



Respondent No: 1
Login: Jeff Jordan
Email: jeffjord@gmail.com

Responded At: Mar 31, 2025 10:25:34 am
Last Seen: Mar 31, 2025 15:32:46 pm
IP Address: 172.56.104.62

Q1. **Name** Jeff Jordan

Q2. **Email** jeffjord@gmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

I testified at Montana's first PURPA rate hearings in 1981, managed the design, development and operation of the first small hydro plants to connect to Montana Power under PURPA in '82 and '83, and have been working to reduce carbon emissions ever since. The Clean Energy Transition in the Northwest is stalled by three problems: 1. No proposed plan for adequate wind-power transmission capacity from Eastern Montana to Western Washington. 2. No plan for economic use of unavoidable wind-energy over-generation. 3. No plan for step-by-step power transmission upgrades to morph into the future HVDC Grid. "The Colstrip Express" YouTube video addresses these needs and is detailed and sourced to withstand technical scrutiny. Future videos will expand on this foundation to include: • The Future HVDC Grid in the West, essential to both clean power transmission and future power sharing. • Transmission enhancing battery at Colstrip. • Local Industrial Co-consumption of Wind Overgeneration. • An Economic Redevelopment Plan for Coal Country. • Clean electric smelting of aluminum, copper and steel using wind over-generation. • Using overgeneration to Reduce US and World Industrial-CO2 emissions. This is done without new powerlines in Washington by converting existing power lines to the new MT-HVDC technologies available now. The link to "The Colstrip Express" 1-minute Short <https://youtube.com/shorts/VqTni8mIXNU> The link to the 51-minute "The Colstrip Express" documented video: <https://youtu.be/nzHEReffwAw> The link to "The Future HVDC Grid" short: <https://youtube.com/shorts/IQzdxkGUWSo>

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)** not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?** not answered



Respondent No: 2
Login: Jeff Jordan
Email: jeffjord@gmail.com

Responded At: Mar 31, 2025 11:49:14 am
Last Seen: Mar 31, 2025 15:32:46 pm
IP Address: 172.56.104.62

Q1. Name	Jeff Jordan
Q2. Email	jeffjord@gmail.com
Q3. Share any comment	Formatted pdf of Prior Comment
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/8ca705d4bb5417a4a2d9b5f570cee98293b50e22/original/1743446938/464a0c09c06d23756fcd6474e65416ff_Jeff%20Jordan%2031-25%20Formatted%20Comments%20%28EFSEC%29.pdf?1743446938
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 3**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 02, 2025 11:50:58 am**Last Seen:** Apr 02, 2025 11:50:58 am**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. Name	James
Q2. Email	jamesdelay@hotmail.com
Q3. Share any comment	<p>In light of the catastrophic Jan 2025 Moss Landing BESS fire and newly discovered and confirmed through scientific lab tests issue of toxic fallout from the ash from the lithium battery enregy storage system (BESS) fire- detected at toxic concentrations 27.2 miles downwind, and the potential total destruction of the environment around Moss Landing, Monterey Bay, and the ELkhorn Slough due to the more than 1000x increase in toxic lithium battery related heavy metals spread throughout San jose State University's Marine Research lab in Monterey/Elkorns with 10 years o comparable soil and water samples irrefutably proving the toxic fallout released when a lithium BESS burns. The environmental impacts are catastrophic when millions of lithium battery cells burn- even if it is just one BESS container, the fallout, the toxic gases, and smoke, and if water is used defensively the contaminated runoff (read about the almost 3-mile total fishkill from the toxic runoff in Frederickson, MO)... The environmental impact is catastrophic when a BESS has a fire and there is no 100% effective prevention technology nor a 100% effective extinguishing technology- even when solutions have been sought since the 1990s when lithium batteries first started spontaneously combusting... DO NOT approve a blanket EIS for electric transmission systems...</p>
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/7b1a16c61e3730bbc54d2329351309d581d71577/original/1743619822/7ed8df7cfca2a1aca6b2b95aee2e986d_Review%20of%20gas%20emissions%20from%20lithium-ion%20battery%20thermal%20runaway%20failure.pdf?1743619822
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/bfe0b16c3d59bab6f179ba2c8030c7aded65b57/original/1743619838/a81dff6616b8388ff32c17cc92fa2ed9_San%20Jose%20State%20University%20Lab%20Moss%20Landing%20BESS%20fire%20fallout%20page%201.png?1743619838
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 4**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 02, 2025 13:27:21 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 02, 2025 13:27:21 pm**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Connie Krier

Q2. Email

Cckrier@gmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

This absolutely should not be allowed. Every single site where harm can be done to the environment should be appropriately assessed for the unique impacts of that location. Rubber stamping a category of projects as all the same impact to all environments is a ridiculous notion. Why even have environmental studies or reports done at all. If you can do this for energy or transmission projects, then all construction of residential homes is the same, all road projects are the same, any "category" of project could use your same argument about impacts and create a blanket environmental impact statement. This sets a very scary precedence that the EIS for a project next to salmon bearing stream is exactly the same as a project in an industrial area, or one in a commercial area would have the same impacts as one located in protected public lands with endangered animals. This is just one more way EFSEC and the state are attempting to take the voice of the people away and circumvent the environmental laws this state "claims" to care about. There is no reason for this and no benefit to it.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered

**Respondent No:** 5**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 02, 2025 15:51:07 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 02, 2025 15:51:07 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. **Name** Mars Wirkkala

Q2. **Email** marswirkkala@gmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

To Whom it may concern (i e: all citizens of Washington State): No action should be taken on the Transmission Programmatic Environmental Impact Study (EIS). Any amount of money, promises, deals, and gifts are not worth your conscience if you do not oppose BESS in Washington State. BESS is guaranteed to be a disaster, and your conscience will be as dirty as the environment and health screenings of those affected by any choice you make to advance any BESS projects. You know the risks and dangers BESS. You will not be able to claim immunity. When BESS fails, and they will, and the groundwater is polluted, and people cannot safely return to their homes, and toxicity permeates the minds of those whom you claim to want to help, and towns are evacuated, and FEMA takes over, your name, yes, you who are reading this and deciding what you think is in our, nee', your, best interest, you will have this catastrophe on your soul. You will have your names highlighted in history as being responsible for the downfall of the West Coast. Is the money you are promised worth it?

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)** not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?** not answered



Respondent No: 6

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 02, 2025 17:25:30 pm

Last Seen: Apr 02, 2025 17:25:30 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Ronald Morgan
Q2. Email	ronnieatthewater1313@gmail.com
Q3. Share any comment	No action should be taken. This is the wrong place for this project. Please recheck zoning restrictions Consider distance from homes and school
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 7**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 08, 2025 07:05:27 am**Last Seen:** Apr 08, 2025 07:05:27 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Cynthia Calhoun

Q2. Email

cynthia_calhoun@hotmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

I'm concerned about the threat to the community of these BESS installations. I agree with working to repair environmental damage and reverse climate changes caused by modern practices, but this must be done in a thoughtful, safe and sustainable way. Please stop building these projects in areas where they are a threat to homes, schools and businesses until we have corrected the problems they present.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered



Respondent No: 8

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 17, 2025 14:24:29 pm

Last Seen: Apr 17, 2025 14:24:29 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Teryn Yazdani
Q2. Email	teryn@columbiariverkeeper.org
Q3. Share any comment	Request for Comment Period Extension - attached
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/608ed48e74f4b27696af296af7dc17c811c2cecd/original/1744925054/b694d7cc5c5871f26c87c93b873ea2e6__final-updated_%202025.04.17_CRK%20WA%20EFSEC%20Request%20for%20Extension.pdf?1744925054
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 9

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 18, 2025 12:29:12 pm

Last Seen: Apr 18, 2025 12:29:12 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Julie Carter
Q2. Email	carj@critfc.org
Q3. Share any comment	<p>CRITFC respectfully requests an extension to the comment deadline in order for us and our member tribes to have the capacity to review the document.</p>
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/7e0397e75a1611cacc33bb80c3f66c4b5f817e2/original/1745004547/c540e606e9ae5708b094cbe95d5acfa3_2025%2004%2017%20Letter%20WAEFSEC%20Final%20copy.pdf?1745004547
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 10**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 20, 2025 15:01:55 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 20, 2025 15:01:55 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. Name	Richard van Dijk
Q2. Email	rvd@alderspur.com
Q3. Share any comment	<p>Page 76 needs clarification on the definition of "restricted easement" and should not apply to 230KV lines. Under no circumstance must a 230KV be allowed in less than the prescribed 125' easement. This especially true for 50+ year old outdated narrow easement that were never meant to serve a 230KV line especially when it is now semi rural/suburban. Ensure that the 100' recommended distance is adhered to to minimize 24/7 EMF exposure.</p>
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 11

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 20, 2025 15:16:59 pm

Last Seen: Apr 20, 2025 15:16:59 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **Name** Lisa Busch

Q2. **Email** lbusch93@icloud.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

I do not agree with the proposed Swift Dam to Troutdale High-Voltage Transmission lines. Please find a different way with less impact on the people who live here.

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)** not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?** not answered



Respondent No: 12

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 20, 2025 15:45:13 pm

Last Seen: Apr 20, 2025 15:45:13 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **Name**

Candy Dietz

Q2. **Email**

Bcdietz106@gmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

I am opposed to this line going right over neighboring homes and obstructing views, wildlife and causing potential harm to our health

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)**

not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)**

not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?**

No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?**

not answered



Respondent No: 13

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 20, 2025 16:06:32 pm

Last Seen: Apr 20, 2025 16:06:32 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **Name**

Julie Berge

Q2. **Email**

Swatberge@gmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

These lines will be very near our beautiful Hockinson home. We do not want to see them or have them lower the value of our home. Thank God the towers aren't on our property, but I feel awful for those it is. Move the easement East towards Larch.

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)**

not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)**

not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?**

No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?**

not answered



Respondent No: 14

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 20, 2025 16:23:30 pm

Last Seen: Apr 20, 2025 16:23:30 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **Name** Karen Smith

Q2. **Email** Kareyla@aol.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

PacifiCorps is planning to build high voltage power lines using vastly outdated easements. The land in question has been highly developed since easements were made and now include a great many homes and schools. The current power line proposal will be highly disruptive and gravely consequential to many families. Please persuade PacifiCorps to move the lines east to public land or work with BPA to upgrade existing power. Thank you.

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)** not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?** not answered



Respondent No: 15

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 20, 2025 16:32:57 pm

Last Seen: Apr 20, 2025 16:32:57 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **Name**

B

Q2. **Email**

not answered

Q3. **Share any comment**

The proposed line will have a grave impact on neighbors and needs to be scrapped. Would you want your grandchildren playing this close, eating garden food grown this close, or drinking water from wells this close? I don't think so. Not to mention the potential fire danger and EMF exposure. NO! Move the line to the original location where the land is less populated. It's common sense.

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)**

not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)**

not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?**

No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?**

not answered

**Respondent No:** 16**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 20, 2025 17:18:31 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 20, 2025 17:18:31 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. **Name** Rhae Books

Q2. **Email** Rhae99books@gmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

I'm writing to express my concerns about the proposed route of this power line. The construction of this line poses environmental and health concerns. The east winds often clock 30-60 mph on upper 212th, causing damage yearly. The fire danger is real considering the potential for downed trees and fallen lines. Look what happened in California. I attended the meeting yesterday in Battle Ground and it was apparent that Pacific has no regard for the health or safety of the community of unincorporated Clark county wa. Just another money grab for out of state corporation. We say no. Find another route. The easement is outdated and poses great risk to the health of our community.

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)** not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?** not answered



Respondent No: 17

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 20, 2025 17:26:23 pm

Last Seen: Apr 20, 2025 17:26:23 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **Name**

Sean Smith

Q2. **Email**

nwseansmith@gmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

Hello, I am a highly concerned citizen living along the proposed route. Not one time was it ever disclosed to me that Pacificorp has an easement on my property when we purchased it in 2004 and I'm still not sure that they do. Their current route goes straight down my road NE 212th AVE in which there is no way to accommodate the recommended safe distance for the residences along the route. The Hockinson area where we live is no longer a rural farming community of hundreds of people, it is home to thousands of people with high end homes, much like Happy Valley in Clackamas county Oregon. The BPA in 2009 found this route to be way too impactful and chose an alternate route to the east through the Gifford Pincho on public land. Pacificorp must be compelled to identify alternate routes that won't decimate communities and those who live in them. People are already suffering in our current economic climate and destroying their homes and values along with the health risks is too much to ask not to mention what it would do to the natural beauty of the area and the environment. PacificCorp's proposed 230kV transmission line from Swift Dam to Troutdale OR is dangerous and unjustified. The EFSEC cannot disregard the fire danger, health risks, and the lack of adherence to important safety guidelines that this line poses. Firstly, it is vital to note that the easement is inaccurate. In some areas, due to discrepancies in survey data, it cannot be accurately ascertained exactly where the easement lies. Errors in the placement of the easement on some parcels renders the already too narrow path even narrower, requiring PacificCorp to encroach on land outside the easement. Recent surveys show part of the easement route lies on parcels that have no easement in the deed. PacificCorp does not have rights to the full route and must pursue more land use rights potentially through the use of eminent domain in order to close easement gaps in the route around Camas and for substation placement. PacificCorp should be required to investigate alternative routes. They currently have no plans to do so. This needs to be regulated. There are wider, established routes with transmission lines already in place along the I-5 corridor. There is also a route through the Gifford Pinchot Forest just to the east that would not plow through neighborhoods and environmentally sensitive areas which BPA found to be the preferred route for a similar transmission line in 2009. The easement was obtained in the 1950's when the route was drastically less populated. The draft states "A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF" (pg 509) and yet the route runs over homes as close as 10 feet. Environmental Research Vol 178, Nov 2019 shows exposure to magnetic fields increases risk of leukemia, breast cancer, and brain cancer. Lou Gehrig's Disease aka amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) is also linked to EMF exposure. Additionally, to control vegetation along lines, PacificCorp uses numerous herbicides for line maintenance. Many people along the easement use wells for their drinking water and/or have streams on their property. Monoclonal gammopathy of unspecified origin (MGUS) is a presumed condition for ALL veterans exposed to toxic chemicals, a diagnosis with a statistically significant increased risk of the condition leading to Multiple Myeloma with continued herbicide exposure, specifically those used by PacificCorp. These are all serious public health issues that need to be addressed. The facts clearly show that the easement PacificCorp is attempting to use is outdated, inaccurate, undersized, and poses significant public health and safety concerns which render this project unachievable. While there is no direct link to cancer to the general population, there is a strong correlation to several herbicides used by Pacific Corp to people who have increased risk of cancer. There is a statistically significant increase of cancer in people diagnosed with MGUS (monoclonal gammopathy of unspecified origin) and exposure to herbicides. ALL Vietnam Vets who have been diagnosed with MGUS have an almost 50% chance of the condition leading to Multiple Myeloma if they continue to be exposed to herbicides. Many people along the easement use wells and/or have streams on their property. Pacific Corp utilizes a variety of herbicides for vegetation control, including products containing active ingredients like glyphosate, 2,4-D, fluroxypyr, and triclopyr. They also employ methods like hack and squirt or stem injection with herbicides like imazapyr, glyphosate, triclopyr salts, or picloram. For spring wheat in the Pacific Northwest, they might use Spartan Charge, Aim EC, Affinity Broadspec, Ally Extra, or Express herbicides. "Nine studies testing glyphosate as a single agent for carcinogenicity in either mice (2 studies) or rats (7 studies) via chronic dietary or drinking water administration (Additional file 2: Table S1) - Both mouse studies showed a positive trend toward increased incidence of some rare cancers (kidney tumor [17,18,19] or hemangiosarcoma studies suggested that glyphosate exposure is positively associated with multiple myeloma (MM) A hallmark of MM is that virtually all MM cases are preceded by monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS)"

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered

**Respondent No:** 18**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 20, 2025 19:45:57 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 20, 2025 19:45:57 pm**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Carron Harris

Q2. Email

chefcar64@gmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

PacifiCorp's proposed 230kV transmission line from Swift Dam to Troutdale OR is dangerous and unjustified. The EFSEC cannot disregard the fire danger, health risks, and the lack of adherence to important safety guidelines that this line poses. Firstly, it is vital to note that the easement is inaccurate. In some areas, due to discrepancies in survey data, it cannot be accurately ascertained exactly where the easement lies. Errors in the placement of the easement on some parcels renders the already too narrow path even narrower, requiring PacifiCorp to encroach on land outside the easement. Recent surveys show part of the easement route lies on parcels that have no easement in the deed. PacifiCorp does not have rights to the full route and must pursue more land use rights potentially through the use of eminent domain in order to close easement gaps in the route around Camas and for substation placement. PacifiCorp should be required to investigate alternative routes. They currently have no plans to do so. This needs to be regulated. There are wider, established routes with transmission lines already in place along the I-5 corridor. There is also a route through the Gifford Pinchot Forest just to the east that would not plow through neighborhoods and environmentally sensitive areas which BPA found to be the preferred route for a similar transmission line in 2009. The easement was obtained in the 1950's when the route was drastically less populated. The draft states "A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF" (pg 509) and yet the route runs over homes as close as 10 feet. Environmental Research Vol 178, Nov 2019 shows exposure to magnetic fields increases risk of leukemia, breast cancer, and brain cancer. Lou Gehrig's Disease aka amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) is also linked to EMF exposure. Additionally, to control vegetation along lines, PacifiCorp uses numerous herbicides for line maintenance. Many people along the easement use wells for their drinking water and/or have streams on their property. The facts clearly show that the easement PacifiCorp is attempting to use is outdated, inaccurate, undersized, and poses significant public health and safety concerns which render this project unachievable. While there is no direct link to cancer to the general population, there is a strong correlation to several herbicides used by Pacific Corp to people who have increased risk of cancer. There is a statistically significant increase of cancer in people diagnosed with MGUS (monoclonal gammopathy of unspecified origin) and exposure to herbicides. ALL Vietnam Vets who have been diagnosed with MGUS have an almost 50% chance of the condition leading to Multiple Myeloma if they continue to be exposed to herbicides. Many people along the easement use wells and/or have streams on their property. Pacific Corp utilizes a variety of herbicides for vegetation control, including products containing active ingredients like glyphosate, 2,4-D, fluroxypyr, and triclopyr. They also employ methods like hack and squirt or stem injection with herbicides like imazapyr, glyphosate, triclopyr salts, or picloram. For spring wheat in the Pacific Northwest, they might use Spartan Charge, Aim EC, Affinity Broadspec, Ally Extra, or Express herbicides. "Nine studies testing glyphosate as a single agent for carcinogenicity in either mice (2 studies) or rats (7 studies) via chronic dietary or drinking water administration (Additional file 2: Table S1) - Both mouse studies showed a positive trend toward increased incidence of some rare cancers (kidney tumor [17,18,19] or hemangiosarcoma studies suggested that glyphosate exposure is positively associated with multiple myeloma (MM) A hallmark of MM is that virtually all MM cases are preceded by monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS)"

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered

**Respondent No:** 19**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 20, 2025 19:46:48 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 20, 2025 19:46:48 pm**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Debbie Gann

Q2. Email

Msgannwork@aol.com

Q3. Share any comment

PacifiCorp's proposed 230kV transmission line from Swift Dam to Troutdale OR is dangerous and unjustified. The EFSEC cannot disregard the fire danger, health risks, and the lack of adherence to important safety guidelines that this line poses. Firstly, it is vital to note that the easement is inaccurate. In some areas, due to discrepancies in survey data, it cannot be accurately ascertained exactly where the easement lies. Errors in the placement of the easement on some parcels renders the already too narrow path even narrower, requiring PacifiCorp to encroach on land outside the easement. Recent surveys show part of the easement route lies on parcels that have no easement in the deed. PacifiCorp does not have rights to the full route and must pursue more land use rights potentially through the use of eminent domain in order to close easement gaps in the route around Camas and for substation placement. PacifiCorp should be required to investigate alternative routes. They currently have no plans to do so. This needs to be regulated. There are wider, established routes with transmission lines already in place along the I-5 corridor. There is also a route through the Gifford Pinchot Forest just to the east that would not plow through neighborhoods and environmentally sensitive areas which BPA found to be the preferred route for a similar transmission line in 2009. The easement was obtained in the 1950's when the route was drastically less populated. The draft states "A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF" (pg 509) and yet the route runs over homes as close as 10 feet. Environmental Research Vol 178, Nov 2019 shows exposure to magnetic fields increases risk of leukemia, breast cancer, and brain cancer. Lou Gehrig's Disease aka amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) is also linked to EMF exposure. Additionally, to control vegetation along lines, PacifiCorp uses numerous herbicides for line maintenance. Many people along the easement use wells for their drinking water and/or have streams on their property. Monoclonal gammopathy of unspecified origin (MGUS) is a presumed condition for ALL veterans exposed to toxic chemicals, a diagnosis with a statistically significant increased risk of the condition leading to Multiple Myeloma with continued herbicide exposure, specifically those used by PacifiCorp. These are all serious public health issues that need to be addressed. The facts clearly show that the easement PacifiCorp is attempting to use is outdated, inaccurate, undersized, and poses significant public health and safety concerns which render this project unachievable. While there is no direct link to cancer to the general population, there is a strong correlation to several herbicides used by Pacific Corp to people who have increased risk of cancer. There is a statistically significant increase of cancer in people diagnosed with MGUS (monoclonal gammopathy of unspecified origin) and exposure to herbicides. ALL Vietnam Vets who have been diagnosed with MGUS have an almost 50% chance of the condition leading to Multiple Myeloma if they continue to be exposed to herbicides. Many people along the easement use wells and/or have streams on their property. Pacific Corp utilizes a variety of herbicides for vegetation control, including products containing active ingredients like glyphosate, 2,4-D, fluroxypyr, and triclopyr. They also employ methods like hack and squirt or stem injection with herbicides like imazapyr, glyphosate, triclopyr salts, or picloram. For spring wheat in the Pacific Northwest, they might use Spartan Charge, Aim EC, Affinity Broadspec, Ally Extra, or Express herbicides. "Nine studies testing glyphosate as a single agent for carcinogenicity in either mice (2 studies) or rats (7 studies) via chronic dietary or drinking water administration (Additional file 2: Table S1) - Both mouse studies showed a positive trend toward increased incidence of some rare cancers (kidney tumor [17,18,19] or hemangiosarcoma studies suggested that glyphosate exposure is positively associated with multiple myeloma (MM) A hallmark of MM is that virtually all MM cases are preceded by monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?**

No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?**

not answered

**Respondent No:** 20**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 21, 2025 07:09:29 am**Last Seen:** Apr 21, 2025 07:09:29 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Rhae Books

Q2. Email

Rhae99books@gmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

PacifiCorp's proposed 230kV transmission line from Swift Dam to Troutdale OR is dangerous and unjustified. The EFSEC cannot disregard the fire danger, health risks, and the lack of adherence to important safety guidelines that this line poses. Firstly, it is vital to note that the easement is inaccurate. In some areas, due to discrepancies in survey data, it cannot be accurately ascertained exactly where the easement lies. Errors in the placement of the easement on some parcels renders the already too narrow path even narrower, requiring PacifiCorp to encroach on land outside the easement. Recent surveys show part of the easement route lies on parcels that have no easement in the deed. PacifiCorp does not have rights to the full route and must pursue more land use rights potentially through the use of eminent domain in order to close easement gaps in the route around Camas and for substation placement. PacifiCorp should be required to investigate alternative routes. They currently have no plans to do so. This needs to be regulated. There are wider, established routes with transmission lines already in place along the I-5 corridor. There is also a route through the Gifford Pinchot Forest just to the east that would not plow through neighborhoods and environmentally sensitive areas which BPA found to be the preferred route for a similar transmission line in 2009. The easement was obtained in the 1950's when the route was drastically less populated. The draft states "A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF" (pg 509) and yet the route runs over homes as close as 10 feet. Environmental Research Vol 178, Nov 2019 shows exposure to magnetic fields increases risk of leukemia, breast cancer, and brain cancer. Lou Gehrig's Disease aka amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) is also linked to EMF exposure. Additionally, to control vegetation along lines, PacifiCorp uses numerous herbicides for line maintenance. Many people along the easement use wells for their drinking water and/or have streams on their property. Monoclonal gammopathy of unspecified origin (MGUS) is a presumed condition for ALL veterans exposed to toxic chemicals, a diagnosis with a statistically significant increased risk of the condition leading to Multiple Myeloma with continued herbicide exposure, specifically those used by PacifiCorp. These are all serious public health issues that need to be addressed. The facts clearly show that the easement PacifiCorp is attempting to use is outdated, inaccurate, undersized, and poses significant public health and safety concerns which render this project unachievable. While there is no direct link to cancer to the general population, there is a strong correlation to several herbicides used by Pacific Corp to people who have increased risk of cancer. There is a statistically significant increase of cancer in people diagnosed with MGUS (monoclonal gammopathy of unspecified origin) and exposure to herbicides. ALL Vietnam Vets who have been diagnosed with MGUS have an almost 50% chance of the condition leading to Multiple Myeloma if they continue to be exposed to herbicides. Many people along the easement use wells and/or have streams on their property. Pacific Corp utilizes a variety of herbicides for vegetation control, including products containing active ingredients like glyphosate, 2,4-D, fluroxypyr, and triclopyr. They also employ methods like hack and squirt or stem injection with herbicides like imazapyr, glyphosate, triclopyr salts, or picloram. For spring wheat in the Pacific Northwest, they might use Spartan Charge, Aim EC, Affinity Broadspec, Ally Extra, or Express herbicides. "Nine studies testing glyphosate as a single agent for carcinogenicity in either mice (2 studies) or rats (7 studies) via chronic dietary or drinking water administration (Additional file 2: Table S1) - Both mouse studies showed a positive trend toward increased incidence of some rare cancers (kidney tumor [17,18,19] or hemangiosarcoma studies suggested that glyphosate exposure is positively associated with multiple myeloma (MM) A hallmark of MM is that virtually all MM cases are preceded by monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS)"

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered

**Respondent No:** 21**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 21, 2025 07:26:19 am**Last Seen:** Apr 21, 2025 07:26:19 am**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. **Name** Jason Ding

Q2. **Email** jding183@hotmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

Suggest rerouting powerlines running from Merwin Dam to Troutdale to available less populated areas to the east. DNR land with zero population is readily available very near the proposed route and contains no population whatsoever from the east fork of the Lewis river all the way south to the Columbia river nearly. This is also a hugely impactful Project for Washingtonians with no benefit to them as the apparent destination for power would be Troutdale rather than locally anyway. Thank you!

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)** not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?** not answered

**Respondent No:** 22**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 21, 2025 08:20:01 am**Last Seen:** Apr 21, 2025 08:20:01 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Deanna Koehler

Q2. Email

Deanna.Koehler@gmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

Public Comment Opposing PacifiCorp's Proposed 230kV Transmission Line As a concerned resident, I strongly oppose PacifiCorp's proposed 230kV high-voltage transmission line project. This project poses a significant threat to the environmental, public health, and economic well-being of the communities in its path for several reasons: 1. Environmental Impact: The project would cut through forested areas, wetlands, and wildlife corridors that are essential to local ecosystems. Construction and ongoing maintenance will disrupt these natural environments and may have irreversible consequences for wildlife and biodiversity. 2. Health and Safety Concerns: Proximity to high-voltage power lines raises serious concerns about long-term exposure to electromagnetic fields (EMFs), particularly in residential neighborhoods and near schools. While the science continues to develop, many families are justifiably concerned about the risks. 3. Property Value and Community Disruption: Large-scale transmission infrastructure would significantly impact property values, scenic views, and the rural and suburban character of our communities. Residents who chose these areas for their tranquility and beauty would be unfairly burdened. 4. Lack of Transparency and Public Engagement: Many affected residents were not made aware of this project early enough to provide meaningful input. Projects of this magnitude require open communication, thorough environmental assessments, and genuine community involvement from the outset. 5. Better Alternatives Exist: There are less invasive ways to improve grid reliability and energy distribution—such as using existing corridors, undergrounding lines in sensitive areas, or investing in distributed renewable energy sources that don't come with the same environmental and social costs. I urge regulators and decision-makers to reject this proposal and explore solutions that do not compromise the health, safety, and values of our communities. Our voices matter, and this project does not reflect what is best for the people who live here.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered

**Respondent No:** 23**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 21, 2025 08:30:13 am**Last Seen:** Apr 21, 2025 08:30:13 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Dixie Berg

Q2. Email

fantasyacres80@gmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

We've been through this same exact problem before and it was decided that going through the alternate route through the forest was by far more economical and practical. Less obtrusive to the those living in the path of the old easements. Those easements were done so long ago that the existing population makes it obvious that the route PacifiCorp has chose is so wrong on so many levels!!!! Use common sense and move the path the less populated areas.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered

**Respondent No:** 24**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 21, 2025 08:58:44 am**Last Seen:** Apr 21, 2025 08:58:44 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Laurie Books

Q2. Email

Laurielava@gmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

We live across the street from the proposed power line, where there are current Clark County electrical lines. We went to a meeting with the BPA spokesperson. He sounded like he hadn't even driven the route where they were proposing the line or found an alternative. They want to eminent domain and remove our trees, buy out homes, and move structures in their way. It is unjust. We heard Camas City and an ordinance about major powerlines going through their town, and now Clark County must also do the same.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered



Respondent No: 25

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 21, 2025 09:31:44 am

Last Seen: Apr 21, 2025 09:31:44 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Alan Borem
Q2. Email	alanborem@outlook.com
Q3. Share any comment	<p>The PacifiCorp Powerline that may be going in at Hockenson area may cause issues for me and those living in my neighborhood. The powerlines may be in direct line of site for cell, wifi and internet. We already have limited and poor service in our area and if the powerlines go in it will cause loss of signals. What will PacificCorp do to mitigate this issue?</p>
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 26**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 21, 2025 09:49:47 am**Last Seen:** Apr 21, 2025 09:49:47 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Sue Kaushagen

Q2. Email

skaushagen@msn.com

Q3. Share any comment

My main concern (and there are many) is the safety of our families along this power line system. The EMF's DO affect the health of people and animals. Studies showing this are available. With large families with many children that call our countryside home why risk this terrible possibility when an alternate route with less impact is available. We live in a VERY high wind (east wind) area where these wind events last for days and days. The gusts are easily 60 mph and higher. This could contribute to many dangerous situations ending with wildfires and loss of life for people as well as livestock, sensitive wildlife and dwellings costing millions of dollars, heartbreak and despair. Send Oregon the power (generating from OUR watershed) through the Gifford Pinchot National Forestland. This is a direct route impacting only a small fraction of population. The amounts of herbicides used to "sterilize" the areas under and around the powerline grid will impact the safety of people and animals and these herbicides are known to cause cancer. There will be drift occurring when spraying is done in this magnitude, damaging sensitive flora and fauna; as well as farmland (to feed our livestock) and family gardens that are needed to sustain our food tables for the health of all that have them. Please stop this outdated madness from the devastating decision of bullying the citizens of Clark County into the dangers of health, value of our land and chaos that will be reaped upon us by this horrible choice of this route from this huge corporation when it is completely unnecessary. There is NO upside, benefit to the thousands of people that will be impacted by this callous act. Sincerely, S.K. Kaushagen

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered

**Respondent No:** 27**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 21, 2025 10:41:10 am**Last Seen:** Apr 21, 2025 10:41:10 am**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. **Name** Robert Johnson

Q2. **Email** rrojohnso@gmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

To Whom It May Concern, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed installation of high-power electrical transmission lines over our residential community. As a resident of Hockinson and a direct neighbor to this project, I am deeply concerned about the serious and long-term implications this project poses to our health, safety, property values, and overall quality of life. First and foremost, there are significant health concerns associated with prolonged exposure to electromagnetic fields (EMFs) emitted by high-voltage power lines. Although research on the long-term effects is ongoing, studies have raised serious questions about potential links to various health conditions, especially in children and vulnerable populations. We have children as young as 6 years old, and vulnerable elderly parents living on our property under medical hardship. It is both unwise and unjust to move forward with a project that could pose such risks directly over homes, near schools, and public spaces. In addition, the visual and environmental impact of these power lines will be substantial. Large towers and high-voltage cables would drastically alter the character of our community, reducing the aesthetic appeal and peaceful atmosphere that residents value. This change could also lead to a decrease in property values, placing an unfair economic burden on homeowners who had no say in this decision to build corporate wealth. There are also safety concerns. In the event of severe weather, natural disasters, or technical failures, overhead high-power transmission lines pose a heightened risk of fires, outages, and even electrocution. Routing them through or above populated areas is not a responsible or acceptable risk. I respectfully urge the decision-makers involved in this project to consider alternative routes or methods— such as underground cabling — that would mitigate the adverse effects on our community. We are not opposed to progress or infrastructure improvements, but such development must not come at the expense of public health, safety, and well-being. I hope this testimony will be fully considered and that community voices will guide the final decision. Sincerely, Robert Johnson 21311 NE 189th St Brush Prairie, WA 98606 rrojohnso@gmail.com 4/21/2025

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)** not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)** https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/c28f36870418ed779d14e5d53279b53c90732bdc/original/1745257264/95fd831dcd88c4239962a57bcd15868f_Johnson_Prop.png?1745257264

Q6. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?** not answered

**Respondent No:** 28**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 21, 2025 11:16:13 am**Last Seen:** Apr 21, 2025 11:16:13 am**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. **Name** Valerie Mouser

Q2. **Email** vmouser@comcast.net

Q3. **Share any comment**

I was at a public forum meeting on Saturday where a representative from PacificCorp was there and said the proposed powerline project was for the good of the people, and when we asked him what people he said, and I quote "the customers of PacificCorp". Then we asked him if those customers were in Washington and in the impacted area and he said no we have no customers in Washington and that the customers he was referring to were in Oregon only. This project will only benefit the citizens of a completely different state!!! I say na!

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)** not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?** not answered

**Respondent No:** 29**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 21, 2025 11:55:33 am**Last Seen:** Apr 21, 2025 11:55:33 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Megan Miller

Q2. Email

meganmiller@pomeroyfarm.org

Q3. Share any comment

PacifiCorp's proposed 230kV transmission line from Swift Dam to Troutdale OR is dangerous and unjustified. The EFSEC cannot disregard the fire danger, health risks, and the lack of adherence to important safety guidelines that this line poses. Firstly, it is vital to note that the easement is inaccurate. In some areas, due to discrepancies in survey data, it cannot be accurately ascertained exactly where the easement lies. Errors in the placement of the easement on some parcels renders the already too narrow path even narrower, requiring PacifiCorp to encroach on land outside the easement. Recent surveys show part of the easement route lies on parcels that have no easement in the deed. PacifiCorp does not have rights to the full route and must pursue more land use rights potentially through the use of eminent domain in order to close easement gaps in the route around Camas and for substation placement. PacifiCorp should be required to investigate alternative routes. They currently have no plans to do so. This needs to be regulated. There are wider, established routes with transmission lines already in place along the I-5 corridor. There is also a route through the Gifford Pinchot Forest just to the east that would not plow through neighborhoods and environmentally sensitive areas which BPA found to be the preferred route for a similar transmission line in 2009. The easement was obtained in the 1950's when the route was drastically less populated. The draft states "A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF" (pg 509) and yet the route runs over homes as close as 10 feet. Environmental Research Vol 178, Nov 2019 shows exposure to magnetic fields increases risk of leukemia, breast cancer, and brain cancer. Lou Gehrig's Disease aka amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) is also linked to EMF exposure. Additionally, to control vegetation along lines, PacifiCorp uses numerous herbicides for line maintenance. Many people along the easement use wells for their drinking water and/or have streams on their property. Monoclonal gammopathy of unspecified origin (MGUS) is a presumed condition for ALL veterans exposed to toxic chemicals, a diagnosis with a statistically significant increased risk of the condition leading to Multiple Myeloma with continued herbicide exposure, specifically those used by PacifiCorp. These are all serious public health issues that need to be addressed. The facts clearly show that the easement PacifiCorp is attempting to use is outdated, inaccurate, undersized, and poses significant public health and safety concerns which render this project unachievable.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered



Respondent No: 30

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 21, 2025 12:29:15 pm

Last Seen: Apr 21, 2025 12:29:15 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Chad Donaldson
Q2. Email	Treadstone3606873910@gmail.com
Q3. Share any comment	<p>My family and I live around 1400ft west of your easement high powered line. Please do not build your high voltage line here. We do not want our property values to go down, cancer or our homes to burn in a wildfire.</p>
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 31**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 21, 2025 12:39:46 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 21, 2025 12:39:46 pm**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Jordan Mcknight

Q2. Email

Jordan.mcknight02@gmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

PacifiCorp's proposed 230kV transmission line from Swift Dam to Troutdale OR is dangerous and unjustified. The EFSEC cannot disregard the fire danger, health risks, and the lack of adherence to important safety guidelines that this line poses. Firstly, it is vital to note that the easement is inaccurate. In some areas, due to discrepancies in survey data, it cannot be accurately ascertained exactly where the easement lies. Errors in the placement of the easement on some parcels renders the already too narrow path even narrower, requiring PacifiCorp to encroach on land outside the easement. Recent surveys show part of the easement route lies on parcels that have no easement in the deed. PacifiCorp does not have rights to the full route and must pursue more land use rights potentially through the use of eminent domain in order to close easement gaps in the route around Camas and for substation placement. PacifiCorp should be required to investigate alternative routes. They currently have no plans to do so. This needs to be regulated. There are wider, established routes with transmission lines already in place along the I-5 corridor. There is also a route through the Gifford Pinchot Forest just to the east that would not plow through neighborhoods and environmentally sensitive areas which BPA found to be the preferred route for a similar transmission line in 2009. The easement was obtained in the 1950's when the route was drastically less populated. The draft states "A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF" (pg 509) and yet the route runs over homes as close as 10 feet. Environmental Research Vol 178, Nov 2019 shows exposure to magnetic fields increases risk of leukemia, breast cancer, and brain cancer. Lou Gehrig's Disease aka amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) is also linked to EMF exposure. Additionally, to control vegetation along lines, PacifiCorp uses numerous herbicides for line maintenance. Many people along the easement use wells for their drinking water and/or have streams on their property. Monoclonal gammopathy of unspecified origin (MGUS) is a presumed condition for ALL veterans exposed to toxic chemicals, a diagnosis with a statistically significant increased risk of the condition leading to Multiple Myeloma with continued herbicide exposure, specifically those used by PacifiCorp. These are all serious public health issues that need to be addressed. There are many other problems with this route including but not limited to: corona-generated noise when the line is operating; disrupting environmentally sensitive areas including wetlands and severe soil erosion areas; clearing of native plant habitats (adverse effects to special-status plant habitat and species); permanent loss of general wildlife habitat; disruption to fish habitat (runoff and sediment delivery to streams and decreased riparian shade along streams); decreased property values, leading to loss of property tax revenue; adverse cultural resource disruptions/intrusion on historic viewsheds; severely impacted visual resources; additionally, increased traffic and risks of electrocution, fire, toxic material spills, and tree felling during construction. The facts clearly show that the easement PacifiCorp is attempting to use is outdated, inaccurate, undersized, and poses significant public health and safety concerns which render this project unachievable.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered

**Respondent No:** 32**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 21, 2025 12:40:26 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 21, 2025 12:40:26 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. **Name** Karen Martsolf

Q2. **Email** Karenmartsolf@gmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

PacifiCorp's proposed 230kV transmission line from Swift Dam to Troutdale OR is dangerous and unjustified. The EFSEC cannot disregard the fire danger, health risks, and the lack of adherence to important safety guidelines that this line poses. Firstly, it is vital to note that the easement is inaccurate. In some areas, due to discrepancies in survey data, it cannot be accurately ascertained exactly where the easement lies. Errors in the placement of the easement on some parcels renders the already too narrow path even narrower, requiring PacifiCorp to encroach on land outside the easement. Recent surveys show part of the easement route lies on parcels that have no easement in the deed. PacifiCorp does not have rights to the full route and must pursue more land use rights potentially through the use of eminent domain in order to close easement gaps in the route around Camas and for substation placement. PacifiCorp should be required to investigate alternative routes. They currently have no plans to do so. This needs to be regulated. There are wider, established routes with transmission lines already in place along the I-5 corridor. There is also a route through the Gifford Pinchot Forest just to the east that would not plow through neighborhoods and environmentally sensitive areas which BPA found to be the preferred route for a similar transmission line in 2009. The easement was obtained in the 1950's when the route was drastically less populated. The draft states "A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF" (pg 509) and yet the route runs over homes as close as 10 feet. Environmental Research Vol 178, Nov 2019 shows exposure to magnetic fields increases risk of leukemia, breast cancer, and brain cancer. Lou Gehrig's Disease aka amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) is also linked to EMF exposure. Additionally, to control vegetation along lines, PacifiCorp uses numerous herbicides for line maintenance. Many people along the easement use wells for their drinking water and/or have streams on their property. Monoclonal gammopathy of unspecified origin (MGUS) is a presumed condition for ALL veterans exposed to toxic chemicals, a diagnosis with a statistically significant increased risk of the condition leading to Multiple Myeloma with continued herbicide exposure, specifically those used by PacifiCorp. These are all serious public health issues that need to be addressed. There are many other problems with this route including but not limited to: corona-generated noise when the line is operating; disrupting environmentally sensitive areas including wetlands and severe soil erosion areas; clearing of native plant habitats (adverse effects to special-status plant habitat and species); permanent loss of general wildlife habitat; disruption to fish habitat (runoff and sediment delivery to streams and decreased riparian shade along streams); decreased property values, leading to loss of property tax revenue; adverse cultural resource disruptions/intrusion on historic viewsheds; severely impacted visual resources; additionally, increased traffic and risks of electrocution, fire, toxic material spills, and tree felling during construction. The facts clearly show that the easement PacifiCorp is attempting to use is outdated, inaccurate, undersized, and poses significant public health and safety concerns which render this project unachievable.

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)** not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?** not answered



Respondent No: 33

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 21, 2025 16:24:04 pm

Last Seen: Apr 21, 2025 16:24:04 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Laura Hiserote
Q2. Email	lhiserote@gmail.com
Q3. Share any comment	not answered
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/73d575159bfa953e6ee8314624e718242360c5b0/original/1745277824/c72aac6c8cc904c1ffeb302059f5021d_Laura%20Hiserote%20Objections%20to%20PacifiCorp%20Powerline.pdf?1745277824
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 34**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 21, 2025 17:34:03 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 21, 2025 17:34:03 pm**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Juliana Pearson

Q2. Email

Pearson_juliana@yahoo.com

Q3. Share any comment

PacifiCorp's proposed 230kV transmission line from Swift Dam to Troutdale OR is dangerous and unjustified. The EFSEC cannot disregard the fire danger, health risks, and the lack of adherence to important safety guidelines that this line poses. Firstly, it is vital to note that the easement is inaccurate. In some areas, due to discrepancies in survey data, it cannot be accurately ascertained exactly where the easement lies. Errors in the placement of the easement on some parcels renders the already too narrow path even narrower, requiring PacifiCorp to encroach on land outside the easement. Recent surveys show part of the easement route lies on parcels that have no easement in the deed. PacifiCorp does not have rights to the full route and must pursue more land use rights potentially through the use of eminent domain in order to close easement gaps in the route around Camas and for substation placement. PacifiCorp should be required to investigate alternative routes. They currently have no plans to do so. This needs to be regulated. There are wider, established routes with transmission lines already in place along the I-5 corridor. There is also a route through the Gifford Pinchot Forest just to the east that would not plow through neighborhoods and environmentally sensitive areas which BPA found to be the preferred route for a similar transmission line in 2009. The easement was obtained in the 1950's when the route was drastically less populated. The draft states "A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF" (pg 509) and yet the route runs over homes as close as 10 feet. Environmental Research Vol 178, Nov 2019 shows exposure to magnetic fields increases risk of leukemia, breast cancer, and brain cancer. Lou Gehrig's Disease aka amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) is also linked to EMF exposure. Additionally, to control vegetation along lines, PacifiCorp uses numerous herbicides for line maintenance. Many people along the easement use wells for their drinking water and/or have streams on their property. Monoclonal gammopathy of unspecified origin (MGUS) is a presumed condition for ALL veterans exposed to toxic chemicals, a diagnosis with a statistically significant increased risk of the condition leading to Multiple Myeloma with continued herbicide exposure, specifically those used by PacifiCorp. These are all serious public health issues that need to be addressed. There are many other problems with this route including but not limited to: corona-generated noise when the line is operating; disrupting environmentally sensitive areas including wetlands and severe soil erosion areas; clearing of native plant habitats (adverse effects to special-status plant habitat and species); permanent loss of general wildlife habitat; disruption to fish habitat (runoff and sediment delivery to streams and decreased riparian shade along streams); decreased property values, leading to loss of property tax revenue; adverse cultural resource disruptions/intrusion on historic viewsheds; severely impacted visual resources; additionally, increased traffic and risks of electrocution, fire, toxic material spills, and tree felling during construction. The facts clearly show that the easement PacifiCorp is attempting to use is outdated, inaccurate, undersized, and poses significant public health and safety concerns which render this project unachievable.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered

**Respondent No:** 35**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 22, 2025 04:47:42 am**Last Seen:** Apr 22, 2025 04:47:42 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Elizabeth Merrill

Q2. Email

elizabethmmerrill@msn.com

Q3. Share any comment

PacifiCorp's proposed 230kV transmission line from Swift Dam to Troutdale OR is dangerous and unjustified. The EFSEC cannot disregard the fire danger, health risks, and the lack of adherence to important safety guidelines that this line poses. Firstly, it is vital to note that the easement is inaccurate. In some areas, due to discrepancies in survey data, it cannot be accurately ascertained exactly where the easement lies. Errors in the placement of the easement on some parcels renders the already too narrow path even narrower, requiring PacifiCorp to encroach on land outside the easement. Recent surveys show part of the easement route lies on parcels that have no easement in the deed. PacifiCorp does not have rights to the full route and must pursue more land use rights potentially through the use of eminent domain in order to close easement gaps in the route around Camas and for substation placement. PacifiCorp should be required to investigate alternative routes. They currently have no plans to do so. This needs to be regulated. There are wider, established routes with transmission lines already in place along the I-5 corridor. There is also a route through the Gifford Pinchot Forest just to the east that would not plow through neighborhoods and environmentally sensitive areas which BPA found to be the preferred route for a similar transmission line in 2009. The easement was obtained in the 1950's when the route was drastically less populated. The draft states "A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF" (pg 509) and yet the route runs over homes as close as 10 feet. Environmental Research Vol 178, Nov 2019 shows exposure to magnetic fields increases risk of leukemia, breast cancer, and brain cancer. Lou Gehrig's Disease aka amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) is also linked to EMF exposure. Additionally, to control vegetation along lines, PacifiCorp uses numerous herbicides for line maintenance. Many people along the easement use wells for their drinking water and/or have streams on their property. Monoclonal gammopathy of unspecified origin (MGUS) is a presumed condition for ALL veterans exposed to toxic chemicals, a diagnosis with a statistically significant increased risk of the condition leading to Multiple Myeloma with continued herbicide exposure, specifically those used by PacifiCorp. These are all serious public health issues that need to be addressed. There are many other problems with this route including but not limited to: corona-generated noise when the line is operating; disrupting environmentally sensitive areas including wetlands and severe soil erosion areas; clearing of native plant habitats (adverse effects to special-status plant habitat and species); permanent loss of general wildlife habitat; disruption to fish habitat (runoff and sediment delivery to streams and decreased riparian shade along streams); decreased property values, leading to loss of property tax revenue; adverse cultural resource disruptions/intrusion on historic viewsheds; severely impacted visual resources; additionally, increased traffic and risks of electrocution, fire, toxic material spills, and tree felling during construction. The facts clearly show that the easement PacifiCorp is attempting to use is outdated, inaccurate, undersized, and poses significant public health and safety concerns which render this project unachievable.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered



Respondent No: 36

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 22, 2025 07:37:31 am

Last Seen: Apr 22, 2025 07:37:31 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **Name** Christine and Roger Neill

Q2. **Email** gochristineneill@gmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

Please see our attached comments. Do not hesitate to contact me for clarification or more information.

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)** https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/175ea5a0e9727b7dabeb93e6941bcc96258555d8/original/1745332639/76871436166aac721fa9a05369fc0391_Comments%20for%20the%20Draft%20Transmission%20Programmatic%20EIS%20for%20the%20State%20of%20Washington%20Energy%20Facility%20Site%20Evaluation%20Council.docx.pdf?1745332639

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?** not answered



Respondent No: 37

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 22, 2025 08:21:10 am

Last Seen: Apr 22, 2025 08:21:10 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **Name** Judy Mason

Q2. **Email** Judymason139@gmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

Please do not take our land! It appears this would run right through the middle of 236th Ave. We strongly oppose this plan!

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)** https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/46d0c5e0f21f0eeffa3d04d2f8c2d6c78867e3bf/original/1745335257/c50843ba3591c5c12e51cf9d23bf2a7e_IMG_6058.jpeg?1745335257

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?** not answered



Respondent No: 38

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 22, 2025 09:15:31 am

Last Seen: Apr 22, 2025 09:15:31 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **Name**

James & DuJuann Donaldson

Q2. **Email**

dujuannm@gmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

My address is 20631 NE Risto Road BG WA We live 1400 feet to the west of this line & there are trees between us that will catch fire not to mention the cancer risk. It will be a big danger to us! Please stop this and let me know if there is another meeting in BG on this! DuJuann & Jim Donaldson

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)**

not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)**

not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?**

No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?**

not answered

**Respondent No:** 39**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 22, 2025 11:51:43 am**Last Seen:** Apr 22, 2025 11:51:43 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Saundra Lanz

Q2. Email

Sandilanz@hotmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

Please consider our comments below for the welfare, safety and health of our community and our state. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of transmission lines have significant impacts to our environment and human health. Issues to highlight: Easement widths are fire and weather event risks Toxic substances in maintaining lines Prolonged EMF exposure with homes near/under lines Surface and groundwater risks for the health for our children and community Allowing Right-of-Way (ROW) reductions with modified poles for entire routes that are inadequate or too narrow for requested powerlines, risks from tree fall-ins, gaps in contiguous lines, centerline skews and/or home protection from proximity risks is unjust and unethical to, by default, require eminent domain as the main mechanism to acquisition. Impacts to communities that include redundant transmission lines without alternate route analysis, puts our communities at higher risks Property devaluation and community livability We ask you to hold transmission routes for the public and ratepayers to a high standard of safety and ethics as you oversee new transmission projects. Our specific comments for the Draft PEIS: Pg. 76 Figure 2.1-2 Illustrates a 230kV Right-of-Way (ROW) within scope of 125-200' Clarify intended safe use of ROW standards. Define the width of easement as the minimum safety standard to 200' for 230kV+ lines. Recommend for optimal safety as 200'+ to reduce human, fire and weather condition interaction with lines. (100' to centerline). Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities... cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." On Pg 76 the draft states: "engineered... poles...can be used for...230kv facilities when the ROW is restricted." What is the safe width of a "reduced ROW" for a 230kV line? Clarify the application use of a "reduced ROW," for example: use in population density, fire break/tree fall-in potential zones, watershed, waterways, wetlands, sensitive populations (children, etc.), near schools, protected or old growth forests, home distances to lines etc. Clarify how much of a new transmission line can utilize the "reduced ROW?" An entire project, a portion or percentage? Clarify the term "restricted" in the use of a new transmission line construction? What connotes "restricted" as used in the excerpt above from page 76. Clarify if a "reduced ROW" can be utilized in a change of direction on a line run. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." WAC 197-11-030 Policy. (b) "Prepare environmental documents that are concise, clear and to the point, and are supported by evidence..." Pg 76 states: "... when ROW is restricted" We need clarification. When "reduced ROW" clause is instated, we cannot have eminent domain as the primary mechanism to take unaware and non-deeded landowners for an entire or part of a new transmission line project. Clarify when a "reduced ROW" is utilized, confirm that there was an ethical review with public input, of adjacent lands and property owners have been notified in the title deed that the property is at risk of eminent domain. If an entire or partial project is at risk for eminent domain, substantiate why the proposed utility project will need to use engineered poles to fit into a "restricted" zone. For example, if a project has been to be reviewed to include a request for engineered poles to fit into a restricted easement AND the easement has been found to include outdated and/or inadequate deed exhibits, undersized widths, inadequate for its intended use (e.g. an 80 year old easement), skewed or assumed center lines, missing and/or gaps in easements, and tree fall-in risk of adjacent non-deeded parcels, the project will be reviewed for validity. If any are found and the requesting utility company will instate the use of a "reduced ROW" and/or eminent domain to mitigate these inadequacies, the project will be given a determination of significance for adverse impacts and rendered inoperational for the transmission size requested. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 "(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:..." (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;" Pg 76 states "...choice of design... depends on factors such as... the surrounding environment." We need to clarify this definition of design choice. We are concerned about disregarding safety or not honoring our WA State deeds and

Clark County property lines a “design choice.” We must oversee wetlands, population density, health effects, fire safety, deeds and property lines, and homes under or within 100 feet of lines as a public health and a vulnerable population issue and not a design choice. Define, under what conditions, a utility company can propose design changes to the permitting agencies as a remedy of an inadequate easement. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:... (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;” Pg. 509 states “A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF’s” Protecting children and sensitive populations from the cumulative effects of Electromagnetic Field (EMF) exposure is very important to our communities. Define and clarify home proximity distances along a new proposed line before permits are issued to be a minimum of 100’ from an overhead line. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(2) ... scope... in proximity to existing, more suitable routes and effective use of existing routes. (4) In defining the scope of nonproject review of electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, the energy facility site evaluation council shall request input from agencies, federally recognized Indian tribes, industry, stakeholders, local governments, and the public to identify the geographic areas suitable for electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, based on the climatic and geophysical attributes conducive to or required for project development.” In conclusion, I invite EFSEC to continue its protection of public health, environmental and safety standards for our state. In addition, we feel it is paramount to protect our rights as landowners and the ethics of the appropriate use of and application of transmission projects to communities we live in. Keep Washington safe and livable for our future.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 40**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 22, 2025 11:56:21 am**Last Seen:** Apr 22, 2025 11:56:21 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Blaine Lanz

Q2. Email

Blaine@lanz welding. Com

Q3. Share any comment

Please consider our comments below for the welfare, safety and health of our community and our state. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of transmission lines have significant impacts to our environment and human health. Issues to highlight: Easement widths are fire and weather event risks Toxic substances in maintaining lines Prolonged EMF exposure with homes near/under lines Surface and groundwater risks for the health for our children and community Allowing Right-of-Way (ROW) reductions with modified poles for entire routes that are inadequate or too narrow for requested powerlines, risks from tree fall-ins, gaps in contiguous lines, centerline skews and/or home protection from proximity risks is unjust and unethical to, by default, require eminent domain as the main mechanism to acquisition. Impacts to communities that include redundant transmission lines without alternate route analysis, puts our communities at higher risks Property devaluation and community livability We ask you to hold transmission routes for the public and ratepayers to a high standard of safety and ethics as you oversee new transmission projects. Our specific comments for the Draft PEIS: Pg. 76 Figure 2.1-2 Illustrates a 230kV Right-of-Way (ROW) within scope of 125-200' Clarify intended safe use of ROW standards. Define the width of easement as the minimum safety standard to 200' for 230kV+ lines. Recommend for optimal safety as 200'+ to reduce human, fire and weather condition interaction with lines. (100' to centerline). Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities... cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." On Pg 76 the draft states: "engineered... poles...can be used for...230kv facilities when the ROW is restricted." What is the safe width of a "reduced ROW" for a 230kV line? Clarify the application use of a "reduced ROW," for example: use in population density, fire break/tree fall-in potential zones, watershed, waterways, wetlands, sensitive populations (children, etc.), near schools, protected or old growth forests, home distances to lines etc. Clarify how much of a new transmission line can utilize the "reduced ROW?" An entire project, a portion or percentage? Clarify the term "restricted" in the use of a new transmission line construction? What connotes "restricted" as used in the excerpt above from page 76. Clarify if a "reduced ROW" can be utilized in a change of direction on a line run. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." WAC 197-11-030 Policy. (b) "Prepare environmental documents that are concise, clear and to the point, and are supported by evidence..." Pg 76 states: "... when ROW is restricted" We need clarification. When "reduced ROW" clause is instated, we cannot have eminent domain as the primary mechanism to take unaware and non-deeded landowners for an entire or part of a new transmission line project. Clarify when a "reduced ROW" is utilized, confirm that there was an ethical review with public input, of adjacent lands and property owners have been notified in the title deed that the property is at risk of eminent domain. If an entire or partial project is at risk for eminent domain, substantiate why the proposed utility project will need to use engineered poles to fit into a "restricted" zone. For example, if a project has been to be reviewed to include a request for engineered poles to fit into a restricted easement AND the easement has been found to include outdated and/or inadequate deed exhibits, undersized widths, inadequate for its intended use (e.g. an 80 year old easement), skewed or assumed center lines, missing and/or gaps in easements, and tree fall-in risk of adjacent non-deeded parcels, the project will be reviewed for validity. If any are found and the requesting utility company will instate the use of a "reduced ROW" and/or eminent domain to mitigate these inadequacies, the project will be given a determination of significance for adverse impacts and rendered inoperational for the transmission size requested. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 "(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:..." (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;" Pg 76 states "...choice of design... depends on factors such as... the surrounding environment." We need to clarify this definition of design choice. We are concerned about disregarding safety or not honoring our WA State deeds and

Clark County property lines a “design choice.” We must oversee wetlands, population density, health effects, fire safety, deeds and property lines, and homes under or within 100 feet of lines as a public health and a vulnerable population issue and not a design choice. Define, under what conditions, a utility company can propose design changes to the permitting agencies as a remedy of an inadequate easement. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:... (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;” Pg. 509 states “A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF’s” Protecting children and sensitive populations from the cumulative effects of Electromagnetic Field (EMF) exposure is very important to our communities. Define and clarify home proximity distances along a new proposed line before permits are issued to be a minimum of 100’ from an overhead line. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(2) ... scope... in proximity to existing, more suitable routes and effective use of existing routes. (4) In defining the scope of nonproject review of electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, the energy facility site evaluation council shall request input from agencies, federally recognized Indian tribes, industry, stakeholders, local governments, and the public to identify the geographic areas suitable for electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, based on the climatic and geophysical attributes conducive to or required for project development.” In conclusion, I invite EFSEC to continue its protection of public health, environmental and safety standards for our state. In addition, we feel it is paramount to protect our rights as landowners and the ethics of the appropriate use of and application of transmission projects to communities we live in. Keep Washington safe and livable for our future.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 41

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 22, 2025 11:58:11 am

Last Seen: Apr 22, 2025 11:58:11 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Marie Ogier
Q2. Email	mariepogier@gmail.com
Q3. Share any comment	not answered
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/06e56d8b8cfb7e22c1bd4a8d27d04701bad364dc/original/1745348274/34d7e89662dd7b37589b5ebcd1d349_Comments%20for%20the%20Transmission%20Programmatic%20EIS%20for%20the%20State%20of%20Washington%20Energy%20Facility%20Site.pdf?1745348274
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 42**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 22, 2025 12:17:07 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 22, 2025 12:17:07 pm**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Alicia Hamilton

Q2. Email

aliciahamilton131@hotmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

PacifiCorp's proposed 230kV transmission line from Swift Dam to Troutdale OR is dangerous and unjustified. The EFSEC cannot disregard the fire danger, health risks, and the lack of adherence to important safety guidelines that this line poses. Firstly, it is vital to note that the easement is inaccurate. In some areas, due to discrepancies in survey data, it cannot be accurately ascertained exactly where the easement lies. Errors in the placement of the easement on some parcels renders the already too narrow path even narrower, requiring PacifiCorp to encroach on land outside the easement. Recent surveys show part of the easement route lies on parcels that have no easement in the deed. PacifiCorp does not have rights to the full route and must pursue more land use rights potentially through the use of eminent domain in order to close easement gaps in the route around Camas and for substation placement. PacifiCorp should be required to investigate alternative routes. They currently have no plans to do so. This needs to be regulated. There are wider, established routes with transmission lines already in place along the I-5 corridor. There is also a route through the Gifford Pinchot Forest just to the east that would not plow through neighborhoods and environmentally sensitive areas which BPA found to be the preferred route for a similar transmission line in 2009. The easement was obtained in the 1950's when the route was drastically less populated. The draft states "A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF" (pg 509) and yet the route runs over homes as close as 10 feet. Environmental Research Vol 178, Nov 2019 shows exposure to magnetic fields increases risk of leukemia, breast cancer, and brain cancer. Lou Gehrig's Disease aka amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) is also linked to EMF exposure. Additionally, to control vegetation along lines, PacifiCorp uses numerous herbicides for line maintenance. Many people along the easement use wells for their drinking water and/or have streams on their property. Monoclonal gammopathy of unspecified origin (MGUS) is a presumed condition for ALL veterans exposed to toxic chemicals, a diagnosis with a statistically significant increased risk of the condition leading to Multiple Myeloma with continued herbicide exposure, specifically those used by PacifiCorp. These are all serious public health issues that need to be addressed. There are many other problems with this route including but not limited to: corona-generated noise when the line is operating; disrupting environmentally sensitive areas including wetlands and severe soil erosion areas; clearing of native plant habitats (adverse effects to special-status plant habitat and species); permanent loss of general wildlife habitat; disruption to fish habitat (runoff and sediment delivery to streams and decreased riparian shade along streams); decreased property values, leading to loss of property tax revenue; adverse cultural resource disruptions/intrusion on historic viewsheds; severely impacted visual resources; additionally, increased traffic and risks of electrocution, fire, toxic material spills, and tree felling during construction. The facts clearly show that the easement PacifiCorp is attempting to use is outdated, inaccurate, undersized, and poses significant public health and safety concerns which render this project unachievable.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered

**Respondent No:** 43**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 22, 2025 13:35:01 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 22, 2025 13:35:01 pm**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Robert Johnson

Q2. Email

rrojohnso@gmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

Please consider our comments below for the welfare, safety and health of our community and our state. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of transmission lines have significant impacts to our environment and human health. Issues to highlight: Easement widths are fire and weather event risks Toxic substances in maintaining lines Prolonged EMF exposure with homes near/under lines Surface and groundwater risks for the health for our children and community Allowing Right-of-Way (ROW) reductions with modified poles for entire routes that are inadequate or too narrow for requested powerlines, risks from tree fall-ins, gaps in contiguous lines, centerline skews and/or home protection from proximity risks is unjust and unethical to, by default, require eminent domain as the main mechanism to acquisition. Impacts to communities that include redundant transmission lines without alternate route analysis, puts our communities at higher risks Property devaluation and community livability We ask you to hold transmission routes for the public and ratepayers to a high standard of safety and ethics as you oversee new transmission projects. Our specific comments for the Draft PEIS: Pg. 76 Figure 2.1-2 Illustrates a 230kV Right-of-Way (ROW) within scope of 125-200' Clarify intended safe use of ROW standards. Define the width of easement as the minimum safety standard to 200' for 230kV+ lines. Recommend for optimal safety as 200'+ to reduce human, fire and weather condition interaction with lines. (100' to centerline). Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities... cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." On Pg 76 the draft states: "engineered... poles...can be used for...230kv facilities when the ROW is restricted." What is the safe width of a "reduced ROW" for a 230kV line? Clarify the application use of a "reduced ROW," for example: use in population density, fire break/tree fall-in potential zones, watershed, waterways, wetlands, sensitive populations (children, etc.), near schools, protected or old growth forests, home distances to lines etc. Clarify how much of a new transmission line can utilize the "reduced ROW?" An entire project, a portion or percentage? Clarify the term "restricted" in the use of a new transmission line construction? What connotes "restricted" as used in the excerpt above from page 76. Clarify if a "reduced ROW" can be utilized in a change of direction on a line run. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." WAC 197-11-030 Policy. (b) "Prepare environmental documents that are concise, clear and to the point, and are supported by evidence..." Pg 76 states: "... when ROW is restricted" We need clarification. When "reduced ROW" clause is instated, we cannot have eminent domain as the primary mechanism to take unaware and non-deeded landowners for an entire or part of a new transmission line project. Clarify when a "reduced ROW" is utilized, confirm that there was an ethical review with public input, of adjacent lands and property owners have been notified in the title deed that the property is at risk of eminent domain. If an entire or partial project is at risk for eminent domain, substantiate why the proposed utility project will need to use engineered poles to fit into a "restricted" zone. For example, if a project has been to be reviewed to include a request for engineered poles to fit into a restricted easement AND the easement has been found to include outdated and/or inadequate deed exhibits, undersized widths, inadequate for its intended use (e.g. an 80 year old easement), skewed or assumed center lines, missing and/or gaps in easements, and tree fall-in risk of adjacent non-deeded parcels, the project will be reviewed for validity. If any are found and the requesting utility company will instate the use of a "reduced ROW" and/or eminent domain to mitigate these inadequacies, the project will be given a determination of significance for adverse impacts and rendered inoperational for the transmission size requested. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 "(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:..." (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;" Pg 76 states "...choice of design... depends on factors such as... the surrounding environment." We need to clarify this definition of design choice. We are concerned about disregarding safety or not honoring our WA State deeds and

Clark County property lines a “design choice.” We must oversee wetlands, population density, health effects, fire safety, deeds and property lines, and homes under or within 100 feet of lines as a public health and a vulnerable population issue and not a design choice. Define, under what conditions, a utility company can propose design changes to the permitting agencies as a remedy of an inadequate easement. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:... (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;” Pg. 509 states “A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF’s” Protecting children and sensitive populations from the cumulative effects of Electromagnetic Field (EMF) exposure is very important to our communities. Define and clarify home proximity distances along a new proposed line before permits are issued to be a minimum of 100’ from an overhead line. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(2) ... scope... in proximity to existing, more suitable routes and effective use of existing routes. (4) In defining the scope of nonproject review of electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, the energy facility site evaluation council shall request input from agencies, federally recognized Indian tribes, industry, stakeholders, local governments, and the public to identify the geographic areas suitable for electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, based on the climatic and geophysical attributes conducive to or required for project development.” In conclusion, I invite EFSEC to continue its protection of public health, environmental and safety standards for our state. In addition, we feel it is paramount to protect our rights as landowners and the ethics of the appropriate use of and application of transmission projects to communities we live in. Keep Washington safe and livable for our future.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 44**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 22, 2025 14:26:15 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 22, 2025 14:26:15 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. **Name** John Gibson

Q2. **Email** jetdoc2@icloud.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

I would like to see emphasis put on the environmental risks of these projects. Such as use of herbicides, effect on bees and other wildlife, plus damage to streams and rivers. EMF health risks because of close proximity to power lines, European standards are a lot different to US standards. EU recognizes a link between EMF and cancer risks, where the US sees no risk. Safety issues with power lines in close proximity to buildings, fire risk from broken lines. Power utilities have been successfully litigated against for allowing forest fires to start from power lines, this is a serious problem. There needs to be more stringent requirements for easement size and risk to line damage in forested areas, due to wind blowing trees onto the lines or lines breaking and causing fires. Wildlife habitats and food must be addressed. Safety is paramount to individuals and needs to be addressed more stringently when planning projects.

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)** not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?** not answered

**Respondent No:** 45**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 23, 2025 07:30:44 am**Last Seen:** Apr 23, 2025 07:30:44 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Shaun Holahan

Q2. Email

sph@q.com

Q3. Share any comment

Comments for the Transmission Programmatic EIS for the State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) Please consider our comments below for the welfare, safety and health of our community and our state. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of transmission lines have significant impacts to our environment and human health. Issues to highlight: Easement widths are fire and weather event risks Toxic substances in maintaining lines Prolonged EMF exposure with homes near/under lines Surface and groundwater risks for the health for our children and community Allowing Right-of-Way (ROW) reductions with modified poles for entire routes that are inadequate or too narrow for requested powerlines, risks from tree fall-ins, gaps in contiguous lines, centerline skews and/or home protection from proximity risks is unjust and unethical to, by default, require eminent domain as the main mechanism to acquisition. Impacts to communities that include redundant transmission lines without alternate route analysis, puts our communities at higher risks Property devaluation and community livability We ask you to hold transmission routes for the public and ratepayers to a high standard of safety and ethics as you oversee new transmission projects. Our specific comments for the Draft PEIS: Pg. 76 Figure 2.1-2 Illustrates a 230kV Right-of-Way (ROW) within scope of 125-200' Clarify intended safe use of ROW standards. Define the width of easement as the minimum safety standard to 200' for 230kV+ lines. Recommend for optimal safety as 200'+ to reduce human, fire and weather condition interaction with lines. (100' to centerline). Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities... cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." On Pg 76 the draft states: "engineered... poles...can be used for...230kv facilities when the ROW is restricted." What is the safe width of a "reduced ROW" for a 230kV line? Clarify the application use of a "reduced ROW," for example: use in population density, fire break/tree fall-in potential zones, watershed, waterways, wetlands, sensitive populations (children, etc.), near schools, protected or old growth forests, home distances to lines etc. Clarify how much of a new transmission line can utilize the "reduced ROW?" An entire project, a portion or percentage? Clarify the term "restricted" in the use of a new transmission line construction? What connotes "restricted" as used in the excerpt above from page 76. Clarify if a "reduced ROW" can be utilized in a change of direction on a line run. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." WAC 197-11-030 Policy. (b) "Prepare environmental documents that are concise, clear and to the point, and are supported by evidence..." Pg 76 states: "... when ROW is restricted" We need clarification. When "reduced ROW" clause is instated, we cannot have eminent domain as the primary mechanism to take unaware and non-deeded landowners for an entire or part of a new transmission line project. Clarify when a "reduced ROW" is utilized, confirm that there was an ethical review with public input, of adjacent lands and property owners have been notified in the title deed that the property is at risk of eminent domain. If an entire or partial project is at risk for eminent domain, substantiate why the proposed utility project will need to use engineered poles to fit into a "restricted" zone. For example, if a project has been to be reviewed to include a request for engineered poles to fit into a restricted easement AND the easement has been found to include outdated and/or inadequate deed exhibits, undersized widths, inadequate for its intended use (e.g. an 80 year old easement), skewed or assumed center lines, missing and/or gaps in easements, and tree fall-in risk of adjacent non-deeded parcels, the project will be reviewed for validity. If any are found and the requesting utility company will instate the use of a "reduced ROW" and/or eminent domain to mitigate these inadequacies, the project will be given a determination of significance for adverse impacts and rendered inoperational for the transmission size requested. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 "(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:... (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;" Pg 76 states "...choice of design... depends on factors such as... the surrounding environment." We need to

clarify this definition of design choice. We are concerned about disregarding safety or not honoring our WA State deeds and Clark County property lines a “design choice.” We must oversee wetlands, population density, health effects, fire safety, deeds and property lines, and homes under or within 100 feet of lines as a public health and a vulnerable population issue and not a design choice. Define, under what conditions, a utility company can propose design changes to the permitting agencies as a remedy of an inadequate easement. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:... (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;” Pg. 509 states “A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF’s” Protecting children and sensitive populations from the cumulative effects of Electromagnetic Field (EMF) exposure is very important to our communities. Define and clarify home proximity distances along a new proposed line before permits are issued to be a minimum of 100’ from an overhead line. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(2) ... scope... in proximity to existing, more suitable routes and effective use of existing routes. (4) In defining the scope of nonproject review of electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, the energy facility site evaluation council shall request input from agencies, federally recognized Indian tribes, industry, stakeholders, local governments, and the public to identify the geographic areas suitable for electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, based on the climatic and geophysical attributes conducive to or required for project development.” In conclusion, I invite EFSEC to continue its protection of public health, environmental and safety standards for our state. In addition, we feel it is paramount to protect our rights as landowners and the ethics of the appropriate use of and application of transmission projects to communities we live in. Keep Washington safe and livable for our future.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 46**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 23, 2025 19:59:36 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 23, 2025 19:59:36 pm**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Gleen Felix

Q2. Email

glen.fx08@gmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

I concur with Christine and Roger Neill's comments below: Comments for the Transmission Programmatic EIS for the State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) Please consider our comments below for the welfare, safety and health of our community and our state. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of transmission lines have significant impacts to our environment and human health. Issues to highlight: Easement widths are fire and weather event risks Toxic substances in maintaining lines Prolonged EMF exposure with homes near/under lines Surface and groundwater risks for the health for our children and community Allowing Right-of-Way (ROW) reductions with modified poles for entire routes that are inadequate or too narrow for requested powerlines, risks from tree fall-ins, gaps in contiguous lines, centerline skews and/or home protection from proximity risks is unjust and unethical to, by default, require eminent domain as the main mechanism to acquisition. Impacts to communities that include redundant transmission lines without alternate route analysis, puts our communities at higher risks Property devaluation and community livability We ask you to hold transmission routes for the public and ratepayers to a high standard of safety and ethics as you oversee new transmission projects. Our specific comments for the Draft PEIS: Pg. 76 Figure 2.1-2 Illustrates a 230kV Right-of-Way (ROW) within scope of 125-200' Clarify intended safe use of ROW standards. Define the width of easement as the minimum safety standard to 200' for 230kV+ lines. Recommend for optimal safety as 200'+ to reduce human, fire and weather condition interaction with lines. (100' to centerline). Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." On Pg 76 the draft states: "engineered... poles...can be used for...230kv facilities when the ROW is restricted." What is the safe width of a "reduced ROW" for a 230kV line? Clarify the application use of a "reduced ROW," for example: use in population density, fire break/tree fall-in potential zones, watershed, waterways, wetlands, sensitive populations (children, etc.), near schools, protected or old growth forests, home distances to lines etc. Clarify how much of a new transmission line can utilize the "reduced ROW?" An entire project, a portion or percentage? Clarify the term "restricted" in the use of a new transmission line construction? What connotes "restricted" as used in the excerpt above from page 76. Clarify if a "reduced ROW" can be utilized in a change of direction on a line run. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." WAC 197-11-030 Policy. (b) "Prepare environmental documents that are concise, clear and to the point, and are supported by evidence..." Pg 76 states: "... when ROW is restricted" We need clarification. When "reduced ROW" clause is instated, we cannot have eminent domain as the primary mechanism to take unaware and non-deeded landowners for an entire or part of a new transmission line project. Clarify when a "reduced ROW" is utilized, confirm that there was an ethical review with public input, of adjacent lands and property owners have been notified in the title deed that the property is at risk of eminent domain. If an entire or partial project is at risk for eminent domain, substantiate why the proposed utility project will need to use engineered poles to fit into a "restricted" zone. For example, if a project has been to be reviewed to include a request for engineered poles to fit into a restricted easement AND the easement has been found to include outdated and/or inadequate deed exhibits, undersized widths, inadequate for its intended use (e.g. an 80 year old easement), skewed or assumed center lines, missing and/or gaps in easements, and tree fall-in risk of adjacent non-deeded parcels, the project will be reviewed for validity. If any are found and the requesting utility company will instate the use of a "reduced ROW" and/or eminent domain to mitigate these inadequacies, the project will be given a determination of significance for adverse impacts and rendered inoperational for the transmission size requested. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 "(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:..." (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;" Pg 76 states "...choice of design... depends on factors

such as... the surrounding environment.” We need to clarify this definition of design choice. We are concerned about disregarding safety or not honoring our WA State deeds and Clark County property lines a “design choice.” We must oversee wetlands, population density, health effects, fire safety, deeds and property lines, and homes under or within 100 feet of lines as a public health and a vulnerable population issue and not a design choice. Define, under what conditions, a utility company can propose design changes to the permitting agencies as a remedy of an inadequate easement. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:... (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;” Pg. 509 states “A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF’s” Protecting children and sensitive populations from the cumulative effects of Electromagnetic Field (EMF) exposure is very important to our communities. Define and clarify home proximity distances along a new proposed line before permits are issued to be a minimum of 100’ from an overhead line. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(2) ... scope... in proximity to existing, more suitable routes and effective use of existing routes. (4) In defining the scope of nonproject review of electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, the energy facility site evaluation council shall request input from agencies, federally recognized Indian tribes, industry, stakeholders, local governments, and the public to identify the geographic areas suitable for electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, based on the climatic and geophysical attributes conducive to or required for project development.” In conclusion, I invite EFSEC to continue its protection of public health, environmental and safety standards for our state. In addition, we feel it is paramount to protect our rights as landowners and the ethics of the appropriate use of and application of transmission projects to communities we live in. Keep Washington safe and livable for our future.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 47**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 23, 2025 21:05:51 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 23, 2025 21:05:51 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. **Name** Christine and Roger Neill

Q2. **Email** gochristineneill@gmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

Please add this to my earlier comments. Thank you. 6. Pg. 80 states "2.2.1 Action Alternative: This Draft Programmatic EIS evaluates potential impacts associated with the development of electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230 kV or greater in Washington. Electrical transmission facilities are defined in 80.50.020(12) as "electrical power lines and related equipment." Therefore, the Action Alternative in this Draft Programmatic EIS includes development of new overhead and underground transmission facilities, as well as the upgrade or modification of existing transmission facilities. Section to include "private and/or public owned power facilities along with any private and/or public ROW require appropriate siting analysis for new and expanded facilities, including an analysis of considerations of alternative sites and using existing site and corridor collocation/upgrades." Requesting this addition to close the ambiguity of a private energy company with their own privately owned easement traversing through many types of communities for financial and power supply benefit without the oversight of an alternative route analysis is unjust, unsafe and financially burdening to homeowners.

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)** not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?** not answered

**Respondent No:** 48**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 24, 2025 08:40:42 am**Last Seen:** Apr 24, 2025 08:40:42 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Gary Ogier

Q2. Email

gary.ogier@gmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

Please consider the below comments related to the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. The results of your efforts in this matter greatly affect the welfare, safety and health of our community and our state. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of transmission lines have significant impacts to our environment and human health. Key issues: -Easement widths are fire and weather event risks. -Toxic substances in maintaining lines. -Prolonged EMF exposure with homes near/under lines. -Surface and groundwater risks for the health for our children and community. -Allowing Right-of-Way (ROW) reductions with modified poles for entire routes that are inadequate or too narrow for requested power lines, risks from tree fall-ins, gaps in contiguous lines, center line skews and/or home protection from proximity risks is unjust and unethical to, by default, require eminent domain as the main mechanism to acquisition. -Impacts to communities that include redundant transmission lines without requiring alternate route analysis, puts our communities at higher risks. -Property devaluation and community livability puts a high cost on residents. We ask you to hold transmission routes for the public and ratepayers to a high standard of safety and ethics as you oversee new transmission projects. Other specific comments for the Draft PEIS: Pg. 76 Figure 2.1-2 Illustrates a 230kV Right-of-Way (ROW) within scope of 125-200' Clarify intended safe use of ROW standards. Define the width of easement as the minimum safety standard to 200' for 230kV+ lines. Recommend for optimal safety as 200'+ to reduce human, fire and weather condition interaction with lines. (100' to center line). Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." On Pg 76 the draft states: "engineered... poles...can be used for...230kv facilities when the ROW is restricted." What is the safe width of a "reduced ROW" for a 230kV line? Clarify the application use of a "reduced ROW," for example: use in population density, fire break/tree fall-in potential zones, watershed, waterways, wetlands, sensitive populations (children, etc.), near schools, protected or old growth forests, home distances to lines etc. Clarify how much of a new transmission line can utilize the "reduced ROW?" An entire project, a portion or percentage? Clarify the term "restricted" in the use of a new transmission line construction? What connotes "restricted" as used in the excerpt above from page 76. Clarify if a "reduced ROW" can be utilized in a change of direction on a line run. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." WAC 197-11-030 Policy. (b) "Prepare environmental documents that are concise, clear and to the point, and are supported by evidence..." Pg 76 states: "... when ROW is restricted" We need clarification. When "reduced ROW" clause is instated, we cannot have eminent domain as the primary mechanism to take unaware and non-deeded landowners for an entire or part of a new transmission line project. Clarify when a "reduced ROW" is utilized, confirm that there was an ethical review with public input, of adjacent lands and property owners have been notified in the title deed that the property is at risk of eminent domain. If an entire or partial project is at risk for eminent domain, substantiate why the proposed utility project will need to use engineered poles to fit into a "restricted" zone. For example, if a project has been to be reviewed to include a request for engineered poles to fit into a restricted easement AND the easement has been found to include outdated and/or inadequate deed exhibits, undersized widths, inadequate for its intended use (e.g. an 80 year old easement), skewed or assumed center lines, missing and/or gaps in easements, and tree fall-in risk of adjacent non-deeded parcels, the project will be reviewed for validity. If any are found and the requesting utility company will instate the use of a "reduced ROW" and/or eminent domain to mitigate these inadequacies, the project will be given a determination of significance for adverse impacts and rendered in-operational for the transmission size requested. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 "(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:..." (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;" Pg 76 states "...choice of design... depends on factors

such as... the surrounding environment.” We need to clarify this definition of design choice. We are concerned about disregarding safety or not honoring our WA State deeds and Clark County property lines a “design choice.” We must oversee wetlands, population density, health effects, fire safety, deeds and property lines, and homes under or within 100 feet of lines as a public health and a vulnerable population issue and not a design choice. Define, under what conditions, a utility company can propose design changes to the permitting agencies as a remedy of an inadequate easement. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:... (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;” Pg. 509 states “A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF’s” Protecting children and sensitive populations from the cumulative effects of Electromagnetic Field (EMF) exposure is very important to our communities. Define and clarify home proximity distances along a new proposed line before permits are issued to be a minimum of 100’ from an overhead line. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(2) ... scope... in proximity to existing, more suitable routes and effective use of existing routes. (4) In defining the scope of nonproject review of electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, the energy facility site evaluation council shall request input from agencies, federally recognized Indian tribes, industry, stakeholders, local governments, and the public to identify the geographic areas suitable for electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, based on the climatic and geophysical attributes conducive to or required for project development.” In conclusion, please continue the protection of public health, environmental and safety standards for our state, while also protecting the rights and well being of landowners and residents. Above all, we want to keep Washington safe and livable now and for future generations to come.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 49

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 24, 2025 15:05:51 pm

Last Seen: Apr 24, 2025 15:05:51 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **Name**

Tom Galka

Q2. **Email**

galka.tr@gmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

Why destroy all the people's properties when they can update the existing lines or move the proposed line farther east?
Please take into consideration that your home could be what they are about to destroy.

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)**

not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)**

not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?**

No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?**

not answered



Respondent No: 50

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 24, 2025 15:08:40 pm

Last Seen: Apr 24, 2025 15:08:40 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **Name**

Robyn Galka

Q2. **Email**

galka.tr@gmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

We have worked hard our entire lives to have a home - now, pacific power gets to ruin our properties and environments without any concern or accountability to the people?! Shame on you all.

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)**

not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)**

not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?**

No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?**

not answered

**Respondent No:** 51**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 25, 2025 10:47:01 am**Last Seen:** Apr 25, 2025 10:47:01 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Pamela Ashford

Q2. Email

speechEEPam81@gmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

I concur with Christine and Roger Neill's comments below: Comments for the Transmission Programmatic EIS for the State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) Please consider our comments below for the welfare, safety and health of our community and our state. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of transmission lines have significant impacts to our environment and human health. Issues to highlight: * Easement widths are fire and weather event risks * Toxic substances in maintaining lines * Prolonged EMF exposure with homes near/under lines * Surface and groundwater risks for the health for our children and community * Allowing Right-of-Way (ROW) reductions with modified poles for entire routes that are inadequate or too narrow for requested powerlines, risks from tree fall-ins, gaps in contiguous lines, centerline skews and/or home protection from proximity risks is unjust and unethical to, by default, require eminent domain as the main mechanism to acquisition. * Impacts to communities that include redundant transmission lines without alternate route analysis, puts our communities at higher risks * Property devaluation and community livability * We ask you to hold transmission routes for the public and ratepayers to a high standard of safety and ethics as you oversee new transmission projects. Our specific comments for the Draft PEIS: Pg. 76 Figure 2.1-2 Illustrates a 230kV Right-of-Way (ROW) within scope of 125-200' Clarify intended safe use of ROW standards. Define the width of easement as the minimum safety standard to 200' for 230kV+ lines. Recommend for optimal safety as 200'+ to reduce human, fire and weather condition interaction with lines. (100' to centerline). Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." On Pg 76 the draft states: "engineered... poles...can be used for...230kv facilities when the ROW is restricted." What is the safe width of a "reduced ROW" for a 230kV line? Clarify the application use of a "reduced ROW," for example: use in population density, fire break/tree fall-in potential zones, watershed, waterways, wetlands, sensitive populations (children, etc.), near schools, protected or old growth forests, home distances to lines etc. Clarify how much of a new transmission line can utilize the "reduced ROW?" An entire project, a portion or percentage? Clarify the term "restricted" in the use of a new transmission line construction? What connotes "restricted" as used in the excerpt above from page 76. Clarify if a "reduced ROW" can be utilized in a change of direction on a line run. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." WAC 197-11-030 Policy. (b) "Prepare environmental documents that are concise, clear and to the point, and are supported by evidence..." Pg 76 states: "... when ROW is restricted" We need clarification. When "reduced ROW" clause is instated, we cannot have eminent domain as the primary mechanism to take unaware and non-deeded landowners for an entire or part of a new transmission line project. Clarify when a "reduced ROW" is utilized, confirm that there was an ethical review with public input, of adjacent lands and property owners have been notified in the title deed that the property is at risk of eminent domain. If an entire or partial project is at risk for eminent domain, substantiate why the proposed utility project will need to use engineered poles to fit into a "restricted" zone. For example, if a project has been to be reviewed to include a request for engineered poles to fit into a restricted easement AND the easement has been found to include outdated and/or inadequate deed exhibits, undersized widths, inadequate for its intended use (e.g. an 80 year old easement), skewed or assumed center lines, missing and/or gaps in easements, and tree fall-in risk of adjacent non-deeded parcels, the project will be reviewed for validity. If any are found and the requesting utility company will instate the use of a "reduced ROW" and/or eminent domain to mitigate these inadequacies, the project will be given a determination of significance for adverse impacts and rendered inoperational for the transmission size requested. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 "(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:..." (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;" Pg 76 states "...choice of design... depends on factors

such as... the surrounding environment.” We need to clarify this definition of design choice. We are concerned about disregarding safety or not honoring our WA State deeds and Clark County property lines a “design choice.” We must oversee wetlands, population density, health effects, fire safety, deeds and property lines, and homes under or within 100 feet of lines as a public health and a vulnerable population issue and not a design choice. Define, under what conditions, a utility company can propose design changes to the permitting agencies as a remedy of an inadequate easement. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:... (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;” Pg. 509 states “A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF’s” Protecting children and sensitive populations from the cumulative effects of Electromagnetic Field (EMF) exposure is very important to our communities. Define and clarify home proximity distances along a new proposed line before permits are issued to be a minimum of 100’ from an overhead line. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(2) ... scope... in proximity to existing, more suitable routes and effective use of existing routes. (4) In defining the scope of nonproject review of electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, the energy facility site evaluation council shall request input from agencies, federally recognized Indian tribes, industry, stakeholders, local governments, and the public to identify the geographic areas suitable for electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, based on the climatic and geophysical attributes conducive to or required for project development.” In conclusion, I invite EFSEC to continue its protection of public health, environmental and safety standards for our state. In addition, we feel it is paramount to protect our rights as landowners and the ethics of the appropriate use of and application of transmission projects to communities we live in. Keep Washington safe and livable for our future.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 52**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 25, 2025 10:49:54 am**Last Seen:** Apr 25, 2025 10:49:54 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Kelley Ashford

Q2. Email

kashford12@gmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

I concur with Christine and Roger Neill's comments below: Comments for the Transmission Programmatic EIS for the State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) Please consider our comments below for the welfare, safety and health of our community and our state. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of transmission lines have significant impacts to our environment and human health. Issues to highlight: Easement widths are fire and weather event risks Toxic substances in maintaining lines Prolonged EMF exposure with homes near/under lines Surface and groundwater risks for the health for our children and community Allowing Right-of-Way (ROW) reductions with modified poles for entire routes that are inadequate or too narrow for requested powerlines, risks from tree fall-ins, gaps in contiguous lines, centerline skews and/or home protection from proximity risks is unjust and unethical to, by default, require eminent domain as the main mechanism to acquisition. Impacts to communities that include redundant transmission lines without alternate route analysis, puts our communities at higher risks Property devaluation and community livability We ask you to hold transmission routes for the public and ratepayers to a high standard of safety and ethics as you oversee new transmission projects. Our specific comments for the Draft PEIS: Pg. 76 Figure 2.1-2 Illustrates a 230kV Right-of-Way (ROW) within scope of 125-200' Clarify intended safe use of ROW standards. Define the width of easement as the minimum safety standard to 200' for 230kV+ lines. Recommend for optimal safety as 200'+ to reduce human, fire and weather condition interaction with lines. (100' to centerline). Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." On Pg 76 the draft states: "engineered... poles...can be used for...230kv facilities when the ROW is restricted." What is the safe width of a "reduced ROW" for a 230kV line? Clarify the application use of a "reduced ROW," for example: use in population density, fire break/tree fall-in potential zones, watershed, waterways, wetlands, sensitive populations (children, etc.), near schools, protected or old growth forests, home distances to lines etc. Clarify how much of a new transmission line can utilize the "reduced ROW?" An entire project, a portion or percentage? Clarify the term "restricted" in the use of a new transmission line construction? What connotes "restricted" as used in the excerpt above from page 76. Clarify if a "reduced ROW" can be utilized in a change of direction on a line run. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." WAC 197-11-030 Policy. (b) "Prepare environmental documents that are concise, clear and to the point, and are supported by evidence..." Pg 76 states: "... when ROW is restricted" We need clarification. When "reduced ROW" clause is instated, we cannot have eminent domain as the primary mechanism to take unaware and non-deeded landowners for an entire or part of a new transmission line project. Clarify when a "reduced ROW" is utilized, confirm that there was an ethical review with public input, of adjacent lands and property owners have been notified in the title deed that the property is at risk of eminent domain. If an entire or partial project is at risk for eminent domain, substantiate why the proposed utility project will need to use engineered poles to fit into a "restricted" zone. For example, if a project has been to be reviewed to include a request for engineered poles to fit into a restricted easement AND the easement has been found to include outdated and/or inadequate deed exhibits, undersized widths, inadequate for its intended use (e.g. an 80 year old easement), skewed or assumed center lines, missing and/or gaps in easements, and tree fall-in risk of adjacent non-deeded parcels, the project will be reviewed for validity. If any are found and the requesting utility company will instate the use of a "reduced ROW" and/or eminent domain to mitigate these inadequacies, the project will be given a determination of significance for adverse impacts and rendered inoperational for the transmission size requested. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 "(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:..." (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;" Pg 76 states "...choice of design... depends on factors

such as... the surrounding environment.” We need to clarify this definition of design choice. We are concerned about disregarding safety or not honoring our WA State deeds and Clark County property lines a “design choice.” We must oversee wetlands, population density, health effects, fire safety, deeds and property lines, and homes under or within 100 feet of lines as a public health and a vulnerable population issue and not a design choice. Define, under what conditions, a utility company can propose design changes to the permitting agencies as a remedy of an inadequate easement. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:... (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;” Pg. 509 states “A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF’s” Protecting children and sensitive populations from the cumulative effects of Electromagnetic Field (EMF) exposure is very important to our communities. Define and clarify home proximity distances along a new proposed line before permits are issued to be a minimum of 100’ from an overhead line. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(2) ... scope... in proximity to existing, more suitable routes and effective use of existing routes. (4) In defining the scope of nonproject review of electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, the energy facility site evaluation council shall request input from agencies, federally recognized Indian tribes, industry, stakeholders, local governments, and the public to identify the geographic areas suitable for electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, based on the climatic and geophysical attributes conducive to or required for project development.” In conclusion, I invite EFSEC to continue its protection of public health, environmental and safety standards for our state. In addition, we feel it is paramount to protect our rights as landowners and the ethics of the appropriate use of and application of transmission projects to communities we live in. Keep Washington safe and livable for our future.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 53**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 25, 2025 10:52:43 am**Last Seen:** Apr 25, 2025 10:52:43 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Christopher Ashford

Q2. Email

ashfords4@aol.com

Q3. Share any comment

I concur with Christine and Roger Neill's comments below: Comments for the Transmission Programmatic EIS for the State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) Please consider our comments below for the welfare, safety and health of our community and our state. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of transmission lines have significant impacts to our environment and human health. Issues to highlight: Easement widths are fire and weather event risks Toxic substances in maintaining lines Prolonged EMF exposure with homes near/under lines Surface and groundwater risks for the health for our children and community Allowing Right-of-Way (ROW) reductions with modified poles for entire routes that are inadequate or too narrow for requested powerlines, risks from tree fall-ins, gaps in contiguous lines, centerline skews and/or home protection from proximity risks is unjust and unethical to, by default, require eminent domain as the main mechanism to acquisition. Impacts to communities that include redundant transmission lines without alternate route analysis, puts our communities at higher risks Property devaluation and community livability We ask you to hold transmission routes for the public and ratepayers to a high standard of safety and ethics as you oversee new transmission projects. Our specific comments for the Draft PEIS: Pg. 76 Figure 2.1-2 Illustrates a 230kV Right-of-Way (ROW) within scope of 125-200' Clarify intended safe use of ROW standards. Define the width of easement as the minimum safety standard to 200' for 230kV+ lines. Recommend for optimal safety as 200'+ to reduce human, fire and weather condition interaction with lines. (100' to centerline). Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." On Pg 76 the draft states: "engineered... poles...can be used for...230kv facilities when the ROW is restricted." What is the safe width of a "reduced ROW" for a 230kV line? Clarify the application use of a "reduced ROW," for example: use in population density, fire break/tree fall-in potential zones, watershed, waterways, wetlands, sensitive populations (children, etc.), near schools, protected or old growth forests, home distances to lines etc. Clarify how much of a new transmission line can utilize the "reduced ROW?" An entire project, a portion or percentage? Clarify the term "restricted" in the use of a new transmission line construction? What connotes "restricted" as used in the excerpt above from page 76. Clarify if a "reduced ROW" can be utilized in a change of direction on a line run. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." WAC 197-11-030 Policy. (b) "Prepare environmental documents that are concise, clear and to the point, and are supported by evidence..." Pg 76 states: "... when ROW is restricted" We need clarification. When "reduced ROW" clause is instated, we cannot have eminent domain as the primary mechanism to take unaware and non-deeded landowners for an entire or part of a new transmission line project. Clarify when a "reduced ROW" is utilized, confirm that there was an ethical review with public input, of adjacent lands and property owners have been notified in the title deed that the property is at risk of eminent domain. If an entire or partial project is at risk for eminent domain, substantiate why the proposed utility project will need to use engineered poles to fit into a "restricted" zone. For example, if a project has been to be reviewed to include a request for engineered poles to fit into a restricted easement AND the easement has been found to include outdated and/or inadequate deed exhibits, undersized widths, inadequate for its intended use (e.g. an 80 year old easement), skewed or assumed center lines, missing and/or gaps in easements, and tree fall-in risk of adjacent non-deeded parcels, the project will be reviewed for validity. If any are found and the requesting utility company will instate the use of a "reduced ROW" and/or eminent domain to mitigate these inadequacies, the project will be given a determination of significance for adverse impacts and rendered inoperational for the transmission size requested. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 "(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:..." (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;" Pg 76 states "...choice of design... depends on factors

such as... the surrounding environment.” We need to clarify this definition of design choice. We are concerned about disregarding safety or not honoring our WA State deeds and Clark County property lines a “design choice.” We must oversee wetlands, population density, health effects, fire safety, deeds and property lines, and homes under or within 100 feet of lines as a public health and a vulnerable population issue and not a design choice. Define, under what conditions, a utility company can propose design changes to the permitting agencies as a remedy of an inadequate easement. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:... (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;” Pg. 509 states “A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF’s” Protecting children and sensitive populations from the cumulative effects of Electromagnetic Field (EMF) exposure is very important to our communities. Define and clarify home proximity distances along a new proposed line before permits are issued to be a minimum of 100’ from an overhead line. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(2) ... scope... in proximity to existing, more suitable routes and effective use of existing routes. (4) In defining the scope of nonproject review of electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, the energy facility site evaluation council shall request input from agencies, federally recognized Indian tribes, industry, stakeholders, local governments, and the public to identify the geographic areas suitable for electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, based on the climatic and geophysical attributes conducive to or required for project development.” In conclusion, I invite EFSEC to continue its protection of public health, environmental and safety standards for our state. In addition, we feel it is paramount to protect our rights as landowners and the ethics of the appropriate use of and application of transmission projects to communities we live in. Keep Washington safe and livable for our future.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered



Respondent No: 54

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 25, 2025 13:46:19 pm

Last Seen: Apr 25, 2025 13:46:19 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Catherine and Roger Jarvis
Q2. Email	cthjrv@aol.com
Q3. Share any comment	
	Please see attachment
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/37a72fb98d0eddc8b97f24937887d2aea0361a4c/original/1745613932/e2e7ac3cb33959bca5d8b0401b9dd712_PacifiCorp%20comments.docx?1745613932
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 55**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 27, 2025 20:19:05 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 27, 2025 20:19:05 pm**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Randall Schultz-Rathbun

Q2. Email

rschultzrathbun@aol.com

Q3. Share any comment

I concur with Christine and Roger Neill's comments below: Comments for the Transmission Programmatic EIS for the State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) Please consider our comments below for the welfare, safety and health of our community and our state. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of transmission lines have significant impacts to our environment and human health. Issues to highlight: Easement widths are fire and weather event risks Toxic substances in maintaining lines Prolonged EMF exposure with homes near/under lines Surface and groundwater risks for the health for our children and community Allowing Right-of-Way (ROW) reductions with modified poles for entire routes that are inadequate or too narrow for requested powerlines, risks from tree fall-ins, gaps in contiguous lines, centerline skews and/or home protection from proximity risks is unjust and unethical to, by default, require eminent domain as the main mechanism to acquisition. Impacts to communities that include redundant transmission lines without alternate route analysis, puts our communities at higher risks Property devaluation and community livability We ask you to hold transmission routes for the public and ratepayers to a high standard of safety and ethics as you oversee new transmission projects. Our specific comments for the Draft PEIS: Pg. 76 Figure 2.1-2 Illustrates a 230kV Right-of-Way (ROW) within scope of 125-200' Clarify intended safe use of ROW standards. Define the width of easement as the minimum safety standard to 200' for 230kV+ lines. Recommend for optimal safety as 200'+ to reduce human, fire and weather condition interaction with lines. (100' to centerline). Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." On Pg 76 the draft states: "engineered... poles...can be used for...230kv facilities when the ROW is restricted." What is the safe width of a "reduced ROW" for a 230kV line? Clarify the application use of a "reduced ROW," for example: use in population density, fire break/tree fall-in potential zones, watershed, waterways, wetlands, sensitive populations (children, etc.), near schools, protected or old growth forests, home distances to lines etc. Clarify how much of a new transmission line can utilize the "reduced ROW?" An entire project, a portion or percentage? Clarify the term "restricted" in the use of a new transmission line construction? What connotes "restricted" as used in the excerpt above from page 76. Clarify if a "reduced ROW" can be utilized in a change of direction on a line run. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." WAC 197-11-030 Policy. (b) "Prepare environmental documents that are concise, clear and to the point, and are supported by evidence..." Pg 76 states: "... when ROW is restricted" We need clarification. When "reduced ROW" clause is instated, we cannot have eminent domain as the primary mechanism to take unaware and non-deeded landowners for an entire or part of a new transmission line project. Clarify when a "reduced ROW" is utilized, confirm that there was an ethical review with public input, of adjacent lands and property owners have been notified in the title deed that the property is at risk of eminent domain. If an entire or partial project is at risk for eminent domain, substantiate why the proposed utility project will need to use engineered poles to fit into a "restricted" zone. For example, if a project has been to be reviewed to include a request for engineered poles to fit into a restricted easement AND the easement has been found to include outdated and/or inadequate deed exhibits, undersized widths, inadequate for its intended use (e.g. an 80 year old easement), skewed or assumed center lines, missing and/or gaps in easements, and tree fall-in risk of adjacent non-deeded parcels, the project will be reviewed for validity. If any are found and the requesting utility company will instate the use of a "reduced ROW" and/or eminent domain to mitigate these inadequacies, the project will be given a determination of significance for adverse impacts and rendered inoperational for the transmission size requested. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 "(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:..." (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;" Pg 76 states "...choice of design... depends on factors

such as... the surrounding environment.” We need to clarify this definition of design choice. We are concerned about disregarding safety or not honoring our WA State deeds and Clark County property lines a “design choice.” We must oversee wetlands, population density, health effects, fire safety, deeds and property lines, and homes under or within 100 feet of lines as a public health and a vulnerable population issue and not a design choice. Define, under what conditions, a utility company can propose design changes to the permitting agencies as a remedy of an inadequate easement. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:... (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;” Pg. 509 states “A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF’s” Protecting children and sensitive populations from the cumulative effects of Electromagnetic Field (EMF) exposure is very important to our communities. Define and clarify home proximity distances along a new proposed line before permits are issued to be a minimum of 100’ from an overhead line. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(2) ... scope... in proximity to existing, more suitable routes and effective use of existing routes. (4) In defining the scope of nonproject review of electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, the energy facility site evaluation council shall request input from agencies, federally recognized Indian tribes, industry, stakeholders, local governments, and the public to identify the geographic areas suitable for electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, based on the climatic and geophysical attributes conducive to or required for project development.” In conclusion, I invite EFSEC to continue its protection of public health, environmental and safety standards for our state. In addition, we feel it is paramount to protect our rights as landowners and the ethics of the appropriate use of and application of transmission projects to communities we live in. Keep Washington safe and livable for our future.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 56**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 27, 2025 21:35:47 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 27, 2025 21:35:47 pm**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Anil Prem

Q2. Email

anil_prem@hotmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

I am real concerned about placing transmission lines through established neighborhoods. Real concerned about the negative health effects on people already living near proposed power lines.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered

**Respondent No:** 57**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 27, 2025 22:43:32 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 27, 2025 22:43:32 pm**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Jay Dier

Q2. Email

Jdier2301@yahoo.com

Q3. Share any comment

Comments for the Transmission Programmatic EIS for the State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) Please consider our comments below for the welfare, safety and health of our community and our state. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of transmission lines have significant impacts to our environment and human health. Issues to highlight: Easement widths are fire and weather event risks Toxic substances in maintaining lines Prolonged EMF exposure with homes near/under lines Surface and groundwater risks for the health for our children and community Allowing Right-of-Way (ROW) reductions with modified poles for entire routes that are inadequate or too narrow for requested powerlines, risks from tree fall-ins, gaps in contiguous lines, centerline skews and/or home protection from proximity risks is unjust and unethical to, by default, require eminent domain as the main mechanism to acquisition. Impacts to communities that include redundant transmission lines without alternate route analysis, puts our communities at higher risks Property devaluation and community livability We ask you to hold transmission routes for the public and ratepayers to a high standard of safety and ethics as you oversee new transmission projects. Our specific comments for the Draft PEIS: Pg. 76 Figure 2.1-2 Illustrates a 230kV Right-of-Way (ROW) within scope of 125-200' Clarify intended safe use of ROW standards. Define the width of easement as the minimum safety standard to 200' for 230kV+ lines. Recommend for optimal safety as 200'+ to reduce human, fire and weather condition interaction with lines. (100' to centerline). Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities... cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." On Pg 76 the draft states: "engineered... poles...can be used for...230kv facilities when the ROW is restricted." What is the safe width of a "reduced ROW" for a 230kV line? Clarify the application use of a "reduced ROW," for example: use in population density, fire break/tree fall-in potential zones, watershed, waterways, wetlands, sensitive populations (children, etc.), near schools, protected or old growth forests, home distances to lines etc. Clarify how much of a new transmission line can utilize the "reduced ROW?" An entire project, a portion or percentage? Clarify the term "restricted" in the use of a new transmission line construction? What connotes "restricted" as used in the excerpt above from page 76. Clarify if a "reduced ROW" can be utilized in a change of direction on a line run. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." WAC 197-11-030 Policy. (b) "Prepare environmental documents that are concise, clear and to the point, and are supported by evidence..." Pg 76 states: "... when ROW is restricted" We need clarification. When "reduced ROW" clause is instated, we cannot have eminent domain as the primary mechanism to take unaware and non-deeded landowners for an entire or part of a new transmission line project. Clarify when a "reduced ROW" is utilized, confirm that there was an ethical review with public input, of adjacent lands and property owners have been notified in the title deed that the property is at risk of eminent domain. If an entire or partial project is at risk for eminent domain, substantiate why the proposed utility project will need to use engineered poles to fit into a "restricted" zone. For example, if a project has been to be reviewed to include a request for engineered poles to fit into a restricted easement AND the easement has been found to include outdated and/or inadequate deed exhibits, undersized widths, inadequate for its intended use (e.g. an 80 year old easement), skewed or assumed center lines, missing and/or gaps in easements, and tree fall-in risk of adjacent non-deeded parcels, the project will be reviewed for validity. If any are found and the requesting utility company will instate the use of a "reduced ROW" and/or eminent domain to mitigate these inadequacies, the project will be given a determination of significance for adverse impacts and rendered inoperational for the transmission size requested. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 "(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:... (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;" Pg 76 states "...choice of design... depends on factors such as... the surrounding environment." We need to

clarify this definition of design choice. We are concerned about disregarding safety or not honoring our WA State deeds and Clark County property lines a “design choice.” We must oversee wetlands, population density, health effects, fire safety, deeds and property lines, and homes under or within 100 feet of lines as a public health and a vulnerable population issue and not a design choice. Define, under what conditions, a utility company can propose design changes to the permitting agencies as a remedy of an inadequate easement. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:... (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;” Pg. 509 states “A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF’s” Protecting children and sensitive populations from the cumulative effects of Electromagnetic Field (EMF) exposure is very important to our communities. Define and clarify home proximity distances along a new proposed line before permits are issued to be a minimum of 100’ from an overhead line. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(2) ... scope... in proximity to existing, more suitable routes and effective use of existing routes. (4) In defining the scope of nonproject review of electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, the energy facility site evaluation council shall request input from agencies, federally recognized Indian tribes, industry, stakeholders, local governments, and the public to identify the geographic areas suitable for electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, based on the climatic and geophysical attributes conducive to or required for project development.” In conclusion, I invite EFSEC to continue its protection of public health, environmental and safety standards for our state. In addition, we feel it is paramount to protect our rights as landowners and the ethics of the appropriate use of and application of transmission projects to communities we live in. Keep Washington safe and livable for our future. In summary there are alternative routes that can be used that would be safer for our residents, better for the environment, less detrimental to property values and would not require the taking of property via eminent domain.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 58

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 28, 2025 08:18:16 am

Last Seen: Apr 28, 2025 08:18:16 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Scott Downes
Q2. Email	scott.downes@dfw.wa.gov
Q3. Share any comment	not answered
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/40145a7781a16b8d50efb9e8b3c81ce355e37c8f/original/1745853437/eed6c9b602fd0abed1dcd921e86de02e_WDFW%20comments%20on%20Draft%20PEIS%20for%20Transmission%20Lines.pdf?1745853437
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 59

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 28, 2025 12:38:44 pm

Last Seen: Apr 28, 2025 12:38:44 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Bob Washa
Q2. Email	frdwa@outlook.com
Q3. Share any comment	not answered
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/2ca67152f285c7d412cd2902312df1ee59c7996e/original/1745869088/93d4b724479ff6916a65ad3414e4c358_Siting%20Commission%20Comments.pdf?1745869088
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 60**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 28, 2025 17:21:15 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 28, 2025 17:21:15 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. Name	Martha Todd
Q2. Email	Marthajeane112@gmail.com
Q3. Share any comment	<p>When my great aunt and uncle signed this agreement, their concept of what a power line was was entirely different than what it is. Today, Palm right? Living history, farm and Pomeroy farm are now a place for gatherings, weddings and community events. The pomeroy farm is also a haven for many in the local community, a place of rest, relaxation, and in just enjoyment of the natural beauty. This power line would be very disruptive and completely ruin the appeal and the sense of what the community has come to Noah's Pomeroy farm. I'm very interested in knowing how the historic. Aspects of the log house, which sits on the national historic register, will be impacted by this high voltage line. Thousands of people use that parking lot, including school children that come visit our farm every year.</p>
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 61**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 28, 2025 21:34:33 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 28, 2025 21:34:33 pm**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Jon Unurh

Q2. Email

jonny_rue@yahoo.com

Q3. Share any comment

I concur with Christine and Roger Neill's comments below: Comments for the Transmission Programmatic EIS for the State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) Please consider our comments below for the welfare, safety and health of our community and our state. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of transmission lines have significant impacts to our environment and human health. Issues to highlight: Easement widths are fire and weather event risks Toxic substances in maintaining lines Prolonged EMF exposure with homes near/under lines Surface and groundwater risks for the health for our children and community Allowing Right-of-Way (ROW) reductions with modified poles for entire routes that are inadequate or too narrow for requested powerlines, risks from tree fall-ins, gaps in contiguous lines, centerline skews and/or home protection from proximity risks is unjust and unethical to, by default, require eminent domain as the main mechanism to acquisition. Impacts to communities that include redundant transmission lines without alternate route analysis, puts our communities at higher risks Property devaluation and community livability We ask you to hold transmission routes for the public and ratepayers to a high standard of safety and ethics as you oversee new transmission projects. Our specific comments for the Draft PEIS: Pg. 76 Figure 2.1-2 Illustrates a 230kV Right-of-Way (ROW) within scope of 125-200' Clarify intended safe use of ROW standards. Define the width of easement as the minimum safety standard to 200' for 230kV+ lines. Recommend for optimal safety as 200'+ to reduce human, fire and weather condition interaction with lines. (100' to centerline). Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." On Pg 76 the draft states: "engineered... poles...can be used for...230kv facilities when the ROW is restricted." What is the safe width of a "reduced ROW" for a 230kV line? Clarify the application use of a "reduced ROW," for example: use in population density, fire break/tree fall-in potential zones, watershed, waterways, wetlands, sensitive populations (children, etc.), near schools, protected or old growth forests, home distances to lines etc. Clarify how much of a new transmission line can utilize the "reduced ROW?" An entire project, a portion or percentage? Clarify the term "restricted" in the use of a new transmission line construction? What connotes "restricted" as used in the excerpt above from page 76. Clarify if a "reduced ROW" can be utilized in a change of direction on a line run. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." WAC 197-11-030 Policy. (b) "Prepare environmental documents that are concise, clear and to the point, and are supported by evidence..." Pg 76 states: "... when ROW is restricted" We need clarification. When "reduced ROW" clause is instated, we cannot have eminent domain as the primary mechanism to take unaware and non-deeded landowners for an entire or part of a new transmission line project. Clarify when a "reduced ROW" is utilized, confirm that there was an ethical review with public input, of adjacent lands and property owners have been notified in the title deed that the property is at risk of eminent domain. If an entire or partial project is at risk for eminent domain, substantiate why the proposed utility project will need to use engineered poles to fit into a "restricted" zone. For example, if a project has been to be reviewed to include a request for engineered poles to fit into a restricted easement AND the easement has been found to include outdated and/or inadequate deed exhibits, undersized widths, inadequate for its intended use (e.g. an 80 year old easement), skewed or assumed center lines, missing and/or gaps in easements, and tree fall-in risk of adjacent non-deeded parcels, the project will be reviewed for validity. If any are found and the requesting utility company will instate the use of a "reduced ROW" and/or eminent domain to mitigate these inadequacies, the project will be given a determination of significance for adverse impacts and rendered inoperational for the transmission size requested. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 "(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:..." (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;" Pg 76 states "...choice of design... depends on factors

such as... the surrounding environment.” We need to clarify this definition of design choice. We are concerned about disregarding safety or not honoring our WA State deeds and Clark County property lines a “design choice.” We must oversee wetlands, population density, health effects, fire safety, deeds and property lines, and homes under or within 100 feet of lines as a public health and a vulnerable population issue and not a design choice. Define, under what conditions, a utility company can propose design changes to the permitting agencies as a remedy of an inadequate easement. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:... (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;” Pg. 509 states “A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF’s” Protecting children and sensitive populations from the cumulative effects of Electromagnetic Field (EMF) exposure is very important to our communities. Define and clarify home proximity distances along a new proposed line before permits are issued to be a minimum of 100’ from an overhead line. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(2) ... scope... in proximity to existing, more suitable routes and effective use of existing routes. (4) In defining the scope of nonproject review of electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, the energy facility site evaluation council shall request input from agencies, federally recognized Indian tribes, industry, stakeholders, local governments, and the public to identify the geographic areas suitable for electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, based on the climatic and geophysical attributes conducive to or required for project development.” In conclusion, I invite EFSEC to continue its protection of public health, environmental and safety standards for our state. In addition, we feel it is paramount to protect our rights as landowners and the ethics of the appropriate use of and application of transmission projects to communities we live in. Keep Washington safe and livable for our future.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 62**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 28, 2025 21:36:03 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 28, 2025 21:36:03 pm**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Tiffany S. Williamson

Q2. Email

tipwilliamson@gmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

I concur with Christine and Roger Neill's comments regarding right of ways, livability, health concerns, potential loss of value in residential property as they have stated them below: Comments for the Transmission Programmatic EIS for the State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) Please consider our comments below for the welfare, safety and health of our community and our state. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of transmission lines have significant impacts to our environment and human health. Issues to highlight: Easement widths are fire and weather event risks Toxic substances in maintaining lines Prolonged EMF exposure with homes near/under lines Surface and groundwater risks for the health for our children and community Allowing Right-of-Way (ROW) reductions with modified poles for entire routes that are inadequate or too narrow for requested powerlines, risks from tree fall-ins, gaps in contiguous lines, centerline skews and/or home protection from proximity risks is unjust and unethical to, by default, require eminent domain as the main mechanism to acquisition. Impacts to communities that include redundant transmission lines without alternate route analysis, puts our communities at higher risks Property devaluation and community livability We ask you to hold transmission routes for the public and ratepayers to a high standard of safety and ethics as you oversee new transmission projects. Our specific comments for the Draft PEIS: Pg. 76 Figure 2.1-2 Illustrates a 230kV Right-of-Way (ROW) within scope of 125-200' Clarify intended safe use of ROW standards. Define the width of easement as the minimum safety standard to 200' for 230kV+ lines. Recommend for optimal safety as 200'+ to reduce human, fire and weather condition interaction with lines. (100' to centerline). Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." On Pg 76 the draft states: "engineered... poles...can be used for...230kv facilities when the ROW is restricted." What is the safe width of a "reduced ROW" for a 230kV line? Clarify the application use of a "reduced ROW," for example: use in population density, fire break/tree fall-in potential zones, watershed, waterways, wetlands, sensitive populations (children, etc.), near schools, protected or old growth forests, home distances to lines etc. Clarify how much of a new transmission line can utilize the "reduced ROW?" An entire project, a portion or percentage? Clarify the term "restricted" in the use of a new transmission line construction? What connotes "restricted" as used in the excerpt above from page 76. Clarify if a "reduced ROW" can be utilized in a change of direction on a line run. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." WAC 197-11-030 Policy. (b) "Prepare environmental documents that are concise, clear and to the point, and are supported by evidence..." Pg 76 states: "... when ROW is restricted" We need clarification. When "reduced ROW" clause is instated, we cannot have eminent domain as the primary mechanism to take unaware and non-deeded landowners for an entire or part of a new transmission line project. Clarify when a "reduced ROW" is utilized, confirm that there was an ethical review with public input, of adjacent lands and property owners have been notified in the title deed that the property is at risk of eminent domain. If an entire or partial project is at risk for eminent domain, substantiate why the proposed utility project will need to use engineered poles to fit into a "restricted" zone. For example, if a project has been to be reviewed to include a request for engineered poles to fit into a restricted easement AND the easement has been found to include outdated and/or inadequate deed exhibits, undersized widths, inadequate for its intended use (e.g. an 80 year old easement), skewed or assumed center lines, missing and/or gaps in easements, and tree fall-in risk of adjacent non-deeded parcels, the project will be reviewed for validity. If any are found and the requesting utility company will instate the use of a "reduced ROW" and/or eminent domain to mitigate these inadequacies, the project will be given a determination of significance for adverse impacts and rendered inoperational for the transmission size requested. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 "(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:..." (iv) Environmental justice

and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;” Pg 76 states “...choice of design... depends on factors such as... the surrounding environment.” We need to clarify this definition of design choice. We are concerned about disregarding safety or not honoring our WA State deeds and Clark County property lines a “design choice.” We must oversee wetlands, population density, health effects, fire safety, deeds and property lines, and homes under or within 100 feet of lines as a public health and a vulnerable population issue and not a design choice. Define, under what conditions, a utility company can propose design changes to the permitting agencies as a remedy of an inadequate easement. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:... (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;” Pg. 509 states “A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF’s” Protecting children and sensitive populations from the cumulative effects of Electromagnetic Field (EMF) exposure is very important to our communities. Define and clarify home proximity distances along a new proposed line before permits are issued to be a minimum of 100’ from an overhead line. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(2) ... scope... in proximity to existing, more suitable routes and effective use of existing routes. (4) In defining the scope of nonproject review of electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, the energy facility site evaluation council shall request input from agencies, federally recognized Indian tribes, industry, stakeholders, local governments, and the public to identify the geographic areas suitable for electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, based on the climatic and geophysical attributes conducive to or required for project development.” In conclusion, I invite EFSEC to continue its protection of public health, environmental and safety standards for our state. In addition, we feel it is paramount to protect our rights as landowners and the ethics of the appropriate use of and application of transmission projects to communities we live in. Keep Washington safe and livable for our future.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 63**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 29, 2025 11:25:01 am**Last Seen:** Apr 29, 2025 11:25:01 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Kim Forgione

Q2. Email

kimmiee84@yahoo.com

Q3. Share any comment

[Attached is a Word format of my comments] We ask you to hold transmission routes for the public and ratepayers to a high standard of safety and ethics as you oversee new transmission projects. 1. Path width requirements should not be open to interpretation or mutable, particularly by the companies who stand to profit from using their own judgment to get around such regulations by making changes to structures as they see fit. Companies should not be able to squeeze high voltage lines into restricted paths by making engineering changes at their discretion. Regulations are for public safety and making them mutable based on such factors nullifies their purpose thereby putting the public and the environment at risk. Furthermore, eminent domain should not be the main mechanism used by public companies to acquire additional land to meet width requirements. This should not be allowed in populated areas when other, less populated land is an option. Said company should be required to analyze alternative routes before eminent domain can be pursued. 2. If companies try to get an exception to path width requirements based on design and the surrounding environment, we need to clarify this definition of design choice. We are concerned about disregarding safety or not honoring our WA State deeds and Clark County property lines a "design choice." We must oversee wetlands, population density, health effects, fire safety, deeds and property lines, and homes under or within 100 feet of lines as a public health and a vulnerable population issue and not a design choice. Define, under what conditions, a utility company can propose design changes to the permitting agencies as a remedy of an inadequate and/or historic easement. 3. Page 509 states "A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF's." Due to the gravity of the health threats from EMF exposure, this needs to be a set-in-stone requirement, not merely a suggestion. Furthermore, this should be increased to 200 feet. Protecting children and sensitive populations from the cumulative effects of Electromagnetic Field (EMF) exposure is very important to our communities. Define and clarify home proximity distances along a new proposed line before permits are issued to be a minimum of 100 feet (preferably 200 feet) from a transmission line. Please see study summaries below regarding the risks of ongoing EMF exposure and toxic exposure due to transmission line maintenance. British Medical Journal 4;330(7503) Jun 2005: May 29, 2018 "There is an association between childhood leukemia and proximity of home address at birth to high voltage power lines, and the apparent risk extends to a greater distance than would have been expected from previous studies." Int J Mol Sci 23(3):1339 Jan 2022 showed a link between EMF exposure and the production of oxidative stress which can trigger or enhance the expression of cancer causing genes. Environmental Research Vol 176, Sept 2019: "A statistically significant association was found between ALS and residential exposure to UHF-EMFs. A higher risk was estimated for every 1V/m increase in UHF-EMF exposure with a significant trend." PLoS One 26;7(11), Nov 2012: "Occupational exposure to ELF-EMF was significantly associated with increased risk of ALS in pooled studies (RR=1.29, 95%CI=1.02-1.62), and case-control studies (OR=1.39, 95%CI=1.05-1.84), but not cohort studies (RR = 1.16, 95% CI = 0.80-1.69). In sub-analyses, similar significant associations were found when the exposure level was defined by the job title, but not the job-exposure matrix. In addition, significant associations between occupational exposure to ELF-EMF and increased risk of ALS were found in studies of subjects who were clinically diagnosed but not those based on the death certificate." Environmental Research Vol 178, Nov 2019 shows exposure to magnetic fields increases risk of leukemia, breast cancer, and brain cancer and that studies conducted by unbiased organizations show a link between EMF and leukemia but studies by industries do not. "A major goal of this study is to examine how source of funding influences the reported results and conclusions. Several meta-analyses dating from about 2000 all report significant associations between exposure and risk of leukemia. By examining subsequent reports on childhood leukemia it is clear that almost all government or independent studies find either a statistically significant association between magnetic field exposure and childhood leukemia, or an elevated risk of at least OR=1.5, while almost all industry supported studies fail to find any significant or even suggestive association. A secondary goal of this report is to examine the level of evidence for exposure and elevated risk of various adult cancers. Based on pooled or meta-analyses as well as subsequent peer-reviewed studies

there is strong evidence that excessive exposure to magnetic fields increases risk of adult leukemia, male and female breast cancer and brain cancer. There is less convincing but suggestive evidence for elevations in several other cancer types. There is less clear evidence for bias based on source of funding in the adult cancer studies. There is also some evidence that both paternal and maternal prenatal exposure to magnetic fields results in an increased risk of leukemia and brain cancer in offspring.” May 31, 2011: International Agency on Cancer “classifies radiofrequency electromagnetic fields as possibly carcinogenic to humans” British Medical Journal May 29, 2018 First comprehensive analysis of risk of childhood leukemia and distance to power line residence which revealed an increased risk for residences within 50 meters of 200+KV power lines. Environmental Research June 2020 Vol 185 association of all brain tumors and residential proximity to power lines. Regression analysis found significant association at the 95% confidence interval with an odds ratio of 2.94 for cumulative duration living at less than 50 meters of power lines greater than 200KV. British Journal of Cancer 2000 vol 83 page 692 9 pooled studies documenting odds ratio of 2.0 in children exposed to 0.4uT or greater strength. Internal Medicine Journal 37(9):614-9, Sept 2007: “Although recognizing that this study has limitations, the results raise the possibility that prolonged residence close to high-voltage power lines, especially early in life, may increase the risk of the development of myeloproliferative disorders and lymphoproliferative disorders later.” To control vegetation along lines, companies use numerous herbicides for line maintenance: glyphosate, 2,4-D, fluroxypyr, and triclopyr, imazapyr, glyphosate, triclopyr salts, picloram, Spartan Charge, Aim EC, Affinity Broadspec, Ally Extra, and Express herbicides. These leech into surface and groundwater affecting wells and communities’ drinking water. Monoclonal gammopathy of unspecified origin (MGUS) is a presumed condition for ALL veterans exposed to toxic chemicals, a diagnosis with a statistically significant increased risk of the condition leading to Multiple Myeloma with continued herbicide exposure. As you can see, there is ample evidence that shows there are significant health risks associated with EMF exposure, particularly when looking at unbiased studies that have not been influenced by industries that profit from transmission lines. The industry gets around this by saying it cannot be proven conclusively, but there is very strong supportive evidence. Regardless, we should not be treated like guinea pigs. With this much evidence, we need to create and enforce stronger safety standards for dwellings in proximity to transmission lines. 4. The path width required for a 230kV transmission line should not exist as a range of 125 to 200 feet or arbitrarily narrower. It should be required to be at least 200 feet regardless of design when considering fire safety, weather danger, surface and groundwater risks, property devaluation (and subsequent decreased tax revenue to the state), homeowners insurance availability/affordability, and adverse effects to the health and livability of the surrounding community. In conclusion, I invite EFSEC to continue its protection of public health, environmental and safety standards for our state. In addition, we feel it is paramount to protect our rights as landowners and the ethics of the appropriate use of and application of transmission projects to communities we live in. Keep Washington safe and livable for our future.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/2212c894f871b74f755f43d8070cc8bdfafa5d73/original/1745950922/8981e71186fa7571d40c510f5a261fd4_EFSEC%20comment%20KF.docx?1745950922
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 64**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 29, 2025 13:23:48 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 29, 2025 13:23:48 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. **Name** Jacob Daugherty

Q2. **Email** jdaugherty330@gmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

Some points to consider: A. Due to fire and weather danger, health risks, environmental concerns, and community livability, requirements on path width minimums for 230kV lines need to be clearly stated and enforced with no exceptions regardless of design. Otherwise, power companies can do anything they want based on what they perceive to be engineered for safety within a narrower width. That essentially means they have no regulations at all. B. Based on a literature search, the minimum path width for a 230 kV line should be at least 200 feet and the required distance from dwellings even greater to avoid health risks of cancers, ALS, and other neurodegenerative diseases. Furthermore, the minimum distance from dwellings needs to be enforced. C. Power companies should be required to analyze alternative routes regardless of whether or not they own easements in order to protect communities, neighborhoods, and environmentally sensitive areas particularly when the easement is unused and/or historic (50+ years old) in nature as population density and environmental standards change significantly over decades' time. D. If power companies plan on using an existing easement but the planned path for the proposed transmission line is incomplete, in order for them to obtain new land acquisition, they must make their case that such acquisitions are necessary including analysis of all alternative routes before permitting. E. Power companies should be required to establish how they plan to maintain the vegetation along transmission lines when close to dwellings, wells, surface and groundwater as there is great risk to residents who are exposed to pesticides on a long term basis, particularly children and veterans. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I appreciate the work you do to protect communities and the environment.

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)** not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?** not answered



Respondent No: 65

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 29, 2025 14:41:07 pm

Last Seen: Apr 29, 2025 14:41:07 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Mark Rogers
Q2. Email	markrvan@comcast.net
Q3. Share any comment	Move the power lines East past the established neighborhoods. Things have changed greatly since the 1950's!
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/c1b83692bb3841939e2ac67e01226168c8ea20ee/original/1745962808/eb9ecff148c5cdcc66e7a08112cf2243_Move%20theline%20East.docx?1745962808
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 66

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 29, 2025 16:07:41 pm

Last Seen: Apr 29, 2025 16:07:41 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Kathryn Felix
Q2. Email	curtiskathryn93@gmail.com
Q3. Share any comment	not answered
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/2212c894f871b74f755f43d8070cc8bdfafa5d73/original/1745968054/dd0093f2d7d0428e1be9e0920199170e_EFSEC%20comment%20KF.docx?1745968054
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 67

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 29, 2025 21:25:49 pm

Last Seen: Apr 29, 2025 21:25:49 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **Name** Ryan Crompton

Q2. **Email** rwccorps@gmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

This is a great approach for the state to be taking to help be more efficient and faster when reviewing transmission line applications. And since many of these projects have many of the same attributes it makes sense to review those once and start from there on every new project application. I feel like a week doesn't go by without seeing an article or a news segment on how the grid is struggling and more transmission capabilities are needed. With everyone putting in AC, data centers popping up throughout Wenatchee, Quincy and the new factories in Moses Lake this approach should help get power to where it's needed as cheap as possible and allow our state to keep growing.

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)** not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?** not answered

**Respondent No:** 68**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 30, 2025 14:24:05 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 30, 2025 14:24:05 pm**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Patrick Borunda

Q2. Email

performs360@gmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

Having read your draft regulations, we have a couple of questions for you. On Page 509 you say, "A safe minimum distance of 100 feet ...is recommended to minimize health effects of EMFs.' Why is "recommended" seen as a strong enough precaution? Why isn't it "required?" From a long-term social accounting perspective, it makes more sense to have a one-time capital outlay to acquire an alternative route to avoid habitats and permanent commercial and agricultural structures than it does to expose generations of citizens to health damages from EMFs. You're in the business of ensuring sound public policy for the long run. Take a long view now. In the absence of an iron-clad minimum safe distance, the regulated entities should be required to cover in their entirety the cost of moving affected structures to an alternative location on the owners' property outside the recommended minimum distance. The cost should not be borne by property owners for corporate convenience. In a similar vein, if eminent domain is to be invoked anywhere on the proposed transmission route, then construction and user utilities must be mandated to show that alternative routes have been evaluated and shown to be infeasible. This is not about corporate cost accounting but rather a matter of good social policy. Very truly, Patrick Borunda and Marit Federcell

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered



Respondent No: 69

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Apr 30, 2025 18:57:38 pm

Last Seen: Apr 30, 2025 18:57:38 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Brian Knotts
Q2. Email	brian8knotts@gmail.com
Q3. Share any comment	See attached uploaded text file.
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 70**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 30, 2025 21:25:30 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 30, 2025 21:25:30 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. Name	Wei Pan
Q2. Email	dillon.w.pan@gmail.com
Q3. Share any comment	Please see the uploaded comments below.
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/d3e41ca2122b660dda87ccfc456ced68e6abbf0b/original/1746073493/c1da3629b2442127d5cbc2890bfc43f1_PacifiCorp%20HV%20transmission%20line%20comments.docx?1746073493
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 71**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** Apr 30, 2025 22:00:30 pm**Last Seen:** Apr 30, 2025 22:00:30 pm**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Pamela Graham

Q2. Email

rickiracer12x@gmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

In addition to my desire to demand that you review alternate routes, I concur with Christine and Roger Neill's comments below: Comments for the Transmission Programmatic EIS for the State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) Please consider our comments below for the welfare, safety and health of our community and our state. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of transmission lines have significant impacts to our environment and human health. Issues to highlight: Easement widths are fire and weather event risks Toxic substances in maintaining lines Prolonged EMF exposure with homes near/under lines Surface and groundwater risks for the health for our children and community Allowing Right-of-Way (ROW) reductions with modified poles for entire routes that are inadequate or too narrow for requested powerlines, risks from tree fall-ins, gaps in contiguous lines, centerline skews and/or home protection from proximity risks is unjust and unethical to, by default, require eminent domain as the main mechanism to acquisition. Impacts to communities that include redundant transmission lines without alternate route analysis, puts our communities at higher risks Property devaluation and community livability We ask you to hold transmission routes for the public and ratepayers to a high standard of safety and ethics as you oversee new transmission projects. Our specific comments for the Draft PEIS: Pg. 76 Figure 2.1-2 Illustrates a 230kV Right-of-Way (ROW) within scope of 125-200' Clarify intended safe use of ROW standards. Define the width of easement as the minimum safety standard to 200' for 230kV+ lines. Recommend for optimal safety as 200'+ to reduce human, fire and weather condition interaction with lines. (100' to centerline). Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities... cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." On Pg 76 the draft states: "engineered... poles...can be used for...230kv facilities when the ROW is restricted." What is the safe width of a "reduced ROW" for a 230kV line? Clarify the application use of a "reduced ROW," for example: use in population density, fire break/tree fall-in potential zones, watershed, waterways, wetlands, sensitive populations (children, etc.), near schools, protected or old growth forests, home distances to lines etc. Clarify how much of a new transmission line can utilize the "reduced ROW?" An entire project, a portion or percentage? Clarify the term "restricted" in the use of a new transmission line construction? What connotes "restricted" as used in the excerpt above from page 76. Clarify if a "reduced ROW" can be utilized in a change of direction on a line run. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." WAC 197-11-030 Policy. (b) "Prepare environmental documents that are concise, clear and to the point, and are supported by evidence..." Pg 76 states: "... when ROW is restricted" We need clarification. When "reduced ROW" clause is instated, we cannot have eminent domain as the primary mechanism to take unaware and non-deeded landowners for an entire or part of a new transmission line project. Clarify when a "reduced ROW" is utilized, confirm that there was an ethical review with public input, of adjacent lands and property owners have been notified in the title deed that the property is at risk of eminent domain. If an entire or partial project is at risk for eminent domain, substantiate why the proposed utility project will need to use engineered poles to fit into a "restricted" zone. For example, if a project has been to be reviewed to include a request for engineered poles to fit into a restricted easement AND the easement has been found to include outdated and/or inadequate deed exhibits, undersized widths, inadequate for its intended use (e.g. an 80 year old easement), skewed or assumed center lines, missing and/or gaps in easements, and tree fall-in risk of adjacent non-deeded parcels, the project will be reviewed for validity. If any are found and the requesting utility company will instate the use of a "reduced ROW" and/or eminent domain to mitigate these inadequacies, the project will be given a determination of significance for adverse impacts and rendered inoperational for the transmission size requested. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 "(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:..." (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW

70A.02.010;" Pg 76 states "...choice of design... depends on factors such as... the surrounding environment." We need to clarify this definition of design choice. We are concerned about disregarding safety or not honoring our WA State deeds and Clark County property lines a "design choice." We must oversee wetlands, population density, health effects, fire safety, deeds and property lines, and homes under or within 100 feet of lines as a public health and a vulnerable population issue and not a design choice. Define, under what conditions, a utility company can propose design changes to the permitting agencies as a remedy of an inadequate easement. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 "(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:... (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;" Pg. 509 states "A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF's" Protecting children and sensitive populations from the cumulative effects of Electromagnetic Field (EMF) exposure is very important to our communities. Define and clarify home proximity distances along a new proposed line before permits are issued to be a minimum of 100' from an overhead line. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 "(2) ... scope... in proximity to existing, more suitable routes and effective use of existing routes. (4) In defining the scope of nonproject review of electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, the energy facility site evaluation council shall request input from agencies, federally recognized Indian tribes, industry, stakeholders, local governments, and the public to identify the geographic areas suitable for electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, based on the climatic and geophysical attributes conducive to or required for project development." In conclusion, I invite EFSEC to continue its protection of public health, environmental and safety standards for our state. In addition, we feel it is paramount to protect our rights as landowners and the ethics of the appropriate use of and application of transmission projects to communities we live in. Keep Washington safe and livable for our future.

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)**

not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)**

not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?**

No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?**

not answered

**Respondent No:** 72**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** May 02, 2025 18:38:24 pm**Last Seen:** May 02, 2025 18:38:24 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. Name	Matt Sarkinen
Q2. Email	Msarki@outlook.com
Q3. Share any comment	<p>All, I live on 213th Ave, in brush prairie, the proposed line will be coming right across my property corner, nobody talked to me or asked to use any part of the private road, there's nothing in my deed allowing for this, and also, i am a maintenance lead on our driveway repair team along with a couple of other guys on the road. How about you get permission or offer to pay us to use oir road?? Nobody's allowed to trespass, BTW please, thanks, Matt Sarkinen Thank you, Matt</p>
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 73**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** May 05, 2025 23:32:20 pm**Last Seen:** May 05, 2025 23:32:20 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. **Name** Darrel Rast

Q2. **Email** Rast77@gmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

The route through our populated communities should not be considered when alternatives exist. The potential for fires and health effects exposes Pacificorp to enormous future liability running these lines through land that is now largely residential. The route through GPNF is so much better for everyone.

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)** not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?** not answered

**Respondent No:** 74**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** May 06, 2025 08:31:12 am**Last Seen:** May 06, 2025 08:31:12 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Matthew Frohs

Q2. Email

mattfrohs@hotmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

I concur with Christine and Roger Neill's comments below: Comments for the Transmission Programmatic EIS for the State of Washington Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (EFSEC) Please consider our comments below for the welfare, safety and health of our community and our state. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of transmission lines have significant impacts to our environment and human health. Issues to highlight: Easement widths are fire and weather event risks Toxic substances in maintaining lines Prolonged EMF exposure with homes near/under lines Surface and groundwater risks for the health for our children and community Allowing Right-of-Way (ROW) reductions with modified poles for entire routes that are inadequate or too narrow for requested powerlines, risks from tree fall-ins, gaps in contiguous lines, centerline skews and/or home protection from proximity risks is unjust and unethical to, by default, require eminent domain as the main mechanism to acquisition. Impacts to communities that include redundant transmission lines without alternate route analysis, puts our communities at higher risks Property devaluation and community livability We ask you to hold transmission routes for the public and ratepayers to a high standard of safety and ethics as you oversee new transmission projects. Our specific comments for the Draft PEIS: Pg. 76 Figure 2.1-2 Illustrates a 230kV Right-of-Way (ROW) within scope of 125-200' Clarify intended safe use of ROW standards. Define the width of easement as the minimum safety standard to 200' for 230kV+ lines. Recommend for optimal safety as 200'+ to reduce human, fire and weather condition interaction with lines. (100' to centerline). Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." On Pg 76 the draft states: "engineered... poles...can be used for...230kv facilities when the ROW is restricted." What is the safe width of a "reduced ROW" for a 230kV line? Clarify the application use of a "reduced ROW," for example: use in population density, fire break/tree fall-in potential zones, watershed, waterways, wetlands, sensitive populations (children, etc.), near schools, protected or old growth forests, home distances to lines etc. Clarify how much of a new transmission line can utilize the "reduced ROW?" An entire project, a portion or percentage? Clarify the term "restricted" in the use of a new transmission line construction? What connotes "restricted" as used in the excerpt above from page 76. Clarify if a "reduced ROW" can be utilized in a change of direction on a line run. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 (3) "...consider (all) impacts to: ...overburdened communities...cultural resources and interests,... land uses... and must identify measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate probable significant adverse environmental impacts." WAC 197-11-030 Policy. (b) "Prepare environmental documents that are concise, clear and to the point, and are supported by evidence..." Pg 76 states: "... when ROW is restricted" We need clarification. When "reduced ROW" clause is instated, we cannot have eminent domain as the primary mechanism to take unaware and non-deeded landowners for an entire or part of a new transmission line project. Clarify when a "reduced ROW" is utilized, confirm that there was an ethical review with public input, of adjacent lands and property owners have been notified in the title deed that the property is at risk of eminent domain. If an entire or partial project is at risk for eminent domain, substantiate why the proposed utility project will need to use engineered poles to fit into a "restricted" zone. For example, if a project has been to be reviewed to include a request for engineered poles to fit into a restricted easement AND the easement has been found to include outdated and/or inadequate deed exhibits, undersized widths, inadequate for its intended use (e.g. an 80 year old easement), skewed or assumed center lines, missing and/or gaps in easements, and tree fall-in risk of adjacent non-deeded parcels, the project will be reviewed for validity. If any are found and the requesting utility company will instate the use of a "reduced ROW" and/or eminent domain to mitigate these inadequacies, the project will be given a determination of significance for adverse impacts and rendered inoperational for the transmission size requested. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 "(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:..." (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;" Pg 76 states "...choice of design... depends on factors

such as... the surrounding environment.” We need to clarify this definition of design choice. We are concerned about disregarding safety or not honoring our WA State deeds and Clark County property lines a “design choice.” We must oversee wetlands, population density, health effects, fire safety, deeds and property lines, and homes under or within 100 feet of lines as a public health and a vulnerable population issue and not a design choice. Define, under what conditions, a utility company can propose design changes to the permitting agencies as a remedy of an inadequate easement. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(3)(a)...analysis of the following probable significant adverse environmental impacts, including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to:... (iv) Environmental justice and overburdened communities as defined in RCW 70A.02.010;” Pg. 509 states “A safe, minimum distance of 100 feet from transmission facilities is recommended to minimize the health effects of EMF’s” Protecting children and sensitive populations from the cumulative effects of Electromagnetic Field (EMF) exposure is very important to our communities. Define and clarify home proximity distances along a new proposed line before permits are issued to be a minimum of 100’ from an overhead line. Citing PEIS document driving RCW 43.21C.405 “(2) ... scope... in proximity to existing, more suitable routes and effective use of existing routes. (4) In defining the scope of nonproject review of electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, the energy facility site evaluation council shall request input from agencies, federally recognized Indian tribes, industry, stakeholders, local governments, and the public to identify the geographic areas suitable for electrical transmission facilities with a nominal voltage of 230kV or greater, based on the climatic and geophysical attributes conducive to or required for project development.” In conclusion, I invite EFSEC to continue its protection of public health, environmental and safety standards for our state. In addition, we feel it is paramount to protect our rights as landowners and the ethics of the appropriate use of and application of transmission projects to communities we live in. Keep Washington safe and livable for our future.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 75**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** May 06, 2025 10:05:48 am**Last Seen:** May 06, 2025 10:05:48 am**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. **Name** David Krueger

Q2. **Email** davek1122@gmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

I think that easements that were obtained in the years past did not consider the growth and housing and communities that have since been built and that today they would not be approved. A review or study of the easements should be redone and evaluated on the requirements of today and not several years ago when most of the area was inhabited by families. The health risks and risk of fires should be considered as they are increasing as time goes on, and more studies have been done to assist in evaluating those risks. I know that it costs more to have wires buried underground, however, it is much safer and also keeps the beauty of the area in tact. I also feel that since this will not improve Washington residents or provide any service to us that the costs should be up to Oregon. I also think that since the power is going to Oregon alone, that they should have to use facilities and sources in Oregon and not from a neighboring state. I do oppose such uses of Washington resources for another state.

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)** not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?** not answered

**Respondent No:** 76**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** May 10, 2025 08:17:53 am**Last Seen:** May 10, 2025 08:17:53 am**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Bonnie S Helms

Q2. Email

bonnibusmaximus@aol.com

Q3. Share any comment

This is a statewide project so, if the number of comments is low, the EFSEC council has only their selves to blame. This PEIS will affect all Washingtonians, yet you hardly make an effort to engage the people to be involved and make comment on something so consequential, impactful and costly. In regards to the EIS, you MUST continue to allow each project to go through its own SEPA process and to NOT be guided by a single study. As things evolve technologically, politically and economically, each area of our state will have different needs and requirements that must go through their own justified due process. You cannot paint our state with a single brush just so that you may have ease of siting. This is a gross overreach and unconstitutional move by the council, which is in line with the corruption that lies with having a chair that has questionable ethics. Please see the article by cascade PBS below: <https://www.cascadepbs.org/investigations/2025/04/new-washington-energy-chairs-industry-ties-raise-ethics-questions> Further, the April Executive Order restricts the council specifically in regards to energy. The POTUS has said: American energy dominance is threatened when State and local governments seek to regulate energy beyond their constitutional or statutory authorities. For example, when States target or discriminate against out-of-State energy producers by imposing significant barriers to interstate and international trade, American energy suffers, and the equality of each State enshrined by the Constitution is undermined. Similarly, when States subject energy producers to arbitrary or excessive fines through retroactive penalties or seek to control energy development, siting, or production activities on Federal land, American energy suffers. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/04/protecting-american-energy-from-state-overreach/> Washington state has a large amount of federal land which is included in this PEIS. If this is allowed to go through, if you, the council, approve this PEIS, it will not only be in direct violation of the WA state constitution, but you will be performing an action that oversteps the federal government. This is not your place. You must vote for the "No Action Alternative" untile either more Washingtonians are allowed to partake in this process, OR until the federal lawsuits with the state and the Federal govt are concluded. It's quite hypocritical to sue over an energy emergency, yet to be creating one yourselves. <https://www.atg.wa.gov/news/news-releases/wa-joins-states-suing-trump-over-illegal-attacks-wind-energy-development> This is not the right time. Either take no action or delay this process until a fair assessment of the PEOPLE's energy needs is completed. This PEIS is not that, it is overreach, unconstitutional, not equitable and not in our best interests.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered



Respondent No: 77

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: May 10, 2025 08:45:39 am

Last Seen: May 10, 2025 08:45:39 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Kristen Weise
Q2. Email	Kmweise@comcast.net
Q3. Share any comment	<p>I request that the council take the "no action alternative" so that projects continue to go through individual review. A single study should not guide every state transmission project when each area of our state will have its own unique needs and barriers. This is another overreach by the EFSEC council. Multiple other cities counties and states are pausing these installations due to the ongoing environmental and health concerns.</p>
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	not answered
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 78**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** May 14, 2025 13:06:00 pm**Last Seen:** May 14, 2025 13:06:00 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. **Name** Patti Reynolds

Q2. **Email** pattireynolds55@gmail.com

Q3. **Share any comment**

The decision by Pacificorp to activate its rights to an easement purchased 50 years ago appears fully driven by corporate profit without regard for environmental and personal property concerns of the long-standing residents impacted by this easement. The Clark County leadership in the past certainly showed no restraint in allowing developers to increase residential structures so this previously low-home count easement is now an impact on homes, environment and wildlife . Current Clark County leadership has stated concerns they were not aware. Pacificorp has potentially insufficient land to meet construction and safety standards and an eminent domain strategy creates an economic nightmare and safety concerns for a large taxpayer base in our County. I ask that development and construction permits be denied first this plan

Q4. **Upload your document (optional)** not answered

Q5. **Upload a picture (optional)** not answered

Q6. **Did you also share a video?** No

Q7. **What is the title of your video?** not answered

**Respondent No:** 79**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** May 14, 2025 16:58:45 pm**Last Seen:** May 14, 2025 16:58:45 pm**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. Name	dee carlson
Q2. Email	deecarlson57@msn.com
Q3. Share any comment	Please see attached document
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/942a80b6385080788744188277cdfb78f43fc15c/original/1747267113/f850ac00eb04ed125a39d16a6013aad7_Power%20Line%20PEIS.pdf?1747267113
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 80

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: May 15, 2025 10:11:19 am

Last Seen: May 15, 2025 10:11:19 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Teryn Yazdani
Q2. Email	teryn@columbiariverkeeper.org
Q3. Share any comment	not answered
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/b00367b491c7a85a88baf11a31acd85a972786fd/original/1747329075/64f441a80c93b6cd1cca810a3dee39ce_2025.05.15__final_%20CRK%20Transmission%20PEIS%20Comments.pdf?1747329075
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 81

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: May 15, 2025 11:06:07 am

Last Seen: May 15, 2025 11:06:07 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	DNR SEPA Center
Q2. Email	SEPACENTER@DNR.wa.gov
Q3. Share any comment	Thank you for your consideration, please see our letter attached.
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/4771ed1bfb8df7782245fa9b1ce035fd69889efb/original/1747332214/a4bcc392f3d56e65d0dd5ba23b88e562_DNR%20Comments%20Transmission%20PEIS.docx?1747332214
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 82

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: May 15, 2025 13:12:51 pm

Last Seen: May 15, 2025 13:12:51 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Doug Howell
Q2. Email	seattlehowell@gmail.com
Q3. Share any comment	See attached document
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/cccf8b303f104762fd300c0e723756ced6f5763/original/1747339965/89fbc1d96807d9ab0416f1704de1a585_Howell%20comments%20on%20EFSEC%20transmission%20PEIS.pdf?1747339965
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 83

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: May 15, 2025 14:04:32 pm

Last Seen: May 15, 2025 14:04:32 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Audie Huber
Q2. Email	audiehuber@ctuir.org
Q3. Share any comment	<p>Please find attached the comments of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation Department of Natural Resources on the Transmission PEIS.</p>
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/6d63c4b2c2d36c5cb5e83c7cb19e737ad5a394e7/original/1747341877/261fc73fbd12cbbc3a0d87f38bb6b39a_CTUIR%20DNR%205%2015%202025%20Letter%20to%20WA%20EFSEC%20re%20Transmission%20PEIS%20final%20with%20attachment.pdf?1747341877
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 84

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: May 15, 2025 14:10:05 pm

Last Seen: May 15, 2025 14:10:05 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Julie Carter
Q2. Email	carj@critfc.org
Q3. Share any comment	not answered
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/1aa03e27eb91dd34374e45cdcf9b7eb0b1cc7008/original/1747343391/112a4031a7943bd112a04f7db91412eb_2025%2005%2015%20CRITFC%20comments%20PEIS%20Docket%20No181034.pdf?1747343391
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 85

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: May 15, 2025 14:23:00 pm

Last Seen: May 15, 2025 14:23:00 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Audie Huber
Q2. Email	audiehuber@ctuir.org
Q3. Share any comment	<p>Please find attached the comments of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation Department of Natural Resources on the Transmission Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.</p>
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/6d63c4b2c2d36c5cb5e83c7cb19e737ad5a394e7/original/1747344165/ec2bf3be11c563035e4c63ab6f96db35_CTUIR%20DNR%205%2015%202025%20Letter%20to%20WA%20EFSEC%20re%20Transmission%20PEIS%20final%20with%20attachment.pdf?1747344165
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 86

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: May 15, 2025 14:43:52 pm

Last Seen: May 15, 2025 14:43:52 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Casey MacLean
Q2. Email	casey@renewablenw.org
Q3. Share any comment	not answered
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/9ecef7fd4456187ffa84da23af94a43beff24494/original/1747345427/eee268fc3b70d1099dee0d8fbbffc888_EFSEC%20Transmission%20PEIS_RNWComments_Final.docx.pdf?1747345427
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 87

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: May 15, 2025 14:59:19 pm

Last Seen: May 15, 2025 14:59:19 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Altinay Karasapan
Q2. Email	altinay.karasapan@climatesolutions.org
Q3. Share any comment	not answered
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/09fae38a255295793f34114052075622e3040ebd/original/1747346332/e486319c22e68821fbe952a7290a266c_CS%20Tx%20PEIS%20Comments.pdf?1747346332
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 88

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: May 15, 2025 16:08:03 pm

Last Seen: May 15, 2025 16:08:03 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Sara Leverette
Q2. Email	sara.leverette@pse.com
Q3. Share any comment	Thank you for this opportunity to comment.
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/3589382e2f6238c1e80ed7832e769028e83d95b3/original/1747350455/3f6a4125ffcd4168cb535f8b9b87ce99_5-15-25%20-%20Puget%20Sound%20Energy%20-%20Draft%20PEIS%20Comment%20letter.pdf?1747350455
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 89

Login: jesantos

Email: julian@waconservationaction.org

Responded At: May 15, 2025 16:26:00 pm

Last Seen: May 15, 2025 23:24:44 pm

IP Address: 67.161.81.184

Q1. Name	Julian Santos
Q2. Email	julian@waconservationaction.org
Q3. Share any comment	not answered
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/d730ae558ed2c8710f0b8fb120d62457ca20d9b5/original/1747351553/e69f9f9a4e118a72d60a1c0b91a4466f_WCA%20Comments%20on%20Draft%20Transmission%20PEIS.pdf?1747351553
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 90

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: May 15, 2025 16:30:41 pm

Last Seen: May 15, 2025 16:30:41 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	George Lynch
Q2. Email	george.lynch@commerce.wa.gov
Q3. Share any comment	not answered
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/0ec085f71b0097f8bbf3916952fc39163bd64555/original/1747351833/939a1080d1758d4575e42442d44158ed_Commerce%20Energy%20Policy%20Comments%20-%20Transmission%20PEIS%202025-05-15.pdf?1747351833
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 91

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: May 15, 2025 16:45:41 pm

Last Seen: May 15, 2025 16:45:41 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation
Q2. Email	anthony@yakamanation-olc.org
Q3. Share any comment	Comment Letter Attached.
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/dc1233d084a059c11ede33ed2c082ce94bb2793b/original/1747352701/c575af2b57540b67906f5bf021e2ce59_Letter%20%28Signed%29_YN_EFSEC_DPEIS%20%285.15.25%29.pdf?1747352701
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 92

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: May 15, 2025 16:48:46 pm

Last Seen: May 15, 2025 16:48:46 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Austin Smith Jr.
Q2. Email	riley.neffwarner@bbklaw.com
Q3. Share any comment	not answered
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/63a4588debf82ccb3e62d32bcd061b15d0ac22c/original/1747352883/6a60197416b60b28981d7055525eccb1_WA%20Transmission.pdf?1747352883
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered

**Respondent No:** 93**Login:** Anonymous**Email:** n/a**Responded At:** May 15, 2025 16:52:02 pm**Last Seen:** May 15, 2025 16:52:02 pm**IP Address:** n/a**Q1. Name**

Randy and Marianne Ingram

Q2. Email

xmarianneix@gmail.com

Q3. Share any comment

We researched this easement prior to purchasing our home. What made us not concerned were 2 specific items. 1. The easement was older than 50 years old and had not been built upon. It is my understanding that this classifies as an abandoned easement. 2. The reasoning that the easement was obtained upon, was to ship power from the Swift dam hydro project, to the Troutdale substation. Speaking to engineers involved, the Swift dam did not have enough volume to generate power that necessitated the line. Rather the power generated was so insignificant, that it was transferred to the trunk via low volume service lines. Unless the Lewis River has grown substantially in volume, this project is not being used for its original intent. Rather, I speculate that the project is planned to ship high volume power as an alternate path to the I-5 corridor lines. This is disingenuous. If they are planning to ship high volumes of power as I suspect, this easement is not large enough and the line should be moved east to less population density.

Q4. Upload your document (optional)

not answered

Q5. Upload a picture (optional)

not answered

Q6. Did you also share a video?

No

Q7. What is the title of your video?

not answered



Respondent No: 94

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: May 15, 2025 16:58:25 pm

Last Seen: May 15, 2025 16:58:25 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Joshua Rubenstein
Q2. Email	joshua.rubenstein@tnc.org
Q3. Share any comment	not answered
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/3d9d8fb466905fd81dcffb59b3f6ac6da0722833/original/1747353502/96b5327b38df1c4e72cd6b5b470f4410_Transmission%20PEIS%20comments%20EFSEC%20May%2015%202025.pdf?1747353502
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered



Respondent No: 95

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: May 15, 2025 16:59:33 pm

Last Seen: May 15, 2025 16:59:33 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. Name	Nadine Nadow
Q2. Email	nadine@conservationnw.org
Q3. Share any comment	not answered
Q4. Upload your document (optional)	https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ehq-production-us-california/22c418086b544ed37ccc5ee3393b88c4048c650c/original/1747353560/3af700a0c87f92e75c5a145b2c46fa4e_CNW.EFSEC%20Transmission%20Draft%20PEIS%20Comment%20-%20May%2015_%202025.pdf?1747353560
Q5. Upload a picture (optional)	not answered
Q6. Did you also share a video?	No
Q7. What is the title of your video?	not answered