

**BEFORE THE OREGON PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**LC 50**

**In the Matter of**

**IDAHO POWER COMPANY  
2009 Integrated Resource Plan**

**REPLY REGARDING  
PETITIONS FOR  
INTERVENTION OF MOVE  
IDAHO POWER AND  
NANCY PEYRON**

Idaho Power Company (IPC) does not object to the intervention of Move Idaho Power (MIP) but does wish to preclude from LC 50 any discussion of proposed routes for its proposed Boardman-Hemingway transmission line. But such discussion cannot lawfully be excluded from a process examining a utility's proposed Integrated Resource Plan (IRP).

Under the Commission's integrated resource planning adopted guidelines:

- c. The primary goal must be the selection of a portfolio of resources with the best combination of expected costs and associated risks and uncertainties for the utility and its customers.

OPUC Order No. 07-047, Appendix A, pp. 1-2. The term "resources" includes transmission lines. Utilities are required to "compare different \* \* \* locations" of resources in their portfolio risk modeling and must "identify in the plans any additional sources of risk and uncertainty." *Id.*, p. 1. The plan must also identify "environmental compliance costs" and "any barriers to implementation." *Id.*, p. 5.

The specific route of a transmission line can significantly affect its cost-effectiveness (or "best cost/risk" analysis), its risks and uncertainties, its environmental compliance costs, and its barriers to implementation. For example, say Route A follows existing transportation corridors and does not cross any areas of wildlife habitat. Route B, however, crosses habitat areas for wildlife, included protected

species, and also impairs views from a national interpretative center specifically intended to provide views of historical artifacts.

These two routes will have different costs and risks. In addition to the cost of construction, Route B will have the added costs to the public of destroying wildlife habitat and historical views. Route A may be cost-effective, while Route B is not. Thus, the cost-effectiveness of a proposed transmission line may be determined by its routing. And the utility is required to "compare different \* \* \* locations." Guideline 1.a., Adopted IRP Guidelines.

The same is true for the other mandatory integrated resource plan criteria. Route A in this example would appear to have fewer risks and uncertainties, as it is less likely to engender dedicated public opposition and attendant litigation. Route B would appear to have higher environmental compliance costs, including the cost of measures to mitigate harm to sage grouse and other species. Route A would have fewer "barriers to implementation."

Thus, it is perfectly appropriate for participants in LC 50 to present evidence about the economic and environmental impacts of various transmission line routes and to argue that the inclusion of certain routes would preclude the IPC plan from representing "the best combination of expected costs and associated risks and uncertainties for the utility and its customers." Precluding such discussion would be legal error, as would precluding the discussion of Power Plant B in place of Power Plant A in the IRP.

Further, IPC contends that "EFSC is also required to conduct a public contested case hearing." But, as noted in the MIP/Peyron Motion for Contested Case Hearing, the EFSC contested case need not address the need for any facility that is contained

in the utility's IRP acknowledged by the OPUC, so the opportunity for the public to address the drawbacks of the proposed Boardman-Hemingway line will at EFSC be truncated or non-existent, should IPC prevail in this docket.

Dated: March 8, 2010

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Milo Pope

---

MILO POPE  
OSB No. 671024  
Yervasi Pope PC  
1990 3rd Street  
P.O. Box 50  
Baker City, OR 97814  
541 523-7973 voice  
541 523-7993 fax  
milo@thegeo.net

Attorney for Move Idaho Power

---

DANIEL W. MEEK  
OSB No. 791242  
10949 S.W. 4th Avenue  
Portland, OR 97219  
503-293-9021 voice  
503-293-9099 fax  
dan@meek.net

Attorney for Nancy Peyron

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I served the foregoing REPLY REGARDING PETITIONS FOR INTERVENTION OF MOVE IDAHO POWER AND NANCY PEYRON by mailing a copy properly addressed with first class postage to every address listed on the service list on the docket website this date for which paper service has not been waived:

Jason Jones  
Dept of Justice  
1162 Court St NE  
Salem, OR 97301-4096

Linnea Wittekind  
Public Utility Commission  
P.O. Box 2148  
Salem, OR 97308-2148

I further certify that I also served the same document by electronic mail, pursuant to OAR 860-013-0070(4), on every email address listed this date on the service list on the docket website (in addition to puc.filingcenter@state.or.us).

adam.bless@state.or.us  
ann@rnp.org  
bkline@idahopower.com  
bob@oregoncub.org  
brian.kuehne@pgn.com  
catriona@oregoncub.org  
cbearry@idahopower.com  
chcombs@bpa.gov  
cvictoria@idahopower.com  
denise.saunders@pgn.com  
djones@idahopower.com  
dwalker@idahopower.com  
gordon@oregoncub.org  
gsaid@idahopower.com  
hsjuj@bpa.gov  
janet.prewitt@doj.state.or.us  
jason.w.jones@state.or.us  
jordan.white@pacificorp.com  
kbokenkamp@idahopower.com

kelcey.brown@state.or.us  
linnea.wittekind@state.or.us  
lisa@mcd-law.com  
lnordstrom@idahopower.com  
mec@eslerstephens.com  
mstokes@idahopower.com  
myoungblood@idahopower.com  
nelson@thnelson.com  
oregondockets@pacificorp.com  
pete.warnken@pacificorp.com  
pge.opuc.filings@pgn.com  
ppengilly@idahopower.com  
rgale@idahopower.com  
rogerfindley@q.com  
stephens@eslerstephens.com  
suzanne@rnp.org  
vijay.a.satyal@state.or.us  
wendy@mcd-law.com  
zigzagtom@gmail.com

Dated: March 8, 2010

---

Daniel W. Meek