

SN CRAC NEPA Public Meeting
May 20, 2003
Meeting Notes
DRAFT

Kathy Pierce (KP) opened the meeting at 7:05 p.m. with a summary of the NEPA comment period, how to comment, and the purpose of the meeting: KP noted that the SN CRAC process appears consistent with the market-driven policy of the BP EIS and its risk management strategy.

BPA staff attending: Kathy Pierce (meeting lead), Jim Kehoe, Rick Yarde, Hub Adams, and Kelly Mason

Three members of the public attended: Lon Peters, Kevin O'Meara, and Erin Conway [these attendees wrote several others in to be included on the mailing list]

Lon Peters, representing Generating Public Utilities (GPU), who will file written comments next week.

1. When was the notice of this meeting sent out? KP: end of April, for the May journal.
2. To whom was the notice sent? KP: posted on various BPA websites including the SN CRAC website, and in the Journal.
3. Was there a mailing? KP: no.
4. It was the journal and the postings? KP: correct.
5. Was there a Federal Register notice posted? KP: not separate, but included in the other SN CRAC FR notice.
6. When did you start working on NEPA compliance for SN CRAC? KP: in 2001 when we laid out in the CRAC discussion, and it tracks to 97 or 98.
7. Which part of that is particular to SN CRAC? KP: the rate case people are in touch with us and let us know what was happening.
8. Before the decision was made to trigger the SN CRAC? KP: we have not made a NEPA decision at this point, that will come later.
9. What was the first decision – to start the NEPA? KP: the decision was made when they did the last rate case and the strategy that was talked about with subscription in 1998 or 97.
10. Is this the first scoping meeting for NEPA? KP: this is technically not a NEPA scoping meeting. Scoping is used for getting an idea of issues for an EIS, but that this is a tiered ROD strategy ensures that the NEPA process was integrated into the larger SN CRAC process, so that in the subscription process and the 2000 rate process and in the current SN CRAC process, NEPA is completely integrated, so there was not specific scoping for this process because we are using an EIS already in place.
11. Will the notes that are taken tonight be part of the formal record for the rate case or the rate process? KP: it will be part of the NEPA record of decision.

I'm not sure how it will figure into the overall record, but my understanding is that the record closed on the formal SN CRAC process already. All of these comments will be discussed in the environmental analysis process.

12. What is the nature of the draft document – is it an EA or an EIS? KP: it is properly characterized as a tiered ROD and the analysis will appear either in the ROD for the administrator's SN CRAC decision as a separate chapter, or as a stand-alone tiered ROD, a decision hasn't been made yet.
13. In order to make sure that we are properly notified of any NEPA activities, is there a separate mailing list? KP: put your name on the sign-in sheet at the door, or you can contact us anytime and let us know you want to be included.
14. In the FR notice, there was a discussion on 12052. The bottom left-hand corner paragraph on section c at "an initial review..." The second sentence talks about the rate levels. Did the rate staff give you rate levels to compare to the BP EIS levels, or did you come up with them yourself? KP: We meant rate design, not specific numbers. The BP EIS used a relationship analysis.
15. So there was no numerical analysis at all in this initial review? KP: because of the type of analysis in the original document, specific numbers weren't needed, but rather it was a discussion of maximum rate...basically costs must be covered by revenues.
16. Is there any plan at this point in the NEPA analysis to do numerical analysis? KP: in the NEPA analysis, no.
17. Is there a plan to do any environmental analysis such as impacts to air quality, water quality, electricity consumption? KP: those analyses were included in the BP EIS and Subscription ROD, so we have a fairly in-depth analysis of those things in there.
18. So we should look at the BP EIS and the Subscription Strategy ROD? KP: correct.
19. Subscription strategy ROD, December 98, had a NEPA chapter? KP: It was a NEPA tiered ROD, specific to NEPA, not included in the administrator's ROD – they were separate documents...[KP goes on to describe the two decision documents under NEPA and the Power Act]. KP asks if anyone else has comments.

Kevin O'Meara, from the Public Power Council: I don't have anything else to add besides what Lon is getting at.

Lon:

I don't have any further questions.

Final comments received at approximately 7:40 p.m. Meeting ended at approximately 9 p.m. (BPA staff waiting to see if anyone else came, but no one did)