

✓ Men Ack
sent 6/18/07

✓ To AV

✓ To Commis.
S H

Jean Jewell

From: twononas@msn.com
Sent: Sunday, June 17, 2007 5:46 AM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Leslie Nona follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-06-23
Name: Leslie Nona
Address: 6411 W. Dry Creek Road
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip: 83714
Home Telephone: 208-345-9792
Contact E-Mail: twononas@msn.com
Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

I have read over the Petition for Reconsideration of Commission Final Order No. 30322 submitted July 14, 2007, by John R. Hammond, Jr., Attorney for Avimor, LLC. I disagree with many of Mr. Hammond's assertions: 1. I have no doubt that the Special Facilities Agreement will place a great financial burden and undue risk on existing ratepayers -- Avimor will need to sell more than 400 houses per year to make this plan fly, and even in it's hottest year, Hidden Springs only sold 100, with far less now given the current market. Ratepayers should not be forced into covering Avimor's poor gamble, and that's exactly what will happen. 2. The claim that the Commission's Order unjustly turns Avimor's advance into a contribution which insures that other ratepayers will benefit at its expense is ridiculous -- the Commission is merely doing its job to avoid a very risky situation which would hugely burden already saddled ratepayers. The Commission should be commended for its foresight and prudence. 3. Charges of discriminating against Avimor and its future residents is groundless -- the SFA is simply too risky and would affect not only Idaho Power but an enormous number of ratepayers. The Commission is wise to recognize this and not give preferential treatment at the expense of so many others. 4. As far as any new, updated cost information provided by Idaho Power goes, this information is 'preliminary' and 'believed to be in the \$1,100..' what? Range? Does that mean between \$1,100 to \$6,500? None of this information is confirmed, nor was supporting documentation provided as far as I can see. I don't believe Avimor should have more time to investigate this number, as Mr. Hammond requests. You would think that in a case as important to them as this, and with legal representation, they would have got it right the first time. I am highly doubtful of this new information, and I suspect they are, too, otherwise we would have seen supporting documentation attached. No stalling, please. I am also very sorry about the two deaths in Mr. Hammond's family, but as a professional myself, I am keenly aware that business goes on despite my personal life, and that's what covering partners are for. I think Avimor has had plenty of time to put their case together lo' these many months.

Thank you for considering my comments,
Leslie Nona, longtime ratepayer who is looking at a significant new increase in rates even without Avimor -- I prefer not to eventually pick up their tab.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 65.54.98.111
