

Jean Jewell

From: Ed Howell
Sent: Thursday, July 17, 2003 10:45 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Ed Howell; Gene Fadness; Tonya Clark
Subject: Comment acknowledgement

WWW Form Submission:

Thursday, July 17, 2003
9:44:59 AM

Case: IPC-E-02-12
Name: Marlin Brown
Street Address: 4723 N Draft Ave
City: Boise
State: ID
ZIP: 83713
Home Telephone: 208-939-4434
E-Mail: marlinbrownjr@msn.com
Company: Idaho Power
mailing_list_yes_no: yes

Comment_description: I wanted to state that I am for automated meter reading for several reasons. Primarily, it is my understanding that automated meter reading removes the human element from meter reading and is consequently more accurate. It also reduces the times an Idaho Power person has to trudge through my yard, knowing that they do not stay on the sidewalk but just walk from one yard to the next. I understand that Intermountain Gas has just implemented a similar system and from the literature they distributed it seems as though they expect significant cost savings. I would expect Idaho Power to experience similar savings. I am strongly for automated meter reading in Idaho.

Transaction ID: 717944.59
Referred by: <http://www.puc.state.id.us/scripts/polyform.dll/ipuc>
User Address: 198.182.9.1
User Hostname: 198.182.9.1

Jean Jewell

From: Ed Howell
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2003 9:58 PM
To: Jean Jewell; Ed Howell; Gene Fadness; Tonya Clark
Subject: Comment acknowledgement

WWW Form Submission:

Wednesday, July 16, 2003
8:58:05 PM

Case: IPC-E-02-12
Name: Lorianne Turpen
Street_Address: 1123 Garfield St.
City: Idaho Falls
State: Idaho
ZIP: 83401
Home_Telephone: 208-523-6159
E-Mail: kitty_tigger@msn.com
Company: Idaho Falls Power (City of Idaho Falls)
mailing_list_yes_no: yes

Comment_description: I am curious about this, because if we, as the consumer foots the bill, it's going to make it hard on those of us that can barely afford the use of power now. I'm talking about the lower income people that only get minimum wage. And how would this reduce our bill in the long run?? Especially when the regular rates keep rising like they do.

Transaction ID: 7162058.5
Referred by: <http://www.puc.state.id.us/scripts/polyform.dll/ipuc>
User Address: 65.102.76.153
User Hostname: 65.102.76.153

Jean Jewell

From: Ed Howell
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2003 7:17 PM
To: Jean Jewell; Ed Howell; Gene Fadness; Tonya Clark
Subject: Comment acknowledgement

WWW Form Submission:

Wednesday, July 16, 2003
6:16:57 PM

Case:
Name: Patti Smith
Street_Address: 5125 Pinion Dr
City: Pocatello
State: ID
ZIP: 832-4
Home_Telephone: 2082334575
E-Mail: cpsmith@velocitus.net
Company: Idaho Power
mailing_list_yes_no: yes
Comment_description: I DON'T believe Idaho Power should be directed to install automated meters. As I understand it, this technology, and implementaion, is fairly new. It has not been proven to be cost effective, and I don't believe will save consumers money, but will increase power bills. Also, lets keep as many decent paying jobs in Idaho as we can. At least until a few trials can be run on just how cost saving the meters will be.

Transaction ID: 7161816.57
Referred by: <http://www.puc.state.id.us/scripts/polyform.dll/ipuc>
User Address: 208.14.172.48
User Hostname: 208.14.172.48

Jean Jewell

From: Ed Howell
Sent: Thursday, July 17, 2003 2:05 PM
To: Jean Jewell; Ed Howell; Gene Fadness; Tonya Clark
Subject: Comment acknowledgement

WWW Form Submission:

Thursday, July 17, 2003
1:05:13 PM

Case: IPC-E-02-12
Name: Steven E. Senteno
Street_Address: 1957 Teal Lane
City: Boise
State: ID
ZIP: 83706
Home_Telephone: 208-331-1311
E-Mail: s.senteno@att.net
Company: Idaho Power
mailing_list_yes_no: no
Comment_description: July 17, 2003

Gentlemen:

Regarding: Case No. IPC-E-02-12, Order No. 29291 and the Idaho Public Utilities Commission inviting public comment on whether Idaho Power should be required to implement automated meter readers, what features they should include and how they should be paid for. As a public member, I respectfully submit the following comments.

Steven E. Senteno
1957 Teal Lane
Boise, ID 83706

Telephone: 208-331-1311
Email: s.senteno@att.net

Should the company be directed to install automated meters?

Customers want:

- A fair price for Service
- Service that never fails
- When Service fails, fix it fast
- Meet your commitments
- Do it right the first time

The Company wants:

- To make money
- To improve value to Shareholders

Unless the service price to Ratepayers is to be reduced, then the AMR infrastructure deployment is of little or no value to the Customer.

From a Company perspective, if a technology does not support improvements in process efficiency through volume management, improved cycle time, reduction of cost and repeat rates - then the Company (Shareholders) realize no gain.

Technology Vendors often attempt to sell "solutions" in search of "problems". If the Company's Account Management Processes (through performance data analysis) cannot be streamlined by technology, then a mandate to deploy technology, makes no financial sense.

How can advanced metering technology help the company and its ratepayers make the most of advanced technology?

Simply stated, the Company must show that AMR will contribute to efficiency improvements within their Account Management Processes that shall translate to reduced rates and/or increased profit.

Lacking the Company's concurrence, then it would seem reasonable to seek the input of an independent 3rd party to investigate other Utility Companies' use of AMR then bring your team an assessment.

Certainly, the Company and PUC should stay abreast of the potential that technology brings (balanced against needs) yet not be swayed by a Vendor's proposed "silver bullet" solution.

What are the types of technology that should be employed?

The ONLY technology that should be employed is that which meets the Company's defined needs. To leap to a choice of technology without first defining a need is indeed, putting the cart before the horse.

What is the time frame for implementation?

If determined that AMR deployment is a "smart" thing to do and if the funding source is robust, then "sooner and faster" is obviously better. Lacking an immediate and/or infinite source of funding, then the deployment timeframe should occur at a rate that does not negatively impact Ratepayers or Shareholders.

How should the Company recover costs associated with AMR?

The question implies the funding source will not be robust and that Customers and Shareholders will be asked to pick-up the tab - which puts this discussion in a circular path: Should the Company be directed to install automated meters? The response does not change: Unless the service price to Ratepayers is to be reduced, then the AMR infrastructure deployment is of little or no value to the Customer. From a Company perspective, if a technology does not support improvements in process efficiency through volume management, improved cycle time, reduction of cost and repeat rates - then the Company (Shareholders) realize no gain.

Transaction ID: 7171305.13

Referred by: <http://www.puc.state.id.us/scripts/polyform.dll/ipuc>

User Address: 12.82.144.92

User Hostname: 12.82.144.92