

## *Public Meetings*

# ORIGINAL

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COMMENTS TO  
KANGLEY-ECHO LAKE TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT  
Monday Meeting, February 3, 2003

RECEIVED BY EPA  
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT  
PROJECT: KELT-1420  
RECEIPT DATE: FEB 03 2003

Mount Si Senior Center  
North Bend, Washington

Reported by: Betsy E. Decater, RPR  
License No. 601-835-443

1 MR. RICHARD BONEWITS: I'd like to make a comment.  
 2 I assure you I haven't read those five documents. That's  
 3 one comment. And the second one is that I have downloaded  
 4 the summary and gone through the summary with a fairly fine  
 5 comb. And since you are going to be -- I'm not sure that  
 6 the path is clear for you from here on, having, as I told  
 7 you earlier, listened to some of my associates in other  
 8 venues who may have some other things to say to you tomorrow  
 9 or later. I would suggest that you put together a chart  
 10 that shows the alternatives, something similar to what you  
 11 did in the previous Environmental Impact Statement, the one  
 12 that you showed us and ran through last year.

1420-001-001

13 At the back of that was a table of four or  
 14 five charts, and I'm not suggesting that you take the time  
 15 to try to put all the data that you put in those charts, but  
 16 something that was rather simple that says that here are  
 17 basically the alternatives, our preferred route and here are  
 18 the other four, and maybe three or four bullets under each  
 19 of those elements which address both the environmental  
 20 impacts, the people impacts, the cost impact, and the  
 21 mitigation.

1420-001-002

22 And when I have written to you or our group  
 23 has written to you time and time again, we keep asking you  
 24 to consider mitigation in terms -- in terms of what I call  
 25 environmental or ecological equivalence and which is --

1420-001-001 Table 2-3 of the SDEIS summarizes the impacts and costs of the alternatives considered.

1420-001-002 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.

1420-001-002

1 correctly, which is to say, if you -- and this is a little  
2 bit of the conversation I had with you earlier, that if you  
3 were to offer the same mitigation on routes A, C, B, or D  
4 that you're offering for your preferred route, I'm certain  
5 that your costs for routes A, B, C and D would quadruple  
6 probably from where they are.

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

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

18                   MR. GENE LYNARD: What you're asking for is  
19 to compare apples with apples, and we don't have all of the  
20 apples. We have the apples for the preferred. We have a  
21 good handle on what the mitigation cost is for that. The  
22 different types of mitigation we're talking about here  
23 mostly is compensatory mitigation, and we don't know what  
24 that mitigation -- those mitigation measures come from the  
25 regulatory agencies, Corps of Engineers, King County, State

1420-001-002

1 Department of Ecology, and the other alternatives other than  
2 the preferred action, we have not designed those.

3 MR. RICHARD BONEWITS: But you put numbers  
4 out there, cost figures, and I think you can easily  
5 extrapolate from the numbers you put out there that, hey,  
6 based on when we did this for the preferred route, the cost  
7 went up by a factor of two, you know. Would you understand  
8 what I'm saying?

9 MR. GENE LYNARD: Oh, I do. I think that's  
10 an excellent comment.

1420-001-002

11 MR. RICHARD BONEWITS: And apply that same  
12 logic to the other four, these numbers would be even higher.  
13 So it makes the case more strongly that you have chosen the  
14 right route by all measures on that account.

15 MS. DIANE ADAMS: So, Gene, is there a way  
16 that you can address that at this point?

17 MR. LANDER: Oh, yeah, we will address all  
18 comments in the final EIS, and that is an excellent comment.

19 MS. DIANE ADAMS: Super. We've captured that  
20 comment, then. Thank you. Any other questions from anybody  
21 else? And then we'll go back to Mr. Bonewits.

1420-002-001

22 MR. MARK STAR: I go by the name of Mark  
23 Star. I am a retired corporate pilot. I did spend 15 of my  
24 last 25 years of flying with power companies like Puget  
25 Sound Energy and so on, so I know a little bit about flying

1420-001-002

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.

1420-002-001

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.

1 power lines. But what really kind of bothers me a little  
2 bit, being a Depression kid, is the tearing down of a line  
3 bothers me.

1420-002-001

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

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

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

1420-002-001

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

1420-002-001 |

1 you do something with it to keep it.

2 MS. IVY TYSON: Right. Well, one of our

3 alternatives is to keep it and build another parallel line

4 to it.

5 MR. MARK STARR: And it would keep the line

6 that has just one power line on it?

7 MS. IVY TYSON: Right. So, I mean, we have

8 two alternatives: One is to tear it down and rebuild it,

9 and one is to build a power line to it.

10 MR. MARK STARR: Well, that makes me feel

11 better already.

12 MR. GENE LYNARD: And also that line is about

13 50 years old, too.

14 MR. MARK STARR: Well, I may be, too, and I'm

15 built out of this stuff, and that stuff's built out of

16 steel. It ought to last a hell of a long way yet. Gene,

17 I'm just joking.

18 The second comment I would like to make

19 would be a lifesaver. To those of us that have had a lot of

20 experience flying power lines, and I've flown a lot of power

21 lines, the more of those bright bulbs you put up there, and

22 they must be rather expensive compared to even putting a

23 meeting on like this, the easier it is for us to see,

24 particularly in inclement weather and so on when, oops,

25 there's a power line, particularly that what I call a ground

6

1420-002-002

1420-002-002 BPA will work with the FAA to determine spans that need to be marked for safety.

1 wire ^ ck, that big single line that's way up on top.  
2                   Because some pilots coming by there, they  
3 might not be that well acquainted with the line, will see  
4 maybe three or four, whatever they are, great big power  
5 lines sagging across the valley and they think that if they  
6 go over those big lines that are sagging across the valley  
7 that they're in the clear, but they're not, there's that  
8 line that you have going across there.

1420-002-002

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

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

1420-002-002

20                   MR. MARK STARR: Well, yeah. I mean, beyond  
21 the FAA in an area of common sense. I've been around the  
22 FAA a lot, but beyond that, the lines up there, it is hard  
23 to see. Put on some goggles sometime when you're out  
24 crop-dusting like he was and try to see that line. It's  
25 hard to see.

1420-002-002 BPA will work with the FAA to determine spans that need to be marked for safety.

1 MS. DIANE ADAMS: Thank you. Mr. Bonewits,  
2 thank you for being so patient.

3 MR. RICHARD BONEWITS: Well, that's fine.  
4 I'm training for tonight. We're going to have a very  
5 controversial subject tonight, Critical Areas Ordinance,  
6 Sensitive Areas Ordinance to you, and be glad that you work  
7 for the federal government and not the private citizen of  
8 King County, because mitigation would really be expensive if  
9 you had to comply with it in every detail.

10 But this point has to do with I want to ask  
11 the engineer or the planner, as they make their presentation  
12 tomorrow at the following meeting, to really stress the  
13 point of the relationship in terms of the year-over-year  
14 demand growth versus conservation.

15 You've made that in the past, and I know  
16 we're a small group and we're very informal here today, but  
17 that question needs to be answered before its asked for most  
18 people. It will just save you a lot of time. And if my  
19 recollection is right, what you've told us before suggests  
20 that we are such voracious hogs of power that our  
21 year-over-year demand growth is ten times, at least ten  
22 times larger than what we save in conservation. And if  
23 that's a true statement, you ought to say it. One of you  
24 ought to just say it.

1420-001-003

1420-001-003 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.

1 MS. DIANE ADAMS: Why don't we go ahead and  
2 move into the formal comment period now, and we have two  
3 speakers signed up, Mr. Jon Zak and Mr. Richard Bonewits.

4  
5 MR. RICHARD BONEWITS: Thank you. My name is  
6 Richard Bonewits. I'm chairman of the Greater Maple Valley  
7 Area Council. We serve as citizens advocates for the  
8 unincorporated portion of Tahoma School District. It means  
9 not including the City of Maple Valley. There are about  
10 14,500 in the service area.

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

23 But I've checked their estimate against the  
24 National Power Consumption, and their estimate is within --  
25 he said 2 percent. The annual growth rate that's allowed is

9

1420-003-001

1420-003-001 Comment noted.

1420-003-001 Comment noted.

1420-003-001

1 normally a percent and a half to three, and you can find  
 2 that at the Department of Energy report that comes out  
 3 periodically.

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

1420-003-002

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

1420-003-003

23           Others following me will show you, not so  
 24 much today, because so far Jon is the only one that came to  
 25 follow me, but tomorrow we're going to expect to show you

1420-003-002 Comment noted.

1420-003-003, -004, and -005 Comment noted.

1420-003-003 |

1 again the differences between land stewardship by the City  
2 of Seattle and people that live in the rural area, and

1420-003-004

3 you'll find that we compare very favorably with the City of  
4 Seattle in their stewardship of their wonderful watershed.

1420-003-005

5 We know they're doing a good job, but they just recently  
6 started it. They got into it because they anticipated being  
7 caught short by the Endangered Species Act and were urged to  
8 put that plan together about seven years ago.

1420-003-007

9           And I'm proud that they did it, but damn  
10 well I want them to finish it up, get rid of all the 650  
11 miles of roads in the watershed. It's many times more than  
12 the lines that you're planning to use. Others will describe  
13 the impacts tomorrow if this line is built outside the

1420-003-008

14 watershed. We'll also show you that the rural residents  
15 have done a better job at stewardship. And I want you to  
16 know that in our team we have over 1500 people that signed  
17 petitions that went to Bonneville last year and in four  
18 groups, roughly four to five groups, mainly two large ones,  
19 the one that I really act as the leader of and another group  
20 that thought that they were better off fighting the battle  
21 by themselves, but there were two others that joined us, and  
22 we were joined by the mayors of Issaquah, Maple Valley, the  
23 Covington City manager, and they all have written letters to  
24 Bonneville supporting the route through the watershed and  
25 irate about putting it anywhere else.

1420-003-007 and -008 Comment noted.

1420-003-009

1 In addition to that, since Janette's here  
 2 today and she works for King County council member David  
 3 Irons, and he has been with us from day one, your King  
 4 County councilman from this district. We have U.S.  
 5 Representative Jennifer Dunn with us on this in our  
 6 position, two state representatives. Glenn Anderson, Cheryl  
 7 Pflug, and the members of the King County staff of Maria  
 8 Cantwell. It took a while, but we got them. So I'm asking  
 9 everybody here to stand up today and give your comments.  
 10 Jon, you're next.

1420-004-001

11  
 12 MR. JON ZAK: My name is Jon Zak, and I live on  
 13 two and a half acres in a development of about a hundred  
 14 homes in Maple Valley. Our eastern property boundary will  
 15 be the centerline of the proposed transmission line  
 16 right-of-way line for Alternative C and we would lose the  
 17 trees on one-quarter of our property. These trees are in a  
 18 Native Growth Protection area. These trees range in size  
 19 from two and a half to five foot in diameter breast height  
 20 above the ground.

1420-004-002

21 Alternative C would completely destroy our  
 22 privacy and our view of the trees in our backyard. It would  
 23 destroy our experience of living in nature. This was the  
 24 reason we bought this property. As part of Habitat  
 25 Conservation Plan, the map was prepared showing the age of

1420-004-004

1420-003-008 Comment noted.

1420-004-001 and -002 Comment noted.

1420-004-003, -004, and -005 Comment noted.

1420-004-004

1 trees in the watershed. On BPA's preferred alternative  
2 route, the age of the trees is 10 to 30 years. The trees in  
3 my property in the Native Growth Protection zone make the

1420-004-005

4 trees in the watershed look like toothpicks.

1420-004-006

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

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

1420-004-006

14 MR. JON ZAK: McClellan's Bute, you can see  
15 that as you're driving up I-90. There's another picture and  
16 you can see the cut and the erosion around that road.  
17 Another picture, just some of the logging roads. This was  
18 taken in June, so there's still a little bit of snow.

19 And there's Chester Morris Lake. You can  
20 see all the second- and third-growth trees. And this is a  
21 view of our backyard, so this is in an area that would have  
22 to be cut because these trees are endangering the power  
23 lines. And this is another view of our backyard.

24 MS. DIANE ADAMS: Jon, when did you take  
25 those pictures?

1420-004-006 Comment noted.

1420-004-006

1 MR. JON ZAK: Last June of 2002. And I've  
2 got some more pictures taken off the Seattle Public  
3 Utilities website. They didn't have enough pixels, so I  
4 couldn't blow them up, but this shows some road  
5 construction. And, you know, I don't think that heavy  
6 equipment is using vegetable oil.

7 MR. RICHARD BONEWITS: We didn't see any  
8 helicopters there either.

9 MR. JON ZAK: Here's a picture of Chester  
10 Morris Lake, and you can see they separated the good water  
11 from the bad water with that boom. And you can see more  
12 heavy equipment, you know, construction workers right around  
13 the lake shore. Some more heavy equipment building the  
14 road. And then here's showing some erosion on an existing  
15 logging road. That's it with the pictures.

1420-004-006

16 Pictures of the construction in the  
17 watershed by Seattle Public Utilities proves their  
18 hypocrisy. Seattle Public Utilities has one standard for  
19 themselves and another one for the BPA. I believe  
20 conservation organizations should be spending their time and  
21 efforts on something more critical than the Cedar River  
22 Watershed. How about George Bush's proposal for cutting  
23 trees in national forests to prevent fires? How about all  
24 of the clear-cutting on the Raging River Watershed just  
25 north of Tiger Summit along Highway 18? Activities like the

1420-004-006 Comment noted.

1420-004-006

1 passage of the Wild Sky Wilderness Bill and the addition of  
2 the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area are far more important than  
3 a watershed that is off limits to the public.

1420-004-007

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

1420-004-008

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

1420-004-009

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

1420-004-010

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

1420-004-011

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

1420-004-014

25 And the final question, number four:

1420-004-007 Comment noted.

1420-004-008 Comment noted.

1420-004-009 Comment noted.

1420-004-010 Comment noted.

1420-004-011 Comment noted.

1420-004-012 Comment noted.

1420-004-013 Comment noted.

1420-004-014

1 Clearing 91 acres for a second power line would require  
2 one-tenth of one percent of the watershed's total acreage of  
3 90,240. How can this small an amount of clearing have any

1420-004-015

4 impact on water quality?

1420-004-016

5 The Habitat Conservation Plan is a great  
6 idea. Too bad the Habitat Conservation Plan was not an idea  
7 in the City of Seattle. The City was forced to create a  
8 Habitat Conservation Plan to meet the requirements of the  
9 Endangered Species Act. How about the habitat of people  
10 living along Alternative C? Is the wildlife habitat inside

1420-004-017

11 the watershed more important for both wildlife and humans  
12 outside the watershed? The people who lose their property

1420-004-018

13 will be paying a price for Seattle's water. The City of  
14 Seattle will destroy the rural communities of Hobart and  
15 Ravensdale all due to their unfounded water quality issues.  
16 Thank you.

17

18 ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS:

19

1420-005-001

20 On Route B and D, Camp Waskowitz, owned by  
21 Highland Public District, has received historic status.

1420-005-002

22 Concerned that B and D will affect it. Why does the

1420-005-003

23 watershed get more preference than the camp? Kids?

1420-005-004

24

1420-006-001

25 You have done the study three times and were

16

1420-004-014 Comment noted.

1420-004-015 Comment noted.

1420-004-016 Comment noted.

1420-004-017 Comment noted.

1420-004-018 Comment noted.

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.

1420-006-001

1 correct each time!

2

1420-007-001

3 Hang plenty of bright balls on all of your  
4 power lines, including high, hard to see ground wire, so  
5 pilots can see them easily. Retired corporate pilot with  
6 power company, oil lines, gas lines, etc. Thanks.

7

1420-008-001

8 I purchased my 5-acre piece in Hobart area  
9 based on BPA letter that you were dropping Alt. C from  
10 further consideration. Now I can't sell until I get an  
11 answer regarding.

12

1420-009-001

13 Concerned whether I would be compensated  
14 fairly for loss to market property value if an easement had  
15 to be acquired across my property. (Compensated for  
16 difference in property value due to the power line.)

1420-009-002

17

1420-010-001

18 Landowners that want to sell their  
19 properties are left in a position that until the Record of  
20 Decision comes out - may not be able to sell their  
21 properties.

22

1420-010-001

23 Is there anything that could delay the  
24 Record of Decision beyond August?

25

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.

1420-011-001 |

1

Any concern about EMF contaminating the

1420-011-002 |

2

water quality?

3

1420-012-001 |

4

What is the age of the trees that would be

5

taken in proposed right-of-way?

6

1420-013-001 |

7

What is cost of proposed in relation to

8

other alternatives?

9

1420-014-001 |

10

The BPA plan is to double-circuit the line

11

crossing the Cedar River in the Preferred Alt. Why not

12

double-circuit the whole 5-mile route through the CRW?

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1420-011-001 and -002 EMF has no impact on water quality. Water passing through magnetic or electric fields is no different from "unexposed" water.

1420-012-001 The trees that would be removed from the right-of-way for the preferred route vary in age from young plantations to stands that have trees upwards to 80 years of age.

1420-013-001 Please see Chapter 2 of the SDEIS for the costs of each alternative. See also Table 2-3.

1420-014-001 See response to Comment 1421-039-002.



# ORIGINAL

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COMMENTS TO  
KANGLEY-ECHO LAKE TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT  
Tuesday Meeting, February 4, 2003

PROJECT NO. 01-0000000000  
PROJECT NAME  
KELT-172  
DATE  
FEB 05 2003

Seattle Center, Rainier Room  
Seattle, Washington

Reported by: Betsy E. Decater, RPR  
License No. 601-835-443

	1	HANDWRITTEN COMMENTS:
	2	
1421-001-001	3	I have a power line that goes through my property
1421-001-002	4	(Alt. A). We have enough problems already - I don't want a
	5	new line with higher K.V. (500-kV).
	6	
1421-002-001	7	I have a concern about the additional "noise" as
1421-002-002	8	well as potential health issues. "Scary in a family
	9	neighborhood."
	10	
1421-003-001	11	I object to taller towers due to the negative
1421-003-002	12	visual effect.
	13	
1421-004-001	14	I object to a power line that is an alt (B or D)
1421-004-002	15	through homeowner properties that in essence would condemn
1421-004-003	16	my property, produce a 375 kV and double line 500 kV new
1421-004-004	17	line. Not only is this a health risk, noise pollution,
1421-004-005	18	equity issue and visual issue, and presently has eliminated
1421-004-006	19	my option to sell property until this issue is decided -
	20	(disclosure real estate issue) with potential lawsuits.
	21	
1421-005-001	22	People's issues are taking a backseat to wildlife
	23	issues!
	24	
1421-006-001	25	The CRW is in noncompliance with federal regulations
		2

1421-001-001 and -002 Comment noted.

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

1421-003-001 and -002 Comment noted.

1421-004-001 and -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.

1421-006-002

1 requiring filtration systems. "Surface Water Treatment  
2 Rule" (refer to federal standards for drinking water)

1421-007-001

3  
4 The CRW knew the filtration requirements in 1996. The  
5 Toll River filtration was completed in 2000 by Seattle  
6 Public Utilities. The CRW is using the BPA project, using  
7 political pull to have BPA pay for this filtration system.

1421-008-001

8  
9 The new RIW would occupy an area equal to one-tenth of  
10 one percent of the CRW - (141 Square miles). Seems like a  
11 "minor" impact! Alts B and D would impact much greater  
12 area.

1421-009-001

13  
14 Selling a property with power lines, increasing tower  
15 height, higher voltage, additional lines, potentially makes  
16 my property unsalable.

1421-009-002

17  
18 I've hade to put improvements to my property on hold  
19 until I know which route you'll build. As a result, the  
20 original estimate for my improvements has risen by 37%,  
21 while I've been on hold!! I can't write any of this off on  
22 my taxes - it's my loss due to your project.

1421-010-001

1421-011-001

23  
24 If BPA is concerned about people, why not design  
25 towers that are aesthetically pleasing rather than a

1421-006-002 Comment noted.

1421-007-001 Comment noted.

1421-008-001 Comment noted.

1421-009-001 and -002 See response to Comments 1420-009-001  
and -002.

1421-010-001 See response to Comment 1389-001.

1421-011-001 BPA's primary concerns when designing our towers are  
strength and safety. Aesthetics is difficult to quantify.  
Some find our towers aesthetically pleasing, others do not.

1421-011-001 | 1 negative visual impact?  
2

1421-012-001 | 3 This is all political for CRW and Sierra Club. I  
1421-012-002 | 4 agree underground transmission lines would be the best way  
1421-012-003 | 5 to go. I realize it's cost prohibitive. Then why force the  
1421-012-004 | 6 line across other alternatives when human beings are  
1421-012-005 | 7 impacted - financially, aesthetically, noise pollution.  
1421-012-006 | 8 everything!  
9

1421-013-001 | 10 I live along Alt. B/D, served by the Sallal Watershed.  
11 Will you enforce the same mitigation measures (i.e.,  
1421-013-002 | 12 helicopter logging, micropyles, etc.) to protect this  
13 watershed?  
14

1421-014-001 | 15 The Rocky Reach No. 5 line is directly over the  
16 electric box (generator) which delivers water to Mt. Si and  
17 Sallal homesites (Alt. B-D).  
18

1421-015-001 | 19 CRW's mission statement is in support of "people" and  
20 the environment/ecology. The Sierra Club supports CRW's  
21 mission statement. To achieve the mission statement, the  
22 Sierra Club is willing to use "aggressive grass roots action  
23 on an unprecedented scale to influence public policy." (See  
24 their website.) If they are in support of people, then why  
1421-015-002 | 25 put people at risk? We the people along alternatives along

4

1421-012-001 and -002 Comment noted.

1421-012-003, -004, -005, and -006 Comment noted.

1421-013-001 and -002 BPA may use helicopter construction for alternatives outside the Cedar River Watershed and the watershed belonging to the city of Kent. Helicopter construction would be an option for the contractor who would determine if it would be economical to use a helicopter as compared to constructing roads and crane pads such that erosion would be kept to a minimum. BPA is committed to using the most efficient method of construction while minimizing erosion. In the Cedar River Watershed the issue is also associated with Seattle needing to build a \$105 million turbidity filtration plant if BPA's project were to trigger a massive erosion event. No such concern about a filtration plant exists outside the CRW.

1421-014-001 Comment noted.

1421-015-001 and -002 Comment noted.

1421-015-002

1 the watershed don't have the empowerment to fight at the  
2 same levels.

1421-016-001

4 There's already an existing power line across the CRW.

1421-016-002

5 They report the water quality is outstanding - so do they  
6 have any studies or monitoring data to show that the power

1421-016-003

7 lines have caused sediment-turbidity of particles, erosion,  
8 contamination. How bad is it now? These structures don't  
9 have micropyles - weren't constructed with helicopters!!

1421-017-001

11 Commercial logging is banned in the watershed. Any

1421-017-002

12 money from timber cut in the watershed should go to  
13 restoration of the watershed to be conducted by the City.

1421-018-001

15 I believe you have addressed "all" of CRW's issues  
16 (helicopter logging, mitigation, plant replacement, etc.)  
17 The letters made it sound as if you have agreed to pay for  
18 the filtration system if needed. Is this true? Your letter  
19 states, "If BPA decides to build the line, we would mitigate  
20 for any impacts to the watershed to ensure a safe drinking  
21 water supply for the Seattle area."

1421-018-002

22

1421-019-001

23 How close can homes be to the edge of the R/W?

1421-020-001

24  
25 The DEIS does not identify the specific locations of

5

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.

1421-020-001 | 1 the staging areas - this makes the alternatives difficult to  
 2 evaluate. You should at least have some alternatives for  
 3 locations of staging areas.  
 4

1421-021-001 | 5 The way you've numbered/identified your alternatives  
 6 is very confusing, 1, 2, 3, 4, A, B, C, D - you should have  
 7 started over when you added alternatives.  
 8

1421-022-001 | 9 Mitigation lands not specifically defined.  
 10

1420-023-001 | 11 Double circuit over Cedar River but not over Raging  
 12 River.  
 13

1421-024-001 | 14 Specific properties proposed as mitigation are not  
 15 enough. Specific properties need to include properties  
 16 along Raging River.  
 17

1421-025-001 | 18 Land mitigations need to be paid for by BPA.  
 19

1421-026-001 | 20 How do you mitigate for TV interference?  
 21

1421-027-001 | 22 If you put taller double circuit towers on each side  
 1421-027-002 | 23 of the Cedar River - you could allow the vegetation to grow  
 24 taller near the Cedar than you would otherwise allow.  
 25

6

1421-021-001 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.

1421-022-001 Please see response to Comment 340-002.

1421-023-001 Comment noted.

1421-024-001 See response to Comments 1415-003 and -004.

1421-025-001 See response to Comment 1415-005.

1421-026-001 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.

1421-027-001 and -002 BPA is proposing to use double-circuit towers within the existing ROW on each side of the Cedar River.

1421-028-001

1 The CRW provides drinking water to the entire City of  
2 Seattle and surrounding areas. This affects between 1.5 and  
3 3 million people. These people are not trying to  
4 "confiscate" or otherwise impact the people (property  
5 owners) who are in potential alternative areas. This is an  
6 issue of power needs vs. Environmental/drinking water  
7 concerns. This has nothing to do with "property values."  
8 To inject the fear of sale value of a property into this  
9 issue ignores the basic premise, and is very selfish.

1421-028-002

1421-028-003

1421-028-004

10

1421-029-001

11 The need to conserve energy is very real, and a valid  
12 approach for this reason, the nontransmission alternative  
13 should be seriously considered. In that light, social  
14 policy in regards to commercial advertising in particular  
15 needs focus.

1421-029-002

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1421-028-001, -002, -003, and -004 Comment noted.

1421-029-001, and -002 Comment noted.

1421-030-001

1 OPEN MEETING Q&A:

2

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Lou, you mentioned  
4 that you're in negotiations with the City, continuing to do  
5 that. Can you elaborate on those, what the status of those  
6 is and what the issues are there?

7 MR. LOU DREISSEN: We're -- I think really all I  
8 can say at this point is we're still talking with the City  
9 and the City's talking with us. And the City is very clear  
10 that they don't want this transmission line on their  
11 property. So the negotiations center around what kind of  
12 mitigation measures can BPA do to cross the watershed,  
13 associated particularly with the drinking water, impacts to  
14 the drinking water quality, and also with the Habitat  
15 Conservation Plan. So we're, like I said, talking,  
16 negotiating back and forth with Seattle City with those two  
17 large issues.

18 BPA recognizes that certainly from our standpoint  
19 we're trying to build an electrical system that is reliable  
20 and safe for the area. We also recognize that drinking  
21 water quality certainly is very important to the local  
22 citizens, and so it's a very large concern to us to make  
23 sure we don't impact the drinking water quality. And also  
24 that Seattle and the environmental community went through a  
25 large step to create a Habitat Conservation Plan on the

8

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.

1 watershed, and that's also very important and then trying to  
2 find ways to mitigate for the impact that this project may  
3 have on that Habitat Conservation Plan.

4           So we're looking at not only construction  
5 mitigation, and certainly you probably heard about some of  
6 those already that includes special footing types on the  
7 watershed, micropyles, using helicopters to place structures  
8 in place as opposed to using a large crane to place, also  
9 using helicopters to take some trees out of the area, taking  
10 care of how the roads are placed and any new roads that are  
11 needed are placed and making sure that there's no erosion  
12 coming off the roads. And our best management practices,  
13 using silt fences and bales of hay at every disturbed area,  
14 if that's necessary. So we'll be studying every disturbed  
15 area and determining what needs to take place in those  
16 areas. I'm looking at using two double-circuit towers, for  
17 instance, for crossing the Cedar River Watershed, or the  
18 Cedar River itself, excuse me, in that canyon because,  
19 again, we're very concerned about the potential for erosion  
20 into the Cedar River because of the drinking water quality  
21 aspects and it also happens to be important to the corridor  
22 from the wildlife standpoint.

23           In addition to all that, we're looking at --  
24 certainly BPA's already purchased 350 acres immediately  
25 adjacent to and north of the Cedar River as a possibility of

1 turning that over to the City of Seattle for compensation  
2 for 90 acres that the right-of-way would take out of the  
3 habitat, and we're also -- BPA is also looking at some other  
4 properties as a potential, besides that 350 acres, also with  
5 the potential of turning those properties over to Seattle.  
6 So negotiations are still ongoing, which I think at this  
7 point it's been ongoing for quite a while, and I think  
8 that's a good sign that we're still talking to each other.  
9       Certainly time is of the essence. I think one  
10 thing that wasn't mentioned in much detail is that we are  
11 looking at starting construction, if possible, and if  
12 everything comes to a proper conclusion on the preferred  
13 plan, we would like to start construction like in the August  
14 time frame on the preferred plan with the energization,  
15 completion of the project and energization by the end of  
16 this year. As Brian mentioned earlier, BPA still thinks  
17 it's important, not really from our standpoint but Seattle's  
18 standpoint, King County's standpoint and to some degree also  
19 Canada with the Canadian entitlement standpoint, that this  
20 project is built and we build back in the reliability that's  
21 needed in our system.  
22       So the local area, including Seattle, really needs  
23 this project. If it were to go to one of the other  
24 alternatives, we would probably likely add another two years  
25 on our schedule as a minimum because the only alternative

1 we've really -- transmission alternative we've looked at is  
 2 the preferred plan where we've done detailed survey and  
 3 engineering work and we're ready to move on that. If we  
 4 were to turn to one of the other alternatives, we would have  
 5 to do all of those aspects, all of the detailed design, all  
 6 of the detailed engineering surveys, certainly some of the  
 7 environmental surveys will also have to be done on some of  
 8 those other alternatives.

1421-031-001

9 MS. CINDY DENSMORE: My first question is with the  
 10 BC power. You said it was going to go back in 30 years --  
 11 I'm a little nervous here -- and that the power that we  
 12 would have to give back, does that mean that you guys would  
 13 have to buy power from BC?

1421-031-001

14 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: No. So the benefits of  
 15 building these storage dams in Canada in the 1960s is  
 16 that --

17 MS. CINDY DENSMORE: You're using their power, so  
 18 when you give it back to them, do you have to buy power?

19 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: Either it's produced in  
 20 the existing process or we would have to purchase it?

21 MS. CINDY DENSMORE: Yeah, you would have to  
 22 purchase it, that's what I'm asking.

1421-01-031

23 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: So I can't say  
 24 specifically what a utility will do to produce that --

25 MS. CINDY DENSMORE: So how cost effective is

1421-031-001 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.

1421-031-001 |

1 that?

2 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: I'm sorry, why don't you  
3 go ahead with the question.

1421-031-001 |

4 MS. CINDY DENSMORE: Well, I'm just wondering is  
5 it -- if you bought the power from BC instead of building  
6 this line, and then my other question is that -- I'm nervous  
7 -- we also sell energy to California, okay, why can't we --  
8 sorry --

9 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: I can try and answer that.  
10 Because this is the least cost alternative for the  
11 Canadians. They want their power back that's produced in  
12 the United States. We have looked at other alternatives to  
13 returning the power over the transmission system. We spent  
14 more than ten years in discussions with the Canadians and an  
15 agreement was signed in 1999 to require the return of that  
16 power. That's what they would prefer because it's to their  
17 advantage to get the power returned.

1421-031-001 |

18 MS. CINDY DENSMORE: But are they going to sell  
19 that power to somebody else?

20 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: I don't think that's very  
21 likely in the wintertime. That's when they need it the  
22 most. They're a winter peaking area just like we are.

1421-031-001 |

23 MS. CINDY DENSMORE: Well, but for 30 years they  
24 have not used this power. Now all of a sudden they're going  
25 to use this power?

1 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: I think part of the reason  
2 if you look at the forecast of the supply and demand  
3 situation in Canada, they are load resource balance, they  
4 are approaching load resource balance, so this is the point  
5 that they need that power back, that is correct.

6 MR. LOU DREISSEN: What's happened is the same  
7 thing in the Vancouver area, in particular, has happened in  
8 the Seattle area. So if you are familiar with King County  
9 and how its grown, Vancouver has grown very large also. So  
10 they're continuing to add load to their electrical demand.  
11 So they're in an similar situation really to what King  
12 County is currently. So they want to have the ability to be  
13 able to not only to sell power to California like they have  
14 or to the Northwest, we bought power from them also, but  
15 also to get that power back to them because they really need  
16 it in the Vancouver area, just like Brian said, during their  
17 winter just like we do in the Northwest.

18 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: Typically Northwest  
19 utilities both in the United States and Canada will sell to  
20 California in the summertime when their demands are peaking  
21 because of air-conditioning loads. In the wintertime the  
22 power tends to travel north. So there's really no reason to  
23 be selling large amounts of power into California in the  
24 winter. The direction is the other way when Vancouver and  
25 Puget Sound area loads are peaking during the cold weather.

1421-032-001

1 MR. MICHAEL SHANK: Two questions. Lou, you  
 2 admitted not having done a detailed analysis on all the  
 3 other alternatives but having done so on the preferred, so  
 4 my question is why haven't you, as you are kind of legally  
 5 required to within processes that have been established for  
 6 years, why haven't you spent the time on the nontransmission  
 7 alternatives like you have on the watershed?

1421-032-002

8 Secondly, you evaluated the nontransmission  
 9 alternative under that understanding that you had \$25  
 10 million, and so how would the \$25 million be funneled into  
 11 and how long would it last under a nontransmission  
 12 alternative? You're required to explore that alternative  
 13 not under the understanding that, okay, we're going to write

1421-032-003

14 a check to the watershed which is our preferred, how much  
 15 would that check sustain us for a nontransmission  
 16 alternative, you're required to check it out not under any  
 17 kind of price quote which you have done, and I'm  
 18 wondering -- the two questions: Why haven't you explored in  
 19 the systems analysis, engineering analysis other  
 20 alternatives like you did with the watershed? Because you  
 21 claim all alternatives are on the table, but you just said  
 22 five minutes later that you're ready to move and by the end  
 23 of the year you'll be constructing. So there's some  
 24 inconsistency there. But particularly the 25 million on the  
 25 nontransmission, why did you use that as kind of a parameter

1421-032-004

14

1421-032-001 and -002 BPA thoroughly examined non-transmission alternatives in the SDEIS. 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.

1 to work within because that actually shouldn't have been  
2 there as a parameter.

3 MR. LOU DREISSEN: I'll try to answer the first  
4 one. Maybe Brian can answer the second one. For starters  
5 is BPA elected, and it's not required, elected to look at  
6 the preferred plan and do a detailed engineering and  
7 environmental and survey aspects to that alternative with  
8 the hopes, strictly with the hopes that we would be able to  
9 finish this project in the time frame that we thought it was  
10 needed.

11 From a legal standpoint, we do not need to do  
12 detailed engineering and those kind of aspects on every  
13 alternative. We need to do a reasonable search, and we've  
14 done that, and most of our search has been associated with  
15 what we consider a maximum impact. So we've looked at more  
16 than likely what will take place in those other alternatives  
17 so that we compare one alternative against another. We have  
18 looked at it from a cost standpoint, we've looked at every  
19 alternative so we can have a comparative analysis from one  
20 alternative to another, and if one of those alternatives  
21 were to be chosen, which is usually what BPA does in most of  
22 its projects, is that the detailed engineering and detailed  
23 survey doesn't happen until after a directed decision  
24 because there's a tremendous amount of costs associated with  
25 that, there's a lot of time associated with that.

1           So, again, from a timing standpoint, BPA elected  
2 to take the risk to do the detailed engineering and detailed  
3 survey studies during the time frame that we were doing the  
4 environmental analysis on all the alternatives, recognizing  
5 that in the end BPA may end up choosing one of the other  
6 alternatives, in which case all of these costs would be  
7 subcosts and we would need to do the same kind of an issue  
8 on the alternative that actually gets chosen.

9           So strictly BPA wanted the project -- saw that the  
10 project needed to be done within the time frame we're  
11 looking at. Actually, originally we were looking at the  
12 need for this project to be completed last year, so now  
13 we're looking at this year based upon the new load forecast  
14 and other aspects and also went back and added additional  
15 routes in our environmental process.

16           MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: To respond to Michael's  
17 questions regarding the analysis of the nonconstruction  
18 alternatives, there are really two components to the  
19 analysis that the experts did for us. The first is a  
20 technical feasibility, what does it take to defer the need  
21 for a line and is that achievable, and the second is an  
22 economic evaluation of comparing that cost against the  
23 project.

24           The chart that I show here, which showed the  
25 amount of load reduction that's required for both the

1 aluminum smelter and the large industrial loads, and the  
2 amount of generation that would need to be on line has no  
3 limitation on economics. That's simply a physical need of  
4 the system. Okay? And so their evaluation showed, for  
5 example, that demand reduction at industrial plants would  
6 need to be 28 percent of the load. Regardless of what we  
7 pay in the way of incentives, that is a huge, huge  
8 participation into band reduction programs. Typical  
9 response is on the order of five percent in industrial  
10 programs around the country based on their survey.

11 Now, the second part of the analysis does look at  
12 economics, and one of the things that we look at in the  
13 analysis is a cost comparison of various alternatives. As  
14 the consultants noted, the amount of payments that's  
15 available given the projected cost of the project is  
16 relatively small on a dollars per kilowatt basis. And even  
17 if you doubled or tripled or quadrupled the cost of the  
18 project looking at the other wires alternatives, you would  
19 get no where near the level of incentive payments that we've  
20 seen in other demand response programs around the country.

21 MR. MICHAEL SHANK: Just a point of clarification  
22 of what I was asking to your question, I wasn't recommending  
23 that you do similar involvement because I understand there  
24 was some contract -- potential contracting bids going out  
25 already on the watershed, which is actually undermining the

1421-032-004

1 need for process, but I was just more interested in BPA's  
2 investment in all possible alternatives. It's obvious that  
3 you were invested in the watershed, and I was looking for  
4 equal investment distributed among several alternatives, not  
5 necessarily engineering and contracting, but just more time  
6 investment, money investment.

7 MR. LOU DREISSEN: Well, I think the fact  
8 that we've gone through and opened up our environmental  
9 process and come back with a supplemental draft EIS  
10 indicates that we're spending a lot of time and effort on  
11 all these other alternatives. I think we are looking at  
12 those on an equal basis, so we've spent a lot of time.  
13 We've hired several environmental consultants to go through  
14 those other alternatives to come up with detailed analysis  
15 from an environmental impacts perspective. But I think that  
16 short of doing the detailed engineering and surveying  
17 aspects on the preferred route, they're all being treated  
18 equally. We spent an equal amount of time on all of them.

1421-033-001

19 MR. RICHARD CHAMPLIN: You mentioned that you  
20 drilled 1,170 holes, or something to that effect, in looking  
21 for cultural resources and indicated that perhaps two of  
22 them had some that you deemed were insignificant. I was  
23 wondering how do you determine whether something is  
24 insignificant and is that determination done in concert with  
25 the tribes that might be concerned about that?

18

1421-033-001 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.

1 MR. GENE LYNARD: We didn't drill the holes. We  
 2 dug these holes with a shovel, our cultural resource  
 3 contractor did, and the two items that were found, one was a  
 4 spike related to the logging industry and the other was a  
 5 trench, and neither were deemed to have any cultural  
 6 significance.

1421-034-001

7 MR. HILLARY LORENZ: During your discussions with  
 8 the City of Seattle, did they ever talk to you about an  
 9 operation they called forebay cleaning at the Landsburg  
 10 Diversion Site?

11 MR. LOU DREISSEN: No, I have not heard about  
 12 that.

1421-035-001

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I have two questions,  
 14 one very brief, this is great, but I have forgotten and it  
 15 didn't jump out at me. how many -- going through the  
 16 watershed, your preferred alternative, how many acres would  
 17 be cleared with your additional 150 foot easement?

18 MR. GENE LYNARD: 91.

1421-035-002

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: 91. Second thing, is  
 20 this is very good, you read the cost of this, cost of that,  
 21 do you guys ever have a piece of paper that says Alternative  
 22 A, B, C, D and Alternative 1, 2, 3 cost, land clearing and  
 23 so forth, or am I just missing it?

24 MR. GENE LYNARD: That's in our EIS Table 2.3. We  
 25 have a summary table, Table 2.3, summary of impacts from

1421-034-001 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.

1421-035-001 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.

1421-035-002 Please see Table 2-3 in the SDEIS which compares the various alternatives.

1 alternatives, and it's at the very bottom we have the cost  
2 for each of the alternatives.

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you. I  
4 just didn't have that.

5 MR. GENE LYNARD: And that's on the cd.

6 MR. CHARLIE RAINES: Good evening. I'm Charlie  
7 rains, and I'm speaking on behalf of the Sierra Club. We  
8 still have questions about the need for this line but will  
9 address those in our written comments. Tonight I'll focus  
10 on construction alternatives. BPA has proposed its new  
11 power lines through the Cedar River Watershed and the upper  
12 Raging River Watershed. The City has just completed their  
13 HCP which is protecting the forests of the Cedar River  
14 Watershed which is prime habitat for wildlife and drinking  
15 water for over a million people.

1421-036-001 |  
1421-036-002 |

16 The Sierra Club is opposed to a linear clear-cut  
17 through the watershed that's proposed by BPA. This could  
18 seriously damage the low elevation forest and resulting  
19 impacts on fish and wildlife and water. BPA's corridors  
20 right now are weed infested wastelands and BPA has projected  
21 alternatives that would have eliminated the additional  
22 clearing by double-circuiting the existing towers. Due to  
23 public opposition and the grossly inadequate draft EIS, BPA  
24 has now written a new EIS. Appropriately, the document  
25 looks at other alternatives, some of which would run through

1421-036-003 |  
1421-036-002 |

20

1421-036-001 and -002 Comment noted.

1421-036-003, -004, and -005 Comment noted.

1421-036-005

1 Maple Valley which would severely impact rural lands, others  
2 would impact forests across the Cascades. None of the  
3 alternatives should be constructed as proposed.

4 If BPA chooses on the construction alternatives,  
5 it must be fully mitigated which is required by any federal  
6 projects. Unfortunately, the mitigations proposed in the  
7 EIS are not sufficient for any of the alternatives, in many  
8 cases just too vague. BPA says it will protect the water  
9 quality of the Cedar River Watershed. We urge you to  
10 continue your discussions with the City of Seattle to  
11 actually accomplish this. The EIS also alludes to acquiring  
12 replacement forests to mitigate for the forest cut for the  
13 new line but offers no specifics on location, size or  
14 quality. How can a reviewer determine if a mitigation is  
15 adequate for an alternative when there are no specifics?

1421-036-006

16 Conversations with BPA staff indicate forest  
17 mitigation is planned only for the Cedar River portion. The  
18 Raging River is ignored, despite a long stretch of the  
19 proposed line bordering and then crossing the river.

1421-036-007

20 Clear-cutting this close to a major salmon river is not  
21 acceptable today. We understand that BPA is considering

1421-036-008

22 acquiring Section 25 just south of Cedar River, but there's  
23 been no commitment to acquire the entire section nor that

1421-036-009

24 BPA would fund it. We understand that BPA is considering  
25 forest legacy or other conservation funds to acquire some of

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.

1421-036-009

1 that land. These are critical for other projects, and BPA  
2 should be paying for the impacts of their projects with  
3 their own funds.

1421-036-010

4 The EIS contains vague language about the best  
5 practices for vegetation management in the right-of-way.

1421-036-011

6 This should be replaced with solid objectives of habitat and  
7 time frames for achieving them. So we urge BPA to pursue

1421-036-012

8 conservation and other electrical system changes before

1421-036-013

9 building a new power line, if a line is constructed to fully  
10 mitigate any new or expanded corridor, including acquiring

1421-036-014

11 and protecting nearby forest lands. Until these issues are  
12 addressed adequately, we will continue our opposition to  
13 this project. Thank you.

1421-037-001

14 MS. CINDY BERRES: Hi. My name is Cindy Berres,  
15 and I'm concerned about BPA's proposal to build a power line  
16 through the Cedar River Watershed, which the City has just  
17 recently protected from logging. I feel they should

1421-037-002

18 mitigate any new or expanded corridors by acquiring and

1421-037-003

19 protecting nearby forest lands along the Raging River and  
20 Section 25 near the Cedar River. Also I believe that there

1421-037-004

21 should be no new roads built and they should install the  
22 towers with helicopters. Thank you.

1421-038-001

23 MR. MICHAEL SHANK: As there has not been  
24 sufficient time to review the 1800 page supplement draft  
25 environmental impact statement or the nontransmission

22

1421-036-010 and -011 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.

1421-036-012, -013, and -014 Comment noted.

1421-037-001, -002, -003, and -004 See response to Comment 340-002.

1421-038-001 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.

1421-038-001

1 alternative study, Biodiversity Northwest requests an  
 2 additional 30 days to review and allow for public comment,  
 3 both organizationally and citizens also needing more time  
 4 for adequate review.

5         Assuming the new deadline of April 1st, 2003, all  
 6 interested parties will have more accurate time to give  
 7 proper examination to the stated articles and studies.  
 8 Without the 30-day extension, BPA could be perceived as  
 9 attempting to move pertinent information forward without  
 10 sufficient public review. We hope that BPA complies. While  
 11 Biodiversity Northwest will need more time to fully inspect  
 12 the 1800 page SEIS and the nontransmission alternative, we  
 13 would like to take this opportunity to encourage BPA to not  
 14 proceed with the Cedar River Watershed like they're  
 15 proceeding with the Columbia River, by backing out of  
 16 contracts, commitments and promises.

1421-038-002

17         With the watershed as the preferred alternative,  
 18 how is the City of Seattle, environmental groups and  
 19 citizens expected to believe the promises put forth in any  
 20 BPA administered mitigation package if it is not legally  
 21 binding? We understand from BPA's track record, example,  
 22 the Columbia River, that the agency prefers to refrain from  
 23 any legally binding commitment at all, and how, then, can we  
 24 believe anything that you offer at the negotiating table  
 25 unless BPA will agree to sign under the legally binding

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."

1421-038-002

1 line?

1421-038-003

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

1421-038-004

5 Biodiversity Northwest also encourages BPA to follow the  
6 legal procedures as stated in the Need for Process which are  
7 required agency of BPA, to seriously study all feasible

1421-038-005

8 alternatives and to be in compliance with scoping comments  
9 that request specific studies.

1421-038-006

10 The SEIS at first look seems to fail in this  
11 regard, refraining from any feasible nontransmission  
12 alternative that is more comprehensive, incorporating  
13 entitlement negotiations, demand response programs, demand  
14 site management programs, generation and distributed  
15 generation, regional availability of natural gas, existing  
16 distributed generation, new distributed generation, renewal  
17 generation and emerging technologies. BPA's SDEIS appears  
18 to review only a handful of these possible nontransmission  
19 alternatives and has admitted to failing to produce anything  
20 comprehensive because of lack of time.

1421-038-007

21 We're encouraging you to take the necessary time.  
22 Tom Foley states that these studies will need to take place  
23 in the next few years, and we're asking you to study them

1421-038-008

24 now. The rest of Biodiversity Northwest's comments will  
25 come after the public comment due date has been extended.

24

1421-038-003 Comment noted.

1421-038-004, -005, and -006 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.

1421-038-007 and -008 BPA is very concerned about the schedule for this project and has not extended the comment period.

1 Thank you.

2 MR. ELDON BALL: I am Eldon Ball, and looking  
3 through the information that were provided, I noticed that  
4 for Alternative B you have an existing 150-foot right-of-way  
5 with towers 150 feet high with a single circuit 345 kilovolt  
6 line. It's proposed if that alternative be used that it be  
7 replaced with 185 high double 500 kilovolt circuit line.

1421-039-001

8 Now, perhaps the cost of doing that in Alternative B is more  
9 than would be done by I think it's only nine miles on your  
10 preferred alternative versus I think it was 38 miles the  
11 other way. If you choose alternative -- the preferred  
12 alternative, then my question, and I think this should be  
13 thoroughly considered, why not replace the single circuit  
14 line that you have there within the existing I believe it's  
15 150-foot right-of-way with a double circuit similar to  
16 what's proposed for Alternative B and that way you wouldn't  
17 need to require any new right-of-way? I would think that  
18 the damages would be far less. Thank you.

1421-039-002

19 MR. RICHARD CHAMPLIN: My name is Richard  
20 Champlin. I noticed some comments up there on the wall that  
21 indicate that some people seem to think that this is a lot  
22 of tree huggers versus property owners, and it's kind of sad  
23 that some people have got that into their head, because this  
24 is not about that. Nobody's trying to take anybody's  
25 property away. This is about a forest, the Cedar River

1421-040-001

1421-040-002

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.

1421-040-003

1 Watershed, which threads the City of Seattle and surrounding  
2 areas, which is one of only a few in the entire United  
3 States that is so clean it needs no filtration system other  
4 than what nature has provided. This is also, whether it is  
5 indicated in the provided documentation by BPA or not, about  
6 an energy fatal brought about by regulation and a subsequent  
7 opportunistic energy fraud perpetrated by Enron and other  
8 companies.

1421-040-004

9           We were told some time ago there was a shortage  
10 coming up, which I believe was manufactured, and that  
11 therefore we need to upgrade power. We are still being told  
12 this in spite of what has happened over the last year and a  
13 half. I have not forgotten about Enron and the way they  
14 scammed the entire Western United States. Evidently some  
15 have forgotten, but I hope you haven't. Because of this  
16 ongoing perpetuated threat of having our lights, our heat  
17 and our dialysis machines suddenly turned off, we're  
18 supposed to throw our entire concept of environmental  
19 stewardship out the door. We are supposed to be concerned  
20 now about energy shortages and quote, unquote national  
21 security more than we are about clean water.

1421-040-005

1421-040-006

22           If polluted water lost an entire species of salmon  
23 and other fish, the loss of habitat and further degradation  
24 of a fast disappearing forest and the insult to the people  
25 that might have hunted and fished there before we came is

26

1421-039-003, -004, and -005 Comment noted.

1421-039-006, -007, and -008 Comment noted.

1421-040-006

1 not a threat to our national identity and pride, then what  
2 is it? Is it progress? I don't buy that.

1421-040-007

3 Please don't try to blackmail us with threats of  
4 blackouts. BPA needs to stop thinking about cheap and easy.  
5 They need to think about management and about respect for  
6 the concerns of the majority of us who do depend on this  
7 water, this shed, and who love this area for its beauty.  
8 Thank you.

1421-040-008

9 MR. RON IVERSON: I'm Ron Iverson. I have  
10 property in the Hobart area which will be affected by  
11 Alternative C. I've been to probably ten meetings on this,  
12 and I guess I can sum it all up: BPA, you did it right the  
13 first time; and the second, democracy does work. I've been  
14 to eight meetings and get damn tired of people that have  
15 cultural diversity problems and things like that. First few  
16 meetings we had I thought this thing was resolved, and then  
17 March 26th Margaret (inaudible) had some comments and you  
18 probably got tired of listening to four people say they want  
19 to tear down the existing power line -- I'm not making this  
20 up -- abrogate the Canadian treaty, litigate, litigate,  
21 litigate with dollar signs in their eyes. I got tired of  
22 that. I was kind of ticked off about that.

1421-041-001

1421-041-002

23 But I think this product that you guys have put  
24 together is much better. I have looked at -- there  
25 certainly can be no argument on any of us if the water

1421-040-006, -007, and -008 Comment noted.

1421-041-001 and -002 Comment noted.

1 quality is going to be affected, we would all go away. If  
2 there's any compelling evidence that building a parallel  
3 line is going to degrade that water system, we would all say  
4 look at some other alternatives. There's no compelling  
5 evidence. And it looks like Seattle's concerns for water  
6 quality predates the proposed line. I think we all want  
7 something that has the least impact on people, the  
8 environment, and we can't throw out cost completely.

1421-041-003

9           So the bottom line, I think you guys have done a  
10 really good thing here. I have seen some things on poles  
11 and mitigation and so forth that I didn't see before, so my  
12 compliments to you. And, finally, I want to say something  
13 about Biodiversity Northwest, which is not exactly in your  
14 back pocket. I think Michael Shank and his crew look at  
15 things aggressively and, by golly, their comments said deep  
16 six Alternative C. Michael, I do appreciate you being  
17 willing to take a look at all these things and get rid of  
18 one of the dumbest alternatives you can say. I said with  
19 the math that any third grader could figure out that was the  
20 worst alternative.

1421-041-004

21           MS DIANE ADAMS: Sir, let's keep our comments  
22 focused on the draft EIS, please.

1421-041-005

23           MR. RON IVERSON: Final thing, I would say you did  
24 a good job. One compelling comment I heard from a lady was  
25 why would you use the power of eminent domain to screw up

1421-041-006

1421-040-003 and -004 Comment noted.

1421-040-005 and -006 Comment noted.

1421-041-006

1 private property when you have a good public property that's  
2 available at no impact?

1421-042-001

3 MR. ERIC ESPENHORST: My name is Eric Espenhorst,  
4 and I haven't been to quite as many of these meetings as the  
5 previous gentlemen, but I have read through quite a few BPA  
6 documents and I've been to several of these meetings. And  
7 I'd like to start by saying no one requested that BPA look  
8 any further into Alternatives B or D, and by doing so -- I  
9 mean, those cross Cascade lines were the original thing 20  
10 years ago that got people riled up. BPA didn't pursue it  
11 then because it was a very environmentally harmful idea  
12 then, it's a very environmentally harmful idea now. No one  
13 asked you to look into it further, and I think by studying  
14 that one I feel that you are using this process simply to  
15 shake out even worse environmental alternatives and say,  
16 well, we looked around, we still have to go through the  
17 Cedar.

1421-042-002

18 The supplement DEIS. I don't think the  
19 nontransmission alternative in there is a viable  
20 alternative. It's full of things that could happen, it's  
21 full of discussions of elements that don't work. It is not  
22 a rigorous alternative the way A through D and 1 through  
23 whatever are. One of the things that the neighbors agree on  
24 and we tree huggers on is that we don't want a transmission

1421-042-003

25 line through a place that's important to us. And the only

1421-042-001

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.

1 way you can achieve that while achieving the other goals  
2 that BPA has is by developing a nontransmission line  
3 alternative. This nontransmission alternative is not a  
4 viable one, particularly so -- particularly for two reasons.  
5 One, it's still based on the old BPA business  
6 plan. Back in '94 you did an EIS which concluded that there  
7 were lesser -- there were alternatives that were viable that  
8 involved more energy conservation, changing rate structures,  
9 et cetera, these would save rate payers money and have fewer  
10 environmental impacts. BPA said we're not going to do that,  
11 so from my view everything BPA has done since then is based  
12 on the business plan is on the wrong foundation. We've seen  
13 BPA rates double since the business plan. That was not  
14 anticipated, but you say, oh, no, we're still in the  
15 business plan mode. You need a new mode, guys.  
16 Secondly, the specific alternative for the -- I've  
17 already mentioned I think the alternative is too vague and  
18 the Appendix J that discussed it -- and I'm running out of  
19 time, three minutes for 1800 pages -- you're still -- the  
20 primary tool that the consultants used to evaluate the cost  
21 effectiveness of energy conservation is the good old  
22 fashioned rate impact, which looks at how a particular  
23 alternative will affect rates, which is not unreasonable,  
24 except that BPA does not apply that when it goes out and it  
25 augments its power with 20 percent market power and rates

30

1421-042-003

1421-042-004

1421-042-005

1421-042-004, -005, and -006 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.

1421-042-006

1 double. BPA has a choice to look at societal costs and  
 2 societal benefits and that is the choice that you should  
 3 make.  
 4           It's imperative -- you state that it is imperative  
 5 to keep the transmission business lines looking at rates.  
 6 That's not imperative. That's a choice. If you don't make  
 7 a choice to look at all the societal costs and benefits,  
 8 develop a nontransmission alternative that's viable, you're  
 9 not doing the public any good and don't think that this is  
 10 over. Thank you.

1421-043-001

11           MR. RICHARD BONEWITS: Well, I'm not going to ask  
 12 you to justify the demand. I'm not going to ask you to  
 13 change people's habit because we can't get them to turn the  
 14 light bulbs off or put timers on the water heater. We've  
 15 been through all of that a year ago. It's all in the book.  
 16 Those answers are there.

1421-043-002

17           90 percent of the power demanded for this power  
 18 line comes from Seattle and the suburban cities, less than  
 19 one percent is used in the area within which it's running.  
 20 A major BPA quadrangular transmission line grid already  
 21 exists in this area, and believe me there's 130 kV, 230 kV  
 22 and 500 kV lines already there. All proposed transmission  
 23 lines cross sensitive rivers, either the Cedar or the  
 24 Snoqualmie, many streams and wetlands and forested lands,

1421-043-003

25 all proposed routes have the potential for significant

1421-043-001, -002, and -003 Comment noted.

1421-043-003 |

1 environmental damage.

2           In this -- in what you have planned, the approach  
3 you took, you made Seattle a beneficiary to a BPA  
4 construction management plan that the rural area citizens

1421-043-004 |

5 would love to have. It is more protective to the  
6 environment than your own past practices, your present  
7 practices or anything demanded by King County and certainly  
8 is not going to make what we call the Critical Areas

1421-043-005 |

9 Ordinance. Seattle is also beneficiary to a generous  
10 mitigation plan that more than compensates for the  
11 environmental damage of a second power line. Proposed route

1421-043-006 |

12 through the watershed -- outside the watershed, I should  
13 say, will result in more damage and you're going to see

14 firsthand evidence, and some of you folks in Seattle that  
15 doubt that, we're encouraging you to get off the tour bus  
16 through the watershed. We have been on that, too, but we  
17 want you to come out and look at the rural area and we're

1421-043-007 |

18 going to show you that the trees are bigger on the outside  
19 than they are in.

1421-043-008 |

20           Seattle raised water quality issues, but that's a  
21 red herring, too. No one is going to compromise water  
22 quality. no one is proposing to do anything about  
23 compromising. There's been an existing line in the  
24 watershed for 30 years and there's no evidence of a problem.

1421-043-009 |

25           In '92 the Seattle was ordered to come up with a

1421-043-004 and -005 Comment noted.

1421-043-006 and -007 Comment noted.

1421-043-008 Comment noted.

1421-043-009

1 design for a filtration plant. It has not been implemented  
2 yet. It was ordered to do so by the State of Washington.

1421-043-010

3 It is still not in place. It could more for itself by  
4 getting rid of the roads and doing what it says it's going  
5 to do in the Habitat Conservation Plan than it can about  
6 arguing with the 92 acres.

1421-043-011

7 Now, the cost is an issue, and the studies clearly  
8 show the difference, and, therefore, isn't any doubt in my  
9 mind that when you go one level more in detail and put the  
10 mitigation to it, it may quadruple again and it's going to  
11 quadruple on the longer routes.

1421-043-012

12 Lastly, if the folks at Seattle would like  
13 something to really look at, consider studying another  
14 alternative route: The Rocky Reach, the Renton line, you  
15 could energize that one and run it right down the middle of  
16 Lake Washington on pontoons with 180 foot towers on it.  
17 That might be more environmentally friendly.

1421-043-013

18 MR. RICHARD TINSLEY: Some places in the country  
19 have some pretty terrible water, but we're fortunate here in  
20 the Seattle are to have good water, so clean and pure that  
21 we don't have to build an expensive filtering plant for it.  
22 We want to keep it that way. For the last 50 years or so,  
23 Seattle has had a practice of buying up private lands in the  
24 watershed so they can maintain the purity of their water.  
25 And through this diligent effort they have managed to do so.

1421-044-001

1421-043-009 and -010 Comment noted.

1421-043-011 and -012 Comment noted.

1421-043-013 Such an option will not be studied because it is  
unfeasible. Pontoons would likely not support the heavy  
towers and the whole project would be expensive even if  
it were feasible.

1421-044-001

1           The land is not open to the general public, it's  
 2 not open for recreation, et cetera. They want to keep it  
 3 for water quality, and as an added bonus we get the wildlife  
 4 habitat and so on. I'm not convinced at all that this  
 5 transmission line needs to be built, but if it is built, it  
 6 should not be built in the Cedar River Watershed. If it is  
 7 in the Cedar River Watershed, that will make more of an  
 8 impact, you have your vehicles driving up and down for  
 9 maintenance, you have the oil percolating into the ground,  
 10 and there's more of a potential for polluting the water  
 11 which would require us to build an expensive filtration  
 12 plant. Don't put it in the watershed. Thank you.

1421-044-002

1421-044-003

13           MR. SCOTT TAYLOR: Hi, guys, I'm Scott Taylor. I  
 14 am a tree hugging property owner. I live outside of Hobart  
 15 over on Tiger Mountain, and I work in Seattle. So no matter  
 16 what decision BPA makes, I get it one way or the other. If  
 17 they go through the watershed and the water quality is  
 18 compromised, I will drink it at work. If they go through my  
 19 backyard and they compromise the water quality of my well, I  
 20 get it at home. So I'm able to see both sides of the story.

1421-045-001

21           I want to give you guys some compliments on your  
 22 EIS. You guys went through an awful lot of work on  
 23 identifying mitigation techniques. Specifically I was  
 24 impressed about the vegetable oil instead of hydraulic  
 25 fluids. That's pretty cool. I didn't know you could do

34

1421-044-001, -002, and -003 Comment noted.

421-045-001 and -002 Comment noted.

1421-045-001

1 that. Helicopters, I knew about that; the micropile  
 2 footings, that's awesome; temporary mats; minimize  
 3 vegetation cutting. You guys have gone through an awful lot  
 4 of -- I mean, there's a whole list on page S-4 of all the  
 5 stuff you are going to do to minimize impact to the Cedar  
 6 River Watershed, and I applaud you on that.

1421-045-002

7           However, I would like to point out what I think to  
 8 be a bit of political hypocrisy. That list isn't there if  
 9 you go through any of the alternatives, and that frankly  
 10 pisses me off. If you guys are going to take helicopters  
 11 and do micropile footings on this, which is the Cedar River  
 12 Watershed, why not do it on hundred year old trees that are

1421-045-003

13 in my backyard. I have spotted owls, two of them, in my  
 14 backyard right where this photo was taken. Your

1421-045-004

15 responsibility is not to Seattle, it's to the environment.  
 16 And if you are guys are minimizing impact and going through  
 17 this whole list of stuff that you can do just for Seattle,

1421-045-005

18 do it for all the other alternatives as well. Thank you.

1421-045-006

19           MS. PAM TRUJILLO: Well, I have to agree with what  
 20 Scott just said. If I could, I'd like to introduce myself,  
 21 my name is Pam Trujillo. I'm directly affected with both  
 22 options B and D. I am also a King County model horse farm.  
 23 I am a King County wildlife refuge, which includes, just  
 24 like Scott said, eagles, falcons, bats, owls, coyote. I  
 25 have a herd of about 40 elk that actually sleep in my front

1421-046-001

1421-045-003, -004, -005, and -006 Please see response to Comment 1420-001-002.

1421-046-001 Comment noted.

1421-046-001 |

1 yard, among other things.

1421-046-002 |

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 6,000 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's the environment from a family  
17 standpoint being affected?

1421-046-003 |

1421-046-004 |

1421-046-005 |

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

36

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.

1421-046-005 |

1 opportunities.

1421-046-006

2 I know for myself personally during the time that  
3 this has gone on, and I did want to mention one thing -- I'm  
4 running out of time here -- there was a request for a  
5 deadline extension. I received notification and anybody  
6 who's involved in this received notification in May. I feel  
7 that's adequate time for an extension, and I can tell you  
8 from a personal standpoint I have been put on hold as regard  
9 to anything to do with my property, whether it's remodel  
10 ventures, whether it's a sales venture, and if this  
11 continues to go on hold, I cannot offer my property without  
12 the potential of a lawsuit with this still being in a hold  
13 mode.

1421-047-001

14 I realize there's a lot of issues that all of us  
15 are affected with, we don't -- no one wants a power line,  
16 but the fact is we can't allow just emotion to lead this.  
17 It has to be a fact of whether or not we do need power, and  
18 I'm out of time. Anyway, I would like to say for the record  
19 that I don't feel an extension is in my best interest or in  
20 the best interest of the homeowners. There's adequate time  
21 to have read what's out there and to digest the EIS and  
22 today isn't the first day for that.  
23 MS. HELEN JOHNSON: My name is Helen Johnson, and  
24 I'm a 60-year-old grandmother from Hobart, and this is the  
25 last place that a 60-year-old grandmother from Hobart wants

1421-046-006 Comment noted.

1421-047-001 Comment noted.

1 to be. I've only given one other public speech, and it was  
2 right here last year and it was probably the same speech I'm  
3 going to give tonight. But this is important because I  
4 think sometimes that we get lost in facts and we forget  
5 about people.

6 I want to tell you a little bit about Hobart.  
7 Hobart is a very, very special place. It's made up of very  
8 special people. It's been here for a hundred years. It was  
9 here before the watershed. It was -- the watershed was  
10 donated to the City of Seattle by a member of a Hobart  
11 family. Now, if this isn't biting the hand that feeds you,  
12 I don't know what is. We're made up of many second and  
13 third generation families in Hobart. We've poured our hearts  
14 and our souls into this land. Many of us grew up there, we  
15 were born there. We've stayed there and lived there and  
16 we've buried our loved ones in the Hobart cemetery, and now  
17 you want to tell us that it's all for nothing because you're  
18 going to destroy this little area all for the -- for more  
19 power for the City of Seattle. We don't need it, they do.

20 This is not a newly rich neighborhood made up of  
21 wealthy landowners. These are hard-working folks who have  
22 lived there all their lives and they have taken good care of  
23 this land for years. We don't even have a store out there  
24 except for one little mom-and-pop grocery store, and it's  
25 run by a third generation Hobart family.

1421-047-001

1421-047-002

1421-047-002 Comment noted.

1421-047-003

1 Last year I listened to some wonderful young  
 2 people who give tours through the watershed and they say  
 3 tourists love it, and we do, too. And we know why they love  
 4 it, because we live there, we have the same animals, we have  
 5 the same plants on this side of the fence. On our side of  
 6 the fence on any day you can see the elk, deer, bear,

1421-047-004

7 cougar, possums, raccoon, coyotes, too many kinds of birds  
 8 to list. And they don't know they're not supposed to be  
 9 over here, so they live where we do too. And we take care  
 10 of them. We take care of them better than the City of  
 11 Seattle ever has.

1421-047-005

12 We do have one thing in Hobart that the watershed  
 13 doesn't have, and that's people, but I'm beginning to think  
 14 that people really don't count much anymore. So I'm begging  
 15 you to consider the consequences to the farms and the homes  
 16 and the people before you make this decision and please do  
 17 the right thing so the citizens of Hobart can get on with  
 18 their lives. Thank you.

1421-048-001

19 MR. HILLARY LORENZ: My name is Hillary Lorenz.  
 20 My land is underneath proposed route Alternative C. I've  
 21 been in public water since 1985 as an operator, carry a  
 22 four-year degree in public water policy, and I worked in the  
 23 late 1990s for two and a half years for Seattle Public  
 24 Utilities at Landsburg out at Lake Youngs as a water  
 25 treatment operator.

1421-047-003, -004, and -005 Comment noted.

1421-048-001 Comment noted.

1 My job for Seattle Public Utilities at Landsburg  
2 was to raise and lower the gates of the diversion damn to  
3 take more or less water through the diversion pipe out of  
4 the Cedar River, transport it down to Lake Youngs where it  
5 was treated and sent on to the City of Seattle and other  
6 purchasers purveyors. During the two and a half years that  
7 I was there at Landsburg, the City of Seattle performed a  
8 practice they called forebay cleaning. And that's where we  
9 raise the gates on the Cedar River diversion damn, allow the  
10 water -- all of the water to go down the natural stream  
11 channel. We dried out the intake structure for the pipe  
12 that goes down to the transmission line that goes to Lake  
13 Youngs.  
14 They entered that intake structure with a backhoe,  
15 rubber-tired backhoe, and they scooped sediment out of that.  
16 I read in here on the third item, page 5-4, use of vegetable  
17 oil in place of hydraulic fluids within the Cedar River  
18 Watershed. I tell you now, they didn't use vegetable oil in  
19 that case, backhoe. If you go to Landsburg and you walk  
20 behind that diversion structure, you'll find thousands of  
21 cubic yards of sediment that they have piled up over the  
22 years from this regular practice of entering their intake  
23 structure.  
24 These are the same people that are talking to you  
25 about concerns of water quality, having your vehicles on

1421-048-001

1421-048-001 BPA has received information from SPU: "Landsburg Raw (CPR-1) Turbidity Data (in pipeline downstream of diversion) 1993 to 2001 - Daily Readings." In reviewing this data we found there had been only one spike to 5 NTU on 12/29/96. If BPA decides to build this project, BPA plans to monitor water conditions in the vicinity of the project.

1421-048-001

1 their land in the watershed, they are entering the actual  
 2 intake structure with hydraulic equipment. I ask you that  
 3 if you are going to continue negotiations or discussions  
 4 with the City of Seattle you talk to them about flow studies  
 5 and the turbidity studies that they have performed during  
 6 the forebay cleaning. They will have it on record. They  
 7 keep track of that sort of thing. They're required by law  
 8 to keep track -- as they raise or lower the gates, they have  
 9 to keep track of the gauging station where the river  
 10 elevation is, they have to keep track of turbidity as they  
 11 change the diversion on that river. So it's going to be on  
 12 record, and I ask you to talk with them about their forebay  
 13 cleaning practice. Thank you.

1421-049-001

14 MR. JON ZAK: My name is Jon Zak. I live on two  
 15 and a half acres in a development of about a hundred homes  
 16 in Maple Valley. Our eastern property boundary will be the  
 17 centerline of the proposed transmission line right-of-way  
 18 for Alternative C. We would lose trees on one quarter of  
 19 our property. These trees are in a native growth protection

1421-049-002

20 zone. The trees range in size from two and a half to five  
 21 feet in diameter breast height above the ground. We never

1421-049-003

22 would have purchased this property if we knew a power line  
 23 would be in our backyard. Alternative C would completely  
 24 destroy our privacy and our views of trees in our backyard.

1421-049-004

25 It would destroy our experience of living in nature. This

1421-049-001 and -002 Comment noted.

1421-049-003, -004, and -005 Comment noted.

1421-049-004

1 was the reason we purchased this property. Part of the  
2 Habitat Conservation Plan, a map was prepared showing the  
3 age of trees in the Cedar River Watershed. On the BPA's  
4 preferred alternative route, the age of the trees is like 10  
5 to 30 years. The trees on my property in the native growth  
6 protective zone make the trees in the Cedar River Watershed  
7 look like toothpicks.

1421-049-005

8 I would like to talk about what Seattle calls the  
9 pristine watershed and their legacy for the future. This  
10 watershed has been decimated by logging for a hundred years.  
11 There are over 600 miles of gravel logging roads in the  
12 watershed. I would like to show you some pictures.

1421-049-006

13 This is from a book published by the Sierra Club  
14 published in 1965, it shows some old growth along the Sock  
15 River. You're not going to see any of that on the Cedar  
16 River. There's another picture of the Sock River forest.  
17 This is a picture of a trail in the Ashland Curtis Grove on  
18 the way to Snoqualmie Pass. This is a picture of the Cedar  
19 River Watershed, Chester Morris Lake. There's quite a bit  
20 of difference. Here are more pictures. Look at the road  
21 cuts and erosion. Chester Morris Lake and see the  
22 clear-cuts and logging roads.

23 And this is our backyard. Another shot of our  
24 backyard. These are some pictures off the Seattle utilities  
25 website, some of the erosion on the travel roads. Here's

42

1421-049-006 Comment noted.

1421-049-006 Comment noted.

1421-049-006

1 some of the heavy equipment. Like Hillary said, they are  
2 not using vegetable oil. Here's more heavy equipment,  
3 people working right around Chester Morris Lake. That's all  
4 the pictures. If anybody wants to see them, I'll have them  
5 later. Anyway, thank you.

1421-050-001

6 MS. LISA TAYLOR: Hi, I'm Lisa Taylor, and I'm a  
7 resident of Tiger Mountain. My husband is Scott, we live at  
8 the north end of Alternative C. My grandfather grew up on  
9 the Olympic Peninsula, as did my father, and I grew up in  
10 southeast Bellevue and Eastern Washington. I think for  
11 those of us who live this long in this community have our  
12 hearts broken by what has happened to our environment. And  
13 I applaud the City of Seattle and all the other  
14 environmentalist groups, of which I am a frequent donator,  
15 for their efforts to recover these areas.

16 However, I'm also a property owner, and strangely  
17 when I bought my property, I thought that I would be the  
18 owner of that property, that I would have the responsibility  
19 and the right to protect my old growth forest. My husband  
20 and I clear blackberries by hand and we plant native species  
21 along our seasonal creek. Since we purchased our home four  
22 and a half years ago, we discovered that we had properties  
23 that were illegally subdivided and spent our savings to buy  
24 those properties to avoid lawsuits and to protect that  
25 forest area. We subsequently discovered that King County

1421-050-001 Comment noted.

1421-050-001

1 overlooked certain aspects of the construction of our home  
2 and it would require being underpinned in our foundation,  
3 that was a second mortgage. We then discovered that we may  
4 be seeing power lines in our community that could cause  
5 erosion or damage to our home or even loss of our community.

1421-050-002

6 Now I hear that we have environmental laws that  
7 may be put into practice in King County that will prevent me  
8 from even replanting the blackberries that choke the north  
9 end of my seasonal creek. So I'm wondering, feeling like an  
10 ant stepping -- trying not to be stepped on by the giants,  
11 if my property is an environmental jewel that must be  
12 protected at all costs, if I am a part of a rural economy  
13 that should be protected by our Growth Management Act or if  
14 I'm a resource to be used by the urban areas for their  
15 landfills and their power lines.

1421-050-003

16 So I'm not sure what to say anymore except that  
17 I'm getting really tired and I'd like BPA to make their  
18 decision and I'd like them to make it soon. As an  
19 environmentalist, I believe the best option is through the  
20 watershed and I urge the City of Seattle to continue their  
21 negotiations and let's no be penny wise pound foolish.

1421-050-004

22 There are a lot of private properties out there that were  
23 formerly forest industry that can be added to that  
24 watershed. I think you would find enormous support from the  
25 local community, as well as perhaps BPA, to continue to add

44

1421-050-002 Comment noted.

1421-050-003 and -004 Comment noted.

1421-050-004

1 to the legacy of that watershed by bringing properties out  
 2 of private forest production and maintaining our rural  
 3 character. We would absolutely support that kind of  
 4 mitigation. I hope you can come up with an answer that will  
 5 work for all of us. Thank you.

1421-051-001

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I just -- I'm a  
 7 novice at this, but I'm interested to find out, because it  
 8 hasn't been mentioned, I have not read it if it's in there,  
 9 where are the funds coming from that are going to be paying  
 10 for whatever alternative is chosen?

11 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: Bonneville borrows the  
 12 cost of capital projects such as transmission lines from the  
 13 treasury as we do for all the other projects that Bonneville  
 14 might do for fish and wildlife enhancement, for  
 15 replenishment of the core and bureau generation facilities  
 16 on the Columbia River. So we borrow the money from the  
 17 treasury and repay that money through the rates that are  
 18 paid through the use of our transmission facilities.

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: The US Treasury.

20 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: That's right, the United  
 21 States Treasury.

1421-051-001

22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you. I'm  
 23 curious how much money you've spent on the consulting  
 24 reports that have gone into this EIS and the supplement to  
 25 the EIS and if you would make a fraction, even ten percent

1421-051-001 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.

1421-051-001

1 of that money available to the citizen groups to do an  
2 independent review of this. Because the consulting firms,  
3 and I know these consulting firms, and they are not doing  
4 independent research, they are doing advocacy for your  
5 preferred action.

6 So it's a two-part question: How much have you  
7 spent on consultants and would you be willing to make even  
8 10 percent of that available to the public, to public groups  
9 to do an independent review?

10 MR. GENE LYNARD: As far as the environmental, the  
11 cost for the environmental work to date, we're over a  
12 million dollars.

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: And part B of the  
14 question?

15 MR. LOU DREISSEN: Part B, I don't think BPA would  
16 be interested in pursuing, giving any monies to private  
17 groups to review our documents.

18 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I'm shocked.

1421-052-001

19 MR. JON ZAK: Last year some of the environmental  
20 organizations were talking about double-circuiting, and I  
21 understood you explained how because of redundancy it wasn't  
22 feasible. Then I was surprised to hear Lou mention  
23 double-circuiting across the Cedar River. So I don't know  
24 if that's an exception to the rule or if you could do that  
25 why can't you do it through the five-mile stretch through

1421-052-001 See response to Comment 421-039-001.

1421-052-001 |

1 the Cedar River Watershed.

2 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: The reason that we're

3 concerned about putting the two circuits on the single tower

4 or what's called double-circuiting is because of the risk of

5 a single event, a wind storm, ice, snow loading or landslide

6 taking out both circuits at the same time. There's a

7 brochure at the back that explains the planning criteria

8 that Bonneville and all utilities use in North America for

9 planning their grids, and they require us to consider loss

10 of a double-circuit as a single event.

11 There is an exception. There's a footnote to the

12 table that says for certain very short occurrences, such as

13 crossing of a river, it's acceptable to use double-circuit

14 towers and not have to consider that from your evaluation.

15 It's on that basis that we made the decision that would be

16 acceptable to use the two double-circuit towers to cross the

17 Cedar River, but clearly it would not be an exemption for

18 the nine-mile project.

1421-053-001

19 MS. HELEN JOHNSON: Well, I have a couple of

20 questions. We hear conflicting things about Seattle's

21 water. Last year I believe the King County council woman

22 told us they had two infractions, and then we have people

23 telling us that their water is so pure that they don't need

24 a filtration system. I know for a fact that they were in

1421-053-002 |

25 the watershed last year asphalt paving roads, and I believe

1421-053-001 and -002 Comments noted.

1421-053-002

1 they were doing work on bridges and the mess they're making  
2 at Landsburg is just incredible.

3           So, you know, I mean, I'm not so sure that their  
4 water is so pure and I'm not sure Seattle doesn't have an  
5 ulterior motive here. I'm just curious if you're really  
6 going to do all that much damage because they're already  
7 doing damage.

8           MR. LOU DREISSEN: Well, I don't really at  
9 this point want to talk for Seattle, but I'll try to give  
10 you my understanding of the situation is that Seattle is  
11 mandated to provide a level of drinking water quality  
12 associated with rules that the Department of Health has in  
13 place. So what those rules indicate is that they can't  
14 exceed five turbidity units two or more times per year.

15           So Seattle monitors the water very closely at  
16 their outtake point. So anytime that the water turbidity  
17 gets to about a level of three and a half to four turbidity  
18 units, they start really looking at shutting their system  
19 down. And they shut their system down a dozen or two dozen  
20 times a year, depending upon the storm activity that goes  
21 on. So their five turbidity units is a fairly pure level,  
22 and that -- the turbidity could well exceed 50 to a hundred  
23 turbidity units during a storm event. So they monitor that  
24 water very closely.

25           And the events that you were describing, I

1 don't -- you know, I don't know all the events that have  
2 happened out there, but I know one, for instance, is that  
3 they had a beaver damn break and during a storm event they  
4 can monitor that water very closely as the turbidity rises.  
5 But as in this case here, it was a slide, it was a part of  
6 the beaver dam breaking, they had no forewarning when that  
7 turbidity hit their outtake point. So they clearly exceeded  
8 the five turbidity units at that event.

9           The difference is that they are exempt from  
10 natural causes, and that was determined a natural cause. So  
11 they're exempt from that, so it's okay. And I believe the  
12 other events have been the same way. The landslide there in  
13 the reservoir, upper reservoir was naturally caused, caused  
14 by the earthquake activities. So those kind of activities  
15 are exempt from the regulations.

16           What is not exempt are predictable events,  
17 predictable meaning by construction, for instance, by our  
18 transmission line construction. They're also very concerned  
19 anytime you have to do road construction inside the  
20 watershed because, again, those are predictable events. You  
21 could have two main events happen or more without triggering  
22 the need for having to build a turbidity filtration plant.

23           The other issue that a lot of people get mixed up  
24 with is that they are building what some people call a  
25 filtration plant currently. That filtration plant will not

1421-054-001

1 take care of turbidity. It takes care of bugs in the water.  
2 So that filtration plant costs them a lot of money, well  
3 over a million dollars, or a hundred million dollars. They  
4 don't want to spend another hundred million dollars or more  
5 for a turbidity filtration plant. So really that's what the  
6 issue is is turbidity in the water. So that's what  
7 everybody is concentrating on currently, everybody meaning  
8 Seattle and also obviously that's BPA. So we're trying to  
9 prevent erosion, we're trying to prevent turbidity in the  
10 water.

11 MR. RICHARD BONEWITS: I want to answer Helen's  
12 question. I am a user of Seattle water, and like many of  
13 the rural areas, I have Seattle water supplied to me through  
14 a purveyor. I can speak to the subject of quality. I don't  
15 have any question about Seattle's water management. I know  
16 that watershed manager, I know some of the people that work  
17 there, I even know Mrs. Pager, who I have worked with in  
18 other venues, and they're all very concerned about  
19 maintaining water quality. So that's not the issue.

20 But there is an issue at least as far as I'm  
21 concerned about taste. And, in my own case, the answer to  
22 it was simple, put a filter in my house. That's what we do,  
23 we filter Seattle's water. And that's what a lot of people  
24 find they have to do because, as they pointed out, there's  
25 times of the year the turbidity, for various reasons, some

50

1421-054-001 Comment noted.

1421-054-001

1 of them natural, some of them are not natural, that there's  
 2 more turbidity in the water that adds taste to it. But as  
 3 far as the coordination of fluorination, it goes on, it's  
 4 monitored daily. So they do an excellent job. I never  
 5 question that.

1421-055-001

6 MR. SCOTT TAYLOR: I just want to ask Lou a point  
 7 of clarification. You implied that they would -- a hundred  
 8 million dollar plant for turbidity filtration, but I was  
 9 under the impression their current filtration plant, the one  
 10 that takes the bugs out, at least when I read the RFP before  
 11 it was constructed, was they were bidding on a plant that  
 12 had an optional component that could be added on top of that  
 13 so it wouldn't necessarily require a second filtration plant  
 14 to take the turbidity out, they would simply execute on the  
 15 option that they already planned to do before, yes or no?

16 MR. LOU DREISSEN: What you are saying is very  
 17 correct. So what I'm talking about is adding another plant  
 18 to the existing plant. So they provided for that option, so  
 19 to add to that existing plant would be another hundred to  
 20 hundred and ten million dollars. So that's what everybody  
 21 is trying to avoid.

1421-056-001

22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: First, just before the  
 23 question, I think it's important to acknowledge as -- I'm  
 24 Dave Atcheson with Biodiversity Northwest. We asked in our  
 25 comments on the draft environmental impact statement for

1421-055-001 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.

1421-056-001 Comment noted.

1421-056-001

1 Bonneville Power Administration to issue a supplemental  
 2 draft environmental impact statement that would study other  
 3 alternatives, and we specifically asked for more study of  
 4 the nontransmission alternative.

5           So I think it's important to acknowledge that they  
 6 did that and thank you for doing that. We'll have our  
 7 comments, detailed comments on those submitted in writing,  
 8 and I think other folks made good points about that. I just  
 9 wanted to acknowledge that. My short question is: In the  
 10 cost effectiveness determination for putting the new  
 11 transmission line in, it's actually -- it's actually going  
 12 to be beneficially economic to BPA and the rate payers  
 13 because of the loss savings because that line will be more  
 14 efficient -- there won't be as much loss of energy through  
 15 heat; is that correct? So what I'm wondering is does that  
 16 actually mean that BPA comes out ahead financially? Is this  
 17 line a money maker for BPA?

1421-056-002

18           MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: No. In fact, it's not a  
 19 money maker for Bonneville, but it is a money maker for  
 20 consumers. And the reason is is that in our transmission  
 21 rates, we include the cost of the wires and the cost of  
 22 operating and maintaining that equipment. But the losses,  
 23 the energy that's lost through heat of the wires, heating of  
 24 the wires, must be replaced by the electric customers, by  
 25 the retail utilities. So they benefit directly because if

52

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.

1 this line saves energy and the amount is significant, at the  
2 time of normal peak it's about 11 megawatts of peak power,  
3 that means that the total losses on the system will be  
4 reduced and the amount that the retail utilities have to  
5 return to us to replace that is reduced by 11 megawatts. So  
6 their consumers benefit. But there's no financial  
7 consequence to Bonneville transmission. I might say our  
8 friends on the other side of the house in our power business  
9 line, they and their customers will, in fact, benefit.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



# ORIGINAL

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COMMENTS TO  
KANGLEY-ECHO LAKE TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT  
Tuesday Meeting, February 4, 2003

RECEIVED BY EPA  
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT  
OFF: KELT 1423  
RECEIPT DATE: FEB 05 2003

Seattle Center, Rainier Room  
Seattle, Washington

Reported by: Betsy E. Decater, RPR  
License No. 601-835-443

1422-001-001

1 FIRST MEETING 12:00 - 3:00 NONTRANSMISSION ALTERNATIVES:

2 MALE SPEAKER: What is the contingency that  
3 pushes Covington over?

4 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: So the information  
5 about a particular contingency is not included in the EIS  
6 for security concerns. If you are interested in seeing that  
7 report, you can sign a waiver of that and get a copy of  
8 that, but I can't discuss that here.

9

1422-002-001

10 MS. SUE KUEHL: Just this morning I received  
11 an e-mail from our account exec at TBL letting us know that  
12 there's negotiations going on right now with Power X to try  
13 to make some kind of arrangement or agreement to send more  
14 energy southbound through the northern intertie to alleviate  
15 some of the northbound congestion. How does that affect all  
16 this stuff that you are looking at?

17 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: So we've been in  
18 negotiations with the Canadians regarding the return of the  
19 entitlement for about two and a half years now. Actually,  
20 we've probably spent 15 years negotiating the return of the  
21 entitlement, recognizing that beginning in 1998. I think it  
22 was, we had to start making the returns. We have not  
23 reached any agreement other than what's in the exchange of  
24 notes from 1998. So we are still obligated to return that  
25 power with the same level of reliability for which we have

2

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

1 to serve loads in the Northwest. There is no other  
2 agreement other than the one from 1998 and no new agreements  
3 have been reached. I checked this with the account  
4 executive yesterday, with the power account executive.

5 MS. SUE KUEHL: I'm just curious if there is  
6 an agreement that's reached, does that reduce your need for  
7 the Kangley-Echo Lake line?

8 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: If somehow an  
9 agreement would be reached that would, say, limit the return  
10 obligations, then the need for Kangley-Echo Lake potentially  
11 could be put off by two to four years. But the need is  
12 still there because the load is still growing in the Puget  
13 Sound area.

1422-003-001

14 MR. KURT CONGER: Does the high Ross return  
15 to Seattle, that's factored into this study to determine how  
16 load is going into this?

17 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: Yes, the high Ross  
18 return is included in our studies.

1422-003-001

19 MR. KURT CONGER: I'm going to see if I got  
20 the right answer at the end of this. It appears that if  
21 more time were available, we could look at a fairly wide  
22 range of demand site alternatives to the Kangley-Echo Lake  
23 line. But given the times frames we're faced with right  
24 now, am I correct in concluding that the analysis shows that  
25 it's very unlikely that we would be able to defer

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.

1422-003-001

1 construction of that line using the demand alternatives that  
2 you analyzed?

3 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: My interpretation is  
4 that if we had more time, more alternatives and greater  
5 quantities would be available, but my belief is we might be  
6 able to push it out for a couple of years. It just means we  
7 would have to build the line a couple of years later than  
8 our current schedule.

9 MR. FOLEY: One of the things if you had more  
10 time, you might be able to see whether or not some of these  
11 plants were built, for example, and that would -- so I think  
12 we would be -- there's always value in delay if you don't --  
13 you know, if you don't run into a problem with not being  
14 able to meet load. So you've got this trade-off obviously.

15 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I wasn't here  
16 in the beginning, so maybe you guys covered this. I'm just  
17 curious in relationship to all those questions about could  
18 you delay the project, it's my understanding that Bonneville  
19 has a curtailment plan in place now for -- with local  
20 utilities so that if the line reached certain loadings that  
21 local utilities would have to get some of the industrial  
22 customers to shut off even this winter. Is that still in  
23 place?

1422-004-001

24 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: Yes, the curtailment  
25 plan is in place, and the curtailments would, in fact, be

4

1422-004-001 The Puget Sound Area Load Curtailment Plan is still in place.

1 shared by local utilities and BC Hydro in proportion to the  
2 amount of power that they're moving through the area.

3 MR. KURT CONGER: But is it accurate to say  
4 that there are agreements in place for retail customers to  
5 shut off?

6 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: So I do not know what  
7 plans the retail utilities may or may not have in place.  
8 They are obligated to find the curtailment, and I don't know  
9 how they're going to get it.

1422-004-001

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: What happens if  
11 you don't get it?

12 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: The question is what  
13 happens if you don't get it. Again, the curtailment plan  
14 would actually be put in place before a contingency occurred  
15 because we'd have to be sure that if we had an outage we  
16 don't bring the whole region into a blackout. So at  
17 basically the control centers would issue an order to reduce  
18 transmission schedules, and utilities would have to follow  
19 that. And as far as I know, utilities do not generally  
20 disobey an order from one control center to another.

1422-005-001

21 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: So what range  
22 of megawatts are we talking about?

23 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: The question is how  
24 many megawatts, what range. It's difficult to say. If you  
25 look at the numbers in the study, the overload is 122

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.

1422-006-001

1 megawatts at Covington, which is about 380 megawatts spread  
 2 throughout the area. So depending upon the actual loading  
 3 at the time, it would be somewhere -- could be a little bit  
 4 less than that, could be a little bit more. One of the  
 5 problems is these are based on using computer models to  
 6 precisely predict the amount of megawatts. We generally  
 7 can't be that precise and correct, so we typically have to  
 8 over-drop loads to be sure we're safe and under the limits.

9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So the question I  
 10 have is given that there would be significant savings as a  
 11 result of the new line in terms of energy losses, why was  
 12 the value of those savings not calculated in when you were  
 13 calculating how much you would spend on incentives for  
 14 nontransmission alternatives?

15 MR. SNULLER PRICE: When we were looking at  
 16 the incentive levels, we were looking at the differential in  
 17 the transmission business lines revenue requirement, which  
 18 is another way of saying that is we were looking at the  
 19 incentive payment as a direct alternative to the money that  
 20 would go to a transmission line, so just looking at the  
 21 change in revenue requirement.

22 Now, if you look at how the transmission --  
 23 TBL's revenue requirement is calculated, the loss savings  
 24 are not a component of the TBL revenue requirement. So  
 25 that's why the incentive level was based on that just as a

6

1422-006-001 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.

1 direct substitute for the transmission lines.

2 MR. BRIAN SILVERSTEIN: So let me try that.  
3 So if you look at it just from a transmission business line  
4 perspective or transmission -- right, from our perspective,  
5 we do not get compensated directly for the losses. The  
6 losses are returned by the retail utilities. But if you  
7 look at the analysis that they did for total resource costs,  
8 for instance, delivery price of power or the societal costs,  
9 the value of those lost savings are, in fact, included in  
10 the analysis.

11 So I think that they are correctly accounted for,  
12 and I think one way to look at it, if you look at it from  
13 those perspectives, the loss savings are really offsetting  
14 against the cost for the transmission lines. So, in fact,  
15 the transmission lines cost zero, or, in fact, it saves  
16 money for consumers as a whole.

17 Thank you very much.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

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 4th day of February, 2003.

  
Notary public in and for the  
State of Washington  
at Sammamish, King  


My commission expires 03-20-06

# ORIGINAL

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COMMENTS TO  
KANGLEY-ECHO LAKE TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT  
Wednesday Meeting, February 5, 2003

PROJECT NO. 1729  
PROJECT NAME  
PROJECT DATE: FEB 06 2003

Maple Valley Community Center  
Maple Valley, Washington

Reported by: Betsy E. Decater, RPR  
License No. 601-835-443

1429-001-001

1 MS. FLORENCE TOLLEFSON: My name is Florence  
 2 Tollefson, F-l-o-r-e-n-c-e, capital T-o-l-l-e-f-s-o-n, and I  
 3 live in Maple Valley in the Hobart area. And we have for  
 4 months and months now heard one alternate choice after  
 5 another one. The last one expressed in the letter was to go  
 6 through the Cedar River Watershed. That is my choice also.  
 7 The lady at the desk had information on alternate sources.

1429-001-002

8 That is not of any kind of interest to me whatsoever because  
 9 eventually they're going to have to come back and put a line  
 10 in somewhere sometime. So put it through the watershed now  
 11 and forget all the other stuff because it's too expensive  
 12 and it will affect neighborhoods, you know, in very dramatic  
 13 negative ways. So I am not interested in anything else but  
 14 to go through that watershed and that's that.

1429-002-001

15 MS. SANDY WILDERMUTH: I was at the last meeting,  
 16 and it occurred to me that I was talking with people here  
 17 who were all in the same bucket. It was the choir singing  
 18 to the choir. There was no one here from the City, there  
 19 were no decision-makers here to listen to it and it seemed  
 20 like everyone here all supported the watershed option,  
 21 whichever one that is. So I wondered who do we really need  
 22 to be speaking to in order to voice our desires for that  
 23 option?

1429-003-001

24 MS. SONIA PREEDY: Our property is bordered on the  
 25 south by your current power line. If you put in Option C.

2

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.

1429-003-001

1 then the western side of our property would also have an  
2 easement along it. The reason we object to that option and  
3 feel that it should go in the watershed is we have such a  
4 difficult time with the public using the easement for  
5 recreational, dumping, partying on, and it's very hard to  
6 get them to leave at times, they're rude. And we contact  
7 the police, the police tell us that we're to hold the people  
8 until they can get there, and you can't do that. And so  
9 this really puts an onus on the property owner because they  
10 believe that this is government property and belongs to the  
11 public.

1429-004-001

12 MR. DAVE PIMENTEL: Howdy, gentlemen. It's been a  
13 little while. Just got in from Oregon. We weren't even  
14 planning on being here, but I'm glad we showed up and just  
15 sat down really basically. When we went through the whole  
16 deal last year, we felt that we had some stiff opposition  
17 from downtown, so to speak, and what I want to know is what  
18 is -- what's it like? What's the atmosphere on the other  
19 side like right now? You know, what do we, who oppose  
20 Alternative C, what's our best path to take to make sure  
21 that the position is held that you're preferred alternative  
22 goes through?

23 MR. LOU DRIESSEN: I assume that you're talking  
24 about downtown Seattle, not downtown --

25 MR. DAVE PIMENTEL: That's correct.

1429-004-001 See response to Comment 1429-002-001.

1 MR. LOU DRIESSEN: Well, you call it opposition,  
2 I'll call it differences of opinion. There's folks around  
3 that are concerned about the impact this line could have  
4 crossing the watershed. They're concerned about the impacts  
5 to the drinking water, they're concerned about the impacts  
6 to the Habitat Conservation Plan, which Seattle went through  
7 a lot of effort to put that into place.

8 So those folks are still concerned. The issue  
9 hasn't gone away. We're working with Seattle at this point  
10 and we're meeting like on a weekly basis with Seattle trying  
11 to figure out a way to where we can take care of most of  
12 their concerns. So as part of that, BPA has gone through  
13 this detailed engineering and surveying analyses, we were  
14 able to figure out where the new towers are going to go, for  
15 instance, and where any of the new access roads are going to  
16 go. And with that information, we were able to determine  
17 exactly what kind of mitigation measures from an  
18 environmental perspective need to take place.

19 So as a result of that, we were able to determine  
20 that we will not be filling in any wetlands, for instance,  
21 so that was a big issue. We were able to minimize clearing  
22 outside of the right-of-way. We were able to minimize  
23 clearing inside of the right-of-way to the extent BPA has  
24 determined that it's okay for one span just to cross the  
25 Cedar River, for one span it would be okay to double-circuit

1 such that a new line would go inside the existing  
2 right-of-way that's out there now, and we would put in two  
3 double-circuit structures and put both lines, existing line  
4 and new line, on those two double-circuit structures. And  
5 by doing that, no clearing will need to take place across  
6 the Cedar River.

7           So these are all fairly large concessions.  
8 Another fairly expensive method we just started using at  
9 BPA, we said we are going to use specialty footings inside  
10 the watershed, we are going to use what we call micropyle  
11 footings, and it's something that is evolving as we go  
12 along. The design of that is evolving as we go along, so we  
13 intend to use those.

14           Also, we intend to use a helicopter to place  
15 structures. So that normally we would have to use a large  
16 crane to go out there and install the structures, we don't  
17 need a large crane if we use a helicopter. So we will use  
18 helicopters after the footings are in the place to put the  
19 structures in place and use the helicopter also to string  
20 the line. We're going to use a helicopter to help do some  
21 of the logging out there. So these are all trying to  
22 minimize and possibly even eliminate any potential erosion  
23 that would take place out there. So that's a concession on  
24 the drinking water quality aspect.

25           On the Habitat Conservation Plan we're working

1 with U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and (inaudible) and Seattle,  
2 all three of those parties to see what we can do to minimize  
3 impacts to the Habitat Conservation Plan. BPA has purchased  
4 350 acres immediately north of the watershed with the idea  
5 that that acreage should be handed over to Seattle to help  
6 compensate for the 90 acres that we would be taking as a  
7 result of this project.

8 BPA is looking at other properties outside the  
9 watershed adjacent to the watershed with the intention of  
10 turning those properties over to Seattle if we're able to  
11 come to some agreement. BPA is also looking at buying  
12 insurance, for instance, to counteract the potential of if  
13 something were to happen, even though the odds are so small,  
14 that something were to happen and the drinking water would  
15 be degraded such that Seattle would need to build a  
16 filtration plant that we would have insurance in place that  
17 would help pay for that.

18 So the other aspect is the environmental community  
19 is still concerned about problems in the area, and we're  
20 trying to work with the environmental community at this  
21 point also.

22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Alternative A affects  
23 the community that I live in, and you made a comment that  
24 you didn't think that you could take it down long enough to  
25 do whatever, you know, to put up the new line. I'm kind of

6

1429-005-001

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.

1429-005-001

1 confused by that because my understanding was that you were  
2 actually going to put a third line using the additional  
3 right-of-way that you've had since about 1942, which now  
4 most everybody uses as a nice screen to their property. And  
5 so I'm a little confused by what you said. If you have to,  
6 quote, take it down, why would you do that if you're going  
7 to just put up another line?

8 MR. MIKE KREIPE: The proposal there is you're  
9 talking about the Covington Maple Valley 230 kV line. The  
10 proposal there is to take that -- because our right-of-way  
11 is only -- it only can take either a single structure,  
12 either double circuit or single circuit, we will take a  
13 single circuit down and replace it with a double circuit,  
14 put the existing line back on one side and build a new line  
15 on the other side. So essentially we're not going to put  
16 two parallel structures there, or one set of structures, the  
17 old and the new line. So you have to take the old one down  
18 before you put the new one up.

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So you already have  
20 two?

21 MR. LOU DRIESSEN: There's two parts to this,  
22 basically -- actually, there's three parts to this  
23 Alternative A. So Alternative A would start at Kangley, for  
24 instance, and from Kangley to Covington there's a vacant  
25 right-of-way that's available. Near Covington there's two

1 existing lines already in that right-of-way, but there's a  
2 vacant portion on the right-of-way. This new line would  
3 utilize the vacant portion.

4           What Mike's talking about is from Covington to the  
5 north.

6           UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No. I'm talking about  
7 the piece that goes through Winterwood Estates.

8           MR. LOU DRIESSEN: Right through there Alternative  
9 A would utilize the vacant right-of-way which is on the  
10 north side of those two lines.

11           UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Right. And that's the  
12 area where you have went and cleared all the trees and --

13           MR. LOU DRIESSEN: That's correct. A lot of trees  
14 have grown up inside of our right-of-way there and people  
15 use that like for backyards and will definitely impact the  
16 folks that live alongside that right-of-way.

17           UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So that's not the part  
18 you're talking about taking down. You would, in fact, put a  
19 third line in there.

20           MR. LOU DRIESSEN: That's very correct.

21           UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: But when it turns and  
22 goes through Covington, then you would still only maintain  
23 two towers. Is that what you are saying?

24           MR. MIKE KREIPE: The part I was talking about was  
25 the section right here where we have one circuit we would

1429-006-001

1 replace with a double circuit. I think the part you're  
 2 talking about is here where there's a single circuit and we  
 3 will add a circuit on that right-of-way, so they're both  
 4 part of the same plan. So it's --

5 MS. DIAN ADAMS: Does that answer your question,  
 6 sir?

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: You would have in that  
 8 area where it goes through three sets of towers?

9 MR. MIKE KREIPE: That's correct.

10 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Once this is  
 11 completed, how many years do you anticipate this will hold  
 12 the amount of power that's needed?

13 MR. MIKE KREIPE: Well, I've gotten that question  
 14 tonight from a couple of people. In fact, we had it a year  
 15 ago in some of the questions, which I wrote a response. The  
 16 line we have through there now starts in Monroe to Echo Lake  
 17 to Raver, that's the north-south line. It was built in the  
 18 late '60s, early '70s, so it's approaching 30 years. It has  
 19 provided good service. It's hard to look at the future and  
 20 know what growth's going to be. Actually, load growth now  
 21 is much less than it's been in the last 30 years. We had  
 22 six to seven percent load growth for a long time, we have  
 23 two percent load growth now.

24 I would suggest -- my experience, I've had 30  
 25 years in planning, I would suggest that it would last at

9

1429-006-001 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.

1 least as long, but there are things happening in the power  
2 supply business, distributed generation, fuel cells, you  
3 hear about them in the news. They have been around a long  
4 time, a lot of people are trying to figure out how to mass  
5 produce them. When they are mass produced, they will be  
6 cheaper. You could very likely have your own power supply  
7 produced by gas in your own home. It could happen. 20, 30  
8 years, the load growth is all handled, at least at residence  
9 with those devices. It could happen at some point that no  
10 new transmission, major grid type transmission is needed.  
11 But I would say that line, short of that happening, that  
12 line should last 25 or 30 years.

13 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I was just  
14 wondering, you were talking about you were going to be  
15 minimizing the amount of timber you'll be taking down in the  
16 watershed to try and help them out to meet some of their  
17 environmental goals, I guess. Well, on my land that's in  
18 preferred alternative 1, anyways, I asked them to minimize  
19 the amount of trees that they took down on one of my lots  
20 should they come across there because I spent a lot of money  
21 in developing a 20-acre piece there that I have a creek that  
22 goes through there also that was of great concern to King  
23 County as to a hundred year flood plain.

24 So I had to have a lot of engineering done having  
25 to do with that hundred year flood plain, and that cost a

1429-007-001

1429-007-002

1429-007-001 and -002 Comment noted.