

✓ Ken Ack
sent 4/28/05

✓ To A.V.

✓ To Commis.
; H

Jean Jewell

From: Ed Howell
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2005 9:12 PM
To: Jean Jewell; Ed Howell; Gene Fadness; Tonya Clark
Subject: Comment acknowledgement

WWW Form Submission:

Wednesday, April 27, 2005
8:12:16 PM

Case: IPC-E-05-10
Name: Kathryn Taghon
Street Address: 925 N Parkdale Ave
City: Meridian
State: ID
ZIP: 83642
Home Telephone: 208-429-5880
E-Mail: ktaghon@msn.com
Company: Idaho Power
mailing_list_yes_no: yes
Comment_description: Dear Commissioners:

I am writing to express my concern over the Idaho Power request to place the construction costs of the Bennett Mountain Power Plant into its base rate, which by Idaho Power's analysis would be an annual increase of \$9.6 million.

I am opposed to this request, because quite simply, this is the responsibility of the stockholders to pay for infrastructure and capital improvements. I do not feel that it is the burden of the rate payers. I urge you to turn down this request.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Taghon

Transaction ID: 4272012.16
Referred by: <http://www.puc.state.id.us/scripts/polyform.dll/ipuc>
User Address: 70.56.200.135
User Hostname: 70.56.200.135

✓ Gen. Ack -
sent 4/28/05

✓ To AW.

✓ To Commis.
; Staff

Jean Jewell

From: Ed Howell
Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2005 11:27 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Ed Howell; Gene Fadness; Tonya Clark
Subject: Comment acknowledgement

WWW Form Submission:

Thursday, April 28, 2005
10:26:42 AM

Case: IPC-E-05-10, IPC-E-05-14, IPC-E-05-15

Name: Brad Gore
Street Address: 2348 Echo Ave.
City: Parma
State: Idaho
ZIP: 83660

Home Telephone: 208-674-1146

E-Mail: albgore@fmtc.com

Company: Idaho Power

mailing_list_yes_no: yes

Comment description: IPC's PCA, Bennett Mtn., and tax adjustment rate cases should be deferred or denied outright. Something is structurally wrong when IPC requires "rate relief" every year. If IPC needs to ask for a moratorium on new construction for a period of time to get its supply in line with existing demand, then so be it.

Those of us who have lived here for years are being continually asked to foot the bills for all the new customers IPC has signed on. These are the people who should pay a surcharge for new power production facilities, such as Bennett Mtn. This idea is not dissimilar to impact fees charged by the City of Boise to developers. New IPC customers should be paying impact fees to defer the incremental cost of providing new generation capability.

Speaking as an agricultural irrigator, yearly increases in power costs will soon put me and other pumpers out of business. I cannot continue to pass on my increased irrigation charges to downstream buyers. If I then have to eat the increased cost of production, I will be left with no profitability. Irrigators, at least, should be exempt from additional near-term rate increases. It is far easier for commercial and industrial electricity users to defray increased costs. Residential consumption is minimal enough so as not to be crippling. Let non-irrigation users bear the near-term costs for whatever the IPUC determines is fair rate relief for IPC. And make new IPC clients pay surcharges for the problems arising from their entry into the IPC market.

Transaction ID: 4281026.42

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

User Address: 137.118.1.16

User Hostname: 137.118.1.16

✓ Men Ask
sent 4/28/05

✓ To Commus
; H

Jean Jewell

From: Ed Howell
Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2005 1:26 PM
To: Jean Jewell; Ed Howell; Gene Fadness; Tonya Clark
Subject: Comment acknowledgement

WWW Form Submission:

Thursday, April 28, 2005
12:26:03 PM

Case: IPC-E-05-10
Name: Blair R. Anderson
Street Address: 157 Cordova Ave.
City: Twin Falls
State: Idaho
ZIP: 83301-8032
Home Telephone: 208-73401207
E-Mail: brand@filertel.com
Company: Idacorp/ Idaho Power

Comment description: I am in wonderment as to why thoes of us who are forced to use Idaho power's electric are compelled to pay for two new gas fired power plants? most of us are not share holders! we can't even afford to buy any! I was always taught that the investors paid the cost of any new construction out of there dividends, before being passed down to us poor people on retirement, with very little income! What has happened to wind power in this state? most every other state in America has wind power, why is this state always 50 years behind the times?!!

I have also heard that some concern located in San Diego Ca. has planned to build a coal fired elect plant North/East of Jerome, Id.

Coal went out in the 40's!! We do not need any more polution in any form! yes, we need elect power! but not that bad! It is my opinion that only after you have shown some progress in serving the people of this state with more modern up to date methods do you deserve any rate increasrs! In other words, Put up or Shut up!! eather produce

somthing us poor people can pay for or get out and let thoes who can do it!!!

I have been back in Idaho for 19 years now, and every year Idaho Power has applied for a large rate increase!. Some of us just do not have the money to pay these increases! If we could see some positive advancements toward new technology, and I don't mean in the next 50 years, I mean now! like in the next year!

What advancement's have been made in the use of Geothermal energy in Idaho ? Iceland has used it for 100 years, California has some also Nevada, Why are we not looking for these sources? Idaho has some great Geothermal locations!

Transaction ID: 4281226.3
Referred by: <http://www.puc.state.id.us/scripts/polyform.dll/ipuc>
User Address: 63.165.173.59
User Hostname: 63.165.173.59

✓ Ken Aule
sent 4/28/05

✓ To Commis.
; H

Jean Jewell

From: Ed Howell
Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2005 12:48 PM
To: Jean Jewell; Ed Howell; Gene Fadness; Tonya Clark
Subject: Comment acknowledgement

WWW Form Submission:

Thursday, April 28, 2005
11:48:29 AM

Case: **IPC-E-05-10**
Name: WILLIAM AUGSBURGER
Street Address: 16066 LATAH DRIVE
City: NAMPA
State: IDAHO
ZIP: 83651
Home Telephone: 208 466 7545
E-Mail: augies@webtv.net
Company: IDAHO POWER
mailing_list_yes_no: **yes**

Comment_description: A BROCHURE IN MY LATEST POWER BILL TITLED "ELECTRICITY RATES APRIL 2005 IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT CHANGES TO YOUR ELECTRICITY RATES" WAS THE FIRST I HAD KNOWN THAT I WAS ABOUT TO GET TO "BUY" PART OWNERSHIP OF A POWER PLANT! IT PUZZLES ME THAT I AM BUYING INTO THE BENNETT MOUNTAIN POWER PLANT AND NOT EVEN A STOCK HOLDER. I'LL BET THE REAL STOCK HOLDERS ARE LAUGHING ALL THE WAY TO THE BANK!

Transaction ID: 4281148.29
Referred by: <http://www.puc.state.id.us/scripts/polyform.dll/ipuc>
User Address: 209.240.205.63
User Hostname: 209.240.205.63

RECEIVED
FILED



2005 APR 28 AM 8:32

IDAHO PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

A. Wayne Frandsen
644 Main Ave. No.
Twin Falls, ID 83301

April 26, 2005

Idaho Public Utilities Commission
POB 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0074

RE: Idaho Power proposed rate increases. IPC-E-05-10, IPC-E-05-15

To whom it may concern;

In reading over the propoganda that Idaho Power sent out in support of their rate increases several things came to mind that I think should be considered prior to action on these increases.

As to the PCA, I understand what it is and why it is needed. I obviously would prefer that rates go down and not up but that ain't going to happen. I do question what will deferring this increase to later will do later if the drought continues. At some point Idaho power will be forced recoup these increased generation costs. Obviously the deferral is in a attempt to keep rates from increasing to much at once, and I appreciate this. Hopefully the future will bring improved water conditions and will allow these costs to be recouped when generation costs are lowered as a result of more hydro power being available. However we can not be assured of this and I hope someone is keeping this in mind so as not to allow us to be caught between the proverbial rock and hard place.

As for the Bennett Mountain Power Plant, I have some serious reservations about increases to fund this. It is my understanding that this plant is being built to supply anticipated future power needs as more customers hook up to the system. In their propaganda IP stated the plant was to produce power to meet peak loads "at times when customers use the most power, namely hot summer afternoons when air conditioning and irrigation use are at their highest". This is all well and good, but IP has done a excellent job of meeting those peak loads in the past without Bennett Mountain. The only reason for them to be unable to continue their excellent record would be increased loads due to new customers. That being said, why are existing customers being asked to foot the bill to provide power for new customers? Why not let these new customers pay for their own power and the generating capacity needed to produce it? If this necessitates a two tier rate structure, one for old customers and one for new customers then so be it. The current proposal amounts to the current customers being forced to subsidize the new customers power rates, and that is just plain wrong. One of many reasons for the influx of new residents is our low power rates. They are used to much higher rates any way so why should I have my rates raised so they get a break?

Lastly you may recall, the State of Idaho recently announced the intent to purchase water rights on several thousands of acres of farm land. As a result this water will not be pumped out of the river, but will be left in it with a resultant savings of a bunch of power. I am not sure how

much exactly this will be, but I have seen the pumps that are being idled and I guarantee you can run a fair sized city on the power they won't be using. In addition, IDWR has recently ordered well irrigators to come up with 173,000 acre feet of water or to shut down thousands of additional wells. Since their ain't 173,000 acre feet of water available it stands to reason that there will be a major shutdown of wells with resultant power savings. And all these savings are during the claimed hot summer irrigation peak. How much consideration of these savings has been given in this rate increase? Since power plant construction and resultant rate increases are planned years in advance and take more years to come to fruition, and the pumping shutdowns have come about in the last year or less the answer to that question is obviously none.

So it becomes apparent that Bennett Mountain is not needed to provide power for existing customers. It is also apparent that Idaho Power should look to the new customers to pay for generating capacity needed to service them and rates for existing customers should not be increased for this purpose.

Basically Idaho Power is saying that they are going to defer a 4.75% temporary increase in favor of a 1.84 % permanent one. After all it will take only slightly over 2.5 years to make the same money with the permanent raise and it doesn't expire like the larger one does. And note the larger increase is deferred, not waived. They will be back in the future wanting that one to.

For these reasons the Bennett Mountain increase should be, and I urge that it be, DENIED.

Thank you for your time.



A. Wayne Frandsen