

From: [charles.pace](#)
To: [Comments](#)
Subject: Comment on Electric Bills report 2016-9
Date: Monday, August 08, 2016 10:40:55 AM

From the standpoint of providing a meaningful discussion of "trends" in the regional economy, the report falls far short. E.g., to the extent staff intends to use 2014 data on GDP, employment, etc. as useful or, now, even interesting, basis for meeting the requirements of section 839b(e)(3)(D) is silly. Please understand, this non-report reporting doesn't violate--and actually may meet--the requirements of the Power Act, as amended. But that is only because the statutory language contains a phrase that says, in effect, the Council's demand forecast can be whatever it "deems appropriate." And that is enough ambiguity to allow the Council, albeit in consultation with the Administrator, et al., to forecast demands however it wants. Knock yourselves out ... with nonsense if you like. There is, however, a potential problem. It goes back to the shenanigans--polite term--of June 2006 when the customers pointed out that the Council's budget far exceeded the statutory limits expressly imposed on the amount of funding that the Administrator may divert from the Bonneville Fund to support the Council's operations. It was fascinating to watch this unfold from inside the window of the Policy Working Group established to do the District Court's (Oregon, Jim Redden presiding) bidding. As at least two Council members (and numerous staff) know, the "deal" that came down was that the Power Council would continue to get funding far in excess of the statutory limits imposed by the 1980 Power Act. The way this would be accomplished--this is now 'sop' and codified in "memos" smuggled past the public in the dark of night--is the Administrator would simply make up sales to IOUs out of whole cloth (fiction) and include such imaginary sales in the calculation of funding limits on the Council. Kind of laughable, really. Except that those are ratepayers' funds that are being unlawfully diverted. I don't mean to bore you with what you have already dismissed as an "old" issue. But here is the thing: ratepayers did not go away empty handed. In return for illegally diverting ratepayers' funds to the Council, a majority of the Council--six out of eight--embarked with BPA on a course of action that, in retrospect, is so highly unethical--I believe it was actually and repeatedly criminal--that I wish I had never had anything to do with it. They, quite literally, annihilated the public process underlying the amendment of the basin's fish and wildlife program and development of the regional power plan in favor of a back door "frank" discussions between BPA, the Council and the tribes and other parties that were willing to go along. In effect, the June 2006 controversy that enshrined the Council's and the Administrator's violation of restrictions on diversion of resources from the Bonneville Fund. In agreeing to support the Council's operation in excess of statutory limits, a majority of the Council (together with staff) and personnel at the highest levels of BPA conspired to extort agreement from tribes and states to abandon their litigation positions in the District Court in order to receive "hush money" laundered thru the Council's program. It's all in the record. It's even in the rate case. I remember Scott Corwin at BPA's first IPR (Integrated Program Review) being adamant that there would be no more money to purchase tribe's silence. And that is precisely how it

was presented by BPA and Council to the tribes: agree to "STFU" and you get a silo of ratepayer money set aside for you. If they didn't go along with a scandalously flawed "BiOP," they would be subjected to the "full force" of the ISAB review. In response to the question of what would happen if the ISAB gave a project proposed by a STFU ("Accord") tribe, there was no ambiguity whatsoever: as long as the tribe was silent, they would receive funding no matter what ISAB said. An adverse review by ISAB would, otherwise, be fatal. I'm not making any of this up. This was how the discussion went down at the highest levels ... or almost the highest levels. The real action was turning the United States District Court into an old time "wire room" under the watchful eye and with the full blessing--even open encouragement--by Judge Redden. What a story! Fascinating. And here is how it all comes back to the statutory requirement for a 20-year demand forecast. The Council can do it however it deems appropriate. But to make it meaningful, I hope you will focus on IOU loads and, especially, on the resources--federal and non-federal--that will actually be required the IOU loads that Bonneville. That provides a much more meaningful--and potentially actionable--report that outdated 2014 GDP data. Of course ... that is the most recent available at the state level ... staff may say. Exactly! The Council has spent the last 10 years running from controversy and cutting deals out of sight of the public. The 20 year demand forecast coupled with the other requirements of 839b(e)(D) provides an opportunity to send the region a much needed signal: (1) that it will back away from the "buy a deal" paradigm that permeates all aspects of the Council's activities; and (2) conform the annual budget to the statutory limits.