

From: [PUCWeb Notification](#)
To: [Jan Noriyuki](#)
Subject: Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb
Date: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 2:00:05 PM

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Kent Britton
Submission Time: Sep 20 2022 1:31PM
Email: krbritton@hotmail.com
Telephone: 970-560-4995
Address: 2606 E. Piccadilly Ln
Eagle, ID 83616

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-22-22

Comment: " I have a solar system on my home. I have listened to the IPC's presentation of the VODER study and tried to read through and understand it best I can. I can understand IPC's desire to lower the cost of purchasing electricity from residential solar systems, however I have questions and comments that I hope the IPUC can ask as they try to evaluate and decide this issue. First, I would like to comment on the cost of electricity and generation issue. From the study, It doesn't reveal the cost IPC would have from it's own solar generation facilities. I think solar is generally less efficient than hydro power or natural gas, and there is the firmness issue of the power. However, IPC touts their investment in solar generation and battery farms in recent news articles. So, my question is, if it is desirable to have solar generated electricity, should the comparison for costs of wholesale power not be more for that type of power. Second, As I understand IPC does not include an environmental or social factor in their calculations because IPC is under no mandate to produce that type of energy, or there is no cost for failure to produce energy in that way. If that is the case, again, why is IPC touting their own solar development? Is it for public opinion only? One way to look at my investment in solar power is that I am not only investing for my own future reduction in energy cost, but I am also investing in IPC's generation of electricity. Should a homeowner who puts significant resources into purchasing a system and utilizes the space on their rooftop not get some return on their investment for the production of energy returned to the grid? I feel the current net monthly billing with the ability to store credits does compensate for that investment. If another formula is used to calculate the payback of home generated electricity, I think some factor that would compensate for that investment of money and square footage should also be included. I guess what I am saying is that to some degree, my investment in solar generation for my home is also an investment in IPC and maybe there should be some return on that as well. Back to my questions. So, if solar generated power is important to Idaho Power Company, why not continue to incentivize homeowner to make that investment using their rooftop space rather than going out and using land to build more solar farms? At the same time the Federal Government is trying to incentivize with tax credits, why does IPC want to de incentivize with rate structure change. A comment on the credit balances. I know in Colorado where they are also on net monthly billing, that they will pay off the credit balance at the end of the year at a wholesale rate. That way the credits do not just continue to accumulate and look like a huge expense owed on the books. I would be willing to accept something like that. Thanks, Kent Britton "

From: [PUCWeb Notification](#)
To: [Jan Noriyuki](#)
Subject: Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb
Date: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 4:00:08 PM

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Jon Minkoff
Submission Time: Sep 20 2022 3:44PM
Email: mink@speedyquick.net
Telephone: 208-459-4740
Address: 11648 Eva Lane
Caldwell, ID 83607

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-22-22

Comment: "Idaho Power is a very good company, but its in-house VODER Study is terrible. The underlying assumptions lead to a significant underestimation of both the avoided costs and the environmental and social benefits of on-site solar generation. The resulting proposed cut in compensation would greatly discourage the installation of new panels and slow the transition to renewable energy at a time when it is clearly sorely needed to counter the climate crisis. Idaho Power should be credited and rewarded for the amount of customer solar generation it links to the grid, as well as for its company-owned solar generation. They both help to move us toward a clean, safe and sustainable future. I like the idea of monetary credit for excess energy sent to the grid because Idaho Power currently pays nothing for net surplus energy from larger producers who can't use it all on their contiguous property. The amount of uncompensated excess energy should be factored into the cost-benefit analysis for the company. IF a rate change requiring separate channel meters is approved, all current net meter producers should be grandfathered in and the new meters should just be mandated for subsequent installations. That would save a lot of money and honor the investments people have already made. Customer generators should be considered colleagues and contributors in relation to Idaho Power, not competitors. We lighten the load of infrastructure investment and energy demand, and deserve a fair compensation in return. Underpaying on-site generators would negatively impact not only those households, but also the state and the planet as a whole. Please reject the VODER Study and either authorize a new independent study or keep net metering as a functional future-oriented system. "
