

Dear Board Members,

I and my family are residents of Tooele County. I have worked in the County for 32 years and lived in Tooele Valley for the past 11 years.

I have read Rocky Mountain Power's petition for review of the denial of its application for a conditional use permit by Tooele County dated April 7th, 2010.

I have also read Tooele County's Response to Petition for Review dated April 22, 2010.

I attended the Tooele County Planning and Zoning Commission meetings on February 3, 2010 and March 3, 2010 where Tooele County Planning staff recommended to the P&Z Commission that 22 mitigation measures be required of Rocky Mountain Power in order to receive the requested conditional use permit (CUP). A review of the record of the P&Z meeting will reveal that the Planning and Zoning Commission placed a 23rd condition on Rocky Mountain Power. Rocky Mountain Power accepted all 23 mitigation requirements.

The P&Z Commission then denied the CUP application, claiming that Rocky Mountain Power could not meet the mitigation requirements.

To date, the Tooele County P&Z Commission has never explained why they believe Rocky Mountain Power cannot meet the 23 mitigation measures imposed by the P&Z Commission.

The Matter is now submitted to the Utility Facility Review Board for resolution. Tooele County in it's response to petition for review acknowledges that it lacks the expertise or resources to advocate for another route while denying the route identified in Rocky Mountain Power's CUP application. Tooele County further requests the Board utilize its "authority, expertise and resources to evaluate not only RMP's proposed route but any alternative route the board deems worthy of consideration."

Since this matter was placed before the Board, the Bureau of Land Management on April 23, 2010 published the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and proposed plan amendment to its resource management plan on the Mona to Oquirrh Transmission Corridor Project. The FEIS is the culmination of over 3 years of extensive planning and environmental scientific studies of the impacts of the proposed Mona to Oquirrh Transmission Corridor.

The Board should look to this study for guidance in deciding the matter before them, as it is far more extensive and complete than any analysis the board could possibly complete in the amount of time that it is given to issue a decision on this matter.

The study was conducted by the US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management in conjunction with the Utah Governor's Public Lands Coordination Office. The FEIS discloses the impacts of various alternatives of the proposed 146 mile transmission corridor. Although the study looked at 15 alternatives, the prevalent

alternatives analyzed include 1) the BLM's proposed alternative route on Federal lands, 2) the Environmentally preferred alternative route, 3) proponent's (RMP) proposed route, and 4) the no action alternative.

Detailed analysis was given to these alternatives and great effort was made to include dozens of government agencies, and thousands of citizens through public information news letters and meetings. Tooele County residents were most prevalent in responding to the results of the draft EIS during the comment periods.

In spite of Tooele County's criticism of RMP's proposed route, the BLM's proposed alternative route and the environmentally preferred route all share the same corridor for which Tooele County has refused to issue a CUP.

Tooele County has denied RMP's CUP application based on the alleged negative impacts of it's proposed route and ignored the fact that the BLM's preferred alternative and the Environmentally preferred alternative each have selected the same corridor thru the settlement canyon to middle canyon (south east bench of Tooele County).

The FEIS has looked at each of the issues raised by Tooele County in its Response to Petition for Review as well as many others. Even with the attention given to this portion of the corridor by Tooele County residents, the BLM and its cooperating State agency has remained firm in identifying this corridor as their preferred alternative and the most environmentally preferred alternative.

Rocky Mountain Power would be remise in it's fiduciary responsibilities to the majority of it's customers to ignore the environmental science and pursue a more expensive, less reliable, and less environmentally friendly route to appease the approximately 800 persons in Tooele who have petitioned the BLM to abandon this route.

The issue of critical view shed continues to be the most emotional issue surrounding this route. The FEIS Volume II appendix G visual simulations show the anticipated impact to the view shed in the disputed area.

I hope these observations assist you in your deliberations and efforts to reach a decision that benefits all of the citizens of Utah.

Sincerely,

  
Lee-R. Brown

Note:

L.R.Brown currently performs business consulting for US Magnesium LLC., Rocky Mountain Power, and performs voluntary lobbyist duties for Tooele County at the Utah State Legislature. I am also Chairman of the Tooele County Trails Committee and the Tooele County Water users Committee