From: peter barry

To: <u>CLARK Christopher \* ODOE</u>; <u>CORNETT Todd \* ODOE</u>; <u>HEUBERGER Stacey \* ODOE</u>; <u>Rowe Patrick G</u>;

tbrooks@cablehuston.com; cstokes@cablehuston.com; stuarts@cpi.coop; brent.bybee@co.crook.or.us; derekgreen@dwt.com; ott.irene@frontier.com; brian@hellscanyon.org; dockets@idahopower.com; mlarkin@idahopower.com; cgarone@inteserra.com; djohnson@co.lake.or.us; adam@mrg-law.com; dockets@mrg-law.com; jocelyn@mrg-law.com; tmabbott@co.morrow.or.us; loisbarry31@gmail.com;

cyncarper@yahoo.com; bonniejdunn8@gmail.com; lisana23@yahoo.com; jgold@eoni.com; bjackson@eoni.com;

mkoltuv@bluum.org; jkreider@campblackdog.org; larkingreg34@gmail.com; marie.lyon@gmail.com;

garymarlette@yahoo.com; summersowwinterweave@gmail.com; jmfisherman9@gmail.com;

amorrison@eoni.com; ctrochlell@gmail.com; sandj0704@gmail.com; thinkski@gmail.com; chrysalis@thegeo.net; mrsvivianmyoung@gmail.com; Jennifer Joly; PUC UtilityERP.RESOURCE \* PUC; cathie.allen@pacificorp.com;

jennifer.angell@pacificorp.com; brian.fritz@pacificorp.com; zachary.rogala@pacificorp.com; carla.scarsella@pacificorp.com; oregondockets@pacificorp.com; stefan.brown@pgn.com;

pge.opuc.filings@pgn.com; cece.coleman@pgn.com; matt.gordanier@pgn.com; mark.lindley@pgn.com; jd.podlesnik@pgn.com; ezra.richards@pgn.com; FREEMAN Robin \* PUC; HERB Kim \* PUC; Riemenschneider Johanna; Jones Jason W; amc@stateside.com; dromain@rflawlobby.com; robert.waldher@umatillacounty.gov;

alec.shebiel@umatillaelectric.com; jessica.epley@ziply.com; DAVIS Diane \* PUC

Cc: ALLWEIN Christopher \* PUC; BATMALE JP \* PUC; CONWAY Bryan \* PUC; DAVIS Diane \* PUC; DOUGHERTY

Michael \* PUC; MARTIN Garrett \* PUC

**Subject:** B2H -- to OPUC Commissioners and Staff -- Put TRUTH and Democracy First

**Date:** Monday, August 15, 2022 10:24:59 AM

In past hearings and work sessions regarding the B2H application, the 'application' and its proponents have been the center of focus. That the process is driven by an 'applicants' idea on how to make a profit ---certainly does not justify it as a reasonable nor appropriate proposal for energy solutions or common sense ---NOT least cost/least risk compared to modern, intelligent and solutions using the most recent and beneficial technologies.

What follows is germane to this process.

I object to the proposed, unacceptable, 3 minute time allotment for those good citizens who have spent literally thousands of hours of their lives, unpaid, working diligently to make the obvious plain to all:

--- that the B2H is simply an environmental disaster, a continuance of out-dated thinking to new age issues, and most egregiously, a bald-faced profit grab by a for-profit, investor owned, out-of-state, monopoly (which are

'supposed' to be held, by regulators to the highest standards as they have unequaled 'gifts and power' from the society.)

--- that these few good people of Oregon, are the ONLY ones doing the thankless and arduous task of wading through the incompetent and manufactured 'application' by the Idaho Power Corporation, to show you, and everybody, that this self serving scam is contrived under a moving set of 'needs' (= a new 'need' is invented as the previous lame one is shown completely faulty), that the propositions included in this smoke and mirrors application are incomplete, erroneous and often out-right lies. These citizens volunteer to do your work, that of the OPUC and that of the other agencies and governmental officials, because you and the others deem it acceptable to 'check off the boxes' of this lobbyist manufactured process.

These hard working people have sacrificed their most precious resource, their time, to be good members of their community and state and planet. To 'grant' them 3 MINUTES to provide evidence, explanation, and nuance, and to counter the hundreds of thousands of pages of BS application, sham 'administrative law' judge rulings that are beyond biased, and Corporate double-speak layered on for over a decade by an army of lawyers and lobbyists and PR wanks, is beyond a slap in the face. It is deplorable. This not democracy by any stretch. Not fair. Not in the Public's Interest? Is it??

These few citizens 'for truth and justice' should be the center piece of your hearings, and should be asked at every turn and question, what their take on that particular issues is as well as their big-picture view of this corporate scheme.

Who knows it better? They have studied this more than any single agency bureaucrat, more than any EFSC staff or Councilor, more than than ODOE and OPUC put together. Even if they knew only 1/100th of these others, they have a CREDIBLE and UN-ASSAILABLE, and UN-CORRUPTED standard of ETHICS and TRUTH that no on else in this mess can even dare claim.

These people have already been deemed 'lessor' ---"limited party status", less than the the For Profit Monopolists who are Full Party members. There issues have been at first constrained by the lobbyist written rules of the State (yes they are), 'denied' on many important issues by administrators and 'judges', and even had their issues narrowed or re-defined. most pressing and obvious issues cannot even be 'heard' --- like is there a legitimate 'need', and why the \$2 Million dollar, 2 year, study funded by rate payers, written by hundreds of scientists and specialists, as to where the least impact route would be (with no judgement as to need) was ignored by Idaho Power Corporation? Why did they instead 'choose' to ask for a route right across the view-shed of entire towns, across sensitive wildlife areas, exactly in front to the 'Scenic View Designed' National Historic Oregon Trail

Interpretative Center? Egregious, idiotic, rude, ,....wrong. Why?

So even with all of these layers of limitations tangling up the efforts of some good citizens of our State, they STILL have numerous fundamental standing issues that alone, and certainly in aggregate, show this application for what it is --- inept at best, and an outright scam at worst.

Oregon and Oregonians deserve better than this overt 9% profit scheme. 300 miles of clearcuts and industrial construction that will defile Oregon for a century ---for what? For Why?

Do we not have better and brighter ideas and solutions in 2022? We do. They are numerous and are REAL solutions for this new century and beyond. Are we mired in an old process that was devised and gamed by rich corporate players, a system dominated by the 'applicant' ---in so deep that we cannot see how corrupt it is?

YOU have absolutely NO good reasons nor obligations to approve of this scam. Give these good people of Oregon that represent 95% of Oregonians (---how many have written you with cogent arguments justifying any part of this line?) give them, the respect and time to prove this scheme is simply that. That this Corporation has twisted and lied every step of the way to connive an approval toward one end.

You are the fire-wall, the voice of conscience, the voice of reason, the voice for the future,

Oregon is really counting on you.

## Peter Barry

On Monday, August 15, 2022 at 08:56:01 AM PDT, DAVIS Diane \* PUC <diane.davis@puc.oregon.gov>wrote:

Docket Name: CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY RULE UPDATE

Description: Comments filed by Kelly Skovlin and Don Mc Allister.

Use the link below to view this document:

http://edocs.puc.state.or.us/efdocs/HAC/ar626hac12478.pdf

If you no longer wish to receive notifications in this docket, please contact the Administrative Hearings Division Support Unit at puc.hearings@puc.oregon.gov or (503)-378-6678