

**From:** [PUCWeb Notification](#)  
**To:** [Jan Noriyuki](#)  
**Subject:** Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb  
**Date:** Friday, July 15, 2022 5:00:05 PM

---

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Eric Clark  
Submission Time: Jul 15 2022 4:58PM  
Email: [ericedwardclark@gmail.com](mailto:ericedwardclark@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 208-861-7182  
Address: 2652 W Cedar Grove Street  
Meridian, ID 83646

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-22-22

Comment: "To Whom It May Concern: I recently installed a solar system on my house for a few reasons. One of which was the understanding that PUC had indicated that Idaho Power would continue to provide monthly net metering at a 1:1 ratio along with a Value Study to be performed. After review of the study, I have some major concerns. First, the proposed calculation of the flat ECR (at most ~\$0.0426 Figure 4-17 of study) is less than 50% of their current residential retail rate (\$0.086/kWh; excluding the summer surcharge after x number of kwh). What happens when Idaho Power increases their retail rate in a year or two (8% last month)? Will the ECR increase accordingly, or will it stay at ~\$0.0426/kwh? The study is unclear on whether the ECR would be reevaluated once a year or once every couple of years. And it is also unclear if they are proposing the flat or time-variant ECR. I would assume that they would prefer the time-variant as they return even fewer kWh to the customer during times of excess. Secondly, the proposed hourly net billing would require a generator such as myself to utilize any excess credit within the hour it is generated as stated on the ID Power FAQ website. If I understand it correctly, that will mean that Idaho Power would provide credit at ~40% (based on hypothetical ECR within the study), but only if I used it in that hour. That is ridiculous as the point is to only pull from the grid when needed, which of course would likely be in a subsequent hour where they would charge me the full retail rate. It sounds like any time my system would provide them excess power, they would get that for free most hours of the day. Also, why does that hypothetical ECR calculation only include 12 hours of generation time? That would be fair in the winter months, but during the summer it may be closer to 16. Thirdly, it was my understanding that the PUC requested that environmental impacts be one of the key elements of the study. However, section 4.5 of the study explicitly states that costs and potential benefits were excluded unless related to direct savings or an avoidable cost. The study references the PUC Order 35284 Case # IPC-E-21-21. If the citation is referring page 27 of that order, it appears not to correlate with the environmental costs. Ultimately, the study essentially punts on the issue. It appears that the point of the study from Idaho Power's perspective is to appeal to the PUC by suggesting that the cost of upkeep of infrastructure, administrative costs etc. are becoming too much of a burden for the utility so they should be able to pass more of it onto the customer (or at least pay the generator an unfair price for excess production). Also, it seems odd that the study was commissioned by the utility and not an unbiased third party. At the end of the day, I chose to put solar panels on my house for environmental purposes and to reduce my reliance on and associated costs attributed to Idaho

Power. These proposed changes would significantly prohibit others like me from considering solar. Therefore, it seems like Idaho Power is being somewhat disingenuous when they claim to be promoting solar yet turn around and make it more difficult for people to see the economic benefits. Ultimately, I suggest that the current monthly net metering program remain in place. If PUC does not agree with that, I would like to see a grandfathering in approach similar to that issued in 2019. Lastly, when does the PUC plan to make a determination on Idaho Power's proposed changes? Thank you for the consideration. "

-----

---

**From:** [PUCWeb Notification](#)  
**To:** [Jan Noriyuki](#)  
**Subject:** Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb  
**Date:** Saturday, July 16, 2022 1:00:08 PM

---

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Talian Kretschmar  
Submission Time: Jul 16 2022 12:01PM  
Email: [talian.j.k@gmail.com](mailto:talian.j.k@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 307-421-4153  
Address: 11612 W Violet CT  
Boise, ID 83713

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-22-22

Comment: "I am interested in receiving monetary compensation for excess power generated from my newly installed solar system. My system currently generates 31 kWh max during the summer months. It was installed at the beginning of June, so I do not know the impact in the winter months. "

-----

---

**From:** [PUCWeb Notification](#)  
**To:** [Jan Noriyuki](#)  
**Subject:** Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb  
**Date:** Sunday, July 17, 2022 12:00:12 PM

---

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Kirby Clendenon  
Submission Time: Jul 17 2022 11:09AM  
Email: [kclendenon@gmail.com](mailto:kclendenon@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 208-870-5599  
Address: 4520 Marble Front Rd  
Caldwell, ID 83605

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-22-22

Comment: "Having read the comments submitted thus far re: IPC-E-22-22, I want to voice agreement with some of those comments made thus far. We too had our solar installed in February 2022. I am retired, and have only a modest income to carry me through the rest of my life. It was a big decision to purchase solar panels from Comet Energy, but given the 1st year solar tax credit and the expected savings I would experience in power bills, after about 8 years, it seemed prudent and wise to install solar. I am not just interested in my personal benefits but also see installing solar as a needed adjunct to our power grid and a step in the direction of being kind to our planet. My grand-daughter wrote me a letter saying "Thank you grandpa; and the earth thanks you too." Cutting from 6-7 cents per kWh to 2-4 cents per kWh would effectively kill our efforts to afford power in 10 years when we will reach our mid 80's. It is unfair to my wife and I to change the rules after we made this expensive decision. This appears to be a very greedy move cloaked by in-house studies by Idaho Power. Help save our efforts please!"

-----

---

**From:** [PUCWeb Notification](#)  
**To:** [Jan Noriyuki](#)  
**Subject:** Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb  
**Date:** Sunday, July 17, 2022 4:00:10 PM

---

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Jered winfrey  
Submission Time: Jul 17 2022 3:58PM  
Email: mariejeredwinfrey@yahoo.com  
Telephone: 530-559-6316  
Address: 2003 east 1400 south  
gooding, ID 83330

Name of Utility Company: Idaho power with solar

Case ID: IPC-E-22-22

Comment: "We received a letter from idaho power today and i'm making a comment about this case .Im writting in protest. We spent 22k \$ on solar system thinking that we could pay it off by a certain amount of time and now with these changes they're wanting to do,its a good investment turned out to be a horrible investment and we're very discouraged we're going to tell everyone that we know to never invest in solar its not worth it. specially when they can change the rules anytime they wanted. No one will put solar panels in there roof top and expect a return with in 30 to 40 years. If I would have known this earlier I would have never invested in solar.thankyou."

-----

---

**From:** [PUCWeb Notification](#)  
**To:** [Jan Noriyuki](#)  
**Subject:** Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb  
**Date:** Sunday, July 17, 2022 5:00:11 PM

---

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Doug Lamb  
Submission Time: Jul 17 2022 4:39PM  
Email: [jlambknits@gmail.com](mailto:jlambknits@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 205-573-0734  
Address: 5174 Choctaw Way  
Boise, ID 83709

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-22-22

Comment: "It is my opinion that those who already have a solar system installed should be grandfathered in to the current reimbursement system. I do not understand why the grandfathering is proposed to stop on 12/20/19. Those who have installed a solar system at any time have had to use the information that was then available regarding if a solar system made sense financially. To change how the solar system impacts a customer's bill after the system was installed, is not fair to those who decided to install a solar system based on the information available at the time. To be fair, the new rules should only apply to those who install a new solar system after the change is applied. That way they can properly evaluate if it makes sense financially to install a system. To change the rate structure now for those who already have a solar system installed, may make their system no longer financially viable, but they still have a system that they have to pay for. "

-----

[\]](#)

**From:** [PUCWeb Notification](#)  
**To:** [Jan Noriyuki](#)  
**Subject:** Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb  
**Date:** Saturday, July 16, 2022 7:00:15 AM

---

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Matt Williams  
Submission Time: Jul 15 2022 8:49PM  
Email: mwilliams252@protonmail.com  
Telephone: 208-250-9472  
Address: 4016 S Taradale Ave  
Meridian, ID 83642

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-22-22

Comment: "Idaho Public Utilities Commission Board, As an Idaho Power customer who just very recently installed solar this study and proposals within it to make these changes concern me. I became interested in solar a few years ago due to growing demands in my household for electricity, and the increase in power outages at our previous property over the last 2-3 years. I recall last year, and just received another again this year a letter from Idaho Power requesting help with the peak loads on our grid by allowing them (for a credit) to install a box on my AC unit to lower our cooling demands during extreme peaks. My solution to this? Install a solar system that would not only provide my home with power during these peak times but also build it large enough that I could offset several of my neighbors AC usage demands at these peak times on the grid as well. By doing this I help myself as well as the grid when it needs it most, using the credits to pull back some of that power later at night, the lowest demand/cost time. How can Idaho Power put out these requests to their customers, say they support solar and renewable energy, and still request to reduce the customer's side of this mutually beneficial situation by slashing the credits? If we must go to a monetary vs KWh credit scheme, and Idaho Power apparently has the ability to monitor import and export in real time, then pay the market rate to us for that peak power we produce, not a standard, bottom of the barrel best case rate. The power produced during peak is more valuable than at off peak and the credit rate would have to reflect this for it to be even remotely fair. Reading through this study gives me the impression that Idaho Power wants to frame customers with solar generation as a burden on the grid, and other customers – this simply is not the case. The benefit to Idaho power from our rooftop solar systems is simple, solar produces its highest output along the same times that there is the highest demand on the grid. Power I generate doesn't have to travel miles from a power plant, through several substations and transformers to get from my home to my neighbors – it passes through the transformer here in the neighborhood and back out to our immediate area to ease the load on the grid from several homes. The benefit to me is that by not only offsetting my load, but others around me with my solar array during peak times I can pull back some of that power later, at night when demand is low and there is no strain on the grid. Solar is the best thing a grid taxed by high AC and other afternoon/early evening demands could ask for, its peak output lines up perfectly with peak demands on the grid. Growth of EVs continues to accelerate, this will also place the grid under even more strain as customers get home from work, blast the AC, fire up the oven, and now also plug in their car. I am honestly surprised that Idaho Power is not actively doing more

to encourage and grow their exporting solar customer base. Instead here they are trying to slow down process in more distributed power production. This is a mutually beneficial arrangement for both us solar exporting customers, Idaho Power, and non solar customers who can continue to enjoy low prices and electricity that is there when they need it. I can understand some of the points made about how, perhaps, net metering customers who offset all of their yearly usage do not pay their fair share to maintain the grid which we do rely on when the sun is not shining. I see this as the same scenario that happened when I had to register my EV with the DMV. Since I do not pay gas tax to help maintain the roads that I also use – they charge me more. As an alternative to this frankly ridiculously low export rate being proposed, it would be easier to accept a modestly higher connection fee for those systems that net out to zero usage for the year I can also understand the fiscal liability having a huge bank of unused credits can impart on a company. I think it would be reasonable to modify the expiration of these to two years – allowing seasonal ups and downs to smooth out. This would ensure that customers do not end up without a bank of credits when they need them (winter) to pay them back for their assistance to the grids peak loading in the summer, but also avoid an ever increasing bank of credits that are a liability on the companies financials. Perhaps even a cap in KWh could work here, perhaps based on usage? Say a customer can bank up to a years worth of their average usage as a cap? There are many other more reasonable and fair alternatives to explore to solve this problem instead of abolishing net metering. Thank you for allowing for public comment, and incorporating as many inputs from consumers as possible when evaluating this proposal. Matt"

-----

Name: Lyle Zufelt  
Submission Time: Jul 15 2022 11:07PM  
Email: [zufeltco@netzero.net](mailto:zufeltco@netzero.net)  
Telephone: 208-989-8259  
Address: 9965 GRAND TARGHEE TRL  
Middleton, ID 83644

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-22-22

Comment: "I installed solar panels on my home with the idea that energy prices would be increasing in the future. The initial cost, although expensive, we considered an investment for the future. If Idaho Power makes cuts to its compensation for energy generated by solar panels there will be no more incentive for customers to install and maintain solar panels on their homes. Idaho Power will lose potentially hundreds of thousands of kilowatts that could have been used for years to come. It is sad to think that they might be that shortsighted. When solar panels are no longer a good investment Idaho Power will find it has developed a difficult problem in meeting the energy needs of it's expanding customer base. Thanks for your time and consideration."

-----

---