

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/6/2015 8:58:46 PM

First name: Trent

Last name: Averett

Organization: AMERICAN CITIZEN

Title: Mr

Comments: My name is Trent Averett and I am a property owner on Peavine Mountain primarily under the ownership of Peavine Pines. I wish to have my following comments entered into the record in response to the recently published Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), dated December 2014.

Your letter dated December 2, 2014 states that per the Humboldt-Toiyabe Forest Plan the Poeville alignment was identified as the agency preferred alternative. The letter states, "to manage all utility, road and transmission corridors and when utility right of way applications are received, the first priority will be to utilize existing corridors." However, this statement seems to be in conflict with the logic provided for denying the All Private Land Alternative of Section 2.10.5 of the DEIS. This section states that the All Private Land Alternative was eliminated from consideration because "This alternative would unavoidably use the same corridor."

It is stated that the Poeville Alternative would utilize existing utility corridors more than any of the other action alternatives. But this is achieved by building substantially more miles of new transmission lines than the other proposed alternatives. Per Table 2.11-1 of the DEIS the Poeville alignment will accomplish the goal by building 75%, or 7.7 additional miles of new transmission line compared to the Peavine Alternative. 190 new transmission line poles would be built compared to just 109 for the Peavine Alternative. Short term disturbance is 628 acres for the Poeville Alternative compared to 302 acres for the Peavine Alternative. The brunt of the disturbance is on privately held landowners. 69% of the total disturbed acreage for the Poeville Alternative will be on private land compared to only 29% of the total disturbed acreage for the Peavine Alternative.

The Scoping Notice dated November, 2011 stated "the project would consist of the construction and operation of approximately 10 miles of new 120 kV overhead transmission line." Yet by choosing the Poeville Alternative as the preferred alternative the scope of this project has nearly doubled in size from the originally stated scope. By building twice as much overhead transmission line than is required this will ensure that this power line is visible from virtually the entire Truckee meadows valley.

In addition to the Visual Resource Issue, I further agree with the items of the issue summary on pages ES-ii and ES-iii of the DEIS. All private properties proximate to this transmission line will undoubtedly experience a loss in value. Additionally, public health and safety will be negatively affected as a result from electric field and magnetic field from the transmission line.

Finally, I agree with all of the issues identified on page 1-8 of the DEIS. Specifically, I am concerned with the potential of unauthorized off-highway vehicle (OHV) use and noxious and invasive weed infestations that will certainly result from disturbing so much property.

Please reconsider the stated preferred alternative of the Poevill Alternative and choose the much cheaper, less disturbing, and viewshed preserving alternatives such as the Mitchell Alternative, Peavine Alternative, or the All Private Land Alternative.