

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Mauricio Steffen  
Submission Time: Nov 23 2023 10:20AM  
Email: [nerdhrdr@live.com](mailto:nerdhrdr@live.com)  
Telephone: 208-703-0255  
Address: 17323 N. Ronan Ave.  
Nampa, ID 83687-9269

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-11

Comment: "People are struggling enough with rising costs. Idaho Power makes enough money to be able to absorb these costs without paying them on to consumers. Idaho Power should have to have an independent financial review to prove the need to raise costs."  
-----

Name: Don Kemper  
Submission Time: Nov 23 2023 10:33AM  
Email: [dkemper398@gmail.com](mailto:dkemper398@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 208-870-0776  
Address: 1821 Edgecliff Terrace  
Boise, ID 83702

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-11

Comment: "I was initially shocked by IPC's proposal to put the burden of the increase on low-income families by raising the service fee six-fold and eliminating the conservation discount. However, I am now thankful that the company, staff and interveners have agreed to lessen the fee increase (though it is still a 200% increase) and to keep the conservation discount for the first 800 KWh of monthly use. I also appreciate increasing the summer peak dates and hours to encourage conservation. I support the settlement and ask for the Commission's acceptance."  
-----

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Therese Gerard  
Submission Time: Nov 26 2023 2:09PM  
Email: [thergera@gmail.com](mailto:thergera@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 208-602-7766  
Address: 3906 W Catalpa Dr  
Boise, ID 83703

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-11

Comment: "Decisions regarding the proposed increases in this case should take into consideration the decisions being made in Case # IPC-E-23-14. The impact of the proposed enormous increase in the monthly base rate per customer in this case, combined with the proposed move away from net-metering in case # IPC-E-23-14, has the potential for a sever negative impact for solar-power generating customers."

-----

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Laurie Price  
Submission Time: Nov 27 2023 12:32PM  
Email: [i2oothelper@yahoo.com](mailto:i2oothelper@yahoo.com)  
Telephone: 208-860-6965  
Address: 2812 Muskrat Ct  
Nampa, ID 83687

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-11

Comment: "With all the requests for rate increases, verses decrease to the annual Energy Efficiency Rider, why? Why is it that with people not being able to afford living expenses, especially rent or mortgage, who is hit hardest with each increase you've asked for, why not hit the construction companies and NEW construction For infrastructure additions growing customer base. President and CEO Lisa Grow, why aren't the Oregon customers not impacted by this new filing coming up in 2024.  
My monthly electric bill will go up 11.61\$ I've got friends who are struggling with utility electric heating bills this winter who's bill is already over \$170.00. limited incomes, single parents.  
Manage the money better, get it from the new construction. We have to manage our money to live on. Passing new bonds to cover education costs, schools, lots of new construction and influx of people, there has to be a better way "

-----

Dan Farrell  
3621 S Basilica Way, Meridian, ID 83642  
703.622.3303  
Idaho Power Customer

IPC-E-23-11 proposes to begin a staged increase in the service charge from \$5/month to \$35/month over the next few years. The notice of proposed settlement sets the increase to \$10 in 2024 and \$15 in 2025. Idaho Power Company (IPC) argues that the higher fixed costs will make collection of fixed costs "more equitable" so that high volume customers are not "subsidizing lower energy users". However, they don't give any evidence in their proposal or testimony as to how the changes achieve those objectives. I believe the new service charges are not equitable and that raising them will simply create additional revenue to IPC for the following reasons:

1. Simple math shows that the higher service charges alone make the average cost per KWh much higher for low volume users. How can that be a good thing to charge low volume energy users more for their energy? Conversely, how can it be good to charge higher volume customers less on average for their energy?
2. Recovery of fixed costs through volumetric charges works and keeps average costs equal for all users. There is no need to change it.
3. IPC admits that the new service charges are only trying to recover a portion of the fixed costs in a more equitable manner. So, why not allow them to recover all their fixed costs through service charges with a charge of \$70 or more per month? The same reasons you have for not going to \$70/month should convince you to keep it at \$5/month or drop it all together, Volumetric recovery of fixed costs already works. Don't mess things up with large service charges.
4. With the large service charges, I would expect to see corresponding drops in volumetric rates. For example, if my service charges increase by \$10//month, shouldn't there be a corresponding \$10/month reduction in energy costs to keep my costs the same. I searched IPC-E-23-11 and saw no evidence that IPC was offsetting the new service charges with lower energy costs. That means that the new service charges are simply a new revenue secure stream for IPC. Given the number of residential customers that IPC has, that is a revenue increase of \$74M alone (\$10/month\*12months\*620,000customers)
5. There's no doubt that if there were competition in the power market, IPC would not be asking for large servicer fees. As a customer, I do most of my business with companies without service fees. That's how I buy my gas, food, clothing etc. Think of a local gas station trying to charge you \$10/month for the privilege of buying their gas– I'd never shop there unless their price was so low and I bought so much that I'd save money. The only time I'll go with a company that charges an annual service fee (like Costco or Amazon) is when I'll save money in the long run or get something extra in return. But IPC is not Costco or Amazon and the service fees don't result in any savings or benefits to me. Allowing IPC to charge a service fee is a bad idea.

I urge IPUC to reject the original IPC request for an increase in the service charge and also reject the proposed settlement increases. The changes are unjustified and simply create new revenue for IPC and are not in the public interest.

-----

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Tim Yoder  
Submission Time: Nov 28 2023 9:12AM  
Email: [timmyoutside@live.com](mailto:timmyoutside@live.com)  
Telephone: 208-340-4441  
Address: 2700 N 30th St  
Boise, ID 83703

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-11

Comment: "Dear Idaho Public Utility Commissioners, I urge you as Commissioners to reject Idaho Power's base rate increase application and reject the proposed settlement. I do agree that inflation of wages and material cost may increase Idaho Power's cost to maintain the current infrastructure. If this is the case, then the base rate should only be increased by the rate of inflation. Perhaps this measure could be assessed by the Cost Of Living Adjustment provided to Social Security recipients. To increase the base rate 100%-500% is absolutely out of bounds in the field of reasonableness and fairness. This proposed increase would disproportionately and adversely affect those on a limited and fixed income. Idaho Power claims it needs more money to cover infrastructure costs of the growing valley population. Current customers and ratepayers should not have to bear this cost burden for Idaho Power to expand its customer and profit base. That added infrastructure cost should be borne by those demanding this increase, namely the developers of expansion projects.

It's obvious that Idaho Power is trying to increase its revenue from customers who have taken initiatives to save energy through home improvements like better insulation and energy saving appliances. These measures are promoted by Idaho Power and now the Company wants to extract a larger percentage of revenue from these same customers who have saved them energy.

Please don't allow Idaho Power this unreasonable rate increase.

Thank you for your consideration."

-----

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Rian Keyes  
Submission Time: Nov 28 2023 10:40AM  
Email: [ribread1@aol.com](mailto:ribread1@aol.com)  
Telephone: 208-371-1199  
Address: 1452 East Adelaide Street  
Meridian, ID 83642

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-11

Comment: "I do not agree with these significant rare increases. I guess I don't get how you expect for families in Idaho who already struggle to put food in the tables for their children to be able to keep the heat and lights on in their homes with the increases everywhere else if this additional increase goes through. It's absurd to be honest. You should have plenty of customers that have moved here to Idaho to keep the rates down. Be a good company and think about the people here locally. "

-----

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Daryl Albiston  
Submission Time: Nov 28 2023 2:00PM  
Email: [darylalbiston@gmail.com](mailto:darylalbiston@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 208-724-0297

Address: 26736 Old Highway 30  
Caldwell, ID 83607

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-11

Comment: "I am opposed to the Idaho PUC once again giving a "pass" to Idaho Power because they made bad financial decisions in the past, and have failed to acknowledge them.  
As a private citizen and former government employee, I learned early on that Idaho Power was/is a business whose only concern is the "bottom line" and its stockholders.  
Had it really been a "public utility" then the people of Idaho would have had 85% of the "voice" when it came to Wyoming coal-fired generating plants, solar farms, and buy-back of excess electricity from Idaho Power customers who also had solar panels.  
Idaho Power should be reminded that, although it works in the utility industry, it is a PRIVATE business who cannot keep coming back to the PUC for "bail-outs" due to those errors in financial judgement."

-----

Name: Barbara Albiston  
Submission Time: Nov 28 2023 2:22PM  
Email: [bealbiston@gmail.com](mailto:bealbiston@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 208-794-7231  
Address: 26736 Old Highway 30  
Caldwell, ID 83607

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-11

Comment: "I am adamantly OPPOSED to yet ANOTHER rate hike by Idaho Power because of faulty decisions made by its corporate officers and out-of-state stockholders.  
Coal-fired generators, in 1969, were probably a good idea in regards to the Jim Bridger Generation Plant. By the late 2000s, however, Idaho Power should have been more "forward thinking". Instead, in November 2013, it asked the PUC for millions of dollars (from ratepayers' pockets) for upgrades to same which were being mandated by new Clean Air Act rules concerning Regional Haze!  
At that time, a Sr. Vice-President from Idaho Power was quoted as saying: "(Idaho Power) would have to think seriously about any decisions the PUC takes that rejects a reliance on rate-payers to bear the costs of upgrades".  
Hmm, I always thought that's exactly what "real" businesses and their stockholders do in such circumstances. But, it appears that Idaho doesn't share that opinion OR the PUC wouldn't be holding these PUBLIC hearings.  
Let's be clear shall we. Everyone knows that Idaho Power is NOT and NEVER has been a "public utility". It is a corporation who worries more about "stockholders" than "stakeholders"; i.e. its electrical companies.  
I think NOW is the time for the PUC to look at Idaho Power as a BUSINESS and not solely as a UTILITY.  
I have a fairly good retirement, but I worry about those who don't or the 2-wage earner households who are among the 35%-40% of Idahoans at or barely above the poverty level. How will these CONTINUALLY rising costs affect them in the future?"

Maybe the PUC should be thinking more about them and less about Idaho Power and its stockholders greed.

Oh, and just how many of those stockholders are actually Idaho residents and care about what's happening here?"

---

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Eric Elliott  
Submission Time: Nov 28 2023 3:02PM  
Email: [erichomaselliott@gmail.com](mailto:erichomaselliott@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 208-867-4566  
Address: 2911 N Sheffield Ct  
Boise, ID 83702

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-11

Comment: "Idaho Power's proposed price "modernization plan" is the opposite of what the people of Idaho need. The plan will unfairly raise prices for families that can least afford it, increasing power bill by over 30% for homes that use very little electricity. And it will significantly decrease the power bills for homes that use a large amount of electricity.

The plan discourages energy efficiency. This is in opposition to Idaho Power's stated goals, and will result in wasteful design of homes and neglect of fundamental things like energy efficient appliances, windows, doors and insulation.

It may also encourage some to leave the grid completely, using solar and battery in the home to supply power. This is the opposite of where we should be aiming with power policy. We should be encouraging a flexible and efficient grid, with power priced to encourage energy efficiency and creative behaviors and innovations at the home level that can help stabilize the grid, such as charging electric vehicles during off peak hours, transferring power from home battery to grid during peak hours.

IPUC, please stand up for fairness and a more efficient energy future and turn down this application by Idaho Power.

A price increase should be from an increase in charge for power use, and should be a uniform percentage increase at each level as currently priced.

Sincerely,  
Eric Elliott, MD

It "

---

Name: Eric Elliott  
Submission Time: Nov 28 2023 3:34PM

Email: [erichthomaselliott@gmail.com](mailto:erichthomaselliott@gmail.com)

Telephone: 208-867-4566

Address: 2911 N Sheffield Ct

Boise, ID 83702

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-11

Comment: "This is an addendum to my earlier comment.

I wanted to attend the hearing in person, but since it was scheduled in the middle of the afternoon on a Tuesday, I could not leave work to be present.

I attempted to call in, but the IPUC website did not have information to dial in for this meeting. I called and spoke with a very helpful person, Leslie, and she provided me the call in number and I was able to connect. Unfortunately, due to the time it took me to access the meeting, I was only able to hear the last minute of testimony at approximately 3:10pm, and then heard that no one else showed up to speak!

Leslie confirmed that the website doesn't have the information to call in to today's meeting, which is now over, at 3:25pm.

This hearing did not provide adequate access to Idaho Power's customers:

1. It was held in mid-afternoon on a weekday, when most customers are at work and cannot attend.
2. Information to dial-in to the meeting was not provided on IPUC website, therefore it was not adequately published.

I respectfully request that a second hearing be held because of these issues, on an evening so that access is improved.

Sincerely,  
Eric Elliott"

-----  
Name: Sayed Bahuddin Mirbacha

Submission Time: Nov 28 2023 3:36PM

Email: [sayedbahauddinmirbacha@gmail.com](mailto:sayedbahauddinmirbacha@gmail.com)

Telephone: 208-872-0816

Address: 240 E Elwood In

Boise , ID 83706

Name of Utility Company: Idaho power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-11

Comment: "Dear PUC!

My name is Sayed Mirbacha. I'm a freshman at Boise State University. It's been over two years I work as an activist. This is the third time I'm attending here and the second time testifying. Each time I had to

skip my job shift or skip my homework to be able to attend with the hope that I'm going there as a resident and as a part of my responsibility and the PUC decision makers will make a decision and then later I will say it's worth it that I attend. I'm really confused about this, is the PUC job is to hear from the people or they are here to help the business companies and money seekers to get rich with the money that comes out of the Idahoans pocket? I don't know if you heard about the 17 sustainable development goals of the United Nations. Their very first goal is ( no poverty) and their 7th goal is affordable and clean energy. Now, according to the Idaho power plans, they will increase the fixed rate from \$5-\$15 within the next two years and I'm sure they will raise it again and again. Don't you think how it will really negatively affect the economy of low income people? We have 11% of people under the poverty line in our community, and many more low-income people that struggle to pay their utility bills Currently, I'm enrolled in college as a full-time student and beside that I have two jobs and doing activism. I'm working hard not just because getting a degree and making more money. I work hard as a resident to help the people in my community with making a positive impact. My message to the PUC is, if you sign and agree to the Idaho Power Plan, it will not only make it harder for me to make a positive impact as a resident, but it will also increase poverty and hunger in the community. I want you to think deeply about this case because this case is mostly harmful to and will hurt so many Idahoans.

Thank you.

"

-----  
Name: Eric Elliott  
Submission Time: Nov 28 2023 3:52PM  
Email: [erichthomaselliott@gmail.com](mailto:erichthomaselliott@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 208-867-4566  
Address: 2911 N Sheffield Ct  
Boise, ID 83702

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-11

Comment: "I submit to the commission a report on the harms of fixed charges for electricity:

<https://advocacy.consumerreports.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Caught-in-a-Fix-FINAL-REPORT-20160208-2.pdf>

The web address above can be copied into a browser to generate a pdf document.

Please read and consider this document in decision regarding the rate increase.

I thank the IPUC for detailed attention to this matter.

Sincerely,  
Eric Elliott"



November 26, 2023

Dear Idaho Public Utilities Commission – I am writing to express our concerns about Idaho Powers General Rate Case Request (IPC-E-23-11). In the flyer that Idaho Power sent us they propose that the average Idaho Residential Consumer using 950 kilowatt hours per month would see a bill increase of about \$11.61. They went on further to say that they are requesting to raise residential rates by 10.78% and small general service rates by 11.4% and irrigation users by 11.7%. However, in the same flyer they explain that they are only requesting .9% for the large general services users and 5.98% for large power users. It seems like the large power users in this state are not going to pay their fair shares of the cost increases.

This request to the PUC from Idaho Power is lengthy and very detailed, really too much to read and comment on at one time. I would like to focus on a couple of small details that will affect us the most. We live in a house on 2.5 acres in Twin Falls County. We get 2 power bills from Idaho Power. We have a residential power bill with grandfathered solar (schedule 06) and a separate service for a 3 horse power irrigation pump that is on a separate transformer and bill (schedule 07). It is used to sprinkle less than an acre of pasture. We currently pay \$5.16 service charge a month in the off-irrigation season when no power is being used and during the irrigation season, we pay between \$8 and \$17 a month including the \$5.16 service charge (for about 6 months). It appears that Idaho Power plans to raise the service fee from \$5 to \$15 for schedule 06 and from \$5 to \$15 for schedule 07 folks like us – an increase of **200 to 300%** on the first price raise and more in subsequent years! If they are allowed to charge the \$35 they plan on - then we in Idaho would be paying one of the most expensive service charges in the nation and we live in a lower cost state. Doesn't seem right. It would cost more the first time they raise the service fee than most of our total monthly bills are now. We don't even pay \$20 on our highest use months on the irrigation pump. This past year our highest use month was 2.7kWh which cost us including the service charge \$16.95. Now Idaho Power wants us to pay \$20 a month just for basic service without using any electricity! That is more than our highest monthly bill!

Our house has solar panels and most months we only pay the service charge so again we are facing a **220%** raise next year and if Idaho Power gets their way more each year for a number of years. I don't think they are taking into consideration that in the summer air-conditioning and irrigation season when we produce excess power that they (Idaho Power) sells our excess power at a seasonally higher price or possibly at the higher green energy price. We do not understand why Idaho Power wants to hit us upside of the head with a 2x4 like this price hike when they made a gross profit of 970.1 million dollars last year (as I found on google). Both our accounts are paid auto-pay so they don't even have to chase bill payment.

Idaho Power committed to the PUC that they would have outreach to notify the public of their request. We think they were misleading in the "Idaho Power files General Rate Case" flyer that they attached to our July 2023 bills. They state "if this request is approved as filed the average Idaho residential customer using 950 kwh per month would see a billing increase of about \$11.61. Proposed impacts for all Idaho Power customers in table below." The general rate case chart found in the flyer is different from the general rate case (exhibit 48) in the official request to the PUC. For instance, residential 10.78% versus 12.25%. I think that if a slick statement about a specific kwh usage and the cost of \$11.61 had instead reflected that Idaho Power wants to increase you service rate by **200 or 300%** and then increase by a lot more in the near future you would have had a lot more people chiming in on this request. Instead, we had to really do some digging around to find this out. This info is further down in the document and they don't even mention the service charge being raised in the flyer they send out. (reference application – 5, items 10, 11, 12...).

I don't think that Idaho Power should not be allowed to jack up service rates anywhere near what they are asking for.

Thank you for listening and reading this letter –

Melody Asher

2502 Laurie Lane

Twin Falls, ID 83301

**Robert E. Sojka, 2506 Laurie Lane, Twin Falls, ID 83301, Nov. 27, 2023**

**Around 2018 Idaho Power began a campaign that unambiguously and persuasively declared its commitment to conversion to renewable energy. It identified the environmental benefits and incentivized home-owners to join the effort. Much of the public had recognized that need even before IDP made this announcement and welcomed IDP's proclaimed commitment to partner with them to achieve their goal of 100% clean energy by 2045.**

**IDP even provided modest incentives to encourage conversion. The federal government also chipped in. But for most home owners, farmers and small businesses their personal investment FAR EXCEEDED the total incentives. A typical household spent an additional \$20K to \$40k or more out of pocket after incentives to install solar generation to produce its full annual need for electrical power. Our cost was nearly \$40,000.**

***IDP stated monthly net metering would be the financial covenant between solar homes and IDP, based on the set power rate for all residential consumers.*** Homeowners would pay a small monthly grid access fee for power at night. IDP could sell excess day production at the going rate via the grid for profit. No mention was made initially of changing the rate formula after installation.

**It didn't take long before IDP changed the rate formula. A couple years into its inauguration IDP changed conditions in midstream for those embarking then on the program. IDP Attached the agreement to the original installer/property owner, not the structure (hence different conditions upon sale or inheritance, which seems utterly unfair and unusual for most property infrastructure). A termination date was established for the rate agreement(s) (2045?). Those entering the program past the initial few years came in under different financial arrangements, although original participants were supposedly grandfathered in under the initial financial arrangements. Now once again IDP wants to change its mind. We're told it's due to fairness consideration to non-solar power users.**

**My concept of a fair arrangement with non-solar-powered grid-users is that before they have access to IDP power they pay the same per square foot cost up front for their homes that we invested in our homes to generate power for IDP. IDP benefits financially by not having had to create additional generation or do the maintenance on our system. WE PAID FOR THAT. Show solar users the actual profit IDP makes when selling our excess power to the grid. At the end of the year pay us for the unused excess power that our solar panels generated. Currently we operate in a financial information vacuum regarding time-dependent energy rates that is clearly being interpreted for the main benefit of IDP and its investors, not for consumers of power at large. Fairness depends on full transparency which I do not feel is the current state of affairs.**

Thank you for letting me speak to --  
you today!

I just want to say that a 200-300%  
raise in the monthly service charge  
(4 more in the next few years) is  
just Too much.

I will just hand in my letter now  
with more comments for you to read.

I daho Power is doing okay without  
these outrageous price increases.

I looked up their profits for  
last year - they had gross profit  
of \$970.1 million. Please do

not allow I daho Power to get  
away with these large monthly

charges. I understand raising  
rates, some just not this much!

Thank you

Melody Asher  
2502 Laurie Lane,

Turn Falls