

✓ Response sent by Gene F. 1/12/06

✓ To A.V.

✓ To Commes :H

Gene Fadness

From: Ed Howell
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2006 9:44 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Ed Howell; Gene Fadness; Tonya Clark
Subject: Comment acknowledgement

WWW Form Submission:

Monday, January 09, 2006
9:43:53 AM

Case: IPC-E-05-28
Name: Kathleen Englund
Street_Address: 424 West Cherry Lane #21
City: Meridian
State: Idaho
ZIP: 83642
Home_Telephone: (208)288-1736

E-Mail:
Company: Idaho Power Company
mailing_list_yes_no: yes

Comment_description: Dear Idaho Public Utility Commission,
The Idaho Power Company has again submitted for another rate increase.
I am opposed to this.
When was the last increase they received?

Please Reply.
In this increase residents are paying higher rates than other organizations? In their proposal the average resident will pay some \$5.00 to \$6.19 more on their bill.
What specific needs have they asked for other than

"operating" costs?
I DO NOT believe with their recent increase they have been given-
This increase for "operating Cost" is NOT justified !.
In your consideration do you look also at the review of Administrative persons also given an increase in pay?

Do you investigate this after rate increases are given?
I am an Idaho resident who feels Idaho Power needs to be regulated more.
Sincerely,
Kathleen Englund

Transaction ID: 19943.53
Referred by: <http://www.puc.state.id.us/scripts/polyform.dll/ipuc>
User Address: 205.188.117.11
User Hostname: 205.188.117.11

✓ Ack. Ack sent 1/11/06
✓ To AV.
*✓ To Comments
E H*
Jean Jewell

From: Ed Howell
Sent: Friday, January 06, 2006 10:04 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Ed Howell; Gene Fadness; Tonya Clark
Subject: Comment acknowledgement

WWW Form Submission:

Friday, January 06, 2006
10:04:18 AM

Case:

Name: LEONARD G. BAXTER
Street Address: 6198 BRIAN WAY
City: BOISE
State: ID
ZIP: 83716-8809
Home Telephone: 208.334.8424
E-Mail: LEN.BAXTER@GMAIL.COM
Company: IDAHO POWER (AN IDACORP COMPANY)

mailing_list_yes_no: yes

Comment_description: WHILE READING THE CONSUMER CONNECTION, JANUARY 2006, THAT CAME WITH MY IDAHO POWER BILL YESTERDAY, I NOTICED THAT RESIDENTIAL ELECTRIC SERVICE MONTHLY COST FOR 1,000 KWH AS OF JULY 1, 2005 FOR BOISE, IDAHO WAS \$65.69. IDAHO POWER MAKES A PERSON BELIEVE THAT IDAHO POWER RATES AMONG THE NATION'S LOWEST. BUT THEN IT SAYS THIRD LOWEST IN THE WEST. FURTHER ON IT SAYS NATIONALLY 20 COMPANIES HAD RESIDENTIAL RATES THAT WERE LOWER. IDAHO POWER WILL NOT TELL ME WHO THOSE 20 COMPANIES ARE. I TOLD THEM THEY SHOULD FIND OUT WHY 20 COMPANIES IN THE NATION HAVE LOWER RATES THAN IDAHO POWER. WHY SHOULD IDAHO POWER EVER BE ASKING FOR RATE INCREASES WHEN THERE ARE 20 OTHER COMPANIES IN THE NATION THAT HAVE LOWER RATES? IDAHO POWER SHOULD TAKE OFF THE SERVICE CHARGE AND THE CONSERVATION PROGRAM FUNDING CHARGE. I WOULD GIVE UP THE FEDERAL COLUMBIA RIVER BENEFITS SUPPLIED BY BPA CREDIT TO GET RID OF THE SERVICE CHARGE AND THE CONSERVATION PROGRAM FUNDING CHARGE. I HOPE THE IPUC MAKES IDAHO POWER FIND OUT WHAT THE OTHER 20 COMPANIES IN THAT NATION ARE DOING TO HAVE LOWER RATES THAN IDAHO POWER. THANK YOU.

Transaction ID: 161004.18

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

User Address: 164.165.237.2

User Hostname: 164.165.237.2

Jean Jewell

From: Ed Howell
Sent: Friday, January 06, 2006 10:25 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Ed Howell; Gene Fadness; Tonya Clark
Subject: Comment acknowledgement

WWW Form Submission:

Friday, January 06, 2006
10:25:19 AM

Case:

Name: LEONARD G. BAXTER
Street Address: 6198 BRIAN WAY
City: BOISE
State: ID
ZIP: 83716-8809
Home Telephone: 208.334.8424
E-Mail: LEN.BAXTER@GMAIL.COM
Company: IDAHO POWER (AN IDACORP COMPANY)

mailing_list_yes_no: yes

Comment_description: I FORGOT A POINT. WHILE READING THE CONSUMER CONNECTION, JANUARY 2006, THAT CAME WITH MY IDAHO POWER BILL YESTERDAY, I NOTICED THAT IDAHO POWER COMMERCIAL CUSTOMERS RATE BETTER THAN RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS. MEDIUM-SIZED COMMERCIAL ACCOUNT RATES WERE RANKED THE FOURTH LOWEST NATIONALLY WHILE SMALL INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS' RATES WERE THE THIRD LOWEST IN THE NATION. RESIDENTIAL ACCOUNTS WERE 21ST LOWEST IN THE NATION. WHY SHOULD US RESIDENTIAL ACCOUNTS BE 21ST IN THE NATION WHILE THE COMMERCIAL ACCOUNTS ARE 4TH AND 3RD? IT LOOKS LIKE US RESIDENTIAL ACCOUNTS ARE SUBSIDIZING THE COMMERCIAL ACCOUNTS. LIKE RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TAX PAYERS ARE SUBSIDIZING COMMERCIAL PROPERTY TAX PAYERS. PLEASE INVESTIGATE WHAT YOU CAN AND MAKE RESIDENTIAL ACCOUNTS 3RD OR 4TH IN THE NATION INSTEAD OF 21ST. THANK YOU.

Transaction ID: 161025.19

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

User Address: 164.165.237.2

User Hostname: 164.165.237.2

✓ No response
Sent - name illegible

✓ To Comms
JH

Idaho Public Utilities Commission
472 W Washington St.
Boise, Idaho

RECEIVED
FILED
2006 JUN -5 PM 2:56
IDaho PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

Dear Sirs:

I am writing to comment on the October 28th filing by Idaho Power to have its base rates increased by 7.8 percent.

I respectfully request that you will be judicious in your decision since not all that is ask for is generally needed. There seems to be no end to requests for more rate increases by the public utilities and the government to be paid from the pockets of Idaho workers. I believe that some of these utilities have made huge profits in the past at the expense of the people.

If you find Idaho Power needs an increase I believe the request should be denied and instead of a base rate increase for all users the base rate increase should apply only to the three lowest rate users namely large commercial, Industrial and Irrigation until they are equal to the other highest rate users. An overall base rate increase by equal percentage only increases the disparity between the rates in favor of the lower base rate users. Even though all would go up the higher rates go up faster than the lower rates. I believe that all customers should be totally responsible in the use of Idaho Power and that the higher rate users should not have to subsidize the lower rate users use of such power. This system only fosters waste and non conservation by the lower rate users while the higher rate users pay for this waste and non conservation. There is little incentive for the low rate users to conserve energy use when the residential and small commercial users pay for this cost.

In summary I would request that the base rate request be denied and that only a request for rate increases for the irrigation, industrial and large commercial users rate be given until they mirror the rates of the small commercial and residential rate users.

Sincerely

