Chapter 3 — Comments and Responses - SDEIS

In this Chapter comments from:

- Federal Agencies
- State Agencies
- Local Agencies
- Tribes
- Groups and Individuals
- Public Meetings

BPA completed a supplemental draft environmental impact statement (SDEIS) for the proposed Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project. The SDEIS was released to the public for a 45-day review and comment period that ended on March 1, 2003. Five public meetings were held at various locations in King County during the week of February 3-6 to gather public comments on the SDEIS.

This chapter contains the written comments from letters, e-mails, and comment sheets received during the comment period for the SDEIS and BPA's responses to those comments. It also contains the comments from the public meetings and telephone calls received during the comment period. Chapter 2 contains the written and oral comments received during the comment period for the DEIS and BPA's responses to those comments.

Letters and comment sheets were given numbers in the order they were received. Separate issues in each letter were given separate codes. For example, letter 394 might have issues 394-001, 394-002, and 394-003 identified within its text. Comments from the public meeting were also numbered. BPA prepared responses to each of these individual comments.

The chapter is organized in the following sequence: comments from federal agencies are followed by comments from state agencies (page 3-7), local agencies (page 3-11), tribes (page 3-31), then groups and individuals (page 3-43). Comments from the public meetings are at the end of the chapter (page 3-163). Because we have organized comments this way and often reference responses to other comments, please use the numerical list on the back of this page for reference. See also the reference page in Chapter 2. A listing of related comments by issue is at the end of the chapter on page 3-343.
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Lou Driesen
Project Manager
DOE-Bonneville Power Administration
P.O. Box 491
Vancouver, WA 98666-0491

Re: Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

Dear Mr. Driesen:

On July 8, 2002, the USDA Forest Service (USFS) entered into an Interagency Agreement (No. 02-IA-110657/03002) as a cooperating agency with the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) in the development of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project.

As stated in the agreement, the USFS is to review environmental documentation and provide feedback to ensure that these documents could support decisions that may be required by the USFS. This includes environmental review and coordination with BPA on transmission line alternatives that cross National Forest System lands on the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie and Wenatchee National Forests. In addition, the agreement specifies that the USFS, as a cooperating agency, will provide guidance on potential issues and analysis needs to sufficiently address current USFS requirements and processes.

In reviewing the SDEIS that was recently released, I note that BPA is recommending Alternative 1, which parallels an existing BPA transmission line through the Cedar River Municipal Watershed, as the preferred alternative for this project. This alternative does not cross National Forest System land and, therefore, would not require any action on the part of the USFS.

However, the analysis has not been performed at the same level of intensity for the alternatives proposed across National Forest System land. I understand you are aware that if one of the alternatives across National Forest System land (Alternative B or D) were selected as the preferred alternative for this project, the SDEIS would be inadequate to support the necessary decisions that would be required by the USFS. Additional field surveys, analysis, and consultation would be necessary to adequately display and disclose the impacts that would likely occur on National Forest System land. If this situation were to occur, further project delay would be inevitable in order to accommodate the required steps.

I look forward to a continuing cooperative relationship regarding this project and other BPA projects that may involve National Forest System lands. If public comment on the SDEIS suggests a possible change in the preferred alternative, please notify the USFS project contact, Floyd Rughalski, at the earliest possible time. Thank you.

Sincerely,

/S/ SONNY J. ONEAL
SONNY J. ONEAL
Forest Supervisor

1480-001 Comment noted.

1480-002 Comment noted.

1480-003 BPA is aware of the additional work necessary if an alternative on National Forest land is chosen and the time it would take to complete this work.

1480-004 Thank you for your cooperation.
February 28, 2003

Dear Mr. Driessen,

The Department of the Interior has reviewed the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project, King County, Washington. The Department does not have any comments to offer.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Preston A. Sleeper
Regional Environmental Officer
State Agencies
A list was developed from the sign-in sheets and any one who requested to be added to the mail list was, along with people/persons who signed in, but were not found on previous lists.
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Washington State Legislature  Metropolitan King County Council
February 7, 2003

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office – KC – 7
PO Box 12599
Portland, OR 97212

Re: Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Project – SDEIS

Dear Public Affairs Office:

We would like to take this opportunity to thank the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) for all of its hard work and efforts in completing the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Project. BPA’s willingness to consider all of the comments submitted for this document is to be commended.

We continue to support BPA’s preferred alternative for construction of this important transmission line as the most reasoned and balanced solution. The SDEIS clearly shows that the preferred alternative is both the most cost-effective and the most environmentally sound option.

We also applaud BPA’s consideration of new and environmentally friendly technologies such as micropiles and the use of helicopters in the construction plan for the transmission line.

Thank you again for your hard work and dedication to the community.

Sincerely,

Dino Rossi
State Senator
5th Legislative District

Cheryl Fogel
State Representative
5th Legislative District

Glen Anderson
State Representative
5th Legislative District

David W. Iranzi
King County Councilmember
Council District 12

cc: The Honorable Jennifer Dunn, U.S. Congress
Greater Maple Valley Area Council

1446-001 Comment noted.

1446-002 and -003 Comments noted.
Local Agencies
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February 4, 2003

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Officer - KC-7
P.O. Box 12999
Portland, OR 97212

RE: KECN - Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Project
DOE/EIS 0317-S1

Dear Sirs,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed alternatives for the Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project, Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The City of Kent supports your decision to proceed with Alternative 1 as outlined in the EIS.

1447-001 Comments noted.

1447-002 The City of Kent groundwater supply area has been addressed in the SDEIS. Additional information has been provided in Shannon and Wilson Inc.’s letter to BPA dated January 16, 2003. See Appendix Y.

1447-003 See response to Comment 1447-002.

1447-004 and -005 See response to Comment 1447-002.

1447-006, -007, and -008 Comment noted. Documented anadromous fish use of Rock Creek, a tributary to the Cedar River at river mile 18, includes Chinook salmon, Coho salmon, and sockeye salmon per the Washington Department of Fisheries - A catalog of Washington stream and salmon utilization, Volume 1, Puget Sound (1975), and fish use information available at Stream Net (<http://www.streamnet.org>) accessed March 2003. Sockeye are considered to be present only within the main stem of the Cedar River.
BPA would site its transmission facilities (towers and access roads) to minimize sensitive resources such as streams and wetlands. BPA avoids these resources where it can, spans them where it can’t avoid them, and mitigates if it can’t span them. Impacts to the fishery resource are expected to be low to moderate, the same as with the Proposed Action, and the impact to wetlands are expected to be moderate with 17 acres of wetlands affected. The impact to groundwater is expected to be moderate to high. The wells under the City of Kent’s wellhead protection program are considered highly susceptible to groundwater contamination.

We look forward to working with you to manage our regional natural resources.

Sincerely,

Don Wickstrom, P.E.
Public Works Director

c: Mr. Kelly Peterson, Wellhead Protection Engineer
  Mr. William Wolski, Environmental Engineering Manager
  Mr. Brad Lake, Water Superintendent
  Mr. Patrick Fitzpatrick, Deputy City Attorney
  Mr. Tom Brubaker, City Attorney
  Mr. Judy Nelson, Covington Water District
  Mr. Gene Lyard, Bonneville Power Administration
  Ms. Cindy Cutter, Bonneville Power Administration
  File
February 27, 2003

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office-KC
PO Box 1299
Portland, OR 97212

RE: Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

To whom it may concern:

King County Department of Development and Environmental Services (DDES) has completed its review of the Supplemental Draft Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project. King County DDES focused primarily on impacts to the natural environment, specifically project impacts related to wetlands, streams, and fish and wildlife.

As specified in previous comment correspondence, King County’s Sensitive Areas Ordinance (SAO), KCC 21A.24, only allows for the alteration of wetland, and wetland and stream buffers for specific permitted alterations or under provisions of a Reasonable Use Exception, KCC21A.24.070, or Public Agency or Utility Exception (PAUE), KCC 21A.24.070A. The PAUE is code applicable to your situation for the proposed project.

Alternatives Analysis/Sensitive Areas Review/Mitigation

King County DDES understands that the BPA proposes to build a single-circuit 500-kV transmission line from a tapping point on an existing 500-kV line near Kangley, Washington to an Echo Lake substation near North Bend, Washington. The preferred alternative for this line, also called Alternative 1, is nine miles long. Five miles of the proposed route would go through the Cedar River Municipal Watershed. In addition, Echo Lake substation would be expanded by about three acres to the east and new equipment would be installed to accommodate the new line.

Based on review of Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the preferred alternative cannot meet all provisions of

Section 21A.24.070 of the King County Code provides for an agency or utility to apply for an exception to the Sensitive Areas Ordinance, if the application of this chapter would prohibit a development proposal by a public agency and utility.

As a federal government agency, BPA is prevented from applying for a local government permit, including an exception to a local government code. Since Congress has not waived sovereign immunity with respect to local zoning ordinances, BPA is prevented from complying with the County's procedural requirements. Although we do not comply with the procedural provisions of local government code, we do comply with the substantive intent of local government law, and we feel we have done so in minimizing impacts to sensitive resources to the maximum extent possible.

BPA as a federal agency does not apply for county permits, but would meet the equivalent of county requirements where feasible. Due to the nature of a transmission line, it is not possible to not impact riparian areas along streams and rivers and wetlands and their buffers. In order to keep a transmission line reliable, tall-growing species of trees need to be cut within riparian and wetland areas. BPA is proposing to compensate by planting/seeding low-growing plant species back where taller trees would have been taken. In addition BPA would purchase, or fund the purchase of, other properties (just for the Kangley-Echo Lake Project Alternative 1). BPA's intention is to convey the land to the City of Seattle for long-term protection. If all or part of the property is found to be unsuitable for mitigation of habitat loss, BPA intends to sell those portions of the property considered unsuitable for this purpose. In this case, BPA would sell the property subject to a restriction prohibiting residential or commercial use. The prohibition of commercial use would not include timber growing and harvesting, which would continue to be an allowable use.

BPA understands that the King County Code recognizes that utility corridors must cross sensitive areas in order to provide
the King County Sensitive Areas Code (21A.24). However, the King County’s Sensitive Areas Code recognizes that utility corridors must cross sensitive areas in order to provide service to King County residents. The Code allows utilities in wetland buffers (KCC 21A.24.330.E), in stream buffers (KCC 21A.24.370.D), and across streams (KCC 21A.24.370.G), subject to certain criteria. Crossing wetlands with utilities is not a permitted alteration. The proposed clearing and/or filling in wetlands and in wetland and stream buffers requires a Public Agency Utility Exception (PAUE) for the construction of the transmission lines (KCC 21A.24.070.A). These Code citations are included in this letter for reference.

The criteria for authorizing PAUE’s as set forth in KCC 21A.24.070.A(2) are identified below:

- The department shall review the application based on the following criteria: there is no other practical alternative to the proposed development with less impact on the sensitive area, and the proposal minimizes the impact on sensitive areas.

- An analysis of alternatives to the project is required in order to approve a PAUE. Administrative Rule 21A-24-025 specifies criteria for DDES’ evaluation of an alternatives analysis for a PAUE. DDES shall review the applicant’s evaluation of alternatives, needs and objectives, the nature of the project, and the other factors set forth in subsection A of the rule, to determine if there is a practical alternative that would satisfy the purpose and need for the project and result in less impacts to the sensitive area and buffer. DDES shall determine that there is no practical alternative only if it concludes that the basic purpose of the project cannot practically be accomplished using a project or non-project alternative, an alternative location, or an alternative construction technique that would avoid, or result in less adverse impacts on, a sensitive area or its buffer.

The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) performed an Alternative Transmission Line Routing Analysis for the Langley–Echo Lake Transmission Line Project (DDES June 2001 and SDEIS January 2003). Alternative project routes and design and construction methods were considered, and this study provided optimum routes for the corridors associated with the Project. The factors weighed in evaluating various routes for the transmission lines: use of existing corridors, community impacts, environmental impacts, construction factors, and system reliability.

King County DDES has noted that impacts to wetlands and streams have been minimized through the design and review process. Because the preferred route (Alternative 1) would parallel an existing 500-kV transmission line, compared to the other action alternatives, clearing would be minimized and the need to construct additional access roads (2.9 miles of new access road) would be reduced. Additionally, 0.6 miles of access road would be removed from service.

BPA has completed a wetland delineation report, dated March 28, 2002, which has been sent to you.

For a complete review of all streams proposed to be crossed under project Alternatives A, B, C (Options C-1 and C-2), and D (Options D-1 and D-2), please see Appendix N of the SDEIS. Revised Appendix A – Table A-1 of the Final Fisheries Technical Report (see Addition to Appendix A in the FEIS) contains this information for Alternatives 1-4. For a complete list of streams

services to King County residents, that crossing wetlands is not a permitted alteration, and that a utility/public agency must apply for a public agency/utility exception. Please see previous response.

As a federal government agency, BPA is required to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) under the National Environmental Policy Act before making a decision on any major federal action, such as adding a 500-kV transmission line to BPA’s main grid.

BPA has prepared a SDEIS, identifying the impacts of nine build alternatives, non-transmission alternatives and a No Action Alternative. As a part of this analysis, BPA identified how those impacts could be mitigated.

In addition to the best management practices, BPA proposes to offer 473 acres in compensatory mitigation to mitigate for the loss of approximately 90 acres of habitat for the northern spotted owl, and for alteration of 14 acres of forested wetlands to nonforested scrub/shrub wetlands within unincorporated King County. The 473 acres of compensatory mitigation would be located immediately north and immediately south of the Cedar River Municipal Watershed.
The BPA identified mitigation measures that would be utilized under any of the proposed action alternatives. These mitigation measures include, but are not limited to, use of special design elements and construction techniques, season restrictions on construction, supervised erosion control practices, purchasing lands as replacement habitat for habitat affected by the project, wetland mitigation including careful cutting and removal of only vegetation that are tall-growing species, reseeding where vegetation has been removed, and purchase of lands that contain wetlands, streams, and upland habitats.

Under the action alternative review, King County DDES noted that, with the exception of Alternatives B and D, similar impacts on wildlife identified under all alternatives, however, it was noted that overall, the least amount of vegetation disturbance would occur under the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 1). Additionally, under Alternative 1, a total of 14 acres of wetland would be impacted. Impacts to the 14 acres of wetland only include vegetation disturbance, and the primary impacts would include the conversion of forested wetlands to shrub and emergent wetlands. Fewer acres of impacts to wetlands were noted under some of the other action alternatives; however, as stated previously, overall land area impacts under the other action alternatives were greater. With the exception of Alternatives B and D, impacts to fisheries and stream resources were identified as being similar under all the action alternatives. At this time, however, it is not clear exactly how many streams and of what type are proposed to be crossed under each of the alternatives.

It is understood that mitigation for environmental impacts will include minimization during project construction and operation, limited on-site mitigation, and that most impacts will be primarily mitigated off-site. It is also understood that the off-site mitigation options are still being finalized.

Overall, based on the provided alternative analysis, it appears that King County DDES could support the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 1). However, BPA has not supplied sufficient documentation to establish conditions and mitigation measures to insure the proposed project will mitigate impacts on streams, wetlands, and associated buffers, and fish and wildlife.

Under the selected alternative, the BPA will need to:

1) Accurately quantify impacts to streams, wetlands, and their buffers. To facilitate quantification of impacts, the BPA will need to delineate and classify wetlands (KCC 21A.06.1415) and streams (KCC 21A.06.1240) within 100-feet of the proposed right-of-way. Based on the classification of wetland and streams, their location, and buffer requirements, impacts to wetland, streams, and their buffers would need to be quantified.

2) Mitigation will be required for alteration of wetlands, streams, and their buffers. The PAUSE process does allow some flexibility in mitigation; however, mitigation should be consistent with the following King County regulations:

BPA has purchased 350 acres in the Raging River Basin and may purchase or fund the purchase of other properties that could be used for compensatory mitigation to mitigate for the unavoidable impacts to sensitive resources. These properties may achieve greater biologic and hydrologic conditions, as called for by KCC 21A.24.340, than would result without the project.

BPA anticipates no alteration to streams; however, stream buffers would be impacted, as allowed by King County Code.
Per KCC 21A.24.340, all alterations on wetlands shall be replaced or enhanced on the site or within the same drainage basin using the following formulas: Class 1 and 2 wetlands on a 2:1 basis and Class 3 Wetlands on a 1:1 basis with equivalent or greater biologic functions. Replacement or enhancement off the site may be allowed if the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of King county that off-site location is in the same drainage sub-basin as the original wetland and that greater biologic and hydrologic conditions will be achieved.

Per 21A.24.380, replacement or enhancement shall be required when a stream or buffer is altered pursuant to an approved development proposal. There shall be no net loss of stream functions on the development proposal site, and no impact on stream functions shall occur from the approved alterations. Replacement or enhancement for approved stream alterations shall be accomplished in streams on the site unless the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of King county that: 1) enhancement or replacement on the site is not possible, 2) the off-site location is in the same drainage sub-basin as the original stream, and 3) greater biologic and hydrologic functions will be achieved.

3) Monitoring of the mitigation measures shall be required for five years following installation as specified on the approved plan, to evaluate whether or not the project performance standards have been met.

Should you need to discuss this information further, please feel free to call me at 206-296-7392.

Sincerely,

Bill Keschke
Environmental Scientist III

BPA understands King County requirements and would meet those requirements where feasible including monitoring.
Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

I am writing on behalf of the City of North Bend to comment on the Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS).

1490-001

The City is in support of the SDEIS conclusion that Alternative 1, a new single circuit 500-kv transmission line routed through the Cedar River Municipal Watershed, would have the least environmental and fiscal impact. The City notes that Alternative 1 provides substantially increased environmental mitigation measures to protect the Cedar River Watershed at a significant cost to the BPA customers. If similar care were taken to protect the environment on any of the other alternatives evaluated in the SDEIS, the cost of those alternatives would be significantly higher. The potential increase in cost to mitigate routes other than Alternative 1, to the same mitigation standards proposed for Alternative 1, should be evaluated in the Supplemental Final Environmental Impact Statement.

1490-002

The City is not in support of Alternative B, rebuilding the Rocky Reach-Maple Valley-345 kV to Double Circuit 500-kv from East of Stampede Pass to the Echo Lake-Maple Valley line. Alternative B would result in a replacement of the existing 150-foot tall towers with 180-foot tall towers. The change would create a significant increase in the visibility of the transmission line from the City of North Bend, adversely impact the Rattlesnake Mountain Scenic Area south of North Bend, and adversely impact the scenic value of the Mountains to Sound Greenway, for the length of the new line. Access routes required for reconstruction of the line could adversely impact the Forster Woods subdivision located south of Interstate 90 in North Bend.

1490-003

Similarly, the City is not in support of Alternative D, constructing a new Single-Circuit 500-kv line west of the Cedar River Watershed to the Echo Lake-Maple Valley line. As proposed in the SDEIS, the new 500-kv line would be located adjacent to the existing...
1490-004 150-foot tall Rocky Reach-Maple Valley 345 kV running from east of Stampede Pass to the Echo Lake-Maple Valley lines. Alternative B would result in clearing another 150-foot wide right of way and constructing a new set of 180-foot tall towers next to the existing 150-foot tall Rocky Reach-Maple Valley 345 kV towers. Alternative D would also create a significant increase in the visibility of the transmission line from the City of North Bend, adversely impact the Rattlesnake Mountain Scenic Area south of North Bend, and adversely impact the scenic value of the Mountains to Sound Greenway for the length of the new line. Access routes required for construction of the new line could adversely impact the Forster Woods subdivision located south of Interstate 90 in North Bend. Additionally, the 150-foot wide clearing required for Alternative D could adversely impact the stream, steep slopes and geologically unstable ground above the Forster Woods development. The City experienced significant flooding and sedimentation problems from the streams eroding the unstable ground on the north slope of Rattlesnake Ridge in 1996. The City strongly opposes any action that would adversely impact the stability of the hillside and increase runoff and sedimentation in the streams on the North slope of Rattlesnake Ridge.

1490-005

1490-006 Comment noted.

1490-007 Comment noted.

For the reasons outlined above the City is would favor implementation of Alternative 1, a new single circuit 500-kV transmission line routed through the Cedar River Municipal Watershed, because it would have the least environmental and fiscal impact, based on the information contained in the SDEIS.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Laurence Stockton,
Community Services Director

Copy

Mayor
Council
City Attorney
City Administrator
March 1, 2003

Lou Driesen, Project Manager
Bonnieville Power Administration
P.O. Box 3621
Portland, Oregon 97208-3621


Sent via e-mail to: comment@bpa.gov

Dear Mr. Driesen:

Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) is responsible for providing drinking water to 1.3 million customers in urbanized areas of western King County and the southern portion of Snohomish County. SPU takes approximately two-thirds of its drinking water from the Cedar River. SPU owns the 90,546-acre Cedar River Municipal Watershed (CRW) and manages its land and aquatic resources for water supply, the protection and restoration of fish and wildlife habitat, and the protection of cultural resources. SPU’s Companion Utility, Seattle City Light, owns and operates a hydroelectric facility and associated transmission lines in the Watershed.

1492-001

This letter provides SPU’s comments on BPA’s Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS) for the Kanglely-Echo Lake Transmission Project. SPU provided comments during the scoping for the Draft EIS (DEIS) in letters to BPA dated April 28, 2000, and October 2, 2000. SPU also provided comments during the comment period for the DEIS on September 4, 2001. SPU provided comments to BPA on the scoping of this SDEIS in a letter dated July 22, 2002. To the extent applicable, these comments are incorporated herein by this reference.

SPU has the following major points on the SDEIS. Additional details for these points and others are included below.

1492-002

- The purpose and need for this project should be clearly and completely described in the SDEIS.

1492-003

BPA has worked closely with the City of Seattle to develop construction measures and stormwater pollution controls to minimize water quality impacts from construction of the project. From the onset, BPA designed the project, including placement of roads and towers, to avoid all sensitive areas, to the maximum extent feasible. To address unavoidable impacts, BPA is in the process of acquiring and protecting compensatory mitigation properties adjacent to the CRW that will help reduce future impacts to the CRW from potential development. We also intend to implement new turbidity monitoring devices in the CRW to increase awareness of when the water supply system may need to temporarily shut down to protect City water customers due to turbidity. Finally, we are acquiring insurance coverage for unforeseen events (caused by BPA’s construction or operation and maintenance of the transmission line), which would trigger new environmental requirements. We believe we are taking extraordinary steps to address the concerns raised by the comment.

1492-004

Please see the mitigation listed for each of these resources in the SDEIS. Also please see responses to Comments 340-002, 1415-003, and -004.

1492-005

A Summary of Transmission Planning Studies is provided in Appendix H (available on request). BPA did a comprehensive evaluation of transmission infrastructure needs which is summarized in “BPA Infrastructure Projects, February, 2003,” available at http://www.bpa.gov/Corporate/KC/home/keeping/03kc/KC_Infrastructure.pdf. A variety of alternatives were identified to address the particular purpose and need, including reconfiguration of existing lines in the Puget Sound area. The alternatives are described in Chapter 2 of the SDEIS.
The primary beneficiaries are consumers in the Puget Sound Area and in British Columbia served by retail utilities that take service over the BPA transmission grid. This essentially represents all residential, commercial and industrial consumers in the area. For information on the Canadian Treaty, please see Section 1.2.2 of the SDEIS, Appendix I and response to Comments 1422-002-001, 1422-002-002 and 1421-031-001. Consumers in the Puget Sound Area directly benefit from the Treaty. We believe that Canada may “make profits in the lucrative short- and near-term markets” mostly in the spring and summer, not in the winter when this problem occurs.

The reference to this line was changed in the SDEIS for security reasons.

BPA has included in its planning any future potentials for any alternative. This Kangle-Echo Lake project cannot be included with any future alternative. In fact, in the early 1990s, BPA did a project that would have produced a new 500-kV line across the Cascade Mountains into the King County area and also the Kangle-Echo Lake project. Through the then environmental/NEPA process, BPA determined that the “Cross-Mountain” portion of the project and the Kangle-Echo Lake portion could be delayed by construction of a new substation, called Schultz, in the Ellensburg area, and through targeted conservation. Also it was determined that if another line is needed across the Cascade Mountains, then it would likely be needed north of Seattle in the Monroe area and not in the Echo Lake Substation area. BPA has tentatively determined that the next cross-Cascade line is needed in 2010, but that date could be substantially affected by the rate of load growth and new generation west of the Cascade Mountains. Therefore Alternative B and D likely will have no advantage to future projects and cannot combine economical resources. BPA has also acknowledged in the current Kangle-Echo Lake SDEIS that Alternatives A and C would use a vacant 500-kV circuit on their north end to get into Echo Lake Substation. BPA has plans to use this vacant circuit sometime in the near future as growth in King County continues. When the need arises to use these
the 50-year old 545 kV Rocky Reach-Maple Valley line over Snoqualmie Pass or building another 500kV on the Maple Valley-Echo Lake alternative (A) with a new 500kV line could alter the "preferability" among current project alternatives and present valuable opportunities for cost savings over the long term. Why are these future projects for these lines not being considered for design and construction simultaneously with the needed 500kV line? If the reason is that BPA's planning horizon is "five to seven years" (SDEIS p. 1-4 (box)), then this would be inconsistent with BPA's previous actions on other projects. That is, BPA has previously invested resources for the long-term without knowing the complete future picture (e.g. WPPS and Trojan). Such an investment (designing and constructing two projects in concert) would appear to offer cost advantages in this case, considering even conservative estimates of growth in Western Washington. The SDEIS should completely describe all short- and long-term planned system upgrades, reconstruction, and new construction for all transmission facilities in and near the project area, and describe why BPA has not investigated design solutions involving the reconstruction/upgrade/construction of two or more transmission lines in concert as project alternatives.

RISK ASSESSMENT FOR "FAIL SCENARIOS"

The SDEIS should include an explanation of how risks to power lines are calculated and used in defining system reliability standards and performance. This would provide a better context for BPA's risk assessments for this project. For example, Watershed forests can be subject to extreme fire hazard, "microbursts" have historically leveled forests near the proposed project, and parts of the proposed line would be located on ancient landslide deposits. The SDEIS appears to take a superficial, simplistic risk evaluation approach that doesn't fully justify selection of the proposed action in terms of reliability. BPA should address these potential risk issues in the SDEIS.

ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED IN THE SDEIS

SPU appreciates the SDEIS's inclusion of alternative routes located outside the CRW. However, it is not clear why the four alternatives (besides the proposed action) that cross the Cedar River Watershed (CRW) are still being analyzed and considered in the SDEIS. These superficially alternative actions are distracting and don't bring any significant information to light. In addition, the SDEIS fails to provide detailed cost estimates for all alternatives while still using project costs to evaluate alternatives. The cost estimates associated with project alternatives are difficult to understand. The SDEIS needs to present a cogent and detailed description of cost estimates for all alternatives because BPA is using relative costs in the decision-making process for this project. It is difficult to assess if project costs are being "inflated." For example, additional cost of mitigation for alternatives mixes standard and nonstandard design and construction BMPs with "mitigation." The BMPs should be considered standard elements of design and construction, not additional mitigation costs: use of erosion specialists and monitors for erosion control, use of temporary mats to cross wetland vegetation, use of special surveying techniques to minimize vegetation disturbance; use of special clearing criteria; restricting ground-disturbing activities to the dry season (Alternative 1); minimizing wetland impacts, use of special care and design for crossing fish-bearing streams (Alternative A). But, when actual compensatory mitigation actions are described, these are not included in the mitigation costs across the board for other alternatives (e.g., measures needed for the

vacant circuits and either Alternative A or C is using this vacant circuit, then another transmission line would need to be constructed to replace the vacant circuit occupied by Alternative A or C. Other future projects are not in the same area and/or provide no benefits to this project, such as a possible future line from Echo Lake Substation to the north. BPA planned Kangley-Echo Lake as part of a broad examination of infrastructure needs, which is summarized in Infrastructure Keeping Current, February, 2003, available at http://www.bpa.gov/Corporate/KC/home/keeping/03kc/ KC_Infrastructure.pdf.

See response to Comment 1492-006.

1492-009 and -010 The risks and criteria that BPA uses to plan the grid are summarized in Section 1.2.1 of the SDEIS and described in more detail in “Reliability Standards: meeting national and regional requirements for electric system reliability,” available at http://www.bpa.gov/Corporate/KC/home/keeping/03kc/ KC_Reliability.pdf. BPA has over 30 years of experience with an existing transmission line in the CRW which has operated with acceptable reliability and without impact on the CRW.

1492-011 and -012 Comment noted. Please see response to Comments 1420-001 and -002.

1492-013 and -014 Please see response to Comments 1420-001 and -002.

1492-015 and -016 Please see response to Comments 1420-001 and -002. BPA would minimize and mitigate impacts to wetlands and other sensitive areas on any alternative. BPA would likely not purchase additional properties for impacts to sensitive areas outside the CRW.

1492-017 See response to Comment 382-026.

1492-018 The only alternative that has detailed engineering and engineering survey information available is the Proposed Action (Alternative 1). Due to the need to get the project energized as quickly as possible, BPA has taken the risk and
gathered this information knowing that the Administrator could choose another alternative. If he chooses another transmission alternative, BPA would need another two or more years to energize this project. BPA understands that it is taking a financial risk investing in the preferred alternative beyond what BPA would normally do ahead of the Record of Decision. Other alternatives do not have this detailed information. For the other alternatives, BPA has used a worst case scenario, such as more clearing than would actually be necessary, including clearing at sensitive areas such as wetlands and creek and river crossings.

1492-019 and -020 Comment noted.

1492-021, -022, and -023 See response to Comment 382-026.

1492-024 Comment noted.

1492-025 Comment noted.

1492-026, -027, and -028 Comment noted.

BPA's proposed transmission line would expand the existing 150-foot wide right-of-way through the CRW to a 300-foot wide right-of-way. BPA did evaluate the impacts to vegetation (low to moderate), and for threatened, endangered or sensitive species (moderate).

1492-029, -030, and -031 Please see responses to Comments 1492-004 and 1421-030-001. BPA has consulted with the USFWS and NMFS. Letters from NMFS were included in the SDEIS (Appendix U) and state that NMFS agrees with BPA's determination of "may affect, but not likely to adversely affect" for Puget Sound chinook and their designated habitat.

1492-032, -033, and -034 Spills of fuel or hazardous materials in the CRW could impact groundwater that may eventually flow into the Cedar River. The potential for such spills would be greatest during construction. A spill response plan will be developed and incorporated into the SWPP Plan, as described in Section 4.3.3.2 of the SDEIS. See response to Comment 394-139. In
The SDEIS should take into account the growing local and regional importance of the CRW as a wildlife and fish habitat, a wildlife movement corridor, and a refuge amid urban development and extractive uses. This role has a significant social and biological value that needs to be taken into consideration in evaluating the potential impacts of this project.

SPU recently completed its Habitat Conservation Plan for the Cedar River Watershed under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). On April 21, 2000, the City of Seattle along with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) signed the Implementation Agreement for this HCP and received the associated incidental Take Permits under the ESA. The HCP and its implementing agreements represent the cutting edge, regionally and nationally, of applied ecosystem management principles and were the culmination of over six years of effort in building regional consensus on the future direction for the management of the terrestrial and aquatic resources of the Watershed.

The intensive public review for this HCP revealed broad public support for protecting the habitats in the Watershed and not creating large openings in the forest by commercially harvesting timber. In response to this, the City decided to discontinue commercial timber harvest over the next 50 years. BPA's proposed route through the Watershed would result in making large clearings in this important forested area. The local and regional consequences of the proposed large-scale fragmentation and removal of older forest in this sensitive area should be thoroughly evaluated in the SDEIS.

In its covering letters for the DEIS and SDEIS, SPU identified the need for BPA to address the impacts of the project on the HCP. SPU needs to be certain that the proposed project will not diminish the conservation value of the plan and that the City and its water supply customers will be fully protected.

SPU believes that the proposed routes through the CRW would, unless adequately mitigated, have significant impacts on species protected under the Endangered Species Act, and on their habitats. Protected salmon species are expected to be present in the Alternative 1 through 4 project areas by the fall of 2003. These issues need to be carefully evaluated in the SDEIS, which should disclose and evaluate the extent to which the proposed routes through the CRW would affect the habitat of listed species. The SDEIS should also describe how BPA would protect the City from any possibility that the terms of the HCP will be violated.

**IMPARTING TO DRINKING WATER SUPPLY**

Generally, the SDEIS downplays the regional significance and social function of the CRW as a municipal water supply. For example, Section 4.5 indicates that groundwater impacts for Alternative A would be low (despite the groundwater contributions to Cedar River reservoirs upstream of Landsberg), while groundwater impacts for Alternative A would be high due to the City of Kent wellhead protection area. The SDEIS must explicitly address the potential impact of the proposed action on drinking water and the City's ability to provide water so that the public will be satisfied, and the SPU is required to control the Waterhed in accordance with a Department of Health (DOH)-approved control program. If anything, the Cedar River and its tributaries in this area of native forest could pose significant risks to the drinking water supply during construction. Construction activities have the potential to cause high water turbidity events that could result in exceedance of federal drinking water standards and potentially result in the need for expensive water filtration that otherwise would not be needed or required. The SDEIS should disclose and evaluate these risks, and describe how BPA will protect the City and its water supply customers from the associated potential harm. In addition, the SDEIS needs to present a more detailed discussion of federal and state drinking water quality regulations and constraints as they pertain to the CRW.

Please see response to Comment 1492-004. Impacts to drinking water regulations have been discussed in the SDEIS. As mentioned above, BPA is proposing to extraordinary steps to minimize construction impacts to the CRW by designing the project to avoid impacts, by undertaking various best management practices to minimize harm, and by purchasing mitigation to compensate for those impacts that cannot be avoided. The mitigation should leave the CRW with a net environmental benefit. Moreover, BPA already has an existing 500-KV line that parallels the proposed line. The existence of the existing line offers convincing evidence that such a line is compatible with water quality. To our knowledge, no water quality problems have ever been attributed to the existing line. If there are some minimal impacts to water quality during construction, these impacts would only be temporary. The ROW should be stabilized (naturalized) in one or two growing seasons.

Please see response to Comments 1420-001 and -002.

BPA has prepared a SDEIS and has included Chapter 5, entitled “Consultation, Permit and Review Requirements.” Within Chapter 5, BPA has discussed consistency with federal, state and local environmental laws, and regulations. Additionally, BPA has published a letter from the Washington Department of Ecology (Appendix V of the SDEIS), stating that “Ecology agrees with your determination and assessment that the proposed action is consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of Washington’s...
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Coastal Zone Management Program and will not result in any significant impacts to the State’s coastal resources.” With respect to the King County Sensitive Areas Ordinance, Chapter 5 of the SDEIS states that BPA will comply with the substantive intent of the County zoning ordinance.

1492-039 and -040 The cultural resources work conducted for the selected alternative is adequate to conclude that its potential for impacts on these resources is low. The study was exceptionally thorough, starting with background research and a sensitivity analysis that concluded that the routing had a relatively low potential for containing cultural resources. The fieldwork included more than 1,150 subsurface test probes and also involved the participation of the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe in the survey and in interviews about traditional use of the area. The methods and results of the cultural resources study are reported in a lengthy report that is confidential with respect to public distribution but has been reviewed by SPU, the State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, and the Indian tribes. An additional survey will be conducted of newly-identified project features such as roads and staging areas. The report includes an Unanticipated Discovery Plan that provides specific procedures in the event that any artifacts or human remains are found.

We do not believe the new line would be visible from either State Route 18 or from I-90; however, the proposed transmission line would be visible to air traffic flying over or in the vicinity the Cedar River Municipal Watershed. Our SDEIS identified this impact and stated that the impact to visual resources would be low to moderate on views from cars or aircraft, and moderate to high on some Kangley area residents for whom the transmission line would be the dominant visual feature.

The transmission line would be designed to mitigate the visual impacts with darkened steel towers, nonspecular conductors and insulators that are non-reflective.
February 28, 2003

Bonneville Power Administration
KC-7, PO Box 12999
Portland, OR 97212

To Whom It May Concern:

King County, Department of Natural Resources and Parks (KCDNRP), is pleased to have the opportunity to comment on the supplemental draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the proposed Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project. As a steward of King County's environment and natural resources, this agency has concerns regarding the extent of analysis performed by the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) on the impacts of this project on those resources and, in particular, on federally listed salmonids in King County, Washington.

1515-001 and -002 Comment noted.

1515-003, -004, -005, and -006 Comments noted.

1515-007 Comment noted.

1515-008 Comment noted.

1515-009 and -010 BPA has consulted with the NOAA and NOAA has stated that since the Proposed Action incorporates avoidance and minimization measures into the project design, the effects of the action can be expected to be discountable and insignificant. NOAA has concurred with our effect determination of "may affect, but not likely to adversely affect" for Puget Sound chinook and their designated habitat.

1515-011 See response to Comment 1485-007.
King County believes that the Final Supplemental Fisheries Report (Fisheries Report) of the SDEIS does not provide adequate analysis of the potential adverse impacts to chinook and coho populations resulting from each proposed alternative. In fact, the Major Conclusions section (section 1.3) of the report (page 7) states that “All action alternatives would have similar impacts to fish and their habitat.” This is not accurate since each alternative proposes crossings at different river locations with different populations of fish and a variety of habitats. Before a final EIS is issued, specific impacts of each alternative should be prepared.

The Fishwies Report acknowledges that the clearing of riparian vegetation along the Raging River and other streams with threatened salmonids “could constitute a high impact” (page 39). Recognized impacts such as decreased large woody debris recruitment, decreased riparian shading, increased stream temperatures, and increased bank erosion may result in significant cumulative impacts to fish and their habitats. Yet, the report also states that “conclusions cannot be confirmed until the extent of clearing needed in the affected areas is known” (page 39). This is important information and should be provided in order to make an informed selection of the alternatives. King County would like to see a more thorough analysis of impacts performed at each of the proposed alternative sites.

The Final Supplemental Vegetation Technical Report (Vegetation Report) does not provide an in-depth analysis of riparian clearing needed to accommodate the conductors, overhead ground wires, and Insulators designed for each alternative. In order to make an informed decision regarding alternative selection and the impacts of each alternative on vegetation management, more information is needed. For example, if the minimum conductor-to-ground clearance for a 500-kV line is just over 29 feet, what is the allowable distance between vegetation and the conductors? Does the vegetation need to be removed completely even in the riparian areas?

In summary, King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks has a specific interest in protecting the Raging River. It is an important tributary to the Snoqualmie River and provides spawning and rearing habitat for threatened salmonids. The current suite of alternatives, in particular the preferred alternative, propose management actions that could have significant adverse impacts to the Raging River and its adjacent riparian area. The state of information and the depth of analysis provided in the SDEIS, the Fisheries Report, and the Vegetation Report do not adequately address these potential impacts. King County requests that BPA conduct a more thorough analysis on the impacts to the Raging River and its salmon populations and present the findings before an alternative is selected.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the SDEIS for the proposed Kangle–Echo Lake Transmission Line Project. If you have any questions about our comments, please call James Schroeder, Project Manager, in the Water and Land Resources Division with the King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks, at (206) 205-8309.

Sincerely,

Daryl Grigsby
Manager

cc: Rick Kirkby, Manager, Water Resources Unit, King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks (KCDNR)
Kevin Owens, Manager, Regional Policy Unit, KCDNR
Harry Reinert, Special Projects Manager, King County Department of Developmental and Environmental Services (KCDDES)
Mark Solitro, Transfer of Development Rights Program, KCDNR
Bill Kerschke, Senior Ecologist, Land Use Services Division, KCDDES
James Schroeder, Project Manager, Water and Land Resources Division, KCDNR

BPA believes that the analysis of specific impacts has been completed for each alternative, is accurate, and gives the decision maker enough information to make an informed decision.

The Raging River crossing is located across a very deep drainage and in some areas near the river, no vegetation would be cut because there is enough clearance between the line and the river. Some trees may be cut where they could pose a danger to safe operation of the line.

The minimum allowable clearance between conductor and vegetation is 20 feet plus the specific vegetative species’ growth factor. In general, all tall-growing species would be cut to almost ground level except at specific sensitive areas such as riparian areas where any vegetation could be allowed to grow within the 20 feet plus growth factor to the conductor. So the actual height of the vegetation allowed at riparian areas depends on the actual height of the conductor at that site. Due to the special status of the Cedar River Watershed and its HCP, BPA is willing to work with Seattle to allow young, tall-growing tree species to remain longer before cutting to create a taller habitat without creating a hazard for the transmission line. If possible, no low-growing vegetation species will be cut near riparian areas during construction.

BPA believes that the analysis of specific impacts has been completed for each alternative, is accurate, and gives the decision maker enough information to make an informed decision. Because of the presence of endangered species in the area including chinook salmon in the Raging River, BPA prepared a biological assessment and entered into Section 7 consultation with NMFS in July 2001. This consultation was completed on January 28, 2002, with their finding that “Since the proposed action incorporates avoidance and minimization into the project, NMFS can expect the effects of the action to be discountable or insignificant. Therefore NMFS concurs with your effect determination of “may effect, but not likely to adversely affect” for Puget Sound Chinook and their designated habitat.

Please see response to Comments 1515-014 and -015.
Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs -RC
P.O. Box 12395
Portland, Oregon 97212

SBA Representative:

Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County ("District") has reviewed the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement Summary DOE/EA-0317-S1 and applicable appendices. The District comments will focus on the need for transmission reinforcements in the Puget Sound area and not on the specific corridor and facility alternatives proposed to implement the Northwest transmission system reinforcement.

The District actively participated in a number of Northwest transmission planning activities including the Bonneville Power Administration Infrastructure for Technical Review Committee ("ITRC"). This committee was formed to evaluate needs for significant transmission addition in the Northwest, including the Klamath Lake transmission line project. BPA evaluated numerous alternatives with electric industry representatives. The ITRC evaluated and selected the projects to meet their needs, in addition to provide for future needs. The "Puget Sound Area Additions Project," also known as "GI Project," includes the Klamath Lake-500-kV transmission line which will be located in Snohomish County. These projects were carefully coordinated with other planned projects, including the second 500-kV line between Monroe - Echo Lake known as the "J-5 Corridor GII Project." The Northwest electric utilities have developed and supported these electric system plans to benefit the Puget Sound and Northwest.

1516-001 Comments noted.
1516-002 Comments noted.
1516-003 Comment noted.
1516-004 Comment noted.
1516-005 Comment noted.
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January 28, 2003

Mr. Ken Johnston
Tribal Account Executive
Department of Energy
Korpsville Power Administration
P.O. Box 491
Vancouver, WA 98666-0491

Dear Mr. Johnston:

This is in response to your letter dated January 14, 2003 re: T-DIF-2 in King County, Washington.

The position and concerns of the Tulalip Tribes are outlined in the following SOP’s:

1434-001 Comments noted.

1434-002 BPA will do its best to minimize impacts to these resources.

1434-003 As a federal agency, BPA is required to comply with the Endangered Species Act, therefore, surveys would be conducted for rare and endangered plant species if their habitat could be found in the area. No rare or endangered plant surveys were conducted for the proposed project, since the habitat where these species are found is not present. The only other plant surveys that were conducted as a part of the proposed project was for undesirable plants, such as noxious weeds. BPA routinely conducts weed surveys before and after construction.

1434-004 and -005 BPA has proposed extensive mitigation to protect water resources and fisheries.

1434-006 BPA is working closely with representatives of the Snoqualmie and Muckleshoot tribes, both of whom are federally-recognized tribes. With respect to site visitations, BPA would be happy to take representatives of the Tulalip tribes to the site, and would do so, with the landowners permission.
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1487-001 Comment noted.

1487-002 The report, including the Appendix D, Unanticipated Discovery Plan, is being revised in light of your comments. BPA will continue to consult with the Muckleshoot Tribe as required for Section 106 compliance and will conduct additional assessment of the access roads and staging areas. Consultation will be ongoing through the construction of this project, if BPA decides to build Alternative 1.

1487-003 and 004 Comment noted.

1487-005 BPA will continue to work with SPU and the Muckleshoot Tribe to develop a specific plan that meets the needs of all parties interested in providing forage plants while protecting the safety of the transmission line, should BPA decide to build Alternative 1.

1487-006, -007, -008, and -009 BPA does recognize the cultural importance of the CRMW to the tribe and provided for HRA to interview Muckleshoot tribal elders in coordination with tribal staff. HRA’s cultural resource survey was thorough. BPA conducted many meetings with tribal members to understand the tribe’s concerns. See Appendix W. Meetings with the tribe continue.

We also understand that future development within the CRMW is limited by the landowner, Seattle Public Utilities. Furthermore, we understand that currently three power line rights-of-way exist within the CRMW, two BPA rights-of-way and one Seattle Public Utilities right-of-way. The proposed project would be located adjacent to one of the existing BPA rights-of-way, thereby minimizing environmental impacts to the maximum extent possible.

With respect to the assertion that we have not analyzed the cumulative effects of the proposed project through the CRMW, we disagree. We have analyzed the cumulative effects of the proposed action for each resource area in the DEIS and the SDEIS. We have designed the proposed transmission line to avoid sensitive environmental resources where we could, span them where we could not avoid them, and offer compensatory planning.
Throughout the SDEIS, and specifically in its discussions of treaty rights and trust responsibility, BPA does not take into account the unique cultural importance of the CRW for the Muckleshoot Tribe, or the implications of the unusual circumstances that will preserve the Watershed from future development under Seattle Public Utility ownership. The cumulative impacts of the proposed second transmission line through this preserved area, rather than through more developed routes, have not been addressed in the SDEIS, nor is the BPA’s trust responsibility to mitigate for such adverse and cumulative effects discussed. The disproportionate impacts on the Tribe are also a matter of Environmental Justice subject to the direction of Executive Order 12898.

In conclusion, BPA has a continuing duty to manage lands associated with this project over which it has authority, to assure that Tribal treaty rights are unimpacted. This duty includes the obligation to consult with and involve the Muckleshoot Tribe, and integrate BPA and Tribal co-management plans where decisions involve such issues as the harvest of trees, placement of wood in streams, culvert installation and maintenance, availability of wood for fuel and cultural purposes, planting for eradication of noxious weeds and selection of species for replanting, and designation of areas for treatment, for mitigation or for habitat replacement.

Please contact me at (360) 802-2202, x165 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Melissa Calven, Director
Muckleshoot Wildlife and Cultural Resource Programs

mitigation to mitigate for impacts that could not be avoided. We believe we have met our trust responsibilities.

With respect to causing disproportionate impacts to tribal interest, as opposed to others, we also disagree. BPA has been meeting with the Muckleshoot Tribe on the proposed action for over three years. During this time, we have sought to find out if the proposed project would impact any traditional cultural properties (TCPs), and interviews with tribal elders were conducted. The information revealed that no TCPs would be affected. And to avoid impacts to other cultural resources such as plants or woody vegetation important to the Tribe that could neither be moved or harvested in advance of construction, we proposed to relocate the facilities (towers and access roads), as long as they would not be relocated from uplands to wetlands, and would not affect any angle points or the substation expansion area. Following the 45-day review period BPA gave the tribe to recommend relocating any of the proposed facilities, none were received.

Additionally, BPA’s cultural resource contractor, with assistance from the Muckleshoot and Snoqualmie tribes, undertook a cultural resource survey of the proposed right-of-way, digging more than 1,170 holes looking for cultural resources. Only two potential resources were found, one an artifact related to the logging industry (metal spike) and the other, a trench, were discovered. Neither were of any cultural significance.

BPA wishes to continue to meet with the Muckleshoot Tribe in an attempt to meet our Trust responsibilities; however, we disagree that constructing the line along the proposed alignment would violate the Executive Order on Environmental Justice. BPA feels that it has considered this Executive Order during the environmental review, and feels that none of the alternatives analyzed would violate the intent of the Executive Order.

As stated above, BPA has initiated consultation with the Muckleshoot Tribe on this project, and we remain committed to continue to meet and consult with the Tribe on matters that concern them. BPA is developing a ROW management plan which is environmentally sensitive, and will leave woody debris in streams to benefit fish and other wildlife, to the extent practical. It will also involve use of native plant seeds. However, the majority of the proposed ROW occurs within the CRW, owned and managed by SPU. SPU adopted an
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDEIS citation, Page.</th>
<th>SDEIS text</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1487-020</td>
<td>&quot;BPA would install 9 gates&quot;.</td>
<td>Access restrictions affect Tribal resources management and exercise of treaty rights. MIT requests access to those areas behind gates that are owned by BPA; and BPA cooperation in obtaining access to lands owned by other entities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1487-022</td>
<td>The probability for encountering prehistoric cultural resources along any of the alternatives varies by landform and increases along the Cedar river and other water sources. There is also a high probability of encountering many historic-period cultural resources despite that fact that few recorded resources are in the immediate vicinity of the alternatives. Many such resources have been identified in archival sources and maps, although few have been formally inventoried or even verified on the ground by cultural resource professionals.</td>
<td>This section does not accurately reflect the information contained in BPA's Cultural Resources Report regarding eligible and potentially eligible sites within the APE for the preferred project route. It also indicates that Section 106 compliance work was not initiated for any route except the proposed alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1487-025</td>
<td>&quot;In general the Proposed Action contains the least</td>
<td>It is not possible to generalize about the HCP for this watershed in April 2000, and any harvest of trees, and/or placement of wood, in streams or on the land, would be undertaken with the permission of the landowner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1487-026</td>
<td>&quot;In general the Proposed Action contains the least</td>
<td>No new fish culverts would need to be installed for the proposed project. However, BPA has agreed to correct problems associated with three existing culverts on its Raver-Echo Lake ROW, immediately adjacent to the proposed ROW. Prior to doing so, BPA would obtain the appropriate permits from the Army Corps of Engineers and will ensure that they meet the current Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife design criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1487-013, -014, -015, -016, and -017 No new fish culverts would need to be installed for the proposed project. However, BPA has agreed to correct problems associated with three existing culverts on its Raver-Echo Lake ROW, immediately adjacent to the proposed ROW. Prior to doing so, BPA would obtain the appropriate permits from the Army Corps of Engineers and will ensure that they meet the current Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife design criteria.

1487-018 and -019 Pursuant to tentative agreements reached with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife, through a biological consultation, and negotiations with the City of Seattle, BPA has agreed to purchase several tracts of land, to permanently protect those lands from development, and to allow them to be managed as wildlife habitat and for conservation purposes. See response to Comment 340-002.

1487-020 and -021 BPA is acquiring easement rights for access roads and the transmission line right-of-way, and does not have the authority to grant access to others. Anyone wanting to access private property must seek the permission of the underlying fee owner.

1487-022 and -023 HRA performed a thorough survey of the preferred route and located a logging feature and a trench feature, neither of which appears to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The contractor has conducted further work at the trench feature, at the request of OAH and the Muckleshoot Tribe. They found nothing significant. HRA preformed background research and viewed the routes of the other alternatives to provide a professional opinion of their sensitivity for containing cultural resources.

1487-024 and -025 BPA will conduct a cultural resource assessment of proposed access roads off the previously surveyed ROW and will also survey the proposed staging areas if the areas have not been previously disturbed.
number of culturally sensitive areas of all alternatives, with much of the route situated on moderate to steep slopes and with no cultural resource sites (formally inventoried or identified by archival research) occurring on or within its proposed ROW.

probability (for archaeological discovery) rating for this extensive linear route. While 2/3 of the lands within the proposed ROW may be steep slopes, 1/3 should be considered to have a high probability for cultural resources. The last sentence is incorrect, as at least two NR eligible or potentially eligible properties were identified within the ROW. (Ref MTI letters to BPA of 2/3 and 2/13/03)

1487-028 and -029 Comment on springs and other environmental features noted. BPA is not required to conduct detailed cultural resource surveys of all alternative routes.

1487-030 and -031 Comment noted. Construction of the preferred alternative would not adversely affect the CRPT.
The cultural resources assessment concluded that construction of the preferred alternative should not adversely affect the CRPT and that there were no other traditional cultural resources that would be affected.

Comment noted.

Construction of the preferred alternative is not expected to result in adverse effects to the CRPT.

It is unclear from the comment precisely what disproportionate impacts the writer is referring to. As stated above, the proposed alignment does not actually touch any land currently owned by the Muckleshoot Tribe. BPA also believes whatever Treaty rights the Tribe has now, before the proposed project would be implemented, will remain intact. As far as BPA can tell, the highest percentage of population of Native Americans (including all Native Americans, Eskimo and Aleut) that would be affected by any of the five alternatives is 1.07 percent (Alternatives B and D) of the affected population. Overall, as far as we can tell from the census data, the social and ethnic makeup of those persons most directly affected by the preferred alternative, those in greatest proximity to the project, are above-average income, non-minorities. In fact, the area has relatively few residences or businesses, and is more rural, or forested in nature than urbanized. The project is not located in an area inhabited by the underprivileged or minority populations. The project is not intended to benefit one segment of the population, or specific community, as a regional electrical distributor will benefit the general population of King County, the City of Seattle, and western Canada. As such, we believe the Tribe would share in the benefit of the project, as would the general population as a whole.

The cultural resources assessment stated that the proposed project would not adversely affect three previously identified resources located within the APE and proposed for listing in the National Register: the Cedar River Pack Trail; the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul, and Pacific Railroad right-of-way; and the Cedar River Cultural Landscape District.
BPA agrees that as a federal agency, we have a general trust responsibility. As we have indicated in our negotiations with the Tribe, we want to continue to try to address concerns raised by the tribe, and will do so as long as those concerns are consistent with our other statutory duties and obligations.

The cultural resources assessment did not identify any cultural resources and use areas that would be adversely affected by the construction of the preferred alternative.

See response to Comment Letter 405.

Fawning and calving season for deer and elk occurs from March to June. If the decision is made to build Alternative 1, construction would begin in August, after the fawning and calving season has ended.
1487-046 and -047 BPA will continue to work with SPU and the Muckleshoot Tribe to develop a specific plan that meets the needs of all parties interested in providing forage plants while protecting the safety of the transmission line, should BPA decide to build Alternative 1.

1487-048 and -049 BPA is interested in reviewing MIT's study. BPA uses relevant information in developing vegetation management plans for BPA's ROWs. The MIT's suggestions for high quality deer and elk forage on BPA's ROWs are important input to the vegetation management process and will be studied. BPA will work with relevant parties to determine the best vegetation management plans.

1487-050 See response to Comment 1485-009 and 1487-006.
BPA should adopt and implement an aggressive vegetation management program to limit colonization by non-native species regardless of whether or not such a program is also being carried out by adjoining landowners. The disturbance caused by the transmission line ROW is often the agent that allows the invasive species into an area. We believe BPA should take responsibility to keep all ROW’s clear of noxious weeds.

See response to Comment 1487-051.

BPA has maps of fee-owned property and does take full responsibility for the control of noxious weeds on fee-owned property. However, as stated above under Comment 1487-051, if the surrounding landowners are not treating or trying to control the noxious weeds on their property, it may not be feasible or cost effective for BPA to do so. BPA would work with adjoining landowners where possible to gain control over noxious weeds in the area. BPA would like to work with the Muckleshoot Tribe to identify those areas that would result in the greatest benefit to treat.

See revised Map 9.

BPA (Snohomish Region) over the last 2 or 3 years has taken an active role in reducing the spread of noxious weeds, primarily Scotch broom. When soil is disturbed during vegetation maintenance activities we typically use grass seed on the disturbed areas. This is a direct result of a request to do so by the Muckleshoot Tribe. The State and County Weed Boards do not require the eradication of Scotch broom. It may not be feasible or cost effective to treat all areas if the surrounding landowners do nothing. Because of budget constraints, BPA needs to choose the potential areas, in consultation with tribes and landowners, where the desired results can be achieved.

See response to Comment 1487-055 and -056. BPA is proposing to acquire land for compensatory mitigation for these impacts. See response to Comment 340-002.

See response to Comment 1487-058.
Groups and Individuals
Chapter 3 — Comments and Responses - SDEIS

1389-001 BPA apologizes for the disruption that this project has caused to landowners along the proposed route alternatives. Although the SDEIS identified the preferred route, route Alternatives A-D remain under consideration. The Record of Decision, which is expected in August 2003, will identify whether BPA has decided to proceed with the non-transmission alternative, no-action alternative, or identify which route has been selected for the construction alternative. We cannot provide advice to you regarding disclosure laws.

1390-001 and -002 Comment Noted.

1390-003 and -004 Construction noise is typically exempt from noise ordinances because they are temporary impacts, but BPA would try to keep noise to a minimum. Please see Sections 4.13 and 4.14 of the SDEIS. BPA would use best management practices to hold down dust and minimize air pollutants.

1390-005 Please see response to Comment 340-002.
1391-001 Comment noted.

1392-001 Comment noted.

My wife and I live in North Bend close to the watershed area and we would not want any harm to come to that pristine area, however, it seems the most sense to add the additional power site there. We are in favor of your preferred route, Alternative A.

Dr. and Mrs. Alan Bryant
26326 42nd Way SE
North Bend, WA
Chapter 3 — Comments and Responses - SDEIS

1393-001, -002, and -003  Please see response to Comments 1390-003 and -004.

1393-004  Comment noted.
Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

"I'd Like to Tell You ...

1. Please have your environmental studies look at

2. I need more information about

3. I have these other comments: "Put the lines through the waterfall.

☐ Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mailing list if you have received mailed notice.)

Name: [Name]
Address: [Address]
E-Mail Address: [E-Mail Address]

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:
Bonnieville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - KC
P.O. Box 12999
Portland, OR 97213

1394-001  Comment noted.
Kangleay - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

“I’d Like to Tell You…”

1. Please have your environmental studies look at:

2. I need more information about:

3. I have these other comments:

---

BPA will compensate landowners fair market value for the land rights needed for the Kangleay-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project. We apologize for the disruption that this project has caused to other landowners impacted by the proposed project.
Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project
“*I'd Like to Tell You...*”

1. Please have your environmental studies look at...

   JAN 28, 2023

2. I need more information about...

3. I have these other comments:
   I live in Waterwood East and
   I have trouble in my back yard; I do not
   want more in my back yard.

☐ Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mailing list if you have received mailed notice.)

Name: SAM FELD
Address: 1931 S. 28TH ST., Kent, WA 98032
E-Mail Address:

1396-001 Comment noted.
Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

"I'd Like to Tell You:"

1. Please have your environmental studies look at

2. I need more information about

3. I have the following comments

   [Handwritten text:] Good job & good line. You name the best route and this is all I can say. Existing power transmission lines through water sheds.

   [Signature: Dan Gibson] 3131-3274 Way SE
   [Signature: Raven Dale]

 Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mail list if you have received this notice.)

 Name ____________________________
 Address __________________________
 E-Mail Address ______________________

 Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:

 Bonneville Power Administration
 Public Affairs Office - KC
 P.O. Box 12299
 Portland, OR 97212

1398-001 Comment noted.
We agree with your choice
of Alternative 1. This is the
most logical and safe choice.

Name: Eric / Judy Benton
Address: PO Box 614, Ravensdale, WA 98051

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003.
Our understanding is that Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) is constructing a water purification plant, not a water filtration plant at Lake Youngs. The water purification plant involves using ultraviolet light to purify drinking water at this location. We understand that the plant has been designed to be compatible with a water filtration plant, should SPU ever add such a facility in the future.
Chapter 3 — Comments and Responses - SDBIS

1401-001 Comment noted.

1401-002 Comment noted.

Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

"I'd Like to Tell You ..."

1. Please have your environmental studies look at

2. I need more information about

3. I have other comments. I am a lifetime member of the Serra Club and a Structural Engineer. Anybody that looked at the topo map would have seen the project has almost no impact on Cedar River water quality. I say go ahead and build the line using good construction practices to minimize any run-off during construction.

Name: Robert Harn
Address: 4007 39th SW Seattle, WA 98126

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - KC
P.O. Box 12999
Portland, OR 97212
Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

"I'd Like to Tell You..."

1. Please have your environmental studies look at

2. I need more information about

3. I have these other comments: From the line that the erected, it appears it will disrupt many homes and disrupt family

☐ Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mail list if you have received mailed notice.)

Name: Walter & Evelyn Miller
Address: 27233 SE 208th St.
Maple Valley, WA 98038
E-Mail Address:

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office, Inc.
P.O. Box 12099
Portland, OR 97212

1402-001 Comment noted.
For the protection of aquatic species, no in-water work is proposed for constructing the Raging River crossing. If in-water work is required, US Army Corps of Engineers-approved in-water work windows for the Raging River would be adhered to (no work from July 1st - September 15th) for the protection of salmonid species. Furthermore, the floodplain of the Raging River is about 180 feet below the surrounding plateau from which the conductor wire would be strung. This feature will enable the conductor to be strung without the removal or trimming of trees within the floodplain of the river, thus avoiding potential affects to the aquatic and terrestrial habitats that could occur if work was performed within the riparian area associated with the Raging River.
1404-001 Comment noted.

1404-002 The final decision will be made by BPA's Administrator in a Record of Decision. People on the project mailing list will be sent notice of the decision.

1404-003, -004, -005, and -006 Comment noted.
Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

"I'd Like to Tell You ..."

1. Please have your environmental studies look at

2. I need more information about

3. I have these other comments: We agree with Alternative 1.
   Thank you.

☐ Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mailing list if you have received a mailed notice.)

Name: Sara Donnan & Darrel Nash
Address: 21667 220 Pl SE Maple Valley WA 98038
E-Mail Address: 

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - P.O. Box 12999
Portland, OR 97212

1405-001 Comment noted.
Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

"I'd Like to Tell You..."

1. Please have your environmental studies look at

2. I need more information about

3. I have these other comments

The BPA's current SEPA is the right result environmentally and from a social cost perspective. It makes no sense to run the line outside the reservoir.

☐ Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mail list if you have received a mailed notice.)

Name: Angela Pierson

Address: 10213 West 167th Street, Kirkwood, Missouri 63122

E-Mail Address:

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office, P.O. Box 1700
Portland, OR 97207

1406-001 Comment noted.
In response to your January 14, 2003 letter, my comment pertains to the adequacy of your route information. The map scale is so small that it is not possible to precisely determine the route i.e. you are only illustrating wide corridors. Without the exact location within the corridor, it is difficult to evaluate the impact on residents, wetlands, etc.

Alain Cornell
29270 168th Ave. SE
Kent, WA 98032
Alain@nsco.com

---

Hello, my name is Danica Wetland and I continue to receive information on the Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project in the mail. However, I cannot tell by the map that you have sent me and the map on your website, if this proposal would affect my property. I reside at 16722 SE Kent-Kangley Road. Can you please let me know if this information is being sent to me as a community member or if this proposal will actually affect my property.

Danica Wetland
Wk (425)2977-0977

---

As principal of Grass Lake Elementary in the area possibly affected by the addition of power lines, I wish to express my deepest concern regarding the impact on our children and families. Notwithstanding the unknown physical harm this project may have on us, I am also concerned about the height of the power standards. My understanding is that they could double or triple in height. I have visions of an earthquake toppling these standards and then falling onto our school grounds. We are directly next to the current power standards.

Please reconsider the placement of any additional power lines/poles to an area not adjacent to our school.

Thank you

Linda Wagner, Principal
Grass Lake Elementary
28700 151st Place S.E.
Kent, WA 98032
(253) 373-7661
Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

"I'd Like to Tell You..."

1. Please have your environmental studies look at:  
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)

2. I need more information about:  
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)
   (Allow two weeks for this step)

3. I have these other comments:  
   Mitigation for the transmission line should include the conservation of riparianlands adjacent to 
   the Columbia River (selected to support the existing 
   protected area).

☐ Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mail list if you have received mailed notice.)

Name:      Paul R. Johnson
Address:   4132 16th Drive
           Seattle, WA 98104

E-Mail Address:

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:
Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - 5C
P.O. Box 10999
Portland, OR 97218

1410-001, -002, and -003 Please see response to Comment 340-002.
Chapter 3 — Comments and Responses - SDEIS

1411-001 Renewable generation such as wind and solar were not considered for this study because their resource characteristics are a poor match for BPA's needs to defer this project. Wind energy was excluded because the Puget Sound Area is not home to a commercial-grade wind resource. Solar was excluded because the critical hours occur during the winter months when solar radiation is scarce, and many of the target hours occur during the evening. Please see Appendix J, Section 5.3.6.

Comment noted.
BPA has sent you maps indicating that your property lies over a mile east of Alternative C.
Chapter 3 — Comments and Responses - SDBIS

1413-001, -002, and -003  Comment noted.
We will not be able to attend the public meetings you will have regarding the SDEIS for Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Line. We wanted to support your decision to build the power line next to the existing one inside the Cedar River Watershed, instead of the neighborhoods of Maple Valley.

Thank you

Ron and Kathy Ryan
26631 SE 237th St.
Maple Valley, WA 98038
425-432-2673
I am writing to make known my extreme concern about the proposed powerline to be constructed. Such a move should not happen until conservation and other electrical systems have been fully explored.

If a powerline is to be constructed, then BPA must mitigate any new or expanded corridor by acquiring and protecting nearby forestland including:

- 400 acres along Raging River near Highway 18, and
- 600 acres near the Cedar River (Section 25, owned by Plum Creek Timber Co., and subdivided for development)

This mitigation MUST be done with BPA funds, not with Land and Water Conservation Fund, or Forest Legacy money, as BPA has suggested.

On any powerlines constructed I believe that BPA should raise the height of the lines and minimize width of any corridors over the Raging & Cedar Rivers to protect riparian forests.

There should be NO NEW ROADS! If towers are to be installed, it should happen with helicopters.

A continual program for removal of non-native plants growing in the newly deforested areas must be implemented.

Thank you.

Alyson Schier
4170 180th Avenue SE
Fall City, WA 98024
425-222-4898

Please see response to Comment 349-001.

Please see responses to Comments 340-002 and 1489-001 regarding BPA's easements on property transferred to the City of Seattle and others.

BPA would use its own funds to purchase additional properties. BPA would likely be purchasing more than is needed for mitigation. Agencies interested in those remaining parcels with conservation easements or deed restrictions could use any of their own funds including Land and Water Conservation Funds or Forest Legacy money.

Because the Cedar River is a drinking water source and has potential fish habitat, our Preferred Alternative crosses the Cedar River using double-circuit towers on the existing ROW, thus minimizing clearing across the Cedar River. The double-circuit towers will cost $2 million. BPA looked at this possibility at the Raging River crossing. Because the Raging River is not a drinking water source we determined that the cost was too high for the benefit. We will mitigate and will consider topping trees, if feasible, instead of complete removal across the Raging River.

BPA is proposing constructing the line with helicopters. However, there is work that needs to be done that requires access roads. Most of the roads that would be used are existing roads, with only new spur roads needed to the new tower sites. BPA does need access to each tower for maintenance also.

Please see response to Comment 382-017.
BPA Communications
DM-7 P.O. Box 12999
Portland, OR 97212

Seattlemen,

Please build the proposed Kiggins Lake Transmission Line next to the existing one inside the Cedar River Watershed. The alternative route should be a deviation to keep low line and home.

Thank you,

Walter Miller

Copy sent to:

State Representative
5th Legislative District

Cheryl Cypherg

1416-001 Comment noted.
Chapter 3 — Comments and Responses - SDEIS

1418-001 BPA's analyzed several alternatives inside and outside of the Cedar River Municipal Watershed. Alternative A would rebuild BPA's existing Covington to Maple Valley 230-kV transmission line to a double-circuit 500-kilovolt (kV) line. The new towers would be about 175-ft. tall. The new 500-kV line would be constructed on existing right-of-way. Each end of the new line would be connected to existing unused 500-kV circuits such that the new line would be connected to the Raver and Echo Lake Substations. The northern vacant circuit would need to be connected to Echo Lake Substation with a short line on BPA property. BPA preferred transmission route is Alternative 1, which would construct a new single-circuit 500-kV transmission line across the Cedar River Municipal Watershed. The project map is posted on the Transmission Business Line Web site, www.transmission.bpa.gov/projects. If you need a more detailed map, BPA can send one to you in the mail.

1417-001 This property is located along Alternatives B and D. Although the SDEIS identified the preferred route, Alternatives A-D remain under consideration. The Record of Decision, which is expected in August 2003, will identify whether BPA has decided to proceed with the non-transmission alternative, no-action alternative, or identify which route has been selected for the construction alternative.

Kuehn, Ginny - DM-7
From: rhodynut@netzero.net
Sent: Monday, February 03, 2003 2:30 PM
To: comment@bpa.gov
Subject: T-DITT-2

I continue to support BPA's preferred route, Alternative 1, which parallels an existing BPA transmission line through the Cedar River Municipal Watershed. Thank you for considering my previous input and continuing to keep me informed of this project progress.

Jan Bailey
2333 26th Ave SE
Maple Valley, WA 98038

1419-001 Comment noted.
I am very concerned about the proposed Kangley/Echo Lake Transmission Line also known as the Raging Cedar Powerline for the impacts this project will cause on the Cedar and Raging Cedar valleys. These are my concerns:

1) Is the project necessary? BPA states that the new line is needed to accommodate electrical growth and reliability concerns in the Puget Sound Area. As for growth, I request that BPA pursue an aggressive conservation campaign before building a new powerline. Puget Sound residents, more than just about any other in the country, understand the need for conserving energy, and will do it if educated and asked to. And as for reliability concerns, I ask BPA to pursue electrical system changes to the best of its ability and the existing system's capability.

2) If BPA does build a new corridor or expand an existing one, it's imperative that it mitigates for the environmental impacts. BPA should acquire and protect nearby forestland including 400 acres along the Raging River near Highway 18, and 600 acres near the Cedar River that is Section 25, owned by Plum Creek Timber Co, and currently subdivided for development. In order to pay for necessary mitigation, BPA needs to use its own funds, and not those of the Land and Water Conservation Fund or Forest Legacy money. If BPA decides that it can't afford mitigation, then it shouldn't proceed with the project. BPA does build a new line, I request the following: raise line height and minimize the corridor width over the Raging and Cedar Rivers to protect riparian forests; do not build any new roads, and install towers with helicopters; and replace invasive plant species such as Scotch broom and blackberry with native vegetation in rights of way.

4) As for where to build the line, I request that BPA doesn't build it in the Cedar River Watershed. This 90,000-acre watershed provides low elevation forest habitat for wildlife, something that is being gobbled up by ever-increasing development in the greater Seattle area. The watershed has been logged in the past, but the City of Seattle has taken progressive steps to rectify the past damage by prohibiting further logging, thereby ensuring a continued and reliable source of clean drinking water. I don't see how clearing cutting a swath of mature forests, erecting electrical towers and stringing power cables will do anything to preserve wildlife habitat and clean water.

Thank you

Sincerely, Chris Gulick

1423-001 Comment noted.

1423-002 The project is necessary in order to reliably meet electric demands in the Puget Sound Area during extreme cold weather. BPA has supported conservation programs in the region for many years. Nevertheless, it is clear that conserving enough power to delay the project is not possible. See Section 2.2.9 and Appendix J of the SDEIS. See also response to Comment 1421-032-003. Further comments noted.

1423-003 and -004 Please see responses for Comments 1415-003, -004 and -005.

1423-005, -006, -007, and -008 BPA would use the existing right-of-way for the existing 500-kV line by using double-circuit structures to cross the Cedar River, such that no clearing needs to take place within the Cedar River canyon. BPA would use care to minimize clearing at the Raging River crossing. To raise structures would impose a reliability hazard for BPA because the new line could potentially fall into the existing line. The current design would prevent that. Also, taller structures may present a hazard to flying aircraft and may require special paint and lights. BPA will concentrate on clearing techniques and encouraging low-growing vegetation along the Raging River and associated creeks. BPA is studying how best to take care of noxious weeds such as Scotch broom. BPA has programs in place to take care of Scotch broom with machine cutting and herbicides. Chemicals cannot be used in the Cedar River Watershed, so BPA would use other means to try to control these invasive plants. BPA is working with the city, county and tribes to determine the seed mixtures to use to meet their needs. Some new roads would be needed so that some existing roads that currently go through wetlands can be removed. Short spur roads will be needed for access to individual tower sites.

1423-009, -010, and -011 Comment noted.
This is my 3rd time attending such a hearing. I was hoping we would not have to get into a seemingly indefinite battle, but here we are.

This is about a pristine forest, the Cedar River Watershed, which serves the City of Seattle and surrounding areas, and which is one of only a few in the entire United States that is so clean it needs no filtration system other than what nature has provided.

This is also about whether it is indicated in the provided documentation by the BPA or not, about an energy debacle brought about by deregulation and the subsequent opportunistic energy fraud perpetrated by Enron and other companies. We were told there was a shortage (which was manufactured), and that therefore we need to upgrade our power grid.

We are still being told this. I have not forgotten about Enron and the way they scammed the entire Western United States. Evidently others have forgotten. I hope you haven’t.

Because of this ongoing perpetuated threat of having our lights, our heat, and our dialysis machines suddenly turned off, we are supposed to throw our entire concept of environmental stewardship out the door. We are supposed to be concerned now about energy shortages and “national security” more than we are about clean water.

If polluted water, the loss of entire species of salmon and other fish, the loss of habitat for numerous other species, further degradation of a fast disappearing forest, and the insult to the people that hunted and fished there before we came is not a threat to our national identity, and our national pride, then what is it? A simple inconvenience? Is it progress?

I don’t buy that. Please don’t try to blackmail us with threats of blackouts. That is exactly what Enron and the rest of those corrupt corporations were telling us. We need to hear the truth.

The BPA needs to stop thinking about cheap and easy. They need to think about management, and about respect for the concerns of the majority of us who depend upon this water, this watershed, and who love this area.

By the way, BPA employees and their subcontractors are being paid money to come in and gouge another swath out of our watershed. Those of us such as myself, who go there to restore it, to repair the damage, do NOT GET PAID. We do it for free, because we give a damn!

Thank you.

1423-001 and -002 Comment noted.

1424-003 Comment noted.

1424-004 and -005 Comment noted.

1424-006, -007, and -008 Comment noted.

1424-009, -010, and -011 The risk of blackouts is real. On August 10, 1996, a transmission outage on the BPA system blacked out 7.5 million customers up and down the west coast. BPA is working to make sure that does not happen again. Comments noted.

1424-012 and -013 Comment noted.
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Biodiversity Northwest

Protecting and restoring forests of the Pacific Northwest

BPA

Communications – KC-7

PO Box 12999

Portland, Oregon 97212

Subject: Comments on Kangley Echo-Lake Fever Lake Project

1425-001

See response to Comment 1421-038.

1425-002

See response to Comment 1421-038.

1425-003

See response to Comment 1421-038.

1425-004

See response to Comment 1421-038.

1425-005

See response to Comment 1421-038.

1425-006

See response to Comment 1421-032-003.

1425-007

The consultants developed a comprehensive study of non-transmission alternatives that was not compromised by the time available to complete the analysis. See responses to comments 1421-038-004, -005 and -006. They found that "A high level of load reduction or additional generation is required to defer KEL. (Appendix J, Section 1.2)" See response to Comment 1421-032-003. The immediacy of the problem makes achieving this large amount of demand reduction even less feasible.
1426-001  See response to Comment 1421-039-002.

1426-002, -003, and -004  BPA would propose to make it such that some roads within the existing right-of-way could no longer be used. Those roads go through wetlands. In addition, BPA would work with the city of Seattle to see about removing from service other roads for the benefit of Seattle and BPA. Also see responses to Comment 1415-003, -004 and -005 concerning purchasing other lands.

1426-005 and -006  See responses to Comments 1415-003, -004 and -005. BPA would use its own funds.

1426-007, -008, and -090  BPA would use helicopters and other techniques to minimize disturbance to soils. Trees cut may be left inside wetlands to provide for wildlife cover and to minimize disturbance to the ground. Low-growing vegetation would be allowed to grow adjacent to and near streams. No clearing would take place inside the Cedar River canyon.
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1427-001 Other than the concerns about Seattle’s drinking water, there would be no direct impacts to people within the CRW. One to two homes may be removed outside the CRW. There would be visual impacts in the Kangley/Selleck area and to those people traveling inside the CRW.

1427-002 and -003 Comment noted.
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Telephone comment by Ginny Kuehn
02/06/2003

Katie Saylor
3209 SE 44th St.
Fall City, WA 98074
(425) 222-1715

1428-001

Suggestion to - instead of cutting new swath through the Cedar River Watershed double-up your lines on the existing towers.

Kuehn, Ginny - DM-7

From:  Joel Szolak [joels@cedarriver.org]
Sent:  Friday, February 07, 2003 1:01 PM
To:  comment@bpa.gov
Subject: Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Project

Please extend the comment period for this project by at least 30 days. More time is needed for the public to read and digest the entire 1600 page EIS, and review the study on the Non-Transmission alternative.

Thank you for your consideration.

Joel P. Szolak
Executive Director
Friends of the Cedar River Watershed
6512 23rd Avenue NW #201
Seattle, WA 98117
(206) 297-2441
f (206) 297-5142

1431-001

Due to the very tight schedule, BPA will not extend the comment period.

Kuehn, Ginny - DM-7

From:  MARGE CHISBUS [mchisbus@attbi.com]
Sent:  Sunday, February 09, 2003 1:54 PM
To:  comment@bpa.gov
Subject: alternate C

Dear Sir / Madame of BPA
We are very much opposed to the alternate C, and feel along with many others it should be going through the water shed like proposed a couple of years ago. This whole thing has put us on "hold" for many months now in regards to selling our property. As soon as the votes are counted we NEED a written statement from RP saying they are not using alternate C which would then take our property at:
28513 SE 236th St
Maple Valley, WA 98038
425-413-8867
mchisbus@attbi.com
Thank you for your time reading this.

1432-001

Comment noted.

1432-002

Comment noted.
1433-001 and -002 We have already undertaken our environmental review of sensitive areas such as streams and wetlands, and have published this information in the SDEIS. BPA's first priority in designing its facilities is to avoid where we can, span where we can't avoid, and mitigate for those sensitive areas that cannot be spanned. However, if BPA selects any other alternative other than Alternative 1, additional environmental work would be necessary, primarily surveys.

1433-003 Comment noted.

1433-004 and -005 Comment noted.
Mr. Lou Driessen
BPA
Communications KC-7
P.O. Box 12999
Portland, OR 97212

Re: Kangley/Echo Lake Transmission Line

Dear Mr. Driessen:

In regards to the Kangley/Echo Lake Transmission Line, also known as the Raging Cedar Powerline for the impacts this project will cause on the Cedar and Raging River valleys, I have the following comments:

1) Is this project necessary? BPA states that the new line is needed to accommodate electrical growth and reliability concerns in the Puget Sound area. As for growth, I request that BPA pursue an aggressive conservation campaign before building a new powerline. Puget Sound residents, more than just about any other in the country, understand the need for conserving energy, and will do it if educated and asked to. And as for reliability concerns, I ask BPA to pursue electrical system changes to the best of its ability and the existing system’s capability.

2) If BPA does build a new corridor or expand an existing one, it’s imperative that it mitigates for the environmental impacts. BPA should acquire and protect nearby forestland including 400 acres along the Raging River near Highway 18, and 600 acres near the Cedar River that is Section 26, owned by Plum Creek Timber Co. and currently subdivided for development. In order to pay for necessary mitigation, BPA needs to use its own funds, and not those of the Land and Water Conservation Fund or Forest Legacy money. If BPA decides that it can’t afford mitigation, then it shouldn’t proceed with the project.

3) If BPA does build a new line, I request the following: raise line height; and minimize the corridor width over the Raging and Cedar Rivers to protect riparian forests; do not build any new roads, and install towers with helicopters; and replace invasive plant species such as Scotch broom and blackberry with native vegetation in rights of way.

4) As for where to build the line, I request that BPA doesn’t build it in the Cedar River Watershed. This 50,000-acre watershed provides low elevation forest habitat for wildlife, something that is being gobbed up by ever-increasing development in the greater Seattle area. The watershed has been logged in the past, but the City of Seattle has taken progressive steps to rectify the past damage by prohibiting further logging, thereby ensuring a continued and reliable source of clean drinking water. I don’t see how clearcutting a swath of mature forests, erecting electrical towers and stringing power cables will do anything to preserve wildlife habitat and clean water.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Amy Guilick
Bonneville Power Administration

Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

"I'd Like to Tell You..."

1. Please have your environmental studies look at bright balls on all of your power lines, including the high voltage lines, it's hard to see, so pilots can see them all easily.

   Thanks from retired trucker who has lots of gear

   mark flying, QD. It's very important.

2. I need more information about using flying QD I'm very important

3. I have these other comments:

   Have a good day!

   [Signature]

   [Date]

   Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mailing list if you have received mailed notice.)

   Name: Mark A. Starr
   Address: 4938 S.E. 149th Pl., North, WA 98133
   E-mail Address: SSTAR@Microsoft.com

   Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:

   Bonneville Power Administration
   Public Affairs Office - MC
   P.O. Box 1999
   Portland, OR 97207

1436-001 BPA will work with the FAA to determine spans that need to be marked for safety.
Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

I'd Like to Tell You...

1. Please have your environmental studies look at

2. I need more information about

3. I have these other comments: We believe the preferred (alternative) is the best choice with the least amount of impact to the surrounding communities and environment. Utilizing the existing right of way requires the least amount of new property being disturbed.

We live in the Echo Lake (2) development.

☐ Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mailing list if you have received a mailed notice.)

Name: TERRY B. HENRIK MIOSHIN
Address: 22828-2272 Ave SE 98438

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - RC
V.O. Box 10999
Portland, OR 97212
Some folks have talked about sediments running into the Cedar River from the BPA construction activity. To me this idea makes no sense. What is the distance from the river to the closest transmission tower? I thought I heard 1,000 feet. According to the SDEIS, the total cleared area for each tower is 40 square feet. How can a 40 square foot area, located a distance of 1,000 feet from the river, cause any measurable sedimentation in the river? The banks of a river have a far greater potential of causing sediments to flow into the river than two 40 square foot cleared areas 1,000 feet from the river.

SPU has trashed the Cedar River Watershed, now they want to trash my backyard (Alt. C).

As part of preferred alternative I has the BPA looked at decommissioning existing gravel roads in the CRW. Alternative I requires 91 acres of cutting trees for the new right of way. The BPA would decommission 91 acres of logging road. Ninety one acres of road would equate to 21.4 miles of logging road (assuming a 35 foot road cut).

As part of preferred alternative I has the BPA looked at purchasing adjacent parcels for mitigation.

Jon Zulk
PO Box 351
Hobart, WA 98025

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

BPA is in discussions with Seattle about the possibility of decommissioning some roads outside the rights-of-way. Some existing roads inside the existing right-of-way would be made such that people can no longer travel across them. Those particular roads would be replaced with new roads because the existing roads go through wetlands. BPA has purchased 350 acres of land immediately north of the watershed and is looking at the possibility of purchasing more lands.

See response to Comment 340-002.
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Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

"I'd Like to Tell You..."

1. Please have your environmental studies look at

2. I need more information about

1439-001 Comment noted.
1439-002 Comment noted.
1439-003 Comment noted.
1439-004 Comment noted.
1439-005 Comment noted.
1439-006 Comment noted.
1439-007 Comment noted.
1439-008 Comment noted.
1439-009 Comment noted.
1439-010 Comment noted.
1. Please have your environmental studies look at the impact on the streams and wildlife and sides of the water shed for example. The trees on our farm—-fir, cedars, maples, hemlock—are much older than those that would be cleared in the water shed.

2. I need more information about the water shed.

3. I have these other comments: Our country is in crisis on many fronts right now. We should be energetically researching systems that would reduce our need for electricity. People might be more willing to conserve energy if they were charged a higher rate for power used that exceeded a reasonable amount.

Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mailing list if you have received mailed notice.)

Name: Sarah J. Tracy
Address: 

E-Mail Address: 

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - KE
P.O. Box 12999
Portland, OR 97212

1440-001, -002, and -003 BPA's environmental analysis that was recently completed and published in the SDEIS included analysis on four “build” alternatives outside of the Cedar River Municipal Watershed, Alternatives A, B, C and D.

1440-004 and -005 Comment noted.
1441-001 Comment noted.

1441-002, -003, and -004 Thank you for your comment. BPA will offer landowners fair market value for the land rights needed for this project. Please refer to the SDEIS, Section 4.11.2.5, Community Values and Concerns, Property Value Impact.
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1442-001 and -002 Comments noted.

1. Please have your environmental studies look at

2. I need more information about

3. I have these other comments

Attended the Feb 6 Meeting (2003)

- Take High School - Summary Comments

1. BPA is doing a good job representing plan of options.

2. Although I am obvious choice for the people of SE King County

3. If other option is selected, you will get a huge negative response and will cause further delay / added costs.

Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on this mail list if you have received mail notice.)

Name: [Redacted]
Address: 1403 S 78th St Kent, WA 98032
E-Mail Address: [Redacted]

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:
Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - RC
P.O. Box 12995
Portland, OR 97212
Chapter 3 — Comments and Responses - SDEIS

1443-001 Our environmental studies included Alternative C, both Options C1 and C2. Land use impacts would be high with both options, and the impacts to the visual resource would be moderate to high for those residents where the transmission line would be the dominant visual feature.

1443-002 BPA will offer landowners fair market value for the land rights needed for this project. See response to Comment 1441-002. If BPA needs to acquire land rights across your property, and you disagree with BPA's opinion of fair market value, BPA would be willing to review any additional market data that you may have, or review recent appraisals of your property. You may also choose to use the condemnation process, and have the courts establish Just Compensation for your property.

1443-003 and -004 Comments noted.
1. Please have your environmental studies look at ____________________________

2. I need more information about ____________________________

3. I have those other comments. My family has lived in the Pacific NW for 50 years. I favor the preferred Alternative No. 4 and would like to see no amount go to the city of Seattle and/or building of facilities for the City of Seattle. The decision should be made now and not delayed any longer as the new transmission lines when completed will save approximately $5K/year of energy costs.

Please put me on your project mailing list. (If you are already on the mailing list, if you have received mailed notice.)

Name: JOHN HUSON
Address: 20313 S.E. 243rd St. Maple Valley WA 98038

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - K-2
P.O. Box 12999
Portland, OR 97212

1444-001 and -002 Thank you for your comment and concern for BPA's financial situation. BPA is committed to mitigating the impacts caused by this project. Some of that mitigation may be to pay Seattle to offset the cost of right-of-way through the CRW.

1444-003 The preferred alternative would reduce losses by approximately 11 MW on peak.

Comment noted.

1444-004 Comment noted.
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1445-001, -002, and -003 Comments noted.

---

Bonneville Power Administration
Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

"I'd Like to Tell You . . ."

1. Please have your environmental studies look at

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2. I need more information about

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3. I have these other comments

1445-001

The effect on families living above the
existing community. The effect it will have
on people. These homes have value and
potential. How is residential area along
alternative A?

1445-002

1445-003

Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mailing list if you have received mailed notice.)

Name:

Address:

E-Mail Address:

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - KC
P.O. Box 12999
Portland, OR 97212

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:

FEB 1 2 2003
Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

"I'd Like to Tell You . . ."

1. Please have your environmental studies look at: [Redacted]

2. I need more information about: [Redacted]

3. I have these other comments: Keep out the power line project you have in mind. Take it elsewhere. Thank you.

[Redacted]

☐ Please put me on your mailing list if you have received mailed notice.

Name: R.T. Naylor
Address: P.O. Box 7399
Covington, WA 98042

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - A162
P.O. Box 15990
Portland, OR 97212

March 1, 2003

1448-001 Comment noted.
Kangling - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

"I'd Like to Tell You..."

1. Please have your environmental studies look at

2. I need more information about

3. I have these other comments: The route through the clear cut watershed is the correct route to utilize and has the least impact at all, the watershed has been logged for many years and the maximum clearing for the coulee is nothing compared to just clearcutting. I will accept cuts that are 8 feet wide. More prime feller where they desire forest. In fact, it made excess money norm at the time since no trees will eventually be replaced to break.

Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mailing list if you have received a mailed notice.)

Name: Wayne C. Sawyer
Address: 28307 170th St. NW, Covington, WA 98042
E-Mail Address: wayncovers@comcast.net

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - RC
P.O. Box 12099
Portland, OR 97212

1449-001 and -002 Comments noted.
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1450-001, -002, and -003 Comments noted.

1. Please have your environmental studies look at This is a joke, the groups... are not formed to protect people, they were formed to protect you to make deals. We buy almost... out of air/water, the water, food, air are toxic.

2. I need more information about __________

3. I have those other comments you better tell people the truth and cut the load. Cutting the trees in the... water shed, another transmission line etc etc... will just make you time for everyone. You passed the point of no return a long time ago. Deal with it. I am fighting the same issues for over 40 years. Denial of reality does not change reality.

[Box for putting me on your project mailing list, you are already on the list if you have received mailed notice]

Name: Carolyne DeVito
Address: 8441 36th Ave SE Seattle, WA 98196
E-Mail Address:

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:
Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - KC
PO Box 12999
Portland, OR 97299

Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project
“I'd Like to Tell You...” KELY 1-4-18
FEB 18 2019

1450-001

1450-002

1450-003
Chapter 3 — Comments and Responses - SDEIS

1451-001 Comments noted.

1451-004, -005, and -006 Each of the alternatives will impact residential properties either directly, by having to acquire land rights needed for new right-of-way, or indirectly, by constructing a new line adjacent to residential property. See response to Comment 1441-002.

1451-007 and -008 See response to Comment 1395-001.

1451-009 and -010 Comment noted.

1451-011 Comment noted.

1451-012, -013, and -014 Comment noted.

1451-015 Comment noted.

1451-016 Our environmental analysis looked at the long-term health impacts of the proposed transmission line and concluded that the impacts would be mostly no to low impacts, and a high impact for the No Action Alternative.

1451-017 The loss savings benefits go to consumers through their retail utility, but not to BPA. See response to Comment 1421-056-001. Also, all alternatives for this project result in lower losses ranging from 4 to 11 MW lower than without the project. Comment noted.
Kuehn, Ginny - DM-7

From: William Rogers (apriori@msn.com)
Sent: Wednesday, February 12, 2003 1:01 PM
To: command@bpa.gov
Subject: Kangley Echo Lake Transmission line

As a resident of Winterwood Estates I am writing to endorse the BPA proposal for the Kangley Echo Lake Transmission line to be installed over the Cedar River Watershed. This is the best proposal for power lines installation available. It will not affect property values or endanger schools near the present lines running through Winterwood Estates.

Thank You,
William T. & Sheryl-Hean Rogers
18610 S.E. 287TH St.
Kent, Wa. 98042-5425
256/831-1791

February 12, 2003
P.O. Box 259
Maple Valley, WA 98038

Bonneville Power Administration
Communications Office - KC-7
P.O. Box 12999
Portland, OR 97212

Re: Proposed Kangley/Echo Lake
500KV Transmission Line

Dear Sirs:

I believe the proposed route through the Cedar River watershed is the best one, especially considering the alternatives.

First, I think that Seattle's fears of their water supply becoming contaminated by silt run-off are unfounded. Was the water quality harmed when the first power line was constructed? And the chances of it happening are even more remote now with the use of modern, environmentally aware techniques such as the use of silt fences and employing helicopters to carry in much of the material.

Second, if the Seattle Water Dept. is so worried about their water supply being contaminated, why did they allow the construction of a fish ladder on the Cedar River at Landsburg Park? I would much prefer a little silt in my drinking water once than thousands of rotting salmon every year!

Third, the argument about disturbing the wildlife is ridiculous. The elk herds and deer have become so accustomed to people that they range freely through the Hobart-Maple Valley area. I have had to put up fencing to keep them out of our yard. And the demand for more land for "wildlife mitigation" is simply a land grab tactic.

The watershed route is the only sensible choice. Please do all that you can to avoid running it through populated areas. It will be to every one's advantage.

Sincerely,

Charles F. Stotts
**1454-001**

We must examine and be able to survive loss of a double circuit (allowed exceptions include the one span across the Cedar River). Alternative B puts the 500-kv line on a tower with the existing Rocky Reach-Maple Valley 345-kv line. The 345-kv line is not as strong a source as a 500-kv line, so the simultaneous loss of one 500-kv and one 345-kv is not traumatic. Also they go to different locations - we won’t lose two lines into Echo Lake Substation.

**1455-001 and -002** Comments noted.

**1455-003 and -004** Comments noted.

**1455-005 and -006** Our analysis looked at the impacts to the social environment as well as the natural environment for all project alternatives under consideration including Alternative A. A summary of these impacts is contained on Table 2-3 in the SDEIS.
As a resident of Winterwood Estates, we oppose Alternative B because of the impact it would have on our community. It would significantly affect property values because it would have an impact on our environment, especially with the loss of hundreds of trees. The current powerline runs adjacent to the Grass Lake Elementary School, and increased EMS would pose a health risk.

We encourage the NPA's proposal for the Kangley-Boho Lake Transmission Line Project over the Cedar River watershed, so the new line does not impact the Winterwood Estates residential area.

Thanks,
Mike & Judy Smith
28139 192 Pl. S.E.
Kent, WA 98042

1458-001, -002, and -003 Comments noted.

1458-004 Comment noted
We attended the public meeting held February 5th at the Maple Valley Community Center regarding the SDEIS and the proposed additional BPA transmission line through the Cedar River Watershed. We wish to express our thanks to BPA for preparing the SDEIS and holding public meetings throughout the area. That said, however, as long-time residents of the greater Maple Valley area, we still have deep reservations and concerns with this project. We don't want this additional transmission line in the Cedar River Watershed. It is a forest preserve and an additional transmission line would seriously damage this ecosystem and bring serious risks to the drinking water of so many in the Puget Sound area. We also don't wish to see an additional transmission line cut through the greater Maple Valley area and adversely affect our fellow residents.

We have reviewed the SDEIS and offer the following specific comments:

1. BPA fails to clearly demonstrate a need for an additional transmission line. It is not apparent BPA has done enough to increase conservation and reduce demand, especially during the peak power periods in question. BPA should pursue serious conservation and energy efficiency programs before building an additional transmission line.

2. BPA's Non-Transmission Alternative isn't comprehensive enough. It is not a feasible and legitimate alternative as it is required. We request a more thorough evaluation of a non-transmission approach.

3. BPA's risk analyses are not consistent across the board. When looking at worst-case events, such as a 1 in 20 year cold snap to "justify" the supposed need for an additional transmission line, any contamination to the Puget Sound and new water supply from the Cedar River Watershed leading to replacement and construction of water filtration plants should also be addressed in worst-case risk and cost analyses.

4. It is not apparent that double-circuiting of the transmission line through the Cedar River Watershed has been adequately addressed. What are the specific cost and risk analyses associated with such double-circuiting and how would they compare to the Preferred Alternative?

5. The 1961 Columbia River Treaty is touted as a reason for an additional transmission line. However, British Columbia is a power exporter. Power delivered to Canada over an additional transmission line most likely will be brought right back to California. BPA stated at the public meeting they have no authority to change the treaty. That understood, we believe that in the public interest it is prudent for BPA to explore with the proper Federal Authorities (who can affect changes to the treaty through negotiation) whether such arrangement with Canada might obviate or at least defer an additional transmission line. It is not apparent in the SDEIS that BPA has explored this approach in any meaningful way.

6. What specific mitigations is BPA proposing and committing to if and when an additional transmission line is built? BPA should protect other forest lands to offset the loss of forest from the Preferred Alternative's linear corridor through the Cedar River Watershed. Since there is little ancient forest for replacement of cutting mature forests, a multiple should be applied. The following nearly forest lands should be included: (1) 400 acres along Staging River near SR18 and (2) 600 acres near the Cedar River specifically, Section 25, owned by Plum Creek Timber Co., and regarded for development. This should be done with BPA funds, not with Land and Water Conservation Fund or Forest Legacy money, as BPA has suggested. This is BPA's mitigation for viewing the Puget Sound area's water supply and, therefore, BPA should pay with their own funds.

In summary, we request BPA thoroughly address a Non-Transmission Alternative backed by a serious conservation and energy efficiency program, one in which all Puget Sound area citizens and businesses will in the near term and the long term. In addition, we urge BPA to revise the project to reflect our concerns and those of many other Puget Sound area citizens and organizations. We received our comments herein be included in the public record. Thank you very much for your efforts.

From: Peter Rimbos [primbos@att.com]
Sent: Saturday, February 15, 2003 6:02 PM
To: comment@bpa.gov
Subject: BPA Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Line—SDEIS COMMENTS

Lou Diessman
BPA - KC/7
PO Box 12936
Portland, Oregon 97221

Mr. Diessman,

1459-001 Comments noted.
1459-002 and 003 Comments noted.
1459-004 and 005 See response to Comment 1423-002.
1459-006 See response to Comments 1421-032-002 and 003.
1459-007 and 008 BPA and Seattle recognize that the risk for causing more than two events of massive erosion to happen in one year during the construction phase is extremely unlikely. Although extremely small, the risk is still there. BPA would purchase insurance just in case for the cost of a turbidity filtration plant if one were needed to be constructed.

1459-009 Section 2.3.8 of the SDEIS examines the double-circuit alternative. The WECC Reliability Criteria (http://www.wecc.biz/documents/policy/WECC_Reliability_Criteria_802.pdf) does not permit exceptions for double-circuit towers but for short distances (e.g., river crossings). See page 28, Table I, Category C, Contingency 5 (Any two circuits of a multiple circuit powerline) and footnote g. BPA did a risk analysis for the WECC Reliability Probability Evaluation Work Group (RPEWG) to demonstrate acceptable performance for the proposed Kangley-Echo Lake line on a parallel right-of-way.

1459-010 See response to Comment 1421-031-001.
1459-011 Please see response to Comments 1415-003, 004 and 005.
1459-012 See response to Comments 1421-038-004 and 1421-032-003.

Comments are included in the public record.
1. Please have your environmental studies look at __________________________
   __________________________
   __________________________
   __________________________

2. I need more information about __________________________
   __________________________
   __________________________
   __________________________

3. I have these other comments: I support REA proposal for the Kangley Echo Lake Transmission Line Project over the Chena River Watershed.

   [Signature]
   Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mail list if you have received mailed notice.)

   Name: Denny, James
   Address: 1411 S.E. 28th St. Renton, WA 98058
   E-Mail Address:

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:
Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - RC
P.O. Box 12999
Portland, OR 97212

1460-001 Comment noted.
3-96
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1461-001 Comment noted.

1. Please have your environmental studies look at

2. I need more information about

3. I have those other comments: I would like to voice my support for the Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project to be installed over the Color River Watershed. It will have the least negative impact at this location.

1461-001 Comment noted.

☐ Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mailing list if you have received mailed notice.)

Name: Dale Wilson
Address: 58028, 194th Pl SE, Kent, WA 98042

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - RC
P.O. Box 13990
Portland, OR 97212
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Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

“I'd Like to Tell You…”

1. Please have your environmental studies look at ____________________________

2. I need more information about ____________________________

3. I have these other comments: I fully support BPA's proposal for the Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line project to be installed over the current water supply. This is the best alternative as it avoids the Gross Lake Elementary School. Thanks for coming to that solution.

1462-001 Comment noted.

1462-001

Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mail list if you have received mailed notice.)

Name: Glori E. Harmer
Address: 18521 NE SE, Camas, WA 98602
E-Mail Address: ________________

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:
Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - RC
P.O. Box 1299
Portland, OR 97207-1299
1. Please have your environmental studies look at.

2. I need more information about

3. I have these other comments

I support your proposal for the new Kangley Echo Lake Transmission lines to be installed over the Cedar River Watershed as this would have the least impact on neighborhoods, schools, and the environment.

I am concerned of the effects on people.

Thank you for your attention.

Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mailing list if you have received mailed notice.)

Name: Shirley J. Jones
Address: 32401 175 Ave SE, Kent, WA 98032
E-Mail Address:

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - RC
P.O. Box 12999
Portland, OR 97212
1465-001

---Original Message---
From: Stan Fuller [mailto:stan@siwa.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2003 8:23 AM
To: webmaster@epa.gov
Subject: re: Kanglely-Siho Lake Transmission Line Project

I am opposed to a increase in power lines going thru my residential area (Winterwood) I think it is better to go thru the water shed. Stan Fuller 19315 SE 264th, st. Kent, WA. 98032

STAN

1465-001 Comment noted.
1466-001 Comment noted.

1466-002 Comment noted.

1466-003 Comment noted.

1466-004 This item has been addressed in a letter to BPA dated March 3, 2003 and is summarized below. The Schultz-Raver No. 2 500-kV transmission line traverses east-west across the south end of the Foothills Water Assoc. (FWA) service area. The Raver-Echo Lake 500-kV transmission line extends to the north across the northwest corner of the FWA service area. The FWA’s well field is located about one block east of the current Raver-Echo Lake transmission line easement and abuts the south boundary of the Cedar River Watershed.

Alternative 1 extends about 3,800 feet through the FWA service area. Alternative A would tap into the Schultz-Raver No. 2 500-kV transmission line near the west boundary of the FWA service area and extend west in an existing transmission line ROW. If Alternative 1 or A is constructed, a relatively small portion of the existing area that the FWA currently serves will be impacted. These impacts will be limited in intensity and area and will be primarily temporary.

Potential impacts to the groundwater supplies are discussed in Appendices F, M and Y. It is unlikely that the FWA’s groundwater source will be impacted by the construction or operation of the transmission line; however, spills of fuel oil, lubricants or other hazardous materials could occur. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan that will include a hazardous materials spill response plan will be required to be in place during construction. These plans typically require vehicle fueling and storage, and storage of hazardous materials, to occur away from groundwater protection areas. This plan is intended to facilitate a rapid, appropriate response to reduce or eliminate potential impacts in the unlikely event that a hazardous material spill occurs.

1466-005 and -006 Please see response to Comments 1466-004.

1466-007 Routes 4A and 4B are still under consideration as are all of the alternatives analyzed in detail in the SDEIS.

PS. The names and numbers of some of the community groups and officials involved with this water system are listed below:

Washington DOD: Jim Nihon 253-395-6764 Bob James 253 395 6764
USRS: Vic Paquet 253 877 2881 Dave Demax 509-664-0239
Washington State Public Works Board - Jesse Brouillette 509 775 5009
King County CEDOG - Eric Juen 206 296 8906
The expected magnitudes of the electric and magnetic fields from the proposed Kangley–Echo Lake 500-kV line are described in Appendix E, Electrical Effects. As indicated in Appendix G, Assessment of Research Regarding EMF and Health, health effects research (through mid-2000) shows no convincing evidence that field levels associated with the proposed line cause harmful health effects. This conclusion represents the findings of numerous scientific review panels. Furthermore, regulatory organizations have stated that there are insufficient data to establish exposure limits based on long-term exposures to fields at the levels found near transmission lines.

Subsequent updates of the health assessment find that recent research findings have not altered the conclusion that there is no convincing evidence linking transmission line fields to adverse health effects. The latest assessment was prepared for the BPA Grand Coulee–Bell 500-kV project and includes research through May 2002 (see Appendix Z).

BPA must rely on assessments of known impacts and not on possible future findings. Epidemiological, cellular and animal research over several decades has not demonstrated a link between exposures to electric and magnetic fields from transmission lines with an adverse health effect. To speculate on the impacts of future legal proceedings arising from unidentified impacts is beyond the scope of the environmental process.

Comments noted.
Alternatives 2, 4A and 4B were located to avoid residences. Seattle does not want the transmission line to cross the CRW, but if it does, then only if it were parallel to the existing line to minimize impacts. That is the main reason for BPA choosing Alternative 1 as the preferred plan while recognizing that it could cause the removal of two homes.

See response to Comment 1395-001.
February 16, 2003

Bonneville Power Administration
Communications Office – KE-7
P.O. Box 12999
Portland, OR 97212

Reference: Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

Dear Sirs:

Please leave out my property for consideration of the new proposed location of your 500 Kilovolt transmission line. My property address is 19202 208th Avenue S.E. Renton, WA 98058

My husband and I built our home at the above address in 1954 and ’55. It has been my home all these years and I am very content here. The additional high voltage would impact the future sale of my property. Who would want to live under that? It is definitely a high-impact on the future land use. Please consider the alternatives in your final decision and let me live in peace as I have all these years. Thank you for the opportunity to express my request.

Sincerely,

Jewell Browning
19202 208th Ave. S.E.
Renton, WA 98058
(425) 422-0358

1469-001 Comment noted.

1469-002 Thank you for your comment. See response to Comment 1441-002.
1470-001 Comment noted.

1470-002 Comment noted.

1470-003 and -004 Comment noted.

1471-001 Comments noted.
1472-001 Comments noted.

1472-002 Comments noted.

1473-001 Comments noted.

1473-002 and -003 Comments noted.

1473-004 Comments noted.

As a concerned Westwood Estates homeowner, I would like to add my comments to those of 1472-001. The proposed transmission line would run across our property, which is valued at $180,000. I worry about the potential for future land use conflicts. The transmission line is a potential fire hazard. I am concerned about the potential for increased EMF exposure. The aesthetics of the proposed line would be detrimental to our neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

Rich Crump
28617 184th Place S.E.
Renton, WA 98055

I support Alternative 1 as it has the least environmental impact, the least social impact, and benefits the community.

Raymond Power
23916 232nd Place SE
Kapowsin, WA 98348
Dear Mr. Dressen:

My wife and I have lived in the Hobart area for 18 years. Two years we moved 1/2 mile west into our dream home in Maplewood Estates. Alternative “C” of the BPA plan has a 500kv line running on our eastern property boundary. We would not have purchased this home had we known about the possibility of a 500kv powerline running next door. If this powerline is built bordering our back yard we will be moving.

I would like to talk about the human cost of this project. We spent two years looking for our home. I don’t want to do that again!! Other people have spoken about being reimbursed for property easements, right of ways, etc. Will we be reimbursed for having this line bordering our property? I doubt it. Will this line reduce our property value? Of course. Our view will be a transmission line next door, instead of tall trees on a gues belt. Are we going to have harder time selling our house? Of course. Are these being factored into the cost of this project? I doubt it. They should be!!! Are my neighbors and I going to do everything possible to stop this legally? You can count on it.

I would like to talk about what Seattle calls the “pristine watershed and their legacy for the future”. This watershed has been decimated by logging for about 100 years. There are more than 600 miles of gravel roads in the watershed. At the BPA meeting at the Seattle Center last week, I was happy to hear that folks from Seattle are planting trees in the watershed. Where do you think they are planting these trees? In the second growth forest, I don’t think so. How about in a clearcut created by logging? How can a clearcut with some newly planted trees in an area with 600 miles of gravel roads, be called a “pristine watershed”. I suppose it is pristine compared to First Avenue in Seattle.

My definition of old growth is a forest where one could walk through with out seeing 10 to 15 foot diameter stumps. I don’t think there is any of this left in the watershed. One needs to go to Mount Rainier National Park, Olympic National Park, North Cascades National Park or some of the Wilderness areas recently established by the Forest Service to see old growth. Nature, not man is the only cause of trees falling here!! This is the legacy we are leaving for our children. Not some watershed that’s been raped for 100 years and now is un-touchable!! Are people in Seattle that provincial or are they apathetic?

I would like to address vandalism on transmission lines. I believe that in the cost analysis, vandalism must be taken into account in the life cycle cost of any new transmission line. I am sure the BPA must keep records of vandalism repairs on transmission lines. It should be an easy thing to take into account.

The watershed is the best location for this new transmission line !.

Sincerely,

Jon Zak
PO Box 555
Hobart, WA 98025

1474-001 Comments noted.

1474-002 Comments noted.

1474-003, -004, -005, and -006 BPA will compensate landowners fair market value for the land rights needed for the Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project.

We apologize for the disruption that this project has caused to other landowners impacted by the proposed project.

1474-007 and -008 Comments noted.

1474-009 and -010 Comments noted.

1474-011 and -012 Although a serious problem, transmission line vandalism costs are tolerable over the life expectancy of the transmission line. Natural caused damage from wind, ice, snow, landslides and lightning strikes is typically more significant than man-caused vandalism. Still, vandalism is a matter that BPA takes seriously and addresses directly and proactively. BPA has been closely monitoring trends in transmission line vandalism since 1988. Over that period of time, system-wide transmission line vandalism has averaged approximately $500,000 per year. This is the direct cost of replacing/reparing damaged equipment and does not include the economic losses to customers inconvenienced by loss of power, or the losses to BPA from foregone power sales revenues resulting from service interruptions. In 1994, BPA established a toll-free nationwide hotline for citizens and ratepayers to report any incidents of malicious vandalism, illegal dumping, theft or threats impacting BPA property and assets, and BPA personnel. Rewards of up to $25,000 are offered for information leading to the arrest and conviction of any person committing criminal act against the power system. The program has helped to reduce transmission line vandalism by more than 80 percent.

Comment noted.
Dear Mr. Drewesen,

I found this information on the Seattle Public Utilities website. It should be obvious to anyone reading this document that the turbidity problems in the water of the Cedar River are the direct result of poor management by SFU. The BPA should not have to pay for any filtration plant.

This is the link to this webpage:
http://www.ci.seattle.wa.us/51/CedarRiverHCP/road.htm

Below, I have copied and pasted this information for your use:

Road Improvements and Maintenance

Road improvement projects and maintenance activities will reduce sediment loading to streams from road-related landslides and erosion.

Watershed Road Improvements and Maintenance

Several road-related activities will be carried out in the watershed to minimize sediment delivery to streams, improve drainage patterns altered by roads, and provide fish passage. Roads are a major contributor to accelerated rates of sedimentation and erosion into streams, and thus can adversely affect water quality. Road Decommissioning.

Many roads in the watershed were used almost exclusively for logging traffic in the past and will no longer be needed. The Over $5 million designated to a road decommissioning program to deactivate 236 miles (38%) of the existing road network. This will have substantial benefits, as these roads will no longer contribute to sedimentation of streams and will not require the time and money involved in maintenance.

Roads will be decommissioned in a manner that will improve hillside drainage patterns and stabilize and minimize sediment delivery to streams. At stream crossings, culverts and fill material will be removed and other restoration efforts will be undertaken to restore natural stream function, benefit fish survival, increase spawning habitat, and protect the drinking water supply. Road Improvements.

Road improvements will increase the functionality of the watershed road system while maintaining more natural flow patterns and providing for fish habitat. Existing roads will be improved for long-term control of sediment loading to streams and to allow for the expansion of fish habitat. Roads with priority stream crossings will be upgraded to provide passage of 100-year flows, and problem stream crossings will be stabilized to reduce erosion. Ditches will be designed to empty away from streambanks and crossings will mimic the natural hillside flow patterns. Fish passage structures may be constructed in specific locations where roads break the connectivity of fish habitat and fish would significantly benefit from access to upstream habitat. Additionally, new roads may be constructed for emergency reasons or to establish access to new projects. These roads will be constructed according to rigorous standards to prevent road-related problems. Road Maintenance.

Road maintenance standards will be improved as new technology and equipment become available to allow effective management of the watershed road system. Road maintenance activities will be carried out to allow use by the watershed staff and prevent any future sedimentation problems. Maintenance activities include: grading and shaping of the road surface; maintaining ditches and waterways and cleaning culverts and catch basins; installation, replacement and repair of culverts; mechanical vegetation control; application and replacement of rock ballast and surfacing; and removal of material such as rock fall from cut banks.

Sincerely,

Jon Zak
Box 551
Holbert, Washington 98025
E-mail: jon.zak@metrokc.gov

1475-001 Comments noted.

1475-002 and -003 Comments noted.

1475-004 and -005 Comments noted.

1475-006 Comments noted.
Kuehn, Ginny - DM-7

From: Zak Jon [jon.zalk@metrokc.gov]
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2003 9:36 AM
To: Lou Dressel; Gene Lynard
Cc: Comments@papa.gov
Subject: Kangley Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

---Original Message---
From: Zak Jon
Sent: Friday, February 1, 2003 3:05 PM
To: Zak Jon
Subject: Re: Kangley Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

Lou, Gene,

Please check out this site:
http://www.shybeast.net/kil/earthquake/default.htm

Click on "Begin Slide Show".

Under "Masonry Pool":
- Sedimentation due to failure of lakeshore
- Oil fences
- Road construction in HCP
- Oil-splitted booms used to dampen wave action to minimize erosion from exposed soil
- Installation of a floating debris curtain in Lake to isolate DIRTY WATER from WATER INTAKE
- Heavy Equipment operating near spill area

Under "100 Road."

- Sump of fill at culvert outlet, gilmore Cedar River
- Quarter mile long series of tension cracks

Under "200 Road."

- Tension cracks above a steep slope near Chester Morse Lake
- Relocate road into sit on solid ground
- Sumps
- Landslide in rock-cut slope

Prior to adopting the "Habitat Conservation Plan," SPU was logging like crazy in the watershed. I am happy that commercial logging has been stopped. However, the BPA will cut less than 1/10 of one percent of the watershed area for the new transmission line corridor. If this was before the adoption of the "HCP" the cutting of trees would not have been an issue. The way SPU had been managing the watershed is a classic example of poor management, bureaucracy and short sightedness. Now, the precautions SPU is demanding the BPA take in the construction of the new transmission line is HYPOCRISY!!

Sincerely,

Jon Zak
PO Box 451
Hopland, WA

1476-001 and -002 Comments noted.

1476-003 and -004 Comments noted.

1476-005 Comments noted.
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Dear Mr. Driesen:

1477-001 My wife and I live on 2-½ acres in a development of about 100 homes in Hobart. The water in our development is supplied by "Cedar River Water & Sewer." They buy their water from Seattle Public Utilities. Because we drink Seattle water, we too expect clean water. Our eastern property boundary will be the centerline of the proposed transmission line right of way for Alternative "C". We would lose the trees on one quarter of our property. These trees are in a native growth protection area. Our trees range in size from 2-1/2 to 5 feet in diameter. I doubt there are trees this size in the lower watershed. Aren't our trees as important as trees in the watershed? Alternative "C" would completely destroy our privacy and our views of magnificent trees in our backyard. It would destroy our experience of living in nature. This was the reason we bought this property.

I would like Seattle Public Utilities to answer these three (3) questions:

1477-006 1. Where is the evidence that BPA has caused any harm to water quality or watershed operation in its 30 years of operating a power line in the watershed?

1477-007 2. What evidence does Seattle have that clearing an additional 80 acres for a second power line is more damaging to water quality than failure to replant the 600 miles of logging roads already in the watershed? The total acreage of 600 miles of logging road is almost 1,900 acres. An additional 80 acres for a second power line is only 4% of the acreage of the logging roads already in existence in the watershed.

1477-008 3. Clearing 80 acres of second or third growth forest for an additional power line would require less than 1/10 of 1 percent of the watershed total acreage of 90,240. How can this small an amount of clearing have any impact on water quality?

1477-009 The "Habitat Conservation Plan" is a great idea. Too bad the Habitat Conservation Plan was not an idea of the City of Seattle. The City was forced to create a Habitat Conservation Plan to meet the requirements of the Endangered Species Act. How about the habitat of people living along Alternative "C". Is wildlife habitat inside the watershed more important than habitat for both wildlife and humans outside the watershed? The people who lose their property will be paying the price for Seattle's water. The City of Seattle will destroy the rural communities of Hobart and Ravnodale, all due to unfounded water quality issues. I wonder how history will look back at this?

1477-010 Alternative "C" would clearcut approximately 250 acres of private property for the new power line right of way. How could any property owner in the Hobart/Ravnodale area be reimbursed for the aesthetic loss in property value due of this new right of way? This public right of way should be located on public property! The routing that BPA is proposing for Alternative "C" is ludicrous!!!

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jon Zak
PO Box 551
Hobart

1477-001 and -002 Comments noted.
1477-003 and -004 Trees are a valuable resource irrespective of where they would be located. BPA would minimize clearing for the project to the maximum extent possible.
1477-005 Comments noted.
1477-006 Comments noted.
1477-007 and -008 Comments noted.
1477-009 and -010 Comments noted.
1477-011 and -012 Comments noted.
1477-013 BPA's environmental analysis on the proposed project addresses impacts on the human environment, which includes both the social as well as the natural environment. BPA does not rate wildlife habitat inside the CRW more important than habitat for wildlife and humans outside the CRW.
1477-014 Comment noted.
1477-015, -016, and -017 Comment noted.
From: Zak, Jon [Jon.Zak@METROKC.GOV]  
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2003 9:16 AM  
To: Lou Driesen  
Cc: Gene Lynard; Comment@bpa.gov  
Subject: KECN - Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Project

---Original Message---  
From: Zak, Jon  
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2003 2:50 PM  
To: Zak, Jon  
Subject: FW: RE: KECN - Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Project

---Original Message---  
From: Zak, Jon  
Sent: Friday, January 24, 2003 11:58 AM  
To: Zak, Jon  
Subject: FW: RE: KECN - Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Project

To: Mr Lou Driesen

1478-001  
Alternative "C" passes over hundreds of individual residences. I can not speak for others, but I would never purchase a home under or near a 500 KV line. It is not fair to add this 500 KV line on any established neighborhood. I don't know how anyone could put a price on the reduction in property value and the aesthetic loss caused by this proposed line. I believe this proposed 500 KV line would result in a flood of lawsuits from the affected landowners.

1478-002  
I believe that any new route should pass through the watershed. There are existing transmission lines in the watershed already. This is the shortest route. There are few homes to pass over. The watershed has already been logged extensively. I have hiked up McClellan's twice many times and every time I am shocked by the devastation I see in the watershed. Loss of streamlining Any small stands of old growth timber could be easily avoided in the routing of the new line. This route would be less expensive for the BPA and would save money for all users of BPA power. A route through the watershed would not affect the adjacent communities. I can't understand why anyone in Seattle would be concerned with an additional transmission line in the watershed. How many people in Seattle have even visited the watershed? How much damage would a few more transmission towers do a 90,000 acre watershed create?

1478-003  
I have been in the Sultan Basin Watershed. It is the watershed for the City of Everett. After signing in at a checkpoint anyone can visit the Sultan Basin Watershed. They even allow fishing and the use of canoes, kayaks and even electric powered boats on Spada Lake. This watershed is also heavily logged and there are clear cuts everywhere.

1478-004  
It's time to quit the politics and let the BPA run the line through the watershed!!

Sincerely,

Jon Zak  
PO Box 551  
Snoqualmie, Washington 98065  
E-mail: jon.zak@juno.com  
E-mail: jon.zak@metrokc.gov

1478-001 and -002 Comment noted.

1478-003 Comment noted.

1478-004 Comment noted.

1478-005 Comment noted.
I did a survey of the trees in our backyard. All our trees are second growth. These trees are in the right of way for the proposed Alternative "C". All of these trees will have to be logged for the proposed powerline right of way. The trees I measured ranged in diameter from 22 inches to 60 inches. A sixty inch diameter tree is 5 feet! Are there trees this size in the lower watershed? Here is a partial inventory of our larger trees:

Cedar #1  31 inch diameter  
Cedar #2  47 inch diameter  
Hemlock #3  22 inch diameter  
Cedar #4  56 inch diameter  
Cedar #5  60 inch diameter  
Hemlock #6  25 inch diameter  
Cedar #7  44 inch diameter  
Fir #8  41 inch diameter  
Cedar #9  51 inch diameter  

To compute the diameter I measured the circumference of these trees at four (4) feet above ground level and then divided by 3.1416.

Aren't our trees as important as trees in the watershed? Our trees are very important to us! These trees are one of reasons we purchased this property. If these trees are logged out our view would become transmission towers or transmission wires. These trees are worth a great deal more to us than the market value we would receive from the BPA. Our trees are the "crown jewels" of our property!! There is no reasonable amount of money that could reimburse us for the aesthetic loss of these trees!

Sincerely,

Jon Zak  
PO Box 551  
Hobart, WA  98025
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BPA Communications – KC-7
PO Box 12999
Portland, Oregon 97212
Subject: Comments on Kangley Echo-Lake Power Line Project

1481-001 See response to Comments 1421-038-004, 1421-038-005 and 1421-038-006.

1481-002 See response to Comments 1421-032-003 and 1421-032-004.

BPA believes it has followed the required NEPA procedures. In response to public comments, we prepared a SDEIS to consider additional alternatives not considered in the DEIS. In the SDEIS, we considered a reasonable array of non-transmission alternatives.

1481-003 We are being consistent in our numbers. We also assume a worst case scenario concerning the filtration plant and would purchase an insurance package for that risk. The cost of the insurance policy is included in the cost of the preferred plan, Alternative 1.

1481-004 See response to Comments 1421-038-004, 1421-038-005 and 1421-038-006.

BPA has undergone formal consultation with the USFWS. We also conducted focused surveys for spotted owls last year, and are conducting them again this year. Thus far, no spotted owls have been detected in the action area. The USFWS has determined that this project does not jeopardize the continued existence of spotted owls, and that the take attributed to this project is minimal. Our proposed mitigation would ensure that more potential owl habitat is protected if the project is built, compared to the No Action Alternative.
Chapter 3 — Comments and Responses - SDEIS

1481-007 BPA is in the process of finalizing a Memorandum of Agreement with Seattle that contains a description of the mitigation we have agreed to provide for this project. This is a legally binding document.

1481-008 The MOA prohibits BPA from building new rights-of-way within the CRW. However, BPA has retained the right to make improvements (e.g., upgrades) within the proposed right-of-way for this project.

1481-009 BPA will maintain the roads in the CRW that it uses in good working order. However, the CRW contains hundreds of miles of roads that were built to log timber and for other purposes, and are unrelated to any of BPA’s projects. Therefore, BPA does not believe it is our responsibility to remediate or restore impacts created by others. However, in one instance, BPA has agreed to abandon 0.6 mile of BPA road.

1481-010 Concerning the acquisition of lands outside the CRW, please see response to Comments 1415-003, -004, and -005.

1481-011 Currently there is no water filtration plant on the Cedar River water supply, so replacement is not possible. BPA would purchase an insurance policy to cover the cost of a filtration plant in case a filtration plant would need to be constructed due to impacts from this project. It is unlikely that this would occur because of impacts from this project.

1481-012 See response to Comment 1481-007. See response to Comment 1481-007.

1481-013 See response to Comment 1421-038-001.

The preferred alternative (the Watershed) is an option only if BPA adheres to the following:

a. Double-Circuit wires on entire project (no widening of path necessary)

b. Spotted Owl Habitat issue resolved and mitigated (Biodiversity Northwest is as concerned as USFWS is on potential adverse effects to Spotted Owl habitat. This issue has not gone off our radar screen until we hear otherwise from USFWS.)

c. Legal and binding commitment on any Mitigation Package with Seattle

d. Develop legal contract that prevents BPA from entering Watershed in future.

e. Remove roads in Cedar River Watershed after construction is finished.

f. Acquire lands to add to Watershed to mitigate for removal of trees.

g. Fund the replacement of a City Filtration Plant if you cause a violation (as noted in the WA State Dept. of Health standards) in the City of Seattle’s water supply.

With the Watershed as BPA’s preferred alternative, how is the City of Seattle, environmental groups and local citizens expected to believe the promises put forth in any BPA administered mitigation package if it if is not legally binding? We understand from BPA’s track record (e.g. the Columbia River) that the agency prefers to refrain from any legally binding commitment at all. How then can we believe anything that you offer at the negotiating table unless BPA will agree to sign under the legally-binding line?

Biodiversity Northwest encourages BPA to discuss a mitigation package with the City only if BPA is willing or be held accountable for their alleged promises.

Biodiversity Northwest is still requesting a 30 day extension (until April 1) to provide adequate opportunity for public comment to be thorough and comprehensive. Without that 30 day extension, BPA (it appears) is trying to grease thorough scrutiny of their Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Submitted by

Michael Shank
Outreach Director
Biodiversity Northwest
4640 Sunnyvale Ave. N. #321
Seattle, WA 98103
Chapter 3 — Comments and Responses - SDEIS

1482-001 and -002  BPA determines the height of its transmission lines by maintaining a safe clearance between the phase conductors and ground and other points such as other power lines, communication lines and roads. Raising lines is not economical and can cause safety problems for air traffic. Additionally, there are visual impacts that have to be considered. Right-of-way widths are determined by calculating how much the conductor swings and keeping a safe horizontal clearance to objects not on right-of-way such as buildings. Raising the line would not necessarily reduce the right-of-way width needed.

See also response to Comment 340-002.

1482-003 and -004  There will be some increase to the amount of roads due to the very short new “spur” roads needed to get to individual tower sites. Other new road segments are needed to bypass wetlands that existing road segments go through. BPA is in discussions with Seattle concerning the potential of closing more roads within the CRW. Concerning Seattle’s electric rates, BPA’s study of non-transmission options indicates those options at best would delay the need for this project by only two to three years making these non-transmission options not viable.
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3.115

1483-001 and -002 The BPA as specified under the EPA rules pertaining to stormwater discharges into surface water bodies (40 CFR 122-124), shall obtain an NPDES permit for construction activities, including clearing, grading, and excavation, that disturbs one or more acres of land. Under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, federal facilities (or projects) are subject to these permitting requirements, administration of this program has been delegated to the State, however, for federal projects, EPA administers this program. BPA as a federal agency, will obtain a general NPDES permit from EPA Region 10. BPA will prepare a project specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention (SWPP) plan. This plan helps ensure that erosion control measures would be implemented and maintained during construction. It also addresses best management practices for stabilization, stormwater management, water quality monitoring, and other control measures. Additionally the SWPP plan contains a site-specific Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan, that covers the project scope of work (including equipment, materials, and activities). Refer to Comment Letter #394 - Appendix A. Section 1.1.1.4 Storage, Assembly, and Refueling Areas, and 4.5.2.1.

1483-003 Please also see response to Comments 1420-001 and -002. A new transmission line does benefit the general public including those property owners who are directly impacted. The cost of a new power line are added to the cost of electricity people throughout the region buy. As the cost of the project goes up, so do the rates people pay for their electricity. BPA seeks the least cost alternative that has the least overall impacts. BPA has determined Alternative 1 through the CRW is its preferred route as having the least overall environmental impacts and the least overall cost.

---

Kuehn, Ginny - DM-7

From: Zak, Jon [Jon.Zak@METROKC.GOV]

Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2003 11:03 AM

To: Lou Driessen

Cc: Gene Lynard; Comment@bpa.gov

Subject: Kangley-Echo Lake Transmission Line Analysis Issues

Dear Mr. Driessen,

After attending the recent public meeting in Maple Valley, I wanted to mention a couple of issues I feel should be given consideration at as part of the transmission line right-of-way analysis.

First, in regard to the potential for pollution or siltation of the water supply for the alternatives which cross the Cedar River Watershed, has any analysis been done to quantitatively estimate and compare the potential pollution/siltation from the proposed transmission line project, with current levels of pollution and siltation? The proposed project, both during the construction phase and during normal operation in succeeding years, might likely be insignificant when compared to siltation and pollution levels arising from natural causes, current normal use and management activities in the watershed, and particularly in comparison with past years when active logging operations were common in the watershed. And if the additional pollution/siltation is insignificant, there would seem to be little justification to even consider alternatives which cost more or significantly impact a larger number of property owners outside the watershed.

Also, when comparing costs of the various alternatives, are BPA project costs the only costs compared, or are overall costs to the public and additional potential benefits considered? For example, even if the BPA were made to contribute to the cost of a water filtration system as part of this project, that filtration plant would significantly improve water quality above current baseline levels, might likely have to be installed at some point in the future because of existing siltation/pollution levels, and if so the cost would be borne by the public anyway, regardless of which governmental agency provided the funding. Costs spent to buy new power line right-of-ways, by comparison, are not a net benefit to anyone - not the citizens who are forced to give up part of their land, not the adjacent landowners who must live with the impacts of the power line, and not the public if land is available in the watershed which would not significantly adversely impact water quality.

I would like to request that these issues be given consideration in your Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Sincerely,

Jon Zak
PO Box 551
Hobart, WA 98025
We have reviewed the SDEIS and have attended all four public meetings conducted in King County earlier this month. The information provided by BPA has substantiated the need for additional electrical power capacity in this region. The arguments provided by BPA regarding conservation and alternative sources have been compelling — people are not going to make “lifestyle changes” sufficient to offset demands of growth and alternative sources are too far in the future.

We would like to make these comments about the SDEIS, itself.

1. Maintenance costs were not identified in the analysis for any of the alternatives. We expect that they are length dependent and location dependent. We would expect maintenance costs to be significantly lower for the preferred alternative, since it is the shortest and most highly protected. We believe that a 50-year projection of maintenance costs should be included in the costs of all alternatives for decision purposes.

2. BPA has (and is) offering Seattle Public Utilities a disproportionately more expensive environmental mitigation plan for the Seattle Watershed. This coupled with a disproportionately more expensive construction management plan, which has been offered for the Seattle Watershed, marks the true picture of costs. BPA should add the incremental environmental mitigation and the incremental construction costs, which were developed for the Seattle Watershed route(s), to the costs of each of the proposed routes outside the watershed to reflect more accurate cost comparisons. Common sense would suggest that the relative cost difference between all routes outside the Seattle Watershed and the preferred route are much greater than the figures shown in the SDEIS. This comparison (e.g. based upon incremental cost analyses) is the correct basis for decision-making.

3. The SDEIS understates the socio-economic impact proposed routes A and C in two ways: a. Direct impacts to property values and community values of transmission line construction.

b. Permanent indirect impacts to property values and community values (e.g. less flexibility in property owner’s use of property and being subject to BPA operations personnel presence at any time).

On another point, BPA appears to be taking advantage of its status as an agency of the Federal Government in its real estate offers. We suspect that this is, in part, a result of the corporate independence of the BPA real estate organization. Whatever the reason, it is unfortunate because it further jeopardizes an otherwise excellent plan. BPA should be using local, state certified appraisers. Note that we previously (June 2007) provided your office with an independent consultant’s study, which corroborates the point that BPA’s real estate appraisals for private property are lower than real estate experience, including our own.

In conclusion, Bonneville has made the right route decision three times — keep the 500 KV transmission line in the Seattle Watershed.

Richard E. and Joan R. Bonnivista
2011 4 S 706th St.
Maple Valley, WA 98038

Cc: State Representative Cheryl Pflug, State Representative Glenn Anderson, State Senator Dino Rossi, State Representative Jack Caime, State Representative Geoff Simpson, State Senator Stephen Johnson,
U.S. Representative Jennifer Dunn, U.S. Senator Patty Murray, U.S. Senator Maria Cantwell
King County Council Member David Irons, King County Council Member Kent Pollen
Governor Gary Locke

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

In actuality, the maintenance costs, based on present worth, are not a large cost contributor for comparison analysis. The CRW does provide protection for the transmission lines, but the special care BPA maintenance crews will need to take to preserve/enhance wildlife habitat and to protect water quality in the Cedar River and Rock Creek more than make up for any savings BPA would see as a result of security within the CRW.

The increased costs for going through the CRW are based on mitigation for removing timber covered by Seattle’s HCP and for mitigation for potential impacts to Seattle’s drinking water source. BPA has included mitigation measures for the other routes based on the type of potential impacts they would have to wildlife habitat and other resources.

Please see response to Comments 1420-001 and -002.

The SDEIS provides general socio-economic impacts of the proposed transmission line for all route alternatives. Please refer to Section 4.11.2.5, Community Values and Concerns, Property Value Impact. If the Record of Decision identifies that the construction alternative has been selected along a specific route, then specific appraisals will be prepared for the land rights needed.

See response to Comments 1484-008 and -009.

BPA staff appraisers are not required to be state certified. However, all BPA staff appraisers have chosen to be state certified. BPA appraisers follow the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Standards and follow all applicable federal guidelines. Also see response to Comment 1429-021-001. If BPA needs to acquire land rights across your property, and you disagree with BPA’s opinion of fair market value, BPA would be willing to review any additional market data that you may have, or review recent appraisals of your property. You may also choose to use the condemnation process, and have the courts establish Just Compensation for your property.

Comment noted.
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February 26, 2003
To: Lou Driesen
BPA - KC-7
PO Box 12999
Portland, Oregon 97299

Re: Kangley/Echo Lake Transmission Line

Dear Mr. Driesen,

This letter is in response to the EIS for the proposed Kangley/Echo Lake Transmission Line.

Before building the proposed 9-mile long transmission line through the Cedar River Watershed, I urge you to consider other alternatives, including energy conservation programs, revising contracts with Canada and other electrical system changes.

This transmission line will severely impact forests, wetlands and other wildlife habitat and corridors in the Cedar River Watershed. Salmon in the Cedar and Raging Rivers may be affected as well as the quality of this drinking water source.

If the Bonneville Power Administration does in fact decide to build the transmission line through the watershed, BPA must fully mitigate for the impacts of a new line and propose specific steps to achieve proper mitigation for this project.

Proper mitigation for any new or expanded corridor should include acquiring and protecting nearby forestland. Since there is not adequate ancient forest left in the area to acquire that is equivalent to the quality of forest proposed to be clear cut for the transmission line, it is necessary to increase the amount of lesser quality forest acquired. Since this is BPA’s mitigation project, these forest lands need to be purchased with funds from BPA’s budget and should be factored into the total cost of the transmission line project. These lands should include:

- 400 acres along Raging River near Highway 18, and
- 600 acres near the Cedar River (Section 25, owned by Plum Creek Timber Co., and subdivided for development).

To protect riparian forests, a mitigation plan should also include raising the height of lines and minimizing the width of the clear cut corridor by placing 2 circuits on each tower over the Raging & Cedar Rivers. To minimize the impact of construction, the installation of towers should be done by helicopter, and no new roads built.

Finally, the mitigation project should address eradication of weeds, such as Scotch broom, that migrate into the area as a result of clear-cutting. Native plant restoration should occur in areas previously inhabited by weeds.

Please consider other options to building a transmission line through the watershed. If these alternatives are considered and BPA still decides to build a transmission line through the watershed, they must do so with the least impact, the proper mitigation plan and they must factor the costs of mitigation into the costs of the project.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Kristen Paynter

1485-001 Comment noted.

1485-002 BPA has considered other alternatives. See Chapter 2 of the SDBS.

1485-003 and -004 NMFS has concurred with BPA’s analysis that the proposed action “may affect, but not likely to adversely affect” Puget Sound salmon. See Appendix U of the SDBS.

1485-005 Please see response to Comments 1415-003, -004, and -005.

1486-006 Please see response to Comments 1415-003, -004, and -005.

1485-007 BPA would be replacing two structures on the existing line with double-circuit structures at the Cedar River crossing due to potential but unlikely impacts to Seattle’s unfiltered drinking water and to fish and wildlife. The cost of this double-circuit option is over $2 million for construction and material costs and an unknown amount for the loss to utilities while the existing line is out of service for at least three weeks during the summer. The double-circuit option also would reduce reliability of the system somewhat by having both circuits on the same towers.

1485-008 The crossing of the Raging River also has potential environmental impacts, but would not impact an unfiltered drinking water supply. BPA is not proposing a double-circuit option across the Raging River due to the potential high costs, decrease in reliability, and the ability to mitigate potential impacts to the river. Mitigation could include topping of trees if feasible and planting and seeding low-growing plants where trees have been cut.

The trees that would be removed are primarily second growth conifers about 36 to 75 years old. See response to Comment 340-002 regarding BPA’s purchase of property for compensatory mitigation.

1485-009 It may not be possible to eradicate noxious weeds such as Scotch broom within the CWR because BPA is unable to use herbicides as a management tool. The proposed corridor would be monitored annually to identify any noxious weeds. The area would also be replanted with native plants and/or grasses in disturbed areas to control any noxious weeds during...
construction. Maintenance of both the existing corridor and the proposed corridor would include yearly monitoring for noxious weeds and the treatments prescribed. The following treatment methods would be used to control the spread of noxious weeds: machine cutting, hand cutting, pulling and re-planting with native plant species and or grasses. Outside the CRW, herbicides may be used with the permission of the landowner.

1485-010 BPA has considered other alternatives to building a transmission line. See Chapter 2 of the SDBS.

1485-011 Comment noted.

---

Kuehn, Ginny - DM-7

From: Robin [rmcclellan55@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2003 8:45 PM
To: commenv@bpa.gov
Subject: Kaneohe-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

Feb. 27, 2003

To Whom It May Concern:

We would like to state our support for the Bonneville Power Authority's proposal for the Kaneohe-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project to be installed over the Cedar River Watershed. Although new to the community, my husband and I are deeply concerned about the impact an expansion of power lines would have on the Windwood Estates.

Although very concerned about the all the effects (decrease in property values, increase in the Electric & Magnetic fields, harm to near by parks and the loss of hundreds of trees), we worry most about the impact an expansion of this magnitude would have on the Grass Lake Elementary School. It is un conceivable that this site would ever be considered for an expansion with a school sitting so close to it. Please take this into consideration when making your decision.

Again, we strongly urge you to support the BPA proposal for the Kaneohe-Echo Lake Transmission Line Project to be installed over the Cedar River Watershed.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Robin and Michael McClellan
1901 1/2 SE 282nd St.
Kent WA, 98032

1486-001 and -002 Comment noted.
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February 28, 2003

Lou Dreissell, Project Manager
BPA - KCC - 7
P.O. Box 12999
Portland, Oregon 97221

RE: Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

Dear Mr. Dreissell:

The Mountainneers is one of the oldest and largest conservation and recreation organizations in the Pacific Northwest with approximately 15,000 members. We have been very active commenting on many BPA projects, and numerous energy projects by various other agencies over the years. The Kangley - Echo Lake Project stands at the intersection of two public utility services, which many of our members, directly depend upon; that is to say, electric power and clean, fresh water. We are anxious that both of these services be provided in an environmentally benign fashion as possible.

1488-001

The Mountainneers appreciates the effort put into the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) and into investigation of possible non-construction alternatives. These addressed many of the issues raised by the initial DSEIS. The list of actions proposed to mitigate the adverse effects of power line construction, page S-4 of the SDEIS is most impressive and we support all of them. Should the BPA choose Alternative I, through the Cedar River Watershed (CRW), we believe that the BPA should provide mitigation of the necessary right-of-way clearance by decommissioning at least an equal area of roads both within the CRW and in the Raging River Drainage.

1488-002

The Mountainneers is strongly supportive of the single tower, double circuit crossing, of the Cedar River and maximum protection of all wetlands and riparian areas.

1488-003

The Mountainneers have worked very hard along with many other organizations, including the Seattle Public Utility Department to develop the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for the CRW, protecting both water quality and conserving habitat. The CRW provides both clean, fresh water for the city and, many suburbs and is an important spawning habitat for salmon. Any insurance purchased to provide mitigation of potential damage to the water quality must be adequate to redress the full cost of the worst case scenario.

1488-004

We appreciate that current electrical distribution system reliability and efficiency require that additional transmission lines are required. However, The Mountainneers strongly encourages the BPA to increase emphasis and funding on conservation, and distributed generation, such to obviate the future need for such large projects through either protected lands or residential areas.

Thank you for the opportunity to make these comments.

Sincerely,
THE MOUNTAINEERS

Glenn Eades,
President

Cc: Margaret Pageler, Seattle City Council
Sara Patton, Northwest Energy Coalition

1488-001 Comment noted.

BPA would replace some existing roads within the Cedar River Watershed that currently go through wetlands with new roads that would bypass wetlands. No fill would be placed within wetland. The roads replaced would be made such that vehicles could no longer traverse them and would have to use the new roads. BPA would also make it such that one particular road on the north side of the watershed, just outside the watershed, could no longer be used by the public. No additional roads outside the watershed would be decommissioned. BPA is in discussions with Seattle on potential other roads that could be decommissioned within the watershed.

1488-002 Comment noted.

1488-003 Comment noted. The insurance has a limit of $105 million. This was the estimated cost of building a water filtration plant designed to meet the Cedar River Watershed’s requirements.

1488-004 and -005 Please see Chapter 2 for information on BPA’s conservation programs and funding and Appendix J for information about non-transmission alternatives.
The Sierra Club has reviewed the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the proposed Kangley- Echo Lake Transmission Line. BPA has appropriately decided to issue a Supplemental EIS on this project as the earlier draft EIS was inadequate and failed to look at an adequate range of alternatives. We offer these comments on the SDEIS.

1491-001  Comment noted.

The proposal, also known as the Raging-Cedar Powerline, due to its potential impact on these two watersheds, is designed to provide additional system capacity and reliability by constructing an additional circuit. The preferred alternative is constructing nine miles of new 500kV line with towers 135' high through the Cedar and Raging River watersheds. This proposal will have significant environmental impacts. The Sierra Club is still opposed to this project as proposed.

1491-002 and -003  Comment noted.

Impacts

BPA lines have huge impacts on forests and related wildlife including loss and fragmentation of habitat. The City of Seattle has just recently protected the forests of the Cedar River Watershed, which is prime wildlife habitat and provides drinking water to over a million people. This linear clearcut proposed by BPA will seriously damage the forest and could impact the water quality.

BPA has allowed existing corridors to become weed infested wastelands. Impacts of construction and operation will adversely affect water quality for a municipal water supply, affect compliance with the ESA, and diminish efforts to recover salmon and other listed species. Routes through rural areas are also disruptive to those communities.

1491-004 and -005  BPA and SPU are working together to control the spread of noxious weeds in the existing corridor and will continue to work together in the future on the proposed corridor. The existing corridor has had little or no effect on water quality in the CWR.
BPA has begun to recognize the seriousness of the impacts this project would have, but should acknowledge the effects of cumulative impacts of transmission lines crisscrossing the forests of this region. Contrary to BPA’s impression that this project poses low impacts to ecological and cultural resources, the cumulative effects of this and other BPA lines is significant. When combined with other loss of forest, these effects become quite significant.

**Alternatives**

Appropriately, the new document looks at additional alternatives. Some of these would run through Maple valley, which would severely impact rural lands. Others would impact forests across the Cascades. All of the construction alternatives have serious impacts. None should be constructed as proposed.

We strongly oppose the preferred alternative, due to its huge impacts on the ecosystem and a municipal watershed. We are also opposed to Alternative C as it has unacceptable impacts on forests and rural communities. Alternative D also has unacceptable impacts on ecological, recreational and community resources.

Alternative B, by rebuilding in the existing corridor has fewer, but still significant impacts on those resources. Alternative A, by primarily using existing corridors, has less impact on residential areas than C. Double-circuiting all or most of the proposed route would be a better choice than most of the other alternatives.

BPA has still not demonstrated a compelling need for construction of a new line at this time. BPA must seriously consider the conservation/land management alternative, at least in the near term.

**Mitigation**

If BPA pursues a construction alternative, it must fully mitigate for the impacts of constructing and maintaining a line, whichever route is selected. This is a required element of any federal project. Earlier, BPA had failed to provide adequate mitigation, thereby avoiding the true costs of alternatives. This is only partially corrected in the SDEIS. Additional measures are described, but some are inadequate or only vaguely mentioned without specifics. These must be explicitly described in the FEIS with binding provisions. In addition, all alternatives should be treated equitably in achieving a high standard of mitigation.

In other cases, these measures are actually standard practices (sometimes called best management practices or BMPs) and not really project mitigation measures. They do not fully offset, reverse, or rectify the impacts of constructing the proposed project. Thus, BPA’s suggestion that “maintaining environmental quality” and “minimizing impacts” are two of the purposes of this project is not convincing.

See response to Comments 1423-002, 1421-038-004, 1421-038-005 and 1421-038-006

See response to Comments 1420-001 and -002.

See response to Comments 394-090 and 394-104.

Comment noted.
Habitat

BPA cannot externalize the costs of this project, as it has done with previous lines, and mitigating for habitat losses from powerlines is required. The loss of the forest is more than just a loss of timber revenue. It is a permanent loss of habitat that is rapidly disappearing - especially in the foothills of the Cascades in King County. The cost of such replacement must be included in the total cost of the preferred alternative, then compared among the alternatives. The sale of timber by the underlying landowner does not mitigate the long-term impacts of logging. Past practices of ignoring the permanent loss of forest are no longer acceptable.

The Cedar River watershed encompasses a unique lowland forest that will be protected in perpetuity, thanks to the City of Seattle’s vision and commitment. Surrounding remnants of the original forest, the second growth has been growing and developing for up to 100 years. Nowhere else in the county will we see such ancient forests - at low elevation and in large blocks. This is also a critical ecological connection to Tiger Mountain and Rattlesnake Ridge. Many forestlands in the Cedar River Watershed will approach old growth status with proper land management. While lands in the Raging River may be managed for timber, they will still provide age classes of over 40 years. In the powerline right of way, trees will never exceed a few years old. Due to conservation easements being developed in that valley, it should not be converted to urban uses. This and its location make this valley particularly significant for forest ecosystem conservation. Thus, BPA should mitigate for the difference in this type of forest, by acquiring and conserving for forestry an equivalent amount of land that would otherwise be converted to non-forest uses.

The impact of the BPA line will be in perpetuity, therefore the mitigation must be in perpetuity. The only reasonable solution is that BPA must replace the lost habitat.

The SDEIS alludes to acquiring replacement forest to mitigate for forests cut for the new line, but offers no specifics on location, size or quality. How can a reviewer determine if the mitigation is adequate for an alternative when there are no specifics? Construction is carefully spelled out and the mitigation is just a vague promise. Personal conversations with BPA staff indicate forest mitigation is planned only for the Cedar River portion. The Raging River is ignored, despite a long stretch of the proposed line bordering and then crossing the river. Clearcutting this close to a river is just not acceptable today.

We have previously suggested lands that would be good candidates for offsite mitigation for loss and fragmentation of forests. At a minimum, mitigation should include two tracts. One is section 25 just south of the watershed. The other is protection of about 300 acres of lands along the Raging River where the lines are parallel and/or cross the river. The latter would not only help to mitigate forest and impacts, but river and fisheries impacts as well. The Final EIS should be

1491-018, -019, -020, and -021 Please see response to Comments 1420-001 and -002.

1491-022 and -023 Comment noted.

1491-024 Please see response to Comments 1415-003, -004, and -005 concerning purchasing of lands outside the watershed.

1491-025, -026, and -027 Please see response to Comments 1415-003, -004 and Comments 1485-006, -007, and -008.
specific, stating that at least these lands will be acquired and managed to develop late-successional forest characteristics.

1491-028 It is disturbing that we have heard that BPA is looking at Land and Water Conservation Funds or Forest Legacy funds to acquire some of the replacement habitat land. These funds are limited and are for pre-active conservation, not to pay for required mitigation for a federal project. This is a BPA project with BPA impacts and mitigation must be paid for by BPA— not robbing other critical conservation projects.

BPA has committed to combining the new circuit and existing circuit on one set of towers where they cross the Cedar River. This addresses a critical need. However, the same approach should be taken at the Raging River crossing.

The height of transmission lines at Cedar and Raging River crossings should be high enough to allow late successional forest to grow to 200' tall in the riparian zone of the river and to mature heights on the slopes above the river bottom. Given the topography on either side of the river, that should be feasible. BPA should also increase the height of the towers in that vicinity.

Water Quality

The proposed mitigation for the Cedar River watershed route, includes efforts to prevent toxic material entering the river. This is appreciated, but the standard for a municipal watershed must be high. Extraordinary provisions are needed. We support the City of Seattle's efforts to protect the water supply. There are also risks to the salmon and water quality of the Raging River, and appropriate mitigation should be applied to any activities in that valley, including the expansion of the substation.

Vegetation Management

The EIS contains vague language about best practices for vegetation management. This should be replaced with solid objectives of types of habitat and timeframes for achieving success. This should include eliminating Scotch broom and other invasive weeds, restoring native habitat of varying types and initiating work simultaneously with construction.

Without the changes noted above, our opposition to this project will continue.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. Please keep us apprised of any actions related to the project.

Sincerely,

/]

Charles C. Raines

Director

Cascade Checkerboard Project

1491-028 See response to Comment 1423.

1491-029 and -030 Please see response to Comments 1485-006, -007, and -008.

1491-031 and -032 Please see response to Comments 1485-006, -007, and -008.

1491-033 Please see response to Comment 1485-009.

1491-034 and -035 Please see response to Comment 1485-009. We may not be able to initiate work at the same time as construction. However, there are practices such as putting down straw and seeding with grasses that could reduce the spread of noxious weeds. Hydoseeding may also be an alternative.
1493-001, -002, -003, -004, and -005  BPA gathers information regarding well locations along the project route through surveys, examination of title policies, and landowner interviews. If you have a well that is located along the project route, please share the specific well location information with BPA to ensure that safeguarding the well is addressed in the construction specifications, if the construction alternative is selected.

Please refer to the SDEIS, Section 4.11.2.5, Community Values and Concerns, Property Value Impact. King County was included in the studies regarding the impacts of transmission lines on property values. If an easement is acquired across your property, BPA's offer would be based on a professional real estate appraisal.

When BPA acquires rights-of-way for its transmission facilities, they are not made available for public use. Sometimes landowners and BPA can work together to place gates across access roads that BPA uses to access its transmission facilities.

1493-036 See response to Comment 1467-002.
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1494-001, -002, and -003  See response to Comments 1484-008 and -009.

Kangle - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project
"I'd Like to Tell You..."

1. Please have your environmental studies look at...

2. I need more information about...

3. I have these other comments: WE HAVE 2 TRANSMISSION LINES NEAR OUR HOME, AND WE DO NOT WANT ANOTHER. WE ARE CONCERNED THAT OUR PROPERTY VALUE WOULD DROP IF THERE IT MAY CLOSE US TO COUNCIL MEETINGS, THESE ARE JUST TOO MANY HOUSES IN THIS AREA.

THANK YOU.

Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mail list if you have returned mailed notice.)

Name: JEFF JACOBS
Address: 18815 SE 287 ST Kent 98042
E-Mail Address: JACOBSMG04@ATTNET.COM

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:

Sonnonville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - BC
PO Box 13969
Portland, OR 97211
To Whom It May Concern:

Hello, my name is Beth Hamilton. I am a fifth grade teacher at Woodridge Elementary School in the Bellevue School District in Bellevue, Washington. In school, we had a botanist from the Cedar River Watershed come talk to our 5th graders about the watershed. We also will visit and learn about the watershed in March. In addition, as a school we do "stream team" which is a project to help the city of Bellevue keep the streams safe and clean for the salmon in the fall.

Therefore, my students are very knowledgeable and have strong feelings about our natural resources and natural areas. As a teacher and a resident of the area, I am concerned about a power line being placed in the sacred area of the watershed, as are my students.

To further our learning inside and outside of school, my students have compiled information and opinions about the power line being put through the watershed. They have written letters to you, the Bonneville Power Administration, to voice their concerns. I hope you take the time to read and listen to their concerns. They may only be 10 and 11 years old, but they have great ideas and insight! Thank you for taking the time to read our letters.

Sincerely,

Beth Hamilton
Teacher

P.S. Replies can be sent to my name at the above address.
To Whom It May Concern,

Hello, my name is Christie. I am in the fifth grade at Woodridge Elementary school. A little over a week ago we had a guest speaker come talk to us. He talked to us about how you and the rest of B.P.A. are thinking about putting a power line through the Cedar River Watershed.

I think that is a bad idea! Why I think that is a bad idea is because you will clear cut 90 acres of trees. It is like all of a sudden someone cuts your house down so they can have more power. Would you like that? I don’t think anyone would like that! Even though they are animals, they still have feelings!

Another very important thing that building a power line could do is pollute the water we drink! Do you want water that is clean and fresh or more power? We can live without power, but we can’t live without water. We need it to be clean so we don’t get sick! I want the water to clean! I think everyone else wants clean water too!

Well, I hope my letter helped you change your mind! If you end up building the power line I hope you do things to protect the animals! The man who came and talked to us said it could cause a landslide so maybe you could do something to prevent that from happening! So, I hope that you take some of my advice and think about this decision carefully! Thank you for reading my letter, it means a lot to me!

Sincerely,

Christie Melby
3-128
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1497-001 BPA is proposing to construct one transmission line next to the existing BPA line through the watershed. BPA supports many conservation programs throughout the Northwest and has done a study that suggests that not enough energy could be conserved to remove the need for this new line. See Section 2.2.9 and Appendix J of the SDEIS.

1497-002, -003, and -004 BPA is concerned about potential impacts to wildlife and will purchase other lands that will be preserved for wildlife.

BPA is required to have firefighting equipment on hand during construction and will comply with any fire restrictions if there is high fire danger during construction.

BPA did consider other alternatives that would be build around the watershed, including alternatives that would require removing homes. Our preferred alternative was selected because, overall, it has the least potential environmental impacts.

1497-005 Thank you for your comments.

To Whom It May Concern,

Hi! My name is Abigail. I am in 5th grade and go to school at Woodridge Elementary. One day a man named Clay Antieau, from the watershed, came to talk to us about the Cedar river watershed, and that’s why I am contacting you. When Clay left I got concerned about the power lines going through the watershed. I am concerned that this will hurt the animals and might make a fire.

I am worried about you putting in a power line because it might hurt the animals that live there. You might hurt the animals that live there because you would have to clear cut 90 acres of trees. That’s where birds live! They would then need to find a new habitat now that you’re replacing them with power lines! I felt that the animals should be able to keep their homes... besides they were there first!

When you put in the power lines I am worried that it might start a fire. If a fire would happen, animals might die and their homes would be destroyed. I feel that the animals should be kept safe with no threats from the power line.

As you probably can tell, I am very concerned about you putting in a power line through the watershed wildlife system. I have some questions that might concern you putting in the power lines. How many power lines are you going to put in there? Why don’t you put the power lines through the city? Why don’t you build it around the watershed? Why don’t we vote?

And why don’t we conserve the energy? Thank you for listening to my letter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Abigail Antieau

February 13th, 2003

12619 S.E. 20th Place
Bellevue WA 98005
To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Grace Gunarso. I am in the 8th grade at Woodridge Elementary School in the Bellevue District area. We had Clay Antieau, from the Cedar River Watershed, talk to us about the Watershed. I think that putting a powerline through the watershed would make the water dirty and could cause a fire. It will cause a fire because trees might fall to the power line. For example the fire might go through any city and burn it down. I feel that we could lose alot of electricity by the fire.

I think it is not a good idea because it could make the water dirty or you could cause a fire. You could do half underground and half above ground. Or, you could make it though the city. Thank you for reading my letter.

Thank you,
Grace Gunarso

1498-001, 002, 003, and 004 Thank you for your comments. BPA has had a transmission line in the Cedar River Watershed for over 30 years. This existing line has not caused dirty water or a fire. BPA is required to cut trees that might be a danger to the line. These “danger trees” need to be cut so that what you are concerned about will not happen.

BPA has considered putting the line underground, but it is very expensive and so it is not being considered. BPA also is considering putting the line through neighborhoods outside the Cedar River Watershed. These other routes also have impacts to people and wildlife.
To Whom it May Concern,

Hi my name is Danielle. I'm in 5th grade at Woodridge Elementary. I am writing to power because you want to put a power line through the watershed. I am here to tell you what I think about that. I think you shouldn't put the power line through the watershed because you might hurt animals or kill trees.

I think it might hurt animals. For example, when you cut down trees you can you can kill birds, squirrels, and other animals that live in trees will also be hurt. This is not good because they won't have homes.

I think it's bad to cut down 90 acres of trees. This is bad because then we won't have trees for shade and to block the rain. Less air destroys animal's homes.

I think you should put the power line through the underground. This would save animals and trees by not cutting down trees or their habitats. Thank you for reading my letter.

Sincerely,
Danielle, Ruby
To Whom It May Concern,

Hello, my name is Julian. I am in 5th grade in Bellevue. My teacher is Mrs. Hamilton. A man from the Cedar River Watershed came to my school and told us about the watershed. I live here in Bellevue and I think you should not put the power line there because you can hurt the animals or kill the plants.

I think putting the power line through the watershed could hurt the animals when you chop the trees down. Bird’s homes will be destroyed, then they will have to move. I think the birds should be able to keep their homes because they put a lot of hard work into their nests.

I think you should not put the power line there because you will kill the plants when you chop trees down. The plants will die when you and the construction machines will walk and run over the plants and then they will have to grow again. It will take them a long time to grow and you will kill bugs that live in them. Some plants might be endangered plants too.

By putting a power line through the watershed you would be killing plants or hurting animals. Instead you could do it differently. You can build around the watershed or you can build under the watershed. Thank you for listening.

Sincerely,
Julian

1500-001, -002, -003, -004, and -005 Please see responses to Comment letters 1498 and 1499.
To Whom It May Concern,

Hi my name is Tyler. I’m 11 years old and I go to Woodridge Elementary school. We had a person from the watershed talk to us about what you want to do to the watershed. I think that putting a power line through the watershed is a bad idea because you could kill animals or cause a landslide.

I think putting a power line through the watershed could kill animals. You could kill animals by destroying rare animal homes. For example, you could kill animals and they might become instinct or kill animals that are illegal to kill.

If you put a power line through the watershed, then you could cause a landslide. If you cause a landslide then you will kill animals, destroy their homes, or mess up your plans for a power line.

Thanks for listening,

Tyler

Hi

BPA is proposing many mitigation measures to prevent damage to the drinking water supply and to wildlife habitat. Thank you for your comments.
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1502-001, -002, -003, -004, and -005 Thank you for your comments. Please see responses to Comment letters 1498 and 1499.

BPA has extensive experience with energy conservation in the Pacific Northwest and encourages energy conservation through programs with Northwest utilities. Conservation could not reduce the need for this project, but it is a good idea to reduce the need for energy in specific areas and at specific times of the day and year.

To Whom it May Concern,

Hello, my name is Meagan Guthill. I am a 5th grade student at Woodridge Elementary School. I am writing to you because I have heard of your idea of putting in a line of power through the Cedar River Watershed. My classmates and I are very worried about this. I am concerned about you hurting animals that live there and killing 90 acres of trees.

Many animals and wildlife live at the watershed. If you build a power line through the watershed it would destroy animal habitats and they would not have anywhere to go. What if some people came up to you and said, “Oh sorry, but you can no longer live here because the people of Bellevue need more power.” What would you say?

Another thing, you would kill many trees and acres of plant life in the process of building the power line. Trees and plants are living creatures, not just as. It would also change the air we all breathe. All that for power.

Me and others would feel very hurt if you put in a man-made structure. It would destroy tree and plant land. Also the animals would not have a place to live. So, please don’t put a power line through the watershed. Many people are concerned about your idea. Maybe you could build the power line somewhere else or we could conserve energy. Those are only a few ideas.

Thank you for your time,

Meagan Guthill

1502-001

1502-002

1502-003

1502-004

1502-005
Hi, I'm Chaz. I'm a fifth grader at Woodridge Elementary. On Monday February 3rd, Clay Antoine came to our school from the watershed. He came to talk to us about how you want to put a powerline through the Cedar River watershed. I have not been to the watershed before but I know that it’s a well protected area. I am concerned about the powerline going through the area. I am writing because you are going to wreck the animal’s homes and pollute the water.

One reason is because you will force animals out of their homes and feeding areas. For example, you will destroy bird homes because they live in trees. Also you will most likely destroy their watering areas. I feel that this is wrong. I think that because you don’t want to destroy people’s homes but what about the animals homes? If you put your powerline there they will have to find a new habitat. Do you even care about them?

One other thing that could happen is you could pollute the water system. For example, you might cause mud to slide into the water. I don’t think that you should not put those huge man made structures through the watershed.

Please consider this. And please, make the right choice about the powerline. Thank you for your time.

From, Chaz DeMontrouz
To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Eli. Recently someone came to my school to talk to us about the BPA building a power line through the Cedar River Watershed. He tried to convince my classmates and I that this would be a bad thing. I think it would be okay to do this, but here is an idea so the BPA doesn’t cut as many trees down. I love trees.

I think you should use helicopters to lift the parts you need for a power line to the sights you want to build the power line. Then you wouldn’t have to cut down trees to make new roads. There would be more habitats for the animals this way. Plus, trees provide oxygen and we need oxygen to live.

I love trees. Humans are important and we need electricity. On the contrary, animals need homes too. So we need to make an even balance. Put a power line through the Cedar River Watershed but try not to cut as many trees. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Eli

1504-001, -002, -003, and -004 Thank you for your comments. Please see responses to Comment letters 1498, 1499, 1500, 1501 and 1502.

BPA is proposing to use helicopters for construction in the Cedar River Municipal Watershed.
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,

My name is Yuto and I am 10 years old. I go to Woodridge Elementary School. Mr. Antoine from the Cedar River Watershed came to Woodridge Elementary School to talk to the 5th grade students. He asked us if you should put a power line through the Cedar River Watershed. I am writing to you because I think you shouldn’t put a power line through the watershed.

One reason why I think you shouldn’t put a power line through the watershed is that you are going to cut down 90 acres of trees. I think if you need to cut trees you shouldn’t put a power line through the watershed. By killing trees, it could destroy animals homes.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS. PLEASE SEE RESPONSES TO COMMENT LETTERS 1498, 1499, 1500, 1501 AND 1502.
For example, if we lose trees birds and bugs could lose their homes and that will hurt them.
If I was a bird or insect I would not like losing my home.
If you put a powerline in, it could pollute the H2O. You could kill salmon and we drink that water. If we didn’t drink water we would die. It would be sad to die and would not be good to drink polluted water.

If I was in the BPA, even if it takes lots of money, I would not build the powerline through the watershed. I suggest building it underground. It would be much better to not cut trees or do bad things to the animal habitat.

Sincerely,
Yuto
1506-001 Thank you for your comments. Please see responses to Comment letters 1498, 1499, 1500, 1501 and 1502.

To Whom it May Concern:

Hi, my name is Sterling. I’m writing because I heard that you want to put a power line through the Cedar River wetland. I don’t think that is a good idea because it can hurt animals. You will cut down 90 acres of trees permanently. By cutting down trees it will destroy animals like squirrels and birds. Homes. This is bad because then
they would have no way to live.

If you don't put the power line through the water shed it will sure animal 3 by not destroying their home.

I don't think putting the power line through the water shed is a good idea at all. I hope you don't put the power line through the water shed.

Thank you for reading my letter.

From,

Sterling
1507-001, -002, and -003 Thank you for your comments. Please see responses to Comment letters 1498, 1499, 1500, 1501 and 1502.

1507-001

I am a 6th grade student. Elementary school, my name is Edward, and I'm writing you because you want to put power lines through the water shed. I think this is a good idea because you are going to trees and hurt animals.

I think it could hurt animals because in order to put in the power lines and poles you want to clear the trees or trees forming. That could hurt animals because you'll destroy their homes, and other animal habitats. The water shed is one of the natural habitats of many species and water.

My conclusion is that it is a bad idea to put the power lines through the water shed, because you need trees to clear to access the land forming. If we destroy it, we can't have the land under ground. You put the power lines but any water grows until its out of the water shed. Then put it above ground.

Thank you,

Robert MacNeil
Hi my name is Tiffany and I am a fifth grader. I am writing this because I don't think you should put the power line through the Cedar River Watershed because you can hurt the animals. It will hurt the animals because they would lose their homes and they could get hurt. For example, a bird could lose its home because you could knock its tree that it lives in.

I think instead of building the power line through the watershed I think you should build the power line around the watershed. I think that because we don't want you to hurt the animals.

Thank you,

Tiffany
1509-001, -002, -003, and -004 Thank you for your comments. Please see responses to Comment letters 1498, 1499, 1500, 1501 and 1502.

To Whom It May Concern,

Hi my name is Kevin and I just wanted to let you know that I think you shouldn't put the power line through the Cedar River. One reason is it won't give us clean water. Second, is we will loose salmon.

Water - If you put the power line through the Cedar River Watershed because you might pollute the water and give out chemicals which is poison and dangerous. I would also mean we would have to built the watershed somewhere else because the Cedar River Watershed is polluted.

Salmon - We will loose Salmon by chemicals, and slide which causes silt to kill the race Salmon in the water. This is bad because the water will be polluted. This will kill the Salmon.

Why don't you ask people to conserve energy. Hope you do the right thing and take this into your consideration.
1510-001, -002, -003, and -004  Thank you for your comments. Please see responses to Comment letters 1498, 1499, 1500, 1501 and 1502.
To Whom It May Concern,

Hi my name is Courtney. I am a fifth grade student at Woodrige Elementry. At school we had Clay Antieau come and teach us about the Cedar River Watershed. We learned all about the plant life and wildlife there. I am writing to you because I am concerned about the animals and polluting the water if you build a powerline through the watershed.

The watershed is filled with wildlife that has lived there for many years. Putting a power line in there might disturb their natural life style. They might not even want to live there anymore. There aren't many wild places like the watershed and I think for the animals sake, do not interfere with that natural place.

I am also concerned about the water. Clay told us it might cause a land slide. If the dirt gets into the water it could contaminate it. Some of the rarest salmon are being released into the rivers and lakes. If the water gets to dirty the salmon will die and so will many other fish, frogs, and insects.

I know we need energy but maybe if we used less we wouldn't need a power line. If we really need it, then we could build it around the watershed. Then it wouldn't bother any wildlife. I hope this letter gave you some other idea to get energy.

Sincerely,

Courtney

1511-001, -002, -003, -004, -005, and -006 Thank you for your comments. Please see responses to Comment letters 1498, 1499, 1500, 1501 and 1502.
1512-001, -002, -003, and -004  Thank you for your comments. Please see responses to Comment letters 1498, 1499, 1500, 1501 and 1502.

To whom it may concern,

Hello my name is Brian. I'm a fifth grader at Woodridge Elementary. I heard about the powerline going through the watershed. I think you should find a different way no matter what it takes. It's better then ruining the habitat of many animals. The animals make the watershed a natural area.

The animals make the watershed a natural place. If you put in a powerline, some animals would have to leave. This is bad because animals make the water better because the fish eat the bugs. If you put in a powerline you'll contaminate the water, the fish will die, the bugs will fill the water with eggs, and the fish won't be there to eat them. So, the water will be full of bug eggs, which is bad for the water.

Instead of making the powerline above ground, I suggest you put some underground. You could put the powerline so they're above ground until the watershed, then make them go underground through the watershed. It's the least frustrating way because it wouldn't be messing up the watershed. Thank you for taking time to read my letter.

Sincerely,
Brian

To whom it may concern,

12619 S.E. 20th
place Bellevue WA
98005
February 13, 2003

1512-01, -002, -003, and -004  Thank you for your comments. Please see responses to Comment letters 1498, 1499, 1500, 1501 and 1502.
To whom it may concern:

Hello, my name is Brian and I am a student at Woodridge Elementary. I am concerned about the power line going up and wouldn't want it going through the watershed. I learned about the water with stream team. As a class we go and check the water to see if it is good for the salmon. I learned about the watershed from a man named Mr. Antheau, a botanist, from the watershed. I have two main reasons why I don't want the power lines going up. One, is that it could hurt or kill animals and second, is that the construction would pollute the water.

I think putting the power line through the watershed would hurt the animals! You would be hurting or killing them with man made structures that would be destroying their homes. For example, all the birds and squirrels would have to find new homes and habitats. You're cutting down 90 acres of trees. That's a lot of animal homes! This could kill the plants also that could be rare and hard to find. If I were an animal, I wouldn't want to find a new home and building an all new home.

The water will be dangered too. It would either kill the fish or make them sick. This could mess up the food chain in the water. The fish also have to find new homes with different rivers until it all goes away. I hear that they are putting rare salmon in the river. This would pretty much wipe them out from the start! We, too, drink and use this water. You could try to get it all out but then you would use too many chemicals to do that. I also feel strongly about this because it would not only make salmon die or find new rivers, but this could hurt us too!

So altogether it could kill animals, trees, fish, and pollute the water. I would hate for it to come up but if you had to, then maybe you could try to do it around the watershed. Or, half under ground and half on top to miss the watershed. You could even use other lines. Anything to keep this sacred area special.

Sincerely,

Brian
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1517-01, -002, and -003 Comment noted.

Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the list if you have received mailed notice.)

Name: JEFF HAGENHURST
Address: 86207, SE 384th St
E-Mail Address: Maple Valley WA 98038

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - RC
P.O. Box 12999
Portland, OR 97212
Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

"I'd Like to Tell You . . ."

1. Please have your environmental studies look at: ____________________________

2. I need more information about: __________________________________________

3. I have these other comments: The King County Council is planning on adopting a revision to the Critical Areas Ordinance that would prohibit all property owners from cutting ANY trees on 65% of their land. All King County Council lands are included in this, so it is totally inappropriate to even consider putting the EPA Line through these same lands. "NO" to Alternatives A-C! "Yes" to Alternative 1!

☐ Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mail list if you have received mailed notices.)

Name: Kathy Myers
Address: 36807 SE 224th St.
E-Mail Address: Maple Valley, WA 98038

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - RC
PO. Box 1292
Portland, OR 97207

1518-001 and -002  Comment noted.
Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

“I'd Like to Tell You…”

1. Please have your environmental studies look at

2. I need more information about

3. I have three other comments:
   
   1519-001
   Alternative 1: Minimal negative impact on humans, ecosystems, and habitat balance (especially wetlands)
   
   1519-002
   Alternative 2: Significant and irreversible negative impact on humans, limited areas, and already fragmented and "at-risk" habitat (annual residential elements)
   
   1519-003
   Please select Alternative 1 through the watershed

☐ Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the list if you have received mailed notices.)

Name: Lisa West
Address: 7398 184th Ave SE, Auburn WA 98001
E-Mail Address:

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:
Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - RC
P.O. Box 13999
Portland, OR 97212

1519-001, -002, and -003 Comment noted.
1520-001 Comment noted.

1520-002 Relocations are subject to specific regulations under Public Law 91-646. The brochure, “Your Rights and Benefits as a Displaced Person,” provides information for parties displaced from their residences, businesses or farm operations and can be obtained at the following Web site: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/realestate/rights/index.htm. The purpose of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 is as follows: “The purpose of this title is to establish a uniform policy for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced as a result of federal and federally assisted programs in order that such persons shall not suffer disproportionate injuries as a result of programs designed for the benefit of the public as a whole.”
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1521-001 and -002  Comment noted.

1521-003 and -004  Comment noted.

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - KC
Portland, OR 97212

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:

Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

"I'd Like to Tell You..."

1. Please describe your environmental studies:

2. I need more information about:

3. I have these other comments: Kangley has so many salmon-bearing streams and many species of wildlife that would be harmed by this project. The proposed project area already has "damaged" habitat as compared to the unaffected.

Please do not degrade the natural habitat any further.

Please choose alternative 1 - through the mountains.
Bonneville Power Administration

Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

"I'd Like to Tell You..."

1. Please have your environmental studies look at:

2. I need more information about:

3. I have these other comments: Whatever alternative you choose, you should fully mitigate the damage caused by installing the new line. For this mitigation, consider using helicopters to install new lines in lieu of roads. Replace non-native plants in rights-of-way with native species. I would like to see how BPA would acquire new forestlands, either by purchase or leasing.

Please put me on your mailing list. (You are already on the mailing list if you have received this notice.)

Name: Joe Gursch
Address: 1221 28th Avenue, Seattle, WA 98122

E-Mail Address:

Please mail your comments by July 22, 2002 to:

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - KC
PO Box 1300
Portland, OR 97201

1522-001 See response to Comment 340-002.
1522-002 BPA is proposing to use helicopters for construction on Alternative 1 to reduce the need for new roads.
1522-003 BPA is working with agencies, landowners, and tribes to determine the best plant mix for animals. Native species would be part of that mix.
1522-004 Please see response to Comments 1415-003, -004, and -005.
1523-001 Comment noted.

1523-002 Comment noted.

1523-003 Comment noted.

1523-004, -005, and -006 Comment noted.

1523-007 Comment noted.

1523-008 Comment noted.
Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

"I'd Like to Tell You . . ."

1. Please have your environmental studies look at .

2. I need more information about .

3. I have these other comments . Please do not put this new project through Winterwood Estates. We support the Cedar River route.

   Thank you.

☐ Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mail list if you have received mailed notice.)

   Name ________________________________

   Address ________________________________

   E-Mail Address ________________________

   Please mail your comments by March 3, 2000 to:

   Bonneville Power Administration
   Public Affairs Office, P.O. Box 1909
   Portland, OR 97208

1524-001 Comment noted.
1525-001 Comment noted. Alternative 1 is BPA's preferred alternative.

1525-002 Comment noted.

I have attended meetings and spoken with your staff. Please take this into account on Childhood Lead\n
1525-001 Comment noted. Alternative 1 is BPA's preferred alternative.

1525-002 Comment noted.

I have attended meetings and spoken with your staff. Please take this into account on Childhood Lead.

1525-001 Comment noted. Alternative 1 is BPA's preferred alternative.

1525-002 Comment noted.

I have attended meetings and spoken with your staff. Please take this into account on Childhood Lead.

1525-001 Comment noted. Alternative 1 is BPA's preferred alternative.

1525-002 Comment noted.

I have attended meetings and spoken with your staff. Please take this into account on Childhood Lead.

1525-001 Comment noted. Alternative 1 is BPA's preferred alternative.

1525-002 Comment noted.

I have attended meetings and spoken with your staff. Please take this into account on Childhood Lead.

1525-001 Comment noted. Alternative 1 is BPA's preferred alternative.

1525-002 Comment noted.

I have attended meetings and spoken with your staff. Please take this into account on Childhood Lead.

1525-001 Comment noted. Alternative 1 is BPA's preferred alternative.

1525-002 Comment noted.

I have attended meetings and spoken with your staff. Please take this into account on Childhood Lead.

1525-001 Comment noted. Alternative 1 is BPA's preferred alternative.

1525-002 Comment noted.

I have attended meetings and spoken with your staff. Please take this into account on Childhood Lead.

1525-001 Comment noted. Alternative 1 is BPA's preferred alternative.

1525-002 Comment noted.
Electromagnetic fields may be a health hazard

Barrell Hay
Special to The Seattle Times

Q: How much danger are EMF transmissions in and around the house? My friend saw a photo on the Internet of a woman sitting in an EMF detector and claims it causes cancer. I have heard this is not true.

A: It is always wise to be cautious when it comes to health and safety, especially when it comes to things that are not well understood. Electromagnetic fields (EMF) are present in various forms, such as those created by electrical appliances, wireless devices, and power lines. The concern about EMF exposure has been growing, but the scientific consensus is not yet clear.

Several studies have been conducted to investigate the potential health effects of EMF exposure, including cancer. The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), an agency of the World Health Organization (WHO), has classified certain types of EMF as possible or probable human carcinogens. However, the overall evidence is not strong enough to establish a causal relationship with cancer.

The National Academy of Sciences reviewed the available evidence in 1996 and determined that "the current body of evidence does not show that exposure to EMF fields poses a human health hazard." The report noted that more research is needed to fully understand the potential health effects of EMF exposure.

The IARC has also classified some EMF sources, such as those from cell phones and power lines, as "possibly carcinogenic to humans." However, the classification is based on limited data and the evidence is not conclusive.

Despite the lack of definitive proof, many people are concerned about EMF exposure and try to avoid or minimize it. Some individuals use EMF shields, filters, or other products, but the effectiveness of these measures is not scientifically proven.

In conclusion, while there is no clear evidence linking EMF exposure to cancer, it is important to be aware of the potential risks and采取 appropriate precautions to minimize exposure whenever possible.
Kangley - Echo Lake Transmission Line Project

"I'd Like to Tell You . . ."

1. Please have your environmental studies look at

2. I need more information about

3. I have three other comments: I believe the displaced people who have lost property or had its use and value impaired should be paid much more than has been offered.

4. You have saved a lot of money by giving this route & need to save this right.

☐ Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mail list if you have received mailed notices.)

Name: LANCE CABBLE
Address: 8321 S.E. Kirkland & Apostle Valley, 97209
E-mail Address: rexe@ au info.com

Please mail your comments by March 1, 2003 to:

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - RC
P.O. Box 12994
Portland, OR 97212

1526-001

1526-002

1526-001 and -002 See response to Comment 1520-002.
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1527-001 and -002 Comment noted.
1527-003 BPA has analyzed the impacts on a per unit basis for all of the alternatives. The impacts were quantified for distance (miles), area (acres) and other units such as milligauss and decibels. Please see the summary table of impacts in the SDEIS, Table 2-3, located from page 2-67 through 2-74.
1527-004 and -005 Comment noted.
1527-006 Comment noted.
1527-007 Comment noted.
1527-008 Comment noted.
1527-009 and -010 Comment noted.
1527-011 and -012 Comment noted.
1527-013 Comment noted.
1527-014 See response to Comments 1484-008 and -009.
1527-015 Comment noted.
1527-016, 017, and -018 Comment noted.
1527-019 Comment noted.
1527-020 The estimated cost to acquire land rights was included in the economic costs for all alternatives.
1527-021 and -022 See response to Comment 1474-011.
1527-023 BPA is trying to work with all property owners. The issue for property owners is often concerning the value they think their property is worth compared to the fair market value as obtained from other properties recently sold in the same area. BPA felt it was inappropriate to discuss the specifics of individual negotiations at a public meeting. BPA will continue to work with landowners to try to find a common solution.
1527-024 On the watershed, the City of Seattle has the responsibility to protect drinking water. This responsibility is monitored by the State Department of Health and the federal Environmental Protection Agency, as well as the public. The watershed also has an established Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). The proposed acquisition of the properties is only one aspect of the mitigation plan to protect the watershed. BPA recognizes that the private properties in this area exhibit some of the same qualities as found in the watershed in regard to timber, vegetation, and wildlife, but the private properties do not have the same public responsibilities.
Dear Sir or Ma,

I am writing in regard to your taking the second line through the Seattle Water front. I was pleased you were considering that route. It would seem it would be much less costly, environmentally less intrusive, and adversely affect less people. At one of your meetings, I heard people speak of your professional conduct and applaud it.

I hope you will reconsider the amount of money you offered the five land owners. Repeal your line leaves the land unable to develop as they had planned. I know that route saves you much money I hope you will consider that and compensate them more fully.

Sincerely,
Margaret Crabtree
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1529-001 Most of these two comments quote the regulations, and as such we note the references. Concerning the listed categories of impacts, BPA believes each category referenced above has been adequately described in the EIS. BPA agrees that the proposed project and its associated management practices could have potentially significant impacts. That is why we immediately proceeded to produce an EIS rather than an Environmental Assessment. However, we believe the preferred alternative, and its associated mitigation and best management practices mitigate those potentially significant impacts to a level below the level of significance with the exception of impacts to forested wetlands due to right-of-way clearing and to the visual resource. In fact, we believe the proposed project represents an environmental net benefit to the CRW, and to the public.

We disagree that it is improper to use relative terms such as "low, medium or high" to discuss the nature of the impacts. We believe making these assessments helps the public and decision-maker to be better informed concerning the nature of the various impacts upon the environment.
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1529-002
The property owners along all proposed transmission lines outside the watershed hired an expert economist, Greg Easton of Property Counselors, to review the BPA's previous analysis contained in your Draft EIS. We also have had numerous discussions with appraisers and realtors in King County that totally dispute your SDEIS conclusion that there would be low to moderate long-term impacts to property values expected (see Chapter 4 SDEIS). Alternative C, in particular, would displace 30 to 35 homes whereas Alternative A (Preferred Alternative) would displace two. Thirty to thirty-five homes in the Hobart area is a significant percentage of the entire community and hence the document should disclose there would be a significant adverse impact.

1529-003
Several factors are considered in determining the impacts to properties including environmental and socioeconomic. Some of the socioeconomic impacts must be generalized until specific appraisals are conducted on the impacted properties. Also see 1484-008 and 1484-009.

1529-004
By using the rating of low, moderate, high based on the population of the area, or number of dwelling units the transmission lines would benefit understates the impacts. Again, the impacts must be described in context with the impacts and not what area is benefited (i.e., Seattle Metro area). For this reason, we are requesting that you re-analyze your impact analysis based on the affected environment it is affecting and not the entire Seattle Metro area.

1529-005
Please let us know if we can be of further assistance. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at (425) 391-4700. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Carol A. Beek, J.D.
Environmental Consultant and Hobart Resident

Cc: Senator Maria Cantwell
Dino Kusti, State Senator, 5th Legislative District
Glen Anderson, State Representative, 5th Legislative District
Cheryl Pflug, State Representative
Ron Simms, King County Executive
David Ivens, King County Council
Larry Phillips, King County Council
Abe Frisinger, Mayor, City of Issaquah
BPA thoroughly examined a number of alternatives, including conservation and changes to the grid (see Section 2.2 of the SDEIS). Please see response to Comments 1415-003, -004, and 005. BPA would need to construct some new short spur roads to get to the new tower sites from existing roads. In addition, BPA would build new road segments to replace existing roads that proceed through wetlands. BPA and an independent contractor have looked at other non-transmission alternatives, as described in the SDBS, and have determined they do not meet BPA or the region's needs. Non-transmission alternatives would only delay the need for the project by about 2-3 years. BPA thoroughly examined a number of alternatives, including conservation and changes to the grid (see Section 2.2 of the SDEIS).
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Table 2-3 of the SDEIS summarizes the impacts and costs of the alternatives considered.

BPA is concerned about mitigating environmental impacts whether inside or outside the CRW. Inside the CRW, the issues are contaminating the drinking water for the city of Seattle and surrounding communities that also use the Cedar River Watershed for their supply and the impacts to the established Habitat Conservation Plan. As a result, BPA is proposing to use extensive best management practices and use special engineering techniques and construction practices to minimize impacts to the drinking water. BPA is also looking at purchasing lands to compensate for the lands that would be changed in character within the CRW and its HCP. BPA is also committed to minimizing impacts to the environment outside the CRW including the drinking water (likely wells) to individual residences and potential impacts to the creeks and rivers where low-growing vegetation would be left. BPA would use conventional designs and construction methods while also implementing best management practices to those areas outside of the CRW including those areas outside the CRW on the preferred alternative. BPA can minimize impacts to the environment to those properties outside the CRW by implementing conventional best management practices and conventional designs and construction techniques.
correctly, which is to say, if you -- and this is a little bit of the conversation I had with you earlier, that if you were to offer the same mitigation on routes A, C, B, or D that you're offering for your preferred route, I'm certain that your costs for routes A, B, C and D would quadruple probably from where they are.

And I know you don't have time to get those numbers and I don't think -- and I know it isn't necessary to go to the extent of detailing those numbers, but if you did go to the extent to put a number out there, if you would just put a qualitative judgment on each of the numbers you have that says, here, here's what we put in the study as one figure, but if we had to do the same equivalent kind of things, then I think that would be useful. There's another chart --

MS. DIANE ADAMS: Let me stop you right there. Gene, do you want to respond?

MR. GENE LYNARD: What you're asking for is to compare apples with apples. And we don't have all of the apples. We have the apples for the preferred. We have a good handle on what the mitigation cost is for that. The different types of mitigation we're talking about here mostly is compensatory mitigation, and we don't know what that mitigation -- those mitigation measures come from the regulatory agencies, Corps of Engineers, King County, State...
The cost figures in the SDEIS include the best management practices anticipated for each route, using special design and construction techniques inside the Cedar River and Kent watersheds and conventional designs and construction techniques for those areas outside of the watersheds including those areas outside the watershed for the preferred alternative. The cost for each alternative also includes costs to process potential condemnation cases and to work with a great many more landowners and on some options, the removal of many homes. As noted in the SDEIS, the costs are greater for those alternatives outside of the CRW.

In Alternative B, the existing double-circuit 345-kV line is replaced with a double-circuit 500-kV line. To meet the need, a 500-kV line is required. Unfortunately, it is not feasible to modify the existing line to add a 500-kV circuit on the other side. The existing structures are simply not designed to carry a 500-kV line. The only feasible approach is to tear down the existing line and replace it with double-circuit 500-kV, operating one side at 500-kV and the other at 345-kV.
power lines. But what really kind of bothers me a little bit, being a Depression kid, is the tearing down of a line bothers me.

Isn't there any way in this overall program that that line up there with only power lines hanging on one side and the other side is vacant, to save that line or to use it in some manner?

MS. IVY TYSON: I can address that. We built that line as a 345 kV line and then that technology became kind of obsolete, so Bonneville doesn't build 345 kV lines anymore. We build 500 kV lines in replacement. The existing towers would not support putting a 500 kV line on them because of the strength of them and because of how much clearance they have from the line to the steel and issues like that.

So in order to upgrade it, we would have to tear it down and rebuild it. Did that answer your question?

MR. MARK STARR: Well, mostly. I'm sure you know a lot more about this than I do, but the very fact of just tearing it down bothers me. It's like building a new school and then 12 years later somebody wants to tear it down and build another new school. And I'm just fishing around to see if there isn't some way in the overall program of distributing power lines in the Northwest that that line can be saved, whether you give it to Puget Sound Energy or
you do something with it to keep it.

    MS. IVY TYSON: Right. Well, one of our
alternatives is to keep it and build another parallel line
to it.

    MR. MARK STARR: And it would keep the line
that has just one power line on it?

    MS. IVY TYSON: Right. So, I mean, we have
two alternatives: One is to tear it down and rebuild it,
and one is to build a power line to it.

    MR. MARK STARR: Well, that makes me feel
better already.

    MR. GENE LYNARD: And also that line is about
50 years old, too.

    MR. MARK STARR: Well, I may be, too, and I'm
built out of this stuff, and that stuff's built out of
steel. It ought to last a hell of a long way yet. Gene,
I'm just joking.

The second comment I would like to make
would be a lifesaver. To those of us that have had a lot of
experience flying power lines, and I've flown a lot of power
to lines, the more of those bright bulbs you put up there, and
they must be rather expensive compared to even putting a
meeting on like this, the easier it is for us to see,
particularly in inclement whether and so on when. oops.
there's a power line, particularly that what i call a ground

1420-002-002 BPA will work with the FAA to determine spans that need
to be marked for safety.
wire & ck. that big single line that's way up on top.

Because some pilots coming by there, they might not be that well acquainted with the line, will see maybe three or four, whatever they are, great big power lines sagging across the valley and they think that if they go over those big lines that are sagging across the valley that they're in the clear, but they're not, there's that line that you have going across there.

And a very good friend of mine in Kittitas County ran into that line on May 18th, 1980, the same day the mountain blew its top, he ran into that high line up there and flipped his airplane over and killed him. And I'm speaking not just on his behalf, he was a very good friend of mine, but this has happened to a number of pilots that have hit lines. And those balls aren't all that expensive, and then we can say to Puget, let them know Bonneville Power has balls.

MS. IVY TYSON: Well, we always work with the FAA to mark the lines.

MR. MARK STARR: Well, yeah. I mean, beyond the FAA in an area of common sense. I've been around the FAA a lot, but beyond that, the lines up there, it is hard to see. Put on some goggles sometime when you're out crop-dusting like he was and try to see that line. It's hard to see.
To the extent that consumers are applying demand side management (DSM) (conservation) measures, or the retail utility is sponsoring DSM programs, those effects have been incorporated into the electric demand forecast. In the examination of non-transmission alternatives, the consultants found, “The range of 412,000 MWh to 1,500,000 MWh of required energy reduction is high compared to the level of annual growth in the Puget Sound Area of approximately 1,000,000 MWh. The DSM programs would need to reduce energy each year from half to one and a half times the annual energy growth.” See Appendix J, Section 6.4 and the response to Comment 1422-005-001.
MS. DIANE ADAMS: Why don't we go ahead and move into the formal comment period now, and we have two speakers signed up, Mr. Jon Zak and Mr. Richard Bonewits.

MR. RICHARD BONEWITS: Thank you. My name is Richard Bonewits. I'm chairman of the Greater Maple Valley Area Council. We serve as citizens advocates for the unincorporated portion of Tahoma School District. It means not including the City of Maple Valley. There are about 14,500 in the service area.

First I want to summarize. BPA has studied the issue of where to put another 500 kV transmission line to serve the Puget Sound region three times over the past three years, and three times they concluded that it should be through the Seattle Watershed because it is the shortest, least costly, does the least environmental damage, affects the fewest people and preserve their other existing routes. And this is one of the answers to one of your questions, part of the reason for leaving one of those other lines vacant or not touching it at this time around, it still gave them a little bit more growth for the future in case they missed their estimate.

But I've checked their estimate against the National Power Consumption, and their estimate is within -- he said 2 percent. The annual growth rate that's allowed is
normally a percent and a half to three, and you can find
that at the Department of Energy report that comes out
periodically.

These three studies ought to be enough to
convince people that the route through this watershed is the
best route, but don’t count on it. Citizens in this
community need to stand up and speak in behalf of BPA’s
tentative decision to help ensure that when this line is
built and energized it really is in the watershed. And I
know we don’t have many people here from North Bend today,
and I was hoping to see a few more from this region or from
Kittitas County, because I’m encouraging every one of you to
come downtown to Seattle tomorrow and join us. We’re going
to be there.

BPA has provided the technical detail, the
supporting analysis in the SDEIS that they briefly reviewed
with you. This line is needed to meet the region’s power
and way above the conservation savings that we have been
touted so loudly by the politicians and the various people
in Seattle and other places. Conservation is useful, but it
does not offset our voracious appetite for electrical
energy. Year-over-year energy demand exceeds conservation.

Others following me will show you, not so
much today, because so far Jon is the only one that came to
follow me, but tomorrow we’re going to expect to show you
again the differences between land stewardship by the City
of Seattle and people that live in the rural area, and
you'll find that we compare very favorably with the City of
Seattle in their stewardship of their wonderful watershed.
We know they're doing a good job, but they just recently
started it. They got into it because they anticipated being
captured by the Endangered Species Act and were urged to
put that plan together about seven years ago.
And I'm proud that they did it, but damn
well I want them to finish it up, get rid of all the 650
miles of roads in the watershed. It's many times more than
the lines that you're planning to use. Others will describe
the impacts tomorrow if this line is built outside the
watershed. We'll also show you that the rural residents
have done a better job at stewardship. And I want you to
know that in our team we have over 1500 people that signed
petitions that went to Bonneville last year and in four
groups. Roughly four to five groups, mainly two large ones,
the one that I really act as the leader of and another group
that thought that they were better off fighting the battle
by themselves, but there were two others that joined us, and
we were joined by the mayors of Issaquah, Maple Valley, the
Covington City manager, and they all have written letters to
Bonneville supporting the route through the watershed and
irate about putting it anywhere else.
In addition to that, since Janette's here today and she works for King County council member David Irons, and he has been with us from day one, your King County councilman from this district. We have U.S. Representative Jennifer Dunn with us on this in our position, two state representatives, Glenn Anderson, Cheryl Pflug, and the members of the King County staff of Maria Cantwell. It took a while, but we got them. So I'm asking everybody here to stand up today and give your comments. Jon, you're next.

MR. JON ZAK: My name is Jon Zak, and I live on two and a half acres in a development of about a hundred homes in Maple Valley. Our eastern property boundary will be the centerline of the proposed transmission line right-of-way line for Alternative C and we would lose the trees on one-quarter of our property. These trees are in a Native Growth Protection area. These trees range in size from two and a half to five feet in diameter breast height above the ground.

Alternative C would completely destroy our privacy and our view of the trees in our backyard. It would destroy our experience of living in nature. This was the reason we bought this property. As part of Habitat Conservation Plan, the map was prepared showing the age of
trees in the watershed. On BPA's preferred alternative
route, the age of the trees is 10 to 30 years. The trees in
my property in the Native Growth Protection Zone make the
trees in the watershed look like toothpicks.

I'd like to talk about what Seattle calls
the pristine watershed and a legacy for the future. The
watershed has been decimated by logging for about a hundred
years. There are over 600 miles of gravel logging roads in
the watershed. I would like to show you some pictures now.
This is a picture taken from McClellan's Butte looking down
into the watershed.

MR. RICHARD BONEWITS: Jon didn't explain
that he's a mountain climber.

MR. JON ZAK: McClellan's Butte, you can see
that as you're driving up I-90. There's another picture and
you can see the cut and the erosion around that road.
Another picture, just some of the logging roads. This was
taken in June, so there's still a little bit of snow.
And there's Chester Morris Lake. You can
see all the second- and third-growth trees. And this is a
view of our backyard, so this is in an area that would have
to be cut because these trees are endangering the power
lines. And this is another view of our backyard.

MS. DIANE ADAMS: Jon, when did you take
those pictures?
MR. JON ZAK: Last June of 2002. And I've got some more pictures taken off the Seattle Public Utilities website. They didn't have enough pixels, so I couldn't blow them up, but this shows some road construction. And, you know, I don't think that heavy equipment is using vegetable oil.

MR. RICHARD BONEWITTS: We didn't see any helicopters there either.

MR. JON ZAK: Here's a picture of Chester Morris Lake, and you can see they separated the good water from the bad water with that boom. And you can see more heavy equipment, you know, construction workers right around the lake shore. Some more heavy equipment building the road. And then here's showing some erosion on an existing logging road. That's it with the pictures. Pictures of the construction in the watershed by Seattle Public Utilities proves their hypocrisy. Seattle Public Utilities has one standard for themselves and another one for the BPA. I believe conservation organizations should be spending their time and efforts on something more critical than the Cedar River Watershed. How about George Bush's proposal for cutting trees in national forests to prevent fires? How about all of the clear-cutting on the Raging River Watershed just north of Tiger Summit along Highway 18? Activities like the
passage of the Wild Sky Wilderness Bill and the addition of
the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area are far more important than
a watershed that is off limits to the public.

I would like Seattle Public Utilities to
answer these four questions:

Number one: Where is the evidence that BPA
has caused any harm to water quality or watershed operation
in its 30 years of operating a power line in the watershed?

Question two: What evidence does Seattle
have that clearing an additional 91 acres for a second power
line is more damaging to water quality than failure to
impressively replant the 600 miles of logging roads already
in the watershed?

I did a calculation of the acreage of all
the logging roads in the watershed. The total road acreage
is over 2600 acres. An additional 91 acres for a second
power line is only three and a half percent of the acreage
of the logging that's already in existence, and this does
not even include any acreage for existing clear-cuts.

Question three: When is Seattle going to
acknowledge to the public that it was ordered to develop an
extensive water treatment system as the result of pathogen
problems in 1992, part of those plans included the
development and design of a water filtration facility?

And the final question, number four:

Comment noted.
Clearing 91 acres for a second power line would require one-tenth of one percent of the watershed's total acreage of 90,240. How can this small an amount of clearing have any impact on water quality?

The Habitat Conservation Plan is a great idea. Too bad the Habitat Conservation Plan was not an idea in the City of Seattle. The City was forced to create a Habitat Conservation Plan to meet the requirements of the Endangered Species Act. How about the habitat of people living along Alternative C? Is the wildlife habitat inside the watershed more important for both wildlife and humans outside the watershed? The people who lose their property will be paying a price for Seattle's water. The City of Seattle will destroy the rural communities of Hobart and Ravensdale all due to their unfounded water quality issues.

Thank you.

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS:

On Route B and D, Camp Waskowitz, owned by Highland Public District, has received historic status. Concerned that B and D will affect it. Why does the watershed get more preference than the camp? Kids? You have done the study three times and were

1420-005-001, -002, -003, and -004 The Camp North Bend (or Camp Waskowitz) Historic District was listed in the National Register of Historic Places and the Washington Heritage Register in 1993. Its area of significance is identified as "Conservation." Construction of Project Alternatives B or D would have an adverse effect on the district by adding to the land use, noise, and visual impacts that accompany the existing line. If one of these alternatives were selected, BPA would work with the State Historic Preservation Officer to take into consideration the impact and develop mitigation measures or otherwise resolve the adverse effect.
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1420-006-001  Comment noted.

1420-007-001  BPA will work with the FAA to determine spans that need to be marked for safety.

1420-008-001  After BPA released a draft environmental impact statement in June 2001, BPA was asked and agreed to analyze in greater detail alternatives outside of the watershed, and to look at non-construction alternatives. BPA has conducted this additional analysis and concluded that Alternative 1 is still the preferred transmission line route. The final decision will be made by BPA’s Administrator in a Record of Decision, scheduled for August 2003. People on the project mailing list will be sent notice of the decision.

1420-009-001 and -002  Please refer to the SDEIS, Section 4.11.2.5, Community Values and Concerns, Property Value Impact. King County was included in the study. If an easement is acquired across your property, BPA’s offer would be based on a professional real estate appraisal.

1420-010-001  See response to Comment 1389-001.

1420-010-001  There are multiple things that could delay the Record of Decision, such as BPA choosing a different alternative other than the current preferred alternative, new information obtained from the comment period for the SDEIS that would result in more studies, drastic changes in BPA’s economic health, a sudden downturn in anticipated load growth beyond currently anticipated, and many other unforeseen items. BPA is committed to use its best efforts to have a Record of Decision in August 2003.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment 1420-011-002</th>
<th>EMF has no impact on water quality. Water passing through magnetic or electric fields is no different from &quot;unexposed&quot; water.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment 1420-012-001</td>
<td>The trees that would be removed from the right-of-way for the preferred route vary in age from young plantations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment 1420-012-002</td>
<td>to stands that have trees upwards to 80 years of age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment 1420-013-001</td>
<td>Please see response to Comment 1420-039-002.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please see Chapter 2 of the SDEIS for the costs of each alternative. See also Table 2-3.
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1421-001-001 Comment noted.

1421-001-002 Comment noted.

1421-002-001 Comment noted. Please see Section 4.13 of the SDEIS for information about noise impacts.

1421-002-002 Comment noted.

1421-003-001 Comment noted.

1421-003-002 Comment noted.

1421-004-001 Comment noted.

1421-004-002 Comment noted.

1421-004-003, -004, -005, and -006 See response to Comment 1389-001.

1421-005-001 BPA is conducting the environmental review on the proposed project on the human environment. The human environment includes both the social environment and the natural environment. The social environment includes such resources areas as land use, recreation, transportation, socioeconomics, noise, public health and safety, aesthetics, and cultural resources. Before BPA makes a decision on locating any of its major transmission facilities it looks at all environmental impacts, costs and how the alternative would affect the transmission system. Natural resources, including wildlife, are not favored over social resources in BPA’s decision-making.

1421-006-001 Comment noted.
require filtration systems. "Surface Water Treatment Rule" (refer to federal standards for drinking water).

The CRW knew the filtration requirements in 1996. The Toll River filtration was completed in 2000 by Seattle Public Utilities. The CRW is using the BPA project, using political pull to have BPA pay for this filtration system.

The new RIM would occupy an area equal to one-tenth of one percent of the CRW - (141 Square miles). Seems like a "minor" impact! Alts B and D would impact much greater area.

Selling a property with power lines, increasing tower height, higher voltage, additional lines, potentially makes my property unsalable.

I've had to put improvements to my property on hold until I know which route you'll build. As a result, the original estimate for my improvements has risen by 37%, while I've been on hold!! I can't write any of this off on my taxes - it's my loss due to your project.

If BPA is concerned about people, why not design towers that are aesthetically pleasing rather than a...
negative visual impact?

This is all political for CRW and Sierra Club. I agree underground transmission lines would be the best way to go. I realize it's cost prohibitive. Then why force the line across other alternatives when human beings are impacted - financially, aesthetically, noise pollution, everything!

I live along Alt. B/D, served by the Sallal Watershed. Will you enforce the same mitigation measures (i.e. helicopter logging, microphyles, etc.) to protect this watershed?

The Rocky Reach No. 5 line is directly over the electric box (generator) which delivers water to Mt. Si and Sallal homesties (Alt. B-D). CRW's mission statement is in support of "people" and the environment/ecology. The Sierra Club supports CRW's mission statement. To achieve the mission statement, the Sierra Club is willing to use "aggressive grass roots action on an unprecedented scale to influence public policy." (See their website.) If they are in support of people, then why put people at risk? We the people along alternatives along
the watershed don't have the empowerment to fight at the
same levels.

There's already an existing power line across the CRW.
They report the water quality is outstanding - so do they
have any studies or monitoring data to show that the power
lines have caused sediment-turbidity of particles, erosion,
contamination. How bad is it now? These structures don't
have micropyles - weren't constructed with helicopters!!

Commercial logging is banned in the watershed. Any
money from timber cut in the watershed should go to
restoration of the watershed to be conducted by the City.

I believe you have addressed "all" of CRW's issues
(helicopter logging, mitigation, plant replacement, etc.)
The letters made it sound as if you have agreed to pay for
the filtration system if needed. Is this true? Your letter
states, "If BPA decides to build the line, we would mitigate
for any impacts to the watershed to ensure a safe drinking
water supply for the Seattle area."

How close can homes be to the edge of the R/W?

The DEIS does not identify the specific locations of

1421-016-001, -002, and -003 You are correct. The current water quality
in the CRW is good.

1421-017-001 and -002 Comment noted. If BPA were to decide to
construct the project through the Cedar River Municipal
Watershed, it would purchase the land rights from Seattle
Public Utilities, who own title to the CRMW. The
disposition of any monies that would be obtained by
SPU for the timber that would be removed to construct
the line would be up to SPU, not BPA.

1421-018-001 and -002 BPA has not committed to purchasing a
filtration plant. BPA has agreed to purchase insurance
that could pay for a filtration plant in the event the
project causes Seattle to need to construct such a
filtration plant by order of the Department of Health. BPA
is committed to safe guard Seattle’s drinking water with
multiple mitigation measures that would reduce or
eliminate erosion.

1421-019-001 BPA's transmission line easements do not allow structures
within the right-of-way. BPA does not control location of
structures outside of its right-of-way.

1421-020-001 BPA has no information on where the staging area(s)
would be located at this time. The selection of staging
areas would be at the discretion of the contractor and
would be approved by the landowner. No staging areas
would be in the Cedar River Watershed.
the staging areas - this makes the alternatives difficult to evaluate. You should at least have some alternatives for locations of staging areas.

The way you've numbered/identified your alternatives is very confusing. 1, 2, 3, 4, A, B, C, D - you should have started over when you added alternatives.

Mitigation lands not specifically defined.

Double circuit over Cedar River but not over Raging River.

Specific properties proposed as mitigation are not enough. Specific properties need to include properties along Raging River.

Land mitigations need to be paid for by BPA.

How do you mitigate for TV interference?

If you put taller double circuit towers on each side of the Cedar River - you could allow the vegetation to grow taller near the Cedar than you would otherwise allow.

BPA used numbers (1, 2, 3, and 4) to represent alternatives being considered in the Cedar River Municipal Watershed and letters (A, B, C and D) to represent alternatives being considered outside of the watershed. Since this labeling was used in the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS), BPA decided to continue to use it for the SDEIS.

Please see response to Comment 340-002.

Comment noted.

See response to Comments 1415-003 and -004.

See response to Comment 1415-005.

Interference with television reception can be corrected by any of several approaches: improving the receiving antenna system; installing a remote antenna; installing an antenna for TV stations less vulnerable to interference; connecting to an existing cable system; or installing a translator. BPA has an active program to identify, investigate, and mitigate legitimate complaints.

BPA is proposing to use double-circuit towers within the existing ROW on each side of the Cedar River.
The CRW provides drinking water to the entire City of Seattle and surrounding areas. This affects between 1.5 and 3 million people. These people are not trying to "confiscate" or otherwise impact the people (property owners) who are in potential alternative areas. This is an issue of power needs vs. Environmental/drinking water concerns. This has nothing to do with "property values."

To inject the fear of sale value of a property into this issue ignores the basic premise, and is very selfish.

The need to conserve energy is very real, and a valid approach for this reason, the nontransmission alternative should be seriously considered. In that light, social policy in regards to commercial advertising in particular needs focus.

1421-029-001, and -002 Comment noted.

1421-028-001, -002, -003, and -004 Comment noted.
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1421-030-001  BPA is continually meeting with the city of Seattle concerning crossing the CRW with a new transmission line. The City and BPA are in negotiations. The issues for Seattle are impacts the transmission line could cause to their drinking water and to their Habitat Conservation Plan. BPA would implement best management practices to minimize impacts to the drinking water and the HCP. As a result, Seattle has made it clear they do not want the new transmission line to cross their watershed unless considerable mitigation and best management practices are put in place. As described the SDEIS, considerable best management practices for design and construction have already been agreed to. BPA has also purchased 350 acres, and would purchase more lands to help mitigate crossing of the watershed.

---

OPEN MEETING Q&A:

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Lou, you mentioned that you’re in negotiations with the City, continuing to do that. Can you elaborate on those, what the status of those is and what the issues are there?

MR. LOU DREISSEN: We're -- I think really all I can say at this point is we're still talking with the City and the City’s talking with us. And the City is very clear that they don’t want this transmission line on their property. So the negotiations center around what kind of mitigation measures can BPA do to cross the watershed, associated particularly with the drinking water, impacts to the drinking water quality, and also with the Habitat Conservation Plan. So we're, like I said, talking, negotiating back and forth with Seattle City with those two large issues.

BPA recognizes that certainly from our standpoint we're trying to build an electrical system that is reliable and safe for the area. We also recognize that drinking water quality certainly is very important to the local citizens, and so it's a very large concern to us to make sure we don't impact the drinking water quality. And also that Seattle and the environmental community went through a large step to create a Habitat Conservation Plan on the
watershed, and that's also very important and then trying to find ways to mitigate for the impact that this project may have on that Habitat Conservation Plan. So we're looking at not only construction mitigation, and certainly you probably heard about some of those already that includes special footing types on the watershed, micropiles, using helicopters to place structures in place as opposed to using a large crane to place, also using helicopters to take some trees out of the area, taking care of how the roads are placed and any new roads that are needed are placed and making sure that there's no erosion coming off the roads. And our best management practices, using silt fences and bales of hay at every disturbed area, if that's necessary. So we'll be studying every disturbed area and determining what needs to take place in those areas. I'm looking at using two double-circuit towers, for instance, for crossing the Cedar River Watershed, or the Cedar River itself, excuse me, in that canyon because, again, we're very concerned about the potential for erosion into the Cedar River because of the drinking water quality aspects and it also happens to be important to the corridor from the wildlife standpoint.

In addition to all that, we're looking at -- certainly BPA's already purchased 350 acres immediately adjacent to and north of the Cedar River as a possibility of
turning that over to the City of Seattle for compensation
for 90 acres that the right-of-way would take out of the
habitat, and we're also -- BPA is also looking at some other
properties as a potential, besides that 350 acres, also with
the potential of turning those properties over to Seattle.
So negotiations are still ongoing, which I think at this
point it's been ongoing for quite a while, and I think
that's a good sign that we're still talking to each other.
Certainly time is of the essence. I think one
thing that wasn't mentioned in much detail is that we are
looking at starting construction, if possible, and if
everything comes to a proper conclusion on the preferred
plan, we would like to start construction like in the August
time frame on the preferred plan with the energization,
completion of the project and energization by the end of
this year. As Brian mentioned earlier, BPA still thinks
it's important, not really from our standpoint but Seattle's
standpoint. King County's standpoint and to some degree also
Canada with the Canadian entitlement standpoint, that this
project is built and we build back in the reliability that's
needed in our system.
So the local area, including Seattle, really needs
this project. If it were to go to one of the other
alternatives, we would probably likely add another two years
on our schedule as a minimum because the only alternative
The Canadian Treaty power is produced at dams in the U.S. (See Appendix I.) In an agreement from the 1960s, the Canadians sold their one-half share of the benefits to the United States for 30 years. Those sales are now expiring. Both the Canadian and U.S. utilities have been planning for this eventuality when determining their resource needs. According to published information, British Columbia is approaching load/resource balance, including the return of the Treaty power. U.S. utilities have planned to develop or purchase the power needed to meet the return obligation. British Columbia sells power to California mostly in the spring, summer and fall. During the winter cold weather event that triggers the need for the proposed line, British Columbia would also be seeing increased demands, and would use all of the power to meet their own needs.
MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: I'm sorry, why don't you go ahead with the question.

MS. CINDY DENSMORE: Well, I'm just wondering if you bought the power from BC instead of building this line, and then my other question is that -- I'm nervous -- we also sell energy to California, okay, why can't we -- sorry --

MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: I can try and answer that. Because this is the least cost alternative for the Canadians. They want their power back that's produced in the United States. We have looked at other alternatives to returning the power over the transmission system. We spent more than ten years in discussions with the Canadians and an agreement was signed in 1999 to require the return of that power. That's what they would prefer because it's to their advantage to get the power returned.

MS. CINDY DENSMORE: But are they going to sell that power to somebody else?

MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: I don't think that's very likely in the wintertime. That's when they need it the most. They're a winter peaking area just like we are.

MS. CINDY DENSMORE: Well, but for 30 years they have not used this power. Now all of a sudden they're going to use this power?
MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: I think part of the reason if you look at the forecast of the supply and demand situation in Canada, they are load resource balance, they are approaching load resource balance, so this is the point that they need that power back, that is correct.

MR. LOU DREISSEN: What's happened is the same thing in the Vancouver area, in particular, has happened in the Seattle area. So if you are familiar with King County and how it's grown, Vancouver has grown very large also. So they're continuing to add load to their electrical demand.

So they're in a similar situation really to what King County is currently. So they want to have the ability to be able to not only to sell power to California like they have or to the Northwest. We bought power from them also, but also to get that power back to them because they really need it in the Vancouver area, just like Brian said, during their winter just like we do in the Northwest.

MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: Typically Northwest utilities both in the United States and Canada will sell to California in the summertime when their demands are peaking because of air-conditioning loads. In the wintertime the power tends to travel north. So there's really no reason to be selling large amounts of power into California in the winter. The direction is the other way when Vancouver and Puget Sound area loads are peaking during the cold weather.
1421-032-001 BPA thoroughly examined non-transmission alternatives in the SDBS. Please see Appendix J.

1421-032-003 and -004 The consultant's study examined non-transmission alternatives in terms of feasibility as well as economic effectiveness. In Appendix J, Section 1.2, they find "As illustrated in Figure 1, a 3-year deferral of the line would require 100% of the available load relief from the large aluminum smelter in the area, plus operation of all existing generation not expected to be on-line, plus load relief from 28% of industrial load in the area. To put the 28% industrial participation rate in perspective, we reviewed information from 13 utility DR programs, and found only four with participation rates above 5%." This finding is without regard to cost.

The EIS also considers the economics of each alternative. The $25 million figure was established as a reference to compare non-construction alternatives to the preferred alternative.
to work within because that actually shouldn't have been there as a parameter.

MR. LOU DREISSEN: I'll try to answer the first one. Maybe Brian can answer the second one. For starters is BPA elected, and it's not required, elected to look at the preferred plan and do a detailed engineering and environmental and survey aspects to that alternative with the hopes, strictly with the hopes that we would be able to finish this project in the time frame that we thought it was needed.

From a legal standpoint, we do not need to do detailed engineering and those kind of aspects on every alternative. We need to do a reasonable search, and we've done that, and most of our search has been associated with what we consider a maximum impact. So we've looked at more than likely what will take place in those other alternatives so that we compare one alternative against another. We have looked at it from a cost standpoint, we've looked at every alternative so we can have a comparative analysis from one alternative to another, and if one of those alternatives were to be chosen, which is usually what BPA does in most of its projects, is that the detailed engineering and detailed survey doesn't happen until after a directed decision because there's a tremendous amount of costs associated with that. there's a lot of time associated with that.
So, again, from a timing standpoint, BPA elected
to take the risk to do the detailed engineering and detailed
survey studies during the time frame that we were doing the
environmental analysis on all the alternatives, recognizing
that in the end BPA may end up choosing one of the other
alternatives, in which case all of these costs would be
subcosts and we would need to do the same kind of an issue
on the alternative that actually gets chosen.

So strictly BPA wanted the project -- saw that the
project needed to be done within the time frame we're
looking at. Actually, originally we were looking at the
need for this project to be completed last year, so now
we're looking at this year based upon the new load forecast
and other aspects and also went back and added additional
routes in our environmental process.

MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: To respond to Michael's
questions regarding the analysis of the nonconstruction
alternatives, there are really two components to the
analysis that the experts did for us. The first is a
technical feasibility, what does it take to defer the need
for a time and is that achievable, and the second is an
economic evaluation of comparing that cost against the
project.

The chart that I show here, which showed the
amount of load reduction that's required for both the
aluminum smelter and the large industrial loads, and the
amount of generation that would need to be on line has no
limitation on economics. That's simply a physical need of
the system. Okay? And so their evaluation showed, for
example, that demand reduction at industrial plants would
need to be 28 percent of the load. Regardless of what we
pay in the way of incentives, that is a huge, huge
participation into band reduction programs. Typical
response is on the order of five percent in industrial
programs around the country based on their survey.

Now, the second part of the analysis does look at
economics, and one of the things that we look at in the
analysis is a cost comparison of various alternatives. As
the consultants noted, the amount of payments that's
available given the projected cost of the project is
relatively small on a dollars per kilowatt basis. And even
if you doubled or tripled or quadrupled the cost of the
project looking at the other wires alternatives, you would
get nowhere near the level of incentive payments that we've
seen in other demand response programs around the country.

MR. MICHAEL SHANK: Just a point of clarification
of what I was asking to your question, I wasn't recommending
that you do similar involvement because I understand there
was some contract -- potential contracting bids going out
already on the watershed, which is actually undermining the
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Cultural resources are evaluated for their eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The criteria for eligibility are found in the Code of Federal Regulations, 36 CFR 40.4. BPA requires its cultural resource contractor to prepare determination of eligibility forms, which it then submits to the State Historic Preservation Officer for review. The Tribes receive materials about the cultural resources assessment and determinations of resource eligibility for their review.

need for process, but I was just more interested in BPA's investment in all possible alternatives. It's obvious that you were invested in the watershed, and I was looking for equal investment distributed among several alternatives, not necessarily engineering and contracting, but just more time investment, money investment.

MR. LOU DREISSNER: Well, I think the fact that we've gone through and opened up our environmental process and come back with a supplemental draft EIS indicates that we're spending a lot of time and effort on all these other alternatives. I think we are looking at those on an equal basis, so we've spent a lot of time. We've hired several environmental consultants to go through those other alternatives to come up with detailed analysis from an environmental impacts perspective. But I think that short of doing the detailed engineering and surveying aspects on the preferred route, they're all being treated equally. We spent an equal amount of time on all of them.

MR. RICHARD CHAMPLIN: You mentioned that you drilled 1,170 holes, or something to that effect, in looking for cultural resources and indicated that perhaps two of them had some that you deemed were insignificant. I was wondering how do you determine whether something is insignificant and is that determination done in concert with the tribes that might be concerned about that?
MR. GENE LYNARD: We didn’t drill the holes. We
dug these holes with a shovel, our cultural resource
contractor did, and the two items that were found, one was a
spike related to the logging industry and the other was a
trench, and neither were deemed to have any cultural
significance.

MR. HILARY LORENZ: During your discussions with
the City of Seattle, did they ever talk to you about an
operation they called forebay cleaning at the Landsburg
Diversion Site?

MR. LOU DREISSEN: No, I have not heard about
that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I have two questions.
one very brief, this is great, but I have forgotten and it
didn’t jump out at me. How many -- going through the
watershed, your preferred alternative, how many acres would
be cleared with your additional 150 foot easement?

MR. GENE LYNARD: 91.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: 91. Second thing, is
this very good, you read the cost of this, cost of that,
do you guys ever have a piece of paper that says Alternative
A, B, C, D and Alternative 1, 2, 3 cost, land clearing and
so forth, or am I just missing it?

MR. GENE LYNARD: That’s in our EIS Table 2.3. We
have a summary table, Table 2.3, summary of impacts from

No, they have not. BPA is committed, if the preferred
alternative is chosen, to use the extensive best
management practices outlined in the SDEIS. BPA
recognizes that this project may be held to higher
standards than those used by Seattle in the past. BPA is
very concerned about the potential impact to Seattle’s
drinking water.

Approximately 86 acres would be cleared within the
proposed right-of-way. Additional “danger trees” would
be taken outside of the right-of-way. Danger trees are
any trees that may pose a threat to the safe operation of
the line.

Please see Table 2-3 in the SDEIS which compares the
various alternatives.
alternatives, and it's at the very bottom we have the cost
for each of the alternatives.

    UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you. I
just didn't have that.

    MR. GENE LYNARD: And that's on the cd.

    MR. CHARLIE RAINES: Good evening. I'm Charlie
rains, and I'm speaking on behalf of the Sierra Club. We
still have questions about the need for this line but will
address those in our written comments. Tonight I'll focus
on construction alternatives. BPA has proposed its new
power lines through the Cedar River Watershed and the upper
Raging River Watershed. The City has just completed their
HCP which is protecting the forests of the Cedar River
Watershed which is prime habitat for wildlife and drinking
water for over a million people.

    The Sierra Club is opposed to a linear clear-cut
through the watershed that's proposed by BPA. This could
seriously damage the low elevation forest and resulting
impacts on fish and wildlife and water. BPA's corridors
right now are weed infested wastelands and BPA has projected
alternatives that would have eliminated the additional
clearing by doubling the existing towers. Due to
public opposition and the grossly inadequate draft EIS, BPA
has now written a new EIS. Appropriately, the document
looks at other alternatives, some of which would run through

1421-036-001 and -002 Comment noted.
1421-036-003, -004, and -005 Comment noted.
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1421-036-006 and -007  BPA is planning to mitigate for crossing the Cedar River Watershed. The lands outside of the watershed are owned by private landowners and the Department of Natural Resources. BPA pays to cross their properties. Those landowners can use those moneys received from BPA to purchase other properties if they determine it necessary. BPA intends to closely examine the clearing needs along and near the Raging River and would use methods to minimize erosion potential to the Raging River, such as topping of trees, if feasible, and encouraging low-growing vegetation.

1421-036-008 and -009  See response to Comment 1415-003 and -004.
BPA is working with SPU to develop a vegetation management plan for both the existing and proposed rights-of-way. The plan will prescribe site-specific management practices that provide habitat, protect and restore aquatic resources, and control weeds.

Comment noted.

BPA is allowing 45 days for public/agency review of the SDEIS. We acknowledge that the document contains a lot of information, and that an EIS consists of two documents, i.e., the draft and final EISs. We anticipate releasing the final EIS on July 1, 2003, and a Record of Decision in August. To maintain this schedule, BPA cannot assure that comments received after March 1, 2003 will be considered in the FEIS.
3-206
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1421-038-002  BPA is committed, and legally bound to implement the mitigation measures that it inserts into its Record of Decision, pursuant to 40 CFR 1503.3  That federal regulation states, in part, “Mitigation (§ 1505.2(c)) and other conditions established in the environmental impact statement or during its review and committed as part of the decision shall be implemented by the lead agency or other appropriate consenting agency.”

1421-038-001

alternative study. Biodiversity Northwest requests an additional 30 days to review and allow for public comment, both organizationally and citizens also needing more time for adequate review.

Assuming the new deadline of April 1st, 2003, all interested parties will have more accurate time to give proper examination to the stated articles and studies.

Without the 30-day extension, BPA could be perceived as attempting to move pertinent information forward without sufficient public review. We hope that BPA complies. While Biodiversity Northwest will need more time to fully inspect the 1800 page SEIS and the nontransmission alternative, we would like to take this opportunity to encourage BPA to not proceed with the Cedar River Watershed like they’re proceeding with the Columbia River, by backing out of contracts, commitments and promises.

With the watershed as the preferred alternative, how is the City of Seattle, environmental groups and citizens expected to believe the promises put forth in any BPA administered mitigation package if it is not legally binding? We understand from BPA’s track record, example, the Columbia River, that the agency prefers to refrain from any legally binding commitment at all, and how, then, can we believe anything that you offer at the negotiating table unless BPA will agree to sign under the legally binding
Biodiversity Northwest encourages BPA to discuss a mitigation package with the City if BPA is willing to be held accountable for their alleged promises.

Biodiversity Northwest also encourages BPA to follow the legal procedures as stated in the Need for Process which are required agency of BPA, to seriously study all feasible alternatives and to be in compliance with scoping comments that request specific studies.

The SEIS at first look seems to fail in this regard, refraining from any feasible nontransmission alternative that is more comprehensive, incorporating entitlement negotiations, demand response programs, demand site management programs, generation and distributed generation, regional availability of natural gas, existing distributed generation, new distributed generation, renewal generation and emerging technologies. BPA's SDEIS appears to review only a handful of these possible nontransmission alternatives and has admitted to failing anything comprehensive because of lack of time.

We're encouraging you to take the necessary time.

Tom Foley states that these studies will need to take place in the next few years, and we're asking you to study them now. The rest of Biodiversity Northwest's comments will come after the public comment due date has been extended.

Comment noted.

BPA believes it has considered a reasonable array of non-transmission alternatives, including demand response programs, demand-side management measures, local power generation, and the availability of natural gas, solar and wind power as alternative energy sources. A study of non-transmission alternatives was undertaken as a direct result of scoping comments.

The examination of non-transmission alternatives was comprehensive in that it examined the three broad categories of measures: demand response, demand side management and generation. The measures were looked at individually as well as packaged together to take advantage of the best characteristics of each. Please see Appendix J.

BPA is very concerned about the schedule for this project and has not extended the comment period.
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1421-039-001

1421-039-001 and -002 Rebuilding the existing line to a double-circuit line essentially provides no additional capacity to serve the Puget Sound load. This is because BPA must plan for an outage of the double-circuit line as required by the North American Electric Reliability Council (NERC). Whereas, if we build a single circuit line parallel to the existing line, the NERC Criteria (and more specifically the Western Electricity Coordination Council Criteria) does not require us to consider the outage of both single-circuit lines. See also response to Comment 1459-009.

1421-040-001 and -002 Comment noted.
Watershed, which threads the City of Seattle and surrounding areas, which is one of only a few in the entire United States that is so clean it needs no filtration system other than what nature has provided. This is also, whether it is indicated in the provided documentation by PEA or not, about an energy fatal brought about by regulation and a subsequent opportunistic energy fraud perpetrated by Enron and other companies.

We were told some time ago there was a shortage coming up, which I believe was manufactured, and that therefore we need to upgrade power. We are still being told this in spite of what has happened over the last year and a half. I have not forgotten about Enron and the way they scammed the entire Western United States. Evidently some have forgotten, but I hope you haven't. Because of this ongoing perpetuated threat of having our lights, our heat and our dialysis machines suddenly turned off, we're supposed to throw our entire concept of environmental stewardship out the door. We are supposed to be concerned now about energy shortages and quote, unquote national security more than we are about clean water.

If polluted water lost an entire species of salmon and other fish, the loss of habitat and further degradation of a fast disappearing forest and the insult to the people that might have hunted and fished there before we came is...
not a threat to our national identity and pride, then what is it? Is it progress? I don't buy that.

Please don't try to blackmail us with threats of blackouts. BPA needs to stop thinking about cheap and easy. They need to think about management and about respect for the concerns of the majority of us who do depend on this water, this shed, and who love this area for its beauty.

Thank you.

MR. RON IVERSON: I'm Ron Iverson. I have property in the Hobart area which will be affected by Alternative C. I've been to probably ten meetings on this, and I guess I can sum it all up: BPA, you did it right the first time; and the second, democracy does work. I've been to eight meetings and get damn tired of people that have cultural diversity problems and things like that. First few meetings we had I thought this thing was resolved, and then March 26th Margaret (inaudible) had some comments and you probably got tired of listening to four people say they want to tear down the existing power line -- I'm not making this up -- abrogate the Canadian treaty, litigate, litigate, litigate with dollar signs in their eyes. I got tired of that. I was kind of ticked off about that.

But I think this product that you guys have put together is much better. I have looked at -- there certainly can be no argument on any of us if the water
quality is going to be affected, we would all go away. If there's any compelling evidence that building a parallel line is going to degrade that water system, we would all say look at some other alternatives. There's no compelling evidence. And it looks like Seattle's concerns for water quality predates the proposed line. I think we all want something that has the least impact on people, the environment, and we can't throw out cost completely.

So the bottom line, I think you guys have done a really good thing here. I have seen some things on poles and mitigation and so forth that I didn't see before, so my compliments to you. And, finally, I want to say something about Biodiversity Northwest, which is not exactly in your back pocket. I think Michael Shank and his crew look at things aggressively and, by golly, their comments said deep six Alternative C. Michael, I do appreciate you being willing to take a look at all these things and get rid of one of the dumbest alternatives you can say. I said with the math that any third grader could figure out that was the worst alternative.

MS DIANE ADAMS: Sir, let's keep our comments focused on the draft EIS, please.

MR. RON IVERSON: Final thing. I would say you did a good job. One compelling comment I heard from a lady was why would you use the power of eminent domain to screw up

1421-040-003 and -004 Comment noted.

1421-040-005 and -006 Comment noted.
There were several comments previously received requesting BPA specifically study routes B and D as viable alternatives to crossing the Cedar River Watershed. Those comments came from the city of Seattle, Tribes and environmental groups. Alternatives B and D are constructible, though very expensive. They do present their own environmental issues as indicated in the SDEIS. Alternatives B and D, if not chosen for this project, could still be used for some future transmission line project currently not planned.

Please see response to comments 1421-032-001 and 1421-038-006.

1421-042-002 and -003  Comment noted.

The analysis of non-transmission alternatives (Appendix J) does not reference and was not based on the Business Plan EIS.
The analysis of non-transmission alternatives, Appendix J, examined six different economic perspectives. Ratepayer Impact Measure (RIM) - Transmission Company, while important, was only one of the measures. See Appendix J, Section 3. Even assuming societal costs and benefits were the basis for a decision, the non-construction alternatives can not meet the need. See response to Comment 1421-032-003.
double. BPA has a choice to look at societal costs and societal benefits and that is the choice that you should make.

It's imperative -- you state that it is imperative to keep the transmission business lines looking at rates. That's not imperative. That's a choice. If you don't make a choice to look at all the societal costs and benefits, develop a non-transmission alternative that's viable, you're not doing the public any good and don't think that this is over. Thank you.

MR. RICHARD BONNERT: Well, I'm not going to ask you to justify the demand. I'm not going to ask you to change people's habit because we can't get them to turn the light bulbs off or put timers on the water heater. We've been through all of that a year ago. It's all in the book. Those answers are there.

90 percent of the power demanded for this power line comes from Seattle and the suburban cities, less than one percent is used in the area within which it's running. A major BPA quadrilateral transmission line grid already exists in this area, and believe me there's 110 kV, 230 kV and 500 kV lines already there. All proposed transmission lines cross sensitive rivers, either the Cedar or the Snoqualmie, many streams and wetlands and forested lands. all proposed routes have the potential for significant
In this -- in what you have planned, the approach you took, you made Seattle a beneficiary to a BPA construction management plan that the rural area citizens would love to have. It is more protective to the environment than your own past practices, your present practices or anything demanded by King County and certainly is not going to make what we call the Critical Areas Ordinance. Seattle is also beneficiary to a generous mitigation plan that more than compensates for the environmental damage of a second power line. Proposed route through the watershed -- outside the watershed, I should say, will result in more damage and you're going to see firsthand evidence, and some of you folks in Seattle that doubt that, we're encouraging you to get off the tour bus through the watershed. We have been on that, too, but we want you to come out and look at the rural area and we're going to show you that the trees are bigger on the outside than they are in.

Seattle raised water quality issues, but that's a red herring, too. No one is going to compromise water quality, no one is proposing to do anything about compromising. There's been an existing line in the watershed for 30 years and there's no evidence of a problem. In '92 the Seattle was ordered to come up with a
design for a filtration plant. It has not been implemented yet. It was ordered to do so by the State of Washington.

It is still not in place. It could more for itself by getting rid of the roads and doing what it says it's going to do in the Habitat Conservation Plan than it can about arguing with the 92 acres.

Now, the cost is an issue, and the studies clearly show the difference, and, therefore, isn't any doubt in my mind that when you go one level more in detail and put the mitigation to it, it may quadruple again and it's going to quadruple on the longer routes.

Lastly, if the folks at Seattle would like something to really look at, consider studying another alternative route: The Rocky Reach, the Renton line, you could energize that one and run it right down the middle of Lake Washington on pontoons with 180 foot towers on it. That might be more environmentally friendly.

MR. RICHARD TINSLEY: Some places in the country have some pretty terrible water, but we're fortunate here in the Seattle area to have good water, so clean and pure that we don't have to build an expensive filtering plant for it. We want to keep it that way. For the last 50 years or so, Seattle has had a practice of buying up private lands in the watershed so they can maintain the purity of their water. And through this diligent effort they have managed to do so.
The land is not open to the general public, it's not open for recreation, et cetera. They want to keep it for water quality, and as an added bonus we get the wildlife habitat and so on. I'm not convinced at all that this transmission line needs to be built, but if it is built, it should not be built in the Cedar River Watershed. If it is in the Cedar River Watershed, that will make more of an impact, you have your vehicles driving up and down for maintenance, you have the oil percolating into the ground, and there's more of a potential for polluting the water which would require us to build an expensive filtration plant. Don't put it in the watershed. Thank you.

MR. SCOTT TAYLOR: Hi, guys, I'm Scott Taylor. I am a tree hugging property owner. I live outside of Hobart over on Tiger Mountain, and I work in Seattle. So no matter what decision BPA makes, I get it one way or the other. If they go through the watershed and the water quality is compromised, I will drink it at work. If they go through my backyard and they compromise the water quality of my well, I get it at home. So I'm able to see both sides of the story.

I want to give you guys some compliments on your EIS. You guys went through an awful lot of work on identifying mitigation techniques. Specifically I was impressed about the vegetable oil instead of hydraulic fluids. That's pretty cool. I didn't know you could do
that. Helicopters, I knew about that: the micropile
tfoings, that's awesome; temporary mats: minimize
vegetation cutting. You guys have gone through an awful lot
of -- I mean, there's a whole list on page 5-4 of all the
stuff you are going to do to minimize impact to the Cedar
River Watershed, and I applaud you on that.

However, I would like to point out what I think to
be a bit of political hypocrisy. That list isn't there if
you go through any of the alternatives, and that frankly
pisses me off. If you guys are going to take helicopters
and do micropile footings on this, which is the Cedar River
Watershed, why not do it on hundred year old trees that are
in my backyard. I have spotted owls, two of them, in my
backyard right where this photo was taken. Your
responsibility is not to Seattle, it's to the environment.
And if you are guys are minimizing impact and going through
this whole list of stuff that you can do just for Seattle,
do it for all the other alternatives as well. Thank you.

MS. PAM TRUJILLO: Well, I have to agree with what
Scott just said. If I could, I'd like to introduce myself.
my name is Pam Trujillo. I'm directly affected with both
options B and D. I am also a King County model horse farm.
I am a King County wildlife refuge, which includes, just
like Scott said, eagles, falcons, bats, owls, coyote. I
have a herd of about 40 elk that actually sleep in my front
1421-046-001
1 yard, among other things.
2 Additionally, I have a legal service that I
3 provide in North Bend, but no matter what, as has been
4 brought out here, we're all personally affected, whether
5 it's the watershed in drinking water or whether or not it's
6 our own personal lives. However, one thing I did want to
7 bring out is, for example, as a personal homeowner, I back
8 to a historical conservation reserve. And when you look at
9 the Seattle City, and I don't know if there are any Seattle
10 people here, I haven't heard from them, they offer
11 visitation for 10,000 children to view natural habitat.
12 However, Camp Waskowitz, which I back to, offers visitations
13 for 8,000 children during the course of each year. That has
14 not been addressed as being also an issue of habitat
15 problems that may exist in the sense of how are children
16 being affected. How is the environment from a family
17 standpoint being affected?
18 But we have to look at not only the facts. I read
19 on the website the Sierra Club mission statements, the
20 biodiversity mission statements and so forth, and it's very
21 clear that their issues are for the rights of the general
22 population. However, I have to also agree with Scott that
23 if there are going to be certain mitigation issues and
24 pylons and so forth directed, helicopters coming in to do
25 this and that, we, too, as homeowners should get the same

1421-046-002 and -003 Both Camp Waskowitz and the Cedar River Municipal Watershed have major BPA transmission lines located within their boundaries, and both would be impacted by project alternatives i.e., 1-4B would impact the CRMW, and Alternatives B and D would impact Camp Waskowitz. Should BPA select any of these alternatives, it would work with the landowner to minimize impacts. See also response to Comment 1420-005-001.

1421-046-004 and -005 Please see response to Comment 1420-001-002.
I know for myself personally during the time that this has gone on, and I did want to mention one thing -- I'm running out of time here -- there was a request for a deadline extension. I received notification and anybody who's involved in this received notification in May. I feel that's adequate time for an extension, and I can tell you from a personal standpoint I have been put on hold as regards to anything to do with my property, whether it's remodel ventures, whether it's a sales venture, and if this continues to go on hold, I cannot offer my property without the potential of a lawsuit with this still being in a hold mode.

I realize there's a lot of issues that all of us are affected with, we don't -- no one wants a power line, but the fact is we can't allow just emotion to lead this. It has to be a fact of whether or not we do need power, and I'm out of time. Anyway, I would like to say for the record that I don't feel an extension is in my best interest or in the best interest of the homeowners. There's adequate time to have read what's out there and to digest the EIS and today isn't the first day for that.

MS. HELEN JOHNSON: My name is Helen Johnson, and I'm a 60-year-old grandmother from Hobart, and this is the last place that a 60-year-old grandmother from Hobart wants
to be. I've only given one other public speech, and it was	right here last year and it was probably the same speech I'm
going to give tonight. But this is important because I
think sometimes that we get lost in facts and we forget
about people.

I want to tell you a little bit about Hobart.
Hobart is a very, very special place. It's made up of very
special people. It's been here for a hundred years. It was
here before the watershed. It was -- the watershed was
donated to the City of Seattle by a member of a Hobart
family. Now, if this isn't biting the hand that feeds you,
I don't know what is. We're made up of many second and
third generation families in Hobart. We've poured our heats
and our souls into this land. Many of us grew up there, we
were born there. We've stayed there and lived there and
we've buried our loved ones in the Hobart cemetery, and now
you want to tell us that it's all for nothing because you're
going to destroy this little area all for the -- for more
power for the City of Seattle. We don't need it, they do.

This is not a newly rich neighborhood made up of
wealthy landowners. These are hard-working folks who have
lived there all their lives and they have taken good care of
this land for years. We don't even have a store out there
except for one little mom-and-pop grocery store, and it's
run by a third generation Hobart family.
Last year I listened to some wonderful young people who give tours through the watershed and they say tourists love it, and we do, too. And we know why they love it, because we live there, we have the same animals, we have the same plants on this side of the fence. On our side of the fence on any day you can see the elk, deer, bear, cougar, possums, raccoon, coyotes, too many kinds of birds to list. And they don’t know they’re not supposed to be over here, so they live where we do too. And we take care of them. We take care of them better than the City of Seattle ever has.

We do have one thing in Hobart that the watershed doesn’t have, and that’s people, but I’m beginning to think that people really don’t count much anymore. So I’m begging you to consider the consequences to the farms and the homes and the people before you make this decision and please do the right thing so the citizens of Hobart can get on with their lives. Thank you.

MR. HILLARY LORENZ: My name is Hillary Lorenz. My land is underneath proposed route Alternative C. I’ve been in public water since 1985 as an operator, carry a four-year degree in public water policy, and I worked in the late 1990s for two and a half years for Seattle Public Utilities at Landsburg out at Lake Youngs as a water treatment operator.
my job for Seattle public utilities at landsburg
was to raise and lower the gates of the diversion dam to
take more or less water through the diversion pipe out of
the cedar river, transport it down to lake youngs where it
was treated and sent on to the city of seattle and other
purchasers purveyors. during the two and a half years that
i was there at landsburg, the city of seattle performed a
practice they called forebay cleaning. and that's where we
raise the gates on the cedar river diversion dam, allow the
water -- all of the water to go down the natural stream
channel. we dried out the intake structure for the pipe
that goes down to the transmission line that goes to lake
youngs.

they entered that intake structure with a backhoe,
rubber-tired backhoe, and they scooped sediment out of that.

i read in here on the third item, page 5-4, use of vegetable
oil in place of hydraulic fluids within the cedar river
watershed. i tell you now, they didn't use vegetable oil in
that case, backhoe. if you go to landsburg and you walk
behind that diversion structure, you'll find thousands of
cubic yards of sediment that they have piled up over the
years from this regular practice of entering their intake
structure.

these are the same people that are talking to you
about concerns of water quality, having your vehicles on
their land in the watershed, they are entering the actual
intake structure with hydraulic equipment. I ask you that
if you are going to continue negotiations or discussions
with the City of Seattle you talk to them about flow studies
and the turbidity studies that they have performed during
the forebay cleaning. They will have it on record. They
keep track of that sort of thing. They're required by law
to keep track -- as they raise or lower the gates, they have
to keep track of the gauging station where the river
elevation is, they have to keep track of turbidity as they
change the diversion on that river. So it's going to be on
record, and I ask you to talk with them about their forebay
cleaning practice. Thank you.

MR. JON ZAK: My name is Jon Zak. I live on two
and a half acres in a development of about a hundred homes
in Maple Valley. Our eastern property boundary will be the
centerline of the proposed transmission line right-of-way
for Alternative C. We would lose trees on one quarter of
our property. These trees are in a native growth protection
zone. The trees range in size from two and a half to five
feet in diameter breast height above the ground. We never
would have purchased this property if we knew a power line
would be in our backyard. Alternative C would completely
destroy our privacy and our views of trees in our backyard.
It would destroy our experience of living in nature. This
was the reason we purchased this property. Part of the
Habitat Conservation Plan, a map was prepared showing the
age of trees in the Cedar River Watershed. On the BPA's
preferred alternative route, the age of the trees is like 10
to 30 years. The trees on my property in the native growth
protective zone make the trees in the Cedar River Watershed
look like toothpicks.
I would like to talk about what Seattle calls the
pristine watershed and their legacy for the future. This
watershed has been decimated by logging for a hundred years.
There are over 600 miles of gravel logging roads in the
watershed. I would like to show you some pictures.

This is from a book published by the Sierra Club
published in 1965, it shows some old growth along the Sock
River. You're not going to see any of that on the Cedar
River. There's another picture of the Sock River forest.
This is a picture of a trail in the Ashland Curtis Grove on
the way to Snoqualmie Pass. This is a picture of the Cedar
River Watershed, Chester Morris Lake. There's quite a bit
of difference. Here are more pictures. Look at the road
cuts and erosion. Chester Morris Lake and see the
clear-cuts and logging roads.

And this is our backyard. Another shot of our
backyard. These are some pictures off the Seattle utilities
website, some of the erosion on the travel roads. Here's
some of the heavy equipment. Like Hillary said, they are
not using vegetable oil. Here's more heavy equipment.
people working right around Chester Morris Lake. That's all
the pictures. If anybody wants to see them, I'll have them
later. Anyway, thank you.

MS. LISA TAYLOR: Hi, I'm Lisa Taylor, and I'm a
resident of Tiger Mountain. My husband is Scott, we live at
the north end of Alternative C. My grandfather grew up on
the Olympic Peninsula, as did my father, and I grew up in
southeast Bellevue and Eastern Washington. I think for
those of us who live this long in this community have our
hearts broken by what has happened to our environment. And
I applaud the City of Seattle and all the other
environmentalist groups, of which I am a frequent donor,
for their efforts to recover these areas.

However, I'm also a property owner, and strangely
when I bought my property, I thought that I would be the
owner of that property, that I would have the responsibility
and the right to protect my old growth forest. My husband
and I clear blackberries by hand and we plant native species
along our seasonal creek. Since we purchased our home four
and a half years ago, we discovered that we had properties
that were illegally subdivided and spent our savings to buy
those properties to avoid lawsuits and to protect that
forest area. We subsequently discovered that King County
overlooked certain aspects of the construction of our home
and it would require being underpinned in our foundation.
that was a second mortgage. We then discovered that we may
be seeing power lines in our community that could cause
erosion or damage to our home or even loss of our community.

Now I hear that we have environmental laws that
may be put into practice in King County that will prevent me
from even replanting the blackberries that choked the north
end of my seasonal creek. So I'm wondering, feeling like an
ant stepping -- trying not to be stepped on by the giants,
if my property is an environmental jewel that must be
protected at all costs, if I am a part of a rural economy
that should be protected by our Growth Management Act or if
I'm a resource to be used by the urban areas for their
landfills and their power lines.

So I'm not sure what to say anymore except that
I'm getting really tired and I'd like BPA to make their
decision and I'd like them to make it soon. As an
environmentalist, I believe the best option is through the
watershed and I urge the City of Seattle to continue their
negotiations and let's no be penny wise pound foolish.

There are a lot of private properties out there that were
formerly forest industry that can be added to that
watershed. I think you would find enormous support from the
local community, as well as perhaps BPA, to continue to add
To date, our environmental studies, including the EIS, draft and supplemental DEISs, and final EIS have exceeded $1 million. The funds to pay for these costs come from BPA’s customers, since BPA is self-financed. BPA does not receive the appropriations that other government agencies typically receive, but recoups its operating and maintenance costs through its rates. The team that BPA has retained to assist in the environmental analysis are experts in their respective fields and were hired by BPA to undertake an objective analysis of the environmental impacts of the proposed alternatives. Their impact ratings were based on objective factors that were identified for each resource, and are contained in their technical study reports as well as in the EIS. With respect to BPA funding an independent review of the environmental analysis that was undertaken for the proposed project, BPA does not feel that this would be necessary.
of that money available to the citizen groups to do an
independent review of this. Because the consulting firms,
and I know these consulting firms, and they are not doing
independent research, they are doing advocacy for your
preferred action.

So it's a two-part question: How much have you
spent on consultants and would you be willing to make even
10 percent of that available to the public, to public groups
to do an independent review?

MR. GENE LYNARD: As far as the environmental, the
cost for the environmental work to date, we're over a
million dollars.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: And part B of the
question?

MR. LOU DREISSEN: Part B, I don't think BPA would
be interested in pursuing, giving any monies to private
groups to review our documents.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I'm shocked.

MR. JON ZAK: Last year some of the environmental
organizations were talking about double-circuiting, and I
understood you explained how because of redundancy it wasn't
feasible. Then I was surprised to hear Lou mention
double-circuiting across the Cedar River. So I don't know
if that's an exception to the rule or if you could do that
why can't you do it through the five-mile stretch through
the Cedar River Watershed.

MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: The reason that we're concerned about putting the two circuits on the single tower or what's called double-circuiting is because of the risk of a single event, a wind storm, ice, snow loading or landslide taking out both circuits at the same time. There's a brochure at the back that explains the planning criteria that Bonneville and all utilities use in North America for planning their grids, and they require us to consider loss of a double-circuit as a single event.

There is an exception. There's a footnote to the table that says for certain very short occurrences, such as crossing of a river, it's acceptable to use double-circuit towers and not have to consider that from your evaluation.

It's on that basis that we made the decision that would be acceptable to use the two double-circuit towers to cross the Cedar River, but clearly it would not be an exemption for the nine-mile project.

MS. HELEN JOHNSON: Well, I have a couple of questions. We hear conflicting things about Seattle's water. Last year I believe the King County council woman told us they had two infractions, and then we have people telling us that their water is so pure that they don't need a filtration system. I know for a fact that they were in the watershed last year asphalt paving roads, and I believe
they were doing work on bridges and the mess they're making at Landsburg is just incredible.

So, you know, I mean, I'm not so sure that their water is so pure and I'm not sure Seattle doesn't have an ulterior motive here. I'm just curious if you're really going to do all that much damage because they're already doing damage.

MR. LOU DREISSEN: Well, I don't really at this point want to talk for Seattle, but I'll try to give you my understanding of the situation is that Seattle is mandated to provide a level of drinking water quality associated with rules that the Department of Health has in place. So what those rules indicate is that they can't exceed five turbidity units two or more times per year.

So Seattle monitors the water very closely at their outtake point. So anytime that the water turbidity gets to about a level of three and a half to four turbidity units, they start really looking at shutting their system down. And they shut their system down a dozen or two dozen times a year, depending upon the storm activity that goes on. So their five turbidity units is a fairly pure level, and that -- the turbidity could well exceed 50 to a hundred turbidity units during a storm event. So they monitor that water very closely.

And the events that you were describing, I
don't -- you know. I don't know all the events that have
happened out there, but I know one, for instance, is that
they had a beaver dam break and during a storm event they
can monitor that water very closely as the turbidity rises.
But as in this case here, it was a slide, it was a part of
the beaver dam breaking, they had no forewarning when that
turbidity hit their outtake point. So they clearly exceeded
the five turbidity units at that event.

The difference is that they are exempt from
natural causes, and that was determined a natural cause. So
they're exempt from that, so it's okay. And I believe the
other events have been the same way. The landslide there in
the reservoir, upper reservoir was naturally caused, caused
by the earthquake activities. So those kind of activities
are exempt from the regulations.

What is not exempt are predictable events,
predictable meaning by construction, for instance, by our
transmission line construction. They're also very concerned
anytime you have to do road construction inside the
watershed because, again, those are predictable events. You
could have two main events happen or more without triggering
the need for having to build a turbidity filtration plant.

The other issue that a lot of people get mixed up
with is that they are building what some people call a
filtration plant currently. That filtration plant will not
take care of turbidity. It takes care of bugs in the water. So that filtration plant costs them a lot of money, well over a million dollars, or a hundred million dollars. They don't want to spend another hundred million dollars or more for a turbidity filtration plant. So really that's what the issue is is turbidity in the water. So that's what everybody is concentrating on currently, everybody meaning Seattle and also obviously that's BPA. So we're trying to prevent erosion, we're trying to prevent turbidity in the water.

MR. RICHARD BONEWITS: I want to answer Helen's question. I am a user of Seattle water, and like many of the rural areas, I have Seattle water supplied to me through a purveyor. I can speak to the subject of quality. I don't have any question about Seattle's water management. I know that watershed manager. I know some of the people that work there. I even know Mrs. Pager, who I have worked with in other venues, and they're all very concerned about maintaining water quality. So that's not the issue.

But there is an issue at least as far as I'm concerned about taste. And, in my own case, the answer to it was simple, put a filter in my house. That's what we do. we filter Seattle's water. And that's what a lot of people find they have to do because, as they pointed out, there's times of the year the turbidity, for various reasons, some
The cost of adding to the currently planned “filtration bug killing plant” with a turbidity plant is $105 million (estimated), which is what is currently being used for a dollar figure. The currently planned filtering plant will not filter turbidity so that component would have to be added on.
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Bonneville Power Administration to issue a supplemental draft environmental impact statement that would study other alternatives, and we specifically asked for more study of the nontransmission alternative.

So I think it's important to acknowledge that they did that and thank you for doing that. We'll have our comments, detailed comments on those submitted in writing, and I think other folks made good points about that. I just wanted to acknowledge that. My short question is: In the cost effectiveness determination for putting the new transmission line in, it's actually -- it's actually going to be beneficially economic to BPA and the rate payers because of the loss savings because that line will be more efficient -- there won't be as much loss of energy through heat; is that correct? So what I'm wondering is does that actually mean that BPA comes out ahead financially? Is this line a money maker for BPA?

MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: No. In fact, it's not a money maker for Bonneville, but it is a money maker for consumers. And the reason is is that in our transmission rates, we include the cost of the wires and the cost of operating and maintaining that equipment. But the losses, the energy that's lost through heat of the wires, heating of the wires, must be replaced by the electric customers, by the retail utilities. So they benefit directly because if

1421-056-002

The preferred alternative would reduce losses by approximately 11 MW on peak. This would result in annual energy savings of 48,180,000 kWh, valued at nearly $2 million per year. This is cost-effective from a total resource cost and societal perspective. Retail utilities and others who use the BPA transmission system return energy losses to BPA. Therefore the retail utilities, and their consumers, would benefit. It does not make money for BPA.
this line saves energy and the amount is significant, at the
time of normal peak it's about 11 megawatts of peak power.
that means that the total losses on the system will be
reduced and the amount that the retail utilities have to
return to us to replace that is reduced by 11 megawatts. So
their consumers benefit. But there's no financial
consequence to Bonneville transmission. I might say our
friends on the other side of the house in our power business
line, they and their customers will, in fact, benefit.
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1422-001-001 This is discussed in Appendix H. For security reasons, parties must sign a nondisclosure agreement to receive a copy of Appendix H.

1422-002-001 BPA negotiated with British Columbia for more than 10 years to develop the details of the Treaty power return. The March 29, 1999, Entity Agreements codify the obligations. See Appendix I for a description of the Treaty. While there have been ongoing discussions between BPA and Powerex at all levels, no new agreement was reached. The Canadians are entitled to have the power returned to meet their own needs.
1422-002-002 See response to Comment 1422-002-001. If you take a look at the Puget Sound Area load bar graph in the EIS you will notice that if the Canadian Treaty return is eliminated (the purple part at the top of the bar graph, page 1-5) the need for the project only changes by two years, from 2004 to 2006.

1422-003-001 Terms of the High Ross agreement are incorporated into the planning studies. The High Ross return from Canada slightly reduces the power flowing from south to north. The amount of demand response required is much larger than utility programs have achieved in the past. See response to Comment 1421-032-003. The short time makes it even less likely that these large amounts can be found.
The Puget Sound Area Load Curtailment Plan is still in place.

MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: My interpretation is that if we had more time, more alternatives and greater quantities would be available, but my belief is we might be able to push it out for a couple of years. It just means we would have to build the line a couple of years later than our current schedule.

MR. FOLEY: One of the things if you had more time, you might be able to see whether or not some of these plants were built, for example, and that would -- so I think we would be -- there's always value in delay if you don't -- you know, if you don't run into a problem with not being able to meet load. So you've got this trade-off obviously.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I wasn't here in the beginning, so maybe you guys covered this. I'm just curious in relationship to all those questions about could you delay the project. It's my understanding that Bonneville has a curtailment plan in place now for -- with local utilities so that if the line reached certain loadings that local utilities would have to get some of the industrial customers to shut off even this winter. Is that still in place?

MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: Yes, the curtailment plan is in place, and the curtailments would, in fact, be
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1422-004-001 Retail utilities will likely take whatever steps are needed, including load curtailment, to avoid an area-wide blackout.

1422-005-001 For the winter of 2003-04, 381 MW of load reduction or additional generation within the Puget Sound Area is required. Two years later, the amount increases to 841 MW. See Appendix J, Section 2.4.
Transmission customers return energy losses to BPA - the costs are not included in the rates. Therefore, the savings are not included in the Ratepayer Impact Measure (RIM) - Transmission Company Cost Test. The savings are considered in the Total Resource Cost (TRC) Cost Test and Societal Cost Test. See Appendix J, Section 3.1. Because the loss savings are a benefit to consumers that offsets the cost of the line, under the latter two measures the savings would reduce the incentives available for non-transmission alternatives.
MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: So let me try that.

So if you look at it just from a transmission business line perspective or transmission -- right, from our perspective, we do not get compensated directly for the losses. The losses are returned by the retail utilities. But if you look at the analysis that they did for total resource costs, for instance, delivery price of power or the societal costs, the value of those lost savings are, in fact, included in the analysis.

So I think that they are correctly accounted for, and I think one way to look at it, if you look at it from those perspectives, the loss savings are really offsetting against the cost for the transmission lines. So, in fact, the transmission lines cost zero, or, in fact, it saves money for consumers as a whole.

Thank you very much.
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1429-001-001 and -002 Comment noted.

1429-002-001 Seattle has given BPA its comments in meetings and in writing. People concerned about commenting about the alternatives can come to BPA's public meetings, write to BPA, comment to their elected officials (local, state, and congressional) and write the Mayor of Seattle. BPA will study all the comments and use those comments along with the information in the EIS to make a decision.

1429-003-001 Comment noted.

The activities that you describe taking place on your property involve criminal trespass (illegal dumping, performing unwanted recreational activities and holding parties), and should be pursued by the County Sheriff's Office. Any help you could obtain for law enforcement, such as license plate numbers, names/address from any discarded mail, pictures and/or typical times of occurrence would aid law enforcement in arresting those who are responsible.
then the western side of our property would also have an easement along it. The reason we object to that option and feel that it should go in the watershed is we have such a difficult time with the public using the easement for recreational, dumping, partying on, and it's very hard to get them to leave at times. They're rude. And we contact the police. The police tell us that we're to hold the people until they can get there, and you can't do that. And so this really puts an onus on the property owner because they believe that this is government property and belongs to the public.

MR. DAVE PIMENTEL: Howdy, gentlemen. It's been a little while. Just got in from Oregon. We weren't even planning on being here, but I'm glad we showed up and just sat down really basically. When we went through the whole deal last year, we felt that we had some stiff opposition from downtown, so to speak, and what I want to know is what is -- what's it like? What's the atmosphere on the other side like right now? You know, what do we, who oppose Alternative C, what's our best path to take to make sure that the position is held that you're preferred alternative goes through?

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: I assume that you're talking about downtown Seattle, not downtown --

MR. DAVE PIMENTEL: That's correct.
MR. LOU DRIESSEN: Well, you call it opposition. I'll call it differences of opinion. There's folks around that are concerned about the impact this line could have crossing the watershed. They're concerned about the impacts to the drinking water. They're concerned about the impacts to the Habitat Conservation Plan, which Seattle went through a lot of effort to put that into place.

So those folks are still concerned. The issue hasn't gone away. We're working with Seattle at this point and we're meeting like on a weekly basis with Seattle trying to figure out a way to where we can take care of most of their concerns. So as part of that, BPA has gone through this detailed engineering and surveying analyses, we were able to figure out where the new towers are going to go, for instance, and where any of the new access roads are going to go. And with that information, we were able to determine exactly what kind of mitigation measures from an environmental perspective need to take place.

So as a result of that, we were able to determine that we will not be filling in any wetlands, for instance, so that was a big issue. We were able to minimize clearing outside of the right-of-way. We were able to minimize clearing inside of the right-of-way to the extent BPA has determined that it's okay for one span just to cross the Cedar River, for one span it would be okay to double-circuit
such that a new line would go inside the existing
right-of-way that's out there now, and we would put in two
double-circuit structures and put both lines, existing line
and new line, on those two double-circuit structures. And
by doing that, no clearing will need to take place across
the Cedar River.

So these are all fairly large concessions.
Another fairly expensive method we just started using at
BPA, we said we are going to use specialty footings inside
the watershed. We are going to use what we call micropyle
footings, and it's something that is evolving as we go
along. The design of that is evolving as we go along, so we
intend to use those.

Also, we intend to use a helicopter to place
structures. So that normally we would have to use a large
crane to go out there and install the structures, we don't
need a large crane if we use a helicopter. So we will use
helicopters after the footings are in the place to put the
structures in place and use the helicopter also to string
the line. We're going to use a helicopter to help do some
of the logging out there. So these are all trying to
minimize and possibly even eliminate any potential erosion
that would take place out there. So that's a concession on
the drinking water quality aspect.

On the Habitat Conservation Plan we're working
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1429-005-001 Alternative A consists mainly of three parts: One part goes from Covington to the north where an existing line would be taken down and replaced with a new double-circuit line, which would carry both the existing line and the new line. Part two goes around the existing BPA substation with new right-of-way and would require removing some homes. Part three would be between Kangley and Covington where there is an existing vacant right-of-way available where the new line could be constructed. You are referring to Part three where the new line could occupy vacant right-of-way that has been vacant for many years. BPA recognizes a new line within this vacant right-of-way would have high impacts to adjacent homeowners.
confused by that because my understanding was that you were
actually going to put a third line using the additional
right-of-way that you've had since about 1942, which now
most everybody uses as a nice screen to their property. And
so I'm a little confused by what you said. If you have to,
quote, take it down. Why would you do that if you're going
to just put up another line?

MR. MIKE KREIFE: The proposal there is you're
talking about the Covington Maple Valley 230 kV line. The
proposal there is to take that -- because our right-of-way
is only -- it only can take either a single structure,
either double circuit or single circuit. We will take a
single circuit down and replace it with a double circuit,
put the existing line back on one side and build a new line
on the other side. So essentially we're not going to put
two parallel structures there, or one set of structures, the
old and the new line. So you have to take the old one down
before you put the new one up.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So you already have
two?

MR. LOU DRZESSEN: There's two parts to this.
basically -- actually, there's three parts to this
Alternative A. So Alternative A would start at Kangley, for
instance, and from Kangley to Covington there's a vacant
right-of-way that's available. Near Covington there's two
existing lines already in that right-of-way, but there's a vacant portion on the right-of-way. This new line would utilize the vacant portion.

What Mike's talking about is from Covington to the north.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No. I'm talking about the piece that goes through Winterwood Estates.

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: Right through there Alternative A would utilize the vacant right-of-way which is on the north side of those two lines.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Right. And that's the area where you have went and cleared all the trees and --

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: That's correct. A lot of trees have grown up inside of our right-of-way there and people use that like for backyards and will definitely impact the folks that live alongside that right-of-way.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So that's not the part you're talking about taking down. You would, in fact, put a third line in there.

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: That's very correct.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: But when it turns and goes through Covington, then you would still only maintain two towers. Is that what you are saying?

MR. MIKE KREIFE: The part I was talking about was the section right here where we have one circuit we would
The existing line on the Cedar River Watershed was built in the late 1960s and has served load growth in the area for nearly 35 years. The new line should serve the area for at least another 30 years and maybe longer depending on the availability of new power generation technologies.
least as long, but there are things happening in the power supply business, distributed generation, fuel cells, you hear about them in the news. They have been around a long time, a lot of people are trying to figure out how to mass produce them. When they are mass produced, they will be cheaper. You could very likely have your own power supply produced by gas in your own home. It could happen. 20, 30 years, the load growth is all handled, at least at residence with those devices. It could happen at some point that no new transmission, major grid type transmission is needed. But I would say that line, short of that happening, that line should last 25 or 30 years.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I was just wondering, you were talking about you were going to be minimizing the amount of timber you'll be taking down in the watershed to try and help them out to meet some of their environmental goals, I guess. Well, on my land that's in preferred alternative 1, anyways, I asked them to minimize the amount of trees that they took down on one of my lots should they come across there because I spent a lot of money in developing a 20-acre piece there that I have a creek that goes through there also that was of great concern to King County as to a hundred year flood plain.

So I had to have a lot of engineering done having to do with that hundred year flood plain, and that cost a
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lot of money, not only my engineer but King County's
engineer looking at it, redlining it back and forth and so
on and so forth. And so, anyways, the -- and it was zoned
RA-5 for one house per five acres, but also it's also based
on, you know, a certain amount of drainage per square foot
of the house and how many trees are left and so on and so
forth.

So I asked them to try and minimize the amount of
trees that they would take off of my property, also for the
impact of value to my other lots because that would open up
the whole line to view all of my lots which would impact the
value of my other lots. And anyways the forrester, the
other BP real estate specialists assured me that they would
try to take care of that.

And anyways the forrester came in there and she
just cleaned that whole lot 100 percent off and even went
into the other lot, was taking some trees off of it too and
gave no consideration into that. So I don't understand why.
you know, BP can give consideration to one, to the
watershed, and they can't give consideration to the other.

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: Let me try to address that a
little bit. The consideration that I'm talking about inside
the watershed is, for instance, on the normal basis of a new
transmission line to go through an area that has timber on
it, we would take any tree that would potentially fall into

1429-007-003 and -004 Due to the height of the trees within the proposed
right-of-way, very few trees can remain within the 150' right-of-way with the exception of very deep drainages
and canyons. For the selection of danger trees outside of
the right-of-way, the stable tree criteria would be used on
all properties along the preferred route. Trees that were
deemed not to pose a threat to the new transmission line
would be left. Consideration is given when danger trees
are selected to impacts regarding landowners from this
clearing.
that line. So in this case here we determined that BPA
would take some risk and that outside the right-of-way --
inside the right-of-way we would not allow any trees to grow
unless it's in a deep canyon. So on flatter terrain or on
sloping terrain, we would not allow any trees to grow inside
of our right-of-way.

Outside the right-of-way, we're going to take a
look at it from a -- more from a maintenance standpoint,
take a look at trees that could potentially fall into the
line because they're diseased or because they're heavily
leaning toward the line. So there are still going to be
trees taken in the watershed outside the right-of-way, there
will be trees taken, but not as many as there would have
been otherwise if we were to take every tree that would
potentially fall into the line. So I don't know what the
situation is on your property, but I would hope that they
would use a similar kind of thing on your property also. So
inside the right-of-way we're not allowing any trees to grow
inside the right-of-way unless they're trees that -- while
you couldn't call them trees, shrubs.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I understand on the
right-of-way and they said maybe they could replant some
shrubs, but I'm talking about the trees outside the
right-of-way, she was calling every tree a dangerous tree.
That lot was scalped when she got through with it, and so a
3-258
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Comment noted.
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Comment noted.
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Comment noted.
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few trees left on the lot next to it, so --

MR. RICHARD BONEWITS: Thank you, Diane. My name

is Richard Bonewits. I'm chairman of the Greater Maple

Valley Area Council. Area residents are pawns in this BPA

500 kV transmission line location issue. As several of the

speakers that are here tonight were at Seattle yesterday and

spoke to the environmental people and to Council Member

Margaret Pagler who also is on an environmental committee

with me for watershed planning for this area, they're going

to tell you, they will be able to tell you if you want to
talk to them that some Seattle residents have willingly or
unwittingly developed an extraordinary but limited interest
in protecting a relatively small part of the environment of
King County, the Seattle watershed.

We want to give Seattle people credit for their
recent discovery of the environment, as reflected in their
Habitat Conservation Plan that Lou mentioned. They were
forced into it knowing that they were going -- they were
going to be facing ESA. They were requested to get it out
and get it done so they could show some progress before ESA
was laid down as a requirement.

But as you will hear from others here, clear-cut
logging of more than 70,000 acres over the last 90 years
with the intended construction of 650 acres of logging road
is not exactly environmentally friendly. Many of you have
done a better job preserving your streams and wetland. And
even after having a 500 kV line across the watershed for
more than 30 years, some Seattle residents and politicians
have decided that the power line should go outside the
watershed and one of those routes is over your head. We
don't know which one, but one of them is.

We have confronted them with the information also
that they have been aware of all the time. Lou mentioned
three things they're concerned with. There are really
principally two: One's the environment and the other is
water quality. They mentioned water quality. In the case
of the water quality issue, there was a fecal coliform
incident in 1992 after which the State Department of Health
ordered them to develop a water filtration facility design
and implementation plan and told them the next incident they
were going to implement it.

This was before Bonneville thought about the
studies that led up to their scoping studies two, three
years ago and came back last year. Some of us knew about
this before them. In fact, Laura's son is a water quality
specialist operating for Seattle at times in the past. Very
familiar with the requirements. The studies were done, the
designs were complete, the ionization plant is being built
right now. I live near it, it's half a mile away, mile
away, not quite a mile, but the filtration plant has not
been built. Still holding up on it.

So if there's another fecal coliform incident, the
theory that the Department of Health will be on their tails
to get that filtration plant built whether or not the power
line goes through the watershed or not. They know that, but
the story still keeps coming out and that's what you'll see
in the press. But to Seattle's credit, many of its people
did participate in these public meetings, including
Councilman Margaret Pagler last night. There has been no
participation from most of the other cities in the region
which share BPA's electrical power, not from Bellevue,
Kirkland or thereabouts.

Bonneville has done its job. It's doing its job.
There are four groups in your community who have gathered
more than 1500 petitions opposing routes outside the
watershed who are here tonight. One of them is Dave and his
wife back there, and the other one is one that I have sort
of led all the way through it, but we've kept coordinated
together on this and working together to get those
signatures, and I want to give them kudos and I also want to
give kudos to some of our elected representatives.

Jay is here representing Cheryl Pfleg, he works
for her. Sara is here, works for Glen Anderson, another
state representative, and Neal behind here works for
Councilman David Irons. They have been with me, behind me

1429-008-006 Comment noted.
We've also had our congressman behind us and we have even had -- been able to enlist a little help from Maria Cantwell's organization, at least they're involved with touching us daily. Your elected representatives have weighed in on your behalf. This is your last time to speak, and that's why I am here today. If you want to talk about this issue, this is it. I'm asking you to all follow that up with written comments and send a copy of those to Post Office Box 101, Maple Valley 98038. I'll see that the politicians get them.

MR. SCOTT TAYLOR: I'll try to be brief. You guys are looking for some feedback on how you did on the distribution of the EIS. I particularly really thought the CD ROM. I'm a computer person, so it worked very well for me. If you are looking for more suggestions, I highly recommend that you put the full text of the EIS on the website. I could not get it on the website, I could only get a summary. It's a pretty large download, so if you had a page where you had the full EIS in sections and you could download PDF's, that would be great.

So I had an interesting conversation with one of the directors from the Sierra Club yesterday, and normally they and I see very, very eye to eye. I consider myself an environmentalist, but in this one particular issue we have...
been at a bit of loggerheads. The Sierra Club does not want
to see any kind of activity through the watershed; whereas,
I actually think that's the preferred alternative.
So we actually chatted for at least a half an hour
yesterday, and we were actually able to find some common
ground, and I would like to share some of that. While we
disagree on the exact route which one should go, we're both
very much stewards of the environment. If BPA can consider
themselves also stewards of the environment, I think that
you guys can make everybody happy, or at least minimize the
damage.

Specifically, if you guys actually choose to go
through the watershed, I want to see some of the things that
the Sierra Club wants to see. I want to see Plumb Creek
added to the watershed and forked over as part of the
mitigation. There's also a hundred acres of property near
the Raging River that can be added as well. You guys are
also double-circuiting a section across the Cedar River.
Both myself and Sierra Club would like to see that across
the Raging River as well.

So I think that there are some extra mitigation
steps that you guys can have to make everybody happy. And,
likewise, the Sierra Club agrees on my point that if you
guys go through anything like Alternative C or A or B or D
that you take the same mitigation measure for that
environment that you are through the watershed.
Specifically, micropylings, helicopters, vegetable oil. All
the things that you would do for the watershed, we require
that you do outside the watershed as well, and I'd like to
see you add that to the costs that you have put forth in
your EIS. Thank you.

MS. LAURA LORENZ: I'm a resident of Hobart for
over 40 years, and my comment is going to be very brief. In
1947 the City of Seattle bought 90,400 acres of land -- the
Seattle city bought 90,400 acres of land for $2.21 an acre
for their watershed, and as a result they closed the
watershed so nobody could enter it. But it also obliterated
several communities, Harriston and Taylor, School District
409, which is Tahoma, lost tax dollars for support of their
school district. The citizens no longer could fish or hunt
in this area or use it for recreation in any way. The Cedar
River got drained, and I mean really drained. In the summer
you can't find enough cool spots for the big fish to live
and you can't recreate in it any longer because it's too
shallow frequently if you have a dry summer.

Both BPA and Seattle are public entities, and I
strongly suggest and believe that public entities or
organizations should be used when -- public lands should be
used for public uses at any time they can do it instead of
going through private lands. So if BPA can go through the
watershed, I'm for it. They have already gotten what they
needed there and they have it and we have sat fast enough.
let's let them use the public land and let the private
people have a little bit of peace and let 1971's decision to
go through the watershed stand in 2003. Thank you.

MR. JON ZAK: Good evening. My name is Jon Zak.

I live on two and a half acres in a development of about a
hundred homes in Maple Valley. Our eastern property
boundary would be the centerline of the proposed
transmission line right-of-way for Alternative C. We would
lose the trees on a quarter of our property, and these trees
are in a native growth protection area. The trees range in
size from two and a half to five foot in diameter. We never
would have purchased this property if we thought the power
line would be running through our backyard. Alternative C
would completely destroy our privacy and our views of trees
in our backyard. It would destroy our experience of living
in nature. This was the reason we bought this property.

On the BPA's preferred alternative route, the one
through the watershed, the age of the trees is like 10 to 30
years. The trees on our property in our native growth
protection zone make the trees in the watershed look like
toothpicks. I've got some pictures here to show you of some
old growth. This is the Curtis Grove on the way up to
Snoqualmie Pass. Some more pictures I showed Seattle but to
let them know what big trees look like. You may not be
aware of what the watershed looks like, so here's a picture
of the upper watershed. You can see there's a couple of big
trees standing outside and it's been logged for almost a
hundred years, 70,000 acres.

Here's another view. there are 621 miles of
logging roads. See Chester Morris Lake and more clear-cuts
and old logging roads on the other side of the lake. And
then here you see a big road cut and more clear-cuts. This
is our backyard. There's another picture of our backyard.

This is off the Seattle Public Utilities website.

This was some work that they did. See this logging road?
It's starting -- sedimentation that's running towards the
river. Here's some other work they were doing right around
Chester Morris Lake with the heavy equipment, probably not
using vegetable oil in the hydraulic systems. Other
pictures show heavy equipment. so -- well. the pictures of
the construction in the watershed by Seattle Public
Utilities proves their hypocrisy.

Seattle has one standard for themselves and
another one for the BPA. I would like Seattle Public
Utilities to answer a couple of questions: Number one,
where is the evidence that BPA has caused any harm to the
water quality or watershed operation in its 30 years of
operating a power line in the watershed?
And, number two, clearing 91 acres for a second power line would require one-tenth of one percent of the watershed's total acreage of 90,240. How can this small amount of clearing have any impact on water quality?

The Habitat Conservation Plan is a great idea.

How about the habitat of people living along Alternative C?

Is wildlife habitat inside the watershed more important than habitats for both wildlife and humans outside the watershed?

The people who lose their property will be paying a price for Seattle's water. The City of Seattle will destroy the rural communities of Hobart and Ravensdale all due to unfounded water quality issues. I wonder what history will say about this. Thank you.

MS. HELEN JOHNSON: I didn't plan on speaking tonight, but my name is Helen Johnson and I live in Hobart and I consider it a privilege to live in Hobart. It's a very special, unique place. It's been there over a hundred years. It was there before the watershed. We have descendants left of the original homesteaders there. They have spent all their lives there. They were born, lived their whole lives there, graduated from school there. They stayed there on the land that they loved, we poured our hearts, our souls into it. We buried our loved ones in the Hobart cemetery. And we have taken much better care of that land than Seattle ever dreamed of doing.
We bought right up against the watershed. The only thing that separates us is a fence. We have the same plants, same animals, same endangered species. And the environmentalists are worried about the watershed, but they don't care if you're on the wrong side of the watershed. They don't care about the species over there. It just doesn't make any sense to come to an area like that and destroy it all for some power for Seattle. Because we don't need the power. Seattle does.

And, you know, it's just we've been there too long, we're too hard working. We just want to be left alone to live our lives. As far as I'm concerned, Hobart should be off limits to everybody but the people that live there, including the government and including King County. And the only extinct -- or people that are endangered of being extinct there are the people, not the animals, it's the rural homeowners.

MS. ALEDAS MORGAN: I'm Aleda Morgan, and I'm on the preferred route, alternative number one, and you all seem to think that we're only talking about the watershed being affected here. Well, there's at least five people on this route that are being affected. And I moved there in 1976 with my husband, this was the farm of my dreams here, and anyways my husband passed away 16 months after we purchased this property. And so, anyways, then he was a
BPA apologizes for the disruption that this project has caused people along the project routes. It is our intent to treat people fairly and with respect.
through. They're going to go through. There's not going to
be a lot I'm going to be able to do about it and in the
hopes that they're going to pay me for my losses.

Anyways, so far to date they came to me, they did
an appraisal on October 25th to 27th and they finally got it
back to me on March 8th of 2002, and they want to buy this
property. I mean, they have been trying to buy our property
out there -- I mean, you all think this has been going on
since June for you. Shoot, this has been going on since
March of 2000. We've been in hell since March of 2000. I'll
guarantee you that.

And so, anyways, they come along and ruining one
five acre tract of mine. I mean totally ruining it, and then
they're ruining over half of another five acre tract. They
came and offered me in March -- well, I wouldn't meet with
them in March because I was going on vacation. They came
along in April, they offered me $160,000 for two five acre
tracts that they're ruining. There still will be a building
spot on one of them, but it had over 500 feet of building of
house feet and now from the right-of-way to the corner of
the property line it is 180 feet.

On the other corner, there's a hundred -- 244
feet, excuse me, and they want to pay me -- I put in a road
that cost me over $75,000. I put in power and phone that
cost me $40,000. I mean, I'm not a rich woman, I'm not a
Big developer, I still truck every day to pay for this and this is my retirement. This is the only retirement that I have. So they’re not just affecting the watershed here, they are affecting my life. There is other people that they’re affecting that their homes. There is a person who has a home there. They have come in there and offered them practically nothing for their home. The woman has had a stroke since this has been going on, the pressure is intense. I had to contact a lawyer in April so they would quit calling me on the phone while I was driving a dumptruck trying to back up, not to drive over top of people while I was backing up. I had to get a lawyer to write them a letter to tell them to quit calling me on that phone because that’s the phone I get my work on, so I have to answer the phone. I finally got to recognize the ID number, so I didn’t answer it anymore.

So I -- you know, this is not just about the Seattle watershed. And I asked you people in June to please, you know, not leave us five people out there at the mercy of Bonneville, because I’ll tell you what, they’re at our door every day, they insisted upon appraisal of the other lady’s house during Christmas. Her husband was away while they had a family member that was sick, and I had to call them up and say you don’t need to be bothering her at Christmastime, you can wait until after Christmas, but.
you know, and they finally let her do that. But it’s been a battle. Every day it’s a battle. It’s a battle with them, and they plan on stealing our property and I truly mean that.

MR. ROBERT GARLAND: I’m Robert Garland. I’m the president of the Winterwood Estates Homeowners Association, and we have several of our residents here tonight. We are affected by the A transmission line. That transmission line, if put through, will make the last lady’s problem look like Sunday school play because there will be about 15 to 20 percent of our residents that will be directly affected either through the fact that the power lines will take out all the trees and have power lines within 30 feet of their house or will take down all the trees and expose the power lines that are there now and ruin the view and the value of the property. So there is -- we have 364 homes in our community and every single division of our community will be affected because of the way the power line runs through at an angle.

We support the BPA’s approach to trying to affect the least amount of people possible. All of the other, at least A and C, it appears, will have a tremendous impact on lots of people, not just five, and it will have a devastating effect even perhaps on one school which is in our community. This power line will not run very far from
BPA has determined that the proposed 500-kV transmission line would require a right-of-way 150 feet wide, along with necessary access roads. If the Record of Decision identifies that a route, other than the current preferred route were to be selected, it would not be possible to construct this year. Many activities including specific surveys, design, additional environmental analysis, appraisals as well as negotiations for land rights with landowners would need to be completed.
Magnetic fields are dangerous to the public. I think if you can go over the watershed, it's got to be that way. We can't impact schools, we can't impact people's homes. I've had a childhood leukemia, you don't want to go there, and I think we just need to protect the general public.

There's a lot fewer people impacted, and it's tragic for those that are, but it seems that, you know, they're the powerful people. We all don't like government shoved down our throat, but I think they have really done their work, they have really done their studies, and you have to look at the least number of people affected. You cannot go over schools, you can't go over neighborhoods like that. The property that other people are talking about around the watershed that own property aren't -- it isn't inhabited with population to the extent that the schools in Winterwood is. We just have to look at that.

MR. RON IVerson: As many of you know, I'm a Hobart area homeowner or landowner. I talked last night and I'll just summarize and say BPA did it right the first time. They did it right this time, only this time they did it -- I really want to compliment you. The way your construction stuff and the fact that you're using vegetable oil instead of motor oil, I don't know how you can do any more mitigation than that. This is a real nice document, but it's hard to read.
1. And I asked, you know, where's the summary of the cost, and they have even done a nice job with that because it's in there. And this lady has got them back there and you really ought avail yourself of something that's readable. Going through the watershed versus Alternative C through Hobart and Ravensdale, impact on all these things is much higher than that. Land use, high impact on Hobart.

2. None on the watershed. Water quality, groundwater high impact. Where are all the Greenies?

3. High impact on groundwater going to Alternative C. Vegetation, low in the watershed, really high in other places. Visual. My God, nobody's going to be bothered by going through the watershed. It sure bothers me going through my backyard. Cultural resources. God, the guy last night was just disappointed. They dug 1100 holes, right. 1170 holes and they only got two things that were even close. God, maybe they got a good one, maybe they got an artifact. No, they got a railroad spike. And the poor guys haven't been able to find any spotted owls, but they're going to keep looking, right?

4. Public health, safety, high impact. All these versus the watershed versus Alternative C. So this is a really good document. My rats are off to you guys. I got one question to ask you that I was confused about last night. They say the technology is advanced so well that the

1429-016-003 and -004 Comment noted.

1429-016-005 Comment noted.

1429-016-006, 007, and 008 Comment noted.

1429-016-009 BPA is following the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service protocols for surveying for the northern spotted owls. Those surveys call for surveys to be conducted over a two-year period during the nesting period of the spotted owl (March 15th through June 15th), unless the project would be constructed in the year the first survey would be conducted. Surveys were conducted during the nesting period in 2002, and they are scheduled for 2003 as well. If any spotted owls are identified, BPA would comply with timing restrictions so as not to disturb the protected species.
efficiency of putting this second line through will more
than take care of the cost of the line. Is that right?

MR. MIKE KREIPE: The energy losses.

MR. RON IVERSON: Yes. In other words, they’re
saying the technology will be so much better that the
economic value and the loss savings is greater than the cost
of the line.

MR. MIKE KREIPE: It’s really not due to
technology. If this were to happen 20 years ago, the same
situation of today, it’s just the physics of how losses
occur in the system.

MR. RON IVERSON: Final thing is: What’s the
bottom line on cost. If you read this baby, would you
rather spend 23 million bucks of your taxpayer money or
double that to 50 million going through Alternative C?

Look at all these costs. I really empathize with the lady
here who’s losing some of her property and so forth. But I
heard that Sierra guy talk last night, and he wants to
litigate. The longer this thing hangs on, the worse it’s
going to be for everybody. So sly litigators, I have no
use for that outfit. And I listened to them afterwards and I
appreciate what you guys are up against. Are they going
to give her a section of land? Hell no. Are they going to
give me any land? Hell no. But this guys holding out
they’ll give a whole section 25 and he’s holding these guys
hostage for that. So be aware that some of the
environmentalists, these Greenies will really be
anti-Greenies as far as I'm concerned.

MR. HILARY LORENZ: My name is Hilary Lorenz. My
property would fall under Alternative C. Last night I spoke
about forebay cleaning at the Landsburg Diversion Site. I
wanted to read from a -- the Draft Final Landsburg Master
Plan. This was put out by Seattle Public Utilities. This
is from their executive summary. On page 7 of that, it
says, Presently the Landsburg intake forebay is cleaned once
yearly during a shutdown of the intake. Deposited silt,
sludge and organic debris are removed by SPU crews using
hand tools and power equipment. That's just Seattle's
documentation of what they do in forebay. I have two other
documents I'd like to speak from, both of them are generated
either by SPU or for SPU, Seattle Public Utilities.

One is an executive summary from their Cedar River
Facilities Planning Project where they discuss the potential
construction of filtration facilities at the Lake Youngs.
The facilities planning project consisted of a series of
tasks that addressed various technical aspects and planning
considerations relating to the implementation of ozone
treatment for SPU's Cedar River water flood. Prudent
planning also resulted in consideration of granular media
filtration and other particle removal technologies.
The summary conclusion in this executive summary says that SPU is planning to implement substantial improvements to its water treatment and supply facilities at the Cedar River source. These projected improvements are based on multiple barrier approach to public health protection and feature the addition of ozone disinfection compatible with addition of filtration facilities at New Lake Youngs intake and roll water pump station. Additional treatment facilities, including filtration, may be justified if, one, regulations change; two, there are new health effects data; three, long-term costs can be minimized through alternative delivery and public/private partnerships.

And I would suggest that they're looking for reduced costs with partnerships maybe with BPA. One other document I want to read from the Seattle Water Department, Cedar River Surface Water Treatment Rule Compliance Project dated January 1996. In the executive summary of that under pilot study objectives, they studied -- in this document they studied two treatment regimes. One was ozone treatment only, which is what they are progressing with now. The other alternative was ozone/filtration. Ozone/filtration, the additional benefits of filtration combined with ozonization including turbidity and particle removal providing a further barrier to parasite removal.
disinfection by-product precursor removal. case in order
reduction, as well as increased system operational
flexibility must be balanced against the added cost for
filtration. Optimum filtration conditions should provide
effective removal of contaminants in the most cost effective
manner. That's from 1996 they're looking at cost effective
manner of filtration.

MS. JOANNA PAUL: I'm Joanna Paul, and I'm in the
area of number one. We will lose our home if BPA comes this
way. None of this was our idea. We lived in the Burien
area and were purchased 25 years ago after 14 years by the
Port of Seattle. We have done this once before. We moved
out to where we thought we could get away from the airplanes
and everything else. We had no idea that a power line was
going to come in. Having a power line come through is not
the issue. The issue is our property. They will be taking
two and a half acres that our house is on and we have over
seven. There is no compensation for that. None of this was
our idea. This has caused us a great deal. It has caused
me a stroke, closing a business and they have undervalued
our property by at least a hundred thousand dollars.

Now, I don't know about you, but a hundred
thousand dollars is a lot of money to me. And we also feel
that we've been harassed. We get calls several times a day.
Not only are we called but then they come out -- and when I

1429-017-001 See response to Comment 1429-013-002.

1429-017-002 and -003 BPA apologizes for the disruption that this
project has caused people along the project routes. It is
our intent to treat people fairly and with respect. We
have offered to buy the lot and house in an effort to
negotiate an agreement. We do not have authority to
condemn more property than is needed for the
transmission project. We can condemn only the
necessary right of way. Our measurements indicate that
the house would be approximately 18 feet from the
outer edge of the right of way and approximately 71 feet
from the nearest conductor of the power line, if the line
is built.
1429-017-002

speak of them I'm referring to BPA -- there's notes left on
my door, my car windshield. One phone call is enough. And
when we say we're not going to take their offer, which is a
hundred thousand dollars less, at least, we're told they
will condemn us and they will not only condemn us but then
they will take just what they need, not our house, so the
power lines will sit seven feet from our house.

1429-017-004

You're talking about how dangerous it is. It's
dangerous to us. I have no problem with the routes. I have
a problem with not receiving fair compensation. None of
this was my idea. BPA literally showed up on my doorstep in
December and said they wanted to do this. If they get away
with this, if they condemn our property, if they take what
they want to take and not pay for it, keep it in mind
because it's our property this time. It may be yours next
time.

1429-017-005

MR. GEORGE McFADDEN: My name is George McFadden.
I live in Issaquah. I want to speak this evening about
minimizing environmental damage and the public participation
process. Having reviewed some of these options, I believe
that the shortest route through the watershed is probably
the one that also is the least environmentally damaging. I
understand that you have many people that see that
differently, including the City of Seattle. But I also want
to point out in terms of public participation, when the City
of Seattle abandoned the 16 road inside the watershed, they
put heavy equipment in the stream, they removed a roadbed,
they put more sediment in their water supply than this
project will ever hope to do.

The people who live along Dead Dog Road, I'm sure
the City has told you that they have a fourth practice
application file, you can comment till Friday. They're
going to put gravel packs along Dead Dog Road to haul rock
into the watershed and then they're going to haul logs out.
I'm sure the City of Seattle has informed the neighbors.

I'm sure they have held public meetings, and I'm sure they
have allowed you to comment. That is the process and it
should happen. It could be a little disingenuous if they
don't. Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I guess my question is
why is BPA so resonant in providing these folks that are
being affected with the proper compensation -- why is BPA so
resonant in apparently providing proper and fair
compensation to these people that are being affected. You
know, that in itself gives you a bad black eye after all the
good work you've done on your study. And I guess I wonder
why you would be so miserly with five or six people when you
can accomplish what needs to be done and affect the least
amount of people and look like heroes except that all of a
sudden you come up looking rather stingy.
And I guess that's a big concern to me to think that you would be that way, because like she said, it could be our property next. And if you go through Winterwood Estates, you're not going to have just five people on you. And like I said, you just might as well fold up your tent because the lawyers will tie you up for at least ten years or more.

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: Well, I'll try to address that a little bit. It's just a fact of life in this business here is that nobody wants transmission lines. No matter where we go, there's going to be people that are not going to like what we're doing. From a fair compensation standpoint, that process and what we go through is that we have often our own appraisers go out there and they appraise the property and they take a look at that and they present that appraisal to the landowner.

And if the landowner doesn't like it, we offer to have it done by an independent appraiser, and in this case this year the independent appraisers were brought in and they appraised the property, and that value was presented to the people. And those appraisals are based on fair market value of similar properties that have sold in the area on a recent basis.

As a federal agency, BPA has difficulty in there's some rules in place, laws in place that we cannot pay a lot
BPA's offer is based on either a staff appraisal, or a contract appraisal. BPA's contract appraisers must be certified in the state where the property to be appraised is located. BPA's staff appraisers are not required to be state certified, but have chosen to be certified in at least one of the states within BPA's service area. Both BPA's contract appraisers and staff appraisers must adhere to the “Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practices,” as well as the “Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions.” BPA requires that any contract appraiser be state certified and maintain a positive professional reputation, and must be familiar with the property types being appraised.

MR. SCOTT TAYLOR: I'm afraid he kind of took most of my question there, so I'll ask a little bit of a follow up. In the event that you need to go to an independent person for evaluation of property, how does that process work? How do you choose the independent evaluator of the

more than fair market value for properties. It has to be some reason for us paying more than fair market value. So we try to take a look at properties and try to pay fair market value. Now, if there's no arrangement made between BPA and that landowner, then people talk about the word condemnation, and, yes, that's an avenue that BPA can take and will take. We don't like doing that.

But as part of that process, then, it gives BPA the right to go in and construct the line. But then BPA does not put the value on the property. That, then, is determined in court and the court will rule on what that value ought to be. That value is sometimes less, sometimes equal or sometimes more than what BPA has offered the landowner.

So I hope that addresses your question. But as far as the community where you're at, it's even more difficult because there BPA already has the right-of-way, so there will be no value, there will be no payments in that sense to those landowners who live immediately adjacent to Alternative A just east of Covington.
And part B of my question is: In areas where you do currently have easement but you increase or impact the area, for instance, I've got fairly large towers running through the north side of my property, but if you decided to make even bigger towers, how do you handle situations like that where you clearly impact the value of my property but you already have that easement?

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: I think there's a couple of questions there. One, we choose an appraiser hopefully that the landowner agrees with also, but it needs to be an appraiser that's recognized, so -- by the appraisal community. The second question if BPA already has the right-of-way, then in most cases BPA also has the right to certain construct -- in the case of Alternative A, construct a transmission line. There used to be a transmission line there one time. It's a long time ago, trees have grown back, but nonetheless BPA has the right-of-way there and has the rights to construct another line there. BPA would like to see what impact that it has on the landowner there. only in the sense that if there's any like crops growing there, impacts to like crops. So in these cases here, there's no crops there. There are trees there and in a lot of cases BPA maintains that those trees belong to BPA. In your case there where there is an...
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1429-021-001 The BPA staff appraisers have reviewed the Kangley-Echo Lake Project appraisals with a value of $25,000 per acre for rural residential home sites. We could not find a discrepancy as far as a value of $25,000 per acre.

However, on the appraisal summary table, there is a "total value of property," including land and improvements. The value per acre could be misconstrued if the value of the improvements was not itemized separately from the land. The total property value includes land, improvements (if any), uneconomical remnants (if any), timber, etc. If you would like to review the appraisal prepared for the land rights needed by BPA on your property, BPA's appraisal staff is available to answer any of your questions.
put total appraised value or the appraisal value per acre
there is $25,000 an acre on the front, but yet on the inside
you're telling me my land's worth 30,000. But they're
offering me 25 on front. And then on top of it, I don't
know if the rest of you are aware, he was talking about
hired appraiser. Well, their appraiser for my property is
their on-staff appraiser, Tom Walcott, and he is not
licensed by Washington. Portland, he is out of Portland.
He's not licensed in any other state to appraise. He does
not have to be licensed because he's federal.
I called the Department of License, Real Estate
Appraisal Section and talked to Mr. Ralph Burkdoll. And,
anyways, I asked him doesn't Tom have to be licensed to
appraise here. and he said, well, if he's federal, no, he
doesn't, but he has to go by the appraisal guidelines. But
it's also very hard for Tom Walcott, who's in Portland, and
when he came and sat at my table. I asked him, I said, do
you know certain regulations, certain things in King County
that are going on, and he did not know. He could not come
up with the right answers for that.

And I've been told that an appraiser cannot come
in out of an area that he's not familiar with and properly
appraise anyone's property. And then when I talked to you
in June, I asked you about. okay, I'm going to have an
appraiser appraise my property. So I used the same
appraiser, I paid for him. I hired him. I paid for him, and
I had him appraise my property, the same one that you people
had hired to appraise the other people's properties, and you
still weren't happy with the appraisal that he came up with
because it came up quite a bit higher than your appraisal.
so --

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: I do not know the details in
your situation there.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: You're not aware of
any of these details, none of these real estate specialists
have ever told you about any of this?

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: They have told me about some of
the items, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Well, then, maybe
you and I need to talk.

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: I'll talk to our realty
department about your situation.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Do you have any
comment on -- why Tom Walcott -- you sat here and told these
people that you use an outside appraiser. You didn't use an
outside appraiser on my property. Why Tom Walcott?

MR. PAUL WOOLSON: Tom Walcott is a skilled
appraiser working for the federal government. I don't know.
Tina, that this is the vehicle --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Well, you told these
people that you are using a licensed appraiser. You're
making your guys look good again. They have no idea. They
have no idea.

MR. PAUL WOOLSON: Tom Walcott is a skilled
appraiser working for the federal government. Whether we
use a fee appraiser or whether we use a staff appraiser, the
appraiser still has to follow the same regulations. It's
called "Use Pop." they still have to follow the same
appraisal practices, and Tom Walcott did.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: But how can he be
familiar with this area?

MR. PAUL WOOLSON: And there was a disagreement
with value. Bonneville Power and the property owner are
still negotiating, and there's still a possibility we might
be able to reach a settlement. Tina. And I think that's all
we're still trying to do.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I still want to talk
with you people too, but I want these people to know what's
going on. Bonneville is not all the good guy that they are
making themselves out to be. They intended to go through
this watershed, they plan on going through this watershed.
None of you people. I don't care what they tell you, have
ever been at risk of them going through your property.

I have rebar in my property. I have cement just
off my property that they have poured and tested for holding
these new towers that they're going to put. If any of you want to come to my place, I'll be glad to show you the rebar, the tower test spots they already poured. They have poured every fourth tower test spot. They plan on going through here. They just don't want to condemn the watershed because then they will look like the bad guy, and they can have my property. I don't care. They can have it. I don't want to hold up progress, but I just want to be paid, compensated for it. I don't want any more people displaced.

I'm sorry.

MS. DIANE ADAMS: And I understand your concern and I think your comment has been recorded and heard by BPA. They clearly continue negotiation, I guess --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Well, they need to hear it, then. The rest of the people need to know what's going on with us five people because they haven't heard it. They haven't. They might have heard us, but they're really not listening and they don't want anybody else to know.

MS. DIANE ADAMS: Well, you've been heard tonight. I guarantee it. There is one more question and we will recess back into the open house.

MR. DAVE PIMENTEL: Well, excuse me, after that, you know. I hate to even ask this question. My concern is -- and, you know, that's some fresh information that really brings light how the government works, and it's true
and I believe you. However, I still have a question.

Is it true that after this comment period on March 1st, you know, you’re going along here saying we’re going through the watershed, we want to go through the watershed and on March 2nd you could say, Ha, alternative C, and we would have no recourse at that point. How would that work.

If -- you know, I’m not presuming that you’ll do that. But could that happen? And, if so, how would that change the whole scheme of actions that would take place?

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: Well, I think I addressed that earlier, that that is a possibility and I want people to know that. I want to warn people about that, is that BPA has gone through an extensive process here and each time we’ve come back to you folks we have the same solution, that is. Alternative 1 as being our preferred. That could still change.

MR. DAVE FIRENTEL: What can change that? The political powers downtown?

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: The political powers of other folks is a possibility or something else that comes along that we currently don’t know about. Just looking at the whole aspect of, you know, cost to the system and environmental issues, the administrator will take a look at all of those aspects and determine which route looks the right route to go with.
MR. DAVE PIMENTEL: You guys aren't new at this
game. You've been doing this for a long time.

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: We've been doing this for a
long time, and I think we're trying to show you that we're
trying to do at least a good job. So we're looking at all
the aspects, we've laid all of those aspects out in this
document here. They're the same issues that our
administrator will take a look at, our team will come up
with a proposal for the administrator, and then the
administrator will decide.

But part of that is also outside of the scope of
this document, and that is the discussions with Seattle, for
instance, and some other factors. So right now this looks
like the best route to go and that's the direction that
we're heading into. But please do not take this as our
final decision because a final decision will not come until
the earlier part of August. So we will also be coming out
with a final EIS in July. There again, there will be a
proposal in a document, but it still will not be the final
choice. The final choice will be when we put a record
decision together.

And as far as BPA trying to look like the good
guy, I don't think we have ever tried to look like being the
good guy. We are trying to do what we consider to be the
right thing. We are looking at actual factors associated
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1429-023-001 and -002  Comment noted.

1429-024-001  After the FEIS is released, people can comment on the FEIS, but there is no formal comment period. Comments received on the FEIS are summarized in the Record of Decision.
why it's called a final document. But if we do get -- we
won't make any decision for 30 days, and if we get any
comments after the final on the final we summarize those and
put those in the record of decision.

MR. RICHARD BONEWITS: The second point, Helen,
find some cultural artifacts on your property.

MS. HELEN JOHNSON: I've got some railroad spikes
probably or logging spikes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Do the comment sheets
carry as much weight as people writing
individual personal letters?

MR. GENE LYNARD: Absolutely. It doesn't make any
difference how they come in, e-mail or letters or --

MR. DAVE PIMENTEL: What's your history on
situations like this where you've got a preferred
alternative and then the comment period closes? What
percentage of completed projects end up being the preferred
alternative versus going in some other direction after the
comment period, for example?

MR. LOU DRIESEN: I'd like to answer that, but I
don't think I want to answer that due to the situation that
we're in on this project right now.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I got a question --

MR. DAVE PIMENTEL: Hold on. Excuse me, sir.

MS. DIANE ADAMS: Hang on, please.
Alternative 2 was originally suggested as an alternative because it avoids existing homes. The city of Seattle, prefers that if a line has to cross the CRW, that it be next to the existing 500-kV line to minimize the overall impacts to the CRW. Alternative 1 is next to the existing line.

MR. DAVE PIMENTEL: He failed to answer my question.
MR. SCOTT TAYLOR: He doesn't have to answer it.
MR. DAVE PIMENTEL: I would like to know why he can't answer that simple question.
MS. DIANE ADAMS: Lou, do you want to repeat your response?
MR. LOU DRIESSSEN: I do not want to answer that question because it may jeopardize our discussions with Seattle. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I'm just looking at the map here, and it looks like Alternative 2 would cure the whole problem.
MS. DIANE ADAMS: I think what the gentleman is looking at here is going Alternative 4A instead of 4B. Was that correct, sir?
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes, yes. It doesn't look like there's any housing in that area at all.
MR. GENE LYLAND: Alternative 2 begins at this point here and goes up. Alternative 2 wouldn't require any homes to be taken.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: That's what it looked like to me.
MS. DIANE ADAMS: And that alternative is still on the table; is that correct?
MR. LOU DRIESSEN: All the alternatives are still on the table.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: When we went to Seattle last time, we were told that if they put the bigger power lines on the Highway A that the people would have to live 350 feet away from the power lines. Now they're telling me you only have to be 75 feet away from it. When we built there, it was a law we had to be 150 feet away from it. Now, why, what's the problem? What happened between Seattle this spring or summer till now?

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: I think there may be some difference of perception. I'm not sure where you're getting these numbers. It may be the difference between the right-of-way width and the distance away from the transmission line itself. I believe that the right-of-way that we have in your area there, there's an existing 230 kv line -- well, it's 345 kv line energized a 230 and that line will be torn down and a new line would be put in its place, double circuit, with one side would handle the existing line and then the other side would be the new line. That right-of-way is 150 feet wide.

For the new larger towers, new larger line, 150 feet wide would be adequate for that new line. Houses can be constructed immediately adjacent to that right-of-way, and in a lot of cases houses are adjacent to that.
The location of the airport was identified in the Land Use, Recreation, Transportation Technical Study Report in Appendix L, and identified on Figure 13 in that report. The Crest Airpark appears to be located approximately 3/4 mile south of Alternative A, at its closest point. The BIS concluded that since the towers would be less than 200 feet high, that they would not enter navigable airspace, therefore, Alternative A would have no long-term impact on this or any other airport in the vicinity of the project.
BPA supports the use of fuel cells and other distributed generation alternatives to meet future power needs. BPA's Energy Efficiency Organization has two programs to promote these technologies. The first is the Energy Web, which integrates the utility electrical system, telecommunications system, and the energy market to optimize loads on the electrical network, reduce costs to consumers and utilities, facilitate the integration of renewable resources, increase electrical system reliability and reduce environmental impacts of load growth.

The second is BPA's Fuel Cell Development Program, which has the goal of accelerating the commercial availability of residential-scale fuel cell systems to meet the distributed power needs of our customers. Because they generate clean, efficient, environmentally-friendly power, fuel cells are a promising source of supplementary electricity to meet future demands. Potential applications include: on-site generation in remote locations, solving power quality or reliability problems, improving system efficiencies where both electricity and hot water are needed, offsetting the need to build new power lines and other applications where environmental impact is the focus. While fuel cells have great potential, they'll need a few more breakthroughs before they can reliably and cost-effectively defer transmission upgrades.
MR. MIKE KREIPE: We have a pilot program. I can't remember the numbers exactly, it was more than ten sites -- we bought equipment and we're setting them in ten locations to learn about them. It's part of our looking at new technology and determining how it really operates and whether they're mature to go into further.

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: This is for the fuel cell technology.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Are you close enough to be able to defer these kind of projects at all? Are you close enough to any kind of breakthrough there where you are able to say we don't need to do anything?

MR. MIKE KREIPE: Take the fuel cell because it's probably the most important thing to talk about here. I do a little bit of reading in that, and they were -- of course, it was the power source in the space programs way back to the '60s. Of course, they're -- it's very expensive. I mean, that isn't the issue there, they needed the power source. It's been 34 years since we know about and working with these. I know ten years ago it was forecast that they would be commercial now.

I know in the last few years people admitted it's taking so much time. There are demonstration sites out now, so it's being sold, it seems to be running -- it's getting to fruition a lot slower than what was expected ten years
ago. I don't know if it's going to slow down some more.
It's kind of an unknown. All I can say is it's not come as
fast as it's been expected. But I hope it's still going to
come. I still expect it to come. It's just going to take
some more time.

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: BPA is also involved with other
research associated with making our transmission grid more
efficient. So we, for instance, placed a newer technology,
certainly new to us, in Maple Valley Substation that allowed
us to defer construction of new facilities. So it's a type
of equipment that makes our facilities much more efficient
under certain circumstances. So we're also continually
looking at our existing system and trying to figure out ways
to make it more efficient using existing technology.

For instance, in the late '80s and early '90s, BPA
had the project of looking to bring another transmission
line across the Cascades into Seattle. And by constructing
a new substation in Ellensburg area we were able to defer
that new line, and right now it's still not on our books as
being needed. So we're continually looking at new
technology and looking at our existing system to see how we
can make it better. We don't like to spend money building
new facilities any more than anybody else does.

MR. MIKE KREIPE: And just so -- part of what Lou
was talking about was FACS devices. It's come up in these
Property owner cannot maintain the ROW when open to the public. Vandalism, dumping, and dangerous activities occur on a frequent basis.

Maps need descriptive layers to show routes and property lines.

Have lived 50 years next to RTA, don’t want the project to be delayed as the property owners want to get on with their lives.

Alternate C crosses over my house. I am planning an extensive remodel. Already have permits and materials. If you were me, what would you do?

Seattle Public Utility has trashed watershed. Now they want to trash private owners’ properties on Route C.
CERTIFICATE

STATE OF WASHINGTON }
COUNTY OF KING }

I, BETSY DECATER, a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public in and for King County, Washington, do hereby certify that I reported in machine shorthand the above-captioned proceedings; that the foregoing transcript was prepared under my personal supervision and constitutes a true record of the proceedings.

I further certify that I am not an attorney or counsel of any parties, nor a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor financially interested in the action.

WITNESS my hand and seal in Sammamish, County of King, State of Washington, this 5th day of February, 2003.

My commission expires 03-20-06
COMMENTS TO
KANGLEY-ECHO LAKE TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT
Thursday Meeting, February 6, 2003

Tahoma Senior High School
Kent, Washington

Reported by: Betsy E. DeCater, RPR
License No. 601-835-443
MS. MARGARET CRABTREE: And I think Alternative 1, I prefer that because there's less disturbance. There's already an existing one across from it, less disturbance to the environment and the people and it will be less cost. I think that should be important and really considered.

KATHY MYERS: My name is Kathy, with a K, Myers, M-y-e-r-s. I just wanted to state my support for the preferred Alternative 1. I think that is by far the wisest choice.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. On your preferred route going through the watershed, then, the way I understand it, if that's turned down for some other reason, then the process is go back all the way through the whole scope of what we've been going through the last four years?

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: No, we've done everything, at least from our opinion, that we need to do. We've identified all these different alternatives, and it's a matter of choosing one of those alternatives. So we do not need to go back and redo all of the scoping meetings and the environmental NEPA process anyway.

So it's just a matter of when -- the administrator gets to decide which option does he choose. So it could be any one of the options, any one of the routing options or the no-action, which means we do nothing, or the option that Mike was describing earlier and that's what we call the
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BPA does not rank the options in that way. It would have to take a look at all the factors to determine the next likely option. Table 2-3 compares all the options, including cost.

MR. GENE LYNARD: I would add, if one of the other alternatives would be chosen other than the preferred, there would be a lot of environmental work that would need to be done. We would -- for the preferred, we recognized it as a preferred early on and we knew we had endangered species in the area, so we prepared a biological assessment and we initiated consultation with the National Marine Fishery Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service. We have also conducted a culture resource survey along the whole length of Alternative 1 and dug 1170 holes as part of our responsibility under the Archeological Protection Act. And on B and D, for example, in the National Forest, we would have to do -- survey for survey and managed species in addition to endangered species. There would be a lot of work involved in that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Then assuming that all the routes are still on the table, can you give me a ranking in terms of what route after Route 1 would be looked at next?

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: We don't rank the different alternatives. I think if you will look at the document, there's a table in there, Gene.

MR. GENE LYNARD: Yeah, Summary Table 2.3 in the EIS is a summary of all the impacts of all the different
resource areas along with the cost of each alternative.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Is some of it, then, done by cost only then?

MR. GENE LYNARD: We have looked at the cost, what each alternative would cost and then that cost information is in that same table. It's Table 2.3, which is in here. It's also in the CD contained in the summary.

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: So we -- BPA and other utilities have tried to rank different alternatives some years ago, and we found that that doesn't really work because the rankings are based upon what your perspective is. So if your perspective is from a landowner, then you're going to weigh it one way. If your perspective is from not wanting to take any trees out from a wildlife habitat standpoint, you're going to weigh it another way.

So what we've done is we've outlined what we consider the impacts are for every alternative, and you can come up with your own conclusion about which one you think is best, including, like Gene says, also from a cost standpoint. So that table includes all the different impacts from all the different categories and also from the cost. And then you can take a look at that and I think you'll see why we chose the preferred route as being the preferred.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. I was just
BPA can comment on the final EIS, but no public meetings will be held. BPA has 30 days after the final before they can sign a Record of Decision, which will designate BPA decision about the project. BPA will notify the public of the decision.
in the EIS.

But the part is when are you going to know, after
the administrator does make a decision, we publish his
decision in what's called a record of decision. And that
record of decision will contain his decision, plus all
comments that have come into the agency since the final was
produced. They will be summarized.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: When the decision is
made I don't really care about. My concerns are if you make
a decision other than the main one. I want to have time to
comment on it and gather the troops to oppose it. And
you're telling me I'm not going to have that opportunity and
you're not offering the criteria you're going to use.

You're saying it's an impact statement, but they don't have
to go by it. So I'm going to leave here the same way I came
in. Not knowing what you are going to choose, and basically
it's going to come to a political thing. You can't even say
it's going to be close, or environmental impact or who has
the most political clout.

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: Well, that's why I mentioned
earlier. I don't want people to get the misconception that
the final route is chosen. What we have done, though --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: But the final route
being chosen doesn't really mean anything because you're
going to choose it without giving us a chance to respond to
MR. LOU DRIESEN: No, you are responding to it by coming to these meetings. That's why we have the scoping meeting, that's why we've had this meeting. That's what these meetings are all about. We're getting your comments, and we know that Alternative A and C --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Well, I can tell you that most of my neighborhood is not here because the fact is that you are going with the preferred route and they assume you're going to go that way. If it goes somewhere else, you're going to get a lot more resistance and they're not going to have a chance to speak.

MR. LOU DRIESEN: I'm not sure you were at our scoping meeting this last time because this room here was filled with people who were opposed to Alternative C and Alternative A. I think we've gotten the message pretty clear about if we were to choose Alternative A or C there's going to be large opposition to either one of those alternatives. And that's what these meetings are all about. So that's all included. And that's why there's such a huge volume here, because it includes all the comments. We've gotten a tremendous amount of comments on these different alternatives. So I think we understand what the issues are.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Okay, I'll take your word for it. But if it goes through A or C, you'll see some
BPA has identified Alternative 1 as the proposed route for this line. BPA is willing to take the risk to survey and acquire land rights along Alternative 1 so that the line could be constructed after the Record of Decision, with as little delay for energization as possible. BPA acknowledges that the final decision will not be made until the Record of Decision, which is scheduled for August 2003. If the decision is made to choose another route, then energization would be delayed by several years.
already basically -- by doing that you have already decided which way you're going to go. I mean, doesn't that make sense? You don't go around and pay somebody a bunch of money for their land and then say, hey, we're going to go this way.

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: As I mentioned earlier, that's the risk that BPA was willing to take, that there's a lot of efforts that went into the preferred route because we think that this project is necessary for this area and we need to get this project done. And if we don't do this effort in parallel with what the environmental process is, then we would not be able to energize this line when we think this line needs to be energized. So if we were to wait until the record decision and then go through and do the survey and engineering work and the environmental detail associated with that and then construct, you're looking at another two years down the road.

So we think this project is needed as soon as possible. We, in fact, were trying to build this project last year and we weren't able to do that because we needed to go back and, like Gene mentioned, reopen up our document again and look at the different alternatives. So we put a lot of effort into this preferred alternative, and I don't think any one of us is denying that, including working with the landowners along there and including buying properties.
because we have bought some properties along in there.
We've also bought 350 acres north of the Cedar
River Watershed as mitigation for crossing the watershed.
So a lot of effort has been put into the project, and BPA is
willing to forego all of that if the decision is go to with
one of the other alternatives. So I want to make it clear
again, we have not made the final decision. It's always
possible that one of the other routes gets chosen. So until
August, when we will make a final decision, all the
different options, all the different routing options are
still on the table. They're all still viable, they're all
still possible.

MR. CLOYD PAXTON: Well, my name is Cloyd Paxton.
Let's talk about the effects of EMF. To whom it may
concern, I pray it's BPA, magnetic field is a moving charge
of particles which might enforce acts on electric current
forced and exerted on a given object, like human's bodies,
machinery, animals, so on and so forth. That's in Webster.
Page 23, Book of the EMF National Institute of Environmental
Health Sciences, like the Hanford atomic generator that
produced electricity, science knew how to make electricity
but did not know how to get rid of the breaching up of the
atomic nucleus. So we have lots and lots of radioactive
material in large lit vats and containers that causes
nausea, vomiting, headaches, diarrhea, loss of hair.
teeth -- destruction of white blood cells and hemorrhages.
Now, that's also proven back in 1920 as a fact. Still we
don't know what to do with radioactive radiation water
that's leaking into our stream.

Let's talk about melatonia efforts or effects in
laboratories. In the book EMF, melatonia is the hormone
secreted by the penal gland in adverse proportion to the
amount of light received by the retina important to
regulating the biorhythm in the eye of a person. And isn't
it ironic, I say isn't it ironic that my wife has uveitis,
it's an inflammation of the uvea, and it's inside the
eye ball of the eye.

Now, doctors call that bird-shot eye, which has no
meaning in Webster's language. She's blind. Her driver's
license has been taken away because of her blindness. The
inflammation is on her retina. We live within 175 feet of
that middle line of power, that power line. We are going
under the power line at all times. Since the 40 years we
have been, had heart surgery twice, two angioplasty
operations. Now my heart rhythm is off beat. It don't beat
right now. Had it checked here just not too long ago and
it's missing a beat.

Why all this is happening to me I don't know. But
why we take care of the spotted owl, the fish and the bugs
and that kind of environment but there are no laws for

1430-005-002 Comment noted.
people telling them how far they should stay away from the
EMF power lines. I say it takes the course of time to
really know what it's doing to the people. Like the Hanford
project. I hate to think of the 500 kV's running across my
property -- right now it's 230 or 240. I am worried about
and frightened of the 500 kV. How much more can we take?
Man can destroy himself, like it says in the Bible.

Now, I wonder about that power line. The power
line that's right by my place. There's a strand of about
2,000 feet. It goes across the Maple Valley River over
across -- or across the Maple Valley Highway, across the
river and on the other side is a stretch of about 2,000
feet. I have seen that baby when they had an earthquake and
looked like that thing was flopping around like galloping
gerty, and what's going to happen when they put a 190-foot
pole up there? I don't know. It worries me. Basically,
with all that 500 stuff coming. That's all I got to say.

MR. JON ZAK: Good evening. My name is John Zak.
I live on two and a half acres in a development of about a
hundred homes in Maple Valley. Our eastern property
boundary will be the proposed transmission line right-of-way
for Alternative C. On BPA's preferred alternative route,
the age of the trees is 10 to 30 years. The trees on my
property range in size from two and a half to five foot in
diameter. The trees on my property make the trees in the
watershed look like twigs. I would like to talk about this
Cedar River Watershed. This watershed has been decimated by
logging for about a hundred years. There are over 600 miles
of logging within the watershed. I would like to show you
some pictures.

I hiked up McClellan’s Butte looking into the
Cedar River Watershed. You can see I’m standing in some
trees that have been there forever and looking down into the
logging. This is another picture looking at some of the
road cuts. There are 621 miles of gravel logging roads in
the watershed. And Seattle complains about erosion, but how
much erosion is caused by all the road cuts from the logging
roads?

Picture looking down at Chester Morris Lake. See
the different ages of the trees. Logging roads on the
hillsides of the second and third growth timber. A similar
picture. I’d like to show a picture of some old growth
trees. This is what the watershed should look like. This
is the Ashland Curtis Grove on the way up to Snoqualmie
Pass. Another picture of the Ashland Curtis Trail from the
Ashland Curtis Grove.

This is a picture of our backyard. Here’s another
picture of our backyard. It will go through our eastern
property boundary and all these trees will have to be taken
down. And here’s some of the -- this is some of the work

1430-006-002 and -003 Comment noted.
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1 that Seattle Public Utilities has done on the watershed.
2 That's actually on their website, it's public information.
3 See a logging road, all of the erosion?
4 I have another picture of equipment right around
5 Chester Morris Lake. And BPA will be using vegetable oil in
6 their hydraulic systems. I wonder what Seattle will be
7 using? Here's more equipment. Here's a picture of Chester
8 Morris Lake. You can see the bad water and the better
9 water.
10 Pictures of the construction in the Cedar River
11 Watershed by Seattle Public Utilities proves their
12 hypocrisy. Seattle Public Utilities has one standard for
13 themselves and another one for the BPA. I would like
14 Seattle Public Utilities to answer these three questions:
15 Number one, where is the evidence that BPA has
16 caused any harm to the water quality or watershed operation
17 in its 30 years of operating a power line in the watershed?
18 Two, what evidence does Seattle have that clearing
19 an additional 91 acres for a second power line is more
20 damaging to water quality than failure to progressively
21 replant the 600 miles of logging roads already in the
22 watershed?
23 Three, clearing 91 acres for a second power line
24 would require one-tenth of one percent of the watershed's
25 total acreage of 90,240. How can this small amount of
clearing have any impact on water quality? That's it.
Thank you.

MS. TINA MORGAN: I might need an extra minute or
something, but right now I want to speak on behalf of
Bonneville. I spoke on behalf of ourselves. We live on
Alternative Route No. 1, and we have pretty well accepted
the fact that we feel that Bonneville is going to come
through our properties and will eventually be able to meet
an agreement with the watershed and come through the
watershed. So we have pretty well resigned to the fact that
they are coming through our properties.

And, anyways, and my opinion of the watershed
trying to hold Bonneville up for 230 million, and I don't
know how much it is now, if it's even become higher than
that. for a filtration system that just because they want
Bonneville to buy it to go through the property. I mean, to
go through their watershed. So I don't agree with what the
Seattle watershed is trying to do with Bonneville. They
spent a lot of money on environmental issues and their money
that they want for this filtration plant could be spent to
help save the fish, to save other environmental issues,
so -- and Bonneville is very sensitive, I feel. From what
I've read, to environmental issues.

And I also -- I hauled logs out of the Seattle
watershed after my husband passed away in 1978, and I did so

1430-007-001 Comment noted.
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until 1992 until they closed the watershed down. And sometime in the '90s I actually quit hauling in the watershed, particularly I'm not exactly sure on the day they shut the watershed down to logging, but I will tell you we had over a hundred trucks coming out of there a day and we were creating a cloud of dust over that watershed that you could see all the way to Seattle, and they weren't too worried about the filtration system at that time.

So I really do feel that Seattle is holding Bonneville up. And as far as impact goes to other people's properties, this probably makes the most sense to go this way, they're impacting the fewest amount of people. But what we're asking for is -- where we're at is you guys have been living this since sometime last year. We've been living this since March 22nd of 2000. And, anyway, that was our first contact.

BPA contacted me March 22nd, and I'm assuming probably the rest of the folks, about their proposal routes about the new 500 kilowatt line. Preferred route at the time was Alternative No. 1 at that time also, through the watershed. They would also affect five private property owners, and I am one of them.

Starting in the winter of 2000/2001, they asked for a letter of permission to enter my property, which I signed on December 8th of 2000. BP started that process of

Comment noted.
surveying and staking their proposed right-of-way across our property. Well, I want to finish this. I spoke for BP, now I want to speak for me.

Anyways, on September 11th of 2001, they contacted us about appraising our land. BP sent out an appraiser to our properties, to my property, anyways, on the 25th and the 27th, 2001. During that time, I was very cordial and friendly towards all of the BP folks that came by, and I even showed them where there was already stakes in the ground to save them time on surveying my property. And I actually have a survey -- antique survey post that's from the early 1900s when they came through my land that they have used for satellite pinpointing.

Anyways, they assured me they would pay me fair compensation. I gave them total access to my property. April of 2002, BP contacted me about the appraisal on my property was complete as of March 8th, 2002. I'm reading faster. They were ready to present me with the appraisal and also were prepared to write me a check at that time. They also have said that they are not in the habit of necessarily buying property, but then in another time they said they do that all the time, so I'm not sure which one they do.

They are affecting two buildable five acre parcels of mine. There will be no building site left on one of the
BPA staff appraisers are not required to be state certified. However, all BPA staff appraisers have chosen to be state certified in at least one of the states within BPA’s service area. BPA appraisers follow the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practices and follow all applicable federal guidelines. Also see response to Comment 1429-021-001.
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And their appraiser, Tom Walcott, is the one who did it. He's their in-house appraiser. He's not licensed in the State of Washington or even Oregon. BP informed me that federal government appraisers do not have to be licensed. BP's Tom Walcott is totally unfamiliar with King County land values and does not live here and work here in our day-to-day real estate market. I had a talk with Ralph Burkdoll from Washington State Department of License and Real Estate Appraisers about this. He said he would like to look at their appraisal.

So what I'm asking for I don't think -- I'm asking for fair. We are all asking for fair compensation for our property. And we are afraid that -- you know, we are sure they are going to go through our property and we are -- you know, have rectified ourselves to that fact. But we need to have fair compensation for our property and we need -- you folks are going to be off the hook, we've all believed, truly believe, of course, the final decision won't be, but as soon as the final decision comes down, if we haven't sold our properties before then, they will condemn us. And we have been told this. They tell us that every day.

Every time they call us, "We're going to condemn you, we're going to condemn." We're told this constantly. Anyways, you have no idea when you give an easement you have no rights left on your property. You can only use it for

1430-007-005 BPA apologizes for the disruption that this project has caused people along the project routes. It is our intent to treat people fairly and with respect.
pasture basically, you have no rights, if they let you use it for pasture. They will permit you to grow some products on it, some crops or something, as long as they're within a certain size and so on and so forth. But you have to get a permit from them to do that. You have to pay for a permit, unless they waive this permit.

You have no idea what you're giving up when they take an easement from you, and all we want to do is be paid for the damages and for that compensation. And I'm sorry if I took a little bit too long, but I thought I started out on BP's side as far as where they need to go, but we need to be compensated and we are asking in that neighborhood, there's only five of us, for your help and for your support. And the state representatives that you have had on board, we need help from those state representatives because I don't feel at this time that we're going to get a fair shake unless we get some help. Thank you.

MR. DON BREIGMANN: I got most of my frustrations out before, but I just wanted to reiterate basically what this woman is saying. If we are going to be spending these many millions of dollars for the thing, why can't you just offer them a hundred thousand over, no matter what it effects, unless you're talking a hundred homes. I understand you are talking five to ten properties. So why don't we just go from 100,000 over property value and half a
1. mill more and it's done and that seems like a fair thing to do. No matter who gets it. I mean, I'm opposed to you taking my house. But my house is worth well over three hundred thousands, and if it goes through the backyard, it takes all my trees down. I'm looking right at the line. It would go down at least a hundred thousand dollars, fifty thousand dollars in property value. So I would be basically a hundred thousand more in mortgage than the home would be worth. So no matter who it goes through, I agree with what she's saying. They should be fairly compensated, and if it's that important a thing and it's such a small amount of homes, overcompensate.

2. **MR. STEVE BRUNNETTE:** Like I said, I'm a property owner, and Tina has pretty much said what I've kind of felt all along, they are going to come through our land. And we have a house, we actually have two homes in which it is going to effect. We have a barn underneath one of the right-of-ways right now which is an existing line and they're going to take that, too. It's too close to the line. It will start a fire and burn down the other line.

3. We have a horse that's been living there, and I can't have a building over 10-by-10, so I don't know where he's going to go. And we have a rental house there, and it's a business. That's kind of our retirement. We figured

BPA has contracted for an appraisal of your property with a local appraiser. Upon receipt, we will be in a position to make you an offer on your property. BPA has been negotiating with other landowners along the preferred route for options to purchase transmission line easements, since the decision has not been made to construct.

Comment noted.
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1430-010-004, -005, and -006 BPA has an option to purchase 640 acres from Plum Creek immediately south of the watershed in the Kangley/Selleck area. This property could be divided into 20 acre parcels. BPA would prevent commercial or residential development on this property if it is acquired.
that the water table in that area is very shallow. This
property has been subdivided for five acre lots. Should
these properties be developed, the Puget Sound is suddenly
going to find septic drain fields and chem lawns in their
water table for their water supply. The City of Seattle
needs this property. I believe it is in the best interest
of my community for them to acquire this property.

Additionally, the 350 acres that the BPA has
offered I think is also of benefit. I think additionally
the community is probably going to ask for and support in
your negotiations with the City of Seattle that a buffer be
placed along the Raging River in order to protect that area
more fully and that those lines there be double-circuited to
cross the river as you have with the Cedar.

So in the end, I believe that our communities
would back a negotiations with Seattle that would increase
the protection of that area in order for you to get on with
your project. I believe that is ultimately in the best
interest of the City of Seattle, the local community and the
Bonneville Power Administration. I am somewhat frustrated
with the City of Seattle in their discussions regarding the
water filter. We’ve also spent time researching this and
the data seems to say to me that the City of Seattle has
needed a turbidity filter, will need a turbidity filter and
just doesn't have the cash for one. I do think they are
All alternatives would receive the appropriate level of environmental mitigation. On the watershed, the issue is associated with surface drinking water for the city of Seattle and some other local communities, along with the potential of Seattle needing to install an expensive turbidity filtration plant as a result of excessive amounts of turbidity caused by construction of this project. In addition the watershed has a Habitat Conservation Plan established with the USFWS and NMFS. This project needs to mitigate for potential impacts to the HCP. Private properties also have environmental concerns which BPA would address locally on that property, such as minimizing impacts to wells used for drinking water and minimizing impacts to creeks used by endangered fish species by keeping low-growing vegetation. Concerning where the funds come from for the purchase of lands to mitigate impacts to the watershed, those funds will be from BPA. BPA would likely buy more property than is necessary and would be selling those remaining portions. BPA is looking at other agencies to see if they would be interested in purchasing those remaining portions from BPA with whatever fund they have available, which may be from conservation funds.
you. I concur with your choice. And if it becomes our
alternative route, I would be adamantly opposed to it.
Thanks ever so much.

MR. JOHN HUSON: I just wanted to express my
approval of the preferred Alternative 1 and also if there is
any kind of extension to this process beyond what we have
here, I want to express some dismay and hope that it ends
here, and we will fight to the end, wherever that end might
be. Thank you.

MR. RICHARD BONEWITS: My name is Richard
Bonewits. I'm chairman of the Greater Maple Valley Area
Council. We've been in this battle for the community for
three years. We know these people almost as well as we know
our own family. This is the last of many meetings. I have
been to at least 10, possibly 11, I've lost count, which
were conducted by Lou and his crew in support of this power
line project over the last three years. You haven't heard
half of the questions that have been raised and you haven't
heard half the answers, but they have given good answers,
solid answers every time. We have checked them on the power
lines. Lisa said, the power demand requirements, we've
checked conservation and we've checked alternative energy
forms and a whole bunch of other things. The factors
haven't changed.

BPA came to the right conclusion the first time
three years ago, and two times since, the power line is
needed. There's no question in the engineers' in our
group's mind, and we had some 35 and 40 people from this
community that we took to Seattle last year. engineers,
lawyers, people that live in the area, all kinds of people.
All routes will incur some environmental damage, quite a bit
as a matter of fact. All of them cross one or the other
major salmon bearing rivers, streams, wetlands and so on.

There isn't even a question of a doubt the Seattle
Public Utility watershed route is the least costly, the
least damaging and affects the fewest people. And I want to
tell you that last year this group of ours, a few of them
here tonight, but we really operated with what I call an
opposition steering group, about ten people maximum, it had
environmentalists, as I said, lawyers, engineers and project
managers, people with experiences similar to yours. Over
1500 people in our area signed petitions opposing all routes
outside the Seattle Public Utilities watershed.

Your elected representatives here in the City of
Maple Valley, Covington and Issaquah joined us in letters
and comments to Bonneville in opposition to routes outside
the watershed. Your state representatives, both of them
from District 5, my district, have supported me, are
constantly in touch with me by e-mail. "Do we need to put
any more muscle into it, Dick?" And they're ready to go to
BPA has looked at the potential mitigation costs needed for all the alternatives and those costs are reflected in the overall costs depicted for each alternative as stated in the SDEIS. The SDEIS has already acknowledged that those alternatives outside the CRW would be more expensive than the preferred alternative.

Jennifer Dunn has been involved in it, our state or our U.S. Representative from District 8, and even Senator Cantwell has sent emissaries to meetings and my house and met with some of the people that are here and they are still in contact with us. Don't stop with your comments now. I'm telling you, don't leave it here with just words that you've spoken. I want you to write to Bonneville and I want you to put a carbon copy in the mail, Post Office Box 101, Maple Valley 98038. I will get it. I will see that all of these politicians and including, I failed to mention, our own county councilman for the District 13 -- District 12, rather, Dave Irons, his aid is here tonight again with us, the two state representative aids were with us last night, we had Senator Cantwell's aid with us the night before in Seattle. So don't stop here. Write your comments and send me a copy of it.

The other thing I want to leave Bonneville with two -- I want to say this to you: You have been knowledgeable, professional and courteous, and Diane has been a great facilitator. I have given her a hard time. She's tried to control me, that's pretty tough. There are two messages I want to leave with you: Provide equal consideration for avoiding construction damage to all routes.
and mitigation thereof. If you do that, the result you've already come to in this impact statement says that the costs are far higher in Routes A, C, B and D. Anyone with half a brain can see that if you were to give us the peanut oil or the vegetable oil and the hydraulic system and the helicopters and the pooper scoopers and all the other things that you have to do to satisfy Seattle, your Route A would probably be over a hundred million, probably we'd see C and D up somewhere around two hundred million and Route C would be up around a hundred and fifty. So don't forget those when you make your final decision.

And this last one is for your administrator to take home for you. Don't destroy the great amount of public goodwill that you've created, you've built. Recognize that your compensation offers are low. I own real estate in this area and I know what the value of Tina's land is. You need to recognize the right value for destroying two parcels of land. She's told you she will sell it to you. Just do it. It's a pittance in comparison with what you need. So, please, that will be clearly in the message that you get in writing from us. Thank you.

MR. CLOYD PAXTON: I would like to know why Governor Locke is not entering this project here? I mean, all the people that's got power lines on their property, they don't get any compensation for what they have got and
It looks to me like the taxpayers shouldn't have to pay taxes on that land. The King County ought to take care of them taxes. That is no good to us, you know what I mean, as far as you might be able to drive over it, but you can't raise cattle on it or do a lot of things you want to do on it. So why don't King County pay the taxes on all this land?

I mean, it's just certain ones that's going to get it, but they're the ones that are valuable, you know what I mean, they need it. So I'd like to know why we couldn't get together with Mr. Locke or something like that or whoever it takes and get our taxes paid by King County or whatever, you know. Free. That's all.

Mr. Lou Driessen: Maybe Cindy can answer the governor's office. We got to put you on the spot sometime, Cindy.

Ms. Cindy Custer: For Bonneville I work with elected officials and the state agencies and the legislature, so I talk to your representatives not frequently but at least keep them up to speed on what's going on and I do work with Governor Locke's staff person who deals with energy issues. And he is very aware of this project, he saw your petitions and is keeping a close eye on what's going on. He's chosen at least at this point not to take a public stand, but he's certainly aware of what's
1430-014-001

happening with the line.

MR. CLOYD PAXTON: Well, I think it would help
BPA, you know what I mean?

MS. TINA MORGAN: Well, I'm of the opinion that
maybe BP, on his comment, maybe share in some of the taxes
seeing is how they take a lot of rights away from the
property owner because they pay a one-time fee for the
easement and then have the rights to use it therefore and
tell the property owner what they can and cannot do. So it
does seem a little unfair to me for a one-time payment and
Bonneville uses it forever, gets to make money off the power
that goes across there, even though you call it nonprofit.
But, I don't know, there seems something wrong with that
system to me. But my actual question for myself was I was
wondering how much money to date or do you have any idea has
this controversy with Seattle Watershed caused you?

MR. GENE LYNARD: Well, as far as the
environmental effort, the cost of environmental documents
and the meetings and hiring of consultants, we're over a
million dollars in the last three years. This is an unusual
project and this is a particularly expensive environmental
effort.

MS. TINA MORGAN: I see. But since you had your
original preferred and then when watershed -- when the
watershed threw a monkey wrench into your project, I was

1430-015-001

and -002 You may want to contact your local taxing
authority(ies) and provide them with a copy of BPA's
easement document, and inquire whether a reduction in
your property taxes is possible.

1430-015-003 The costs would be about $10 to $13 million more than
cnventional construction including special designs and
construction techniques and purchasing properties.
just wondering what the costs have been involved since at
that time, if you have any idea, and what you anticipate
them to be until your final decision.

MR. GENE LYNARD: Well, we were -- I had a budget
to do all the environmental work and the budget was a
million dollars. And we would have been well under that had
we produced a final last year. But since we went this
additional -- undertook this additional effort, hiring
additional contractors, doing additional work, we are
probably up 1.2 when we're done.

MS. TINA MORGAN: I was just curious. And then
Joanna Paul here, one of the people in our neighborhood, she
wanted to know, she asked me to ask the question for her.
who makes the ultimate final decision of which way you will
go?

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: Well, the project team looks at
all the factors and then they make a decision that's a
suggestion that goes to the administrator. Then the
administrator decides in the end. So it's the BPA
administrator that makes the final decision. She is asking
where the administrator is located at. The administrator is
located at Portland, Oregon at BPA headquarters.

MR. GENE LYNARD: By the name of Steve Wright.

MR. JON ZAK: And you're in negotiations with
Seattle on the preferred alternative, do you discuss

BPA's Administrator will make the decision on this project.

Some discussions have taken place about
decommissioning roads. Those discussions are continuing
and no commitment has been made.
decommissioning logging roads as a method of mitigation?

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: Yes. They have brought that to
the table, so that's part of the discussions along with
other things.

MR. JON ZAK: Thank you. I would also like to
thank Dick Bonewits for all the work he's done on this so
far for the people in Maple Valley.

MR. RICHARD BONEWITS: I want to answer Cloyd's
question. The Governor has been notified by our group about
this. All 13 King County councilmen have been notified
about it. The Governor did have, through the Department of
Ecology, have the regional manager call me and wonder what
the deal was, and I spent about two hours one day giving him
the background, education.

My position with politicians goes like this:
You're either for us or shut up, and you get most -- those
are your two choices, either come out actively helping or at
least recognize there's more than one side. And for all of
you to understand this, I want you to clearly understand
what he told me, because this is not the first time that
I've been involved with Bonneville, they're generally a
professional group, and this is a professional group, but
let me tell you, Seattle has told us clearly they do not
intend to take this going down. That's why your letters are
necessary. You need to keep it up. You need to talk to
your neighbors. You need to get them to write them, whether
you’re under A, you’re under C, and we have been up and
talked to the people under B and D. So, please, write your
letters.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I got here kind of
late and I didn’t feel worth throwing any speeches. I’ve
talked too much already, one thing I want to ask, make sure
I got it clear, I’ve got some friends in California in the
engineering business, and part of that fiasco was the lack
of transmission. They haven’t made any investment, and so
you just hear about Enron, but it’s really cost them because
of the lack of transmission. I know you guys haven’t had a
chance because of all the things you have to put up with
too, but as I understand this thing, if we put this line
through, we will save five megawatts, is that right?

That means you’re not going to have to buy five
megawatts which falls to the benefit of the taxpayers. Now,
all the folks that are Greenies, you know, Planet Earth and
all that kind of stuff, and alternative energy, which I buy
myself, I throw some extra bucks in where I live, why would
they not recognize that it’s really imperative to get the
project because it will pay for itself? Am I missing
something?

In other words, if you get this thing through, the
efficiency you’re going to have because of this new line is
1 going to save you five megawatts, which is a couple of million bucks at today's prices if the thing goes up. So this thing is going to be a heck of an investment; is that right?

5 MR. GENE LYNARD: That's five megawatts annually.
6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So I hope you use that when you're talking to the folks in Seattle. One thing I have gotten from some of these people like Sierra Club and these other guys with other agendas and the Seattle people that are bitching about water, you're not going to touch that. Is this thing does make sense and you do have to make an investment for the rate payers on transmission lines. So I think you ought to use that. I don't think anybody that I've been at any of these meetings is anti-environment.

13 We're all pro environment. And if you took a pole here, you would probably say has BPA chosen the most environmentally sound alternative? I don't know anybody that says no. So I hope you use that when you are talking to Seattle. And I want to echo Dick's things. I think you guys are very professional.

21 MS. CLOYD PAXTON: I understand that you have bought 350 acres next to the watershed for Seattle, where no one even in Seattle knows where the watershed is at, but these five people that have five homes that you're going to be using. I can't understand why you can't pay them the

1430-019-001 and -002 BPA did take advantage of an opportunity to acquire 350 acres from the Trust for Public Land. The preferred alternative crosses this parcel, it has potential mitigation benefits, and can be resold if the decision is not to construct this route. See response to Comment 1429-013-002.
BPA has the power of eminent domain, or the power to condemn. BPA works closely with landowners to come to a satisfactory agreement if possible. If negotiations are not successful, and the decision has been made to construct a project, BPA would use its power to condemn to secure the necessary land rights. This would apply to land rights needed from any landowner along the route to be constructed, including the City of Seattle, if the preferred route is selected. BPA generally requires six months to acquire rights to property.
The aluminum smelter at Kaiser is shut down and will be dismantled. The aluminum smelter process is continuous in that bauxite is added while the finished aluminum is being poured from the pot. The pots must be kept energized in order to keep the process going. The conductors on our lines are all 2.5 inch or smaller. The blue haze you see is corona, a result of the high voltage stress around the conductors and hardware. The blue haze is not heat being given off by the line.
So that's the way -- they're hooked up in series and they need -- and they have a certain delivery voltage for the whole thing, so that's essentially -- they have to have enough of them to equal the delivery voltage. Could they make them smaller? I don't know a lot, but I know enough to be dangerous. I don't know enough about the design and whether they can modify that in ways, but that seems to be consistent with all the plants. They all have the pot lines that are 50 to 75 megawatts apiece. It's pretty standardized. I don't know if it's old technology.

MR. CLOYD PAXTON: I used to work in a foundry and I know they do that, they can take it down and they can take, in a foundry, out of the bull ladle and put it into billets and, you know, put it in blocks and then put it back in when they want to use it. That way they can shut the heat down. But you talking about these big lines that's going over that they lose a lot of heat, you take that line like out there where I live on Petrovsky, and that thing must be about that big around, four inch, I suppose, huge.

MR. MIKE KREIFE: An inch to two inches.

MR. CLOYD PAXTON: Well, you can see a blue haze off of that when it rains. You know, it looks like about 20 inches. Is that heat that's going -- that you're getting rid of or the lines are getting rid of?

MR. MIKE KREIFE: That's actually the ionize --
the effect of the high voltage. Stress voltage right at the
conductor, it's many thousands of volts and ionizing there
right around it. If you get sharp points, that's why you
notice all the connections are rounded, they have shields
around them, if you get sharp points where it will build up
on that point and you'll see the purplish bluish lights.
It's fairly benign, but it's just a result of the high
voltage stress at that point.

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: It is a loss. And so when
these transmission lines get constructed, we try to make
sure that these little blurs that Mike's talking about, that
they don't occur on conductors. But also Mike is trying to
explain that there's heat loss on those lines, but actually
those lines are fairly efficient. So the actual losses on
the 500 kV line are 2 percent or less?

MR. MIKE KREIFE: Yeah, two.

MR. CLOYD PAXTON: What if you have bigger lines,
do you have less problems?

MR. LOU DRIESSEN: The more kVs you go, the lower
your losses are. So that's one reason why a lot of
utilities try to put up higher kV lines. But even at low
loss, it still has a loss, you know, it's still a loss. And
that small loss is about five megawatts per year.

MS. TINA MORGAN: Yeah, to touch back on Steve's
question, I think what we'd really like to know from the

1430-022-001 and -002  BPA does have the right of condemnation. This
includes private properties and the city of Seattle. Seattle
is aware of this.
neighborhood that we're in is you have continually told us
that if we don't deal with you in the way that you want us
to deal that you are going to condemn our properties. We
got told that -- Jill wasn't like that, she wasn't
necessarily telling that to us every day. But since you've
had a few new people, we hear that quite often.

And we would like to know if you're treating
Seattle in the same manner because they're not wanting to
cooperate with you. Are you giving them the same continual
threat of condemning them as you're giving us? I think we'd
really like an answer to that.

And have you told them outright that you will, you
know, quite possibly condemn them or are you actually
considering a possible condemning of Seattle watershed for
your line? We'd really like you to tell us where you're
going with that with the Seattle watershed because we hear
it every time we talk to one of your representatives.

MR. LOU DRIESEN: In our discussions with
Seattle, the condemnation issue has come up several times.
So they know we have that right and that we're -- that we
can exercise that right. So it is on the table with
Seattle. We haven't told them that we will condemn them one
way or the other. As long as negotiations are continuing,
which they are, we are not looking at exercising that. So,
yes, that discussion has taken place with Seattle.
The public comments received on the DEIS and SDEIS are in the FEIS.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

The SDEIS did not report the loss savings for all of the alternatives. However, we have the information from studies. The loss savings for the other alternatives range from 4 to 11 MWs fewer losses than without the project.
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## Chapter 3 Response to Comment Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>COMMENT NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>access roads</td>
<td>1487-002, 1487-006, 1487-020, 1487-024, 1447-009, 1415-008, 1493-001, 1481-009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anadromous fish (sockeye, coho, chinook) fisheries</td>
<td>1447-006, 1492-030, 1515-009, 1515-018, 1434-004, 1487-013, 1485-003, 1403-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aviation safety</td>
<td>1436-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Treaty</td>
<td>1492-007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar River pack trail</td>
<td>1487-030 thru 038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistency with federal, state, and local laws and regulations</td>
<td>1492-037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consultation with tribes</td>
<td>1434-006, 1487-002, 1487-005, 1487-006, 1487-010, 1487-039, 1487-046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cross-Cascade, cross-mountain line</td>
<td>1492-008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural resources</td>
<td>1492-039, 1487-006, 1487-022, 1487-024, 1487-026, 1487-028, 1487-032, 1487-036, 1487-039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culverts</td>
<td>1487-013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cumulative effects</td>
<td>1487-006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deer and elk</td>
<td>1487-045, 1487-048, 1496-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detail in analysis of alternatives</td>
<td>1492-018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drinking water - CRW</td>
<td>1492-032,033,034, 035; 1400-001, 1415-006, 1484-005, 1485-007, 008; 1496-001, 1527-024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drinking water - Kent</td>
<td>1447-002, 009, 010, 011; 1492-032, 033, 034;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energy savings</td>
<td>1444-003, 1451-017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental justice</td>
<td>1487-006, 1487-036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groundwater contamination</td>
<td>1447-014, 015; 1493-001, 1492-032, 033, 034, 1466-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Conservation Plan, HCP</td>
<td>1515-016, 1487-010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hazardous spills, SWPPP</td>
<td>1492-032, 1466-004, 1483-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health effects</td>
<td>1451-016, 1467-002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insurance policy for watershed</td>
<td>1459-007, 1481-003, 1481-011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County code</td>
<td>1489-001, 1489-005, 1489-006, 1492-037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land use impacts</td>
<td>1529-002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landowner compensation</td>
<td>1395-001, 1441-002, 1443-002, 1474-003, 1493-001, 1527-023, 1520-002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landsburg Mine</td>
<td>1447-014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mitigation</td>
<td>1489-001, 1489-005, 1492-004, 1492-005, 1492-035, 1434-004, 1487-006, 1487-018, 1527-024, 1529-001, 1415-003, 1415-005, 1444-001, 1481-006, 1481-007, 1484-005, 1485-008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noise</td>
<td>1390-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-transmission alternative</td>
<td>1425-006, 1482-003, 1488-004, 1530-001, 1423-002, 1481-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>northern spotted owl</td>
<td>1481-006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noxious weeds</td>
<td>1434-003, 1485-009, 1491-004, 1491-034, 1481-005, 1423-005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose and need</td>
<td>1492-006, 1481-005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raging River</td>
<td>1515-014, 1403-001, 1415-006, 1423-005, 1485-008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>renewable generation</td>
<td>1411-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Creek</td>
<td>1447-006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seismic standards</td>
<td>1409-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socioeconomic impacts</td>
<td>1529-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stream impacts</td>
<td>1447-006, 1489-003, 1489-005, 1487-010, 1426-007, 1433-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system reliability</td>
<td>1492-009, 1459-009, 1485-007, 1485-008, 1423-005, 1451-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threatened and endangered species</td>
<td>1434-003, 1492-026, 1492-029, 1515-017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vandalism</td>
<td>1474-011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vegetation impacts</td>
<td>1515-014, 1515-016, 1487-006, 1487-048, 1492-026, 1522-003, 1423-005, 1426-007, 1476-003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visual resources</td>
<td>1492-039, 1427-001, 1443-001, 1482-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water purification plant</td>
<td>1400-001, 1481-011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wells</td>
<td>1493-001, 1466-004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wetlands</td>
<td>1447-009, 1498-001, 1489-001, 1492-015, 1492-018, 1433-001, 1438-004, 1482-003, 1488-001, 1530-001, 1415-003, 1423-005, 1426-007, 1426-002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife</td>
<td>1477-013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>