

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Andrew Johnson
Submission Time: Aug 15 2023 1:00PM
Email: ajj@andrewjohnson.law
Telephone: 208-250-6468
Address: 22395 Hoskins Rd
Caldwell, ID 83607

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-11

Comment: "After attending the workshop, and reviewing the documents for IPC-E-23-11, it appears that this Case can affect, and/or be effected by, Case No. IPC-E-23-14. I believe it would be in the best interest of all parties (customers, the Idaho Public Utilities Commission, and Idaho Power) to have a workshop that describes how the combined outcomes of IPC-E-23-11 and IPC-E-23-14 will affect Schedule 6 customers and Idaho Power.

Such workshop would address: (1) What would be the combined effect if both Applications were approved; and compare it to (2) What would be the effect if only IPC-E-23-11 were approved; and (3) What would be the effect if only IPC-E-23-14 were approved.

Synthesizing this information into a coherent forum would better help all parties see the big picture, and understand the implications of approving or denying these applications as they relate to one another. Looking at each individually, and not as a whole, does not allow us to see the true impact of either Case.

Also, prior to hosting such workshop, I believe it would be in the best interest of all parties for Idaho Power to send each Schedule 6 customer a pamphlet explaining the three outcomes listed above, so that the workshop could be more efficient with its time and resources.

In the event it is not possible to host a workshop that addresses two Cases at once and shows how each affects the other; I would request that the Commission still require Idaho Power to send Schedule 6 customers a pamphlet describing the ways each Application, and their combined in singular outcomes, affect Schedule 6 customers. Such pamphlets should be sent out with enough time for customers to research the issues and have reasonable time for comments. "

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Andrew Johnson
Submission Time: Aug 15 2023 3:25PM
Email: ajj@andrewjohnson.law
Telephone: 208-250-6468
Address: 22395 Hoskins Rd
Caldwell, ID 83607

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-11

Comment: "Many farmers and home owners in the area have a separate meter on their shop or outbuildings for their power consumption. Case No. IPC-E-23-11 proposes to change the monthly Service Charge for each meter from \$5 to \$35 in 2026.

For those farmers and home owners with these separate meters, the electricity usage is often seasonal or sporadic, and less consistent than the usage at their primary residence. These folks benefit from the separate meter because they can easily distinguish what electricity is being used for business purposes (such as farming and home-based businesses), and what electricity is being used for personal home use. The electricity for business use can be written off on their taxes as an expense.

Changing the cost of the meter from \$5 to \$35 increases the cost of this separate meter from \$60 per year to \$420 per year. The increase is not equally offset for these folks by the reduced cost per kWh because the usage is less than the average use for a home, and is likely seasonal or sporadic. Meaning the farmers and others are paying \$35 per month for a meter that they may not be using during certain months of the year.

To adjust for this increased cost, farmers and home owners must either pass this expense on to their customers (which could put them at a disadvantage compared to the competition), eat the cost, or connect their shop to their home's power meter (which is usually cost prohibitive). None of these are favorable outcomes.

Even if they were to connect the shop to their home, and eliminate the meter, there would be no decrease in the number of kWh used and drawn from the grid, because the shop would simply draw its electricity from the home's meter.

Since the meters are already in place, the billing is automatic, and the kWh usage would be the same whether they have a separate meter on the shop or tie it to the home, there should be little to no additional cost to Idaho Power to maintain this separate meter. Thus, the proposed increased cost of the meter negatively impacts these customers disproportionately, while not adding a balanced value to Idaho Power, other than an increase in month revenue for a meter that is not being used much.

I propose that the Service Charge for each meter remain \$5 to avoid disproportionate expenses to farmers and other property owners who have an extra meter on their property, who will not benefit from the decrease in costs per kWh as it relates to this extra meter.

Or, as an alternate suggestion/comment, I would propose the following: If an address has more than one meter on it, that the first meter be charged a \$35 Service Charge in 2026, and all other meters at the same address be charged a \$5 Service Charge in 2026. This would offset the negative impact felt by farmers and others with extra meters on their properties. "
