

✓ Jim Ack
sent 4/28/05

✓ To A.V.

✓ To Commes
; 14

Jean Jewell

From: Ed Howell
Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2005 1:05 PM
To: Jean Jewell; Ed Howell; Gene Fadness; Tonya Clark
Subject: Comment acknowledgement

WWW Form Submission:

Thursday, April 28, 2005
12:04:52 PM

Case: IPC-E-05-15

Name: Jeff Justus
Street_Address: 4031 st james loop
City: nampa
State: idaho
ZIP: 83687

Home_Telephone: 208-860-0751
E-Mail: eme@heritagewifi.com

Company: idaho power
mailing_list_yes_no: yes

Comment_description: A real conservation program by Idaho power is the answer, not a rate increase. There rate increase will just begin the snowball effect and cause every electric user to increase there cost. Which will in turn cause Idaho power be back for another rate increase next year siteing cost of labor ect., and then comparing there low rates to "other states".

The "other states" have created a snowball effect so large and costly that, people and business are leaving.

My house is 3500 sqft with 135 lights. I replaced 125 of them with compact fluourescent bulbs. The avg. life of the bulbs is 6 years. My 13 month avarage electrical usage is 28 KWh per day or 840KWh per month or \$42.72 per month. Each bulb uses 1/4 the energy with the same light output (14watts replaces a 65watt) Idaho power does not have a real good conservation program. Why?

They will now drive the cost of natural gas up as well, using it to produce electricity. Here is the "rocket science"

If idaho power had a program to replaced some of the light bulbs (each bulb saves 50 watts) 50watts x208,000 people (each person has 1 light bulb,most houses have 45 light bulbs and assuming 4 people per house) So 208,000 people X 50 watts not needed=1040000watts surplus per hour for 6 years.

It does not take long to have a surplus of power available.

And there is the money spent on trying to get a rate increase because of "drought" or "demand" or what ever.

28.6 or 9.6 million dollars it will never end, Idaho power could replace every light bulb in every house for far less money and have mega watts surplus power to sell on the market with out a rate increase.

The bottom line is simple, Idaho power you don't get any more money and you would not be requesting more money if you had a real conservation program. Investing money in the demand side is the simple solution. A \$7 dollar credit does not get it. I reduced my electrical operating cost by more than 65% !

So explain to me again why a power company can not do this?

We can be the most energy efficient city in the United states if we had the will. The program that Idaho power use to have of a stepped cost per KWh after X KWh is the incentive that I used to get my usage down.

I urge you to just say no to the increase and focus on the conservation of end users.

We do not need the same rates as "other states" that are out of control!

(What put calif in the hole? Do you remember Gray Davis and the power deal?)

Did Calif implement conservation? No And they are broke now.

The cost of A/C in a very small house in calif is well over \$300 per month

We are smarter and more conservitave than other states.
Lets stop the snowball effect and show the rest of the world how it is done.
Lets "meet the expected increasing peak loads as usage on the company's system continues to rise" with a conservation program that works. Not a Increase with some compairson to "only 2.2%" or average 6.3% per year or the real compounding % of 6.3 on 6.3 for every year. and at some point will have power costs that are what Calif pays or higher.
I want a 6.3% raise but wont get it.
My property taxes are approching "other states"
So how much less will i have? At some point We will have to leave Idaho.
As the cost of living compounds, there is far reaching effects on schools, goverment, cities, and our quality of life here.

Our average income here is much lower than other states. We can not pay high rates.

So what does happens if you say no? Will they Quit?

All the companies I have worked for, could solve this problem.
Simple light bulbs could be a mega watt start, VF irrigation pumps are next, High SEER A/C credits or trade in. A stepped cost per KWh used is good, I changed my bulbs and cut my usage.

When All the Conservation programs have been implemented that can be implemented, then and only then should a increase be approved.
Stop this snowball effect now before it becomes to large to stop and has effected our quality of life. I can see where we are headed and we dont need to go there.

I Urge you to just say no.

Regards Jeff Justus

Transaction ID: 4281204.52
Referred by: <http://www.puc.state.id.us/scripts/polyform.dll/ipuc>
User Address: 63.76.118.22
User Hostname: 63.76.118.22

Jean Jewell

✓ Gen Ack
sent 4/28/05

✓ To A.V.

✓ To Commes
; H

From: Ed Howell
Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2005 8:40 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Ed Howell; Gene Fadness; Tonya Clark
Subject: Comment acknowledgement

WWW Form Submission:

Thursday, April 28, 2005
7:40:24 AM

Case: Idaho Power Increase Request - IPC-E-05-15

Name: John Hopson

Street Address: 305 NE Mashburn Rd

City: Mountain Home

State: Idaho

ZIP: 83647

Home Telephone: 208 587 7445

E-Mail: hopsonj@msn.com

Company: Idaho Power

mailing_list_yes_no: yes

Comment_description: Please disallow any increase to Idaho Power until such time that they start seriously building renewable power source plants. Natural Gas is not one of them. I don't want to pay for these type of plants, please do you job and protect the public, not the providers.

Transaction ID: 428740.24

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

User Address: 65.102.77.104

User Hostname: 65.102.77.104

✓ Gen. Ack
sent 4/28/05

✓ To A.V.

✓ To Commis
E H

Jean Jewell

From: Ed Howell
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2005 10:10 PM
To: Jean Jewell; Ed Howell; Gene Fadness; Tonya Clark
Subject: Comment acknowledgement

WWW Form Submission:

Wednesday, April 27, 2005
9:09:50 PM

Case: **IPC-E-05-15**

Name: Lon Childers
Street_Address: 208 10th Ave. North
City: Nampa
State: id
ZIP: 83687
Home_Telephone: 2084661527
E-Mail: randlenterprise@msn.com
Company: Idaho Power
mailing_list_yes_no: **yes**

Comment_description: I think it is past due for the PUC to consider building Nuclear power plants along the Snake and Columbia rivers. It is a simple solution to a long term problem with the rapid population growth in the Northwest. Nuclear power plants were suppose to be built along the Columbia river in the mid seventies between Hanford Washington, and Boardman Oregon. This problem needs to be acted on soon or all residents of the Northwest will be without power, or subject to brownouts. Lets leave a good power supply for generations to come.

Transaction ID: 4272109.50
Referred by: <http://www.puc.state.id.us/scripts/polyform.dll/ipuc>
User Address: 207.225.39.252
User Hostname: 207.225.39.252

✓ Sen. Ack -
sent 4/28/05

✓ To AV.

✓ To Commms
; 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

✓ Gen Ark
sent 4/28/05

✓ To Commes
:tl

Jean Jewell

From: Ed Howell
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2005 4:29 PM
To: Jean Jewell; Ed Howell; Gene Fadness; Tonya Clark
Subject: Comment acknowledgement

WWW Form Submission:

Wednesday, April 27, 2005
3:29:05 PM

Case: Electricity Rates April 2005 *IPC-E-05-15*
Name: Ron Daugherty
Street Address: 149 N. 16th Avenue
City: Pocatello
State: Idaho
ZIP: 83201
Home Telephone: 208 233-0028
E-Mail: rondaugherty@earthlink.net
Company: Idaho Power
mailing_list_yes_no: no

Comment description: After reading your "justifications" for an upcoming rates increase of some 6.3 percent, you folks are just not getting the idea. And you're sure not planning for a reasonable future. Forget water as your primary source. Begin investing in steam, sun and wind power alternatives. You do nothing of benefit in these areas at all. Drill for thermo power from underground; use it generate power and re-circulate back into the ground. All you folks do is maintain the status quo and take, take, take the money from customers. And nothing will change. Next year, we'll see the same shortages with the same thoughtless excuses for not developing pro-active planning for the future. Stop taking the money and running....

Transaction ID: 4271529.5
Referred by: <http://www.puc.state.id.us/scripts/polyform.dll/ipuc>
User Address: 4.228.3.137
User Hostname: 4.228.3.137

✓ Gen Ack
sent 4/28/05

✓ To AV.

✓ To Commus
i H

Jean Jewell

From: Ed Howell
Sent: Thursday, April 28, 2005 8:52 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Ed Howell; Gene Fadness; Tonya Clark
Subject: Comment acknowledgement

WWW Form Submission:

Thursday, April 28, 2005
7:52:28 AM

Case: **IPC-E-05-15**
Name: Patty
Street Address: 1104 W Washington
City: Meridian
State: Idaho
ZIP: 83642
Home Telephone:
E-Mail:

Company: Idaho Power
mailing_list_yes_no: **yes**
Comment_description: I realize that costs are going up, but I feel that Idaho Power wants these rate increases in order to keep their profit levels up. It is getting harder and harder for people to make ends meet and this rate increase will make it just that much more difficult. Please, for once, consider the middle/lower income families who will have to come up with this extra money and deny these rate increases.

Transaction ID: 428752.28
Referred by: <http://www.puc.state.id.us/scripts/polyform.dll/ipuc>
User Address: 12.18.144.101
User Hostname: 12.18.144.101

✓ Ken Hark
sent 4/28/05

✓ To A.V.

✓ To Comm
: H

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

✓ Men. Ack
sent 4/28/05

✓ To AV.

✓ To Comm.
; H

Stacey Crosby

*10356 Cory St.
Boise, Idaho 83704*

Phone: 208-378-0922

Cellular: 208-407-2842

Email: infowench@ldylnqstkn.com

April 27, 2005

Idaho Public Utilities Commission

RE: Proposed Idaho Power Rate Increase - *IPC-E-05-15*

There is a Federal Law entitled "The American's With Disabilities Act" that prohibits the discrimination of the disabled. While it is strictly observed in other states, in Idaho, it is basically ignored, and our disabled become the unwilling victims of abuse, discrimination and victimization.

It is easy to abuse and ignore this segment of the population. Why? These are individuals who in some cases have lost the ability to live as normal, functioning parts of society. Their inability to continue earning an income, has destroyed their confidence, their way of life, and any hope they had in living a somewhat comfortable life.

Many have owned homes, and as their income disappears, lose the home they worked so hard to obtain, and watch their dreams crushed. They find Idaho Power asking for increases they can not afford since their Social Security is fixed and even cost of living increases don't cover increases for medication or food.

Now Idaho Power claims that they can no longer afford the present rates because of the years of drought, when in fact their executives and parent company are paid according to *Enron* standards. They are asking for an increase.

I am disabled, and have been subjected to the worst violations under the act. I am disabled and I have been lied to, abused by lenders and utilities. It takes two years for you to tread your way through the system, to the point where you are finally heard by an Administrative Law Review Judge. Then, if you are lucky, your claim for your social security will be approved. In the two years that it takes any savings or retirement accounts that you had accumulated all the years you worked are now depleted.

Again, and again, I have found myself in a humiliating bottomless void that does not properly address the needs of this group of citizens. Yes, there is Energy assistance available but even the annual EA payment is being decreased in increments and soon this so needed assistance will no longer be available. There are no low income or special rates for the disabled that other Power Companies provide offered by Idaho Power.

For those with the ability to get up in the morning, go to work to earn the funds you need to live, I say this: Consider what would happen, if you lost that ability. After years of working, contributing your life, time, and energy to insuring your needs, those of your family, and those of your country, you suddenly lost that ability. Do you have savings? I did, and they are gone now. Do you have family to help? I do not. My mother has breast cancer and is elderly. My parent's savings must see to her needs first. My father is deceased. Do you have friends who will help? I don't think any of us will approach friends for money that they are not certain they will be able to pay back. Most seem to be in the same situation with mounting bills and pay that does not keep up with the basic cost of living

The bottom line is this – the citizens of Idaho are not in the financial position to pay for another increase. Most have not had an increase in their pay so an increase by Idaho Power makes no sense.

I think most Idahoans would agree that the salaries and bonuses paid to Idaho Power were paid at the expense of and at the victimization of the citizens of the State of Idaho, especially those who are living on a benefit like Social Security as I am. ***You don't justify a rate increase with the drought and then over pay your executives.*** It is a fraudulent abuse especially since there are no other options available in Idaho to change to. They have a monopoly on the market and consumers have no choice but to deal with them for their power.

Please, reject Idaho Power's latest request for a rate increase. Idaho can not afford to pay more. We certainly can not afford the rates we have now.

Sincerely,

Stacey Crosby