

----- Original message -----

From: Jay Hodgens

Date: 11/07/2014 3:56 PM (GMT-06:00)

To: "Hanson, Gary (PUC)", "Nelson, Chris", "Fiegen, Kristie"

Subject: BHP Transmission Line - duplicate email without attachment.

Because attachments may prevent proper delivery to PUC email addresses, the former email is being re-transmitted without the attachment. Ms Cremer is in possession of the attachment.

I understand that you have acted on the BHP application.

I am sorry that I could not attend the Evidentiary Hearing. I did not attend as I did not have the resources and time that BHP, their engineering staff, their attorneys, and the Commission all have. I have spent an awful lot of time on the project. Further, due to repeated delay in response to the proposal we tendered to BHP last week, it was only yesterday that I submitted a Motion for Continuance or Application Denial that was based primarily Final Route that BHP identified last month was, in effect, a new application. (<https://puc.sd.gov/commission/dockets/electric/2014/EL14-061/deny.pdf>)

It is herewith attached again for your information.

This, and other communications submitted to the PUC e-Docket filing system and PUC Staff have apparently not been received. This can be verified with Ms Cremer and others, and by the need for me to fax the motion to your offices at the last moment!

I listened to its web recording. It appears that routinely, the absence of the applicant to submit evidence is considered a demonstration of proof, e.g. failure to prove that local jurisdictions even read or were aware of the project, let alone commenting on its impacts. I know of one County Commissioner who was unaware of the project. Similarly, neighbor Gene Woodle, Esq has not yet received notification of project. Unavailability of the Public access to the Proof of Mailing of notification prevents verification of this.

Further, during the hearing, when asked what deleterious impact to property values exist, BHP response was again, "I have no knowledge." While difficult, if not impossible to prove, it is only common knowledge that living with site of utility lines is of less value than with utility lines. That is why our subdivision blasted to install Underground utilities! It has also just come to my understanding that BHP has represented Hills Material as the owner of the land to the East of Steele, whereas in actuality, it is Northwest Engineering Co. Dave Crabb, CFO indicates that NWE has never formally received notification of the project, AND it appears that both Mark Carda BHP Project Manager, and BHP surveyors know this.

Finally, the representation by BHP that my representations are unfounded due to the submission of substantiating information was similarly unsubstantiated. While not an intervenor, on numerous occasions Jim Steele has indicated that his neighbor to the east (NWE, not Hills Materials) was represented by BHP to have granted ROW access for the Transmission. I believe Ms Leonard had similarly indicated this understanding. During the hearing, BHP indicated that much as well. In fact, they have not. I applaud your insightful questions, such as the impact on property values from Transmission line crossing. I am sorry that you did not insist on a meaningful answer, but were satisfied with BHP real, or feigned ignorance. In future applications, I encourage you to consider that the resources of a public utility for permit acquisition make nearly any public opposition moot. Further that absence of (or applicant failure to provide proof of) jurisdiction action, (e.g. letters from impacted jurisdictions that there will not be undue disruption to orderly development) is not the same as a demonstration of the absence of undue disruption!

Thank you for your time.

Jay Hodgens 605-350-4367