RECEIVED

2012 MAR -2 PM 4:47

IDAHO PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF IDAHO POWER COMPANY FOR AUTHORITY TO SHARE REVENUES WITH CUSTOMERS IN CONFORMANCE WITH ORDER NOS. 30978 AND 32424.	CASE NO. IPC-E-12-13

IDAHO POWER COMPANY

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

MATTHEW T. LARKIN

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Matthew T. Larkin. My business address is 1221 West Idaho Street, Boise, Idaho.

Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

A. I am employed by Idaho Power Company ("Idaho Power" or "Company") as a Regulatory Analyst II in the Regulatory Affairs Department.

Q. Please describe your educational background.

A. I received a Bachelor of Business Administration degree in Finance from the University of Oregon in 2007. In 2008, I earned a Master of Business Administration degree from the University of Oregon. I have also attended electric utility ratemaking courses, including *The Basics: Practical Regulatory Training for the Electric Industry*, a course offered through New Mexico State University's Center for Public Utilities, and *Introduction to Rate Design and Cost of Service Concepts and Techniques*, presented by Electric Utilities Consultants, Inc.

Q. Please describe your work experience.

A. I began employment with Idaho Power as a Regulatory Analyst I in January 2009. As a Regulatory Analyst I, I provided support for the Company's regulatory activities, including compliance reporting, financial analysis, and the development of revenue forecasts for regulatory filings.

In January of 2012 I was promoted to Regulatory Analyst II. As a Regulatory Analyst II, my responsibilities have expanded to include the development of complex cost-related studies and the analysis of various strategic regulatory issues.

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?

A. My testimony describes the Company's proposed implementation of the revenue sharing mechanism established by the Idaho Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") in Order No. 30978 in Case No. IPC-E-09-30, and modified by Order No. 32424 in Case No. IPC-E-11-22. My testimony begins with a brief outline of the mechanism as established in Case No. IPC-E-09-30 and describes the outcome of applying the mechanism to year-end 2009 and 2010 financial results. Further, my testimony details the settlement stipulation approved by Order No. 32424 in Case No. IPC-E-11-22, which extends the mechanism through 2014 and provides for a one-time modification to the revenue sharing provision as it applies to year-end 2011 financial results. My testimony concludes with the determination of 2011 revenue sharing benefits, the allocation of benefits to individual customer classes, and the proposed inclusion of class-allocated benefits in the 2012 Power Cost Adjustment ("PCA") filing.

I. BACKGROUND

Q. Please provide a brief description of the revenue sharing mechanism established by Order No. 30978 in Case No. IPC-E-09-30.

A. On January 13, 2010, the Commission issued Order No. 30978 approving the settlement stipulation filed in Case No. IPC-E-09-30. Through this stipulation, a mechanism was established to allow the Company to accelerate the amortization of accumulated deferred investment tax credits ("ADITC") if the Company's actual Idaho jurisdictional year-end return on equity ("ROE") fell below 9.5 percent in any year from 2009 through 2011. This mechanism also included a provision for revenue sharing if the Company's actual Idaho jurisdictional year-end ROE exceeded 10.5 percent in any year over the same three-year period. Per the terms of the stipulation, 50 percent of the Idaho jurisdictional year-end ROE in excess of 10.5 percent was to be shared with customers in the form of a reduction in rates.

Q. Did the mechanism established by Order No. 30978 result in any action following the completion of the 2009 or 2010 fiscal years?

A. No. In 2009 and 2010 the Company's actual Idaho jurisdictional year-end ROE was between 9.5 and 10.5 percent, resulting in no accelerated amortization of ADITC or revenue sharing with customers.

Q. Have any modifications been made to the revenue sharing mechanism since its inception in Case No. IPC-E-09-30?

A. Yes. On December 27, 2011, the Commission issued Order No. 32424, approving the settlement stipulation filed by Idaho Power, Commission Staff ("Staff"), and Micron Technology, Inc. ("Micron") in Case No. IPC-E-11-22. This stipulation modified and extended the revenue sharing mechanism through 2014, continued authorization for the Company to accelerate the amortization of ADITC if earnings fall below 9.5 percent over the same time period, and included a provision for a one-time modification to the revenue sharing mechanism based on year-end 2011 financial results.

Q. Please describe the one-time modification made to the 2011 revenue sharing mechanism per the settlement stipulation approved in Order No. 32424.

A. As described above, the initial revenue sharing mechanism established in Case No. IPC-E-09-30 directed the Company to share 50 percent of the Idaho jurisdictional 2011 year-end ROE in excess of 10.5 percent with customers in the form of an offset or reduction to rates. When Case No. IPC-E-11-22 was filed in the fourth quarter of 2011, the Company had experienced one-time benefits that contributed to increased earnings for the 2011 fiscal year. Consequently, it was anticipated that the Idaho jurisdictional 2011 year-end ROE would exceed the revenue sharing threshold of 10.5 percent established in Case No. IPC-E-09-30.

Given the expected level of revenue sharing following the close of the 2011 fiscal year, the Company, Staff, and Micron agreed through settlement negotiations to a one-time modification to the mechanism established in Case No. IPC-E-09-30, resulting in increased revenue sharing potential based on year-end 2011 financial results. As stated on pages 2 and 3 of the settlement stipulation approved in Case No. IPC-E-11-22:

> [The one-time adjustment] will set aside 75 percent of the Company's share of the Idaho jurisdictional, 2011 year-end ROE in excess of 10.5 percent to be provided as a customer benefit in the form of an offset to amounts in the Company's pension balancing account to reduce the amount that would otherwise need to be collected in rates.

Alternately stated, in addition to the customers' 50 percent share of the Idaho jurisdictional 2011 year-end ROE in excess of 10.5 percent, customers would also receive 75 percent of the Company's share of 2011 ROE in excess of 10.5 percent in the form of a reduction in deferred pension expense.

II. QUANTIFICATION OF YEAR-END 2011 REVENUE SHARING

Q. Please describe the methodology used to determine the Idaho jurisdictional 2011 year-end ROE.

A. The methodology used to determine the Company's Idaho jurisdictional 2011 year-end ROE is the same methodology used for both the year-end 2009 and year-end 2010 ROE determinations. First, the Company prepared a full jurisdictional separation study ("JSS") based on third quarter financial information as of September 30, 2011, and jurisdictional allocation factors from the 2010 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Form 1 filing. The results of this study were used to develop allocation factors for various components of operating income and rate base. Following the completion of the 2011 fiscal year, retail revenues were directly assigned to each jurisdiction, and the allocation factors from the third quarter JSS were applied to all other year-end system financial figures to determine year-end Idaho jurisdictional net rate base and operating income. Common equity was then allocated according to each jurisdiction's proportion of net rate base. Finally, the Idaho jurisdictional year-end ROE was determined by dividing the Idaho-allocated earnings on common stock by the Idaho-allocated portion of common equity.

Q. Have you provided an exhibit demonstrating the application of this methodology?

A. Yes. Exhibit No. 1 provides a step-by-step calculation of the Idaho jurisdictional ROE and subsequent revenue sharing benefits based on year-end 2011 financial results utilizing the methodology described above.

Q. What was the Company's Idaho jurisdictional 2011 year-end ROE?

A. As shown on line 45 of Exhibit No. 1, the Company's Idaho jurisdictional 2011 year-end ROE was 12.55 percent.

Q. Based on the terms of the settlement stipulation approved in Order No. 32424, does this indicate the need for revenue sharing with customers?

A. Yes. The 12.55 percent Idaho jurisdictional ROE is greater than the 10.5 percent trigger for customer revenue sharing.

Q. Has the Company quantified the Idaho jurisdictional 2011 year-end ROE in excess of 10.5 percent?

A. Yes. As displayed on line 61 of Exhibit No. 1, in 2011, the Company exceeded an Idaho jurisdictional year-end ROE of 10.5 percent by $33,007,182.

Q. Per the terms of the settlement stipulation approved in Order No. 32424, what portion of the $33,007,182 will be shared with customers?

A. As modified by the stipulation approved in Order No. 32424, revenue sharing based on year-end 2011 financial results will be provided to customers in two components. The first component reflects customers' 50 percent share of the Idaho jurisdictional 2011 year-end ROE in excess of 10.5 percent allowed for in the original revenue sharing mechanism approved in Case No. IPC-E-09-30. This component, calculated at 50 percent of $33,007,182, results in a customer benefit prior to tax gross-up of $16,503,591. After tax gross-up, customers receive a total rate reduction of $27,098,897. These amounts are displayed in Exhibit No. 1 on line 64.

The second customer benefit is the result of the one-time modification to the revenue sharing mechanism per the settlement stipulation approved in Order No. 32424. As described earlier in my testimony, this stipulation allowed for customers to receive 75 percent of the Company's 50 percent share of the Idaho jurisdictional 2011 year-end ROE in excess of 10.5 percent in the form of an offset to the Company's pension balancing account. As shown on line 65 of Exhibit No. 1, this amount was calculated as 75 percent of the Company's 50 percent share of $33,007,182, or

$12,377,693. After tax gross-up, customers receive a total benefit of $20,324,173 in the form of a reduction to deferred pension expense. After 2011 fiscal year earnings were finalized, an accounting entry was made to reduce the pension deferral balancing account by $20,324,173 with an effective date of December 31, 2011.

Q. What is the total benefit customers will receive as a result of revenue sharing based on the Company's actual year-end 2011 financial results?

A. After tax gross-up, the combination of the $27,098,897 reduction to rates and the $20,324,173 reduction to the pension balancing account results in an overall customer benefit of $47,423,069.

III. CLASS ALLOCATION

Q. How does the Company propose to allocate the $27,098,897 rate reduction to customer classes?

A. The Company proposes to allocate the $27,098,897 rate reduction to customer classes based on each class's proportional share of forecasted base revenues for the June 1, 2012, through May 31, 2013, sharing period. Because the $27,098,897 benefit is revenue driven, allocating these dollars proportionally to base revenues aligns the allocation of the benefit with the driver of the benefit.

Q. How was the appropriate level of base revenues attributable to the Amended Electric Service Agreement ("AESA") with Hoku Materials, Inc. ("Hoku") determined for the purpose of allocating revenue sharing benefits?

A. On February 17, 2012, the Company, Hoku, and Staff filed a settlement stipulation in Case No. IPC-E-12-02 requesting Commission acceptance of the terms of a reformed AESA between the Company and Hoku. Under the terms of the reformed AESA, Hoku's monthly minimum billed energy charge is set at $800,000 through June 2013, which, as stated on page 5 of the stipulation, is "to be applied by Idaho Power to First Block Demand, Second Block Demand, and First Block Energy charges." Further, on pages 5 and 6 the stipulation states, "Idaho Power's accounting for each of these components will be treated the same as the current treatment for each component under the current AESA."

For the purpose of allocating revenue sharing benefits, the Company calculated base retail revenues for the June 1, 2012, through May 31, 2013, sharing period according to the terms of the filed settlement stipulation. As stated above, expected payments from Hoku over the twelve-month test period reflect charges associated with First Block Demand, Second Block Demand, and First Block Energy. Because First Block Energy charges are treated as surplus sales for ratemaking purposes, they are not included in the allocation basis for revenue sharing benefits. The remaining two components, First Block and Second Block Demand, were calculated for the June 1, 2012, through May 31, 2013, time period. The total revenue associated with these demand charges, calculated at $2,835,760, was used as the allocation basis for Hoku's portion of revenue sharing benefits as displayed on line 23 of Exhibit No. 2.

Q. Are the proposed allocation amounts in column E of Exhibit No. 2 subject to final Commission approval of the settlement stipulation filed in Case No. IPC-E-12-02?

A. Yes. The revenue-based allocation reflects the terms of the settlement stipulation as filed in Case No. IPC-E-12-02, which is currently pending Commission decision. Should the Commission choose to not approve the contract or modify its terms, any resulting impact on expected revenues from the Hoku AESA during the June 1, 2012, through May 31, 2013, sharing period will have a direct effect on the allocation of revenue sharing benefits included in this filing.

Q. What is the impact of allocating the proposed rate reduction to customer classes proportionally to base revenues?

A. Exhibit No. 2 details the allocation of the $27,098,897 revenue sharing benefit to customer classes proportionally to forecasted base revenues for the June 1, 2012, through May 31, 2013, sharing period. As displayed in column G of Exhibit No. 2, each customer class receives a decrease of approximately 3.25 percent relative to current base revenues.

IV. RATE DESIGN

Q. How does the Company propose to include the class-allocated revenue sharing benefits in rates?

A. With the exception of the Special Contracts for Micron, Hoku, the U.S. Department of Energy, and J.R. Simplot, Inc. ("Special Contracts"), the Company proposes to include the class-allocated revenue sharing benefits listed in column E of Exhibit No. 2 as an offset to 2012 PCA rates effective June 1, 2012, through May 31, 2013. The allocated dollar amounts are divided by each class's expected kilowatt-hour ("kWh") usage over the twelve-month sharing period to derive an offset to PCA rates in effect over the same time period. The resulting rate offset will coincide with any PCA rate change, resulting in an individual cents-per-kWh rate for each rate class reflecting PCA recovery less the class-allocated portion of revenue sharing benefits. Total revenue sharing benefits credited under the proposed rates will be subject to the true-up portion of the PCA in the same manner as other PCA components. Column F of Exhibit No. 2 contains proposed class-specific revenue sharing rates to be included as part of the Company's 2012 PCA filing.

Q. What is the Company's proposal for providing revenue sharing benefits to its Special Contracts?

A. Rather than providing revenue sharing benefits to Special Contracts through a volumetric rate, the Company proposes to provide Special Contracts a flat dollar-per-month credit in twelve equal portions to serve as an offset to monthly invoices billed for June 2012 through May 2013 usage. This revenue credit is calculated at one-twelfth of the total revenue sharing benefit allocated to each Special Contract as displayed in column E of Exhibit No. 2.

Q. Why is the Company proposing to provide revenue sharing benefits to Special Contracts through a flat dollar-per-month credit rather than a volumetric cents-per-kWh rate in the same manner as other rate classes?

A. The Company's four Special Contracts are comprised of four individual large load customers. When rates are set for these customers, they are based on expected electric usage for each customer over the applicable test period. Consequently, recovery of costs, or, in this case, the crediting of benefits, is subject to the usage of a single customer for each respective Special Contract. When a Special Contract's usage is largely uncertain for the test period, it results in increased risk of under- or over-crediting benefits to that customer if benefits are provided through a volumetric cents-per-kWh rate.

Due to uncertainty surrounding energy consumption for the Hoku AESA over the twelve-month test period, the Company does not currently possess a sufficient kWh estimate upon which to base a volumetric cents-per-kWh credit. Therefore, providing a flat dollar-per-month credit to Hoku's invoices over the June 2012 through May 2013 time period removes the risk associated with under- or over-crediting revenue sharing benefits due to large variances in actual usage.

The Company's proposal to provide flat dollar-per-month credits to the remaining three Special Contracts provides consistent treatment among all Special Contract customers, while maintaining a twelve-month effective period that is consistent among all rate classes. Because Special Contracts are comprised of single customers and are not expected to shift between rate classes over the twelve-month test period, providing a flat dollar-per-month credit is both a practical and accurate way to provide revenue sharing benefits to these customers.

Q. Why is it not appropriate to provide flat dollar-per-month credits to customers in all other rate classes?

A. The calculation and application of flat dollar-per-month credits to customers taking service under general tariff schedules is problematic for two primary reasons. The first issue arises in determining the appropriate flat dollar-per-month credit amount for individual customers belonging to rate classes with multiple customers. Under the Company's proposal, revenue sharing benefits are allocated to customer classes proportionally to forecasted base revenues for the June 1, 2012, through May 31, 2013, test period. Base revenues are forecasted using the Company's retail revenue forecast model, which forecasts revenues on a rate class basis. Determining customer-specific, dollar-per-month credit amounts would require the calculation of forecasted base revenues on a customer-by-customer basis, which is beyond the level of granularity provided in the current load and revenue forecast models. Alternately, the Company could provide equal dollar-per-month credits to all customers within a rate class, but this is also problematic. This approach would result in inequalities within each rate class, as benefits would be allocated to individual customers equally regardless of usage within each class;

i.e., the largest customers within a rate class would receive the same dollar-per-month credit as the smallest customers within a rate class. The Company's proposal for providing revenue sharing benefits accounts for class responsibility for overall revenue sharing benefits and individual customer responsibility for class-allocated benefits within each rate class.

The second issue with flat dollar-per-month credits for all rate classes arises due to the potential for customers taking service under general tariff schedules to shift between levels of service. Unlike Special Contracts, which typically remain static under their respective Electric Service Agreements, customers in other rate classes have the potential to shift between tariff schedules; for example, it is possible for a customer taking service under Schedule 19 to reduce its usage and shift to Schedule 9. If revenue sharing benefits are provided through flat dollar-per-month credits, problems could arise when monthly credit amounts change for individual customers as they shift between schedules. By providing revenue sharing benefits through a volumetric cents-per-kWh rate, if a customer shifts between rate classes, the overall revenue credit provided would still be tied to that individual customer's energy usage. This approach maintains the connection between the revenue sharing benefit provided and the individual customer's contribution to overall retail sales.

Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

A. Yes.

BEFORE THE

IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

CASE NO. IPC-E-12-13

IDAHO POWER COMPANY

LARKIN, DI
TESTIMONY

EXHIBIT NO. 1

Idaho Power Company
Revenue Sharing Calculation
For the Twelve Months Ended December 31, 2011

Line		Actual September 30, 2011 TOTAL SYSTEM	IDAHO	IDAHO %	Actual December 31, 2011 TOTAL SYSTEM	IDAHO	IDAHO %
8	*** SUMMARY OF RESULTS ***						
9	TOTAL COMBINED RATE BASE	2,514,221,537	2,327,399,859	92.6%	September Allocations/Ratios		
10							
11	DEVELOPMENT OF NET INCOME				Update figures in RED		
12	OPERATING REVENUES						
13	RETAIL SALES REVENUES (Incl 449.1 Rev)	667,981,069	635,304,219	Direct Assign	861,643,565	819,177,174	Direct Assign
14	OTHER OPERATING REVENUES	142,257,884	126,636,926	89.0%	187,040,474	166,502,059	89.0%
15	TOTAL OPERATING REVENUES	810,238,953	761,941,145		1,048,684,039	985,679,233	
16							
17	OPERATING EXPENSES						
18	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE EXPENSES	526,340,944	497,387,599	94.5%	688,777,814	650,889,024	94.5%
19	DEPRECIATION EXPENSE	84,271,510	78,638,575	93.3%	113,001,742	105,448,401	93.3%
20	AMORTIZATION OF LIMITED TERM PLANT	4,665,365	4,378,374	93.8%	6,361,132	5,969,826	93.8%
21	TAXES OTHER THAN INCOME	21,695,579	19,700,080	90.8%	28,894,715	26,237,060	90.8%
22	REGULATORY DEBITS/CREDITS	21,074	0	0.0%	28,099	0	0.0%
23	PROVISION FOR DEFERRED INCOME TAXES	25,775,067	23,914,060	92.8%	35,377,618	32,823,289	92.8%
24	INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT ADJUSTMENT	(873,218)	(810,902)	92.9%	(1,131,934)	(1,051,154)	92.9%
25	FEDERAL INCOME TAXES	(51,704,525)	(47,846,754)	92.5%	(57,754,420)	(53,445,254)	92.5%
26	STATE INCOME TAXES	(1,626,455)	(1,449,905)	89.1%	(803,160)	(715,978)	89.1%
27	TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES	608,565,341	573,911,128		812,751,606	766,155,213	
28							
29	OPERATING INCOME	201,673,612	188,030,017		235,932,432	219,524,020	
30	ADD IERCO OPERATING INCOME	802,867	762,911	95.0%	5,967,745	5,670,748	95.0%
31							
32	OPERATING INCOME BEFORE OTHER INCOME AND DEDUCTION:	202,476,479	188,792,927		241,900,177	225,194,768	93.1%
33	ADD AFUDC EQUITY				25,484,072	23,590,453	92.6% (L 9)
34	ADD OTHER INCOME AND DEDUCTIONS				(2,696,488)	(2,510,271)	93.1% (L 32)
35							
36	INCOME BEFORE INTEREST CHARGES				264,687,761	246,274,951	
37	LESS INTEREST CHARGES				71,055,112	65,775,293	92.6% (L 9)
38							
39	NET INCOME				193,632,649	180,499,658	
40							
41	ACTUAL YEAR-END RESULTS - BEFORE ITC ADJUSTMENT						
42	EARNINGS ON COMMON STOCK				193,632,649	180,499,658	
43	COMMON EQUITY AT YEAR END				1,553,102,197	1,437,697,427	92.6% (L9)
44							
45	RETURN ON YEAR-END COMMON EQUITY				12.47%	12.55%	
46							
47	EARNINGS ON COMMON STOCK @ 9.50 ROE				147,544,709	136,581,256	(L43 * 9.5%)
48	EARNINGS ON COMMON STOCK @ 10.50 ROE				163,075,731	150,958,230	(L43 * 10.5%)
49							
50							
51	ACTUAL YEAR-END RESULTS - AFTER ITC ADJUSTMENT						
52	INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT ADJUSTMENT					(48,528,622)	(L47-L42) / (1-9.5%)
53	ADJUSTED EARNINGS ON COMMON STOCK					131,971,037	
54	ADJUSTED COMMON EQUITY AT YEAR-END					1,389,168,805	
55	ADJUSTED RETURN ON YEAR-END COMMON EQUITY					9.50%	
56							
57	**IF IDAHO RETURN ON COMMON EQUITY (Line 45) <9.5%**						
58	ADDITIONAL ITC ADJUSTMENT (Annualized)	If L 52 is negative, then 0 if positive, then smaller of L52 or $25,000,000				0	
59							
60	**IF IDAHO RETURN ON COMMON EQUITY (Line 45) >10.5%**						
61	IDAHO EARNINGS GREATER THAN 10.50% ROE	If L42- L48 is negative, then 0, if positive, then L42-L48				33,007,182	(L42-L48)/(1-10.5%)
62							
63	**Per Order #32424:**					After Tax	Tax Gross Up
64	CUSTOMER SHARE - 50% (Reduction to rates)					16,503,591	27,098,897
65	* ADDITIONAL CUSTOMER SHARE - 75% OF COMPANY'S 50% SHARE (Reduction to Pension expense)					12,377,693	20,324,173
66	COMPANY'S SHARE - 50% (A one-time adjustment applied in 2011 to allow 75% of the Company's 50% share as a Customer benefit)					4,125,898	
67	IDAHO EARNINGS GREATER THAN 10.50% ROE					33,007,182	
68							

Exhibit No. 1
Case No. IPC-E-12-13
M. Larkin, IPC
Page 1 of 1

BEFORE THE

IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

CASE NO. IPC-E-12-13

IDAHO POWER COMPANY

LARKIN, DI
TESTIMONY

EXHIBIT NO. 2

Idaho Power Company
Calculation of Revenue Impact
Class Allocated Revenue Sharing Benefits
State of Idaho
Filed March 2, 2012

Line No	Tariff Description	Rate Sch. No.	(A) Average Number of Customers	(B) Normalized Energy (kWh)	(C) Current Base Revenue	(D) Percentage of Idaho Base Revenues	(E) Allocated Revenue Sharing Benefit	(F) Cents per kWh Rate	(G) Percent Revenue Change
	Uniform Tariff Rates:								
1	Residential Service	1	399,329	4,896,272,827	$387,467,359	46.50%	($12,600,731)	(0.2574)	(3.25)%
2	Master Metered Mobile Home Park	3	23	4,942,681	$370,890	0.04%	($12,062)	(0.2440)	(3.25)%
3	Residential Service Energy Watch	4	0	0	$0	0.00%	$0	0.0000	0.00%
4	Residential Service Time-of-Day	5	0	0	$0	0.00%	$0	0.0000	0.00%
5	Small General Service	7	28,165	144,888,296	$14,582,873	1.75%	($474,246)	(0.3273)	(3.25)%
6	Large General Service - Secondary	9S	31,428	3,056,964,925	$176,263,576	21.15%	($5,732,224)	(0.1875)	(3.25)%
7	Large General Service - Primary	9P	185	420,423,939	$20,267,655	2.43%	($659,119)	(0.1568)	(3.25)%
8	Large General Service - Transmission	9T	2	2,712,595	$130,769	0.02%	($4,253)	(0.1568)	(3.25)%
9	Dusk to Dawn Lighting	15	0	6,481,376	$1,164,504	0.14%	($37,871)	(0.5843)	(3.25)%
10	Large Power Service - Secondary	19S	1	6,678,959	$319,772	0.04%	($10,399)	(0.1557)	(3.25)%
11	Large Power Service - Primary	19P	112	1,930,039,445	$81,935,354	9.83%	($2,664,599)	(0.1381)	(3.25)%
12	Large Power Service - Transmission	19T	3	41,905,243	$1,677,118	0.20%	($54,541)	(0.1302)	(3.25)%
13	Agricultural Irrigation Service	24	16,642	1,720,204,410	$109,589,454	13.15%	($3,563,932)	(0.2072)	(3.25)%
14	Unmetered General Service	40	2,030	15,807,753	$1,093,480	0.13%	($35,561)	(0.2250)	(3.25)%
15	Street Lighting	41	361	23,165,568	$2,940,507	0.35%	($95,628)	(0.4128)	(3.25)%
16	Traffic Control Lighting	42	397	2,981,282	$143,101	0.02%	($4,654)	(0.1561)	(3.25)%
17	Total Uniform Tariffs		478,678	12,273,469,299	$797,946,412	95.76%	($25,949,819)		(3.25)%
18									
19	Special Contracts								
20	Micron	26	1	451,138,622	$17,270,254	2.07%	($561,642)	NA	(3.25)%
21	J R Simplot	29	1	203,558,197	$6,775,568	0.81%	($220,347)	NA	(3.25)%
22	DOE	30	1	244,266,665	$8,452,110	1.01%	($274,869)	NA	(3.25)%
23	Hoku	32	1	NA	$2,835,760	0.34%	($92,221)	NA	(3.25)%
24	Total Special Contracts		4	898,963,484	$35,333,692	4.24%	($1,149,078)		(3.25)%
25									
26	Total Idaho Retail Sales		478,682	13,172,432,783	$833,280,104	100.00%	($27,098,897)		(3.25)%

Note:
June 1, 2012 - May 31, 2013, Forecast

Exhibit No. 2
Case No. IPC-E-12-13
M. Larkin, IPC