

-----Original Message-----

From: Dennis Zimmer [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 2003 1:38 PM
To: comments@nwppc.org
Subject: Counsel Document-2002-19

NWPC-Dear Sirs,

Comments concerning the Counsel Document-2002-19.

I applaud the efforts to recognize & attempt to look into the future on economic viability for BPA in a evolving market & consumer changes.

First comment is rather technical writing in nature, as the Document is rather long:

1) Consider revising the format to an title-outline-index-content-summary-appendix style, each section enumerated. Present document format is difficult to read & follow along.

Concerning the long term contracts:

2) Attempting to establish a long-term contract service life is a pretty good idea. What is missing (from what I have read), is a diversity spread over the life of the proposed contract lengths of twenty years. Consider offering flexibility to BPA and it's customers by limiting the contract to 10% total production/load volume per year. For example, if you currently have 9-Smelter loads, schedule these at 20-year contracts, renewable at n+2-year intervals. Thus smoothing out the unknown load variables to some acceptable degree.

Concerning sustained funding for conservation & renewable resources:

3) The approximately 3% of revenues of retail sales of electricity through the "system benefits charge", seems altogether too linear in the context of Today's marketplace. Just as every other thing associated with BPA, a degree of flexibility in its economic responsibilities seems in order. Expenditures for worthwhile conservation & renewable resources projects is of course, commendable, but within the frame work of "slice" consumption dependant upon actual output, it seems equally necessary to modulate this expense accordingly.

Sincerely,

Dennis J. Zimmer, PE
Electrical Engineer
(406)-721-5936
[REDACTED]