

Diane Holt

From: Johnbay1986@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 2:57 PM
To: Diane Holt
Subject: Case Comment Form: John Bay

Name: John Bay
Case Number:
Email: Johnbay1986@gmail.com
Telephone:
Address:
Nampa Idaho, 83686

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power
Comment: Hello,

I just wanted to comment on the changes to net metering that Idaho Power is trying to pass. We purchased our solar system in 2018 to help reduce our impact on the environment, but also to improve the investment in our home and reduce our monthly energy bill. The net metering program was what ultimately persuaded my wife and I that solar was the right option.

Since going solar, we have been lucky enough to see our energy bill cut by 80% and our property value jump by at least the investment we put into the panels. With this, we are able to shift the savings in our power bill towards the loan on the panels.

What Idaho Power is proposing, will ultimately devalue our panels by half, if not more, and drop the value of our house as a result. Not only that, it would bring back a larger energy bill and make the investment we made a burden, rather than a worthwhile investment to help the environment and power company.

This isn't about people not paying their fair share of upkeep on the infrastructure, as solar residents only make up around 3.5% of their customers. It's about raising their bottom line and insuring someone down the road gets a heavier pocket.

Please block Idaho Power on this.

Thank you,

-John Bay

Unique Identifier: 164.165.206.42

Diane Holt

From: Diane Holt
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 3:18 PM
To: Diane Holt
Subject: FW: Idaho Power - Solar Buy Back Program IPC-E-18-15

Subject: Idaho Power - Solar Buy Back Program IPC-E-18-15

Commissioners,

Apologies for this direct form of communication on this subject but frankly I don't trust your staff is giving enough weight to "residential end consumers" comments when using the standard procedures. I will make this brief.

I am an Idaho resident consumer trying to manage my household costs in anticipation of retirement. I recently made a \$55K investment in a Solar Energy system. That is a HUGE investment for a resident. A driving factor of that decision was Idaho Power's comparatively generous buyback program. Now, all the big entities are telling you to vote to cut this program in half. But no one seems to be listening to the overwhelming opposition by simple Idaho residents. I, along with hundreds of other Idaho citizens are NOT in favor of cutting that program for residential consumers.

There are two simple points I would like to place before the IPUC.

1. At first, when compared to other States, Idaho Power seems to have a generous program. However, based on the cost to generate, that should be expected! Cost to generate Hydro is 1/3 the cost of fossil and less than 1/2 the cost of Nuclear generation. (https://www.eia.gov/electricity/annual/html/epa_08_04.html) Our rates are low but they are not 1/3 or even 1/2 that of other states. Idaho Power can be generous to Idahoans if they want.
2. Hydro provides ~2/3 of Idaho's Electricity. 1/3 comes from other states at higher rates. Adding Solar to the Idaho grid reduces our dependency on these more expensive outside sources. Idaho's entire electrical energy needs could be met if Idaho Power would simply encourage responsible solar contribution. Penalizing Idaho solar contributors, especially resident contributors, is not in Idaho's best interest.

This proposed settlement simply penalizes Idaho solar users to put more profit into Idaho Power coffers. The combination of low generation cost and the need for more local energy at lower rates should be enough for Idaho Power to continue to encourage solar generation in Idaho. NOT to discourage it.

Let's try for a win/win scenario. We can make rate adjustments for commercial solar producers but stop penalizing end resident users.

We are the end users, we are families on budgets, we are trying to better our lives. In the end we end up paying for everyone's activities, and this time we need a break. Let residential users keep the near retail buyback level. Many of us are investing in Solar to reduce our energy costs when we retire. Some

Diane Holt

From: jim@brinkerhoff.net
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 2:20 PM
To: Diane Holt
Subject: Case Comment Form: James Brinkerhoff

Name: James Brinkerhoff
Case Number: IPC-E-18-15
Email: jim@brinkerhoff.net
Telephone: 208-371-4239
Address: 13455 Burgundy pl
Caldwell Idaho , 83607

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Comment: Dear IPUC members:

Let it be known that I, as a solar producer, agree with all previous comments that are against Idaho Power's recent application referenced above. Rather than have you read the same points others have made, I would just like to add some additional points which I could not find in previous comments.

1. Grandfathering: I think it's obvious that there needs to be some sort of grandfathering clause in the final agreement. But I believe instead of it being for an individual it should be for a specific property. Not for an individual tied to a specific property but for that specific property. As solar producers, we all invested significant amounts of money under the terms of the previous Idaho Power kWh for kWh agreement. Many of us made the decision to go solar not only to do our part by producing clean renewable energy but also thought of it as an investment in our property. This proposed new rate schedule reduces that investment significantly. Under this new rate schedule.....after investing \$66K I believe I will see very little increased property value. I want my property grandfathered in for at least 20 years!
2. Net hourly measurement basis: Let's face it this Idaho power application is focused primarily on solar producers. Let's think for a minute, solar producing only happens when the sun is out and there's no clouds and never at night. The whole purpose of individual solar production is to use it later when there is no sun! Under this measuring bases we will pay for the power we just generated the very next hour if a cloud comes by! Perhaps Idaho power does need to be compensated for cost associated with their power grid. But net hourly measurement is not the way to do this. It is unfair for solar producers and contrary to previous Idaho Power agreements.
3. Private Solar energy production can be good for Idaho Power's grid:
I can well imagine that on those hot sunny days of summer when their power production and grid are stretched to the limit, Individual solar producers are a definite benefit to Idaho Power's production and distribution capabilities.
4. Idaho power has a stated goal to have completely green energy:
As private solar energy producers we can be part of that. Instead, I believe that Idaho Power will charge existing customers again to add new solar production. They have no interest in using our solar power to reach their goals..... and by which not having to charge customers as much for new solar production. They want to control all solar production. By squashing the private solar production industry consumers will pay more for new solar energy provided by Idaho Power.

IP Promotions for saving energy are hypocritical:

If IP gets approval on this application, which basically Squashes private solar generation, they need to stop ads and flyers showing all of their programs for residential customers to save energy with LED bulbs and AC timers and the like. Who saves more energy than private solar producers?

Diane Holt

From: dcook16@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 11:55 AM
To: Diane Holt
Subject: Case Comment Form: Donald Cook

Name: Donald Cook
Case Number: IPC-E-18-15
Email: dcook16@gmail.com
Telephone:
Address: 177 E Observation Dr
Meridian ID, 83642

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Comment: I was on the fence to purchase solar power in Idaho based on the kickbacks and support from Idaho/Idaho Power. It seems that other states surrounding Idaho celebrate users getting solar and Idaho Power is trying to cripple it. The current system is fair at best, now after investing more than 40k in sustainable energy Idaho Power is proposing a change that is not equitable or fair to current Solar Subscribers. The idea is creating clean energy for personal use, Idaho Power is proposing a change that virtually makes solar power worthless, the proposal states that by 2028 users would receive a 4.4 cent credit per kWh which at current rates would only be a fraction of what we would pay otherwise. The proposal also states that the new compensation rates is intended to make it fair and equitable for other users. This is just another example of how big business is attempting to stifle the consumer, this proposal only benefits Idaho Power, it denies the opportunity to create clean energy and save money. I hope the community and IPUC realize the actual impact that this will have concerning the bettering of our environment and community. This is an egregious attempt to devalue solar energy, only hurting the consumer. Idaho power should parade those investing in Solar vs. sweeping their feet out from under them.

Unique Identifier: 164.165.206.42

Diane Holt

From: ann.swanson@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 12:25 PM
To: Diane Holt
Subject: Case Comment Form: Ann Swanson

Name: Ann Swanson
Case Number: IPC-E-18-15
Email: ann.swanson@gmail.com
Telephone: 2082448521
Address: 2161 Diane Lane
Pocatello ID, 83201

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Comment: I recently purchased solar panels for my home and I am opposed to lowering the credit solar customers receive on their bill. The proposed rate changes are unacceptable because they devalue my and other's investment in the environment and it will slow the adoption of clean energy in our state. I am helping Idaho Power reach it's 100% renewable energy goals and shouldn't be penalized for making an investment in that goal in and in clean energy.

Unique Identifier: 164.165.206.42

Diane Holt

From: matthewsilvers@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 1:14 PM
To: Diane Holt
Subject: Case Comment Form: MATTHEW SILVERS

Name: MATTHEW SILVERS
Case Number:
Email: matthewsilvers@gmail.com
Telephone: 2083766112
Address: 4403 W Alpine St
Boise ID, 83705

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Comment: Idaho Power offers a program for customers with solar known as "net metering." In this program, net metering allows solar customers to receive a credit on their bill for the excess electricity they send back to the grid. Today, that credit is the same as the rate all customers pay Idaho Power for electricity. It is a fair credit for the valuable investment in local clean energy that benefits us all.

Now, Idaho Power and others have developed a new program for solar customers. This new program provides a different value for the extra solar power a customer provides to the grid. Over the next eight years that rate will decline by about 50%.

Net-metering must remain equitable with no discounting to the citizens that have made the investment and provide benefits to society in sending their excess electricity into the grid.

Unique Identifier: 164.165.206.42

Diane Holt

From: mona.xu@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 1:25 PM
To: Diane Holt
Subject: Case Comment Form: Xiaomeng Xu

Name: Xiaomeng Xu
Case Number: IPC-E-18-15
Email: mona.xu@gmail.com
Telephone:
Address: 161 S 15th Ave
Pocatello ID, 83201

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Comment: It's troubling that the value of credit for solar customers may decrease roughly 50%. The proposed rate change will negatively affect jobs and the adoption of clean energy in Idaho. Idaho Power has a stated goal of providing 100% renewable energy to all customers by 2045. Over 4,000 Idaho families (mine included) have already invested in rooftop solar and it is unfair to have the rules changed after substantial investments in solar power have been made. The rate change will also significantly negatively impact Idahoans who have yet to adopt solar but want to. In the public interest, IPUC needs to regulate Idaho Power so they can keep their 100% renewable commitment. This will also help our economy and solar jobs, and it is also the right thing to do in terms of fairness.

Unique Identifier: 164.165.206.42

Diane Holt

From: darencr@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 11:28 AM
To: Diane Holt
Subject: Case Comment Form: Daren Crockett

Name: Daren Crockett
Case Number:
Email: darencr@gmail.com
Telephone: 2082517217
Address: 11762 N Cumberland Rd
Pocatello ID, 83202

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Comment: I put a solar system on my house and spent around \$90,000 doing it. It seems that the utilities have encouraged that and the government gave tax credits to help do it. Now that it's done I get a letter stating they want to change and pay me for the power I generate at a rate about 40% lower than what they charge. That basically is stealing from me and the government effectively reducing the value of my system by 40% or \$36,000. I don't feel like they should be able to change the rules after the fact. Those who already have self generating systems should be grandfathered in to keep the deal the same as it was when we got the system. Another big issue is the way they want to work the difference in power generation is that they want to calculate it on a hour by hour basis. During the summer for about 6 hours a day I can generate 5-6 times more power than I will use and then at night ofcourse I am not generating any power. Also during the winter I am generating substantially less. My system was set up to generate on an annual basis the same amount that I use. If they do set it up to pay less for power generated than what they charge it needs to be set up on an annual difference or at the very least a monthly difference. Doing it hourly on a system that only averages 4-6 hours of good production a day is unfair. Please don't allow this to happen.

Unique Identifier: 164.165.206.42

Diane Holt

From: Scottydm3@hotmail.com
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 11:34 AM
To: Diane Holt
Subject: Case Comment Form: Scot McGavin

Name: Scot McGavin
Case Number: IPC-E-18-15
Email: Scottydm3@hotmail.com
Telephone: 2083444270
Address: 5479 W Overland Rd
Boise ID, 83705

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Comment: One year ago this month we contracted with Altenergy to install a 10Kw solar panel array. We chose to do this for many reasons, one of which is that we had the ability to use net metering to push electricity back into the grid and make a difference in not only the energy use in Idaho, but in the Northwest as well. It is unacceptable to pull net metering out from under us and all the others like us who put in a solar panel system. Idaho Power has made a promise to have 100% clean energy and we are part of that process. Do not reduce our contribution by reversing the laws that were in place when we installed our system.

Unique Identifier: 164.165.206.42

Diane Holt

From: msshoe81@q.com
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 8:55 AM
To: Diane Holt
Subject: Case Comment Form: Michael Shoemaker

Name: Michael Shoemaker
Case Number: IPC-E-18-15
Email: msshoe81@q.com
Telephone: 2088692037
Address: 5250 Adams Rd
New Plymouth ID, 83655

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Comment: In 2018, we installed a solar panel electric generation system under the net metering program. During high power generation months, we build a credit of kilowatt hours with Idaho Power that we use during low power generation months. The system was designed so that it generates our electricity use over the course of a year. After having our system operational for 18 months, we can testify as to how our system has worked.

During the months of May thru September, we generate approximately 1,000 kilowatt hours/month in excess of what we use. During December thru March, we use about 1200 kilowatt hours more/month than we generate. During April and November, our use and generation are close to equal. Based upon Idaho Power's website, we generate extra electricity during Idaho Power's higher demand months. On a daily basis, we typically generate more electricity than we use from 2 hours after sunrise until 2 hours before sunset. We believe this system works well.

We understand from information received from Idaho Power and Auric Energy Companies that you are considering a proposal to change the net metering program. As we understand the proposal, Idaho Power is seeking a rate difference between the kilowatt hours we generate vs. the kilowatt hours we use. On the surface this may seem reasonable for a profit motivated company to request. In practice, the monitoring on an hourly basis of what is generated and what is used seems costly. Has Idaho Power shown all of the costs associated monitoring these accounts? If this is allowed, we believe the following conditions should be required:

- Only new customers will be affected. Customers with existing systems should continue under the rules in effect when their systems were installed. This is the only fair and reasonable option available. When we made the considerable investment to install our system, we reasonably assumed the program would continue so the investment could be recouped.
- The rate Idaho Power pays should reflect the rate they would show for cost if they built a similar facility to replace the electricity being generated. This rate will likely increase as Idaho Power continues building additional sources of electricity.
- If existing customers are affected, Idaho Power should be required to pay for all kilowatt hours of credits at the rate in effect at the time when the credits were accumulated.

When we installed our system, we determined we will need close to twenty years of trouble free service to recoup our investment. Our system generated approximately 16 Mwh of electricity during the past 12 months. Any difference in the rates will increase our power bill and cause an increase in time to recoup on our investment to beyond our lifetimes. We believe this proposal will effectively kill the net metering program.

Unique Identifier: 164.165.206.42

Diane Holt

From: wilair@outlook.com
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2019 6:39 AM
To: Diane Holt
Subject: Case Comment Form: Gary Wilttrout

Name: Gary Wilttrout
Case Number: IPC-E-18-15
Email: wilair@outlook.com
Telephone: 2083628894
Address: 3007 S Riva Ridge Way
Boise Idaho, 83709

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Comment: Allowing existing solar customers to stay on the existing net metering program and applying the new program only to new customers is a commonsense compromise that allows all parties to keep agreements made in good faith.

We should not be penalized for investing our money into a program that was created to incentivize purchasing renewable generation.

Unique Identifier: 164.165.206.42

Thomas Baskin
3688 N Willowbar Way
Garden City, Idaho 83714
Tombaskin3@gmail.com

RECEIVED
2019 NOV 18 AM 10:22
IDAHO PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

Idaho Public Utilities Commission
PO Box 83720
Boise, Idaho 83720-0074

Re: Case Number IPC-E-18-15

November 15, 2019

Members of the Commission;

I write in response to your invitation for comment on the proposed net metering Settlement. I see that a number of organizations I would expect to support rooftop solar production participated in the negotiations leading to the Settlement, including the Idaho Conservation League (ICL), Vote Solar, Idaho Sierra Club, City of Boise and the Idaho Clean Energy Association. Of these, the Idaho Sierra Club, Idaho Clean Energy Association and City of Boise approved the Settlement. ICL did not approve, but did agree not to oppose. It is as unclear to me why ICL withheld its approval, as it is why the others approved; the Settlement contains no explanation of the positions of the parties relative to the eventual settlement. More important to the average consumer, just at the point one's interest is piqued, the discussion of the methodology employed to calculate the export credit rate turns to gibberish. Could discussion of this critical number be made any more opaque? Finally, I seem to remember that when the rooftop solar class was authorized by the PUC, there was a contemporaneous order that a "study" be conducted to quantify an export rate that would fairly compensate Idaho Power (IP) for infrastructure costs that were being unfairly avoided by rooftop solar customers. I see no reference to such study in the Settlement, leading me to think that the study was mooted by the fact of Settlement. I suggest that the completion of the study is important to understanding what is fair and what is not.

At any rate, there was one fight on which no consensus could be reached; should those who have already committed to rooftop residential solar should suffer the rules to be changed while they are still paying off their investments? Many of those who invested in rooftop solar did so only after being satisfied that it penciled out for them. Now, the underlying assumptions concerning the rates paid for rooftop solar production will change, dropping by 50% over the next eight years. This will be visited on many people who were willing to do what they thought of as the environmentally responsible thing, as long as they could avoid taking a beating in the process. Things may no longer pencil out for these folks, unless they are grandfathered in to the current rate structure for rooftop residential solar.

The Settlement and supporting press releases from IP and the PUC treat this as the Hard Problem, the problem which could not be solved, and which we are about to blast a lot of hot air at. However, the impact of the Settlement on a handful of early adopters is assuredly not the Hard Problem.

The Hard Problem, or Hard Choice, if you will, is to make a public policy judgment about whether it is in the long term interest of all of us (not just ratepayers and power producers) to incentivize future rooftop solar production in Idaho. Based only on what I can glean from the Settlement, those at the negotiating table decided that it wasn't that important. However, the parties to the Settlement must have known that very few will put up rooftop solar if it does not pencil out for them. Why that was deemed the right path forward, particularly by those who I would expect to support solar, is not reflected in the Settlement.

The Settlement acknowledges that rooftop solar may provide "environmental benefits", but these considerations pointedly did not figure in the discussion about how to set the export credit rate for rooftop production. This stuns me. Perhaps environmental benefits were thought to be too hard to quantify. Regardless, environmental considerations which auger in favor of greater reliance on solar were ignored. (Even those who were not invited to the table don't seem to have any stomach for the larger fight. The Snake River Alliance, a local environmental group responsible for the "Solarize the Valley" program, only appears to lament the loss of net metering perks to existing rooftop solar customers.)

In Idaho, acceptance of the fact of climate change has been slow, but it is coming. It is inevitable. In his January 16, 2019 remarks to the Idaho Environmental Forum, Governor Little acknowledged that climate

change is real, and that we must employ a number of strategies, both regulatory and market driven, to address it. There are things coming at us we can no longer ignore. For example, the 2018 National Climate Assessment cautions that those of us in the northwest who rely on cold winters and a deep snowpack for irrigation and hydropower will be impacted by a warmer climate. When there is not as much water running downhill to spin turbines, we must be prepared to rely on additional means of power production. Burning more coal is irresponsible, and unnecessary. The State will always rely on hydropower, but the slack can be taken up by wind and solar. Whether you believe that climate change is human caused or not doesn't matter. As long as you know it is real, rooftop solar is the low hanging fruit, and its installation should be encouraged everywhere in Idaho, even if it comes at the expense of IP shareholders. We make political choices all the time to subsidize things that are thought to be for the public good. A lot of people with the right credentials call climate change an existential crisis. Maybe we should act like it is.

I am an early adopter. My wife and I put up rooftop solar on our new home a couple of years ago. I forget it's there until I see my monthly IP bill. Our decision to do this was in part based on our assumption that net metering would continue to be administered in substantially the same manner over the life of our system. There were other reasons too, a few of which you can probably glean from this letter. Regardless, I will be adversely affected if you apply the proposed Settlement to existing rooftop solar customers. You could grandfather me in, and that will make me and a few others very happy to have been so smart to get in on this good thing. However, in so doing you will ignore what you really need to do. I am happy to forego any special treatment in exchange for a net metering program that creates a little bit more of an incentive for other Idahoans to do the right thing. I encourage you to give no special consideration to existing net metering customers, and adopt an export credit rate that makes it attractive for all Idahoans to consider installing rooftop solar. In other words, I ask you to address the Hard Problem, not the easy one.

Yours Very Truly



Thomas Baskin

RECEIVED

To: Idaho Public Utilities Commission
In regards to Case Number IPC-E-18-15

2019 NOV 18 AM 10:21

November 15th, 2019

IDAHO PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

I am deeply bothered by Idaho Power's recent letter I received that Idaho Power has reached a settlement with IPUC that will significantly reduce the rates that rooftop solar generators are credited for. I recently installed a rooftop solar system last month and this ruling significantly reduces the value of my investment to reduce Idaho's reliance on carbon fuels and hydro power that is devastating fisheries. This is wrong on so many levels! My investing in solar power reduces Idaho Power's investment in the grid in reducing the transmission power for their energy plants to my house. IPUC and Idaho Power need to incentivize consumer-generated power and not discourage people from investing in clean energy. I do not appreciate that Idaho Power has been quietly scheming to reduce solar power credit for longer than I have had my solar system. Clearly profits are put ahead of customer service and clean energy production by Idaho Power if IPUC approves this proposal.

Please do not approve these disincentives to solar power:

- The proposal to reduce credit rates to 50% less from current levels is unacceptable. Adjust Idaho Power's net metering credits accordingly that is both fair to Idaho Power and Idaho citizens that have invested and keep it economically viable for future solar investors.
- Drop the non-export option that will further disincentive investments in solar power.

Additionally this proposal will result in less private investment in solar technology. Idaho Power should appreciate its customer's investments in solutions that reduce our reliance on carbon-based and environmentally-damaging energy sources. The Idaho Public Utilities Commission should not bow down to the financial influences of Idaho Power and stand up for Idaho Citizens.

Sincerely, Randy Anderson



Pocatello, Idaho

Highbasin@gmail.com

November 05, 2019

Idaho Power
PO Box 70
221 W. Idaho St.
Boise, ID 83702

RECEIVED

2019 NOV 18 AM 10:21

IDaho PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

To all concerned

Upon receiving your notice to all customer's generating power and your intent to lower the credit rate (with only one meeting and one open phone line period) I felt the only way I have even a chance to have any input was to write.

Let me begin by introducing myself: I'm a retired 68 year old who invested in a roof top solar system to help offset my future of fixed income. The solar system was installed in August 2018 at a cost of just under \$12,000.00 dollars. I pay my \$5.22 a month (though I don't know why) and generate more power than my small home needs. My thoughts about generating more than needed was the feeling that electric cars are the future and I want enough power to charge one if ever I purchased one. In talking to your representatives I found out that I only use approximately 27% of the power I produce. The other 73% of my power goes on your grid, with no charge to you. I receive "credits" which I will accumulate until I die or sell my home at which time all credits disappear. Since installing my solar system my house insurance has gone up to cover the cost of the new asset and Nampa City is threatening to increase my assessed value of my home for tax purposes.

I can bow to your not wanting to give everyone the full retail rate for the power we give you for free because you do maintain the structure to transport the energy where needed. However, even if your production cost would drop to 2.2 cents per kWh, after you spend all the money you plan to on your Jordan Valley solar project I feel we deserve more than just "credits" till we die or sell our homes. After all we had our cost to.

I understand not all circumstances are the same: some generate part of what they use and others are businesses with different peak needs, etc. "Final credit rates" shouldn't be the only issue here. A comprehensive plan should have several different options to meet (generally speaking) individual circumstances. A plan A: for individual home owners with excess power. Plan B: for businesses who's use varies. Plan C: large businesses who produce some of there energy but need more. These are just some examples.

Please do not just look at your rate changes without looking at the full picture and how it is effecting all of us. My recouping of my investment now is at least 15yrs out. That makes me 83yrs. old at the time – the current life expectancy of a male according to most studies. My generated energy at present will still be no more than 15yrs. of credits of free energy to you and nothing but cost to me.

Stephen Rubadue
1558 W. Edwards Loop
Nampa, ID 83686
208-461-1134