

✓ Gen Adm
sent 1/20/05

✓ To A.V.

✓ To Comm
:H

RECEIVED
FILED



2005 JAN 14 PM 2:46

IDAHO PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

The Idaho Public Utilities Commission
P O Box 83720
Boise, Idaho 83720

Case Number: IPC-E-04-29

January 13, 2005

Commissioners:

I am totally against the increase in funds Idaho Power is requesting to collect from ratepayers in connection with the "energy efficiency fee". While the residential programs which were utilized in years past have been very successful, I question the effectiveness of the current programs. I also believe that no small commercial conservation programs have been implemented, however this customer also contributes to the additional rate fees.

Idaho Power, as a company, has little or no monetary investment in making these programs functional. The use of subcontractors as a mode of conservation is not involvement in conservation, but more a method used to present an image. As example, I would like to address the "high efficiency clothes washer" program. The price for each of these units is between \$1,000 and \$1,500, a cost which is out of range for the average consumer. This is no more than a contractor program promoted by Idaho Power.

In previous years, Idaho Power has had very active and productive conservation programs with employees responsible for the results to the benefit of the ratepayers as well as the company. These programs were discarded in favor of deregulation (which did not occur).

It is my opinion that until Idaho Power Company and their employees take an active interest in these types of programs, they will continue to be just an ongoing image projection. Increasing the amount of money collected from the ratepayers is not a solution, as should be noted by the fact that they have asked for another increase in 2007.

There is a real need for energy awareness programs as well as active conservation. As long as Idaho Power can continue to sell all of the electrical energy they have access to, it doesn't appear that they are deeply interested in programs that involve serious commitment.

Thank you for the opportunity of expressing my opinions.



Alan E. Robinson

✓ Jean Ask sent 1/20/05 *✓ To AV* *✓ To Commes 5:14*

Jean Jewell

From: Ed Howell
Sent: Sunday, January 16, 2005 5:33 PM
To: Jean Jewell; Ed Howell; Gene Fadness; Tonya Clark
Subject: Comment acknowledgement

WWW Form Submission:

Sunday, January 16, 2005
5:32:58 PM

Case: IPC-E-04-29
Name: Steve & Nora Mickelson.
Street Address: 11140 W. Oneida Drive
City: Boise
State: Idaho
ZIP: 83709
Home Telephone:

E-Mail: signwest@cableone.net
Company: Idaho Power

mailing_list_yes_no: yes

Comment_description: We are new residents to Idaho, and cannot believe how often Idaho Power requests a rate increase---it appears that there is nothing they want to pay for out of their own revenues! What happened to the "cost of doing business"? This latest request is among the more ridiculous ones we've heard: they want ratepayers to cough up more money per month in order to support programs to conserve energy?? They should instead be encouraging ratepayers to use less electricity and suggesting ways we can do that. In the long run, using less electricity is the very best plan for all of us. It makes no sense for the utility to think only about buying more power instead of conserving what we have.

Please say NO to this latest request by Idaho Power.

Transaction ID: 1161732.58
Referred by: <http://www.puc.state.id.us/scripts/polyform.dll/ipuc>
User Address: 24.117.243.162
User Hostname: 24.117.243.162