

Jean Jewell

From: Gene Fadness
Sent: Monday, February 11, 2013 9:52 AM
To: Erik Jorgensen; Jean Jewell
Subject: FW: PUC's webpage consumer comments not working

IPC-E-12-29

Importance: High

From: Britt Ide [mailto:brittide@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, February 11, 2013 9:52 AM
To: Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC's webpage consumer comments not working

Gene,

The PUC webpage allowing consumers to make comments is not working. I completed this page <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html> and repeatedly tried to submit it. It failed saying: "This webpage is not available. The connection to www.puc.idaho.gov was interrupted." I tried again repeatedly over many days and using different browsers (Chrome & Firefox).

I'd like to comment on case # IPC-E-12-29. I acknowledge that it will become public record.

I support Demand Side Management. I'm concerned with IPC's proposal. While I appreciate that the DSM may not be needed this summer, I believe it will be needed as the economy and population grows. We'll need DSM to keep our rates low going forward. The proposal (especially the letter I already received from IPC as a Cool Credits participant) seems to kill the DSM program without future planning. The letter doesn't have a future proposal and wasn't clear. I worked hard to recruit friends to join Cool Credits to help keep IPC & customer costs down (by reducing peak demand). This proposal jeopardizes the entire program (it is hard to recruit busy people!) and is short sighted. Please encourage a more thoughtful program to better protect IPC and ratepayers.

PS Many people see this proposal as a "bait and switch": Build Langley Gulch and then Kill DSM. I don't think that is the PUC or IPC intent. Please help clarify commitment to DSM in our future. The cheapest KW is the one we don't use.

Thank you.

**Britt Ide
Boise, Idaho**