

Appendix 4: Team Input

1.) Is there a revised route that you believe is permissible and constructible that should be considered? Why?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I could support all three. Living in Northern Canyon County none of the routes affect me and it would be hard for me to support one over the other. All of these routes appear to avoid private property and utilize as much public land as possible, this is what we've been asking for.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All three of the proposed routes do <u>not</u> impact me directly. As such, I do not feel qualified to comment as any of them in terms of placing a priority. I do prefer all three of these routes over previously proposed routes that impacted large acres of irrigated farmlands. In addition, these routes appear to impact less private land. I favor increased usage of public land.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is difficult to determine with the maps available whether the Western route could be situated along a non-offensive path across the John Day Valley. Except for this issue, the Western route, with its emphasis on using public land, is best in my opinion. It is frustrating that the federal family can prevent a route that is intended to serve the public. It is frustrating and incomprehensible that tax-paying landholders should be considered – or expected to give-up their precious rights to replace what public landowners should be expected to accommodate. I would like to have access to the digital data for the west, central and eastern routes in a GIS compatible format. The routes are now refined to a point that additional accuracy will be necessary for meaningful comment while each route presented has its specific advantages – the Western route, with its emphasis on public land – is best.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed routes appear to meet my preference. Public us on public land. The shorter route will be the best for all IPCO ratepayers.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current proposed routes as of March 9, 2010 appear to represent the best alternate choices based on the constraints and the choices of the citizen's groups. As representative from the South project team, the choices and options on the Central and Eastern routes through the Baker area should reflect the citizens of that area. The final routing as the Western routes passes through the John Day Valley be weighted to a choice voiced by the citizens of that area.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I believe that with all the work done by IPC and the PATs, any of the proposed routes are permissible and constructable. The fact that these routes attempt to minimize impact on homes, towns, farm ground, and sensitive wildlife makes them vastly

1.) Is there a revised route that you believe is permissible and constructible that should be considered? Why?
<p>superior to the other routes that have been dropped.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since I'm located in Idaho the routing of the line through Owyhee county to the Oregon line makes great sense in that it has the least impact on people and private property.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We live in Canyon County where the proposed routes have been rejected. Thus our situation, if the new proposed routes hold, has greatly improved. However, I have great sympathy for people who will be impacted. The objectives, wherever the routes fall, are the same – respect private property, environmental concerns and the integrity of historical sites. In other words do the least harm.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed route meets my approval. Just to reiterate however, “public use public land.” The shorter route would be best for all Idaho Power Company ratepayers.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't believe I have the expertise to make the determination between the 3 routes. I do want the route which is the most permissible and cost effective way.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I believe the route that connects with the Baker Alternatives is the most feasible. I do not, however, feel that it is my prerogative to tell Baker which route they should take. I would not oppose the western route, though I believe permissibility and construction would be more difficult.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes – The central route as it seems the most likely to be permitted and does not cross EFU land in Malheur County. • I'm not as sure about where it should go in Baker County – perhaps something could be worked out so it could go further east away from the Interpretive Center.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The three proposed routes seem to be well thought out. I was pleased with the selection process. I do not own land in these areas, but coming from a farm in prime Ag land, the routes that minimize the intrusion of the line on prime farm land and city areas of impact, would be preferred. • I have always felt that a power line for a public good should be placed on public lands.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No, we feel the proposed routes being offered at this time are good and we are pleased to see that Idaho Power has made strides towards balancing the needs of private landowners and public lands.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since all proposed routes are the same as it applies to Owyhee County – I feel that those impacted by the 3 various routes should have a better understanding and better knowledge as to route preference in their area. • As to the ability to get permitted, any proposed route through Owyhee County will need to go through the public hearing process for a conditional permit. Due to the requirement for a public hearing and approval of a COP by the Owyhee County

1.) Is there a revised route that you believe is permissible and constructible that should be considered? Why?
<p>Planning and Zoning Commission, I cannot comment as to the probability of permissibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two other routes that had been previously considered that went north out of Owyhee County were properly removed as alternates as they had far greater negative impacts, which would be difficult if not impossible to mitigate cost effectively.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West route is best for us in heavy Ag. with many workers which we use on the farms. We grow onions and use lots of labors.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 3 routes we spoke about at the 9th meeting are ok with us in Wilder.
<p>Yes, see my comments on the tan colored comment sheet. Why? – Because Idaho Power stands a much better change of approval with at least a piece of the route staying in Idaho. As it is, there is not one foot of it in Idaho except that needed and necessary to get over directly to Oregon, seemingly as quickly and directly as possible. EFSC is going to look at that immediately, you can be sure.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't think so many proposed routes have all ready been considered and narrowed down, this has been done with a great deal of effort. • The only thing that comes to mind is as a proposed route is chosen and through the NEPA process problems arise on issues. It may be necessary to reconsider at that time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any of the three are acceptable – Projects for the public good should be constructed as much as possible on Govt land
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You did not spend much time or energy looking at any routes in Idaho. It was decided in the very beginning that this line will be in Oregon and that's it. • It is nice to see that you are considering running this line out over public land and non-farmed land. • I still do not trust that this line will be built where you last proposed this line west of the treasure valley.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well; it is hard to see this monstrous thing go anywhere even though we need (but this would not benefit us) and enjoy the electricity. • Please consider the Western Route.

1.) What are your LIKES concerning the Eastern alternative route?	2.) What are your DISLIKES concerning the Eastern alternative route?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing corridor go east of Int. center (way east). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't go west of Int. Center.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crosses national forest in a designated corridor • Easiest to construct • Max use of existing corridors • Least sensitive stream impact • Least forest clearing • Least view impacts • Avoids John Day and west side of Baker County 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on Oregon Trail Interpretive Center • Sage Grouse impact • Longest route • Largest impact on irrigated cropland • Largest impact on private ground
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most miles of existing corridors • Least miles of new corridors and lesser construction costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most private land and most irrigated ground, therefore more potential problems with region EFU regulations.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Probably better than the central through Baker area – probably better to ask Baker residents. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It uses the existing utility corridor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It crosses more prime farm land
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This route is also good as an alternate to the Western route. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would like to see the Baker alternate be pushed further away from the Interpretive Center if at all possible
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crosses EFU ground and homes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 111 miles exiting corridor • Low forest clearing • Less rugged terrain • 8 crossings • Less restrictive classes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longer miles • To much private land • 22 miles crop land

1.) What are your LIKES concerning the Eastern alternative route?	2.) What are your DISLIKES concerning the Eastern alternative route?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated utility crossing • Least construction difficulty 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follows 111 miles of existing corridor • Uses a designated utility corridor – should be easier for Idaho Power 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sorry to see Baker Valley intruded by line • 22 miles of irrigated cropland • It is in the “viewshed” of <u>more</u> people • 69% private land crossed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It stays in the sagebrush of Malheur County 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The aesthetic values of the Cottonwood Mountain breaks will be diminished greatly and forever. • It is way too close to the Oregon Trail Historical museum and site. Get it miles east of there somehow!!
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think that has proven to be very difficult. Based upon your findings and map locations. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Idaho portion on Govt land in Owyhee County 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This line needs to stay out of the Baker City Valley for the same reasons that it needed to move in the Malheur Valley.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This line is not “in keeping” with our Oregon Trail and the Interpretive Center.

1.) What are your LIKES concerning the CENTRAL alternative route?	2.) What are your DISLIKES concerning the CENTRAL alternative route?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Length is reasonable • Follows existing corridors reasonable • New corridor not a problem • Forest clearing acres reasonable • Rugged terrain reasonable • Special status stream crossings limited • John Day Valley is avoided • Wallowa Whitman National Forest RMPs allow for transmission lines • Construction difficulty moderate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lot of miles of private land • 39% of miles is public, could be more public less private • Restrictive FS/BLM visual closed excessive miles. Could be due to more recent FS and BLM RMP's
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Go to East (way East) of Int. Center.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shortest route and uses existing corridor. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Least impact on irrigated cropland • Less special stream crossings than western route 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longer than western route • Near 1/3 of line is high construction difficulty • Difficulty of national forest crossing • Medium impact on private land • Most impact on views
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fewer irrigated acres/miles cropland • Avoids John Day Valley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 25.5 miles of restrictive FS/BLM visual classes • Higher construction difficulty
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoids EFU land • Avoids residences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be too close to the Interpretive Center in Baker
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses the approved utility corridor through the blues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crosses some Ag lands
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This route is fine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No dislikes

1.) What are your LIKES concerning the CENTRAL alternative route?	2.) What are your DISLIKES concerning the CENTRAL alternative route?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do have a concern about the impact on forested land
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stay clear of EFU ground 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only 9 miles of irrigated crop land • Following existing corridors • 13 crossings • 30 miles forest land • Lower construction difficulty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 172 miles of private land • High construction difficulty
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Least irrigated cropland affected what you must realize is that once irrigation is disrupted – furrow, - flood or sprinkler it is harder always. It will take more labor, time, or equipment from then to forever. It isn't just visual, it isn't just inconvenient, it is hard to farm, thus more expensive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sorry to see Baker Valley impacted – visually • 61% on private land
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To destroy the aesthetic values of the Elkhorn Mountains would be a sin. The view from I-84 is perhaps one of the most spectacular view sheds from any freeway in the United States. Would Idaho Power propose a 500 KV – 200-foot high tower every 1200 feet line along the base of the Sawtooth range? I think not. Stay away from the Elkhorn front!! It and the John Day River Valley are <u>Oregon Treasures!</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>I like it.</u> Less impact to landowners. • It makes much better sense to follow an existing energy corridor across federal land. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Idaho portion in Owyhee County on Gov't land. 	

1.) What are your LIKES concerning the CENTRAL alternative route?	2.) What are your DISLIKES concerning the CENTRAL alternative route?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not many. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You need to keep it out of farmland and also out of the view of the Oregon Trail. There is not much in that area that is farmed, stay out of it. • There is only one Oregon Trail, leave it alone and stay away. • If there was not any room anywhere else, the answer would be different, but all of the area in that county you go right by the biggest town and most developed area.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would affect so many people and ranches.

1.) What are your LIKES concerning the WESTERN alternative route?	2.) What are your DISLIKES concerning the WESTERN alternative route?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Shorter</u>: I like this route <u>the best</u>. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goes through least populated areas • Shortest route • Minimal impact on both private land and irrigated cropland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highest construction difficulty • Problems with national forest crossings (longest) • Lowest use of existing corridors • Grant County is dead set against the line
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Least amount private land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highest construction difficulty, therefore highest cost
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It misses more of Malheur County • I really like this route the best – if it were the least restrictive due to environmental and governmental factors as well as construction factors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It may be less possible than the central route due to environmental and governmental concerns.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoids the most prime farm lands and has the highest percent public lands for this power line 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is our favorite route it looks more direct then the others and has less impact on forested areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No dislikes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stay away from all EFU ground 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50-50 private and public land • Avoids Interpretive Center 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longest miles • 46 crossings • High construction difficulty
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shortest • Out of site for <u>more</u> people • The land affected is 50% public/ 50% private 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lot of new corridor

1.) What are your LIKES concerning the WESTERN alternative route?	2.) What are your DISLIKES concerning the WESTERN alternative route?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoids Baker Valley – a lot of people go through Baker and “breeds” resistance just ‘cause they see it – out of site for <u>more</u> people 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is absolutely <u>nothing</u> to like about this route at all!! <u>Nothing, zero, nada, zilch-</u> To get anywhere near the Strawberry Mountain range or the John Day River would be like messing with your Salmon River or Stanley Basin. <u>Get my point? Please.</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It seems to be much more difficult once it leaves Malheur County. However, that would be another scoping teams issues. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Idaho portion on Govt land Shortest 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> You have finally reached the idea that we gave you a long time ago. If you had done your homework in the beginning we could have saved all of us a lot of work and heart ache. Stay out of farmland and avoid view sheds. I still do not see why this cannot stay on the east side of the Snake River as that is the largest service area and where the power will be needed the most. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We still do not have any guarantee that you will not move it back to where you wanted it in the beginning.

1.) What are your LIKES concerning the WESTERN alternative route?	2.) What are your DISLIKES concerning the WESTERN alternative route?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This route appears to intrude on people less than the other routes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It is sad to mess up the countryside with these lines.

# of comment sheet	Name	1.) Based on the analysis, is there an alternative you support as the proposed route?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I support the Central routes as the preferred route. The Snake River Valley routes are not reasonable routes. The irrigated ag, many residences, cities and city impact areas, and impact to private property are strong reasons to not consider those routes. • The proposed line from Hemingway to the Oregon border should stay on the south side of the existing Pacific Corp. line.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I support all three routes. It is hard for me, not being an engineer, to pick one route over another. I guess the route that Idaho Power feels is the most permissible, cost effective and least intrusive is the logical choice.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I support all three proposed routes. I <u>do not</u> support previously proposed routes. I think you should pick the route that is currently proposed that is least intrusive.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, the west route to bypass Baker problems.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The shortest route will be less expensive for ratepayers. The Central route is the best route using an existing corridor.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I believe the western route should be the proposed route. Final adjustments as this route crosses the John Day Valley should minimize the impact on the local citizens.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The eastern route appears to have the most advantages, but has the highest impact on people. I can support any of the routes as proposed and feel that the people in the John Day and Baker areas should make the final determination of which route crosses their area.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The best route is undoubtedly the eastern route for reasons delineated on the chart, page 39. The one really big negative is that it impacts the most private land and irrigated cropland. Therefore I would be forced to choose the central route even though it will be more costly to build because it will impact fewer private holdings and therefore fewer people. Having formerly been in an area of impact I can't wish that on anyone else.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The central route is the best route for use when using existing corridor. But the shortest route is best for the ratepayers as it is the least expensive route to build.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I support the most cost effective route. I also support the route that has the largest % of public land. I also support the route which effect the least amount of prime farm ground. • I totally support this process we are in and I commend Idaho Power for stepping up.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The western route is a true alternative for the entire project.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The central route west of Vale and through area by Brogan I'm not sure of what would be best through baker. • The best would be no route if need is not proved.

# of comment sheet	Name	1.) Based on the analysis, is there an alternative you support as the proposed route?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think that the western route avoids the most prime farmland. • But I feel that the people affected the most should have input on the best route for the region. • It appears to me that the Central and Eastern routes would be cheapest, but has the most human interference.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our preference is for the western route we feel like this route will impact the least amount of private homeowners.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any and all proposed routes are subject to a conditional use permit and public hearing process before the planning and zoning commission. • Every proposed project is heard on its own merits and measured against the Owyhee County Comprehensive Plan and supporting ordinances.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Western route is best for us in Onion Industry, no onion ground is bothered by this route. We ship ~ 1 million 50# units/yr to Sysco foods and outback restaurant and need all the ag ground possible. www.snakeriverproduce.com
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East has the most positives for me.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I support the western route because it is on 50% public land – the whole nation will “benefit,” the whole nation should “host.” I believe it will be out of the way for <u>more</u> people. • The western route is less intrusive to irrigated ground; though, central is 1 mile less, getting it away from Baker Valley probably negates that 1 mile difference, in my mind. • I didn’t look at this from a cost analysis – as a ratepayer, that might affect my judgment. I don’t know how much any of this costs, dollars and cents (sense). • Thinks like easement acquisition, environmental group lawsuits, construction costs and difficulties, probably justify the eastern route. These are your <u>real</u> concerns; but in my world, I support the western route, without the knowledge of cost. • Thank you for taking our concerns and opinions into consideration. Please see this process as necessary and do the “right route” for everyone involved – the public, the private, and the utility company.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I still believe that a route east of Boise and on to I-84 via Gem, Payette and Washington counties, is a viable, permittable and constructable route. That potential route was summarily dismissed with little to no CAP involvement. We never saw any written analysis involving construction difficulty, permitting difficulty, or mitigation costs for that corridor. Basically, all of the written analysis regarding construction, permitting and mitigation were done for the Malheur County routes only. • I further believe decision to side-step the Idaho route was motivated entirely for political reasons.

# of comment sheet	Name	1.) Based on the analysis, is there an alternative you support as the proposed route?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therefore, being honest, I really do not support any of the three routes Idaho Power has selected through Malheur County.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None at this time.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any of those three alternates acceptable – Project should be as much as possible on government and.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You need to stay out of the farmland in the Malheur and Baker counties. I know that is not possible in the Hermiston area.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Western Route appears to be the most acceptable of the three proposed routes, if we must choose.

152

Amanda Edge

From: McCarthy, Kent [KMcCarthy@idahopower.com]
Sent: Monday, March 22, 2010 8:04 AM
To: Kara Veit; Amanda Edge
Subject: FW: CAP route comments

From:
Sent: Sunday, March 21, 2010 7:01 PM
To: McCarthy, Kent
Cc: rosemary@rbcl.net
Subject: CAP route comments

I am not very fond of forms so will just send my thoughts on the 3 routes via this email.

I strongly support the Western route as my 1st choice. It would impact the fewest people's land, farming operations and views. I know this one will be challenged by the public land people and Grant county but I feel it meets the criteria the best.

But we need to have a good backup route and for this I would leave it up to the Baker group to decide which is the least bad. The one that went farthest east around the Interpretive Center (but was on Sage Grouse) looks best to me if it could be made to work.

If you need any more specifics, let me know. And thanks for all the hard work.

[Weight Loss Program](#)
[Best Weight Loss Program - Click Here!](#)



This transmission may contain information that is privileged, confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the information contained herein (including any reliance thereon) is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you received this transmission in error, please immediately contact the sender and destroy the material in its entirety, whether in electronic or hard copy format. Thank you.

2SL



Oregon Natural Desert Association
33 NW Irving Bend, OR 97701

March 24, 2010

To: Kent McCarthy
Idaho Power Company
P.O. Box 70
Boise, ID 83707
Email: KMcCarthy@idahopower.com
Fax: (208) 388-6647
Send via email and fax

Dear Mr. McCarthy,

The Oregon Natural Desert Association ("ONDA")¹ appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Boardman to Hemmingway Transmission Line Project. We have been involved in the South Project Advisory Team meetings hosted in Ontario and value the collaborative process Idaho Power has undertaken to site this line.

ONDA understands that utilities are faced with the challenge to increase transmission capacity due to projected growing energy demand. However, we feel energy conservation is a measure that could save money, avoid the need to build new energy generation and transmission infrastructure, and prevent undue environmental harm in the long term. Northwest Power Council's most recent power plan finds, "conservation to be available and cost-effective to meet 85 percent of the region's load growth of the region for the next 20 years."² With the Boardman Power Plant planned to close in 2020 (or sooner),³ we strongly suggest Idaho Power evaluate whether a new 500-Kilovolt is needed. We hope that Idaho

¹ ONDA is a non-profit public interest organization dedicated to preserving and protecting the public lands of eastern Oregon. ONDA has a long history of interest and involvement in eastern Oregon's public land management. ONDA's mission is to protect, defend, and restore forever the health of Oregon's native deserts. The over 1,400 members and staff of ONDA use and enjoy the public lands, waters, and natural resources of eastern Oregon for recreational, scientific, spiritual, educational, aesthetic, and other purposes. ONDA and its members also participate in information gathering and dissemination, education and public outreach, commenting upon proposed agency actions, and other activities relating to the federal government's management and administration of the public lands and federally-protected areas in eastern Oregon.

² Northwest Power Council. 6th Northwest Power Plan, "Plan Overview." Accessed March 2010:
http://www.nwcouncil.org/energy/powerplan/6/final/PlanOverview_021010.pdf

³ Portland General Electric. "PGE to pursue plan to eliminate coal at Boardman Plant." January 14, 2010.
Accessed March 2010:

http://www.portlandgeneral.com/our_company/news_issues/news/01_14_2010_pge_to_pursue_plan_to_eliminate_coal_at_boardman_plant.aspx

252

Power and the possible partner(s) using this line have taken into account how energy generation might change in ten years after the Boardman Plant discontinues coal-fired operations.

In the event that need is determined by the Public Utility Commission, we hope Idaho Power will site the line where there will be the least impacts. Of the three lines (West, Central, and East), we feel the Eastern Route will do the least environmental harm and we strongly recommend that Idaho Power choose this route over the other two. Although we understand and sympathize with the landowners, communities, and businesses along the proposed corridor who will endure visual impacts and impacts to their land, the presence of roads and an interstate highway, existing transmission corridors, and other infrastructure make this line more environmentally friendly and less impactful. The principal factor in deciding which route to choose should be which route most coincides with areas that are already degraded for wildlife habitat and intersect least with other significant natural and public resource values.

Although the proposed Eastern Route is the longest route, other characterizations of this route negate the additional 17 miles or 24 miles compared to the Central Route and Western Route, respectively. According to Idaho Power's summary of the three routes, the Eastern Route goes through the least amount of forest clearing and rugged terrain, crosses the least special status streams, and impacts the least amount of miles of restricted visual resource classes. The small 5-mile portion of this project that goes through the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest does so in existing designated utility corridor. Moreover, 37% of the Eastern Route will follow existing corridors as compared to less than half that amount for the Western Route.

ONDA strongly opposes the Western Route because it would have the most significant impacts to natural resources and undeveloped areas of the three routes. The Western Route would cross through John Day River Basin, a scenic and natural resource rich area, and traverse 46 special status streams. Additionally, it would go through the most national forest land (Malheur and Umatilla National Forests) where there are no existing corridors for transmission. Potential impacts to areas with unspoiled character, including the significant clear cuts that would be required on national forest lands, would be unacceptable. The certain impacts from construction and maintenance on the Western Route to sensitive streams—including sedimentation damage from construction and removal of timber on steep slopes in strongholds for fish species protected under the Endangered Species Act—mean that any attempt to permit or build the Western Route could face significant litigation hurdles. Additionally, Idaho Power reported that 117.1

252

miles or 42% of the Western Route would be categorized as having "high construction difficulty,"⁴ making it also the least economical of the potential routes.

We do not favor the Central Route because this route would also cause significant impacts and would go through Wallowa-Whitman National Forest where there are no existing utility corridors. Like the Western Route, the Central Route would traverse more rugged terrain than the Eastern Route, and 35% of the route would be considered "high construction difficulty" by Idaho Power.

None of proposed routes will be free of impacts and we hope that Idaho Power will conduct at least three years of environmental studies along the project route. All of the proposed routes will overlap with areas identified as Greater sage-grouse habitat. The Greater sage-grouse was recently found to warrant protection by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service due the declines in populations throughout the West. This "warranted but precluded" listing now puts the responsibility on State and federal land managers to protect this species from further decline. We ask that Idaho Power take all measures to reduce the severity of impacts to the Greater sage-grouse by conducting thorough environmental analysis before construction takes place, avoiding construction in sage-grouse habitat during the spring and summer mating season, adhering to the recommended buffer zones by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife ("ODFW") and federal land management and wildlife protection agencies, and instituting effective mitigation measures when impacts are unavoidable.

We appreciate this opportunity to comment on the proposed routes and to be a part of the project advisory process. In the future, we hope to continue to give our input and provide expertise as this project goes through additional environmental review and siting processes.

Sincerely,

Copied to:

⁴ Idaho Power. "CAP Routing Results." South PAT meeting, March 9, 2010.



MSL

IDAHO FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

500 West Washington Street • P.O. Box 167
Boise, Idaho 83701-0167 • (208) 342-2688
FAX (208) 342-8585

Kent McCarthy
Idaho Power Company
P.O. Box 70
Boise, ID 83707

March 17, 2010

Dear Mr. McCarthy:

On behalf of the more than 63,000 Idaho families who are members of the Idaho Farm Bureau Federation, I am writing to provide comments on the proposed routes for the Boardman to Hemmingway Transmission Line Project.

I apologize for not being able to attend the South Project Advisory Team Meeting #5 which was held on Tuesday, March 9, 2010 in Ontario, Oregon. I appreciate Kara Veit sending the information that was discussed at the meeting so we could review and make comments.

Our members are most directly impacted by the section of transmission line that will go from Hemmingway to the Idaho/Oregon border. It appears that you have eliminated all alternate routes from consideration except the southern-most route to the Idaho/Oregon border. Although it would be helpful to have more detailed maps of this particular section to see the specific route through the area, we agree with this decision and support the route that has been identified as the most reasonable route through Idaho to complete this project.

You have requested that we provide comments on the three proposed routes for this project. While all three routes identified use the same alignment through the Idaho portion of the project, our members will still see impacts on their rates based on the route chosen through Oregon. We therefore offer the following comments in regards to the proposed routes.

Each of the three proposals seems to have pros and cons. Specifically, we like the fact that the western alternative is the shortest in length, goes through fewer county jurisdictions, crosses the least amount of private land, and only crosses 10 miles of irrigated crop land.

We like the fact that the central route proposal crosses the least amount of irrigated cropland, although not significantly less than the western proposal.

3 SV

We are concerned that the eastern alternative crosses the most private land of the three, and is also the longest route meaning more miles of transmission construction. However, there may be other mitigating factors that would cause the other routes to be more costly such as the number of stream crossings involved in the western alternative or the number of miles of rugged terrain of greater than 25% slopes in both the central and western alternatives.

All other things being equal, we prefer the western alternative since it crosses the least amount of private land. However, we understand that several factors go into the cost of the project. Therefore, we encourage you to select the least cost alternative that has the highest probability of obtaining all necessary permits to enable construction to proceed in a timely manner.

The bottom line is that our members prefer the most economically viable alternative so that their rates will be able to stay as low as possible into the future, avoiding as much private land as possible.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on your proposed alternatives and look forward to this project moving forward to help ensure a reliable electrical grid in Southwest Idaho.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you need any additional information.

Sincerely,