

February 8, 2011

PAC-E-11-06

Ryan Ashcraft
Hamer Id, 83425

Idaho Public Utilities Commission
PO Box 83720
Boise, Idaho 83720-0074

To Whom It May Concern:

The load control program was sold as a way to reward local farmers for conserving while giving the utility an avenue of increased revenue by selling the conserved power to an outside market at higher margins. It was a "win-win" situation. The proposed changes sound like the utility wants to change it to a "win more—selective limited gain" program. The curtailment comes during the hottest, driest part of the season which makes management critical in order for the program to work. Rocky Mountain Power has done a good job in making the program flexible and workable. However, with reduced incentives, the return will not justify the risk in cash crops.

I don't understand why the program needs to be limited unless the capacity doesn't exist logistically. Why would you want to limit participation in a beneficial program?

Allowing the company to select participants is a bad idea. A better approach would be to set certain parameters in which the program works most effectively and then open it up for anyone wishing to participate. Perhaps that is the case with the 50 hp limit. If the power diverted from a small motor does not return enough to cover the cost of implementing the program then that would make sense.

As I understand it, when a grower opts out he/she foregoes the incentive for that opt out. I put much effort into not opting out, adding an additional penalty is just a sort of slap in the face to boot. \$5 is insignificant compared to what I am losing if I am forced to opt out.

As is, I think the program is very workable. I even enroll potato fields in the program. Water scheduling does become a problem sometimes and has to be managed carefully. The ability to opt out is critical when a pump or circle goes down. I appreciate Rocky Mountain Power's willingness to facilitate this program which helps to curb the high cost of power. This seems like a good fit if it can use energy more efficiently rather than increasing production so that capacity is far greater than need in spring, fall, and winter.

Sincerely yours,

Ryan Ashcraft

RECEIVED

2011 FEB -7 PM 2: 24

IDAHO PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

PAC-E-11-06

Feb 3, 2011

To whom it may concern:

As an irrigator who has participated in the Rocky Mountain Power Load Control Program I wish to express how beneficial it has been for us as irrigators. It has reduced our power costs by a large percent. I have been told (by power company employees) that the program worked so well that they were going to decrease those that could participant and lower the incentive. As we are facing HIGHER cost for fuel and fertilizer it seem totally unfair to increase our power cost just because the program worked. It would raise our cost by over 22%.

Thank You,
Carl M. Ball
Hamer Farm LC
PO Box 69
Lewisville, Id 83431
208-754-4651

PAC-E-11-06



Diamond Milliron Ranch, Inc.

4503 North Little Lost River Highway
P.O. Box 10
Howe, Idaho 83244
208-767-3124
208-767-3136 fax

Send to: <i>Idaho Public Utilities Com.</i>	From: <i>DON & Billie Phillips Rocky & Carol Ross</i>
Attention: <i>Irrigation Control Lead</i>	Date: <i>2/11</i>
Office Location: <i>BOISE, ID.</i>	Office Location: <i>Howe, ID.</i>
Fax Number: <i>208-334-3702</i>	Phone Number: <i>767-3124</i>

- Urgent
- Reply ASAP
- Please comment
- Please Review
- For your Information

Total pages, including cover

Comments:

We irrigators of the Diamond Milliron feel the change will hurt our operation with less money & a poorer crop, with prices on the rise we rely on these incentives. We would like NO change. Thank you.

Jean Jewell

From: secretary
Sent: Tuesday, February 08, 2011 8:18 AM
To: Barb Barrows; Jean Jewell
Subject: FW: PAC-E-11-06 COMMENT

From: bradysbeef@gmail.com on behalf of John Brady[SMTP:JOHN@BRADYSBEEF.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, February 08, 2011 8:17:27 AM
To: secretary
Subject: PAC-E-11-06 COMMENT
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Dear Secretary,

I am opposed to the restructuring of Rocky Mountain Power's load control rates. We have taken advantage of this program as an option to reduce our irrigation costs and help manage peak loads which is a very real issue. It is very inconvenient to participate and at a lower rate of payback we will probably not do it. We have been in the program since the beginning of it, and by their own admission in the petition before you, the program was quite successful in the beginning. Now that they have too many applicants and cannot manage the load, we who joined them early are just getting lumped in with the whole group to be cut down to size. I object. Those of us who helped out in the early stage of the program should be allowed to stay on at the current rate--or higher. Those that came on board later should be the ones down sized or compensated less.

Please be fair about this.

Thanks,

John Brady
3975 E. Virginia Rd.
Downey, ID 83234

Jean Jewell

From: secretary
Sent: Saturday, February 05, 2011 1:25 PM
To: Barb Barrows; Jean Jewell
Subject: FW: Be wise say no to utility company's load control reduction.

PAC-E-11-06

From: mrspud@iglide.net[SMTP:MRSPUD@IGLIDE.NET]
Sent: Saturday, February 05, 2011 1:22:57 PM
To: secretary
Subject: Be wise say no to utility company's load control reduction.
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Bryan Searle
538 E. 1250 N.
Shelley, ID 83274-5023

February 5, 2011

Public Utilities Commissioners
PO Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0074

Dear Public Utilities Commissioners:

I wish to comment on the Rocky Mountain Power Dispatchable Irrigation Load Control Program, case number PAC-E-11-06. I have participated in the load control program the past few years. It was not an easy decision to make as we could face the potential of a yield and quality loss due to hot weather from a lack of water. It is a huge risk we have taken but have done so because of the savings in growing of a crop. Trying to lower our input costs to be profitable and yet not losing the full potential. By allowing Rockymountain Power to cut back will make that decision an easier one that of not participating in the program. This in turn will have them back to you to allow them to build more power generation raising the over all price for power. The peak time is a very short one and one we can work with if we are compensated as promised for participation in the program. All the equipment is installed on all our systems no matter the horse power and would be of little or no cost to continue the program as promised in the beginning. I feel we should be compensated even at a higher amount for the risk and inconvenience of the power being turned off. I need a program I can count on year after year and power to be supplied at a reasonable cost. The program is there, we are trying to make it work please do not allow the proposed changes. Thank-you, for listening to my concerns.

Sincerely,

Bryan Searle
208-521-5636