

✓ Gen Ack  
sent 8/15/07

✓ To Av.

✓ To Comms  
; 14

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** nodes65@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 15, 2007 5:06 AM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from JOHN K. NODES follows:

-----  
Case Number: AVU-E-07-07  
Name: JOHN K. NODES  
Address: 3060 E. BURGUNDY TRAIL  
City: POST FALLS  
State: IDAHO  
Zip: 83854  
Home Telephone: 208/457-8442  
Contact E-Mail: nodes65@yahoo.com  
Name of Utility Company: Avista  
Add to Mailing List: Yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

Kindly allow me to express my dissatisfaction with the proposed Avista rate increase. As this is one of many in the past year or two, I highly disagree with their proposals. I feel that a down-sizing is long overdue. What with CEO's acquiring original artworks, stockholders always on the plus side, inflated salaries, etc., let them tighten their belts like everyone else. There's 46 million who can't afford health insurance. What are we to do? Sincerely, John K. Nodes

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 76.178.140.39

-----

✓ Gen Ask  
sent 8/15/07

✓ To AV

✓ To Comments  
: 14

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** judyofrancis@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 15, 2007 3:15 AM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Judy Francis follows:

-----  
Case Number: AVU-E-07-07  
Name: Judy Francis  
Address: 2584 E. Black Forest  
City: Post Falls  
State: ID  
Zip: 83854  
Home Telephone: 2084491661  
Contact E-Mail: judyofrancis@gmail.com  
Name of Utility Company: AVISTA  
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

This is concerning Avista rate hike for Idaho. Unless CEO's reduce their salaries no rate increase should be given. This increase hurts low income and what little is left of the middle income, not the wealthy. Therefore the wealthy CEO will not be effected but millions of others will. So say NO to this increase unless AVISTA CEO's are willing to take less.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 76.178.131.2

-----

✓ Gen Ack  
sent 8/15/07

✓ To AV.

✓ To Comm  
; 14

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** gfleisch986@hotmail.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 14, 2007 11:47 AM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Gerald Fleischman follows:

-----  
Case Number: AVU-E-07-07  
Name: Gerald Fleischman  
Address: 11535 W. Hazeldale Ct.  
City: Boise  
State: Idaho  
Zip: 83713  
Home Telephone: 208-376-2148  
Contact E-Mail: gfleisch986@hotmail.com  
Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power Company  
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

This surcharge (PCA) in this case takes the risk from those who make the decisions on energy resources for power generation (the utilities) and put it on those who have no choice (the ratepayers). The PCA process may have been a good thing when all generating resources were known and the only variables were fuel costs, but that time has gone. Any system that is based on no change is bound to fail. Because of the PCA, utilities have a strong (very strong) bias in favor of known energy resources, those which may not be intermittent, but which have price and supply risks. Perhaps an answer here is to place more of the risk on those who make the decisions on resource acquisition. Perhaps 75% utility and 25% ratepayer; opposite of what it is now. Is it good for the ratepayers that the risks of price volatility are passed directly to them, when they have no say in ways to limit or reduce that risk? How is a renewable energy developer going to compete against fossil fuels whose limitations are obscured from the utilities by the PCA while the limitations of renewable energy resources are at least partly known and accounted for?

It may seem logical and good for ratepayers that reductions in costs are passed back through to them. What is really passed back through to them is not higher or lower costs, it is risk. What is the definition of risk? Variability of outcomes. There is no other way to see the PCA other than passing risk through to the ratepayer.

Another item, the utility has to show that the expenses are prudent and in the interest of the ratepayers. Here is an example that could show the probable futility of such an effort. Take Nome. All its electricity is supplied by diesel-fueled engine generators. Under a PCA system, why would Nome Joint Utilities Service look at wind power, something that could provide energy at perhaps 8 cents/kWh? The answer is, it wouldn't. The problem for Nome Joint Utilities Service is that it is rather close to its ratepayers. They can see and feel the cost of electricity. NJUS managers can't just sit back and say, 'Hey, what are we going to do? The price of diesel went up 50% in the last year? You got any ideas? Besides, we're still doing OK. We just pass the fuel cost on to you and we're happy. That doesn't fly in Nome, as evidenced by Nome bringing in Brian Jackson this week for advice on wind power development, and it shouldn't fly here.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 164.165.96.2

-----