

✓ Gen Ack
sent 10/30/06

✓ To A.V.

✓ To Commis.
S
H

Jean Jewell

From: bcrafton@co.twin-falls.id.us
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2006 4:24 AM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Bill Crafton follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-06-21
Name: Bill Crafton
Address: Post Office Box 5143
City: Twin Falls
State: Idaho
Zip: 83303-5143
Home Telephone: 208-736-4588
Contact E-Mail: bcrafton@co.twin-falls.id.us
Name of Utility Company:
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:
I have been observing this for some time and it appears that Idaho Power just does not want any wind generation. I support Mr. Grover's proposal and think it is ridiculous that Idaho Power is allowed to keep changing the rules. Delay in this case is as good as denial and will destroy the opportunity for Mr. Grover and others to move forward. One has to ask why Idaho Power waited until now to bring in the transmission up grade question when it was expressed that sufficient was available to support the projects being proposed in that area.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc/ipuc.html>
IP address is 216.83.79.6

✓ Gen Ack
sent 10/30/06

✓ To A.V.

✓ To Commu.
iH

Jean Jewell

From: mailmark@otc.isu.edu
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2006 4:20 AM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Mark Mailhot follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-06-21
Name: Mark Mailhot
Address: 962 A McKinley Ave
City: Pocatello
State: ID
Zip: 83201
Home Telephone: 208-238-3096
Contact E-Mail: mailmark@otc.isu.edu
Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:
I think that the attempt of the power company to pull the rug out of a renewable power source is dirty and underhanded. The Cassia Wind project is an important step into furthering renewable power sources and 'nipping it at the bud' as a way of decreasing competition in the future is wrong.
Mark Mailhot

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc/ipuc.html>
IP address is 134.50.8.139

✓ Gen Ack
sent 10/30/06

✓ To AV

✓ To Commis
; H

Jean Jewell

From: grovthan@isu.edu
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2006 3:07 AM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Thane Z. Grover follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-06-21
Name: Thane Z. Grover
Address: 1626 South 3rd Ave.
City: Pocatello
State: Idaho
Zip: 83201
Home Telephone: 208-705-7397
Contact E-Mail: grovthan@isu.edu
Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

I strongly encourage the Idaho Public Utilities Commission to support the honest efforts of Cassia by setting an efficient deadline for a decision and allowing Cassia project to move forward. The benefits of Cassia to us Idahoans is clear (I would be glad to elaborate if needed). I am seriously dissapointed by the actions of Idaho Power in pushing for such a selfish and inhibiting condition.

Thank you for considering my comment, Thane Z. Grover

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc/ipuc.html>
IP address is 134.50.8.174

✓ Men Ack
sent 10/30/06

✓ To AV.

✓ To Comm. H

Jean Jewell

From: youngrs@syllivestock.myrf.net
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2006 2:19 AM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Sherman and Rosalie Young follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-06-21
Name: Sherman and Rosalie Young
Address: 3134 South 1900 East
City: Wendell
State: Idaho
Zip: 83355
Home Telephone: 208-536-6185
Contact E-Mail: youngrs@syllivestock.myrf.net
Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

RE Cassia Wind Farms - Idaho Power

We are extremely disappointed in Idaho Power for their tactics in delaying construction if the wind farms in Twin Falls County. It seems they have resorted to every strategy possible to delay the construction with the intent to eventually make it financially impossible to pursue the project. First they delayed the project by saying that Cassia was not exempt from the moratorium they imposed. When the PUC ruled otherwise, after many months' delay, they have decided to try other schemes to deter them. Now they are asking them to upgrade their whole transmission system, which THEY would do if other coal-fired or natural gas plants were brought online. They are asking Cassia Wind Farms to bear an unreasonable burden. The worst case scenario they are claiming - of overloading the transmission system - is unlikely to occur and IF it did occur there are already other methods in place to reduce transmission if necessary. We feel that Idaho Power is pulling out all the stops to delay the project and using their mega size to crush the project without just cause. Not only will their tactics cost Cassia in time escaped to recoup their sizeable investment in time and money, but it will also add to the cost of turbines and other components and it will cost the state and county thousands of dollars in tax revenues and jobs. Wind energy is a valuable renewable energy resource and should be developed in Idaho on a large scale as it has been done in other parts of the country. Furthermore, the rate of 6 cents per kW is not unreasonable for Idaho Power to pay - locked in for years to come. We urge you to make a SPEEDY DECISION AND ALLOW CASSIA WIND FARMS TO PROCEED WITHOUT FURTHER DELAY.

Sincerely,

Sherman and Rosalie Young

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc/ipuc.html>
IP address is 63.239.248.1

✓ Gen. Ask
sent 10/30/06

✓ To Commus.
i H

Jean Jewell

From: ronelkin@safelink.net
Sent: Saturday, October 28, 2006 5:10 AM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Ron Elkin follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-06-21
Name: Ron Elkin
Address: 712 east 4900 north
City: buhl
State: idaho
Zip: 83316
Home Telephone: 208 543 0929
Contact E-Mail: ronelkin@safelink.net
Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power
Add to Mailing List: no

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

The IPUC must slap down Idaho power co. in its' ongoing attempts to stonewall private developers of wind power. IP advertises for and even accepts additional moneys in the name of 'Green Power' yet everyone who has tried to develop this power has been stonewalled to some extent. It is wrong to present to interested parties that IP wants this development when they clearly do not. Stop the manipulation. The IPUC is here to protect the rate payer. That means, in this case, expanding energy development. The rate payers of Idaho have said over and over they want to explore green power generation.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc/ipuc.html>
IP address is 12.169.182.161

✓ Ben. Ake
sent 10/30/06

✓ To AU.

✓ To Comm. 5H

Jean Jewell

From: neilgu@mail.com
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2006 5:16 PM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Neil Gu follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-06-21
Name: Neil Gu
Address: 12798 W Silverbrook Ct
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip: 83713
Home Telephone: (208) 939-9639
Contact E-Mail: neilgu@mail.com
Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

I am interested in renewables and in saving money for myself as a ratepayer. I would hope that the Commission be visionary as they decide on this case and look at the big picture. In particular, I would hope that the following points be considered:

1) I don't want to be labeled an extremist when I say that it really looks like Idaho Power is building obstacles to stop PURPA QF's, but by looking at the facts. I see the following happening to the areas they control in Idaho. 10MW of wind went online in 2004 (Fossil Gulch). 0 MW of wind went online in 2005, 0 MW wind online in 2006, and where are the projects for 2007? Is their fate is decided in this hearing? For the 13th windiest state, I hope this trend will soon end. I find it hard to believe that where other utilities are gobbling up wind generation at record rates, and neighboring states are making mandatory Renewable Portfolio Standards, that Idaho Power has only found 10MW of available space on its system (despite what it says it plans). Looking through the 2006 IRP it looks as if Idaho Power is deciding to put up more walls for PURPA projects when they mention in the policy section that they plan to file at the Commission to reduce the PURPA rates, and also to take the green tags from the projects.

2) It seems that Idaho Power is really splitting hairs to try and stifle Cassia. Cassia seems to be willing to build/upgrade a new substation and feeder lines and main lines all the way to the shared backbone transmission grid. It makes sense that small wind projects shouldn't have to worry about getting involved in building and maintaining the shared grid of Idaho Power. Won't these improvements be used by many different customers, and wouldn't the upgrades be needed with any new generation in the same area? Even if it was the avoided cost surrogate resource the upgrades would be needed. The Cassia projects are pretty much in the middle of Idaho Powers territory.

3) I would like to see generation and transmission added by Idaho Power. I think that paying the costs today will save much money later. BPA generation is nearing its limits, and Idaho Power will not be able to continue to rely on the market for low prices. They need to lock in now, and they can do that by increasing generation and transmission capacity. I think that not only should they try and get a lot of PURPA, but they should be actively participating in owning wind generation in Idaho (emphasis on the IN Idaho - sed below).

4) As Idaho Power needs new generation, I am willing to pay a slight premium for wind projects that are located within Idaho, and in particular for smaller projects like Cassia Gulch Wind Farm. The reason? It might seem selfish, but it is because they will put money back in my pockets and in other ratepayers pockets. For example, the Wolverine Creek project in Idaho Falls will bring in annual property tax of well over 1 million dollars. Based on current turbine prices, the Cassia projects will also bring in over \$400,000 per year. All of this goes to help pay for services that residents like myself would otherwise pay for. Split those amounts up between Idaho residents and that is an

extra \$1 in each Idahoans' pocket. The projects will also pay Idaho Income tax (probably no federal tax because of PTC credits.) I am sure that you are also aware that for every 10MW of capacity, 2-3 long term local jobs are usually created (smaller projects usually hire more per MW). All of this money will stay in Idaho and will benefit ratepayers like myself.

In conclusion I support your actions to allow the Cassia Projects to move forward by placing the responsibility of Grid or Network upgrades on the utility. Although I know I will end up paying for the upgrades as a ratepayer, I can see the benefits in the bigger picture.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc/ipuc.html>
IP address is 71.221.148.169

Jean Jewell

From: toddhaynes@boisestate.edu
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2006 10:49 AM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Todd A. Haynes follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-06-21
Name: Todd A. Haynes
Address: 310 S. Garden St.
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip: 83705
Home Telephone: 208-283-5846
Contact E-Mail: toddhaynes@boisestate.edu
Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:
Dear Commission:

This letter concerns the complaint brought by Cassia Gulch Wind Park and Cassia Wind Farm LLCs against Idaho Power Company.

It appears that Idaho Power Company continues to be very creative in its efforts to thwart PURPA wind energy facilities in its service territory. First, it initiated the infamous 90/110 performance band. When that failed to prevent hopeful wind energy generators from moving forward, it requested a moratorium on PURPA projects. While that moratorium did not go ahead, the IPUC's decision to limit future PURPA wind projects to 100 kW (for standard pricing) has effectively killed new PURPA projects. However, several projects which had been deemed to be sufficiently underway were "grandfathered" in under the old rules (10 aMW per month).

The Cassia wind parks were grandfathered in, against Idaho Power Company's wishes. In a new effort to kill these projects (a tactic which - if the company's history is a guide - will likely be applied to the other grandfathered projects), Idaho Power is attempting to saddle these small, farmer-owned projects with a \$50M+ cost: to upgrade the company's transmission lines. This after Cassia has already agreed to upgrade the local distribution line from the project to the substation.

If the SEMPRA coal plant had been not been killed by the state legislature, would Idaho Power have required SEMPRA to upgrade transmission lines? I think not. In all likelihood the company would have passed this cost on to the ratepayers, which is the proper course of action. Did the company require the natural gas powered "peaking plants" near Mountain Home to bear the costs of upgrading its transmission lines? Will the proposed natural gas peaking plants in Boise be required to bear similar costs? If the answer to these questions is "no", then the same logic should apply to the Cassia projects.

Perhaps even more importantly, time is of the essence in the Cassia case. The federal tax credits will expire at the end of 2007. If the project is not online by that time (14 months from now), it will not be eligible for the tax credits. Without the tax credits, the project will be economically unfeasible. At the same time, turbine costs are increasing rapidly. The Cassia projects were initially planned to be constructed in the fall of 2005. Idaho Power has successfully delayed the project by more than 1 year, causing Cassia's costs to increase significantly. A cynical view of the situation would lead one to conclude that Idaho Power's actual motivation is to kill this (and other) project in any way possible. The company is certainly award of both factors: 1) upcoming tax credit deadline; and 2) rapidly increasing turbine costs. It is hard to conclude that these factors are not driving Idaho Power's efforts to saddle Cassia with the burdensome costs of upgrading transmission lines while simultaneously dragging out this case (running out the clock).

I urge the commission to take the following actions:

1. Be expeditious in your ruling - time is of the essence.
2. Rule in favor of the Cassia wind projects. The commission's role is to regulate the utility company, which enjoys a monopoly. Therefore the commission should not allow the multi-million dollar monopoly company to bully a small, farmer-owned project, which seeks to add clean, reliable power at a fixed price to the grid for the benefit of all Idaho ratepayers.

Sincerely,

Todd A. Haynes
Boise, Idaho

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc/ipuc.html>
IP address is 132.178.123.30
