

September 8, 2015

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

RECEIVED
2015 SEP 14 AM 8:53
IDAHO PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

Dear Sir or Madam:

Regarding Avista's recent rate proposals for 2016 and 2017.

I see the proposal is a continued effort to pass through increasing costs through a regressive cost method; essentially penalizing those who live in small places over those who live in larger places. What I'm specifically addressing is the large bump up in the basic charge from \$5.25 to \$8.50.


I love these general public notices. This one says the average residential service will incur an increase of 6.9% and 6.7% for 2016 and 2017. Per my May's billing of \$21.43, account #12117942, I've calculated my charges will increase to \$25.31 or 18.1% in 2016 and to \$26.53 or 4.8% in 2017. Over a two year period my bill will increase 23.8% versus an average user's increase of 14.1%. My future billing amounts include a franchise fee of 3% and Avista's rate increases doesn't. I feel my calculations are more accurate since everyone has to pay either a 1% or 3% franchise fee. My calculations were determined with the help of Joe Miller, Senior Regulatory Analyst of Avista.

I'm sure when you look at proposed rate changes, you look at a number of different items such as comparing rate structures of surrounding areas such as Eastern Washington. During your research you might conclude since their commission is charging x amount for basic charges, we should allow it too. It's kind of like compensation committees for companies or governmental organizations; you pay x amount for your employees, we should do the same. Eventually common sense is left behind. As in this proposal; the basic charge explodes and continues to penalize the lower energy user even more.

I've never liked the basic charge because it hurts generally a poorer consumer who live in smaller places and who are trying to conserve energy consumption. I believe basic charges should be eliminated and just use the multi-tier rate schedule in which rates increase as consumption increases.

As far as this rate proposal goes, if you continue to allow increases in basic charges; it just tells me you are continuing down the wrong path in not getting the billing system right. It simply tells the poor, they will continue to subsidize the rich. Common sense tells me to get rid of the basic charge.

Sincerely,



Tom Wolny

Jean Jewell

From: foxhaven100@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, September 12, 2015 4:13 PM
To: Beverly Barker; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness
Cc: foxhaven100@aol.com
Subject: Case Comment Form: Michael Fox

Name: Michael Fox
Case Number: AVU-E-15-05
Email: foxhaven100@aol.com
Telephone: 208-687-1783
Address: 13403 N Grand Canyon St
Rathdrum ID - Idaho, 83858

Name of Utility Company: Avista

Comment: Since the early 1970s, energy consumers have been urged, coerced, and sometimes forced to conserve. Technology, building codes, appliance design, energy rate structures, etc., have all been focused with a primary goal of conserving energy. For the most part Avistas electric rate structures have seemingly been based on the cost of service between various rate classes and the residential rate structures are designed to encourage conservation, use less, and penalizes waste.

Apparently current rate levels and design, rebates, promotions, and conservation programs have been too successful and Avista is now saying oops! Avistas proposed rates are designed to counter ALL conservation efforts and actually punishes those customers that have made the effort to conserve and have paid the price of efficiency.

The proposed rate increases will only exacerbate the problems Avista now foresees with declining profits. Rate increases of this magnitude and punitive design will only lead to additional efforts by consumers to seek alternate sources of electricity such as solar to reduce their monthly costs and edge ever closer to the so-called "death spiral". Avista is seeking to dramatically change the way revenue is generated and take away the consumers ability to control his costs by using less energy.

Avistas proposed rate changes should be denied. Instead, Avista should be encouraged to look at both side of the equation and reduce its operating costs the same way it has told its consumers to do for years, be more efficient. Another approach is for Avista to partner with consumers and regulators with innovative ideas such as promoting conversion from wood burning stoves to high efficiency heat pumps, or consider time of use rates that allow the utility to better manage the costs of electric demand.

Thank you for providing the opportunity to submit comments on Avistas rate proposal.

Unique Identifier: 76.178.26.249