

November 2001

Attention Lou Driessen, Project Manager  
Bonneville Power Administration - KC-7  
PO Box 12999  
Portland, Oregon 97212

RECEIVED BY BPA PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT LOG#: <i>KELT-428</i>
RECEIPT DATE: DEC 06 2001

Mr. Driessen,

I am deeply disturbed about your plans to build nine miles of new 500-kilovolt line through the Cedar and Raging River watersheds and your 1.5 miles of new road construction. Your preferred alternative states a plan to permanently clear-cut a swath from 150' to 285' wide through the forest, including Seattle's watershed, which is currently protected from logging. This plan would destroy forests recently protected by the City of Seattle and Protect Our Watershed Alliance. There are important salmon fisheries in Raging River and the City of Seattle is working to re-establish salmon in Cedar River. It was a landmark decision by Seattle to preserve its watershed forests. Would BPA propose a powerline through Mt. Rainier National Park? Then why through our protected watershed? Please thoroughly address your reasons for dismissing the other alternatives in your final EIS as your draft didn't adequately explain the reason they were thrown out.

Most of all, please realize that your plan is a temporary fix. In the next 10 years, we will be at the same load capacity that we are at now. What then? More logging in our watershed? What we need are stronger conservation programs. It is an unrealistic view that we have unlimited amounts of resources here in the Pacific Northwest. We have met a load capacity because the population has grown so significantly in the last 10 years. It's time we insist on conserving what we have and making it enough instead of simply saying we'll go find more. Especially when the only offered solution is one that could potentially contaminate the drinking water supply for over 800,000 Seattle residents who said they were willing to pay several dollars extra each year to protect our watershed.

If in the end you decide that conservation won't work and we need a new line, add additional circuits to towers in the existing corridor. I realize the potential for large scale failure, but I also realize the possibility is rare that this would happen. I INSIST that any forest or wetlands that are damaged be replaced. I also ask for a new EIS with needed information, a substantive cumulative effects analysis and additional alternatives especially including conservation.

Thank you,

*Sabrina Shupard*

*650 SW 316<sup>th</sup> St.  
Federal Way, WA 98023*

**Kuehn, Ginny -KC-7**

**From:** mlorincz [mlorincz@fhcrc.org]  
**Sent:** Monday, December 10, 2001 4:20 PM  
**To:** comment@bpa.gov  
**Subject:** Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Project

RECEIVED BY BPA PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT LOG#: <i>KELT-429</i>
RECEIPT DATE: DEC 11 2001

Hello,

I am writing to voice my opinion on the Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Project. Clearcutting in the Cedar River Watershed to construct a powerline highway through this beautiful natural area is not a good solution to the issue faced by the Bonneville Power Administration  
The Cedar River Watershed should be preserved as is.

Matthew C. Lorincz  
mlorincz@fhcrc.org

**Kuehn, Ginny -KC-7**

**From:** Lynard, Gene P - KEC-4  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 11, 2001 2:12 PM  
**To:** Kuehn, Ginny -KC-7  
**Cc:** Driessen, Laurens C - TNP-TPP-3  
**Subject:** FW: Proposed Raging-Cedar Powerline

RECEIVED BY BPA PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT LOG#: <i>KELT-430</i>
RECEIPT DATE: DEC 11 2001

Another email on the Kangley-Echo Lake EIS. Thanks.

-----Original Message-----

From: Darrel Weiss [mailto:djweiss1@mindspring.com]  
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2001 8:06 PM  
To: Gene Lynard (E-mail); Laurens Driessen (E-mail); Tom Pansky (E-mail); Vickie VanZandt (E-mail)  
Cc: Ron Sims (E-mail); Gary Locke (E-mail); Heidi Wills (E-mail); Jan Drago (E-mail); Jim Compton (E-mail); Judy Nicaastro (E-mail); Margaret Pageler (E-mail); Nick Licata (E-mail); Peter Steinbrueck (E-mail); Richard Conlin (E-mail)  
Subject: Proposed Raging-Cedar Powerline

Dear Bonneville Power Official (Mr. Lynard, Mr. Driessen, Mr. Pansky, Ms. VanZandt):

You know how people are always saying "not in my backyard"? I would like to remind you that this is not the case for myself and many others who are very concerned that a new powerline is proposed to be built in the Habitat-Conservation-Plan-protected Cedar River watershed. It is not our backyard -- it the Seattle area's primary drinking water supply -- and it is a place that really should not be considered for a construction project of this magnitude.

I'm surprised that you let the not-in-my-backyard-property-owners (those whose properties fall into your category of "routes considered but eliminated") scare you off.

The watershed is not the only alternative. It is not the best alternative. It is the riskiest alternative. It is the most damaging alternative (and therefore, most certainly, the most costly alternative).

The City of Seattle's drinking water watershed should not be for sale.

I believe it was a mistake to quickly rule out alternatives outside the watershed because "hundreds of rural-residential properties" would object to a powerline in their backyard.

I am copying this message to my elected officials, urging their support in siting the powerline outside the watershed. If the project moves forward within the watershed, I urge them to assure that significant mitigation compensation be assessed the BPA. I also urge them to make sure the BPA takes every precaution to assure that the watershed is not damaged or compromised in any way.

The safeguards necessary to comply with the 50-year HCP protecting the watershed have not been adequately addressed. They need to be addressed considerable detail. The impacts also must be adequately mitigated.

Please -- do not trample on the watershed! Pursue another, less threatening route.

---

Darrel Weiss  
755 N 204th  
Shoreline, WA 98133-3112  
206-542-0687