual pollution such as transmission lines and near sensitive wildlife that would be damaged by the construction of transmission lines. Why are you even considering going through acreage that has been chosen for a school? Doesn't your staff research such things before proposing routes. And finally, please allow more time for public comment by extending the comment period by three months so that the area residents can have more input. Due to the rural nature of the area, many residents have limited access to news so additional time should be allowed to provide information to more residents.

Thank you,

Sandi Higgins

Communication ID: 12488

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: BRUCE AND LESLIE BELL

BPA, without doubt, is off base with their entire scoping process. I am honored to be a part of the Steering Committee that united in an incredibly short period of time to aid Bonneville Power Administration find a better route for the proposed routes for such a massive project. I stand behind the letter that was emailed to Mark Korsness on Dec. 13 via email, and the letter that will be presented to him as a representative of BPA on December 14, at 11am. Our home is located on Segment 39 within the proposed easement. Our home, would not be condemned. We would simply be asked to live under the magnetic fields associated with the 500 kv lines. I am most concerned because my husband has a pacemaker. The EMF's emitted will most assuredly play a role in his future medical issues. We will not be able to afford to purchase another home. At the meeting at the Camas Fire Station on November 21, 2009, Mark Korsness was asked the question, "What about people that have homes and will live within the electromagnetic field?" The questioning went a step further, as my husband has a pacemaker. A Pacemaker without doubt, deals with the electrical issues of the heart. Mr. Korsness' response was quite generalized and in essence, it was said that each person with a pacemaker would be taken under individual consideration, based on whom the manufacturer of the pacemaker is. I find this most disconcerting. I would like BPA to extrapolate on the manufactures of pacemakers and the model numbers of those that BPA deems in jeopardy. I would like to see a report on what BPA deems worthy of negotiation. There is nothing on this green earth, that can even come close to saying, "I can live in an environment, where electricity, pulsating down upon my body is not going to do me harm." Going on to say, "My heart is regulated by an electrical device, and adding external pulsating fields 24 hours a day emitted from a 500 kV power line next to our home is not going to do me harm?" Give me time to show

BPA otherwise. As my husband's wife, I know better. I've already met with his pacemaker device representative. By putting a 500 kV line next to our home and asking us to live within this EMF is incomprehensible. My husband, implanted with a pacemaker... can we ask that he be placed on the endangered species list? That is not an option, as I know. How many human lives are you taking into account with your proposals? Shame on you. Where is the line drawn? Answer that. In detail. BPA has how many employees looking out for the best interest of their concerns? The least you can do is give us time to investigate the misfortune you have bestowed.

Find another route, in a non-populated route.

Share your studies with the people. Shame on you. FOIA.

Act as a responsible company, not only about the dollar, but also about lives, human, fauna and flora and whatever we call bugs. What are the effects of EMF's on insects, which make up over 1/3 of the species on earth and play such an important role? Extend your scoping period. Allow the citizens to realize what they are up against. I personally have put in an excruciating amount of hours when there were few in my life. My attempt was to pull together property owners along Segment 39 and then beyond. Without proper notification there is no way that property owners realize what is really happening. They are still "in the dark" about the severity upon their livelihood of the project that BPA sets forth. We have seven "resident" deer. We see them every morning and every evening except sporadically in late September and October... rutting? Our "resident 7" bring their deer buddies to upwards of 40 for morning grazing and evening passing. We nod to sleep with the sound of owls (have you ever sat at night and listened to the sound of mature owls teaching their young to fly? It is truly a memorable experience) and frogs grokking you to sleep. Our neighborhood cussed the "she bear" and her two cubs two years ago. The team took down our bird feeders, and messed up our porches. This called for neighborhood alerts to keep the dogs close to home and went on for many months. Later, we had a vet bill to have upwards of 30 porcupine quills removed from our Labrador Retriever's face and chest. The pain he went through was most uncomfortable. Still, the hummingbirds, finches and grosbeak, and those that I don't have the time to identify that feed every day out our dining room window are true creatures and will be effected. Some birds will stay distant for a short time while the Peregrine Falcon visits, as they are the natural food for the falcon. Dragonflies will swarm when the conditions are correct with heat and humidity. Praying Mantis and Lady Bugs balance this system. Squirrels and chipmunks are our comedians. There is a moose antler in our 49th Circle, where they gain their calcium. The coyotes yelp at night. Come to think of it... they have not been around... better figure why. Is it the existing corridor for BPA's lines that already are there? I could easily go on... and bring up oodles of what is wonderful about living here. There are. Too many wonderful areas that are not populated. True. The wildlife learned to skip over and through the 230kV lines within a mile or less of our home. To bed in our compost pile, which maintains heat I vote for, "Open a corridor in a non-populated area. Study our wildlife. If you do not have what you need to "scope" this enormous project, please, let us know as a community. We are here to help you. Regardless of where BPA goes, all these species will be affected. " Do not let the species of Homo sapiens's be impacted. Find a Better Way BPA. BPA has not allowed the citizens of Washington enough time to investigate, much less analyze our concerns and thoughts. Extend

the scoping period. Let us help you find a route. Answer our questions. Share, fully and honestly your research.

Respectfully,

Leslie and Bruce Bell

Communication ID: 12489

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: DAVID M SIMMS,CAROLYN SIMMS

To Whom It May Concern,

We write this letter regarding the BPA consideration of issues for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project. My husband and I live along the proposed route 51, and have lived on our property for seventeen years. Our property is adjacent to a natural gas pipeline to the east and the current BPA lines to the West. First of all, we would like to say the current proposal is unnecessary and inappropriate. It is outrageous that the current technology and existing system is more than enough to bring power to other areas and yet is not even being considered. The fact is that our government is expected to look after the health, safety and welfare of its citizens. The current plan proposes an excessively expensive option that would negatively affect the health, safety and welfare of US citizens. BPA currently could achieve the same results with what they have even if regulations would need to be reviewed and possibly altered - which would be less expensive and intrusive to all of us. Also, we propose other avenues for the proposed lines that would have the least environmental and property impact, which we believe have not been considered at this time, as follows:

- Burying the lines in the existing right of ways between the current lines; or
- Burying the lines along the I-5 Corridor; or
- Placing the lines in the middle of the existing right of ways on a modified tower that would be tall and thin, rather than the proposed wide model. With expanding technology, it would seem that these alternatives should at least be considered and the costs associated therewith determined order to moving forward with the current proposal. Additionally, it should be noted that the proposed project is for creating either new or expanded easements for the power lines. As you well know, studies have shown, exposed power lines can cause health issues for those living under or near them for extended periods of time. The power lines are both ugly and a nuisance to property owners living under or around them, as well. It is well known that the property values along the lines are impacted by the presence of the lines for the aforementioned reasons. We own approximately 12 acres along the proposed route and an additional 5 acres of timber property adjacent to the other 12. Our property has already been shown to the County for consideration to be further divided, which will be reviewed at its next

opportunity. The property values will be greatly affected and possibly completely diminished with the placement of the easement and resulting property lines. It would be impossible to get even close to the current deflated property values, much less expect any opportunity for continued growth in values with the placement of the lines. And with years of anticipated speculation by BPA, it is difficult to make any real plans for either development or sale of the property. Finally, the alternative route from line 51 is route 50, which seems to be a better and more direct route. A significant amount of the property along route 50 is open and without affecting residences or current development. The properties are open fields, which could still be used for agriculture. Therefore, in the alternative that the proposed project be implemented, we would like to request BPA to choose route 50 rather than option 51 for its project. Again, it would be most appropriate to use the existing system for development of further lines. If regulations need to be updated to allow this use, BPA should be expanding its resources to facilitate that to happen. If BPA can show the existing system must be expanded, then it should do so within its current areas. If we can bury natural gas lines, why not electrical ones?! If the current proposal goes forward route 50 should be the one chosen for East County. If you have any questions, please contact us at the number below. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,

David and Carolyn Simms

Communication ID: 12490

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JOHN PARSONS

Please consider my response and inquiries to the proposed I-S Corridor reinforcement project.

My family and I have property just east of LaCenter, Washington that contain an existing BPA transmission line and tower running north from Vancouver. The existing right of way dissecting our property BPA owns is approximately four acres or so of land, the new proposal identified on your map increases the amount of land needed by two to three times. The present use of the existing right of way through our property and use of others lands already owned by BPA is not at a capacity that precludes additional infrastructure development needed to increasing and strengthen the transmission grid within the region.

Condemnation of additional lands for a SOD-kilovolt transmission line appears to be based on a want, rather than a need. Please share the criterion used for determining the need for a line and right of way for a transmission line of this magnitude. In reviewing the BPA information documents reporting the intent and purpose of the proposed action, I found it difficult to determine facts and did not see how this action would allow "green energy...wind power" to be moved from where it is created to our location, is the plan to use existing lines through the Columbia Gorge or do you have new or other

additional connected actions that are not included or being analyzed with the I-S corridor project? Please show/share all proposed actions to be undertaken in order to create a fully functioning /needed SOD-kilovolt transmission line system. In reading your posting in the Federal Register, the intent and purpose for the proposal is to meet long term commitments, potential growth as well as providing green power. Are the long term commitments intended for this region where the power is created? Is the intent to seek long term agreements outside of the Pacific Northwest and this region? Is BPA developing a SOD-kilovolt transmission system in order to provide power outside of the United States and out of this region? "Approaching capacity, continue to be tested and increased likelihood the transmission system will soon exceed itself" are terms used within the BPA "fact sheet" dated September 2009. Please share the facts rather than speculation and scare tactics such as what is the existing full capacity of (all) the grid, what (level or target) are you attempting to provide and for whom, (future growth, out of region uses?) Please share/identify all BPA right of way lands not currently utilized. Please share BPA's record of utilization of right of way lands and use of the existing transmission grid within the region. Additional "facts" BPA should analyze is what existing transmission lines are not currently energized or have been turned off? What is the use rate and history of the Chenoweth Goldendale No 1 transmission line. How is this line needed/ tied to the I-S corridor enhancement project? What is BPA's history of use of such lines as this and others that are now suddenly deemed high priorities for future development. Condemnation of additional right of way lands is simply wrong when existing lands and existing transmission systems are not in use or used below a capacity as designed. Right of way lands not fully utilized by BPA over many decades should be used prior to condemning additional private lands for a new and overly grand project.

Other facts when determining alternatives for placement must include economic considerations. What is the least expensive proposal that would meet your objective? How much property tax revenue (both present and long term) will be lost from high density populated areas such as identified within Clark County and other populated areas? Existing and future potential lost income must be considered prior to additional condemnation of private tax based lands. Please share the cost analysis of completing a project such as this on private lands as compared to locating on non -taxed State or Federal lands. While the proposal shared thus far appear to be any or all potential areas that may someday be of use to BPA, I find it hard to believe that a more narrow listing of preferred alternatives have yet to be identified. The loss of public trust is much more difficult to rebuild than that of constructing a transmission line.

John Parsons

[Address]

Communication ID: 12491

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JOHN "JACK" GERSTKEMPER

Dear BPA:

I submitted the attached document to your website address at www.bpa.gov/go/I-5 on Sunday, December 14, 2009. I am submitting this hardcopy of the same document to Portland Post Office Box 9250 to insure that you receive the document prior to the close of the scoping period for the I-56 Corridor Reinforcement Project. In light of this information, I ask that BPA pursue one of two different solutions to their I-5 Corridor

Reinforcement project:

1. Locate the proposed 500 kV line as far as possible from populated areas. BPA's alternative routes include two eastern routes through lands owned and managed by the Washington Department of Natural Resources. Either of these routes would avoid populated areas in downtown Vancouver and rural housing developments east of the unincorporated community of Hockinson. A new route that minimizes impact to private land should also be analyzed. The new route I propose is 4 miles east on the Gifford Pinchot National Forest.
2. Use underground superconductor technology to place the transmission line underground. This technology would provide greater transmission capacity in the future, eliminate above-ground environmental issues and could be located on a 25' easement along existing road rights-of-way.

Sincerely,

Jack Gerstkemper

Land Use Issues

Related to BPA's I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

Submitted to BPA as part of the public scoping process

December 14, 2009

By Jack Gerstkemper, Retired Forester

The Western Hemlock Ecological Zone describes the low-elevation forest on the western slopes of the Cascades. This forest type once covered Clark County from Fort Vancouver up to an elevation of 3000 feet in the Gifford Pinchot National Forest. The Western Hemlock Ecological Zone includes many different native plant communities that vary with elevation, soil, slope aspect and proximity to water. The primary successional stages in this zone include red alder as a pioneer tree species and a forest of large douglas firs as an intermediate seral stage. In the absence of a stand replacing fire, the old-growth forest would be dominated by shade tolerant western hemlock, hence the name of the ecological zone. Douglas fir is the primary commercial species in this ecological zone. Douglas fir reseeds naturally and has been extensively planted in managed forests throughout the Western Hemlock Ecological Zone. The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is considering a variety of routes through this ecological zone for a new 500 kV transmission line. The BPA's I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project Study Area Map identifies Segments 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34 and 35 as possible routes for their proposed 500 kV

transmission lines through southeastern Clark County. Many of the site-specific ecological issues are similar in all the Segments listed above. Environmental impacts to soils, wildlife and riparian areas are common to segments 26 thru 35. There is, however, one issue that is dramatically different when comparing Segments 26 thru 35: Segment 31 has a large population of human beings living in the understory of the ecological zone. Other segments are relatively devoid of humans.

For the past 50 years, Clark County has been issuing building permits along a 100-foot wide easement acquired by Pacific Power and Light in 1957. For the past 50 years, people have been building their homes immediately adjacent to this easement. The homes are generally large. The home owners are generally middle class or upper middle class. Lot sizes are large, typically ranging from 1 acre to 20 acres. The large lots in Segment 31 often include the native forest vegetation of the Western Hemlock Ecological Zone.

My neighborhood and my home are typical of the development Clark County has encouraged along Segment 31. Our neighborhood, Hockinson Highland Estates, was subdivided into twenty-four 5-acre lots in 1990. Many owners built their "Dream Homes" on their 5-acre lots. Five acres is too large to mow and too small to farm, so many owners let the native forest return to a portion of their lots. My current home has one acre of landscaping around the house and 4 acres of native forest. The native vegetation on my 5-acre lot provides habitat for deer, rabbits, bears, bobcats, the occasional mountain lion, red-tailed hawks and countless other, less obvious species. The main difference between my property and the commercial forest land east of me is that my forest is better maintained than land managed by timber companies and the DNR. I live on my land and care for it meticulously. My neighbors do the same. The BPA's two easternmost routes pass through timber land managed by the Washington DNR and privately-owned, commercial forest land. The lands along these two easternmost routes are managed primarily for timber production. Aerial photographs of the DNR and Private timber lands in segments 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 34 show large areas in a mono-culture, douglas fir forest, logged in clear-cuts and accessed by unpaved logging roads. Segment 31, where I live, offers greater biodiversity than the commercial timber lands to the east. Segment 31 features a variety of landscapes that include pastures, gardens, lawns, forests and well-buffered riparian areas along with the homes. The Segment 31 landscape is well maintained. The roads are paved. There is very little erosion. Wildlife is encouraged with bird feeders, nesting boxes and a no-hunting policy enforced by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. For many of its human residents, Segment 31 represents an idyllic natural setting. We work hard to maintain that environment. BPA's 500 kV transmission line would dramatically change that environment.

The transmission line would directly impact 5 of the 24 lot in my development by crossing or bordering the 5 lots. It would indirectly impact other lots with a noisy, unhealthy, unsightly, electro-magnetic field suspended 120 feet in the air. Clearing the over-story trees to prevent windfall damage to the power lines would require a strip clearcut approximately 300 feet wide for the 14 miles length of segment 31. The resulting 500 acre clear-cut is totally out of context with the existing land use in Segment 31. A large, strip clear-cut is more compatible with the existing land use on the commercial forest lands east of Segment 31. Washington State law requires the Department of Natural Resources to maximize

revenue on their timber lands. This mandate has led to a patchwork of clear-cuts, roads and extensive second-growth stands of douglas fir. DNR rotation ages are short and timber harvest is frequent on their commercial timber lands. A 300-foot wide clear-cut could blend well with clear-cuts on DNR lands and privately owned timber lands where clear-cut dimensions often exceed 300 feet on two or more sides of the clear-cuts. BPA's proposal for 500 kV transmission line with a cleared easement bears a striking similarity to the land management practices on DNR Lands. The only significant difference between DNR's land management practices and those proposed by BPA is that BPA's easement would not allow the return of the tall trees within the easement. The DNR's maximum-revenue management objective could be met by leasing the land to BPA for the annual value of their timber harvest. Creative DNR foresters could grow other commercially valuable forest products in the strip clear-cut. Salal, bear grass, Oregon grape, devils club, cascara, bay, and yew are a few of the species that have commercial value. Land under the power lines could be leased to commercial Christmas tree growers.

An alternative low-cost management prescription for the BPA easement would be to allow brush species to provide a natural successional stage in the western hemlock ecological zone. The brush communities provide food and cover for deer, elk, bear and other species. Big game populations would benefit from the creation of a brushy easement. Hunting is a popular recreation activity in eastern Clark County that injects a great deal of money into the local economy. Locating the proposed 500 kV line on DNR land could result in positive economic benefits for Clark County by increasing big game species in Clark County. No such economic benefits from hunting accrue if the transmission line is located on Segment 31. Rifle hunting is not permitted along most of Segment 31 because of the housing. A cleared easement would only encourage poaching of the type that occurred in my neighborhood a few years ago when a poacher shot and killed a deer along Powell Road. If the poacher's bullet had missed the deer, it could have hit my neighbor's home. Any economic comparison of the segments 28 through 34 should include costs to the community and cost to private citizens resulting from the change in land use. The decreased property values and corresponding decrease in annual property tax revenues should be compared against the immediate value of timber harvested with the installation of the power line minus the present value of future lost timber revenues within the cleared easement. Any such economic comparison is likely to strongly favor locating the transmission line on commercial timber land.

There is also an issue regarding a violation of trust to the homeowners along Segment 31. The existing Pacific Corp easement through our neighborhood is 100 feet wide. That is wide enough for an 80 kV line. For 50 years Pacific Corp and Pacific Power and Light have told inquiring landowners that their companies had no plans for development of the easement. The easement's location connecting Yale Lake Dam with Camas has led landowners to believe that a small power line might someday occupy the easement. Clark County has freely issued building permits along the easement for 50 years. It is a violation of 50 years of trust to invoke Eminent Domain and adverse condemnation to build the largest power line in the State of Washington on a small existing easement. Such action is inconsistent with 50 years of land use in Segment 31. Finally, there is logic for locating this line as much as possible on public lands. Millions of rate payers will receive the benefit of this power line. A few land-owners along Segment 31 should not be asked to bear the economic and environmental burden for this project. BPA has not yet proposed a route that minimizes impacts to private land owners. That route is four (4) miles

further east, on the Gifford Pinchot National Forest. The DBIS should evaluate a new route that starts from one of two existing BPA east-west easements east of Segments 39 and 49. From this starting point in the south, a route could proceed northeast across DNR lands, then north 11.5 miles along the western boundary of the Gifford Pinchot National Forest (GPNF) to the vicinity of Green Knob. From this point, the route could leave the GPNF and proceed 4.5 miles northwest across private land to join Segment 29. Comparing this GPNF route with other alternative routes yields the following:

(see attachment)

The distance along Segment 31-27 route was estimated to show that this route is primarily on private land. A route utilizing Segment 28 instead of Segment 27 shows a similar percentage of private land ownership. Impacts to private land owners decrease as the route is moved further east. The negative impacts of this project should not be borne by property owners adjacent to Segment 31. This project should be located on public lands because the general public receives the benefits of the project. The I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project is consistent with the Gifford Pinchot N.F. multiple-use management policy and the DNR's maximum timber revenue policy. The project is inconsistent with residential neighborhoods along Segment 31. I ask the BPA to evaluate a route using the Gifford Pinchot National Forest that will minimize the impacts to private citizens whose tax dollars support the DNR and the National Forests. A longer route connecting Yale Lake Dam with Segment 39 or 49 near Camas could be constructed entirely on public land by extending the Gifford Pinchot NF alternative even further north to the next block of DNR land, then proceeding due west across DNR land to the Yale Lake Dam. This route would avoid private land altogether and place the burden for this project on public land where it rightfully belongs. This route should also be evaluated by BPA.

Land use issues argue strongly against locating the 500 kV transmission line on Segment 31. Segment 31 should be dropped from further consideration in this analysis.

Jack Gerstkemper, Retired Forester

Communication ID: 12492

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JOHN "JACK" GERSTKEMPER

Childhood Leukemia at Minnehaha Elementary School, Vancouver WA

Dear BPA:

I submitted the attached document to your website address at www.bpa.gov/go/i-5 on Sunday, December 13, 2009. I am submitting this hardcopy of the same document to Portland Post Office Box 9250 to insure that you receive the document prior to the close of the scoping period for the I-56

Corridor Reinforcement Project.

Sincerely,

Jack Gerstkemper

Childhood Leukemia Patients and Adult Diseases

at Minnehaha Elementary School, Vancouver Washington

Jack and Barbara Gerstkemper

December 12, 2009

A 2002 study by the California Department of Health Services concluded that persons living in close proximity to Electro-Magnetic Fields were at increased risk of childhood leukemia, adult brain cancer, Lou Gehrig's Disease and miscarriage. A 2007 study by R.M. Lowenthal Of the University of Tasmania School of Medicine in Australia was more specific regarding the proximity of power lines to the victims. Lowenthal's study concluded that living within 328 yards (984 feet) of a high voltage power line puts adults at more than 2 times greater risk and children at 5 times greater risk for developing cancer when compared to adults and children who do not live near high voltage power lines. Barbara Gerstkemper, Minnehaha Elementary School 2nd grade teacher, has knowledge of seven students and staff at Minnehaha Elementary School who have contracted diseases referenced in the two studies above. Barbara has taught in eight elementary schools in her thirty-year career as an elementary school teacher. She never encountered a case of childhood leukemia or Lou Gehrig's Disease at any of the other seven schools where she taught. Of the eight elementary schools where Barbara has taught, Minnehaha is unique in the number of 230 kV power line bisecting the school's boundary area. Minnehaha Elementary School is 0.60 miles east of BPA's Ross Substation in Vancouver, WA. The existing 230 kV transmission line in Segment 25 of BPA's I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project passes within 1000 feet of Minnehaha Elementary School. Four additional BPA easements with 230 kV transmission lines radiate from the Ross Substation across the Minnehaha School boundary. Several of these easements contain multiple rows of transmission towers. Some homes in the Minnehaha school boundary are 25 feet horizontal distance from 230kV power lines. The analysis phase of the Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the I-5 Corridor Reinforcement project begins on December 14, 2009. BPA proposes to upgrade two of the Ross Substation corridors to 500 kV transmission lines. These would be the largest transmission lines in the Washington State. We request that the DEIS analyze the correlation between the existing 230kV power lines in the immediate vicinity of the Ross substation with the health problems at in the Minnehaha area. This study could be performed by correlating cancer treatment records from Oregon Health Science University and Doernbecker's Children's Hospital with attendance records at Minnehaha Elementary School. An alternative location for BPA's 500 kV line passes through property owned by the Hockinson School District, 15 miles northeast of Minnehaha. There are currently no 230 kV transmission lines in the Hockinson School District. As a point of comparison, we asked Dr. Grubbs, Superintendent of Hockinson Elementary School, if he knew of any childhood leukemia patients in his school district. Dr Grubbs polled

his staff and found no one who could recall a case of childhood leukemia at Hockinson schools. The following is a list of recent health cases at Minnehaha Elementary School. It is not a comprehensive list. The list was compiled informally by recollection of Minnehaha elementary school teachers. Jack and Barbara Gerstkemper and the Vancouver School

District respect the privacy of these individuals and their families. Please do the same. Childhood Leukemia Patients at Minnehaha Elementary School:

1. Felix D: 3-years-old. Currently undergoing chemo-therapy treatment. Felix's sister, Cella D., is a student in Barbara Gerstkemper's 2009-2010 2nd grade class.

2. Preston G.: Student in Vikki Ellsburg's 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 3rd grade classes. Preston repeated 3rd grade because he missed so much school during his chemotherapy treatments. Preston is currently in 6th grade at Jason Lee Middle School. Vikki Ellsburg still teaches at Minnehaha

3. Alea H.: Chamomile Swartz's 2005 1st grade class: Alea's present whereabouts are unknown. Mrs. Swartz now teaches 2nd grade at Minnehaha.

4. Unnamed 6-year-old girl: Kerry Perrin's 2000 1st grade class. Only attended school in AM because of chemotherapy treatment and side effects. Girl's present whereabouts are unknown. Kerry Perrin stopped teaching at Minnehaha in 2002, but still lives in Vancouver WA.

5. Stephanie D. Attended Minnehaha in 1999. Stephanie is an acquaintance of Carol Donovan. Carol is a secretary at King Elementary School in Vancouver. Carol Donovan was a secretary at Minnehaha Elementary School when Stephanie was a student at Minnehaha. Stephanie's mother and father are deceased. Adult Staff at Minnehaha Elementary School:

1. Lynne M.: Office Staff at Minnehaha for 30 years. Lived within the Minnehaha Elementary School boundary area. Contracted Lou Gehrig's disease in 1999 while working at Minnehaha Elementary School. Died 5 months later.

2. Wanda S.: 4th grade teacher. Taught more than 20 years at Minnehaha: She contracted a rare form of ovarian cancer in late 2003 and died in March 2004. This report only lists students and staff Barbara Gerstkemper encountered at Minnehaha Elementary School. There are probably more children and adults in the Minnehaha community with diseases linked to prolonged exposure to high voltage transmission lines. We believe the apparent correlation between high voltage transmission lines and the diseases in the Minnehaha area is a subject that should be investigated by a neutral organization as part of the analysis currently underway for BPA's I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project.

Communication ID: 12493

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: BOB STEVENSON

To whom it may concern,

In reference to I-5 Corridor Improvement to BPA Powr line.

I live at [Address], Route segment 50 line. I sternly object to expansion of easement or building beside existing power lines. I have 2 young children + 5 cows that are on my property as well as myself. There has been enough studies affecting humans + live stock (R.E. cancer + other illness)

I purchased this property 5 yrs ago as an investment. The property will be annexed into Camas City limits + when that happens the plans were to split my property + build 2 more houses. That was to be my retirement. The market has wiped me out. I'm a contractor that's my only hope.

I would like to reference Dr. John Simmons letter as well as the mills family LLC, + the city of Camas letters. Please consider different routes or underground as alternatives.

Bob Stevenson

RLS construction

Communication ID: 12494

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: GINA ANDREWS

The purpose of this letter is to provide formal comment on your I-5 Reinforcement Project and to request changes be made to the proposal.

First, I will express concerns about the proposal and then finish with a recommendation for an alternative solution which I believe needs to be considered. I am opposed to the addition of the 500KV line along route 9 for the following reasons:

- The 500KV line which would be added would be through a portion of the City of Kelso -- through a well-established and heavily populated neighborhood. This would put the line way too close to homes -- which likely were allowed to be built because there was no indication that a line of this size would ever come through the area. It is likely that the worst case scenario considered by officials when approving building permits for these homes was for a 230 KV line. This proposal is more than twice that voltage.
- This line crosses a portion of my granddaughter's land where she has just constructed a home with her husband in order to raise her young child. It is also very close to the longer established home of my daughter. I am very concerned about the prospects of my great grand children being raised (living and playing) this close to the much higher 500KV lines which are being proposed. I am also opposed to the

siting of this line on route 10 for the following reasons:

- Many of the properties this line would cross already support single family residences - including one where my grandson is raising my great grand child. As with route 9, I am very concerned about my great grandchildren living and playing this close to 500KV lines.
- One of my properties along this route has a newly constructed US Coast Guard communication tower with which I am concerned about interference from the 500KV line. This is a tower which is a critical piece of infrastructure for public safety and emergency rescue operations. Siting of the new line so close to this tower also contradicts your goal of separating infrastructure to minimize the impacts that terrorists or weather could have on our infrastructure. Siting this line too close could enable either force to knock out power as well as to destroy critical communications infrastructure needed to respond to any terrorist or weather emergency. This area is at an elevation where weather is known to cause damage as a storm 10-15 years ago decimated the timber which was growing on this property at the time – it could damage overhead powerlines next time.
- This route may cross a piece of my property which otherwise has tremendous value for a recreation home. And there are other residential and recreation properties in the area which would be affected as well. I am concerned about both of these proposed routes as well as other routes through timberland since such a line through currently timbered property would have several devastating environmental and economic impacts on the owners of those properties including:
 - Increasing the risk of trespass, dumping, soil erosion (from ATV use), and drug production and use. These are problems which many landowners already struggle with and which are known to be aggravated along powerline ROW's/easements. Trespass can lead to legal (injury) liability issues: dumping can lead to clean up (including toxic wastes) liability; and erosion can lead to requirements to control sediment created by non-forestry (unauthorized ATV) use.
- While BPA may be required to mitigate for creating a long, narrow strip clearcut which will never be reforested, the project will still lead to wider breaks in riparian zone timber along fish bearing streams and rivers - most of which support threatened or endangered species of fish. Landowners have suffered additional regulations on their forestlands in order to protect fish, therefore, any other degradation of habitat could lead to yet more stringent regulations being forced onto landowners. Once mitigation is completed adequate or not -I have little confidence that BPA will return if such mitigation is later found to be inadequate.
- Whether a new route is chosen or new lines placed on the existing ROW/easement along route 9, there is still likely to be additional roading of these areas in order to access new towers. This increases the risk of erosion and places landowners in a situation where other portions of roads will be used/used more extensively. Considering that BPA is doing poorly in participating in maintenance of the roads they use now, my concern is that it will only aggravate this problem as well. I have stated my concerns above and would request that routes 9 and 10 be eliminated from consideration. And based on these concerns, there are several other routes in the same category which should be eliminated also. In place of these

routes, I believe BPA needs to formally consider a route through Oregon. It seems to me that most of the property from Troutdale to Rainier Oregon is either industrial land (and industries use a lot of power) or uninhabited, open areas. It is likely that there is or has been an easement/ROW in this area in order to transmit power from the now deactivated Trojan Nuclear Power plant. It seems to me that the new line could be run up the Oregon side of the Columbia River and cross the river near Longview, then north to the Castle Rock substation.

I believe that the above factors show that an Oregon route would have far less impact on homeowners, forestland owners as well as have less impact on fish and wildlife and the areas they inhabit, therefore, I strongly request that you reject any Washington route and construct the added transmission needed using an Oregon route.

Sincerely yours,

Gina Andrews

Communication ID: 12495

Date: 12/1/2009

Name: DAVID R MILLER, MARY LEE MILLER

To: Linda Roberts

Subject: Write your Commissioner

I believe you live in the Hockinson area so I assume you are well aware of BPA's route # 31 proposal. Destroying the lives of thousands of Hockinson residents seems insane when two alternative routes to the east would affect far fewer homeowners. Please do all that you can to oppose this proposal. Thank you.

Communication ID: 12496

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: JOHN ANDERSON

John Anderson – My name is John Anderson, first of all I'd like to thank Louis Jennifer and Troy for being so welcoming and in making this process so comfortable. I live on Segment 31 and there are a couple issues I'd like to briefly address. Segment 31 is on 212th Ave right above Hotchkinson. I've been there my whole life. My family had actually an open space taxation agreement with the county since 1978. The reason that's important, my understanding right now, is that the BPA is in the very preliminary

stages of identify things that a represent important impacts. We know that east Clark County has been a model of the kind of timber land, small farm and wetlands protection close to an urban area that is idealized in the most forward looking environmental policies. And a big part of that is because of the pioneering work of the Clark County commissioners in 1973 when we began this open space taxation agreement work. I pulled out the paper work as I was going through it. We're a multi generational farm, looking at the work that I had with, my father had done. In 1978 Dean Cole, Connie Curney and Dick Granger, who were all commissioners, at that time had signed this letter in congratulating my father. The important language, and the reason this is important, the agreement that we had with the county recognized that such land has substantial public value as open space. And that the preservation of such land constitutes an important physical, social, aesthetic, and economic asset to the public. Well what's so interesting about that is that I think that the board of county commission now has a very important role since were just identifying the things that need to be studied. In essence the county has already done the kind of environmental impact statement by identifying these lands that have been held open as public space and important and sensitive environmental areas. Lands that people have forgone developing in order to create these open spaces and timber lands next to these urban areas. That's really what defines the character of the east county. That brings me to my second point, as I begin to think about well, what is the mechanism who is going to protect us in this process with the BPA, I think that the board of county commissioners is uniquely positioned to do that. Because you have the best knowledge of what resources are here, what the kind of parcels of land represent, the quality of life in the neighborhoods that will be affected. What I'd like you to consider doing first of all, I think these parcels need to identified and there needs to be some kind of report sent to the BPA identifying these are environmental necessary protected land, that the impact could be catastrophic if we put those 500 K lines across it. Our farm would be wiped out. My last thing that brings me to that, we want to be able to begin to develop some relationships to. My understanding is that the public cutoff date for public comment with the BPA is December 14. Obviously there going to be continuing to get input and lobbying and revisions are going to be made and there's going to be all kinds of things. And this idea that the public, the private land owner, can't comment past the 12-14 is pretty arbitrary and I think pretty unfair. What I'd like you to consider is to go ahead and create another citizens advisory group just like the other ones, you have over 2 dozen that you're relying on know, that study any type of policy that you're dealing with. That citizen advisory group would be really crucial to you and us, because we support you, and I think one of the first topics, and I guarantee you these meeting would all be very well attended, identifying way that the board of county commissions could support these neighborhood, timber lands and farms. We may come up with some ways that you haven't thought of. But also, we'll support you and bolster you in this as you begin to deal with the BPA as you begin to try and identify these environmentally sensitive areas because you really are the experts on it. In conclusion, what I like to begin to have done, is some kind of report, maybe get the staffs working, this idea that we have a huge the east county is comprised of these one open space tax agreement properties after another. These are multigenerational farms and homes and they should be identified as such. The county has identified these as necessary to the public infrastructure. They are critically important to the environment as seen as a public asset. You need to identify them and create a citizen advisory group. Thank you very much.

Communication ID: 12497

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: JOHN A POLOS

Good Morning, I'm John Polos and I lived out by Battleground Lake for about 38 years and I do live close, very close, to the 31 site. I'd like to give you guys, gentlemen, a map that shows you a map so you can get familiar with it. Ok, I'm going to speak on three issues in my three minutes. What is a high voltage transmission system and why do we need one. Number 2, why does BPA feel they need a new 500KV line on the west side. And 3, how can we deal effectively with BPA to come up with the best solution for a power system in the Northwest. My background is, I work part time right now for Clark county Sherriff's Office Search and Rescue. I'm a registered electrical engineer. I spent 30 years as an engineer with Bonneville Power, so I know how they work. What is a high voltage transmissions line? Well, everywhere in the world you have local utilities like Clark PUD, Seattle City Light, PGE, serving the individual end user with low voltage electricity. And, you need a high voltage transmission coming to and charge to wheel the 500,000 230,000 150 KV large chunks of energy throughout that region. BPA is that agency for the Pacific Northwest as Con Edison for the Northeast and Tennessee Valley authority is for the Southwest. You need a high voltage transmission system for two reasons: to wheel power to everybody and to control the system to set the frequency and the voltages. So that's, you can't get along without it. You go to an island like Kauai they can get along without it, they just have one utility that the distribution system. You need a high voltage transmission system. Point number 2, why does BPA feel they need a 500 KV line, a new one. BPA's system is broken up into two sides. The east side and the west side of the cascades. If you look at the east side it's 15000+ MW of generation. You look at the Westside primarily 15000 MW of load. And BPA is a big player. They've got roughly 20,000MW installed capability at the federal dams and the WHOOPS power system. They don't own the dam, the dams are owned by the core of engineers and the Bureau of Rec. BPA gets that power and it belongs to them when it crosses from the switch art at the dam into their substation and then they sell it and then pay off the dams. Anyways, the system has grown and it's pushed to the limit and it's very unstable right now. There's a lot of things I'm not going to go into technical stuff. Not all the line capacity is useable. There is real power and there is imaginary power and the two add up to what called apparent power. Basically what that analogy is, you've a beer glass that's 6 inches high and you've got 5 inches of beer and 1 inch of foam. And you can't get away from that and you can't get away from imaginary power eating up part of your capacity. BPA does need to do something. And they are going to get a 500 KV line probably. What we need to do, moving on to my third point is to deal effectively with them to get them to listen to us. I think one of the best things we can do is have our citizen's send in comments. If they got 3 comments on line 31 they might use it. If they get 10,000 comments they are not even going to consider it. Or line 30 or 28 or 32. What we're proposing is to, I'm summarizing, we propose to keep to keep in contact with the BPA and to let them know that a site maybe it's not even on the drawing board, that minimizing the effects to citizens. Maybe in can be out somewhere in the Gifford Pinchot where no one is affected until it gets down to the river and hits one of the two existing lines. In final conclusion, BPA is listening, I've talked to Mark Kohnnesses, in fact I talked to him an hour ago, he's the project manager, and we sent him

a letter and that's the reason they've extended the deadline from the 23rd to December 14th. All comments received after the deadline will still be considered. My personal gut feeling with 30 years of work there is there's no way they are going to pick a site with a lot of people on it but they have to show that they looked at these options. Thank you very much.

Communication ID: 12498

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: JIM MALINOWSKI

Jim Malaonski- Amboy – I am an electric power engineer too. Worked for 31 years for Pacific Gas and Electric, did some of these types, and analyzed these types of projects. I think there is no doubt as the previous speaker indicated there is a need to reinforce of the network. The issue I think is to try to minimize the impact on people on scenic value and historic values of the county. One of the routes goes directly through Salachu prairie over the oldest house, remaining house in the prairie something from the 1800s. I think it would be a shame to have that kind industrial, and I'm a supporter of transmission, we need transmission, but I think we should locate it where minimizes impact. What I'd urge you to do is among the other things that are suggested I'd like to see the commission write a letter to Bonneville saying that you feel it's critical that the line be routed in a way that minimizes impact on people on the scenic values of the county and on the historic areas of the county. And I think the easterly route, there is some concern about where is crosses dole valley, and I know the people in dole valley are concerned, I think there is routing to the east through the national forest, and state forest that would have minimal impact on people on scenic values and historic values and still allow the line to function and reinforce the network. (The commissioner asked Jim a question relating to burying the line)The cost even at lower voltage is about 10 times the costs of overheard. It would be prohibitively expensive. Conductors in the air can radiate heat that's generated and you can operate at much higher currents. When you've got that buried in the ground the heat that's being generated can't be dissipated. You're talking about putting the conductors in pipes, you're talking about significant amounts of insulation, and all of that costs money.- Amboy – I am electric power engineer too. Worked for 31 years for Pacific Gas and Electric, did some of these types, and analyzed these types of projects. I think there is no doubt as the previous speaker indicated there is a need to reinforce of the network. The issue I think is to try to minimize the impact on people on scenic value and historic values of the county. One of the routes goes directly through Salachu prairie over the oldest house, remaining house in the prairie something from the 1800s. I think it would be a shame to have that kind industrial, and I'm a supporter of transmission, we need transmission, but I think we should locate it where minimizes impact. What I'd urge you to do is among the other things that are suggested I'd like to see the commission write a letter to Bonneville saying that you feel it's critical that the line be routed in a way that minimizes impact on people on the scenic values of the county and on the historic areas of the county. And I think the easterly route, there is some concern about where is crosses dole valley, and I know the people in dole valley are concerned, I think there is routing to the east through the national forest, and state forest that would have minimal impact on people on scenic values and historic values and still allow the line to function and reinforce

the network. (The commissioner asked Jim a question relating to burying the line)The cost even at lower voltage is about 10 times the costs of overhead. It would be prohibitively expensive. Conductors in the air can radiate heat that's generated and you can operate at much higher currents. When you've got that buried in the ground the heat that's being generated can't be dissipated. You're talking about putting the conductors in pipes, you're talking about significant amounts of insulation, and all of that costs money.

Communication ID: 12499

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: KEN CHRYSLER

My name is Ken Chrysler. I own about 5 acres up on Segment 30. I'm not a very good speaker by the way. You'll have to forgive me a little bit there. I'll try to sum it up. I'm basically a nobody. BPA, I did a little research, they're a big guy. They are a super power organization. They were established in the 40's. TVA was established first and then BPA came online. Unfortunately they have a history of being a bully. They took the whole city of Bonneville and moved half of it. They made a lot of promises to businesses in that city and they didn't follow through. That city became much poorer after BPA did it's work. You can go down here to the river to the water museum. I was just there last weekend beautiful museum. They have a little plaque talks about BPA made a lot of promises to the white fisherman and the Indian fisherman when they established there dams and basically did not follow through. You know, it happened a long time ago, but really not that long ago. It wasn't that long ago by the way that they started selling their power through a federal mandate nationally. We used to have extremely cheap power here in the Northwest. It was one of the best things we had. We used to have jobs making aluminum, lots of jobs making aluminum. That went away about 10 years ago when they started selling nationally. It was promised they would come back; it was one of the aluminum companies said that, but it they never came back as you know. They folded up. We became poorer. I'm just saying this to let you know when BPA says they are gonna put a power line, I'm talking a big power line, if you go online, these things are not what's in production today. You go look at what they are now, they're like giant Trojan horses, they are huge. When they put that thing up, it's gonna be like nothing you've seen in this county before. When they put it up if they decide to put it over my land and condemn my land, they'll destroy me. I mean, they'll absolutely destroy me. I grew up without any money, and I worked hard saved my money, built my house, put a few hundred grand into my house, cash, at one point it was worth 400 grand and I was paying taxes on that in 08. Just got my letter from Clark County, it's worth 300,000 grand. BPA wants to condemn me for 300 grand. What am I going to do? Do you think I'll get the same house for 300 grand? I won't. It's a great time for them to do what they're doing. So, look, I and then how do you get around a bunch of crying people saying "not on my land, not on my land". Well you divide and conquer them up into a bunch of little voiceless groups. It's a great a way to conduct a campaign. And they're dividing us up right now. We've got segment 31 against segment 30 against segment 29. Let's, not put it on my land, well, actually, we're all comrades here, unfortunately we're all brothers these power lines will destroy me if they're on segment 30. They'll destroy some of my fellow

Clark County residents if they're on segment 31. There is more that segment 30 has in common with 31 and against BPA than we do against each other. And we need somebody to look out for us. Because, even if they decide, well it's not touching your land but it's a hundred feet, 200 feet away from it. Again, they'll destroy me, my property values, and they won't compensate me for that btw. I talked to Mark Korhnses at the meetings. Visual aesthetics mean nothing. They can't put a price on it, supposedly, visual aesthetics mean nothing. I guarantee you, you guys probably own homes, you put a big giant power line near your home, your property values are gone. I wouldn't want to live, if I were buying a place, by a giant monster horse shaped power line and that's what gonna be. I'm just a small fly relatively speaking; everyone in this room is actually a pretty much small fry when it comes to the power the BPA. I'm not sure what were doing here or what we can accomplish but I'm urging us to stick together as Clark County and do our best to get these guys out of the county. That's my number one proposal and request. If we can't get them out of the county then we need to have them, we need to dog them every step of the way that they put one of these giant horse like devices up that we don't destroy someone's property values. If they're gonna condemn they got a give them ample compensation not fair market value. OK? Because California Nevada did some terrible things along with Washington Mutual my property values are pretty much under the water for what I paid for it, and probably the same for a lot of people. It's a great time to buy it up. When prices are low go ahead and buy it up. I don't know if that what they're doing but they're timing is certainly impeccable. All I'm asking you guys to consider putting these things, if they gotta go through Clark County, put them through DNR. One of the things I was told when I went to the meeting, I grabbed a hold of one of their engineers, who wasn't gonna stay on the job. He was leaving and was willing to talk a little more freely. DNR is against the homeowner. DNR doesn't want that on their property. I don't blame them. Take down some of their trees, fire hazards maintenance whatever it is but at the end of the day I don't BPA listening to DNR because DNR is a giant organization relative to a small little homeowner like myself. The trees are not gonna b e upset if they have to look at these property lines. If its gotta go its gotta go down where the trees are. Not down hovering over somebody's property line. There is a lot of mixed information about the health hazards out there. We need you guys to stick up for us.

Communication ID: 12500

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: MICHAEL VEELY

Good morning. My name is Michael Veely I live in the honey wood neighborhood along 112th avenue. The points everyone has made so far are all valid and I believe well spoken. I'd like to thank you for this opportunity to talk to you. I wanted to make sure you folks had a visual on what these towers look like. They are 150 feet tall, the size of a 15 story building and there are no power lines in existence that are bigger than 500,000 volt lines. They are the same power lines that come directly off Bonneville dam. Now, I am not technically affected by this, and I say technically because it's not going through my backyard. I will however, the gentlemen prior was talking about visual aesthetics, I moved from Washington from Oregon because of the schools because of the history of Clark County and because of

the beauty in my neighborhood. Please understand that the swath of land, the easement, is in current existence is a 100 feet wide. To meet standard the standard has to be 150 feet wide. So BPA is going to purchase this easement from another utility, originally the assumption was it would be for an underground cable or telephone pole or something like that. So ultimately they are going to cut down tree to make a 150 wide path. Bulldoze the land and this will be the backyard of the people who live across the road from me. Every time I look out my window instead of seeing these beautiful trees I'm going to see these 150 foot towers that buzz 24 hours a day. Just the thought of it is simply horrible. A gentleman mentioned the health concerns, a close friend of mine at the place where I work, at age 30 she was diagnosed with thyroid cancer. It turned out to be benign, she had her thyroid removed and now she's just fine. It's no coincidence that every doctor that she saw, and she saw numerous physicians, every single one of them asked her " did you grow up living under high power lines?". Now the studies that had been done on the health effects of living and playing near these high tension lines have all been on 230,000 volt lines. There were health effects that were document as a result. These are 500,000 volt lines. And, between the aesthetics the live ability, our land values have already been affected because one of my neighbors who's been attempting to sell his house in this poor economy and has been unable to do so. Now if a buyer comes up that individual needs to disclose the fact that it is a possibility that BPA will be running these lines right through the middle of our neighborhoods. Imagine that. As a matter of fact, her house sits somehow on the easement. It is a real possibility that this line were to go through go directly over her house so they would have to buy her out and bulldoze their house. I would plead with you stand up for us and do whatever you can to oppose and were not against anybody else or BPA. We understand the need what we would like to see is as the other gentlemen stated the lines should go in an unpopulated where the health effects will not be concerned and the neighborhoods will not be destroyed by essentially a freeway going through the middle of our neighborhood.

Communication ID: 12501

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: ERIN E GROVER

My name is Erin Grover. I grew up in Clark County I've lived here my whole life. I live on line 29 which is right up from the East Fort Lewis River. On my property there is a 600 year old snag. It's older than the Declaration of Independence. It stood that long and it' still stands. My creek bed has medicinal plants that are endangered in our area that could provide medical help for people. My property is currently listed as riparian repair property. The Dole Valley has incredible historic value not only Native American but also generations of families that have lived in that area. There is a one room school house, the remnants of it, down the road from where I live. Growing up in Clark County I had a girlfriend that lived under the BPA power lines of Hazleville that dies of Hotchkiss disease. My first husband had lymphoma from living under the power lines by Evergreen High School. So I can speak to experiences with that having affected my life. There are families in the Dole Valley area that have as many of 18 children it's not unpopulated. People keep saying that it's in the middle of nowhere, nothing out there and to shove

the line there. I don't think that's the answer either. My prayer is that you guys will take the time to take a deeper look at this and see the huge impact not only scenically, people come up there to bike kayak, it goes the way the line 29 runs now it going right through Tarbell horse camp. It'll be huge impact to this county knowing what this county likes and having grown up here. Those proposed lines cross the east fork of the river in three places. Where I live, it's "V"ed so you're going to see it all the way across. BPA tells me the lines will be 200 feet tall crossing that river. It's just I think I really important to look at, and I appreciate your time.

Communication ID: 12502

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: ANONYMOUS

Thank you for hearing us. I am close to line 31 I was not 600 feet from the center line however I would be significantly impacted by it. As everyone has already mentioned the aesthetic impact, I'm also very concerned about the health ramifications. My husband's , my brother in law's cousin lived in a neighborhood under high power lines, and at the age of 32 developed thyroid cancer. She's now 34 and will spend the rest of her life on medication on doctor visits and treatments. There were four other people in her neighborhood who were also in their 30's that developed thyroid cancer. Two of them are gone. As far as the opportunity to put power lines underground, My husband has done some research on new technologies and there is a company called American superconductor who has the technology to put a cable underground with a 25 foot wide easement. And I know that they have been in contact with BPA. A lot of community members have contacted this company to pursue dialog with them. And we had actually coordinated a call between this company and representatives from our senator in Brian Braids office, which actually got postponed because American Superconductor wants to communicate directly with BPA and not bypass them or step on anyone's toes. I think this should encourage, pursued publically and not happen behind the scenes which is what's happening with this technology. I don't understand how they would only need a 150 foot wide path for an easement for a 150 foot high tower when other smaller towers in the community have 300 feet buffers around them. There is a huge concern about safety and I'm very concerned also by the fact that I wasn't notified so you double the number of people who were notified and truly those neighboring properties are significantly impacted but there not really given an opportunity to voice their concerns. Many people still don't know about who are right on the path. Even though they've extended the comment period if they are willing to continue to address concerns and comments that are submitted they should publicly acknowledge that on their website and let people know that. To just tell one or two people I don't think is adequate and I don't think enough people have had an opportunity to investigate the impact on them and make comments about it. I appreciate the opportunity with you.

Communication ID: 12503

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: JEFF D. LAWSON

I too am not a great public speaker but my name Jeff Lawson and I live just outside of battleground along 212th avenue by segment 31. I'm not here to talk about the aesthetics, the impact to the environment, all those things have been said by other people and I'm here to actually appeal to you as human beings and hopefully all of you have been able to enjoy maybe being a father. The impact this has on the families that live not directly underneath it, yes, those people will be compensated and it won't be enough but the people who live right next to it. My home, I have 3 acres, built a home seven years ago, two daughters under the age of 5 I will not live next to them. I cannot and I will not. I will get nothing from BPA expect a property value that is destroyed. I will give it back to the bank and I will walk away with nothing. That is the effect it will have on more than just me but every family that lives along the corridor and there are a lot of them. If you take a look at Google maps walk down and look at the houses along those corridors and let me tell you they all have families just like mine. I'm here to just ask you because you are the power for us people. We need your help, our families need it.

Communication ID: 12504

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: RICHARD VAN DYKE

My name is Richard Van Dike and I live up in the Hutchinson area on 212th. I'm not going to address all the other issues that most people have done but I wanted to look at it from a tax perspective. Just under 13 homes affected by this the county assessed value is about 4.8 million and we pay 64,000 dollars in taxes combined, right off the Clark County GIS site. And if I extrapolate that back to what's on line 31 there are approximately 500 parcels directly affected which contain 300 homes. If we take that and extrapolate that back out from a tax perspective back out to the Clarke County, assuming that the property values drop between 30 and 50 percent, it's going to cost the county close to a million dollars worth of property taxes coming in to you guys. That would have to be made up some other way. Plus BPA has everybody on the lines that 29 27 30 31 which is far in excess of the 500 parcels have effectively put their lives on hold. We cannot sell out houses we cannot do anything with them. I would even go so far you gentlemen go to the county tax assessor temporarily and have them reevaluate our property until BPA decided what they want to do. That portion of Property tax is an escrow for now. Thank you.

Communication ID: 12505

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: ROBERT J. BOYLE

My name is Bob Boyle. I live in the Farger lake area. I, along with a group of people who are now getting together are directly impacted line lines 26 and 27 and we've heard a lot of information here about how this would be completely devastating to people's lives, property values and just their way of life. I don't want to rehash that. As an issue that I wanted to bring up; which is Clark County right now as you're aware of has the highest unemployment rate in the state, which is nearly 14%. I think that in the 21st century we can put our heads together us homeowners, you folks, BPA come up with some kind of a viable solution that could possibly put these folks to work by maybe creating a project as we've mentioned. Possibly putting it underground moving it further east. Yes it's going to cost more money but with the possibility of applying for stimulus funds. It would put to work it would create a win-win situation. I think appropriate for the 21st century way of thinking now. Just because I know the BPA has the right to do what they want to do. Just because they have that right it doesn't mean that they have to take the path of least resistance. We've all witnessed recently, what has come through the banking industry by them being within their rights to regulate and control mortgage values and we're living the effects of that now. I'm just urging you folks to work with us and BPA to come up with a viable solution that will handle our energy needs and preserve a way of life that so many people enjoy.

Communication ID: 12506

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: LISA A ANDERSON

My name is Lisa Anderson and I live on the 31 route. I'm also a – my main interest is in the environmental effects of the these Trojan horses as they've been called. I'm not going to read all of my comments here but I covered the EMF hazard for the residents in the neighborhoods is a grave, It'll stretch out the EMF fields, it'll stretch out I believe up to 500 feet beyond the lines and make it virtually unlivable for the people there. My main concern is for the native animals and plant species that propagate on our lands. We have about 10 acres and it's mostly wetlands. I wrote, many of targeted properties in Hutchinson are uniquely suited for native animal species because of the dampness the native plants and open spaces and trees that provide shelter and the relatively warm temperatures. Tree frogs and newts have congregated on our land every spring since we moved here and produce thousands of tadpoles. A personal project of mine in the last 5 years has been to enhance the natural wetland environment that we have after the natural summer with some embedded pools to ensure that many of these amphibians will come to maturity each year. I have also augmented the natural algae and plants tadpoles eat with boiled lettuce the amphibian population on our property has grown greatly since I started this project. And now many have taken up residence on our property. What we have done with our property over the nearly 40 years we've owned it is a showcase for bringing the natural back. Steps such as taken what was mostly cow pasture then planting evergreens, letting the native plants come back, using no chemicals maintain nature trail throughout the property and then encouraging the amphibians to come back; has let us experience progressively the diversity of wildlife that lies dormant in this area. At times it almost seems magical as you never know what you will see. Each season seems to bring new things to our attention. One year a family of screech owls stayed for the

summer. Our special red squirrel, dragonflies, butterflies, doves, hawks, hummingbirds. Each day brings new surprises. If route 31 is chosen almost all of our marsh land about 7 acres worth will be blanketed with high EMF levels. That is unacceptable in short it, if it must be built it should be built in the most uninhabited least environmentally sensitive area possible.

Communication ID: 12507

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: RICHARD BRANTLEY

Morning my name is Richard Brantley. I live up between Kelly Hill between Farger Lake and Yacolt. I'm right under this yellow swath like the rest of these people and I agree with pretty much everything they say. Including the fact that I love electricity, I use it all throughout my house, got no complaint with it. There's no reason why they can't run this line through the DNR national forest and state lands. Where those wide swaths that they cut are much appreciated by the elk and the deer. They come out of the woods they feed in those brushy areas and a lot of other animals like that. Furthermore I'm not aware of any new generation, electrical generation of the western side of the Cascade Mountains. I don't know why this line is coming south from castle rock when, actually I'm not aware of where this electricity is being generated and I don't believe they stated this in any of their literature. If it's on the east side of the mountains why don't they run it down the Columbia Gorge with the other power lines that already run down there since they seem to want to power the South West Washington and Trout Lake area that sounds like a logical course of events. That's what I got to say, thank you.

Communication ID: 12508

Date: 11/24/2009

Name: DOUGLAS R BROCKBANK

My name is Doug Brockbank I'm a Hutchinson resident. I want to thank for taking the time and having the patience to allow us to be here this morning. It is really appreciated. For the last month I've had a pretty strange combination of anger and terror over the developments here. As I've listened here I have the sense and actually know for a fact there are thousands of us that are feeling exactly the same way about this. And so I know that the time is short and more by way of summary than anything else. There's a thousands reason bout why we care so deeply about this. Literally our lives and futures and way of life is at stake here a number of people have mentioned issues and as we've looked into studies on health how they know there's a lot of different viewpoints on it. BPA might say there is inclusive health data on it it's hard to find independent studies and what re out there are there are actually very very scary. BPA had mentioned in some of the conversations earlier that cited examples proximity to power lines are already, everywhere we see cases of it frequently, but you know that was a long time ago and we've learned a lot since then. And it wasn't long ago we thought a lot of smoking there was no link between

smoking and cancer and I'm hoping we evolve past that, the health effects are huge and – close magnify glass. The culture, I guess I just want to, we could go on about all the reasons it effects us so deeply, I just want to reiterate why we would hope you would care so the very future of what Clark County is, I think is at stake here when you start talking about running a 6 lane freeway down some of the most beautiful country lands and properties. And completely change the face of the whole area forever. It's a major fork in are the road in terms of what this county becomes. I agree with the statement and know you're well aware of the financial impact the dollar impact this has. More broadly then that ,what does this county become in the future if we don't make the right decisions now and look at the obvious choices of moving through places where people's lives and futures are affected and again thank you very much for making the time.

Communication ID: 12509

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: MR. MCKEE

Yes I sent a fax up on Sunday, yesterday, and I was trying to confirm the fact that you received it. My fax did not print out a confirmation that it had been sent but my computer or my fax did say that it was being sent. And this is Mr. McKee. My phone number here is area [phone number]. Thank you.

Communication ID: 12511

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: JACK SCHUMACHER

I own 87 acres, sect 33 and 33 acres, Sect 28. Both on [Address]. Both parcels are and have been intensively managed for tree farming and production of forest products, logs, poles and special order items of 70-80 year old timberland manages these properties since 1959 and 1963.

No way will you be allowed to treaspas in any way or form to inspect the use of any portion of these properties, for destruction for a power line or any other public use, when you have other options to construct what you intend to perform. This crop can not be moved like most other subjects, as they require long term management and cannot be treated as product that can be moved from place to place.

So I ask you to look to your other options available to you. You do have other options maybe, I believe your electricity in areas closer to your demand where in the hell is your long range planning?

Don't be shoving your stupid ideas down us tax payers.

What you are attempting to do here in well managed county properties is assinen. So get your heads out of your [expletive] and get real.

I am not suggesting what you should do, but what you have in mind here is stupid and the land and home owners are ready to fight. So get sensible here and back off.

Communication ID: 12512

Date: 12/12/2009

Name: RHONDA HEIDEGGER,CARL HEIDEGGER

Please have you environmental studies look at:

The effect of this project on salmon creek - especially the use of herbicides.

I have these other comments:

We bought our property knowing PPL had a right of way at the road, never thinking a project of this magnitude would be proposed. The existing right-of-way is not even sufficient. One of our major concerns is the health effect of living so near a strong EMF, especially since we have young children. Another is the noise a power line of this size generates- it is not compatible with populated areas- which is probably why the line in eastern Washington is run through desolate country. Also, how will the interference affect our electronics- cell phones, computers, cordless phones, etc. what about pacemakers? If someone in the house had to have one, would we be forced to move? Keep this monstrosity away from people.

Communication ID: 12513

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: LEO T RIVOLI

Please have your Environmental Studies look at:

- o The erosion potential of virtually all slopes located on the South side of the East Fork of the Lewis River East along NE Sunset Falls Road and impacts to these highly erosive areas by possible BPA structures.
- o The cumulative impact to wildlife and anadromous fish stocks from logging (clearcutting) hundreds and possibly thousands of acres of forest as part of creating a clear zone in future BPA right of way for alignment #29.
- o The environmental impact of placing powerlines far from urban areas and having to transport people and equipment to maintain these lines versus placing the lines in areas where the response time and infrastructure are already in place to facilitate maintenance of the lines.

- o The health impact of Electromagnetic fields (EMF) generated from 500kV power lines in close proximity to single family residences along the proposed route.
- o The impact to rural residents (many of whom moved to rural areas to have a quiet environment) from hum or buzzing caused by high voltage lines in wet/foggy weather.
- o The impact to rural residents' (many of whom moved to rural areas to enjoy views unencumbered by large numbers of man-made buildings or structures) rights to peaceful enjoyment of their property from proposed BPA towers and wires needed for the new transmission line.
- o The environmental impacts of utilizing alignment #29 which is a new alignment versus utilizing existing right of way (even if it requires widening) in an alternative alignment in a more urban environment.

I have these other comments:

- o There will be increased response time for BPA maintenance crews for power lines located far from population centers as opposed to placing the lines in close proximity to urban areas.
- o Regardless of whether science has definitively found a connection between health problems and EMF generated by transmission lines, potential buyers of properties near BPA lines will either want to purchase these properties at a discount, or avoid them entirely due to the concern (whether founded or not) over EMF. Therefore, there are financial damages to properties located adjacent to BPA rights of way even when those rights of way have been purchased with enough width to theoretically protect residents from health problems (based upon current science).
- o Much of the forestland being proposed for a BPA corridor on alignment #29 is actively logged to generate income to support Washington State schools. I'd like to ask you to study and consider the long-term financial impacts to the State of Washington from removal of these lands from productive, income-producing use.

Ownership:

Although my mailing address is [address], Ridgefield, Washington, I own a house in the impacted area, along with several other parcels. Here is a list of property I own in the impacted area:

Serial No. [Number], Clark County, WA

Thank you for your consideration,

Leo T. Rivoli

[Address]

Ridgefield, WA 98642

Communication ID: 12514

Date: 12/5/2009

Name: MARTHA LINDBERG, LARS LINDBERG

The human impact if line 26 through Yacolt, Amboy line the DNR worries about the environmental impact. They are irresponsible for ignoring the human impact.

We live on a family farm of 80 acres. The families involved are Massie, 4 Lindberg families, Simonson's and Heideggers. Your proposed powerline would devastate the quality of life we share on our farm. Our farm [Address]. We cannot afford to lose value in our property with several of us struggling as self employed in this economy.

Just because DNR doesn't want to divide the parcel they own farther east it doesn't make sense to divide our properties and ruin our land values.

Let the DNR absorb the loss of the tress instead of us losing our lifetime investment of property.

Go further east with a proposed line. It only makes sense.

Communication ID: 12515

Date: 11/25/2009

Name: THOMAS WOLFORD

This is in response to the proposed routes 30 and 31 near Lucia Falls.

1. First please explain why "permission to Enter Property" was requested for our property Parcel ID [number]; Parcel ID [number] when the nearest proposed route is approximately 2500 feet up stream.

2. Please provide the decision matrix to be used for the final route. For example, if you are using Kempner Tregoe Decision Analysis then send us a list of musts and weighted wants.

3. We don't agree with any of the proposed routes but instead would suggest

reinforcement of the existing route with contingency planning for emergency outages to minimize the impacts. Efforts to increase conservation are a better solution to any route change.

Please have your environmental studies looked at and report back:

1. The region near Lucia Falls is designated as scenic, and has been managed by the Clark County Development Department to preserve and limit growth. The construction of a 500K volt transition line is counter to the preservation efforts of the county.

2. The Lucia Falls region of the East Fork of the Lewis River is a rearing area for salmon and steelhead . Habitat controls are in effect to preserve this fish sensitive area, and limits construction near the river's edge. For example, new construction is limited to 200 feet from the ordinary high water line above Lucia Falls. It is unbelievable that a transmission line would be allowed to clear cut and maintained a tree -free right of way to the river's edge. Silt and runoff would ruin this salmon and steelhead nursery. The county parks department has limited water access at Lucia Fall Park...no swimming or

water contact is allowed to help preserve the water quality. Therefore, this high voltage line is contradictory to any of the above conservation efforts.

3. Several of the residents along the East Fork of the Lewis River use the water from the river for drinking and household use. The quality of this water will be adversely affected by clear cutting for the transmission power line right of way and thru herbicide maintenance to avoid growth of trees and woody plants.

4. The East Fork of the Lewis River is a flyway for Bald Eagles. Eagles are seen daily flying up and down the river. There are nesting and roosting sites nearby. I often recycle salmon heads and carcasses by placing them on the bank and watching the eagles eat and feed their offspring. Power lines are known killers of eagles, because their wings are above their heads and they fly looking down thus, encountering power lines. Also, WDFW's fact sheet supports the preservation of habitat along the East Fork of the Lewis: "Bald eagles have a wing span of 6 ½ , to 7 ½ , feet, and weigh 6-15 pounds ...

Once they have established a territory they often return to it year after year. Habitat needs of bald

eagles include timber with large trees near water. In Washington, 97% of nests are within 3,000 ft of a marine, lake or river shore. Large trees along shorelines are important perch sites for foraging. At night, eagles often perch together in communal roosts. Roost sites are selected that provide a favorable microclimate, such as protection from prevailing winds. Many roosts located near winter food sources are used year after year."

A brief Google search revealed that:

"Electrical power lines are another danger for the Bald

Eagle in its nesting or wintering habitat. Eagles are

electrocuted each year by landing on high voltage

wires. "Riley," one of the eagles born April 1994 at

Bradford Woods, was found dead in northern Indiana.

He had been electrocuted by a power line"

Electrocuting Eagles Costs PacifiCorp \$10.5 Million

CASPER, Wyoming, July 14, 2009 (ENS) - One of the largest electric utilities in the West pleaded guilty Friday in federal court in Casper to illegally killing golden eagles and other migratory birds in the state.

Copyright Environment News Service, ENS, 2009. All rights reserved.

Therefore, for the reasons outlined above, we strongly urge that you consider other alternatives for the power line route other than through these environmentally sensitive areas.

Dr. Thomas I. Wolford

[Address]

Yacolt, Washington 98675

Communication ID: 12516

Date: 11/30/2009

Name: SANDY BRANCH, TED BRANCH

[Comment form empty]

Communication ID: 12517

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: DEBORAH ROMANCHOCK,JOHN ROMANCHOCK

We are worried about the health effects of having a huge 500 KV power line going over our property – it will effect our lives

- Our quality of life will come down from the following: studies show it will kill us, it will ruin our properties environment with humming noise and visual ugliness, our mental health will suffer from having our lives ruined.

- Our environment we live in means a lot to us- putting this power line in will ruin our environment and leave us trapped not able to sell and move because the horrible powerline will devastate our property value.

- Would you like a 500 KV power line over your house?

- Do you like ruining peoples lives? And would you like the same for yourselves?

It is in-humane to negatively effect people when just east of Segment #31 is vast DNR land where no one lives- a clear cut through timber harvest land does not ruin lives and actually helps biodiversity since most herbivores love clear cuts in the forest.

- We recently got a permit from the Clark County to build a addition – on the permit it said property was a riparian zone and no disturbance to natural vegetation is allowed.

- PLEASE GO THROUGH DNR LAND.

Communication ID: 12518

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: PAUL MACCHIA

Paul Macchia left a voicemail [with STAFF] this morning wanting more information on the I-5 project. He wants someone to explain these numbered segments on the map to him, provide more details about the maps on the web. Also he has questions about the "Oct. 9 mailing" and who it went to. His number is [phone]

Communication ID: 12519

Date: 10/23/2009

Name: CARL BARK

Carl Bark of Battleground wants to know if the powerline is going by his property.

Communication ID: 12520

Date: 12/14/2009

Name: KAREN REELY

Please have your environmental studies look at:

Please have your people consider a few conditions concerning our piece of property. We currently have a wide variety of wildlife that live, eat and quiet frequently cross our property. Included but not limited to this list are elk, deer, coyotes, squirrels, raccoons, rabbits and hawks. There are numerous conditions on our property that are advantages for wildlife habitat. We live on the upper portion of the property. The lower half of the property has fir and alder trees for food and coverage. There is also a natural creek on this portion of the property. Our concern is with towers and lines crossing over it that the changes would interfere with the existence of the wildlife. Also, the increased traffic necessary to maintain the structure would interfere with wildlife habitat.

I have these other concerns:

- 1) There have been a number of studies done on health issues connected to Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs). The U.S. National Council on Radiation Protection said there is impressive evidence showing that even very low exposure to electromagnetic radiation has a long term effect on health.
 - 2) A February report by physicist at Britain's University of Bristol shows power lines attract particles of radon-- a colorless, odorless gas that is linked with cancer.
 - 3) A 367- page document entitled Evaluation of the "Potential Carcinogenicity of Electromagnetic Fields" came to light in 1990. Chief among the conclusions was specifying that power line electromagnetic fields should be classified as a probable human carcinogen. William Farland, then director of EPA's office of Health and Environmental Assessment ordered this conclusion deleted from the report.
 - 4) Some studies suggest that EMF's may promote cancer by interfering with transmission of calcium across the cell membrane, a flow that governs such processes as muscle contraction, egg fertilization, cell division and growth. EMF's may also disturb a cell's ability to process hormone, enzyme and other biological signals that regulate normal growth. Melatonin a regulatory hormone ordinarily stimulates immune response and may suppress tumor growth. Reduced melatonin production has been linked to breast and prostate cancer. EMF's are also known to affect nerve impulses.
 - 5) If there are no worries about EMF's why does an EMF' committee exist? And has existed for sometime. Environmental journalist Paul Brodeur is convinced EMF's are one of the greatest environmental threats.
 - 6) This is our home, and has been for twenty years. We have worked hard and saved our money to
-

acquire our portion of the American Dream. We have put a lot of effort into getting our home as we like it. This is also a home for our grandchildren. It doesn't seem right that someone just in the name of progress could come into an economically recessed area and pay us much less for our property than what we would need to replace what we have.

Communication ID: 12521

Date: 12/7/2009

Name: BARBARA EIGNER

KWIK Center LLC

[Address]

Portland, Oregon 97206-5819

December 4, 2009

Dear Members of I-5 Corridor Reinforcement Project

When called the comment and information line (800) 230-6593 someone from Bonneville Power has returned by call. The problem with this is that the oral reply I received was usually so vague it was no definite answer at all. The BPA spokes person did not say "I don't know BPA's company policy on this, when I find out what the policy is, I'll give you a call. In addition printed information pamphlets provided at the meetings did not address some of my concerns. I have not yet mailed the Permission to Enter Property Form because I need Bonneville Power Administration to first specifically answer in writing my concerns about liability insurance, property taxes, pre-merchantable timber, and vegetation maintenance under power lines.

Liability Issues

The clearing of a ground corridor under proposed power lines presents the opportunity for an increase in ATV and motorcycle traffic. Forest landowners face the problem that opening up easement corridors in a forested area provide more accessible opportunities for "dare devil stunt" ATV and motorcycle riders to invade the area for thrills. Unfortunately one of these "dare devil stunt" ATV riders got hurt, expecting and got damages awarded in court against the landowner, creating a serious problem for the landowner.

It is common practice in the forest industry that when a commercial timber company needs an easement across someone's property in order to provide access for the hauling of logs or some other forest management activity, the industrial timber company provides the landowner with a Certificate of Insurance listing the landowner as "additional insured" on the liability insurance policy the industrial timber company has. The transmission of electric power is similar to the transport of logs in the respect that they are both marketable products.

I am requesting Bonneville Power's answer in writing concerning listing the landowner as "additional

insured" on Bonneville Power's own liability insurance. I am requesting that this "additional insured" coverage is to cover the entire area of the easement strip owned by the landowner.

Property Taxes

Neither property tract owned by KWIK Center LLC would be appropriate for the growing of Christmas trees in a power line right of way because the soil is too rocky for the farm equipment needed to grow Christmas trees. There is no feasible opportunity to grow greenery for the florist industry in a power line right of way because the increased amount of sunlight in that area would contribute sun-scald blemishes in the greenery that the florist doesn't want. Most of the ornamental shrub greenery of interest to the florist needs at least partial shade. Most businesses that forage for florist greenery tend to be unstable and W1fiable. Forest landowners do not want BPA to expect the property owners of transmission easement corridors to pay taxes on that property in perpetuity with no hope of gaining income from that easement area over the years to pay the taxes. When I spoke with a BPA spokesperson by phone, I was informed that this issue of property taxes in transmission right of way easements was negotiable. What is meant by the word "negotiable"? The county assessor may assess a lower tax rate on such easement corridors, however, the county assessor still wants tax revenue in perpetuity. I am requesting BPA's articulate answer in writing which states that BPA in addition to the easement, will reimburse the landowner of the corridor easement property every year in perpetuity for whatever sum the county assessor states.

Pre Merchantable Timber

Growing timber means growing a crop in the slow lane. After native wild trees have been harvested, growing timber requires site preparation before seedlings from a nursery are planted by hand. Herbicide spraying during the first 3 or 4 years is needed to help the seedlings survive vegetative competition. Interplanting may be needed because some of the planted seedlings may not survive. Mice, mountain beavers, and other rodents can chew small seedlings, deer and elk feed on them as well, porcupine and bear go after the sap under tree bark. Pre- commercial thinning is needed to improve the quality of the stand. Pre-commercial thinning doesn't pay for itself at the time it is done. It can easily take an additional 20 years after pre-commercial thinning to pay for itself in terms of increasing the valuation of the stand. That is a long time. Other risks include winter storms, Summer drought, disease, fires, theft and vandalism, and pressure for development. There isn't any other kind of farming that can truly compare with the realities of growing timber.

Running a Christmas tree farm is the only kind of farming that has even some resemblance to growing timber. Christmas tree seedlings are first grown in a nursery, often planted by hand, (some are somewhat machine planted), herbicide spray is needed to reduce vegetative competition for the seedlings, basal pruning as well as pruning for better shape and form is done. Depending upon the species and growing conditions it can easily take 7 to 11 years to grow a Christmas tree after planting. One finds very few table size Christmas trees available for sale on lots for good reason. The first few years in the cultivation and growing a Christmas tree are the most expensive. Because Christmas trees are marketed and sold by the height of the tree, the grower generally has more money invested in a

table size tree than the grower could get from the sale of that small size tree. There are a few exceptions. If the lower branches of a Christmas tree happen to be unacceptably one sided, which can result from growing on a steep hillside, the grower may cut the top for a table tree, however, that decision is weighed against the option of just simply letting the tree grow another 2 or 3 years.

Because of this there is a standard practice in the Christmas tree industry that if someone damages a Christmas tree at any time after the day it is planted, the grower will assess damages against the person doing the damage according to the full cost of that tree at the projected time of harvest even though the damaged tree is nowhere near the size of the tree at intended harvest.

You are probably wondering why I take the time to tell you all this about Christmas trees when I have no intention of growing them. Both Christmas trees and timber trees take a long time to grow and growers need to do whatever they can to protect themselves against the risks of growing the crop. The longer time span needed to raise a marketable timber tree to the level of economic maturity increases the risk of growing timber. Young planted timber stands growing 15 to 20 years after they are planted still need an additional 20 to 25 years before they reach economic maturity. The idea of slashing, piling and burning a stand of 15 to 20 year old timber trees that have been recently pre-commercially thinned at considerable expense, doesn't set well with timber growers considering all the time and risks involved in growing timber, whereas Christmas tree growers expect to collect damages for injury done to Christmas trees. Please state in writing how PBA assesses the value of 15 to 20 year old timber trees.

Vegetation Maintenance Under Power Lines

According to information pamphlets, BPA normally removes all trees on the transmission line and access road easements when constructing a new transmission line. When a forested area is clearcut and no tree replanting is done a major part of the returning vegetation tends to be brush species and sucker sprouts from remaining stumps. Invasive species such as Scotch Broom and tall blackberry tend to be more aggressive than native brush species. This can develop into a serious environmental problem. The literature presented states that most crops that grow less than 10' tall can be grown safely under power lines. However, wild brush species can grow much higher than 10' tall. What is BPA's customary brush herbicide spraying and manual chopping maintenance schedule for easement right -of -ways once the tower lines have been established? What is the maximum brush height beyond which BPA considers is no longer acceptable? Impacted brush left to grow 10' high presents a serious mess.

Sincerely,

Barbara Eigner

Manager

[Phone number]