



Planning for the Future

## Community Advisory Committee Meeting #7

**Wood River Inn**  
603 N Main Street, Hailey, ID

Thursday, October 25, 2007

### Results

#### Meeting Purpose:

- To review the draft plan document, gather comments for edits, etc.
- To discuss plan implementation steps, roles and responsibilities
- To discuss and reach agreement on the next steps for plan introduction

#### I. Attendance

##### Citizen Advisory Committee

- Len Harlig
- Chuck Carnohan
- Tom Bergin
- Tom Hellen
- Nick Purdy
- Nils Ribi
- Rod Kegley
- Tara Hagen
- Rob Struthers
- Chuck Turner
- Rick Baird

##### Idaho Power Staff

- Kent McCarthy
- Dan Olmstead
- Bryan Hobson
- Lynette Berriochoa
- Dave Angell
- Marc Patterson
- Jim Bell
- Jared Hansen

#### KMP Planning

- Mike Pepper, KMP Planning, Facilitator
- Lynn Jaynes, Meeting Secretary

#### II. Present Draft Plan Document

- Presentation of highlights of the draft plan document
- Discuss / Gather comments / Edits from the committee

<http://www.idahopower.com/newsroom/projnews/wrep.htm>

Comments:

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- Idaho Power has done a wonderful job explaining the more technical aspects of the project to the committee. The community, however, is not going to be up to speed as quickly and probably won't read the report. They are only going to look at the nitty gritty—what is the need? the plan? and the solution? We should boil the whole report down to layman's terms, not using technical terms like megawatts, kilowatts, etc. The draft plan we have should become the appendix to the report but not the main report. We need a more manageable report to present to the community. The presentation could be simplified but would reference the plan, in case someone wanted to research the more comprehensive details such as maps and people to contact, and reference the website, etc.
- The focus in this county is often environmentalism and conservation. This isn't addressed strongly enough in the current plan explanation.
- Part of the problem 12 years ago when electrical needs in the valley were assessed was that Idaho Power did not explain well enough what the need was. The fire has helped to bring to the forefront of the collective consciousness the need for redundancy and reliability.
- We need to condense the essence of the plan and emphasize need and purpose, as this has been underplayed to date. People are not using less power. The community also needs to know that alternative power sources have not been effective and are not efficient but were considered by the committee.
- One committee member felt that bringing the summer's fire issue into the presentation would not be an effective strong point to play up because it has not been an issue for the committee. It certainly could be used as an example, just not a turning point or major issue.
- We also need to educate people about the amount of power they're using, as in lighting whole large buildings, driveways, pavers, etc. If people understood what the significance was of the amount of power they're using, this would help them understand the power needs.
- Let's not call this a "plan" but rather "committee findings" so as to prevent off-putting the community as though the decision has already been made.
- Recommended that we communicate to the community the need, the urgency, the critical nature of the situation and concisely lay out the options in a one-page document, rather than presenting the detailed case and then boiling it down to the plan at the end. Basically, people in general are not willing to wade through the details.
- Early indications from some governmental entities have not been favorable. Have we addressed demand-side management and alternative power sources as thoroughly as we might have, so that we can answer those hard-hitting challenges more thoroughly and more satisfactorily? These challenges will come from the community and we must be prepared to meet them.
- If the committee findings don't address conservation and demand-side management, as well as explain how this plan will benefit the individual and alternate energy sources, the community will not accept it.
- The proposed line route from Northwest Energy coming through Idaho is proposed because Montana has extra power and this is an export route. This power could be used by Idaho Power as well as Utah, Oregon, California and the rest of the western system. However, this is a major transmission issue and not a local transmission issue, and as such would not impact the Wood River plan under consideration.
- One caution for presentation would be not to create a "sales pitch", and especially not an Idaho Power "sales pitch". That would be readily detected by community members and quickly repelled. Nonetheless, the community does need the education regarding what the needs of the valley are.
- One committee member felt that the fire dangers should be addressed in the report because these "eventualities" do happen and do create critical concerns.

AREA DESCRIPTION

- Should the plan refer to the 1995 Community Advisory Committee? This should be mentioned but we probably wouldn't need a lot of explanation to accompany it.
- The Technical Background should be addressed in just one or two sentences. The bulk of it should be addressed in the Executive Summary. Example: "At the rate we've been growing, we should be \_\_\_\_\_(this large) in 20 years."
- The kilowatt and megawatt terms should be converted so that they're all the same, as most will not be able to convert and comprehend these quickly. Example: "We project \_\_\_\_\_(x-number) people, and the needs will be \_\_\_\_\_ (x-amount) of power."
- The area description and the 1995 Community Advisory Committee findings would be moved to the background as opposed to being part of the introduction.

- Existing WR Electrical Supply System: Use the map for a visual in the plan, as this is the best way for people to quickly comprehend.
- We need a scenario sentence in the report to explain it. An example would be, “In the dead of winter, if this line goes down then . . .” (shedding load, people without power for 4 hours at a time, etc.)
- We also need a statement saying this valley is different from most in that peak load is during winter, not summer, which is the most devastating time to lose power. (In contrast to, say, Southern Idaho.)
- Conceptually, would it be helpful to illustrate the points graphically—as in maps, etc.? This might be helpful but again, the summary needs to be held to only a page or so. The bulk of the report could use more visuals for explanation. Caution: Some charts are not helpful because they assume a base knowledge. Numbers don’t mean as much as percentiles do. As an example, a megawatt chart won’t mean much.
- Focus on key points and only use the data that supports those points as supporting evidence. Cut out all other data.
- Use a key sentence about existing reliability that grabs attention, Ex: One sentence in the report said, “It won’t be long . . .” (until this will not meet our needs). Explain what “it won’t be long” means.
- The Existing Reliability Chart was confusing to some. This would be an appendix-type chart.
- Explain what is meant by “sustained” outage versus “momentary” outage.
- Explain “maintenance outage” somewhere—what does that mean for the average household? What maintenance outages affect reliability?
- One of our original questions as a committee was, “If this outage only happens once in a blue moon, then why do we need upgrades?” That was a question of the 1995 committee, which helped defeat the upgrades then. We have to help people understand that we’re 12 years down the road now and the probability of these “blue moons” happening are that much greater, the lines are that much older, etc.
- Geothermal discussion needs to be added. However, each time other power sources are discussed, we still need to include the discussion that transportation/distribution of that power needs to be addressed regardless of the power generation source. This has to be addressed in the report, however, so that the community knows this was fully addressed and discussed within the committee.

#### ENERGY EFFICIENCY:

- One thing that would help would be a statement of how much energy could be saved by having commercial and residential users implementing some energy efficiency measures.
- We still need to address that even with conservation measures, the valley is still growing. For instance, “We need x-amount of power in five years but this could be put off for seven years with conservation,” etc. We’re still adding plasma TVs and snowmaking capabilities, etc., and this needs to be brought out to address the current need. (Capacity issues.)
- State building standards and communities can do a lot to encourage conservation.
- Don’t forget to make the point between the reliability issues and capacity issues.
- It would be important to point out the importance of the ski and tourist industry economic impact of the north valley as an issue for providing capacity and reliability.
- One comment gleaned from the community was the perception that Idaho Power was behind the times for conservation and energy efficiency. This perception needs to be changed by Idaho Power—they need to put itself in the forefront of the issue and take ownership of their conservation efforts, more especially since this plan will be a forerunner for Idaho Power to go into other distribution areas to form plans. Idaho Power should be more proactive and not as reactive, and project this to the communities.
- We (IPCo) need to talk to Theresa Drake to address implementation for winter conservation and efficiency issues, as opposed to summer issues.
- Part of the challenge will be for Idaho Power to convince people that they are thinking like the community members are thinking, and everyone is on the same page.
- County Commissioners will probably have the final say for the plan. In that respect, there is a long way to go as far as trusting Idaho Power to have the community’s interest at heart.

#### COMMITTEE ALTERNATIVE:

- There is concern over using the word “consensus”, which might give the perception that there had been a vote. We could use “finding or recommendation” instead. Others felt “consensus” was the appropriate word because it describes, “Well, this is what we can live with.” We didn’t actually vote; however, we did rank options. Other ways to say it are “majority recommendation” or “preferred alternative” but perhaps we can’t find a better way to say it.
- How should we present these—as Alternative 1, Alternative 2, etc.? We need to get away from A1, C1, etc., because that won’t mean anything to anyone but the committee members. We should present it as “Alternative 1”

<http://www.idahopower.com/newsroom/projnews/wrep.htm>

- or “Alternative 2”, etc., or “preferred alternative 1” and then explain that this is preferred but “in case we run into these hurdles then we would prefer alternative 2”, etc. Or describe the hurdles that Alternative 1 might encounter.
- There could be more discussion in the appendices that informs individuals about how the alternative was reached and what other alternatives were discussed in order to get to the preferred choice.
  - The text should describe the zones, at least to some extent, because zones 1 and 2 blended to some degree in later discussions when the transfer station was moved south to Burmah Road.
  - On page 28 where it says “the committee shared numerous comments” we could say there was a concept discussion for a development there (at Spring Creek). The comments need to not give the impression that we are considering providing power for a new city.
  - After “potential airport location” get rid of the east/west verbiage and avoid specifics for any potential airport locations.
  - Replace “Environments of Critical Concern” and replace with “Areas of critical environmental concern”. (Page 28)
  - Take out “gravel borrow hole site”. (page 28)
  - Areas south of Burmah Road already have Wilderness Area designations that have to be determined by Congress, so no developments can go forward there until the determination is made. North of Burmah Road does not yet have those designations.

#### ZONE 2 MID-VALLEY:

No comments

#### ZONE 3 NORTH VALLEY:

- The plan talks about contentious ROW issues. Maybe it should mention that the committee talked a lot about view corridor issues, cost issues and comparing new lines to existing lines. It was proposed this should be addressed in the body of the Plan. We need to reinforce that there was a thorough and lively debate about the impact of these alternatives and although the alternative does not present a unanimous view, it does reflect more support for the lines being overhead as opposed to underground for these reasons....and then delineate the reasons.
- Again we have to decide whether we’re going to present this as “preferred”, and if we do then we need to use other terminology like “feasible” to further explain it. There is concern about using the term “preferred”. What does that mean? A consensus does not mean unanimous.
- **The committee did strongly agree that there needs to be a new line up the valley from Hailey to Ketchum, along the SH75 corridor.** What that installation looks like still needs to be determined. In an ideal world we would prefer that to be underground but whether that is fiscally possible remains yet to be determined.
- Perhaps the committee cannot bring the process any further down that road (underground versus overhead lines).
- The process is that Idaho Power needs to take this to the PUC and acquire permits. If it goes underground, then the commission needs no further input. If the lines go overhead, then Idaho Power has to try to figure out ROW costs, permits, etc.
- Could we say that to implement the preferred choice, this violates two ordinances and explain those ordinances?
- Again, perhaps this committee should only take this plan to the point of bringing power into the valley, and overhead or underground lines still remains to be settled.
- The only other possibility instead of using SH75, was using SH75 part of the way then going up Cold Springs. Again, this was voted down for several reasons—fire danger / damage to transmission structures being one.
- Did we discuss route options as thoroughly as we needed to? Our original discussion in the groups was to use existing corridors wherever possible—this was one of our major goals initially. Our mapping exercises didn’t explore these routes extensively due to the original goals and this should be mentioned in the text of the report, as to why optional routes weren’t used. We should build the case that the committee looked at other routes but these were rejected for these reasons.... (reliability issues, using existing corridors, ROW problems, etc.)
- Make the point that the PUC will require funding resolutions if underground lines are part of the proposal and additional funding is not set forth.
- About 1987 when the proposed route for the line from Midpoint was discussed, the heart of the line was through Picabo, up HW20 and SH75. This was rejected and then another route was proposed by an individual property owner. Although we’re reasonably sure that the most efficient way of getting to Ketchum is along SH75, it is possible that another route might be available. Maybe we hadn’t explored those routes as thoroughly as we could have.

- Remember this is an advisory committee, and even though we have routes identified, etc., unforeseen circumstances develop and no matter what the committee decides the actual plan may not adhere to the committee recommendations.
- Based on the information the committee has at present, SH75 is the best route. We can't develop routes based on hypothetical situations at this time. This committee has to make the best decisions possible based on the current information available.
- Alternative one is probably the most feasible route, whether it's the most desirable or not.
- There will be individuals in the community who will question any plan, no matter what the committee proposes.
- Are we confident enough to leave the wording on pages 29-30 or do we use the wording Mike Pepper suggested? **Consensus seemed to be to use Mike Pepper's wording. Again, the wording needs to be that 1) we agree there is a need for more/additional power to address redundancy and reliability needs (between Hailey and Ketchum), and 2) based on what we know, this (along SH 75) is our preferred route, and 3) depending on what we learn further in the process, this is where we are going.**
- IP's next step is to make a proposal for the overhead line, which sets the base for the cost, as a starting point. Then the community discussions can begin.
- Describe other options considered for the north valley and describe why the other alternatives were dropped (in the body of the report).

### Plan Document Synopsis

- **Make the document simpler**
  - **1-2 page executive summary**
    - **outline the need (existing conditions / growth projections, redundancy and reliability)**
    - **outline the committee's findings (in simple terms) for all three zones**
      - **Zone 1 – summarized from report**
      - **Zone 2 – summarized from report**
      - **Zone 3 – strong committee support for constructing a new line along SH 75 from WR to Ketchum – determination as to OH / UG will be made through the permitting and public process**
    - **Include simple study area map and graphics to illustrate**
  - **6-10 page document body**
    - **To clearly explain process, need, and broader description of the committee recommendations for each Zone – organized by Zone**
  - **Appendix**
    - **All technical information, maps, graphs, tables, etc.**
    - **Background as needed, including reference to the 1995 committee work**

### III. Plan Implementation Strategy

- Discuss / Develop implementation strategy
- Gather committee input

### PHYSICAL IMPLEMENTATION COMMENTS:

- We have a capacity issue to address for the north valley, and if it is implemented 10-12 years from now, then we have a different argument. A longer implementation schedule may imply less need.
- Our most pressing need is redundancy (and reliability) to the north part of the valley. Other needs can be met as growth occurs, and are less time critical.
- The five-year plan is to build from the WR station to Ketchum (redundancy /reliability issue, not load issue), and Burmah to Moonstone. Midpoint to Burmah and then to Silver provides additional reliability and future load service capability. In 10 years the plan is to go from Moonstone to WR. In 30 years the plan addresses build from Picabo to Silver. The 15-year plan just adds voltage support and doesn't involve land usage. In 30 years upgrade Silver to WR to 200 mw and add a third transformer.
- Moonstone to WR structures would have to be replaced but the net result is that the visual impact will not change. This wasn't mentioned in the paragraph write-up. It needs to be mentioned that the visual impact will not change.
- When we talk about WR to Ketchum, it would be helpful to immediately address the single-pole approach, as opposed to other structures (including pictures).

#### IV. Plan Introduction to Community (Cities, Counties, public)

- Discuss initial plan presentation to Blaine County local governments
- Gather committee input for initial plan presentation
- Discuss / Identify roles and responsibilities

#### PUBLIC COMMUNICATION:

- The current (tentative) plan is to present the plan first to Blaine County Leadership Council, County Commissions (Blaine Co. and Lincoln Co.), then City Councils, P&Zs, then the general public. The press is present at the BCLC, and Idaho Power would give everyone, including the press, a write-up to help prevent miscommunications.
- There was concern that mayors, etc., would get the information secondhand. We might want to be aware of the news cycle and address city councils, etc., and make a presentation to them before it hits the newspapers.
- It might be good to have one large introductory meeting to give an overall view of the plan, then address individual councils to present more site specifics. The problem is this would create a very large group.
- First impression to the public is crucial and there was concern about having the media report correctly to the readership/community based on a smaller meeting. If the meeting were larger, then there is less opportunity for miscommunication. This also does away with jurisdictional jealousies. The process is less prejudiced with a larger group with open invitation.
- The first meeting would not necessarily be a comment meeting; that would come later with the smaller meetings where crowds are more manageable. The caution is that larger crowds can get more rowdy.
- It might be best for jurisdictional individuals to have a preview instead of having them hear it for the first time with their constituents, as this puts them on the spot. It would be important to clearly state that this would not be a verbal comment meeting but written comments would be accepted. Support for that is that this is just an informational meeting on the findings of the committee, and just an opportunity to present the content of the report. This WOULD NOT be a public hearing.
- Would Lincoln County be addressed separately or in the initial meeting? The invitation could be extended to include them but since those residents wouldn't necessarily drive up a repeat meeting could be scheduled in their area.
- This could be held at the community campus in the old high school auditorium.
- Presentations could include multiple formats.
- Fridays and Wednesdays are the only open weekdays for local governments.
- It should be clearly explained that this is just a content meeting, and not a public hearing, but express that public meetings (open house events) will be held and they will be given opportunities to publicly express their concerns.
- An open house can be a good way to present the information, where individuals are invited over a 4-hour period (for example) to come in and look at maps and see charts and explanations, etc. This was done at the (SH 75 EIS) highway meeting and was successful. Informational tables could be set up within the facility somewhere where the initial plan is introduced and people could mingle with Idaho Power reps and committee reps and gain information.
- We could send information out previous to the initial meeting. This, however, could be counterproductive.
- At the initial meeting, the informational tables could also be set up similar to an open-house format, so that after the meeting people can view maps and familiarize themselves with the issues. Comment forms could be sent home with people and they would be encouraged to send these in or bring them to the subsequent area-specific meetings to address the need for comment submissions.
- It would also be helpful to make presentations to Rotary meetings and other community meetings towards the end of the process.
- To what extent are committee members willing to engage in the presentation to the community? A CM felt that committee members should stay within their communities, instead of crossing community lines where they would be less influential. At different places and in different forums committee members some members might need to excuse themselves from the process when conflicts of interest arise. Idaho Power could ask for volunteers from the committee for each venue and the general feeling was that committee members would be available and willing to assist the process where possible.
- After the presentations, Idaho Power then starts the permitting process. A five-year period is anticipated before the first part of the plan is implemented.
- Would the introduction to the communities begin before the holidays? February is better in terms of weather but Presidents Week is a bad time. January could be considered, as well—maybe late January.
- The key will be to advertise this and create some excitement for it.

- Will there be another review of the draft? Another meeting is not necessary but an email review of the revised draft would be beneficial. Committee members will have a two-week opportunity to make comments of the revised draft (with changes highlighted), and that could be emailed to committee members again if further discussion is necessary due to significant conflict. The finalized document will be submitted to committee members before Christmas.
- **Ideally, there would be a one-page “Executive Summary”, then a 6-10 page explanatory document, followed by appendices and maps.**

#### **Plan Introduction Synopsis**

- **Presentations Order**
  - **A – Group presentation – open to cities, counties and general public**
    - **Presentation only – no comments taken**
    - **Display boards available for one on one discussion with IPCo and Committee members following the presentation**
    - **Handouts of the plan executive summary available – with link to web site for full plan**
    - **Comment forms available for completion and mail-in later**
  - **B – Series of open house events**
    - **One or more in each zone**
  - **C - Individual presentations to all affected local governments – including Lincoln Co.**
  - **D - Presentations to community groups – Rotary, Chamber, etc.**
  - **E - Other presentations as needed**
- **Committee Role – to assist in open house events**
  - **And other assistance as requested by IPCo (and accepted by Committee member)**
- **Media**
  - **Handout (executive summary) issued at the initial group presentation**

#### **V. Next Steps, Process Evaluation and Wrap up and Adjourn by 2:00 p.m.**

- Process evaluation
- Remaining outstanding issues
- Final questions