

# Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line Project

---

North Project Advisory Team Meeting 2 Summary

July 30, 2009

---

Hermiston Conference Center

415 S. Highway 395

Hermiston, OR 97838

## **Table of Contents**

Introduction.....	2
Background.....	3
Overview.....	4
Presentations.....	7
Community Criteria Discussion.....	13
Panel Questions and Answers.....	14

## Introduction

**This document summarizes the second North PAT meeting held in Hermiston, Oregon on July 30, 2009 from 4 p.m. to 9 p.m.**

Idaho Power is committed to partnering with communities to identify proposed and alternate routes for the Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line Project. The initial process of identifying a route began in late 2007 when Idaho Power submitted documents to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and Oregon Department of Energy–Energy Facility Siting Council (EFSC). Following public scoping meetings held in October 2008, these agencies received public input requesting that Idaho Power conduct more extensive outreach while identifying the transmission line route.

In Spring 2009, Idaho Power initiated a process to engage communities—from Boardman, Oregon, to Melba, Idaho—in siting the Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line Project. This process is called the Community Advisory Process.

As a part of the Community Advisory Process, a Project Advisory Team has been formed in each of the three geographic project areas: North, Central and South. The Project Advisory Teams are made up of residents, property owners, business leaders and local officials.

The Project Advisory Teams will work closely with technical experts to recommend proposed and alternate routes.

**During the Community Advisory Process the Project Advisory Teams will:**

- **Identify** issues and concerns; develop criteria for evaluating possible routes and integrate community criteria with regulatory requirements.
- **Develop** a range of possible routes that address community issues and concerns. Routes will be identified through mapping sessions; routes not meeting the regulatory and community criteria will be removed from consideration.
- **Recommend** proposed and alternate routes, which will be carried through the permitting process.
- **Follow through** with communities during the state and federal permitting process.



## **Background**

The North Project Advisory Team includes representatives from Morrow County and Umatilla County. The first North Project Advisory Team (PAT) meeting was held May 27, 2009. At the first North Project Advisory Team meeting, team members:

- Reviewed and discussed the purpose and need for the project, work to date and how the Community Advisory Process would proceed.
- Formed smaller working groups and identified community concerns and suggestions about the project.
- Developed community criteria based on the community concerns and suggestions identified by Project Advisory Team members.

Project Advisory Team and community members will use regulatory, engineering and community criteria when developing proposed and alternate routes for the transmission line.

- **Regulatory and engineering routing criteria** include state and federal regulations, policies and other standards that are applicable to development of a route. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), U.S. Forest Service (USFS), and Oregon Department of Energy-Energy Facility Siting Council (ODOE-EFSC) will use these criteria when reviewing proposed and alternate routes and determining if they should authorize the project.
- **Community criteria** include the concerns and suggestions identified by Project Advisory Teams in each area of the project – for example, irrigated farmland.

The second North Project Advisory Team meeting provided team members with an opportunity to learn more about regulatory criteria and ask questions directly to the federal and state agencies involved with the authorization of the Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line Project.

## **Overview**

The purpose of the second North PAT meeting was to give team members a better understanding of:

- The federal, state and public processes involved in the project.
- The regulatory and engineering criteria that will be used to develop routes for the transmission line.
- The requirements and regulations the project will have to meet.

Team members also refined the community criteria at the second North PAT meeting.

Identifying routes for the Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line will involve multiple processes and jurisdictions, agencies and communities. Idaho Power invited representatives from the BLM, ODOE-EFSC, U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and Oregon Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) to the second PAT meeting to participate in an informative panel discussion and present their agency's review processes.

As part of the panel discussion, each representative gave a presentation that outlined their agency's review process and addressed key issues that may arise as the processes work together. Project Advisory Team members were given the opportunity to ask the representatives questions about the regulatory criteria that will be used during the siting process.

The following information was provided in advance to help team members prepare for the panel discussion:

- A siting process background paper prepared for Project Advisory Team members to provide more information about the federal, state and public processes involved with the project.
- Tables of regulatory and engineering routing criteria.
- Draft community criteria that were developed from the concerns and suggestions submitted by team members at the first PAT meeting.

## **Meeting Agenda and Format**

Idaho Power hosted the second North PAT meeting in Hermiston, Oregon, on July 30, 2009 at the Hermiston Conference Center.

Twenty-seven people attended the second North PAT meeting.

A copy of the invitation letter for the second North PAT meeting can be found in Appendix 1.

### **The meeting objectives were to:**

- Discuss the role of each agency involved with the Boardman to Hemingway Project
- Refine community criteria

- Provide a forum where PAT members could discuss regulatory and engineering criteria with the appropriate agencies

**The meeting included:**

- Presentations by representatives from the BLM, ODOE, U.S. Forest Service, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Idaho Power.
- A facilitated discussion about the community criteria to identify issues and incorporate input from team members.
- A question-and-answer session between team members and the resource agency representatives.

**Presenters:**

- Idaho Power—Stacey Baczkowski, Senior Biologist
- BLM—Renee Straub, BLM Project Manager
- USFS—Kurt Wiedenmann, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest, District Ranger, La Grande Ranger District
- ODOE—Adam Bless, Energy Facility Analyst
- ODFW—Mark Kirsch, ODFW District Wildlife Biologist

**Handouts:**

Organizational binders were provided to all team members. The binders included a meeting agenda from the first PAT meeting and the Community Advisory Process flowchart handout. The following handouts for the second meeting also were included in the binders and are available in Appendix 2:

- North PAT #2 Agenda (Two changes were made to the agenda: Renee Straub represented the BLM instead of Lucas Lucero and Eric Hackett, Idaho Power, was unable to attend.)
- Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line Project Siting Process Background Paper
- Boardman to Hemingway Project Advisory Team PowerPoint presentation
- BLM PowerPoint presentation
- USFS PowerPoint presentation
- State of Oregon's ODOE-EFSC PowerPoint presentation
- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) PowerPoint presentation
- Community Criteria comment sheet
- Meeting Evaluation comment sheet
- Invitation to public meetings

## **Team Member Input**

- Idaho Power asked team members to evaluate the meeting by completing Meeting Evaluation comment sheets. Transcriptions of the Meeting Evaluation comment sheets are available in Appendix 3.
- Nine team members completed the Meeting Evaluation comment sheet. Responses included the following:
  - Four team members responded that they planned to attend the Pilot Rock public meeting.
  - Seven team members responded that they planned to attend the Boardman public meeting.
  - Eight team members responded they were available to attend the PAT #3 meeting/mapping session on September 23 and 24.
  - The majority of team members responded positively to the panel discussion and appreciated the opportunity to interact with the resource agency representatives.

## **Presentations**

### **Welcome—Kent McCarthy, Idaho Power CAP Project Leader**

McCarthy welcomed participants and reviewed the agenda. Two changes were made to the agenda: Renee Straub represented the BLM instead of Lucas Lucero and Eric Hackett was unable to attend for Idaho Power. Team members were told that if the panelists were not able to answer engineering questions, these questions would be forwarded to Hackett and answers would be returned to the team via e-mail.

### **Introductions and Agenda—Rosemary Curtin, PAT facilitator**

- Curtin thanked team members and panelists for attending and asked everyone to briefly introduce themselves. Curtin then went over the following housekeeping items:
- Reviewed the team binders and handouts for the meeting.
- Documents from all the first PAT meetings are available on the project Web site [www.boardmantoemingway.com](http://www.boardmantoemingway.com).
- Idaho Power hosted two optional Purpose and Need meetings on July 8, 2009 in Baker City and Ontario. The summary from these meetings will be posted to the project Web site when finalized.
- Seven public meetings have been planned and will be held in communities in all three advisory areas. Invitations will be distributed to team members and they are encouraged to attend.
- Contact information for all Project Advisory Team members will be posted at these public meetings. If the team members would not like their information included on the PAT member display board they need to contact RBCI.
- Review of proposed mapping session dates. The mapping sessions will consist of an evening introduction followed by an all-day mapping workshop the next day.
- Review of upcoming mapping sessions:
- The first evening, a meeting will be held to give team members instructions about the mapping workshop.
- The following day, mapping sessions will be open from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. for people to drop in and identify routes. County planners are encouraged to attend these mapping sessions.
- After the first session, the routes will be analyzed by Tetra Tech and Idaho Power. Analyzed routes will be presented to the PAT, including their advantages and disadvantages. This analysis process will continue until an acceptable route is mapped. Resource agency data will be available during the mapping sessions.

## **Panel Presentations**

The purpose of the panel was to meet representatives from the resource agencies involved in the project and learn about their processes, functions, roles and responsibilities. All PowerPoint presentations and the siting process background paper that summarizes agency roles and responsibilities can be found in Appendix 2.

### **Idaho Power—Stacey Baczkowski, Senior Biologist**

Baczkowski works with environmental considerations in routing the line. She explained the regulatory materials, which includes a list of acronyms and the table of regulatory and engineering criteria. Baczkowski explained the table of regulatory and engineering criteria summarizes the regulations and requirements the project will have to meet; some of the regulations are route dependent and some are independent of the chosen route. The table of regulatory and engineering criteria will be used during the mapping sessions. The regulatory and engineering criteria table includes avoidance areas, placement opportunities, and exclusion areas (Appendix 5).

### **Bureau of Land Management (BLM)—Renee Straub, BLM Project Manager**

Straub delivered a PowerPoint presentation, which outlined the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the responsibilities of lead and cooperating agencies, and BLM suggestions. Straub's presentation included the following information:

- The CAP and NEPA processes have several differences:
  - o CAP is a process chosen by Idaho Power to identify proposed and alternative routes.
  - o NEPA is a federal law that requires agencies to analyze and disclose potential impacts of projects or programs to ensure agencies make well-informed decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is a detailed analysis prepared by federal agencies to comply with NEPA when a project is expected to have significant environmental impacts.
- Responsibilities of the BLM as the lead agency in the NEPA process:
  - o BLM will prepare the EIS.
  - o BLM must select an agency-preferred alternative and will not participate in the CAP route development process.
  - o BLM will consult with other agencies and tribes and evaluate the project against numerous laws, regulations and policies prior to selecting an agency preferred alternative and mitigation, approving or denying the right-of-way grant and the Land Use Plan Amendment.
- Cooperating agencies assist the BLM with preparing the EIS. Seventeen agencies in Oregon and Idaho have expressed interest in participating as cooperators.
- Review of the EIS process, which is currently in the scoping phase:
  - o After scoping, the BLM will develop alternatives, conduct the environmental analysis, prepare a draft EIS, and file a notice of availability in the Federal Register.

- o The draft EIS has a 45-day comment period, after which the BLM responds to comments and selects the preferred alternative.
- o The BLM will prepare the final EIS, file another notice of availability, circulate the final EIS for 30 days, and file a record of decision.
- Review of the parts of an EIS and the comprehensive list of known issue areas to be analyzed along the entire route. Additional issues may arise during the CAP process during scoping or during review of the draft EIS.
- The BLM suggested the following:
  - o CAP teams will not resolve all routing issues or mitigate all environmental impacts.
  - o CAP teams should focus on developing routes in “opportunity areas” and keep routes away from “avoidance” or “exclusion” areas.
  - o CAP teams should consider routes in the BLM Public Scoping Report that make use of “opportunity areas.”
  - o CAP routes are not “final approved” routes.
  - o After the CAP process, team members should remain involved by reviewing and commenting on the draft EIS and draft Proposed Order.
- All routes, including CAP routes, will be presented by the BLM and ODOE in public scoping meetings after the CAP process. The BLM, with help from cooperating agencies, will identify reasonable routes for detailed analysis in the EIS.

**U.S. Forest Service (USFS)—Kurt Wiedenmann, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest, District Ranger, La Grande Ranger District**

Wiedenmann discussed the USFS’s role as a cooperating agency in the NEPA process.

Weidenmann’s presentation included the following information:

- The USFS will make a separate decision from the BLM regarding USFS lands. At least three, and possibly four, national forests are on the potential route. The three likely forests along the route are the Wallowa-Whitman, Umatilla, and Malheur national forests, together constituting about six million acres. The route may also reach the Ochoco National Forest.
- National Forest System lands have forest plans (land and resource management plans) that guide land management and provide land management allocations similar to city zoning regulations. Forest plans also give general guidance regarding transmission lines and utility corridors.
- A map of the three national forests, showing the following:
  - o Exclusion areas (red)—Hells Canyon National Recreation Area (HCNRA) and congressionally designated wilderness areas
  - o Avoidance areas (yellow)—areas with high resource values, such as wild and scenic rivers protected under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act; Research Natural Areas; and municipal watersheds
  - o Opportunity areas (green)—areas generally conforming for use by utilities, in which the USFS still has to address issue areas and mitigate if possible

- A map with current transmission lines, highways, and corridors, noting that existing power lines come through the HCNRA because they pre-date the HCNRA's establishment.
- A map of management areas (MAs) in the La Grande Ranger District. MA1 would be the least controversial and denotes areas allocated to timber emphasis (e.g., road construction, grazing, harvesting). As the MA numbers increase, the resource objectives increase and are more restrictive. MA 17 is a utility corridor (the only one on the Wallowa Whitman National Forest) that was designated in the 1990s because a Bonneville Power Administration transmission line and large underground natural gas line run through that area.

### **Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE)—Adam Bless, Energy Facility Analyst**

Bless discussed Oregon state siting criteria. Bless told team members that he is available for questions outside of Project Advisory Team meetings. Bless' presentation included the following information:

- The lead state agency is EFSC, a seven-person citizen board. The ODOE serves as staff to EFSC, does most of the detailed review, and makes recommendations to EFSC.
- EFSC criteria apply on all land in Oregon—including private land, Oregon state land and federal land—and come from three areas:
  - o Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) chapter 345, divisions 22, 23, 24, and 27 (these are captured on the regulatory and engineering criteria table [Appendix 5])
  - o Other state agency and county rules (e.g., ODFW guidelines, county land use plans)
  - o The Project Order issued in January 2009—a comprehensive list of the regulatory criteria (available at the Boardman to Hemingway Web site)
- OAR 345 Division 22 contains the 14 core standards that incorporate other standards by reference. Bless expanded on the following standards:
  - o Retirement/financial assurance—If the line becomes obsolete, removal and restoration are the applicant's responsibility. The applicant must include an estimate that is reviewed by an outside source for removing the line and restoring the route. As a condition of approval, the applicant must provide a bond or letter of credit to cover the estimate. Under no circumstances would the landowner have to remove the equipment and restore the site.
  - o Need—Idaho Power must make its case for a finding of need and compliance with the standards in an application, which is subject to public review. Need is a unique standard because EFSC relies on the Oregon Public Utilities Commission (PUC) (a sister agency) to review Idaho Power's Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) to determine need. Idaho Power's new case for need will be included in the IRP to be submitted by December 31, 2009.
- Review of some of the route-related standards in more detail:
  - o Biology standards are based on ODFW's six habitat categories.

- o Land use standards are based on criteria directly from the County Comprehensive Plan, although EFSC can make direct goal findings or take goal exceptions.
- o Scenic standards only protect inventoried resources included in the County Comprehensive Plan or a tribal or federal land management plan.
- o Although no public health and safety standards exist, EFSC has broad statutory authority to place any conditions on a permit to protect public health and safety, including routing conditions. EFSC can and has considered electromagnetic fields in past applications.
- The EFSC standards incorporate many other rules and standards from agencies and counties and require EFSC to determine “no net significant adverse impact” (with mitigation). Bless encouraged PAT members to read the OAR or Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) because the names of the standards often do not tell the whole story.

### **Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife—Mark Kirsch, ODFW District Wildlife Biologist**

Kirsch discussed ODFW’s role in the siting process. Kirsch’s presentation included the following information:

- The project area is about 300 miles long and includes the following:
  - o Habitat for five native anadromous fish species, bull trout, and redband trout
  - o Important habitat for a variety of wildlife
  - o Federal and State protected species
  - o Important hunting, angling, and recreational areas
- ODFW’s role in siting is mostly advisory unless the line crosses ODFW-owned land. The ODFW provides data, contributes to scoping and plan development, and requires mitigation.
- Various ORS, OAR and species management plans provide authority and guidance for species management and habitat protection, especially ODFW’s Fish & Wildlife Habitat Mitigation Policy. The policy is based on the premise that habitats can have varying levels of importance based on conditions and the location of habitat and on the need and sensitivity of associated species. The policy contains a hierarchy of habitat categories, defining Category 1 as irreplaceable, essential, and limited habitat; Category 2 as essential habitat; and Category 6 as neither essential nor limited habitat. Ideally, Category 2 habitat would be avoided since mitigation is often expensive. The goal for Category 6 habitat is to minimize impacts; no mitigation requirement exists for Category 6.
- The ODFW assists the applicant in the following:
  - o Collecting information to categorize habitats
  - o Assigning categories
  - o Quantifying impacts
  - o Proposing mitigation

- The ODFW recommends mitigation consistent with OAR 635 and the following considerations:
  - Location and duration of the proposed development action
  - Alternatives to the proposed development action
  - Affected fish and wildlife species and habitat
  - Nature, extent, and duration of impacts
- EFSC siting standards of particular interest to the ODFW are fish and wildlife habitat and threatened and endangered species. The ODFW only becomes involved if a fish and wildlife impact exists. EFSC will have to address fish and wildlife mitigation in the final order, which will likely have some mitigation for the impacts.
- Species of concern include the following:
  - Washington ground squirrels (state listed as Endangered)
  - Ferruginous hawk, Swainson's hawk, and burrowing owl nests (sensitive species)
- The following are habitats of concern:
  - High quality grassland or shrub-steppe habitat (Habitat Category 1 if occupied by Washington ground squirrels and Category 2 habitat if not currently occupied by Washington ground squirrels)
  - Wetlands and riparian habitats (Category 1 habitat)

## **Community Criteria Discussion**

During the first North PAT meeting, concerns and suggestions submitted by North PAT members were developed into community criteria. The community criteria will be presented at the public meetings in August 2009 and will be used with the regulatory and engineering criteria during the mapping sessions.

At the second North PAT meeting, Rosemary Curtin facilitated a discussion with the team members to identify if any of the draft community criteria needed to be added or changed.

Team members provided the following feedback on the draft community criteria (see also Appendix 4 for flipchart transcriptions):

- The Naval bombing range should be added as a placement opportunity. McCarthy warned that representatives from the Navy did not recommend placing the line across the bombing range but agreed to add it to the list.
- Placement opportunities and avoidance areas should be ranked by importance. For example, a transmission line will not affect ranging animals or agricultural land as much as irrigated land.
- Irrigated land should be kept and exclusive farm-use (EFU) land should be removed from the avoidance areas.
- Conflicts exist between avoidance areas and placement opportunities, so PAT members are going to have to weight these items.
- If landowners understood what Idaho Power had planned for ROW acquisition, they would have a better idea if the line should be supported or opposed.
- Wind farms should be added as a placement opportunity.
- I 84 should be added as a placement opportunity.
- Property owners willing to have the line on their land should be added as placement opportunities.

Team members were also given a Community Criteria comment sheet to provide input.

- Two team members completed the Community Criteria comment sheet. Team members were asked if additional community criteria needed to be included and if the existing criteria needed to be changed. Transcriptions of the community criteria comment sheets are available in Appendix 3. No team members responded on the comment sheets that the existing community criteria needed to be changed.

Team members were informed at the meeting that the recommended changes would be made to the draft community criteria and the final version would be distributed to team members for review. The final community criteria would be distributed at the public meetings in August.

## **Panel Questions and Answers**

Team members were given the opportunity to ask questions to the resource agency representatives and Idaho Power representatives. Below are the questions asked by team members and the answers provided by the resource agency representatives and Idaho Power at the meeting.

### **What has Idaho Power budgeted for the ROWs**

Mike Barrie, Idaho Power: Idaho Power pays for all easements. The process begins with fair market value as assessed by a certified appraiser. Legally, easements are based on how the easement affects the property. Idaho Power's standard process is to start at 50 percent of fair market value, while also negotiating access roads, etc.

### **Is irrigation allowed under a transmission line?**

Barrie, Idaho Power: Yes, the only restriction would be permanent structures violating the National Safety Electrical Code. Idaho Power tries to line the towers on corners of pivots that are basically wasteland.

### **Why haven't PAT members received our Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) as a cooperator?**

BLM: Lucas Lucero (BLM Project Manager) is still working on the MOUs and the BLM is still holding conference calls with cooperators. Straub will check with Lucero to make sure cooperators are still involved.

### **Is there a cooperators phone call scheduled?**

BLM: A phone conference is tentatively scheduled for August.

### **Is there a map of the sensitive areas and are there habitat categories 3, 4, and 5?**

ODFW: That depends on the sensitive area; some haven't been identified, and some sites will likely be identified when surveys occur after the route has been chosen. There are 6 habitat categories—1 through 6—however, tonight's presentation only addressed 1, 2, and 6.

### **What agency is responsible for routing through the I-84 corridor?**

ODOE: If the Department of Transportation (DOT) doesn't have a prohibition for placing the line along the I-84 corridor, then it would be subject to the same state process as any other piece of land.

McCarthy, Idaho Power: McCarthy thinks the DOT has a prohibition against using the interstate ROWs for a transmission line; however, they allow use of areas along the corridor.

BLM: Public land identified as a federal energy corridor has been analyzed in the Westwide Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS.

Baczkowski, Idaho Power: The Westwide Energy Corridor is available online, and Idaho Power will bring those maps to the mapping sessions.

**Can the USFS include county lines on their maps?**

USFS: The USFS will do that.

**Is there a make or break cost for Idaho Power?**

Baczkowski, Idaho Power: Cost definitely matters, and the most inexpensive line would be the straightest. It varies from there to avoid avoidance areas, etc.

Angell, Idaho Power: In order to go through this process, Idaho Power needed an idea of transmission line length. Idaho Power hasn't determined a specific length restriction, but the company will know when it is too expensive and when they have to do something different. But, Idaho Power is committed to this process. The company expects to have partners and other uses for this line. However, if the line gets too long and our partners pull out, that is a deal breaker.

**When does Idaho Power plan to file the IRP with the PUC?**

Angell, Idaho Power: The 2006 IRP originally discussed this transmission line. Idaho Power is updating the IRP and will file it at the end of the year—Idaho Power switched the planning cycle from even to odd to align with Avista and PacifiCorp, and because of the financial recession, the Idaho PUC and Oregon PUC recommended realigning those numbers. The company will file on December 31 and will have a new load forecast out by mid-August. Idaho Power can bring slides about the load forecast for the next meeting. Idaho Power is building a combined cycle combustion turbine (CCCT) plant in Idaho and has requested a certificate of public necessity and convenience. The company expects that this line will still be beneficial and part of the preferred portfolio. IRP meetings are open meetings and everyone is welcome to attend. Idaho Power will forward those dates to PAT members.

**Has IPC considered other alternatives if this transmission line is not economically feasible?**

Angell, Idaho Power: Idaho Power is pursuing multiple projects simultaneously, such as the CCCT plant 8 miles east of the state line on I-84 and transmission across southern Idaho into Wyoming.

**Could video capabilities be used to save some travel for PAT members in the future?**

Angell, Idaho Power: Idaho Power has had some negative activity in this process, so the company thinks we need to be here in person. But, if video linking is fine, that is an option.

**Is Idaho Power considering a payback period to reimburse these infrastructure costs that would enable Idaho Power to make a change on the route?**

Angell, Idaho Power: In the IRP, Idaho Power looks at portfolios over a 30-year life compared to other portfolio options.

**Can Idaho Power lengthen the line if it is cost effective to make a change in the line's length to accommodate a certain area or resource?**

Angell, Idaho Power: The PUC must deem the route as prudent and the cost must not be such that Idaho Power can't recover the cost through reasonable rates. If the PUC excludes a portion of the line, the shareholders must cover the cost.

**If a transmission line crosses private land and is deemed to be adverse to wildlife, what mitigation would the ODFW look for?**

ODFW: If there was a disturbance effect that caused animals to move away from the line, mitigation would have to accommodate the animals and enhance zones away from the line. If the animals were moving off property, impacts to those lands would need to be discussed.

**Have studies been done to determine, once the species have been disturbed, how long it would take before they move back and if they can become acclimated to that disturbance?**

ODFW: Research, not related to transmission development, has been done on deer and elk. It is necessary to correlate to a particular action to make an educated guess. However, with a great number of species, the ODFW doesn't know a lot.

**Would that disturbance drive them away, and would they never come back?**

ODFW: It depends on the species. The disturbance wouldn't affect some species at all. Unless the ODFW knows a disturbance will occur, mitigation focuses on the habitat. For conservation purposes, the ODFW tries to work outside nesting season, etc.

**How will Idaho Power allocate the production and wheeling of power from the Boardman coal fire plant?**

Angell, Idaho Power: Only 10% (67 megawatts [MW]) of the energy created at the Boardman Power Plant is owned by IPC. That energy is sent through the BPA transmission system to customers in Idaho. Once this line is built, that energy would be put on the new line and Idaho Power will be able to purchase an additional 220 MW out of the mid-Columbia hub.

**What is the percentage of saving if Idaho Power uses its own constructed line instead of BPA's line?**

Angell, Idaho Power: Idaho Power would have to work up number for that. Transmitting power from the Boardman coal plant alone would not justify this line.

**On the earlier slides with the criteria, there were comments about the substation. The map shows the Boardman substation. It needs to be made clearer on those documents that our community was referring to the proposed northeast Oregon substation.**

Angell, Idaho Power: Idaho Power will take care of that. Portland General Electric will decide where that substation will be located and Idaho Power will build it accordingly. The northeastern substation will be quite large.

**Where will the September 23–24 meeting be held?**

McCarthy, Idaho Power: Idaho Power was thinking of alternating between Boardman and Hermiston, what is the group's preference?

The group decided to hold the meeting in Boardman.

**Who decides how much power is generated at the Boardman coal plant?**

McCarthy, Idaho Power: Boardman is a base-load plant, preferring to run at full power whenever necessary; it runs constantly except for maintenance. It cannot put out more power than nameplate capability.

Angell, Idaho Power: Boardman is operated by Portland General Electric but managed by an operating committee of the owners.

**Next Steps**

McCarthy displayed the process, dates, and locations for the upcoming mapping sessions. McCarthy explained there would be an evening meeting and an open house mapping session the following day. Two Geographic Information Systems (GIS) would be available at the all-day mapping session.

After the mapping sessions, Idaho Power would like to hold another meeting for the general public to view the routes developed by the Project Advisory Teams.

The following questions were asked regarding the next steps:

**Although Idaho Power doesn't have a preferred route, could the company place points on the map to give PAT members some idea of where they want the line to be?**

Baczkowski, Idaho Power: Idaho Power has tried to do that through the routing criteria in the table, which gives exclusion areas where the line can't go, opportunity areas where it could go, and gray areas in between. Idaho Power also had previously proposed routes.

McCarthy, Idaho Power: Idaho Power could give the PAT the scoping document to see where the proposed lines were, but is hesitant to do so because of how they were received.

**Could Idaho Power put points on the map?**

Baczkowski, Idaho Power: The only two points Idaho Power has on the map now are Boardman and Hemingway. Idaho Power would ask the PAT to set any other points on the map.

Curtin, RBCI: PAT members are going to need technical, regulatory and engineering advice. After the second mapping session, Idaho Power might propose some solutions for issues the PAT is struggling with.