BEFORE THE NORTHWEST POWER AND CONSERVATION COUNCIL

DRAFT SIXTH POWER PLAN PUBLIC MEETING
MEETING BEFORE
COUNCILMEMBER JAMES A. YOST (Presiding)
COUNCILMEMBER MELINDA S. EDEN
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2009
4:00 P.M.

JR Williams Building, Hall of Mirrors
700 West State Street
Boise, Idaho

WITNESS APPEARANCES

PUBLIC MEETING

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2009

4:00 P.M.

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: The appointed hour is upon us. It's Tuesday, October 13th, at four o'clock, a time scheduled for the public hearing of the Northwest Power and Conservation Council to discuss and receive public comments on the Sixth Power Plan of the Council.

And I'm Jim Yost. I'm one of the Idaho members of the Northwest Power and Conservation Council. Bill Booth is the other member. Joining us here today is a member from Oregon, Melinda Eden, and I'd like to ask her if she'd want to make a comment or statement.

COUNCILMEMBER EDEN: I'm just very happy to be here. I think it's important. It's important to me that Councilmembers hear comments from folks who care to testify about the plan from other states, so that's why I'm here. I'm very pleased to be in Boise and pleased to see plenty of folks here to talk to us about the plan. Thank you.

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Thank you, Member Eden.

I want to welcome everyone here. And the process for the meeting will be that I have a short statement that I will read.

I'll have John Fazio from central staff present

about a five-minute slide presentation that gives an overview of the Sixth Power Plan.

After that, we'll use the sign-up sheet and will ask that you provide your comments as you signed in, in the order in which you signed in, and we'll go through that.

That will be the process we'll use. We'll be here until 6:00 p.m. this evening.

So, welcome to the public hearing held by the Northwest Power and Conservation Council on the Council's Proposed Sixth Northwest Power Plan. The Northwest Power Act directs the Council to develop a regional conservation and electric Power Plan, and to review that Plan every five years.

The Council is now engaged in its latest five-year Power Plan review. As part of that effort, the Council released a Draft Revised Power Plan on September 3rd for public review and comment. The Council will be taking written comment on the Draft Power Plan until November 6th. The Council will also hold public hearings like this one on the Draft Plan in all four of the Northwest states over the next six weeks. Tomorrow night, we will be in Idaho Falls.

If you would like to comment at the hearing, please sign in on the sheet provided for that purpose. You may also leave written comments with us this evening if you desire. Your comments will be recorded, placed in the

Council's administrative record for the power plan review, and most importantly, considered carefully by the Council as it makes its decisions on the Final Power Plan later this year.

For more information on the Proposed Sixth Power Plan, including the text of the Draft Plan itself, please visit the Council's Web site at www.northwestcouncil.org.

You may submit comments by using the "How to comment" link on the Web page devoted to the Draft Power Plan.

Thank you.

John, can you show us the --

MR. FAZIO: You bet. Let's try this. Thank you. Is it on? There.

MS. EDEN: It's on. You're on.

MR. FAZIO: Thanks. I've had a cold for a week and my voice is a little weak and I may lose it, so if I can't talk, then I guess Jim will come up and finish the presentation.

But my name is John Fazio. I work for the central staff, I'm a systems analyst, and about two years ago the Councilmembers directed at staff, including me, to begin the process that involves creating a Power Plan. And that process involves collecting data on electricity demand, upon resources that provide electricity, and on potential

conservation measures. And so we started that process, and we started that process with the involvement of utilities, state agencies, and other interested parties via advisory committees, public hearings -- or, public meetings, rather. And so the past couple of years we've collected all this information, we've put that information into our models, and we've provided the Council some analysis, which they used then to put this Plan together.

The goal of the plan is pretty simple --

Am I blocking you guys? Okay. -- we want to keep the lights on. Pretty simple, but we want to do it keeping the costs low, and we'd like to also minimize price fluctuations from year to year. We really want to avoid what happened in 2001 in this region. And, of course, we want the power system operation to support and aid in fish and wildlife operations.

So, how does this Plan work for the utilities in the region? Well, what the Plan really is is a strategy, and it provides an inventory of cost-effective resources that utilities can use in their own processes to develop their own integrated resource plans.

The Plan itself is a regional plan, looks at the region as a whole. It is not a Plan for individual utilities. And the Council wants to recognize that each utility is going to have its own specific needs and access

to the various resources, and, therefore -- and it's not part of the Council's duties to do planning for utilities but to provide this information for utilities so they can do the planning on their own.

This slide shows -- I don't intend to go through this slide. I just want to show you this is somewhat of a supply curve for resources that we examined and they are listed in order of cost, levelized lifecycle costs, starting with on the left, way over on that side, conservation, and we've got coal, we've got nuclear in here, we've got woody residue, all kinds of resources based on all of the information that we collected. We ran these through lifecycle models to assess their costs and this is what we started to work with to develop the plan.

The next couple of minutes, I'm just going to summarize briefly what's in the plan in terms of these various resources, starting with conservation.

Conservation we've found is the lowest-cost resource. Regardless of any scenario that we looked at -- high carbon penalties, low carbon penalties -- conservation was always there as the lowest resource available. It avoids the risks of fuel prices, carbon penalties. It contributes both to peak and annual needs. And, actually, it can provide most of the region's expected load growth over the next 20 years.

Wind. Wind is being acquired to satisfy renewable energy standards that three of the four Northwest states have adopted. The Council recognizes that additional wind could also be cost competitive with other resources, and we found that, in fact, several hundred megawatts of additional wind would be cost effective depending on where your utility sits in access to that resource. Again, wind avoids the risks of fuel prices and carbon penalties, and it also can offset a good part of the region's load growth over the next 20 years.

The problem with wind, of course, is that it's variable. You get power when the wind blows, and quite often when -- during a heat wave or a cold snap, the wind may not be there. So, it provides a challenge for utilities, especially Bonneville Power Administration, to properly integrate this resource so that we can use it without causing any reliability issues.

Natural gas. Turns out that the plan recognizes that gas may be needed in the short term for various reasons: For capacity needs, that's equivalent to meeting hourly needs of the region; for flexibility, i.e., associated with wind integration; and, in particular, for local utility needs who may not have access to all of the other resources that could be cost effective.

Gas carries the fuel price risk. It also emits

carbon, but not the same levels as, obviously, the coal plant.

One other finding from the Plan is that -- sorry about the noise, the microphone -- that looking at the carbon risk for the region, currently, there's legislation that's being discussed on the federal level, at the state level, about carbon emissions and how we can reduce them. One of the facts is that the coal plants in this region emit 85 percent of the power system's carbon dioxide emissions, but they provide approximately 20 percent of the region's electricity. So in order to reduce the carbon emissions from the power sector in the Northwest, we have to reduce the operation of the coal plants, and reducing the operation of the coal plants will likely require that natural gas be used instead in some cases.

In the Plan, we have a Five-Year Action Plan which addresses actions that should be taken over the next five years. Of course, five years out, the Council will again endeavor to produce another Power Plan. So the Five-Year Plan is really the thing that we're looking at in terms of actions that the region can take.

And the Five-Year Action Plan, in a nutshell, is we have a target of 1,200 average megawatts of conservation for the region by 2014. We assume -- the Council assumes -- that state requirements will be met in terms of renewable

resources, and that, in addition, more wind will be acquired if it's cost effective, and gas-fired generation will be developed where it's needed and if it's needed either by a local utility or in order to integrate other resources such as wind. Council also recognizes that for better integration of wind and all these other resources, that we need to improve the capability of the transmission network, and improve the access to markets and ancillary services, and look into methods such as the smart grid. And, of course, the Council is going to recommend that we continue to do research on new technology, both for generating resources and on conservation measures and potential.

So, in a nutshell, that's the plan. And I think -- I'm finished with my presentation. I think the next thing is comments.

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Correct.

MR. FAZIO: I'll just leave it there.

COUNCILMEMBER EDEN: John, would you mind turning off the PowerPoint projector, please?

MR. FAZIO: Sure. You bet.

COUNCILMEMBER EDEN: Thank you.

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: We have high-tech equipment in our office, and that bucket is an example of how high tech we can get.

Karen, I'm assuming these with the stars on them

are those who want to testify.

MS. DUNN: You might want to read their name though in case they don't have a star.

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Bob Neilson.

MR. NEILSON: Will not testify.

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Will Hart.

When you present your testimony, would you give your name and address for the record?

WILL HART, appearing as a public witness, testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Thank you. Will Hart, Idaho Consumer-Owned Utilities Association, P.O. Box 1898, Boise, Idaho, 83701.

Good evening, Member Eden and Member Yost. Again, my name is Will Hart, and I'm the executive director of the Idaho Consumer-Owned Utilities Association. I represent 14 rural electric cooperatives and eight municipalities in Idaho. Combined, ICUA member utilities serve over 120,000 power consumers in our state.

Thank you for the opportunity this evening to provide our comment on the Sixth Power Plan. We will be providing additional written comment prior to the deadline in November.

On behalf of our 120,000 member consumers, I would like to thank the Council for, in our perspective, a generally reasonable and thoughtful Plan that fulfills its regional electric power-planning purposes by providing guidance and information in meeting the future power needs of the region in a cost-effective and responsible manner. In addition, the Plan recognizes the need for flexibility by explicitly allowing resource acquisitions to meet utility needs, even if those acquisitions differ from the general regional Plan.

One thing of very critical importance to ICUA members specifically and to the region generally, the plan provides an excellent discussion of the federal hydro system. The plan describes how important the hydro system is in keeping our carbon emissions low, and notes the significant increase in carbon emissions that would occur should the hydro generation be reduced due to dam removal. And the plan describes how the flexibility of the hydro system is used to integrate other carbon-free renewable resources which our association supports.

ICUA believes that the costs associated with fish and wildlife mitigation, the hydro system's ability to integrate renewables, and the carbon reduction that the dams provide, are critical to include in the Plan, as these elements inform decisions and model assumptions. We do have

some concerns regarding conservation targets.

ICUA recognizes that conservation is typically the lowest-cost resource and generally believes it's the best way to meet growing loads, and our members have been on the forefront of attempting to meet conservation and efficiency goals.

We appreciate the Council's recognition of the inherent uncertainty in the amount of conservation that can be accomplished in the next five years by providing a range of conservation savings instead of a specific target. However, we still have concerns over the availability of certain measures, the lead time to develop and implement programs to distribute the measures, and the affect of current economic conditions.

All that being said, ICUA members believe in the consistent professional work of the Council, as well as your willingness to accept our input and listen to our concerns. I thank you for the opportunity you provided today to briefly comment on the Sixth Power Plan, and thank you for the in-depth opportunity you gave our association last week in Sun Valley to discuss our organization and the challenges we face.

Thank you, members, and have a good evening.

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Thank you, Will.

(The witness left the stand.)

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Michael Heckler.

MICHAEL HECKLER, appearing as a public witness, testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Good evening. My name is Michael Heckler, H-E-C-K-L-E-R. I'm participating as a private individual, so my address is my residence, 2245 Roanoke -- R-O-A-N-O-K-E -- Drive, Boise, 83712.

I'd like to make three or four points this evening, and I appreciate the opportunity to do that. First, I offer a congratulations. I think that you've done an excellent job both through staff and the Councilmembers in recognizing the significant opportunities that efficiency still represents. There's a very large scale of efficiency opportunities available to you. They're available at low cost and they're available at very low technological risk, and I congratulate you for making them the first resource that you're looking at to meet requirements over the next 20 years.

I also appreciate the fact that you're looking now not just at average megawatts, you're not just looking at energy, but you're actively looking at load shape, that you're recognizing that we've got a growing summer peak, and that that affects the resource selection that's available to

keep the lights on.

And, finally, your comments regarding flexibility and the relatively low risk and fast implementation that can be made by changing your operations of flexibility. Setting up a market for capacity, shortening the periods of time in which trades take place, could be done relatively quickly and that can fairly dramatically reduce the amount of reserves required to accommodate variable generation resources.

There is one area where I think that your performance has not been so good, and that is that you haven't provided leadership in the region on how we should approach CO2 and carbon control. I think in doing that, you're missing an opportunity and that in one fundamental error -- area -- you've overlooked an element of analysis, and that is that the Northwest in general -- and I'll mention Idaho later in particular -- have a comparative advantage over the rest of the nation in that we can implement reductions in CO2 quicker and at a lower cost than the average for the nation as a whole.

You've set here, up here, over a period of time an efficiency infrastructure that does not exist in other parts of the nation. You've got agreement from consumers, from utilities, from governments, a mechanism for implementing efficiency opportunities that might not exist in the Midwest

or the Southeast or other parts of the country. Our area is also rich in noncarbon-generating resources, and the presence of those carbon-generation alternatives and our ability to exploit efficiency more effectively than other regions makes it so that we can shut down carbon-producing generation at a lower cost than other regions. If there's a cap in trade, we can sell permits at lower than the market cost will bear.

I don't think your analysis has looked at that comparative advantage. If it had, I think you'd step up to a leadership role in putting forward guidelines for pricing CO2 and for retiring coal plants. Now, my expectation is that with Washington, Oregon, and Montana already participating in the Western Climate Initiative, and by that process implicitly agreeing to a goal of a 15-percent reduction in carbon emissions by 2020, my expectation is that it's the representatives from Idaho who are in some way holding up the acceptance of carbon standards.

I've worked in energy-related areas for a number of years in Idaho and I think I have some perspective on the receptivity of members of our government in this state to carbon control, and I don't think that it's particularly accepting of carbon control. There are some within the government that recognize the economic advantages that could accrue to this state if we were to have an implicit carbon

control.

There is better -- the rainy, gray day today notwithstanding -- there is better solar energy in Southwestern Idaho and a small portion of Southeastern Oregon during the summer months than there is in Phoenix, Arizona. There is an opportunity to use concentrated solar power here that doesn't exist in other parts of the Northwest. We have significant biomass in the state, we've got over one average gigawatt of wind available in this state, and there's substantial geothermal, and we don't produce any fossil fuels. We don't have a dog in the fossil fuel fight, and yet we're protecting them.

If the Council were to set out guidelines for utilities' pricing of CO2 and retiring coal plants, if you're wrong, when you do the mid-term review, you can make an adjustment. If you set them out and you're right, by then even Idaho might think that they thank you for having done so.

Thanks for the opportunity.

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Thank you, Mike.

(The witness left the stand.)

DICK ADAMS, appearing as a public witness, testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Good evening. My name is Dick Adams. I'm the executive director of Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee, often known as PNUCC. Our address is 101 Southwest Main in Portland, Oregon, 97204.

I'd like to add my congratulations to you also about -- on getting a Plan out. As John Fazio said, it's been a long two years.

And I'd also like to thank and recognize you for really creating a collaborative environment over that two-year period to invite utilities and others with interest in energy future to participate, not only in your Council meetings, in your power forum meetings, and also your willingness to come to other forums. You've been to the PNUCC board of directors meetings several times and other settings. I believe all of that has created a Plan that has -- I think it's a better Plan. I think it is a Plan that people are more likely to embrace and use as we move forward.

I'd also like to acknowledge, Member Eden, for your leadership in the Power Committee. You oversaw thousands of PowerPoint presentations, looking at lots of data and detail, and was able to pull out of all of that a sense of what needed to be put together to plan and actually produce something that adds value to the region. Not a small feat.

And, Mr. Yost, I compliment you for your tenacity in ensuring that the right questions are addressed in the Plan. That wasn't always the case over the last couple years. And I really wanted to acknowledge the work that you've put in personally to make sure the right questions are asked and the answers are understandable, and that's not always been an easy task with this sort of -- with the technical aspects of this industry.

That being said, I also want to acknowledge that the Plan is extremely important at this time. It comes at a time where many -- there are many major issues, and I think one of the key values of your plan is that it addressed some of the challenges of energy policy. We all know that the uses and the -- and the need for electricity are changing, whether it be iPods and Twittering, or as plug-in hybrids. We know that challenges of electricity are only growing. I think your Plan does an excellent job of describing some of those challenges and acknowledging them.

And I think a key element of your Plan is it creates a tool for communicating to a broader audience than just the industry, to policy makers, and the general public on what some of these challenges are and how you, as a body, have laid out a plan to address those challenges.

I think the Plan also highlights how the role of customers is likely to change in the future. Your

highlighting of the cost effectiveness of conservation and how the customers will be required to change their practices in order to achieve those savings, whether it be replacing some of the equipment that uses more energy than the current technology or changing the way homes are built, those are all activities that will be required on the customer side of the meter for the most part, and your Plan lays out a good strategy and helps define why it's so important to get there.

A couple of elements: I'm not planning to go through our written response we provided to you I think a couple weeks ago. Hopefully you've had a chance to look at it and make some sense to it. I also hope that there aren't too many surprises in there. We've been working with you over the last few years, and I'd be disappointed if there were many surprises. But I did want to highlight a couple things.

And, also, as the Plan moved forward, there was a lot of discussion about putting together scenarios -- what if and what if that and what if this -- and I applaud your effort to actually create six or 10 different scenarios of what the Plan might look like, what our energy future might look like, if different circumstances were to unfold, if we didn't have renewable portfolio standards what would the impact be, if we didn't have coal plants what the impact be.

The what-if scenarios I think creates a great font of information for people to really understand that down each of these various paths there are challenges, and there are some pluses and minuses, and I think your Plan does a good job of highlighting those impacts and effects.

I think your Plan also puts together a great narrative, as one of the earlier speakers mentioned, on conservation potential and some of the challenges. It is -- it does a very good job of highlighting the challenges associated with getting consumers to change their behavior, and maybe the role that state building codes might play or even national appliance standards could play in achieving some of these savings.

Most of the conversation today seems about large-scale wind farms and other large-generating resources, and I applaud you for highlighting the importance of some of these smaller-scale, almost backyard technology. There are some utilities that are adding onto, in small, one- and two-megawatt increments, to some of their existing facilities, and while they may not be available at a large supply curve from a regional perspective, those are important megawatts that do add up.

And like an earlier person mentioned, we have moved in our industry from relying on average megawatts as our metric of sufficiency in energy to really trying to

understand the need to add resources to meet the growing peak demands and the flexibility that's needed to integrate some of the intermittent wind resources, for example, and, again, I think your Plan does a good job of describing the challenges.

And, lastly on the kudos, is there's been a lot of discussion about power costs, and while I personally favor net present values and '06 dollars as an indicator of what power costs are, not everybody fully understands what that's going to do to the power bill. And you're to be complimented for showing in various places within your Draft Plan how power costs are likely to change going forward, and I think in enough different ways that various audiences can grasp what that means.

There's a couple areas I think we could use your help on between now and the Final Plan, and one of them is conservation and the other is carbon, the two Cs.

As you've highlighted in your Draft Plan, conservation plays a prominent role. You've indicated it's going to meet 85 percent of the future needs. One of the pieces that's not been done to date is to help us understand what risk we face as an industry, as a region, by putting that much reliance on conservation. We know it will be a challenge to achieve that amount and utilities are working to get there, and -- but we could use some help on it. Help

us to understand the risks associated with that much reliance. We know there's challenges in getting people to install these measures, but how does that translate into maybe a slightly different path or different activities we might need to take on as we move forward? You deal with uncertainties in a lot of different areas in your Plan, and this is one I think that could use a little more help between now and the Final.

And on the carbon policies, you've outlined four or five different scenarios mostly dealing with the notion of a tax or using economic principles to change how different resources might be operated or built in the future. Our suggestion, our request, is you put together a scenario that looks at a -- it's a what-if case. I'm not suggesting there's a particular target, but look at the impact of defining a specific carbon reduction in terms of millions of tons of CO2, for example. There are a lot of different conversations going on at the national, as well as Western and state, levels about what the target should be. Pick one of those and help us understand if a policy is put in place to meet a certain target, how would that be implemented. Your Plan and analysis to date looks at implementing it through some financial incentives, and it may produce the same results but we're not quite sure. And it would be very useful to better understand in a more

simple way what would be the implications of meeting a prescribed target.

And then a couple suggestions on tuning up your communication. We think that early on in the report it should include a statement of need, a place where you describe, in some ways, the problem statement. You have a forecast of growing demand. How does that translate into need for not only energy but capacity in the winter and summer months, and this element you describe as flexibility, which is helping keep the lights on moment to moment.

And then a couple suggestions for the future: You've done a great job in teeing up the issue of capacity and trying to understand how that needs to be addressed in the future. I think between now and it's hard to even imagine the Seventh Plan, but at some point in time there will be a next Plan, one of the things you can help us do as an industry is develop not only tools, but help us think about how will we address the capacity -- growing capacity -- needs of the Northwest system.

So, with that in mind, again, congratulations, and thank you for the opportunity to comment.

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Thank you, Dick.

(The witness left the stand.)

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Let's see. Next, Ron Whitney.

RON WHITNEY, appearing as a public witness, testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Good evening. My name is Ron Whitney, representing the Northwest Energy Coalition. Address is 13965 West Chinden Boulevard, Boise, Idaho. I thank you for the opportunity to testify here tonight.

The Northwest Energy Coalition applauds the Council for showing that we need no new fossil fuel power plants and for proposing to meet the next 20 years of growing Northwest electric demand with 5,800 average megawatts of new energy efficiency and 1,800 average megawatts of new renewable energy. These excellent clean energy targets are attainable and affordable and must not be watered down. At this point, they are the least we should expect. Lowering the conservation target, for example, would cost Northwest residents money and jobs.

The amount of cost-effective energy efficiency renewables in the Draft Plan produces a surplus of generating resources compared to loads. This result will allow the region to begin phasing out its dirty coal plants while providing high reliability and the ability to integrate the Plan's wind development.

The Draft Plan will stabilize global warming emissions, but not reduce them, not at all. It will not

help achieve the carbon reduction goals already in place in Washington, Oregon, and Montana. Instead of telling utilities it's okay to keep relying on dirty coal plants, the Council should chart a course to a carbon-free future based on more fully developing our energy efficiency and renewable energy resources. The Plan should be based upon carbon reduction goals for the region consistent with the latest climate science.

The only way to actually reduce utility-based global warming pollution is to phase out the many coal plants now supplying dirty power to the region. The Council's Draft Plan fails to adopt such a goal. Council staff did analyze the cost and benefits of doing so, however, and the results show shutting down coal plants is quite doable. Council analyzed shutting down all the coal plants used to serve regional loads, whether inside or outside the region, by 2020. This would reduce our climate emissions by about one quarter of today's level. The forecast bill impact of shutting down the region's coal plants ranges from seven to 13 percent over 20 years. This would hardly be noticeable year to year, and a somewhat slower phase-out of coal could reduce those bill's impacts substantially.

The Plan fails to establish a CO2 price that utilities should use for planning and operating their

systems. This disregards the damage caused by continued emissions. The Council analyzed carbon price scenarios that ranged from zero to $100 per ton and based its long-term energy efficiency target on an expected emission cost of $47 per ton by 2029. However, the Council did not give utilities the projected greenhouse gas pollution cost to use in planning and operating their systems. This delivers the false message that global warming remains uncertain, and that any related costs are mere speculation.

The Five-Year Action Plan portion of the Draft features reduced conservation targets: 1,200 average megawatts rather than the proportional amount of 1,450 average megawatts that would save the region the most money and create the most jobs.

The Council's Action Plan for conservation sets up the region for failure. It calls for a midyear, two-and-a-half-year-point term review of regional progress for meeting the five-year target that could respond to inadequate utility efforts to simply lowering the target. The Council says that it might have to lower the conservation target due to uncertainty about new technologies, economic conditions, et cetera, but there's a little uncertainty about the vast known energy efficiency potential available to utilities. A midterm review is a good idea for judging progress, calling lagging efforts to task, and sharing ideas on what it is and

what is not working. It cannot become an out for utilities that fail to meet their share of the Council's reasonable and quite achievable targets.

Council staff analyses confirm important new studies such as bright future and the power of efficiency, showing that we can affordably shut down the coal plants now serving our region, start electrifying transportation, restore endangered salmon, develop our abundant clean energy resources, and revitalize our economy in the process. The Northwest Power and Conservation Council needs to assure that the power system fulfills its climate responsibilities while responsibly meeting our energy needs. The Draft Plan relies on others to make the hard choices. It's reactive rather than being proactive. It says we should position ourselves to make the changes needed only if someone else tells us we must. This sends the wrong message to the region, mainly that the status quo is really okay, and it's not.

On a more personal basis, I've become a little bit more intimately concerned about the energy efficiency renewables and conservation as our country has kind of dropped into the economic doldrums here. I've been asking myself what we really need to do to get out of the current bad economy, to increase the jobs in this country and become a competitive country once again. For years and years, the

United States has been a leader. We led the industrial revolution as we taught other countries how to manufacture, we led the technological revolution and taught other peoples how to use computers and the Internet, et cetera, et cetera. And right now we have an opportunity and it's one that we're behind in. We seem to have fallen behind in the concept of how important energy efficiency, renewables, conservation, just where energy technology is, and other countries are leading us right now. We're in second and third place.

And I think we really need to set our goals high when we're looking at energy efficiency in conversation and conservation. There's an opportunity here to create those jobs and bring people back to work and become a leader again on a worldwide basis, but to do so, we have to set our goals high. Our country has never accomplished anything by setting goals low. We've always done it by setting high standards and high goals. You know, they say that if you set a small goal, the worst thing that's going to happen is that you're going to achieve that goal. So we really need to set our targets as high as we can.

Thank you.

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Thank you, Ron.

(The witness left the stand.)

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Leif Elgethun.

LEIF ELGETHUN, appearing as a public witness, testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: My name's Leif Elgethun, and I'm here actually representing two organizations. The first is going to be Clean Lakes, Incorporated, the company I work for. I am their zebra and quagga mussel veliger services manager, and over the course of this past summer we've been providing early detection services to the Idaho State Department of Agriculture, as well as commencing design of a zebra and quagga mussel decontamination unit for prevention methods here in the state of Idaho, as well as the region.

My company has been providing aquatic ecosystem restoration and maintenance services for over 34 years, which has included aquatic invasive pest control in the West since the early '80s. This experience we've been using to conduct science and research of the zebra and quagga mussels and the imminent threat they pose to the Northwest region, in particular, the hydropower electric system here in the region.

It is our understanding that the Council has been briefed on the biology as well as the threat the mussels pose to our electrical system by Fred Nibling of the BOR Denver office, and we've also been in contact with Jim Ruff regarding some questions he has had about the zebra and

quagga mussels.

We'd like to commend you guys for your proactive approach to this particular part of the region's energy equation, and encourage you to continue your efforts to minimize the threat. However, we are concerned that an economic analysis be completed that takes the costs associated with mussel infestations and the costs associated with preventing their spread to the Northwest region during the Five-Year Action Plan and the 20-Year Plan.

We are concerned with this primarily because the rapid spread with which these things move. They didn't even cross, basically, the 180th meridian until two years ago -- 2007 -- when they were found in Lake Mead. Within two years, they have completely infested that lake, as well as much of the Colorado River, and they've been found as far north as Utah and some lakes in California. We're worried that if this isn't addressed in this Plan, by the time the Five-Year Plan or even the Midyear Plan -- or, the Midplan -- comes out, it may already be too late and we may already be playing catch-up.

And, you know, we encourage that the Sixth Power Plan include those costs associated with the possible mussel infestation throughout the Northwest region, and especially in the fully-connected Columbia River Basin, which serves a very large portion of our hydroelectric needs. And they may

only need to be in the high-case scenario, depending on your guys's expertise.

We also encourage that the Northwest Power and Conservation Council actively support all currently available prevention technologies and best case practices, and that they encourage their partners to continue developing our best defense against the mussels.

And for Clean Lakes, we'd like to again thank the Council for your efforts with the Draft Sixth Power Plan and their proactive attitude to this regional threat to our power supply.

I'm also going to give testimony on behalf of the Idaho Chapter of the US Green Building Council, on behalf of their board. I'd like to offer our organization's support of the Northwest Power and Conservation Council's Draft Sixth Power Plan.

The US Green Building Council, Idaho Chapter, is an organization of companies and individuals including architects, engineers, interior designers, landscape architects, government officials, developers, business owners, product manufacturers, attorneys, and students. Our mission is to accelerate the implementation of high-performance building concepts, technologies, and practices through education and advocacy.

Buildings are an essential element to the solution

to the energy, resource, and climate issues our country and region is facing. I think your guys's Sixth Power Plan acknowledges that, and I commend you guys for the effort you put into the ability of buildings to actually be a part of the solution.

The technology to make substantial reductions in energy use in buildings that already exist, your Plan acknowledges that. Modest investments in energy-saving technologies can yield buildings and communities that are significantly more profitable and healthier places to live and work.

Buildings annually account for about 39 percent of US primary energy use, 70 percent of US resource use, 12 percent of water, and buildings consume about 40 percent of raw materials globally. The main part of this Power Plan, of course, is that energy use, which is 40 percent. If we're going to achieve the conservation and energy efficiency goals that you guys have laid out in your plan, I think the buildings will be a big part of that.

The Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Green Building Rating System has been developed by the US Green Building Council, and is a nationally-accepted benchmark for the design, construction, and operation of high-performance buildings. It is a voluntary, consensus-based, national rating system for new and existing buildings

that promotes a whole building approach. The model conservation standards in the Draft Sixth Power Plan actually reference ASHRAE 90.1-2007 standards. LEED for new construction now requires a 12-percent improvement over this standard, and we think that the Draft Sixth Power Plan may want to look at updating their recommendation to 10 percent over the ASHRAE 90.1-2007 standard.

We wholeheartedly agree with the conclusion of the Sixth Power Plan, that the most cost effective and least risky resource for the region is approved efficiency of electricity use. Because of the higher cost of alternative generation sources, rapid-developing technology, and heightened concerns about global climate change, conservation holds a large potential for the region. Aggressive pursuit of this conservation and improved efficiency will delay investments in more expensive and uncertain forms of electricity. As the Draft Plan indicates, investments in additional transmission capability and improved operational agreements are also important for the region, both to assess growing site-based renewable energy, and to better integrate it into the power system.

The Pacific Northwest is expected to develop and expand over the next 20 years. Electricity use before accounting for new conservation is expected to grow by about 1.3 percent per year. Residential and commercial sector

electricity use account for much of that growth in demand. All of this growth and energy demand must be met by a combination of existing resources, more efficient use of electricity, and new generation.

The Plan shows that a substantial amount of the growth in demand for electricity could be met by conservation. Analysis shows that over 5,800 average megawatts of conservation are cost effective in the Draft Plan, and conservation is the only resource that has no carbon emission costs, system integration costs, or transmission costs. In general, failure to achieve the conservation included in this Plan will increase both the cost and the risk of the power system.

The US Green Building Council, Idaho Chapter, strongly recommends that the Northwest Power and Conservation Council's Draft Sixth Power Plan be adopted, and we'd thank you again for the opportunity to present the views of our chapter.

(The witness left the stand.)

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Thank you, Leif.

Ken Miller.

KEN MILLER, appearing as a public witness, testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Good afternoon, Chairman -- or, Member Yost, and welcome back to Idaho, Member Eden and staff.

My name is Ken Miller. I am the -- I work on the energy -- Clean Energy Program at the Snake River Alliance, and currently serve as the chair of the Northwest Energy Coalition. My address is Box 1731 in Boise, at 83701.

On behalf of the Alliance, I first want to congratulate the Members and the staff of the Council for your extraordinary work on this Power Plan. As you've heard in prior public hearings elsewhere in the region, those of us who work on energy issues in the Northwest enthusiastically supported your Fifth Plan, and in particular the ambitious energy efficiency and conservation goals laid out in that Plan, goals that the region not only embraced but exceeded well ahead of schedule.

We believe the Draft Sixth Plan's efficiency goals are equally ambitious, but also equally attainable. The fact that our region can meet almost half of our new load through energy savings is remarkable, and testament to our collective desire for a clean energy future. In addition, the promise of meeting a balance of our new load growth through renewable energy is equally welcome as we transition to a new, clean energy economy.

Energy efficiency is the cornerstone of the

Alliance's energy program, but climate issues such as greenhouse gas emissions are thoroughly intertwined in our resource decisions. While Idaho has not established carbon reduction targets, the other three states in the region have. It is imperative that we take action not just to stabilize carbon emissions from our electricity generation, but actually reduce those emissions. This is where we believe there is still room for improvement in the Draft Sixth Plan.

We believe the Council should factor in the true environmental cost of the resources in its resource recommendations. In so doing, the Council can send unmistakable signals to our utilities that continued reliance on coal-fired generation at today's levels is not sustainable from an environmental standpoint, nor from a risk or a economic standpoint.

Most of us believe that some form of carbon regulation, whether through a tax or trade mechanism, is inevitable, either through the Western Climate Initiative or through federal regulation, or, quite likely, both. It is therefore critical that we, as a region, prepare for carbon constraints. The sooner we begin planning for that eventuality, the better off we'll be by embracing more affordable energy efficiency and clean resources.

We believe it's a moral imperative, as well as an

economic one. There's simply no way to obtain meaningful greenhouse gas emission reductions while keeping the region's existing coal fleet intact. Here in Idaho, our state's largest electric utility says it plans to respond to shareholders' demands by beginning to reduce its carbon emissions. If a utility like Idaho Power, which relies on coal for 40 percent or more of its generation, can make this commitment, then surely the Council, with its impressive record of environmental stewardship, can plot a course to do the same.

It won't come as a surprise, since I do work with the Northwest Energy Coalition, that we agree with the two recent studies that have been referenced early, bright future and the power of efficiency. Both of those reports illustrate how our region can wean itself of dirty coal plants, restore our endangered salmon runs, electrify our future vehicle fleets, and develop our rich renewable energy resources, while still maintaining our affordable and reliable electric power system.

And one thing came up to me when -- came to me -- when I was coming over here: I just read the most recent clearing up and there was an item which I think it was Terry Morlan who briefed the Council at last week's meeting in Sun Valley that there were a number of comments in favor of nuclear power, that spoke favorably of nuclear power. I

guess I would offer a counterview in I guess if it weren't for nuclear power, we might not even be sitting here tonight given the history that the Council has with nuclear generation. It's our view that in the course -- or, the 20-year course or time frame of this Power Plan, that nuclear power is not an economic resource. We haven't dealt with the waste issues, and we certainly -- well, it just doesn't come -- it's not a time frame -- it could not be deployed on a time frame that is really acceptable in the time frame that's in this Power Plan.

So, I want to thank you for being here in Idaho, and we will be submitting more detailed comments in the very near future. Thank you.

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Thanks, Ken.

(The witness left the stand.)

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Liz Woodruff.

LIZ WOODRUFF, appearing as a public witness, testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Hello. My name is Liz Woodruff, 1414 East Hays, Boise, Idaho, 83712.

Councilmember Eden and Yost, thank you very much for the opportunity to testify before you today and offer support and congratulations to the Northwest Power and

Conservation Council for their emphasis on energy efficiency and conservation in this Draft Sixth Power Plan.

As others have noted and I will reaffirm, reports like those just referenced by Ken Miller from the Northwest Energy Coalition demonstrate the reality that we can secure a brighter future by making energy efficiency the first and fundamental approach to the forecasting and planning around energy policy in the Northwest region. The Council has wisely recognized this and released a Draft that underlies the need for increased energy efficiency as the first choice of a fossil fuel energy production, and we very much appreciate that.

I'd like to take a minute to just reference something that I haven't heard referenced tonight and I think is relevant in a cursory way but also an important way, especially since we have the opportunity to address an Idaho member, and that is that this emphasis on efficiency in the Draft Sixth Power Plan dovetails perfectly with the Idaho Energy Plan passed overwhelmingly by the Idaho Legislature during the 2007 session. So in the interim between your Fifth Power Plan and your Sixth Power Plan, the Idaho Legislature embraced a very similar tone, and I believe that the Northwest Power and Conservation Council helped to set that tone.

The Energy Plan passed by the Legislature took

months to develop, cost the State $300,000, and put energy efficiency and renewable energy as the first resources of choice over fossil fuels. Among the many recommendations addressing the electrical sector was recommendation E-2, which asks the Idaho Public Utilities Commission to implement conservation and efficiency targets for all Idaho utilities by either setting those targets within the Public Utilities Commission or referring to the targets set by the Northwest Power and Conservation Council.

I share this for two reasons: First, to highlight the parallel work between the Northwest Power and Conservation Council and the Idaho Legislature, and to affirm to both of you that the emphasis on efficiency in the Draft Plan is a politically-accepted and feasible position across party lines in this state. In other words, the notion of efficiency as the first resource of choice is now a norm. It's no longer, you know, a notion designated to environmentalists. It's something that has been accepted across party lines throughout this state.

And, secondly, I mention this to demonstrate how state policy is intertwined with regional planning, and to point out that the Northwest Power and Conservation Council is held in very high regard by the Idaho Energy Plan and by the Idaho Legislature, as is demonstrated by the intertwining of the Northwest Power and Conservation Council

into the actual text of the Energy Plan.

So, the point is that what you all say matters in this state to the way policy is implemented, and it helps lay the groundwork for pushing us forward to secure reliable and affordable and safe energy in our region. So, thank you so much for your current approach and emphasis on energy efficiency. I believe it really was the platform from which that emphasis on energy efficiency has been normalized in this state.

And so with your influence in mind, I ask that you re-evaluate the role of this Plan in helping set more stringent carbon reduction goals for this region. As climate legislation moves federally, it is essential that Idaho is well-positioned to compete with a new climate centric marketplace. By aggressively addressing the need for carbon reduction through recommending the phasing out of fossil fuel plants, the integration of a realistic assessment of carbon costs for utilities into the plan, and by highlighting a need for a robust integration of renewable energy, you can help Idaho prepare itself to address this new carbon centric/climate centric economy. And I hope you will re-evaluate the approach to carbon reduction goals in the Plan.

Thank you very much. (The witness left the stand.).

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Thank you, Liz.

Betsy Bridge.

BETSY BRIDGE, appearing as a public witness, testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Hi, my name is Betsy Bridge, and I am the energy efficiency associate and an attorney for the Idaho Conservation League. Our address is 710 North Sixth Street, Boise, Idaho.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on this Sixth Power Plan. I just have three very brief points to make.

The first, as you are probably well aware, efficiency is the cleanest, quickest, and safest way to meet our growing energy needs, so to begin I just want to congratulate you and thank you for the Council proposing to meet growth and electricity demand with energy efficiency and renewables. It's a very attainable and affordable goal, and I also believe it will help spur economic development in the region.

The second point I'd like to make is that the Sixth Power Plan must address the reduction of greenhouse gases, not just their stabilization, and in order to do so we must start phasing out the coal plants in the region.

This is also an affordable and attainable goal. As I think was quoted earlier this evening, according to the Council staff, the impact on rates would be between seven and 13 percent. This is a very negligible amount over 20 years. And being that this is such a small impact in rates, I think it's important to remember that the cost of mitigating climate change now will be much lower than adapting to climate change in the future.

My third point: The Council also needs to provide a projected cost for greenhouse gas pollution in their resource planning for utilities to use in their resource planning. Whether it's in the form of a cap in trade, a carbon tax, regulation under the Clean Air Act, carbon will carry a heavy price in the future. The Council is the lead policy maker for energy issues in the region, so it is imperative that the Sixth Power Plan include a carbon cost.

That's all I have for this evening. Thank you very much.

(The witness left the stand.)

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Thank you, Betsy.

Lou Landry.

LOU LANDRY, appearing as a public witness, testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Hello. Do you need my address? Is

that part of the protocol here?

COMMISSIONER YOST: It's part of the protocol. If you don't want to give it --

THE WITNESS: Oh, not a problem. I just didn't know.

The name is Lou Landry, and I live in Boise at 915 South Phillippi, and that's 83705.

I come as a citizen. I am on the board of the Snake River Alliance, but primarily, I come here as a citizen.

And just as a point of reflection, years ago I got interested in a poet by the name of Gary Snyder who's also an essayist on the environment, and he called people to understand their bioregion, to understand the watershed: Where does your water come from and where does it go once you've used it and the community has used it? And it made me also think about where do you get your juice? Every time you put on a light or turn on the blender, where did it come from and who or what paid the price? And just as a citizen as I looked at it and I thought, well, every time I do this I guess salmon pay a price for it, it looks like, as best I can understand that debate on hydro.

And then as I looked at living in Ada County and where Idaho Power -- and I did become a stockholder so I could get information and show up at the stockholders'

meeting. I'm now retired and so I have a little time to look at these things and try to be a responsible citizen. And then I realize, well, part of the price is paid for by the people who live in Wyoming and I guess further east where we have coal, where we buy a lot of our coal-generated power.

So that made me think about what is going on and so I learned about your group, and it's sort of intriguing, your role. I think I just have a little bit of an understanding of it. So I appreciate what I've heard in terms of really emphasizing efficiencies. Give you an example:

I'm building a house. I'm acting as the owner/contractor. And I've been doing I call it "green on a budget," and how do I be as responsible as I can, and I'll tell you what, it's not easy. It's not easy to get great information. There's very conflicting information. And so as we think about the new housing stock and getting information out I think primarily to contractors -- but I am going to be part of the Energy Star system and I have an Energy Star consultant or certifier or whatever that will help me -- it just seems, to me, that we could do a much better job of helping folks as we start to build homes think about that long life cycle and how we can really make it efficient. That's one thing that occurred to me.

But the other thing that really occurred to me in

terms of your plan is to think about what kind of leadership the Northwest should have regarding alternatives and renewables. I just think of us as an area with such amazing resources for renewable energy, and I would just ask you is that really strongly emphasized enough in your Plan?

As I started to learn a little bit about Idaho Power I learned this thing about base capacity, and then it spiking up, these needs that sort of spike up on those hot summer days, those 100-degree days that can go on for weeks here at times, and the irrigation and the air conditioners go on; and I'm wondering why there aren't more incentives to get solar power on the roofs of the houses to help out. It just looks simple to me and I don't see it there. And maybe that's not in your role, but I wonder about it.

I also, as a citizen, hear things about melting ice caps and melting glaciers in Tibet and water shortages, and I wonder are you being aggressive enough as we need to look at reducing our carbon. I don't know, but I assume that we may have a major problem on our hands as citizens, and I'm wondering is your Plan aggressive enough in that area.

And the other thing, in terms of whether or not nuclear is in our future, I remember a while back when they started to talk about pork as being the new white meat, and I think there's a certain kind of magical thinking about

this thing called clean coal and clean nuclear. Everything that I've seen sort of doesn't talk about what I experienced when I lived out in Gallup, New Mexico, where uranium was being mined and the tailings were blowing around the Navajo reservations in the dust and the kinds of cancers that were being picked up, or when the tailings pond at Church Rock broke and nuclear effluent moved down the Rio Puerco all the way to Saint Johns, Arizona. And I don't believe the industry has gotten that much better. So I really have doubts about this thing called clean nuclear and that that's our solution.

So, whatever leadership and vision that you have for us in terms of improving efficiencies and the use of alternatives and renewables, I'd really appreciate it.

Thank you. Thank you for your time.

(The witness left the stand.)

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Thanks, Lou.

That's all that's signed up that I have or indicated that they wanted to testify. If there's anyone else that has signed in that wants to say something, you're welcome to do that.

Bert Bowler.

MR. BOWLER: My leg went to sleep. Hopefully I'm not asleep myself.

BERT BOWLER, appearing as a public witness, testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Thank you, members of the Council. My name is Bert Bowler, and I represent Snake River Salmon Solutions at 910 Main Street, Suite 233, Boise, 83702.

I also would like to reiterate congratulations on putting together a well-crafted Plan, and myself as an advocate for dam removal, primarily to promote dialogue in the Northwest on efficacy of the opportunities for dam removal and recovering salmon. It's a huge issue right now. We're awaiting for a judge's response on the biological opinion. But I'd just like to say, Good job, Council, on looking at the economics of dam removal, putting that in your modeling, and I think that's really a first step because we really need to engage in that issue and hopefully from -- through the Sixth Power Plan and beyond, we will be in a regional dialogue on the whole issue of the efficacy of removing Lower Snake dams, replacing the power, and recovering salmon and the economy in the Northwest. And I think it's a great start that you actually gave that much attention to the model runs talking about Lower Snake dam removal.

Thank you.

(The witness left the stand.)

MR. YOST: Thanks, Bert.

There was someone else?

JEFF BURNS, appearing as a public witness, testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Good evening. My name is Jeff Burns. I'm the director of business development for Renewable Energy Resources, 5920 West Victory Road, Boise, Idaho, 83709.

Excuse me. First off -- excuse me -- I'd like to applaud the Council's efforts on the Sixth Power Plan. I look forward to sitting back and watching how this process progresses, and hopefully a favorable outcome for all involved.

In my role as director of business development for Renewable Energy Resources -- by the way, we do small wind, solar, being solar PV and solar thermal, as well as geothermal heating and cooling systems for residential, commercial, and agricultural customers. But in my role, I am in the trenches every day trying to help people obtain renewable energy for their homes, farms, and businesses. I'm aware of the cost concerns involving renewable energy; I hear them every day. That's probably one of the major obstacles I face in growing what we do as a business. But I

do believe as renewable energy does become more readily available, that prices will come down, hopefully.

And so just to kind of put into perspective what we're doing here, I'd like to kind of offer you the following:

In the 1950s, people were looking for more efficient ways to move from Point A to Point B, and thus the federal interstate highway system was built.

In the 1990s, people were out there looking for more efficient ways to obtain and transfer information, and thus the World Wide Web, or better known as the Internet, was built.

Here in 2009, approaching 2010, we're again looking for a better, faster, cheaper way, and this time has to do with energy. We are working on building a smart energy grid and all of the associated energy efficiencies and renewable energy measures to support it. This is a major paradigm shift in how we use and generate energy. It is not an easy task what you're doing, but I think you're doing a very good job.

The results of the smart grid should be an improved quality of life for everyone, just as driving on our freeways and using the Internet has made life better for all Americans. And in terms of making life better, I think one major thing stands out, and that is job creation. If we look at the three analogies I gave you, with the freeways,

we're still out there building and maintaining roads, particularly here in Idaho it seems. With the Web and the Internet, we've seen a prosperous IT industry develop with companies like Google, Yahoo, Microsoft. My hope is that with the development of a smart grid and the associated renewable energy and conservation measures that come with it, we will also see a major job-based creation that will allow for years to come people to have well-paying and stable jobs to support their families.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak with you.

(The witness left the stand.)

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Thank you, Jeff.

Anyone else who would like to make a comment? Yes.

STEVE HOWE, appearing as a public witness, testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm Steve Howe, and I'm with Renewable Energy Solutions. I think the focus on conservation is fantastic, it's excellent. I've got only two or three comments.

One, this graph that shows available resources by cost, I'm wondering if you have a similar one of available resources by CO2 production for comparison, if you've got that sort of analysis.

And then, from -- oh, my address is 2682 Peregrine, here in Boise.

And then I'm wondering whether or not it makes sense to have as a -- as a goal CO2 reduction. I think I echo a number of people's comments on that. And then a baseline to know where we are now. Maybe we know that already. Maybe we know what CO2 production we've got.

And then I'd like to echo the comments of establishing a reduction goal and then measurement towards that goal from a -- from an engineering point of view. I think that's a -- that sort of plan would set us on the path for reduction of CO2 emissions over a period of time.

And the last comment I've got is that coal-fired power plants, while one concern is CO2 emissions, there are also a number of other both air and water quality issues that are associated with CO2 production or energy production via coal, and I should just mention those and enter those in as a comment.

Thank you.

(The witness left the stand.)

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Thanks, Steve.

The rest of you don't need to be bashful. We're here to hear what you have to say. Anyone else have a comment or would like to make a comment?

I don't see anyone. Well, we were scheduled to

have the hearing go till six o'clock. We're going to go till six o'clock, but right now we're going to -- we'll take a short recess and if others decide they want to make a comment or we have some other folks arrive that want to make a comment, we'll come back into session.

And, so, we'll be recessed until we get some more customers.

(Recess.)

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: We'll reconvene. We have -- one more individual has requested an opportunity to present us some comments, so we'll -- now we will hear from Hans Glenn.

HANS GLENN, appearing as a public witness, testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Hello. I just want to applaud the Council's efforts and just mention that I'd like to see reduced CO2 emission goals, time lines, strategies, and methods, something along those lines, that look at solutions to reduction.

I also want to reiterate the need for, you know, conservation efforts and energy efficiency, and the economic and environmental benefits that those conservation and efficiency bring.

That's all I had. Thanks.

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Thanks, Hans.

(The witness left the stand.)

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Does the Commissioner want to testify? Lou?

MR. LANDRY: Do you have time? Could I add one thing?

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Lou, come up to the microphone and I'll let you add to your comments that you made earlier.

LOU LANDRY, reappearing as a public witness, further testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Thank you. I had not seen your brochure. Lou Landry, and you have my address, 915 South Phillippi.

When it talks about your role, the principle duties of the Council, and number three is to provide for broad public participation in these processes and inform the Northwest public about regional energy issues, and I may be way, way, way out of the loop so that maybe you're doing so much more than I could comprehend in terms of informing the public, but I started out with that notion of what this essayist I've been very influenced by, this fellow named Gary Snyder, in terms of understand your bioregion, understand your water. If you would like the public to be

really knowledgeable, are there ways that you might consider that public information role so that the broader public understands what it means to turn on the switch? And I know that there's a lot of competing interest for people's time and their level of energy and attention, but it seems to me these are critical issues in our society, and we're a society where a lot of people have got an opinion.

And I watch TV and I watch the coal industry doing some big public information about clean coal and selling people on this notion of clean coal, and maybe there is something called clean coal. I'm kind of doubtful.

But just at a very fundamental level, I would say what are you all doing to inform the public about where their energy sources are and what the trade-offs are in terms of the various big decisions we make?

Thank you.

COUNCILMEMBER YOST: Thank you.

(The witness left the stand.)

MR. YOST: Anyone else have anything for the good of the order?

Well, I'm going to stay here until six o'clock, but I think I'll adjourn the hearing right now. Thank you.

(The hearing adjourned at 5:56 p.m.)

AUTHENTICATION

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript to the best of my ability of the proceedings in the matter of the Northwest Power and Conservation Council Draft Sixth Power Plan Public Meeting, commencing Tuesday, October 13, 2009, at the JR Williams Building, of Mirrors, 700 West State Street, Boise, Idaho, and the original thereof for the file of the Council.

_____

WENDY J. MURRAY, Notary Public in and for the State of Idaho, residing at Meridian, Idaho.

My Commission expires 2-8-2014.

Idaho CSR No. 475