

**Public Meeting Notes**  
Bonneville Power Administration  
Regional Dialogue Policy Proposal  
Shilo Inn at Idaho Falls, Idaho  
3:30 p.m. – August 23, 2006  
Attendees: Approx. 77 (not including BPA)

These notes are intended to summarize oral comments given at the Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) public meeting on its Regional Dialogue Policy Proposal (Proposal). This summary is not a verbatim transcript. It will become part of BPA's official record.

\* \* \*

### Opening Remarks

**Mark Gendron, the vice president for requirements marketing at BPA**, convened the public meeting at 3:30 p.m. Attached is a list of attendees.

Gendron welcomed attendees and encouraged oral comments at the meeting and, if desired, separate written comments. The agency's Proposal was released for public review on July 13, 2006. The official comment period will end Sept. 29, 2006.

He called attention to a special public meeting on Direct Service Industrial (DSI) customer service to be held Sept. 8 in Portland, from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. in BPA's Rates Hearing Room.

Gendron summarized the Proposal and opened the floor for public comment without regard to topic. He said BPA wants to clarify the Proposal and encouraged questions.

\* \* \*

### Public Comments

**Bill Punkoney, Assistant to the Counsel to the Governor** of Idaho, read a letter by **Gov. Jim Risch** stating areas of interest and concern to the state (a hard copy will be submitted). The governor expressed support for the residential exchange program's sharing of benefits in the federal hydro system. It is the policy of the state, he wrote, to share in the costs and problems of the system, and also to share in the benefits.

He noted that benefits are proposed to be reduced from \$300 million annually to \$250 million. He requested that BPA provide accounting to support the change and that BPA schedule a meeting with his office within a matter of weeks.

He said the state expects Tier 1 power and rates would be provided to the residential and small farm consumers of investor-owned utilities (IOU).

He said Idaho supports the integration of wind but that it should not be a cost borne by the residential exchange program.

The letter concluded that the state will support the Proposal only as a whole, not piecemeal.

**Lee Staker, Bonneville County Commissioner**, read the contents of a letter from the lieutenant governor expressing strong support for the law's requirement to provide benefits to the residential consumers of IOUs. "The sharing of benefits has been ongoing," he said. Given that Idaho shares in the difficulties and costs associated with fish operations, it's only appropriate to share in the benefits of the system, he said.

BPA's proposal to reduce benefits from \$300 million to \$250 million "raises considerable concerns." He requested that BPA provide fiscal accounting and assumptions to Gov. Risch for his office's review.

Idaho understands the challenges of integrating wind into the system, he said, but the costs of doing so should not be an exposure borne by the residential exchange program.

**Randy Budge of the Pocatello firm Cooper and Budge that represents Monsanto** in rate work said BPA should reconsider any reduction in benefits to residential and irrigation customers. "They should be maintained at existing levels," and adjusted for inflation, he stated.

Monsanto, he noted, does not buy power from BPA for its phosphate operation at Soda Springs. Since 1951 the firm has been the largest customer of PacifiCorp and a producer of P<sup>4</sup> elemental phosphorus; they employ 800 people, providing 40 percent of the local job base. Their product is used to manufacture Roundup, food products, and other items. He said it is an extremely competitive business, with extraordinary pricing pressures from China. With advancing power costs, Monsanto is now the last phosphorus producer in the U.S. One third of its production costs go to electricity, with an annual consumption of 1.4 billion kilowatt-hours (kWh).

Fifty percent of its power comes from Rocky Mountain Power (formerly Utah Power, a division of PacifiCorp) in southeast Idaho. A new power purchase contract, if approved, will result in a 16½-percent rate increase. "Electricity is a big deal," he said, adding that Monsanto is represented at this meeting "to support our residential and irrigation customers – our friends."

He expressed a concern about a "rippling effect on other rates, a disruption of rates," in the event of reduced BPA benefits. Monsanto's rate could be indirectly affected because remaining costs would have to be spread to other customers.

In conclusion, he urged the Proposal be modified to allow IOUs to retain the current level of benefits, with adjustments.

**Rep. Tom Loertscher of District 31** said, "The Proposal will dramatically affect those in my district." He said farm customers are reliant on the exchange credit. He also mentioned that he has to generate three-phase power on his ranch, an undertaking that is becoming increasingly unaffordable due to rising diesel costs.

He said BPA's Proposal will have the same detrimental effect on agriculture in the state. "With dramatically increasing costs to customers, how will [agriculture] handle these increased costs?" he asked. He said farmers cannot pass costs on; they must be absorbed. There will be a dramatic effect on those who pump water, he said. "We have a tough economic challenge, a struggling economy, and as costs increase, it becomes less affordable to live."

He spoke to the "inflationary side of the equation": as we approach 2011, the \$300 million available now will decrease. "The \$250 million constitutes a double hit on the inflation side," he said.

**Mark Mickelsen of the Idaho Irrigation Pumpers Association** said the IIPA members are served by Rocky Mountain Power and Idaho Power Company. He said he has the same concerns expressed by others at the meeting. “I am concerned about the reduction from \$300 million to \$250 million,” he said. “Considering inflation, the number should be more like \$350 million in 2012.”

With this decrease in benefits, we are looking at \$10-30 an acre-foot in increased costs, he stated. “We can’t take that,” he said. “Pumpers and irrigators want to do what they can to see that doesn’t happen.”

**Eric Olsen is an attorney in Pocatello;** his firm, Racine Olson Nye Budge & Bailey, represents the Idaho Irrigation Pumpers Association. He said the policy behind the Northwest Power Act was to share the benefits of the hydro system with the IOUs. Nine out of 10 Idaho consumers receive their power from IOUs, he said, and the only way Idaho gets benefits is through the exchange credit.

“Keep the benefits as generous as possible,” he urged. “We’re facing pressures: financial, water costs, and so on. The Proposal could have a significant effect on our members.”

He said consumers of Rocky Mountain Power have enjoyed the lion’s share of the exchange benefits compared to those served by Idaho Power Company. He also mentioned that these benefits have become “an integral part of life” for Idahoans.

He said the exchange credit from 2002-2006 was a “product of the western energy crisis, and we knew it [high levels] would go away; there’d be a cliff. But now we’re facing another one.” He said an appropriate amount of credit is supposed to be provided so that small farm customers can participate in the federal hydro system.

He said he is aware that BPA provides irrigation rate mitigation to customers served by publicly owned utility systems, and he asked BPA to be cognizant of the “serious nature of the Proposal” as it affects non-publicly served irrigators.

**Rep. Dell Raybould of District 34** said his constituents are served by Rocky Mountain Power and Fall River REC. “Residential and small farms have a statutory right to share in the benefits of the federal system,” he stated. “The IOUs don’t get the benefits; the end-users do.” Sixty percent of the total customers in the region obtain IOU service, he said, and 40 percent through the publics. “Yet they [the publics] receive 82 percent of the benefits.”

The proposed reduction in benefits, he said, represents “a direct hit on the customers of private utilities; it’s an unfair thing.” He said he believes “‘REAs’ and ‘munis’ have a right to get power at the lowest rate – but not at the expense of consumers of the other utilities.” Under BPA’s proposal, residential customers of IOUs would see a 5½-percent increase in their power bills, he said, and irrigators would face a 12½-percent increase. “This could be another nail in the coffin of eastern Idaho agriculture.”

He noted ongoing increases in fertilizer costs, machine parts, and the like. “We depend on the help from Bonneville to get normal rates,” he said. “We should be getting increases [in benefits], not decreases, if you take inflation into effect.

“Bonneville gets benefits from Idaho irrigators in increased flows through flow augmentation water. At the peak season we contribute 487,000 acre-feet per year, or \$30 million worth of extra power to Bonneville. It’s a real benefit to Bonneville that could have gone to other irrigators.”

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) is costing Bonneville about \$400 million a year in fish-recovery expenditures, he said. “The salmon aren’t only for the benefit of the customers of Bonneville and the Northwest. It [the ESA] is a national act. The eastern U.S. ought to be helping pay for it,” he said, and the federal government should help with ESA costs.

**Scott Levy maintains a website at [www.bluefish.org](http://www.bluefish.org).** He said it is designed to provide factually correct information to the public, adding that that he wished to correct certain errors in others’ testimony.

“Yes, Bonneville gets money,” he said, “but so does Idaho Power, from augmentation. Bonneville spends not \$400 million, but \$600 million a year, or \$6 billion dollars over the next ten years.” Under the ESA, “the taxpayer doesn’t pay much, that’s true,” he noted. “Most of the money comes from ratepayers.” He said he wants to make sure people have “good numbers.”

He asked why BPA plans to go to 20-year rate periods. “It seems like six years is a good thing; six is more like an election cycle. When you’re spending \$75,000 an hour on salmon recovery, going to a 20-year cycle,” he said, is of concern.

BPA’s Mark Gendron clarified that BPA is proposing 20-year contracts and two-year rate periods.

Levy asked whether customers can “drop out” anytime from their contracts and whether utilities “want to commit to Bonneville” for 20 years.

Gendron replied that specific purchase commitments will be a matter of final contract language.

Stating his understanding that Tier 1 sales are expected to be based on a Federal Base System (FBS) level of 7,300 megawatts (MW), Levy noted this was a change from an earlier published figure of 7,400.

Gendron commented briefly on the derivation of the FBS capability figures in the Proposal.

Levy expressed a concern that BPA ought to make 20-year contracts “to fend off customers from Bonneville service” that are burdened with “the high cost of Energy Northwest.” If that were done, he said, “overall costs would be lower.” Energy Northwest costs are “a continuing concern” because the plant is “not meeting its goals.” Including nuclear costs in Tier 1 may not be appropriate, he said. “Maybe lock them into Tier 2.”

He said the Lower Snake dams are causing jeopardy to salmon. “You’re saying we can offer firm load for 20 years, but a lot can happen” to change the picture, he concluded.

**Jerry Rigby, an attorney from Rexburg,** said his firm of Rigby, Thatcher, Andrus, Rigby & Moeller represents some of the area’s cooperative utilities. He is the chair of the Idaho Water Resource Board.

Of concern are ESA flow augmentation issues of fairness and fair play. History is important, he said. The area has had an agricultural base for years. Economic capital is based on certain programs continuing in existence – for example, the exchange. He said that to change the program dramatically as proposed raises the question, Is it fair play?

Regarding flow augmentation, he said, “We have gone overboard in taking more than our burden on ESA flow issues.” Fish above Shoshone Falls have never been our problem, he said, “but we are making it our problem.”

He spoke to a Catch-22, that if it becomes economically unfeasible to use power for irrigation and farmers are forced to revert to flooding fields, they won't be able to promote flow augmentation. "Don't destroy an industry that is being a good sister state," he said.

He stated that Idaho has every kind of utility – private, cooperative, municipal – and that these are desperate times. "Be careful when cutting out long-term programs that have been relied on."

**William Adams, policy analyst with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes,** said his group supports salmon recovery.

BPA's proposal, he said, does not support new tribal utilities. "We are trying to become a new tribal utility and get into renewables and conservation, especially wind," he stated. "But the way High Water Marks [HWM] are to be set prevents new small utilities."

He said that while his group likes the small utility exemption, tribal utilities will start small and grow, and setting HWMs based on early load levels won't work for them. "Provide an exception beyond the 50-MW limit; add flexibility to the 250-MW limit. Twenty years is a long time."

He said the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes support the views of bluefish.org.

The sales of surplus power, he said, should not be used to lower Tier 1 rates but to offset the cost of service to new preference customers. "And don't squeeze the fish and wildlife program to lower rates to Tier 1."

On BPA's proposed fallback position, he said new publics will not be allowed any Tier 1 power. "This is unacceptable, and contrary to statute."

He wondered whether the president's budget proposal is illegal.

Changes in BPA's policy on transfer service, he said, were to have taken place in 2011, not when the RD policy is finalized, as has now been called for in the Proposal. "This creates a true hardship for new tribal utilities."

**Judy Chestnutt is an Alcoa employee.** She said her company is a leading aluminum producer. Its Intalco plant at Ferndale, Wash., is operating at one-third capacity because of high power prices. At its Wenatchee plant, half the load is served by BPA, the other half by Chelan Public Utility District (PUD).

Aluminum is a global commodity, she explained, and a major cost of production is power. "We can't pass the cost of power on, because we don't set the [commodity] prices," she said.

Alcoa has been a Direct Service Industrial (DSI) customer of BPA since 1937 and the firm's Vancouver plant began taking service in 1939. At that time Clark PUD did not exist, so Alcoa became directly served by the government. "We never had the opportunity to be served by the local PUD."

She said that "finding a fair way to distribute the benefits [of the system] is the number one priority." She described BPA's proposed DSI service alternatives – no power, financial benefits, and 560 MW at the PF (Priority Firm) rate. "At Intalco if we ran at full operations, our net power rate would be \$52 per megawatt[-hour]. Now it's about \$36 per MW. This compares with \$27 per MW to utilities.

BPA's current arrangement to provide financial benefits "won't work long term," she said. "It's a bridge to 2011 when we hope to buy power like other industries through the local PUD."

“We want something that’s fair to all interests,” she said, enumerating parties that include the IOUs and DSIs. Fairness to Alcoa, she said, means that they are served like other plants that purchase cost-based power from utilities. Alcoa’s DSI status is a “historical accident,” she said.

The DSIs have provided regional benefits ranging from metal production for the war effort to provision of power reserves. “Communities and employees rely on Alcoa for their paychecks,” she said. “We are a tremendous benefit to the local community.”

If Alcoa were provided 560 MW of power, it could operate at 100 percent capacity, but if it received no power, Intalco would likely close, she explained. “The 560 is a reasonable amount. BPA once sold 3,000 to the aluminum companies. Five-hundred sixty will not be enough, but we think we can make it work; it’s a compromise we’re willing to make.”

**Dar Olberding of the Idaho Grain Growers** said the federal government pushed a farm bill by which millions of dollars were made available to “prop up” agriculture. “Why would another part of the government want to increase our power rates by increasing the exchange rate?” he asked.

**Jo Fikstad, assistant manager for Idaho Falls Power (IFP)**, said her organization appreciates the opportunity to testify. Bonneville and IFP have been good business partners, she explained, and also commending BPA on its Proposal. “Bonneville has listened to its public power customers to keep the FBS low cost.” She said IFP looks forward to long-term certainty of federal-base power.

High Water Marks will be forecast, then tried up, she commented, observing that in 2012, “there will be public customers with net requirements lower than their HWMs.” She said IFP supports using 2010 actual net requirements figures.

With six customers served under the South Idaho Exchange contract, “there will be challenging opportunities for them,” she said. “Transfer service should not be used as leverage to buy Tier 2,” she said. She described the several dollar and MW caps on transfer service in the Proposal and urged that BPA set caps at a cost level, not a demand level. She mentioned that from 2008 until 2011, the first three years of the contract, the contemplated \$800,000 annual cost limit will not be made use of and should be deducted from the cap totals.

She pointed out that at the end of the contracts, there will be a greater need to deliver non-federal power, and recommend increasing the cap toward the end of the contract life.

She said Slice is “an ideal product” to attain the primary goals BPA has identified under the RD – for example, encouraging customers to develop infrastructure and non-federal resources, and reducing BPA’s role as the region’s power supplier.

Idaho Falls is “generally supportive” of the Proposal, she concluded.

**Beatrice Brailsford of the Snake River Alliance** asked about the kinds of generation capacity that require three years to develop. “I’m concerned about renewables and the nuclear possibility,” she said.

Mark Gendron of BPA explained that his agency has not identified specific resources it hopes to see developed, “except for renewables with respect to Tier 2.” He explained that BPA is obligated to follow the requirements of the Northwest Power Act and to follow the recommendations of the Northwest Power and Conservation Council regarding furthering conservation and renewables.

**Don Burtenshaw, the state representative for District 35,** said, “I see my constituents taking a look at the [augmentation] program where 487,000 acre-feet of water has been important to our state. We are interested in maintaining the status quo on the \$350 million.” He explained that farmers rely on deep wells for irrigation, and that 30-40 years ago, flood irrigation lands were converted to sprinklers, resulting in a savings of water and cost.

He provided an example of the cost to build power facilities to reach irrigation systems, costs that were in part offset by increases in efficiency of water use. “We saved water and put in a big investment, and if we must pay more for electricity, it’s gotten to the point that the only persons making money are those who have ground to sell to developers.” He said the farm industry has no young people in it unless it’s through inheritance. “It’s a touch-and-go business,” he said, citing the drop in price of wheat from \$4.50 a bushel fifty years ago to \$3 now.

“We’ve gotten more efficient,” he said, “but we got no credit for the water saved. We would like to see the status quo. We need that help.”

**Jeff Raybould, a farmer from St. Anthony,** said, “If there’s a reduction in the [exchange] program, it will affect me in comparison with others in the Pacific Northwest who get power from public utilities with lower rates. They’ll be able to beat us in the marketplace.”

He said that the intent of Congress is to be treated fairly and that all electric consumers are to get benefits. “Look at the program and analyze the projections. Is it comparable to what other consumers are getting? Keep or increase the \$300 million.”

**Jeff Siddoway** said he is running for a seat in District 35. He said he’s signed contracts for wind energy. He observed that the ESA issues had already been covered in the meeting.

Changing the exchange program, he said, “does disrupt the basis we’re used to. It’s not necessary. It’s not fair. Keep the current proposal.”

He asked, “Why does BPA want this shift? Why ask rural America to carry more of a burden? It’s an oxymoron: we’re trying to make out better but you’re taking it from us.”

As to alternative resources, he asked who was supposed to develop them. Regardless who does, he said, mitigation will be required. “Idaho Power Company can tell you about the costs of relicensing renewables,” he said. “This nation is in such a pathetic situation now, and I have strong views on why.”

BPA’s Mark Gendron explained that the proposed level of exchange benefits is “in the range of where historical benefits have been,” and that BPA has not looked at one-year’s data but a stream of existing benefits over the program’s life. BPA’s proposal “reflects the medium range of historical benefits,” he said, adding it will be “difficult to predict the benefits if we re-establish the residential exchange program.” He offered that it would be a “contentious effort to calculate the benefits, using a complicated formula.” The Proposal, he said, “tried to show what the benefits might be – that’s how we came to our proposal.”

Gendron said BPA is urging the region to come to agreement on this issue and that absent agreement on the value and method, “we go back to the historical statutory approach to determine benefits.” There’s a great deal of uncertainty and risk for all customers, he said, and the potential range of benefits could go to zero, although as to an exact figure, “we don’t know what the benefits would be.”

Siddoway asked about the setting of the 400-horsepower (hp) limit on the exchange benefits, and Gendron replied that the use of that figure has been “consistent under a proven program.”

As to resource development, Gendron said the agency envisions a combination of distributed generation, utility-constructed generation, conservation, and Bonneville-acquired resources. “We have an obligation to serve the loads of preference customers,” he explained. “We can’t own resources, but we would acquire resources on their behalf.”

**Scott Levy** of bluefish.org asked whether BPA is committing to 750 or more MW of conservation under the Proposal and how that would be attained.

Gendron explained, “We’d offer conservation programs and encourage utilities to also develop their own programs. We will commit the MW associated with both [efforts] toward the Council targets.”

**Dee Reynolds, general manager at Fall River Rural Electric Cooperative** in Ashton, said his utility supports the RD Proposal.

He said he wished to offer a “second perspective” on the matter of irrigation benefits. “We’re on the other side of the equation as to who pays for fish, the DSIs, and residential exchange program costs. It’s now based on a political decision. You’re getting 27-mills [of benefit] from Rocky Mountain Power, and that’s almost identical to [the rate] Bonneville is proposing. We are now equal. The residential exchange should be zero.”

He urged BPA to “look at what the methodology should be,” rather than a “political decision” on the residential exchange program, DSI service, and fish. “My customers will see higher rates because of that.”

**Valynn Highbarger of Blaine Larsen Farms** asked about BPA’s proposed changes to the exchange program. “Why are you doing this? It will have an obvious result: higher costs to agriculture.”

BPA’s Mark Gendron said the level of benefits would be lower under the Proposal, but the distribution of value to the region’s six IOUs will affect how benefits reach specific end-users.

Highbarger said that “a common belief here is that it [the proposed change] will affect irrigated agriculture. If going back to the ‘good old days’ – using historical norms – means it’s tougher for us, BPA should consider our plight.”

Many people depend on agriculture, she said. “What will your statisticians project will happen to us? We need help. It’s a choice. You’re choosing to go in this direction.”

Gendron offered to meet with her and others after the meeting to explain in greater detail the basis for BPA’s proposal on exchange benefits.

He acknowledged the importance of her comment and reminded attendees that the Proposal is not a final decision. “You have an impact on our decision,” he said. “We’re looking for agreement. Absent that, there are risks, hence the fallback. We want parties other than Bonneville to come to agreement. Frankly, that does require compromise.”

**Heber Carpenter of Raft River Rural Electric Cooperative** in Malta said, “We are here on the opposite side of the residential exchange. It seems like if the \$250 million in the Proposal is too much, and others are saying, ‘raise it,’ maybe you’re getting to a true compromise and that you will have to make a decision.”



As to the proposed 20-year contracts, “We’d take 30 if the contract turns out like the Proposal is heading,” he said. “Give us certainty on the amount of power, and let us make the resource decisions.” But if every five or six years BPA changes the rules, “you’re stuck.”

**Russell Westerberg, a residential consumer of Idaho Power Company**, said nine of 10 people are served by IOUs in Idaho. He said BPA would be remiss by not asking for a show of hands among attendees to demonstrate who benefits under the exchange program.

Mark Gendron of BPA said he recognized the sentiments expressed by many attendees and that he appreciated the comments made.

**Manager Ralph Williams of United Electric Cooperative** said irrigation load comprises about 20 percent of his utility’s load requirement. “We’re sympathetic with the plight of irrigators,” he said, pointing out also that he is the chair of Northwest Irrigation Utilities.

“But what Bonneville is trying to do is strike a balance,” he testified, “between those who buy power from Bonneville and the small farm customers of IOUs.” He described the legislative history of the 400-hp line of demarcation for what qualifies under the law as an eligible farm to receive exchange benefits.

“We have problems with BPA’s proposal, too,” he continued. “But they’ve done a good job on paper; United supports the proposal. It’s not perfect, but all [parties] must compromise.”

As to transmission service, he pointed out what he sees as a disparity in the way Idaho Power-connected customers are treated under the Proposal. “We are looking to Intermountain’s third unit in Delta, Utah – but how can we get the power from Delta? We’re about to build the project and sign a contract, and we have to transport it through Rocky Mountain Power, then Idaho Power Company, and then over some small Bonneville lines. The Proposal says non-federal power must touch the Bonneville main grid” to qualify for transmission coverage.

He urged BPA to “look at that policy; work with the eastern Idaho customers – we have a unique situation” warranting special consideration. He said all customers in southern Idaho supported BPA on its Grid West initiative. Had it materialized, “it would have solved the pancaking” issue, Williams said.

On the Slice product, he said, “I’m a full requirements utility, like Soda Springs. There’s been a lot of acrimony due to rates. If there are benefits for Slicers, the full service customers have to pay for them, and vice versa.” He urged BPA to develop a rate to “do away with the in-fighting.” BPA needs political strength of its customers, he said. “We need each other desperately.”

He added that United would submit written comments through the various member organizations to which it belongs.

\* \* \*

By 5:50 p.m., there were no other attendees wishing to make comments or ask questions, and the meeting was tabled. BPA attendees remain presented until the official closing time of 7:00 p.m. to receive any additional testimony.

**Ted Watanabe, a resident of Idaho Falls**, arrived at the meeting at approximately 6:00 p.m. and asked for an explanation of the “de-funding by Sen. Craig” of a certain fish counting facility.

BPA's Mark Gendron said a subject-matter expert within his agency would contact Watanabe to provide information.

Watanabe asked why "the region" did not oppose the termination of the Trojan nuclear plant, "yet it screams" about the proposed removal of the Lower Snake dams. In light of the Trojan closure, he questioned whether there is a power shortage in the region and whether the Lower Snake dams are necessary for the grid. "I want to take out the four dams," he said, explaining they were originally installed under the Eisenhower Administration to furnish power to the Hanford project. But now that there is "no load there," the dams could be removed, he stated. "Put in a nuke at Hanford instead."

Watanabe also asked for clarification of the president's budget proposal, and Gendron explained that surplus sales revenues in excess of \$500 million would be used to pre-pay BPA's Treasury debt.

\* \* \*

*Respectfully submitted,*  
Rodney A. Aho, notetaker  
Bonneville Power Administration  
(503) 230-3634

Attendees  
BPA Regional Dialogue Public Meeting  
Idaho Falls, Idaho – August 23, 2006

1.	Adams, William D.	Shoshone-Bannock Tribe
2.	Allen, Burten D.	Emery Farm Inc.
3.	Brailsford, Beatrice	Snake River Alliance
4.	Budge, Randall C.	Monsanto
5.	Burtenshaw, Don	Idaho Dist. 35
6.	Burtenshaw, Lee	
7.	Carpenter, Heber	Raft River Rural Electric Cooperative
8.	Chestnutt, Judy	Alcoa
9.	Clauson, Anthony	Cornelison Farms
10.	Clawson, Scott	Scottco LLC
11.	Cornelison, Brett	24/7 LLC
12.	Crapo, Richard	Riverside Farm
13.	Diehl, Hugh	Alcoa/IAMAW
14.	Erickson, Coleen	Rep. Mike Simpson
15.	Fikstad, Jo	Idaho Falls Power
16.	Flaherty, Pat	Alcoa/IAMAW
17.	Flowers, Jackie	Idaho Falls Power
18.	Gellings, Matt	Idaho Grain Producers Assoc.
19.	Godfrey, Lee	City of Soda Springs
20.	Gould, Gary	Shoshone-Bannock Tribe
21.	Greco, Nancy	SRA
22.	Grover, Shaun	Mud Lake Water Users
23.	Hansen, Christopher	Cornelison Farms
24.	Hansen, Gordon O.	City of Burley
25.	Harker, Lionel	Cornilson Farms
26.	Henley, Vicki	Alcoa/IAMAW
27.	Highbarger, Valynn	Blaine Larsen Farms
28.	Ison, Robb	Ison Farms
29.	Jacobs, Kirk	Silver K. Farms
30.	Jones, Dale	Cornelison Farms
31.	Keller, Kendall	Idaho Farm Bureau
32.	Levy, Scott	www.bluefish.org
33.	Loertscher, Tom	Legislative Dist. 31
34.	Marvin, Nate	City of Weiser
35.	Maughaw, Gaylord	Monteview Canal Co./Producers Canal Co.
36.	McCulloch, Robert	Producers Irr. Canal
37.	Mecham, Larry	Larry Mecham Farms
38.	Messerli, Gerald	Mud Lake Water Users
39.	Meyerin, Knut	U.S. Senator Craig
40.	Mickelsen, Mark	Idaho Irrigation Pumpers Assoc.
41.	Miller, Ken	NW Energy Coalition

42.	Newman, LaVar	
43.	O'Meara, Kevin	PPC
44.	Obenchain, Phil	Idaho Power Co.
45.	Olberding, Dar	Idaho Grain Producers
46.	Olsen, Eric L.	Idaho Irrigation Pumpers Assoc.
47.	Parkinson, Tim	Larsen Farms
48.	Pfeiffer, Dan	IPWC
49.	Pond, Glen	PacifiCorp
50.	Punkoney, Bill	Gov. Jim Risch
51.	Raybould, Jeff	Raybould Bros. Farms
52.	Raybould, Rep. Dell	Raybould Bros. Farms
53.	Reynolds, Dee	Fall River Rural Electric Cooperative
54.	Richard, Pete	IDAT
55.	Ricks, Will	RIC Farms
56.	Rigby, Jerry	Rigby Thatcher & Andrus
57.	Robison, Nikki	Walker Farms
58.	Sanden, Barb	Idaho Falls Power
59.	Saver, Chris	Saver Farm
60.	Seavle, Stanley	Stan & Kurt Seavle Farms
61.	Siddoway, Jeff	
62.	Skidmore, Gary	Skidmore Farms
63.	Smead, Robert	Rocky Mtn. Power
64.	Smith, Jim	Monsanto
65.	Staker, Lee	Bonneville Co. Commission
66.	Summer, Gary	Summerco, Inc.
67.	Summers, Kelly	Frank Summers, Inc.
68.	Vadnais, Steve	Larsen Farms
69.	Walters, Shawn	Walters Farms
70.	Webster, Kevin	Webster's Inc.
71.	Webster, Mick	Sen. Larry Craig
72.	Webster, Shawn	Webster Mile High Farm
73.	Westerberg, Russell	Westerberg & Associates
74.	Wilcox, Jerry	Keith Wilcox & Sons
75.	Williams, Ralph	United Electric Coop.
76.	Wood, Byron	L&J Farms
77.	Wood, Lynn	Mud Lake Water Users
78.	Aho, Rodney	BPA
79.	Burbank, Nita	BPA
80.	DeClerck, Angela	BPA
81.	Gendron, Mark	BPA
82.	King, Larry	BPA
83.	Stiles, Rebekah	BPA
84.	Thompson, Garry	BPA
85.	Williams, John	BPA
86.	Wilson, Scott	BPA