



RECEIVED

2012 MAR 14 PM 4:49

IDAHO PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

JASON B. WILLIAMS
Corporate Counsel
jwilliams@idahopower.com

March 14, 2012

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Jean D. Jewell, Secretary
Idaho Public Utilities Commission
472 West Washington Street
Boise, Idaho 83702

Re: Impact of Proposed Settlement Stipulation in Case No. IPC-E-12-02 (Hoku Contract Reformation Proceeding) and Clarification of Certain Language in the Applications in Case Nos. **IPC-E-12-06 (Transmission Deferral)**, IPC-E-12-07 (Non-AMI Depreciation), IPC-E-12-08 (Depreciation Rates), and IPC-E-12-09 (Boardman Rates) and clarification of rate calculation language in those Applications.

Dear Ms. Jewell:

The Idaho Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") Staff contacted Idaho Power Company ("Idaho Power" or "Company") last week seeking clarification on certain items contained in the four Applications filed with the Commission on February 15, 2012, in Case Nos. IPC-E-12-06 (Transmission Deferral), IPC-E-12-07 (Non-AMI Depreciation), IPC-E-12-08 (Depreciation Rates), and IPC-E-12-09 (Boardman Rates).

Hoku Contract Reformation Impact. A Joint Motion for Approval of Settlement Stipulation which would reform a portion of the Special Contract between Idaho Power and Hoku Materials, Inc. ("Hoku") was filed on February 17, 2012, and is currently pending approval in Case No. IPC-E-12-02. The customer communications associated with the Company's three March 2, 2012, filings contained a chart depicting the revenue impact by class from current billed rates as if the proposed Settlement Stipulation pending in Case No. IPC-E-12-02 was approved by the Commission. In discussions with Staff last week, the Staff and Idaho Power agreed that the Company should recalculate the rate impact of the four February 15, 2012, filings to likewise include the impact of the Hoku Settlement Stipulation as if it were approved by the Commission.

Idaho Power hereby submits this informational filing in the above-captioned dockets with the following revenue impact calculations that include the rate impact with an assumption that the Settlement Stipulation in Case No. IPC-E-12-02 is approved as filed. It is important to note that the percentages presented in the table represent the percentage change in total Idaho jurisdictional "billed revenue" which includes revenue from base rates, the Power Cost Adjustment, and the Fixed Cost Adjustment. The percentage change numbers included in the Applications in Case Nos. IPC-E-12-06 (Transmission Cost Deferral), IPC-E-12-07 (Non-AMI Depreciation), IPC-E-12-08 (Depreciation Rates), and IPC-E-12-09 (Boardman Rates) were measurements from base rate revenue only.

| | Revenue Impact By Class | | | | | Overall Change |
|-----------------------|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------|------------|----------------|
| | Percentage Change from Current Billed Rates | | | | | |
| | Residential | Small General Service | Large General Service | Large Power | Irrigation | |
| Transmission Deferral | 0.06% | 0.05% | 0.09% | 0.13% | 0.08% | 0.08% |
| Non-AMI Depreciation | (1.32%) | (1.04%) | (1.63%) | 0.00% | (1.68%) | (1.25%) |
| Depreciation Rates | 0.30% | 0.29% | 0.32% | 0.33% | 0.33% | 0.31% |
| Boardman Rates | 0.18% | 0.17% | 0.19% | 0.20% | 0.19% | 0.19% |
| FCA | 0.28% | 0.31% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.14% |
| Revenue Sharing | (3.17%) | (3.16%) | (3.25%) | (3.26%) | (3.25%) | (3.21%) |
| Langley Gulch | 7.00% | 6.99% | 7.18% | 7.21% | 7.17% | 7.10% |
| Combined Effect | 3.34% | 3.61% | 2.91% | 4.60% | 2.85% | 3.35% |

¹ Includes Lighting Schedules

² Includes Special Contracts

Clarification of Application Language. Idaho Power inadvertently used imprecise language to describe how the rate impacts were calculated in the four Applications filed on February 15, 2012. Idaho Power hereby submits this informational filing to clarify the language of each Application as follows:

Case No. IPC-E-12-06 (Transmission Deferral): Paragraph 8 on page 4 of the Application should read: "As a result of the amortization period, the Company proposes an overall average uniform percentage increase of 0.08 percent applied as a uniform cents per kWh increase to all customer classes . . ." On page 7 of the Application, paragraph 17 should read: ". . . (2) approving an increase of \$688,156 in the annual revenue recovered, which results in an uniform percentage overall average increase of 0.08 percent to all customers classes; . . ."

Case No. IPC-E-12-07 (Non-AMI Depreciation): Paragraph 6 on page 4 of the Application should read: "The Company proposes a uniform percentage cents per kWh decrease to Tariff Schedules . . ."

Jean Jewell
March 14, 2012
Page 3

Case No. IPC-E-12-08 (Depreciation Rates): Paragraph 7 on page 4 of the Application should state: "The Company requests that the incremental revenue requirement of \$2,656,213 be ~~spread to recovered from all customer classes on a uniform percentage basis and be recovered~~ through a uniform percentage increase to all base rate components except the service charge."

Case No. IPC-E-12-09 (Boardman Rates): Paragraph 4 on page 3 of the Application should read: "The Company requests that the incremental revenue requirement of \$1,583,373 be ~~spread to customer classes on a uniform percentage basis and be recovered~~ from all customer classes through a uniform percentage increase to all base rate components except the service charge."

Importantly, none of these clarifications impact the Company's request in any of the four proceedings. Again, the Company is submitting these clarifications for informational purposes.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Williams", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jason B. Williams

JBW:kkt