

Wallingford-Ingo, Gail

From: Pamela A Kuhrt <pkuhrt61@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2019 1:54 PM
To: Wallingford-Ingo, Gail
Subject: BH Alternative A4 Route (CORRECTION)

From: Marcie Defoe <marciedefoe@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2019 2:36 PM
To: Pamela A Kuhrt <pkuhrt61@outlook.com>
Subject: BH Alternative A4 Route (CORRECTION)

CORRECTION IN RED

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Marcie Defoe <marciedefoe@yahoo.com>

To: Pamela A Kuhrt <pkuhrt61@outlook.com>
Sent: December 10, 2019, 1:33:14 PM MST
Subject: BH Alternative A4 Route

The only possibility that I can see, is to pursue the A4, Hwy 50 Route as I mentioned to you and Mel earlier. To our favor, Black Hills has already documented that this route:

- 1 - meets their purpose and need
 - 2 - does not cross any developed residential properties
 - 3 - meets their project cost
 - 4 - total length in miles is less than their preferred route
 - 5 - runs parallel to Hwy 50 in existing easement
- In addition, it:
- 6 - doesn't devalue existing properties
 - 7 - doesn't negatively impact resale values
 - 8 - the line is not contiguous with any properties involved

BH stated their reasons for not considering this route is:

- 1 - it would be within 1,000 ft of 169 residents (north side)
- 2 - it would be within 2,500 ft of **502** residents (south side)
- 3 - it would have a visual impact on more residents

BH has not even contacted any of these resident for input. They just looked at the numbers (1,000-2,500 footage and total properties) and made a decision to skip them.
Numbers alone do not present an accurate picture.

After driving through the area yesterday, it appeared to me, that most of the residents south of Hwy 50 would not have a direct view of the line. Only the residents on Calle de Camelia Dr (less than 75) face the line. I also did not talk to any residents, or take any pictures.

From: Pamela A Kuhrt <pkuhrt61@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2019 10:01 PM
To: Wallingford-Ingo, Gail
Subject: Black Hills Purpose and Need are met by the Hwy 50 route

From: Marcie Defoe <marciedefoe@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2019 5:26 PM
To: Pamela A Kuhrt <pkuhrt61@outlook.com>; Mel Manrose <ml4570rose@yahoo.com>
Subject: Black Hills Purpose and Need are met by the Hwy 50 route

Hi Pam and Mel,

We don't have much time between now and Tuesday to come up with new information to present to the commissioners. So I was going through last years Black Hills document titled "Black Hills ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS - Canon West Reliability Project" dated November 2018.

Noted Discrepancy - The [Hwy 50] route was one of BH's proposed routes in 2018. In BH's 'Table 1. Comparison of Alternatives' [shown below] BH states that this route MET Black Hills PURPOSE and NEED. Their stated reason for not using this route was that it would affect a greater number of residents than their Preferred Route. And that the residents had not been notified.

In our latest, November 26, 2019, Public Hearing with the Commissioners, Seth stated that "the distribution line along Hwy 50 was in CDOT's ROW and therefore could not be used by BH". (I think Commissioner Heart asked this question but I'm not sure.) Seth did not mention that this route would affect more residents (which doesn't seem possible when looking at the maps). Nor did he mention that these residents hadn't been notified. These last two points were last years reason for not using the Hwy 50 route.

Marcie

(Excerpt in last years Black Hills 'ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS - Canon West Reliability Project dated November 2018.)

Table 1. Comparison of Alternatives (page 15)

Route ID	Does the Alternative Meet the Purpose ³ and Need?	Total Length (Miles)	Miles Under-ground	Parcels Crossed	Residences within 1,000 feet of New Easement	Residences between 1,000 - 2,500 feet of New Easement ¹	Cost Relative to Preferred Route (Pueblo County Only) ⁵
A1	No	19.56	0	39	234	396	1.04P
A2	No	18.89	0	23	234	396	1P
A3	No	17.03	0	16	140	416	0.9P
A4	Yes	15.68	0	18	169 ²	502 ²	0.83P
Preferred	Yes	18.87	0	19	26 ²	180 ²	1P

B1	No	21.37	0	24	247	441	1.13P
B2	No	16.98	0	20	164	386	0.90P
B3	Yes	18.87	3	19	3 ^{2,4}	131 ^{2,4}	1P+8.52M ⁶
B4	Yes	15.32	0	18	191 ²	788 ²	0.81P
B5	Yes	14.97	0	13	191 ²	743 ²	0.79P

¹ Residences between 1,000 and 2,500 feet of the new easement could experience some visual impacts depending on topography and other factors, but the level of visual impacts decreases with distance from the transmission line.

² This does not include the residences that are adjacent to the existing West Station transmission corridor since existing transmission poles would be utilized for the Project.

³ Routes that do not connect to the Pueblo West industrial area do not meet the purpose and need for the Project.

⁴ For Route B3, residences along the underground segment are not included.

⁵ 'P' is estimated cost of the Preferred alternative. Detailed cost estimates have not been developed for each route alternative. Costs estimates are assumed based on the length of the transmission line and are presented in relation to the preferred route estimate. We assume overhead line construction would cost an approximate \$250,000 per mile on average.

⁶ Underground costs are detailed in Appendices A – C. 3 Miles of underground transmission would cost an estimated \$9,270,000 in addition to the cost of the Preferred alternative (minus the \$750,000 of overhead costs for the 3 miles).

4.2.4 Alternative A4 (proposed by Black Hills on page 16 & 17)

Black Hills Energy also considered routing the transmission line further south to run parallel to Hwy 50 into Fremont County. Because the western tie-in point is in the North Cañon area, this would require the route to traverse north through more populated areas in Fremont County which would affect more individual land owners than are affected by the proposed route. In addition, there would be more land owners south of Hwy 50 that would have the line within their viewshed as they look west than is proposed under the Preferred Route. (My note: The people south of Hwy 50 would not have the poles in their back yard...their property values would not be impacted.)

Alternative A4 would result in visual impacts to the largest number of residents as compared to the other alternatives identified by Black Hills Energy. As shown in Table 1, new easement for alternative A4 in Pueblo County would be within 1,000 feet of 169 residences and within 2,500 feet of 502 additional residences. The Preferred Route would be within 1,000 feet of 26 residences and within 1,000 feet to 2,500 feet of 180 additional residences. Because this alternative would have more visual impacts on residences than the Preferred Route, it was not considered further.

4.2.6.4 ALTERNATIVE B4 (proposed by the public on page 19)

Alternative B4 was proposed by members of the public and is similar to the route analyzed previously by Black Hills Energy as Alternative A4.

The easement for alternative B4 would be within 1,000 feet of 191 residences (more than 7 times as many residences as the Preferred Route). Because the residences adjacent to the easement for alternative B4 are different landowners than the ones near the Preferred Route, they have not been notified of Pueblo

County proceedings to date. Alternative B4 would be between 1,000 feet to 2,500 feet from 788 residences, over 4 times as many as the Preferred Route.

Note that the existing West Station transmission corridor from West Station Substation already has transmission poles. Residences near the existing easement would not experience additional visual impacts, and those residences have not been included in the total above and in Table 1.

Wallingford-Ingo, Gail

From: Pamela A Kuhrt <pkuhrt61@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2019 9:04 AM
To: Wallingford-Ingo, Gail
Subject: Fw: Talking Points for the November 26th Public Hearing

Hello Gail,

Yesterday at the Commissioners' hearing, I submitted a letter by Marcie Defoe that I had retyped for reading, but I misprinted a percentage in the paragraph that speaks about the National Association of Realtors, typing 30% instead of 10%. If you are submitting documents to Case Documents for the Permit No. 1041 2019-003, please use Marcie Defoe's original letter below. Thank you.

Also, would you please clarify what Commissioner Hart said about having a week to submit any other documents or important information for this case. Because of the Thanksgiving holiday, our group would like to know the deadline for that.

Thank you for your attention to these matters. Have a nice Thanksgiving and holiday season.

Sincerely,

Pamela A. Kuhrt
1237 N. Parkridge Dr.
Pueblo West, 81007
720-273-4240

From: Marcie Defoe <marciedefoe@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2019 12:18 AM
To: Pamela A Kuhrt <pkuhrt61@outlook.com>
Cc: Mel Manrose <ml4570rose@yahoo.com>
Subject: Talking Points for the November 26th Public Hearing

Pam,

I'm not planning to speak at the public hearing on the 26th but the following thoughts did come to mind.

Also, If you know of someone who has a visual to present on the 26th, feel free to share this with them if they need talking points to go with their presentation.

Marcie

One of the amenities of living in Pueblo West is our unencumbered vistas. These precious views provide residents with a blissful escape from the environmental pollution and stresses of city living. These exceptional real estate properties come with a premium price tag. Many of these investors are retired or preparing for retirement. They expect to spend their remaining days enjoying the health benefits of quiet living

and the privilege of being close to nature. A quality lifestyle that brings happiness into daily lives as well as increased health benefits.

Yet, once again, Black Hills Energy wants to disrupt the lives of Pueblo West residents by disfiguring our landscape and creating an eyesore. They are determined to run their transmission lines through our equestrian easements, nearby residential properties and across our priceless vistas instead of using other existing easements. Transmission towers and their overhead power lines are a form of visual pollution. They are unpleasant, ugly and negatively affect our aesthetic senses.

A recent study by A & M University, Texas, determine that visual pollution contributes negatively to human health and stress levels. As our stress levels increase, our blood pressure, heart rate and respiration also increases.

The National Association of Realtors says visual pollution can shave more than 10% off the value of nearby properties.

The United States Federal Highway Acts of 1965 and 1991 address the use of billboards, signage and advertising. It does not prohibit the placement of transmission power lines adjacent to highways.

The Lineman's and Cableman's Handbook states that *"If the appearance of overhead lines would be unsightly then underground lines should be installed"* There is no legitimate reason why Black Hills Energy can't use one of the other existing utility easements to take their line to Canon City. As a publicly held company, their only motive is to increase assets and boost profit.

We Pueblo West residents respectfully ask our Board of County Commissioners to - support your constituents - respect our quality of life -and deny this permit request from Black Hills Energy.

Please don't let us down. Thank you.