

Jean Jewell

From: Jean Jewell
Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2012 4:55 PM
To: Jean Jewell
Subject: FW: Comments on Case No. AVU-E-12-07

-----Original Message-----

From: Jo Lowe [<mailto:josephineklowe@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2012 9:53 AM
To: Gene Fadness
Subject: Comments on Case No. AVU-E-12-07

Dear Idaho Public Utilities Commissioners,

I'm writing to ask that you DO NOT APPROVE Avista Utilities' application to reduce its Idaho energy efficiency rider by 1.3 percent, or \$3.46 million, in case AVU-E-12-07.

As you have pointed out repeatedly in the past, energy efficiency is the least-cost resource available to our electric utilities, and they should be encouraged to increase their energy efficiency programs rather than decreasing them. While I understand that Avista says it is over-collecting through its energy efficiency rider, I also understand that there are always new and improving technologies to obtain even more savings than we're already getting. In this time of promising advances in ways to save energy, the last thing we should be doing is reducing the modest amount of funding for these programs. Avista has done a good job in providing efficiency programs and incentives to its Idaho customers, but it can do much more. Allowing the company to cut its efficiency funding would send exactly the wrong message during these times of energy challenges.

While Avista said it surpassed the electric savings by 115 percent of its Integrated Resource Plan goal, I urge you as regulators to question whether our utilities are placing the bar too low in setting their efficiency goals. Surely there are even more savings that are achievable by Avista and that meet your cost-effective tests, and the more energy we save today means we'll need to build fewer expensive power plants in the future. It might be one thing if Avista was collecting millions of extra dollars from customers, but over-collecting \$316,231 for electric efficiency programs does not seem so extreme as to justify reducing funding at the present time. Reducing the efficiency rider now could raise the risk that the demand side management (DSM) programs could be underfunded in the future if Avista does its job in pursuing all cost-effective energy efficiency.

Finally, at about \$1.05 for residential customers, the impact of reducing the rider funding on customer bills will hardly be noticeable, while the customer savings from a well-funded DSM program can more than offset the cost of the rider. On behalf of customers of all utilities across Idaho, please let our utilities know that energy efficiency is still our highest priority and that Idaho will do its share in meeting our region's ambitious energy conservation goals!

Thank you,

Jo Lowe
110 limekiln ln.
110 limekiln ln.
ketchum, ID 83340

Jean Jewell

From: Jean Jewell
Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2012 4:55 PM
To: Jean Jewell
Subject: FW: Comments on Case No. AVU-E-12-07

-----Original Message-----

From: David Monsees [<mailto:dmonsees@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2012 2:29 PM
To: Gene Fadness
Subject: Comments on Case No. AVU-E-12-07

Dear Idaho Public Utilities Commissioners,

I'm writing to ask that you DO NOT APPROVE Avista Utilities' application to reduce its Idaho energy efficiency rider by 1.3 percent, or \$3.46 million, in case AVU-E-12-07.

As you have pointed out repeatedly in the past, energy efficiency is the least-cost resource available to our electric utilities, and they should be encouraged to increase their energy efficiency programs rather than decreasing them. While I understand that Avista says it is over-collecting through its energy efficiency rider, I also understand that there are always new and improving technologies to obtain even more savings than we're already getting. In this time of promising advances in ways to save energy, the last thing we should be doing is reducing the modest amount of funding for these programs. Avista has done a good job in providing efficiency programs and incentives to its Idaho customers, but it can do much more. Allowing the company to cut its efficiency funding would send exactly the wrong message during these times of energy challenges.

While Avista said it surpassed the electric savings by 115 percent of its Integrated Resource Plan goal, I urge you as regulators to question whether our utilities are placing the bar too low in setting their efficiency goals. Surely there are even more savings that are achievable by Avista and that meet your cost-effective tests, and the more energy we save today means we'll need to build fewer expensive power plants in the future. It might be one thing if Avista was collecting millions of extra dollars from customers, but over-collecting \$316,231 for electric efficiency programs does not seem so extreme as to justify reducing funding at the present time. Reducing the efficiency rider now could raise the risk that the demand side management (DSM) programs could be underfunded in the future if Avista does its job in pursuing all cost-effective energy efficiency.

Finally, at about \$1.05 for residential customers, the impact of reducing the rider funding on customer bills will hardly be noticeable, while the customer savings from a well-funded DSM program can more than offset the cost of the rider. On behalf of customers of all utilities across Idaho, please let our utilities know that energy efficiency is still our highest priority and that Idaho will do its share in meeting our region's ambitious energy conservation goals!

Thank you,

David Monsees
1123 N Watson Way
Eagle, ID 83616