October 24, 200 Photocket luc olv

We are contacting you to express our feelings and opinions concerning a 138 volt electric line First Energy has proposed to erect along route 528 in Huntsburg. Montville, and Thompson townships in eastern Geauga County. We are a property owner on route 528, so our beautiful land is one of those affected by this proposal, which I believe is now before the siting board. We will also suggest alternate routes available.

Our farm is in its second generation with a third generation soon to follow. We have been developing and building our land for agricultural purposes and finally have achieved the tilth and fertility prerequisite for successful production. I have been involved in this process for fifty-five years as well as my son now twenty-five years old. This can only be achieved through blood, sweat, and tears, as well as working into the night on countless occasions during the harvest season. We have learned to love and care for our sixty acres comparable to the early pioneers of this great country. Being retired due to age and disability, my neighbor now farms about twenty-five acres with the same care and pride we have done for so long. Another twenty to twenty-five acres is forested and the remainder is wetlands, each with its own adapted wildlife.

First Energy has proposed cutting, clearing, and all things necessary to open a new corridor through virgin territory untainted by "progress." In doing so, our land would be affected greatly and negatively. The tilth and fertility we have worked to obtain would all be for naught. The tilth would be lost due to the use of extremely heavy equipment required to clear the land, drill holes, and insert eighty foot high and four foot wide poles, and all the other probable needs. We might require another two generations to again build up our soil for successful agriculture, and might never achieve its present state.

One might suggest the loss of forest and wetlands as inconsequential, but not so. Many forms of life have taken up residence in these areas. Not only would wetlands be destroyed, but our drainage pattern also. The forests are needed to prevent erosion and provide the habitat for some unusual species, such as the trillium. So these three types of land are all necessary and parts of well planned land management. To lose any one of these would achieve only negative results.

We have no need to remind you of the aesthetic value of our rural county, since we described it in our last letter along with photographs of our beautiful view and sunrises. If these irreplaceable sights are tainted with ugly poles and wires the loss would be nearly unbearable to us.

The loss of all these precious gifts entrusted to us by our great God is completely unacceptable. He has blessed us with this land and surely expects us to care lovingly for it. This we do.

If this proposal is accepted, a new corridor would be cleared through virgin territory. It is projected to run through wetlands on the south, and heading north through a fertile field, then through some more wetlands and lastly through another wonderful field. In effect, this would divide our property into two parcels. Concerning property values, our questions to realtors have shown they would fall drastically. She told us

that the images is to certify firmly that anyone looking for property would not even consider ours with poles and high voltage lines. She would not even show it. We have no plans to sell lots, but future generations might.

American Transmissions Systems Inc., a subsidiary of First Energy, claims to have considered other options, but claims only two of these to be acceptable and will not even consider another corridor. They would rather rape our virgin land for a variety of flimsy reasons. I would suggest the possibility of several other existing corridors which would not require creating another new one and ruin many acres of land and dreams.

First, the open corridor along route 11. I was told it is too far out of the way. My understanding is that this line would also supply Ashtabula County, close to route 11. Why not use the existing corridor and transmit it then westward, rather than opening virgin territory and then transmitting it eastward? This seems like a better option.

Next, there is another existing corridor call the "Rachel Route." This follows the old B&O railway and only requires nine and a half miles rather than the proposed fifteen miles. This savings should be sufficient to justify buried cables. This route was accepted by the siting board ten years ago, but they let the plan lapse for lack of need. That need sure seems to have grown immensely in the following ten years.

There is also a Mayfield Road route. This would run from a huge substation in Chesterland eastward along Mayfield Road to the Ruth substation in East Clairdon, another existing corridor, about twelve miles.

Another possibility is to follow the Geauga-Ashtabula county lines. This would eliminate dividing properties into two portions.

Lastly, I would as consideration of following the Route 87 existing corridor from the intersection of Route 87 and Route 306 eastward to the Burton substation, approximately eleven and a half miles. One objection is the unsightly poles and wires through Punderson State Park. Why could they not bury the cable for this short distance if they are worried about "view shed impacts" within the park?

These alternate routes would use pre-existing corridors and would not require the loss of more agriculture land, nor destroy the labor of the backbone of this country, the farmers.

We feel strongly that this needless rape of virgin land is totally unacceptable. It is difficult to oppose "big business," but we love our land and feel strongly enough to fight for it. We have nowhere else to turn, but to you. Please take our objections into consideration when a final decision is made. We would do just about anything for our land. Would you not do the same? Please help us!

Concerned Property Owners

William, Patricia, and Robert Jonath

This letter was received from DNL office on 12/0 OPSB received and responded on 10/16/07

NO ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE

PROVIDED.