

Diane Holt

From: jammck@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2019 10:41 AM
To: Diane Holt
Subject: Case Comment Form: James McKenzie

Name: James McKenzie
Case Number: IPC-E-18-16, IPC-E-18-15
Email: jammck@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-863-8038
Address: 3212 N. Hawthorne Drive
Boise Idaho, 83703

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power Company

Comment: My wife and I consider ourselves to be "pragmatic parents" which basically means if there are children in the world who need a family and we can provide that family we will do what we can to bring those children into our family. We have adopted nine orphans from around the world. We currently have ten children at home and our monthly electric bill is close to \$225.00. We are energy and environmentally conscientious and as such have converted all our lights to LED's or florescent and have performed all energy saving recommendations of a tight, highly insulated, turn down the temperature home with upgraded Energy Star appliances. For further efficiency we have ductless heating in three bedrooms that were added in the attic.

My understanding is that the current residential rate includes provisions in the first rate block to include the fixed cost (cost of providing connection to the grid) in the first \$75.00 of the bill. The rate for the second \$75.00 of my bill also has the fixed cost expenses included, as does the rate for the third \$75.00 of my bill. As we consume about \$225.00 of electricity we also fall into the higher rates for blocks two and three of what the staff refers to as rate blocks in discouraging wasteful use of service (Case number: IPC-E-18-16 Staff: 20190430 Staff Report.pdf Attachment B: No. 3a).

Consider the following example; I only have one connection to the grid, if the fixed cost turns out to be \$25.00 per connection to the grid, I am paying for my fixed cost obligation in the first \$75.00 of my bill and then pay an extra \$50.00 per month of fixed costs in the remaining \$150.00 of my bill, which must be paying for someone else's connection to the grid. Also, I am paying a higher rate for the wasteful practice of having clean children with clean clothes and clean dishes, since my monthly kilowatt use typically extends into block three of the residential rate structure, which is inflated to discourage wasteful use of electricity.

I don't mind paying the true cost of the service I receive, but don't feel that it is fair that I should be penalized for having a large family, while those who are more environmentally minded rather than human kind minded are afforded the luxury of not paying their fair share of the costs of service they receive.

I am considering the potential economic benefits of adding a few solar panels to my roof before this case is settled to be able to benefit from the great deal that grandfathered in solar generators might be getting of a potentially phased approached of reduced cost of energy and no fixed cost charge for connection to the grid. While it would not help the many customers, whose residential bill exceeds \$75.00 per month, who are burdened with subsidizing those who currently have a net zero metering bill because of their solar power, it might reduce my bill by \$50.00 per month of extra fixed cost charges.

Perhaps as this case is settled I could receive a rebate for all those months where I paid an additional \$50.00 towards someone else's service, it would certainly contribute greatly to my ROI of providing a family for orphaned children. Just a