

Miranda Benson

From: Miranda Benson
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 10:08 AM
To: PCD Hearings
Subject: FW: Xcel Power Pathway re:Parcel no 200000461

From: jgardner80808@aol.com <jgardner80808@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 4, 2024 12:04 AM
To: PLNWEB <PLNWEB@elpasoco.com>
Subject: Xcel Power Pathway re:Parcel no 200000461

Opposition to current Xcel plans and documents submitted

I own parcel number 200000461 and I am also the Chairman of the Tri-County Fire Protection District.

I'll address Fire Protection concerns first. To my knowledge Xcel has not directly contacted our Fire Protection District to discuss future impacts to our fire district. To my knowledge, Xcel does not currently have a wildland fire plan, nor have they studied those potential impacts to our FPD. Rush Rd and Judge Orr Rd are two of the worst roads in the county already presenting safety concerns. Rush Rd is a main emergency traffic route from our station at Rush to the northern portion of our district. The increased traffic from heavy equipment, semis, and concrete trucks will further damage the already poor road conditions, thus further delaying response times to portions of the district. Who will ensure these roads remain in satisfactory condition during construction? Judge Orr Rd east of Ramah Hwy is some of the oldest pavement in the county, and that road condition worsens every day. Add all this construction traffic to that section of the road, and it will be completely demolished. This presents further safety and emergency vehicle traffic issues. What benefit will our FPD receive from this project? Will it be a tax based issue as is the case with the wind farms? Will Xcel provide the FPD with funds to be able to provide additional services as during constructions this project will add to the already increasing call volume. Because our firefighters and EMTs are completely volunteer, will Xcel do some on site training as online training is not all that feasible for volunteer agencies? Just some initial concerns.

As related to my personal property

Aside from being totally opposed to the project, I am also opposed to multiple portions of the application.

I attended several of the "public meetings" Xcel describes. They were not at all how they described. Other than visual displays, there were no public presentation speakers. They did receive a lot of push back and negative comments during those meetings. There has been no explanation as to why they can not go underground. They played "pin the tail on the donkey" at one set of open houses where each attendee got to put a sticker on where they thought the line should go. Essentially this put neighbor against neighbor, father against son, brother against brother.....literally.

Their initial and thus far only offer for a ROW across my property is a joke, basically a one time payment of current assessed value for the approx 5.5 acres it would affect. It does not address the permanent defacing, devaluation, or future use or sale of said land. Nor does it address any ongoing payments for each tower as they will be generating profit using my land. There currently is no requirement to bring the land back to its original condition after the project is complete. It will take a minimum of 2 years for the grasses to come back. Xcel should be required to bring the landscape condition (flat) back to that condition, as well as ensure native grasses are planted where they have been trampled.

The project does not directly address road conditions, in fact, it minimizes the impact to our current and future road conditions. Commissioner Gonzales, as well as several DPW employees have previously acknowledged the very poor road condition of Judge Orr road east of Ramah Hwy. I have made multiple road complaints over the last 25 years, both personally and as the former Fire Chief about the condition of our roads specifically Judge Orr. In the last 30 yrs this section of judge orr has been chip sealed one time. The pavement is over 40 years old. The potholes appear faster than they can fill them. Still nothing has been done. The added traffic of up to 60 concrete trucks a day, 20 dump trucks, 10 cars, 25 semi trucks, a couple cranes, and a couple areal lifts will completely demolish what is left. Based on the current Development agreement, those road conditions will be allowed to be the same or worse after the project which is totally unacceptable. If the county is to receive any economic benefit, it should directly benefit those of us directly affected by the project. Xcel should be forced to rebuild the roads as they are done. Nothing should be left in worse condition. As for Oil Well, the road I live on, it stands to see triple or more of the usual daily traffic, much of it semis or other big trucks. Now I know we live in the county, on the dusty plains, that shouldnt mean I just have to deal with the additional dust from the road for this project. I will demand dust abatement either from the county or from Xcel before I sign off on any agreement. Their traffic and road study is a joke. You cant tell me that the additional road traffic during the project will not affect the condition of the roads. It will only make already poor conditions worse, who is liable for that? The term "road damage" is used in the development agreement. The problem is "road damage" already exists on every single road in the project area. In fact there are some signs place already indicating such. Isnt this just a way to get Xcel out of any liability.

Notification of increased traffic to those folks who live on the travel and haul routes should also be required, not just property owners along the route.

If I wanted to erect some sort of high tower on my property, I would be required to get a permit for each one, Id have to get a soils test for each one. Xcel is a private company, they should be required the same.

Is the county prepared to provide my legal fees should I decide I dont want this on my property, supposedly the commissioners are against eminent domain?

El Paso County will receive no benefits from this project. In fact it is very obvious by their plans, the ultimate goal is to take all of the agriculture land out here and put turbines on it. Where is the protection of our land rights? Are the commissioners prepared or already primed for that to be allowed to happen?

The "acceptable" sound level is 50dB. Their towers will produce 49.8. Lets get as close as possible so we cant prove its above what they say it will be. I choose to live in the country for a reason. Quite is one of them.

I can promise, if this passes I will be calling each and every day with road condition complaints.

This is nothing more, nothing less than a land grab for a political agenda.

Ill have more precise thoughts in a later email.

Thanks,

Jeremy C. Gardner