

RECEIVED

Idaho Public Utilities Commission  
P.O. Box 83720  
Boise, Idaho 83720-0074

2010 DEC 16 AM 8:20

IDAHO PUBLIC  
UTILITIES COMMISSION

To Whom It May Concern:

We are unable to attend either meeting in our area which will discuss Rocky Mountain Power's proposed rate increase for their Eastern Idaho customers. . **A rate increase is alarming to us.**

**#1.** There was no increase in our Social Security incomes this year, nor will there be in 2011. Groceries continue to rise. (And now electricity????)

**#2.** This would give Rocky Mountain a 10.6% interest rate. Where can we go to get that rate on our small savings?

**#3.** Being retired dairy farmers, we fear for the farmers in Idaho if they have to pay higher rates for electricity. Our food prices will continue to rise if electricity costs increase. We feel it wise to be able to grow food here in the U.S and not have to depend solely on foreign markets.

**# 4.** It seems that it is a bad time to increase electric rated in this economic downturn we are in.

**#5.** We are grateful for electricity and we try to conserve on its use. We appreciate the opportunity to comment and trust that those on the PUC will consider very carefully all aspects of this proposed increase.

We read in the newspaper that Rocky Mountain Power wants us to pay more to buy new windmills and power lines to move electricity to Oregon and California. Surely the PUC would look into this. What is the cost of a new windmill in comparison to a new power plant?

Sincerely,



Morris and Ruth Ann Gregory  
5514 East Sugar Creek Road  
Preston, Idaho 83263

December 13, 2010

Mr. Jim Kempton, President  
ID Public Utilities Commission  
P.O. Box 83720  
Boise, ID 83720-0074

RECEIVED  
2010 DEC 16 AM 8:19  
IDAHO PUBLIC  
UTILITIES COMMISSION

Dear Commissioner Kempton:

RE: Case Number PAC-E-10-07

My name is Chris Leatherman. I moved to Southeastern Idaho five years ago to rear my family. I am employed by Monsanto as a mining engineer and along with my wife am a parent to two high-school aged children and am fostering two elementary aged children. I am writing to express my opposition to Rocky Mountain Power's proposed rate increase.

I am greatly concerned of the potential impacts such a rate increase could have on not only my employer's ability to continue operations in the area, but also the impacts to other rate payers and the region's economy as a whole. As well as being a Monsanto employee, I am a Rocky Mountain power customer (residential rate payer) and am concerned about increased living costs and potential loss of employment if Monsanto curtails or shuts down operations

As a member of Monsanto's mining staff I have first hand knowledge of how Monsanto's costs to do business will be changing with development of a new mine and how new regulatory rules are driving up the cost to do business. I fear that these issues along with the RMP's sizeable rate increase proposal will increase Monsanto's costs enough to force purchase of elemental phosphorus and/or glyphosate from China, thus effectively closing its operations near Soda Springs. I know of the impact this could have on my family and can only image how devastating closure of Monsanto's plant could be to Southeast Idaho. A dramatic rate increase could also negatively impact Rocky Mountain Power with the loss of its largest customer.

Rocky Mountain Power's call for a double digit increase is at such a dramatic level that it threatens the viability of all manufacturers, not only Monsanto. If approved, it will have a rippling effect throughout Southeast Idaho that we may never be able to recover from. In this most severe economic downturn since the Great Depression, we have all had to make do with less. Rocky Mountain Power can, and should, get by with a substantially reduced rate proposal.

Thank you for the chance to comment.

Sincerely,



Chris Leatherman  
1756 Cedar View Road  
Soda Springs, ID 83276

December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2010

Mr. Jim Kempton, President  
ID Public Utilities Commission  
P.O. Box 83720  
Boise, ID 83720-0074

RECEIVED  
2010 DEC 16 AM 8:17  
IDAHO PUBLIC  
UTILITIES COMMISSION

Commissioner Kempton

RE: Case Number PAC-E-10-07

I am writing to you today to express my opposition to Rocky Mountain Power's proposed rate increase.

I am greatly concerned of the impacts the proposed rate increase will have both immediately and in the future for my family and for my employer. I am also concerned for the region as a whole due to the size and scope of the planned increase at all levels, for the impact it will have on existing business and the ability of the region to attract new business.

Reviewing the size of the raises that we have received (and in some cases the lack of them) from our employers coupled with the fact that for the last two years there have been no social security adjustments (due to a flat inflation rate) and the proposed federal employee rate freeze for the next two years. We do not feel that we can absorb these increases and that the increases themselves are out of line with the service being provided to Southeastern Idaho customers. This is partly due to the continued recession that the country is going through and I feel that this will be exacerbated by an increase to my employer and feel that this represents a double hit to me and my family, I do not see how our employers can absorb the increase in cost that is being requested of them and remain viable as a business let alone give the raises that would be needed to partially offset the increase that we, their employees will have in order to avert a major down shift in the standard of living throughout the region.

In Mr. Cupparo's testimony on page five lines 5 through 11 he states that the Gateway Transmission Expansion "will reduce operation cost to customers". After reading his testimony among others I suspect he is referring to customers both South and West of Idaho and that the main benefits of the gateway expansion is the ability to transport energy across Idaho from Wyoming to provide the high cost "green" energy from wind generation that their customers on the west coast have requested along with the ability to move low cost hydroelectric power from its generating sources within Idaho to high cost markets on the coast. In the last few years FMC in Pocatello closed down and while they are not a Rocky Mountain Power customer they did consume power produced in the "shared" grid which encompasses the low cost hydro electric power that attracted these large customers in the past and was a large part of the reason for their locating in Idaho to start with. A large plant like the FMC plant or the Monsanto plant in Soda Springs is said to use the energy equal to a large metropolitan city like Memphis. I have not seen expansion in the region that would

lead me to believe that the power formerly used by FMC is being consumed locally this leads me to believe that this portion of the power is being exported via the grid and that we are being asked to subsidize the energy requirements of the states that Rocky Mountain power services to the South and West of Idaho by paying for the transmission lines needed to transport the power to them not for transmission lines to bring power into Idaho.

For the reasons noted above I do not feel that we in Southeastern Idaho should be asked to pay for any of the Gateway Transmission project until it can be shown that the line is used to provide power into Idaho and then only as a prorated amount based on the value provided to both the utility and to the customers. I also question why we should be asked to pay for high cost variable "wind" generation when Rocky Mountain Power dismantled low cost hydro electric power below Grace a few years ago rather than reinvesting and maintaining the units that were there. The primary problem I see with wind generation is that when the wind does not blow you must have in place either a duplicate unit in an area that the wind is blowing or the capacity to bring generating capacity on line from either hydro, gas, coal or nuclear sources in effect doubling the cost needed for each wind mill turbine. This is a front loaded cost and has no adjustment for future maintenance of the turbine itself. Since Idaho has no preference in law or policy for the use of wind generated power and that Idaho's overall energy use appears to have declined over the last few years (drastically if you include the reduction to Idaho Powers interruptible supply to FMC). I do not agree that wind generation is a "low cost service with manageable and reasonable risk to customers" (as stated in Mr. Tallman's testimony on page three lines 4 and 5).

Rocky Mountain Power is seeking a return on equity of 10.6% this is substantially higher than any long term investment can currently show with most being down around 2%. If you should find that we should be charged for these services the rate they are seeking is out of line with the current economy.

Thank you for the chance to comment.

Sincerely,

Mary S. Oberay

P.O. Box 638

Soda Springs, ID 83276

December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2010

RECEIVED

Mr. Jim Kempton, President  
ID Public Utilities Commission  
P.O. Box 83720  
Boise, ID 83720-0074

2010 DEC 16 AM 8:19  
IDAHO PUBLIC  
UTILITIES COMMISSION

Commissioner Kempton

RE: Case Number PAC-E-10-07

I am writing to you today to express my opposition to Rocky Mountain Power's proposed rate increase.

I am greatly concerned of the impacts the proposed rate increase will have both immediately and in the future for my family and for my employer. I am also concerned for the region as a whole due to the size and scope of the planned increase at all levels, for the impact it will have on existing business and the ability of the region to attract new business.

Reviewing the size of the raises that we have received (and in some cases the lack of them) from our employers coupled with the fact that for the last two years there have been no social security adjustments (due to a flat inflation rate) and the proposed federal employee rate freeze for the next two years. We do not feel that we can absorb these increases and that the increases themselves are out of line with the service being provided to Southeastern Idaho customers. This is partly due to the continued recession that the country is going through and I feel that this will be exacerbated by an increase to my employer and feel that this represents a double hit to me and my family, I do not see how our employers can absorb the increase in cost that is being requested of them and remain viable as a business let alone give the raises that would be needed to partially offset the increase that we, their employees will have in order to avert a major down shift in the standard of living throughout the region.

In Mr. Cupparo's testimony on page five lines 5 through 11 he states that the Gateway Transmission Expansion "will reduce operation cost to customers". After reading his testimony among others I suspect he is referring to customers both South and West of Idaho and that the main benefits of the gateway expansion is the ability to transport energy across Idaho from Wyoming to provide the high cost "green" energy from wind generation that their customers on the west coast have requested along with the ability to move low cost hydroelectric power from its generating sources within Idaho to high cost markets on the coast. In the last few years FMC in Pocatello closed down and while they are not a Rocky Mountain Power customer they did consume power produced in the "shared" grid which encompasses the low cost hydro electric power that attracted these large customers in the past and was a large part of the reason for their locating in Idaho to start with. A large plant like the FMC plant or the Monsanto plant in Soda Springs is said to use the energy equal to a large metropolitan city like Memphis. I have not seen expansion in the region that would

lead me to believe that the power formerly used by FMC is being consumed locally this leads me to believe that this portion of the power is being exported via the grid and that we are being asked to subsidize the energy requirements of the states that Rocky Mountain power services to the South and West of Idaho by paying for the transmission lines needed to transport the power to them not for transmission lines to bring power into Idaho.

For the reasons noted above I do not feel that we in Southeastern Idaho should be asked to pay for any of the Gateway Transmission project until it can be shown that the line is used to provide power into Idaho and then only as a prorated amount based on the value provided to both the utility and to the customers. I also question why we should be asked to pay for high cost variable "wind" generation when Rocky Mountain Power dismantled low cost hydro electric power below Grace a few years ago rather than reinvesting and maintaining the units that were there. The primary problem I see with wind generation is that when the wind does not blow you must have in place either a duplicate unit in an area that the wind is blowing or the capacity to bring generating capacity on line from either hydro, gas, coal or nuclear sources in effect doubling the cost needed for each wind mill turbine. This is a front loaded cost and has no adjustment for future maintenance of the turbine itself. Since Idaho has no preference in law or policy for the use of wind generated power and that Idaho's overall energy use appears to have declined over the last few years (drastically if you include the reduction to Idaho Powers interruptible supply to FMC). I do not agree that wind generation is a "low cost service with manageable and reasonable risk to customers" (as stated in Mr. Tallman's testimony on page three lines 4 and 5).

Rocky Mountain Power is seeking a return on equity of 10.6% this is substantially higher than any long term investment can currently show with most being down around 2%. If you should find that we should be charged for these services the rate they are seeking is out of line with the current economy.

Thank you for the chance to comment.

Sincerely,

*Phyllis A. Cooper*

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** secretary  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 15, 2010 5:09 PM  
**To:** Barb Barrows; Jean Jewell  
**Subject:** FW: Electricity Rate Increase

---

**From:** Chambers, Aaron[SMTP:ACHAMBER@AGRIUM.COM]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 15, 2010 5:08:22 PM  
**To:** secretary  
**Subject:** Electricity Rate Increase  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

IPUC,

I oppose the proposed rate increase by Rocky Mountain Power. This will cost jobs in an already tough market. Please look at this issue from the citizens viewpoint and the impact it will have on individual families. Thank you,

Aaron

---

IMPORTANT NOTICE ! This E-Mail transmission and any accompanying attachments may contain confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. Any dissemination, distribution, copying or action taken in reliance on the contents of this E-Mail by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited and is not intended to, in anyway, waive privilege or confidentiality. If you have received this E-Mail in error please immediately delete it and notify sender at the above E-Mail address. Agrium uses state of the art anti-virus technology on all incoming and outgoing E-Mail. We encourage and promote the use of safe E-Mail management practices and recommend you check this, and all other E-Mail and attachments you receive for the presence of viruses. The sender and Agrium accept no liability for any damage caused by a virus or otherwise by the transmittal of this E-Mail.

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** giles@icsofidaho.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 16, 2010 4:09 AM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Jerry W Giles follows:

-----  
Case Number: PAC-E-10-07  
Name: Jerry W Giles  
Address: 90 E Big Springs Rd  
City: Soda Springs  
State: ID  
Zip: 83276  
Daytime Telephone: 208-547-2310  
Contact E-Mail: [giles@icsofidaho.com](mailto:giles@icsofidaho.com)  
Name of Utility Company: Rocky Mtn Power  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

I was in attendance at the IPUC public hearing regarding Rocky Mountain Power's proposed rate increase which was held in the Grace, Idaho American Legion Hall on December 15th, 2010. I am in opposition to the rate increase. I ask Commissioners Kempton, Smith, and Redford to disapprove the current Rocky Mountain Power electrical rate increase. I see the rate increase as unreasonable. I am in agreement with those who testified during the hearing that: the planning of the increase is unfounded and proped on a law that does not exist; the increase is exorbitant; insuring greater than 10% returns to investors is exorbitant; the economic recessive climate can not afford such a high increase; economic damage in south east Idaho will be broad spread from the ederly and very limited income people to the more prosperous people; the impact on local industries and small business will be severe and damage the job base.

I manage a small trout farm, the Soda Springs Brood Station, for Clear Springs Foods, Inc. in Soda Springs, Idaho. There are six employees in the area to be affected by the electrical rate increase. The increase will effect their personnal lives at home. The increase will effect the bottom line of their product cost by approximately \$3300.00 annually. Increased operation costs exclusive of labor do not allow wage and benefit maintenance or increases. Company wide we employ over 300 people and are an emplyee owned company. No employee has had a raise in two years. We operate in a competitive market. If we were to increase the price of our product at the same rates as Rocky Mtn. Power is proposing we would drive ourselves out of business.

Thank you!

Jerry W Giles

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 216.128.237.252

-----

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** bratgirlav@aol.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 16, 2010 6:31 AM.  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Alexis Vaughan follows:

-----  
Case Number: PAC-E10-07  
Name: Alexis Vaughan  
Address: 77 N. 1ST West  
City: Preston  
State: Idaho  
Zip: 83263  
Daytime Telephone:  
Contact E-Mail: [bratgirlav@aol.com](mailto:bratgirlav@aol.com)  
Name of Utility Company:  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:  
Rocky Mountain Power Persuasive Speech

So I went to the Rocky Mountain Power Presentation in Preston Wednesday night to listen to what people in our community thought about the 10% raise that Rocky Mountain Power is asking for from its customers. As I listened to a few speeches, I realized that the lady at the front table, that was suppose to be paying attention, was looking down at her paper not really paying much attention. So I said something to my dad. He pointed out that the whole presentation was just to see what kind of reaction that they are getting from the audience and customers.

They are only asking for a 10% raise because they know what they are going to get. They are only expecting that 6% raise but ask for the 10 % because if they only asked for the six percent no one will really complain, so pretty much it is just a big business at work.

I still disagree with the 10 % raise though simply because it is taking away from my education and my future. I am not the only kid that actually cares about their future I promise but I am one of the few ready to speak up. Why should us kids have to suffer in our education for Rocky Mountain Power to build wind mills in California and Oregon. I live in IDAHO!! How is it fair that people in Idaho have to pay for something that is going to help other state and not our own state.

Its not our fault that Rocky Mountain Power weren't more responisble with their money and plans. They should have thought about how much money it would take to build the wind mills in the California and Oregon before they started building them. We shouldn't have to pay for their mistakes.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 207.108.238.37

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** ekgregory@juno.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 16, 2010 7:36 AM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Ellen Gregory follows:

-----  
Case Number: PAC-E-10-07  
Name: Ellen Gregory  
Address: 427 N. Maple Ridge  
City: Preston  
State: ID  
Zip: 83263  
Daytime Telephone:  
Contact E-Mail: [ekgregory@juno.com](mailto:ekgregory@juno.com)  
Name of Utility Company: Rocky Mountain Power  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

Wow. In the current economic straits, as I'm sure has been mentioned by multiple commentators, I can hardly believe that PacifiCorp has the audacity to petition for a rate hike, particularly on par with the percentage it angles for. In what alternate business climate--and universe--are they operating?

I urge the commission to refuse PacifiCorp's request. Because if the concept of making do with less doesn't register with PacifiCorp, we in southeastern Idaho just may end up with less business.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 207.225.33.166  
-----

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** bubba@plmw.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 16, 2010 7:41 AM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from brandon fitzgerald follows:

-----  
Case Number: PAC-E-10-07  
Name: brandon fitzgerald  
Address:  
City: preston  
State: ID  
Zip:  
Daytime Telephone:  
Contact E-Mail: [bubba@plmw.com](mailto:bubba@plmw.com)  
Name of Utility Company: Rocky mtn power  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:  
Rocky Mountain Power Company rate increases

Rocky Mountain Power Company wants to raise electricity rates by eighty percent to all its customers that are only in its jurisdiction. This means that the people targeted by this have no choice but to pay it or fight it as it is the only energy provider available to them. That much of an increase is unjust, especially because Rocky Mountain Power is a single monopoly in many places.

The main reason this massive increase is wrong is because there is no real need for one so big. Especially in this low economy where people need all the money they can get. Of course there may be a need for a small increase because of inflation or higher prices for materials, but nothing so extreme.

Secondly but also very importantly, they are planning to put a power line from Wyoming to Utah that passes directly through much of Idaho. This will greatly devalue all properties that it passes through. Worst of all, they expect us to pay for it with the rate increase when we won't benefit from it positively at all.

Lastly Rocky Mountain uses many coal plants that pollute the earth greatly. If they expect us to agree to such a rate increase they need to be building the more eco-friendly, but much more expensive, alternative energy generators.

Rocky Mountain Power Company does not need such a large rate increase. There are many things they need to do, or not do, before they will get this ridiculous rate increase without a fight. Such as not making us pay for someone else's power line, and more renewable energy stations, and of course they must stop trying to take advantage of us just because they are the only power provider around.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 207.108.238.61

-----

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** soccer\_18@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 16, 2010 8:01 AM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Regan follows:

-----  
Case Number: PAC-E-10-07  
Name: Regan  
Address: Preston  
City: Preston  
State: Idaho  
Zip: 83263  
Daytime Telephone:  
Contact E-Mail: [soccer\\_18@yahoo.com](mailto:soccer_18@yahoo.com)  
Name of Utility Company: RMP  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

Rocky Mountain Power

Rocky mountain power is lately trying to higher their prices. This will hurt our community in many ways. It will also hurt our economy. There are ways to fix this problem, other solutions. They need to work to keep prices down by lowering operating costs and improving how they do business. Here are some alternate sources:

Among renewable energy sources, hydropower is one of the most often worldwide and is usually one of the cheapest sources of power. It is by far the largest source of renewable electricity. Hydropower has the advantage of being a very stable source of power because of its storage capacity.

Another alternate source is wind power. The supply of energy from wind has advanced over the past as the cost of generating electricity from wind has decreased. Wind energy is the fastest growing power technology in the world. Since the early 1970s, wind power production has grown at an annual rate of nearly 50. Wind power is likely to grow in coming years, but there are natural and manmade conditions that place limits on its growth potential.

Lastly, solar energy could potentially supply 5,000 times as much energy as the world currently consumes. Capturing the energy contained in sunlight helps out a lot. In 2004, solar energy accounted for less than one-tenth of 1% of the global energy supply, even after a three decade span (1971-2004) during which solar energy production rose at nearly a 30% annual growth rate.

Rocky Mountain power can do other things before they decide to higher prices. These are just three alternatives. If they don't higher their prices it would help everyone out.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>

IP address is 207.108.238.72  
-----

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** seamons7@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 16, 2010 8:02 AM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Joseph Seamons follows:

-----  
Case Number: PAC-E-10-07  
Name: Joseph Seamons  
Address: 7124 E. Birch Creek Rd.  
City: Preston  
State: Idaho  
Zip: 83263  
Daytime Telephone: 208-852-1188  
Contact E-Mail: [seamons7@gmail.com](mailto:seamons7@gmail.com)  
Name of Utility Company: Rocky Mountain Power  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

Hi, my name is Joseph Seamons I am in 11th grade at Preston High School. We have recently been studying the Rocky Mountain Power raise increase in our speech class. We have also had presentation from one of your main managers and also from Senator Bob Geddes. From these two presentations I have heard both sides of the matter. I have also attended the recent meeting were they discussed the raise. I overall feel like I have a good view over what is going on. My opinion on the matter is that there is no need for an increase I will share my reasoning with you in the rest of the following paper.

First, rates are not as low as you guys try to show. Though the average rate for Idaho is 6 cents per kilowatt I have found that in talking to several neighbors and my dad that the rate in Franklan County is much higher. Our average rate per kilowatt is about 10 cents per kilowatt. My uncles is closer to 12 cents and says that when he was on Idaho Power up in Boise that it was closer to 6 cents per kilowatt. The rates here are already as high as some of the rest highest in the country and I would beg you not to go higher.

Secondly, you guys have not been as smart with investing money as you should have. In the presentation given by one of your main managers he showed how you guys have invested in coal and put a lot of money into it. He says you guys chose to do this because you have coal mines down in utah, but are now forced to dig deeper for cleaner coal. I sympathize with you on this point, but I think that you could invest in other more reliable resources such as hydro or perhaps nuclear I don't know but coal is not gonna last forever.

My last point I would like to bring up is you guys are shipping most of your power to California. I know you guys belong to a bigger cooperation known as Pacific Corp, but according to one of the articles in one of your cases you ship more than 50% of the power produced here to California. Now I know this seems a bit odd but shouldn't they be the ones paying the highter rates if they are the ones who are using most the power produced? I also do not think it is fair that some farmers are forced to shut off their irrigation power to their pumps because you cannot produce enough power to go around to everyone. If you can't produce enough power to meet demand then you need to reanalyze what your doing.

In conclusion, hope you can see where I am coming from. We need to try to work with you in order to meet a compromise. Please do not take offence to my paper at all but please consider some of the ideas I have stated in this paper. I know most the people in this community will not except the raise and could cause big problems for you guys. Thank you for taking the time to read my paper and I hope you guys make the best decision.

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** kkidd4@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 16, 2010 8:09 AM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Alexis Iverson follows:

-----  
Case Number: PAC-E-10-07  
Name: Alexis Iverson  
Address:  
City: Preston  
State: Idaho  
Zip:  
Daytime Telephone:  
Contact E-Mail: [kkidd4@yahoo.com](mailto:kkidd4@yahoo.com)  
Name of Utility Company: Rocky Mountain Power  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

Rocky Mountain Power

Persuasive Essay

I have listened to both sides of this situation. I have talked with many people and have reaserched my subject by reading documents pertaining to this subject. I believe that over 10 years a 8% to 12% increase would be reasonable.

If you were to put all of your money in the bank right now you may be able to get a 1% to 2% increase. I would then be able to see a 8 or 12 percent increace total because then it is still more than they would be getting, yet still a reasonable number. Eighty percent is just such an outrageous price that it doesn't seem fair to the rest of the buisnesses around here.

If it is raised 80% other buisnesses may think that since they were able to get such a huge raise and so they think they can also. If the power is raised that will affect everything else. Gas stations have to pay more for their lights and such so they raise their prices. Then stores have to raise prices to cover shipping and electricity bills and this will just keep going on until nearly everything else has been doubled and then where would that leave us?

The only thing that will not double will be people's wages. Many people are barely scraping by right now, so what makes you think that people will be just fine in a couple of years when everything has skyrocketed. This would then send us into inflation and people would begin to panic. We are recently just coming out of a recession, and especially in this area people are not making this kind of money. Do you really want to send us back into one?

While I was listening to one of your representatives speak to us in our class they talked of how bad the enviornmentalists are and how it is nearly impossible to get stuff passed. Most of the power plants are coal plants. Coal is a pollutant. Don't you think that by polluting the air and ruining the atmosphere these enviornmentalists will get upset? Not only that, but into these power plants is where all of our money is going.

After reviewing the information given by both sides I have come to the decision that compromise is the way to go. Utah and Wyoming both solved their problem this way and we can to. My vote is that we allow the power company to make a small increase, but not as significant as they originally asked for. Like I stated before I believe that 8% to 12% would be a rational increase. "Compromise, if not the spice of life, is its solidity. It is what makes nations great and marriages happy." -Unknown

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** pnealy@bearriverpublishing.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 16, 2010 8:49 AM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Pat Nealy follows:

-----  
Case Number: PAC-E-10-07  
Name: Pat Nealy  
Address: 1250 Industrial Park Road  
City: Preston  
State: Idaho  
Zip: 83263-0152  
Daytime Telephone: 208-852-1666  
Contact E-Mail: [pnealy@bearriverpublishing.com](mailto:pnealy@bearriverpublishing.com) Name of Utility Company: Rocky Mountain Power  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

This is concerning the proposed rate increase of nearly 14%. My company, Bear River Publishing, in the Preston Industrial Park currently pays \$100,000 annually for power. The power coming in to my facility is fraught with outages, bumps, brown outs, etc. In the past year I have replaced press drives, computers and other electrical equipment that have all failed after these occurrences. I can produce receipts in excess of \$40,000 for repairs in 2010 alone. The total damage in the past four years easily exceeds double that and all attributable to the power events that continually occur.

I have been unable to give raises to employees for two years due to the downturn in the economy and have reduced my labor force by six to make ends meet. An increase of 14% (\$14,000) further reduces my work force and/or negates any possibility of raises in 2011. Seems odd that the power company thinks that this is acceptable in any way.

Although I have read through the proposal outlining what the increase is for it does not solve my immediate problem or any of those in the Preston area concerning the poor electrical infrastructure. In fact, it appears that the expansion you detail will allow you to move more power to other regions for profit and we get to pay for that expansion and subsequent profit increase only to the company.

Until the infrastructure of Preston is specifically addressed we will not support any increase to expand your capability to carry power to other markets for profit.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 207.225.210.202

-----

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** shoppingname@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 16, 2010 8:20 AM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Clair N. Fitch follows:

-----  
Case Number: PAC-E-10-07  
Name: Clair N. Fitch  
Address: 878 E. Countryside Lane  
City: Idaho Falls  
State: Idaho  
Zip: 83404  
Daytime Telephone: 208.521.4376  
Contact E-Mail: [shoppingname@gmail.com](mailto:shoppingname@gmail.com)  
Name of Utility Company: PACIFICORP DBA ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

I object to the proposed disproportionate increase in electricity rates for the Residential Time of Day (TOD) users via Schedule 36. The basis for my objection is that Rocky Mountain Power ignores the purpose of the Time of Day user in their request, that of shifting a portion of electrical use from the day or peak usage, to the night where there is excess capacity. This proposed increase in Sch. 36 rates will have the unintended consequence of having many TOD users switch to Sch. 1 Residential rates. This will lead to an increase in the required generating/transmission capacity at peak (day) times. The need for increased generating/transmission capacity at peak times will lead to a higher rate base which in turn will result in higher rates per kWh. I have examined much of the testimony and exhibits from the employees and consultants from Rocky Mountain Power and the IPUC staff members. Nowhere in the testimony or exhibits did I find an analysis of the benefit of having TOD users. The only justification for raising the Sch. 36 rates was based on Rocky Mountain applying their desired return on the full rate base across all customers. Mr. C. Craig Paice has a degree in Business Management. Mr. Paice and Rocky Mountain Power ignore the economic benefit of having a load leveling class of customer to take advantage of excess capacity at night. Current Sch. 36 customers are already paying a premium ( \$13.93 per month and 21% more per kWh in the winter day ) over Sch. 1 customers. Mr. Paice or whomever prepared his testimony and exhibits should be required by the IPUC to take into account the economic benefit of having a load-leveling class of customer to take advantage of excess capacity. I suspect RMP did such an analysis when they first proposed the TOD customer class. Maybe Mr. Paice could update the original TOD analysis. Many Sch. 36 customers have made a significant economic investment and changed their lifestyle to conserve power during peak consumption hours and to delay using power until off-peak hours. They should not be punished with disproportional higher rates.

Mr. Keith D. Hessing, an IPUC engineer, in his testimony speaks of moving to "full cost of service". He appears to buy into the concept that Rocky Mountain Power is portraying, that is, there is no benefit to load-leveling and that all customers should be charged the same for peak generating and transmission capacity whether they are using power at peak times or not. I totally disagree with this part of his testimony.

Mr. Bryan Lanspery, an IPUC rate analyst, has a degree in Economic and appears to understand the concept of fixed and variable costs and the benefit of load-leveling better than Mr. Hessing. He advocates treating the Sch. 36 customers the same as the Sch. 1 customers. This, in my opinion, is closer to what is appropriate. It is just my opinion because the details of Mr. Paice's exhibits, especially Exhibit 47, do not facilitate the appropriate

fixed cost vs. variable cost analysis or the taking into account the benefit to all customers of a separate load-leveling customer class .

For this reason, I ask that the IPUC require Rocky Mountain Power to evaluate and to take into account the benefit of load-leveling customers. RMP should not base the Sch. 36 rates on the full peak capacity rate of return because Sch. 36 customers use a lower disproportionate share of the peak generating/transmission capacity.

Thank you, Clair Fitch

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 174.126.77.34

-----

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** dean.welling@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 15, 2010 1:01 PM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Dean Welling follows:

-----  
Case Number: PAC-E-10-07  
Name: Dean Welling  
Address: 5368 Country Club Dr  
City: Pocatello  
State: Id  
Zip: 83204  
Daytime Telephone: 208-547-1508  
Contact E-Mail: [dean.welling@gmail.com](mailto:dean.welling@gmail.com)  
Name of Utility Company: Rocky Mountain Power  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

My Name is Dean Welling, I have lived and worked in Idaho for almost 30 years. For the last 5 years I worked for Monsanto in Louisiana and this last October transferred back to the Soda Springs where I had spent the first 25 years of my career. Today 12/15/10 I attended the rate case hearing in Grace Idaho. I would like to formally echo the many comments expressed such as the lack of Rocky Mountain Power justification for 10.6% return on capital, the lack of supportive economics to invest in wind generation, and the inequity of Idaho rate payers liability to the transmission infrastructure project. If the proposed rate increase is approved it will be very difficult for Monsanto to remain competitive. As mentioned by several testimonies this will threaten many good Idaho jobs and businesses. One thing that the commission should also be aware of is the effect outside the borders of Idaho. By that I mean that Monsanto's phosphorus is sent to Louisiana where the direct plant employs over 1000 people, plus contractors plus countless other business that support the area. The Louisiana plant produces Roundup herbicide. As you may be aware there is fierce competition from China with Gyphosate which is the main ingredient of Roundup. Monsanto has worked tirelessly to reduce manufacturing costs and has also dropped the price of Roundup so as to help our customers, the farmer, control their costs as well. If the proposed rate increase is approved it either has to be passed through Monsanto to their customers and ultimately the end consumer or the other option is that as a matter of survival the farmers will be forced to buy lower cost China material. With the last option so goes many United States jobs to China as well. Neither of the options is healthy for our people and our country. I would urge the commission to not only consider the direct effects on Idaho of the rate increase but also those effects that extend to other parts of the country and reject the proposed increase.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 71.209.55.244

-----