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1. Introduction

This volume of the Hooper Springs Transmission Project supplemental draft environmental impact statement (EIS) identifies comments received on the draft EIS, and provides BPA’s responses to these comments. Section 2 of this volume provides an overview of the comments received on the draft EIS. Section 3 of this volume includes responses to the comments received on the draft EIS. The letters, e-mails, and forms received on the draft EIS, as well as the draft EIS public meeting notes, are provided in their entirety in Section 4 at the end of this volume.

2. Comment Overview

Comments on the draft EIS were submitted at the April 3, 2013 draft EIS public meeting, at two Caribou County Commissioners meetings, and in comment forms, emails, and letters received during and following the draft EIS public comment period. Comments were received from federal, state, tribes, and local agencies, as well as private citizens living in Caribou County. Comments were designated with an identifying number based on the order in which the letter, e-mail, or other item of correspondence was received. Table 2.1 identifies the comment number for each item of correspondence as well as its source.

BPA catalogued a total of 456 comments received on the draft EIS. Comments were primarily made on Chapters 1, 2 and 3 of the draft EIS. Chapter 1, Purpose of Need for Action, received about 13 percent of the comments. Chapter 1 comments focused on the project need and public involvement. Chapter 2, Proposed Project and Alternatives, attracted about 26 percent of the comments. These comments focused largely on the transmission line alternatives and option routes including identification of a preferred alternative, easements, transmission line components, and estimated project cost.

Chapter 3, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures, received most of the comments (61 percent). Comments were in the following areas: land use (9 percent); recreation (0.4 percent); visual resources (9 percent); water resources, floodplains, and wetlands (3 percent); wildlife (48 percent); fish (0.8 percent); cultural resources (3 percent); socioeconomics (6 percent); transportation (3 percent); public health and safety (11 percent); greenhouse gases (0.8 percent); and cumulative impacts (4 percent).

The remaining comments consisted of comments made on the Appendices (CNF Plan Amendment) and other miscellaneous comments.
Table 2-1. List of Correspondence and Commenters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Log No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation/State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0001</td>
<td>Bruce Harris</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0002</td>
<td>James Joyner</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0003</td>
<td>Terry Hatch</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0004</td>
<td>R. Mitchell</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0005</td>
<td>Richard Steffens</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0006</td>
<td>Scott Brown</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0007</td>
<td>Chris Bauer</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0008</td>
<td>Jerry Eichhorst</td>
<td>Idaho Chapter Oregon-California Trails Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0009</td>
<td>Byron Knutsen</td>
<td>Oregon-California Trails Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0010</td>
<td>Alan Prouty</td>
<td>J.R. Simplot Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0011</td>
<td>Gary Miller</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0012</td>
<td>Marie Miller</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0013</td>
<td>Ruth Shea</td>
<td>Trumpeter Swan Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0014</td>
<td>Roderick Drewien</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0015</td>
<td>Theogene Mbabaliye</td>
<td>U.S. EPA, Region 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0016</td>
<td>John Robison</td>
<td>Idaho Conservation League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0017</td>
<td>Adonia Henry</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0018</td>
<td>Al Kackley</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0020</td>
<td>Nisa Marks</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0021</td>
<td>James Crawford</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0022</td>
<td>John Chatburn</td>
<td>Idaho Governor’s Office of Energy Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0024</td>
<td>Ross Wilde</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0025</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0026</td>
<td>Craig Christensen</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0027</td>
<td>Al and Ellis Kackley</td>
<td>Idaho Foundation for Parks and Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0028</td>
<td>Caribou County</td>
<td>Caribou County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– 6/25-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0029</td>
<td>Caribou County</td>
<td>Caribou County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– 9-24-2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0030</td>
<td>Randy Thompson</td>
<td>Bureau of Indian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSTP13 0031</td>
<td>Andrea Santarsiere</td>
<td>Greater Yellowstone Coalition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Response to Comments on the Draft EIS

This section of Volume 2 provides BPA’s responses to the comments received on the draft EIS. These comments, and responses to each comment, are organized by chapter/section generally in accordance with the table of contents of the draft and supplemental EISs.

Purpose of and Need for Action (Chapter 1)

Need for Action

Comment: Please better define the purpose and need for the project. Please identify whether the proposed line is designed primarily to accommodate additional electrical demand, or to provide redundancy in the grid. If the latter, please explain how the proposed project accomplishes the goal of increased transmission system reliability (i.e. the relationship between redundancy and reliability). [HSTP13 0020]

Comment: It is incumbent on BPA to provide a thorough explanation of the need for this transmission line to the citizens in Caribou County.

Response: Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for Action of the EIS, describes the need for the project. Additional information about the project need has been added to Chapter 1 to further explain the need for the project. As described in Section 1.1 of the EIS, a new 115-kV transmission line would primarily address the current voltage stability and reliability concerns while also accommodating additional electrical demand during peak system loads on the southern portion of LVE’s transmission system. Voltage instability could occur if there is an outage on LVE’s Palisades – Snake River transmission line during peak system loads in winter. This type of situation is typically described as a single contingency that BPA must account for when planning and operating the transmission grid to prevent violation of NERC Reliability Standards. If LVE’s Palisades-Snake River transmission line did experience an outage, low voltage conditions would exist at Teton, Tincup and Snake River Substations if the problem is not fixed by January 2014. Additionally, LVE’s Teton – Wilson and Palisades – Swan Valley transmission lines are expected to reach 101% of their thermal capacity by winter and summer 2015. If a line reaches its thermal capacity then it must be shut down possibly causing outages to customers. Shutting a line down may have ripple effects in the system that could increase loading on other lines that would require they also be shut down resulting in additional outages to customers.

A secondary need for the line is to provide redundancy in the transmission system in SE Idaho/NW Wyoming. Currently all of the transmission lines for the FREC and LVE service areas from West Yellowstone, Montana south to Afton, Wyoming originate from PacifiCorp’s Goshen Substation. If a major power failure occurs at Goshen Substation, then a second transmission line into the SE Idaho area would help alleviate major outages to customers of FREC and LVE.
Comment: When you talked about this is in response to a perceived instability in your grid, is this instability currently in your grid or is it a proposed or an expected instability that will arise in the future? And this is premised on population growth for this region? How big of a region are we talking about? Eastern Idaho, all of Idaho, part of Wyoming? [HSTP13 0028]

Comment: Why is it [the line] unreliable right now? [HSTP13 0029]

Response: As discussed in Chapter 1 of the EIS, the current transmission system is reliable and there is not a current instability issue on the grid. Based on system conditions, the first system instability could occur as early as January 2014, as described above.

Concerning the role of population growth in load growth, the transmission system planning studies that BPA performs take into account overall electrical use in the area. Electrical use in the area includes not only population growth but also other factors such as new generation projects and new industrial loads. In general, the area considered in the planning studies included southern Montana, eastern Idaho and Western Wyoming. The area spans approximately 13,000 square miles and includes Jackson, Wyoming and Driggs, Idaho as well as many small remote areas such as West Yellowstone, Montana and Afton, Wyoming.

Comment: Well, have you ever had a collapse of it [the system]? [HSTP13 0029]

Comment: Has that ever happened that you have had to drop people off [the system]? Where at? [HSTP13 0029]

Response: To date, there has not been any instances of a collapse of the transmission system in the project area, and BPA has not had to drop customers off the system to maintain reliability. System instability has not occurred because WECC criteria mandates that BPA design and operate the system in a way that does not allow for collapse in case a critical outage occurs under peak loading. However, as discussed, in Chapter 1 of the EIS, stability and reliability problems are projected to occur in the near future without implementation of the proposed project.

Comment: I’m wondering – I haven’t studied the whole thing, but I’m wondering how much need there really is for this line? I mean, we’ve been getting along forever without this line. I just wonder how important it really is? If we’re really short on power or if maybe Jackson out to quit heating $7 million homes. [HSTP13 0025]

Comment: So the perception of instability with this particular 32-mile line could potentially be something you are looking at 20, 25 years in the future? So it could be unnecessary if population were to decline or remain static? But didn't you say right now you're projecting the instability will start showing up about 2014? [HSTP13 0028]

Comment: Why has oil dropped down 8 percent just this week? I mean -- I mean energy costs are going down because there's no demand for 'em and you are telling us we're going up 3 percent. This does not make sense. [HSTP13 0029]
Comment: So then everything -- I mean, if everything were to stay constant, we'd be okay? Okay. So then why are we putting the new line in? So there is some growth then? Okay. But I haven't seen any of this growth. Where is it happening? Is it Jackson Hole? Due to the recession, this growth has not happened. So we're in a recession and you're saying your demand has gone up 3 percent? Does that make sense, really? [HSTP13 0029]

Response: The reasons for why the project is needed are described in Chapter 1 of the EIS. As discussed in previous responses, BPA transmission planners study the entire transmission system in this area as a whole. The transmission system in this area covers all of SE Idaho and NW Wyoming. BPA studies the transmission system very closely at 5 and 10 year intervals to insure the system can handle any expected load growth. While expected electrical load growth in Jackson Hole is a factor, load growth has occurred and is expected to occur throughout the study area, regardless of variations over time in fuel prices. Chapter 1 of the EIS has been updated to better reflect the current expected range of load growth rate that could occur and to better explain when potential stability and reliability problems on the system could occur.

Comment: So how far out do you project your -- your need to where it affects your infrastructure to stabilize your grid?[HSTP13 0028]

Response: As discussed above, BPA transmission planning engineers study the transmission system at 5 and 10 year intervals to determine system stability and needs during times of peak loading. Any predictions further out than that would be difficult to determine and are considered speculative. However, it is expected that the proposed project would avoid the need for any further large transmission projects in the area for the foreseeable future.

Comment: I'm sure you're aware that Simplot will be closing its Smoky Mine out there in Smoky Canon. That's where the line goes from the substation down Tenco. It goes south from there and it goes over to Smoky Canon and supplies Simplot's energy needs. And I'm a little bit curious as to why it can't be put off for another couple of years while they're closing that mine down and use that energy rather than create a new line through undisturbed property? Well, you mentioned that this new line is going to be hooked up to Lower Valley Energy, and I believe it's Lower Valley Energy that does supply the power to Simplot. And it looks like that would be an available resource rather than creating another one. [HSTP13 0028]

Comment: My first question is: What about the power that will be coming from the Simplot mine in two years when they close down that will no longer be used? Is that something that can go into the system and be distributed? They use an awful lot of power up there and they're going to be closing down. What will happen to the power wattage that was used at Simplot?[HSTP13 0029]
Response: As noted in Chapter 1 and in responses above, the proposed transmission line is needed for future peak demand based on projected load growth in the entire SE Idaho/NW Wyoming area. The reduction in power demand from the planned closure of Simplot’s Smoky Mine does not have a large enough impact on overall expected peak loads within the southern portion of LVE’s transmission system to change planning study results or the need for the proposed line.

Comment: But that line is beyond where you are connecting in. If you lose that line on the other side, what difference does it make if you build this line at all? I’m not getting that. [HSTP13 0025]

Comment: If it’s all coming from the Palisades, why do we need it to come through here? [HSTP13 0025]

Comment: It doesn’t continue to loop the other way? Where it goes into Idaho Falls, is that where it’s going? That loop doesn’t continue back around to Palisades? [HSTP13 0025]

Comment: Wouldn’t that feed if this line down on Palisades goes out? [HSTP13 0025]

Response: As noted above, the proposed transmission lines would provide redundancy to the SE Idaho and NW Wyoming transmission system. The proposed Hooper Springs Substation and transmission lines would provide another transmission path for the power in the event the connection to Palisades Dam through Snake River Substation is lost or overloaded. The transmission system loop that BPA is proposing to connect into feeds LVE’s Lanes Creek, Valley and Tincup substations in Caribou County in addition to LVE’s Freedom, Bedford, Grover, Afton 1 and Dry Creek substations in Wyoming. The proposed transmission lines would also provide another line to LVE and FREC customers in case a major power failure occurred at PacifiCorp’s Goshen Substation.

Comment: The need for new transmission in the Northwest has been well documented and this project represents an opportunity to enhance the reliability of the region’s electric power grid. The new Hooper Springs-Lower Valley 115-kilovolt (kV) transmission line proposed by the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is designed to maintain voltage stability and accommodate load growth. Knowing that additional transmission capacity will be available in the future factors into Idaho’s every planning goals and increases opportunities for economic development. [HSTP13 0010]

Response: Comment noted.
Purpose of Action

Comment: So these people won’t get any benefit, except maybe up the power rates from what they are now? [HSTP13 0025]

Comment: What benefit is it? That’s what Mrs. Torgesen just said. What benefit do we get out of it, other than if you do access a private property with monetary return? Are there other benefits? [HSTP13 0025]

Comment: I don’t see where it’s going to benefit this community ever. The power is already here and you’re going to move it from here somewhere else. [HSTP13 0025]

Comment: I want you people to know that you have been to my home twice. We have been out to Clark Valley to the cattle range. I have not really heard anything here much today that we haven’t discussed with your crew. That being said, they were very nice to me, but I have not found one iota of a thing that will benefit me from this line going through. I told them that when they came and I haven’t change my mind. But I do want you to know that they have treated me very nicely. Thank you. [HSTP13 0025]

Response: The benefit to Caribou County residents would be continued reliable electrical service from their local power provider during times of peak loads. Additionally, customers of LVE and FREC would see the most benefit because the proposed transmission lines would provide another transmission line into their area helping to alleviate major outages to those customers. Also, Hooper Springs Substation would be designed and constructed with room to expand if additional service to the City of Soda Springs is needed in the future.

Comment: When you say northern California, how far south does that go? Does it take San Francisco? So basically it’s Oregon, Washington, some in California, Idaho? [HSTP13 0029]

Comment: Now, is it possible, once you get this line in, that you are going to be able to transmit more electricity into a higher-priced market such as Portland or Seattle; is that what we’re playing with here? [HSTP13 0029]

Comment: This project is to provide power running to the east; is that not correct? Isn’t it true most of it’s going to Jackson Hole? Have we looked at bringing power to this area from the east, like, into Wyoming and bringing it this way? [HSTP13 0028]

Comment: I can’t happen to think that you got 50 million bucks or whatever you are talking about, you’re going to ship this power somehow into a higher-priced market because I am assuming that Seattle and Portland and maybe some of the larger cities pay more for their power than we do here. And that’s what you are enabling this thing to happen. [HSTP13 0029]

Comment: You’ll purchase it from them [Rocky Mountain Power] and move it somewhere else.
Response: As discussed in Chapter 1 and above, the project is needed to address voltage stability and reliability concerns on LVE’s transmission system. Project purposes do not include transmission of power to other areas outside of the SE Idaho/NW Wyoming area.

Comment: The other question that was jotted down here, I know when the big power line went up through Lanes Creek, those people were pretty excited because they thought they were going to get power. Once the line was through, no, we can’t take power down from a big line like that. And probably the only reason they got permission and got cooperation is they thought they could get power, which is another dishonesty. So how easy will power be to access from this line you’re putting through? [HSTP13 0018]

Response: Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for Action, describes how LVE and other utilities are customers of BPA who purchase all, or almost all, of the electric power required to serve their electrical loads from BPA. Residential customers would still receive electricity from their current provider but the new transmission lines would mean the electrical system in SE Idaho/NW Wyoming is more reliable.

Comment: Is the power that you are going to (inaudible) over this line, is that excess power that you have on hand now or are you going to have to create that somehow? [HSTP13 0028]

Response: The power source to the proposed Hooper Springs Substation would be purchased by BPA from PacifiCorp’s 345-kV system at their Three Mile Knoll Substation. This power would offset power that is currently being purchased from Goshen Substation.

Public Involvement

Comment: A question about your formal meeting that you intend to have. Is this going to be a meeting that will have a moderator and will have minutes and questions and answers in an organized forum or is this going to be another kind of walk-about and chat with the folks there? I just question how comments and questions of the audience can be recorded and addressed, you know, and kept other than just from memory if there isn't minutes taken and, you know, a formal question-and-answer? [HSTP13 0029]

Response: BPA held a public meeting in April 2013 to gather comments on the draft EIS. The meeting was a combination open-house style and question and answer session. Audience members provided verbal comment during the question and answer session which was recorded by a court reporter. All comments gathered at the public meeting have been responded to in Volume 2 of this supplemental draft EIS and also have helped to inform project design and development and identification of the preferred alternative (the South Alternative’s Option 3A).
Comment: This is the last meeting I could find in this document that showed that there was a public meeting where input was recorded. I know that I attended on meeting and I know there was a meeting afterwards that my brother and others that I’ve spoken to attended that has not been mentioned in this document at all. And some very fine concerns were raised at that meeting. [HSTP13 0025]

Comment: I am wondering if the comments and questions, technical and philosophical, that were presented at that meeting are going to be recorded on this? Was there any record of any of that or did everything that was expressed just go out the window? [HSTP13 0025]

Response: BPA attended two Caribou County Commissioner meetings in June and September 2012 to describe and give an update on the Hooper Springs Transmission Project. Since it was not BPA’s meeting, we did not gather comments. However, all comments and responses were recorded by a Caribou County court reporter and those have been posted in their entirety on BPA’s Hooper Springs Transmission Project website: http://www.efw.bpa.gov/environmental_services/Document_Library/HooperSprings/. Responses to these comments are also included in Volume 2 of this supplemental draft EIS.

Comment: You've talked about a lot of things here and you got a lot of holes in your program, a lot of things that you haven't done that could be done to alleviate the concerns that we're expressing here today. Are you going to do anything about this or are you just giving us lip service? I think we need to have at least one more meeting on this to find out what you've done with these suggestions and holes that we're finding that you haven't done. [HSTP13 0028]

Response: BPA held a project update meeting in September 2013 to provide an opportunity for the public to gather additional information and have their questions answered regarding the current alternatives. The meeting was open-house style with BPA and contractor engineering, realty, and environmental staff available to answer questions. Feedback from this meeting was incorporated into the project design and considered in the development and identification of the preferred alternative.

Comment: So have you been in contact with all of the private landowners that have property on the proposed route? So they're all aware of how to get ahold of you with their concerns about this thing? If someone has concerns and they feel like they haven't had the appropriate opportunity to express those, what would you recommend they do at this point? [HSTP13 0028]

Comment: Both routes (North and South) being considered by BPA cross private property. We believe that it is very important for BPA to work carefully with private landowners to address concerns regardless of the ultimate route chosen. [HSTP13 0010]
Response: BPA has reached out to all private and public landowners along both North and South alternatives and route options. Additionally, BPA has encourage landowners and other interested parties to contact the project manager or realty specialists to address concerns including arranging face-to-face meetings.

Comment: Just one suggestion. I think that what the attitude of most of the folks here, when you bring more people back, it probably would be good if they were straight talk and not super polished, you know, to gloss over something just -- I don't think anybody is going to buy -- I think you've probably figured that out. Nobody is going to buy a well --well-spoken excuse. Whatever it is, I would hope that there would be some straight talk on what some alternatives can be, what some possibilities could be and how everybody could work this out so it's satisfactory. [HSTP13 0028]

Comment: I think this -- what we would like to see is -- the public here -- is just some consideration and some coordination. And I don't think there's anybody here that's really wanting to see the power project stopped, but we'd certainly like to see an appropriate route taken, one that has less impact on -- on individual landowners and one that, we think, should be more cost-effective to go the shorter route. Maybe it won't be. I'm not an engineer and I don't know. But we'd like to see it done with some sort of sense rather than a bureaucracy at work.[HSTP13 0029]

Response: Comment noted. BPA has worked extensively to coordinate with the public – and in particular potentially affected landowners – concerning the proposed project, and has used valuable information from this coordination in its analysis of the project alternatives as well as in identifying the agency’s preferred alternative. BPA also has attempted to provide information to the public in as even-handed and straight-forward fashion as possible. BPA intends to continue this approach throughout the environmental review process.

Comment: And I want to be sure that everybody understands that in addition to being a state Senator, I also have a real job and I work for Agrium U.S. Industries. I'm not here on their behalf. They didn't ask me to be here today. And I haven't had any discussions with BPA over power line routes. And, Eric, I don't know who you've talked to in our company, but I'd be happy to facilitate some of the discussions and conversations if we need to go there. And I don't know if the southern route is the best route. I brought a series of questions up just to make sure that we have considered all options and that we've made sure that if we're not going that route that there is a better route. So I'd make that offer to you, Eric, to facilitate some discussions with some people in our company. And I haven't been involved in any discussions, even inside our company, on this route, but I can find the right people to talk to.[HSTP13 0029]

Response: Comment noted. Thank you.
**Comment:** I live at Wayan at the end of Gravel Creek Road. And when you are talking about your preliminary workup, I -- we’ve been told all along that we would seek permission to go on your land. On July 15, my daughter and I found surveyors just east of my property, a fence to the south and a fence to the west. And I said to the Adam Dell, who was the head guy – kid there, I said, What are you doing on my property? And he said, I'm surveying. I'm on forest land property. I said, You are not on forest land property. And I would like you guys -- to invite you out and show you where my cattle are -- are grazing and look at the -- the cow pies and this is the area they were in and it is my property. [HSTP13 0029]

**Comment:** I am from Wayan and I just have a couple of quick questions and one statement. My one statement: I think there’s several people in the valley that they’ve trespassed on that has not given permission besides Madelyn with pictures, other people have that they’ve been. That's my statement. [HSTP13 0029]

**Response:** Comment noted. It is not BPA’s policy to allow trespassing of any sort by its employees or contractors.

---

**Proposed Project and Alternatives (Chapter 2)**

**General Comments**

**Comment:** I would just be asking -- well, but is this still just a proposal? If we let y'all in the easement and study it, it's not cut-and-dried that you are going to do that?[HSTP13 0029]

**Response:** Yes, at this point in time, BPA has not made a decision on whether or not to build the proposed line and it is still a proposal. In addition, all alternatives and options described in detail in the EIS are being considered by BPA for this proposal. Because of this, if a landowner allows BPA access to their property to conduct studies for the proposed project, this does not mean that BPA will choose to build the project, let alone build it on a route that would cross that landowner’s property.

**Comment:** OER objects to BPA’s failure to disclose various alternatives in the Draft EIS. This includes BPA’s consideration of the Blackfoot River Wildlife Management Area as alternative on the southern route. Understanding that BPA has certain time restrictions, OER believe that a complete and full discussion of all relevant options is necessary for high-quality decision-making. By not including this and potentially other alternatives, interested stakeholders are limited in the amount of helpful feedback they can provide to BPA. [HSTP13 0022]

**Response:** BPA believes that it has sufficiently discussed potential alternatives for the proposed action in the draft EIS, including both those alternatives considered in detail and those alternatives considered but eliminated from detailed study. Regarding a proposed reroute on the Blackfoot River WMA, BPA has revised the draft EIS and prepared and issued a supplemental
draft EIS to address this reroute, which is referred to as Option 3A. BPA has worked with all interested parties to gather feedback for all route options, including Option 3A. The project update meeting held in September 2013 was an opportunity for the public to gather additional information about the proposed WMA reroute and other routes, and have their questions answered by BPA. Feedback from this meeting was incorporated into the project design and considered in the decision making process.

Comment:  Because the Draft EIS does not address all feasible alternatives, does not accurately present resources and detailed mitigation actions for the public to comment on, and does not included a preferred alternative, BPA should prepare a supplemental draft EIS according to § 1021.314 before a final EIS is published. [HSTP13 0017]

Comment:  GYC commented on the initial scoping for this proposal; however, we did not comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”) because none of the proposed alternatives would have located the transmission line within the WMA. The new alignment of the proposed line differs greatly from any of the line locations proposed in the DEIS, which was released for public comment this past March. Should BPA wish to relocate the transmission line so that it passes through the WMA, BPA must release a supplemental environmental impact statement to disclose the impacts of this change. [HSTP13 0031]

Comment:  Thus, if a modification may substantially change the environmental impacts of a project, the agency must reevaluate and reveal the new effects.

In sum, a supplemental NEPA analysis is generally required if changes proposed will cause significant environmental impacts.

In the case at hand, BPA is proposing to change the location of the transmission line to cross through a significant portion of the WMA, a change that will undoubtedly lead to significant environmental impacts that were never analyzed in a NEPA document that would appropriately inform the agencies and the public of the project impacts.

All of these values may be significantly impacted by the location change proposed by the BPA. For this reason, BPA may not move forward with this new proposal without first issuing a supplemental EIS that fully discloses and analyzes the environmental impacts of the new alternative. [HSTP13 0031]

Response:  As discussed in the previous response, BPA has prepared this supplemental draft EIS to include detailed analysis of Option 3A and provide the opportunity to comment on this routing option for all interested parties. BPA believes that the EIS adequately addresses all feasible alternatives for the proposed action and sufficiently describes the affected environment and possible mitigation measures to allow meaningful public comment. While identification of the agency’s preferred alternative in a draft EIS is not required under NEPA, BPA has nonetheless identified its preferred alternative in the supplemental draft EIS (see Section 2.7 of Volume 1).
**North Alternative**

**Comment:** My concern is with the northern route. On the maps it’s page 29-1 where my parcel is depicted. I just wanted to provide that information for the BPA people so they can zero in on that more quickly. And perhaps look at a route realignment and pulling the line south a little bit away from my four acre property. Plus taking the access further south on the lower two existing offramps that are there. [HSTP13 0025]

**Comment:** If we could make a new PI from Tower 30-2, and then route that southwesterly to Tower 28-8, that would help pull the power line southerly, away from the smaller parcel. And it would increase the access from the two routes southerly along Highway 34 as visited with our right-of-way – our access people this evening here at the meeting. [HSTP13 0025]

**Comment:** It seems to me that access through this four acre property is an overburden and an expectation beyond something that is practical. I would like to see a revision in the route should the north route be chosen. [HSTP13 0025]

**Response:** BPA has worked with the landowner and further analyzed this area. Design changes have been made to move the proposed transmission line location slightly southeast and to modify the access road to enter the property from an existing highway approach. This change would mean that the four acre property mentioned by the commenter would not be divided by the line and access road. Additionally, BPA has identified the South Alternative’s Option 3A as the preferred alternative which would not cross this landowners land.

**Comment:** My family is involved in farming north of Soda Springs, ID. The proposed “Northern Route” as originally proposed crosses nearly 6 miles of our land. We are probably, by far, the most effected farmers in the area. Given that we as a human race need and depend on a safe, reliable, and affordable supply of electrical power, we do not oppose the “Northern Route” as originally proposed. We would ask, as landowners, that the power line be placed ON the property line where two different landowners join, and that the poles be placed as close as possible to rural county roads. We would ask that the poles, where possible, be placed on or borderer natural rock outcroppings, in an effort to minimize the impact on our farming operations. We would also request that when crossing thru the middle of a field, that you run the pole line “true” north and south, or “true” east and west, as to facilitate our use of GPS guidance systems on our equipment. [HSTP13 0006]

**Response:** BPA has worked with the landowner and further analyzed this area. Additionally, BPA has identified the South Alternative’s Option 3A as the preferred alternative which would not cross this landowners land.

**Comment:** Why don’t you just follow Highway 34? [HSTP13 0028]
Response: An alternative that followed Highway 34 from the proposed Hooper Springs Substation to Lanes Creek Substation was reviewed in the early stages of project planning. However because Grays Lake Wildlife Refuge is so close to the highway in this area, it was assumed impacts to migratory birds traveling to and from the refuge would be high. This alternative also would have added mileage to the transmission line which would mean higher costs and potentially higher overall environmental impacts.

Comment: The North Alternative crosses state endowment trust land between markers 11 and 15. The Long Valley road option does not cross state endowment land. It is IDL’s preference that this project avoid state endowment land. [HSTP13 0022]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: You've got a substation up there off of 34 about Tenco; is that correct? But isn't that the one where this line will eventually tap into?[HSTP13 0029]

Comment: There's a substation there (inaudible). Now, is this line not more efficient to go directly into a substation than tapping in the line down below? Isn't that what the bottom line of this thing is? Why don't you build a substation down there -- how expensive are they – so that the southern route could tap into a substation right there?[HSTP13 0029]

Comment: But it's easier for your line to tap into a substation rather than just get the line similar from the southern route? So that's why we're going the northern route because that's easier to do?[HSTP13 0029]

Comment: He was talking about if you go the southern route, you were going to tie into the end of that line. They've got the substation down on Highway 34 in the Lane's Creek area. If that's going to be a problem, they could move that substation to the other end of the line so you can tie back into the sub on that (inaudible) –[HSTP13 0028]

Response: A proposal to connect into Lanes Creek Substation is part of the North Alternative that BPA is evaluating. In general, it is more reliable to connect into a substation rather than tap an existing line and essentially extend the line. However in this case, in the location where BPA is proposing to tap the existing LVE line it would be difficult to operate and maintain a substation because of harsh winter conditions with poor access.

Comment: As described above, the increased impacts that result from the north alternative need to be more thoroughly and accurately described so that 1) BPA can make more informed decisions and 2) local residents, visitors to the region, the general public, and local, state, and federal agencies can evaluate the impacts of all feasible alternatives. [HSTP13 0017]
Response: Comment noted. BPA believes that the EIS adequately describes and analyzes the potential impacts associated with the North Alternative, and that this analysis allows decision makers, the public, and others to understand the impacts of the alternatives considered in the EIS.

---

Comment: After reviewing the written materials and the plat map, it is apparent that if the “Northern Route” is selected, there will be an adverse impact and “taking” of the westerly 100’ of the farm property which is adjacent to and extends north along Highway 34, and as the highway proceeds northward.

Of the three (3) available options, it is the position, and request of the William Meads Trust that the proposed high voltage transmission line be submitted as a “no-action alternative” proposal. However, if it is determined that the power line project is going to be approve and constructed, then, the William Meads Trust requests that the construction be pursuant to the “Southern Route” alternative. [HSTP13 0026]

Response: Comment noted.

---

South Alternative

Comment: Eric, in the last meeting in June, the contention was made that the transmission line would go -- that if you would take that southern route, you would have to travel across some of the historic mining sites that were CERCLA sites. It would look like from that map there was a route where you could skirt all of those. Sometimes the corridors are pretty narrow, but it looked like there were some corridors where you could stay out of those sites. Have you looked at doing that and, if so, why are you dismissing that option? Are you still doing some work to see if that's a viable option? [HSTP13 0029]

Comment: Eric, just looking at the map, it looks like there would be a way to realize most of the southern route and bypass the mines. I don't know the geology or the topography of that area. I’m guessing there’s probably other obstacles to doing that, but do you know that for sure that you couldn't reroute this around the mines and if you could still make that work? [HSTP13 0028]

Comment: My concern is I live in Wayan. We've got a place there in Wayan and you're bringing that thing within 100 feet of our house, our home. I believe it's 400. Pardon me. (Inaudible) the strip's 100 feet. It's going to be 400 feet from our house. Okay. But what we're saying is, yeah, we need that line or you need the line or whatever, but with a little work and effort and negotiations, from what we were seeing it there, take that southern route and -- as the Senator over here said -- move the -- move it so you're not going across the mining and all that threat that you're worried about. Do a little more work and then it solves the problem and Wayan won't have to deal with this thing. [HSTP13 0029]
**Comment:** Couldn’t you come farther to the south on a lot of the public land and stay on Forest Service ground without getting the mines involved? I think from just looking at the crowd here, we have a lot of people that this is going to be in their backyard and I think that’s probably why a lot of ’em’s here is to -- they’re wondering why it has to be right through their area out there. [HSTP13 0028]

**Comment:** Now, as I -- I got to get the Monsanto people involved. A lot of those streams run north and south with the mountains with the ore seams and a lot of the mine sites that I’ve seen in my experience are -- I don’t know -- 1,000 feet wide, maybe, at the most. But they -- you know, they follow that seam down and it seems to be quite narrow to me. Although they have other acreage around on each side in this developable right, can’t there be agreements reached where they could -- you know, we could take from ridge to ridge or identify where the ore seams are known to be and plan to be mined in the future and couldn’t you more closely coordinate with them in a way that would be constructive to hop and skip over their concerns so you wouldn’t have to move the line again or have any concerns like that? [HSTP13 0029]

**Comment:** if you look at this map, just swing it around a little bit and it all goes away. Avoid the mines, avoid all this stuff, change the direction a little bit and you don’t even need to bother us up here. [HSTP13 0028]

**Response:** As described above, BPA evaluated three alternatives plus route options during the NEPA process. During project scoping, while BPA did eliminate alternatives that did not meet the purpose and need, the South Alternative and options were not among those eliminated. BPA has continued to study and refine the South Alternative and its options during preparation of the supplemental draft EIS including how best to avoid possible CERCLA sites and active mines. As discussed in Section 2.7, BPA has identified the South Alternative’s Option 3A as the preferred alternative. See Sections 3.1.1, Land Use, and 3.13, Public Health and Safety for further discussion of issues related to current and former mining sites.

**Comment:** That southern or shorter route, that goes -- it’s up -- and I haven’t been out there for years, I have to apologize -- but that runs close to a county road now where your trucks could follow that if you had a problem out there. Is that not true? Or a good part of it does anyway.[HSTP13 0028]

**Response:** The commenter is correct in that the South Alternative and some its options do parallel Blackfoot River Road most of the way to Blackfoot River Narrows which would provide adequate access to the line similar to the North Alternative where it travels along Highway 34.

**Comment:** Well, you guys are going through ground that’s been there for generation after generation. I mean, our ancestors would just roll over in their graves if they could see what you’re doing. And we’ve got -- now, we’ve got to look at it for the rest of our lives. You know, it would be one thing, though, if you were going -- had a proposed line that went straight over that valley, then we could almost thank you for doing what you could to go around this. But I still
think going about twice as far, I think you should be able to do some -- if you've got really good lawyers, you should be able to arrive at something that would protect you and build it straighter, a shorter route. [HSTP13 0028]

Response: See response above regarding BPA’s continued refinement of the South Alternative and route options.

Comment: This letter is in reference to BPA’s proposed transmission project’s South Alternative and the effect and impact this specific route alternative will have pursuant to the farm and ranch property owned by the Mark J. & Beth Carter Family.

Accompanying this letter are copies of three Aerial Photomaps showing pole and transmission line locations which were presented by BPA at the April 3, 2013 meeting held in Soda Springs, Idaho; ref. Sheets 13, 14, and 15: 4/1/13. At this meeting, Ross Wilde (Carter Family representative) reviewed and discussed these maps with various BPA members of staff. Ross expressed some of the Carter Family concerns and discussed the previous farming history that is visibly obvious. Given the route and pole locations as drawn on these three maps it appears the Carter Family could accept this plan. Of concern is the initial and extended impact to the ranch’s homestead which is located close to the power line.

The Carter Family owns two full sections (640 acres ea.) of property that would be effected by the line route as shown on the Arial Photomaps. The East section would have one pole in the S/E corner of the section and the West section would have four poles in the S/W corner of that section near the homestead. Considering the variety of agricultural options and potential with the land and water, any other route option or pole location effecting these two sections of Carter property is not acceptable and will be adamantly opposed. [HSTP13 0024]

Response: BPA has worked with the landowner and further analyzed this area. Design changes have been made to the proposed transmission line and access roads locations to reduce impacts to the landowner.

No Action Alternative

Comment: I’m affiliated with property that’s on the south route, so I can empathize with Mr. and Mrs. Hunsaker, the impact that it’s has on ranchers out there. The one question that I would like to have BPA address is in your one letter here it says, “BPA is also considering a no action alternative. That is BPA would not build the transmission line.”

I would like to have you elaborate on that a little bit. To have that put in there they way that is, that has to be a consideration that you’re addressing. Does that mean there’s another line or another route or another option that isn’t part of this? [HSTP13 0025]
Response: BPA always considers the No Action Alternative as a possible solution to meet a project’s purpose and need. However, as described in Sections 2.4 and 2.6 of the EIS, without a new line, voltage stability and reliability problems on the transmission grid in SE Idaho/NW Wyoming could continue. Additionally, the growing energy requirements in this area may not be met. In this case, the No Action Alternative would not meet the project’s purpose and need.

Comment: I could say right now, by a show of hands, the no build would get a hundred percent. Ready? Well, I guess maybe not a hundred percent.

Response: Comment noted.

Easements and Land

Comment: I think what my last question would be when you estimated your costs, how did you estimate what the compensation was going to be for the private landowners? And what I'm saying is you have an estimate of 40 to $50 million to come around and I don't think you've taken into consideration what it's likely to cost you to compensate the landowners. Because I guarantee you, we've been through this before with the Lander Trail and we won our case at that point. We did not accept the low-ball figure that was given to us. And I don't think anybody in this room is going to accept the low-ball figure that you guys are going to throw out. We're going to have to look at this thing for the rest of our lives, for our children's lives, and very few people in this room ever intend to sell their land. We -- most of us have children who will inherit this land and we really don't want to look at a 100-foot swath of power lines going through what -- when my father's estate was appraised -- was designated the highest and best use was the pristine value of the land and recreation or greater. So you are just voiding the appraised value of our land that we have actual appraisals on this land which that's what they say the best use of the land is. But you're not only destroying our values, you're destroying other people's values whom you're not touching because they have to look at it, too. So I think you'd better take that into consideration when you give your ballpark figures because there isn't anybody in this room who's given you permission to even come in and survey. And if you're going to use eminent domain, which I think is probably the only way you're going to get this ground, you know, there will be something other than low ballpark. You need to go across the land that's already been ruined by the mining, not ruin. [HSTP13 0028]

Response: If the decision is made to construct the transmission line along the preferred alternative, BPA would seek to purchase easements across private land. Each parcel would be properly evaluated and appraised to determine the fair market value. BPA would provide an appraisal on each easement it proposes to acquire. Each land owner would be given the opportunity to accompany the appraiser and provide input into the appraisal.
Comment: If any routing option selected by BPA crosses state land, there will be a need for BPA to work with the relevant state authority as well as OER on appropriate site specific mitigation. [HSTP13 0022]

Response: Comment noted. If BPA makes the decision to construct a new transmission line, we would work with the relevant state authority and OER to mitigate impacts to state lands if they are crossed.

---

Comment: Any routes that cross state endowment land must be located to minimize impact to the remainder of the parcel. A 20-year term easement would be the authorizing instrument issued to allow the project ton trust land. Application for use can be obtained from any IDL office. [HSTP13 0022]

Response: Comment noted.

---

Comment: And when you said you were going to take out a single pole when it goes across cropland and when it comes across grazing lands, you are going to go back to the double pole? And that will still be 100 feet? And the road would be in that 100 feet, too?[HSTP13 0028]

Response: As described in Chapter 2, BPA is proposing to use steel single pole structures in agricultural areas. For the North Alternative, once the line leaves these areas, structures would change to double wood pole structures. For the South Alternative, all proposed structures would be steel single pole structures.

Also described in Chapter 2, is BPA’s standard easement 100 foot easement for a 115-kV transmission line (for both single- and double-circuit transmission line). This width is based on the typical swing of the conductor and electrical clearance needed to maintain public safety. The access roads would require a 20 to 50 foot easement based on the topography and layout of the access road. Not all access roads would be located within the transmission line ROW. Placement of roads is also based on topography and the availability of existing roads.

---

Comment: The other thing, I’ve never heard anybody say that if this goes across private property what you’ll pay to have each pole and what you’ll pay for a right-of-way. [HSTP13 0025]

Comment: I want to know the impact on the landowners. You mentioned that some landowners have accepted $500 in compensation. Is that just for access to their property during this preliminary phase? This isn't -- this isn't an easement for the transmission line if you should decide to build there, is it? So eventually if the transmission line were built across private property, is there compensation to the landowner? [HSTP13 0028]
**Comment:** So this will be a one-time fee to these landowners, a one-time payment – [HSTP13 0028]

**Comment:** Your compensation agreement (inaudible) will it be a one-time – a one-time fee to the landowners or will you be paying them based on the rate of how much power is going to be going across the line on an annual basis? [HSTP13 0028]

**Response:** BPA has offered to pay landowners 500 dollars to gain access to their property for civil and environmental surveys. This payment is a one-time payment and has absolutely no relationship to any future easement negotiations between BPA and the landowner. Any easement payments made in the future would also be a one-time payment for a perpetual easement on the property.

---

**Comment:** I’ve never seen an environmental impact study before. I was shocked at the easements. And you’re going to get one bite at the apple when you give up the easement. This will be on your land forever. I want to just warn you, from all of these restrictions, make sure that it’s a big apple and that you get a damn big bite, because there won’t be any second bite. They have it when they take that easement. [HSTP13 0025]

**Comment:** Mr. Kackley’s comments on the easements and the right-of-ways that will be granted and the impact on the trees is just tremendous. I had no understanding that it was going to be that wide and that invasive into the surrounding properties. [HSTP13 0025]

**Response:** As described above, the proposed transmission line easement width would be 100 feet wide for both the North and South alternatives and options. Easements for access roads that fall outside the transmission line easement would be 20 to 50 foot wide.

---

**Comment:** And if the landowner didn’t want to negotiate an agreement, ultimately what happens? Do you take the property? Do you take the easement through eminent domain and force it to happen? You don’t want to do that, but is that ultimately an option that you would consider? I understand it’s not something you would want to do. So you think it's unlikely that in the end you’ll put it across private property where the landowners don't agree? [HSTP13 0028]

**Comment:** What's going to happen if we don't give you permission and the use to go through our land?[HSTP13 0029]

**Comment:** Okay. Let’s say it goes to eminent domain -- don’t I have a good case where you have an original route that was okayed, approved and turned it down yourselves and didn’t have adequate proof that it was inadequate? And, like I say, I think I’d have a pretty good case if -- if you decide to go through me but you had an alternate route that was okayed, you spent a lot of money on and your lawyers said, well, maybe, maybe we can't go there but it's no definite proof? [HSTP13 0029]
**Comment:** Who oversees that? It does go to the Department of Justice at that point and the case is heard in front of a judge and the judge makes the ultimate decision.[HSTP13 0029]

**Comment:** If you have to resort to eminent domain, what would be the time, like, for example, the person is served and then (inaudible)? Well, let me just ask an additional question. If you go to the process of eminent domain, it's (inaudible), correct? I mean --Yes, but --But percentage-wise, most of the time, if it does go to eminent domain, it goes to the party that's attempting to do (inaudible) --the only thing you're going to be arguing about is what's fair market value. It would be the price, then. It wouldn't be whether it was justification of taking the land or not?[HSTP13 0028]

**Response:** Eminent domain is a last resort for BPA. BPA preference is to work with landowners to come to an agreement on the price of an easement.

---

**Comment:** If the landowner is being damaged from a fallen line overheating or something and there was a fire that caused damage or if you had a pole fall over and you had to bring equipment in and tore up my field while the grain hadn't been cut, would the landowner be compensated for that?[HSTP13 0028]

**Comment:** You have (inaudible) poles designated on my place. What kind of fire protection do you have? I mean, if the power line goes down. Well, anything, wind. I know of farmers that's had some poles sheared off from wind shears. You just tromped his grain to pieces trying to get it out. Would you compensate for the damages? Just for the first time initial purchase, right, that's where I am only to see the money?[HSTP13 0028]

**Response:** As described in Section 3.1.4, Mitigation, BPA would compensate landowners for damage to property or crops, as appropriate.

---

**Comment:** “Upgrade of line or increase of corridor: Electricity use in these has been increasing at a rate of about three percent a year.” This line will not have to be – the line will have to be increased or expanded in about 34 years, meaning more right-of-way or that something will have to happen there. And I assume that they're going to try to parallel the right-of-ways. [HSTP13 0025]

**Response:** It is unknown what potential electrical loads will be in the timeframes referenced by the commenter. It also would be speculative to attempt to predict how these future electrical loads would be addressed by BPA. However, BPA is designing the project to accommodate predicted loads for at least the next 10 years and likely many years beyond that. Accordingly, BPA has no plans to acquire additional ROW or propose to place another transmission line adjacent to the proposed line.
Transmission Line Design

Comment: We just need to know a schedule or some kind of an outline that says, okay, the 33 mile route is going to have x amount of poles, x amount of miles, x amount of wire. So much stuff at this substation, so much at that substation. So there’s going to be the bottom line value. The same thing with the 22 mile one. And then maybe we can see what you’re up against. Right now we can’t. [HSTP13 0025]

Response: Chapter 2, Proposed Project and Alternatives, describes the project components that would be required for the North and South alternatives. The North Alternative would require about 234 structures over the 33-mile length and the South Alternative would require 210 structures over the 22.5-mile length. A description of the conductor and substation equipment is also included in Chapter 2. Substation work would be required at both the proposed Hooper Springs and existing Lanes Creek substations for the North Alternative while work would only occur at the Hooper Springs Substation for the South Alternative and its options.

Comment: Okay. Question 2: On the south route, the Senator suggested maybe we could hop and skip around through the areas of concern. What’s your longest span that you can do between your towers on this project? What’s the engineering?[HSTP13 0029]

Response: As described above, BPA has been working to further develop the South Alternative and its options to avoid areas of concern to BPA. Regarding conductor spans, while very long spans can be design and constructed they are very costly. Typically a span of 1200 feet would be the longest span BPA would propose based on the proposed structure types and terrain located along each route.

Comment: How deeply do you think you’re going to sink the holes for the power poles?[HSTP13 0028]

Response: As described in Chapter 2, structure footings for the North Alternative would be about 10 feet deep for wood poles and about 15 feet deep for steel pole structures. On the South Alternatives, footings would be between 15 and 30 feet deep depending on whether the structure is a suspension or dead end structure.

Comment: “Guy wires would generally be within the north alternative right-of-way, and no further than 50 feet from the right-of-way center line.” This means that probably they could also probably be outside of the right-of-way, I would assume. [HSTP13 0025]
Response: It is possible that a guy wire would need to be located outside of the proposed ROW regardless of alternative. If this occurs, BPA would ask to purchase an additional guy wire easement from the property owner.

Access Roads

Comment: Another thing that I'm -- I'm curious about --and I certainly don't know your business as well as you do -- but your road standards for year-round access, I've seen a lot of power lines and some of 'em going over difficult terrain that do not seem to have any sort of road access and they seem to get along fine. What is it that compels BPA to demand year-round access roads? [HSTP13 0029]

Comment: Now, your line will enter in Alpine through that rugged country. Does it have an access road to provide the 12-month access through the -- where the line goes through the Swan Valley? [HSTP13 0029]

Response: BPA’s maintenance and reliability standards require year-round access to all structures.

Comment: You're going up over a mountain that's at about 30 degrees or more. How are you going to get a road up there? You're doing switchbacks? And clearing trees as you go? It's mostly rocks up there, though. But we will see that from the valley then? [HSTP13 0029]

Response: Construction and improvement of access roads are described in Chapter 2, Access Roads. Access roads required in steep topography could possibly require a series of switchbacks that may fall outside of the transmission line ROW in order to maintain appropriate road grades as defined in BPA’s access road engineering standards. As described in Chapter 3, Visual Resources, access roads would be more visible on steep slopes, especially where cut and fill is needed.

Vegetation Clearing

Comment: “The north alternative would require the permanent removal of approximately 110.6 acres of native vegetation.” I take that to mean clear cutting. [HSTP13 0025]

Response: All tall growing vegetation would be removed from the transmission line ROW as described in Chapter 2, Vegetation Clearing. For the North Alternative clearing as mentioned above, approximately 75.5 acres of the total 110.6 acres of native vegetation consists of grass- and sagebrush-dominated vegetation communities. In these areas, vegetation would be removed or crushed and would likely be reestablished within two-growing seasons.
**Comment:** The EIS proposes to clear large acres of timber for the transmission line. Unlike regular timber sales which are replanted or regenerate naturally, this clearing and the accompanying maintenance road will have to be maintained in perpetuity, making this an irretrievable and irreversible commitment. [HSTP13 0016]

**Response:** As noted above and in Chapter 2, all tall-growing vegetation would be cleared from the ROW. For the life of the transmission line, the ROW would be maintained to be compatible with low-growing vegetation species. When tall-growing vegetation grows or falls close to a transmission line it can cause an electrical arc that can start a fire, cause an outage of the line, or injure or kill someone.

**Comment:** How wide of an area would you have to clear-cut when you cross through timberland?[HSTP13 0028]

**Response:** Across private timberland all tall growing trees within the 100 foot ROW would be cleared. On either side of the new ROW, danger trees that pose a hazard to construction activities and reliable operation of the transmission line also would be removed as described in Chapter 2, Vegetation Clearing. Danger tree removal depends on the tree’s height, health, and species. On C-TNF lands, the USFS has requested that BPA clear a 250 foot wide area initially. During operation of the line, BPA would then manage vegetation with the 100 foot wide ROW including danger trees along the ROW edge.

**Comment:** I have a small four acre recreational property out there, deeded to me from my grandfather. It’s a keepsake piece of property. In this design process the power lines will skim along the south boundary line of this four acre parcel. If I understand that right, the quaking aspen forest on this property will have to be thinned back and cut away from this power line. I think that’s a huge impact on a small recreational property to have to bear. [HSTP13 0025]

**Response:** As described above, all tall growing trees including aspens that are within the transmission line ROW would be cleared including removal of danger trees outside the ROW. While, BPA has proposed a reroute of the North Alternative to move the line off this property, there may be some danger trees identified outside of the ROW that would need to be removed.

**Comment:** Run a 100-ft ROW, open areas to weed invasion. [HSTP13 0014]

**Response:** BPA would conduct pre- and post- construction weed surveys to assess the noxious weed presence within the ROW and along access roads. During operation and maintenance of the transmission line and access roads, BPA’s vegetation management is guided by its Transmission System Vegetation Management Program EIS. BPA adopted an integrated vegetation management strategy for controlling vegetation along its transmission line ROWs in
2000. This strategy involves choosing the appropriate method for controlling the vegetation based on the type of vegetation and its density, the natural resources present at a particular site, landowner requests, regulations, and costs. Measures also would be implemented during construction to limit the spread of weeds as discussed in Section 3.4.4 of the supplemental draft EIS including following guidelines used by land managers on state and federally managed land.

**Construction Schedule and Work Crews**

**Comment:** Can you give me an idea of the time line? When do you hope to start construction? [HSTP13 0028]

**Response:** As described in Chapter 2, Construction Schedule and Work Crews, if BPA decides to proceed with the Project after completion of all necessary environmental review, construction of the proposed substation and transmission lines could begin as early as June 2015.

**Maintenance**

**Comment:** “tall trees that grow outside of the right-of-way that could fall into the line must be removed.” And then later on in this – I have this by page number. Later on in that page it says that “On either side of the new corridor, danger trees that pose a hazard to construction activities and reliable operation of the transmission line would be removed.” So the impact on the land can be far outside the right-of-way. [HSTP13 0025]

**Response:** The commenter is correct. BPA would have the right to clear danger trees if they posed a threat to the transmission line. The landowner, as the owner of those trees, would be compensated.

**Comment:** Now, on the easement that you want, this is an easement for the power poles themselves, plus you are going to have to have a road that goes through there so you can maintain those power poles, correct? [HSTP13 0028]

**Response:** Chapter 2, Easement and Land, describes the proposed easement widths including ROW and access roads. As mentioned in above responses, the transmission line ROWs would require a 100 foot wide easement and up to 50 feet wide easements for access roads that fall outside of the transmission line easements. BPA may also purchase guy easements if a guy wire needs to be placed outside of the transmission line easement.
Estimated Cost

**Comment:** How is the federal government compensated for the power lines or transmission lines across the public property? Who is funding the Bonneville Power Administration for you to build this line? [HSTP13 0028]

**Response:** BPA is a self-funded federal agency. We generate all of our revenue from the transmission and power rate payers of the entire northwest. BPA does not receive appropriated tax dollars like most federal agencies.

**Comment:** I’m with Agrium. I just would like to put on the public record that the southern route, one of the CERCLA sites, is associated with us. We do have concerns that it is also close to an operation that we have right now. If that route is the accepted alternative, there will be costs associated that we expect BPA to bear to move that line around the mining operation as is required. [HSTP13 0025]

**Response:** As described above, BPA recognizes that the mining leases pre-date the proposed transmission line proposal and constitute an existing contract with the federal government. While the mining leases would allow BPA to use the surface for a transmission line and access roads, this surface use cannot unreasonable interfere with the mining company’s right to fully extract the phosphate. If BPA decides to proceed with the project along an alternative that travels near or within a mine area or CERCLA site, easements would be negotiated to avoid interference and address current and future land use needs.

**Comment:** The cost of construction, regardless of whether the “Northern Route” or the “Southern Route” is selected will be approximately $55.0 million. There is no cost saving by selecting the longer “Northern Route”. [HSTP13 0026]

**Comment:** Extended costs of longer distance through the north Grays Lake route. [HSTP13 0021]

**Comment:** The construction cost for the north and south routes is estimated at $51 million for both routes. However, no supporting information is provided. Although materials for the lower voltage line along the north route are cheaper than those for the higher voltage line along the south route, the north alternative is approximately 50% longer (9.5 miles longer) than the south alternative, requiring more labor, access roads, vegetation removal, and materials. A detailed explanation of how these cost estimates were obtained should be provided for the north and south alternatives and how various routing options for the public adequately evaluate the costs associated with the project. [HSTP13 0017]

**Comment:** The draft EIS provides no data at all to substantiate the assertion that despite this difference in length, both the North and South Alternatives would cost “about $51 million”. [HSTP13 0013]
**Comment:** The EIS also fails to explain why the projected costs of the South Alternative jumped from $9.3 million in the 2009 Preliminary EA to the current $51 million estimate. This nearly 500% increase in projected price of the South Alternative in less than 4 years is not credible. If something as tangible as cost projections can change by over $40 million (5-fold) so quickly with no supporting facts, why should the public believe any of the much less tangible projected environmental impacts mentioned in this draft EIS? [HSTP13 0013]

**Response:** BPA notes the comment and has performed additional engineering and cost analysis since publication of the draft EIS. Under the North Alternative, construction cost of the Hooper Springs Substation, additions to Lanes Creek Substation, construction of the proposed 33-mile-long single-circuit 115-kV and 0.2-mile-long 138-kV transmission lines is estimated to be about $72.5 million. Annual maintenance costs would be about $10,000 to $20,000. Under the South Alternative, construction cost of the Hooper Springs Substation and the proposed 22.5-mile-long double-circuit 115-kV and 0.2-mile-long 138-kV transmission lines is estimated to be about $62.4 million. Annual maintenance costs would be about $10,000 to $20,000.

**Comment:** In addition, the cost of the proposed action along the south alternative in the 2009 Environmental Assessment was $27.3 million ($18 million for the substation and 9.3 million for the transmission line). Although costs have likely increased since 2009, it does not seem reasonable that costs have nearly doubled in the past 4 years to the currently estimated $51 million as stated in the Draft EIS. BPA should include a rational as to why the estimated cost for the south alternative has increased by 46% since 2009. [HSTP13 0017]

**Comment:** My concern with the presentation is we get told that there’s 22 miles on one route and 33 miles on the other route. And then that they’ll cost about the same, but never a price. I’m sorry, but putting in 33 miles on one route should cost more, realizing that is it is a different type of pole and a different style. But, still, you’re going to have to pay for the right to go through people’s lands. You’re going to have to pay extra for the poles. [HSTP13 0025]

**Comment:** Exactly how much will it cost, estimated of course, for the 33 mile line? And exactly, estimated of course, for the 22 mile line, so that people can see exactly what you’re saying. We’re in the dark on that. We don’t know what you are talking about as far as costs, what you’re talking about as far as availability and all of your different things that go into that. [HSTP13 0025]

**Comment:** If the price is the same, I don’t want 10 extra miles of wire and poles out across our countryside. If the price is the same, why do I want 10 extra miles of wires and poles? [HSTP13 0025]

**Comment:** How much -- I guess this is 30 miles north from what your original plan was going through the mining. How much is that costing you? An additional 30 miles of power lines poles and right-of-way and all that rigamarole, how much is that costing you? [HSTP13 0028]
Comment: Another thing that occurs to me on that same issue is if it's that much shorter to go the other route, it would appear that it should be probably $10 million less to construct, more or less. And if it was, I seriously doubt you'd have over a $10 million fine for digging 20 or 30 post holes. [HSTP13 0028]

Comment: I have a question - you were talking about the cost of the transmission lines, the shorter one and the longer one, but it seemed like when you were talking about the shorter one that you said that they were different kind of wires and it was three wires instead of two wires or something. And so it sounded to me a little bit like apples and oranges. If that line that's going that's the northern route were to be put on the southern route with just what you're proposing for now, how much would that cost versus how much it would cost to go the northern route, the increase in that process? [HSTP13 0028]

Comment: The last time we were here you said that the increase to the northern route would cost an additional $10 million versus going with the southern route and now this time you're telling us it's a wash. What happened to that $10 million? [HSTP13 0029]

Comment: So how much is this project costing? [HSTP13 0029]

Response: As described in Chapter 2, Estimated Cost for both the North and South alternatives, the total cost of the Northern Alternative would be about $72.5 million and the total cost of the Southern Alternative would be about $64.2 million based on current project estimates. These cost estimates include all costs to date plus future expenditures to build each alternative. The costs of the route options would be similar.

Comment: Bonneville Power acknowledges that one of the criteria considered in favor of the Northern Line is its proximity to an existing substation. What is the amount of money saved by Bonneville Power by utilizing this existing substation? How is this dollar saving weighed against the environmental impact in Bonneville Power’s analysis? What is the formula utilized by Bonneville Power in such weighting and how can the public obtain a copy of this analysis? [HSTP13 0027]

Response: Electrically the Lanes Creek Substation is a secure and reliable place to terminate the line in order to connect it with the existing grid. However, while it is less expensive to connect into an existing substation rather building a new substation, terminating the North Alternative at the Lanes Creek Substation does not reduce the total project cost as compared to the total cost of the South Alternative or its options (see above for project costs).

Comment: Did the amount of studies you have to provide going across private land rather than going across that much government-controlled land that's in that state of repair or disrepair, did the cost of those studies have anything to do with the decision to go with the northern route? [HSTP13 0028]
Response: Prior to release of the supplemental draft EIS, BPA had not identified a preferred alternative. Additionally, the amount or cost of studies on private or public land does not play a part in the identification of a preferred alternative. BPA has however identified a preferred alternative in this EIS and it is Option 3A.

Comment: Okay. You're going to pass 50 or $60 million in charges off to these people over in Star Valley, is that what you are telling us? Well, who's paying for this thing then? [HSTP13 0029]

Comment: Okay. And the ratepayers -- I know you are looking out for the ratepayers, but you are going the northern route and it's going to cost a lot of money. You're going to have to maintain those lines -- another 10 miles of lines until the world comes to an end, I guess. That's going to cost the ratepayers. Has anybody thought about asking the Idaho congressional delegation to slip something into a bill that would give you immunity from this problem of crossing the mines? I think that our senators and representatives, if we're going to save 10 or 15 or $20 million, would be happy to do that and especially in the state budgets. [HSTP13 0028]

Response: See comment above for a description of BPA as a self-funded federal agency. The commenter is correct in that maintenance costs would likely be greater for a longer line. BPA’s preferred alternative, Option 3A, would cross less miles than the North Alternative.

Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study

Non-wires Alternative

Comment: Once a ROW is secured additional development, including larger and/or more transmission lines, could occur in the foreseeable future, especially since BPA has not included any “non-wires” measures (e.g., energy conservation) to address energy use and reliability. BPA dismisses energy conservation entirely as only a short-term solution, rather than incorporating it into a long-term sustainable energy use plan. [HSTP13 0017]

Response: Chapter 2, Non-wires Alternatives describes BPA’s evaluation of a non-wires solution to the project’s need. The possible non-wires measures identified included the following: energy efficiency—increasing efficiency of existing buildings or appliances to reduce electricity use; demand response—managing when power is used at its source; distributed generation—constructing a new natural gas peaking generation facility at or close to the source of load; fuel switching—changing energy consumption from electricity to natural gas, primarily for space and water heating, to reduce peak demand. BPA determined that a combination of non-wires measures could at most defer, but not eliminate, the need to construct a transmission line, and there is a fundamental level of uncertainty about whether these measures could be fully implemented in time to address the growing need for the Project.
Comment: It would seem like that relationship [with LVE] should continue, not be dissolved, because they have a power station that feeds into that – what you are trying to accomplish. [HSTP13 0025]

Comment: Lower Valley Energy also has supply stations other than the Palisades to feed that line. They have a propane unit, fire generating system. [HSTP13 025]

Response: BPA has coordinated with LVE on many aspects of this proposal, including the development of possible alternatives for this project. Although LVE does have sources of power that feed into their system, these sources are not adequate to support the current and forecasted area loads. During winter peak loadings, most of the area support comes from the transmission system to the east (Goshen Substation). There is a propane system in the Jackson area, but it feeds area gas needs, and does not have the capacity to provide back-up for the electrical system. This project would provide a direct source to the southern portion of LVE’s system to compensate for loss of the LVE’s Palisades-Snake River line should an outage occur.

Comment: We appreciate the additional “non-wires alternative” which demonstrated that the project could be deferred until 2016 or 2020. While Phase 1 and 2 studies of this alternative showed that the transmission line project could not be entirely eliminated, it demonstrated it could be deferred while the project is reassessed through a Supplemental EIS. Given the recent slowdown in the regional and national economy, the BPA should again reassess the urgency for this project and factor in additional increases in efficiency and alternative routes from power generation sources to consumers. We believe that this alternative should be fully developed in a Supplemental EIS. As part of this effort, the BPA should show the locations of all these transmission lines along with the Westside Energy Corridor. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: As described in Sections 1.1 and 2.5.6 of this supplemental draft EIS, BPA has continued to assess the need for the proposed transmission line as well as its timing. These assessments have reaffirmed that a combination of non-wires measures could at most defer, but not eliminate, the need to construct a transmission line. Accordingly, non-wire measures remain an alternative that was considered but eliminated from detailed study in the EIS. BPA believes that the EIS adequately discusses possible non-wire measures and the reasons why this alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

Undergrounding

Comment: The EIS should also analyze the feasibility of burying certain sections of powerlines which has been done routinely in Europe. [HSTP13 0016]

Comment: Given that the purpose of the Hooper Springs Transmission Project is to “improve the stability and reliability of the transmission system in southeastern Idaho,” the Draft EIS should include an analysis of constructing an underground transmission system, which are generally more reliable than overhead transmission systems (Hall 2012). Because of this
omission, the current Draft EIS does not adequately evaluate all potential alternatives. A
detailed cost-benefit analysis, including monetary and non-monetary costs/benefits, of overhead
transmission lines and underground transmission lines should have been included in the Draft
EIS. [HSTP13 0017]

**Comment:** Underground transmission systems have 1) increased reliability during storms
and high winds (which frequently occur throughout the project area), 2) reduced exposure to
lightening (which also frequently occur throughout the project area), and 3) newer underground
cable systems tend to be more reliable and require less maintenance than overhead installations
(Hall 2013). In addition, underground systems result in less exposure to wildlife, mitigate the
negative impacts on visual resources, and have better public safety (Hall 2013). One of the main
challenges associated with installation of underground transmission systems is their monetary
cost; however technologies and cost-effectiveness have improved, making their construction
more feasible. For example, a 333-mile underground electric transmission line from Quebec to
New York City was recently approved by their state Public Service Commission (Rulison 2013).
Because of numerous public comments related to visual resources, wildlife, and rural land uses,
during the scoping period and at the public information meeting it is important for BPA to
consider underground power transmission for the entire length of the north and south
alternatives. [HSTP13 0017]

**Comment:** If constructing the entire length of the transmission line underground is not
feasible, then constructing a portion of the route underground where negative impacts to
wildlife, land uses, and/or visual resources occur should also be considered. [HSTP13 0017]

**Response:** BPA did not consider an underground alternative for the transmission line
because this issue was not raised during project scoping. A discussion of undergrounding has
been added to the supplemental draft EIS in Section 2.5.7. Generally, burying the transmission
line would increase the construction cost of the project by 10 to 20 times the cost of an overhead
line, and would result in much higher maintenance costs. Additionally, while undergrounding a
transmission line can reduce visual impacts, environmental impacts to natural resources from
undergrounding the transmission line are typically the same or greater than impacts associated
with an overhead line. Finally, due to the difficulties in locating failed or damaged underground
cables, any necessary repairs could take significantly longer, making this alternative less
advantageous from a service and reliability standpoint.

**Comment:** Have you seen in your past any other places where you have actually buried the
lines instead of suspending it up on poles? [HSTP13 0028]

**Response:** While there are cases where utilities bury power lines, BPA would not propose to
bury either the North or South alternatives or their options for the reasons mentioned above.
Alternative Routes

Comment: Erich, on that line coming from Palisades southeasterly onto – yeah, that line right there. Why don’t you build a second line there and strengthen that structure through there rather than encumber this southeastern Idaho area? Is there not a possibility to run a second line through – to widen your easement right-of-way through there with a second line to support the existing line? [HSTP13 0025]

Comment: As far as your secondary line there by Palisades, you know, we’re looking at the same thing down around the Rupert and burley area with this Gateway transmission line. They want them separated and not run parallel. I stand the chance of getting hit by lightning if I walk outside of this building too, but I’m not holding my breath that that is going to happen. [HSTP13 0025]

Comment: What is the cost factor of building that parallel line from Palisades Dam to backfeed into Lower Valley Energy’s loop there? [HSTP13 0025]

Response: As described above, the proposed transmission lines would provide redundancy in the SE Idaho/NW Wyoming transmission system. Because all of the transmission lines for the FREC and LVE service areas originate from PacifiCorp’s Goshen Substation, expanding existing lines does not solve the existing problem where all lines serving the area are sourced at Goshen Substation. Because an alternative that includes a new line constructed parallel to an existing line in the Palisades Dam area does not meet the project need for a second source (other than Goshen Substation) into the area, a cost estimate has not been prepared.

Comment: So is there a different route they could go and still build a secondary line there and not affect us by building from Threemile and out either through Lanes Creek or out through the south route? [HSTP13 0025]

Response: In order to provide redundancy, BPA needs to interconnect with the 345-kV system in the area. PacifiCorp’s Threemile Knoll Substation was selected as the proposed point of connection because geographically the substation is closest to the system loop that needs to be strengthened. The next closest point of connection would be Idaho Power’s Bridger Substation 169 miles to the south. In order to connect to LVE’s and FREC’s systems a much longer transmission line with additional impacts and much higher costs than the proposed transmission line routes would be needed.
Agency’s Preferred Alternative

Comment: From the first meeting we had over in the school system, you told us you were going to take the northern route and that was all that it was going to be to it. I asked a number of people at that meeting and it was the northern route, the northern route, the northern route. All the rest of it is out. There was no doubt in your minds that you were going to go about this that way and you've held to it regardless of everything else. There's no room -- there's no compromise at all in your going to the south route, but we know what the plan was. It was to condemn a right-of-way all the way through private land. And you were determined to do that and you were not going to go the southern route no matter what any of us said and it's been that way every since. And every meeting we've had since, it's the same bunch of crap. [HSTP13 0029]

Comment: I’ve been to all four of the meetings like a lot of people in this room today. At every meeting we’ve had, since the first one, BPA has said the only group that they were going to allow for was going out to Gray’s Lake and that was going to be it. We had no choice. From the very first meeting where they had the four routes, the first thing they said was we are going to Gray’s Lake on Highway 34 and there’s nothing you can do about it.

They have maintained that right up to this meeting. And the only reason that they’re having this meeting is because we’ve all stood together and said to hell with that. You can go up Lanes Creek where it isn’t a burden on us. [HSTP13 0025]

Comment: So, Eric, can you tell me where we are today? Is there still an opportunity for this group to impact the route of that line or are you guys set on the northern route at this point and it's a done deal? [HSTP13 0029]

Response: BPA has been evaluating three alternatives each with a number of routing options (including the No Action Alternative) since the Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS was published in 2010. The preferred alternative (South Alternative’s Option 3A) was not identified until release of this supplemental draft EIS. Public comment was taken very seriously and helped to influence identification of the preferred alternative (South Alternative’s Option 3A) by BPA.

Comment: The Bureau of Indian Affairs Fort Hall Agency and Fort hall Irrigation Project are commenting in support of the South Alternative Option 2. Although we are in support of Option 2, we do support the selection of any of the Southern Alternative options over any option in the North Alternative as a preferred Alternative. [HSTP13 0030]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: In addition, we recommend BPA consider these differences in impacts to vegetation and wildlife when selecting a preferred alternative. [HSTP13 0020]
**Comment:** Pursuant to the SHC framework, we urge BPA to consider when selecting a preferred alternative the compatibility of the project with the overall rural and natural character of the landscape, including wildlife and visual resources. [HSTP13 0020]

**Comment:** In contrast, much of the southern alternative crosses land already subject to disturbance. The portion of the southern alternative that runs east-west is largely within a corridor of existing linear disturbances. Currently there are multiple distribution lines, a transmission line, paved roads, and the railway and multiple haul roads that serve the surrounding mines. Fragmentation, especially by linear features, is a major concern for many wildlife species. Co-locating linear disturbances, such as the proposed project, is an effective way to minimize wildlife impacts. We strongly recommend BPA consider this when selecting a preferred alternative and when micrositing the proposed line. [HSTP13 0025]

**Response:** Comments noted.

**Comment:** Again, I understand that we have to have poles and wires to bring electricity. Clearly I think you’ll hear from the community that we prefer the southern route. We prefer the shorter distance so as not to have the impacts. [HSTP13 0025]

**Response:** Comment noted. Environmental impacts have been evaluated in the supplemental draft EIS including the difference in line lengths between the alternatives and options considered.

**Comment:** While Idaho appreciates the Bonneville Power Administration’s (BPA) efforts thus far in this process, we would like to register our strong objection to the fact that BPA did not designate a Preferred Alternative in the Draft EIS. BPA’s decision to not designate a Preferred Alternative creates a strain on state agency and local government resources, as well as Idaho citizens, as they attempt to review the proposed routes. [HSTP13 0022]

**Response:** BPA did not identify a preferred alternative in the draft EIS because it was important to gather comments from the public and incorporate those into the process of identifying a preferred alternative. As discussed in Section 2.7 of the supplemental draft EIS, BPA has identified the South Alternative’s Option 3A as the preferred alternative.

**Comment:** I think if they want to get to that substation they out to keep their eye on the ball and get to the substation with the southern route. It’s just arrogance and orneriness that they’re going to do it to us regardless of what we say. And if we don’t hold together they will do it. That’s why this meeting is held today, the only reason. [HSTP13 025]

**Comment:** They brought new people that haven’t been here before. There’s even a guy out there that has a public relations tag on his shirt. Before it’s always been we’re going to do it or way and to hell with you. I think they’ll try to do it again. I would ask all the people here today to stand with us and make them go the other way. [HSTP13 0025]
Comment: As far as I’m concerned, I would go with the 22 mile route any day because it doesn’t ruin the views, doesn’t ruin people’s hunting and fishing and their cattle ranches, their homes. You’re impacting a lot of people to go through the 22 mile route. It’s going to make this community very upset and it’s not worth it. That’s not what we’re here on this earth for is to make’s everybody’s life miserable. We’re here to work together, so let’s work together and see what we can do to make the 22 mile route work. Thank you. [HSTP13 0025]

Comment: And I know you’ll have concerns with property owners regardless of which route you take, but this is a shorter route. It would impact fewer landowners, I would say, and potentially keep you away from the mines that are concerned – environmental concerns you have there. [HSTP13 0028]

Comment: The “Northern Route” will be approximately 32 miles long and includes two (2) route options. While the “Southern Route” will be approximately 22 miles long and includes four (4) options. There is no need to add an additional 10 miles of electrical lines and transmission poles across the corridor. [HSTP13 0026]

Comment: I look at 10 miles of wires and poles. That’s what I see on this map. One route, 32 miles, the other route 22 miles. I’m concerned about the 10 miles difference of wire and poles.

Basically, you know, we’ve got to get electricity where we need it to be able to meet customers and stuff. You said we don’t have a, I guess, higher line than the other. We’re looking at both of them as equal. But one requires 10 extra miles of wire and poles. It doesn’t matter where you put it, that’s going to impact. It impacts the farmers and the ranchers, the recreationists, the tourists, people traveling through our area. [HSTP13 0025]

Response: In the supplemental draft EIS, BPA has evaluated both alternatives to determine impacts to resources along their routes. An additional 10 miles of transmission line and associated access roads on the North Alternative would have a higher environmental impact on some resources. As discussed in Section 2.7, BPA has identified the South Alternative’s Option 3A as the preferred alternative.

Comment: Simplot became aware in 2008 that a new electrical transmission line was under consideration for a route north and east of Soda Springs, Idaho. As a business owner accustomed to electrical service outages for our operations and with employees who are members of the communities in Caribou County, we welcome the opportunity for improving electrical service and capacity for the southeastern corner of Idaho. [Eventually, this project became known as the “Hooper Springs Transmission Project.”] Simplot, as described below, favors the South Alternative. However, we believe that either route would be preferable to the “No Action” Alternative. Simplot does not support the No Action Alternative. [HSTP13 0010]

Response: Comment noted.
Mitigation

**Comment:** BPA should take additional steps to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts to natural resources along these routes. [HSTP13 0016]

**Comment:** We appreciate the analysis of the Northern Route along Highway 34. We would like to see additional analysis of ways to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts along this route. [HSTP13 0016]

**Response:** Comments noted. Throughout preparation of the draft and supplemental draft EISs, BPA has proposed ways to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts to natural resources, as appropriate.

**Comment:** The proposed project has the potential to impact resources within the proposed corridor for a long time. Therefore, we recommend that the final EIS describe a monitoring program designed to assess both impacts from the project and the effectiveness and the proposed mitigation measures for the impacts. The document should also indicate how the program would use an effective feedback mechanism to assure environmental objectives would be met throughout the project lifespan. [HSTP13 0015]

**Response:** BPA conducts post-implementation monitoring of compliance and mitigation effectiveness on a sample set of new construction and transmission rebuild projects on a yearly basis. The monitoring helps BPA determine if mitigation measures implemented were effective for their desired purpose and provides a method to improve mitigation proposals in environmental documents or the process of implementing mitigation. During and after construction, activities are also monitored to ensure that environmental specifications are implemented as stated.

**Comment:** As stated in our previous comments, the list of proposed mitigation measures are measures to minimize impacts, and not to mitigate them. Additional descriptions are needed. [HSTP13 0016]

**Response:** Comment noted. Mitigation measures have been described in greater detail in the EIS where necessary. These measures have been designed to avoid, minimize, and otherwise mitigate for potential project-related impacts, consistent with 40 CFR 1508.20.

**Comment:** Descriptions of affected resources, environmental consequences, and mitigation in the current EIS are too general. In addition, complete information on some resource concerns are lacking. Therefore it does not afford adequate public review and comment to evaluate the specific mitigation actions proposed for specific impacts as required by policy of the Environmental Quality Improvement Act 43 FR 55990, Section 1500.2 and Department of
Response: BPA believes that the EIS describes the affected environment, potential environmental consequences, and possible mitigation measures at an adequate level of detail under NEPA, and that it provides sufficient information concerning potentially affected resources to allow decision makers and the public to understand the potential impacts of the proposed project. In addition, input and comment from the public on the draft EIS has been used to provide even more complete information on resources and potential project impacts in the supplemental draft EIS. Through publication of notice in local newspapers, direct mailing and outreach to landowners and occupants of nearby properties, and the solicitation of comment through public meetings, BPA has provided opportunity for public review and comment that complies with the above regulations.

Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures (Chapter 3)

Comment: We note with appreciation that the DEIS addresses many of the issues we raised during the project scoping period in August 2010, including analysis of cumulative and climate change effects. Thus, we commend BPA staff for working with a variety of stakeholders and considering public comments in the NEPA analysis for the project. The DEIS document includes a good description of resources in the project area, anticipated impacts, and mitigation measures to offset the impacts. In particular, we appreciate information provided in section 2.6 (p. 2-33) comparing alternatives, their impacts to various resources and associated mitigation measures, and cost. [HSTP13 0015]

Response: Comment noted. Thank you.

Comment: We support timely improvements and expansion of transmission infrastructure where needed, but in the case of the Hooper Springs Transmission Line Project, we are deeply concerned that the proposed route does not strike the appropriate balance between minimizing costs and minimizing environmental effects. In particular, we have concerns regarding the urgency as well as the adverse environmental effects from all the proposed alternatives. [HSTP13 0016]

Comment: As stated above, we have concerns regarding the apparent urgency of this project as well as the adverse environmental effects from all the proposed alternatives. [HSTP13 0016]
Response:  Comment noted. Chapter 1, Purpose of and Need for Action of the supplemental draft EIS and responses above describe the need for the project. While the draft EIS did not include a preferred alternative, several alternative as well as potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures were addressed in the draft EIS.

Comment:  I would like to see a map with the alternatives. [HSTP13 0007]
Response: Comment noted. A map was sent to the commenter. Additionally, maps of the North Alternative, South Alternative, and their respective routing options are shown in Chapter 2 of the supplemental draft EIS and on the project website.

Land Use

Comment: One other comment that I’ve had. Since this would be a publicly used utility, it would be appropriate to use basically public lands it's constructed on rather than have individual landowners be the ones that have to bear the burden of having the lines through their property. And that seems to make sense where it's the public generally, why not have it land that they own, as well?[HSTP13 0029]

Response: Because of the mosaic pattern of land ownership in the project area, it was not feasible to route the proposed project exclusively across public land. Chapter 3 provides analysis of impacts to land use in the project area and proposed mitigation measures. Wherever practicable, the proposed transmission line would be sited in locations that would result in minimal negative impact to the function and productivity of private lands.

Comment: On the north versus the south route, private versus public, wouldn't it be true that there is maybe less public land that you go across, but there is a larger percent of private land that you do not go across because the route is not shorter? So if you had total miles of private one side versus the other, north versus the south, there would still be significantly less on -- on -- on private land, wouldn't it? Because the -- the other route is a third shorter basically?[HSTP13 0029]

Comment: More private property transversed. [HSTP13 0021]
Response: The proportion of public versus private land traversed by each alternative is roughly similar; private land represents 65 percent of the ROW length on the North Alternative, whereas private land represents 68 percent of the ROW length on the South Alternative. The South Alternative would traverse less private land than the North Alternative – 15 miles versus 21 miles – due to the shorter transmission line length.
Comment: Simplot remains a strong advocate for the construction of the Hooper Valley Transmission Project, regardless of the ultimate route chosen. Although we believe it is most appropriate that a project intended to serve the public is better placed on public land where possible. Simplot is committed to provide the rights to use Simplot land if necessary to build the infrastructure that will improve the economic sustainability of this region. [HSTP13 0010]

Response: Comment noted. Thank you.

Comment: Then what about the mining impact? If we’re worried about the mining impact on the southern route, wouldn't it be the same as the forest in the Wayan area, the mining impact? [HSTP13 0029]

Response: The North Alternative does not traverse any mining areas; therefore the mining impacts to the area of C-TNF traversed by the North Alternative would be less than the South Alternative.

Private Lands

Comment: Finally, the northern alternative would cross farmland enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP). The CRP program is designed to encourage uses of environmentally sensitive land that have conservation benefits. Please discuss current agricultural practices on the CRP land along the northern alternative and any existing associated wildlife benefits. [HSTP13 0020]

Comment: We note that BPA will be consulting with the Farm Service Agency in assessing the project impacts to prime farmlands and CRP lands. We recommend that the final EIS include outcomes of those consultations and recommended measures to avoid and reduce impacts to those lands. [HSTP13 0015]

Response: Comment noted. BPA has coordinated with the Farm Service Agency regarding CRP lands. As part of these discussions, BPA inquired about any additional information that was available concerning current agricultural practices and related wildlife benefits on CRP lands, and has included this information in the supplemental draft EIS where applicable.

Comment: I have one – not more -- scathing remark to give. We talked a lot about the Gray's Lake area. But what about the farmers here that's north of town? I've heard a little bit of discontent from some of them and not super critical, but it would be a firm suggestion that maybe you could align your poles between -- if you take that route -- on the boundary between the property owners so there wasn’t a blank spot in the field that they’d have to go around and farm around. If you had it up closer to the line and they could farm right up to the line on both sides, not to have to dodge the poles; is that right? We got farmers in the group here. Is that how you’re thinking? [HSTP13 0029]
Comment: The consumption of hydropower will continue to grow. Meet the need but be accommodating to the irrigation systems and other agriculture. [HSTP13 0003]

Response: Comment noted. BPA has attempted to align the proposed transmission lines near the property boundary when crossing private land wherever feasible. Wherever possible, the proposed transmission line would be sited in locations that would result in minimal negative impact to the function and productivity of agricultural lands.

Comment: Okay. So that would be an issue. And probably the same with the access road that you'd require if it's that close or far away from a regular public road. I'll bet they'd like it so they didn't have to go around that, too, just right up to the edge of it.[HSTP13 0029]

Response: BPA has attempted to align access roads near the property boundary when crossing private land wherever feasible. Wherever possible, the proposed access roads would be sited in locations that would result in minimal negative impact to the function and productivity of agricultural lands.

Comment: The northeastern portion of the northern alternative crosses lands donated by the Kakley family in 2006 to the Idaho Foundation of Parks and Lands for preservation in perpetuity under a conservation easement. These lands provide habitat for sharp-tailed grouse (Tympanuchus phasianellus), sage thrasher (Oreoscoptes montanus), sage sparrow (Artemisiospiza belli), Brewer’s sparrow (Spizella breweri), and other grassland and sagebrush species. Please address the easement in subsequent NEPA analysis, including an explanation of the proposed transmission line’s compatibility with the terms of the conservation easement. [HSTP13 0020]

Response: Comment noted. An earlier iteration of the North Alternative had placed the route across the property in question, but based on habitat considerations and the status of that property as a conservation easement, the North Alternative no longer crosses the Kackley parcel.

Comment: Additionally, several Land Trusts, including the Teton Regional Land Trust and the Sagebrush Steppe Regional Land Trust have identified conservation values for protection within the proposed project area, particularly within the rural ranching lands of northern Caribou County. Please address how the conservation and wildlife values of private lands and the potential for conservation land acquisition, donation, or purchase of easements could be affected by the proposed northern alternative. [HSTP13 0020]

Response: BPA welcomes consultation with all interested parties regarding the proposed project. At this time the preferred alternative is Option 3A which would not cross lands specifically selected for acquisition. It is speculative to discuss hypothetical impacts to unidentified lands that may or may not be acquired, donated, or become subject to an easement at some indeterminate point in the future.
Comment: The DEIS does not take into account the effects of the proposed transmission line on ongoing efforts to alleviate sandhill crane depredation of crops in the area. For several years participating landowners have agreed to let cranes use portions of their fields in return for payment from an endowment set up through the Idaho Fish and Wildlife Foundation. It is imperative that the proposed action not limit the effectiveness of ongoing actions to minimize crop depredation by cranes or cause additive mortality from collisions to cranes currently being managed or hunted in the depredation area. We suggest BPA develop a coordinated strategy to assure the transmission line route does not conflict with the management goals of lure crop plantings or IDFG-managed hunting locations, and that crane strikes do not increase within proximity to lure crop plantings. [HSTP13 0020]

Response: Mitigation measures described in Chapter 3, Wildlife, would reduce the potential for mortality associated with avian collisions. BPA would install visibility enhancement devices on the overhead ground wires to reduce the risk of collision in areas that have been determined by the avian risk model to bear a high risk of increased avian collisions.”

State Lands

Comment: We appreciate the fact that the southern routes appear to avoid directly impacting the Blackfoot Wildlife Management Area (WMA), but are still concerned about the southern route’s proximity to the WMA [HSTPS13 0020]

Comment: We recommend that the transmission line be routed as far south of the WMA as possible while still avoiding the Inventoried Roadless Area (Dry Ridge) on the USFS. The line should avoid Mill Canyon in section 21, and instead, after crossing Dry Ridge should follow a course due east or southeast into the next drainage to the south. This drainage seems to be unnamed but may have been referred to as Mosquito Creek on the May 17 field tour. The drainage has a road and open to motorized vehicles ‘less than 50’” in width” on several trails according to the current USFS Travel Plan Revision. Impacts to wildlife habitat would be lessened in this drainage that already has a road and is disturbed. [HSTP13 0022]

Comment: We reiterate our past encouragement for any routing decisions to minimize effects to the visual and wildlife resources of Blackfoot River Wildlife Management Area (WMA). The WMA was acquired in 1995 and has been maintained since with the assistance from partners including Ducks Unlimited, The Greater Yellowstone Coalition, Trout Unlimited, and the North American Moose Foundation. The primary goals are to benefit aquatic and terrestrial wildlife through the improvement of vegetation communities, and to provide wildlife related public use opportunities such as hunting, fishing, trapping and viewing. We request continued consultation and early opportunity to work with BPA on minimization and mitigation if the preferred route is to cross the WMA. [HSTP13 0022]
Response: BPA recognizes the Blackfoot River WMA as important public lands managed for recreational activities and as wildlife habitat, and understands the concerns about the proximity of the South Alternative and its route options to the WMA. Many different routes have been investigated by BPA in an effort to avoid crossing the Blackfoot River WMA while still meeting the project’s purpose and need. In the draft EIS, the routing of the South Alternative and its route options completely avoided crossing the WMA. However, all of these routes would cross the planned Husky-North Dry Ridge Mine and the majority of the North Maybe Mine Investigation Area.

Following release of the draft EIS, BPA, BLM, and the lessee of the Husky-North Dry Ridge Mine met to discuss the viability of a transmission line crossing the phosphate resource within the mine leasing area for this mine. BLM made it clear that under mining laws, the transmission line, as a surface use, cannot interfere with the lessee’s ability to develop their lease (i.e., the ability to fully extract the ore within the lease area). While BPA could design the line to span the 400 to 600 feet wide operational area of the mine, very tall structures would be required. In addition, included in the mine operational area would be a haul road along both sides of the mine. The lessee would not want transmission structures between the haul road and the mine edge nor would they want transmission line access roads to interfere with the haul road. Furthermore, the placement of conductor over the mine pit would limit the lessee’s ability to use certain types of equipment because they could come in contact with the conductor or at least be within an unsafe distance from the energized line. The lessee also could not use explosives to construct the mine. The use of explosives creates “fly rock” which can travel vertically hundreds of feet into the air possibly coming in contact with the conductor. Additionally, BPA prefers to not construct a transmission line in areas where there is the potential that the line would need to be moved. Because of all of these considerations and concerns, BPA developed Option 3A for the South Alternative, which necessarily required routing onto the southern edge of the Blackfoot River WMA to avoid the mining areas in the vicinity.

Another factor in the routing of Option 3A within the Blackfoot River WMA are the BLM’s resource recovery requirements for phosphate deposits including the Husky-North Dry Ridge deposit within and south of the WMA. The lease (issued in 1983) is a contract with the federal government giving the lessee exclusive rights to recover the phosphate resource within the lease. Accordingly, the BLM’s position is that it could not recommend to the USFS that they issue a surface use authorization for a transmission line across the leased phosphate resource if it would interfere with the phosphate recovery.

Regarding the North Maybe Mine Investigation Area, it was BPA’s intent when proposing possible routes, to avoid construction, operation, and maintenance of a transmission line in areas of known contamination and to avoid direct contact with waste dumps, seeps, or mine pits. For this reason, Option 3A was proposed because it avoids as much is possible the Investigation Area along East Mill Creek and to the south toward the past mining activities at North Maybe Mine.
BPA has worked extensively with IDFG and the C-TNF to site the Option 3A ROW, access roads, and structures to minimize intrusion onto and impacts to the Blackfoot River WMA and C-TNF lands. This supplemental draft EIS describes Option 3A, provides a detailed analysis of its potential environmental impacts, and allows all interested parties the opportunity to comment on this routing option. BPA welcomes continued consultation with IDFG and the C-TNF, as well as suggestions from interested parties, regarding further avoidance and minimization to these areas and their resources.

**Comment:** Sections 3.1 & 3.7: We understand that at least one option under consideration for the southern alternative would cross a Wildlife Management Area (WMA) administered by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG). Ownership of the WMA is split between IDFG and the Idaho Department of Lands. Section 3.1 of the DEIS briefly mentions state lands on the southern alternative, but does not identify where those lands are or identify the WMA. As acknowledged in section 3.2, the WMA is administered to provide for public recreation, to improve Yellowstone cutthroat trout (Oncorhynchus clarkia bouvieri) habitat, and to provide upland and riparian habitat for the benefit of wildlife, including wintering elk, deer, and moose. Construction of new roads and infrastructure as part of the southern alternative likely would impact the resource values the WMA is designed to protect. Consequently, we encourage BPA to explicitly address impacts to the WMA and the wildlife that uses it in the land use ...sections of subsequent NEPA analysis. [HSTP13 0020]

**Response:** The commenter is correct in that Option 3A would cross the Blackfoot WMA. Section 3.1.3, Environmental Consequences of the South Alternative, South Alternative Route Options, Option 3A, describes land use impacts to the WMA from Option 3A.

**Comment:** As stated in the Draft EIS, the construction of the transmission line and access roads along the north route is not consistent with the Corridor Management Plan for Highway 34, the Pioneer Historic Byway, which is designated as a State of Idaho and National Scenic Byway. Because of this, the resulting impacts should be classified as high, not moderate. [HSTP13 0017]

**Response:** Comment noted. The Corridor Management Plan for the Pioneer Historic Byway provides management prescriptions for preserving the visual and scenic qualities of the highway corridor (Pioneer Historic Byway Committee 2000). The Corridor Management Plan does not prohibit the construction of transmission lines, but rather recommends that road building and infrastructure development within the byway corridor should minimize visual impacts, and that future installation of overhead power lines along the byway corridor should be minimized. In the case of unavoidable disturbances, the Corridor Management Plan states that materials should blend in with their backgrounds.
In an effort to reduce visual impacts, the transmission line would be sited to blend in with the background to the extent possible. Where the transmission line would parallel or cross Highway 34, the transmission line would be in the foreground and obvious to motorists; however, for large portions of the North Alternative corridor, the transmission line would be partially or completely obscured by topography. This would especially be true for the portion of ROW crossing state lands east of Highway 34, and the portion crossing BLM and C-TNF lands in the northeastern part of the North Alternative corridor. In this northeastern portion of the North Alternative, the use of wood pole structures from line miles 11 to 22 would further allow the line to blend in with the background.

Comment: In a 14 February 2013 news release, the Idaho Outdoor Business Council stated that “preservation of prime wildlife habitat in Idaho… is a sound investment in Idaho’s recreation-based economy” and cited programs such as the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) as important to preserving and increasing public access to natural areas. LWCF have been used in Caribou County to conserve the natural rural landscape. Rural communities that conserve and build upon these natural and historic resources will be better positioned to enhance quality of life for their residents (Partnership for Sustainable Communities 2011).

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: Presently, this project does not intend to utilize state property. However, in the event this transmission project is altered to include state property, it is appropriate for Idaho’s comments to include specific considerations related to state land holdings.

Response: Comment Noted.

Comment: Any use of Endowment Lands will require application for and approval of term easements with fees based on current market rates. Easements may include multiple uses in some locations. Final location of any easements should be placed, wherever possible, in locations that will result in minimal negative impact to the function and productivity of Endowment land.

Response: Comment noted. Any use of Endowment Lands would be contingent on the approval of an easement and BPA acknowledges that fees would be based on current market rates. Final location of any easements would be placed, wherever possible, in locations that would result in minimal negative impacts to the function and productivity of Endowment land.
U.S. Forest Service Lands

Comment: As stated in the Draft EIS, construction of the transmission line along the north route crosses a portion of the Gravel Creek Special Emphasis Area and is also not consistent with the management goals identified by the USFS Caribou-Targhee National Forest. However, no mitigation measures are stated in section 3.1.4 for this negative impact, classified as high for both short and long-term impacts. It is not adequate to state that “BPA is currently working with USFS to further avoid or minimize potential project-related impacts to this area.” Under federal NEPA law, BPA is required to analyze the short and long-term impacts to the Gravel Creek Special Management Area and describe how these impacts will be mitigated. The fact that the USFS Caribou-Targhee National Forest is listed as a cooperating agency in preparation of this EIS further supports that these impacts and mitigation measures should be specified. [HSTP13 0017]

Comment: Additional mitigation is needed if the Gravel Creek Special Emphasis Area is impacted at all. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: The roughly 328-foot portion of the proposed North Alternative ROW traversing the Gravel Creek Special Emphasis Area, similar to other portions of the project crossing National Forest lands, is the subject of an application for an amendment to the Caribou National Forest plan, included as Appendix A of the supplemental draft EIS. The Amendment would change the portion of ROW currently designated as management prescription 2.1.6(b) to management prescription 8.1, Concentrated Development Area. BPA is required by the forest plan to undertake consultation with the USFS, IDT, Federal Highways Administration (FHWA), and USACE regarding routing of the transmission line ROW over lands within management prescription 2.1.6(b), per the Memorandum of Understanding amongst those agencies. No roads or structures would be sited on the portion of the North Alternative ROW traversing lands currently designated as management prescription 2.1.6(b). Potential impacts to lands within management prescription 2.1.6(b) and associated mitigation measures are discussed further in Section 3.1 the supplemental draft EIS.

Mining Areas

Comment: It is our understanding that the mining companies have found ways to eliminate most, if not all of the various mining area concerns that the draft EIS portrayed for the South Alternative. [HSTP13 0013]

Response: All of the alternatives have been developed in cooperation with mining companies to determine the best possible route while minimizing impacts to the environment and the mining operations. As discussed in Section 3.13, there remain contamination issues associated with mining areas crossed by the South Alternative. It is also possible that unknown contaminated sites could be discovered during construction of the South Alternative or its options, in mining areas crossed by the corridor. BPA would strive to mitigate potential impacts by avoiding excavation in areas of identified contaminants and conducting soil sampling in areas reasonably likely to be contaminated by mining waste containing selenium and other hazardous substances.
**Comment:** We recommended siting all new facilities and structures in previously developed corridors as much as possible. However, we do not have significant concerns regarding placing transmission lines in areas with past or proposed mining activity. Material from formerly reclaimed mining areas may need to be rehandled to help address selenium contamination issues. Transmission line construction could either mobilize contaminants or impair needed reclamation efforts. [HSTP13 0016]

**Response:** BPA is aware of potential mining contamination hazards. Chapter 3, Public Health and Safety of the supplemental draft EIS addresses issues related to mining and potential hazards of past contamination issues. The North Alternative avoids direct impacts with mines. For the South Alternative and Options 1 through 4, there is a small likelihood that they would come in contact with contaminated mining sites. However, transmission lines and access roads would be sited to avoid areas of contamination. As noted in Chapter 3, Land Use, Option 3 would avoid both the Blackfoot Bridge Mine and the Conda/Woodall Mountain Mine, while Option 4 would avoid the Conda/Woodall Mountain Mine. Option 3A would avoid the Blackfoot Bridge Mine, the Conda/Woodall Mountain Mine, and the Husky-North Dry Ridge Mine.

**Comment:** In the DEIS, BPA identified two issues related to mining especially for the South Alternative. Specifically:

1. Accommodating new mining operations that may be built along or adjacent to the South Alternative Route.

   *Issue number one can be resolved by coordinating closely with the phosphate mining operations that are planned for Caribou County regardless of the ultimate route chosen.* [HSTP13 0010]

**Response:** Comment noted. All alternatives and options have been developed in cooperation with all landowners including mining companies to determine the best possible route while minimizing impacts to the environment and the mining operations.

**Comment:** You talked about the south route over the mining property. Is some of it unmined property that might be permitted in the future that you're protecting? [HSPT13 0028]

**Response:** The South Alternative and its options have the potential to cross areas of future mining activity. As mentioned above, BPA has developed alternatives in cooperation with all landowners including mining companies. As noted above in responses regarding estimated costs, BPA recognizes that surface uses cannot unreasonable interfere with a mining company’s right to fully extract the phosphate. Since subsurface rights take precedent, BPA could be required to relocate its transmission line to allow for mining activities. BPA prefers to not construct a transmission line in areas where there is the potential that the line would need to be moved.
Recreation

Comment: In addition, the Blackfoot WMA and surrounding area has important aesthetic characteristics that many Idahoans want to maintain. Blackfoot Bridge WMA attracts visitors from all over Idaho to fish and to enjoy the scenery. The impacts of the southern routes on the undeveloped nature of the area do not appear capable of being mitigated and these southern alternatives should be rejected. [HSTPS13 0016]

Comment: GYC’s members regularly use and enjoy the lands and waters of southeast Idaho, including the Blackfoot River Wildlife Management Area, for a variety of activities such as fishing, hiking, hunting, wildlife viewing, photography, and other pursuits. If BPA were to change the alignment for the Hooper Springs Transmission Project so that it crosses into the WMA, GYC’s and its member’s interests would be substantially harmed.

As we understand, based on a map dated July 9, 2013, BPA now is considering a change in alignment of the transmission line to pass through the WMA. In fact, from our best calculation more than a mile of the line would be constructed within the WMA. GYC and its members have a long history in protection the WMA. GYC “adopted” the WMA through the Idaho Department of Fish and Game’s “Adopt-a-Wetland” program in 1997 and our staff and members have volunteered more than one thousand hours of labor on the WMA. We have carried out numerous restoration and enhancement projects that have improved fish and wildlife habitat within the WMA. The proposed alignment change as illustrated in the July 7, 2013 map will have profound, negative effects on habitat within the WMA, which in turn will negatively affect GYC’s members and supporters, as well as the larger public who value the WMA for a variety of recreational activities. [Greater Yellowstone Coalition Letter]

Comment: Moreover, the WMA provides an important recreational site for residents of and visitors to Idaho. People visit the WMA each year to participate in a variety of activities, including fishing, hiking, hunting, wildlife viewing, and photography. [Greater Yellowstone Coalition Letter]

Response: BPA recognizes the importance of the Blackfoot River WMA as a recreational area and that GYC is an active participant in restoration and enhancement projects within the WMA. As described above, BPA has, after investigating numerous routes in an effort to avoid crossing the Blackfoot River WMA, identified Option 3A as the preferred alternative. This route would avoid the proposed Husky-North Dry Ridge Mine and the majority of the North Maybe Mine Investigation Area. BPA has worked extensively with IDFG to site the Option 3A ROW, access roads, and structures to minimize impacts to the Blackfoot River WMA.
Visual Resources

Comment: Pursuant to our mission and the framework of SHC, we recognize the value of providing for the needs and values of people when considering project impacts. As expressed by the public at the April 3, 2013, meeting in Soda Springs, visual impacts across the proposed northern alternative are of concern to local landowners and those who recreate in the area, including at Gray’s Lake NWR. The northern alternative is not consistent with the rural and natural visual experience of the area, including Gray’s Lake NWR. Please address in subsequent NEPA analysis the potential visual impacts of the northern alternative to Gray’s Lake NWR. [HSTP13 0020]

Response: Comment noted. The closest point from Gray’s Lake is over 3 miles from the North Alternative; however, an assessment of visual effects on private lands and visitors at the Gray’s Lake NWR has been conducted and is discussed in Chapter 3, Visual Resources.

Comment: The selection of the “Northern Route” will also adversely impact the views associated with the “scenic corridor” which extends north from Soda Springs to the termination point of the project. [HSTP13 0026]

Comment: The northern route would impact scenic and historical routes. [HSTP13 0012]

Comment: It is shocking that BPA would give serious consideration to developing a new transmission line corridor through an area that has high scenic values, is relatively “pristine”, and that is globally renowned for its high concentrations of birds, when the South Alternative provides a viable way to avoid the highest avian conflict areas and confine the transmission corridor primarily to an area that already has a relatively high level of human activity and disturbance. [HSTP13 0013]

Response: An assessment of visual effects on the “scenic corridor” of the North Alternative and its options, has been conducted and is discussed in Chapter 3, Visual Resources and Appendix B, Visual Resources Assessment. As described above, BPA’s preferred alternative is the South Alternative’s Option 3A.

Comment: If this was physically possible, it would be visually objectionable and a maintenance nightmare. [HSTP13 0013]

Response: Comment Noted

Comment: All photo-simulation photos (Figures 3-11, 3-12, 3-13, 3-14, 3-15, 3-17, 3-18) appear to have been taken with a wide angle camera lens and only depict visual simulations of the proposed transmission line from far distances. [HSTP13 0017]
Response:  Comment noted. Updated simulations have been incorporated into the supplemental draft EIS. Photos were taken with a digital camera using a standard lens. Visual simulations were intended to provide support to narrative descriptions of potential visual changes to the existing setting. As is typical, simulations were conducted using standard, agreed-upon methods and were reviewed by appropriate agency staff for accuracy. Where appropriate, close-up views of the proposed project were provided.

Comment:  No photo simulations are included where the transmission line is adjacent to or crosses Highway 34 or local roads. The evaluation of environmental consequences is therefore biased and does not sufficiently evaluate impacts to visual resources where the transmission line is near and/or crosses Highway 34 and local roads. [HSTP13 0017]

Response:  Comment noted. Additional visual simulations have been provided and analyzed in Chapter 3 which depict the impact to visual resources for points where the project crosses Highway 34.

Comment:  And then it says, “All pictures in section 39.3. These pictures are small and of poor quality, possibly from being printed. They give a false impression of how the lines will appear. [HSTP13 0025]

Response:  As noted above, visual simulations are intended to provide support to the narrative descriptions, which present a detailed analysis of the potential for visual changes to the existing setting. Additional visual simulations have been added to Chapter 3, Visual Resources. The photos were likely compressed for printing and uploading of the document. Originals can be provided or the pictures in the document can be enlarged and/or not compressed.

Comment:  For aesthetic values, we would prefer that the transmission line not be visible from any portion of the WMA. [HSTP13 0022]

Comment:  We appreciate efforts to keep the line as far away from the WMA property as possible, and particularly routing that prevents visual impacts from the river valley in the middle of the WMA. [HSTP13 0022]

Response:  Comments noted. Section 3.3.3, Environmental Consequences of the South Alternative, South Alternative Route Options, Option 3A, describes the impacts to visual resources within the Blackfoot River WMA.
Comment:  Figure 3.3 was taken several hundred yards east of the Kackley Ranch gate. To the north you can see the Crawford Ranch and Badger Noll. The draft EIS states, ‘Evidence of human presence along this portion of lanes Creek Road includes low fencing, wooden utility lines and residential homes.”

Well, I can tell you that there’s no utility lines visible from where this picture was taken. In the 1970’s, when the Kackleys and the Crawfords contracted for power, they paid to have the lines buried. To view the lines along Highway 34 from the location you would need field glasses and you can hardly see Highway 34. And I know from firsthand experience that it’s hard to see the cars unless there’s light flashing off the windshield.[HSTP13 0025]

Response:  Comment noted. Figure 3.3 of the draft EIS was intended to be a representative photograph from this portion of the project area. While the photograph itself may not contain all the items included in the narrative, those elements are present in the vicinity. There is a wooden transmission line that crosses Lanes Creek Cutoff just over a mile south of the Lanes Creek Substation, and crosses Lanes Creek Road, just south of the intersection of Lanes Creek Cutoff and NF—191 road.

Comment:  “Figure 3-10 shows an existing non-BPA transmission line in the north alternative corridor in a similar configuration as the proposed steel single pole structures. This transmission line is more closely related to the south alternative than the north alternative. It follows the Lanes Creek cutoff road that BPA has identified as the south alternative.” [HSTP13 0025]

Response:  Comment noted. The draft EIS figure was meant to represent a single-circuit configuration steel pole tower, similar to what is being proposed in certain portions of the North Alternative.

Comment:  From a persona side, taking the school board hat off, this is the area that I drive in the summer to relax, the northern route. I don’t drive the southern route. But that northern route is an area that is scenic and is enjoyable to drive. I’m concerned about that and the impact that will have. You’re going to be going along a scenic highway that will ruin a lot of people’s views. And there’s historical landmarks and stuff like that on that highway that will be ruined because you’ve got these power lines. [HSTP13 0025]

Response:  Comment noted. As noted in the EIS Chapter 3, Visual Resources, unavoidable impacts to the visual landscape would occur. Mitigation efforts would be implemented to minimize these impacts when possible and are described in Section 3.3.4, Mitigation.
Vegetation

Comment: The ability of Idaho Department of Lands to manage the Endowment Assets for the maximum benefit of the beneficiaries will be impacted by this project. Among these impacts are:

A: Spread of noxious weeds. Area-specific management plans will be necessary to protect all abutting land owners. [HSTP13 0010]

Response: BPA would conduct pre- and post-construction weed surveys to assess the presence of invasive and noxious weeds within the ROW and along access roads. During operation and maintenance of the transmission line and access roads, BPA’s vegetation management is guided by its Transmission System Vegetation Management Program EIS. BPA adopted an integrated vegetation management strategy for controlling vegetation along its transmission line ROWs in 2000. This strategy involves choosing the appropriate method for controlling the vegetation based on the type of vegetation and its density, the natural resources present at a particular site, landowner requests, regulations, and costs. Measures also would be implemented during construction to limit the spread of weeds as discussed in Section 3.4.4 of the supplemental draft EIS including following guidelines used by land managers on state and federally managed land.

Comment: The most cost-effective way to deal with noxious weeds is to protect strongholds of native vegetation from activities which either spread noxious weeds directly or create suitable habitat by removing native vegetation and disturbing the soil. BPA activities should limit road use and the exposure of mineral soils where weeds may become established. Roads, trails, and rivers serve as the primary routes for noxious weed species expansion. Special care should be taken to safeguard ecologically intact areas that are not currently infested. The Supplemental EIS needs to analyze the effects of noxious weeds in transmission corridors and describe BPA management of weeds in these areas. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: Chapter 3.4, Vegetation, provides a discussion of the potential impacts to native vegetation from the spread of noxious weeds. As discussed above and in Chapter 2 of the EIS, BPA would implement the Vegetation Management Program EIS guidelines and mitigation measures as described in Section 3.4.4 to minimize the spread of noxious weeds.

Comment: The overall impacts to noxious weeds for both alternatives are classified as low in subsection introductory paragraphs; however, low and moderate impacts are referenced in the subsequent text. Therefore impacts to and risk of spreading invasive species should be considered moderate based on existing analysis. This ranking should be reevaluated in light of life-history characteristics of plant and animal species affected. [HSTPS13 0017]

Response: Sections 3.4.2 and 3.4.2 identify the alternative’s impacts to the spread of noxious weeds as low. BPA does not see any indication this analysis should be changed at this time.
**Comment:** However, if temporary roads are necessary, they should be properly reclaimed to prevent unauthorized access as well as preclude noxious weeds. [HSTP13 0022]

**Response:** Chapter 2, Access Roads, describes how temporary roads would be reclaimed according to landowner requirements including installation of erosion control measures, regrading, and reseeding following completion of construction activities.

---

**Comment:** We would recommend that no new roads/trails be constructed for the placement or maintenance of the line (as per the intent expressed on the May17 tour) and mountain brush communities should be preserved to the extent possible. [HSTP13 0022]

**Response:** As described above, BPA’s maintenance and reliability standards require year-round access to all structures. It is BPA intent to minimize impacts to native vegetation such as mountain brush communities where possible.

---

**Comment:** Loss of aspen habitat - IDFG has identified aspen as an important direct and indirect habitat component for terrestrial wildlife species IDFG is particularly award of the benefits of aspen habitats to mule deer and elk for annual recruitment. Idaho’s current Mule Deer Initiative focuses particular importance on fawning habitat and overall forage production associated with aspen stands. The positive impacts of healthy aspen communities on watershed also benefits fisheries. IDFG support efforts focused on the regeneration of aspen communities that are disrupted by this activity. [HSTP13 0010]

**Comment:** If possible, any timber removal should favor the enhancement of aspen communities. [HSTP13 0022]

**Response:** Comment noted. BPA would consider, if opportunities exist, enhancement of aspen communities as part of timber removal activities related to ROW, access road, and pulling site clearing. As described in Section 3.4, Vegetation, the Project would avoid vegetation removal and aspen impacts except as necessary for ROW and access road clearing and to remove trees and snags that would pose a danger to the transmission line. However, the transmission line and permanent access road ROWs must be kept clear of all tall-growing vegetation and would therefore have some impacts to aspen communities.
Soils

Comment: What geologic analysis was made by Bonneville Power in determining the amount of impact on the environment of the proposed Southern Line and Northern Line? Where can copies of this material be obtained by the public for consideration by appropriate personnel? [HSTP13 0027]

Comment: I've wondered, have you ever done a thorough geologic assessment of that southern route? You are worried about these potential contaminants and such. If so, I'd like to see it. I'd like to see a copy of this. You guys just sit up there in Portland and take maps out and draw lines. I find them not very satisfactory and acceptable. I hope you do a more thorough environmental assessment out there than what you are doing. [HSTP13 0029]

Response: BPA conducted geotechnical investigations of the North Alternative in 2012; investigations along the South Alternative would be conducted in 2014. Copies of the geotechnical reports would be made available to the public upon request.

Comment: Have you done any studies on earthquakes?[HSTP13 0028]

Response: Earthquake studies were not conducted. However, USGS earthquake information for the region was reviewed for the supplemental draft EIS.

Comment: I've got one more question on the soil disturbance. When we started talking again about cutting across the mines, you mentioned the steel towers and they were big and required the huge footprint, you know, with a cement base and everything, and that would cause the disturbance. Well, that -- is there a reason that a similar transmission line like is proposed through the Wayan area, the double wooden poles that don't require that kind of a footprint couldn't be used there? It looks like that that would take care of most of the soil disturbance. Then about all you would have -- you could haul off all that -- if that soil was contaminated that you dug up, remove it, fill the hole with cement and the pole and then all you'd have to do is haul in dirt for your road or gravel, and it looks like it would be a minimal deal. I'm not an engineer, but it doesn't look – it looks like the pole (inaudibles) number of miles would appear is what it looks like, you know, for not being able to take a transmission line across there without causing any kind of major environmental impact. [HSTP13 0028]

Response: As described in Chapter 2, the South Alternative would be constructed as a double-circuit transmission line with steel single-pole structures. BPA does not design or build double-circuit lines using wood pole structures because they do not provide the required ground-to-conductor clearance nor is there room on the structure for 6 wires.
Water Resources, Floodplains, and Wetlands

Comment: Please discuss effects anticipated from filling wetlands to install the proposed project, including hydrologic effects to the surrounding area, and resultant potential impacts to the resources available for wildlife use. [HSTP13 0020]

Comment: Also, how about the wetlands you will be crossing?[HSTP13 0028]

Response: Possible impacts from wetland fill or disturbance are discussed in Section 3.6 Water Resources, Floodplains, and Wetlands. Impacts that would potentially occur to wildlife species from wetland impacts are discussed in Section 3.7, Wildlife.

Comment: The Woodall Wetland complex should be avoided entirely. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: Comment noted. Option 4 is the only route that would not avoid the Woodall wetland complex.

Comment: We are particularly concerned about construction of transmission facilities across wetlands, floodplains, unroaded areas and in sensitive wildlife habitat, particularly in the region of the Blackfoot River Wildlife Management Area (WMA) when more appropriate routes exist. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: Impacts to wetland and floodplains within the Blackfoot River WMA are described in Section 3.6.3, Environmental Consequences of the South Alternative, South Alternative Route Options, Option 3A. Impacts to wildlife within the WMA are described in Section 3.7.3, Environmental Consequences of the South Alternative, South Alternative Route Options, Option 3A.

Comment: Finally, please describe any possibility for micrositing of the transmission line along the northern alternative to avoid and minimize impacts to aspen and wetland vegetation. [HSTP13 0020]

Response: BPA does employ micrositing of the transmission to reroute alternatives away from sensitive resources such as wetlands and sensitive plants. Unfortunately, aspen populations are more difficult to avoid because as tall growing vegetation, they must be cleared from the ROW. Section 3.4.2, Environmental Consequences of the North Alternative, describes impacts to about 75.5 acres of grass- and sagebrush-dominated vegetation communities with about 33.4 acres of impacts aspen- and conifer-dominated communities. The majority of the North Alternative does traverse non-aspen type communities.
Surface Water

**Comment:** However, the project will cross many drainages and the combination of riparian vegetation and other vegetation removal, earth moving activities and associated erosion and sediment loading could exacerbate water quality conditions in streams already on the State of Idaho’s 303(d) list due to exceedances of water quality standards for temperature, sedimentation and other pollutants (p. 3-111). [HSTP13 0015]

**Comment:** Because of such potential impacts to water quality, we recommend that BPA continue to coordinate with Idaho Department of Environmental Quality and Tribes affected by the project to assure that the state and tribal water quality standards will be met during implementation of the project, and monitor as appropriate to assure protection of water quality. We also recommend that the final EIS include information about compliance with Water Quality Restoration Plans that function as BPA’s share of implementing relevant Total Maximum Daily Loads, such as the Blackfoot River TMDL, designed to meet State and Federal water quality rules and regulations in the planning area. [HTSP13 0016]

**Response:** BPA would continue to coordinate with Idaho DEQ as applicable to address any concerns about water quality standards. The project does not cross any tribal lands so consultation with tribes for water quality is not required. There is one proposed access road culvert installation on an unnamed tributary to Gravel Creek on the North Alternative. As described in Section 3.6.2, no new access roads for the North Alternative would be constructed over any perennial waterbodies and no access roads crossing the Blackfoot River, Little Blackfoot River, Meadow Creek or Gravel Creek would be improved. There are no proposed access road stream crossings on the South Alternative or its options. Section 3.6.4 describes mitigation measures that would be implemented to lessen possible impacts to water quality. Information has been added to Section 3.6.1 to describe the Blackfoot River’s TMDLs.

---

**Comment:** Since the project also anticipates obtaining Clean Water Act § 401 and 404 authorizations, and in a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit for planned construction activities likely to disturb on or more acres, the final EIS should include updated information on those permit application processes and recommended measures to protect water quality. [HSTP13 0015]

**Response:** Section 4.9, Clean Water Act, describes all CWA permits including Section 401, 402, and 404. However, Section 4.9 has been updated with additional information regarding impacts to waters of the U.S. and possible permits required. Mitigation measures to protect water quality are described in Section 3.6.4, Mitigation.
Groundwater

**Comment:** In addition, groundwater extraction in the area, land disturbance, material storage, waste disposal, inadvertent chemical or hazardous liquid spills, and compaction produced by vehicular traffic can all affect recharge to the local aquifer and groundwater quality. [HTSP13 0016]

**Response:** Sections 3.6.2 and 3.6.3, Environmental Consequences of the North Alternative and Environmental Consequences of the South Alternative, describes impacts to groundwater from construction. Mitigation measures described in Section 3.6.4 include preparation of Spill Prevention and Response Procedures which would reduce possible impacts to groundwater.

Wildlife

**Wildlife Habitat and Species**

**Comment:** Section 3.4.2 and 3.4.3 discuss impacts to vegetation resources and indicate that the proposed project would directly affect vegetation communities through trampling and removal due to construction of the transmission line, access roads and workspaces. Some impacts would be temporary, while others would be permanent. Since thermal modification and sedimentation are the primary cause of streams not supporting beneficial uses in the project area, we are concerned that vegetation removal along waterways could result in streambank scouring, erosion, poor drainage and loss of soil and wildlife habitat. Therefore, we recommend that such areas be targeted for active restoration to increase vegetation cover and improve thermal conditions in stream channels. [HSTP13 0015]

**Response:** Comment noted. Sections 3.4.2 and 3.4.3 and response above describe how all tall growing vegetation would be removed within the transmission line ROW. This includes all riparian areas unless the conductor is high enough that trees can remain on the ROW. Mitigation measures described in Sections 3.5.4 and 3.6.4 for Geology and Soils and for Water Resources, Floodplains, and Wetlands, include retention of low-growing vegetation, maintaining erosion controls near waterways, and reseeding of disturbed areas would help reduce impacts to stream channels and wildlife habitat.

**Comment:** Please have your environmental studies look at: Power lines have little or no impact on wildlife. [HSTP13 0003]

**Comment:** Please have your environmental studies look at: And the wolves, bear, lions, coyotes, eagles, crows and ravens have pretty well taken care of useable wild life anyway so that’s no issue. [HSTP13 0003]

**Comment:** Please have your environmental studies look at: Animal, bird and fish impact. [HSTP13 0004]
Comment: The North Alternative (32 miles) is about 50% longer than the South Alternative (22.5 miles) and impacts to wildlife, particularly birds, are much higher. [HSTP 13 0013]

Response: Sections 3.7.2, Environmental Consequences of the North Alternative and 3.7.3, Environmental Consequences of the South Alternative, address the impacts of the proposed alternatives and options to wildlife.

Comment: Please have your environmental studies looks at: Effect on winter range for deer elk etc. [HSTP13 0005]

Response: Sections 3.7.2 and 3.7.3 address the impacts of the proposed alternatives to wildlife habitat, including big game habitat.

Comment: Lastly, in addition to the errors and omissions regarding impacts to swans and other birds, the EIS shows similar problems with regard to its analysis of impacts to big game in the project area. Contrary to Appendix F, which states that white-tail deer are more abundant in the area than mule deer, anyone familiar with that area knows that is nonsense. Mule deer and elk are the abundant big game species. [HSTP13 0013]

Response: Comment noted. Appendix F represents observations made during wildlife surveys in the area.

Comment: Waterfowl and waterbirds are the primary avifauna at Grays Lake. Besides the 250 pairs of nesting Sandhill Cranes, numerous waterfowl species nest here, including Trumpeter Swans, as well as shorebirds (Killdeer, Long-billed Curlew, Willet, Spotted Sandpiper, Willet, Wilson’s phalarope, Wilson’s Snipe), waterbirds (American Coot, Virginia Rail, Sora, American Bittern), and Northern Harriers. Colonial species at Grays Lake include: Eared Grebes, White-faced Ibis, Franklin’s Gulls, Black Terns, and Forester’s Terns. During migration, shorebirds (Greater Yellowlegs, American Avocet, Sandpipers) are abundant. Tall grass wet meadows around the marsh support Bobolinks, and Savannah Sparrows, while the willow patches support Willow Flycatchers and Yellow Warblers. [HSTP13 0013]

Response: Comment noted. Additional information on Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge has been added to Section 3.7, Wildlife.
**Comment:** The habitat surrounding Blackfoot Reservoir is a mix of dryland grain fields and native sagebrush steppe with aspen pockets and basalt outcrops. The reservoir has several islands, covered mostly with native sagebrush habitat, but also with some willow riparian. Gull island is used by nesting American White Pelicans, Double-crested Cormorants, California Gulls, and herons. The reservoir is storage for irrigation water, thus can experience low water by late summer. The reservoir is also important as a fishery for stocked rainbow trout and native Yellowstone cutthroat trout. [HSTP13 0013]

**Response:** Comment noted.

---

**Comment:** Based on the above, we suggest there are differences between the two action alternatives in impacts that could result from construction and maintenance of the proposed project, and recommend revising Table 3-19 [3-16] of the DEIS to reflect those differences. [HSTP13 0020]

**Response:** Table 3-19 of the supplemental draft EIS has been updated to include probability of species occurrence along the North and South alternatives and their options.

---

**Comment:** Sections 3.1 & 3.7: We understand that at least one option under consideration for the southern alternative would cross a Wildlife Management Area (WMA) administered by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG). Ownership of the WMA is split between IDFG and the Idaho Department of Lands. Section 3.1 of the DEIS briefly mentions state lands on the southern alternative, but does not identify where those lands are or identify the WMA. As acknowledged in section 3.2, the WMA is administered to provide for public recreation, to improve Yellowstone cutthroat trout (Oncorhynchus clarkia bouvieri) habitat, and to provide upland and riparian habitat for the benefit of wildlife, including wintering elk, deer, and moose. Construction of new roads and infrastructure as part of the southern alternative likely would impact the resource values the WMA is designed to protect. Consequently, we encourage BPA to explicitly address impacts to the WMA and the wildlife that uses it in…wildlife sections of subsequent NEPA analysis. [HSTP13 0020]

**Comment:** The WMA provides important habitat for a variety of wildlife, including moose, elk, and deer. Streams within the WMA provide crucial habitat for native fish, including the imperiled Yellowstone cutthroat trout. Furthermore, the sagebrush lands of the WMA provide habitat for sage grouse, a species with the Fish and Wildlife Service has determined warrants listing under the Endangered Species Act, largely due to fragmentation of the species’ habitat. [Greater Yellowstone Coalition letter]

**Response:** Analysis of impacts specific to wildlife on the Blackfoot River WMA has been added to Section 3.7.3, Environmental Consequences of the South Alternative, South Alternative Route Options, Option 3A.
Comment: The Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) is legally mandated to protect and manage all of the state’s fish and wildlife resources and as a result coordinated the development of a Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for the State of Idaho (CWCS) (IDFG 2005). The CWCS provides “a common framework that will enable conservation partners to jointly implement a long-term approach for the benefit of Species of Greatest Conservation Need” (IDFG 2005). However, the impacts of the proposed transmission line on the Species of Greatest Conservation Need that occur in the project have not been addressed in the Draft EIS. [HSTP13 0017]

Comment: Impacts to all these special status species identified by the State of Idaho and known to occur within wetland and other habitats along the north and south alternatives should be analyzed. Because these species are lacking, the analyses of environmental consequences and mitigation are not sufficient to evaluate. [HSTP13 0017]

Comment: The Blackfoot River/Reservoir (North and South Alternatives), Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge (North Alternative), and Woodall Lakes (South Alternative) all involve heavily used flight corridors for a variety of birds. Bird use includes migratory birds such as ducks, geese, American white pelican, sandhill crane and trumpeter swans. Raptors include bald eagle and peregrine falcons and upland game birds include sharp-tailed grouse and greater sage-grouse. Many of these species are categorized as sensitive by Federal agencies or Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) by Idaho and we believe the DEIS would be strengthened by reflecting Idaho’s SGCN conservation status for these species (http://fishandgame.idaho.gov/public/wildlife/cwcs/). [HSTP13 0022]

Comment: We strongly urge you to select the South Alternative and emphatically reject the North Alternative. The North Alternative creates a needless risk of direct mortality to a breeding group of Trumpeter Swans that is classified as “Critically Imperiled” in Idaho. This route would needlessly and permanently impact the avian resources of two Important Bird Areas of Global Significance, Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge and Blackfoot Reservoir, and the impacts cannot be reasonably mitigated. [HSTP13 0013]

Response: Sections 3.7.2, Environmental Consequences of the North Alternative, and 3.7.3, Environmental Consequences of the South Alternative, address the impacts of the proposed alternatives and options to wildlife including special status species.

Comment: The draft EIS provides a superficial and erroneous description of Trumpeter Swan use of the project area. Some of the omission and errors include: The draft EIS completely fails to disclose that Trumpeter Swans are classified as a Species of Greatest Conservation Need in Idaho and that our nesting population has been designated as “Critically Imperiled”. Instead, the draft EIS merely says that IDFG classifies it as a “game bird”. Technically its designation under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 is indeed “game bird,” however that is totally irrelevant to its conservation status. It is the current conservation status in Idaho of vulnerable species that is (or should be) of paramount interest in this EIS. The EIS should have clearly disclosed that Trumpeter Swans are classified in Idaho as Critically Imperiled, with only 97 adults and about 24 nesting pairs occurring state-wide. [HSTP13 0013]
**Comment:** In Appendix G, the draft EIS erroneously reported the IDFG classification of virtually every sensitive species by focusing on whether it was game or non-game, rather than giving its conservation status (State Rank or SRank) of “vulnerable”, “imperiled” or “critically imperiled”. Whoever put this appendix together apparently did not understand how to use the State Rank system in Idaho which is readily available and explained at: (http://fishandgame.idaho.gov/public/docs/compWildStrategy/appendixB.pdf)

**Response:** Table 3-22 of the EIS has been updated to include the global and state conservation rankings.

---

**Comment:** The draft EIS also fails to disclose that Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge is the single-most important Trumpeter Swan nesting area in Idaho and supports about 1/3 of all of the adults and nesting pairs in the entire state. [HSTP13 0013]

**Comment:** The draft EIS fails to reveal that both Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge and Blackfoot Reservoir have been designated as Important Bird Areas of Global Significance by Bird Life International and the National Audubon Society. The EIS fails to describe the diversity and the abundance of the avian populations whose flight paths would be traversed by the North Alternative route. [HSTP13 0013]

**Response:** Section 3.7, Wildlife, has been updated to include additional information on Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge. In addition, Appendix G, Avian Collision Risk Assessment and Marking Plan, includes information on the status of these locations as Important Bird Areas.

---

**Comment:** In addition to the facts in the IBA description, in August-September there is a very large staging area for Sandhill Cranes, Canada Geese, and other waterfowl in the grain fields and wetlands along the east side of Blackfoot Reservoir along the North Alternative route. The draft EIS should have discussed these unusual avian concentrations and recognized the high risk of bird strikes that a transmission line through this area will cause. [HSTP13 0013]

**Comment:** Your proposed North Alternative route virtually encompasses the spring and fall migration routes to and from Grays Lake National Wildlife Refugee and adjacent environs. The routes are used by thousands of cranes, waterfowl, and many of the other of the 150+ avian species that inhabit this superlative 22,000-acre marsh and associated upland habitats. [HSTP13 0014]

---
Comment: The draft EIS showed no awareness of the daily spring, summer, and fall low altitude foraging/feeding flights to and from Grays Lake Valley by cranes, some waterfowl, and other colonial nesting birds. These movements, which occur daily, involve anywhere from hundreds to several thousand birds of different species, which pass on a broad front southeasterly through Gravel Creek drainage, Hwy 34 corridor, Williamsburg, Lanes Creek, and Tincup Creek with some continuing on to WY. Smaller numbers of birds also move southwesterly from Grays Lake Valley to the Blackfoot Reservoir area and return in these same low altitude flights. Most all of these bird flights would be forced to cross your North Alternative transmission lines. [HSTP13 0014]

Response: Section 3.7, Wildlife has been edited to add additional information on Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge. In addition, Sections 3.7.2 and 3.7.3 of the EIS discuss the potential effects of the North and South Alternatives on avian collisions and Appendix H, Avian Collision Risk Assessment and Marking Plan, includes information on the our analysis of the highest risk areas for avian collisions for all alternatives.

Comment: The draft EIS also fails to reveal that Blackfoot Reservoir, in conjunction with the grain fields to the east of the reservoir where the North Alternative would run, comprise one of the more heavily use Sandhill Crane fall staging areas in Idaho, and the area also receives considerable use by geese and ducks. [HSTP13 0014]

Response: Appendix H includes the avian collision risk assessment and marking plan developed for this project. This assessment and marking plan considered the important bird habitat at the Blackfoot Reservoir in determining both potential impacts to avian species, including sandhill crane, and developing a marking plan to minimize potential impacts.

Comment: I also reviewed the bird list for Species of Special Concern in Idaho (Appendix G) and found more than 35 bird species that occur along or near the North Alternative transmission line route. [HSTP13 0014]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: No bats insects, or gastropods are listed in Section 3.7 Wildlife, but several species that are listed as Species of Greatest Conservation Need occur in southeast Idaho. Impacts to species that occur or are likely to occur along the north and south route alternative should be analyzed. [HSTP13 0017]

Response: BPA consulted with IDFG during the preparation of the supplemental draft EIS. IDFG indicated which species could potentially occur within the project area and those species were included in the supplemental draft EIS. BPA has updated Table 3-22 of the supplemental draft EIS to include the global and state conservation ranking status.
**Comment:** In addition to sage-grouse, we believe that other wildlife such as pygmy rabbits, sage thrasher, sage sparrow, birds of prey, and so forth should be of concern in planning. New construction and infrastructure will also change crucial habitat for these species. The BLM should avoid construction in any designated areas or lands for special management of these species. [HSTP13 0016]

**Response:** BPA consulted with IDFG, BLM, USFWS, and USFS during the preparation of the supplemental draft EIS. These agencies indicated which species could occur in the project area and could be potentially impacted. The EIS addresses these species, including raptors, sage sparrow, and pygmy rabbit in Section 3.7, Wildlife. In the case of the sage sparrow and the pygmy rabbit, no detailed analysis was deemed necessary because they have a low potential to occur in the project area.

**Comment:** Executive Order 13186 (66 Fed. Reg. 3853, January 17, 2001), entitled “Responsibilities of Federal agencies to Protect Migratory Birds,” directs Federal agencies to integrate migratory bird conservation practices into agency activities, and to promote the conservation of migratory bird populations and their habitats. Pursuant to this executive order, the Department of Energy signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Service in 2006, which BPA also operates under. That MOU requires BPA to “avoid or minimize, to the extent practicable, adverse impacts on migratory bird trust resources when conducting agency actions.” In addition, it compels BPA to “ensure that migratory bird protection and conservation is considered in NEPA project reviews.” In keeping with these obligations, we recommend BPA integrate the additional analyses described above into subsequent NEPA analysis for the proposed Hooper Springs Transmission Line project. [HSTP13 0020]

**Comment:** Given that either alternative of the proposed transmission line likely would pose a threat to migratory birds, we encourage BPA to coordinate with the Service on ways to “protect, restore, enhance, and manage habitats of migratory birds.” As agreed to in the MOU and as is being implemented on other transmission lines proposed for construction in Idaho and neighboring states. [HSTP13 0020]

**Comment:** Outside the framework of the EIS, we recommend that BPA prepare a Bird Conservation Strategy (BCS), in coordination with the Service. We recommend the BCS describe how the project complies with the MBTA and the DOE/FWS MOU described above. The BCS should outline measures that BPA would take to avoid, minimize, and compensate for impacts to avian species during all phases of the project. [HSTP13 0026]
Response: Section 3.7.4, Mitigation and Appendix H, Avian Collision Risk Assessment and Marking Plan, describe mitigation measures designed to minimize and mitigate for potential impacts to migratory birds. Measures to be implemented include preconstruction nest surveys, sage-grouse lek surveys, installation of visibility enhancement devices, limiting vegetation removal suitable for grouse nesting, and avoiding snag and large tree removal to the extent possible. The updated 2012 MOU requires BPA to “avoid or minimize, to the extent practicable, adverse impacts to migratory bird trust resources when conducting agency actions.” In addition, it compels BPA to “ensur[e] that migratory bird protection and conservation is considered in NEPA project reviews.”

Comment: In addition to implementing the APLIC guidelines, we recommend revising the mitigation measures proposed in the DEIS to be more specific. As stands, many are too vague to understand what will be implemented on the ground or their effectiveness in avoiding and minimizing impacts to resources. Where these measures pertain to Federal trust resources, including migratory birds and their habitats, we would be happy to assist BPA develop appropriately-specific best management practices and mitigation measures for inclusion in the FEIS. [HSTP13 0020]

Response: BPA appreciates the offer of assistance. As discussed above, BPA has conducted an avian collision risk assessment and developed a marking plan that can be found in Appendix H of the supplemental draft DEIS.

Comment: In addition, mitigation for negative impacts to wildlife should be identified for each alternative and the various routing options. The north alternative is nearly 50% longer than the south alternative and is in closer proximity to Blackfoot Reservoir and Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge, both of which have been identified as globally significant Important Bird Areas (http://netapp.aubudon.org/iba/state/US-ID). Although both transmission line alternatives cross migratory bird pathways, it is likely that the impacts to birds and other wildlife along the north alternative would be significantly higher because it is a longer transmission line. The increased environmental impacts of the north are not currently addressed in the mitigation section of the Draft EIS. [HSTP13 0017]

Response: Both alternatives would require similar mitigation measures, although the exact locations and extent of these measures would vary between alternatives or options. BPA has developed the marking plan to minimize potential avian collisions from the proposed project.
Comment: Appendix F: The species list provided in the DEIS as species documented during project surveys seems improbable for the area. For example, Columbian ground squirrels (Urocitellus columbianus) are not otherwise known to occur in southeastern Idaho, yet are described as being present in “high” abundance. Additionally, hunting records and previous observations show mule deer (Odocoileus hemionus) as significantly more abundant than white-tailed deer (Odocoileus virginianus) in the project area, yet the species list identifies the former as moderately abundant and the latter as highly abundant. Please check that the correct species list is included in the FEIS. [HSTP13 0020]

Comment: Appendix F (Wildlife Species Documented Within the Project During Wildlife and Vegetation Surveys) appears to contain errors. Columbian ground squirrels have not been documented in southeast Idaho. The common ground squirrel in the project area is the Uinta ground squirrel. White-tailed deer occurrence in the project area is known to be very low while mule deer abundance would be considered high. Harvest data and recent surveys suggest black bear numbers are relatively low in the project area. Based on our recent surveys, northern leopard frog numbers would be considered moderate to low. Clarification of the methods employed to obtain abundance and species identification is requested. [HSTP13 0022]

Response: Comment noted. The supplemental draft EIS has been updated to remove incorrect references to species in the project area.

Comment: No information was provided on when wildlife surveys were completed or the methods used. Wildlife surveys of the project area should be completed during spring, summer, fall, and winter in order to account for species that may use the area during different life history stages (e.g., spring migration, breeding, molting (birds), fall migration, and wintering). [HSTP13 0017]

Response: Text in the supplemental draft EIS has been updated to include dates for wildlife surveys. In most cases, survey timing was based on USFS and BLM timing criteria.

Comment: Under both alternatives, the proposed action would include construction of new access roads in order to construct and maintain the proposed transmission line. In many cases, these roads are difficult to close to subsequent public use, despite use of gates, boulders, or other barriers. As acknowledged in section 3.2, roads increase human access, including illegal use by people on ATVs. Increased access can disturb nesting birds, displace wildlife, lead to illegal take, or cause other issues. Please address in the wildlife section of subsequent NEPA analysis the wildlife impacts of new road construction and potential increased human activity in the area, compared to baseline conditions. [HSTP13 0020]

Response: Sections 3.4.2 and 3.4.3 of the supplemental draft EIS contain analysis of the impacts of road construction and increased use to wildlife.
Comment: The selection of the “Northern Route” will adversely impact the hunting and fishing sites located along the route, as well as causing significant interruption to the “flight patterns” of waterfowl and the “game trails” of big game animals. [HSTP13 0026]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: The southern alternative does, however, pass near the mouth of the Blackfoot River narrows. While we do not have data on numbers of migratory birds that use that area, birds migrating through the area likely include pelicans, ducks, geese, and osprey. We recommend that BPA coordinate with the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) to assess use of the area by these species and include in subsequent NEPA analysis a discussion of potential impacts. [HSTP13 0020]

Response: BPA consulted with IDFG during the preparation of the supplemental draft EIS. Use of the Blackfoot River Narrows by birds is described in Section 3.7, Wildlife.

Comment: The affected environment description for wetlands and special status species does not include a complete list of wildlife species that have been documented using wetlands along the affected area of the north and south alternatives. Avian species that occur in wetland habitats along the proposed north and south alternatives, but are NOT listed as species in the section describing wetland wildlife habitat in the Draft EIS are:

Geese: Canada geese.

Dabbling ducks: northern pintail, mallard, northern shoveler, cinnamon teal, blue-winged teal, green-winged teal, American widgeon, gadwall.

Diving and sea ducks: lesser scaup, greater scaup, ring-necked duck, canvasback, redhead, bufflehead, ruddy duck, hooded merganser, red-breasted merganser, common merganser.

Grebes, rails and other marshbirds: eared grebe, western grebe, Clark’s grebe, American coot, sora, Virginia rail, American bittern, Wilson’s phalarope.

Shorebirds: long-billed curlew, spotted sandpiper, willet, Wilson’s snipe, white-faced ibis, upland sandpiper, black-necked stilt, American avocet, greater and lesser yellowlegs, long-billed dowitcher.

Gulls and terns: Franklin’s gulls, Forester’s tern. [HSTP13 0017]

Response: Common wildlife species listed in the draft EIS were not intended to be a complete list of species that could occur in the project area, but are instead a representative sample. However, BPA has updated the supplemental draft EIS with those species listed above as appropriate.
**Comment:** Avian species listed as Species of Greatest Conservation Need by the State of Idaho and known to occur in wetland habitats along the north and/or south route alternatives, but NOT included in Table 3-18 include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northern pintail</th>
<th>Clark’s grebe</th>
<th>Black-necked stilt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesser scaup</td>
<td>American white pelican</td>
<td>American avocet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooded merganser</td>
<td>White-faced ibis</td>
<td>Long-billed curlew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western grebe</td>
<td>Sandhill crane</td>
<td>Wilson’s phalarope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin’s gull</td>
<td>Forester’s tern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other avian species listed as species of Greatest Conservation Need by the State of Idaho and known to occur in other habitats along the north and/or south route alternatives, but NOT included in Table 3-18 include: Swainson’s hawk and Short-eared owl

In addition of IDFG Status (column labeled State Status in Table 3-18), the Statewide Rank should also be included for each special status species. For example, trumpeter swans have a rank of S1B, S2N meaning that the statewide breeding population is critically imperiled and the statewide non-breeding population is imperiled. Several other protected nongame species not currently included in Table 3-18 have a statewide rank of S3B meaning that breeding populations within the state of Idaho are vulnerable. [HSTP13 0017]

**Response:** As discussed above, BPA consulted with IDFG during the preparation of the supplemental draft EIS. However, BPA has added the global and state conservation ranking to Table 3-22.

---

**Comment:** Under the Bald Eagle Protection Act, the transmission line should be sited to avoid any impacts to bald eagles. [HSTP13 0016]

**Response:** Comment noted. As discussed in Sections 3.7, Wildlife and Appendix G, Special Status Wildlife, during aerial raptor nest surveys conducted in 2013, two inactive bald eagle nests were observed within 1 mile of the project corridor. One of these nests, located in the southern portion of the project corridors for both the North and South alternatives, had been documented in 2011 as a potential active bald eagle nest. The second inactive bald eagle nest was documented in a large Douglas-fir snag overlooking the Blackfoot River east of the haul road, near the center of the South Alternative corridor. Several bald eagles were observed soaring and/or foraging during these aerial surveys, but no active bald eagle nests were documented. Because there are no active bald eagle nests located within 660 feet of the proposed project (the recommended buffer for transmission lines in the National Bald Eagle Management Guidelines (USFWS, 2005)), the project alternatives have been sited to avoid impacts to bald eagles.
**Comment:** Anyway, I've just put your map on the computer and I couldn't pick a worse route to go for migratory birds. And they're probably no doubt going to be based on (inaudibles) and having inquired of several environmental groups about this kind of foolishness of putting big transmission lines right on primary migration routes of large birds and, hence, cranes, geese, trumpeter swans. By the way, trumpeter swans, the local population in Idaho is listed as critically imperiled. Anyway, it's a lot of nonsense I see looking at that route. You are in a major migration route, have a scenic highway and we have a historic Lander Trail out there and you guys want to plow right through that with your -- what I consider mess. And there's better ways to go. Your southern route, I've looked at that. Thats pretty (inaudible) except you have these -- I consider -- phony reasons why you shouldn't be looking at that. [HSTP13 0029]

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment:** And lastly, you are subject to laws such as the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1980, which opens you wide open to suits, the Eagle Act of 1940 -- and we can go on and on and on. So I'd like to see these things addressed and not just sit there in some office in Portland and come up with a bunch of nonsense. And that's what I consider your proposal, nonsense. [HSTP13 0029]

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment:** Do you know anything about the flyway treaty? Have you heard about that? Three migration flyways. [HSTP13 0028]

**Response:** Without specific references, BPA is unable to respond to this comment.

**Comment:** Both alternatives of the proposed project cross important breeding, wintering, and migratory habitats for migratory birds. [HSTP13 0020]

**Comment:** Farther south, anywhere from several hundred to a few thousand cranes may use the area near Woodall Springs and the proposed southern alternative in the fall, when they come to feed in nearby grain fields prior to migrating south for the winter. Some of these cranes feed at the grain fields during the day and travel north to roost at the Blackfoot Reservoir each evening. These daily movements cross the proposed project area. [HSTP13 0020]

**Response:** Comments noted.
Comment: Section 3.7: Although the DEIS mentions cranes and swans, it does not quantify the extent of bird use of the area (including the exceptionally large number of cranes that use Gray’s Lake NWR) or describe patterns of bird use and behavior, as they relate to the risk posed by the proposed project. [HSTP13 0020]

Response: Comment noted. BPA conducted an avian collision risk assessment to determine the portions of the alternatives with the highest risk of avian collision. It can be found in Appendix H, along with a marking plan designed to minimize collision risk.

Comment: The DEIS also does not describe waterfowl use. Please include such discussion in subsequent NEPA analysis for the project. Please also describe resultant population impacts expected from the proposed action. [HSTP13 0020]

Comment: What migratory waterfowl flight data and/or material were considered by Bonneville Power in determining the amount of impact by the proposed Southern and the Northern Line? Where can copies of this material be obtained by the public for consideration by appropriate personnel? [HSTP13 0027]

Response: BPA did not include analysis of migratory waterfowl flight data, but instead used information obtained in consultation with state and federal agencies to determine the presence of species in the area, as well as required surveys. A brief description of waterfowl has been added to the supplemental draft EIS.

Comment: Transmission lines provide perches for common ravens (Corvus corvax) and raptors, species that commonly predate on other birds or their eggs. Infrastructure facilitates expansion of raven populations into areas where they were previously absent or in low abundance. Ball (2003) noted that most crane nests at Grays Lake are lost to predators and recent nest success witnessed from 1997-2000 was much lower as compared to Steel (1952) and Drewien (1973). Researchers attributed this at least in part to changes in the predator community, most likely increased raven and coyote populations (Austin 2007). Sandhill cranes, geese, and long-billed curlews (Numenius americanus) that nest on the Refuge are large birds that nest relatively early, before wetland vegetation has grown tall enough to provide shelter. They thus are quite conspicuous to predators while sitting on their nests. Currently, there are few perches along the proposed northern alternative. Fencing is limited on the Refuge, and there are no existing transmission lines and few distribution lines. Increasing the availability of perches in the vicinity of wetland complexes with nesting birds may negatively impact the nesting success of birds on the Refuge and surrounding lands. Please discuss in subsequent NEPA analysis the impacts associated with the proposed line as a perch for predators. [HSTP13 0020]

Comment: Both greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse are known to occur in the area of both alternatives. In addition to the concerns with avian collision addressed above, appropriate methods should be employed to avoid providing additional perch or nesting sites for predators of greater-sage grouse. [HSTP13 0022]
**Response:** BPA has included a discussion of the potential for increased predation in Section 3.7, Wildlife. In addition BPA would continue to coordinate with its cooperating agencies as appropriate sage-grouse and sage-grouse habitat conservation guidance is developed.

---

**Comment:** The timing of construction and maintenance activity could have adverse impacts on nesting raptors. At risk species such as bald eagle, great gray owl, northern goshawk, and peregrine falcon are known to occur in the area. There have been two confirmed great gray owl nesting territories along Rasmussen Ridge and numerous additional sightings throughout the area of the alternative routes. [HSTP13 0022]

**Comment:** In 2004 a great grey owl was sighted in the timbered habitat at the south end of the WMA and there is a possibility of a nest site in the vicinity. Other nesting territories of great grey owl have been identified to the north and south of this location. [HSTP13 0022]

**Comment:** In the vicinity of timbered sections and particularly the area of Dry Ridge, a concerted effort should be made to locate nest sites of forest raptors such as owls and goshawks so nesting sites are avoided. [HSTP13 0022]

**Comment:** The timing of the activity could have adverse impacts on nesting goshawks and great gray owls, both of which are sensitive species. There have been two confirmed great gray owl nesting territories along Rasmussen Ridge. Additional survey should be conducted to determine the extent of breeding goshawks and great gray owls in the project area. [HSTP13 0010]

**Comment:** Additional surveys should be conducted to determine the extent of breeding raptors in the area of all alternatives and disturbance during the breeding through fledging periods should be avoided. [HSTP13 0022]

**Response:** Comments noted. As discussed in Section 3.7.4, Mitigation, pre-construction raptor nest surveys would be conducted before removal of any trees.

---

**Comment:** The draft EIS contains many errors and omissions BPA should reject the North Alternative due to its unacceptable impacts on wildlife, particular on avian species. [HSTP13 0014]

**Comment:** We strongly urge you to select the South Alternative and emphatically reject the North Alternative. The North Alternative creates a needless risk of direct mortality to a breeding group of Trumpeter Swans that is classified as “Critically Imperiled” in Idaho. This route would needlessly and permanently impact the avian resources of two Important Bird Areas of Global Significance, Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge and Blackfoot Reservoir, and the impacts cannot be reasonably mitigated. [HSTP13 0013]
Comment: For all the reasons mentioned above, we ask that you reject the North Alternative and select the South Alternative if action if proven to be essential. Selection of the North Alternative would cause permanent damage to the globally significant avian resources of this area. [HSTP13 0013]

Comment: The Trumpeter Swan Society strongly urges BPA to reject the North Alternative due to the potential impacts to Trumpeter Swans, which are classified as Critically Imperiled in Idaho, impacts to many other avian species, and impacts to two Important Bird Areas of Global Significance. [HSTP13 0013]

Response: Comments noted.

Comment: Raptor populations should be monitored throughout the year to determine level of use and possible hazards from collision and electrocution in the vicinity of the substation and the transmission line. [HSTP13 0022]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: The draft EIS also fails to disclose that throughout the year, these “Critically Imperiled” swans move back and forth on low level local flights between Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge, Chubb Flats, Meadow Creek, Goose Lake, Blackfoot Reservoir, and winter at various sites from Blackfoot Reservoir southward. Much of the North Alternative route, from Mile Marker 1 to about Mile Marker 20 poses a collision hazard risk to Sandhill Cranes as they stage in late summer in this area. It would be impossible to attempt to mark these 20 miles of line sufficiently to reduce bird strikes. [HSTP13 0013]

Comment: Our past research on avian powerline strikes found that 115kv lines can cause major avian mortalities on low flying birds, particularly cranes, waterfowl, and especially the vulnerable trumpeter swans which also nest at Grays Lake. The static wires pose the biggest problems and can contribute to large numbers of mortalities and injuries. [HSTP13 0014]

Comment: In addition, during autumn migrations, snow geese, tundra swans, cranes, and other birds from areas further north that normally stop overnight in route to other destinations, would also be subjected to the BPA net of wires in the Grays Lake and Blackfoot Reservoir vicinities. [HSTP13 0014]

Comment: BPA states it would (3-141) “minimize collision risk through installation of visibility enhancement devices in the area of highest collision risk.” Based upon my 40+ year knowledge of the area and routes of daily bird flights, it would require over 7 miles (from near mile 25 to mile 32) of marking lines with devices to enhance visibility, making your Transmission Line corridor look as if the Eastern Idaho State Fair and Carnival at Blackfoot had moved to rural State Scenic Hwy 34 near Wayan. [HSTP13 0014]
Response: As discussed above, BPA has conducted an avian collision risk analysis and developed a marking plan (see Appendix H).

Comment: The draft EIS also fails to reveal that Trumpeter Swans are usually vulnerable to power line collisions due to their massive body size and weight, and their inability to maneuver quickly. Trumpeters are the heaviest flying bird in North America. Powerline collisions are one of the leading documented cause of death of Trumpeter Swans in the US despite the frequent use of line markers. Because of their great weight (20-30lbs) and huge wingspan (7+feet) collision frequently results in damage to the line and power loss, as well as the death of swans. [HSTP13 0013]

Comment: If Northern route Through Grays Lake There is possibility of migratory bird strikes, ie, Cranes, Swans and Whooping Cranes. They are highly susceptible to wire strikes. [HSTP13 0021]

Response: BPA discusses avian collision risk in detail in Appendix H, Avian Collision Risk Analysis and Marking Plan, including the fact that species type affects collision risk.

Comment: The draft EIS fails to reveal that powerline marking devices do not minimize mortality from avian powerline strikes. At best, they reduce mortality by varying degrees, depending upon a multitude of factors. Utility industry and regulatory agency guidelines clearly state that not siting a new transmission line in heavily used avian flight paths is the only reliable way to minimize avian mortality. [HSTP13 0013]

Comment: Frankly, I find it difficult to believe you studied the potential problems seriously prior to proposing to locate a Transmission line in such close proximity to such large bird concentrations. The evidence available suggests BPA only gave this route a cursory inspection prior to selecting it as the North Alternative route. One of the major criteria in the Avian Collision Model (Heck 2007: 117) that BPA used was: “NEW POWER LINES SHOULD NOT CROSS PERPENDICULAR TO MAJOR FLIGHT CORRIDORS.” BPA obviously did not read this section or took the information lightly, and instead, offered up a superficial but nonviable remedy. Your proposed route puts BPA in direct conflict with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (1918), and possibly the Eagle Protection Act (1940), and other laws. [HSTP13 0014]

Response: BPA developed a marking plan (Appendix H) that follows APLIC 2012 guidelines for minimizing avian collision risk. Although transmission siting to avoid heavily used avian flight paths is ideal, it is not always possible due to other factors. When that is the case, transmission line marking is an accepted practice to minimize avian collisions and mortality.
Comment: The draft EIS failed to utilize the most up-to-date information regarding reducing avian powerline collisions. This is widely available and use should be mandatory on this and all other BPA projects. It appears that BPA has never developed an Avian Protection Plan (APP), as recommended by APLIC and others. [HSTP13 0013]

Comment: To minimize bird collisions and electrocutions, we encourage BPA to implement the 2012 APLIC guidelines, which reflect the current best available scientific information about injury or death of birds from electrocution by and collision with power lines, instead of older versions of the guidelines, as described in the DEIS. [HSTP13 0020]

Comment: Due to the large body mass of trumpeter swans and known collision hazards with power lines, the project impact on trumpeter swans in Table 3-19 should be moderate to high as stated in the text. Similar resource impacts occur for sandhill cranes, a species not even listed in Table 3-19. Flight patterns of birds, including migratory pathways and daily flight patterns between roosting, foraging, and/or nesting areas should be analyzed. In addition, the Draft EIS does not include the most recent information on bird collisions with power lines published in October 2012 by the Edison Electric Institute (Avian Power Line Interaction Committee 2012). [HSTP13 0017]

Response: The supplemental draft EIS has been updated to reflect the 2012 APLIC collision document and to incorporate the above comments into Table 3-22.

Comment: Our August 1, 2006 comment letter referenced adherence to an Avian Protection Plan (APP) and the Avian Power line Interaction Committee (APLIC) guidelines during this project. The DEIS is unclear as to whether the reference to APLIC indicates an adoption of both the APP and the APLIC guidelines, which should be clarified. We strongly encourage BPA to use widely recognized, contemporary methods to reduce powerline collisions, particularly important for the northern alternative. Bird strike diverters should be installed according to recommended protocol and their effectiveness should be monitored and reported with modifications deployed as needed. [HSTP13 0022]

Comment: Both the substation and the proposed transmission line should be constructed to be 'avian safe' according to guidelines of the Avian Protection Plan (APP) and the Avian Powerline Interaction Committee (APLIC). [HSTP13 0022]

Comment: Regarding the Caribou-Lower Valley transmission line we have some concerns with the routing of the line. It is well documented that power lines create hazards for wildlife directly through collisions and electrocution. Construction details should follow guidelines according to the APP and APLIC as above (see Suggested Practices for Raptor Protection on Powerlines and Mitigating Bird Collisions With Powerlines). [HSTP13 0022]

Comment: On the ridgeline itself and adjacent to any wetland areas, bird avoidance devices should be considered to lessen chances of collisions especially during seasonal migrations. [HSTP13 0195]
Comment: In IDFG’s July 12, 2008 comment letter reference was made to the adherence to the Avian Protection Plan (APP) and the Avian Power line Interaction Committee (APLIC) guidelines during this project. It is unclear if the reference to “avian safe” transmission structures (3.2.8 Mitigation Measures) indicates an adoption of APP and APLIC guidelines. [HSTP13 0010]

Comment: We stand by all recommendations in the July 12 letter referring to guidelines in the Avian Protection Plan, wildlife sightings, needed surveys, ad critical wildlife activity periods. As stated previously, bird avoidance devices should be utilized and we would encourage any possible steps to minimize sight distances within the cleared corridor through timber. [HSTP13 0022]

Response: As discussed above and in Section 3.7.4, Mitigation, BPA intends to install visibility enhancement devices on overhead groundwires. In addition, this section indicates that BPA intends to consult with the appropriate state or federal land management agency concerning special status species that have already been identified or that may be identified during follow up surveys, and implement any mitigation measures (such as feasible and appropriate avoidance measures) identified as a result of these consultations. Section 3.7.4 has been updated to clarify that BPA intends to follow both APLIC and APP guidelines in the preparation of the marking plan, as found in Appendix H,

Comment: I also read in your EIS that you’re going to cross some water fowl areas. One of the reasons we live here is because we like to hunt and fish. When I read in there that you’re going to put some gadgets on the poles and wires, and you’ll cut down the mortality of 57 percent of swans and cranes, I have a problem with that. Particularly in some of these areas around Henry and other areas, I think that’s unacceptable. Not only do we have trumpet swans and some endangered cranes in the area, that’s a big concern. Even those gadgets you put on the wires don’t work all that well. Anybody who goes around Soda Creek knows that those poles and wires that are there, even though they have those types of things on them, we get a large mortality with ducks and geese and swans in that area. I’m not saying that the company didn’t work to try not to do that, but I think you got to come up with a better solution. A 57 percent reduction in mortality is not that great a number, guys. There has to be something better. [HSTP13 0025]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: In airspace regularly traversed by waterfowl, BPA should use single poles without guy wires to reduce mortality from collisions. [HSTP13 0016]
Comment: Avian mortalities - In the EA discussion concerning structure installation, reference is made to guy wires. “Some structures may require guy wires that provide stability to structures subject to stress, such as dead-end or angle structures.” ...Guy wires would be within the ROW, anchored no further than 110 feet from the structure.” (2.1.2.2 Transmission Line Structures). In an area of known high wildlife usage, particular large birds, wires strung at levels above ground level even at relative acute angles could result in significant injuries or deaths. [HSTP13 0010]

Comment: Given that the probability of collisions increases when birds cross a transmission line area frequently (APLIC 2012), it is concerning that both alternatives bisect the area between the grain fields and wetlands used by cranes. [HSTP13 0020]

Comment: In addition, the proposed project is in close proximity to areas where young cranes fly as part of daily movements to feeding and roosting areas near the Refuge, Blackfoot Reservoir, and Woodall Springs. Younger birds are known to be less agile fliers, with a correspondingly lower ability to maneuver to avoid power lines (Crowder 200, APLIC 2012). Although a larger percentage of the northern alternative is in close proximity to short cover wetlands and grain fields used by cranes, both alternatives could have potentially large impact on the local population of cranes. [HSTP13 0020]

Comment: Trumpeter swans also use the area surrounding Blackfoot Reservoir. Approximately one third of the adult trumpeter swans in Idaho use Gray’s Lake NWR, including for nesting. Approximately two to 20 swans from the Fivemile Meadows Complex may winter and travel throughout the area, to Woodall Springs (just east of both alternatives), Blackfoot Reservoir, and Gray’s Lake NWR. Tundra swans (Cygnus columbianus) also occasionally pass through the area. Because swans generally travel parallel to the proposed transmission line, collision risk is likely lower than for sandhill cranes. However, risk still exists, as the majority of flights in the area are daily movements at low flight heights. [HSTP13 0020]

Comment: Numerous American white pelicans (Pelecanus erythrorhynchos) use the south end of the Blackfoot Reservoir, in close proximity to both alternatives. Pelicans are also prone to transmission line collisions. [HSTP13 0020]

Comment: Finally, numerous species of waterfowl use the seasonal wetlands and sedge flats at Goose Lake, west of Gray’s Lake NWR. These wetlands attract hundreds of waterbirds and provide vitally important seasonal waterfowl staging areas during spring migration. The proposed northern alternative passes through and immediately adjacent to these wetlands. Waterfowl tend to have high wing loading (small wings), and therefore have limited flight maneuverability, or ability to avoid unseen obstacles such as the shield wires on power lines. Consequently, it is reasonable to anticipate a seasonal high probability of waterfowl collisions along the northern alternative. [HSTP13 0020]
Comment: First, the northern alternative passes within approximately a mile of Gray’s Lake NWR. Gray’s Lake was established in 1965 to protect and restore habitat for ducks, geese, and other species. It includes the largest hard bulrush marsh in the world, and hosts the largest population of nesting sandhill cranes in the world. The Refuge is surrounded by seasonal wetlands managed by BLM, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BLA), and private landowners that provide additional habitat for migratory and nesting waterfowl, cranes, swans, and other avian species. The northern alternative also crosses private lands of high resource value near Blackfoot Reservoir and Goose Lake. The northern alternative transmission line would be in close proximity to two globally recognized Audubon Society Important Bird Areas (IBA), designated at Gray’s Lake NWR and the Blackfoot Reservoir because of the value of local habitats to cranes and other avian species. We are concerned this juxtaposition would place large numbers of birds at high risk for being injured or killed by colliding with the proposed transmission line. Please thoroughly address potential impacts to the avian populations that use the Refuge and surrounding lands. [HSTP13 0020]

Response: Chapter 2 describes BPA’s proposal to use steel single pole structures for the 11 miles of the North Alternative and for the entire length of the South Alternative and its options. This means that single pole structures would be used in the areas between the Blackfoot Reservoir, Woodall Springs and the Blackfoot River where birds move from grain fields to wetlands. As mentioned in responses above and in Section 3.7.4, Mitigation, and Appendix H, Avian Collision Risk Analysis and Marking Plan, BPA intends to install visibility enhancement devices on overhead groundwires.

Comment: The EIS should provide additional information on how powerlines will be designed to minimize electrocutions of raptors. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: Electrocution of bird species is normally is not an impact resulting from transmission lines. Even birds with large wingspans most likely would not touch two conductors at one time. Bird electrocution is normally a concern for distribution lines because they have less distance between conductors than transmission lines.

Comment: The area around Gray’s Lake NWR and Blackfoot Reservoir are of particular importance to sandhill cranes and trumpeter swans, both of which are highly prone to collisions with power lines because of their long legs, large body size, wing shape, tendency to flock, and flight characteristics (Bevanger 1998, APLIC 2012, Morkill and Anderson 1991). Gray’s Lake NWR hosts the largest breeding population of nesting greater sandhill cranes in North America. Annually, approximately 700 sandhill cranes, including 200 to 250 breeding pairs, use shallow flooded wetlands at Gray’s Lake NWR and the surrounding areas within in valley, including seasonally flooded meadows approximately a half mile from the proposed northern alternative. As many as 3,000 migratory sandhill cranes use the area within the Grays Lake basin, proximate to the identified northern alternative, as they stage for the migration to wintering areas. [HSTP13 0020]
**Response:** Comment noted. The supplemental draft EIS has been updated to incorporate the above information.

---

**Comment:** The DEIS describes applying an avian collision model (Heck 2007) to the northern alternative. We would recommend applying the same model to the southern alternative, and using it to compare the two alternatives in a similar way to how collision risk was compared across different sections of the northern alternative. The Service would be interested in seeing the modeling output. Further, we would encourage BPA to include in the Final EIS (FEIS) graphic and written descriptions of model outputs and how they inform selection of a preferred alternative or any micrositing done along the proposed power line route. [HSTP13 0020]

**Comment:** The collision risk model is based on site-specific application of a number of factors that contribute to overall risk (Heck 2007). In subsequent NEPA analysis, please discuss those factors, as well as the additional ones identified in APLIC 2012, and how they apply to each of the proposed alternatives. [HSTP13 0020]

**Comment:** It is difficult to assess the utility of the avian collision model (Heck 2007) used to analyze the collision potential along the North Alternative and we question why a model that is not commonly found in the literature was used: providing the rationale for use of this model rather than other published models would strengthen the DEIS. To allow for our evaluation of this model, please provide information as to where and how the model has been previously applied and the specific inputs used in this application. If the methodology is acceptable, we suggest that the avian collision model also be used to assess the Southern Alternative to adequately compare the two alternatives. [HSTP13 0022]

**Response:** Results and a discussion of the methodology of the avian collision model for the South Alternative and options have been added to the supplemental draft EIS as Appendix H.

---

**Comment:** The Blackfoot River is a heavily used flight corridor for a variety of birds. Bird use is not limited to waterfowl but includes sandhill cranes and tundra swans. We request monitoring of the effectiveness of the bird strike diverters at the Blackfoot River crossing points to ensure avian collusion are minimized. [HSTP13 0010]

**Response:** As discussed in Section 3.7.4, Mitigation, BPA intends to consult with the appropriate state or federal land management agency concerning special status species that have already been identified or that may be identified during follow up surveys, and implement any mitigation measures (such as feasible and appropriate avoidance measures) identified as a result of these consultations.
Comment: Habitat fragmentation resulting from vegetation cleared for the proposed transmission line should be analyzed in more detail to assess its impact on native vegetation, noxious weeds, and wildlife resources. This analysis should include life history strategies of all affected plant and animal species and how they are expected to respond to increased fragmentation and soil disturbance from vegetation removal. [HSTP13 0017]

Response: Comment noted. Sections 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.7.2 and 3.7.3 contain analysis of the effects of the project on noxious weeds, vegetation, and wildlife resources.

Comment: Portions of the project area contain habitat that is crucial to fish and wildlife species such as Yellowstone cutthroat trout, sage-grouse and other species. Such habitat has been severely fragmented and reduced through a variety of land management practices, including road construction and development of rights of way corridors. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: The northern alternative would impact wetlands and more than four times as much aspen-dominated vegetation as the southern alternative. These two communities provide disproportionately high resource value to wildlife. Numerous species including migratory birds, elk, deer, and bears use aspen riparian areas for forage and shelter. Wetlands provide important habitat for waterfowl, cranes, swans, and other avian species. Although the DEIS describes impacts to vegetation in section 3, 4, it does not discuss in section 3.7 the corresponding impacts to wildlife. Please describe the wildlife impacts that would result from clearing aspen and riparian vegetation, including the effects of habitat loss and fragmentation. [HSTP13 0020]

Response: Comment noted. Sections 3.7.2 and 3.7.3 of the EIS describe impacts to wildlife, including the effects of habitat loss and fragmentation.

Comment: This reassessment is critically important as the EIS needs to conduct a more thorough analysis on avoiding, minimizing and mitigating impacts to sage-grouse. The project area appears to contain either Preliminary General Habitat or Preliminary Priority Habitat for Greater Sage-Grouse. [HSTP13 0016]

Comment: The project area appears to contain either Preliminary General Habitat (PGH) or Preliminary Priority Habitat (PPH) for Greater Sage-Grouse (see map below). PPH, as identified in BLM’s Greater Sage-Grouse Interim Management Policies and Procedures, IM 2012-043 (12/27/2011), “comprises areas that have been identified as having the highest conservation value to maintaining sustainable Greater Sage-Grouse populations” that “have been identified by the BLM in coordination with respective state wildlife agencies.” For pending projects in PPH (including those for which a Draft EIS has been issued and would likely have more than minor adverse effects on sage-grouse), the IM provides that the agency must:
Ensure that reasonable alternatives for siting the ROW outside of the PPH or within a BLM-designated utility corridor are considered and analyzed in the NEPA document.

Identify technically feasible best management practices, conditions, etc. (e.g., siting, burying powerlines) that may be implemented in order to eliminate or minimize impacts. (emphasis added) [HSTP13 0016]

Comment: Consequently, transmission lines should be avoided in PPH, and the BPA has not made the requisite findings or considered measures to avoid or offset damage to the habitat that would be affected by this project. If these routes receive further consideration, BPA must disclose these impacts and consider mitigation measures, including the offsite mitigation. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: The supplemental draft EIS has been updated to incorporate the results of additional sage grouse surveys conducted in 2013. Additionally, Map 3-8 has been updated to show Preliminary General Habitat (PGH) and Preliminary Priority Habitat (PPH) for greater sage-grouse. As shown on Map 3-8, all alternatives and options avoid both PGH and PPH. There is a portion of PGH that extends north to the Blackfoot River although this is south of the proposed South Alternative and its options.

Comment: A Supplemental EIS is needed to conduct a more thorough analysis on avoiding, minimizing and mitigating impacts to sage-grouse. Greater sage-grouse suffer from the loss, degradation, and fragmentation of habitat throughout the west. It’s estimated that only 50-60% of the original sagebrush steppe habitat remains in the west (West 200), and in 2007, the American Bird Conservancy listed sagebrush as the most threatened bird habitat in the continental United States. As such, we cannot stress enough how important it is for agencies to consider impacts to sage-grouse and for public land managers to conserve existing habitat and actively restore altered sagebrush steppe habitats. [HSTP13 0016]

Comment: Based on the habitat guidelines for sage-grouse management presented in Connelly et al. (2000), we recommend siting the transmission line in such a way to avoid impacts to sage-grouse. [HSTP13 0016]

Comment: Depending on location and design specifics, the construction of transmission lines within sage-grouse habitat could constitute “nonlinear infrastructure” under the Conservation Plan for Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho (Idaho Sage-Grouse Advisory Committee 2006). Nonlinear infrastructure is defined as “human-made features on the landscape that provide or facilitate transportation, energy, and communications activities—including wind energy facilities.” The Conservation Plan lists infrastructure such as this as the second greatest threat for sage grouse, with wildfires as the greatest risk. Road construction and use associated with transmission line maintenance represents high risk for loss of lek areas, nesting locations, and brood-rearing habitats (Braun 1986, Connelly et al. 2004). In addition, sage-grouse have been shown to avoid transmission lines, presumably because of potential predation. [HSTP13 0016]
Response: BPA has conducted sage-grouse lek survey along the proposed alternatives, as described above and in the supplemental draft EIS which has been updated to incorporate the results, as well as to include additional analysis regarding the potential for effects to sage-grouse, including the potential for increased predation.

None of the alternatives considered cross active leks as defined by Conelly et al. 2000. In addition, the alternatives do no cross preliminary priority or general habitat. However, BPA will need to site the transmission line through some amount of sagebrush habitat in order to fulfill its purpose and need. Federal, state, and private landowners would be still able to manage sage-grouse habitat (as suggested by Conelly et al. 2000) along the proposed corridors so long as the actions do not affect the transmission line. BPA will continue to coordinate with federal and state land managers on sage-grouse presence. The use of monopole structures will reduce the potential perching or nesting of avian predators compared to other tower types such as steel lattice.

Comment: Where impacts are unavoidable, the BLM should implement on and off-site habitat mitigation to offset any impacts to sage grouse. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: BPA assumes the commenter is referring to BPA rather than the BLM. Currently, the proposed alternatives and options avoid long-term impacts to sage grouse.

Comment: The BPA analysis should recognize that sage-grouse are a landscape-scale species and that individuals may move dozens of miles between required habitats. [HSTP13 0029]

Comment: Given the consideration of year-round habitat use and known impacts of human activity on sage-grouse populations, mitigation will be needed for disturbance to sagebrush near lekking areas; disturbance and loss of sagebrush and native forbs used for early brood-rearing; and disturbance and impacts to hydrologic function of wet areas used for early to late brood-rearing. A conservative estimate for the nesting and brood rearing area affected will include buffers with radii of 6.2 miles around known leks. Mitigation specifics could be based on a mitigation template recently created for the Lesser Prairie Chicken, a ground-nesting species facing similar threats (Horton et al. 2010). [HSTP13 0016]

Response: BPA recognizes that the type of habitat required by sage-grouse may be found within the project area. However, as mentioned above and in Section 3.7, Wildlife, the alternatives and options are not within PGH or PPH and there are no known leks within the project area.
Comment:  The BPA should consult closely with the Forest Service, BLM, Idaho Department of Fish and Game and the Local Sage-grouse Working Group to determine appropriate measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts in the Supplemental EIS. With the additional comments received, the BPA should design the transmission line to minimize the potential impacts described above. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment:  As stated above, we recommend reducing roads and trails in identified sensitive areas to preserve existing habitat. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment:  IM 2012-043 requires additional procedures for pending right-of-way applications that would affect more than one linear mile of sage grouse habitat. These procedures include a high-level interagency review process for any right-of-way project that would fail to “cumulatively maintain or enhance sage-grouse habitat.” The sage-grouse habitat that will be affected by proposed project routes has been acknowledged by the BLM as potentially important for protection. Allowing development of a transmission line through this landscape could result in harmful, and potentially irreversible impacts to important greater sage-grouse habitat, both by damaging sage-grouse habitat through the construction and maintenance of power lines and by providing “perches” for raptors and other birds of prey to more easily prey on sage-grouse. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has found that transmission lines have a range of adverse impacts on sage grouse and their habitats. 75 Fed.Reg. 13909, 13928-29 (March 23, 2010). The Service’s 12-month finding on sage grouse noted the many transmission line proposals pending in the western states and explained “If these lines cross sage grouse habitats, sage grouse will likely be negatively affected.” Id at 13929. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: Comment noted. BPA would follow all required procedures and permitting requirements for the Project developed in conjunction with agencies such as USFWS and BLM. At this time, BLM has not required or requested the additional procedures referenced in this comment.

Comment:  The Supplemental EIS should show the proximity of all routes with historic and currently active leks, as well as lek counts over the last several years. [HSTP13 0016]

Comment:  It is unclear from the DEIS whether a sage-grouse lek was “observed” or “discovered” adjacent to the South Alternative (P. 3-135, Appendix G-3). If a lek has been confirmed in the vicinity of the eastern end of the South Alternative, it is significant so we request clarification of the lek reference. [HSTP13 0022]
Response: As described above, BPA has conducted additional sage grouse surveys in 2013 along the South Alternative and options. Chapter 3.7, Wildlife, has been updated to include maps showing the proximity of historic and active lek sites to all alternatives.

Comment: At the elevations of the project, we recommend that project activity be curtailed until mid-May (not “the beginning of May” – Table 2.4, p. 2-50) to protect greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks. [HSTP13 0022]

Response: Section 3.7.4 of the supplemental draft EIS has been updated to indicate restrictions would be in place until mid-May.

Comment: Sage and sharp-tailed grouse (both listed as ‘species of greatest conservation need’ – Idaho Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy, 2005) have been sighted on the WMA in recent years. [HSTP13 0022]

Response: Comment noted.

Big Game Habitat

Comment: Avoiding long straight stretches where possible, minimizing the width of the corridor, and removal of only taller vegetation all would help maintain the security values for big game and other wildlife. [HSTP13 0022]

Response: Comment noted. However, as described in above responses and in Chapter 2, the proposed 115-kV transmission line easement width would be 100 feet wide for both the North and South alternatives and options. Additionally, all tall-growing vegetation would be cleared from the ROW which would be maintained to be compatible with low-growing vegetation species.

Comment: Construction activities should be suspended during elk and deer migration. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: Comment noted. As discussed in Section 3.7.4, BPA would consult with the C-TNF, the BLM, and IDFG regarding construction and access within big game winter range habitat between November 15 and April 15.
**Comment:** Female elk and mule deer are particularly sensitive to disturbance during calving and fawning and we request a construction window that avoids activity during the critical period from late May to late June. We are particularly concerned with the reach for the South Alternative from Dry Valley to Upper Valley, which has been identified as an elk calving area by recent radio-telemetry studies. Currently this area has no U.S. Forest Service identified roads or trails. [HSTP13 0022]

**Comment:** More indirectly, power lines and the associated roads, vegetation removal and visual effects may alter daily and seasonal use by a variety of wildlife. Security for big game during fawning/calving and especially hunting seasons may be affected significantly by increased sight distances. This is especially true at the easterly extent of the proposed transmission line route where it traverses Dry Ridge. This area adjacent to the Blackfoot River Wildlife Management Area (WMA) is heavily used by deer and elk through the spring, summer and fall. Of 25 cow elk radio-collared in the Soda Hills winter range complex (winter ’05-’06) six were recently relocated in this vicinity just south of the WMA and have likely calved in the area. [HSTP13 0022]

**Comment:** Work to install the transmission line in the Dry Ridge vicinity should occur outside of calving, fawning, and fledging periods from late May through early August. [HSTP13 0022]

**Comment:** Female elk are particularly sensitive to disturbance during calving. The general area proposed for the temporary access roads has been identified as an elk calving area. Activity, particularly construction, should not be undertaken within the critical period late May-late June. [HSTP13 0010]

**Response:** Section 3.7.4, Mitigation, has been updated to include limiting construction between Dry Ridge and Upper Valley within the Blackfoot River WMA during the elk and mule deer calving and fawning period and avian breeding and nesting from April 15 to July 1.

**Comment:** IDFG has identified aspen as an important direct and indirect habitat component for terrestrial and aquatic wildlife species. We are particularly aware of the benefits of aspen habitats to mule deer and elk for annual recruitment. Our current Mule Deer Initiative focuses on fawning habitat and overall forage production associated with aspen stands. The positive impacts of healthy aspen communities on watersheds also benefits fisheries. Where possible, aspen community disruption should be avoided and disturbed aspen communities should be regenerated or mitigated. [HSTP13 0022]

**Response:** Comment noted.
Comment: Large numbers of mule deer annually migrate from the north end of the Aspen Range/Wood Canyon higher elevations, across the valley to winter in Soda Hills and the Ninety Percent range. This migration corridor includes the area partially occupied by the Monsanto Soda Springs Phosphorous Plant and the PacifiCorp Substation. Although the proposed Hooper Springs Substation would cover a relatively small area (5.4 acres), the perimeter fencing (page 2-1) would impede mule deer movement through this area. We request actions to reduce and or mitigate potential impacts in consultation with our regional staff. [HSTP13 0022]

Comment: We have no particular concerns with the construction of the proposed substation though we have little information on the detail of the project. Our observation is that substations typically encompass fairly insignificant acreages. However, the general area of the site is heavily traversed by mule deer in the early winter and late spring migrating to and from the Soda Hills wintering area. This migration corridor is already heavily impacted by Highway 34, county roads, railroad lines, residential housing and the Monsanto phosphate production plant. Any further impediments should be avoided or mitigated by improving passage through this bottleneck area. [HSTP13 0022]

Comment: Disruption of mule deer migration corridor - Large numbers of mule deer annually migrate from the north End of The Aspen Range/Wood Canyon across the valley to winter in Soda Hills and the Ninety Percent range. This migration moves through the area currently occupied by the Monsanto Plant and the PacifiCorp Substation. Although the proposed Hooper Springs Substation would cover a relatively small area (5.4 acres) the perimeter fencing (page 2-1) would eliminate mule deer movement through this area. Additional discussion on how to either reduce and/or mitigate this situation is recommended. [HSTP13 0010]

Comment: Surveys should be conducted in the spring and fall to determine the extent of the mule deer migration in the proximity of the proposed substation. [HSTP13 0022]

Response: As described in Chapter 2, the location of the proposed Hooper Springs Substation is adjacent to an existing substation and mining operation. In addition, the land is currently being cultivated. Given the current level of human disturbance and use of the area, it is unlikely that it provides suitable migratory habitat for mule deer or elk.

Comment: The ROW created across Blue Mtn. (approx. miles 22-24.5) would be devastating to migration and wintering Big Game animals because it opens access to what has been up to now a relatively rugged and secure area with very limited human intrusion and which has served as important winter range. [HSTP13 0014]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: The North Alternative route in Miles 21-26 will traverse the primary migration route that elk and mule deer follow as they migrate between lower elevation winter areas to the west and summer habitat east of Grays Lake. [HSTP13 0013]
Response: Comment noted. Consultation with IDFG and C-TNF wildlife biologists indicates the area contains important winter range for elk and moose as well as summer/fawning habitat for mule deer, but is not considered a primary migration route. It is not anticipated that the presence of the ROW would create a barrier to elk and mule deer migration. BPA would continue consult with the C-TNF and BLM regarding construction and access within big game winter range habitat between November 15 and April 15. Within big game winter ranges, disturbed areas would be seeded with preferred big game forage species, as recommended by the C-TNF and BLM.

Blackfoot River Wildlife Management Area

Comment: Any increase in motorized access may lead to reduction in big game security. Currently this area WMA has no US Forest Service identified roads or trails. Security may be compromised if the proposed temporary access roads are not properly reclaimed (retired) to prevent unauthorized access. Mitigation measures should ensure there is no increase in motorized disturbance once the project is complete. [HSTP13 0010]

Comment: There is limited motorized access and therefore limited disturbance to this portion of the WMA and adjacent Forest Service (USFS) land. It would be preferable to maintain this refuge situation and keep the existing habitat intact. [HSTP13 0022]

Response: As discussed in Sections 3.1.4 and 3.7.4, Mitigation, BPA intends to both limit the amount of permanent access roads as well as restrict public access to permanent roads including existing roads on the Blackfoot River WMA and C-TNF.

Comment: Given the large amount of fragmented habitat in the area associated with mining infrastructure and the importance of the remaining habitat, further fragmenting the area near of the Blackfoot Wildlife Management Area appears needless and unacceptable. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: The EIS does not address concerns to the Blackfoot Wildlife Management Area. [HSTPS13 0016]

Response: The supplemental draft EIS has been updated to include a discussion of the Blackfoot River WMA.
we were not fully aware of limitations on the route selection posed by severity of the slope on the west side of Dray Ridge. Because that steep face necessitates approaching the ride at a saddle overlooking the mid-point of Mill Canyon, and because any route down the Mosquito Creek drainage would involve more vegetation alteration and maintenance (disturbance) of the corridor, we no longer see an advantage to pursuing a route down Mosquito Creek. The saddle that the line will approach and cross over is along the southern edge of the unroaded and secluded refugia that we were hoping to protect. Once the disturbance reaches that point, any route that impacts more habitat in the short term or long term is not logical. We agree that following down along the less vegetated Mill Canyon proper, either on the open south-facing slope, or along the road on the north-facing slope, makes more sense for minimizing impacts to wildlife. \[HSTP13\ 0022\]

**Response:** Comment noted. See response above in Chapter 2, South Alternative’s Option 3A.

---

**Fish**

**Comment:** We note that BPA will consult with the US Fish and Wildlife Service, as moderate, long-term fish habitat impacts are anticipated in fish-bearing streams during implementation of this project (p. 3-158). We recommend that the final EIS include outcomes of that consultation and recommended measures to reduce risks to species within the analysis area to protect biota and habitat. [HSTP13 0015]

**Response:** Section 3.8.2, Environmental Consequences of the North Alternative and Section 3.8.3, Environmental Consequences of the South Alternative describe impacts to fish habitat as none to short-term and low. BPA would consult with the appropriate state and federal agencies including the USFWS if needed.

**Comment:** Mill Canyon Creek and other minor tributaries to the Blackfoot River and diamond Creek are occupied by Yellowstone cutthroat trout (also a ‘species of greatest conservation need’) and are potential spawning streams for that species. [HSTP13 0022]

**Response:** Comment Noted. Section 3.8, Fish, identifies the presence of Yellowstone cutthroat trout within the Blackfoot River and upper reaches. Direct impacts to the Blackfoot River would be avoided by spanning the river.
Cultural Resources

Comment: How about the Lander Trail? [HSPT13 0028]

Comment: What consideration has Bonneville Power made in the preservation of the Lander Trail in Idaho? [HSTP13 0027]

Comment: I would like to address a cultural issue on the northern alternative. The Lander Road that goes through that area and in the Wayan area, just east of that, the Lander Road is a nationally recognized immigrant trail under the National Trails Act. That road was built in 1858 and 1859. There’s some original ruts in that area. Once those are gone, they’re gone. Access roads may cross those. And like I said, once those ruts are plowed or harmed, they’re not there anymore. [HSTP13 0018]

Comment: There’s some viewshed issues in that area. It appears to me that the north alternative has some real issues with this cultural business, the Lander Road. [HSTP13 0018]

Comment: This route will closely follow the Lander Road, an emigrant route of great historical value. Placing the transmission project along the Lander Road and/or very close to the route will destroy the viewshed of the route which still today is one of the few places that people can experience the same environment that emigrants to Oregon and California experienced in the late 1850’s and 1860’s. There are numerous historical sites and graves along the Lander Road and I am also concerned about possible damage to these sites with the Northern Alternative. Again, I am opposed to the Northern Alternative of the Hooper Springs Transmission Project. [HSTP13 0008]

Comment: The path now being considered for the transmission lines is near the old Lander Trail, used by many in the pioneer days to cross this area. The construction of towers will have trucks and equipment crossing the old trail or even using it in places. If this happens, the trail, graves, noon resting areas and night camping areas have the potential to be destroyed. And there are places associated with a trail history that are not even known at this time. When those who want to experience this area as the pioneers did, they want to experience the view as it was. There are so few places left when this can be done. Thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns. [HSTP13 0009]

Response: BPA has made every effort to gain access to lands where the Lander Trail may be located but has not been provided access. Section 3.9, Cultural Resources, describes where the North Alternative would cross the mapped Lander Trail; however this portion of the road has not been evaluated for inclusion in the NRHP nor has BPA been allowed to survey for visible tracks. Additionally, because BPA cannot access the area, a viewshed study of the road area has not been conducted.

Comment: The northern route would impact scenic and historical routes. [HSTP13 0012]
Comment:  But from our standpoint, as far as immigrant trails preservation, we would have a real serious concern with the north alternative. [HSTP13 0025]

Response: Comments noted. Potential impacts to cultural resources including historic roads are discussed in Section 3.9, Cultural Resources.

Comment:  Has Bonneville Power examined the federal funds being spent by the Federal Government in preserving the Lander Trail in Wyoming? [HSTP13 0027]

Response: BPA has not examined those funds and would welcome additional information regarding federal funding for historic road preservation.

---

**Socioeconomics**

Comment:  Fishing, hunting, wildlife watching, and other outdoor recreation contribute over $2 billion of Idaho’s $5.3 billion natural resource industry (Wendland and O’Laughlin 2013). When all forms of outdoor recreation activities (non-motorized and motorized) are considered, outdoor recreation created $6.3 billion in consumer spending, $1.8 billion in wages, and $461 million in state and local tax revenue (Outdoor Industry Association 2013). Developments, such as the proposed transmission line, which negatively impact the natural resources of southeastern Idaho need to evaluate the impacts on the recreation economy within Caribou and adjoining counties. Based on personal experience and that of friends and neighbors, people are less likely to recreate in areas disturbed by development, therefore negatively affecting the local economy. [HSTP13 0017]

Response: The impacts to recreational resources have been described in the Recreation section. Short- and long-term indirect impacts associated with the development and operation of the transmission line would diminish the natural appearance and the undeveloped character of certain areas along the routes, affecting vistas and scenery.

The economic value of several resources, including outdoor recreation, is provided in the analysis. However, NEPA does not require that a monetary or quantitative analysis of the total economic value of natural resources or historic resources be undertaken. The description of the impacts, as a result of the proposed action, on natural and historic resources is sufficiently described throughout the document to allow sufficient evaluation by the public of the impact to these resources. Furthermore, undertaking a value analysis of impacts to these resources is a complicated and resource intensive undertaking in itself and the value of these findings would not justify the cost to undertake such an analysis for this project.

Comment:  One thing is I really don’t believe you should be able to go in and destroy people’s income. If you came one of the routes you would do for us. [HSTP13 0018]
Response: Comment noted.

Comment: State Trust Lands are not managed for the public at large and should not be referred to as “public lands” or “open space,” either specifically or in a generic sense. These are working lands producing revenue for the Beneficiary Institutions. [HSTP13 0022]

Response: Comment noted. All endowment assets of the State of Idaho must, per the state Constitution, be managed “in such manner as would secure the maximum long term financial return” to the trust beneficiaries. However, the state also accommodates public use of endowment lands, to the extent feasible, provided such use does not impair financial returns. References to State Trust lands in the supplemental draft EIS has been clarified as managed “in such manner as will secure the maximum long term financial return.”

Comment: The ability of Idaho Department of Lands to manage the Endowment Assets for the maximum benefit of the beneficiaries will be impacted by this project. Among these impacts are:

b. Potential loss of access or value to Endowment Lands [HSTP13 0010]

Response: While users of state Endowment Lands would likely notice the presence of the proposed ROW, structures, and access roads, it is unlikely that the Project would result in an adverse impact to access or value of Endowment Lands. With the exception of land occupied by structures, land within the transmission line ROW corridor would continue to be accessed and used for existing purposes that are compatible with the transmission line corridor, such as grazing, recreation, and public access. In areas leased for grazing, which constitute the majority of Endowment Lands crossed by the proposed Project, construction of the proposed transmission line would result in low short–term impacts during construction; however, the amount of land within the ROW corridor is relatively small compared to the total acreage of Endowment Lands in the vicinity of the Project (53.7 acres for the North Alternative and 12.5 acres for the South Alternative). Additionally, BPA would negotiate and enter into an easement agreement with the Idaho Department of Lands (IDL) in order to cross Endowment Lands, which would generate revenue accruing to IDL and therefore would be consistent with IDL’s mandate to manage these lands for the maximum benefit of the beneficiaries.

Comment: Much private lands that occur on the northern end of the North Alternative are in pastures and some hayfields. A number of ranches are multi-generations, including lands originally homesteaded, and you wish to intrude on their traditional livelihood and rural lifestyle. [HSTP13 0014]
Response: As discussed in Section 3.10, Socioeconomics, during construction of the transmission line, potential impacts to agricultural production may include crop damage (depending on the time of year construction activities cross specific fields), soil disturbance, and/or loss of production for one or two growing seasons due to planting restrictions within or adjacent to the transmission line corridor due to ROW clearing, structure and counterpoise installation, pulling sites, and access road development. Following construction of the Project, agricultural practices would be allowed to resume within the ROW as long as farming activities do not interfere or jeopardize the operation of the transmission line. Few acres of grazing lands would be impacted by construction-related activities when compared to available forage for cattle. Once construction is complete, grazing would return to conditions similar to existing conditions. The majority of agricultural lands would be temporarily disturbed during construction activities, but not affected in the long term.

Property Values

Comment: The right-of-way/easement across the William Meads Trust property will be subject to multiple permanent structures and will impact the farming operation of the Trust property, including the fair market value of the land and its crop production capabilities.

Construction will take nearly two (2) years to begin and complete. There will be a minimum of two (2) years of an adverse economic impact caused by the construction and inability to have total access to the farming property for planting, fertilizing, care, and harvesting of the crop to be grown on the land. [HSTP13 0026]

Response: Construction phase impacts would not take place over the entire footprint of the ROW for the full 2-year construction period. Impacts to any individual properties would be localized and temporary.

Comment: There is no assurance that the parties will be able to amicably be able to arrive at a fair market value of the property and the “value” of the “taking. This may result in extended litigation and incurrence of legal costs and expenses by both parties. [HSTP13 0026]

Response: As mentioned above, if BPA makes the decision to construct the transmission line along the preferred alternative, BPA would seek to purchase easements across private land. Each parcel would be properly evaluated and appraised to determine the fair market value. BPA would provide an appraisal on each easement it wishes to purchase. Each land owner would be given the opportunity to accompany the appraiser and provide input into the appraisal.
**Comment:** The draft goes on to say, ...“Neither alternative is expected to cause long-term, negative impacts on property values along the proposed route or in the general vicinity.” I was a licensed real estate broker in the state of Arizona for 30 years and I can guarantee you that a new transmission corridor through your property is going to adversely impact your property. That statement can’t be true and I didn’t see a real estate appraiser listed as having anything to do with this. [HSTP13 0025]

**Response:** As Discussed in Section 3.10, Socioeconomics, the question of whether nearby transmission lines can affect residential property values has been studied extensively in the United States and Canada over the last 20 years or so, with mixed results. Most studies have concluded that other factors (e.g., general location, size of property or structure, improvements, irrigation potential, condition, amenities, and supply and demand factors in a specific market area) are far more important criteria than the presence or absence of transmission lines in determining real estate value.

---

**Comment:** In Mr. Kackle’s comments on easements, don’t quote me, but I thought you said once this power line accesses your property it would enhance your property value. Am I correct? [HSTP13 0025]

**Response:** Mr. Kackley’s comment was that “those transmission lines are the lines going around Wayan Loop Road that bring your domestic electricity into your farms and ranches. Those are good transmission lines. They do increase the value of your property because you have electricity on your property.”

---

**Comment:** I've noticed over this summer in July the survey crews out there working and apparently they're running a preliminary line called an L line -- is what I see on the survey stakes, the stakes that I've seen on Highway 34. And then up on Williamsburg they are going to run right past the three or four recreational properties, within 150 feet. Is there anything you -- what can you do to move that line away from those properties to help minimize the impact of that loss of value because of this project? There's a question. [HSTP13 0029]

**Comment:** That's a large impact. Someone that's got five or six sections of land for range or farming is one thing, but private, small-acreage landowners can zip right past 'em. I think it's really inconsiderate. Not that this is all inconsiderate. [HSTP13 0029]

**Response:** The commenter is correct that BPA has been conducting civil survey along portions of the North Alternative. BPA has worked with all landowners to minimize impacts to their properties. As described above and in Section 3.10, Socioeconomics, other factors are far more important criteria than the presence or absence of transmission lines in determining real estate value.
Taxes

Comment: My understanding of the EIS is that these are exempt from property taxes. So in essence you come into our community, you impact our community. You say you benefit us and I would recognize that. I think the city of Soda Springs is the only entity in Caribou County that does buy BPA power. Everybody else buys it from somebody else. So I can’t say that you don’t have an influence if you live in city of Soda Springs. But clearly you’re impacting the whole county.

What do you give back for that impact? We live here, we hunt here. We drive those roads for scenic pleasure. We choose to live here for all of the good things that we get, but now you’re going to come in and impact that. What do you give back?

The mines pay property taxes. They contribute to our schools, they fund things. Even Artic Circle and Subway have come in and helped with the schools and tried to contribute in some way. And not only with property taxes but with their contributions.

You’re talking about coming in and spending a couple of years of intense building. You’ll impact our area and then you’ll be gone and what do you leave? That is a big concern for me. I think you have an obligation to leave something. You’re going to be here, you’ll be part of the community. Those lines will be here forever. What do you give back? That’s a big concern.

Response: As described in Section 3.10, Socioeconomics, BPA, as a federal agency exempt from paying local property taxes, would not pay property taxes to Caribou County on the property acquired in fee for the substation and substation access roads. Additionally, BPA would acquire land rights (easements) from private property owners for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the transmission line and access roads. The property owners would retain ownership of the property and continue to pay property tax on the entire parcel, including the land within BPA’s easement, which would have no impact on local and state tax receipts. However, in the short term, project and construction worker spending, as a result of the construction of this project, would slightly increase sales and use tax receipts to municipal and county governments. Therefore, there would be positive benefits to local and state governments from tax receipts during the term of construction of this project.

Additionally, Lower Valley Energy, which purchases its power from the BPA, provides power for rural Caribou County. Therefore, by constructing this line, BPA would enhance the existing power transmission system in rural Caribou County, and address the current voltage stability and reliability concerns within LVE’s system, and would prevent violation of NERC reliability standards. Construction of this line would therefore benefit the entirety of Caribou County and the region of southeastern Idaho served by this line.

Comment: There’s a lot of commerce that passes through this town and I think it will be impacted by that northern route particularly. Communities struggle as they are in these days and we don’t need that impact here diminishing our community.

[HSTP13 0025]
Response: Comment noted. The potential socioeconomic impacts of the project are discussed in Section 3.10 of the supplemental draft EIS. While there may be some beneficial impacts as a result of increased spending in local communities during construction, these would be short term. No adverse impacts are expected, however. Relative to other general market factors, the presence of the transmission line would not be expected to have an impact on commerce.

Comment: This section does not address livability principles identified through an interagency partnership that are important in rural communities (Partnership for Sustainable Communities 2011). The proposed overhead transmission line is in direct opposition to two of these livability principles, including 1) leveraging unique natural and land-based resources to raise the standard of living and 2) conserving and building upon unique historic features and iconic rural landscapes. In addition to the interagency partnership cited above, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service endorsed Strategic Habitat Conservation, which includes “landscapes and system sustainability,” as their approach to conservation in support of their mission: “working with others to conserve, protect and enhance fish, wildlife, and plants and their habitats for the continuing benefit of the American people” (emphasis added). The proposed transmission line, ROW, and access roads compromise the natural features, ecosystem integrity, and iconic rural landscape of southeast Idaho. [HSTP13 0017]

Comment: The iconic rural landscape of southeastern Idaho is defined by farmsteads & ranchlands, historic barns, public lands that support native habitats and wildlife, and working agricultural structures that are visual representations of agricultural, hunting, and natural resource traditions in the State of Idaho and throughout America. Farms, ranches, and recreational amenities such as national forests, national wildlife refuges, and state wildlife management areas all have economic value for rural communities. “Rural American communities are largely defined by their relationship to the agricultural and natural landscape, so conserving working and natural lands is a key strategy for protecting quality of life and the long-term economic viability of farming, forestry, tourism, and other natural resource-based activities” (Partnership for Sustainable Communities 2011). The economic value of the natural and historic resources along the proposed transmission routes is not included in the draft EIS. Therefore, impacts and proposed mitigation to this economic resource cannot be evaluated by the public. [HSTP13 0017]

Response: The expected impacts to land use, visual landscapes, wildlife and fish, historic resources, and the proposed mitigation measures to minimize those impacts, are addressed in Sections 3.1, 3.3, 3.7, 3.8, and 3.9 respectively. Based on the analysis included in the supplemental draft EIS, the project would not be expected to have a high level of impact on the natural features, ecosystem integrity, and iconic rural landscape of southeast Idaho. Additionally, the proposed project is consistent with the stated livability principle of “support existing communities,” as it would improve the reliability of the electrical system in the region.
Transportation

Comment: All alternatives require construction of over twenty miles of permanent roads. Previous management activities have already resulted in extensive road and right-of-way densities throughout our public lands. This density compromises the ability to support wildlife and fish by promoting further human disturbance, fragmenting habitat, accelerating sedimentation, spreading noxious weeds, and encouraging Off Road Vehicle use. Furthermore, there is a positive correlation between roads, even temporary ones, and human-caused wildfire ignitions. We recommend that the BPA seek to further minimize new road construction by placing the line next to previously existing infrastructure and also develop a mitigation plan to close or decommission a greater number of unneeded roads. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: Chapter 2 describes the miles of access roads proposed for the North and South alternatives and options. BPA has designed the proposed access road systems for both the North and South alternatives and options to incorporate as many existing roads as possible. Unfortunately, BPA is not proposing to place the new transmission lines adjacent to existing lines because they are not present in the project area. Additionally, BPA cannot undertake road closure activities on private or public lands except when requested by the landowner. To date, no landowners or land managers have made this type of request.

Comment: New temporary roads for construction and maintenance of transmission lines will provide more access for motorized recreation in areas without a current road system and more opportunities for illegal offroad riding. The devastating impacts of Off Road Vehicles (ORVs) on terrestrial ecosystems are well established. Irresponsible ORV users degrade water quality, spread noxious weeds, fragment habitat, disturb wildlife, increase fires, and displace non-motorized recreationists. While the EIS states that OHVs will not be allowed on closed roads, the Supplemental EIS needs to describe the ability for the BPA to monitor and control ORV use as permitted by land management agencies. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: Comment noted. As described in Section 3.2, Recreation, BPA intends to work with all landowners and land managers concerning possible solutions for controlling or minimizing the potential for unauthorized public access and use that could result from the proposed project. Potential impacts associated with unauthorized public access and use have been added to Section 3.11, Transportation, of the supplemental draft EIS.

Comment: Under both alternatives, the proposed action would include construction of new access roads in order to construct and maintain the proposed transmission line. In many cases, these roads are difficult to close to subsequent public use, despite use of gates, boulders, or other barriers. As acknowledged in section 3.2, roads increase human access, including illegal use by people on ATVs. Increased access can disturb nesting birds, displace wildlife, lead to illegal take, or cause other issues. Please address in the wildlife section of subsequent NEPA analysis the wildlife impacts of new road construction and potential increased human activity in the area, compared to baseline conditions. [HSTP13 0020]
Response: Potential impacts associated with disturbance of wildlife and their habitat, are discussed in Section 3.7 Wildlife, of this supplemental draft EIS. Additional information on potential impacts to wildlife has been added to Sections 3.7.2 and 3.7.3, Environmental Consequences of the North and South alternatives and options.

Comment: Increases in motorized access due to construction of maintenance may lead to reduction in big game security. Measures to ensure there is no significant increase in motorized disturbance, once the project is complete, are strongly recommended. We recommend installation and maintenance of the selected route without constructing additional roads that might lead to additional authorized or unauthorized travel by using track vehicle or helicopter access. [HSTP13 0022]

Comment: We feel it is important that the line be installed and maintained in this reach (from Dry Valley to Upper Valley) without construction of additional roads that might lead to additional authorized or unauthorized travel. [HSTP13 0022]

Response: As discussed above, BPA’s maintenance and reliability standards require year-round access to all structures either by wheeled vehicles. Tracked vehicles are sometime used in emergency situations during the winter in mountainous areas. BPA has, as mentioned above, designed the proposed access road systems for both the North and South alternatives and options to incorporate as many existing roads as possible.

Comment: The ability of Idaho Department of Lands to manage the Endowment Assets for the maximum benefit of the beneficiaries will be impacted by this project. Among these impacts are:

c. Increased trespass activity due to proximity of new roads to Endowment Land. [HSTP13 0010]

Response: As described above, BPA intends to work with all landowners and land managers including the Idaho Department of Lands concerning possible solutions to minimize unauthorized public access and use.

Comment: Other problems with BPA Northern Alternative route include the 100-foot ROW, gravel/rocked roads for maintenance access, invasion of noxious weeds due to disturbances BPA creates along the ROWs, and potential unwanted trespass problems both on private and public lands. You fail to disclose BPA information on associated trespass problems with other projects, especially with ORVs, which you have experienced, such as with the I-5 corridor project near the coast. [HSTP13 0014]
Comment: Run a 100-ft ROW, open areas to weed invasion, and worse, to unwanted trespass problems that may include fences being cut and gates left open, leaving trash, and possible poaching of big game or cattle. Your 100-ft wide corridor would most likely turn into a winter BPA sponsored snowmobile trail. The EIS states that BPA plans to gate access areas, private and public, but I predict you will have limited or no success with that approach. In many winters, snows can be deep in the Wayan area and even the Forest Service has trouble containing cross-country travels in restricted areas, and the State Highway Department experiences problems maintaining open roads Problems created by the BPA project would fall upon landowners and agency personnel to deal with. This would place additional burdens on Caribou County and local law enforcement. In my opinion, BPA should be held responsible for additional costs to the County created by messes left behind by the BPA project. [HSTP13 0014]

Response: As described above, BPA intends to work with all landowners and land managers concerning possible solutions to minimize unauthorized public access and use. All new access roads would be gated following construction of the project to prevent unauthorized access.

Public Health and Safety

Comment: It is also unclear if the slash dispersal from regular maintenance will actually increase or decrease fuel risks. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: Section 2.2.8, Maintenance, describes how BPA’s vegetation management is guided by its Transmission System Vegetation Management Program EIS. Managing vegetation includes the treatment of slash and debris disposal. There are four basic methods of disposing of the vegetative debris generated when vegetation is cut: chipping, lopping and scattering, burning, and mulching. BPA would employ the appropriate method to make sure fuel risk is not increased. Compliance with the landowner or land management agency requirements for fuel loading would be incorporated into all vegetation management prescription for the transmission line.

Comment: Fire management and suppression activities may be severely hampered by the Transmission Line construction and operation and result in loss of Endowment Land productivity. Specific fire management plans should be a pre-construction requirement. [HSTP13 0010]

Response: Section 3.13.4 describes how BPA would initiate discussions with local fire districts prior to construction and work with the districts to develop appropriate fire and emergency response plans.
**Comment:** In the DEIS, BPA identified two issues related to mining especially for the South Alternative. Specifically:

...2. Managing the risk associated with the potential release of contaminants from historical phosphate mines that are located along the South Alternative route.

...As for issue number two, construction of transmission lines and associated infrastructure (road) can likely be done in such a manner so as to minimize the potential release of any hazardous substances. The DEIS states that “if contaminants are disturbed, impacts on workers, the general public, and environmental features could be moderate to high.” The DEIS provides no explanation of how the potential release of contaminants would rate “moderate to high” for impacts to humans and ecological receptors. There has been considerate study of potential risks to both human health and ecological receptors by both the phosphate companies and state and federal agencies. These studies concluded:

...that regional human health and population-level ecological risks were unlikely due to the limited amount of area impacted by previous releases, however, selenium releases in specific locations needed to be addressed.

Simplot recently performed a hazard analysis for workers performing construction in a portion of the Conda Mine site. The construction includes extensive excavation and grading of residual mine materials. This hazard analysis found potential risks to workers due to contamination was low. No personal protective measures are required. The levels of contamination in the Old Tailings pond area are lower than in the construction area. In addition, access to the Conda Mine site for the general public is limited. Therefore the potential for impact to workers and the general public are low. These studies that have been conducted should be reviewed by BPA to more accurately estimate any potential risks that might arise from historical mining operations. [HSTP13 0010]

**Response:** Comment noted. BPA has held recent discussions with the mining companies and the USFS and has been provided detailed site investigation studies, which were only recently available. A review of sampling data indicates that the contamination is confined to disturbed areas of the mine sites and it may be possible, through close coordination with USFS, BLM and mining companies to site the transmission line and associated access roads through this area to minimize potential risk.

---

**Comment:** Do you really believe that any of us think that that's true; that you are going to be -- if you plant a pole in a Super Fund site that Monsanto's going to go broke and all the other phosphate companies are going to go broke and you're going to have to pay to clean up the whole thing? That isn't believable to a single person sitting here. [HSTP13 0028]

**Response:** Comment noted.
Comment:  Is there any way to obtain a waiver from the mines regarding... [HSTP13 0028]

Response: Whether or not a mining company would provide BPA with a waiver would be up the management of that mining company. To date, BPA has not discussed obtaining a waiver from any of the mining companies. Recent cooperative discussions with the mining companies, USFS, and the State of Idaho however indicate that it may be possible to find an acceptable route for the South Alternative or one its options through the mining leases.

Comment:  Another -- another item with Mr. Chatburn from the Energy Resources Department. He mentioned to me when we talked that -- that he would be really interested in having his office and along with the DEQ perhaps do a little negotiation with the EPA and see if there wasn't something to -- they could work out along with some legislators to ease the way for BPA to go through there on a hold harmless. Did he mention anything about that to you? Is this something that would interest you? [HSTP13 0029]

Comment:  You mentioned in your comments – opening comments there were about four mining companies; that l of three of 'em are -- I picked up four. I don't know -- okay -- three of 'em have agreed to a hold harmless agreement, one of 'em isn't or hasn't given you that. From what I heard from the last meeting, most of that stuff’s Monsanto and they spent upwards of a million bucks -- I don't know where I am getting my numbers from -- they've spent upwards of a million bucks to figure out a plan so you guys could go through that southern route and all of a sudden this is just null and void. And -- and then you're telling us that there are four of 'em involved. Who's the fourth one that's not playing ball here? Do you know the reason why they don't give you -- won't give you that hold harmless? [HSTP13 0029]

Comment:  I'd be interested to find out if that was the -- and, you know, just a supposed possibility or if it was actual. I can't imagine that the EPA wouldn't be somewhat reasonable about giving you immunity from -- it would be, in my mind's eye, minimal disturbance compared to what's happened with the open-pit mining. It is not even close to being on the same scale, so I can't imagine that it wouldn't be a little bit within reason to work with those guys on that. But I don't know. Our dealings with EPA hasn't been real good with the county either on some issues that we have with 'em, but I would be really interested to find out what their perspective is on it if there -- if they would agree to any -- any kind of an alternative, you know, or -- or whatever was necessary to take this through an area that didn't impact so many private landowners, through some very scenic, pristine area. [HSTP13 0028]

Response: Under CERCLA, there is no provision for EPA to offer a hold harmless agreement to BPA. However, Executive Order 12580 delegated non-emergency removal authorities to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, as well as remedial authorities for CERCLA sites that are not listed on EPA’s National Priorities List. The Secretary of Agriculture then delegated this authority to the USFS. As discussed above, fruitful discussions are underway with the parties involved.
**Comment:** I just wanted for the record to kind of reiterate the same thing that I mentioned when we were meeting with the county commissioners. I noticed that sort of that general language made it into the draft EIS that said, oh, this is a CERCLA area that we can’t touch. I kind of understand why BPA has that as a kind of cultural thing, because the strict joint and several liability provisions of CRECLA have been pretty tough on any entity that uses PCV’s. And BPA is one such company, one such entity, that has used PCV’s in general in the past.

The thing that we’re missing in this draft EIS is you’re not going to be moving selenium bearing materials around. So, therefore, you’re going to have no liability. There’s no liability there whatsoever. It is as simple a process as going to EPA and saying we would like to route this line along the edge of one or your study areas. Can you assert for us that we won’t be touching any contaminants of concern. They’ll write you a letter saying, oh, yeah, there’s no contaminants of concern there and you’re okay. [HSTP13 0010]

**Comment:** At the April 3, 2013 meeting in Soda Springs Trent Clark, of Monsanto, gave testimony that the BPA would not be liable for any contamination from selenium as the building of the transmission line would not move any phosphate rock.

In the Draft EIS Volume 1, paragraph 3.5.3, page 3-103 it is written: Similar to the North Alternative, geotechnical investigation, including exploratory borings, would be conducted prior to construction of the South Alternative to ensure that excavation would not be deep enough to contact phosphate rock. Therefore, there would be little to no potential for release of selenium during project construction (see Section 3.13, Public Health and Safety).

Based on the above no justification or need for the North Alternative can be based on any issue of pollution by selenium caused by construction of the South Alternative. [HSTP13 0018]

**Comment:** Commissioner, if I could just expand on something that Jim talked about and I wanted to correct some -- some misinformation I heard placed on the record at the beginning of the hearing here today. There are only two Super Fund sites in the area and neither one of them extend north of Monsanto or the (inaudible) so that's the limit of Super Fund sites in Caribou County. Neither one of those interfere with either the northern route or the southern route. And I wanted to make that clear because a lot of the ways that work is done is we'll use contractors to search national databases and one wouldn't find from a national database the nuances and the differences between various cleanup activity. So I just wanted to indicate that, as Jim said, what has been very productive is dialog. Dialog has been good. And -- and it's obvious to me that maybe even more dialog is needed because, for instance, at the mines, in virtually every case, the mines are actually not under Super Fund cleanup orders. No -- no hazard ranking system has been performed at any of those sites and there's no national priority list listing. And so, therefore, just strict or unseverable liabilities that I am sure BPA's concerned about does not automatically apply in those situations. In fact, at every one of those sites, the cleanup is actually proceeding under a voluntary cleanup order, which is an administrative order or a consent, that's entered into at a local court with two parties, EPA and the mining company. And if we need to amend those cleanup orders, we can -- that is actually something that's doable. And I actually think that even under the existing cleanup orders, you know, some -- some statement of what the work is to be done in and around the mine that, you know, good engineering practice applies. If it shows that the good engineering practice done is in the course of erecting a
transmission line is not likely to impact any of the liabilities of that particular cleanup site, that's all that has to be done. You just have to show that you're not -- you're not going to be disturbing anything. [HSTP13 0029]

Response: The commenter is correct that BPA has incurred Superfund liability in the past at several sites because of the historic use of PCBs. However, as noted in responses above, through recent discussions with the USFS and with the benefit of detailed site investigation studies, undisturbed areas in the vicinity of the mine sites have been identified which may provide a pathway for the transmission line (the preferred alternative – Option 3A) through the area at a level of risk acceptable to BPA.

Comment: I don't want to jump in out of turn, but didn't Monsanto already have that offered to BPA? It's my understanding that they had a pretty good sweet deal for BPA all cut and then they backed out of it. [HSTP13 0028]

Response: Comment noted. The original South Alternative and its options were actually designed by LVE in cooperation with Monsanto.

Comment: We recommended siting all new facilities and structures in previously developed corridors as much as possible. However, we do not have significant concerns regarding placing transmission lines in areas with past or proposed mining activity. Material from formerly reclaimed mining areas may need to be rehandled to help address selenium contamination issues. Transmission line construction could either mobilize contaminants or impair needed reclamation efforts. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: As noted in responses above, through close coordination with USFS, the BLM, State of Idaho, and the mining companies involved, the preferred alternative, Option 3A, avoids most of the previously disturbed areas and therefore the potential to remobilize contaminants is low. The route also would avoid interference with future reclamation efforts.

Comment: Closer access to current mining operations. [HSTP13 0021]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: The DEIS states that impacts could be moderate to high if project construction activities come into direct contact with waste dumps, seeps, or mine pits, exposing workers and the environment to contaminants, (p. 3-214). We recommend that the final EIS include a more in-depth discussion of the data and/or studies that support the conclusions. [HSTP13 0015]
Response: Detailed remedial investigation studies provided by the USFS describe the contamination associated with waste dumps, seeps, surface water, groundwater, sediments, and wetlands. A summary of this information has been included in the supplemental draft EIS.

Comment: The final EIS should clarify the use of the term “Superfund Site” by explaining that some of the mine sites are being addressed using CERLCA legal authorities, but are not on the Superfund National Priorities List. [HSTP13 0015]

Response: Comment noted. Although CERCLA authorities are being implemented for remedial actions at particular sites, these sites are not on the EPA’s Superfund national Priorities List. Clarification has been provided in the supplemental draft EIS.

Comment: Another thing that happens when you search national databases is your national database will say the mine is this big. And then what you do if you scratch the surface of it, it'll say, well, the mine is this big, but the lease is actually smaller because the mine has to be big enough to cover the lease. Okay. And so usually the lease is a -- is done naturally by geologists and then surveyors do the mine and they do it to the square, so the mine is always bigger than the actual lease, the lease is always bigger than the actual pit and the pit is actually always bigger than the actual placement of any selenium-bearing materials or any of those materials that you don't want to disrupt. So in Mr. Orencia's question, the question was how far do you have to jump. It really requires dialog. And that's probably a lot of the work that Jim had done was you don't want to look at just the mine or even the lease or even the pit. You want to look at where is the material that you don't want to disrupt. And sometimes that will be a very narrow band. And it should -- again, like I said, dialog should enable us to work through those issues. [HSTP13 0029]

Response: Comment noted. BPA has now initiated a dialog with the appropriate parties.

Comment: We also recommend that the final EIS include additional clarifying information to support the statement that the project construction could encounter hazardous waste, since most mine wastes in the area are Bevill Exempt. [HSTP13 0015]

Response: Comment noted. The supplemental draft EIS has been amended to clarify that hazardous waste is different from contamination.

Comment: You mentioned -- and we were aware of this too -- that the proposed line to come across the now abandoned and reclaimed mines -- some are reclaimed, some not -- it sounded like that was discouraging because of the EPA; is that correct? [HSTP13 0028]
Comment: Then what exactly was the EPA's advice or their policy on that or do you have any copies of that? Or is it just the attorneys that had perceived a risk? [HSTP13 0028]

Response: As originally proposed in the EA for the South Alternative, EPA indicated that if there was an alternative route available it would be best to avoid going through the mine sites.

Comment: And so there's no actual known threat from the EPA that you could become involved in a CERCLA project? [HSTP13 0028]

Response: The concern was based on the provisions of CERCLA and statements by a mining company regarding the originally EA proposed South Alternative.

Comment: But no one has contacted the EPA or the DEQ or anyone to see if they would attempt to involve you with that? [HSTP13 0028]

Response: BPA has contacted and discussed the Project with both the EPA and the IDEQ during the NEPA process.

Comment: One more question, if I may. You are worried about going through the mining thing and disturbing all the dirt from the soil and the pollution stuff there, but yet you don't mind going up through our property and doing the same thing. So isn't there a dichotomy there? [HSTP13 0028]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: Do you have a name for that route that you are -- or that area that you are concerned about that may have potential mining on it? Do you know which mines it is? [HSTP13 0029]

Response: The route is now referred to as the South Alternative. Former and proposed mines in the South Alternative corridor include Conda/Woodall Mountain, Blackfoot Bridge, Ballard, Wooley Valley, North Maybe, and Husky-North Dry Ridge mines. Several options on this route have been identified.
Comment: My second question is: You were concerned about the impact study with the mines that -- and having to move because of the proposed mining site. One is the mountains that you are going over in Wayan is also a proposed mining site. Has that been addressed if you go in and dig? And what with that, it's also proposed? So what if you put it there, just like you're saying you don't want to go the southern route, it would be the same issue with this northern route. If you go over that mountain that is a proposed mining, you will have to move the transmission line. And I was just curious on if you have done a study on that, where those -- where that line would go?[HSTP13 0029]

Response: The North Alternative was designed to avoid future mining lease parcels in that area.

Comment: And then lastly, there was mention that one particular mining company had sued the federal government. Well, that -- that, by the way, isn't Monsanto, but I know the -- I know the situation in that particular case. And it was one of those cases where an effort was made to come up with a joint cleanup agreement. And one party pointed out that, well, wait just a minute. A lot of what we did here was at the federal government's direction, so you should have at least a portion of the liability. That case, by the way, is not pending as was mentioned. That case has now been settled with the federal government agreeing to pick up 32 -- 30 percent of the cleanup costs. And so that's now a settled issue and there is no pending case raising questions about liability, so that's the current status of what...[HSTP13 0029]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: And do you think that going through the Super Fund site and going down 10 feet would cause you to have liability for chemicals going down the creeks like selenium? Do you think that's a realistic assumption?[HSTP13 0028]

Response: Based on recent discussions with the USFS and mining companies, there is a potential for release of contaminants from excavation, depending on where on the mine site the line is located. However, it may be possible to avoid those areas through additional discussions and proper planning.

Comment: You're talking about the mines and the pollution of selenium and stuff. But have you -- without going on private ground, have you dug any holes that deep to see if it would dig up any selenium in that area? Because we are a watershed up there, especially where we are in the south end, and all our water goes on down to Blackfoot and around, keeps going down -- down in that area, so that's why I was just wondering if you had done anything like that.[HSTP13 0028]
Response: BPA has not conducted any test drilling to date, but would do so prior to a decision on whether to build the line and which alternative would be constructed. As noted above, the USFS has recently provided BPA with extensive test data from site investigations underway at the mine sites. Use of this information should be very helpful in determining the best alignment to avoid areas of contamination.

Comment: Please have your environmental studies look at: Also radio frequency impact on humans. [HSTP13 0004]

Response: Section 3.13, Public Health and Safety, provides an analysis of the potential electric field level impacts under all of the alternatives. These impacts are expected to be low.

Comment: It is our understanding that the mining companies have found ways to eliminate most, if not all of the various mining area concerns that the draft EIS portrayed for the South Alternative. [HSTP13 0013] (*See Land Use)

Response: As discussed above, all of the alternatives and options have been developed in cooperation with mining companies to determine the best possible route while minimizing impacts to the environment and the mining operations. As discussed in Section 3.13, there remain contamination issues associated with mining areas crossed by the South Alternative. It is also possible that unknown contaminated sites could be discovered during construction of the South Alternative, in mining areas crossed by the corridor. BPA would strive to mitigate potential impacts by avoiding excavation in areas of identified contaminants and conducting soil sampling in areas reasonably likely to be contaminated by mining waste containing selenium and other hazardous substances.

Greenhouse Gases

Comment: We appreciate the analysis of greenhouse gas emissions during the construction and maintenance of this project, but this analysis fails to evaluate the increased greenhouse gas emissions from the electricity flowing through the transmission line. For this analysis, BPA should look at the current and projected suite of energy producing sites (coal fired power plants, natural gas, wind power, etc). In this manner, the public will be able to better assess the real greenhouse gas emissions produced and conveyed by this transmission line. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: Comment noted. However, while BPA’s transmission lines do carry electricity generated by a number of different sources, BPA does not gather information on greenhouse gas emission from those sources.
Comment: The Idaho Conservation League encourages the BPA to phase out intense greenhouse gas producing energy sources such as coal-fired power plants in favor of alternative energy sources such as wind power. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: Comment noted. However, BPA is tasked with marketing and transmission of electrical power and has no regulatory jurisdiction over the sources of energy generation.

Cumulative Impacts

Comment: A Supplemental EIS is also needed to examine the likelihood of additional transmission lines and associated cumulative effects within the new ROW. [HSTP13 0016]

Comment: In addition, a large number of other transmission line projects are being proposed across Idaho. We are concerned that once a ROW is established, that additional infrastructure will also be placed on this route. A Supplemental EIS should be developed to examine the impacts of multiple lines along each route. The EIS should analyze these cumulative effects more thoroughly and develop alternatives that avoid, minimize and mitigate these impacts. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: Section 3.16, Cumulative Impacts, describes all the reasonably foreseeable actions currently known within the project area. BPA has no reasonably foreseeable future proposals to build additional lines in Caribou County, Idaho. Additionally, because BPA would proposed to build this line to address voltage stability and reliability concerns in the southern portions of LVE’s transmission system, BPA is not aware of any reasonably foreseeable future transmission line projects to be built by LVE.

Comment: As mentioned above, there are a number of other developments in this area, including exploration and expansion of phosphate mines, that may have cumulative environmental effects. We are particularly concerned about water quality, habitat fragmentation, noxious weed expansion, and loss of secure habitat by wildlife. For example, Monsanto is proceeding with the Blackfoot Bridge Mine development toward the west end of the project area and Agrium is continuing to construct temporary exploration roads just north of the project area. There was also discussion in the past of a natural gas pipeline in this area. [HSTP13 0016]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: Please include more specificity in the vegetation, wetlands, and wildlife subsections of the cumulative effects analysis. [HSTP13 0020]
Response:  BPA appreciates the comment; however without further information on what specific information is being requested, it is difficult to respond to this request.

Comment:  Please describe the differences in anticipated cumulative effects between the north and south alternatives. For example, please discuss in more detail cumulative impacts to wildlife from future mining activities in the southern alternative, particularly around the state WMA. [HSTP13 0020]

Response:  Section 3.16, Cumulative Impacts, describes the differences in cumulative impacts between the North and South alternatives. Section 3.16.3 has been amended to include mining as a reasonable foreseeable future action along the South Alternative and Option 3A that would be expected to impact wildlife through the loss and degradation of habitat.

Comment:  In addition, please include in the cumulative effects section discussion of the likelihood of future transmission line upgrades to carry additional electricity, or reasonably foreseeable sources of other energy development that may wish to use transmission in the area. [HSTP13 0020]

Comment:  If the former, please address associated cumulative effects, such as a future need to upgrade existing lines to carry the additional power, as well as any obligations to encourage energy efficiency strategies prior to or in concert with implementing additional infrastructure development. [HSTP13 0020]

Response:  As described above, BPA is not aware of any reasonably foreseeable actions to build additional transmission lines or generation facilities in the project area. If BPA makes a decision to build the transmission line, the need for voltage stability and increased reliability in the southern portions of LVE’s transmission system would be met. Responses above in Chapter 1 state BPA’s actions to fund energy efficiency type programs to help lessen the load on the transmission system.

Comment:  Cumulative impacts on visual resources, recreation, wetlands, wildlife, and socioeconomic resources are not minor. [HSTP13 0017]

Response:  Comment noted.
Comment: In addition, the proposed transmission line may accelerate cumulative impacts from other energy developments that potentially have negative environmental impacts such as geothermal and wind energy. Both geothermal and wind energy have been proposed for exploration in the region. Although I generally support renewable energy sources, they can have negative environmental impacts that need to be evaluated. Therefore, analysis of cumulative impacts of the proposed ROW should include potential cumulative expansion and/or increased infrastructure development to transmit increased energy resulting from these foreseeable actions. [HSTP13 0017]

Response: As described above, BPA is not aware of any reasonably foreseeable actions to build geothermal or wind energy facilities in the project area.

Comment: Generally historic leks scattered along the Blackfoot River corridor above Blackfoot Reservoir have declined over the past forty years. In 1973 five leks were determined active. In 1999 there were three known active leks. As of 2012, only one active lek has been confirmed upstream of Highway 34. The BLM and USFS are currently developing sage-grouse conservation measures to incorporate into land use plans (National Greater Sage-grouse Land Use Planning Strategy). In September 2012, Governor Otter submitted an Idaho Alternative to be incorporated into that strategy. Both the federal and state strategies designate greater sage-grouse habitat in the vicinity of the upper Blackfoot River as “general”, as opposed to “important” or “core” habitat. The Idaho Alternative addresses stabilization of habitats and populations and states that wildfire, invasive species, and infrastructure are the primary threats to sage-grouse in Idaho, and points to focused management of these issues in general habitat in part as a buffer to encroachment of these effects to core and important habitats. Cumulative effects of infrastructure such as the proposed Southern Alternative may be having a significant impact on local populations and it is important to ensure that local population effects do not diminish range-wide population status and trend. While non-forested habitat in the area may be abundant, sage-brush habitat suitable for greater sage-grouse may not be sufficient to support local populations. The Idaho Alternative provides additional detail about management focus in general habitat. [HSTP13 0022]

Response: In Section 3.7, Wildlife, BPA included discussion of the October 2013 BLM and USFS sub-regional sage-grouse planning group’s Idaho and southwestern Montana draft land use plan amendment/EIS (BLM 2013), as well as discussions of the impact of the loss of sage-brush habitat on the sage grouse. Discussions regarding sage-grouse management and addressing habitat and populations concerns are occurring at the state and federal levels. BPA would continue to coordinate with its cooperating agencies as appropriate sage-grouse and sage-grouse habitat conservation guidance is developed. Section 3.16.3 addresses cumulative effects of habitat loss more generally.
**Comment:** Going on and quoting again, “However, the easement portions of both alternatives would pass through more undeveloped areas and require new cleared right-of-ways. These portions of both alternatives thus would have the potential to have a relative high level of contribution on cumulative visual impacts from vantage points along the transmission line right-of-way.”

Well, these impacts are going to be tremendous compared to those little poles that you have going around the loop road and in that area. This statement is just – just has to be challenged. [HSTP13 0018]

**Response:** Additional detail has been provided in Section 3.16.3, Cumulative Impact Analysis, regarding the specific portions of the alternatives that would cross through undeveloped areas, the type of visual disturbances expected based on the physical characteristics of the structures and their contrast to the surrounding landscape. The analysis of impacts is based upon how the amount of expected visual contrast fits within the various thresholds for determining impacts.

---

**Consultation, Review, and Permit requirements (Chapter 4)**

**Comment:** On page 4-7, Section 4-11 River and Harbors Act of 1899 should be removed. There are no waters in the project area considered navigable under the Rivers and Harbors Act. No Rivers and Harbors Act permit would be required for any of the proposed alternatives. [HSTP13 0002]

**Response:** Comment noted. Reference to Rivers and Harbors Act permits in Chapter 4, has been removed.

---

**Appendices**

**Forest Plan Amendment**

**Comment:** And then in the second volume of this impact study there was a part called Need For Amendment. It says, “The north alternative would impact approximately 38.8 acres of aspen-dominated forest.” It is unknown if this is in addition to the acres listed as 110. [HSTP13 0018]

**Response:** The 38.8 acres of aspen-dominated forest is included within the approximately 110 acres of C-TNF land crossed by the North Alternative and is not in addition to that acreage.
Comment:  Caribou National Forest Standards and guidelines, guideline six: Avoid parallel corridors. Consolidate facilities within existing energy corridors where feasible.”

And then they call it consistency. That’s the consistency with what BPA is considering here. “The project would avoid parallel utility corridors.” This project should be built along the already existing corridor that we know runs down the Lanes Creek cut off. [HSTP13 0018]

Response:  There are no existing transmission line corridors within or near the North or South alternative corridors or their options where they cross the C-TNF. The closest existing transmission line to the North Alternative is LVE’s Tincup-Dry Creek line (the line referenced in the above comment), which enters LVE’s Lanes Creek Substation at the eastern end of the North Alternative. The South Alternative and its options would connect to this same line at the eastern border of the C-TNF in the project area.

Routing the new transmission line off C-TNF lands is not economically or environmentally feasible since the power must be transmitted from LVE’s Threemile Knoll Substation on the west side of the C-TNF to either LVE’s Tincup-Dry Creek transmission line or Lanes Creek Substation, both located on the east side of the C-TNF. BPA did look at routing the North Alternative to the north of the C-TNF lands along Highway 34. However, routing the line off the C-TNF would have placed it closer to Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge and within a large wetland area to the south of the refuge. Placing the line in the wetland area would have increased the risk for bird collisions because many avian species likely use this area. An alternative that routed the line to north or south to avoid the C-TNF would be about 150 miles longer than the proposed transmission line routes, increasing project costs, environmental impacts, and impacts to private landowners. For this reason, an alternative that would avoid C-TNF lands was considered but eliminated from detailed study in this EIS. See Section 2.5.4 of the supplemental draft EIS document for further discussion.

Comment:  Next is the Gravel Creek right-of-way. “The right-of-way and danger tree clearing would result in the conversion of land cover on the property, which would not be consistent with the existing management of this parcel for wetland mitigation purposes; therefore, the establishment of a new right-of-way across this area would result in short term, high impact. BPA is currently working with the United States Forest Service to further avoid or minimize potential-related impact on this area.” I think that we need to know the status of this sooner than later. [HSTP13 0018]

Response:  Comment noted. BPA has continued to consult with the C-TNF regarding routing of the North Alternative and potential impacts to the Gravel Creek Special Emphasis Area.
Other Comments and Responses

**Comment:** Have you worked with Lower Valley at all? [HSTP13 0025]

**Response:** BPA has coordinated closely with LVE throughout the proposal and planning phases for this proposed project.

**Comment:** What percentage of landowners have given you permission to go on their property? I really haven't heard of anyone that's given you permission, so I just wondered if you have – the majority of the people are – [HSTP13 0028]

**Response:** BPA has obtained the permission to enter properties for about 80 percent of the parcels along the transmission line route alternatives and options.

**Comment:** So the -- the public or the forest on the southern route has gave you permission, just like I guess you were saying they did in the Wayan area? [HSTP13 0029]

**Response:** The USFS has allowed BPA access onto the C-TNF to perform environmental and civil surveys along both the North and South alternatives and their options.

**Comment:** Would these landowners that have already given you permission, would that be farmers out here north of town that have possibly property lines down there that you will follow and it wouldn't be a great inconvenience or a distraction?[HSTP13 0028]

**Comment:** Have you got any permissions, like -- which direction -- beyond Henry, up in that -- when you start getting into Wayan, have you gotten anybody that's given you permission up in there? I'm thinking everybody -- what is it -- south or -- that's south of Henry, they've probably given you permission because they don’t really care. I'm thinking nobody – they don't live there is what we're saying. Nobody north of Henry has given you permission, I'll bet you anything on that. [HSTP13 0029]

**Response:** Many of the farmers on the southern portion of both North and South alternatives and their options have given BPA permission to enter their property. The commenter is correct in that a majority of residents in the Wayan area have not provided BPA access to their property.
Comment:  But none of the other landowners that have got pristine property; is that accurate? What you called just the dry farmers, not the ones that's got the pristine property in the mountains? The ones that farm and not live here? Okay. Well, I think we have all kind of got the picture. [HSTP13 0028]

Response:  Many of the farmers that have given BPA permission to enter their property feel as strongly about protecting their property as residents in Wayan do. BPA would continue to work with each individual or group of landowners to obtain access for environmental surveys in an effort to conduct the most complete and accurate NEPA process possible.

Comment:  There’s some things that really concern me and probably turn the public opinion against you. One is going on private property without permission. I know that has happened out in Grace. [HSTP13 0018]

Comment:  Are you aware that some of your crew has been entering private property that hasn't been authorized and they've been cutting survey lines, pounding stakes, cutting trees? [HSTP13 0028]

Comment:  And, also, if people would give you the names of landowners who have had people trespassing on their property without permission that you will contact the landowners and make sure you get that resolved. Did I hear that?[HSTP13 0029]

Response:  BPA does not allow or condone trespassing on private property and regrets any misunderstanding that may have occurred during field work conducted by BPA or contract staff.

Comment:  The other thing is they were surveying all over out by us and my husband went down to see what they were doing, if they were going to go in the field. And they didn’t want to tell us who they worked for. They told us they were checking for underground utility services. I think this lying and sneaking around, you have developed a real negative feeling about this project. [HSTP13 0018]

Response:  Comment noted. BPA regrets any misunderstanding that may have occurred during field work conducted in the field by BPA or contract staff.

Comment:  So we kind of feel like you’re coming in here and trying to cheat us. It doesn’t make us want to work with you very much. You have to be upfront, honest, and you have to be fair. In this community that is what we expect. [HSTP13 0018]

Response:  Comment noted.
**Comment:** I’m one of those guys that likes my lights to come on when I hit the switch, but I don’t want a power line across my ranch.

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment:** I seriously oppose the Northern Route Alternative for the Hooper Springs Transmission Project. [HSTP13 0008]

**Comment:** Overall, I find your North Alternative route through the Wayan area poorly conceived and it has a number of major flaws that you have failed to identify and address. In some instances, you have alluded to some of these problems but provided only cursory or incorrect information. I urge you to abandon this ill-conceived alternative and select the South Alternative route if action is proven to be necessary. [HSTP13 0014]

**Response:** Comments noted.

**Comment:** The North Alternative would create a new transmission corridor resulting in degradation of the environment and lands. The South Alternative passes through lands with existing transmission corridors and the land has been impacted by mining activity. There does not appear to be any organized opposition to the South Alternative while the landholders opposed to the North Alternative are organized and there could be possible court action taken holding up or preventing construction of the transmission line if this alternative is selected. [HSTP13 0018]

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment:** OER has been contacted by numerous residents of Caribou County and none of them believe the Hooper Springs line is necessary or beneficial. However, if the line is necessary, their nearly unanimous preference is for the southern route. [HSTP13 0022]

**Comment:** I strongly support the southern route. I do not see a future selenium issue. The longer (northern) route expense of construction and maintenance and private land rights of way issues far outweigh the selenium issue. Also the scenic values that would be destroyed along this historic route would be lost forever. [HSTP13 0011]

**Comment:** I support the southern route. [HSTP 13 0012]

**Response:** Comments noted.
Comment: So I make a motion that BPA follow up on this and that this be taken care of for a southern route (inaudible) on the southern route. [HSTP13 0029]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: They told us that there was a lawsuit out on the southern route so they wouldn’t go through that. And then was a superfund site and they couldn’t go through there. IF they planted one pole in the superfund site they could be held responsible for the entire superfund site. That just is silly stuff, but that’s what they told us and they’re trying to insist on it.

Now they have enough people giving them flak. I understand that BPA claims to never have gone to an easement to try to get it to condemn an easement, but they’re going to have to this time if they think they’re going to go out through Gray’s Lake. Thank you. [HSTP13 0018]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: Simplot remains open to working with BPA and Lower Valley on providing access onto Simplot-owned land to assist with the successful completion of this project. [HSTP 13 0010]

Response: Comment noted. Thank you.

Comment: South Route Alternative – Environmental Benefits: The South Alternative does provide an environmental benefit in connection with Simplot’s proposed Dairy Syncline Phosphate Mine project. The Dairy Syncline project will require the construction of an electrical power transmission line to serve the new mine. IF BPA chooses the South Route Alternative, and the transmission line is build timely, the route will result in disturbing three miles less than the alternative. The alternative is a connection to the Lower Valley transmission lines located at Diamond Creek (see Attachment A). [HSTP13 0010]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: Finally, EPA had an effort underway to foster development of renewable energy sources on CERCLA sites.4 EPA launched RE-Powering America’s Land: Siting Renewable Energy on Potentially Contaminated Land and Mine Sites to encourage the siting of renewable energy facilities on thousands of currently and formerly contaminated properties across the nation. This management plan builds on the progress that’s been made to date under this initiative, and lays out key areas that EPA will focus on. Thought this transmission line is not strictly a “renewable” energy project, it will carry electricity generated from wind turbines and the principles in EPA’s initiative do apply to this situation. [HSTP13 0010]
Comment: Alignment of the Transmission Line to capture renewable resources along the route should be given greater attention. Location of the Transmission Line in potential wind energy corridors or too far away from renewable energy production areas will result in a loss of the ability to capture these resources for the benefit of Endowment Beneficiaries as well as all residents of Idaho. While biological, visual and cultural resources are very important, collection of renewable resources should be a serious consideration. The state understands that interconnection costs are substantial and that adjustment of transmission routes to accommodate small-scale projects is impractical. Accordingly, it is recognized that a value-based approach is necessary when evaluating transmission line placement near renewable resources. [HSTP13 0010]

Response: Comments noted.

Comment: I want to communicate. I don't like you in my area. How's that for communication?[HSTP13 0029]

Response: Comment Noted.

Comment: We've already given you a route. To have to find ways to take it is the problem. You have weird perceptions up there in Portland. And another thing, you're worried about all these birds and stuff. You're giving them more preference than you are us as people. I'm sorry, but that's the way I feel about this. Yeah, it's important that we worry about these birds and all that kind of stuff, but we've got people living in that place, too, and this stuff's coming right down through here. And I think she said last time, this is going to destroy that valley. But you people in Portland, it doesn't matter to you because you live in Portland. [HSTP13 0029]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: Yes. And you are planning to take that right up over our hill. I don't want work with you. I don't have to work with you. Don't bring the line to my house. It's that simple. I hope it's impossible for you, if you want my honest opinion. You shove stuff down our throats when you have an alternative route and the only answer is questions of why you really can't go through there because of one mining company. That's (inaudible) answer these questions. You're trying to sidetrack us. You sidetrack us with other nonsense and you don't get there is a real issue of putting it in an area having less impact on people and less impact on the land, on private lands in particular, and less impact on the wildlife. And you don't seem to consider that. You sit up in Portland and come up with these ridiculous possible problems that are probably nonexistent. Like I say, I'd like to see your geological profile on that area through there to really discuss the issue of potential contamination as I hear from some of you people on it. Where is all that stuff? I don't see any of it. I don't hear you talking about it. the other route that doesn't impact the number of people, the wildlife or the private lands. There is a whole bunch of
important issues right there and you have not addressed those. I find you guys typical
government bureaucrats that tell us a bunch of gobbledygook nothing. Yeah. [HSTP13 0029]

Comment: So you're the government is what you're saying, for the people, by the people and
you're shoving this down our throats? [HSTP13 0029]

Response: Comments noted.

Comment: Three -- another issue -- I know I don't have much time -- but three weeks ago --
my home is fenced all in. And three weeks ago, 90 feet from my deck, I found a beautiful pine
tree chopped down. I have pictures to show you. And that was planted probably 20 to 25 years
ago by my husband. He is no longer here and each day that pine tree becomes just a little more
valuable to me. No one has ever come to me and said -- a Mr. Brown or somebody came several
months ago and I said, I'm not giving permission anywhere. I gave no permission to either
individual. And how would you like to have someone coming 90 feet from your deck and cut off a
beautiful pine tree and just leave it turned over? And I'd like to show the picture to you. It makes
me so angry I just can't hardly contain myself. I never said anything to the -- to the surveyors
because I didn't want to make any problems. But when I saw that pine tree, I was mad as you
know what. [HSTP13 0029]

Comment: I thought I heard a commitment made to Mrs. Blockson was somebody is going to
investigate a tree that was felled and that she will be reimbursed if there's evidence that it was
your surveyors? [HSTP13 0029]

Response: BPA regrets any misunderstanding that may have occurred. BPA real property
services staff has been asked to aid Mrs. Blockson in determining what occurred.

Comment: Is this as controversial as your I-5 corridor reinforcement project? This one has
not spawned a website, though, yet, with No Way BPA. [HSTP13 0029]

Response: The commenter is correct in that a website has not been set up for this project by
members of the public.

Comment: I used to believe that big oil companies were the biggest crooks in this country,
but now I truly believe that title now belongs to BPA. You manipulate the price and supply of
energy to keep your profits up, yet you half-heartedly promote conservation, all the while the
wind turbines sit idle, there is no way you can justify not lowering rates when there is a surplus
of power. This kind of criminal behavior is only allowed by government agencies, if a private
company used these same kind of practices they would be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the
law. No matter how you try to spin this it is called price fixing! How long will it be until all the
loop-holes that require you to purchase excess power from private individuals is closed? Luckily
for you the current Dictator supports absolute control over tax payers, one method of which is to
allow monopolies that conform to the administration agenda. For this reason I have and always will support expansion of private energy production, this is the only recourse private citizen have to recoup the money you steal from rate payers. [HSTP13 0001]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: Please continue to do all you can to stop those unsightly, unproductive and expensive wind generators. How is it the populace of this state ever allowed this to happen? [HSTP13 0003]

Response: The proposed project would not involve the construction of any wind power generation facilities.

Comment: Would support route that would make easiest to tie into green energy source wind, solar. [HSTP13 0005]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: The IDFG does not support or oppose this proposal. The purpose of these comments is to assist the decision-making authority by providing technical information addressing potential effects on wildlife and wildlife habitat and on how adverse effects might be mitigated. [HSTP13 0022]

Response: Comment noted.

Comment: Idaho supports the development of critical electrical infrastructure and the State encourages the project manager to move forward with the process for this project within the anticipated timeline. [HSTP13 0022]

Response: Comment noted.
4. Comment Letters

HSTP13 0001 - harriss
I used to believe that the big oil companies were the biggest crooks in this country, but now I truly believe that title now belongs to BPA. You manipulate the price and supply of energy to keep your profits up, yet you half-heartedly promote conservation, all the while the wind turbines sit idle, there is no way you can justify not lowering rates when there is a surplus of power. This kind of criminal behavior is only allowed by government agencies, if a private company used these same kind of practices they would be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. No matter how you try to spin this it is called price fixing! How long will it be until all the loop-holes that require you to purchase excess power from private individuals is closed? Luckily for you the current Dictator supports absolute control over tax payers, one method of which is to allow monopolies that conform to the administration agenda. For this reason I have and always will support expansion of private energy production, this is the only recourse private citizen have to recoup the money you steal from rate payers.

HSTP13 0002 - Joyner/US Army Corps of Engineers
On page 4-7, Section 4-11 River and Harbors Act of 1899 should be removed. There are no waters in the project area considered navigable under the Rivers and Harbors Act. No Rivers and Harbors Act permit would be required for any of the proposed alternatives.
Proposed Hooper Springs Transmission Project

"I'd like to tell you . . .

Please have your environmental studies look at:

SIRS:

THE CONSUMPTION OF HYDRO POWER WILL CONTINUE TO GROW TO MEET THE NEED BUT THE NEW MACHINERY IS NOT IMPACTING TO IRRIGATION SYSTEMS AND OTHER AGRICULTURE.

POWER LURES HAVE LITTLE OR NO IMPACT ON WILDLIFE AND THE WOLVES BEAR GINS, VULTURES, EAGLES, CROWS AND RAVENS HAVE PRETTY WELL TAKEN CARE OF USELESS WILDLIFE ANY WAY SO THAT'S NO ISSUE.

PLEASE CONTINUE TO DO ALL YOU CAN TO STOP THESE UNSTABLE, UNPRODUCTIVE AND EXPENSIVE

I have these other comments:

WIND GENERATORS, HOW IS IT THE DEPLETION OF THIS STATE EVER ALLOWED THIS TO HAPPEN?

Please tell us your preference for receiving the draft EIS by selecting from the following:

☐ Compact disc (CD) of the EIS (2203)
☐ Printed copy of the EIS, approximately 755 pages (2204)
☐ Notification letter that provides the Web address for accessing the EIS online
  ☐ by mail (2201)
  ☐ by e-mail; please provide your e-mail address __________________________ (2202)
☒ Please remove my name from the mailing list for this EIS
☐ Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mailing list if you have received mailed notices.) (2201)

Fax to BPA at (503) 230-4019 or return your comments by April 22, 2013.
Please have your environmental studies look at:

ANIMAL, BIRD, FISH IMPACT.
ALSO RF IMPACT ON HUMANS.

I have these other comments:

Please tell us your preference for receiving the draft EIS by selecting from the following:

☐ Compact disc (CD) of the EIS (2203)
☐ Printed copy of the EIS, approximately 755 pages (2204)
☐ Notification letter that provides the Web address for accessing the EIS online
  ☐ by mail (2201)
  ☐ by e-mail; please provide your e-mail address ___________________________ (2202)
☐ Please remove my name from the mailing list for this EIS
☐ Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mailing list if you have received mailed notices.) (2201)

Contains sensitive information

Fax to BPA at (503) 230-4019 or return your comments by April 22, 2013.
Please have your environmental studies look at:

Effect on winter range. Re: Deer elk etc.

I have these other comments:

Would support route that would make easiest to tie into green energy source wind, solar.

Please tell us your preference for receiving the draft EIS by selecting from the following:

☐ Compact disc (CD) of the EIS (2203)
☐ Printed copy of the EIS, approximately 755 pages (2204)
☒ Notification letter that provides the Web address for accessing the EIS online
  ☐ by mail (2201)
  ☐ by e-mail; please provide your e-mail address ________________________________ (2202)
☐ Please remove my name from the mailing list for this EIS (2201)
☐ Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mailing list if you have received mailed notices.) (2201)

Fax to BPA at (503) 230-4019 or return your comments by April 22, 2013.
HSTP.13.0006 - Brown/Farmer
My family is involved in farming north of Soda Springs, ID. The proposed "Northern Route" as originally proposed crosses nearly 6 miles of our land. We are probably, by far, the most affected farmers in the area. Given that we as a human race need and depend on a safe, reliable, and affordable supply of electrical power, we do not oppose the "Northern Route" as originally proposed. We would ask, as landowners, that the power line be placed ON the property line where two different landowners join, and that the poles be placed as close as possible to rural county roads. We would ask that the poles, where possible, be placed on or border natural rock outcroppings, in an effort to minimize the impact on our farming operations. We would also request that when crossing thru the middle of a field, that you run the pole line "true" north and south, or "true" east and west, as to facilitate our use of GPS guidance systems on our equipment. Respectfully, Clarke and Nina Brown Scott and Diane Brown Matthew and Curt Brown Stacy and Steve Samowitz

HSTP.13.0007 - Bauer
I would like to see a map with the alternatives.

HSTP.13.0008 - Eichhorst/Idaho chapter Oregon-California Trails Association
To whom it may concern: I seriously oppose the Northern Route Alternative for the Hooper Springs Transmission Project. This route will closely follow the Lander Road, an emigrant route of great historical value. Placing the transmission project along the Lander Road and/or very close to the route will destroy the viewshed of the route which still today is one of the few places that people can experience the same environment that emigrants to Oregon and California experienced in the late 1850's and 1860's. There are numerous historical sites and graves along the Lander Road and I am also concerned about possible damage to these sites with the Northern Alternative. Again, I am opposed to the Northern Alternative of the Hooper Springs Transmission Project. Sincerely, Jerry Eichhorst President, Idaho chapter Oregon-California Trails Association

HSTP.13.0009 - Knutsen/OCTA and an Independent Trail Mapper
Concerning: Hooper Springs Transmission Project The path now being considered for the transmission lines is near the old Lander Trail, used by many in the pioneer days to cross this area. The construction of towers will have trucks and equipment crossing the old trail or even using it in places. If this happens, the trail, graves, noon resting areas and night camping areas have the potential to be destroyed. And there are places associated with a trail history that are not even known at this time. When those who want to experience this area as the pioneers did, they want to experience the view as it was. There are so few places left when this can be done. Thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns.
April 19, 2013

SENT VIA EMAIL TO: www.bpa.gov/comment
ORIGINAL SENT VIA CERTIFIED MAIL #7009 0080 0001 0391 6761
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office - DKE-7
P.O. Box 14428
Portland, OR, 97293-4428

Dear Sir/Ma'am:

The Bonneville Power Administration ("BPA") is proposing to build a new 115-kilovolt (kV) transmission line that would extend from BPA's proposed Hooper Springs Substation near the City of Soda Springs, Idaho, to a proposed BPA connection facility that would connect with the existing transmission system of Lower Valley Energy, a Cooperative Utility Corporation ("Lower Valley") located in northeastern Caribou County. The new 115-kilovolt transmission line would extend for a distance of approximately 22 to 32 miles depending on the routing alternative. BPA also would construct an approximate 0.5-mile-long 138-kV transmission line between the proposed Hooper Springs Substation and PacifiCorp's existing Three Mile Knoll Substation to connect the electrical facilities to the regional transmission grid. The project is needed to improve voltage stability on the transmission grid to meet future load growth in southeast Idaho and northwestern Wyoming.

BPA has released a Draft Environmental Impact Statement ("DEIS") on the Hooper Springs Project and is soliciting comments on two routing alternatives that are being considered for the proposed line from the Hooper Springs Substation to the connection with LVE's transmission system: a North Alternative, including two route options and a South Alternative, including four route options. BPA is also considering a No Action Alternative, that is, BPA would not build the transmission line.

The J.R. Simplot Company (Simplot) has phosphate operations in Caribou County that are directly affected by electrical supply reliability and the location of electrical transmission facilities. These operations include an existing phosphate mining operation near the Idaho-Wyoming border, an existing and related pumping operation at Conda, Idaho, a large ranch along the Idaho-Wyoming border and a proposed mine in the Slug Creek drainage to be located northeast of Soda Springs. Simplot has the following comments on this proposed project.
Introduction
Simplot became aware in 2008 that a new electrical transmission line was under consideration for a route north and east of Soda Springs, Idaho. As a business owner accustomed to electrical service outages for our operations and with employees who are members of the communities in Caribou County, we welcomed the opportunity for improving electrical service and capacity for the southeastern corner of Idaho. [Eventually, this project became known as the "Hooper Springs Transmission Project".] Simplot, as described below, favors the South Alternative. However, we believe that either route would be preferable to the "No Action" Alternative. Simplot does not support the No Action Alternative.

Property Access and Considerations
Both routes (North and South) being considered by BPA cross private property. We believe that it is very important for BPA to work carefully with private landowners to address concerns regardless of the ultimate route chosen.

Simplot was involved in providing access for an earlier version of this project. During the summer of 2008, Simplot was approached by Lower Valley Energy, requesting an easement across Simplot land for the purpose of constructing the new electrical transmission line in connection with the Hooper Springs Transmission Project. This request ultimately resulted in Simplot granting to Lower Valley a 100 foot wide easement across Simplot land for the purpose of constructing, operating, maintaining, rebuilding and replacing a 115-kV double circuit power line to serve this region. This easement was recorded in the official real property records of Caribou County, Idaho on October 15, 2008 as instrument no. 181787.

Soon after the recording of this easement, Lower Valley approached Simplot again requesting permission to use a parcel of Simplot land near Conda, Idaho to stage equipment and to park vehicles that would be used to build the transmission line. In response to this request, Simplot and Lower Valley executed a Lease Agreement for Parking Equipment and Material Staging on May 4, 2009.

Simplot remains open to working with BPA and Lower Valley on providing access onto Simplot-owned land to assist with the successful completion of this project.

South Route Alternative – Environmental Benefits
The South Alternative does provide an environmental benefit in connection with Simplot’s proposed Dairy Syncline Phosphate Mine project. The Dairy Syncline project will require the construction of an electrical power transmission line to serve the new mine. If BPA chooses the South Route Alternative, and the transmission line is built timely, the route will result in disturbing three miles less than the alternative. The alternative is a connection to the Lower Valley transmission lines located at Diamond Creek (see Attachment A).
Southern Route Alternative – Addressing Mining Related Issues
In the DEIS, BPA identified two issues related to mining especially for the South Alternative. Specifically:

1. Accommodating new mining operations that may be built along or adjacent to the South Alternative route.
2. Managing the risk associated with the potential release of contaminants from historical phosphate mines that are located along the South Alternative route.

Issue number one can be resolved by coordinating closely with the phosphate mining operations that are planned for Caribou County regardless of the ultimate route chosen. As for issue number two, construction of transmission lines and associated infrastructure (road) can likely be done in such a manner so as to minimize the potential release of any hazardous substances. The DEIS states that “if contaminants are disturbed, impacts on workers, the general public, and environmental features could be moderate to high.”\(^1\) The DEIS provides no explanation of how the potential release of contaminants would rate “moderate to high” for impacts to humans and ecological receptors. There has been considerable study of potential risks to both human health and ecological receptors by both the phosphate companies and state and federal agencies. These studies concluded:\(^2\)

...that regional human health and population-level ecological risks were unlikely due to the limited amount of area impacted by previous releases, however, selenium releases in specific locations needed to be addressed.

Simplot recently performed a hazard analysis for workers performing construction in a portion of the Conda Mine site.\(^3\) The construction includes extensive excavation and grading of residual mine materials. This hazard analysis found potential risks to workers due to contamination was low. No personal protective measures are required. The levels of contamination in the Old Tailings pond area are lower than in the construction area. In addition, access to the Conda Mine site for the general public is limited. Therefore the potential for impact to workers and the general public are low.

These studies that have been conducted should be reviewed by BPA to more accurately estimate any potential risks that might arise from historical mining operations.

Also, a correction is needed on page 3-199. A statement is made that the new tailings pond at the Conda Mine is a source of contaminants; that statement is incorrect.

---

\(^1\) BPA. 2013. Hooper Springs Project DEIS. P.3-124.
Finally, EPA had an effort underway to foster development of renewable energy sources on CERCLA sites. EPA launched RE-Powering America’s Land: Siting Renewable Energy on Potentially Contaminated Land and Mine Sites to encourage the siting of renewable energy facilities on thousands of currently and formerly contaminated properties across the nation. This management plan builds on the progress that’s been made to date under this initiative, and lays out key areas that EPA will focus on. Though this transmission line is not strictly a “renewable” energy project, it will carry electricity generated from wind turbines and the principles in EPA’s initiative do apply to this situation.

**Summary**

Simplot remains a strong advocate for the construction of the Hooper Valley Transmission Project, regardless of the ultimate route chosen. Although we believe it is most appropriate that a project intended to serve the public is better placed on public land where possible, Simplot is committed to provide the rights to use Simplot land if necessary to build the infrastructure that will improve the economic sustainability of this region.

Please contact Don Stutevant at 208.389.7306 if you have any questions regarding these comments.

Sincerely,

Alan L. Prouty  
Vice President, Environmental & Regulatory Affairs

Attachment

C:

   Erich Orth, BPA (etorth@bpa.gov)  
   Vic Conrad, J.R. Simplot Co.  
   Lori Hamann, J.R. Simplot Co.  
   Scott Lusty, J.R. Simplot Co.

---

HSTP13 0011  -  miller
I strongly support the southern route. I do not see a future selenium issue. The longer (northern) route expense of construction and maintenance and private land rights of way issues far outweigh the selenium issue. Also the scenic values that would be destroyed along this historic route would be lost forever.

HSTP13 0012  -  miller
I support the southern route. The northern route would impact scenic and historical routes.
The Trumpeter Swan Society strongly urges BPA to reject the North Alternative due to the potential impacts to Trumpeter Swans, which are classified as Critically Imperiled in Idaho, impacts to many other avian species, and impacts to two important Bird Areas of Global Significance. Our detailed comments are provided in the attached file.
Dear Sirs:

On behalf of The Trumpeter Swan Society (TTSS), I am submitting comments on the draft EIS regarding the proposed Hooper Springs Transmission Line. TTSS is a 501c3 organization that works across North America to assure the vitality and welfare of Trumpeter Swan populations. The swans that nest in Eastern Idaho and adjacent portions of Montana and Wyoming comprise the most vulnerable nesting group in North America and have been a primary focus of our conservation and management efforts for 45 years. In the past 25 years they have twice been petitioned for listing under the Endangered Species Act.

TTSS has comprehensive and very detailed knowledge of Idaho’s nesting Trumpeter Swans, in part because I have resided seasonally in Wayan, Idaho since 1990 and we have studied Idaho’s swans since 1976.

On behalf of TTSS, I submit the following comments:

1. **We strongly urge you to select the South Alternative and emphatically reject the North Alternative.** The North Alternative creates a needless risk of direct mortality to a breeding group of Trumpeter Swans that is classified as “Critically Imperiled” in Idaho. This route would needlessly and permanently impact the avian resources of two Important Bird Areas of Global Significance, Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge and Blackfoot Reservoir, and the impacts cannot be reasonably mitigated.

2. It is shocking that BPA would give serious consideration to developing a new transmission line corridor through an area that has high scenic values, is relatively “pristine”, and that is globally renowned for its high concentrations of birds, when the South Alternative provides a viable way to avoid the highest avian conflict areas and confine the transmission corridor primarily to an area that already has a relatively high level of human activity and disturbance. It is our understanding that the mining companies have found ways to eliminate most, if not all of the various mining area concerns that the draft EIS portrayed for the South Alternative.
3. The North Alternative (32 miles) is about 50% longer than the South Alternative (22.5 miles) and impacts to wildlife, particularly birds, are much higher. The draft EIS provides no data at all to substantiate the assertion that despite this difference in length, both the North and South Alternatives would cost “about $51 million”. The EIS also fails to explain why the projected costs of the South Alternative jumped from $9.3 million in the 2009 Preliminary EA to the current $51 million estimate. **This nearly 500% increase in projected price of the South Alternative in less than 4 years** is not credible. If something as tangible as cost projections can change by over $40 million (5-fold) so quickly with no supporting facts, why should the public believe any of the much less tangible projected environmental impacts mentioned in this draft EIS?

4. The draft EIS provides a superficial and erroneous description of Trumpeter Swan use of the project area. Some of the omission and errors include:

a. The draft EIS completely fails to disclose that Trumpeter Swans are classified as a **Species of Greatest Conservation Need** in Idaho and that our nesting population has been designated as **“Critically Imperiled”**. Instead, the draft EIS merely says that IDFG classifies it as a “game bird”. Technically its designation under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 is indeed “game bird”, however that is totally irrelevant to its conservation status. It is the **current conservation status** in Idaho of vulnerable species that is (or should be) of paramount interest in this EIS. The EIS should have clearly disclosed that **Trumpeter Swans are classified in Idaho as Critically Imperiled**, with only 97 adults and about 24 nesting pairs occurring state-wide.


---

**Trumpeter Swan**

*Cygnus buccinator*

Aves — Anseriformes — Anatidae

**CONSERVATION STATUS / CLASSIFICATION**

- **Rangewide:** Apparently secure (G4)
- **Statewide:** Critically imperiled breeding/Imperiled non-breeding (S1B,S2N)
- **ESA:** No status
- **USFS:** Region 1: No status; Region 4: Sensitive
- **BLM:** Regional/State imperiled (Type 3)
- **IDFG:** Game bird

**BASIS FOR INCLUSION**

Low productivity in Idaho breeding population; regional threats.

--------

In Appendix G, the draft EIS erroneously reported the IDFG classification of virtually every sensitive species by focusing on whether it was game or non-game, rather than giving its
conservation status (State Rank or SRank) of “vulnerable”, “imperiled” or “critically imperiled”. Whoever put this appendix together apparently did not understand how to use the State Rank system in Idaho which is readily available and explained at:
(http://fishandgame.idaho.gov/public/docs/compWildStrategy/appendixB.pdf)

b. The draft EIS also fails to disclose that Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge is the single-most important Trumpeter Swan nesting area in Idaho and supports about 1/3 of all of the adults and nesting pairs in the entire state.

c. The draft EIS also fails to disclose that throughout the year, these “Critically Imperiled” swans move back and forth on low level local flights between Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge, Chubb Flats, Meadow Creek, Goose Lake, Blackfoot Reservoir, and winter at various sites from Blackfoot Reservoir southward. Much of the North Alternative route, from Mile Marker 1 to about Mile Marker 20 poses a collision hazard for these swans at various times of year. Much of this stretch also poses high collision risk to Sandhill Cranes as they stage in late summer in this area. It would be impossible to attempt to mark these 20 miles of line sufficiently to reduce bird strikes. If this was physically possible, it would be visually objectionable and a maintenance nightmare.

d. The draft EIS also fails to reveal that Trumpeter Swans are unusually vulnerable to power line collisions due to their massive body size and weight, and their inability to maneuver quickly. Trumpeters are the heaviest flying bird in North America. Powerline collisions are one of the leading documented cause of death of Trumpeter Swans in the US despite the frequent use of line markers. Because of their great weight (20–30 lbs) and huge wingspan (7+ feet) collision frequently results in damage to the line and power loss, as well as the death of the swans.

e. The draft EIS fails to reveal that powerline marking devices do not minimize mortality from avian powerline strikes. At best, they reduce mortality by varying degrees, depending upon a multitude of factors. Utility industry and regulatory agency guidelines clearly state that not siting a new transmission line in heavily used avian flight paths is the only reliable way to minimize avian mortality.

f. The draft EIS failed to utilize the most up to date information regarding reducing avian powerline collisions. This is widely available and use should be mandatory on this and all other BPA projects. It also appears that BPA has never developed an Avian Protection Plan (APP), as recommended by APLIC and others.

REDUCING AVIAN COLLISIONS WITH POWER LINES: STATE OF THE ART IN 2012

Reducing Avian Collisions with Power Lines (Collision Manual) was first published by the Avian Power Line Interaction Committee (APLIC) and Edison Electric Institute (EEI) in 1994 under the title Mitigating Bird Collisions with Power Lines. The 2012 edition of this manual provides electric utilities, wildlife agencies, and other stakeholders with guidance for reducing bird collisions with power lines based on the most current information. This is especially important given the need to reduce bird injury and mortality from collisions, comply with bird protection laws, and enhance the reliability of electrical energy delivery. The 2012 edition was co-authored by members of U.S. and Canadian utilities; wildlife biologists from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
5. The draft EIS fails to reveal that both Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge and Blackfoot Reservoir have been designated as Important Bird Areas of Global Significance by Bird Life International and the National Audubon Society. The EIS fails to describe the diversity and the abundance of the avian populations whose flight paths would be traversed by the North Alternative route

a. Grays Lake NWR (IBA Site 556) [http://netapp.audubon.org/iba/site/556]:

**Site Description**
Grays Lake NWR is in a high mountain valley, with probably the largest hardstem bulrush marsh in North America. This marsh is surrounded by tall grass wet meadows. Grays Lake supports the world’s largest breeding population of Greater Sandhill Cranes. Small components of surrounding habitat include tall wet meadow, aspen, willow, and mountain brush.

**Ornithological Summary** ([http://netapp.audubon.org/iba/site/2328](http://netapp.audubon.org/iba/site/2328))
Waterfowl and waterbirds are the primary avifauna at Grays Lake. Besides the 250 pairs of nesting Sandhill Cranes, numerous waterfowl species nest here, including Trumpeter Swans, as well as shorebirds (Killdeer, Long-billed Curlew, Willet, Spotted Sandpiper, Willet, Wilson’s phalarope, Wilson’s Snipe), waterbirds (American Coot, Virginia Rail, Sora, American Bittern), and Northern Harriers. Colonial species at Grays Lake include: Eared Grebes, White-faced Ibis, Franklin’s Gulls, Black Terns, and Forster’s Terns. During migration, shorebirds (Greater Yellowlegs, American Avocet, Sandpipers) are abundant. Tall grass wet meadows around the marsh support Bobolinks, and Savannah Sparrows, while the willow patches support Willow Flycatchers and Yellow Warblers. There is a hack tower on the refuge that is used annually by nesting Peregrine Falcons.

b. Blackfoot Reservoir (IBA Site 2328) [http://netapp.audubon.org/iba/site/2328]:

**Site Description**
The habitat surrounding Blackfoot Reservoir is a mix of dryland grain fields and native sagebrush steppe with aspen pockets and basalt outcrops. The reservoir has several islands, covered mostly with native sagebrush habitat, but also with some willow riparian. Gull Island is used by nesting American White Pelicans, Double-crested Cormorants, California Gulls, and herons. The reservoir is storage for irrigation water, thus can experience low water by late summer. The reservoir is also important as a fishery for stocked rainbow trout and native Yellowstone cutthroat trout.

**Ornithological Summary**
Gull Island, a 2.5 hectare island in Blackfoot Reservoir, supports the largest nesting colony (1400 nests in 2005) of American White Pelicans in Idaho. This island also supports one of the largest nesting colonies of Double-crested Cormorants (300+ nests) and California Gulls (6,000+ nests) in the state. An active Great Blue Heron, Black-crowned Night-heron, and Snowy Egret rookery can be found here as well. The reservoir itself is also used by waterfowl, waterbirds, and shorebirds during the summer, and possibly migration.

In addition to the facts in the IBA description, in August-September there is a very large staging area for Sandhill Cranes, Canada Geese, and other waterfowl in the grain fields and wetlands along the east side of Blackfoot Reservoir along the North Alternative route. The draft EIS
should have discussed these unusual avian concentrations and recognized the high risk of bird strikes that a transmission line through this area will cause.

6. Lastly, in addition to the errors and omissions regarding impacts to swans and other birds, the EIS shows similar problems with regard to its analysis of impacts to big game in the project area. Contrary to Appendix F, which states that white-tail deer are more abundant in the area than mule deer, anyone familiar with that area knows that is nonsense. Mule deer and elk are the abundant big game species.

The North Alternative route in Miles 21-26 will traverse the primary migration route that elk and mule deer follow as they migrate between lower elevation winter areas to the west and summer habitat east of Grays Lake. Currently this migration route in this area has very little 4 wheeler access and is well protected. Creation of a powerline maintenance road through the heart of the migration path will open the area up to much greater human access, by foot, horse and illegal motorbikes and 4 wheelers. USFS has been unable to control illegal access on many of the existing closed roads. There is no reason to believe that BPA could possibly enforce road closures on the powerline ROW in this area. They do not have the funds nor the manpower. The assertions in the draft EIS that BPA can effectively prevent illegal use of the ROW have no basis in fact. They are wishful thinking.

**For all the reasons mentioned above, we ask that you reject the North Alternative and select the South Alternative if action is proven to be essential.** Selection of the North Alternative would cause permanent damage to the globally significant avian resources of this area.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

**Ruth E. Shea**

Greater Yellowstone Coordinator
The draft EIS contains many errors and omissions BPA should reject the North Alternative due to its unacceptable impacts on wildlife, particular on avian species. See my comments in the attached file.
Sirs:

I have reviewed your Draft EIS (Mar 2013) on the Hooper Springs Transmission Project and have a number of comments. I have lived in the Wayan, Idaho area for over 40 years during spring-fall and a few winters. I am now retired from the University of Idaho where I spent 30 years as a Research Biologist working on a variety of off-campus avian wildlife studies, including at Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge and vicinity, other regions in the Rocky Mountains, and elsewhere. During some of these studies, I caught and banded numerous waterfowl and captured and marked over 1,700 sandhill cranes, including over 1,100 in the Grays Lake area, placed radio transmitters on some, and studied their geographical distribution, habitat use patterns, and behaviors. I was also involved in several studies of mortalities suffered by cranes, waterfowl, and other birds from striking power lines in Colorado and published findings in peer-reviewed journals (Brown, Drewien, and Bizeau 1987, Brown and Drewien 1995).

Overall, I find your North Alternative route through the Wayan area poorly conceived and it has a number of major flaws that you have failed to identify and address. In some instances, you have alluded to some of these problems but provided only cursory or incorrect information. I urge you to abandon this ill-conceived alternative and select the South Alternative route if action is proven to be necessary.

I was dismayed at the arrogant behavior exhibited by some BPA employees or contractors while working in the Wayan area marking your proposed transmission line route. I have yet to talk to any landowners that authorized trespass on their properties by BPA people, yet I heard a number of landowner complaints and in several cases landowners caught trespassing BPA employees/contractors on their properties. I was appalled to learn a BPA survey crew cut down a pine tree near a widow lady’s home. The pine tree had been planted by her late husband. Was the removal of the pine tree on a proposed but yet undecided and unapproved route necessary? Do you normally locate transmission lines so near rural homes? Is it standard operating procedure for BPA to barge through private lands against wishes of landowners in this fashion within proposed project areas?

It is incomprehensible that your voluminous draft EIS completely failed to reveal that both Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge and Blackfoot Reservoir are both classified as Important Bird Areas (IBAs) of Global Significance by Bird Life International, US Partners in Flight, and the National Audubon Society. It is completely irresponsible for BPA to propose a North Alternative transmission line in this area of exceptionally important avian habitat.
Your proposed North Alternative route virtually encompasses the spring and fall migration routes to and from Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge and adjacent environs. The routes are used by thousands of cranes, waterfowl, and many of the other of the 150+ avian species that inhabit this superlative 22,000-acre marsh and associated upland habitats. The draft EIS showed no awareness of the daily spring, summer, and fall low altitude foraging/feeding flights to and from Grays Lake Valley by cranes, some waterfowl, and other colonial nesting birds. These movements, which occur daily, involve anywhere from hundreds to several thousand birds of different species, which pass on a broad front southeasterly through Gravel Creek drainage, Hwy 34 corridor, Williamsburg, Lanes Creek, and Tincup Creek with some continuing on to WY. Smaller numbers of birds also move southwesterly from Grays Lake Valley to the Blackfoot Reservoir area and return in these same low altitude flights. Most all of these bird flights would be forced to cross your North Alternative transmission lines.

The draft EIS also fails to reveal that Blackfoot Reservoir, in conjunction with the grain fields to the east of the reservoir where the North Alternative would run, comprise one of the more heavily use Sandhill Crane fall staging areas in Idaho, and the area also receives considerable use by geese and ducks.

Our past research on avian powerline strikes found that 115kv lines can cause major avian mortalities on low flying birds, particularly cranes, waterfowl, and especially the vulnerable trumpeter swans which also nest at Grays Lake. The static wires pose the biggest problems and can contribute to large numbers of mortalities and injuries. I also reviewed the bird list for Species of Special Concern in Idaho (Appendix G) and found more than 35 bird species that occur along or near the North Alternative transmission line route. In addition, during autumn migrations, snow geese, tundra swans, cranes, and other birds from areas further north that normally stop overnight in route to other destinations, would also be subjected to the BPA net of wires in the Grays Lake and Blackfoot Reservoir vicinities.

In your analysis of Avian Disturbance and Collisions (3-140-141) you acknowledge there are a number of areas, based upon BPA use of an Avian Collision Model (Heck 2007) that present high risk for avian species and result in long term impacts that could be moderate to high. BPA states it would (3-141) “minimize collision risk through installation of visibility enhancement devices in the area of highest collision risk.” Based upon my 40+year knowledge of the area and routes of daily bird flights, it would require over 7 miles (from near mile 25 to mile 32) of marking lines with devices to enhance visibility, making your Transmission Line corridor look as if the Eastern Idaho State Fair and Carnival at Blackfoot had moved to rural State Scenic Hwy 34 near Wayan. This demonstrates no regard whatsoever by BPA for the social/economic value of the Pioneer Scenic Byway along State Hwy 34. In addition, much of the line through the ag lands east of Blackfoot Reservoir where crane and waterfowl use occurs would also require extensive marking.

Frankly, I find it difficult to believe you studied the potential problems seriously prior to proposing to locate a Transmission line in such close proximity to such large bird
concentrations. The evidence available suggests BPA only gave this route a cursory inspection prior to selecting it as the North Alternative route. One of the major criteria in the Avian Collision Model (Heck 2007:117) that BPA used was: “NEW POWER LINES SHOULD NOT CROSS PERPENDICULAR TO MAJOR FLIGHT CORRIDORS.” BPA obviously did not read this section or took the information lightly, and instead, offered up a superficial but nonviable remedy. Your proposed route puts BPA in direct conflict with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (1918), and possibly the Eagle Protection Act (1940), and other laws. It also opens doors for lawsuits by interested parties.

Other problems with BPA Northern Alternative route include the 100-foot ROW, gravel/rocked roads for maintenance access, invasion of noxious weeds due to disturbances BPA creates along the ROWs, and potential unwanted trespass problems both on private and public lands. You fail to disclose BPA information on associated trespass problems with other projects, especially with ORVs, which you have experienced, such as with the I-5 corridor project near the coast.

Much private lands that occur on the northern end of the North Alternative are in pastures and some hayfields. A number of ranches are multi-generational, including lands originally homesteaded, and you wish to intrude on their traditional livelihood and rural lifestyle, run a 100-ft ROW, open areas to weed invasion, and worse, to unwanted trespass problems that may include fences being cut and gates left open, leaving trash, and possible poaching of big game or cattle. Your 100-ft wide corridor would most likely turn into a winter BPA sponsored snowmobile trail. The EIS states that BPA plans to gate access areas, private and public, but I predict you will have limited or no success with that approach. In many winters, snows can be deep in the Wayan area and even the Forest Service has troubles containing cross-country travels in restricted areas, and the State Highway Department experiences problems maintaining open roads Problems created by the BPA project would fall upon landowners and agency personnel to deal with. This would place additional burdens on Caribou County and local law enforcement. In my opinion, BPA should be held responsible for additional costs to the County created by messes left behind by the BPA project.

The ROW created across Blue Mtn. (approx. miles 22-24.5) would be devastating to migration and wintering Big Game animals because it opens access to what has been up to now a relatively rugged and secure area with very limited human intrusion and which has served as important winter range.

Overall, there are a number of errors in the draft EIS, however, I do not have the time to correct errors and omissions. (example: white-tailed deer are abundant in forested areas-nonsense).

Dr. Rod Drewien
Wildlife Biologist, retired
3934 Call Lane, Wayan, Idaho 83285
April 22, 2013

Tish Eaton
Project Environmental Lead
Bonneville Power Administration–KEC-4
P.O. Box 3621
Portland, Oregon 97208

Re: Comments on the DEIS for Hooper Springs Transmission Project.
EPA Project Number 10-034-BPA.

Dear Ms. Eaton:

In accordance with our responsibilities under the Clean Air Act §309 and the National Environmental Policy Act, the US Environmental Protection Agency has reviewed the Bonneville Power Administration Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Hooper Springs Transmission Project CEQ no. 20130052, in Caribou County, Idaho.

The DEIS analyzes potential environmental impacts of a proposal to construct, operate, and maintain a 115-kV transmission line and a 138/115-kV substation on a site adjacent to the PacifiCorp's existing Threemile Knoll Substation near the City of Soda Springs, Caribou County, Idaho. Construction of the 32-mile power line would involve public lands administered by the Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, and other lands under State and private ownership. Project activities would include access road construction and improvements, right-of-way vegetation clearance and earth moving during site preparation for structures and other facilities. There would also be hillside cuts or fills where construction activities would occur in steeply sloped terrain and blasting in rocky areas. If implemented as proposed, the project would address current concerns about power stability and reliability in southeastern Idaho and help to meet ongoing and future power needs in southern Idaho and surrounding areas.

Analysis of impacts from the project considered two action alternatives i.e., a North Alternative, including two route options; a South Alternative with four route options, and a No Action. Each alternative would begin at the proposed Hooper Spring Substation and end at the proposed connection facility with Lower Valley Energy's existing transmission system in northeastern Caribou County. The draft EIS does not identify a preferred alternative and route option(s).

We note with appreciation that the DEIS addresses many of the issues we raised during the project scoping period in August 2010, including analysis of cumulative and climate change effects. Thus, we commend BPA staff for working with a variety of stakeholders and considering public comments in the NEPA analysis for the project. The DEIS document includes a good description of resources in the project area, anticipated impacts, and mitigation measures to offset the impacts. In particular, we appreciate information provided in section 2.6 (p. 2-33) comparing alternatives, their impacts to various resources and associated mitigation measures, and cost. Overall, most impacts by the project would be due to construction activities, which would generate both temporary and permanent impacts related to the project.
footprint and long-term operations and maintenance. Our concerns with the project relate to its potential impacts to water quality, land use and farmlands, and other resources as discussed below.

**Water Quality Impacts**

The DEIS indicates that water quality may be adversely affected if the project construction activities (blasting, surface grading, excavation, and surface pavement) alter the hydrology of springs and surface runoff such that erosion carries sediment and pollutants to local drainages (p. 3-115), accelerating infiltration and migrating through soils to the underlying aquifer. We note that mitigation plans would include implementation of erosion and sediment controls. However, the project will cross many drainages and the combination of riparian vegetation and other vegetation removal, earth moving activities and associated erosion and sediment loading could exacerbate water quality conditions in streams already on the State of Idaho’s 303(d) list due to exceedances of water quality standards for temperature, sedimentation and other pollutants (p. 3-111). In addition, groundwater extraction in the area, land disturbance, material storage, waste disposal, inadvertent chemical or hazardous liquid spills, and compaction produced by vehicular traffic can all affect recharge to the local aquifer and groundwater quality.

Because of such potential impacts to water quality, we recommend that BPA continue to coordinate with Idaho Department of Environmental Quality and Tribes affected by the project to assure that the state and tribal water quality standards will be met during implementation of the project, and monitor as appropriate to assure protection of water quality. We also recommend that the final EIS include information about compliance with Water Quality Restoration Plans that function as BPA’s share of implementing relevant Total Maximum Daily Loads, such as the Blackfoot River TMDL, designed to meet State and Federal water quality rules and regulations in the planning area. Since the project also anticipates obtaining Clean Water Act § 401 and 404 authorizations, and a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit for planned construction activities likely to disturb one or more acres, the final EIS should include updated information on those permit application processes and recommended measures to protect water quality.

We note that BPA will consult with the US Fish and Wildlife Service, as moderate, long-term fish habitat impacts are anticipated in fish-bearing streams during implementation of this project (p. 3-158). We recommend that the final EIS include outcomes of that consultation and recommended measures to reduce risks to species within the analysis area to protect biota and habitat.

**Land Use and Farmland Impacts**

The DEIS indicates that the proposed project would impact federal, state, tribal and private lands and their associated uses, including lands that have been designated as prime farmland and lands managed under the United States Department of Agriculture’s Conservation Reserve Program (p. 3-27). Even though some areas would be disturbed temporarily and restored afterwards, other impacts would be permanent because of structure footing and access road beds and structures. As an example, under the South Alternative, the transmission line ROW for Option 3 would impact about 126 acres of prime farmland, while Options 1 and 2 would affect 33 acres each and almost 77 acres for Option 4 (p. 3-104). We note that BPA will be consulting with the Farm Service Agency in assessing the project impacts to prime farmlands and CRP lands. We recommend that the final EIS include outcomes of those consultations and recommended measures to avoid and reduce impacts to those lands.

Regarding mining land use within the project corridor and vicinity, the DEIS states that the project would cross several existing or proposed mines, some of which are currently under investigation as Superfund
sites under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (p. 3-17). Section 3.13 further discusses the areas and potential public health and safety impacts (p. 3-211). The DEIS states that impacts could be moderate to high if project construction activities come into direct contact with waste dumps, seeps, or mine pits, exposing workers and the environment to contaminants, (p. 3-214). We recommend that the final EIS include a more in-depth discussion of the data and/or studies that support the conclusions. The final EIS should clarify the use of the term “Superfund Site” by explaining that some of the mine sites are being addressed using CERCLA legal authorities, but are not on the Superfund National Priorities List. We also recommend that the final EIS include additional clarifying information to support the statement that the project construction could encounter hazardous waste, since most mine wastes in the area are Bevill Exempt. For more information on Superfund Sites, please feel free to consult the EPA Superfund Program. Our Remedial Project Manager in Idaho is Mr. Dave Tomten who can be contacted at (208) 378-5763 or tomtten.dave@epamail.epa.gov. Physical hazards may also pose a risk to the public if dangerous areas such as pit highwalls are accessible; mitigation for such hazards could include control measures such as gates, fences, or signs.

Vegetation and Wildlife
Section 3.4.2 and 3.4.3 discuss impacts to vegetation resources and indicate that the proposed project would directly affect vegetation communities through trampling and removal due to construction of the transmission line, access roads and workspaces. Some impacts would be temporary, while others would be permanent. Since thermal modification and sedimentation are the primary cause of streams not supporting beneficial uses in the project area, we are concerned that vegetation removal along waterways could result in streambank scouring, erosion, poor drainage and loss of soil and wildlife habitat. Therefore, we recommend that such areas be targeted for active restoration to increase vegetation cover and improve thermal conditions in stream channels.

Transmission Line Monitoring
The proposed project has the potential to impact resources within the proposed corridor for a long time. Therefore, we recommend that the final EIS describe a monitoring program designed to assess both impacts from the project and the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures for the impacts. The document should also indicate how the program would use an effective feedback mechanism to assure environmental objectives would be met throughout the project lifespan.

Based on concerns discussed above and missing or unclear information, we are assigning a rating of EC-2 (Environmental Concerns – Insufficient information) to this DEIS. A copy of the rating system used in conducting our review is enclosed for your reference.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this DEIS. If you have question about our comments, please contact me at (206) 553-1601 or by electronic mail at reichgott.christine@epa.gov, or you may contact Theo Mbabaliye of my staff at (206) 553-6322 or electronic mail at mbabaliye.theogene@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

Christine B. Reichgott, Manager
Environmental Review and Sediment Management Unit

Enclosure
EPA Rating System

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Rating System for Draft Environmental Impact Statements Definitions and Follow-Up Action*

Environmental Impact of the Action

LO – Lack of Objections
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

EC – Environmental Concerns
EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce these impacts.

EO – Environmental Objections
EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no-action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EU – Environmentally Unsatisfactory
EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potential unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

Adequacy of the Impact Statement

Category 1 – Adequate
EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis of data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

Category 2 – Insufficient Information
The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

Category 3 – Inadequate
EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act and or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

Bonneville Power Administration  
Public Affairs Office-DKE-7  
PO Box 14428  
Portland, OR  
97293-4428  

April 22, 2013  

RE: Hooper Springs Transmission Project  

Dear BPA,  

Thank you for considering our comments on the Hooper Springs Transmission Line Project DEIS. Since 1973 the Idaho Conservation League has had long history of involvement with both habitat protection and statewide energy issues. As Idaho’s largest statewide conservation organization, we represent over 25,000 supporters who want to ensure that energy development and related infrastructure are consistent with natural resource protection.  

We support timely improvements and expansion of transmission infrastructure where needed, but in the case of the Hooper Springs Transmission Line Project, we are deeply concerned that the proposed route does not strike the appropriate balance between minimizing costs and minimizing environmental effects. In particular, we have concerns regarding the urgency as well as the adverse environmental effects from all the proposed alternatives. We appreciate the additional “non-wires alternative” which demonstrated that the project could be deferred until 2016 or 2020. While Phase 1 and 2 studies of this alternative showed that the transmission line project could not be entirely eliminated, it demonstrated it could be deferred. We believe that this alternative should have been fully developed. This would give the BPA time to reassess the project through a Supplemental EIS.  

This reassessment is critically important as the EIS needs to conduct a more thorough analysis on avoiding, minimizing and mitigating impacts to sage-grouse. The project area appears to contain either Preliminary General Habitat or Preliminary Priority Habitat for Greater Sage-Grouse.  

We recommend siting all new facilities and structures in previously developed corridors as much as possible. However, we do have significant concerns regarding placing transmission lines in areas with past or proposed mining activity. Material from formerly reclaimed mining areas may need to be rehandled to help address selenium contamination issues. Transmission line construction could either mobilize contaminants or impair needed reclamation efforts. A Supplemental EIS is also needed to examine the likelihood of additional transmission lines and associated cumulative effects within the new ROW.
Please send us any subsequent documents for this project. We look forward to continuing to work with the BPA on this project and others in the future.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John Robison  
Public Lands Director  
(208) 345-6942 x 13  
jrobison@idahoconservation.org
Idaho Conservation League comments on Hooper Springs Transmission Line Project DEIS

Purpose and need
As stated above, we have concerns regarding the apparent urgency of this project as well as the adverse environmental effects from all the proposed alternatives. We appreciate the additional “non-wires alternative” which demonstrated that the project could be deferred until 2016 or 2020. While Phase 1 and 2 studies of this alternative showed that the transmission line project could not be entirely eliminated, it demonstrated it could be deferred while the project is reassessed through a Supplemental EIS. Given the recent slowdown in the regional and national economy, the BPA should again reassess the urgency for this project and factor in additional increases in efficiency and alternate routes from power generation sources to consumers. We believe that this alternative should be fully developed in a Supplemental EIS. As part of this effort, the BPA should show the locations of all these transmission lines along with the Westwide Energy Corridor.

Sage grouse
A Supplemental EIS is needed to conduct a more thorough analysis on avoiding, minimizing and mitigating impacts to sage-grouse. Greater sage-grouse suffer from the loss, degradation, and fragmentation of habitat throughout the west. It’s estimated that only 50-60% of the original sagebrush steppe habitat remains in the west (West 2000), and in 2007, the American Bird Conservancy listed sagebrush as the most threatened bird habitat in the continental United States.1 As such, we cannot stress enough how important it is for agencies to consider impacts to sage-grouse and for public land managers to conserve existing habitat and actively restore altered sagebrush steppe habitats.

Depending on location and design specifics, the construction of transmission lines within sage-grouse habitat could constitute “nonlinear infrastructure” under the Conservation Plan for the Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho (Idaho Sage-Grouse Advisory Committee 2006). Nonlinear infrastructure is defined as “human-made features on the landscape that provide or facilitate transportation, energy, and communications activities...including wind energy facilities.”2 The Conservation Plan lists infrastructure such as this as the second greatest threat for sage grouse, with wildfires as the greatest risk. Road construction and use associated with transmission line maintenance represents high risk for loss of lek areas, nesting locations, and brood-rearing habitats (Braun 1986, Connelly et al. 2004).3,4 In addition, sage-grouse have been shown to avoid transmission lines, presumably because of potential predation.

Based on the habitat guidelines for sage-grouse management presented in Connelly et al. (2000), we recommend siting the transmission line in such a way to avoid impacts to sage-grouse.

Furthermore, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has found the greater sage-grouse warrants protection under the Endangered Species Act and has committed to a final listing decision in 2015; BLM is in the process of rangewide planning to design conservation measures and regulatory mechanisms that would avoid listing. BLM’s Instruction Memorandum (IM) 2012-043 “provides interim conservation policies and procedures to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) field officials to be applied to ongoing and proposed authorizations and activities that affect the Greater Sage-Grouse (Centrocercus urophasianus) and its habitat.”

The project area appears to contain either Preliminary General Habitat (PGH) or Preliminary Priority Habitat (PPH) for Greater Sage-Grouse (see map below). PPH, as identified in BLM’s Greater Sage-Grouse Interim Management Policies and Procedures, IM 2012-043 (12/27/2011), “comprises areas that have been identified as having the highest conservation value to maintaining sustainable Greater Sage-Grouse populations” that “have been identified by the BLM in coordination with respective state wildlife agencies.” For pending projects in PPH (including those for which a Draft EIS has been issued and would likely have more than minor adverse effects on sage-grouse), the IM provides that the agency must:

- Ensure that reasonable alternatives for siting the ROW outside of the PPH or within a BLM-designated utility corridor are considered and analyzed in the NEPA document.
- Identify technically feasible best management practices, conditions, etc. (e.g., siting, burying powerlines) that may be implemented in order to eliminate or minimize impacts. (emphasis added)

IM 2012-043 requires additional procedures for pending right-of-way applications that would affect more than one linear mile of sage grouse habitat. These procedures include a high-level interagency review process for any right-of-way project that would fail to “cumulatively maintain or enhance sage-grouse habitat.” The sage-grouse habitat that will be affected by proposed project routes has been acknowledged by the BLM as potentially important for protection. Allowing development of a transmission line through this landscape could result in harmful, and potentially irreversible impacts to important greater sage-grouse habitat, both by damaging sage-grouse habitat through the construction and maintenance of power lines and by providing “perches” for raptors and other birds of prey to more easily prey on sage-grouse. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has found that transmission lines have a range of adverse impacts on sage grouse and their habitats. 75 Fed. Reg. 13909, 13928-29 (March 23, 2010). The Service’s 12-month finding on sage grouse noted the many transmission line proposals pending in the western states and explained “If these lines cross sage grouse habitats, sage grouse will likely be negatively affected.” Id at 13929.

More recently, the BLM’s Sage-grouse National Technical Team reached the same conclusion and recommended that the BLM “[m]ake priority 4 sage grouse habitat areas exclusion areas for new [right-of-way] permits” with narrow exceptions. Id. Consequently, transmission lines should be avoided in PPH, and the BPA has not made the requisite findings or considered measures to avoid or offset damage to the habitat that would be affected by this project. If these routes receive further consideration, BPA must disclose these impacts and consider mitigation measures, including offsite

mitigation.

The BPA analysis should recognize that sage-grouse are a landscape-scale species and that individuals may move dozens of miles between required habitats. Thus, a significant challenge in managing and conserving sage-grouse populations is the fact that they depend upon different types of habitat for each stage of their annual cycle (Connelly et al. 2009), and upon the ability to move between the different habitats throughout the year. Each seasonal habitat must provide the necessary protection from predators, required food resources, and thermal needs for the specific stage of the annual cycle. Breeding-related events and habitat needs during the proposed management activities from summer 2011 through December 2012 will include:

1) Late brood-rearing period in July through September. Late brood-rearing is focused in wetter areas, especially riparian and spring-associated meadows closely associated with nearby sagebrush.
2) Movement to winter habitat.
3) Occupation of winter habitat from November through February. The primary requirement of winter habitat is sagebrush exposure above the snow, and is generally characterized by dense sagebrush, often including areas of wind-swept ridges.
4) Lekking, which may begin as early as late February, and may extend into May. Lekking requires open expanses of sagebrush within a large area of sagebrush cover. Lek persistence has been affected by disturbance activities within 3.1, 11.2, and 33.5 mile radii (Swenson et al. 1987, Johnson et al. 2009, Knick and Hanser 2009).
5) Female movement to nesting sites and nesting between March and June. Nesting females commonly move 3-5 miles or farther from the lekking site. Females select areas with more sagebrush canopy than is generally available in the surrounding landscape (Holloran et al 2005, Hagen et al. 2007)
6) Hatching and early brood-rearing in May and June. Females continue to use relatively dense stands of sagebrush for earliest brood-rearing habitat if native forbs and insects are available. When vegetation desiccates, females and broods move to wetter areas in search of the native forbs and insects required by chicks.

Knick and Hansen (2009) analyzed factors in lek persistence of over 5,000 leks. They used three radii to test for landscape disturbance effects on lek persistence – radii of 3.1 miles, 11.2 miles, and 33.5 miles. Previous studies had shown behavioral effects on sage-grouse related to sagebrush disturbance at the 33.5 mile radius (Swenson et al. 1987, Leonard et al. 2000). Knick and Hansen’s study showed adverse effects on lek persistence from wildfire at the 33.5 mile radius. At least one lek has been documented near the proposed routes.

Avoiding and minimizing human footprint at a 3.1 mile radius from leks is an important first step in protecting sage-grouse populations, but sage-grouse will be engaged in nesting and brood-rearing, rather than lekking, for most of the planned activity period. Recent studies have shown that only 64% of nesting sites occur within 3.1 miles of leks, but 80% of nests are found within five miles, and 20% of nests occur at distances greater than five miles from leks. Nest success is also greater the farther a nest occurs from a lek, indicating a disproportionate potential importance of these more important nests for population recruitment. Aldridge and Boyce (2007) and Doherty et al. (2010) identify a buffer of 6.2 miles to protect important nesting and brood-rearing habitats.

Given the considerations of year-round habitat use and known impacts of human activity on sage-grouse populations, mitigation will be needed for disturbance to sagebrush near lekking areas; disturbance and loss of sagebrush and native forbs used for early brood-rearing; and disturbance and impacts to hydrologic function of wet areas used for early to late brood-rearing. A conservative
estimate for the nesting and brood rearing area affected will include buffers with radii of 6.2 miles around known leks. Mitigation specifics could be based on a mitigation template recently created for the Lesser Prairie Chicken, a ground-nesting species facing similar threats (Horton et al. 2010).

The BPA should consult closely with the Forest Service, BLM, Idaho Department of Fish and Game and the Local Sage-grouse Working Group to determine appropriate measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts in the Supplemental EIS. With the additional comments received, the BPA should design the transmission line to minimize the potential impacts described above. As stated above, we recommend reducing roads and trails in identified sensitive areas to preserve existing habitat. Where impacts are unavoidable, the BLM should implement on and off-site habitat mitigation to offset any impacts to sage grouse.

The Supplemental EIS should show the proximity of all routes with historic and currently active leks, as well as lek counts over the last several years. Where predation on sage grouse by predators is a concern, towers should minimize perching structures.
Preliminary Priority Habitat (PPH) and Preliminary General Habitat (PGH) are shown for Idaho, while Sage-grouse Core Habitat is shown for Montana. PPH includes areas that have been identified as having the highest conservation value to maintaining sustainable greater sage-grouse populations. These areas include breeding, late brood-rearing, and winter concentration areas. PGH includes areas of occupied seasonal or year-round habitat outside of priority habitat. Both PPH and PGH have been identified by the BLM in coordination with the Idaho Fish and Game Department. Core Habitat in Montana is roughly equivalent to PPH, and includes habitats associated with 1) Montana’s highest densities of sage-grouse, based on male counts and/or 2) sage-grouse lek complexes and associated habitat important to sage-grouse distribution.

Mitigation measures
As stated in our previous comments, the list of proposed mitigation measures are measures to minimize impacts, and not to mitigate them. Additional descriptions are needed.

Alternatives
We appreciate the analysis of the Northern Route along Highway 34. We would like to see additional analysis of ways to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts along this route. The EIS should also analyze the feasibility of burying certain sections of powerlines which has been done routinely in Europe.

Waterfowl and raptors
In airspace regularly traversed by waterfowl, BPA should use single poles without guy wires to reduce mortality from collisions. The EIS should provide additional information on how powerlines will be designed to minimize electrocutions of raptors.

Timber clearing
The EIS proposes to clear large acres of timber for the transmission line. Unlike regular timber sales which are replanted or regenerate naturally, this clearing and the accompanying maintenance road will have to be maintained in perpetuity, making this an irretrievable and irreversible commitment. It is also unclear if the slash dispersal from regular maintenance will actually increase or decrease fuel risks. BP should take additional steps to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts to natural resources along these routes.

Temporary roads
All alternatives require construction of over twenty miles of permanent roads. Previous management activities have already resulted in extensive road and right-of-way densities throughout our public lands. This density compromises the ability to support wildlife and fish by promoting further human disturbance, fragmenting habitat, accelerating sedimentation, spreading noxious weeds, and encouraging Off Road Vehicle use. Furthermore, there is a positive correlation between roads, even temporary ones, and human-caused wildfire ignitions. We recommend that the BPA seek to further minimize new road construction by placing the line next to previously existing infrastructure and also develop a mitigation plan to close or decommission a greater number of unneeded roads.

Wetlands
We are particularly concerned about construction of transmission facilities across wetlands, floodplains, unroaded areas and in sensitive wildlife habitat, particularly in the region of the Blackfoot River Wildlife Management Area (WMA) when more appropriate routes exist. The Woodall Wetland complex should be avoided entirely. Additional mitigation is needed if the Gravel Creek Special Emphasis Area is impacted at all.

Blackfoot Wildlife Management Area
We appreciate the fact that the southern routes appear to avoid directly impacting the Blackfoot Wildlife Management Area (WMA), but are still concerned about the southern route’s proximity to the WMA. Given the large amount of fragmented habitat in the area associated with mining infrastructure and the importance of the remaining habitat, further fragmenting the area near of the Blackfoot Wildlife Management Area appears needless and unacceptable. Our specific comments are attached below.
Habitat, habitat fragmentation, and migration corridors

Portions of the project area contain habitat that is crucial to fish and wildlife species such as Yellowstone cutthroat trout, sage-grouse and other species. Such habitat has been severely fragmented and reduced through a variety of land management practices, including road construction and development of rights of way corridors. Construction activities should be suspended during elk and deer migration. Under the Bald Eagle Protection Act, the transmission line should be sited to avoid any impacts to bald eagles.

Blackfoot Wildlife Management Area

The EIS does not address concerns to the Blackfoot Wildlife Management Area. The 2,400-acre Blackfoot WMA was purchased in 1994 by IDFG. The WMA encompasses 9 km of the upper Blackfoot River, bordered on the north by Spring, Lanes, and Diamond creeks and to the west by the Narrows. Historically, the Blackfoot River was an important stream for Yellowstone cutthroat trout and IDFG has taken steps to restore the Fishery. -Idaho Department Of Fish And Game Fishery Management Annual Report


The Blackfoot WMA is also listed as Idaho birding trail and includes the following bird species: Mountain Bluebird, Savannah and Vesper Sparrows, Yellow Warbler, Cliff Swallow, American Kestrel, Red-tailed Hawk, and Ruffed and Blue Grouse breed in the area. Bald Eagle and Trumpeter Swan are frequently seen in early spring and late fall. Waterfowl including Mallard, Gadwall, Northern Pintail, American Wigeon, Canada Goose, and teal nest on the WMA. Courtship displays of several pairs of Sandhill Crane can be seen in the spring, along with shorebirds such as Wilson’s Snipe, Willet, Long-billed Curlew, Spotted Sandpiper, Sora, and Killdeer. Forest areas provide habitat for Great Gray Owl and Blue and Ruffed Grouse. Yellow, Yellow-rumped, and MacGillivray’s Warblers, Vesper, Chipping, and Savannah Sparrows, American Goldfinch, Lazuli Bunting, Western Kingbird, Evening Grosbeak, Green-tailed Towhee, Steller’s Jay, Ruby-crowned Kinglet, and Willow Flycatcher can be seen. Bald and Golden Eagles, Swainson’s, Red-tailed, and Rough-legged Hawks, and Northern Harrier also frequent the area.


In addition, the Blackfoot WMA and surrounding area has important aesthetic characteristics that many Idahoans want to maintain. Blackfoot Bridge WMA attracts visitors from all over Idaho to fish and to enjoy the scenery. The impacts of the southern routes on the undeveloped nature of the area do not appear capable of being mitigated and these southern alternatives should be rejected.

Additional Wildlife

In addition to sage-grouse, we believe that other wildlife such as pygmy rabbits, sage thrasher, sage sparrow, birds of prey, and so forth should be of concern in planning. New construction and infrastructure will also change crucial habitat for these species. The BLM should avoid construction in any designated areas or lands for special management of these species.

OHHVs

New temporary roads for construction and maintenance of transmission lines will provide more access for motorized recreation in areas without a current road system and more opportunities for illegal offroad riding. The devastating impacts of Off Road Vehicles (ORVs) on terrestrial ecosystems are well established. Irresponsible ORV users degrade water quality, spread noxious weeds, fragment
habitat, disturb wildlife, increase fires, and displace non-motorized recreationists. While the EIS states that OHVs will not be allowed on closed roads, the Supplemental EIS needs to describe the ability for the BPA to monitor and control ORV use as permitted by land management agencies.

Noxious Weeds
The most cost-effective way to deal with noxious weeds is to protect strongholds of native vegetation from activities which either spread noxious weeds directly or create suitable habitat by removing native vegetation and disturbing the soil. BPA activities should limit road use and the exposure of mineral soils where weeds may become established. Roads, trails, and rivers serve as the primary routes for noxious weed species expansion. Special care should be taken to safeguard ecologically intact areas that are not currently infested. The Supplemental EIS needs to analyze the effects of noxious weeds in transmission corridors and describe BPA management of weeds in these areas.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions
We appreciate the analysis of greenhouse gas emissions during the construction and maintenance of this project, but this analysis fails to evaluate the increased greenhouse gas emissions from the electricity flowing through the transmission line. For this analysis, BPA should look at the current and projected suite of energy producing sites (coal fired power plants, natural gas, wind power, etc). In this manner, the public will be able to better assess the real greenhouse gas emissions produced and conveyed by this transmission line. The Idaho Conservation League encourages the BPA to phase out intense greenhouse gas producing energy sources such as coal-fired power plants in favor of alternative energy sources such as wind power.

Cumulative effects
As mentioned above, there are a number of other developments in this area, including exploration and expansion of phosphate mines, that may have cumulative environmental effects. We are particularly concerned about water quality, habitat fragmentation, noxious weed expansion, and loss of secure habitat by wildlife. For example, Monsanto is proceeding with the Blackfoot Bridge Mine development toward the west end of the project area and Agrium is continuing to construct temporary exploration roads just north of the project area. There was also discussion in the past of a natural gas pipeline in this area. In addition, a large number of other transmission line projects are being proposed across Idaho. We are concerned that once a ROW is established, that additional infrastructure will also be placed on this route. A Supplemental EIS should be developed to examine the impacts of multiple lines along each route. The EIS should analyze these cumulative effects more thoroughly and develop alternatives that avoid, minimize and mitigate these impacts.
Bonneville Power Administration  
Public Affairs Office – DKE-7  
P.O. Box 14428  
Portland, OR 97293-4428

Re: Hooper Springs Transmission Project, Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Sir/Madam:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Hooper Springs Transmission Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). My comments are explained below.

Alternative Considerations
Given that the purpose of the Hooper Springs Transmission Project is to “improve the stability and reliability of the transmission system in southeastern Idaho,” the Draft EIS should include an analysis of constructing an underground transmission system, which are generally more reliable than overhead transmission systems (Hall 2012). Because of this omission, the current Draft EIS does not adequately evaluate all potential alternatives. A detailed cost-benefit analysis, including monetary and non-monetary costs/benefits, of overhead transmission lines and underground transmission lines should have been included in the Draft EIS.

Underground transmission systems have 1) increased reliability during storms and high winds (which frequently occur throughout the project area), 2) reduced exposure to lightening (which also frequently occur throughout the project area), and 3) newer underground cable systems tend to be more reliable and require less maintenance than overhead installations (Hall 2013). In addition, underground systems result in less exposure to wildlife, mitigate the negative impacts on visual resources, and have better public safety (Hall 2013). One of the main challenges associated with installation of underground transmission systems is their monetary cost; however, technologies and cost-effectiveness have improved, making their construction more feasible. For example, a 333-mile underground electric transmission line from Quebec to New York City was recently approved by their state Public Service Commission (Rulison 2013). Because of numerous public comments related to visual resources, wildlife, and rural land uses, during the scoping period and at the public information meeting it is important for BPA to consider underground power transmission for the entire length of the north and south alternatives. If constructing the entire length of the transmission line underground is not feasible, then constructing a portion of the route underground where negative impacts to wildlife, land uses, and/or visual resources occur should also be considered.

Proposed Alternatives – Cost
The construction cost for the north and south routes is estimated at $51 million for both routes. However, no supporting information is provided. Although materials for the lower voltage line along the north route are cheaper than those for the higher voltage line along the south route, the north alternative is approximately 50% longer (9.5 miles longer) than the south alternative, requiring more labor, access roads, vegetation removal, and materials. A detailed explanation of
how these cost estimates were obtained should be provided for the north and south alternatives and the various routing options for the public adequately evaluate the costs associated with the project.

In addition, the cost of the proposed action along the south alternative in the 2009 Environmental Assessment was $27.3 million ($18 million for the substation and 9.3 million for the transmission line). Although costs have likely increased since 2009, it does not seem reasonable that costs have nearly doubled in the past 4 years to the currently estimated $51 million as stated in the Draft EIS. BPA should include a rational as to why the estimated cost for the south alternative has increased by 46% since 2009.

Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation
Descriptions of affected resources, environmental consequences, and mitigation in the current EIS are too general. In addition, complete information on some resource concerns are lacking. Therefore it does not afford adequate public review and comment to evaluate the specific mitigation actions proposed for specific impacts as required by policy of the Environmental Quality Improvement Act 43 FR 55990, Section 1500.2 and Department of Energy NEPA Implementing Procedures Title 10 CFR § 1021.313. Examples of these general descriptions and resource analyses that lack sufficient information in the Draft EIS, are provided below.

Land Use
As stated in the Draft EIS, the construction of the transmission line and access roads along the north route is not consistent with the Corridor Management Plan for Highway 34, the Pioneer Historic Byway, which is designated as a State of Idaho and National Scenic Byway. Because of this, the resulting impacts should be classified as high, not moderate.

As stated in the Draft EIS, construction of the transmission line along the north route crosses a portion of the Gravel Creek Special Emphasis Area and is also not consistent with the management goals identified by the USFS Caribou-Targhee National Forest. However, no mitigation measures are stated in section 3.1.4 for this negative impact, classified as high for both short and long-term impacts. It is not adequate to state that "BPA is currently working with USFS to further avoid or minimize potential project-related impacts to this area." Under federal NEPA law, BPA is required to analyze the short and long-term high impacts to the Gravel Creek Special Management Area and describe how these impacts will be mitigated. The fact that the USFS Caribou-Targhee National Forest is listed as a cooperating agency in preparation of this EIS further supports that these impacts and mitigation measures should be specified.

Please also refer to comments below under Socioeconomic Resources related to land use.

Visual Resources
All photo-simulation photos (Figures 3-11, 3-12, 3-13, 3-14, 3-15, 3-17, 3-18) appear to have been taken with a wide angle camera lens and only depict visual simulations of the proposed transmission line from far distances. No photo simulations are included where the transmission line is adjacent to or crosses Highway 34 or local roads. The evaluation of environmental consequences is therefore biased and does not sufficiently evaluate impacts to visual resources where the transmission line is near and/or crosses Highway 34 and local roads.

Please also refer to comments below under Socioeconomic Resources related to visual resources.
Vegetation
Habitat fragmentation resulting from vegetation cleared for the proposed transmission line should be analyzed in more detail to assess its impact on native vegetation, noxious weeds, and wildlife resources. This analysis should include life history strategies of all affected plant and animal species and how they are expected to respond to increased fragmentation and soil disturbance from vegetation removal. The overall impacts to noxious weeds for both alternatives are classified as low in subsection introductory paragraphs; however, low and moderate impacts are referenced in the subsequent text. Therefore impacts to and risk of spreading invasive species should be considered moderate based on existing analysis. This ranking should be reevaluated in light of life-history characteristics of plant and animal species affected.

Wildlife Resources
The affected environment description for wetlands and special status species does not include a complete list of wildlife species that have been documented using wetlands along the affected area of the north and south alternatives.

Avian species that occur in wetland habitats along the proposed north and south alternatives, but are NOT listed as species in the section describing wetland wildlife habitat in the Draft EIS are:

- Geese: Canada geese.
- Dabbling ducks: northern pintail, mallard, northern shoveler, cinnamon teal, blue-winged teal, green-winged teal, American widgeon, gadwall.
- Diving and sea ducks: lesser scaup, greater scaup, ring-necked duck, canvasback, redhead, bufflehead, ruddy duck, hooded merganser, red-breasted merganser, common merganser.
- Grebes, rails and other marshbirds: eared grebe, western grebe, Clark’s grebe, American coot, sora, Virginia rail, American bittern, Wilson’s phalarope.
- Shorebirds: long-billed curlew, spotted sandpiper, willet, Wilson’s snipe, white-faced ibis, upland sandpiper, black-necked stilt, American avocet, greater and lesser yellowlegs, long-billed dowitcher.
- Gulls and terns: Franklin’s gulls, Forrester’s tern.

The Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) is legally mandated to protect and manage all of the state’s fish and wildlife resources and as a result coordinated the development of a Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for the State of Idaho (CWCS) (IDFG 2005). The CWCS provides “a common framework that will enable conservation partners to jointly implement a long-term approach for the benefit of Species of Greatest Conservation Need” (IDFG 2005). However, the impacts of the proposed transmission line on the Species of Greatest Conservation Need that occur in the project have not been addressed in the Draft EIS.

Avian species listed as Species of Greatest Conservation Need by the State of Idaho and known to occur in wetland habitats along the north and/or south route alternatives, but NOT included in Table 3-18 include:

- Northern pintail
- Lesser scaup
- Hooded merganser
- Western grebe
- Clark’s grebe
- American white pelican
- White-faced ibis
- Sandhill crane
- Black-necked stilt
- American avocet
- Long-billed curlew
- Wilson’s phalarope
- Franklin’s gull
- Forester’s tern

Other avian species listed as species of Greatest Conservation Need by the State of Idaho and known to occur in other habitats along the north and/or south route alternatives, but NOT included in Table 3-18 include:
- Swainson’s hawk
- Short-eared owl

In addition to IDFG Status (column labeled State Status in Table 3-18), the Statewide Rank should also be included for each special status species. For example, trumpeter swans have a rank of S1B,S2N meaning that the statewide breeding population is critically imperiled and the statewide non-breeding population is imperiled. Several other protected nongame species not currently included in Table 3-18 have a statewide rank of S3B meaning that breeding populations within the state of Idaho are vulnerable.

Due to the large body mass of trumpeter swans and known collision hazards with power lines, the project impact on trumpeter swans in Table 3-19 should be moderate to high as stated in the text. Similar resource impacts occur for sandhill cranes, a species not even listed in Table 3-19. Flight patterns of birds, including migratory pathways and daily flight patterns between roosting, foraging, and/or nesting areas should be analyzed. In addition, the Draft EIS does not include the most recent information on bird collisions with power lines published in October 2012 by the Edison Electric Institute (Avian Power Line Interaction Committee 2012).

No bats, insects, or gastropods are listed in Section 3.7 Wildlife, but several species that are listed as Species of Greatest Conservation Need occur in southeast Idaho. Impacts to species that occur or are likely to occur along the north and south route alternative should be analyzed.

No information was provided on when wildlife surveys were completed or the methods used. Wildlife surveys of the project area should be completed during spring, summer, fall, and winter in order to account for species that may use the area during different life history stages (e.g., spring migration, breeding, molting (birds), fall migration, and wintering).

Impacts to all of these special status species identified by the State of Idaho and known to occur within wetland and other habitats along the north and south alternatives should be analyzed. Because these species are lacking, the analyses of environmental consequences and mitigation are not sufficient to evaluate.

In addition, mitigation for negative impacts to wildlife should be identified for each alternative and the various routing options. The north alternative is nearly 50% longer than the south...
alternative and is in closer proximity to Blackfoot Reservoir and Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge, both of which have been identified as globally significant Important Bird Areas (http://niapp.audubon.org/iba/state/US-ID). Although both transmission line alternatives cross migratory bird pathways, it is likely that the impacts to birds and other wildlife along the north alternative would be significantly higher because it is a longer transmission line. The increased environmental impacts of the north are not currently addressed in the mitigation section of the Draft EIS.

Socioeconomic Resources
This section does not address livability principles identified through an interagency partnership that are important in rural communities (Partnership for Sustainable Communities 2011). The proposed overhead transmission line is in direct opposition to two of these livability principles, including 1) leveraging unique natural and land-based resources to raise the standard of living and 2) conserving and building upon unique historic features and iconic rural landscapes. In addition to the interagency partnership cited above, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service endorsed Strategic Habitat Conservation, which includes “landscapes and system sustainability,” as their approach to conservation in support of their mission: “working with others to conserve, protect and enhance fish, wildlife, and plants and their habitats for the continuing benefit of the American people” (emphasis added). The proposed transmission line, ROW, and access roads compromise the natural features, ecosystem integrity, and iconic rural landscape of southeast Idaho.

The iconic rural landscape of southeastern Idaho is defined by farmsteads & ranchlands, historic barns, public lands that support native habitats and wildlife, and working agricultural structures that are visual representations of agricultural, hunting, and natural resource traditions in the State of Idaho and throughout America. Farms, ranches, and recreational amenities such as national forests, national wildlife refuges, and state wildlife management areas all have economic value for rural communities. “Rural American communities are largely defined by their relationship to the agricultural and natural landscape, so conserving working and natural lands is a key strategy for protecting quality of life and the long-term economic viability of farming, forestry, tourism, and other natural resource-based activities” (Partnership for Sustainable Communities 2011). The economic value of the natural and historic resources along the proposed transmission routes is not included in the draft EIS. Therefore, impacts and proposed mitigation to this economic resource cannot be evaluated by the public.

Fishing, hunting, wildlife watching, and other outdoor recreation contribute over $2 billion of Idaho’s $5.3 billion natural resource industry (Wendland and O’Laughlin 2013). When all forms of outdoor recreation activities (non-motorized and motorized) are considered, outdoor recreation created $6.3 billion in consumer spending, $1.8 billion in wages, and $461 million in state and local tax revenue (Outdoor Industry Association 2013). Developments, such as the proposed transmission line, which negatively impact the natural resources of southeastern Idaho need to evaluate the impacts on the recreation economy within Caribou and adjoining counties. Based on personal experience and that of friends and neighbors, people are less likely to recreate in areas disturbed by development, therefore negatively affecting the local economy.

In a 14 February 2013 news release, the Idaho Outdoor Business Council stated that “preservation of prime wildlife habitat in Idaho...is a sound investment in Idaho’s recreation-based economy” and cited programs such as the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) as
important to preserving and increasing public access to natural areas. LWCF have been used in Caribou County to conserve the natural rural landscape. Rural communities that conserve and build upon these natural and historic resources will be better positioned to enhance quality of life for their residents (Partnership for Sustainable Communities 2011).

**Cumulative Impacts**
Cumulative impacts on visual resources, recreation, wetlands, wildlife, and socioeconomic resources are not minor. Once a ROW is secured additional development, including larger and/or more transmission lines, could occur in the foreseeable future, especially since BPA has not included any “non-wires” measures (e.g., energy conservation) to address energy use and reliability. BPA dismisses energy conservation entirely as only a short-term solution, rather than incorporating it into a long-term sustainable energy use plan. In addition, the proposed transmission line may accelerate cumulative impacts from other energy developments that potentially have negative environmental impacts such as geothermal and wind energy. Both geothermal and wind energy have been proposed for exploration in the region. Although I generally support renewable energy sources, they can have negative environmental impacts that need to be evaluated. Therefore, analysis of cumulative impacts of the proposed ROW should include potential cumulative expansion and/or increased infrastructure development to transmit increased energy resulting from these foreseeable actions.

**In Summary**
As described above, the increased impacts that result from the north alternative need to be more thoroughly and accurately described so that 1) BPA can make more informed decisions and 2) local residents, visitors to the region, the general public, and local, state, and federal agencies can evaluate the impacts of all feasible alternatives.

Because the Draft EIS does not address all feasible alternatives, does not accurately present resources and detailed mitigation actions for the public to comment on, and does not included a preferred alternative, BPA should prepare a supplemental draft EIS according to § 1021.314 before a final EIS is published.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Adonia R. Henry
70 Grays Lake Rd.
Wayan, ID 83285

Enclosure: References cited in this comment letter
References cited in this comment letter:


Wendland, K. and J. O’Laughlin 2013. Economic contribution of Idaho’s natural resources. Policy Analysis Group Fact Sheet #7, University of Idaho, College of Natural Resources, Moscow, ID.
April 10, 2013

PLEASE HAVE YOUR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES LOOK AT:

At the April 3, 2013 meeting in Soda Springs Trent Clark, of Monsanto, gave testimony that the BPA would not be liable for any contamination from selenium as the building of the transmission line would not move any phosphate rock.

In the Draft EIS Volume 1, paragraph 3.5.3, page 3-103 it is written: Similar to the North Alternative, geotechnical investigation, including exploratory borings, would be conducted prior to construction of the South Alternative to ensure that excavation would not be deep enough to contact phosphate rock. Therefore, there would be little to no potential for release of selenium during project construction (see Section 3.13, Public Health and Safety).

Based on the above no justification or need for the North Alternative can be based on any issue of pollution by selenium caused by construction in the South Alternative.

I HAVE THESE OTHER COMMENTS:

The North Alternative would create a new transmission corridor resulting in degradation of the environment and lands. The South Alternative passes through lands with existing transmission corridors and the land has been impacted by mining activity. There does not appear to be any organized opposition to the South Alternative while the landholders opposed to the North Alternative are organized and there could be possible court action taken holding up or preventing construction of the transmission line if this alternative is selected.

Al Kackley
In Reply Refer To: 01EIFW00-2013-CPA-0058

April 22, 2013

Erich Orth, Project Manager
Bonneville Power Administration
Public Affairs Office
P.O. Box 14428
Portland, Oregon 97293-4428

Subject: Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Hooper Springs Transmission Project

Dear Mr. Orth:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), dated March 2013, for the proposed Hooper Springs Transmission Project (project). The proposed project is located northeast of the city of Soda Springs, Caribou County, Idaho. The northern alternative of the proposed project is approximately a mile south of Gray’s Lake National Wildlife Refuge (NWR; Refuge). Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to construct, operate, and maintain the proposed 115-kilovolt (kV) transmission line. In addition, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and U.S. Forest Service (USFS) would need to issue right-of-way (ROW) grants authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed project. We provide comments here on behalf of Gray’s Lake NWR and the Eastern Idaho Field Office.

The primary concern and mandate of the Service is the protection of public fish and wildlife resources and their habitats. The Service has legal responsibility for the welfare of migratory birds, anadromous fish, and endangered animals and plants occurring in the United States. As such, we are responsible for administering the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 668); the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-712); and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 661-667e). In addition, we administer approximately 150 million acres of public land in the National Wildlife Refuge System, pursuant to the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd-668ee), as amended by the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997.

Based on our review of the DEIS we offer comments on four categories of concern: (1) potential project impacts to sandhill cranes (Grus canadensis), trumpeter swans (Cygnus buccinator), and other migratory birds, and the need to better identify a strategy for avoidance, minimization, and compensation for those impacts; (2) a comparison of the potential biological consequences
associated with the two proposed routes; (3) the adequacy of the level of detail of analysis of impacts presented in the DEIS; and (4) general comments on proposed project actions and potential impacts. Our specific comments, concerns, and recommendations are identified below.

IMPACTS TO MIGRATORY BIRDS

Both alternatives of the proposed project cross important breeding, wintering, and migratory habitats for migratory birds. The area around Gray’s Lake NWR and Blackfoot Reservoir are of particular importance to sandhill cranes and trumpeter swans, both of which are highly prone to collisions with power lines because of their long legs, large body size, wing shape, tendency to flock, and flight characteristics (Bevanger 1998, APLIC 2012, Morkill and Anderson 1991). Gray’s Lake NWR hosts the largest breeding population of nesting greater sandhill cranes in North America. Annually, approximately 700 sandhill cranes, including 200 to 250 breeding pairs, use shallow flooded wetlands at Gray’s Lake NWR and the surrounding areas within in valley, including seasonally flooded meadows approximately a half mile from the proposed northern alternative. As many as 3,000 migratory sandhill cranes use the area within the Grays Lake basin, proximate to the identified northern alternative, as they stage for the migration to wintering areas. Farther south, anywhere from several hundred to a few thousand cranes may use the area near Woodall Springs and the proposed southern alternative in the fall, when they come to feed in nearby grain fields prior to migrating south for the winter. Some of these cranes feed at the grain fields during the day and travel north to roost at the Blackfoot Reservoir each evening. These daily movements cross the proposed project area. Given that the probability of collisions increases when birds cross a transmission line area frequently (APLIC 2012), it is concerning that both alternatives bisect the area between the grain fields and wetlands used by cranes.

In addition, the proposed project is in close proximity to areas where young cranes fly as part of daily movements to feeding and roosting areas near the Refuge, Blackfoot Reservoir, and Woodall Springs. Younger birds are known to be less agile fliers, with a correspondingly lower ability to maneuver to avoid power lines (Crowder 2000, APLIC 2012). Although a larger percentage of the northern alternative is in close proximity to short cover wetlands and grain fields used by cranes, both alternatives could have a potentially large impact on the local population of cranes.

The DEIS does not take into account the effects of the proposed transmission line on ongoing efforts to alleviate sandhill crane depredation of crops in the area. For several years participating landowners have agreed to let cranes use portions of their fields in return for payment from an endowment set up through the Idaho Fish and Wildlife Foundation. It is imperative that the proposed action not limit the effectiveness of ongoing actions to minimize crop depredation by cranes or cause additive mortality from collisions to cranes currently being managed or hunted in the depredation area. We suggest BPA develop a coordinated strategy to assure the transmission line route does not conflict with the management goals of lure crop plantings or IDFG-managed hunting locations, and that crane strikes do not increase within proximity to lure crop plantings.

Trumpeter swans also use the area surrounding Blackfoot Reservoir. Approximately one third of the adult trumpeter swans in Idaho use Gray’s Lake NWR, including for nesting. Approximately
two to 20 swans from the Fivemile Meadows Complex may winter and travel throughout the area, to Woodall Springs (just east of both alternatives), Blackfoot Reservoir, and Gray's Lake NWR. Tundra swans (Cygnus columbianus) also occasionally pass through the area. Because swans generally travel parallel to the proposed transmission line, collision risk is likely lower than for sandhill cranes. However, risk still exists, as the majority of flights in the area are daily movements at low flight heights.

Numerous American white pelicans (Pelecanus erythrorhynchos) use the south end of the Blackfoot Reservoir, in close proximity to both alternatives. Pelicans are also prone to transmission line collisions.

Finally, numerous species of waterfowl use the seasonal wetlands and sedge flats at Goose Lake, west of Gray’s Lake NWR. These wetlands attract hundreds of waterbirds and provide vitally important seasonal waterfowl staging areas during spring migration. The proposed northern alternative passes through and immediately adjacent to these wetlands. Waterfowl tend to have high wing loading (small wings), and therefore have limited flight maneuverability, or ability to avoid unseen obstacles such as the shield wires on power lines. Consequently, it is reasonable to anticipate a seasonal high probability of waterfowl collisions along the northern alternative.

Section 3.7: Although the DEIS mentions cranes and swans, it does not quantify the extent of bird use of the area (including the exceptionally large number of cranes that use Gray’s Lake NWR) or describe patterns of bird use and behavior, as they relate to the risk posed by the proposed project. The DEIS also does not describe waterfowl use. Please include such discussion in subsequent NEPA analysis for the project. Please also describe resultant population impacts expected from the proposed action.

The DEIS describes applying an avian collision model (Heck 2007) to the northern alternative. We would recommend applying the same model to the southern alternative, and using it to compare the two alternatives in a similar way to how collision risk was compared across different sections of the northern alternative. The Service would be interested in seeing the modeling output. Further, we would encourage BPA to include in the Final EIS (FEIS) graphic and written descriptions of model outputs and how they inform selection of a preferred alternative or any micrositing done along the proposed power line route.

The collision risk model is based on site-specific application of a number of factors that contribute to overall risk (Heck 2007). In subsequent NEPA analysis, please discuss those factors, as well as the additional ones identified in APLIC 2012, and how they apply to each of the proposed alternatives.

Transmission lines provide perches for common ravens (Corvus corvax) and raptors, species that commonly predate on other birds or their eggs. Infrastructure facilitates expansion of raven populations into areas where they were previously absent or in low abundance. Ball (2003) noted that most crane nests at Grays Lake are lost to predators and recent nest success witnessed from 1997-2000 was much lower as compared to Steel (1952) and Drewien (1973). Researchers attributed this at least in part to changes in the predator community, most likely increased raven and coyote populations (Austin 2007). Sandhill cranes, geese, and long-billed curlews
(Numenius americanus) that nest on the Refuge are large birds that nest relatively early, before wetland vegetation has grown tall enough to provide shelter. They thus are quite conspicuous to predators while sitting on their nests. Currently, there are few perches along the proposed northern alternative. Fencing is limited on the Refuge, and there are no existing transmission lines and few distribution lines. Increasing the availability of perches in the vicinity of wetland complexes with nesting birds may negatively impact the nesting success of birds on the Refuge and surrounding lands. Please discuss in subsequent NEPA analysis the impacts associated with the proposed line as a perch for predators.

Under both alternatives, the proposed action would include construction of new access roads in order to construct and maintain the proposed transmission line. In many cases, these roads are difficult to close to subsequent public use, despite use of gates, boulders, or other barriers. As acknowledged in section 3.2, roads increase human access, including illegal use by people on ATVs. Increased access can disturb nesting birds, displace wildlife, lead to illegal take, or cause other issues. Please address in the wildlife section of subsequent NEPA analysis the wildlife impacts of new road construction and potential increased human activity in the area, compared to baseline conditions.

To minimize bird collisions and electrocutions, we encourage BPA to implement the 2012 APLIC guidelines, which reflect the current best available scientific information about injury or death of birds from electrocution by and collision with power lines, instead of older versions of the guidelines, as described in the DEIS.

In addition to implementing the APLIC guidelines, we recommend revising the mitigation measures proposed in the DEIS to be more specific. As stands, many are too vague to understand what will be implemented on the ground or their effectiveness in avoiding and minimizing impacts to resources. Where these measures pertain to Federal trust resources, including migratory birds and their habitats, we would be happy to assist BPA develop appropriately-specific best management practices and mitigation measures for inclusion in the FEIS.

COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

Section 3.7: As discussed above with regard to avian impacts and as reflected in Table 3-19 of the DEIS, commonalities exist in the anticipated resource impacts of the two alternatives. However, we have some concerns about resource impacts unique to each alternative that were not well reflected in the DEIS.

First, the northern alternative passes within approximately a mile of Gray’s Lake NWR. Gray’s Lake was established in 1965 to protect and restore habitat for ducks, geese, and other species. It includes the largest hard bulrush marsh in the world, and hosts the largest population of nesting sandhill cranes in the world. The Refuge is surrounded by seasonal wetlands managed by BLM, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), and private landowners that provide additional habitat for migratory and nesting waterfowl, cranes, swans, and other avian species. The northern alternative also crosses private lands of high resource value near Blackfoot Reservoir and Goose Lake. The northern alternative transmission line would be in close proximity to two globally
recognized Audubon Society Important Bird Areas (IBA), designated at Gray’s Lake NWR and the Blackfoot Reservoir because of the value of local habitats to cranes and other avian species. We are concerned this juxtaposition would place large numbers of birds at high risk for being injured or killed by colliding with the proposed transmission line. Please thoroughly address potential impacts to the avian populations that use the Refuge and surrounding lands.

In addition to potential avian impacts, the northern alternative would impact wetlands and more than four times as much aspen-dominated vegetation as the southern alternative. These two communities provide disproportionately high resource value to wildlife. Numerous species, including migratory birds, elk, deer, and bears use aspen riparian areas for forage and shelter. Wetlands provide important habitat for waterfowl, cranes, swans, and other avian species. Although the DEIS describes impacts to vegetation in section 3.4, it does not discuss in section 3.7 the corresponding impacts to wildlife. Please describe the wildlife impacts that would result from clearing aspen and riparian vegetation, including the effects of habitat loss and fragmentation. Please discuss effects anticipated from filling wetlands to install the proposed project, including hydrologic effects to the surrounding area, and resultant potential impacts to the resources available for wildlife use. Finally, please describe any possibility for micrositing of the transmission line along the northern alternative to avoid and minimize impacts to aspen and wetland vegetation.

Finally, the northern alternative would cross farmland enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP). The CRP program is designed to encourage uses of environmentally sensitive land that have conservation benefits. Please discuss current agricultural practices on the CRP land along the northern alternative and any existing associated wildlife benefits. Please discuss the wildlife impacts that could result from construction of the proposed project across lands intended for conservation. We recommend including in this discussion the impacts of access road construction, vegetation clearance (if any), and potential for avian collisions.

In contrast, much of the southern alternative crosses land already subject to disturbance. The portion of the southern alternative that runs east-west is largely within a corridor of existing linear disturbances. Currently there are multiple distribution lines, a transmission line, paved roads, and the railway and multiple haul roads that serve the surrounding mines. Fragmentation, especially by linear features, is a major concern for many wildlife species. Co-locating linear disturbances, such as the proposed project, is an effective way to minimize wildlife impacts. We strongly recommend BPA consider this when selecting a preferred alternative and when micrositing the proposed line.

The southern alternative does, however, pass near the mouth of the Blackfoot River narrows. While we do not have data on numbers of migratory birds that use that area, birds migrating through the area likely include pelicans, ducks, geese, and osprey. We recommend that BPA coordinate with the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) to assess use of the area by these species and include in subsequent NEPA analysis a discussion of potential impacts.

Based on the above, we suggest there are differences between the two action alternatives in impacts that could result from construction and maintenance of the proposed project, and recommend revising Table 3-19 of the DEIS to reflect those differences. In addition, we
recommend BPA consider these differences in impacts to vegetation and wildlife when selecting a preferred alternative.

ANALYSIS IN THE DEIS

Sections 3.1 & 3.7: We understand that at least one option under consideration for the southern alternative would cross a Wildlife Management Area (WMA) administered by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG). Ownership of the WMA is split between IDFG and the Idaho Department of Lands. Section 3.1 of the DEIS briefly mentions state lands on the southern alternative, but does not identify where those lands are or identify the WMA. As acknowledged in section 3.2, the WMA is administered to provide for public recreation, to improve Yellowstone cutthroat trout (Oncorhynchus clarkii bouvieri) habitat, and to provide upland and riparian habitat for the benefit of wildlife, including wintering elk, deer, and moose. Construction of new roads and infrastructure as part of the southern alternative likely would impact the resource values the WMA is designed to protect. Consequently, we encourage BPA to explicitly address impacts to the WMA and the wildlife that uses it in the land use and wildlife sections of subsequent NEPA analysis.

The northeastern portion of the northern alternative crosses lands donated by the Kakley family in 2006 to the Idaho Foundation of Parks and Lands for preservation in perpetuity under a conservation easement. These lands provide habitat for sharp tailed grouse (Tympanuchus phasianellus), sage thrasher (Oreoscoptes montanus), sage sparrow (Artemisiospiza belli), Brewer’s sparrow (Spizella breweri), and other grassland and sagebrush species. Please address the easement in subsequent NEPA analysis, including an explanation of the proposed transmission line’s compatibility with the terms of the conservation easement. Additionally, several Land Trusts, including the Teton Regional Land Trust and the Sagebrush Steppe Regional Land Trust have identified conservation values for protection within the proposed project area, particularly within the rural ranching lands of northern Caribou County. Please address how the conservation and wildlife values of private lands and the potential for conservation land acquisition, donation, or purchase of easements could be affected by the proposed northern alternative.

Section 3.16: Please include more specificity in the vegetation, wetlands, and wildlife subsections of the cumulative effects analysis. Please describe the differences in anticipated cumulative effects between the north and south alternatives. For example, please discuss in more detail cumulative impacts to wildlife from future mining activities in the southern alternative, particularly around the state WMA. In addition, please include in the cumulative effects section discussion of the likelihood of future transmission line upgrades to carry additional electricity, or reasonably foreseeable sources of other energy development that may wish to use transmission in the area.

Appendix F: The species list provided in the DEIS as species documented during project surveys seems improbable for the area. For example, Columbian ground squirrels (Urocitellus columbianus) are not otherwise known to occur in southeastern Idaho, yet are described as being present in “high” abundance. Additionally, hunting records and previous observations show mule deer (Odocoileus hemionus) as significantly more abundant than white-tailed deer.
(Odocoileus virginianus) in the project area, yet the species list identifies the former as moderately abundant and the latter as highly abundant. Please check that the correct species list is included in the FEIS.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Chapter 1: Please better define the purpose and need for the project. Please identify whether the proposed line is designed primarily to accommodate additional electrical demand, or to provide redundancy in the grid. If the former, please address associated cumulative effects, such as a future need to upgrade existing lines to carry the additional power, as well as any obligations to encourage energy efficiency strategies prior to or in concert with implementing additional infrastructure development. If the latter, please explain how the proposed project accomplishes the goal of increased transmission system reliability (i.e. the relationship between redundancy and reliability).

Section 3.3: The mission of the Service is to work with others to conserve, protect, and enhance fish, wildlife, and plants and their habitats for the continuing benefit of the American people. The unprecedented scale and complexity of biological and ecological challenges of the 21st century led the Service to develop a vision of Strategic Habitat Conservation (SHC), based on landscape-level planning for multiple resource values and partnerships (USFWS 2006). The SHC approach adopted by the Service establishes self-sustaining populations of fish and wildlife, in the context of landscape and system sustainability.

Pursuant to our mission and the framework of SHC, we recognize the value of providing for the needs and values of people when considering project impacts. As expressed by the public at the April 3, 2013, meeting in Soda Springs, visual impacts across the proposed northern alternative are of concern to local landowners and those who recreate in the area, including at Gray’s Lake NWR. The northern alternative is not consistent with the rural and natural visual experience of the area, including Gray’s Lake NWR. Please address in subsequent NEPA analysis the potential visual impacts of the northern alternative to Gray’s Lake NWR. Pursuant to the SHC framework, we urge BPA to consider when selecting a preferred alternative the compatibility of the project with the overall rural and natural character of the landscape, including wildlife and visual resources.

SUMMARY COMMENTS

Executive Order 13186 (66 Fed. Reg. 3853, January 17, 2001), entitled “Responsibilities of Federal agencies to Protect Migratory Birds,” directs Federal agencies to integrate migratory bird conservation practices into agency activities, and to promote the conservation of migratory bird populations and their habitats. Pursuant to this executive order, the Department of Energy signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Service in 2006, which BPA also operates under. That MOU requires BPA to “avoid or minimize, to the extent practicable, adverse impacts on migratory bird trust resources when conducting agency actions.” In addition, it compels BPA to “ensur[e] that migratory bird protection and conservation is considered in NEPA project reviews.” In keeping with these obligations, we recommend BPA integrate the
additional analyses described above into subsequent NEPA analysis for the proposed Hooper Springs Transmission Line project.

Outside the framework of the EIS, we recommend that BPA prepare a Bird Conservation Strategy (BCS), in coordination with the Service. We recommend the BCS describe how the project complies with the MBTA and the DOE/FWS MOU described above. The BCS should outline measures that BPA would take to avoid, minimize, and compensate for impacts to avian species during all phases of the project. Given that either alternative of the proposed transmission line likely would pose a threat to migratory birds, we encourage BPA to coordinate with the Service on ways to “protect, restore, enhance, and manage habitats of migratory birds,” as agreed to in the MOU and as is being implemented on other transmission lines proposed for construction in Idaho and neighboring states.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed project. For further information or questions, please contact Nisa Marks of this office, at (208) 237-6232 extension 121, or William Smith of Gray’s Lake National Wildlife Refuge, at (208) 574-2755.

Sincerely,

[Signatures]

David Kampwerth
Field Supervisor

Tracy Casselman
Refuge Project Leader

Cc:
Jim Mende, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Pocatello, Idaho
Jack Isaacs, United States Forest Service, Soda Springs, Idaho
Dave Pacioretty, Bureau of Land Management, Pocatello, Idaho
Earl Somsen, Caribou County, Soda Springs, Idaho

WORKS CITED


Proposed Hooper Springs Transmission Project

“I’d like to tell you . . .”

Please have your environmental studies look at:

If northern route through Grayslake there is possibility of migratory bird strikes, i.e., Cranes, Swans and Whooping Cranes. They are highly susceptible to wire strikes.

I have these other comments:

Extended costs at longer distance through the North Grays Lake route,

More private property transversed,

BPA should be able to get exemption from any Superfund Super brook crossed,

Closer access to current mining operations

Please tell us your preference for receiving the draft EIS by selecting from the following:

☐ Compact disc (CD) of the EIS (2203)
☐ Printed copy of the EIS, approximately 755 pages (2204)
☐ Notification letter that provides the Web address for accessing the EIS online
  ☐ by mail (2201)
  ☐ by e-mail; please provide your e-mail address  (2202)
☐ Please remove my name from the mailing list for this EIS
☐ Please put me on your project mailing list. (You are already on the mailing list if you have received mailed notices.) (2201)
April 26, 2013

Erich Orth
Project Manager
Hooper Springs Transmission Line Project EIS
Bonneville Power Administration
P.O. Box 14428
Portland, OR 97293-4428

RE: Hooper Springs Transmission Line Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Orth:

The state of Idaho appreciates the opportunity to comment on the project referenced above. Idaho’s submission includes general statements as well as specific, project related comments regarding impacts to various resources and activities.

The Idaho Office of Energy Resources (OER) is located in the Executive Office of the Governor and serves as the state entity responsible for coordinating energy policy and planning development within the state of Idaho. Idaho supports the development of critical electrical infrastructure and the State encourages the project manager to move forward with the process for this project within the anticipated timeline.

While Idaho appreciates the Bonneville Power Administration’s (BPA) efforts thus far in this process, we would like to register our strong objection to the fact that BPA did not designate a Preferred Alternative in the Draft EIS. BPA’s decision to not designate a Preferred Alternative creates a strain on state agency and local government resources, as well as Idaho citizens, as they attempt to review the proposed routes.

General Comments

OER submits this material to assist the established process in making the appropriate determinations. It is also important to note that Idaho’s overall best interest is served by balancing energy resource needs with land use, environmental impacts, and historic preservation considerations.

OER has been contacted by numerous residents of Caribou County and none of them believe the Hooper Springs line is necessary or beneficial. However, if the line is necessary, their nearly unanimous preference is for the southern route. It is incumbent on BPA to provide a thorough explanation of the need for this transmission line to the citizens in Caribou County.
OER objects to BPA’s failure to disclose various alternatives in the Draft EIS. This includes BPA’s consideration of the Blackfoot River Wildlife Management Area as alternative on the southern route. Understanding that BPA has certain time restrictions, OER believes that a complete and full discussion of all relevant options is necessary for high-quality decision-making. By not including this, and potentially other alternatives, interested stakeholders are limited in the amount of helpful feedback they can provide to BPA.

If any routing option selected by BPA crosses state land, there will be a need for BPA to work with the relevant state land authority as well as OER on appropriate site specific mitigation.

**Specific Comments Related to Impacts on State Endowment Land**

Idaho Department of Lands (IDL), at the direction of the Idaho State Board of Land Commissioners, manages the Endowment Trust Lands within the State. In December 2007, the Land Board adopted the *State Trust Lands Asset Management Plan* addressing the overall management of Endowment Lands within Idaho.

State Trust Lands are not managed for the public at large and should not be referred to as “public lands” or “open space,” either specifically or in a generic sense. These are working lands producing revenue for the Beneficiary Institutions.

The South Alternative crosses state endowment trust land located in section 28 Township 7 South, Range 43 East, between markers 14 and 15. Option 3 and Option 4 are more direct routes, have fewer bearing changes, are shorter, and do not cross state endowment land. It is IDL’s preference that this project avoids state endowment lands.

The North Alternative crosses state endowment trust land between markers 11 and 15. The Long Valley road option does not cross state endowment land. It is IDL’s preference that this project avoids state endowment land.

Any routes that cross state endowment land must be located to minimize impact to the remainder of the parcel. A 20-year term easement would be the authorizing instrument issued to allow the project on trust land. Application for use can be obtained from any IDL office.

**Comments Related to Wildlife Considerations**

The Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG), acting under the supervision of the Idaho Fish and Game Commission is the state agency charged with carrying out the statutory authority to preserve, protect, perpetuate, and manage all fish and wildlife in Idaho (Idaho Code § 36-103(a)). IDFG’s specific comments regarding impacts to wildlife are attached.

Again, the state of Idaho appreciates the opportunity to submit comments on the Hooper Springs Transmission Line Project Draft EIS and we look forward to working with you as this process continues.

Sincerely,

John Chatburn, Interim Administrator
Idaho Office of Energy Resources
Hooper Springs Transmission Project, DOE/DEIS - 0451
Idaho Department of Fish and Game Comments, April 23, 2013

The Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG), acting under the supervision of the Idaho Fish and Game Commission is the state agency charged with carrying out the statutory authority to preserve, protect, perpetuate, and manage all fish and wildlife in Idaho (Idaho Code § 36-103(a)).

The IDFG does not support or oppose this proposal. The purpose of these comments is to assist the decision-making authority by providing technical information addressing potential effects on wildlife and wildlife habitat and on how adverse effects might be mitigated.

We previously submitted two comment letters on the 2006 proposed Caribou 138/115-kV Substation and Caribou Long Valley 115-kV Transmission Line (August 1, 2006 and September 13, 2006) and participated in a site visit on September 11, 2006. Those earlier comments remain valid as do our comments incorporated into the May 28, 2009 letter from Administrator Kjellander. We offer the following additional comments regarding the March 2013 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

We reiterate our past encouragement for any routing decisions to minimize effects to the visual and wildlife resources of Blackfoot River Wildlife Management Area (WMA). The WMA was acquired in 1995 and has been maintained since with the assistance from partners including Ducks Unlimited, The Greater Yellowstone Coalition, Trout Unlimited, and the North American Moose Foundation. The primary goals are to benefit aquatic and terrestrial wildlife through the improvement of vegetation communities, and to provide wildlife related public use opportunities such as hunting, fishing, trapping and viewing. We request continued consultation and early opportunity to work with BPA on minimization and mitigation if the preferred route is to cross the WMA.

Increases in motorized access due to construction or maintenance may lead to reduction in big game security. Measures to ensure there is no significant increase in motorized disturbance, once the project is complete, are strongly recommended. We recommend installation and maintenance of the selected route without constructing additional roads that might lead to additional authorized or unauthorized travel by using track vehicle or helicopter access. However, if temporary roads are necessary, they should be properly reclaimed to prevent unauthorized access as well as preclude noxious weeds. Female elk and mule deer are particularly sensitive to disturbance during calving and fawning and we request a construction window that avoids activity during the critical period from late May to late June. We are particularly concerned with the reach for the South Alternative from Dry Valley to Upper Valley, which has been identified as an elk calving area by recent radio-telemetry studies. Currently this area has no
U.S. Forest Service identified roads or trails.

IDFG has identified aspen as an important direct and indirect habitat component for terrestrial and aquatic wildlife species. We are particularly aware of the benefits of aspen habitats to mule deer and elk for annual recruitment. Our current Mule Deer Initiative focuses on fawning habitat and overall forage production associated with aspen stands. The positive impacts of healthy aspen communities on watersheds also benefits fisheries. Where possible, aspen community disruption should be avoided and disturbed aspen communities should be regenerated or mitigated.

Large numbers of mule deer annually migrate from the north end of the Aspen Range/Wood Canyon higher elevations, across the valley to winter in Soda Hills and the Ninety Percent range. This migration corridor includes the area partially occupied by the Monsanto Soda Springs Phosphorous Plant and the PacifiCorp Substation. Although the proposed Hooper Springs Substation would cover a relatively small area (5.4 acres), the perimeter fencing (page 2-1) would impede mule deer movement through this area. We request actions to reduce and or mitigate potential impacts in consultation with our regional staff.

The timing of construction and maintenance activity could have adverse impacts on nesting raptors. At risk species such as bald eagle, great gray owl, northern goshawk, and peregrine falcon are known to occur in the area. There have been two confirmed great gray owl nesting territories along Rasmussen Ridge and numerous additional sightings throughout the area of the alternative routes. Additional surveys should be conducted to determine the extent of breeding raptors in the area of all alternatives and disturbance during the breeding through fledging periods should be avoided.

The Blackfoot River/Reservoir (North and South Alternatives), Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge (North Alternative), and Woodall Lakes (South Alternative) all involve heavily used flight corridors for a variety of birds. Bird use includes migratory birds such as ducks, geese, American white pelican, sandhill crane and trumpeter swans. Raptors include bald eagle and peregrine falcons and upland game birds include sharp-tailed grouse and greater sage-grouse. Many of these species are categorized as sensitive by federal agencies or Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) by Idaho and we believe the DEIS would be strengthened by reflecting Idaho's SGCN conservation status for these species (http://fishandgame.idaho.gov/public/wildlife/cwcs/).

Our August 1, 2006 comment letter referenced adherence to an Avian Protection Plan (APP) and the Avian Power line Interaction Committee (APLIC) guidelines during this project. The DEIS is unclear as to whether the reference to APLIC indicates an adoption of both the APP and the APLIC guidelines, which should be clarified. We strongly encourage BPA to use widely recognized, contemporary methods to reduce powerline collisions, particularly important for the northern alternative. Bird strike diverters should be installed according to recommended protocol and their effectiveness should be monitored and reported with modifications deployed as needed.

Keeping Idaho's Wildlife Heritage
As pointed out in the DEIS, greater sage-grouse have been designated as a candidate for listing under the Endangered Species Act. It is unclear from the DEIS whether a sage-grouse lek was “observed” or “discovered” adjacent to the South Alternative (P. 3-135, Appendix G-3). If a lek has been confirmed in the vicinity of the eastern end of the South Alternative, it is significant so we request clarification of the lek reference. Generally historic leks scattered along the Blackfoot River corridor above Blackfoot Reservoir have declined over the past forty years. In 1973 five leks were determined active. In 1995 there were three known active leks. As of 2012, only one active lek has been confirmed upstream of Highway 34. The BLM and USFS are currently developing sage-grouse conservation measures to incorporate into land use plans (National Greater Sage-grouse Land Use Planning Strategy). In September 2012, Governor Otter submitted an Idaho Alternative to be incorporated into that strategy. Both the federal and state strategies designate greater sage-grouse habitat in the vicinity of the upper Blackfoot River as “general”, as opposed to “important” or “core” habitat. The Idaho Alternative addresses stabilization of habitats and populations and states that wildfire, invasive species, and infrastructure are the primary threats to sage-grouse in Idaho, and points to focused management of these issues in general habitat in part as a buffer to encroachment of these effects to core and important habitats. Cumulative effects of infrastructure such as the proposed Southern Alternative may be having a significant impact on local populations and it is important to ensure that local population effects do not diminish range-wide population status and trend. While non-forest habitat in the area may be abundant, sagebrush habitat suitable for greater sage-grouse may not be sufficient to support local populations. The Idaho Alternative provides additional detail about management focus in general habitat.

Both greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse are known to occur in the area of both alternatives. In addition to the concerns with avian collision addressed above, appropriate methods should be employed to avoid providing additional perch or nesting sites for predators of greater-sage grouse.

The following are comments specific to information provided in the DEIS:

It is difficult to assess the utility of the avian collision model (Heck 2007) used to analyze the collision potential along the North Alternative and we question why a model that is not commonly found in the literature was used; providing the rationale for use of this model rather than other published models would strengthen the DEIS. To allow for our evaluation of this model, please provide information as to where and how the model has been previously applied and the specific inputs used in this application. If the methodology is acceptable, we suggest that the avian collision model also be used to assess the Southern Alternative to adequately compare the two alternatives.

Appendix F (Wildlife Species Documented Within the Project During Wildlife and Vegetation Surveys) appears to contain errors. Columbian ground squirrels have not been documented in southeast Idaho. The common ground squirrel in the project area is the Uinta ground squirrel. White-tailed deer occurrence in the project area is known to be very low while mule deer abundance would be considered high. Harvest data and recent surveys suggest black bear numbers are relatively low in the project area. Based on our recent surveys, northern leopard frog numbers would be considered moderate to low. Clarification of the methods employed to
obtain abundance and species identification is requested.

At the elevations of the project, we recommend that project activity be curtailed until mid-May (not “the beginning of May” – Table 2.4, p. 2-50) to protect greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input regarding this project. Please contact Jim Mende or Paul Wackenhut at 232-4703 if you have any further questions about technical issues we have raised.
September 13, 2006

Mark Korsness, Project Manager
Bonneville Power Administration, Public Affairs Office – DKC – 7
P.O. Box 14428
Portland, OR 97293-4428

RE: Proposed Caribou 138/115-kV Substation and Caribou-Lower Valley 115-kV Transmission Line – Mill Canyon portion

Dear Mark:

Paul Wackenhut of our regional staff attended a meeting and field tour regarding the eastern portion of this proposed transmission line on Monday, September 11, and has reported back to me on his assessment of the possible alternatives. Given our understanding that this general routing of the transmission line up the Blackfoot River corridor is the only practical choice, we offer these follow up comments.

In our letter on July 12, 2006, we expressed our desire that this portion of the line avoid the Blackfoot River Wildlife Management Area (WMA), and what we consider to be some important wildlife habitat on the WMA and Caribou-Targhee National Forest lands. At that time we were not fully aware of limitations on the route selection posed by severity of the slope on the west side of Dry Ridge. Because that steep face necessitates approaching the ridge at a saddle overlooking the mid-point of Mill Canyon, and because any route down the Mosquito Creek drainage would involve more vegetation alteration and maintenance (disturbance) of the corridor, we no longer see an advantage to pursuing a route down Mosquito Creek. The saddle that the line will approach and cross over is along the southern edge of the unroaded and secluded refugia that we were hoping to protect. Once the disturbance reaches that point, any route that impacts more habitat in the short term or long term is not logical. We agree that following down along the less vegetated Mill Canyon proper, either on the open south-facing slope, or along the road on the north-facing slope, makes more sense for minimizing impacts to wildlife.

We appreciate efforts to keep the line as far away from the WMA property as possible, and particularly routing that prevents visual impacts from the river valley in the middle of the WMA. We feel it is important that the line be installed and maintained in this reach (from Dry Valley to Upper Valley) without construction of additional roads that might lead to additional authorized or unauthorized travel. We stand by all recommendations in the July 12 letter referring to guidelines in the Avian Protection Plan, wildlife sightings, needed surveys, and critical wildlife activity periods. As stated previously, bird avoidance devices should be utilized and we would encourage
any possible steps to minimize sight distances within the cleared corridor through timber. Avoiding long straight stretches where possible, minimizing the width of the corridor, and removal of only taller vegetation all would help maintain the security values for big game and other wildlife.

Again, we appreciate the BPA’s efforts to solicit input regarding these projects. Please contact Jim Mende or Paul Wackenhut at 232-4703 if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

Mark Gamblin
Regional Supervisor

MG/PW/JM

Cc: Darren Olsen, Soda Springs Ranger Dist., USFS
    Damien Miller, USFWS
    Bob Bramer, IDL
    NRPB

Email: Carl Anderson, Brandon Chamberlin, Tom Maeder, IDFG
August 1, 2006

Mark Korsness, Project Manager
Bonneville Power Administration, Public Affairs Office – DKC – 7
P.O. Box 14428
Portland, OR 97293-4428

RE: Proposed Caribou 138/115-kV Substation and Caribou-Lower Valley 115-kV Transmission Line

Dear Mark:

Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG), acting under the supervision of the Idaho Fish and Game Commission is charged with carrying out the statutory policy to preserve, protect, perpetuate, and manage all fish and wildlife and will advocate for fish and wildlife to receive equal treatment with all other resources in land and water management decisions (Idaho Code § 36-103(a)). In this charge Southeast Region personnel have considered your request for available information and offer the following comment:

We have no particular concerns with the construction of the proposed substation though we have little information on the detail of the project. Our observation is that substations typically encompass fairly insignificant acreages. However, the general area of the site is heavily traversed by mule deer in the early winter and late spring migrating to and from the Soda Hills wintering area. This migration corridor is already heavily impacted by Highway 34, county roads, railroad lines, residential housing and the Monsanto phosphate production plant. Any further impediments should be avoided or mitigated by improving passage through this bottleneck area. Both the substation and the proposed transmission line should be constructed to be ‘avian safe’ according to guidelines of the Avian Protection Plan (APP) and the Avian Powerline Interaction Committee (APLIC).

Regarding the Caribou-Lower Valley transmission line we have some concerns with the routing of the line. It is well documented that power lines create hazards for wildlife directly through collisions and electrocution. Construction details should follow guidelines according to the APP and APLIC as above (see Suggested Practices for Raptor Protection on Powerlines and Mitigating Bird Collisions With Powerlines). More indirectly, power lines and the associated roads, vegetation removal and visual effects may alter daily and seasonal use by a variety of wildlife. Security for big game during fawning/calving and especially hunting seasons may be affected significantly by increased sight distances. This is especially true at the easterly extent of the proposed transmission line route where it traverses Dry Ridge. This area adjacent to the
Blackfoot River Wildlife Management Area (WMA) is heavily used by deer and elk through the spring, summer and fall. Of 25 cow elk radio-collared in the Soda Hills winter range complex (winter ’05-’06), six were recently relocated in this vicinity just south of the WMA and have likely calved in the area. Sage and sharp-tailed grouse (both listed as ‘species of greatest conservation need’ – Idaho Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy, 2005) have been sighted on the WMA in recent years. Mill Canyon Creek and other minor tributaries to the Blackfoot River and Diamond Creek are occupied by Yellowstone cutthroat trout (also a ‘species of greatest conservation need’) and are potential spawning streams for that species. In 2004 a great grey owl was sighted in the timbered habitat at the south end of the WMA and there is a possibility of a nest site in the vicinity. Other nesting territories of great grey owl have been identified to the north and south of this location. There is limited motorized access and therefore limited disturbance to this portion of the WMA and adjacent Forest Service (USFS) land. It would be preferable to maintain this refuge situation and keep the existing habitat intact. For aesthetic values, we would prefer that the transmission line not be visible from any portion of the WMA.

We recommend that the transmission line be routed as far south of the WMA as possible while still avoiding the Inventoried Roadless Area (Dry Ridge) on the USFS. The line should avoid Mill Canyon in section 21, and instead, after crossing Dry Ridge should follow a course due east or southeast into the next drainage to the south. This drainage seems to be unnamed but may have been referred to as Mosquito Creek on the May 17 field tour. The drainage has a road and open to motorized vehicles ‘less than 50’ in width’ on several trails according to the current USFS Travel Plan Revision. Impacts to wildlife habitat would be lessened in this drainage that already has a road and is disturbed.

Surveys should be conducted in the spring and fall to determine the extent of the mule deer migration in the proximity of the proposed substation. Raptor populations should be monitored throughout the year to determine level of use and possible hazards from collision and electrocution in the vicinity of the substation and the transmission line. In the vicinity of timbered sections and particularly the area of Dry Ridge, a concerted effort should be made to locate nest sites of forest raptors such as owls and goshawks so nesting sites are avoided. On the ridgeline itself and adjacent to any wetland areas, bird avoidance devices should be considered to lessen chances of collisions especially during seasonal migrations. Work to install the transmission line in the Dry Ridge vicinity should occur outside of calving, fawning, and fledging periods from late May through early August. We would recommend that no new roads/trails be constructed for the placement or maintenance of the line (as per the intent expressed on the May 17 tour) and mountain brush communities should be preserved to the extent possible. If possible, any timber removal should favor the enhancement of aspen communities.

We appreciate the BPA’s efforts to solicit input regarding these projects and thank you for giving the Idaho Department of Fish and Game this opportunity to provide information regarding fish and wildlife concerns. Please contact Jim Mende at 232-4703 if you have any further questions.
Blackfoot River Wildlife Management Area (WMA) is heavily used by deer and elk through the spring, summer and fall. Of 25 cow elk radio-collared in the Soda Hills winter range complex (winter '05-'06), six were recently relocated in this vicinity just south of the WMA and have likely calved in the area. Sage and sharp-tailed grouse (both listed as 'species of greatest conservation need' – Idaho Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy, 2005) have been sighted on the WMA in recent years. Mill Canyon Creek and other minor tributaries to the Blackfoot River and Diamond Creek are occupied by Yellowstone cutthroat trout (also a 'species of greatest conservation need') and are potential spawning streams for that species. In 2004 a great grey owl was sighted in the timbered habitat at the south end of the WMA and there is a possibility of a nest site in the vicinity. Other nesting territories of great grey owl have been identified to the north and south of this location. There is limited motorized access and therefore limited disturbance to this portion of the WMA and adjacent Forest Service (USFS) land. It would be preferable to maintain this refuge situation and keep the existing habitat intact. For aesthetic values, we would prefer that the transmission line not be visible from any portion of the WMA.

We recommend that the transmission line be routed as far south of the WMA as possible while still avoiding the Invented Roadless Area (Dry Ridge) on the USFS. The line should avoid Mill Canyon in section 21, and instead, after crossing Dry Ridge should follow a course due east or southeast into the next drainage to the south. This drainage seems to be unnamed but may have been referred to as Mosquito Creek on the May 17 field tour. The drainage has a road and open to motorized vehicles ‘less than 50’ in width’ on several trails according to the current USFS Travel Plan Revision. Impacts to wildlife habitat would be lessened in this drainage that already has a road and is disturbed.

Surveys should be conducted in the spring and fall to determine the extent of the mule deer migration in the proximity of the proposed substation. Raptor populations should be monitored throughout the year to determine level of use and possible hazards from collision and electrocution in the vicinity of the substation and the transmission line. In the vicinity of timbered sections and particularly the area of Dry Ridge, a concerted effort should be made to locate nest sites of forest raptors such as owls and goshawks so nesting sites are avoided. On the ridgeline itself and adjacent to any wetland areas, bird avoidance devices should be considered to lessen chances of collisions especially during seasonal migrations. Work to install the transmission line in the Dry Ridge vicinity should occur outside of calving, fawning, and fledging periods from late May through early August. We would recommend that no new roads/trails be constructed for the placement or maintenance of the line (as per the intent expressed on the May 17 tour) and mountain brush communities should be preserved to the extent possible. If possible, any timber removal should favor the enhancement of aspen communities.

We appreciate the BPA’s efforts to solicit input regarding these projects and thank you for giving the Idaho Department of Fish and Game this opportunity to provide information regarding fish and wildlife concerns. Please contact Jim Mende at 232-4703 if you have any further questions.
April 5, 2013

Certified Return Mail

Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)
Hooper Springs Transmission Project
P.O. Box 14428
Portland, Oregon 97293

Subject: Hooper Springs Transmission Project
        ref.: South Alternative

To Whom,

This letter is in reference to BPA’s proposed transmission project’s South Alternative and the effect and impact this specific route alternative will have pursuant to the farm and ranch property owned by the Mark J. & Beth Carter Family.

Accompanying this letter are copies of three Aerial Photomaps showing pole and transmission line locations which were presented by BPA at the April 3, 2013 meeting held in Soda Springs, Idaho; ref. Sheets 13, 14, and 15: 4/1/13. At this meeting, Ross Wilde (Carter Family representative) reviewed and discussed these maps with various BPA members of staff. Ross expressed some of the Carter Family concerns and discussed the previous farming history that is visibly obvious. Given the route and pole locations as drawn on these three maps it appears the Carter Family could accept this plan. Of concern is the initial and extended impact to the ranch’s homestead which is located close to the power line.

The Carter Family owns two full sections (640 acres ea.) of property that would be effected by the line route as shown on the Arial Photomaps. The East section would have one pole in the S/E corner of the section and the West section would have four poles in the S/W corner of that section near the homestead. Considering the variety of agricultural options and potential with the land and water, any other route option or pole location effecting these two sections of Carter property is not acceptable and will be adamantly opposed.

Respectfully,

Ross Wilde, Family Representative

Beth Carter, Family Trustee
PUBLIC HEARING, SODA SPRINGS, IDAHO

HOOPER SPRINGS TRANSMISSION PROJECT

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

April 3, 2013

Soda Springs High School

Transcription of Public Comment Session During Open House.

Rodney Felshaw
Court Reporter.
MR. LYNAM: Good evening. I'm Kurt Lynam. I'm with BPA, their public affairs team.

We have a court reporter here who will be capturing your comments tonight. He will capture your comments and the comments that you make here during this presentation, or afterwards, will actually become part of the official record for the project. That's one of the important things that BPA needs to do here tonight is to listen to and hear what you have to say about this project. So we're very serious about giving people lots of different opportunities to comment and lots of different ways to comment, based on how you're most comfortable with.

Obviously you're here for the presentation. Outside we've got a couple of different stations with subject matter experts who are prepared to share specific information with you based on what we know about the project to date and to talk with you about your specific questions or concerns on the project.

Just outside the library here we've got the land and realty section. Back over towards the entrance we've got NEPA, the National Environmental protection Act station. They've got a simulation tool out there so they can show you what the proposed power line would look like. And then other on the far side of the entryway is the...
engineering station. They'll be able to talk about things like the project schedule, what the appearance of the power line would look like, if it's built, and specific issues like that. At the back of the entryway area there's a place for refreshments. There's some cookies and water and stuff. In the little hallway that goes off the entry area are the restrooms.

For the presentation here tonight, when I get done with this overview, Erich will give a short overview and kind of a summary of the project. He'll talk about the need for the project, possible routes, the process of what will happen from today through the time when a decision is made on the project.

We'll try and keep questions while he's talking to a minimum. I want to cap his time on the stage to about 20 minutes. The rest of the time I want to allocate for those of you who have taken your time to come to this meeting today to have a chance to share your comments. When I recognize you -- I'll kind of facilitate the process. I'll ask you to stand up, state your name, make your comment. And in this public forum here, depending on how many people want to comment, we may have to cap the time for each comment somewhere in the three to five minute range. But not to worry. We'll wrap this up about 6:30. If those of you who want to make formal
comments don't really want to make a comment in front of your friends or neighbors, or if your comment might take longer, I'd like you to check in with my colleague in the back of the room, Colleen. She's right back there in the white blouse. Coleen will schedule you for some time with our reporter. I think we'll probably have enough time that if you have more in-depth comments you could probably have about 10 minutes or so so that your comments will become part of the record for the project.

That's the other thing I wanted to talk about is how you can share your comments. Some people are not shy about saying what they have to say in public. You can comment now during the public meeting portion of the open house. You could also speak with the reporter from 6:30 to 8:00. We have a comment table out in the entryway. You can write your comments on one of our comment forms. And if you would like some comment forms I have some spare ones here. Those comments become part of the public record.

We have a website that is listed in your project orientation guide. I have about a dozen or so here. There's instructions on how to comment online. You can call BPA and give us your comments on the phone or fax them to us.

Regardless of how you share your comments and
your feedback on the project, all of your comments become part of the public record and they will be posted on the project website.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: When does the comment period terminate?

MR. LYNAM: April 22. If it will take you -- if you've got comments that you plan to submit and you think it may take you longer than our comment deadline of April 22nd, please check in with me before the end of today's meeting so that I know to expect your comments. They might not make it in by the deadline otherwise.

But regardless, we will make sure that all of the comments we receive are reflected in the official project record. And you'll be able to review all of the comments on the website probably within about a week of the end of the comment period. So certainly I would think by the end of April we'll have the comments posted.

If you have general questions about the project based on Erich's presentation, feel free to ask those in our public meeting here. If you have specific comments that deal with your land or your business, or something that is better dealt with by a subject matter expert, I would ask you to take those comments to one of our subject matter experts at the different stations outside and that way we can provide a maximum amount of
time for people to share comments and feedback in the meeting here.

Any questions about those kind of general guidelines at this point?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm concerned. We have people here who have had property in their families for a hundred years. I don't think it's very fair to limit them to a three to five minute presentation. I think you should be prepared to stay here a little bit longer so these people can be heard in a group audience that affects them very much.

MR. LYNAM: That's a good perspective. I'd like to throw that out for the rest of the group here. What do you all think about that guideline of having people in this public forum limit their comments to three to five minutes? Do you think that's reasonable or would you prefer a longer comment period even if it means staying longer?

(General consensus agreed to longer.)

MR. LYNAM: We can certainly do that. I just want to be sure that as I'm facilitating the process I don't have one or two people that monopolize everyone else's time. So can we agree on that ground rule? Okay. I'm comfortable with that, then. Thank you. That's a good point.
Any other questions or comments before we get started with Erich's presentation?

All right. Thank you. Welcome. I really appreciate the time that you all have invested to attend our meeting tonight and I'm looking forward to a productive and interesting conversation. So with no further remarks on my part, Erich, over to you.

(Presentation by Mr. Orth not transcribed.)

MR. LYNAM: Okay. At this point Erich has given a short and pretty high level overview of the project. Really, our intent for the rest of this time here this evening is to give you all who have taken your time to attend a chance to share your comments.

Who would like to comment first? I would just ask you to stand up and speak loud enough for the reporter to hear what you are saying and make sure you identify yourself so we know who said what when it becomes part of the record.

MR. KACKLEY: I'm Al Kackely. I have some comments about the easements and other thing. I may take a little bit longer than three to five minutes. If I speak too long just tell me to shut up and sit down.

One thing on the easement, "The north alternative would require a 100 foot easement for the new single-circuit 115 kV transmission line, a 150 foot wide
right-of-way for the new the 138 kV, and an additional 50
foot easement for access roads." This means a 150 to 200
foot easement that will be going across the property.

"Guy wires would generally be within the north
alternative right-of-way, and no further than 50 feet from
the right-of-way center line." This means that probably
they could also probably be outside of the right-of-way, I
would assume. This was taken from the draft EIS.

"Tall trees that grow outside of the
right-of-way that could fall into the line must be
removed." And then later on in this -- I have this by
page number. Later on in that page it says that "On
either side of the new corridor, danger trees that pose a
hazard to construction activities and reliable operation
of the transmission line would be removed." So the impact
on the land can be far outside the right-of-way.

"The north alternative would require the
permanent removal of approximately 110.6 acres of native
vegetation." I take that to mean clear cutting. "The
north alternative would result in the removal of 54.7 more
acres of forested vegetation compared to the south
alternative."

And then in the second volume of this impact
study there was a part called Need For Amendment. It
says, "The north alternative would impact approximately
38.8 acres of aspen-dominated forest." It is unknown if this is in addition to the acres listed as 110.

The draft goes on to say, "Some impacts on property values and salability might occur on an individual basis as a result of a new transmission lane. However, these impacts would be highly variable, individualized, and unpredictable. Neither alternative is expected to cause long-term, negative impacts on property values along the proposed route or in the general vicinity. Impacts unrelated to the project, along with other general market factors, are already reflected in the market value of properties in the area."

I was a licensed real estate broker in the state of Arizona for 30 years and I can guarantee you that a new transmission corridor through your property is going to adversely impact your property. That statement there can't be true and I didn't see a real estate appraiser listed as having anything to do with this.

It goes on to say, "Visual Resources: Overall, the western portion of both alternatives would contribute incrementally, though in a relatively minor way, to potential cumulative visual impacts in that area due to their location in an already developed area generally in the vicinity of existing transmission lines."

My comment on that, those transition lines are
the lines going around Wayan Loop Road that bring your
domestic electricity into your farms and ranches. Those
are good transmission lines. They do increase the value
of your property because you have electricity on your
property.

Going on and quoting again, "However, the
easement portions of both alternatives would pass through
more undeveloped areas and require new cleared
right-of-ways. These portions of both alternatives thus
would have the potential to have a relative high level of
contribution on cumulative visual impacts from vantage
points along the transmission line right-of-way."

Well, these impacts are going to be tremendous
compared to those little poles that you have going around
the loop road and in that area. This statement is just --
just has to be challenged.

And then it says, "All pictures in section
39.3. These pictures are small and of poor quality,
possibly from being printed. They give a false impression
of how the lines will appear. Figure 3.3 was taken
several hundred yards east of the Kackley Ranch gate. To
the north you can see the Crawford Ranch and Badger Noll.
The draft EIS states, 'Evidence of human presence along
this portion of Lanes Creek Road includes low fencing,
wooden utility lines and residential homes.'"
Well, I can tell you that there's no utility lines visible from where this picture was taken. In the 1970's, when the Kackleys and the Crawfords contracted for power, they paid to have the lines buried. To view the lines along Highway 34 from the location you would need field glasses and you can hardly see Highway 34. And I know from firsthand experience that it's hard to see the cars unless there's light flashing off the windshields.

"Figure 3-10 shows an existing non-BPA transmission line in the north alternative corridor in a similar configuration as the proposed steel single pole structures. This transmission line is more closely related to the south alternative than the north alternative. It follows the Lanes Creek cutoff road that BPA has identified as the south alternative."

I think we all know that when you turn and it goes to the power station over there to where I call Tin Cup.

"BPA would not permit any uses of the transmission line right-of-ways that are unsafe or might interfere with construction, operating or maintaining the transmission facilities."

"The ability to have vegetation growing within the north alternative right-of-way is a use that would be reviewed by BPA to determine whether the use is safe, if
there is adequate clearance under the conductor, and
whether the use creates interference with the operation or
maintenance of the transmission facilities. If BPA
determines that the use is compatible, a written agreement
could be entered into between BPA and the landowner. Most
non-woody, low growing crops less than four feet high
could be grown safely under the transmission line.
However, shrubs, brush or other vegetation, such as
orchards," and I know you grow a lot of those out there,
"Christmas trees, all tall growing landscape or natural
vegetation would require a BPA review of special
consideration, but would not likely be allowed within the
right-of-way. Agricultural operations would not be
restricted, but certain precautions would be necessary.
For example, no object would be higher than 14 feet above
the ground within the right-of-way." That is when
irrigation pipes are moved, then should be kept low and
parallel to the ground. Ground elevation should not be
altered, such as piling of dirt within the right-of-way.
Irrigation spraying should not create a continuous stream
onto the conductors or structures. Fences should be
grounded. And the installation of underground pipes and
cables through the right-of-way would require coordination
with BPA to avoid interference with transmission line
grounding systems."
Lots and lots of restrictions on this right-of-way, folks.

"Caribou National Forest Standards and guidelines, guideline six: Avoid parallel corridors. Consolidate facilities within existing energy corridors where feasible."

And then they call it consistency. That's the consistency with what BPA is considering here. "The project would avoid parallel utility corridors." This project should be built along the already existing corridor that we know runs down the Lanes Creek cut off.

Next is the Gravel Creek right-of-way. "The right-of-way and danger tree clearing would result in the conversion of land cover on the property, which would not be consistent with the existing management of this parcel for wetland mitigation purposes; therefore, the establishment of a new right-of-way across this area would result in short term, high impact. BPA is currently working with the United States Forest Service to further avoid or minimize potential project-related impact on this area." I think that we need to know the status of this sooner than later.

"Upgrade of line or increase of corridor: Electricity use in these has been increasing at a rate of about three percent a year." This line will not have to
be -- the line will have to be increased or expanded in about 34 years, meaning more right-of-way or that something will have to happen there. And I assume that they're going to try to parallel the right-of-ways.

    MR. LYNAM: Excuse me, sir. We're at eight minutes.

    MR. KACKLEY: Is anybody complaining?

    MR. LYNAM: I just wanted to check.

    MR. KACKLEY: Okay. My mother told me to sit down more than once.

    "Public involvement: Verbal comments were also submitted" -- this is from the draft still. "Verbal comments were also submitted by multiple individuals and organizations during the July 29th, 2010 public meeting."

This is the last meeting I could find in this document that showed that there was a public meeting where input was recorded. I know that I attended one meeting and I know there was a meeting afterwards that my brother and others that I've spoken to attended that has not been mentioned in this document at all. And some very fine concerns were raised at that meeting.

    "The Pioneer Historic Byway: The north alternative corridor crosses Highway 34 in seven locations. The south alternative crosses Highway 34 in one location. The sensitivity of local residents to the
visual impact of the project may be mitigated by exposure to other existing transmission lines and associated facilities and other dissonant features such as phosphate mines already within the viewshed." That's their word.

"Local residents can be highly sensitive to changes in the landscape that can be viewed from their homes and neighborhoods.

"Drivers tend to be occupied with traffic and navigation and are to a much lesser degree concerned with off-road views. Passengers would have a greater occasion for off-road views. The exception to this assessment is scenic roads and byways, which are considered to provide scenic value as part of the driving experience for drivers as well as passengers."

The last page now. "The ability of a landscape to absorb or incorporate alterations with limited reductions in scenic integrity depends on the landscape's character, complexity, and other environmental factors. A new transmission line next to an existing line provides less contrast, and therefore can be absorbed into that landscape better than introducing a transmission line as a new feature in an undeveloped area." Which this project on the north alternative is going to do.

I've never seen an environmental impact study before. I was shocked at the easements. And you're going
to get one bite at the apple when you give up the easement. This will be on your land forever. I want to just warn you, from all of these restrictions, make sure that it's a big apple and that you get a damn big bite, because there won't be any second bite. They have it when they take that easement.

    Thank you very much.

    MR. LYNAM: Mr. Kackley, thank you for your comments. I appreciate you being the lead off.

    JIM SMITH: My name is Jim Smith. I wear a lot of hats in this community, one of which starts in about 10 minutes so I'm sure I'll be done by then. My job, I work at Monsanto. I'm not a spokesman for Monsanto. My job is energy management procurement. Mr. Clark is the spokesman.

    BPA contractors met with us in regards to accessing some of our property along the southern option. Monsanto understands the difficulty of sometimes permitting things. We will work with you in good faith to allow you access to that property, provided when you pay the bill on the last effort that we did. But we stand willing to help you.

    If I put on my school board hat I have a huge problem with the project. Let me explain. You're right, you do serve -- everybody who comes into our community is
expected to carry their fair share. As a school board member, funding efforts for the community come from property taxes that those people in the community that come and live here bear.

My understanding of the EIS is that these are exempt from property taxes. So in essence you come into our community, you impact our community. You say you benefit us and I would recognize that. I think the city of Soda Springs is the only entity in Caribou County that does buy BPA power. Everybody else buys it from somebody else. So I can't say that you don't have an influence if you live in city of Soda Springs. But clearly you're impacting the whole county.

What do you give back for that impact? We live here, we hunt here. We drive those roads for scenic pleasure. We choose to live here for all of the good things that we get, but now you're going to come in and impact that. What do you give back?

The mines pay property taxes. They contribute to our schools, they fund things. Even Artic Circle and Subway have come in and helped with the schools and tried to contribute in some way. And not only with property taxes but with their contributions.

You're talking about coming in and spending a couple of years of intense building. You'll impact our
area and then you'll be gone and what do you leave? That is a big concern for me. I think you have an obligation to leave something. You're going to be here, you'll be part of the community. Those lines will be here forever. What do you give back? That's a big concern.

From a personal side, taking the school board hat off, this is the area that I drive in the summer to relax, the northern route. I don't drive the southern route. But that northern route is an area that is scenic and is enjoyable to drive. I'm concerned about that and the impact that will have.

I also read in your EIS that you're going to cross some water fowl areas. One of the reasons we live here is because we like to hunt and fish. When I read in there that you're going to put some gadgets on the poles and wires, and you'll cut down the mortality by 57 percent of swans and cranes, I have a problem with that. Particularly in some of these areas around Henry and other areas, I think that's unacceptable. Not only do we have trumpet swans and some endangered cranes in the area, that's a big concern.

Even those gadgets you put on the wires don't work all that well. Anybody who goes around Soda Creek knows that those poles and wires that are there, even though they have those types of things on them, we still
get a large mortality with ducks and geese and swans in that area. I'm not saying that the company didn't work to try not to do that, but I think you got to come up with a better solution. A 57 percent reduction in mortality is not that great a number, guys. There has to be something better.

Again, I understand that we have to have poles and wires to bring electricity. Clearly I think you'll hear from the community that we prefer the southern route. We prefer the shorter distance so as not to have the impacts. Those are my comments.

MR. LYNAM: Thank you. We appreciate it. I think in order we have Allen.

MR. CRAWFORD: I'm Allen Crawford. I look at 10 miles of wires and poles. That's what I see on this map. One route, 32 miles, the other route 22 miles. I'm concerned about the 10 miles difference of wire and poles. Basically, you know, we've got to get electricity where we need it to be able to meet customers and stuff. You said we don't have a, I guess, higher line than the other. We're looking at both of them as equal. But one requires 10 extra miles of wire and poles. It doesn't matter where you put it, that's going to impact. It impacts the farmers and the ranchers, the recreationists, the tourists, people traveling through our
You know, basically Soda Springs is in an industrial setting. We're used to seeing industrial stuff here with the mines and stuff. Does that mean that we're a community where we can just go ahead and add to that and nobody will notice? The people that work out here, or the people that work within the community, just like Jim said, they're looking for opportunities to be able to get out, hunt, fish, recreate out in the areas, travel from here to Jackson or somewhere else. And they want to be able to enjoy the scenery that's out there. We don't need 10 extra miles of wires and poles.

Basically I look at that as just wires and poles that we just put out there because we want to. I don't think we need 10 extra miles of wires and poles.

MR. LYNAM: Thank you, Mr. Crawford. Yes, sir.

MR. OLORENSHAW: My name's Wade Olorenshaw. I'm at 1930 Ivans Road, Bancroft, Idaho.

I would speak on a general level first and that is the license plates I see going out along Highway 34 are not just 3C from Idaho. I see a lot of out of state plates. There's a lot of commerce that passes through this town and I think it will be impacted by that northern route particularly. Communities struggle as they are in these days and we don't need that impact here
diminishing our community.

Mr. Kackley's comments on the easements and the right-of-ways that will be granted and the impact on the trees is just tremendous. I had no understanding that it was going to be that wide and that invasive into the surrounding properties.

With that in mind, I would speak of a personal matter. I have a small four acre recreational property out there, deeded to me from my grandfather. It's a keepsake piece of property. In this design process the power lines will skim along the south boundary line of this four acre parcel. If I understand that right, the quaking aspen forest on this property will have to be thinned back and cut away from this power line. I think that's a huge impact on a small recreational property to have to bear.

Now I lost my train of thought. Okay. The access for this power line is proposed to go through this four acre property. I think that's a large burden for a small piece of property to bear.

Along Highway 34, the designers there, up along the curve, 300 yards on south of my place, have two nice graded accesses off from the highway onto current lands that are cooperating with surveyors and access there. It seems to me that access through this four acre
property is an overburden and an expectation beyond something that is practical. I would like to see a revision in the route should the north route be chosen.

And just personally, I stand in opposition to the north route. I would try to come back to a more general view that it serves a greater public good to try and keep this out of sight and out of mind and let that scenic route be enjoyed by populations across the country.

Thank you.

MR. LYNAM: Thank you. Who was next? Any other comments? Yes, sir.

MR. JENSEN: I'm Doug Jensen. I represent the Idaho chapter of the national organization of the Oregon-California Trails Association. I would like to address a cultural issue on the northern alternative. The land erode that goes through that area and in the Wayan area, just east of that, the land erode is a nationally recognized immigrant trail under the National Trails Act. I'm not sure that's the right name. Congress passed it some years ago and it's administered by the National Park Service.

That road was built in 1858 and 1859. There's some original ruts in that area. Once those are gone, they're gone. Access roads may cross those. And like I said, once those ruts are plowed or harmed, they're not
there anymore.

   There's some viewshed issues in that area. I
was talking to Tish about this before this section
started. It appears to me that the north alternative has
some real issues with this cultural business, the land
erode. We don't have a -- I'm not able to release here
and here and here is where there are visible remnants of
immigrant trails, but they are in that area. It might be
that the office in Boise may have more information on
that. I don't know that for sure.

   But from our standpoint, as far as immigrant
trails preservation, we would have a real serious concern
with the north alternative. Thank you.

   MR. LYNAM: Thank you, Mr. Jensen. We've had five
very good substantive comments so far. I really
appreciate everyone's participation. Another comment?

   MS. HUNSAKER: I'm Caroline Hunsaker. I think some
of you met with my husband earlier today. There's some
things that really concern me and probably turn the public
opinion against you. One is going on private property
without permission. I know that has happened out in
Grace.

   The other thing is they were surveying all
over out by us and my husband went down to see what they
were doing, if they were going to go in the field. And
they didn't want to tell us who they worked for. They told us they were checking for underground utility services. I think this lying and sneaking around, you have developed a real negative feeling about this project.

The other thing, I've never heard anybody say that if this goes across private property what you'll pay to have each pole and what you'll pay for a right-of-way. I know something a couple of years ago was thrown at us. I have a brother-in-law who works -- he's retired now from Utah Power. He said they're not even in the ballpark. So we kind of feel like you're coming in here and trying to cheat us. It doesn't make us want to work with you very much. You have to be upfront, honest, and you have to be fair. In this community that is what we expect.

The other question that was jotted down here, I know when the big power line went up through Lanes Creek, those people were pretty excited because they thought they were going to get power. Once the line was through, no, we can't take power down from a big line like that. And probably the only reason they got permission and got cooperation is they thought they could get power, which is another dishonesty.

So how easy will power be to access from this line you're putting through? That's a question.

MS. EATON: This is just -- we're just taking
comments right now. I think this is just a comment gathering time.

MR. ORTH: I'll answer that one question. You are correct, this is high voltage. I forgot this in my speech. This is a 115 kV, which is 115,000 volt. It's a transmission line that connects substations together. And you're right, you cannot serve a house or a business off of this power line. It is served -- the power goes into the substation and then there's distribution lines. Those are the smaller single pole lines that you see running across the fields and whatnot. Those are what serve the town, the private houses and businesses.

MS. HUNSAKER: And they pay for their own power lines to come to them, right? I know when we got power out where we live it took years and years and years of paying $2,000 a month for unlimited use, but to pay for the power lines. We paid a big price for power.

MR. ORTH: BPA customers, the city of Soda Springs, Lower Valley Energy, Paul River Electric, that's who we sell our power and transmission services to.

MS. HUNSAKER: So these people won't get any benefit, except maybe up the power rates from what they are now?

MR. ORTH: I can't comment on that.

MR. LYNAM: It is hard to speak to the business
practices of the customers that we sell power to. We
don't have any control over what they charge.

MS. HUNSAKER: But you control what you charge them
for, though, so in a way you do.

MR. LYNAM: An excellent comment, Mrs. Hunsaker.
Thank you for bringing that point up. I appreciate it.
Next? Yes, ma'am.

MS. NEDRA TORGESEN: My name is Nedra Torgesen. I
want you people to know that you have been to my home
twice. We have been out to Clark Valley to the cattle
range. I have not really heard anything here much today
that we haven't discussed with your crew.

That being said, they were very nice to me,
but I have not found one iota of a thing that will benefit
me from this line going through. I told them that when
they came and I haven't changed my mind. But I do want
you to know that they have treated me very nicely. Thank
you.

MR. LYNAM: Okay. Thank you. Yes, sir.
MR. HUNSAKER: I'm Keith Hunsaker. In Mr.
Kackley's comments on easements, don't quote me, but I
thought you said once this power line accesses your
property it would enhance your property value. Am I
correct?

MR. KACKLEY: That's what the environmental -- the
draft of the impact statement said.

MR. HUNSAKER: Because you have the power available?

MR. KACKLEY: No, it doesn't say that at all. It just said it wouldn't affect the salability or contribute to decreasing the values not already generally there. And I took exception to that, sir.

MR. HUNSAKER: Okay. Thank you. That was my question. What benefit is it? That's what Mrs. Torgesen just said. What benefit do we get out of it, other than if you do access a private property with monetary return? Are there other benefits?

MR. LYNAM: Did you want to talk to the question of future load growth?

MR. ORTH: I would go back to the need of the project. Again, if we lose one of the lines coming out of Palisades Dam, which is a lot of the generation that supplies the power in this area, if we lose one of those line and it puts stress on the rest of the system, our lines -- one of the lines on the Lower Valley system will actually -- the benefit is --

MR. HUNSAKER: That's a roundabout answer to my question. If I can't assess that readily power, what benefit is it to us?

MR. ORTH: The need of the project is so Bonneville...
can continue with safe and reliable power service to southeast Idaho. The need of the project is there because if we do lose one of those lines in the dead of winter, and we start to lose lines and everyone goes black, then we're in a world of hurt. Bonneville doesn't want to be in that position.

    MR. CRAWFORD: But that line is beyond where you are connecting in. If you lose that line on the other side, what difference does it make if you build this line at all? I'm not getting that.

    MR. ORTH: Because we are feeding -- that's a good question.

    MR. CRAWFORD: If it's all coming from the Palisades, why do we need it to come through here?

    MR. ORTH: It's a 345 Threemile Knoll substation that Rocky Mountain Power has out here. That is what we're going to tap into. We are proposing to build just a short half mile transmission line from Threemile Knoll to feed our Hooper Springs substation. And then from the substation, building one of these alternatives would provide another transmission alternative. And there's a large loop here, and there's some maps out there showing it, but it would strengthen this loop that provides power to everybody down here in southeast Idaho.

    UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And Jackson. That's where
it goes.

MR. ORTH: Southeast Idaho, western Wyoming, is all one transmission system, that is correct. So we have to look out for all of our customers out in this area, including western Wyoming.

MR. LYNAM: Anybody else? We've had good comments.

MR. ELLIS KACKLEY: My name is Ellis Kackley. I've been to all four of the meetings like a lot of people in this room today. At every meeting we've had, since the first one, BPA has said the only group that they were going to allow for was going out to Gray's Lake and that was going to be it. We had no choice. From the very first meeting where they had the four routes, the first thing they said was we are going out to Gray's Lake on Highway 34 and there's nothing you can do about it.

They have maintained that right up to this meeting. And the only reason that they're having this meeting is because we've all stood together and said to hell with that. You can go up Lanes Creek where it isn't a burden on us.

Their ultimate goal is to go up there to that substation. That's the one thing they want the most, is get to that substation. But they were going to put it up through Gray's Lake just to burn our asses. They could just as easily go out and up Lanes Creek, but they've
wanted to do it their way the whole time. And there's never been any compromise on that. They told us no other way than going out to Gray's Lake and across that way.

I think if they want to get to that substation they ought to keep their eye on the ball and get to the substation with the southern route. It's just arrogance and orneriness that they're going to do it to us regardless of what we say. And if we don't hold together they will do it. That's why this meetings is held today, the only reason.

They brought new people that haven't been here before. There's even a guy out there that has a public relations tag on his shirt. Before it's always been we're going to do it our way and to hell with you. I think they'll try to do it again. I would ask all the people here today to stand with us and make them go the other way.

They told us that there was a lawsuit out on the southern route so they wouldn't go through that. And then was a superfund site and they couldn't go through there. If they planted one pole in the superfund site they could be held responsible for the entire superfund site. That just is silly stuff, but that's what they told us and they're trying to insist on it.

Now they have enough people giving them flak.
I understand that BPA claims to never have gone to an easement to try to get it to condemn an easement, but they're going to have to this time if they think they're going to go out through Gray's Lake. Thank you.

MR. LYNAM: Thank you, Mr. Kackley. Any other comments? Yes, ma'am.

MS. IRENE TORGESSEN: My name is Irene Torgesen. I live here in Soda Springs on Kelly Park Road. My concern with the presentation is we get told that there's 22 miles on one route and 33 miles on the other route. And then that they'll cost about the same, but never a price. I'm sorry, but putting in 33 miles on one route should cost more, realizing that is it is a different type of pole and a different style. But, still, you're going to have to pay for the right to go through people's lands. You're going to have to pay extra for the poles. You're going to be going along a scenic highway that will ruin a lot of people's views. And there's historical landmarks and stuff like that on that highway that will be ruined because you've got these power lines.

It kind of upsets me that we get an overall of things, but never the bottom line. Let's get a bottom line. Exactly how much will it cost, estimated of course, for the 33 mile line? And exactly, estimated of course, for the 22 mile line, so that people can see exactly what
you're saying. We're in the dark on that. We don't know what you are talking about as far as costs, what you're talking about as far as availability and all of your different things that go into that.

We just need to know a schedule or some kind of an outline that says, okay, the 33 mile route is going to have X amount of poles, X amount of miles, X amount of wire. So much stuff at this substation, so much at that substation. So there's going to be the bottom line value. The same thing with the 22 mile one. And then maybe we can see what you're up against. Right now we can't.

As far as I'm concerned, I would go with the 22 mile route any day because it doesn't ruin the views, doesn't ruin people's hunting and fishing and their cattle ranches, their homes. You're impacting a lot of people to go through the 33 mile route. It's going to make this community very upset and it's not worth it. That's not what we're here on this earth for is to make everybody's life miserable. We're here to work together, so let's work together and see what we can do to make the 22 mile route work. Thank you.

MR. LYNAM: Thank you, ma'am. Appreciate it. Any other comments?

MR. CRAWFORD: I'll just follow up on that. If the price is the same, I don't want 10 extra miles of wire and
poles out across our countryside. If the price is the same, why do I want 10 extra miles of wires and poles?

MR. LYNAM: Thank you, Mr. Crawford. Any other comments? Okay. Yes, sir.

MR. SOMSEN: I apologize. Earl Somsen. I would like to have explained for the benefit of all those here today that probably have attended some of the meetings that we've had other than here at the school. I was a little confused when Al Kackley said that there's only been two meetings. I'm wondering, we had some very spirited and lively discussions at the courthouse in a few commissioner meetings that involved a good share of you folks here. I am wondering if the comments and questions, technical and philosophical, that were presented at that meeting are going to be recorded on this? Was there any record of any of that or did everything that was expressed just go out the window?

MR. ORTH: Those meetings were not meant to be official comment periods within our NEPA process for comments. We certainly listened to the folks there that day and we took that in as input, but they weren't taken down or part of the draft EIS, no.

MR. SOMSEN: So it won't be considered?

MR. ORTH: No, I didn't say that. They will be considered as input.
MR. SOMSEN: How with no formal recording of it?

MR. ORTH: If you have that available, then, yes.

MR. SOMSEN: We do have.

MS. EATON: Submit them as part of the comments on the draft EIS, would be great.

MR. LYNAM: If you'll provide that to me, I'll make sure it becomes part of the official record of the project. I appreciate you bringing that point up.

Yes, sir.

MR. HUNSAKER: Keith Hunsaker again. If I've been informed correctly, on this southern route, which we are on, and I'm not with it or against it, but we're the minority, apparently. Am I correct that the State of Idaho on the preserve on the ranch, you are denied access through there?

MR. ORTH: We were not. We have worked out with the State of Idaho to gain access across that property. Lower Valley originally was denied access, but we are working with the state, as a cooperating agency, to gain the permission to enter that property to look at alternatives across that land.

MR. HUNSAKER: To my knowledge to this point you've been denied. I just denied you access today. If they have the right to deny you access, what is to say I can't?

MR. ORTH: Every private landowner has the right to
deny us access. Certainly it doesn't help us, you know, to get the information that we need to help us evaluate all of the alternatives plus the options if we can't get on the property to evaluate it.

MR. LYNAM: Any other comments that folks would like to share? While you're thinking about that, I want to remind you that there's a number of different ways to share your comments. You can fill out a comment sheet here, you can e-mail us your comments on the website address. And we've got plenty of time left to go over specific comments here also.

MR. ORTH: Just a reminder, we have a number of subject matter experts out in the hallway. We've got our environmental folks. We have engineers, both transmission line engineers and access road engineers. And then we also have a bunch of folks that cover real property services for us. I heard some of the comments tonight about what does it do to the value of your land, what is the process. The real property folks are out in the hall. You can discuss that with them and the process of how we go through and evaluate and appraise and make payment.

As far as engineering, talk to the engineers about heights of poles, what the poles look like. We have some examples out there. Spacing. Also access roads. We understand that that is one of the largest disturbances is
access roads and building new roads and particularly how that impacts the land. So our access road engineers can certainly answer questions you have about that.

MS. HUNSAKER: One thing is I really don't believe you should be able to go in and destroy people's income. If you came one of the routes you would do for us. The other thing is, people who don't want power developed should quit using it. As long as your power is still turned on, this is not a bad thing. But it's something to think about, I think. There's got to be a way to go through and not disturb -- completely destroy a person's business, which the one route would have done for us.

MR. LYNAM: Thank you, Mrs. Hunsaker. Yes, sir.

MR. EVERETT: Rex Everett. I live out in Enoch Valley. I'm one of those guys that likes my lights to come on when I hit the switch, but I don't want a power line across my ranch.

I'm wondering -- I haven't studied the whole thing, but I'm wondering how much need there really is for this line? I mean, we've been getting along forever without this line. I just wonder how important it really is? If we're really short on power or if maybe Jackson ought to quit heating $7 million homes.

I hate to see this line go through anybody's
property. I own property over in the Driggs area and I've
had two power lines built across me over there. It's
irritating, you know. You've got stuff to look at, you
know.

I'm kind of against the whole project. I'd
like to make sure it's totally necessary before it's even
considered in any direction. That's my comment. Thanks.

MR. LYNAM: Thank you, Mr. Everett. Appreciate it.
Yes, sir.

MR. WILDE: I'm Ross Wilde. I'm affiliated with
property that's on the south route, so I can empathize
with Mr. and Mrs. Hunsaker, the impact that it's had on
ranchers out there.

The one question that I would like to have BPA
address is in your one letter here it says, "BPA is also
considering a no action alternative. That is BPA would
not build the transmission line."

I would like to have you elaborate on that a
little bit. To have that put in there the way that is,
that has to be a consideration that you're addressing.
Does that mean there's another line or another route or
another option that isn't part of this?

MR. LYNAM: Thank you, Mr. Wilde. Let me just talk
very briefly about the point that Mr. Wilde brought up
about the no line alternative. Erich, you may want to
dive in with some specifics there.

Any time BPA, or another electric or gas utility, looks at a new project, one of the options, regardless of what the options are that we might look at such as route A or route B or route C, whatever we're looking at, one of the options we always evaluate is the don't do anything option. That's an obvious thing that has to be on the table. That is why in the letter that Mr. Wild cited we talked about the no build option as an option that we have to evaluate as we look at the potential impacts of this project. So that's a general comment.

Erich, I don't know if you want to talk more specifically about that.

MR. ORTH: The need for the project arises when our electrical use goes up. In some areas you may have decreases in electrical use and higher in others. As a whole, our electrical use has gone up in this area. So that is the whole reason why we've identified the need for the project.

At some point down the road, if that need goes away and we have -- we can re-evaluate and say, you know, we don't need to build anything at this time, we won't build anything. So that would be our no build option.

MR. ENGELER: When you say this area, you're not
saying it's actually coming from here to supply not this area?

MR. ORTH: It supplies --

MR. ENGELER: When you say this area you're talking --

MR. ORTH: Caribou County, southeast Idaho, western Wyoming.

MR. ENGELER: This area doesn't really need it, though. We have our power from Rocky Mountain Power.

MR. ORTH: You do.

MR. ENGELER: You'll purchase it from them and move it somewhere else. I could say right now, by a show of hands, the no build would get a hundred percent. Ready? Well, I guess maybe not a hundred percent.

I don't see where it's going to benefit this community ever. The power is already here and you're going to move it from here somewhere else.

MR. LYNAM: What's your name, for the record?

MR. ENGELER: My name is Walt Engeler. I'd also like to say, you know, you said this is a comment period only, but when somebody has a question they need answers. It's not -- if someone brings up a good point, I would like to have a response. I think that's a very good point.

MR. ORTH: I can address that. One example, on the
northern alternative -- well, on both alternatives the power line feeds into Lanes Creek substation. Out of Lanes Creek substation there's a transformer there and it goes down into distribution power.

And I'm not specifically sure, but I imagine Lower Valley feeds some folks in the Wayan area right out of that Lanes Creek substation. So if that substation goes out because we've lost this other line in the dead of winter, then everyone goes black in that area. That substation feeds residents in that area. So if that substation has another alternative path coming into it, we can keep the lights on.

MR. ENGELE: Lower Valley hasn't had a problem with that. I've been here 20 years and it can be dead of winter and they'll fix it within an hour.

MR. LYNAM: Depending on what the problem is.

MR. ENGELE: Because they supply it from other places there. It's still not enough to convince me this is needed. I'm not buying it. Why can't it -- where does that -- can't that come from somewhere else to get it to those -- it's not for this area. That's why I'm not getting it. It's not for Caribou County. Is there a way for you to, from a different perspective, explain the standards that require you to build that's part of this interconnection?
MR. ORTH: I mentioned earlier we have to safely and reliably operate our system. Our guidelines -- NERC, the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, that is who dictates how we operate our systems.

This is a kind of more general map of the transmission system. You can see here's Palisades Dam here, the reservoir. We have our proposed alternatives down here. And then the Jackson area with plenty of transmission there.

Our concern is if we lose this Palisades/Snake Valley line, or Snake River line, the power has to come around through the Jackson area and then back down here to feed this whole loop of folks here. Yes, it is in Wyoming, but it's also in southeast Idaho. The overload starts on this line right here, the Teton/Wilson line. If we flip a breaker there it just starts to trickle down and goes in all of these lines.

So with this transmission line that we're proposing, it connects into this 345 line at the Threemile Knoll substation outside of town here. It's right out of our Hooper Springs right next to it and then feeds this loop of transmission here, which is all owned and operated by Lower Valley. That would ensure that we would safely and reliably be able to operate this loop if this line goes out and starts to overload these other lines.
MR. ENGELER: It doesn't continue to loop the other way? Where it goes into Idaho Falls, is that where it's going? That loop doesn't continue back around to Palisades?

MR. ORTH: No.

MR. ENGELER: What's the line 31 there? Is that a loop? That's a loop line going over to Jackson. Why can't that feed around and back down?

MR. ORTH: That's what would be needed to feed back into here.

MR. ENGELER: Wouldn't that feed if this line down on Palisades goes out?

MR. ORTH: If this goes out, then we're feeding both on this line and this line coming down. What happens is you've got this pinch point along here that is a transmission path that leaves this whole area in a tough situation if we lose this line.

MR. ENGELER: Increase the size of that line 31.

MR. ORTH: That is -- those are alternatives that we've looked at in our planning studies. Power does run both ways on the line.

MR. CRAWFORD: Lower Valley Energy also has supply stations other than the Palisades to feed that line. They have a propane unit, fire generating system.

MR. ORTH: Most of their generation is in the
Jackson area to feed -- that's where a lot of the load is is in the Jackson area, so they do have a gas pipeline to feed that area.

MR. ENGELE: And where is the location on that one? That's what would feed this line other than the Palisades. Besides those two, is there any others that would help that scenario?

MR. ORTH: No. This is all the transmission that is in the area.

MR. CRAWFORD: Is the Palisades Dam --

MR. ORTH: It provides generation, but there is some gas generation in the Jackson area, correct. But you still need to feed it down through these lines to get it in this area if this line was down.

MR. CRAWFORD: That's where my power comes from and I'm in the north.

MR. ORTH: For the most part you're correct, but if -- we have to look at a situation that if we lose a line what does that do to the system? Does it overload a line? Does it -- it also creates some voltage instability issues in the whole system. Our transmission planners look at all of this and do what if scenarios all through the system. That's what the purpose and the need for the project is.

MR. OLORENSHAW: Wade Olorenshaw. Erich, on that
line coming from Palisades southeasterly onto -- yeah, that line right there. Why don't you build a second line there and strengthen that structure through there rather than encumber this southeastern Idaho area? Is there not a possibility to run a second line through -- to widen your easement right-of-way through there with a second line to support the existing line?

MR. ORTH: That is a possibility. One of our biggest concerns, and this comes from our regulatory commission, you start to build parallel lines, if one line is knocked out because of the weather or an airplane or something, then there's a good chance both of them will be knocked out. So that is why we like to have a separation of the transmission lines. The weather up here could be different than what is going on down here.

MR. FOWLER: My name is Gary Fowler. As far as your secondary line there by Palisades, you know, we're looking at the same thing down around the Rupert and Burley area with this Gateway transmission line. They want them separated and not run parallel. I stand the chance of getting hit by lightening if I walk outside of this building too, but I'm not holding my breath that that is going to happen.

What is the cost factor of building that parallel line from Palisades Dam to backfeed into Lower
Valley Energy's loop there?

MR. ORTH: We have not done studies. That goes back to our NERC. They tell us -- they don't want us to build parallel lines. I understand that it's a small chance, but that's the guidelines we have to follow.

MR. FOWLER: So is there a different route they could go and still build a secondary line there and not affect us by building from Threemile and out either through Lanes Creek our out through the south route?

MR. ORTH: That is a comment that we can't address. We have not done detailed studies. We can't address that comment at this time.

MS. HUNSAKER: We went over in Wyoming and they have some big lines going down there, going into Afton. We took a horse to somebody over there. And he says just put them in the red gate. There were big power lines going over it. When we picked it up it shocked us.

MR. HUNSAKER: Stray voltage.

MS. HUNSAKER: Stray voltage. Do people realize, you know, where you'll put it and what that might do? That's a legitimate thing, am I not right?

MR. ORTH: That is a concern, especially with some barbed wire fences that run along without grounding. Yes, that is a concern, and there can be stray voltage that does occur. We do cover that in the draft EIS.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Have you worked with Lower Valley at all?

MR. ORTH: Yes. Originally part of the project was a joint project. It is no longer, but they still are customers of us that we do provide power and transmission to and so we do work with them.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It would seem like that relationship should continue, not be dissolved, because they have a power station that feeds into that -- what you are trying to accomplish.

MR. LYNAM: We're continuing to work with them. The relationship is not dissolved.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But they're just part of the fixture. I'm not getting the picture of why we need this, because it would seem to me that Lower Valley could actually solve what you propose that we need more power for, or to make this all work for whatever benefit. I'm still not getting it.

MR. ORTH: That question would best be answered by our planning engineer here tonight. I would ask that you table that and ask her after this.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. LYNAM: We originally planned to go until about 6:30 tonight. We're 6:40. A lot of good comments have come out.
Any other comments? Let's maybe take two more
before we wrap it up and get you all out to the individual
stations. I would remind you that if you have other
comments you want to share, maybe comments you didn't want
to share publicly around your friends and neighbors, we
could also get you lined up with our reporter and capture
your comments that way. So, one or two more.

MR. CLARK: I'm Trent Clark. I work for Monsanto. Jim Smith actually is the person who works at Monsanto who has been engaged with this.

I just wanted for the record to kind of
reiterate the same thing that I mentioned when we were
meeting with the county commissioners. I noticed that
sort of that general language made it into the draft EIS
that said, oh, this is a CERCLA area that we can't touch. I kind of understand why BPA has that as a kind of
cultural thing, because the strict joint and several
liability provisions of CERCLA have been pretty tough on
any entity that uses PCV's. And BPA is one such company,
one such entity, that has used PCV's in general in the past.

And just so everybody knows, the way this
statute works, there are gas stations in Pocatello that
when they found PCV's at Pacific Hide and Fur, those gas
stations got told you may be on the hook for a $2 million
cleanup. It's because the gas station had donated a battery to a scout drive where the scouts had taken the battery specifically to Pacific Hide and Fur to be recycled. That's the chain of liability that can track.

The thing that we're missing in this draft EIS is you're not going to be moving selenium bearing materials around. So, therefore, you're going to have no liability. There's no liability there whatsoever. It is as simple a process as going to EPA and saying we would like to route this line along the edge of one of your study areas. Can you assert for us that we won't be touching any contaminants of concern. They'll write you a letter saying, oh, yeah, there's no contaminants of concern there and you're okay.

That happens all the time, especially with the concern these days about Brownfields cleanups. The agency has become a lot more willing to say here's what you can do. And that's all that Bonneville Power would have to do is just say here's what we want to do. Does it touch selenium? No. If you're not moving the battery around, you don't have any liability. If you're not moving selenium around you won't have any liability.

MR. LYNAM: Thank you, Mr. Clark. Appreciate it.

One more comment and then we'll go ahead and wrap it up.

MS. STONER: Erica Stoner. I'm with Agrium.
just would like to put on the public record that the southern route, one of the CERCLA sites, is associated with us. We do have concerns that it is also close to an operation that we have right now. If that route is the accepted alternative, there will be costs associated that we expect BPA to bear to move that line around the mining operation as is required.

MR. LYNAM: Okay. Anything else?

MS. STONER: No.

MR. LYNAM: Thank you, Ms. Stoner. All right. We've spent about the last hour and a half reviewing the project. You all have been very open and honest and straightforward in the comments that you've shared. To the extent that we could, we've tried to answer some of the questions that were presented. I will assure you that your comments from today will appear in BPA's official record for the project.

And I think it was Mr. Sampson, is that correct?

MR. SOMSEN: Somsen.

MR. LYNAM: If I could link up with you afterward, I'll share my contact information with you so you can get me the comments from that meeting and we'll incorporate those as well. I think that will be an important piece of information for the project.
Anyone who wants to have a little bit of extra
time with the reporter, remember to check in with Coleen.
She'll sign you up for the time that you need. Our
reporter is here until 8:00 p.m.

To wrap things up, I just want to say thank
you very much to each of you for the time and effort and
energy you've invested to come and talk with us today. I
would invite you to -- if there's comments or ideas that
come to your mind that didn't surface in the conversation
tonight, share those with us by the other methods I talked
about. And please feel free to check in with the subject
matter experts at the different stations out here in the
open house area.

Unless there's anything else that you want to
talk about, I think that pretty well concludes our public
part of the meeting tonight. Again, I want to thank you
for coming by and talking with us.

(Off the record pending further comments.)

MR. OLORENSHAW: My name is Wade Olorenshaw. My
concern is with the northern route. On the maps it's page
29-1 where my parcel is depicted. I just wanted to
provide that information for the BPA people so they can
zero in on that more quickly. And perhaps look at a route
realignment and pulling the line south a little bit away
from my four acre property. Plus taking the access
further south on the lower two existing offramps that are there. Thank you.

(Off the record pending further comments.)


If we could make a new PI from Tower 30-2, and then route that southwesterly to Tower 28-8, that would help pull the power line southerly, away from the smaller parcel. And it would increase the access from the two routes southerly along Highway 34 as visited with our right-of-way -- our access people this evening here at the meeting. Thank you.

(Close public comment.)
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Tish Eaton  
Environmental Protection Specialist - KEC-4  
Bonneville Power Administration  
P.O. Box 3621  
Portland, OR 97208

Re: William Meads Trust  
Hooper Springs Transmission Project

Dear Ms. Eaton:

Thank you for providing to me for review a copy of the Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") report in written format as well as copies of the plat maps pertaining to the real property associated with the William Meads Trust.

This letter is written pursuant to our agreement that the William Meads Trust could provide written comments to you for inclusion in the EIS analysis with regard to the proposed 115-kilovolt electrical transmission line proposed to be constructed through Caribou County, Idaho.

The William Meads Trust is the owner of the following described real property located in Caribou County, Idaho:

a. **Real Property:**  
Township 7 South, Range 42 East of the Boise Meridian:  
Section 21: W1/2SW1/4  
Section 28: Lots 6 and 7

The real property is currently being leased by the Trust to Doyle DeKay, Ruth DeKay, and Meadowville Ranches for farming purposes. The lease expires on October 31, 2013. The land is comprised of approximately 160 acres (two 80 acre parcels) of which there are between 135 and 139 tillable acres.
After reviewing the written materials and the plat map, it is apparent that if the “Northern Route” is selected, there will be an adverse impact and “taking” of the westerly 100’ of the farm property which is adjacent to and extends north along Highway 34, and as the highway proceeds northward.

Of the three (3) available options, it is the position, and request of the William Meads Trust that the proposed high voltage transmission line be submitted as a “no-action alternative” proposal.

However, if it is determined that the power line project is going to be approved and constructed, then, the William Meads Trust requests that the construction be pursuant to the “Southern Route” alternative.

The request is based upon the following factors as presented in the underlying materials and at the public hearing held in Soda Springs, Idaho on April 5, 2013.

1. The “Northern Route” will be approximately 32 miles long and includes two (2) route options. While the “Southern Route” will be approximately 22 miles long and includes four (4) options. There is no need to add an additional 10 miles of electrical lines and transmission poles across the corridor.

2. The cost of construction, regardless of whether the “Northern Route” or the Southern Route” is selected will be approximately $55.0 million. There is no cost saving by selecting the longer “Northern Route”.

3. The right-of-way/easement across the William Meads Trust property will be subject to multiple permanent structures and will impact the farming operation of the Trust property, including the fair market value of the land and its crop production capabilities.

4. Construction will take nearly two (2) years to begin and complete. There will be a minimum of two (2) years of an adverse economic impact caused by the construction and inability to have total access to the farming property for planting, fertilizing, care, and harvesting of the crop to be grown on the land.
5. The selection of the "Northern Route" will also adversely impact the views associated with the "scenic corridor" which extends north from Soda Springs to the termination point of the project.

6. The selection of the "Northern Route" will adversely impact the hunting and fishing sites located along the route, as well as causing significant interruption to the "flight patterns" of waterfowl and the "game trails" of big game animals.

7. There is no assurance that the parties will be able to amicably be able to arrive at a fair market value of the property and the "value" of the "taking. This may result in extended litigation and incurrence of legal costs and expenses by both parties.

As you are aware the electrical transmission line informational packets were sent by Bonneville Power Administration to an address which was associated with the Trust a few years ago. Since my appointment as Successor Trustee on or about September 16, 2011, the Trust has used the address of:

William Meads Trust  
c/o Craig W. Christensen  
P.O. Box 130  
Pocatello, ID 83240

I appreciate your willingness to extend the comment period for the William Meads Trust from April 22, 2013 and incorporating our comments into the record.

Please keep me advised as to the status of the final "EIS" when it is released, as well as the Record of Decision. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Craig W. Christensen

CWC:jh  
cc: William Meads Trust Beneficiaries
October 10, 2012

VIA U.S. MAIL

Bonneville Power Administration
P.O. Box 3621
Portland, OR 97208-3621

To Whom it May Concern:

At the Open Meeting before the Caribou County Commission on September 24, 2012, following the statement by Dr. Rod Drewien, concerning the inappropriateness of the Northern Line being considered by Bonneville Power Administration, the attorney for Bonneville Power, Mr. Earnest Estes stated that there were no questions raised by that statement.

Implicit in Dr. Rod Drewien's statement to Bonneville Power were a number of questions that we now explicitly address to Bonneville Power:

1. What migratory waterfowl flight pattern data and/or material were considered by Bonneville Power in determining the amount of impact by the proposed Southern Line and the Northern Line?
   a) Where can copies of this material be obtained by the public for consideration by appropriate personnel?

2. What geological analysis was made by Bonneville Power in determining the amount of impact on the environment of the proposed Southern Line and Northern Line?
   a) Where can copies of this material be obtained by the public for consideration by appropriate personnel?

Bonneville Power acknowledges that one of the criteria considered in favor of the Northern Line is its proximity to an existing substation. What is the amount of money saved by Bonneville Power by utilizing this existing substation?

   a) How is this dollar saving weighed against the environmental impact in Bonneville Power's analysis?

   b) What is the formula utilized by Bonneville Power in such weighting and how can the public obtain a copy of this analysis?
4. Has Bonneville Power examined the federal funds being spent by the Federal Government in preserving the Lander Trail in Wyoming?

5. What consideration has Bonneville Power made in the preservation of the Lander Trail in Idaho?

Very truly yours,
Al and Ellis Kackley
Idaho Foundation for Parks and Lands

By: Chas F. McDevitt

GFM/hh
Al Kackley
Ellis Kackley
Executive Director-Idaho Foundation For Parks and Lands
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Mr. John Williams - BPA Constituent Account Executive
Mr. Eric Orth - BPA Project Manager
MR. WILLIAMS: -- that Representative Gilbert
and Senator Tippets, they know me from the state house.
And I will give my cards to other folks, so if they have
any questions, not only dealing with our transmission,
but fish and wildlife, anything.

And what I am going to just explain just very
briefly, it's my responsibility for the Bonneville Power
Administration -- I'm actually housed in Boise, Idaho,
and I am the constituent account executive. My
responsibility is to have a relationship with all
elected officials in the state of Idaho, and that also
includes the governor's office. And I also have
relationships with some of the major non-profits such as
the Idaho Farm Bureau, the water -- Idaho Water Users
Association and some other organizations because of our
impact to their customers and clients.

Today, we're meeting with you to give you an
update on the transmission project that we've been
working on for the past few years. We're at a point now
where we feel it's good to have this meeting and to
provide you a status report.

Today, I brought the project manager, Eric
Orth, and he will go into more detail in terms of what's
going on on the ground and how we plan to move forward.
Eric.

MR. ORTH: Thank you, Commissioners, for having us today.

So like John said, just I wanted to give you an update. We first had started our environmental NEPA process back in July of 2010. At that time, we had a public meeting in August 2010. It was over here at the high school and it was very well attended.

We -- from that point forward, we've been looking at a northern route to our transmission line. Currently, we're still -- we're proposing to build a Hooper Springs substation right outside of town here to the north adjacent to Pacifi-Corp's Three Mile Knoll station. And we're looking at a small tap line coming out of the Three Mile Knoll substation and to Hooper Springs.

And then what we're currently investigating is a 32-mile line that travels to the north, kind of parallels 34, and then heads to the east across a lot of private land, BIA, some BLM parcels, State of Idaho. And then it enters into Forest Service property and then the national forest and then continues east on to Lane's Creek substation, which is owned and operated by Lower Valley Energy through a special use permit through the Forest Service.
And so the last year, it's been pretty busy. Things have picked up, especially this spring. We're working -- contacting a lot of landowners -- private landowners to work with them to gain rights of entry into their -- into their property so that we can investigate the route that we're looking at so that we can do a certain level of engineering analysis to support our NEPA document, which is an environmental impact statement, EIS.

Currently, we are beginning to draft that document, draft a preliminary EIS. And we've done some biological studies, plant studies.

The U.S. Forest Service is going to be a cooperating agency with Bonneville Power in the EIS, and so they'll -- they'll ultimately adopt that document as their NEPA. BLM and BIA, they're not official cooperating agencies, but they will -- we will be working with them and we have met with them.

A lot of the work that's gone on on the ground recently, like I mentioned, is working with landowners. We -- our main focus, we know this could be a very large impact to a lot of the landowners and so we truly are trying to work with all the landowners that it will impact, both the transmission line easement that's -- that we possibly could be proposing if the agency
decides to build the project, and also the access roads
leading -- leading to the -- to the easement.

A few weeks ago I dropped off some maps. I saw
some of you were flipping through the maps. It's pretty
detailed information. That's -- that's the northern
route that we are focusing a lot of our efforts on.

I'm not sure how familiar with -- the project
overall, originally, we had a transmission line route
that was a joint project of Lower Valley Energy that
grew more easterly, coming out of Hooper Springs.
Unfortunately, that crossed over four mining sites that
are under current litigation, and so -- for Super Fund
investigations, so we couldn't -- couldn't -- our
agency, it was too high a risk for our agency to build
and help fund that transmission line. And so that's
where we came back and that's what started our EIS
process in July of 2010.

The other aspects, again, we've got a whole
staff of realty agents out of Boise. HTR, we've hired
HTR to do a lot of work on the realty front.

We're working with landowners. Originally, we
had sent out what we call permission to enter property
forms to the landowners and we -- we are now offering
$500 for the landowners to sign that document. And so
the ones that are signing are getting the money. And
then we also retroactively went back and the landowners that we do need to get on their property that had previously signed, we're getting them the money, as well, so -- so we can be equal to all.

Engineering is continuing on to support the NEPA. That's our main focus right now is to properly evaluate our environmental analysis, look at the cultural resources, like I said, the biological studies and plant studies. The Forest Service has some old growth areas that we're -- that we're avoiding, as well, and so there is -- there are a lot of resources.

There's the -- landowners have also spoken up about some different resources. I know the Cackleys have some pristine property that has an area that -- that they want us to avoid. And we're really taking each -- each landowner, each issue and trying to work through it so that we can hopefully -- our main goal is we -- we need a transmission line somehow that links between the Hooper Springs area and to Lower Valley's transmission path that goes by Lane's Creek.

The reason for it, our load studies show that in the next winter or -- well, in the winter of 2014-15, we have some voltage stability problems with the entire system here in southeast Idaho, and because this is within our -- our authority to provide transmission
services, we need this link in the system to -- to keep from that -- keep from a voltage stability problem, as well as another transmission line that shows thermal overloading once based on a 1 percent rate of growth in the area.

What happens, you know, if -- if -- what Bonneville's most concerned about is we run into these problems in the dead of winter, a line trips out and perhaps another line, and then you get this cascading effect. And it's -- it's going to be very troublesome to get the system back up and running when it's very cold out in the middle of winter. You can't get access to the lines. You don't know where the outage is. And so that's one of our main -- main purposes is to stabilize the system here looking at the load growth.

Are there any questions?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: A few.

MR. ORTH: I figured so.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are you aware that some of your crew has been entering private property that hasn't been authorized and they've been cutting survey lines, pounding stakes, cutting trees?

MR. ORTH: I'm not aware of that. We -- we keep a very active list of properties that -- that we have permissions to go on. This is the first I've heard
of it, honestly. And I apologize if that has happened to any of the landowners.

I would love to hear names and when -- because we do have a lot of people out here I've met and they are -- it is busy and -- but we do -- we do keep an active list of folks' property who we do have permissions to enter.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm sure you're aware that Simplot will be closing its Smoky Mine out there in Smoky Canon. That's where the line goes from the substation down Tenco.

MR. ORTH: Uh-huh.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It goes south from there and it goes over to Smoky Canon and supplies Simplot's energy needs. And I'm a little bit curious as to why it can't be put off for another couple of years while they're closing that mine down and use that energy rather than create a new line through undisturbed property?

MR. ORTH: That's something I can go back to our planning study folks and take a look at. I know that we don't serve Simplot directly, but we do look at the transmission grid as a whole and so we should be able to pull that up for you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, you mentioned that
this new line is going to be hooked up to Lower Valley Energy, and I believe it's Lower Valley Energy that does supply the power to Simplot. And it looks like that would be an available resource rather than creating another one.

MR. ORTH: Okay. We can certainly look at that. It's -- it's our -- our issue is more of a transmission issue. What you are talking about is a power issue. But certainly we can take that back and look at that.

Lower Valley is very supportive of the project. I meet with them monthly. And the -- the Lower Valley and Fall River, both utilities are in need of --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Another question. As I say, I've got a few.

Another question: You mentioned -- and we were aware of this too -- that the proposed line to come across the now abandoned and reclaimed mines -- some are reclaimed, some not -- it sounded like that was discouraging because of the EPA; is that correct?

MR. ORTH: Not necessarily from the EPA. It's -- it's -- it's our lawyers. We've looked at the risks of putting a line in there. And if we happen to put a line through that area and disrupt some soil and cause further contamination just based on what's in the
soil then we could be held liable for -- for a lot of
dollars for cleanup. And that's too high a risk for the
agency to take.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Then what exactly was
the EPA's advice or their policy on that or do you have
any copies of that?

MR. ORTH: We --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or is it just the
attorneys that had perceived a risk?

MR. ORTH: No. Our attorneys have talked to --
not necessarily to the EPA, but to our Department of
Justice and discussed the risks.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But not with the EPA?

MR. ORTH: Not that I am aware of.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And so there's no actual
known threat from the EPA that you could become involved
in a CERCLA project?

MR. ORTH: The threat's not immediate. It's if
we were to cause disturbance -- which, you know, when
you build a transmission line, it can be very
disturbing. And because of the CERCLA law and -- and
being -- being able to be held liable, it's -- it's too
big a risk for our agency to take.

We did a lot of research to come to that
conclusion. It's not something we took lightly.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Did the amount of studies you have to provide going across private land rather than going across that much government-controlled land that's in that state of repair or disrepair, did the cost of those studies have anything to do with the decision to go with the northern route?

MR. ORTH: No. The decision to go to the northern route was made when we finished our environmental assessment back in '09 and we couldn't sign a finding of no significant impact document to allow us to construct there, so that's -- that's -- that was the decision point to move to a different route.

Now, this new route, what we've done is we've avoided all potential mining -- leased mining sites from Monsanto and Simplot and the other companies, and so we've -- we've avoided all those and that was our main goal of this new route.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So you don't view this route as a line of least resistance?

MR. ORTH: It's -- no. It's being met with plenty of resistance. It's -- it's -- what this route does for us is it takes the risk of that -- of being litigated under some kind of Super Fund investigation and cleanup.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But no one has contacted
the EPA or the DEQ or anyone to see if they would attempt to involve you with that?

MR. ORTH: I honestly -- I would have to get back to you on that. I don't talk to our lawyers a lot. I just know that's -- that's what they've decided --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'd be interested to find out if that was the -- and, you know, just a supposed possibility or if it was actual. I can't imagine that the EPA wouldn't be somewhat reasonable about giving you immunity from -- it would be, in my mind's eye, minimal disturbance compared to what's happened with the open-pit mining.

MR. ORTH: Yeah, you are correct.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It is not even close to being on the same scale, so I can't imagine that it wouldn't be a little bit within reason to work with those guys on that. But I don't know. Our dealings with EPA hasn't been real good with the county either on some issues that we have with 'em, but I would be really interested to find out what their perspective is on it if there -- if they would agree to any -- any kind of an alternative, you know, or -- or whatever was necessary to take this through an area that didn't impact so many private landowners, through some very scenic, pristine area.
MR. ORTH: We'll get back to you on that.
We'll put together some bullets of, you know, how we got
to the decision.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.
Have you got anything?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Couldn't you come
farther to the south on a lot of the public land and
stay on Forest Service ground without getting the mines
involved?

MR. ORTH: Unfortunately, no. The potential
mining sites, they reach -- I mean, it's -- it's almost
all the way up to the reservoir up there. There's a
very small gap that -- that can't be mined. And that's,
you know, that's what we're -- we're proposing that
route is to run it through that gap. It gets pretty
close to Highway 34 there and the resort area. But
unfortunately, anywhere to the -- to the east and to the
south, we run into more -- more potential mining sites.
And we did look at that and we've got maps that show all
these parcels that are potential mining sites.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I wonder if I need to
(inaudible) --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think from just
looking at the crowd here, we have a lot of people that
this is going to be in their backyard and I think that's
probably why a lot of 'em's here is to -- they're wondering why it has to be right through their area out there. And so we'll turn --

Is there anybody else that's got any questions?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have one.

How much -- I guess this is 30 miles north from what your original plan was going through the mining.

How much is that costing you?

MR. ORTH: Uh --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: An additional 30 miles of power lines poles and right-of-way and all that rigamarole, how much is that costing you?

MR. ORTH: We're -- right now -- right now our estimates show between 45 and 50 million.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: $50 million?

MR. ORTH: The original proposed route was a 22-mile line. It had the same Hooper Springs substation, but it was a double-circuit line. It was going to be partially funded by Bonneville, partially funded by Lower Valley. And because it was two circuits, it was six wires. It was -- it was not going to be that expensive, but it still would be -- would be up there.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: One more question, if I may. You are worried about going through the mining
thing and disturbing all the dirt from the soil and the
pollution stuff there, but yet you don't mind going up
through our property and doing the same thing. So isn't
there a dichotomy there?

MR. ORTH: We -- we do care that, you know,
that we're -- that we're going to be disrupting your
property and --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But you are willing to
do it to us, but not to the mining company --

MR. ORTH: Well --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- that line?

MR. ORTH: Well, because there's ongoing
investigations on those Super Fund sites, again, it's
too high a risk for Bonneville Power.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, you just told him
that you have not discussed that with EPA yet?

MR. ORTH: Well --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And I want to know why
you're not doing that?

MR. ORTH: I can't say yes or no that we have
talked to the EPA. I'll have to go back and talk to our
lawyers and we can certainly get back to the
commissioners on how we came to that. I know that we've
looked at it. We've talked to the Department of
Justice, and it's -- it's -- it's a risk to Bonneville
and all the ratepayers if we get sucked into a huge
litigation for cleanup if we turn over some dirt or
cause any further contamination of that area.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you really believe
that any of us think that that's true; that you are
going to be -- if you plant a pole in a Super Fund site
that Monsanto's going to go broke and all the other
phosphate companies are going to go broke and you're
going to have to pay to clean up the whole thing? That
isn't believable to a single person sitting here.

MR. ORTH: Yeah, I understand your point.

It -- it is -- it is hard to explain. It is -- it's a
lot of our lawyers making -- making the decision.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there any way to
obtain a waiver from the mines regarding --

MR. ORTH: We -- we would have to be granted
immunity both from the private -- the landowners,
Monsanto and --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't want to jump in
out of turn, but didn't Monsanto already have that
offered to BPA? It's my understanding that they had a
pretty good sweet deal for BPA all cut and then they
backed out of it.

MR. ORTH: I would -- there was some talk. I
don't -- I don't -- I never saw a deal worked up.
MR. WILLIAMS: I happen to know of the finalization of that. I know when I've talked with Monsanto and Simplot, I said you have to get our attorneys to approve this. And just as a general statement, our attorneys looked at our risks. We have a separate risk management organization that also looked at Bonneville's risks. And what they tried to do is prevent Bonneville from getting into a situation where we may be liable for costs and which we're going to have to spread to our ratepayers. And that's something that we take very strongly. So that's -- it's protection.

And we understand that, Hey, why don't you at least look at EPA and DEQ to see if you can get this waiver. That's something, when I go back, I will try to find out.

I don't know the status of Monsanto and Simplot. They talked to our attorneys. I'm going to find that out, as well.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Another thing that occurs to me on that same issue is if it's that much shorter to go the other route, it would appear that it should be probably $10 million less to construct, more or less. And if it was, I seriously doubt you'd have over a $10 million fine for digging 20 or 30 post holes.

MR. ORTH: Well, part of the problem is that
you don't just get in trouble for the post holes you dig.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's an access road, right?

MR. ORTH: Well, but then if it reaches a supply of water -- which there's plenty of creeks and stuff up in those drainages -- and it gets down and it gets all the way down, say down to the reservoir, then look what we've done?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Eric, I just wanted to make sure that I understand what you're saying. The original route is about 22 miles long?

MR. ORTH: Correct.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This northern route is how long?

MR. ORTH: 32.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And it's an additional 45 to 50 million over the cost of the shorter route?

MR. ORTH: No.

THE WITNESS: You said no?

MR. ORTH: No, no, no. The 45 to 50 is the preliminary estimates for the entire project, which would include the Hooper Springs substation, our transmission line of 32 miles and additions to Lane's Creek.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So what's the additional cost to go the additional 10 miles, do you know?

MR. ORTH: I do not know.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you have even a ballpark guess?

MR. ORTH: I don't. I don't want to say. I can go back and we can get that information to you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I want to know the impact on the landowners. You mentioned that some landowners have accepted $500 in compensation. Is that just for access to their property during this preliminary phase? This isn't -- this isn't an easement for the transmission line if you should decide to build there, is it?

MR. ORTH: That's correct. That is purely for right of entry. Nothing else. No binding agreement. I think it's revokable at any time by the landowner.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So eventually if the transmission line were built across private property, is there compensation to the landowner?

MR. ORTH: Oh, certainly. We would have to --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How is that determined?

MR. ORTH: We would -- we would negotiate an easement across -- across their property and we'd appraise it.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And if the landowner didn't want to negotiate an agreement, ultimately what happens? Do you take the property? Do you take the easement through eminent domain and force it to happen?

MR. ORTH: We -- we -- we don't want to do that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You don't want to do that, but is that ultimately an option that you would consider? I understand it's not something you would want to do.

MR. ORTH: As a federal agency, yes, we have that option, but we do absolutely everything that we can. And there's landowners that we've already worked with to change the route to still be on their property but to change it so it can both meet our need and their need. And so that's what we're really asking landowners to work with us on.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So you think it's unlikely that in the end you'll put it across private property where the landowners don't agree?

MR. ORTH: I'm not necessarily saying that everyone is going to agree in its final location. Every time you put an angle or a bend in the line, you have got guy wires, things get bigger, costs go up. The straighter the line, the cheaper it's going to be. So
it's -- we have to weigh the pros and cons on every
change that we make.

We are trying to share the burden of the line
across both private, state and federal lands. And I
think we've done a very good job of doing that.
There's -- there's -- a lot of mileage of the line is
across Forest Service and BLM and BIA property.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you give me an idea
of the time line? When do you hope to start
construction?

MR. ORTH: Our main focus right now is the NEPA
document, the environmental impact statement. We'll
have a draft of the EIS out later this summer, maybe --
maybe in September. That'll -- that'll go through a
couple of comment periods. We take that and we would
receive all the comments and address all the comments
and then hopefully have a final environmental impact
statement sometime in the spring of '13.

At that time, if the -- at that time, our
agency then would -- would possibly have a record of
decision to sign either go or no-go. And we're looking
at that in May of '13. After that, then as far as
starting construction, it essentially could start after
that, but certainly not before.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So have you been in
contact with all of the private landowners that have property on the proposed route?

MR. ORTH: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So they're all aware of how to get ahold of you with their concerns about this thing?

MR. ORTH: As far as I know. As long as they have an accurate mailing address with their property title at the county.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If someone has concerns and they feel like they haven't had the appropriate opportunity to express those, what would you recommend they do at this point?

MR. ORTH: I would recommend that they go to our project website and submit comments there. If you are here today, I can take names and numbers.

I do know that it does happen that -- that property changes hands, records don't get updated with the county and then people are left in the dark. And it's unfortunate that that happens, but we do see it happen from time to time. The folks may not live here on the property; they live somewhere else, and so tracking them down can be a chore, as well.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What's the -- what's (inaudibles) number?
MR. ORTH: Do you have that handy?

MR. WILLIAMS: I don't have it handy. Do you still have my email?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do.

MR. WILLIAMS: It's on there, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Then I'm not sure that I'll be (inaudibles) --

MR. ORTH: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So would you get that to everybody on to sign this --

MR. ORTH: Yes, I will, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Of course, that just has names, so I don't know how you would --

MR. ORTH: We can track down the addresses.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, okay. And anybody that wants that can leave their email address or a phone number with you?

MR. ORTH: That's a great idea.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What percentage of landowners have given you permission to go on their property? I really haven't heard of anyone that's given you permission, so I just wondered if you have -- the majority of the people are --

MR. ORTH: Just looking at the private landowners, yeah, we have the majority.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And a signed to go in --

MR. ORTH: Yes, just for right of entry. Just for right of entry.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't believe that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't either.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Your compensation agreement (inaudible) will it be a one-time -- a one-time fee to the landowners or will you be paying them based on the rate of how much power is going to be going across the line on an annual basis?

MR. ORTH: You are asking about the -- that's the easement, the actual easement for the line?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Uh-huh.

MR. ORTH: It would be a one-time fee.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How is the federal government compensated for the power lines or transmission lines across the public property?

MR. ORTH: How are they compensated? They are not compensated. We -- we write up an agreement. We have easement documents that show where the lines exist across the other federal agencies, but no money changes hands.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So this will be a one-time fee to these landowners, a one-time payment --

MR. ORTH: Payment --
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- if they agree to this?

MR. ORTH: -- yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible) to go over federal land if you don't have to pay for it, right?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

Who is funding the Bonneville Power Administration for you to build this line?

MR. ORTH: All the ratepayers of the Northwest.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a question about -- you were talking about the cost of the transmission lines, the shorter one and the longer one, but it seemed like when you were talking about the shorter one that you said that they were different kind of wires and it was three wires instead of two wires or something. And so it sounded to me a little bit like apples and oranges. If that line that's going that's the northern route were to be put on the southern route with just what you're proposing for now, how much would that cost versus how much it would cost to go the northern route, the increase in that process?

MR. ORTH: That's where I need to get back and see those estimates. Those estimates were put together a long time ago, back in '04, and I -- I would have to dig around to get those.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Now, on the easement that you want, this is an easement for the power poles themselves, plus you are going to have to have a road that goes through there so you can maintain those power poles, correct?

MR. ORTH: That's correct.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. And the ratepayers -- I know you are looking out for the ratepayers, but you are going the northern route and it's going to cost a lot of money. You're going to have to maintain those lines -- another 10 miles of lines until the world comes to an end, I guess. That's going to cost the ratepayers. Has anybody thought about asking the Idaho congressional delegation to slip something into a bill that would give you immunity from this problem of crossing the mines? I think that our senators and representatives, if we're going to save 10 or 15 or $20 million, would be happy to do that and especially in the state budgets.

MR. ORTH: That's a great --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: May I ask you to do that?

MR. WILLIAMS: That goes back to an earlier question. I need to talk with our attorneys --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.
MR. WILLIAMS: -- about if we have had conversations with BPA, DEQ and go from there and then get back to the county commissioners and others.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If we have another meeting, it might be good to have an attorney here to --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah (inaudibles) --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's one other part I'd like to have clarified. I believe either you're misinformed or I misunderstand, but I would like to see by a show of hands all of the people in here that are affected landowners who have given their permission for the power company to go on their land. Just a simple raising your hand.

I think that's a reverse majority.

MR. ORTH: Well, it's --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's a story that I think -- I never talked to nobody to --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. WILLIAMS: Is that information we can share because we entered into contractual arrangements with (inaudible) landowners?

MR. ORTH: I don't know.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, another question to clarify that. Would these landowners that have already given you permission, would that be farmers out...
here north of town that have possibly property lines
down there that you will follow and it wouldn't be a
great inconvenience or a distraction?

MR. ORTH: That's correct.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But none of the other
landowners that have got pristine property; is that
accurate?

MR. ORTH: What's accurate is we've -- we've
received some permission on properties. We've --
I've -- we've received the majority from the private
landowners. None of 'em are here today because they --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What you called just the
dry farmers, not the ones that's got the pristine
property in the mountains?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The ones that farm and
not live here?

MR. ORTH: I -- you're asking me to decide
what's pristine and what's --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Well, I think we
have all kind of got the picture.

Another man here has the floor now.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you know anything
about the flyway treaty? Have you heard about that?

MR. ORTH: No.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Three migration flyways.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Also, how about the wetlands you will be crossing?

MR. ORTH: Well, yeah, there are a number of wetlands.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How about the Lander Trail?

MR. ORTH: The trail, yeah, we got the Lander Trail. That's one of our cultural resources that we're avoiding.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not by the way of your map, you're not.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Going right through it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right down in the center of it.

MR. ORTH: Well, that's -- Mr. Cackley, that's why we want to work with you and help determine where the trail is because right now we can't even be on your property to determine where the trail is to protect it and so that's -- that's the issues that I'm running into. So if we don't -- you know, if we have to -- if we can't get on the properties, we have to make assumptions what's on the property and keep moving forward so we can do our environmental analysis. And the more information we get, the better the document's
going to be. But unfortunately, if we can't get on the property, we have to make some assumptions and guesses.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You can do that, but you can't talk to the EPA?

MR. ORTH: I -- I imagine we've had conversations with the EPA. I don't know what they entailed. But we'll -- we can get back to the commissioners on what were discussed.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you have a handout as to where this proposed line is -- the two routes, the two different routes, the short route and the long route?

MR. ORTH: I do have --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Keith, here's the long route, the north one. But we don't have the one --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You don't happen to have that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't have that it.

MR. ORTH: I've got -- I've got 10. I honestly wasn't expecting -- I apologize -- this many folks. I knew the commissioners would be here.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, is this just the northern route?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, that's the
northern route there. That's the one we're talking about now.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, if you've got the information, they sent the map in the letter, didn't they, to all of you?

(Inaudibles).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll make some copies.

MR. WILLIAMS: While you do that, earlier for those who utilize the computer and would like to find that (inaudible), if you email me -- I hope this is easy enough for you to follow -- jjWilliams@BPA.gov. That's my email address. And, now, if you send me an email, I will send you the website directly to the project information so that you don't have to go to Bonneville's website trying to find out where this particular project is.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would just be asking -- well, but is this still just a proposal? If we let y'all in the easement and study it, it's not cut-and-dried that you are going to do that?

MR. ORTH: That's correct. It's just a proposal and we're -- we're using information that we get from the land to put together our environmental analysis.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, where they showed
me where mine was, you're going to go through up on a hill with rocks. It sounds like a mess to me, you know.

MR. ORTH: Yeah, there's -- there's some tough terrain out there.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, yeah.

MR. ORTH: You know, we've -- we've made it a little tougher on ourselves by trying to avoid the land that's being farmed or, if we can't avoid it, staying on the edges of the fields.

Our original design, we were looking at wood poles, which typically there is two wood poles 12 feet apart. And what we've moved to is a single steel pole through the area that's -- that's cultivated fields to help lessen the impact. Again, we're putting the structures on the edges of your property line, as well, so -- to the farmers, they -- they -- to lessen the impact there.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How wide of an area would you have to clear-cut when you cross through timberland?

MR. ORTH: 100 feet. 100 feet is our typical easement width. That hasn't changed from the beginning of the project.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And when you said you were going to take out a single pole when it goes across
cropland and when it comes across grazing lands, you are going to go back to the double pole?

MR. ORTH: To the double-width pole.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And that will still be 100 feet?

MR. ORTH: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And the road would be in that 100 feet, too?

MR. ORTH: The majority of it. There will -- there are areas that you -- we run into wetlands or creeks and you can't cross those and so sometimes we don't have a continuous road.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That southern or shorter route, that goes -- it's up -- and I haven't been out there for years, I have to apologize -- but that runs close to a county road now where your trucks could follow that if you had a problem out there. Is that not true? Or a good part of it does anyway.

MR. ORTH: I believe it did. I -- yeah, the China Hat Road or -- yeah, it followed China Hat Road up into the hill there, yeah.

When the project was that -- when it was that route, again, it was a joint project with Bonneville Power Administration and Lower Valley. We were funding two-thirds of it; they were funding a third of it. And
they were going to own and operate the line after they
were done. Completely different than our proposed
project now, which Bonneville will construct, own and
operate this transmission line and substations.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This project is to
provide power running to the east; is that not correct?

MR. ORTH: The transmission line itself, it's a
link in the series in this entire electrical grid to
help southeast Idaho here. It's another link that we
need to stabilize the grid.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So it's going to be back
and forth. You are not going to --

MR. ORTH: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- send power to a mine
or something, this is --

MR. ORTH: That's correct.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- this is a larger
implication than that?

MR. ORTH: When we build the line, it can push
and pull power, either way, depending on where the need
is at the time.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Isn't it true most of
it's going to Jackson Hole?

MR. ORTH: It is true that there is a lot of
load in Jackson, but there's also a lot of folks that
live here, too, that need power.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not going to Jackson though.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Have we looked at bringing power to this area from the east, like, into Wyoming and bringing it this way?

MR. ORTH: Bonneville hasn't. That's outside of our balancing authority. We -- we -- we're not obligated to -- to serve power coming out of Wyoming. Is that --

MR. WILLIAMS: It's on, like, the Jim Bridger plant. That would be Rocky Mountain and Idaho Power.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudibles).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Maybe you should talk to them with the EPA and see if you could work something out that way, too, because you're going to be talking to 'em before we do all this.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How deeply do you think you're going to sink the holes for the power poles?

MR. ORTH: Typically it's 10 to 12 feet.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And do you think that going through the Super Fund site and going down 10 feet would cause you to have liability for chemicals going down the creeks like selenium?

MR. ORTH: Yes.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you think that's a realistic assumption?

MR. ORTH: Yeah. Not necessarily the digging of the hole, you know. It's more the -- the roads, the area around the pole that you've got to establish a landing for the heavy equipment, the cranes that you have to bring in. That original route, too, it was -- like I had mentioned, it was six wires instead of three. It was going to be on single steel poles that were going to be 100 to 120 feet tall, a lot bigger. A lot of 'em had concrete foundations, so then you bring in concrete trucks, rebar. It was -- it's a -- it's lot -- a lot more of a line than what we're proposing now.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How many poles would be on (inaudibles) -- how many poles are we talking about?

MR. ORTH: I honestly don't know. I was not involved at that time. Again, that was a Lower Valley Energy project. I just know that there was four sites that are under current investigation that we were crossing --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is the power that you are going to (inaudible) over this line, is that excess power that you have on hand now or are you going to have to create that somehow?

MR. ORTH: It's not -- it's not a plus or minus
power. It's just the fact that we need a transmission link there to help support the whole system. The power comes and goes and moves all over the system like a spiderweb. But without that link, then -- then there's other vulnerabilities in the system. And that's where we are concerned in the middle of winter we start losing a line. And then if you lose a second line, that's when the whole of southeast Idaho gets into some real trouble.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You talked about the south route over the mining property. Is some of it unmined property that might be permitted in the future that you're protecting?

MR. ORTH: There is -- yeah, there is -- yeah, not all of it's mining property. The problem is, though, we need to get from the south (inaudibles) --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Those are the two proposed routes?

MR. ORTH: The -- the original southern route there, you can see (inaudibles) -- it's pink, but this map, you can see all the squares on there. Those are all the potential pinks that are mine areas that we're trying to avoid.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So some of 'em aren't mines; they're even permitted there.
MR. ORTH: No, but (inaudibles) --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Now you're trying to protect those, too?

MR. ORTH: Well, not protect 'em. The thing is we have to get over here to this green line and it looks like (inaudibles). We have to make that connection all the way to that green line, which is the Lower Valley transmission line, the Valley does (inaudibles).

So you see the yellow -- not yellow -- you see -- you can't even see the (inaudibles) --

Yeah, it didn't pick up the (inaudibles).

Oh, well, the yellow route is the -- is the (inaudibles).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Have you done any studies on earthquakes?

MR. ORTH: We do have a geotech who's actually going to be out this week looking at some stuff. We look at potential landslide areas. We know what side of the (inaudible) out here and we do design for it, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You have (inaudible) poles designated on my place. What kind of fire protection do you have?

MR. ORTH: Typically what we do is we control the weeds and vegetation about a 10-foot diameter around the base of the poles.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I mean, if the power line goes down.

MR. ORTH: If the power line -- oh, because of a fire?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, anything, wind. I know of farmers that's had some poles sheared off from wind shears. You just tromped his grain to pieces trying to get it out.

MR. ORTH: We would -- we would come in and -- and replace the wood poles that are burnt. It would be an emergency. We'd be in as soon as we can. And --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Would you compensate -- is what he's asking -- for the damages?

MR. ORTH: Oh, damages because of the wood poles that burned up?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Correct.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, no. Private property.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Private property.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You know, that's our livelihood you are dealing with.

MR. ORTH: We compensate the landowner if we were to (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: To what extent?

MR. ORTH: We -- we appraise the value and
negotiate that with each landowner.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just for the first time initial purchase, right, that's where I am only to see the money?

MR. ORTH: That's correct.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If the landowner is being damaged from a fallen line overheating or something and there was a fire that caused damage or if you had a pole fall over and you had to bring equipment in and tore up my field while the grain hadn't been cut, would the landowner be compensated for that?

MR. ORTH: Yes, yes. If we -- yeah, if we have to go in there in an emergency and cause excess crop damage, especially outside of our easement area, yes, we would certainly compensate the landowner for any lost revenue, yes, certainly. I think maybe that was more your question.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My question is why are you doing it?

MR. ORTH: Why are we doing it? We're doing it because the -- the southeast Idaho grid needs some help and, without it, we could be in a lot of trouble. And we want to keep the lights on for all of you individuals that live in this area.

MR. WILLIAMS: We have to meet reliability
standards.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, you guys are going through ground that's been there for generation after generation. I mean, our ancestors would just roll over in their graves if they could see what you're doing. And we've got -- now, we've got to look at it for the rest of our lives.

MR. ORTH: It's not -- yeah, it's not an easy thing. I understand it'll have -- it could have great impact.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, you don't. You don't understand.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You know, it would be one thing, though, if you were going -- had a proposed line that went straight over that valley, then we could almost thank you for doing what you could to go around this. But I still think going about twice as far, I think you should be able to do some -- if you've got really good lawyers, you should be able to arrive at something that would protect you and build it straighter, a shorter route.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Why don't you just follow Highway 34?

MR. ORTH: Well, we do for the most part. We'd end up with it on more private land if we do that.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. ORTH: Well, you actually land on more federal land and we get away --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They've run into the bird refuge.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, that's true.

MR. ORTH: Yeah, that was one of our concerns was the bird refuge.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible) on the flyway pattern, that's not where you begin.

MR. ORTH: When we're dealing with the flyway pattern, we're -- we're tucking the transmission line in up against the side of the hill there, putting it in the in the trees, you know, in the trees in the buffer and hopefully there won't be any avian collisions. That's our -- that's our mitigation for the flyway.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If you have to resort to eminent domain (inaudible), what would be the time (inaudible), like, for example, the person is served and then (inaudible)?

MR. ORTH: We -- we don't want to go there.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, let me just ask an additional question. If you go to the process of eminent domain, it's (inaudible), correct? I mean --
MR. ORTH: Not necessarily, no. A judge has to decide --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, but --

MR. ORTH: -- in favor of us or in favor of the landowner.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But percentage-wise, most of the time, if it does go to eminent domain, it goes to the party that's attempting to do (inaudible) --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The only thing you're going to be arguing about is what's fair market value.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It would be the price, then. It wouldn't be whether it was justification of taking the land or not?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It most likely would.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Have you seen in your past any other places where you have actually buried the lines instead of suspending it up on poles?

MR. ORTH: We don't bury the lines. If you want to talk costs, a 32-mile line, that would be maybe $500 million to bury 32 miles and you would completely destroy an entire swath of about 20 feet wide. You have to dig up all that earth 20 feet wide, probably, like, 10 feet, 15 feet deep to bury that line. It's a huge environmental impact and the cost is way too much for
the agency and our ratepayers to (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're talking about the mines and the pollution of selenium and stuff. But have you -- without going on private ground, have you dug any holes that deep to see if it would dig up any selenium in that area?

MR. ORTH: No, we have not.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Because we are a watershed up there, especially where we are in the south end, and all our water goes on down to Blackfoot and around, keeps going down -- down in that area, so that's why I was just wondering if you had done anything like that.

MR. ORTH: No, we have not, again, even just doing a test pit on the risk of digging something up.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: When you talked about this is in response to a perceived instability in your grid, is this instability currently in your grid or is it a proposed or an expected instability that will arise in the future?

MR. ORTH: It currently is not instability. Based on expected load growth, it will become an instability.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And this is premised on population growth for this region?
MR. ORTH: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How big of a region are we talking about? Eastern Idaho, all of Idaho, part of Wyoming?

MR. ORTH: Eastern Idaho and western Wyoming, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. ORTH: Yeah. The -- however, our -- we're regulated by the Federal Electrical Regulatory Commission and we have to maintain to the standards that keep us operating our system at a safe level, so we can't wait until after we pass that instability.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

MR. ORTH: Then we're operating our system outside of what we're regulated to do and, therefore, then we can be fined.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So how far out do you project your -- your need to where it affects your infrastructure to stabilize your grid?

MR. ORTH: Typically 25 years. We'll even run some 50-year studies. But obviously the further you get out, the numbers get sketchier. But 25 years is a very common number to look at for load growth.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So the perception of instability with this particular 32-mile line could
potentially be something you are looking at 20, 25 years in the future?

MR. ORTH: The -- the instability itself?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, for this region.

MR. ORTH: Yeah, if load growth began to decrease, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So it could be unnecessary if population were to decline or remain static?

MR. ORTH: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. ORTH: That's correct.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But didn't you say right now you're projecting the instability will start showing up about 2014 or --

MR. ORTH: The winter of 2014 and 2015, that's where our instability in the system starts showing up, yes. And we -- and we -- our system, we would be operating it, again, at a level that would not meet our regulation as an agency to FERC.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I've got one more question on the soil disturbance. When we started talking again about cutting across the mines, you mentioned the steel towers and they were big and
required the huge footprint, you know, with a cement base and everything, and that would cause the disturbance. Well, that -- is there a reason that a similar transmission line like is proposed through the Wayan area, the double wooden poles that don't require that kind of a footprint couldn't be used there?

MR. ORTH: Uh --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It looks like that that would take care of most of the soil disturbance. Then about all you would have -- you could haul off all that -- if that soil was contaminated that you dug up, remove it, fill the hole with cement and the pole and then all you'd have to do is haul in dirt for your road or gravel, and it looks like it would be a minimal deal.

I'm not an engineer, but it doesn't look -- it looks like the pole (inaudios) number of miles would appear is what it looks like, you know, for not being able to take a transmission line across there without causing any kind of major environmental impact.

MR. ORTH: You're talking about the southern route?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, the southern route, correct. If you used the same type of transmission line, just a double pole.

MR. ORTH: I --
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Unless there's a reason that can't be used.

MR. ORTH: Engineering, we -- we -- it would -- it would be difficult for us because we're talking six wires instead of three. We'd have a minimal -- we'd have three wood poles for every structure. That's our standard design.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, isn't there just two going through the -- through the Wayan area? I thought it was a two-pole system?

MR. ORTH: It is primarily a two-pole system, but -- but that's also only carrying three wires. If we go with the southern route, we have to do six wires because we're not linking into a substation at the end. We're hooking into a line, and so it's got to be a loop in/loop out scenario, so that's what makes it six wires instead of three wires.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. ORTH: And the Wayan route is only three wires.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Gary. One more. Gary.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, sorry. John. Gary had his hand up there first. Next will be you. Gary.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He was talking about if
you go the southern route, you were going to tie into the end of that line. They've got the substation down on Highway 34 in the Lane's Creek area. If that's going to be a problem, they could move that substation to the other end of the line so you can tie back into the sub on that (inaudible) --

MR. ORTH: Moving a whole substation like that could cost 10 to $15 million. I don't think Lower Valley is going to want their ratepayers to eat that cost. It's not an option we looked at, that's all I can say.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Senator.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Eric, just looking at the map, it looks like there would be a way to realize most of the southern route and bypass the mines. I don't know the geology or the topography of that area. I'm guessing there's probably other obstacles to doing that, but do you know that for sure that you couldn't reroute this around the mines and if you could still make that work?

MR. ORTH: We -- engineers early on looked at that. There are some very skinny gaps in there. You're following the Blackfoot River drainage.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You only need 100 feet,
so...

MR. ORTH: You only need 100 feet. You're going to -- we're going to be right in there with the Blackfoot River drainage, which typically that river meanders so much you've got a huge wetland.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You are anyway (inaudible).

MR. ORTH: Yeah, we -- definitely we'd cross it --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So I guess the question is have you seriously looked at that? But if not, could you?

MR. ORTH: We haven't recently, but we could look into that option.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And I know you'll have concerns with property owners regardless of which route you take, but this is a shorter route. It would impact fewer landowners, I would say, and potentially keep you away from the mines that are concerned -- environmental concerns you have there.

MR. ORTH: I can take that back and look into it more. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Chris?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think what my last
question would be when you estimated your costs, how did you estimate what the compensation was going to be for the private landowners?

MR. ORTH: Our estimates that we have right now are varied. We don't -- I mean, we use our -- I don't know -- a typical 100-foot easement in a combination of cropland and grazing land. I -- I -- I'd have to go back and look at all the little details. I mean, that is just a ballpark and that's -- we'll -- in our draft environmental impact statement, we'll probably have a more refined estimate in there and you can look at that number. But that's just a ballpark that's (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And what I'm saying is you have an estimate of 40 to $50 million to come around and I don't think you've taken into consideration what it's likely to cost you to compensate the landowners.

MR. ORTH: Okay. Well, we will --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Because I guarantee you, we've been through this before with the Lander Trail and we won our case at that point. We did not accept the low-ball figure that was given to us. And I don't think anybody in this room is going to accept the low-ball figure that you guys are going to throw out. We're going to have to look at this thing for the rest of our lives, for our children's lives, and very few people in
this room ever intend to sell their land. We -- most of us have children who will inherit this land and we really don't want to look at a 100-foot swath of power lines going through what -- when my father's estate was appraised -- was designated the highest and best use was the pristine value of the land and recreation or greater. So you are just voiding the appraised value of our land that we have actual appraisals on this land which that's what they say the best use of the land is.

But you're not only destroying our values, you're destroying other people's values whom you're not touching because they have to look at it, too. So I think you'd better take that into consideration when you give your ballpark figures because there isn't anybody in this room who's given you permission to even come in and survey.

And if you're going to use eminent domain, which I think is probably the only way you're going to get this ground, you know, there will be something other than low ballpark. You need to go across the land that's already been ruined by the mining, not ruin --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: As I've mentioned before, though, we are -- we've talked about the Blackfoot drainage. We are -- as much snow as we get up there, we are a lot of the watershed for the counties
down below us, a lot, and that's -- that's what
(inaudibles), you know, as well.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Any questions?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You've talked about a
lot of things here and you got a lot of holes in your
program, a lot of things that you haven't done that
could be done to alleviate the concerns that we're
expressing here today. Are you going to do anything
about this or are you just giving us lip service?

MR. ORTH: I'll go back and -- I believe we've
actually done a lot more than I've stated today.
Unfortunately, I'm not the best -- I'm not a lawyer.
I'm not a realty agent. I -- I don't have all the
answers, but we will go -- I will go back, yes, and make
sure --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think we need to have
at least one more meeting on this to find out what
you've done with these suggestions and holes that we're
finding that you haven't done.

MR. ORTH: We --

MR. WILLIAMS: We will have a follow-up
meeting. We did not expect --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, it's only going to
get worse if you guys keep going with this
(inaudibles) --
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Don't you remember the meeting at the high school? It was (inaudibles) --

MR. WILLIAMS: What I am saying is that if we would have known the type of questions that was going to be fielded today, we would have brought our environmental specialist, who is also a project leader on the environmental side, and probably brought our attorney who deals with environmental and property so that your -- the questions that you gave us today could be answered. So we definitely will have a follow-up because you raised a lot of issues that maybe I wasn't as aware of as I am today and so this is definitely on my screen.

And, as I mentioned at the beginning, my responsibility is to have a positive relationship with the State of Idaho, the citizens, the elected officials, government officials. And today I -- I can promise you we will have a follow-up meeting. We will more than attempt to address your issues and concerns.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The best one I've heard so far is that gentleman sitting by you. If you look at this map, all you have to do is change a few of the directions in there and this whole problem goes away. And I don't know why you guys haven't done that.

MR. ORTH: We have done that. We --
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But it seems so easy --

MR. ORTH: I know.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- if you look at this map, just swing it around a little bit and it all goes away. Avoid the mines, avoid all this stuff, change the direction a little bit and you don't even need to bother us up here (inaudibles).

MR. ORTH: I'll look into it some more.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. ORTH: We will -- like John said, we'll definitely be having a public meeting when we publish the draft environmental impact statement sometime in September, that's for sure. Probably have two meetings actually, because I know --

MR. WILLIAMS: We probably need to have one before then.

MR. ORTH: Good idea.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Agreed.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. That sounds good.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Next time let the hunters know about this deal on Gravel Creek.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah (inaudibles).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Williams --

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Jjwilliams@BPA.gov.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just one suggestion. I
think that what the attitude of most of the folks here, when you bring more people back, it probably would be good if they were straight talk and not super polished, you know, to gloss over something just -- I don't think anybody is going to buy -- I think you've probably figured that out. Nobody is going to buy a well -- well-spoken excuse. Whatever it is, I would hope that there would be some straight talk on what some alternatives can be, what some possibilities could be and how everybody could work this out so it's satisfactory.

MR. ORTH: I do apologize that we weren't as prepared as we should have been.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, I -- I'm sorry that you came, you know, kind of got blindsided. I've had that happen to me, too, and it's not fun. But nonetheless, some good legitimate points, I think, have been raised.

MR. ORTH: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And thank you for your efforts in trying to present some -- some answers.

MR. ORTH: Thank you for having us.

And thank you, everyone, too, for showing up. I know it's not easy getting here.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'd like to thank
everybody that was in here that participated. It was very orderly. Nobody got unruly. I think that's very good. That's very (inaudibles). I compliment everybody.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudibles) at least we leave our guns outside (inaudibles).

MR. ORTH: (Inaudibles) -- I was a bad guy to first step in the door.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. We appreciate it.

MR. ORTH: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

(MEETING CONCLUDED.)
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UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Whoever speaks, it looks like as many people as is in here, let's go with a minute time limit. And state your name before you start to speak because we'll have it all recorded.

Anything else, (inaudible)?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudibles).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Who wants to go first then? John?

MR. WILLIAMS: I guess, good afternoon. This has been quite a process for us and we took it very seriously. As you know, we met with you back in June and there was quite a lot of concerns regarding our transmission project, and so I wanted to make sure we could answer -- since we couldn't answer all your questions at that time, so I did bring more of the project team with me this time. And I think there is about 10 of us, so we should be able to answer most, if not all, of your questions.

Last Friday, I sent to the commissioners and other elected officials how we would move forward in coordinating with you on this very important project. This was started to be answered in a separate document some of the issues and concerns you raised back in June.

Just quickly, I want to go over how I would
like to try to move forward in today's meeting so that we can definitely hear all of the concerns and issues and try to address them. But first, I would like to introduce some of the core people that I bring to you today at this meeting.

You've met Eric Orth, our project manager for this meeting. The next person is our attorney, Ernie Estes -- I hope I don't get any of this wrong -- our environmental crew, Tish Eaton. And --

MR. GUSTAVSON: Zach Gustavson.
MR. SANDERS: Steve Sanders.
MR. WILLIAMS: Steve Sanders.

And we have some other people here, but I will let the project core project team introduce those folks to you later.

And our realty person on the ground is Joe Katerro, so I just wanted to just mention that because those would be the core people addressing the issues and concerns.

You should also know that the Office of Energy Resources interim director John Chapburn met with us back on August 31. They are a cooperating agency, which means that they're going to gather and speak for the State of Idaho through the governor's office. So other
state entities, particularly departments who may have
some things or input will funnel their information and
career concerns to that particular office, the Office of Energy
Resources.

Now, John had some issues and concerns, as
well, that was aligned with what we heard back in June.
So, again, we're here to package that so that we could
provide that information to you.

And lastly, moving forward, we would like to
also mention what our tentative schedule would be for
the -- for the project moving forward.

And with that, I'm going to let the project
manager, Eric, present the information that he would
like to put before you.

MR. ORTH: Thank you, John.
So you'd mentioned one minute. I'm going to --
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could I get your name?
MR. ORTH: Oh, Eric Orth, project manager for

Bonneville Power Administration.
(Inaudibles).
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. The presenters
will have more than one minute.
MR. ORTH: Okay.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And it will be questions
that will be held to a minute.
MR. ORTH: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner.

Thanks, everyone, also, for making the trip here today and thank you for having us back here. A lot of familiar faces here today and we're hoping that we can answer the questions that you had back in June, as well as John Chapburn's questions and any of 'em that we have today. We have a much bigger staff here that -- that should be able to answer them.

Back when we met in June, there was a lot of questions focused on our original southern route that Lower Valley Energy had presented as the original proposed plan of action for the transmission line. And so we got a sense in the meeting back in June that -- that there was a lot of questions on why Bonneville had -- had abandoned that and had we looked at seriously keeping the line in that position. So we took that back to our office over the last few months and dug up -- dug up the information that we had back in 2010 when we first started the project. We went through our environmental assessment with the Lower Valley route and -- and didn't go forward with that.

And so after that, that's when we started looking at -- looking at first that that original route would be -- would be possible still. And then from that, we further developed the northern alternative.
The southern alternative -- one of the first things we did, we did talk to Lower Valley Energy about being able to lower our risks, environmental and legal and financial risks, by, you know, continuing to put a line in that -- in that original route. They weren't interested, I guess, in giving Bonneville any kind of hold harmless agreement by moving forward, and so that -- that's -- that was one big issue for us.

And then -- so then when Bonneville first started our -- our proposed project and started our environmental impact statement, NEPA process for the new proposed plan, we did -- we did sit down and meet with some of the mining companies, talked to them over in Pocatello about -- about what -- what our environmental and legal risks are and by, you know, putting -- putting a line across the area that's mined here to the south -- or excuse me -- to the north of Soda Springs.

There's certainly -- I think a lot of you've seen the maps with our mine lease areas. There's also the areas that are currently under investigation, areas for -- for the Super Fund sites. And so we -- we discussed with them, you know, what -- what we could do to -- to also enter into some kind of hold harmless agreement. Some of the mining companies agree that we could look at it. One of 'em, unfortunately, did not
agree. So we were left then with, again, with a large risk environmentally and legal risks that could impact and become a financial risk to Bonneville and their ratepayers.

Then we also did discuss with EPA, talked to them. Unfortunately, within the CERCLA law that -- that manages the Super Fund site, once it's identified and being investigated, there's -- there's not a way to enter into a hold harmless agreement with the company. We -- we still could be held -- held liable. And so those are some of the issues that -- some of the big hurdles that we saw in that original -- original southern route.

And some of the things we've done since then, this summer, we -- we did go back and we've talked to Lower Valley because they did have a number of easements that they had purchased, both from private landowners, from the mining companies, and also established easements across the Forest Service land and some BLM land. Took a look at their easements and we did decide they were transferrable.

Some of the biggest concerns that we have, though, is they didn't include any access roads. And so our -- Bonneville's standard is to have full year-round access to each one of the structures. And so with that,
we couldn't -- we would have to go back and -- even if we were able to transfer those easements, we'd have to go back and negotiate access roads across those easements and, also, any access roads that didn't fall within those easements. So that was -- that was going to be a large hurdle.

One of -- one of our concerns with the mining -- the number of mine lease areas out there across where the southern original route crossed is, from an operational standpoint, putting a transmission line across an area that has a high potential of future mining. Since -- since '08 when that original route was scoped out, there's actually already been an area that was a potential mine at the time and now it's going to become a mine. And so that -- that shows to us that that is an active area of change. And so putting a line across that area is -- is a risk to Bonneville that -- that we would potentially in the future have to move that line at our cost unless we negotiated an easement at the time it's signed. And so with that, that's a -- it's a -- it's a -- it's a big problem for us to put a line that's going to -- we have to pay for it twice and move it again sometime in the future.

Some of the other questions we had in general about landowners and willing landowners, you know,
allowing us, I guess, on their property to investigate and look at the -- look at our proposed route to the north, just I want you to know that we're continuing to work with each individual landowner, looking at ways to -- to minimize their impacts, changing routes, changing access roads. We've made a few changes since we met in June to help some landowners. It has moved the line across some new landowners, so we are having to work with them -- the new landowners, that is.

Some of the questions that came from John Chapburn, Department -- or the Office of Energy Resources, you were asking about access and staying as close to Highway 34 as possible, minimizing our need to build a lot of access roads. And we certainly -- our proposed action that follows the northern route, we do follow Highway 34 very closely.

There are two areas that we do vary away from it. One is across state land and it's -- it was mainly a -- an issue with the terrain and, also, just trying to sight the line as straight as possible.

Another area is up around the Gray's Lake area and trying to stay away from that migrating bird path, so it's where we cut up and over the hill, across the Forest Service land. And so that -- that was -- one of the main reasons is to stay away from the birds' flight
path and, as well as, it would have impacted a handful of other landowners and more mileage across private landowners.

There was talk last time -- questions about how we sighted the line across public and private. I think there was the perception maybe the southern route crossed a lot more public lands. We went back and looked at that and it actually crosses a lot more private land -- percentage of private land versus public federal land than our northern route. Our northern route, it still crosses a fair amount of private landowners, but we do cross a lot BLM, BIA and a good chunk of Forest Service land.

When we met in June, too, I think there was some -- some questions of cost that we couldn't -- couldn't answer that day. We went back and looked at our estimates. You know, the southern route, it was a -- it's a double-circuit line where each pole would carry six wires. It was estimated at 22 miles in length. Our northern alternative, which -- which will hook either into the line or into a substation because it -- it connects -- a direct connection to two substations. We only had to make it a single circuit where there is only three wires held by each pole and it was 32 miles.
And looking at the cost of the shorter 22-mile double-circuit line or the longer 32-mile single-circuit line, it was -- it was a wash as far as the estimated cost at this time. And so I just wanted to share that with you.

I believe that is all that I wanted to -- to cover. I was hoping maybe if Steve or Ernie had anything to add at this point or John.

MR. ESTES: Well, I think it might be better -- Ernie Estes from BPA.

I think it might be better to solicit questions at this time, if that's okay with the commissioners.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. ORTH: And I can certainly help facilitate answering questions I can and then I can direct the ones that I can't answer to the folks that are here today.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. ORTH: If that works for you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Questions?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I've got a question.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. On the north versus the south route, private versus public, wouldn't it be true that there is maybe less public land that you go across, but there is a larger percent of private land
that you do not go across because the route is not shorter? So if you had total miles of private one side versus the other, north versus the south, there would still be significantly less on -- on -- on private land, wouldn't it?

MR. ORTH: That's -- that -- that could be true, yes, because you're looking at 22 miles versus --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Because the -- the other route is a third shorter basically?

MR. ORTH: That -- that is -- that is correct. I'm trying to get our -- the other --

So our -- our northern route that is the 32 miles -- I apologize. I don't have it here in front of me -- yeah, that -- that -- that would -- that is possibly correct.

I mean, we can go back and look at the numbers. The percentages, though, when we're looking at -- it is a higher percentage of -- of public land for the longer route. But when you look at total mileage, yes, it may be a wash or it may be -- it may be less just because of the -- the one is shorter.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I suspicion that it would be less by quite a large margin on private land.

Another thing that I'm -- I'm curious about -- and I certainly don't know your business as well as you
do -- but your road standards for year-round access,
I've seen a lot of power lines and some of 'em going
over difficult terrain that do not seem to have any sort
of road access and they seem to get along fine.
What is it that compels BPA to demand
year-round access roads?

MR. ORTH: We -- we operate in -- we want to be
able to operate and maintain our system that enables us
to do so year-round. I wouldn't -- you are correct.
There's lines that don't have permit roads to them and
they operate just fine. The biggest issue is when we do
have an outage or a need to maintain it, especially
during poor weather conditions and you can't get to it
because there is no road, that -- that's -- it's --
it's in case of the emergency situation and so that's --
we've developed our engineering standards and our
operational standards to accommodate year-round access
to all our structures.

It also eases us in maintenance. We do a lot
of, like, visual checks to the line throughout the year
and so that -- that is what we have adopted as our
operational and maintenance standards.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you.

Another -- another item with Mr. Chapburn from
the Energy Resources Department. He mentioned to me
when we talked that -- that he would be really
interested in having his office and along with the DEQ
perhaps do a little negotiation with the EPA and see if
there wasn't something to -- they could work out along
with some legislators to ease the way for BPA to go
through there on a hold harmless.

Did he mention anything about that to you?

MR. ORTH: When we met with him last month, he
didn't mention it. But John has met with him since.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this something that
would interest you?

MR. ORTH: Yes, we are certainly open to any
ideas, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. There is one more
issue here that I've -- I have got down that I wanted to
discuss and there's somebody that's -- that are more
qualified than myself here in the audience, and that's
for the migrating birds that you are putting the line or
proposed to put the line in the spot that you have now
got. And that would be Dr. Rod Druan, and he is the
resident biologist that's been associated for a long
time with the national wildlife refuge.

Mr. Druan, could you speak for a minute on the
migratory bird issue with the power lines.

MR. DRUAN: I'd just (inaudible) with the
route.

My name is Rod Druan. I live in the spring, summer and fall at Wayan the past 40 -- over 40 years and I have spent over 20 years working on the birds at Gray's Lake National Wildlife Refuge, particularly cranes and geese, through the University of Idaho. And I am now retired.

Anyway, I've just put your map on the computer and I couldn't pick a worse route to go for migratory birds. And they're probably no doubt going to be based on (inaudibles) and having inquired of several environmental groups about this kind of foolishness of putting big transmission lines right on primary migration routes of large birds and, hence, cranes, geese, trumpeter swans. By the way, trumpeter swans, the local population in Idaho is listed as critically imperiled. (Inaudible) folks trying to deal with that.

Anyway, it's a lot of nonsense I see looking at that route. You are in a major migration route, have a scenic highway and we have a historic Lander Trail out there and you guys want to plow right through that with your -- what I consider mess. And there's better ways to go.

Your southern route, I've looked at that. That's pretty (inaudible) except you have these -- I
consider -- phony reasons why you shouldn't be looking
at that.

I've wondered, have you ever done a thorough
geologic assessment of that southern route? You are
worried about these potential contaminants and such. If
so, I'd like to see it. I'd like to see a copy of this.

You guys just sit up there in Portland and take
maps out and draw lines. I find them not very
satisfactory and acceptable. I hope you do a more
thorough environmental assessment out there than what
you are doing.

And lastly, you are subject to laws such as the
Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1980, which opens you wide
open to suits, the Eagle Act of 1940 -- and we can go on
and on and on. So I'd like to see these things
addressed and not just sit there in some office in
Portland and come up with a bunch of nonsense. And
that's what I consider your proposal, nonsense.

(Appause.)

MR. ORTH: Thank you. I appreciate your
comments and concerns.

MR. DRUAN: And thank you for (inaudible).

MR. ORTH: We do. We welcome them and we do
appreciate them. We appreciate comments and questions
that anybody in this room has.
We are globally -- just to let you know, we are working on our draft environmental impact statement which does take into account the Migratory Bird Act, the -- any of the flight patterns of the -- of the regional birds and we do take into account our ESA species in the area, both animals, plants. And so we are taking that into account.

Our draft EIS, we are looking at publishing in November, and so that -- that will include all of our analysis. Now, certainly if there are local or regional folks that are much more in tune and experts to what's going on in this area, I think we'd certainly invite getting any -- any information or passing knowledge on to us so that we can properly do our -- our environmental analysis and include all of those concerns.

As you probably understand, too, there are many, many resources that we're trying balance here, the impacts to. Certainly building a transmission line anywhere is going to have an impact on any number of resources. We balance, you know, biology, plant life, cultural resources and so, yeah, it's -- it's difficult. And then the -- I guess your perception of our worries of risks, environmentally, legal, financial risks of crossing the southern route may be perceived as phony,
but they are real risks to our ratepayers.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Though perceived?

That's a big one, perceived.

MR. ORTH: You want to follow up with anything or Tish?

MR. ESTES: Ernie Estes of BPA.

Was there a question in the -- in the statement, if we can respond to any questions within the statement? I heard mostly statements.

MR. ORTH: Okay. I just want to check, too, before we get too far, are we limited on time? Do you have another agenda item at 4:00?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

MR. ORTH: We're -- we're certainly here as long as needed.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think are we.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, we're here, too.

MR. ORTH: Okay. I do want to know, -- I do want it to be known, too, that we will have at least one public meeting when the draft EIS comes out, so there will be another -- at least one formal public forum once that is released. And we also always do offer letters. Any time we have questions or comments, too, we invite people to send those in whenever you have 'em. There doesn't need to be a formal -- a formal comment period.
We'll take 'em anytime.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. A question about your formal meeting that you intend to have. Is this going to be a meeting that will have a moderator and will have minutes and questions and answers in an organized forum or is this going to be another kind of walk-about and chat with the folks there?

MR. ORTH: We could -- we could look at doing it any number of ways. A lot of times in the past, we have more of an open-house format. But if -- if -- if the commissioners and others believe it would be a better format to have a moderator and have a presentation and then ask open house for questions after that, we can do it that way.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just question how comments and questions of the audience can be recorded and addressed, you know, and kept other than just from memory if there isn't minutes taken and, you know, a formal question-and-answer?

MR. ORTH: We will have comments covered and there are -- there are formal comment forms at the meetings that we have, but we will have someone taking notes at those meetings.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And minutes?

MR. ORTH: And minutes, yes.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. You didn't have that in the -- at the last meeting, did you, at the high school? I never saw anyone taking any minutes or notes.

MR. ORTH: We -- no, we did not. We took -- we took -- we captured all the comments from the -- from the comment forms that were there available for folks to fill out and any other comments that we could take while we were visiting the folks. We took that all back as we were scoping the project.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Thanks. I've got a couple of more, but I think I'll wait until everybody else has a chance to say or comment or whatever.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Senator Goedde.

MR. TIPPETS: Thank you, Commissioner. John -- John Tippets. Senator Goedde is (inaudible) --

So, Eric, can you tell me where we are today? Is there still an opportunity for this group to impact the route of that line or are you guys set on the northern route at this point and it's a done deal?

MR. ORTH: There's still plenty of opportunity to make adjustments to the route. Like I'd mentioned, there are large hurdles in that southern route and so we -- you know, we are looking a lot at the northern
route, but there's certainly opportunities. No final decisions have been made. We're far from it. And so there are still opportunities, yes.

MR. TIPPETS: Follow up (inaudible).

Eric, in the last meeting in June, the contention was made that the transmission line would go -- that if you would take that southern route, you would have to travel across some of the historic mining sites that were CERCLA sites. It would look like from that map there was a route where you could skirt all of those. Sometimes the corridors are pretty narrow, but it looked like there were some corridors where you could stay out of those sites.

Have you looked at doing that and, if so, why are you dismissing that option (inaudible) --

MR. ORTH: We have -- we haven't completely dismissed anything at this point. We have looked more closely at skirting a route through there. We can get around the potential leased mine sites. However, there is one particular investigation area that is so large that it creates a -- it does create a barrier that we need to cross the investigation area or a mining lease site to intersect with the existing Lower Valley Energy transmission line that we'd have to connect it to.

MR. TIPPETS: One more thing. So what are you
doing, then, at this point to (inaudibles)? Are you still doing some work to see if that's a viable option?

MR. ORTH: Yep. We're -- we're actually -- we're still getting some data from the Bureau of Land Management to take a look at that to make sure we do have all the data on the map. We will take a field look here before the winter to take a look at the route as it leads up the Blackfoot River Road. That's right here. Maybe it's -- I'd to have look.

But, yeah, we will -- we will do a field visit and take a look at that. Not -- certainly not dismissing it at this point.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Appreciate it. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Jim, excuse me. Commissioner?

MR. SMITH: Do you have a name for that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Your name?


Do you have a name for that route that you are -- or that area that you are concerned about that may have potential mining on it? Do you know which mines it is?

MR. ORTH: It's -- it's it's the North Maybe mine.
MR. SMITH: Okay. What is that?

MR. ORTH: North Maybe mine. It's to the -- it's near the far east, yeah.

MR. TIPPETS: I'm done.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Merle Botley.

MR. BOTLEY: The last time we were here you said that the increase to the northern route would cost an additional $10 million versus going with the southern route and now this time you're telling us it's a wash. What happened to that $10 million?

MR. ORTH: I -- I didn't have all the information in front of me at that time. I was taking a guess and I probably shouldn't have done that. I went back and looked at our numbers of the original routes. We looked at our numbers of the northern route and it's essentially a wash.

MR. BOTLEY: A wash.

Okay. So how much is this project costing?

MR. ORTH: This -- this -- you know, until we got through our NEPA, you know, we can't say for sure.

MR. BOTLEY: Estimated?

MR. ORTH: Estimated, we're looking from 50 to 60 million.

MR. BOTLEY: Okay. You're going to pass 50 or $60 million in charges off to these people over in Star
Valley, is that what you are telling us?

MR. ORTH: No. We will -- our ratepayers, they pay a portion of our entire system that we build, own and operate and we have --

MR. BOTLEY: Well, who's paying for this thing then?

MR. ORTH: Our ratepayers.

MR. BOTLEY: Well, who are they then? Where are we -- who's going to pay for this?

MR. ORTH: A lot of the folks in the room today are ratepayers.

MR. BOTLEY: Okay. So our rates are going up is what you are saying?

MR. ORTH: We -- in order to continue safe operation of the system here in southeast Idaho to serve both -- you know, anybody that lives here in this county or western Wyoming, yes, we need to put in a -- our proposed project, either a southern route or a northern route, in order to continue safe operation of the facilities.

Yeah, go ahead.

MR. ESTES: Ernie Estes, BPA, again.

Any -- the construction of any route is going to have a cost impact on our ratepayers. Our ratepayers are west -- Montana west to the Great Divide, to the
Canadian border, to the Pacific Ocean, to extreme northern California. Most of the citizens living in that area pay for projects like these. $50 million is not -- is not chump change, but in our expenditures over a year or two, that's not a lot of money. We pay more than a billion dollars every year for our -- repaying the federal government for our expenses. So it is a significant amount of money, but to say that, it is not likely that this particular project, you will see a change in your bill because of it. It doesn't mean that a particular project doesn't increase the cost of the -- of the system to the ratepayers. It does. But you have to look at all of our expenses in that context.

MR. BOTLEY: Okay. When you say northern California, how far south does that go?

MR. ESTES: Not very far.

MR. BOTLEY: Does it take San Francisco?

MR. ESTES: No, it just is very northern California. We have Sun Valley -- what's the name of the -- Lakeview and there's a town in northern California that Bonneville serves.

MR. BOTLEY: So basically it's Oregon, Washington, some in California, Idaho?

MR. ESTES: Yeah, it's principally Oregon and Washington and Idaho.
MR. BOTLEY: Okay. Now, is it possible, once you get this line in, that you are going to be able to transmit more electricity into a higher-priced market such as Portland or Seattle; is that what we're playing with here?

MR. ESTES: That was not the purpose of the --

MR. BOTLEY: Well, that's what you are telling us.

MR. ESTES: The purpose of this line is to make our system more reliable.

MR. BOTLEY: Why is it unreliable right now?

MR. ORTH: There's -- we've -- we've got -- looking at the generation at Paddle Creek Dam and the lines that feed in and out of that, our generation constraints at the dam, and then also having to feed all the load in the area, we have certain lines that will be overloaded unless we have another link in the line to offset that from being overloaded, to redirect power to get to other areas. And it's all contained right here in southeast Idaho and western Wyoming.

MR. BOTLEY: I can't happen to think that you got 50 million bucks or whatever you are talking about, you're going to ship this power somehow into a higher-priced market because I am assuming that Seattle and Portland and maybe some of the larger cities pay
more for their power than we do here. And that's what you are enabling this thing to happen.

MR. ORTH: I'm -- I'm -- sir, I'm not familiar with our power rate structure or our transmission rate structure, but --

MR. BOTLEY: But doesn't the -- the numbers don't make sense what you're saying. You've got 50 million bucks and it's supposed to help us here and that does not make sense.

MR. ORTH: The purpose and need of the project is to add a link to the transmission system in southeast Idaho so that we don't have a full collapse of the area or --

MR. BOTLEY: Well, have you ever had a collapse of it?

MR. ORTH: Well, no, because we operate our system in a manner that doesn't allow that to happen.

MR. BOTLEY: Okay. So then everything -- I mean, if everything were to stay constant, we'd be okay?

MR. ORTH: Yes.

MR. BOTLEY: Okay. So then why are we putting the new line in?

MR. ORTH: Because we have a load growth of 3 percent in this area.

MR. BOTLEY: So there is some growth then?
MR. ORTH: In this area, yeah.

MR. BOTLEY: Okay. But I haven't seen any of this growth. Where is it happening? Is it Jackson Hole?

MR. ORTH: It's -- it's in -- it's in the area that we serve there. It's south -- it's all southeast Idaho and, yes, in western Wyoming.

MR. BOTLEY: Due to the recession, this growth has not happened.

MR. ORTH: Our -- our numbers show it has.

MR. BOTLEY: Where?

MR. ORTH: In industry load. And it may not necessarily be population. It could be industrial load. Some of it, I'm sure, is population. There's a number of factors of how we look at load growth. We look at our numbers that are -- are our planning numbers and how much power is getting used throughout the system and -- and, you know, over a 25-year period, we continue to see (inaudible) --

MR. BOTLEY: So we're in a recession and you're saying your demand has gone up 3 percent? Does that make sense, really?

MR. ORTH: People use more computers --

MR. BOTLEY: Why has oil dropped down 8 percent just this week? I mean -- I mean energy costs are going
down because there's no demand for 'em and you are
telling us we're going up 3 percent. This does not make
sense.

MR. ORTH: I -- I can't answer why it does or
doesn't make sense. I just know that there is load
growth in the area and we have to keep up with it,
otherwise, we will have a situation where we will start
losing lines, we will start dropping people off in the
middle of winter. And that's not how we want to operate
our system.

MR. BOTLEY: Has that ever happened that you
have had to drop people off?

MR. ORTH: Yes.

MR. BOTLEY: Where at?

MR. ORTH: It has happened -- well, it has
happened in the Portland area, yes. It happened in the
northeast United States. We dropped off however many
million customers.

MR. BOTLEY: Northeast United States?

MR. ORTH: Yes.

MR. BOTLEY: We're not concerned with them.

MR. ORTH: Well, I know, but those are the
types of situations that we have to be sure that we
don't put ourselves in.

MR. BOTLEY: Okay. Let's shift gears here. I
think I have made my point on this.

You mentioned in your comments -- opening comments there were about four mining companies; that all of three of 'em are -- I picked up four. I don't know -- okay -- three of 'em have agreed to a hold harmless agreement, one of 'em isn't or hasn't given you that. From what I heard from the last meeting, most of that stuff's Monsanto and they spent upwards of a million bucks -- I don't know where I am getting my numbers from -- they've spent upwards of a million bucks to figure out a plan so you guys could go through that southern route and all of a sudden this is just null and void. And -- and then you're telling us that there are four of 'em involved. Who's the fourth one that's not playing ball here?

MR. ORTH: So --

MR. BOTLEY: Why aren't they here today?

MR. ORTH: I can't tell you why they're not --

MR. BOTLEY: Were they invited?

MR. ORTH: This is a public meeting, so everyone is invited, yes.

MR. BOTLEY: Do you know the reason why they don't give you -- won't give you that hold harmless?

MR. ORTH: I think because -- I don't -- I believe because the reason that --
MR. WILLIAMS: Let me try answer that.

This is a meeting to explain some of the things that are happening at Bonneville in connection with this project and it is also to get information and comments from the people who are affected from the public. We're still human beings. We're still planning this project. What we are currently in the process of doing is preparing environmental reviews for this project that will aid us in deciding exactly which route we will take.

It's -- we can be responsible for the things that we do. What we do with landowners in the areas that we are considering, we let them know that we are in the area. We provide information to them so that they can communicate effectively with us.

MR. BOTLEY: Okay. I want to communicate. I don't like you in my area. How's that for communication?

MR. WILLIAMS: It would be better if you put it in writing and sent it to us. It would be more effective. We can certainly take that (inaudible), but what you have to understand is that the agency is chartered by Congress to --

MR. BOTLEY: So you're the government is what you're saying, for the people, by the people and you're
shoving this down our throats?

MR. WILLIAMS: I don't think it's -- I don't
think it's helpful to argue --

MR. BOTLEY: Well, I'm just calling it the way
I see it here.

MR. WILLIAMS: And you are welcome to do that.

MR. BOTLEY: Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Bonneville has to serve all the
citizens of this region.

MR. BOTLEY: At the expense of the people in
Wayan?

MR. WILLIAMS: I don't think at this point that
we have reached this conclusion that you have suggested.

MR. BOTLEY: What?

MR. WILLIAMS: We have not concluded that we
are constructing a line at the cost -- primary cost to
the citizens here. You mentioned earlier that you're --
you suggested earlier that your rates might increase
because we place this line. We responded that we have
many expenses and this is a small one compared to them
so that it is not likely that the expenses for this line
will show up on your bill directly.

Having said that --

MR. BOTLEY: Okay. That's a nominal concern.

My concern is I live in Wayan. We've got a
place there in Wayan and you're bringing that thing within 100 feet of our house, our home. I believe it's 400. Pardon me. (Inaudible) the strip's 100 feet.

It's going to be 400 feet from our house.

MR. WILLIAMS: Most -- we have many challenging questions that are associated with planning and -- the planning -- planning and deciding whether to build a line and where to build the line and yours is one of many. You -- the southern route is a series of questions, the northern route is a series of questions. There will be some folks who would think it's a good idea to have a more reliable system that benefits the region. Others will say, It's a line. I don't want it in my backyard.

We confront those things regularly on most of our decisions, but the key thought that I'd like to give to you is that that's not the question you ask if there's an outage here. Part of the goal is to avoid those outages. Can you promise that nothing will occur? No. It is an electrical system. Can you make it more likely that there will be no loss of load in our area if one line goes out? Yes, we can. That's exactly what we're doing.

MR. BOTLEY: Okay. But what we're saying is, yeah, we need that line or you need the line or
whatever, but with a little work and effort and negotiations, from what we were seeing it there, take that southern route and -- as the Senator over here said -- move the -- move it so you're not going across the mining and all that threat that you're worried about. Do a little more work and then it solves the problem and Wayan won't have to deal with this thing.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, someone will have to deal with it, right?

MR. BOTLEY: Well, this (inaudible) was wide open.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We've already given you a route. To have to find ways to take it is the problem. You have weird perceptions up there in Portland.

MR. BOTLEY: And another thing, you're worried about all these birds and stuff. You're giving them more preference than you are us as people. I'm sorry, but that's the way I feel about this. Yeah, it's important that we worry about these birds and all that kind of stuff, but we've got people living in that place, too, and this stuff's coming right down through here.

And I think she said last time, this is going to destroy that valley. But you people in Portland, it
doesn't matter to you because you live in Portland.

MR. ORTH: Sir, we -- you live off of Wayan Loop Road, right?

MR. BOTLEY: Yes. And you are planning to take that right up over our hill.

MR. ORTH: And we encourage you to work with us to find --

MR. BOTLEY: I don't want work with you. I don't have to work with you.

MR. ORTH: You don't --

MR. BOTLEY: Don't bring the line to my house. It's that simple.

MR. ORTH: Okay. By that statement alone, it makes it difficult for us to work with you.

MR. BOTLEY: I hope it's impossible for you, if you want my honest opinion.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're not very workable with us.

MR. BOTLEY: You shove stuff down our throats when you have an alternative route and the only answer is questions of why you really can't go through there because of one mining company. That's (inaudible) answer these questions. You're trying to sidetrack us. You sidetrack us with other nonsense and you don't get there is a real issue of putting it in an area having
less impact on people and less impact on the land, on private lands in particular, and less impact on the wildlife. And you don't seem to consider that.

You sit up in Portland and come up with these ridiculous possible problems that are probably nonexistent. Like I say, I'd like to see your geological profile on that area through there to really discuss the issue of potential contamination as I hear from some of you people on it. Where is all that stuff? I don't see any of it. I don't hear you talking about it.

MR. ORTH: That's not --

MR. BOTLEY: (Inaudible) the other route that doesn't impact the number of people, the wildlife or the private lands. There is a whole bunch of important issues right there and you have not addressed those. I find you guys typical government bureaucrats that tell us a bunch of gobbledygook nothing. Yeah.

MR. WILLIAMS: We've got somebody else down there. Madelyn.

MS. BLOCKSON: My name is Madelyn Blockson and I live at Wayan at the end of Gravel Creek Road.

And when you are talking about your preliminary workup, I -- we've been told all along that we would seek permission to go on your land. On July 15, my
daughter and I found surveyors just east of my property, 
a fence to the south and a fence to the west. And I 
said to the Adam Dell, who was the head guy -- kid 
there, I said, What are you doing on my property? And 
he said, I'm surveying. I'm on forest land property. 
I said, You are not on forest land property. 
And I would like you guys -- to invite you out 
and show you where my cattle are -- are grazing and look 
at the -- the cow pies and this is the area they were in 
and it is my property. 

Three -- another issue -- I know I don't have 
much time -- but three weeks ago -- my home is fenced 
all in. And three weeks ago, 90 feet from my deck, I 
found a beautiful pine tree chopped down. I have 
pictures to show you. And that was planted probably 20 
to 25 years ago by my husband. He is no longer here and 
each day that pine tree becomes just a little more 
valuable to me. 

No one has ever come to me and said -- a Mr. 
Brown or somebody came several months ago and I said, 
I'm not giving permission anywhere. I gave no 
permission to either individual. 

And how would you like to have someone coming 
and 90 feet from your deck and cut off a beautiful pine 
tree and just leave it turned over?
And I'd like to show the picture to you. It makes me so angry I just can't hardly contain myself.

I never said anything to the -- to the surveyors because I didn't want to make any problems. But when I saw that pine tree, I was mad as you know what.

Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have another one.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My name is (inaudible).

I am from Wayan and I just have a couple of quick questions and one statement.

My one statement: I think there's several people in the valley that they've trespassed on that has not given permission besides Madelyn with pictures, other people have that they've been. That's my statement.

My question is -- my first question is: What about the power that will be coming from the Simplot mine in two years when they close down that will no longer be used? Is that something that can go into the system and be distributed? They use an awful lot of power up there and they're going to be closing down. What will happen to the power wattage that was used at Simplot?

My second question is: You were concerned
about the impact study with the mines that -- and having
to move because of the proposed mining site. One is the
mountains that you are going over in Wayan is also a
proposed mining site. Has that been addressed if you go
in and dig? And what with that, it's also proposed? So
what if you put it there, just like you're saying you
don't want to go the southern route, it would be the
same issue with this northern route. If you go over
that mountain that is a proposed mining, you will have
to move the transmission line.

And I was just curious on if you have done a
study on that, where those -- where that line would go?

MR. ORTH: I'll start with your -- your
second --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. ORTH: -- question.

I was not aware of our proposed route crossing
a potential leased mining site in the Wayan area.

Certainly if you have additional information -- I'm not
sure if it's your land or --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, it's not my land.

MR. ORTH: But -- yeah, if we need to look and
get more information on that, then, yeah, we can do
that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's forest -- forest
MR. ORTH: It is -- oh, it's forest land?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's forest land.

MR. ORTH: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So is the mining area.

MR. ORTH: Okay. The Forest Service is a cooperating agency on the project and so we can -- we can get with them and square that away --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So what's the difference -- oh, I guess it's not forest, but this proposed mining is private on the southern route, the proposed mining is private (inaudible) --

MR. ORTH: It's -- it's a mix of both, both private -- mining companies have their land that they own that the route crosses and then there's also the route crosses federal land that companies have mineral rights to do the mining across the federal lands.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So the -- the public or the forest on the southern route has gave you permission, just like I guess you were saying they did in the Wayan area?

MR. ORTH: They gave Lower Valley permission to have an easement, yes, across that property. They haven't -- they haven't --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Then what about the
mining impact? If we're worried about the mining impact on the southern route, wouldn't it be the same as the forest in the Wayan area, the mining impact?

MR. ORTH: Yes. The potential impact, yeah, it would be -- it would be similar in nature. The southern route does have a rather steep area that we're cutting through. If we had to move the line, we may be in a position there is nowhere to move it and so having -- having the line -- having access to it could become a real -- a real issue for us.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Now, your line will enter in Alpine through that rugged country. Does it have an access road to provide the 12-month access through the -- where the line goes through the Swan Valley?

MR. ORTH: Yes. And the Swan Valley --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's a line --

MR. ORTH: Across the Tetons, is that what you're --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. From -- it would be Alpine north through those --

MR. ORTH: That's Lower Valley Energy's (inaudible) --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. Lower Valley goes from Alpine north. We have from (inaudible) to the
Palisades, Palisades to Swan Valley and then Drummond to Maxwell --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. And is the line --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Those --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- there east of the highway through those mountains there?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The (inaudible) Tetons over to Wyoming?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. 6.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's ours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And it has the access road --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. You run down (inaudible) that's one of our lines.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. And what about the Simplot issue?

MR. ORTH: So on your first question, so that power, we don't serve that power directly. Certainly any power that's not used could be used by others.

What our purpose and need of our project is a transmission need. It's not a power need. We -- we need a link in the system to off-load other lines that will become overloaded in the coming years, and so it's not -- it's not a power issue. It's a transmission
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. One more quick question. Back to Merle's question: Who is the fourth entity that will not give you the (inaudible) the mine?

MR. ORTH: There are four main mining companies --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

MR. ORTH: -- Simplot, Monsanto, P-4 and Indywest.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And one of those four will not?

MR. ORTH: Well, one of -- they've -- they've all got their own issues. There was one company that is currently investigated -- has an investigated area, has sued the EPA. And so, yeah, they're not interested in -- in talking with us on a hold harmless because they're in the middle of a lawsuit with the United States government, so...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. ORTH: And getting back to your statements, certainly we -- we have tried -- we heard back in June that there was the possibilities of some trespassing going on. We went back to our folks, Joe, Chan and some of the other realty folks that are working out in the area, and we got the word out to everybody to make sure
that -- that we're only stepping foot on the land that
the landowner has granted permissions.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's nice.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How many landowners have

granted permission?

MR. ORTH: Let me -- let me finish.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. ORTH: And we also have tightened up our

information internally as far as updating spreadsheets
and keeping everybody informed. We have realty staff
out here, survey staff, there are a number of people so
we are trying very hard to do that.

You asked how many. On 32 miles of the line,
we probably have access to, I would say, 25-26 miles of
it. It's --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How much is private,

though?

MR. ORTH: Pardon?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How much of the private

land --

MR. ORTH: How much of that is private?

Probably at least 18 miles of it's private land. All

the way -- this is -- I'm just talking about my northern

route across the --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible).
MR. ORTH: Oh, yes. Maybe you could answer that better --


I don't have the exact numbers of how many PP's we have signed. But as Eric stated, it's a high percentage on the southern route. On the northern route, it's a smaller percentage. So I can get those numbers and get your contact information and follow up with you on that.

So is there any other questions that I can try to follow up with along those lines?

Mrs. Blockson, first of all, I want to apologize to you.

MS. BLOCKSON: Well, I don't know how they had the audacity to just come in and cut a pine? Maybe if they'd cut a quaking down. I got a lot of those. But that's a beautiful tree.

MR. COTRELL: I understand that.

MS. BLOCKSON: And that's right -- right in my front yard.

MR. COTRELL: Mrs. Blockson --

MS. BLOCKSON: How would you like to have 'em do that to you?
MR. COTTRELL: I understand that. I represent Bonneville, but I'm not a surveyor, so I didn't cut your tree.

MS. BLOCKSON: Well, I --

MR. COTTRELL: But I'm trying to --

MS. BLOCKSON: -- I can also say something that's rumored all over Soda Springs about what your surveyors are doing all night and carousing and drinking, and then they go out during the day to survey. How reliable are they after it's rumored that they are playing all night?

MR. COTTRELL: Well, I -- I understand. And if there is validity to the rumors, then we'll address 'em. But, you know --

MS. BLOCKSON: (Inaudible).

MR. COTTRELL: -- it's kind of like throwing numbers out there. There's no substantiation to it. Anybody can say anything. So Bonneville Power, as Eric and Ernie have expressed to John, we're going to put our best foot forward. So if there's some areas that we need work on, like in this situation, then we need deal with 'em.

I can't take back what happened. I can't put the tree back that was cut down, but I can pay you damages for the tree that was cut down.
MS. BLOCKSON: Well, I don't have anybody to plant my trees anymore.

MR. COTTRELL: Well, we can work that out, too. So if there's situations -- and in your case where we cut down one unhelpful tree, the one tree was 90 feet from your house, I don't know how that happened. The trees that were up by the fence line, in talking to the surveyors, my understanding was that there is some discrepancies on the old surveys and the new survey. I'm not saying our guys are in the right. I'm not saying they're in the wrong, but we need to meet and deal with it, so I'd love to meet with you after this. If there's any other questions from landowners regarding realty-related items, I'm the person you need to chat with.

Shane. Okay. Shane Graham from HTR. We've contracted HTR Engineering out of Boise to help me on this project. She's been one of my right arms in the field, so you've probably chatted with her. So if there's any other questions that you have for her, we'll stay around after the meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a question.

MR. COTTRELL: All right. Let me get to her first (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible).
MR. COTTRELL: Yes, sir.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What's going to happen if we don't give you permission and the use to go through our land?

MR. COTTRELL: I'll tell you from my perspective, we really don't want to go onto your property without permission.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm not saying now, but if we don't give you permission and the line goes and we don't sell, what punitive --

MR. COTTRELL: It's going to go up to the project manager and it's going to go all the way to the administrator of Bonneville Power, Steve Wright, or whoever the administrator is at that time. And they're going to review this project and they're going to dictate whether the project warrants going further in a process where we don't have landowner cooperation and that's --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And you're saying that --

MR. COTTRELL: And that's not going to be a call that's going to be made here.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So you're saying you're taking eminent domain?

MR. COTTRELL: I didn't say that, sir.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Let's say it goes to eminent domain --

MR. COTTRELL: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- don't I have a good case where you have an original route that was okayed, approved and turned it down yourselves and didn't have adequate proof that it was inadequate?

MR. COTTRELL: I can't tell you what type of case you would or wouldn't have. I'm not a legal attorney. I can't -- I understand where you are coming from, but --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But you are going through our property, so that's what's going to end up?

MR. COTTRELL: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And, like I say, I think I'd have a pretty good case if -- if you decide to go through me but you had an alternate route that was okayed, you spent a lot of money on and your lawyers said, well, maybe, maybe we can't go there but it's no definite proof?

MR. COTTRELL: And to answer your question -- I can't answer the hypothetical, but I can tell you in our process, in the event that it would go that process, a federal entity as Bonneville Power has a very stringent guideline that we have to adhere in moving a project
forward, so it's not just BPA wants it and it's a done deal. We have a very strict guideline that we have to move forward on, so your word's going to be heard one way or the other.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who oversees that?

MR. COTTRELL: It's -- it's a process through the federal government that Bonneville Power has as a federal entity. But the -- since condemnation came up, condemnation is a right that Bonneville Power has under a federal entity to operate. That authority goes all the way up to the administrator level to assign and dictate whether he will sign off or she at that time -- because we're going to have a new administrator here pretty soon -- whether they're going to go forward with that process. It's not something that's made at our level.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It does go to the Department of Justice at that point and the case is heard in front of a judge and the judge makes the ultimate decision.

MR. COTTRELL: And it's -- it's a process that if it's deemed to go forward and necessary, there's a strict guideline that we have to adhere to in the acquisition of that property. The landowner has a right to hire their own appraiser to compete with Bonneville
Power's appraisal on what they perceive as fair market value. So it's a pretty stringent guideline, so it's not one-sided.

MR. ORTH: One of the things that we -- we like to do is we want to work with the landowner as much as possible, because once it goes to the Department of Justice, it is out of our hands. And so by us working with the landowners up front, we can hopefully avoid that if it gets that --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Have you got any permissions, like -- which direction -- beyond Henry, up in that -- when you start getting into Wayan, have you gotten anybody that's given you permission up in there?

MR. ORTH: Beyond Henry --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It is about where the Blackfoot River comes through there.

MR. ORTH: Yeah, I'd to have check on maps to give you an accurate answer. I think we do, but I'd have to verify and get back to you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. I know what he is talking about (inaudible) --

MR. ORTH: But we -- we can get that information back to you if I can get your --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm thinking everybody -- what is it -- south or -- that's south of
Henry, they've probably given you permission because they don't really care. I'm thinking nobody -- they don't live there is what we're saying. Nobody north of Henry has given you permission, I'll bet you anything on that.

MR. ORTH: I believe that we have one or two, but we'll have to check and follow up on that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, one or two.

MR. ORTH: One or two. But then we quickly get into Forest Service land and then the Wayan area.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. CACKLEY: Allis Cackley.

From the first meeting we had over in the school system, you told us you were going to take the northern route and that was all that it was going to be to it. I asked a number of people at that meeting and it was the northern route, the northern route, the northern route. All the rest of it is out. There was no doubt in your minds that you were going to go about this that way and you've held to it regardless of everything else. There's no room -- there's no compromise at all in your going to the south route, but we know what the plan was. It was to condemn a
right-of-way all the way through private land. And you were determined to do that and you were not going to go the southern route no matter what any of us said and it's been that way every since. And every meeting we've had since, it's the same bunch of crap.

MR. ORTH: Tish, do you want to address that?

MS. EATON: I don't know what the question is. I think it's a statement, so I'm not sure how to respond to that.

MR. ORTH: I -- I can say that when we first had that meeting in the school, we had just come off of doing an environmental assessment on the southern route with Lower Valley. We -- Bonneville did that because we were funding two-thirds of that project at the time, so we had done our environmental analysis on that -- on that route. And so, yeah, we were looking at another alternative to start scoping our EIS. And so we knew a lot of things about that southern route and we didn't know anything at the time about the northern route so, yeah, we were -- we were -- we did talk a lot about developing and doing our environmental assessment across that northern route.

Now -- now we're 24 months down the road and we are going back and looking at -- at the southern route, looking at the options that are really, you know,
showstoppers for us from keeping us from building the line in that -- in that southern position. No final decisions have been made and we are looking at both.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You told us it was final over at the school. You said you were going the northern route and that was it and we could just shove it.

MR. ORTH: I hope I didn't put it in those words and I apologize for making --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I talked to about three people that told me exactly that.

MR. ORTH: I apologize for -- for that message that we gave you that night.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It doesn't sound any different now.

MR. ORTH: We still have many -- many issues with the southern route. We obviously have many issues with the northern route. And -- and we'll -- we'll move forward on our assessments and weigh all the pros and cons of both routes. And when the time is ready, when we can make a decision, we will.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a question, please.

You've got a substation up there off of 34 about Tenco; is that correct?
MR. ORTH: That's Lower Valley Energy's substation.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But isn't that the one where this line will eventually tap into?

MR. ORTH: No. We were going to tap into Lane's Creek substation.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. There's a substation there. I'm not sure --

MR. ORTH: Yeah, where you make the hairpin turn on 34, right there.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's a substation there (inaudible).

Now, is this line not more efficient to go directly into a substation than tapping in the line down below? Isn't that what the bottom line of this thing is?

MR. ORTH: It's -- it's -- it's just as efficient --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, you're running three lines up to the substation. There's the six over into the main line is what you're telling us?

MR. ORTH: Yes. Because if we connect into another line, we actually have to loop the power in and loop it back out.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So you want to hit that
substation?

MR. ORTH: It's -- operationally, yeah, it --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. ORTH: -- it's a better -- it's a better option.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Why don't you build a substation down there -- how expensive are they -- so that the southern route could tap into a substation right there?

MR. ORTH: You are looking at a very large cost added to the project at that point.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How much does a substation run?

MR. ORTH: I --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't know.

MR. ORTH: -- I can't even begin to guess.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: $10 million?

MR. ORTH: More than that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. I can see why you'd want to go up to the substation then.

MR. ORTH: Yeah. The substation itself, I mean, so that everyone understands, it's operated by Lower Valley Energy under a special use permit from the Forest Service. And we'll go into that area in the fenced yard and bring equipment in and also operate it
under a special use permit from the Forest Service.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But it's easier for your line to tap into a substation rather than just get the line similar from the southern route?

MR. ORTH: It is. We provide year-round access to the substation. We have all the switching equipment. And, yes, it's --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So that's why we're going the northern route because that's easier to do?

MR. ORTH: It -- it -- either -- either -- either proposals meet the purpose and need of the project.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But you would prefer to go to the substation?

MR. ORTH: I don't have that preference one way or the other.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, you have enough people here. Tell us. Is it more preferential to go to that substation?

MR. ORTH: It -- it -- I -- I --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Never mind.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well --

MR. ORTH: Tapping a line (inaudible) of, you know, along -- along that -- that route, that highway -- well, it's not even a state highway that runs Lane's
Creek -- south of the Lane's Creek cutoff road. We would be tapping that line out in the middle of nowhere essentially. We put up some disconnect switches so we can operate it one way or the other. And so, yeah, having access -- year-round access to that would be tougher.

I'm not sure exactly what the plowing schedules are of that area of the county, but I imagine they're going to plow 34 first. And, yes, Lane's Creek substation is right off of 34, so operationally, yeah, it's -- it's --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It makes a lot of sense, doesn't it?

MR. ORTH: It would be -- yeah, it meets more of our maintenance needs.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sir, did you have a question?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I do.

I've noticed over this summer in July the survey crews out there working and apparently they're running a preliminary line called an L line -- is what I see on the survey stakes, the stakes that I've seen on Highway 34. And then up on Williamsburg they are going to run right past the three or four recreational
properties, within 150 feet. Is there anything you --
what can you do to move that line away from those
properties to help minimize the impact of that loss of
value because of this project? There's a question.

MR. ORTH: So the recreational areas -- are you
talking about in the Gravel Creek Campground?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. They're -- they're
small, three, five, seven-acre parcels along Highway 34.

MR. ORTH: So I guess we're not aware of --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible) mitigation.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's (inaudible) mitigation.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. You've got real
estate people involved in this project and everybody's
tied together and you know what you are going through
and why, certainly within 150 feet from the centerline
of your project. Can you move that line?

MR. ORTH: Yes, we can work with those
individual landowners.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How far?

MR. ORTH: Well --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 10 miles? 15 miles?

MR. ORTH: We -- we -- we're working with other
landowners already to make adjustments to the line to
get away from an area. Yes, we can.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think it would be important to find out where those are. If you could let us know, you know, if we've -- I'm not sure where we're talking about.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Say, I have a question.

MR. ORTH: Let me real quick --

That is one of our key mitigations that we do to the (inaudible) --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's a large impact. Someone that's got five or six sections of land for range or farming is one thing, but private, small-acreage landowners can zip right past 'em. I think it's really inconsiderate. Not that this is all inconsiderate.

MR. ORTH: I do understand, yeah, if you have a small parcel, it would be a bigger impact.

MR. WILLIAMS: It would be helpful if you reduced that to writing and send it on to us. It's a different kind of use than I've heard so far.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Would you leave contact information so that we can do that?

MR. WILLIAMS: Sure.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Question 2: On the south route, the Senator suggested maybe we could
hop and skip around through the areas of concern.

What's your longest span that you can do
between your towers on this project? What's the
engineering?

MR. ORTH: Engineering-wise with the wire we're
using, you can -- you can -- you can span --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How far?

MR. ORTH: Our average is 800 -- usually 800 to
1,000 feet.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Up to a thousand.

MR. ORTH: Across -- across flat ground.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. ORTH: As soon as you start adding
terrains, then our spans get shorter.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Now, as I -- I got to
get the Monsanto people involved. A lot of those
streams run north and south with the mountains with the
ore seams and a lot of the mine sites that I've seen in
my experience are -- I don't know -- 1,000 feet wide,
maybe, at the most. But they -- you know, they follow
that seam down and it seems to be quite narrow to me.
Although they have other acreage around on each side in
this developable right, can't there be agreements
reached where they could -- you know, we could take from
ridge to ridge or identify where the ore seams are known
to be and plan to be mined in the future and couldn't
you more closely coordinate with them in a way that
would be constructive to hop and skip over their
concerns so you wouldn't have to move the line again or
have any concerns like that?

Monsanto people -- can anyone speak to the
width of the ore seams and typically what's developed?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Jim?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

Commissioner, (inaudible) or not, we may be the
only friend BPA has in the room right now.

(Laughter.)

And they're shortly pissing us off, so

(inaudibles).

Let me -- let me just make a couple of
comments. When we were aware of this line, Monsanto met
with Lower Valley, who represented as themselves as
representing Lower Valley and Bonneville Power, to work
with them on acceptable routes. We worked diligently.

We did not spend a million dollars. We spent about
$100,000. And we developed some -- some lines and
worked through some paths because there were some paths
that would actually cross Rocky Mountain Power's line,
as well. We actually were the impetus in getting
both -- or Lower Valley and Rocky Mountain together and
to force an engineering study so that they could move through some of these mine sites.

   I would be the first one to tell you that moving through a mine site is not an easy thing to do, but we did locate a path that would be acceptable that they could move through those sites. We did that.

   Now, when you talk about going through the northern route, we don't have properties that we're talking about. The southern route are those properties. We've also just talked to them about their environmental concerns and how we feel about them, which we think are really red herrings. However, they have to manage their own businesses.

   To expect us to accept and hold harmless is not something that's going to happen. I receive no economic value for them putting a line through my property, so I'm not going to hold them harmless. They have to work that out themselves. And they are -- they're a big company and they can do that.

   Monsanto is a little upset about the $100,000 we've already spent that's never been reimbursed. However, we've talked to them about that. They know about that situation.

   We still remain willing to talk to anybody about those routes. That's something we do as a good
neighbor. That's something we tried to work through.
So I would tell you that we're still willing to have
those discussions and -- and have met with them every
time they've requested to meet, so... but we did not
spend a million dollars.

The other issue is the companies that they have
identified. Simplot is definitely an entity. Agrium's
an entity. Monsanto and P-4 are really the same people.
So if you're representing 'em as two companies, it's
probably not a fair representation. P-4 is this wholly
owned subsidiary of Monsanto. So just to clarify that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Jim.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Commissioner, if I could
just expand on something that Jim talked about and I
wanted to correct some -- some misinformation I heard
placed on the record at the beginning of the hearing
here today.

There are only two Super Fund sites in the area
and neither one of them extend north of Monsanto or the
(inaudible) so that's the limit of Super Fund sites in
Caribou County. Neither one of those interfere with
either the northern route or the southern route.

And I wanted to make that clear because a lot
of the ways that work is done is we'll use contractors
to search national databases and one wouldn't find from
a national database the nuances and the differences between various cleanup activity. So I just wanted to indicate that, as Jim said, what has been very productive is dialog. Dialog has been good. And -- and it's obvious to me that maybe even more dialog is needed because, for instance, at the mines, in virtually every case, the mines are actually not under Super Fund cleanup orders. No -- no hazard ranking system has been performed at any of those sites and there's no national priority list listing. And so, therefore, just strict or unseverable liabilities that I am sure BPA's concerned about does not automatically apply in those situations.

In fact, at every one of those sites, the cleanup is actually proceeding under a voluntary cleanup order, which is an administrative order or a consent, that's entered into at a local court with two parties, EPA and the mining company. And if we need to amend those cleanup orders, we can -- that is actually something that's doable. And I actually think that even under the existing cleanup orders, you know, some -- some statement of what the work is to be done in and around the mine that, you know, good engineering practice applies. If it shows that the good engineering practice done is in the course of erecting a
transmission line is not likely to impact any of the liabilities of that particular cleanup site, that's all that has to be done. You just have to show that you're not -- you're not going to be disturbing anything.

Another thing that happens when you search national databases is your national database will say the mine is this big. And then what you do if you scratch the surface of it, it'll say, well, the mine is this big, but the lease is actually smaller because the mine has to be big enough to cover the lease. Okay. And so usually the lease is a -- is done naturally by geologists and then surveyors do the mine and they do it to the square, so the mine is always bigger than the actual lease, the lease is always bigger than the actual pit and the pit is actually always bigger than the actual placement of any selenium-bearing materials or any of those materials that you don't want to disrupt.

So in Mr. Orencia's question, the question was how far do you have to jump. It really requires dialog. And that's probably a lot of the work that Jim had done was you don't want to look at just the mine or even the lease or even the pit. You want to look at where is the material that you don't want to disrupt. And sometimes that will be a very narrow band.

And it should -- again, like I said, dialog
should enable us to work through those issues.

And then lastly, there was mention that one particular mining company had sued the federal government. Well, that -- that, by the way, isn't Monsanto, but I know the -- I know the situation in that particular case. And it was one of those cases where an effort was made to come up with a joint cleanup agreement. And one party pointed out that, well, wait just a minute. A lot of what we did here was at the federal government's direction, so you should have at least a portion of the liability.

That case, by the way, is not pending as was mentioned. That case has now been settled with the federal government agreeing to pick up 32 -- 30 percent of the cleanup costs. And so that's now a settled issue and there is no pending case raising questions about liability, so that's the current status of what (inaudible) --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Senator Tippets.

MR. TIPPETS: Thank you.

Mr. Clark, who do they need to contact to get boots on the ground and understand and really visit about this mine concept?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Jim Smith continues to be Monsanto's contact.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And I think, Jim, isn't -- you're open to continuing that discussion?

MR. SMITH: Oh, absolutely.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. SMITH: So I make a motion that BPA follow up on this and that this be taken care of for a southern route (inaudible) on the southern route.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We all agree.

MR. ORTH: We will follow up. I've already got Jim's phone number.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sir, could you identify yourself, please.

MR. CLARK: I'm Trent Clark with Monsanto.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, you're also with Monsanto?

MR. CLARK: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Senator Tippets.

MR. TIPPETS: Thank you. John Tippets.

And I want to be sure that everybody understands that in addition to being a state Senator, I also have a real job and I work for Agrium U.S. Industries. I'm not here on their behalf. They didn't ask me to be here today. And I haven't had any
discussions with BPA over power line routes.

And, Eric, I don't know who you've talked to in our company, but I'd be happy to facilitate some of the discussions and conversations if we need to go there.

And I don't know if the southern route is the best route. I brought a series of questions up just to make sure that we have considered all options and that we've made sure that if we're not going that route that there is a better route.

So I'd make that offer to you, Eric, to facilitate some discussions with some people in our company. And I haven't been involved in any discussions, even inside our company, on this route, but I can find the right people to talk to.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. ORTH: Appreciate that, Senator. I --

MR. TIPPETS: Can I ask a question as a Senator? I want to make sure that what I heard was -- what I thought I heard was really what I heard.

I thought I heard a commitment made to Mrs. Blockson was somebody is going to investigate a tree that was felled and that she will be reimbursed if there's evidence that it was your surveyors?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Correct.

MR. TIPPETS: And, also, if people would give
you the names of landowners who have had people
trespassing on their property without permission that
you will contact the landowners and make sure you get
that resolved. Did I hear that?

MR. ORTH: Yes, yes. We'll make that
commitment.

MR. TIPPETS: Appreciate that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have one -- not
more -- scathing remark to give.

We talked a lot about the Gray's Lake area.

But what about the farmers here that's north of town?
I've heard a little bit of discontent from some of them
and not super critical, but it would be a firm
suggestion that maybe you could align your poles
between -- if you take that route -- on the boundary
between the property owners so there wasn't a blank spot
in the field that they'd have to go around and farm
around. If you had it up closer to the line and they
could farm right up to the line on both sides, not to
have to dodge the poles; is that right?

We got farmers in the group here. Is that how
you're thinking?

I see a couple of heads nodding yes.

Is that an unreasonable request?

MR. ORTH: No, it's certainly not --
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible) brought it up because they made it so you couldn't even turn around the poles and you would be on your neighbor's property, so...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So they need to either run down one person or down the line, either way. But if they're going to do what they had staked out, it was ridiculous.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. So that would be an issue.

And probably the same with the access road that you'd require if it's that close or far away from a regular public road. I'll bet they'd like it so they didn't have to go around that, too, just right up to the edge of it.

MR. ORTH: Certainly. That is a reasonable request. We have worked with some landowners to move the line right -- right down the property line. We do have a certain width where we are bumping up against either a county road easement or a state highway easement, so we do have to stay off of that so that we don't overlap. Or if we do overlap, we're accepting of the risk of that overlapping. But we certainly would like to work with any landowners where we have placed
the line in a -- in a -- in a place that's not going to work for them.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: One other comment that I've had. Since this would be a publicly used utility, it would be appropriate to use basically public lands it's constructed on rather than have individual landowners be the ones that have to bear the burden of having the lines through their property. And that seems to make sense where it's the public generally, why not have it land that they own, as well?

MR. ORTH: Certainly that -- that comment can be taken.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this as controversial as your I-5 corridor reinforcement project?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They're all controversial.

MR. ORTH: They're all controversial. I would say as far as the -- the size of the community here in Caribou County, yeah, this is -- this is -- this is probably just as busy as I-5.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This one has not spawned a website, though, yet, with No Way BPA.

MR. ORTH: It has not, no. I'm unaware of any (inaudible) --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: A very interesting
website.

MR. ORTH: Bonneville does have a website for this project if you'd like to take a look at it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do they?

MR. ORTH: And you can get the information off of the --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think the other one will draw more attraction. But there is some very interesting comments and letters and including from the -- you know who all from -- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and everyone else, and they weren't entirely favorable either.

But neither here nor there, I think this -- what we would like to see is -- the public here -- is just some consideration and some coordination. And I don't think there's anybody here that's really wanting to see the power project stopped, but we'd certainly like to see an appropriate route taken, one that has less impact on -- on individual landowners and one that, we think, should be more cost-effective to go the shorter route. Maybe it won't be. I'm not an engineer and I don't know. But we'd like to see it done with some sort of sense rather than a bureaucracy at work.

MR. ORTH: Certainly.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No --
MS. EATON: Can I just make one comment to address Mr. Cackley and to speak to that?

So we are in the middle of our environmental process. There has been no decision and that is made by our administrator in the record of decision. We're going to be putting out the draft EIS. We're going to have a public meeting. There -- no decisions have been made, so if it seems like this is just a maze, that's the perception, but that is not how Bonneville is operating in this -- on any project until our administrator makes a decision. So we encourage all comments and participation.

MR. ESTES: Ernie Estes.

I would like to remind folks that we have a goal of getting our environmental impact statement out in November. That means that the earlier we receive comments, the more attention we can give to them.

MS. EATON: Or if they're not, we can't put 'em in the draft EIS. We talk to you at the public meeting and we incorporate them into the final EIS or we do whatever we need to address them to the final EIS, so it's -- we're really still in the middle of this long process.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you for your encouragement, for your participation. I don't think
you will be disappointed. I -- I think -- I think you will have some.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I had one last comment I wanted to make about access roads.

One thing that Bonneville Power will do, too, is in areas where we don't have to do improved roads where we can do route to travels through a farmer's field and we don't have to put gravel down or put any felt down or anything, that's what we're going to do, so we're going to minimize the impact. We'll buy an easement that will be identified via survey and it'll be a route to travel, but it won't actually be an improved road.

And that's going to be a decision that's going to be made from our access road engineering group. So anywhere we can have minimal impact, that's what we want. We'll still pay fair market value as an easement for an access road, but it'll be an unimproved route to travel.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: May I ask one question on that?

You're going up over a mountain that's at about 30 degrees or more. How are you going to get a road up there?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's for our road
MR. ORTH: We --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's going to be a horrendous mess going up that thing.

MR. ORTH: We have to -- we have to go outside the right-of-way quite -- quite a ways, a quarter mile, half a mile, and then switch back.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're doing switchbacks?

MR. ORTH: To get back to it, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And clearing trees as you go?

MR. ORTH: Clearing trees where there's trees, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's mostly rocks up there, though.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is it?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But we will see that from the valley then?

MR. ORTH: Yes, it could be a visual impact, which is one of the things we do analyze in our environmental impact.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. You folks going to be around for a few minutes then --
MR. ORTH: We'll be around.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- in case anybody wants to talk?

MR. ORTH: I've got business cards that I can certainly hand out to anybody that doesn't have one already. And, yeah, we will be around.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Does it have the contact information we need to send in questions, comments? Is the attorney here?

MR. ORTH: It's -- it's --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Where do we actually send our comments so they will be considered?

MR. ORTH: You can send your comments directly to me and they will -- they will get considered and put in, too.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. We thank everybody for being here. We thank you for all your comments. Appreciate it.

(MEETING CONCLUDED.)
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Tish Eaton, Environmental Lead  
Bonneville Power Administration - KEC-4  
P.O. Box 3621  
Portland, OR 97208-36211 

RE: Hooper Springs Transmission Project 

Ms. Eaton, 

The Bureau of Indian Affairs Fort Hall Agency and Fort Hall Irrigation Project are commenting in support of the South Alternative Option 2. Although we are in support of Option 2, we do support the selection of any of the Southern Alternative options over any option in the North Alternative as a preferred Alternative. 

The Bureau of Indian Affairs Fort Hall Agency and Fort Hall Irrigation Project would like to be kept informed as the EIS moves forward and appreciates the opportunity to comment on this project. 

Thank you,  

Randy A. Thompson  
Acting Superintendent  
Bureau of Indian Affairs  
Fort Hall Agency 

CC: David Bollinger, Fort Hall Irrigation Project Manager  
Chrony
August 14, 2013

Tish Eaton, Environmental Lead  
Bonneville Power Administration - KEC-4  
P.O. Box 3621  
Portland, OR 97208-3621  
tkeaton@bpa.gov

Re: Hooper Springs Transmission Project

Dear Ms. Eaton:

The Greater Yellowstone Coalition (“GYC”) has recently learned that Bonneville Power Administration (“BPA”) may propose a significant change of the transmission line location for the above-referenced project that would impact the Blackfoot River Wildlife Management Area (“WMA”). GYC is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization dedicated to protecting the lands, waters, and wildlife of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem (“GYE”). GYC has offices in Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana with approximately 27,000 members and supporters nationwide. GYC’s members regularly use and enjoy the lands and waters of southeast Idaho, including the Blackfoot River Wildlife Management Area, for a variety of activities such as fishing, hiking, hunting, wildlife viewing, photography, and other pursuits. If BPA were to change the alignment for the Hooper Springs Transmission Project so that it crosses into the WMA, GYC’s and its member’s interests would be substantially harmed.

As we understand, based on a map dated July 9, 2013, BPA now is considering a change in alignment of the transmission line to pass through the WMA. In fact, from our best calculation more than a mile of the line would be constructed within the WMA. GYC and its members have a long history in protecting the WMA. GYC “adopted” the WMA through the Idaho Department of Fish and Game’s “Adopt-a-Wetland” program in 1997 and our staff and members have volunteered more than one thousand hours of labor on the WMA. We have carried out numerous restoration and enhancement projects that have improved fish and wildlife habitat within the WMA. The proposed alignment change as illustrated in the July 7, 2013 map will have profound, negative effects on habitat within the WMA, which in turn will negatively affect GYC’s members and supporters, as well as the larger public who value the WMA for a variety of recreational activities.
GYC commented on the initial scoping for this proposal; however, we did not comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”) because none of the proposed alternatives would have located the transmission line within the WMA. The new alignment of the proposed line differs greatly from any of the line locations proposed in the DEIS, which was released for public comment this past March.\(^1\) Should BPA wish to relocate the transmission line so that it passes through the WMA, BPA must release a supplemental environmental impact statement to disclose the impacts of this change.

The Council on Environmental Quality regulations require that an EIS must be supplemented when “[t]he agency makes substantial changes in the proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns.” 40 C.F.R. § 1502.9(c)(1)(i). The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that the twin goals of NEPA are met: informing the public of the environmental impacts of the project and allowing the agency to make an informed decision. See Marsh v. Oregon Natural Resources Council, 490 U.S. 360, 371 (1989) (“It would be incongruous with this approach to environmental protection, and with the Act’s manifest concern with preventing uninformed action, for the blinder to adverse environmental effects, once unequivocally removed, to be restored prior to the completion of agency action simply because the relevant proposal has received initial approval.”). Thus, if a modification may substantially change the environmental impacts of a project, the agency must reevaluate and reveal the new effects.

BLM’s NEPA handbook sheds some further light on when a supplemental EIS will be required. It notes that “substantial changes” requiring supplementation “may include changes in the design, location, or timing of a proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns (i.e., the changes would result in significant effects outside of the range of effects analyzed in the draft or final EIS).”\(^2\) In sum, a supplemental NEPA analysis is generally required if changes proposed will cause significant or uncertain environmental impacts. Marsh, 490 U.S. at 374 (“the decision whether to prepare a supplement EIS is similar to the decision whether to prepare an EIS in the first instance”).

In the case at hand, BPA is proposing to change the location of the transmission line to cross through a significant portion of the WMA, a change that will undoubtedly lead to significant environmental impacts that were never analyzed in a NEPA document that would appropriately inform the agencies and the public of the project impacts. The WMA provides important habitat for a variety of wildlife, including moose, elk, and deer. Streams within the WMA provide crucial habitat for native fish, including the imperiled Yellowstone cutthroat trout. Furthermore, the sagebrush lands of the WMA provide habitat for sage grouse, a species with the Fish and Wildlife Service has determined warrants listing under the Endangered Species Act, largely due to fragmentation of the species’ habitat. Moreover, the WMA provides an important recreational site for residents of and visitors to Idaho. People visit the WMA each year to participate in a variety of activities, including fishing, hiking, hunting, wildlife viewing, and photography.

---

\(^1\) The preliminary Environmental Assessment, released in 2009 also did not include an alternative which would have located the transmission line as passing through the WMA.

All of these values may be significantly impacted by the location change proposed by BPA. For this reason, BPA may not move forward with this new proposal without first issuing a supplemental EIS that fully discloses and analyzes the environmental impacts of the new alternative. See New Mexico ex rel. Richardson v. Bureau of Land Management, 565 F.3d 683, 706 (10th Cir. 2009) (holding supplemental NEPA analysis required even where similar acreage would be disturbed because changed location of disturbance was important).

Thank you for your consideration to this matter.

Sincerely,

Andrea Santarsiere
Idaho Conservation & Legal Associate

Cc: Virgil Moore, Director, IDFG
Randy Budge, Southeast Commissioner, IDFG
Mark Gamblin, Regional Supervisor, Southeast Region, IDFG
Paul Wackenhut, Wildlife Habitat Manager, IDFG