

Public Service Commission - Utility Facility Review Board DOCKET #10-035-39

From: Pete Grimm [REDACTED]
To: <psccal@utah.gov>
Date: 4/28/2010 9:04 PM
Subject: Utility Facility Review Board DOCKET #10-035-39
CC: Kaye Pratt [REDACTED], Maxine Grimm [REDACTED]

UTAH PUBLIC
SERVICE COMMISSION

RECEIVED

Our family has a large piece of property on the bench Southeast of Tooele City. About 500 acres. Two other families each own almost as much more right next to us. I believe our properties and the existing homes and subdivisions already there are the nicest residential and future residential property in Tooele Valley. Rocky Mountain Power's proposed Mona-Oquirrh power line goes right through the property. It will turn nice residential property into ugly industrial property. I have seen no evidence that RMP has given any consideration to the huge destruction of property value that their plan will cause.

failure to realistically consider all the costs.

I have not seen detailed cost estimates for the various alternative routes they are supposed to have considered. They make vague estimates and avoid committing to anything. If you suggest that a longer route is better, they say that longer route equals higher cost. If you suggest a shorter route they start to talk about congestion with other lines or soil liquification or something else. Until the estimates are on paper how can they argue that one route is better than another because it is less costly??

And, based on the loose talk that I have heard, it appears that they are considering only construction costs (not operating costs) and only distance (not land cost or terrain or existing roads) when doing their cost guesstimations. In most projects that I have looked at, operating costs quickly become more significant than initial construction costs. I am told that a power line can carry power much more efficiently if a larger voltage is used. It appears that RMP's plan to split their line and run half voltage much of the way will be much more costly in the long run than if they were to run a high voltage line all the way from mona to terminal.... Yet where are those costs considered? As a lender, I would certainly not be willing to lend on a project with such poor numbers.... Haven't we just seen evidence of what happens when big entities say "trust me" and where regulators have done just that... instead of doing the hard work and made sure they understand all the implications of the proposed actions? You have, I believe, the legal responsibility to verify that they have indeed considered all reasonable alternatives and done so considering all the costs.

specifically failure to consider all of the costs to private property owners.

And based on what I have heard, I do not believe that they intend to recompense any of the private property owners fairly for the huge loss of value that their line will cause to us. Their construction will blight the ground they travel over and near - in our area, they will blight the whole piece of property that we own. Not just a 300 foot or half a mile strip. They will blight all the ground that looks at their towers or is near the lines or is accessed along roads that will be under those lines..... And their blight will last as long as they are there. Yet they tell us that we can only consider a loss for a few years period of time? We're going to get used to their ugly towers? Maybe some people will, but others will be driven away forever from what might otherwise be a beautiful residential and recreational area. Forever. Not just for a few years. They scoff at the medical and health problems that their lines have caused to many individuals - they sound just like the cigarette sellers thirty years ago.... And like many a poor smoker, we small property owners face the prospects of battling huge corporations that are bent on taking what is ours for their benefit... what chance would we have? We depend on you to ensure that their valuation process is complete and fair.

a better route exists.

There is a better route. The concerned citizens of Tooele have suggested a route that is better. It stays away from existing homes. It avoids many of the harms their line will cause along their proposed route. And I believe it is also a less expensive route. It is a route that almost completely avoids the issues of preventing fire-fighting access to the Settlement Canyon reservoir, potential electrification of the reservoir and water distribution lines throughout the city, blighting and potentially poisoning city and private water supplies, destruction of scarce vegetation, blighting views, crossing a super-fund site, bringing medical hazards to existing residents and any individual nearby, destroying recreational areas, and disregarding future connections in their proposed sub-station location (it would be much better to have the substation at the north end of Tooele Valley - near the freeway - where it could also service the larger users and potential users in the valley and points West - and where future power suppliers could connect from Nevada and from the North). It is a route that causes much less concern and potential loss to residents and property owners and governmental entities in Tooele Valley. Thousands of us think so. And did I say that I believe that it is also a less expensive route?

Please don't make it easy for these huge power companies to steam-roll over individuals and families who have lived and hope to live forever in Tooele. Please consider the better route and demand detailed and verifiable cost estimates that consider fair compensation to property owners and full operating as well as construction costs.

Sincerely

Pete Grimm
