

Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line Project

North Project Advisory Team Meeting #5

Summary

March 4, 2010

4 – 9 p.m.

Port of Morrow Convention Center

2 Marine Drive

Boardman, OR 97818

Table of Contents

Community Advisory Process Background.....	3
Project Advisory Team (PAT) Background	4
North Project Advisory Team Meeting #5 Overview.....	6
Presentations	9
North PAT Summary of Comments	22
Q&As and Discussion.....	26

Community Advisory Process Background

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. This process is called the Community Advisory Process.

As a part of the Community Advisory Process, five Project Advisory Teams have been formed: North, Central, South, Grant County and Harney County. 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.



Project Advisory Team (PAT) Background

The North Project Advisory Team (PAT) includes representatives from Morrow and Umatilla counties. Since Spring 2009, Idaho Power has hosted five PAT meetings and one round of public meetings in the North advisory area.

Summaries of all PAT meetings are available on the project Web site www.boardmantohemingway.com.

PAT Meeting #1

The first North PAT meeting was held May 26, 2009 in Boardman, Oregon. The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Review work to date, project status and how the Community Advisory Process would proceed.
- Discuss the purpose and need for the Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line Project.
- Identify community concerns and suggestions for siting the transmission line. The concerns and suggestions were developed into community criteria.

PAT Meeting #2

The second North PAT meeting was held July 30, 2009 in Hermiston, Oregon. The purpose of the 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 would be used to develop routes for the transmission line.

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

Public Meetings

In August 2009, seven public meetings were held in the North, Central and South project advisory areas. In October 2009 two public meetings were held in Grant and Harney counties. The public meetings were held after the Project Advisory Teams met to formulate community criteria for siting possible routes for the transmission line.

Public meetings for the North advisory area were held in Pilot Rock, Oregon on Aug. 19, and Boardman, Oregon on Aug. 20.

The purpose of the public meetings was to:

- Give the public an overview of the project.
- Share the outcomes of the PAT meetings with the public

Concerns and suggestions of the general public were closely aligned with those of the PAT members.

- Allow the public to ask questions and provide input on criteria for siting the transmission line.

Comments submitted at the public meetings indicated the public generally agreed with work completed by the Project Advisory Teams and the criteria that would be used to site the transmission line.

PAT Meeting #3 and Mapping Workshop

The third North PAT meeting was held on Sept. 23 and Sept. 24, 2009. The meeting began with an evening session and ended with an all-day mapping workshop.

The purpose of the meeting and mapping workshop was to begin to identify a range of possible routes for the Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line.

Overall, 49 routes were developed by the South, Central, North, Harney County and Grant County Project Advisory Teams. The North Project Advisory Team developed 15 of these routes.

PAT Meeting #4

The fourth North PAT meeting was held on Dec. 9, 2009 in Boardman, Oregon.

The purpose of the meeting was to present the status and analysis for each PAT-proposed route, and present the analysis methods. In the months before the meeting, staff from Idaho Power and Tetra Tech recorded and labeled all PAT-proposed routes; determined the opportunity, avoidance and exclusion areas crossed by each PAT proposed route; and revised the routes to avoid exclusion and avoidance areas.

PAT Meeting #5

The fifth North PAT meeting was held on March 4, 2010 in Boardman, Oregon. A complete summary of the meeting is included in this document.

Detailed summaries of all Project Advisory Team meetings can be found on the project Web site www.boardmantohemingway.com.

North Project Advisory Team Meeting #5 Overview

Background

The five Project Advisory Teams developed a total of 49 routes (2,184 miles). On Sept. 24, 2009 the North Project Advisory Team (PAT) developed 15 routes at the mapping workshop held in Boardman, Oregon.

Between September and December 2009, engineers from Idaho Power and staff from Tetra Tech, Idaho Power's environmental consulting firm, recorded and labeled all PAT-developed routes; determined the opportunity, avoidance and exclusion areas crossed by each PAT-developed route; and revised the routes to avoid exclusion and avoidance areas. The original PAT-developed routes were combined and revised to encompass 1,984 miles.

Idaho Power presented the revised routes at the fourth North PAT meeting in December 2009. Throughout early 2010, Tetra Tech continued to analyze each revised route for the following factors:

- Permitting difficulty – Community criteria and relative difficulty of gaining necessary permits from the federal, state and local governments.
- Constructability – The relative difficulty associated with building the line in a given route. Considerations include terrain, road construction, clearing, equipment movement and accessibility.
- Mitigation cost – The relative cost associated with mitigation actions required by permitting authorities necessary to permit a route.

The route analysis determined three route alternatives that could be the relatively least difficult to permit and could be constructible; these three routes were labeled the eastern alternative, central alternative and western alternative.

In order to restart the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, Idaho Power is required to submit one proposed route in their revised application to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Idaho Power recommends that either the eastern, central or western alternative be submitted as the proposed route. Alternate routes may be submitted in addition to the proposed route.

North PAT #5 meeting agenda and format

The purpose of the fifth North PAT meeting was to:

- Review progress of the Community Advisory Process and discuss next steps.
- Present analysis of revised routes and route alternatives (Eastern, Central and Western).
- Give PATs the opportunity to give input on the route alternatives.
- Give PATs the opportunity to give input on a possible proposed route.

The meeting was held March 4, 2010 at the Port of Morrow Convention Center in Boardman, Oregon.

Twenty-two people attended the meeting. A copy of the invitation letter, list of invitees and list of attendees is available in Appendix 1.

Presenters:

- Vern Porter, Idaho Power –Vice President of Delivery Operations and Engineering
- Kent McCarthy – Idaho Power, Community Advisory Process Leader
- Dave Angell – Idaho Power, Manager of Delivery Planning
- Rosemary Curtin – RBCI, Facilitator
- Dave Perry – Tetra Tech, Routing and Siting Manager
- Jim Nickerson – Tetra Tech, Vice President, Energy Services

Handouts:

The following handouts were provided to team members at the meeting. Copies of these handouts are available in Appendix 2.

- North PAT meeting #5 agenda
- Idaho Power PowerPoint presentation
- Tetra Tech PowerPoint presentation
- A map of the three route alternatives (Eastern, Western and Central)
- Maps of the potential route alternatives that show evaluations of permitting difficulty, construction difficulty and mitigation cost
- Mileage summary tables and data tables for each route that identify the number of miles that have:
 - Permitting difficulty (low, moderate, high and exclusion)
 - Construction difficulty (low, moderate, high and exclusion)
 - Mitigation costs (low, moderate and high)
- Comment forms:
 - “Alternative Routes” comment form
 - “Eastern Alternative Route Likes/Dislikes” comment form
 - “Central Alternative Route Likes/Dislikes” comment form
 - “Western Alternative Route Likes/Dislikes” comment form

- “Proposed Route” comment form

PAT Input

Team members were provided a series of comment sheets that asked for input on:

- The route analysis
- The three route alternatives (Eastern, Central and Western)
- A possible proposed route

To ensure team members had sufficient time to review the analysis and route alternatives, team members were given until March 25, 2010 to return their comments to Idaho Power via mail or e-mail.

Next Steps

Idaho Power intends to submit their revised SF-299 application to the BLM at the end of March or early April.

After the March 25 deadline Idaho Power plans to:

- Review and summarize all comments.
- Distribute summaries to PAT members and post summaries to the project Web site www.boardmantoemingway.com.
- Communicate results back to the communities.
- Hold public meetings throughout the project area in Spring 2010.

Presentations

Welcome and Meeting Agenda – Rosemary Curtin, RBCI, Facilitator

Rosemary Curtin welcomed team members, asked everyone to introduce themselves and reviewed the three objectives of the meeting:

- Present the analysis of the revised routes.
- Present the three route alternatives (Eastern, Central and Western) that Idaho Power recommends be advanced into the NEPA process.
- Collect input from team members about:
 - The route analysis
 - Likes and dislikes for each of the three route alternatives
 - A possible proposed route

Curtin also reviewed the following information:

- The meeting will be tape-recorded and transcribed. After all comments are collected, a summary will be developed for each PAT meeting. The summaries will be distributed to team members and posted to the project Web site, www.boardmantohemingway.com. Summaries and materials from all previous meetings are currently available on the project Web site.
- Idaho Power posted the route analysis materials to the project Web site one week prior to the meeting. Team members were notified by e-mail that these materials were available on the Web site and were encouraged to review the materials before the meeting.
- Between March 2 and March 10, Idaho Power is holding five Project Advisory Team meetings in Central, North, South, Grant County and Harney County areas. The main objective of each meeting is to gather input about the route alternatives and a possible proposed route.
- Team members will be provided a series of five comment sheets. The comment sheets ask for input on the three route alternatives and a possible proposed route. Team members will be asked to complete their comment forms when the presentations conclude. When filling out their comment forms, team members will have the option to work in small groups or individually.
- Team members have the option of submitting their comment forms at the meeting or returning them to Idaho Power via mail/e-mail by March 25, 2010.
- No decisions will be made until all five PAT meetings have been completed and all comments have been collected and reviewed by Idaho Power.
- Idaho Power would like to submit its revised SF-299 application to the BLM at the end of March or early April. Submitting this application will restart the NEPA process.

- Idaho Power plans to hold public meetings for the Community Advisory Process in early Spring 2010. Scoping meetings will also be held in 2010 for the NEPA process. Idaho Power encourages team members to attend all meetings and stay involved in the process.

Project Update – Dave Angell, Idaho Power, Manager of Delivery Planning

Angell thanked team members for coming to the meeting and explained there were several updates on participation in the Boardman to Hemingway Project. Angell's presentation included the following information:

- Idaho Power's Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) was submitted on Dec. 31, 2009. The IRP calls for the Boardman to Hemingway line to provide 250 megawatts (MW) of power in 2015 and an additional 175 MW in 2017. The line will have additional capacity available and it is expected that other power companies will participate in building the line.
- Throughout the Community Advisory Process, several other entities have shown interest in becoming partners on the Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line Project.
- Idaho Power has recently received permission to announce that the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) and PacifiCorp are currently evaluating partnering with Idaho Power on the Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line Project.
- BPA provides energy to La Grande, Quartz and Baker City. BPA also provides energy to the Oregon Trail Electric Cooperative and eastern Idaho.
- BPA services the La Grande area with a 230 kV transmission line that comes from the McNary Dam area. Currently, when BPA needs to service its McNary transmission line, it cannot use another route to directly provide power to its Oregon customers. If transmission is available, BPA must schedule the power to circulate across Montana and then come back into Oregon. Participating in the Boardman to Hemingway line would give BPA an alternative for supplying power to its Oregon customers if needed.
- BPA is expected to present information to Idaho Power executive management on the decision of its Boardman to Hemingway participation at the end of March.
- PacifiCorp is also considering participating in the Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line Project. Currently, PacifiCorp and Idaho Power are jointly proposing a development called Gateway West that starts in Wyoming, crosses southern Idaho, and ends at the Hemingway substation.
- In February 2010, Mission West Properties, Inc. and CDH Consulting announced they will be developing a new data center property in Ontario, Oregon. The state of Oregon has provided incentives for the data center to locate in Ontario. The data center will use approximately 62 MW of power. The Boardman to

Hemingway Transmission Line will help Idaho Power expand its capacity in order to serve large users, such as this data center.

Community Advisory Process Review – Rosemary Curtin, RBCI, Facilitator

Curtin explained to team members that the Community Advisory Process began almost one year ago. She reviewed the objectives of the past four North PAT meetings. Her presentation included the following information:

- In Spring 2009, Rosemary Curtin and Kent McCarthy conducted one-on-one interviews throughout the project area. They listened to the issues and concerns that community members had about the transmission line. The community members that participated in the one-on-one interviews were asked to be a part of the North Project Advisory Team and to recommend others for inclusion on the team
- Idaho Power hosted the first North PAT meeting on May 26, 2009 in Boardman, Oregon. The purpose of the meeting was to:
 - Review work to date, project status and how the Community Advisory Process would proceed.
 - Discuss the purpose and need for the B2H Project.
 - Identify community concerns and suggestions for siting the transmission line.
- At the first North PAT meeting, team members formed small working groups to discuss and identify community concerns and suggestions about the project. The community concerns and suggestions identified by team members were developed into community criteria.
- The community criteria were used throughout the routing process, along with environmental, engineering and regulatory criteria, to help develop potential routes for the transmission line.
- The second North PAT meeting was held July 30, 2009 in Hermiston, Oregon. The purpose of the 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 would be used to develop routes.
- For the second North PAT meeting, Idaho Power invited representatives from the BLM, U.S. Forest Service, Oregon Department of Energy – Energy Facility Siting Council and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife to participate in a panel discussion. As part of the panel discussion, each representative gave a presentation that outlined their agency’s review process and addressed key issues that could arise as the processes work together. Team members were given the opportunity to ask the representatives questions about the regulatory criteria that would be used during the siting process.

- Public meetings were held in Pilot Rock on Aug. 19, 2009 and Boardman on Aug. 20, 2009. Overall, 106 people attended the two public meetings in the North advisory area. Additional public meetings were held in the other project advisory areas. The purpose of the public meetings was to:
 - Give the public an overview of the project.
 - Share the outcomes of the PAT meetings with the public.
 - Allow the public to ask questions and provide input on the criteria for siting the transmission line.
- In September 2009, Idaho Power held mapping workshops for the Central, North and South PATs. The purpose of the meeting and mapping workshop was to begin to identify a range of possible routes for the Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line.
- The North mapping workshop was held on Sept. 24, 2009 in Boardman, Oregon. The evening before the mapping workshop, Idaho Power held a meeting for team members to explain the regulatory criteria, routing constraints and the Geographic Information System (GIS). During the mapping workshop, team members had the choice of mapping their routes on paper maps or working with GIS operators to lay out routes at computer stations. Team members at the North mapping workshop developed 15 routes.
- Idaho Power kept a detailed record of all routes developed by PAT members. Additionally, team members were asked to provide a written description and comments for each route they identified. This documentation helped Idaho Power understand the location and reasoning behind each route.
- The fourth North PAT meeting was held Dec. 9, 2009 in Boardman, Oregon. At this meeting, Idaho Power presented how the routes developed at the mapping workshops had been revised to avoid exclusion areas and significant constraints.
- The purpose of tonight's meeting, the fifth North PAT meeting, is to present the analysis of the revised routes and gather input about the three route alternatives and a possible proposed route.

Community Criteria and CAP-Developed Routes – Kent McCarthy, Idaho Power, CAP Leader

McCarthy reviewed the community criteria that Idaho Power and PAT members developed at the beginning of the Community Advisory Process. He also presented how the PAT-developed routes were revised and analyzed. McCarthy's presentation included the following information:

- In Spring 2009, Idaho Power determined there was a large amount of opposition to the original route for the Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line Project. In order to gather more public input, Idaho Power paused the NEPA process and implemented the Community Advisory Process.

- Idaho Power recognized that the location of the transmission line would have an impact on local communities. Community and regulatory criteria were given equal weight by Idaho Power and community members when proposing and considering routes.
- In September, PAT members were asked to develop possible routes for the transmission line based on community and regulatory criteria. Idaho Power evaluated all 49 of the routes proposed by the five PATs based on permitting difficulty, construction difficulty, engineering and cost.
- Tetra Tech tried to maintain the original routes developed by the PATs in the mapping sessions as much as possible. Tetra Tech then combined routes with similar purposes in similar geographic regions.
- Idaho Power determined which routes were the most reasonable. The purpose of the fifth North PAT meeting is to ask for input on the Eastern, Central and Western route alternatives recommended by Idaho Power.
- Idaho Power will submit a proposed route as part of its NEPA application. The submission of the revised application will restart the NEPA process.
- In Spring 2009, North PAT members raised the following concerns at the first North PAT meeting:
 - The relationship this line will have with other utility projects planned for the area.
 - Effects on Boardman, Morrow and Umatilla region.
 - Land values.
- North PAT members also provided suggestions for siting the transmission line. The suggestions included:
 - Site the line as far south as possible.
 - Coordinate this line with other proposed transmission lines.
 - Site the line outside the city limits of Boardman.
 - Site the substation strategically to influence the location of other transmission lines.
 - Avoid areas that have the potential for residential or business development.
 - Avoid private land (i.e., farming, grazing, timber).
 - Avoid irrigated land.
- Idaho Power developed the concerns and suggestions provided by team members into community criteria for the North area. When Idaho Power made adjustments to the 49 routes suggested by PAT members, it followed the community criteria closely. Below are the North PAT's community criteria:
 - *Placement opportunities* include: Existing energy corridors; West Wide Energy Corridor; public land (federal and state); transportation and rail

corridors; across the Naval bombing range; co-locate with wind farms; private property owned by people who want the line on their land.

- *Avoidance areas* include: Irrigated farmland; bisecting fields; aerial spraying activity areas; scenic view sheds; areas that have potential for residential and/or business development; urban growth boundaries; areas of tourism; historic landmarks; narrow valleys with agricultural operations; private resource land (i.e., timber); sensitive wildlife habitats (i.e., sage grouse leks); water resources and wetlands; schools; city impact areas; private residences; confined animal feeding operations.
- During the route analysis, all revised routes were evaluated for constructability, permitting difficulty and mitigation cost.
- Permitting is the first concern.
- Construction difficulty is often related to terrain. Building the transmission line in the forest requires that the 250-foot right-of-way be clear-cut.
- The construction of a power line requires the construction of many roads.
- Mitigation will be required if wildlife or another resource is affected.

Introduction of Vern Porter, Idaho Power, Vice President of Operations and Engineering

Vern Porter, Idaho Power, Vice President of Operations and Engineering, formally introduced himself to the team members and thanked everyone for taking the time to attend the meetings.

- Porter has been with Idaho Power for 20 years and was appointed Vice President of Engineering and Operations in October 2009.
- Idaho Power is committed to working with communities to find a route for the transmission line.
- Not all the conversations with community members throughout the CAP have been easy, but Idaho Power values the time and effort that team members have committed to the process.
- The Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line is a regional project that will bring benefits to many people in Oregon, Idaho and Washington.
- When the PAT meetings conclude, the federal and state regulatory processes will restart. These review processes will take several years to complete. Idaho Power encourages all community members to stay involved with the federal process restarts.

Revised Routes and Proposed Route Alternatives – Dave Perry, Tetra Tech, Routing and Siting Manager

Perry introduced himself as a landscape architect and explained that Tetra Tech has been assisting Idaho Power for almost two years with the siting process for the Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line Project. He presented information about the process of determining the most reasonable route by comparing the factors of permissibility, constructability, and cost. Perry's presentation included the following information:

- During the mapping workshops, PAT members developed 49 routes that covered 3,184 miles.
- During the analysis, Tetra Tech divided the project area into 14 regions. The routes in each region were evaluated for difficulty of permitting, constructability and mitigation costs. After these three factors were determined for each route, the routes in each region were compared and the most reasonable route for each region was identified. Some of the regions had small lengths of route; others had 130 to 180 miles.
- For each region Tetra Tech developed a map of the revised routes and mileage summary tables and data tables for each route that identify the number of miles that have:
 - Permitting difficulty (low, moderate, high and exclusion)
 - Construction difficulty (low, moderate, high and exclusion)
 - Mitigation costs (low, moderate and high)
- The permitting analysis takes into account constraints and opportunities. The analysis of construction difficulty considers terrain, road construction, equipment movement, forest clearing and other variables. Mitigation cost is more abstract than construction cost and permissibility.
- The following five regions are in the North area:
 - Boardman
 - Morgan-Ione
 - Umatilla National Forest
 - Pilot Rock
 - West of National Forest Utility Corridor

Perry reviewed the permitting and constructability analysis for each of the five regions in the North area. Below is a summary of the information he presented.

Boardman

- Several of the PAT-proposed routes in the Boardman area were eliminated because they passed through the Naval bombing range and an area of protected land managed by the Nature Conservancy and ODFW. Morrow County and the

Naval bombing range are prime habitat for the Washington ground squirrel, a Category One protected species. Three routes were considered: a north route, a central route and a southern route.

- The north route is the most reasonable route even though it is about 4.5 miles longer than the central route. It has fewer miles rated as high construction difficulty than the central or southern routes.
- All three routes could likely be constructed. The north route is considered the most reasonable because it:
 - Requires 13.9 fewer miles of 500 kV line and requires 400 fewer acres of right-of-way.
 - Avoids crossing intact segments of the Oregon Trail.
 - Avoids a 1200-foot buffer of a nationally designated scenic byway.
 - Crosses 3.5 fewer miles of private land.
 - Crosses 4.6 fewer miles of landslide hazard areas.
- The north route also has a lower impact on several important resource areas including:
 - The Oregon Trail Scenic Byway
 - Highly erodible soils
 - Deer wintering areas
- The north route also will share about 18 miles of line with the Cascade Crossing transmission line, which is planned to be built from the Coyote Springs Plant to the Boardman Power Plant. Combining these lines will save about 13.5 miles.

Morgan-Ione

- The Morgan-Ione region includes two alternative routes: an eastern route and a western route. Through a comparison based on construction difficulty, permitting difficulty and mitigation cost, the analysis determined the western route to be more reasonable.
- The two routes have a similar amount of permitting difficulty. The western route is considered more reasonable because it:
 - Is 3.3 miles shorter and requires 100 fewer acres of right-of-way.
 - Crosses less deer winter range, high erosion hazard land, EFU land, prime farmland soils, and historic trail buffer zone.

Umatilla National Forest

- The Umatilla National Forest region includes two alternative routes: an eastern route and a western route. Through a comparison based on construction difficulty,

permitting difficulty and mitigation cost, the analysis determined the western route to be more reasonable.

- The western route is more reasonable than the eastern route because:
 - It is 9.4 miles shorter and requires 284 fewer acres of right-of-way.
 - It crosses 14.3 fewer miles of deer winter range.
 - It crosses 14.2 fewer miles of EFU land.
 - It crosses 20.3 fewer miles of private land.
 - It crosses 12.1 fewer miles of high erosion hazard land.
 - It crosses 1.7 fewer miles of slopes greater than 35%.
 - Old growth forest areas will be avoided during micro-siting.

Pilot Rock

- The Pilot Rock region includes two alternative routes: a northern route and a southern route. Through a comparison based on construction difficulty, permitting difficulty and mitigation cost, the analysis determined the northern route to be more reasonable route.
- The northern route is considered more reasonable because it:
 - Is 3.7 miles shorter and requires 112 fewer miles of right-of-way.
 - May have willing landowners for approximately 30 miles of the route.
 - Crosses 7.4 fewer miles of deer winter range.
 - Crosses 0.2 fewer miles of steelhead special status stream 300-foot. buffer.

West of National Forest Utility Corridor

- The West of National Forest Utility Corridor region includes two alternative routes: the northern route and a southern route. Through a comparison based on construction difficulty, permitting difficulty and mitigation cost, the analysis determined the northern route to be more reasonable.
- The northern route is considered more reasonable because it:
 - Is 6.7 miles shorter and requires 200 fewer acres of right-of-way.
 - Crosses 39.9 fewer miles of deer winter range.
 - Crosses 7.5 fewer miles of private land.
 - Crosses 1.8 fewer miles of slopes greater than 35 percent.
 - May have willing landowners for approximately 30 miles of the route.

Proposed alternative routes – Jim Nickerson, Tetra Tech, Vice President, Energy Services

After Dave Perry concluded his presentation, Nickerson presented the Eastern, Central and Western route alternatives. He explained how the routes were narrowed down to these alternatives. Nickerson's presentation included the following information:

- There are three categories of why routes were not advanced:
 - Routes that did not meet the project's purpose and need.
 - Routes that were contrary to government or private-sector management plans or to the law.
 - Routes that had combinations of high permitting difficulty or another single factor.
- One specific route that did not meet the project's purpose and need is the route that would have gone east around Boise through Idaho, and north into the state of Washington. The route was considered not reasonable for the following reasons:
 - The route would be 100 miles longer than any other route or combination of routes.
 - Residents of Idaho are just as likely to be concerned about natural resource protection as residents of Oregon are.
 - Washington residents would likely argue the transmission line does not need to go through their state to connect Boardman and Hemingway.
 - Power is projected to be needed on the west side of Boise, not the east, in the near term.
 - In the long term, routing the transmission line east of Boise would require Idaho Power to build two substations and more transmission lines.
- Another factor that eliminated some routes from consideration was a barrier in the middle of the project area consisting of state scenic waterways, federally designated wild and scenic rivers, roadless areas, wilderness areas and other protected and scenic areas.
- Some routes were not advanced because they would be very difficult, if not impossible, to permit.
- Some areas near Boardman present high permitting difficulty issues:
 - The Naval bombing range must be avoided. Two flight paths into the bombing range have 100-foot height restrictions on towers.
 - Several areas around Boardman are under management by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Nature Conservancy for the Washington ground squirrel, a Category One habitat.
 - In general, a transmission line would have to go around the bombing range from the north or south.

- A western route from Grant County or Harney County must work around the Nature Conservancy managed area and must take into account another 500 kV line planned for that area.
- There appears to be a path for the transmission line around the bombing range but the routes that go through the bombing range will not be advanced.
- The Baker Valley area includes some key resources such as pivot irrigation and sage grouse leks.
 - Several sage grouse leks are concentrated at the southern end of the study area, affecting two of the routes.
 - The Baker Valley also includes a Wildlife Management Area and residential development.
 - Further study could possibly reveal more sage grouse leks in the Baker Valley area.
 - Several routes have been eliminated from consideration in the Baker Valley because of their potential impact on agriculture.
 - Idaho Power wants to avoid building the line through Exclusive Farm Use land or through irrigated farmland.
 - A route that closely followed I-84 through the Baker Valley was eliminated because it included an airport exclusion area that would prohibit construction of the towers.
 - One route would create a new corridor across the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest.
- Several routes around the Snake River Valley will not be advanced for the following reasons:
 - Several of the routes proposed by the South PAT crossed both irrigated agriculture in Idaho and Exclusive Farm Use land in Oregon.
 - There is a 300-foot buffer around residences where the transmission line cannot be built.
- Many team members have suggested siting the Boardman to Hemingway line along the same corridor as the existing PacifiCorp Summerlake to Midpoint 500 kV line.
- Eliminating all the routes with high permitting and construction difficulty produced three route alternatives: Western alternative route, Central alternative route and Eastern alternative route.

Western alternative route

- The Western alternative route is 275 miles long, making it the shortest of the three alternative routes. However, the Western alternative route would require creating the most amount of new transmission line corridor.
- The Western alternative route is characterized by natural resource issues:
 - High quality streams
 - Two national forests with no existing utility corridors
 - Rugged terrain
- The Western alternative route crosses Grant County. Throughout the Community Advisory Process, residents of Grant County have commented that they are strongly opposed to having the transmission line built in Grant County, especially through the John Day Valley.
- The Western alternative route would require crossing two national forests that do not have any existing utility corridors.
 - The Umatilla National Forest management plan does not address transmission lines. It was written in the 1980s and is in the process of being updated.
 - The Malheur National Forest management plan does not address transmission lines. The plan was written in the 1980s and is in the process of being updated.
 - The Wallowa-Whitman National Forest has a designated utility corridor. The management plan contains very clear language concerning the placement of transmission lines. A new transmission line will not be considered across the forest unless the capacity within the existing utility corridor has been exhausted.
- It is not clear to Idaho Power where the transmission line could be routed through the National Forest. The Forest Service would be required to accept an application from Idaho Power for any of its routes under their Federal Land Policy and Management Act and other regulations. It's unlikely the Forest Service would approve a new corridor through a national forest if the corridor through the Wallowa-Whitman still has capacity for transmission lines.

Central alternative route

- The Central alternative route is 284 miles long. The route crosses rugged terrain and more streams than the western route.
- The main difference between the Western alternative route and the Central alternative route is that the Central alternative route is located within the Baker Valley.
- The Central alternative route has a high level of construction difficulty.

Eastern alternative route

- The Eastern alternative route is the longest of the three proposed alternative routes by approximately 25 miles.
- The Eastern alternative route would run parallel to I-84 for 44 miles and also run parallel to existing transmission lines for 111 miles. The eastern route would require the least amount of new corridor (188 miles) and would be the least difficult route to construct.
- A disadvantage of the eastern route is that it could create concerns about the view shed from the Oregon Trail Interpretive Center.

Comparison of alternative routes

- The Western and Central alternative routes would use more public land than private land.
 - The Western alternative route would use 137 miles (50 percent) of public land.
 - The Central alternative route would use 110 miles (39 percent) of public land.
 - The Eastern alternative route would use 93 miles (31 percent) of public land.
- The Western and Central alternative routes would require more new corridor than the eastern route.
 - The Western alternative route would require 229 miles of new corridor.
 - The Central alternative route would require 224 miles of new corridor.
 - The Eastern Alternative route would require 188 miles of new corridor.
- The Eastern alternative route would possibly require crossing more irrigated farmland, but it would require less forest clearing.
- The Western alternative route would have the highest construction difficulty.
 - The Western alternative route would include 117 miles of high construction difficulty.
 - The Central alternative route would include 99 miles of high construction difficulty.
 - The Eastern alternative route would include 65 miles of high construction difficulty.

Maps and data tables for each region can be found in Appendix 4. The maps and summaries of the permitting, construction and mitigation factors are also available on the project Web site, www.boardmantoemingway.com.

North PAT Summary of Comments

A series of five comment forms were provided to team members at the meeting. The comment forms asked the following questions:

- 1. Is there a revised route that you believe is permissible and constructible that should be considered? Why?**
- 2. What are your “Likes” about the Western alternative route?**
- 3. What are your “Dislikes” about the Western alternative route?**
- 4. What are your “Likes” about the Central alternative route?**
- 5. What are your “Dislikes” about the Central alternative route?**
- 6. What are your “Likes” about the Eastern alternative route?**
- 7. What are your “Dislikes” about the Eastern alternative route?**
- 8. Based on the analysis, is there an alternative you support as a proposed route?**

Team members were encouraged to complete all comment forms and return them to Idaho Power before March 25, 2010. Some team members wrote letters or e-mails rather than filling out comment forms. Overall, six comment sheets and three letters and e-mails were submitted from the North PAT.

All input provided throughout the Community Advisory Process will be used when Idaho Power submits its revised application to restart the NEPA process.

The following pages provide a summary of all comments submitted by residents from Morrow and Umatilla counties. Comments are listed in order of frequency. Judgment was used to categorize comments submitted in the form of letters and e-mails.

The summary is an overview of the themes and opinions expressed by the North PAT members. The information is not intended to be statistically reliable. Verbatim transcriptions of all comment forms, letters and e-mails can be found in Appendix 4.

Summaries of comments from all five PATs (Central, South, North, Grant County and Harney County) are available on the project Web site, www.boardmantohemingway.com.

Question 1: Is there a revised route that you believe is permissible and constructible that should be considered? Why?

The following additional routes were suggested:

- Another energy corridor to consider is to enter Boardman from the south, going from route MO20 to MO13 to MO8 to MO9 to MO1. Then Portland General Electric could connect up to the Boardman to Hemingway line at MO20 by running their line parallel to the tree farm along MO4 to MO20. By doing this there would still be only one line entering Boardman serving both utilities' needs. Additionally, the southern end of the bombing range could serve for the future hub substation, at least somewhere in the MO20 area.
- The line should run east from the Coyote Springs power plant to the east side of the Navy bombing range, then go south to the southern edge of the bombing range. Then the line should run east (toward Idaho) and west to come around to the coal-fired plant, and then go west onto Salem. This area would also be a good location for a regional power substation.
- Although it appears temporarily discarded, the most appropriate route is route UM9 to UM5 and then further west toward Boardman.
- The route that comes north near Interstate 84 and breaks off west at approximately Meacham is the most acceptable.
- If the route across the mountains from Kamela to Indian Lake and down Rocky Ridge is not feasible, the route from Meacham to point UM3 should be considered.
- The "South" alternative in the Boardman area (route UM3 to UM1) better serves the community because it remains close to major access point for maintenance and repair, but would be contoured and camouflaged from the populated areas if it goes through the foothills.
- The "South" alternative in the Boardman area (route UM3 to UM1) will provide shorter access to future wind projects.

Question 2: What are your "Likes" about the Western alternative route?

The following comments were provided:

- Crosses the least amount of irrigated cropland (if the route does not traverse Baker Lane in Morrow County).

Question 3: What are your "Dislikes" about the Western alternative route?

The following comments were provided:

- Visual impact near Willow Creek.
- Negative impact to view sheds in Grant County.

- Negative impact to natural resources in Grant County.

Question 4: What are your “Likes” about the Central alternative route?

No comments were submitted for this question.

Question 5: What are your “Dislikes” about the Central alternative route?

The following comments were provided:

- Too many permitting issues (specifically in the upper reaches of the John Day River).

Question 6: What are your “Likes” about the Eastern alternative route?

The following comments were provided:

- Follows existing transmission line corridor.
- Preferred entrance into the Boardman substation area.
- Makes the most economic sense of all three route alternatives.

Question 7: What are your “Dislikes” about the Eastern alternative route?

The following comments were provided:

- Negative impact on the view shed from the Oregon Trail Interpretive Center in Baker City.
- The alternative through the Baker City area that goes west of the Interpretive Center would be a visible route in the valley.
- The alternative through the Baker City area that goes west of the Interpretive Center would interrupt pivot irrigation.

Question 8: Based on the analysis, is there an alternative you support as a proposed route?

- The route alternative most often supported as the proposed route by North PAT members was the Eastern Alternative route.

Other comments:

- The maps provided need to have more detail (i.e., road names) in order to more precisely determine the location of where the line is.

- Everyone would benefit from Idaho Power and Portland General Electric coordinating the location of their transmission lines and substations.
- A dual 500 kV circuit for the Idaho Power and Portland General Electric lines would allow for addition of capacity without establishment of an additional footprint and expanded easement.
- Idaho Power should be commended on this public process and their efforts to review and address the alternate routes.
- It is problematic that the location of the Northeast Oregon distribution hub has not been determined. This hub will serve as a the target area for additional future east/west transmission lines from east/west and also for north/south lines out of Canada intended to go through Oregon to California.
- If Idaho Power receives an easement from the Navy to access bombing range property at the northern end, Idaho Power should ask for 1000 feet. The additional feet could be used for future transmission lines. Idaho Power should place the Boardman to Hemingway line on the southern-most part of the easement. This energy corridor would run from route MO2 to MO5.
- Route the line away from the city center of Boardman and keep it away from narrow strips of pivot irrigated agricultural land.
- Large corporate farms would be less impacted by the transmission line than small individually owned and operated farms.
- Not certain that many people in Morrow County are aware that the Western alternative route is under consideration.
- The analysis was logical, and made economical and cultural sense.

Q&As and Discussion

Below is a transcription of the discussion between team members and staff from Idaho Power and Tetra Tech that occurred after the presentations.

PAT member: What is the name of the Northeast substation?

Nickerson: It doesn't have a name right now.

PAT member: Is it built yet?

Nickerson: It's not built.

PAT member: Will Idaho Power co-locate the Portland General Electric (PGE) line with the Boardman to Hemingway one?

Perry: They are only going to need one line, and they'll tap into it. I'm definitely not sure exactly of the electrical things. But instead of having two lines there will be just one.

PAT member: But will it still be a 500 kV line?

Perry: Exactly. The other thing I should add is that this is really based upon locating just inside the boundary of the Navy facility. We've pursued it and we're going to continue to pursue that as the alternate of choice.

PAT member: Where are you in the process? You're just at the analysis stage; you haven't negotiated that or gotten any feel for that or anything else yet, correct?

Perry: We've actually sent PGE an application. And I would guess we'll be meeting with them, and I know that PGE is interested in the same. So anything you could do to help with that...

PAT member: You tell me what you want me to do.

Perry: The more people who are behind it, the more success we'll probably have.

PAT member: Are we going to get any new maps? The maps you have up there are...

Nickerson: We have three extra maps we'll post on the Web site or mail to you.

PAT member: That map that you had of the Snake River Valley that shows irrigated agriculture and home sites. Did you prepare a map like that for Morrow and Umatilla counties?

Nickerson: No we didn't, but we could. And the reason we didn't is that the amount of residential home development is not as significant in Morrow and Umatilla counties as compared with down in the Snake River Valley. I'm not diminishing that there are folks who live up here. We could do something like that for you and post it to the Web site.

Meeting dismissed.