

Boardman to Hemingway Transmission Line Project

South Project Advisory Team Meeting #5

Summary

March 9, 2010

4 – 9 p.m.

Four Rivers Cultural Center

676 SW 5th Ave.

Ontario, OR 97914

Table of Contents

Community Advisory Process Background.....	3
Project Advisory Team (PAT) Background	4
South Project Advisory Team Meeting #5 Overview.....	6
Presentations	9
South PAT Summary of Comments	22
Q&As and Discussion.....	27

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 South Project Advisory Team (PAT) includes representatives from Malheur County in Oregon; and Owyhee, Canyon, Payette and Washington counties in Idaho. Since Spring 2009, Idaho Power has hosted five PAT meetings and one round of public meetings in the South advisory area.

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

PAT Meeting #1

The first South PAT meeting was held May 21, 2009 in Ontario, 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 South PAT meeting was held July 28, 2009 in Ontario, 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 South 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 South advisory area were held in Parma, Idaho, on Aug. 25, Marsing, Idaho on Aug. 26 and Ontario, Oregon on Aug. 27.

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 South PAT meeting was held on Sept. 30 and Oct. 1, 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 South Project Advisory Team developed 14 of these routes.

PAT Meeting #4

The fourth South PAT meeting was held on Dec. 8, 2009 in Ontario, 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 South PAT meeting was held on March 9, 2010 in Ontario, 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.

South Project Advisory Team Meeting #5 Overview

Background

The five Project Advisory Teams developed a total of 49 routes (3,184 miles). The South Project Advisory Team (PAT) developed fifteen of these routes.

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 South 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 its 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.

South PAT Meeting #5 agenda and format

The purpose of the 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 9, 2010 at the Four Rivers Cultural Center in Ontario, Oregon.

Seventy 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
- 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 Appendices 2 and 3.

- South 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.boardmantohemingway.com.
- Communicate results back to the communities.
- Hold public meetings throughout the project area in Spring 2010.

Presentations

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 when the federal and state processes restart.
- PacifiCorp and the Bonneville Power Administration are both currently evaluating participation in the Boardman to Hemingway project.
- On March 2, 2009 Idaho Power hosted a public meeting in John Day, Oregon. On March 3, Idaho Power received a letter from a concerned citizen about statements overheard at a local restaurant following the Tuesday meeting. The negative statements described in the letter, which are clearly not acceptable, are currently being investigated and do not represent the views of Idaho Power. Idaho Power appreciates that the incident was brought to their attention. Based on the investigation into the events, appropriate action will be taken with those responsible. Idaho Power tremendously values its relationships with the communities, and anything that was said in the restaurant after that meeting is not the viewpoint of Idaho Power.

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 – Kent McCarthy, Idaho Power, CAP Leader

McCarthy thanked team members for coming to the meeting and explained there were several updates on participation in the Boardman to Hemingway Project. McCarthy'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 regarding 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 South 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 South Project Advisory Team and to recommend others for inclusion on the team.
- Idaho Power hosted the first South PAT meeting on May 21, 2009 in Ontario, 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 Project.
 - Identify community concerns and suggestions for siting the transmission line.
- At the first South 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, regulatory and engineering criteria, to help develop potential routes for the transmission line.
- The second South PAT meeting was held July 28, 2009 in Ontario, 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 environmental, regulatory and engineering criteria that would be used to develop routes.
- For the second South 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 Parma, Idaho, on Aug. 25, 2009; Marsing, Idaho on Aug. 26, 2009; and Ontario, Oregon on Aug. 27, 2009. Overall, 287 people attended the three public meetings in the South 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 South mapping workshop was held on Oct. 1, 2009 in Ontario, 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 South mapping workshop developed 15 routes.
- Idaho Power kept a detailed record of all routes developed by PAT members. 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 South PAT meeting was held Dec. 8, 2009 in Ontario, 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 South 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 PAT-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 these routes based on permitting difficulty, construction difficulty, engineering and cost.
- Tetra Tech tried to maintain the original routes developed by the PATs 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 by evaluating permissibility, constructability and mitigation cost. The purpose of the fifth South 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 South PAT members raised the following concerns at the first South PAT meeting:
 - Disruption to agriculture and farming.
 - Honesty and credibility of Idaho Power.
 - Property values.
- South PAT members also provided suggestions for siting the transmission line. The suggestions included:
 - Avoid Exclusive Farm Use land.

- Site the line on public property.
- Use existing corridors.
- Give irrigated farmland priority.
- Cross rangeland before farmland.
- Avoid view sheds.
- Avoid historic landmarks.
- The line should follow the highway.
- Avoid new growth and city impact areas.
- Shadow an existing line.
- Follow land boundaries as much as possible.
- Avoid urban areas, children and schools.
- Consider wildlife areas.
- Idaho Power developed the concerns and suggestions provided by team members into community criteria for the South area. When Idaho Power made adjustments to the 49 routes suggested by PAT members, it followed the community criteria closely. Below are the South PAT's community criteria:
 - *Placement opportunities* include: Existing energy corridors; West Wide energy corridor; public land (federal and state); transportation and rail corridors.
 - *Avoidance areas* include: Exclusive Farm Use land in Oregon; prime farmland in Idaho; irrigated farmland; bisecting fields; aerial spraying activity areas; private rangeland; scenic view sheds; areas that 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 areas (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.

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 four regions are in the South area:
 - Snake River Valley
 - Southwest
 - West of Vale
 - Burnt River

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

Snake River Valley

- The Snake River Valley region includes six potential routes that were developed by PAT-members. All of these routes run about 100 miles, roughly north to south, from the Hemingway substation to Weatherby.
- These six routes make up four paths through Malheur and Owyhee counties and are labeled A-F.

- Route A, which follows the Snake River, is considered less reasonable because it crosses Exclusive Farm Use land.
- Route B, which runs parallel to I-84, is considered less reasonable because it would cross the city of Ontario, creating construction and engineering problems.
- Route C crosses the Oregon Trail buffer, elk and deer winter range, and sage grouse core habitat.
- Route D crosses less of the Oregon Trail buffer, elk and deer winter range, and sage grouse core habitat, making it more reasonable than Route C.
- Route F is more reasonable than Route E because it crosses less of the Oregon Trail buffer, elk and deer winter range, and sage grouse core habitat.
- All six of the route alternatives would cross more than 30 miles of irrigated agricultural land. Some (such as Route B) would also enter city impact areas and growing urban areas with large numbers of residences and farms.
- The analysis has concluded that none of the six routes would be a reasonable alternative due to the following permitting factors:
 - Extensive irrigated agriculture and prime farmland.
 - Impact on city impact/urban growth areas and existing urban areas.
 - Extensive impact on residential development.
 - Snake River Scenic Byway.

Southwest

- The Southwest region includes four route alternatives. Tetra Tech labeled these four alternatives:
 - Route A (map points GR3-GR4-HA1-HA2-MA6)
 - Route B (map points GR3-GR4-GR5-HA1-HA2 MA6)
 - Route C (map points GR3-GR4-GR5-HA2-MA6)
 - Route D (map points GR3-MA4-MA5-MA6)
- Through a comparison based on construction difficulty, permitting difficulty and mitigation cost, the analysis determined Route D to be more reasonable because:
 - It is shorter than the other routes.
 - It avoids the Devine Scenic Corridor.
 - It avoids 7.3 miles of occupied lek buffer.
 - It crosses 13.6 miles fewer of forestlands.
 - It allows for acceptable distance between transmission lines.
 - Old growth forests can be avoided during micro-siting.

- Route D, presents significantly less construction difficulty than the other three routes.
- Route A is not reasonable because it is 53.7 miles longer than the shortest route, requires 1,630 more acres of right-of-way, and it crosses the South Fork of the John Day River, which is a wild and scenic river.
- Route B is not reasonable because it is 41.7 miles longer than the shortest route, requires 1260 more acres of right-of-way, crosses 7.3 miles of sage grouse leks and does not allow acceptable separation between 500 kV transmission lines.

West of Vale

- The West of Vale 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 because it:
 - Is 5.6 miles shorter and requires 170 fewer acres of right-of-way
 - Crosses 12.4 fewer miles of sage grouse core area 1 habitat.
 - Crosses 5.6 fewer miles of Exclusive Farm Use land.
 - Crosses 22 fewer miles of private land.
 - Crosses 3.4 fewer miles of prime farmland soils.
 - Crosses 17.8 fewer miles of deer winter range.

Burnt River Analysis

- The Burnt River 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 eastern route to be more reasonable. The eastern route is longer but it was found to be the more reasonable because access to the transmission line for construction and maintenance would be easier.
- The permitting factors for the eastern and western routes were relatively similar.
- The routes involved significant construction difficulty factors:
 - The eastern route is five to six miles longer.
 - The eastern route has more miles of high construction difficulty.
 - The western route crosses the Burnt River Canyon, which has extremely rough terrain.

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 alternative routes: 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 3. The maps and summaries of the permitting, construction and mitigation factors are also available on the project Web site, www.boardmantohemingway.com.

South 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 the 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, 88 comment sheets and three e-mails and letters were submitted from the South 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 collected from comments forms, letters and e-mails that were submitted by residents of Malheur County in Oregon; and Canyon, Payette, Washington and Owyhee counties in Idaho. 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 South 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.boardmantoemingway.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:

- Adjustments should be made to the Eastern Alternative route so it goes farther east and away from the Interpretive Center.
- A route east of Boise that connects to the I-84 corridor via Gem, Payette and Washington counties is still a viable, permissible and constructible route.

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

The following comments were provided:

- Shortest and most direct route.
- Least impact to Exclusive Farm Use land and prime farmland.
- Crosses fewer populated areas.
- Minimal impact to private land.
- Equal use of public and private land.
- Uses more public land.
- Less impact on forested areas.
- Avoids more of Malheur County.
- Avoids the Oregon Trail Interpretive Center.
- Avoids the Baker Valley.
- Idaho portion of the route is on public land.
- Avoids view sheds.
- Goes through fewer county jurisdictions.

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

The following comments were provided:

- Highest construction difficulty.
- Does not use existing corridors.
- Crosses many streams.
- Longest and most complicated route.
- Crosses the National Forest.
- Highest cost.

- Environmental concerns.
- Permitting concerns.
- Negative impact to view sheds.
- Crosses more areas with rugged terrain.

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

The following comments were provided:

- Crosses less Exclusive Farm Use land.
- Follows existing corridors.
- Crosses fewer special status streams.
- Shorter than the Western Alternative route.
- Avoids the John Day Valley.
- Lower/moderate construction difficulty.
- Less impact on landowners and avoids residences.
- Reasonable amount of forest clearing.
- Crosses less areas with rugged terrain.
- Crosses less forestland.
- Idaho portion of the route is on public land in Owyhee County.
- The Wallowa Whitman National Forest management plans allow for transmission lines.

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

The following comments were provided:

- Crosses private land.
- High construction difficulty.
- Negative impact on view sheds in the Baker Valley.
- Negative impact on the Oregon Trail Interpretive Center.
- Requires clear-cutting of forestland.
- Crosses agricultural/cropland.
- Negative impacts to the Oregon Trail.
- Crosses excessive miles of Forest Service/BLM restrictive visual classes.
- Longer than the Western Alternative route.

- Crosses more areas with rugged terrain.

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

The following comments were provided:

- Uses existing corridor.
- Less “high construction difficulty” factors.
- Requires the least amount of forest clear-cutting.
- Less sensitive stream impact.
- Crosses the National Forest in a designated corridor.
- Less impact on view sheds.
- Avoids John Day.
- Avoids the west side of Baker County.
- Crosses the least amount of rugged terrain.
- Crosses sagebrush land in Malheur County.
- Uses public land in Idaho through Owyhee County.

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

The following comments were provided:

- Crosses the most irrigated farmland and Exclusive Farm Use land of the three alternative routes.
- Impacts the Oregon Trail Interpretive Center.
- Most impact on private land of the three alternative routes.
- Longest route.
- View shed impacts.
- Intrudes on the Baker Valley.
- Negative impacts on sage grouse.

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

- Many South PAT members commented they would support any of the three route alternatives as the proposed route.
- The route alternative most often supported as the proposed route by South PAT members was the Western alternative route.

- The second route alternative most identified as the proposed route by South PAT members was the Central alternative route.
- The third route alternative most identified as the proposed route by South PAT members was the Eastern alternative route.

Other comments:

- Farmland needs to be avoided in Malheur and Baker counties.
- If the Eastern alternative route is chosen, the Oregon Trail Interpretive Center needs to be avoided.
- The routes proposed by PAT members that went east of Boise were dismissed with little to no input from the Community Advisory Process. Idaho Power did not provide a written analysis about the construction difficulty, permitting difficulty or mitigation costs for those routes.
- The transmission line should be in Idaho because that is where the most power is needed.
- Idaho Power did not spend much time or energy looking at any routes in Idaho. It was pre-determined that the route would be in Oregon.
- Idaho Power should be commended for the public process they have done over the past year.
- Private landowners should not have to put a transmission line on their property that serves the public.
- Private landowners have no guarantee from Idaho Power that the original route will not still be used.
- The three current alternative routes are much better than the route that was originally proposed by Idaho Power a year ago.

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: Does the mitigation cost include the price of acquisition for easements? Is that under mitigation?

McCarthy: No, that's not under mitigation. But it would include anything that came along with that acquisition – if it required that the land be mitigated in some form. So it's not the direct cost of buying the land, it's mitigation in addition to that.

PAT member: So where would easement costs go in this analysis?

McCarthy: We didn't include easement costs.

PAT member: Oh, that's not even included?

McCarthy: What you see now is the per-mile average cost. We don't know what it's going to cost until we get out in the field. So it's really hard to compare the easement costs until we actually get out there.

PAT member: I have a quick question. What do you consider as far as your parameters for permitting difficulties? Doesn't permitting come from the BLM?

Perry: If you look at what we used, we had about 200 factors. I think maybe an example is the best way. In Oregon, two miles within an occupied sage grouse lek is what they call Category One. We call that an exclusion area. Places like crossing the Oregon Trail, we call those high permitting difficulty areas. Whereas things like erosion, we call moderate or low difficulty areas because we can actually mitigate for that. So we took all those factors and tried to think how those factors would impact getting permits.

PAT member: I guess, on some of your stuff I agree, and on some I disagree. When you talk about crossing the Oregon Trail, you're talking about during construction, right? But once the towers are up, as long as that tower is not on the trail, it's not that big of an issue, is it?

Perry: Well, if it's an intact section of the Oregon Trail, and you speak to the Oregon California Trail Association, what they'd really be interested in is the setting.

PAT member: The view scape. Sure.

Perry: Yes. And you know, if you see it in a valley that hasn't been disturbed, and then you add a transmission line, it's a big impact.

PAT member: You bet. OK.

PAT member: I'm looking at the West of Vale analysis and your Burnt River analysis and the two most reasonable routes in each don't meet.

Perry: No, they don't. They're two different routes. We were looking at the Burnt River, and this actually takes you to the Baker Valley, whereas the West of Vale analysis takes you to a central route. This length right here, this length right here, is the one you're talking about. We did use it for the Baker Valley. It's the only link to the Baker Valley.

PAT member: OK.

PAT member: Does that route to Westfall, there's two branches of it there, does it miss the irrigated farmland that they have?

Perry: I believe they do. These two routes.

PAT member: Does it go just east of Westfall?

Perry: I'm not exactly sure of where Westfall is.

PAT member: On the map. On the left.

Perry: I would say that we would try to avoid irrigated agriculture every place we could. But when doing one of these transmission lines the routing goes on and on. You keep getting down to greater and greater levels of detail, and I would be very surprised if we wound up on irrigated agricultural land out there.

PAT member: On page 23 you went through the criteria of what the Forest Service and the BLM criteria is. I sure think you need to analyze the private land. Because the private property, you know, even though we don't have a file-on-file with the Forest Service but each one of us is private landowners, we have our own business plan – what we have intended for the land. And I think as you go through these scenarios you need to evaluate each one of these properties as though it were wild and scenic, even though it's private.

Nickerson: I think everybody heard the question. The way I respond to that is on those western corridors, even though we are finding more obstacles, there are many, many more miles of public land that's being crossed, and less private land that's being crossed.

One of the things we have to look at in terms of getting a permit is if the law will allow it. If the law doesn't allow it, it's not a route we can follow. So we didn't eliminate things just because it's a wild and scenic river. On the state scenic river log, you can cross it if you're in the right place; you can set the towers back and maybe see the conductors. But it wasn't just one factor that came together in that case. We cross many scenic byways, we crossed a good deal of BLM land and Forest Service land. We talked about this before, but we tried not to say, "Okay, BLM land has this value, private land has this value, Forest Service land has this value." We looked at the management of the land, what is the intention and how is the land being used. If it's private land or agriculture, we tried to avoid it. If it is Forest Service land, set for some kind of old growth, we tried to avoid it.

PAT member: I compliment you. I think you've come light years from where you were a year ago. You're not there yet, but you have come light years. We were looking at major arguments a year ago, but you kind of danced around the question a little bit.

When you go west of Vale, and use that route, are you saying then that you're not going to cross any EFU land in Malheur County? I haven't heard you say that. I'm not that familiar with exactly where that would be there; you are probably more familiar than I am. But I think the solidarity of the people in Malheur County is that the statement is, "Not one acre." I know that's a tough criteria to follow, but I'll just ask you straight out. Have you got that figured out?

Perry: To the best of my recollection, we get right up to the end of the EFU land and go around it, and then head north and east toward Baker. I wish I had 100 percent recall, but I know we were looking for every way we could to get away from every little piece of irrigated farmland up there. We didn't want to go miles and miles to the west before we went east, but I think that's correct. If we cross a piece of farmland, it has to be a very small one. It's a funny-looking route up there. You'd have to look at it close.

Jim Nickerson: I do want to say that we do cross quite a bit of EFU in other locations. Going into Boardman, all of the area is EFU. And there would be perhaps some EFU lands crossed in Baker that are Class Four and Five soils. As long as we can demonstrate that we have exhausted the opportunities to avoid it, there may be some of this transmission line that would be on EFU.

PAT member: About a year and a half ago, in November, we met with a group. Jim, you were there with Idaho Power. I think we suggested this line a year and a half ago that you kind of finally came up with. So you're kind of slow on the uptake, but at least you got there. We think that's a good deal.

I would like to remind everybody that at the conclusion of this CAP process, the battle is not over. The battle is just going into a different realm. It goes from the CAP into the NEPA and EFSC process, and they can follow the recommendation of the CAP, or they cannot follow the recommendation of the CAP. They're not bound by what we decide here tonight.

There is a hearing here, it will probably be in this room, in April. It will be a public field hearing from the Oregon Public Utilities Commission and they will be discussing how need is going to be established for this line. Whether Idaho Power needs this line or not, that meeting is where the need is going to be established. I think this group here needs to come back and have testimony ready on whether this line is even needed. If this line is needed, until you see the towers built, and the line coming over those towers, you really don't know where this line is going to go yet. So don't think you're at the end of the battle; we're just changing battles, okay? Just reminding everyone. But my hat's off to you for coming up with the route we suggested.

Nickerson: Well, thank you.

PAT member: I think I misunderstood one statement you made. You alluded to the fact that you don't place value on public land versus private land. That's what we do as land managers. I have talked to some other owners and land managers who are maybe receptive to having the power line come through, but if Idaho Power is not placing value on the land, it comes down to how much is an owner going to get for right-of-way acquisition and things like that. It seems to me you're not on the same page with us to start, and maybe I just misunderstood the statements there.

Nickerson: When I talk about it from a resource planning point of view and what the law allows in terms of the ability to site a transmission line, or what a management plan says, it makes sense for an agency, whether it's a county's comprehensive plan, or a BLM field office's management plan, I'm not talking about it from the point of view of compensation.

McCarthy: I want to address that just a little bit more. When we do go out to acquire a right-of-way from folks, we negotiate the right-of-way easement purchase with every single landowner.

There will be terms and conditions set forth. The value of the land is the negotiated value for that right-of-way piece, and we do everything we can to negotiate it so both parties are made whole in the transaction. I don't know if that's what you were getting at.

PAT member: Well it just seems to me, somewhat, that the cart is before the horse. There are lines on paper, and I don't know, I guess what I'm trying to get at is ... there are people out there that probably would accept power lines through their properties, but I just don't understand where in the process that starts to happen.

McCarthy: That is a good question. This first step here through the Community Advisory Process is to lay out the routes not in an exact sense but in a sense that will work. But as we get down through the NEPA process and through scoping, and a draft environmental impact statement, we go out speaking to owners to figure out who are the willing land sellers. We're not to that point yet. This is higher level than that. That comes later on through the NEPA process.

PAT member: Is this the time you want to get into all the questions? Is the line full capacity, I mean you've got all the power sold on the line to bring it up to grid, or whatever it goes on?

McCarthy: Not yet. Right now we're building the line to Idaho Power's purposes. But right now Idaho Power's purposes are for 250 megawatts in 2015, then another 175 megawatts in 2017; this is what Idaho Power needs to import into the state. The line will be rated at 850 megawatts coming in this direction, so there will be that excess capacity. That's why PacifiCorp and Bonneville Power Administration are interested in possible ownership of the line too. And then whatever, if there is any capacity left over that is not owned, we have to sell that capacity to whoever wants it to transmit power into or out of or across Idaho and Oregon.

PAT member: So as private landowners, if the line comes across our land you could buy into the company then, or buy part of the watts?

McCarthy: It would be a lot more difficult than that, because at this large of a line to build a substation to take power off...

PAT member: But if you just you go across my land and I could just be part of the company and be a stockholder.

McCarthy: Well, you could be a stockholder of Idaho Power.

PAT member: No, I mean be a stockholder on the line.

McCarthy: To be part of the line itself, you'd have to be... I don't know how to answer that.

Vern Porter: The line would be owned by the companies that participated in building the line itself, so you would have to invest money into building the line to be eligible to own part of it.

PAT member: I'm just trying to keep the value of my land.

PAT member: What does it mean to this group when you say PacifiCorp and Bonneville are interested?

McCarthy: PacifiCorp is the parent company of PPL and Rocky Mountain Power. PacifiCorp is interested in possibly participating as an owner in the line. This line at 500 kV is a huge

investment, and Idaho Power, I'm not sure we could bite off that much investment all by ourselves. We really always wanted to have other investors in the line to help fund the building of the line. So PacifiCorp and Bonneville Power are interested in participating in building the line along with us.

PAT member: So do we have any impact on them? Like we're doing all these meetings for your benefit, does that also carry over to PacifiCorp and Bonneville? Or do you start over?

McCarthy: Anything we've done so far, once they come in, it's the same power line, so whatever has been done here it's the same routing process that they would just be jumping into. So we would most likely be the lead power company still, in permitting the line. But then they would start participating and attending scoping meetings with the BLM and the NEPA process. It's still just the same line, the same process to go through.

PAT member: I thought through the tax credit that's what was being paid, the taxpayers, through the federal government giving you a tax credit, I thought that's how you were able to afford this power line.

McCarthy: This is an investment purely by Idaho Power and its ratepayers in the long run to get this line built. We are not getting any subsidies from the federal government on this line.

PAT member: There's been a couple questions kind of hinting around this, and I just want to make sure that it's clear that the PUC hearing I talked about earlier, if Idaho Power establishes need, they can go back and get eminent domain. That's where condemnation starts. So just be aware of that. If Idaho Power gets the okay from the PUC that they need this line, then they can come back and get eminent domain. And they can come in and put the line through your property, and they'll compensate you whatever you agree to. But you have no choice once they have eminent domain.

McCarthy: You make that seem really simple and it's not. We haven't used eminent domain as a company in over 20 years and we prefer by a long shot not to use it. And in Oregon, as I understand it we would have to go to court individually on each property. In Oregon particularly it's extremely difficult to exercise that right. We haven't used it in 20 years, though we have the right to.

PAT member: Can you give us a rundown on how the meetings in Grant and Baker counties were? Have you gotten much feedback from them yet?

McCarthy: They haven't given us their comments yet. I think they're just thinking about it. We asked them to take time to think about it and supply us with really well thought out comments. What we didn't want from folks was comments that just said, "Stay out of my county." We wanted reasons as to why it shouldn't or should go in an area.

The common theme in Grant County all along has been to stay out of Grant County. I think I met one person in all my time in Grant County so far that said it would be okay to have the line here. And Grant County would be dead set against it. Baker County is a mixed bag, there are actually proponents and opponents, but we haven't gotten the written comments back yet.

PAT member: Explain a little bit more about if you partner on the line with PacifiCorp and Bonneville Power. Bonneville Power is a pretty good-sized outfit. Are you sure that Idaho Power would still be the lead agency? That goes back to the condemnation as well.

Somebody's got to be able to call the shots on that and not have to argue with PacifiCorp whether that's working. And that would probably go to maintenance and all that stuff.

And then my last question is, in your IRP, did you figure that you would only have half the capacity on this line? It goes back to ratepayers, of course, if we had to pay for the entire line and your IRP says it only has to be half full now, and now you're selling off, or not contributing as much as the other two, that makes a big difference all the way along the line.

McCarthy: As for the condemnation authority of Bonneville Power Administration, I was asked that question I think the other day, and I haven't had the chance to find out what kind of condemnation authority they have. I really don't know the answer to that.

PAT member: But they would come over and take the project over since you're much smaller than they are.

McCarthy: That's why we've taken so long so far because we're so very careful about that. We have to make sure we're protected before we release any capacity to anybody, so it's been kind of a chess game all along.

The second question about the IRP and the capacity: The IRP was calculated based on the 425 megawatts and that percentage of ownership of the line. We've always been analyzing this assuming that either we'd have other people owning part of the line, or we would be being paid by others to use the line to transmit energy at cost. So those considerations have always been factored in. We wouldn't want to have to fund the entire line and only use part of it and not get any reimbursement for that.

John Williams, Bonneville Power Administration: Bonneville Power has no interest in taking the lead over this project. This is an Idaho Power project. We would only come in to be one of the next utilities such as PacifiCorp in terms of utilizing the capacity to serve our needs. We have customers in southeast Idaho and the current route is fully loaded, so Idaho Power is trying to add more transmission so they can bring more power in as their load grows. Our customers will experience load growth, and we need to be able to access that extra capacity to meet our load growth for our customers. But we have no interest in terms of taking over. This is an Idaho Power project, and they're the lead and we will follow that if we decide to join. I hope that answers your question.

PAT member: What would happen if neither Bonneville Power Administration or PacifiCorp joined up on this? Would this whole route would be paid for by ratepayers?

Vern Porter: That's a good question. There are others out there that have expressed interest in the line as well, and basically what would happen is we'd have to sit back and analyze where we are, and make a decision at that point.

PAT member: Have any of the others who expressed interest backed off since it started? Because this is has been ongoing for quite a while.

Vern Porter: We get calls from time to time with different entities expressing interest in it. Our discussions have been primarily with PacifiCorp and Bonneville Power.

Meeting dismissed.