

Landowner Inquiry Report
12/16/2015

On Route/ Off Route	Route Segement	Contact Type	Structure Numbers	Tract Number	Tract Name	Contact	Address	Parcel	Number of Contacts	Dates of Contact	Comments
On Route	Highway 163 to Rock Quarry Road	Call In		MCG-7N-2745	Corporation of the EPIS	Corporation of the EPIS		1691200010210001	1	N/A	
Off Route		Call In		N/A	Crouch, Carol	Carol Crouch	919 Marcassin Dr		1	12-12-2014	12-12-2014 DCB Landowner called with concerns about pole location on Scoot Blvd. W/S resolved call by providing information to the LO
Off Route		Call In		N/A	Linder, Jay	Jay Linder			1	10-09-2015	10-09-2015 DCB Landowner wanted to know why the route crosses Nifong to the North for two poles the crosses back to the south side of Nifong. LO was visited by Dan Clark. LO was not there at the time and Dan explained to the assistant that we were trying
Off Route		Call In		N/A	Nicholas, Mark	Mark Nicholas	10200 SW Greenburg Rd		1	09-17-2015	09-17-2015 DCB Mark called wanting to speak to Sega about possibly being the supplier for the materials to build the poles. Unknown if this has been resolved.
Off Route		Call In		N/A	Hogan, Michael	Mike Hogan	1307 Lea Verde Ct		1	10-06-2015	10-06-2015 DCB Landowner called and wanted to know more about the project. He is not happy where it is going and prefers it to be on the other side of the road. City resolved call and Sega to Follow up on engineering issues.
Off Route		Call In		N/A	Mashburn, Paul	Paul Mashburn	1322 Willow Creek Lane		1	02-15-2015	02-15-2015 DCB Landowner called and had questions on pole locations, height and width of poles and EMF issues. W/S handled the call and it seems to be resolved , but seems to not be happy with the answers unless the poles are on the North side of the road
Off Route		Call In		N/A	Evans, Linda	Linda Evans	5200 Claybrook Ct		1	08-17-2015	08-17-2015 DCB Landowner called and had concerns on if the substation will be close to her home. W/S resolved call by providing information on when construction would begin. LO was also interested in attending the open house and wanted information.
Off Route				N/A	White, Florence	Florence White			1	12-14-2015	12-14-2015 DCB WS emailed Florence on December 16, 2015 10a.m. Resolved for now.
Off Route		Call In		N/A	Ridenhour, Cory	Cory Ridenhour	5565 Waterfron Dr		1	10-30-2015	10-30-2015 DCB Landowner called and wanted some information to put together to fight the misinformation being spread around. Dan Clark spoke to LO about the project and options and also provided literature on EMF. Dan promised to bring LO an EMF meter on 11/2. City to follow up.
Off Route		Call In		N/A	McGuire, Jim	Jim McGurie			1	10-30-2015	
Off Route		Call In		N/A	Rockbridge Meadows Apartments	Dan			1	10-14-2015	10-14-2015 DCB Landowner called and had some questions about pole placement since he couldn't make the open house. LO was informed that structure 69 is just outside his property and appears to be in the utility easment. W/S resolved call
Off Route		Website Input		N/A	Fallis, Kim	Kim Fallis			2	10-18-2015 , 10-08-2015	10-18-2015 Landowner emailed again and wanted to know the new electrical load capacity being supplied to Option A. LO was informed that it was best to meet and discuss the information with the City. Unknown status of the meeting. 10-08-2015 DCB Landowner called and had questions regarding the voltage of the power line, rate increase and substation security. LO was informed of the rate increase structure and that security of the substations. W/S resolved
Off Route		Call In		N/A	Shah, Audrey	Audrey Shah			1	10-223-2015	10-23-2015 DCB Landowner wants information about the poles. LO was given information and directions to the website on the project. City resolved
Off Route		Call In		N/A	Brinks Construction	Katrina			1	10-13-2015	10-13-2015 DCB Landowner wanted to know if the City was going to put bids out for the construction of the poles. Connie informed the LO to go to the website to put in a bid. City resolved
Off Route		Website Input		N/A	Munns, Renee	Renee Munns			1	10-15-2015	10-15-2015 DCB Landowner emailed and questioned why the city would pick a major road for this project, rate increases and bonds. LO was informed through email. W/S resolved
Off Route		Call In		N/A	Marinova, Detelina	Detelina Marinova	4107 Nashua Ct		1	08-17-2015	08-17-2015 DCB Landowner called, but it was inaudible. W/S has tried to call back 4 times and was unable to reach the LO.
Off Route		Website Input		N/A	Red Oak Development	Red Oak Development	3401 Broadway Businnes Park CT STE 105		1	11-05-2015	11-05-2015 DCB Landowner emailed the City about where the transmission line was going to be placed. Unknown if this has been resolved.
On Route	Perche Substation to Chapel Hill Road	Call In		PMC-1W-0180	Anderson, Charlotte L.	Ronald G. Anderson	5312 Hiland Pkwy Main Address	1641600010010001	1	07-22-2015	07-22-2015 DCB Landowner called and wanted to now why we were digging up her front yard. LO stated that she was never contacted about the project. W/S handled call and resolved issues.
On Route	Chapel Hill Road to Vawter School Road	Website Input		PMC-2W-0910	Larson Family Revocable Trust	Jon Frederick Larson	4303 ESTHER LEE CT	1670800010020001	1	10-29-2015	10-29-2015 DCB Landowner emailed inquiry and stated that LO was informed the lines would need redone/rearranged because they were not installed properly and LO is concerned about the digging. Dan Clark sent email to LO and explained that there might be some confusion and that the City does not need to rework any of the recently installed Boone Electric underground lines. City Resolved
On Route	Chapel Hill Road to Vawter School Road	Call In	21	PMC-2W-0950	Robbins, Albert W & Sharon	Albert Robbins	4300 N Pinebrook Ln	1670829030010001	1	10-23-2015	10-23-2015 DCB Landowner was upset that the structure will be 20 ft. from his home. LO was informed that the property owners affected by the project will be compesated based on market data. W/S resolved call
On Route	Chapel Hill Road to Vawter School Road	Call In	22	PMC-2W-1000	Iselin, David D & Katherine	David Iselin	4301 W BROOKVIEW CT	1670829020010001	1	05-27-2015	05-27-2015 DCB LO called concerning damges on property. W/S handled call
On Route	Chapel Hill Road to Vawter School Road	Call In		PMC-2W-1070	Wheeler, Roy L & Bonnie E	Roy Wheeler	503 E Nifong Blvd Ste 321	1670829000050001	1	10-06-2015	10-06-2015 DCB Landowner called and wanted to know where exactly their property line is. LO was not able to make the open house. Connie spoke to LO and both agreed to would be easier to send LO a printed map. City resolved
On Route	Vawter School Road to Old Mill Creek Road	Call In	35	PMC-3N-1300	Fisher, Henry K Jr	Henry Fisher Jr	5808 Screaming Eagle	1680100070350001	1	10-06-2015	10-09-2015 DCB Landowner called and tried to use the open house geustionnaire on the website but the submit button did not work. LO's questions were on placement of poles and the distribution lines. LO was informed that there are underground utilities on both sides of the road. Provided web link on the open house. LO did not reply back to email. W/S resolved
On Route	Old Mill Creek Road to Forum Boulevard	Website Input		PMC-4S-2140	Bax, Paul	Paul Bax	2801 Pine Tree Ln	1680000020700001	1	1/20/2015	01-20-2015 DCB Landowner wanted information if the line was going to be on the North or South side of Vawter School Blvd. LO was informed that pole placement has not ben determined at this time. W/S resolved call
On Route	Old Mill Creek Road to Forum Boulevard	Call In		PMC-4S-2240	Columbia School District	School	1818 W Worley St	1680000010010001	1	6/26/2015	06-26-2015 DCB Landowner called inquiring about honoring an agreement with Columbia Schools to bury the line that passes near the elementary schools. Per David Rodriguez response "Only commitment made by the City was to underground/bury any overhead distru

ID	Name	Phone Number	Email	Submitted Paper or Online	Date Submitted	Do you own property along the route?	Address	Are you an electric customer along the route?	Business or Residence	CWL or BEC	Was the Open House on 9/30 informative, and did it provide you with a better understanding of the project?	Please explain your comments regarding the effectiveness of the Open House on 9/30.	Do you have comments about the proposed pole placement? Please explain.	Do you have comments about the proposed pole structure designs? Please explain.	Any other comments you'd like to make about The Columbia Electric Transmission Line Project?
1	Ros Shanker	573-875-2035		Paper	9/30/2015	N		N					I am glad you decided to make this presentation. The length of time and station were good. My suggestion is that you have a 15 minute meeting every .5 hour to reveal the general plan and invite questions. Sometimes this method helps the public because they can hear of other questions that they might not have thought of and thereby glean good info- Ros		
2	Deb Falter		debra.s.falter@gmail.com	Paper	9/30/2015	Y	3500 Vawter School Rd	Y	Residence	CWL					
3	Livonne Pineda	573-445-9764	lcpinedas@hotmail.com	Paper	9/30/2015	Y	3300 W Vawter School Rd	Y	Residence	CWL					
4	Amy			Paper	9/30/2015	N		N			not really	Needed overview presentation. No clear path to take and booths crowded. So hard to get to booths. Didn't have advantage of hearing others questions	Why not do option B which is less populated, cheaper	Too large	Why would you think it's ok to put these giant dangerous gargantuan eyesores in someone's yard. Why not put it in more rural routes. Obtrusive & we are already stressed out- who needs more electromagnetic energy which has been proven dangerous
5	Angela & Adam Boister	573-4242592	hands of healing touch@gmail	Paper	9/30/2015	Y	39515 Forest Acres	Y	Residence	BEC			Unfair to homeowners in this route. Feels like we are backed in a corner		Bullshit
6	Patricia Kowalski	573-256-1295	pmk700@aol.com	Paper	9/30/2015	Y	700 New Market Place	Y	Residence	CWL	Y	I saw exactly where poles are being placed. The real estate (city person) confirmed that property values where these structures are built would be negatively affected- Thanks	WAY TOO Large! it'll be an eyesore to existing homes	This is a travesty to existing homes. These lines could be buried in existing residential areas! Or this could be taken a different route to avoid existing residential areas! I don't know how the city planners have the conscious to do this to property owners	
7	Paul Bax	573-239-0898	paul08bax@gmail.com	Paper	9/30/2015	Y	2801 Pine Tree Lane	Y	Residence	BEC	Y	I was able to have discussions with city staff, hired engineers, and real estate folks & the public	I am satisfied with the explanations I received this evening. I believe that there will be less poles. The size of the new poles and EMFs are concerns. I voted for option B and that is my comment	They are ugly, but I don't know what else could be used... I voted for option B	I'm strongly considering selling my home. The EMF research provided is dated. However, I'd feel bad for whoever would buy my home. The city should have chosen a lesser populated route. Thanks
8	Pat Fowler	573-256-6891		paper	9/30/2015	N		N				As a taxpayer I am concerned that we chose a combination of a reasonable cost and taking mitigating steps to alleviate the concerns of parents and the seniors (and their adult children who care for them) along the route.			
9	Susie Ailor	573-886-2880	ailors@health.missouri.edu	Paper	9/30/2015	N		N				Was troubling that the presentation at individual tables/handouts were misleading	Should not be close to this many schools- feel that the council was not properly educated. Drawing of Mill Creek Elementary and its exposure potentially is misleading. Shows the building being rarely exposed, but playground is at the street with definite increase. Families will have an increase at home and at school for their children	Not 'in line' with good health and the community as a whole. Feel council was misled if not, they do not consider the potential harm for children a concern it should be	
10	Edgar I Ailor III, M.D.	573-42400850	ailorphotography@aol.com	paper	9/30/2015	N		N				This route currently planned for a 161-KV Transmission line following Vawter School Rd & W Nilong goes right by Mill Creek School. The Graph showing the exposure to the electromagnetic field provided by Segs Inc. shows the north wall of the Mill Creek school electromagnetic exposure at .1 milligauss. What it doesn't show is the PLAYGROUND for Mill Creek is 50-75' from the transmission line with (from their graph) a 1.25-2 milligauss exposure. Our communities children & grand children are at that school 8 hours/day 5 days a week. There's evidence for the world health organization and NIH and other sources of an incidence for childhood leukemia with higher EMF exposure. We do not want a high voltage transmission line near our schools. We have to reconsider the route. A is not the best option			
11	Detelina Marinova		detelinam@hotmail.com	Paper	9/30/2015	N	3212 West Creek	Y	Residence		N	I felt it was a one way conversation. Citizens did not have a chance to voice their objections.	Route B needs to be adopted. Given the adverse effects of EMF and huge impact on residential, schools and pre-schools along route A		Route B is cheaper, LESS developed and goes by NO schools
12	Carolyn Hawks	573-268-8543	ccardon@aol.com	Paper	9/30/2015	N		Y	Both	CWL	N		My objection is the selection of Option A. Option B goes by NO schools, much less dense population. I feel the city did not address the health issues, the forums were not publicized enough. There has been much new scientific research since the vote and I believe we should have a revote		
13	Melinda Jenne	573-356-3332	melindajenne@gmail.com	Paper	9/30/2015	N	3660 Scott Blvd	N					PLEASE RETHINK OPTION B! NO SCHOOLS NO DENSELY POPULATED NEIGHBORHOODS 3 MILLION CHEAPER		
14	Nancy & Dennis Palmer	573-864-8454	dennis@costalelectric.net	Paper	9/30/2015	Y	3908 Barrington Dr	Y	Business	BEC			We are concerned with the pole 26 location		
15	Earl & Kathy Bryant	573-442-1041	kbryant@centritel.net	Paper	9/30/2015	Y	3909 Barrington Dr	Y	Residence	CWL	Y		I love that they are going on the south side of Nilong by our house. Thank you for not putting a pole in my bedroom		
16	Mary Dodds & Stan McCarthy	573-442-0167	tropstan@yahoo.com	Paper	9/30/2015	Y	Bedford walk	Y	Residence	CWL	N	Powerline is only part of the construction in the area	Will the area be like the Business Loop and be an eyesore and have to move lines again?		Need to coordinate with the proposed road expansion the city has planned Video speed needs to be slowed down
17	Jennifer James	573-289-3044	jennifer@mchsi.com	Paper	10/5/2015	N	2605 Pine Tree Ln	N	Residence	CWL	Y	I've attended many meetings in regard to this project. I'm frustrated that we are spending to bury utilities on the north side of nilong. Now if we are going to bury utilities spend the \$ to bury these.	I am concerned with the inconclusive studies and unknowns in relation to health and safety. I am concerned with the devaluation of properties along the path especially the north side of bedford walk and of the aesthetic consequences to a road that is still relatively attractive traveling west on nilong from providence.		In earlier meetings and in customer surveys primary concerns for determining the route leaned heavily toward long term reliable power trying to stay as far from residential as possible, environment & aesthetic and cost. Other than the reliable power, we seem to have abandoned the remainder of the primary goals of the project. This is disappointing and misleading. People on the north side of nilong purchased their property knowing there was a sizeable dedicated utility corridor. Their property values reflected that, the people on the south side did not
18	Mardy and Lisa Eimers	573-673-3099	mardyeimers@gmail.com	Paper	10/5/2015	Y	3903 Deerfoot Way	Y	Residence	CWL			Option B and B2 do not affect schools, residences etc. and costs above the same, actually less. Yes life expectancy is less in B and B2 but it is certainly worth it given the health risks of A.		
19	Matthew Hayes	573-356-1964	matthew.hayes@brightstarcare.com	Paper	10/5/2015	Y	4101 Watertown Pl	Y	Residence	BEC			Boone Electric Co-op customers were not sent surveys however the route goes right through their service area. These customer should have a vote in this especially the ones where the route is going.		
20	Niki Kriete	578-808-5721	ankriete@gmail.com	Online	9/30/2015	Y	205 E. Nilong	Y	Residence	CWL	Y	The open house was informative and gave us more of an idea of what to expect (worse than we first thought, the poles are larger). I don't really feel like your input really mattered as the representatives answering questions pretty much said that the poles buffering the traffic on Nilong will likely be cut down to is not enough time to consider the impact this will have on our property values.	This is nonreassuring on the north side of the Nilong/Bethel to Nilong/Forum area to run the lines next to mostly commercial properties. Properties in the Bedford Walk subdivision will be within fall distance of the poles. Mature trees buffering the traffic on Nilong will likely be cut down to run these lines. Properties values will be greatly affected. Typically, poles of this size are placed in a 100 foot easement. These poles will be stuck in a 10 foot easement.	We will have a pole in our backyard that is within fall distance of our house, comprising the safety of my children and our home. Having a pole behind our home will also make it more difficult to sell our home in the future as federal loans for homes with large power poles such as these will need to be reviewed by HUD.	
21	Jay Lindner	573-446-5500	jay@forumgroup.com	Online	9/30/2015	Y		Y	Business	CWL	Did not attend		Would like to know why the route has to cross Nilong to the north side for 2 poles between Peachtree drive and Providence before crossing back to the south side		
22	Teresa Thornbrook		nbheim@hotmail	Online	10/1/2015		4307 Montpelier Place						For once....will the city please listen to the people!!!! We are trying to build back the trust from our city council members and the community members. If you disregard what the residents are saying it will only build deeper wounds and hateful feelings. Please think of others for once and don't put the electric service above ground and don't put it by the schools!!!!		
23	Jessica L. Bax	573-397-2046	jessica.letourneur@gmail.com	Online	10/1/2015		4502 Avondale Place						Please consider burying the proposed power lines that will be installed near Mill Creek Elementary. I am the parent of a Mill Creek child and am concerned about the health of my child and other children and adults in the area being affected by above-ground lines		
24	Amy de Jong	573-999-0028	adejong@gccolumbiamo.com	Online	10/1/2015	Y		Y	Residence	CWL	Y	I didn't see very many happy faces at the Open House!	The poles are in my neighbors on Watertown Place backyard. It is ridiculous to place them next to residential areas when there are commercial properties across the street. The proposed pole placement will significantly affect property values in Bedford Walk.		
25	JR Lawless	573-443-8871	j.lawless@edwardjones.com	Online	10/5/2015	N	3909 Deerfoot Way	Y	Business	CWL	Did not attend		This pole placement is immediately outside my office. I will not continue to do business at this location unless this pole placement is moved across the street. I am very disappointed in your organization concerning this issue. Not only will I have to move locations due to this line placement, it will ruin the aesthetic view of a major economic hub in this town. There are always alternatives and placing the largest, most powerful lines down a major thoroughfare is not only short sighted but shows incredibly incompetent long term planning. My guess is this has been an issue to years and to blame the federal requirements on the decision to place this line down nilong is irresponsible. There is no doubt this will affect my business and force a very costly move. I can't imagine Clayton MO ever using the excuse of a federal mandate to place similar lines down Skinker Blvd. I have informed my landlord that we will be forced to move as my firm will not allow its employees to work directly under these lines. I would imagine that Columbia power and light would not cover the lawsuits that would be inevitable.		

60	Carol Heffner	(660) 651-4085 heffnerc@missouri.edu	Online	10/12/2015	N		N			Did not attend		I am very concerned about the proximity to both Gentry and Mill Creek Elementary. In my opinion there is too much conflicting information to make a decision about the safety of the EMF to these children who will be forced 5 days a week for 8+ hours a day to be in this proximity. Being wrong about the health affects of this 10-20 years from now is not worth the risk. It appears that option 2 was the most cost effective and also, unless I am reading the stats wrong also received the best least favorable score. I am not sure why the additional comments seemed to favor option A so highly but it could be a biased sampling. I personally know some parents who live in Cascades who were upset a few years ago that this would be going through their backyards...but other than that I didn't hear much information. I am very concerned about the potential for ill effects for my daughter who is a second grader at MCE and will attend Gentry. Please reconsider the options that will keep our public school children the most safe in their school.	No	I am in favor of option 2 or 2b.
61	Renee Munns	573-874-9982 reneeunns@gmail.com	Online	10/12/2015	N		Y	Residence	CWL	Y	It was not that beneficial. To have contracted out the work and have those people talk to the public was disappointing. It felt like no one from the city was there to hear concerns. Each table had a different conversation going on at the same time. Anyone with concerns was not able to hear the concerns of others. Maybe that was the plan. I don't think it lead to any productive discussion. Sort of just "here's the information, sort you can't do anything about it" No one can explain why Option B was chosen over A. If the project is going to cost so much, why does the entire city of Columbia not need to vote on it for some sort of bond? Are all residents going to have an increase in their electric bill?	I feel Option B should have been the best option as far as safety, cost, least disruptive to daily life (homes and schools along route), Nifong is a vital road to Columbia, why (with all the other traffic issues) would a major route be chosen for this sort of construction project? Nifong residents, businesses, schools, and other structures will be crippled by traffic during the construction period and the effects of the lines could be felt for a lifetime after. The risk to people's health, decreasing property value and overall aesthetics is not worth choosing option A.	They are huge! What is that going to do to the value of anything located on Nifong? It is no wonder they are usually placed along highways and in places where no one lives!	It was not that beneficial. To have contracted out the work and have those people talk to the public was disappointing. It felt like no one from the city was there to hear concerns. Each table had a different conversation going on at the same time. Anyone with concerns was not able to hear the concerns of others. Maybe that was the plan. I don't think it lead to any productive discussion. Sort of just "here's the information, sort you can't do anything about it" No one can explain why Option B was chosen over A. If the project is going to cost so much, why does the entire city of Columbia not need to vote on it for some sort of bond? Are all residents going to have an increase in their electric bill? I feel Option B should have been the best option as far as safety, cost, least disruptive to daily life (homes and schools along route), Nifong is a vital road to Columbia, why (with all the other traffic issues) would a major route be chosen for this sort of construction project? Nifong residents, businesses, schools, and other structures will be crippled by traffic during the construction period and the effects of the lines could be felt for a lifetime after. The risk to people's health, decreasing property value and overall aesthetics is not worth choosing option A.
62	Jennifer Griffith	573-443-3693 jfer1975@centurytel.net	Online	10/12/2015	N		Y	Residence	CWL	N		I think in addition to the health concerns of it being along routes where all of my kids go to school they will also be an eyesore. Plus, why in God's name would you go through the middle of a residential area when you can go through a less developed area		City Council needs to highly consider option B2. I totally get wanting to go with the option that last the longest but I think we need to take into account it is ridiculous to go through a residential area.
63	Jenny Anderson	573-424-0409 andersonjenny@gmail.com	Online	10/12/2015	N		Y	Residence	CWL	Did not attend		Please reconsider option B for these pole placements. I feel that we as the customer were not informed properly about this and don't want these lines going by the schools our kids attend and businesses that we frequent regularly. Not to mention what a huge eye sore this is going to be right through a major part of our city!! It's not worth the health risk to our community especially children and the elderly		
64	Julie Allen	573-825-4252 juliearson@gmail.com	Online	10/12/2015	N		N					I urge the city and C W&L to use option B for pole placement on this project. It takes a less populated route and does not go by two major schools.		
65	Jessica Hoffman	573-619-3865 hoffmarjes135@gmail.com	Online	10/12/2015	Y		Y	Residence	BEC	Y		PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE do not place these along such a heavily traveled area including an elementary school! Route K is the option for placement		Please do not place these down Nifong. If there is a less traveled and less expensive route - that should be the option to select.
66	Larry Freeseemann	573-445-6577 laryfreeseeman@gmail.com	Online	10/12/2015	N	2605 Pine Tree LN	N			Did not attend		I have lived near these type of poles for electric transmission. They ran along the interstate and in industrial areas not along residential areas which concerns me. I would hope the city is forward thinking and would widen the roads to accommodate the current traffic and future growth from Providence to Scott on Nifong and Vawter School Rd. Once these poles are in place it becomes even more difficult to expand the roads. Slowing and reducing growth in Southwest Columbia and tax revenue for the city.	I understand transmission lines and the size of the poles to carry the electrical. Placement in residential areas is a concern for people and property values.	If the poles are to be installed I would like to see the roads widened to carry the current and future traffic, along the route. Roads expansion would be even more difficult once the poles are installed. Please consider 4 lane road expansion from Providence to Scott Blvd.
67	Mardy T Eimers	573-673-3099 mardyeimers@gmail.com	Online	10/12/2015	N	4109 Watertown Pl	N			Y		No		Thanks for scheduling the open house at Mill Creek Elementary School; it was very, very helpful. My concerns about the power line placement are the following: 1. Health of residents, walkers/runners/bikers/drivers, elementary school kids: the studies that would cited were old and not up-to-date. There are more recent studies that suggest correlations with health effects. Other routes affected few people and cost about the same. Sure, life-expectancy not quite as high but worth the trade-off. 2. The survey was sent to many in Columbia who don't live in the area or even close to the area, so they have little concern as to where the line goes. Citizens' opinions who would be impacted the most were counted the same as those who live in north Columbia, for example. This does not make sense to me. 3. I believe those who responded to survey were misled. Nothing was said about the size, magnitude, potential dangers etc. of the lines. This is not being transparent. Citizens, even citizens along the route did not understand the size and magnitude of poles or potential health risks. Please consider revising the survey and who receives it. 4. I also think the Council was misled. They received information from the perspective of electrical engineers, which is important, but not the only perspective. What about the human side of decisions? What about serious consideration of the other options--which frankly made a lot of sense and appeared to impact negatively fewer citizens. 5. The lines and poles will look terrible, especially down a street that looks reasonably good all things considered. Thanks for giving us a forum to respond and thanks for the open house. I feel all elections are equal.
68	Dennis Crouch	573-289-6361 dcrouch@gmail.com	Online	10/12/2015	Y		Y	Residence	CWL	Did not attend		These appear to be overly close to residential zones. I would propose that you bury the lines when next to existing residential. I also don't understand what this will do to sidewalks.	These appear to be overly close to residential zones. I would propose that you bury the lines when next to existing residential.	These appear to be overly close to residential zones. I would propose that you bury the lines when next to existing residential.
69	Samantha States	573-864-3190 samstates@centurytel.net	Online	10/12/2015	N	3405 Ridgeview Drive	N			Y		I would not like the high voltage lines to go on this route. My kids attend mill creek elementary & I'm concerned about the health concerns with high voltage lines. I attended one of the meetings & think one of the other routes, which were less expensive to run would be a better option. I also think they would look horrible along Nifong, not to mention the loss in property value for the surrounding neighborhoods.	They are too industrial and bulky for Nifong. They would decrease property value along this route.	
70	Frank Aten	(314) 496-6357 faten@gmail.com	Online	10/12/2015	Y	3405 Ridgeview Drive	N			N		No	No	There is absolutely no reason option A should have been chosen versus option B. The entire process was a fraud on the citizens. Boone Co Op customers along the route receive no information prior. The citizens who chose option A also chose to have it buried if that was the option (questions were separate and deceptively presented. The 20+ year life versus 15-20 year life of Option A vs Option B is 1) statistically insignificant and 2) on a discounted CF basis makes B the best choice. For the city to put at risk the health and wealth (housing values that will depreciate considerably) for a more expensive option that residents either were not given proper disclosure is criminal.
71	Elizabeth Aten	314-496-6367 Epaten@gmail.com	Online	10/12/2015	Y		N			Y		EMF's are dangerous to humans. These poles should be run through nonresidential areas. Why would you impact children's lives this way? Why would a city take that kind of insane RISK?	These poles need to be twice the distance tall or buried in a concrete culvert underground.	The Engineering company taxpayer money paid for submitted this plan which the City Engineering Department approved and submitted to the City Council as THEIR recommendation. Screw Plan B which is the choice of taxpayers. Stupid sheep have no clue about the dangers to life and property values and that's the way Government wants it. The City is breeding great distrust and negative feelings it may never recover from. The first cluster of cancer and it's a massive class action suit.
72	Karen Carratura	(573) 256-1392 Karylew@gmail.com	Online	10/12/2015	N		Y	Residence	CWL	N		No	Please take into account the aesthetic of the neighborhoods that these poles will be invading when deciding on placement and size of the poles.	Please seek further input before breaking ground on this project.
73	Sara Gay	574-424-6350 saragayfamily@gmail.com	Online	10/12/2015	N		N			Did not attend		I am concerned about the health risks first and foremost to anyone in homes or schools/businesses along the route. Secondly, I think this will be an aesthetic nightmare and will lower property values along the route.	Yes, see previous	
74	Megan Keicher	573-639-0998 Megan.keicher@gmail.com	Online	10/12/2015	N		Y	Residence	CWL	N		I believe it's a horrible idea, I can't understand why the most populated and expensive route was chosen	No	
75	Karen Grieshaber	573-446-1380 grieshaber@att.net	Online	10/12/2015	N	4004fall ridge dr	N			Did not attend		This proposal drops these poles in a highly populated area. Not only will they be putting homeowners at risk, they will be blocks from schools and nursing homes. There has to be a better way that doesn't put our children, elderly and taxpayers in harms way.	No	

76	Randy Tschigge	573-446-4755	rantsc@centurytel.net	Online	10/13/2015	Y	Bedford Walk neighborhood - 4306 Champlain Ct	Y	Residence	BEC	Did not attend		The placement of the lines needs to be reconsidered. The appearance of the structures is not good and will affect property values	Extremely large and they are an eyesore	
77	Jill Kyle	573-443-7914	jill.kyle@ustfoods.com	Online	10/13/2015	N	3603 Birch Bark Ct	Y	Residence	CWL	Did not attend		Concerned about the health risk and safety for Option A. Home values will definitely go down. At some point Nifong will need to be widened due to increase traffic. Option B is less expensive, will affect less residential homes and health risk. Option B is the best choice for Columbia.	Underground the lines	
78	David & Barbara Anderson	(573) 355-4248	barbandave1@gmail.com	Online	10/13/2015	Y	3711 Woodrill on the Green	N					Because these are high voltage lines, we do feel option B would be a better choice to avoid the proximity to the schools, children in the area, and daycares.	No	
79	Jess L. NEWKIRK	(573) 808-3014	Jessnewkirk@hotmail.com	Online	10/13/2015	Y		Y	Residence	CWL	Did not attend		Please use option B as it will save money as Nifong is widened in the future, and impact less of the current population than along the other option.	No	How short sighted to build, option a and within a short period of time have to move again for proposed Nifong improvements
80	Sara Fougere	(573) 999-1654	fougere@centurytel.net	Online	10/13/2015	N	3907 Deerfoot Way	Y	Residence	CWL	Did not attend		This is a danger to citizens and an eye sore for our community	So ugly!	
81	Gene Austin	660-988-2060	gene.trumanbeu@gmail.com	Online	10/13/2015	Y	3006 Ballard Mill Dr.	N			Y		I realize the time for feedback on the route is past and funds have already been spent doing soil samples, etc for the pole placement along this route. However, I would hope the city would listen to the concerned citizens that oppose this route that goes along neighborhoods, schools, churches and retirement homes. I attended the CP&L meeting at Mill Creek on Oct 5 and several issues were raised. 1. The survey results that was presented to the council included was from a survey that very few people along the route took part in and with an overall response that was very low - <3% of those surveyed I believe. Also, I do not recall getting a survey and the people that did, said they received it the week before Christmas. I believe that is really poor planning if that is the case. Also, the survey did not really clarify what was really happening. I know for those involved in the project transmission lines (the words used in the survey) means the high power lines that are being installed. Until I started researching, I did not know that name symbolized something different that the distribution lines that are already in my backyard. 2. The research provided on the effects of EMF is extremely dated. This was immediately noticed at the MCE meeting and pointed out. Referencing that old research does not seem wise to me since there have been significant research since 1997 (date of research provided) some of which says there is a correlation between EMF and various health issues in people. 3. I realize going around the city will cost more in the long run. From the report given at MCE by CP&L personnel, the initial cost is a little lower but it will not address our electrical distribution needs for as long (10-20 years vice >20 years) so the overall cost to get to the same place will be higher. I also There is a major health concern regarding the placement of these poles. There are too many schools and neighborhoods near this placement route		
82	Jenny Chism	(618) 530-0990	jenny.chism@gmail.com	Online	10/13/2015	Y		N			4101	Did not attend		There must be a better alternative.	Please do not ruin the landscape of this community, but more importantly, please consider the long-term health of its members.
83	Judy Hunter	573-234-1840	sisjr60@gmail.com	Online	10/13/2015	Y	2605 Pine Tree Lane	N					No	No	
84	Lisa Eimers	573-234-1114	lisaemiers2@gmail.com	Online	10/13/2015	Y	4101 Southm Pine Ct.	Y	Residence	BEC	Y		My comments are broader than pole placement; my feeling is that this project is being pushed through way too quickly and without enough resident input.	No	The conversation absolutely needs to continue with regard to the many options available, such as burying the lines. There is no reason this should be decided on our behalves, when the payment it would result in annually would come from us, anyway. We should have a say in how it's decided, especially if we're the ones who would pay for it. I don't perceive I am alone in the willingness to consider paying more to have them buried if indeed this is the best route.
85	Orville Hunter	573-234-1840	hunterj.huntero@gmail.com	Online	10/13/2015	Y		Y	Residence	BEC	Did not attend		Electromagnetic fields are a suspected carcinogen. The extremely high voltage line near an elementary school is a potential cause of childhood cancer, which we must guard against.	No	
86	Abbey Upton	(573) 214-3280	aupton@cpsk12.org	Online	10/13/2015	N	4102 Roxbury Place	N			N		I work at Mill Creek Elementary and am very concerned about my students being near these poles/wires	No	
87	Jack & Valerie Reiske	573-442-9821	vreiske@gmail.com	Online	10/13/2015	Y		Y	Residence	CWL	Did not attend		The chosen route would affect property values. The lines are near a school.	No	
88	Christy Flood	573-447-8070	cflood@philipshardy.com	Online	10/13/2015	N	3609 Blue Cedar Ln.	Y	Residence	CWL	Did not attend		As a parent of children who currently, and will in the future, attend both Mill Creek Elementary and Gentry Middle School, have the following concerns with the chosen route (Option A): • Health and safety of the children in the many schools and daycares along the route. • Health and safety of residents in homes along the route. • NIH-referenced research studies show an increased risk of adverse health concerns, such as childhood leukemia, from exposure to EMF emitted from high voltage power lines. • Home values in the surrounding areas neighborhood can be negatively impacted. • Plans to eventually widen Nifong have not been laid out, and therefore the pole placements could need to be relocated when the road project comes to fruition. • Health and safety of the elderly in the various retirement communities built along the route. • The aesthetics of these poles that will be 5-8 foot wide and 75-150' tall over established neighborhoods and roadways. I urge both City Power & Light and the City Council to consider the route proposed in Option B which was estimated to cost less, and would avoid many of the concerns I, among other citizens, have expressed. The route proposed in Option B is a better solution because of the following: • No schools in its path. • Dramatically smaller residential exposure. • More rural route, which is more typical placement for high voltage lines. • Estimated to be the least expensive route. • Preferred public route according to the City's Decision Matrix		
89	Debbie Taylor	573-864-3380	debbie.taylor0130@gmail.com	Online	10/13/2015	Y	2708 Pine Tree Lane	Y	Residence	CWL	Did not attend		Placement comments: Please consider Option B - this neighborhood and elementary school is not the place for these lines! Option B was estimated to cost less, and would avoid many of the concerns that citizens have expressed. - No schools in its path - Dramatically smaller residential exposure - More rural route, which is more typical placement for high voltage lines - Estimated to be the least expensive route - Preferred public route according to the City's Decision Matrix - Future development can be planned around the lines, rather than lines being dropped into established neighborhoods	No	
90	Tamara Stam	573-446-8457	stamtamara@gmail.com	Online	10/13/2015	N		N			Did not attend		This route (Plan A) along Nifong Boulevard is connected to beautiful homes and properties close to Mill Creek Elementary School and to an MK Trail entrance, and thus is used regularly by many pedestrians, i.e., school children, fitness walkers, joggers, and bicycles. Placement of large poles is not only potentially unhealthy to residents, but definitely would mar the beauty of the street that many people use to walk to school, church, the trail, and to neighbor's homes. It is exactly the wrong way to use this route aesthetically. Such a route used recreationally by many should be beautiful, not uglified.	Burial is better. These poles are ugly and would mar the beauty of Nifong Boulevard.	It would be better to bury those lines.
91	Joe Rivera	573.673.1500	rivera@machens.com	Online	10/13/2015	N	2800 Woodberry Court	Y	Residence	CWL	Did not attend		Knowing the health risks especially to children why would you even consider placing the route by an elementary school or dense population. I just moved to the neighborhood near the route and did not know about the open house.	same as above	
92	Susan Nordberg	445-5646	snordberg@cpsk12.org	Online	10/13/2015	Y		Y	Residence	BEC	Did not attend		I wish the council would reconsider placing these poles so relatively close to schools, retirement centers, peaceful neighborhoods and soon a branch of Boone Hospital. Surely, there are other alternatives to consider of the proposed placement of these poles.	They are so tall, and thick which will detract from the lovely nature environment running the length of Nifong.	Please be smart and keep the poles away from educational and residential buildings.

93	Mark Famen	573-424-1782	mfamen@mchsi.com	Online	10/13/2015	N		N		Y	It was informative since this was the first time we got to see the whole pole placement suggestion. The staff was very polite and intelligent. However, there were several questions and issues that remain, so I don't want to say that I came away from the open house completely satisfied with the answers. I have articulated many of those concerns in an earlier section of this comment form - and some are pretty serious. Also, in many instances, staff had to answer that "the question you asked can only be answered by the council". I do not know when that opportunity will present itself or if such a hearing has been scheduled so that this issue can get a full hearing with ALL council members in attendance and prepared to answer questions - much like the staff was required to do. That would be the best solution in terms of process. Is that a possibility. I would hate for this issue to be decided on an up or down vote before the council has the opportunity to look at multiple options again, now that details of the plan have been revealed. I also don't like the fact that residents of Columbia were only given 14 days to file comments in reaction to a plan that took 6 to 8 months for city staff to devise.	Property Owner Participation and The Process: It is clear that property owners along or near the proposed transmission line route have been actively involved in this project and have expressed their support and concerns regarding the implementation of this project since at least 2010. To be clear, property owners from throughout the city, and in the areas where new transmission lines have been proposed, indicated that they agreed with the city that a reliable power source was needed and wanted; that the solution for providing that power should be a long term solution; and that the city should be conscious of costs. There were also a significant number of concerns expressed in the early stages of this process, and the process itself was incremental in nature and did not reflect the full impact of ANY proposed route in the early stages of discussion. There are three things that should be considered in this regard. First, when residents agreed to these broad "concepts" about new transmission lines, very few details were available. NO information was available from the city at the time of the first hearings about pole height, pole placement, pole spacing, exact route, impact on home and property values, associated health risks from electrical shock or EMF emissions or the plan to bury some existing lines, but not the high voltage lines. In essence, citizens were participating in a "blind" process whereby general concepts were discussed without full knowledge of the ultimate impact of those discussions being known. Secondly, many people who are in close proximity to proposed transmission line routes were not sent the surveys that are currently being cited in city presentations about the new transmission line routes. The reason is simple. Most surveys were distributed as an enclosure in city electric utility billing notices. Unfortunately, I do not want these placed along Nifong. There are too many families that live along the route and with all of the negative impact this will have health and otherwise, this is not the best placement. I do not want lines near my house, so I am firmly against plan B. Underground, plan A or plan B2 are all equally acceptable to me.	No	
94	kelly gunter	(573) 219-9161	kellygunter@mac.com	Online	10/14/2015	N	5203 Thornbrook Pkwy--(potentially VERY close to plan B route)	Y	Residence	BEC		No	Please rethink the placement and do what is best for the community and families that live in this area. Don't just pick the cheapest option.	
95	Bill Durante	(573) 882-3896	durantew@missouri.edu	Online	10/14/2015	Y		Y	Residence	CWL	Did not attend	No	I do not want lines near my house, so I am firmly against plan B. Underground, plan A or plan B2 are all equally acceptable to me.	
96	Debra Carcamo	(314) 956-5234	demagruder@hotmail.com	Online	10/14/2015	N	3606 Ridgeview Dr	Y	Residence	CWL	Did not attend	No	Please consider burying the poles.	
97	Chris Ashton	573-999-6964	christopher_ashton@us.afac.com	Online	10/14/2015		1215 Tartan Place						I understand the plan is to take the high voltage power lines directly down Vwater School Road which basically puts a pole in my backyard. I've been advised the impact on my home value as well as those in the Spring Creek neighborhood will be negatively affected by 20%-50%. Obviously I don't want that but this neighborhood provides a sizeable tax base for the city so decreasing Property values isn't good for anyone. There are also differing opinions on health concerns living near high voltage and this plan not only puts us at risk but also Mill Creek Elementary School. All of this seems unnecessary because I know there are three options and the other two put the High Voltage lines through more rural areas that don't immediately affect existing homes and schools. The other options will also provide the ability to develop housing plans around the lines, reducing the negative effect.	
98	Kimberly Hughes		kimandbert@gmail.com	Online	10/14/2015		1307 Lea Verde Ct						I am disgusted how this option A was slid under the table past our citizens in this area as well as how this was presented to the City Council. Even your art renderings give a false impression. This issue should be brought back in front of the City of Columbia and its affected citizens and businesses in a fair and unbiased manner. The optional route B is more cost effective and considering your mapping plots, the most appropriate for this type of transmission line.	
99	Mike Hogan	(573) 228-8253	mhogan@cpsk12.org	Online	10/14/2015		3803 Blue Cedar Lane						Have talked by telephone to Connie and Jeff White regarding route by my house. Was suggested that I also submit concerns through this means. Drainage issues around Structure 54 where drain pipe exists. Talked about working with residents who are directly affected by construction regarding fixing any issues that may arise on property from new power line construction. Would like to ask to reconsider placement of poles from South Side on this route section and put on North Side where current distribution lines are located as more space between poles and road exists than on South Side. Went to Open House at RBHS; was told that I could use device to check current EMF levels but have not been contacted, please call. Thank you	
100	Nancy	(573) 882-9522	nancelator3@gmail.com	Online	10/14/2015	Y		Y	Residence	CWL		No	I feel very strongly about the close placement of these poles being in close proximity to more than one elementary school and subdivisions with many children; there are known health implications especially to children; seems that option B would be better.	
101	Stacey Dennis	573-673-8567	Stacydennis08@hotmail.com	Online	10/15/2015	N		Y	Residence	BEC	Y	No	This project needs to take an alternate route away from the mill creek elementary school and existing homes!	
102	Sounak Chakraborty	(573) 823-6974	sounakc@gmail.com	Online	10/16/2015	N		Y	Residence	CWL	Did not attend	No	Please stick with option A. That is the best route you have chosen. I heard some residents of Mill Creek are trying to lobby to move to Option B route but that will be a very poor choice.	
103	Amanda Miller	573-489-7394	mandymill@gmail.com	Online	10/16/2015	N		N			Did not attend	No	No	
104	John Glascock(as communicated to Laura Nauser & passed on to Tad Johnson)												I am extremely frustrated with the attempts by some to re-open discussion concerning the transmission line route. I live in the Cascades and my home is one that backs to Route K. We went through this process over two years ago in a well-publicized public comment process. I still believe that the option that was chosen better fits the City's stated preference for routing through commercial areas rather than residential. In addition, those of us in the Cascades (and I would think many along Route K) are not even City electric customers. It seems many residents of Columbia want reliable power, but want the transmission lines that supply it to be someone else's problem. Thank you for this opportunity to provide comment.	
105	Jamie Duggab		colinjam1@icloud.com	Online	10/16/2015		Thornbrook Rdg						2 poles, one right outside of Jeff Smith's retirement project and one near Kent in Springcreek subdivision second or third house going west -- can we move the poles? In regards to the new high voltage power lines, please do not allow plan B to happen!! This will place these lines within eyesight of my home and literally in people's backyards that live in the Steeplechase Subdivision! Plan B2 or A is a much better option!!	
106	Debra Carcamo	(314) 956-5234	demagruder@hotmail.com	Online	10/16/2015		Misty Grove Ct						Please consider option B2 for the new high voltage power lines. Our community does not want those power lines near our neighborhood or the new school. They could be hazardous to our health and they will effect resale value of our homes. Please consider option B2, not B.	
107	Kristi Gregg	573-289-7623	greggk@missouri.edu	Online	10/16/2015		5423 steeplechase drive						I would like for you to consider routes A or B-2. My son is very upset that families are being put at risk for these new power lines. Route B is not desirable.	
108	Michael Hall	(573) 999-7821	mmhall@columbiacivilengineering.com	Online	10/16/2015		4805 Garden Grove dr						I wanted to make a point to CW&L in SUPPORT of the current option A route for the high voltage power line. From an engineering (I am a local civil engineer and NOT a CW&L or City employee) standpoint 1. the plans are 30% done 2. there is no ROW acquisition with the option a route. The Mill Creek folks keep saying option b is cheaper, but there is no easement acquisition in those figures! 3. In addition, we need people to know that with option B, CW&L will need a 60-100' wide easement. Finally, the 69 kV route needed on option b connects to a station that was installed in the late 60's and would be out of capacity almost upon installation (i.e. throwing good money after bad). Thank you for consideration	

