

-----Original Message-----

From: PUCWeb Notification <[Do.Not.Reply@puc.idaho.gov](mailto:Do.Not.Reply@puc.idaho.gov)>

Sent: Monday, May 15, 2023 4:00 PM

To: Jan Noriyuki <[jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov](mailto:jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov)>

Subject: Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Marc Astin

Submission Time: May 15 2023 3:06PM

Email: [mtastin01@gmail.com](mailto:mtastin01@gmail.com)

Telephone: 208-731-0859

Address: 719 Riverview Drive

Twin Falls, ID 83301

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "ID. Absolute opposition. The IP Company is rich enough. There is no equity policy (ESG) for 'fair rates' that are consist with logic. I was promised by government that I would be treated fairly with my recent investment for solar instillation. These proposed changes still my investment, transferring it to big corporations and redistribution to those who don't/can't participate."

-----Original Message-----

From: PUCWeb Notification <[Do.Not.Reply@puc.idaho.gov](mailto:Do.Not.Reply@puc.idaho.gov)>

Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2023 9:00 AM

To: Jan Noriyuki <[jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov](mailto:jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov)>

Subject: Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Greg and Laura Blodgett

Submission Time: May 16 2023 8:09AM

Email: [gregblodgett1@gmail.com](mailto:gregblodgett1@gmail.com)

Telephone: 208-989-6170

Address: 7290 Old Bruneau Hwy

Marsing, ID 83639

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "Dear Sirs,

We are writing in regards to the proposed changes to Idaho Power billing for customers with on-site solar power generation.

We retired in 2019 and moved into what we hope is our long term retirement home. In just the last two years, we have seen our property taxes nearly double, and now it seems we may also see our electricity bill more than double despite our attempts to be more energy independent.

Of the relatively small number of people that we personally know who have installed solar, all are seniors/retirees who, like us, have added solar panels as part of an attempt to protect themselves from ever increasing energy costs.

Federal government incentives along with Idaho incentives encourage people to invest in solar power.

Idaho Power is interested in benefiting their shareholders by buying power from us for as low a price as they can and reselling it for a higher price, so this action is not unexpected.

The IPUC should be our advocate in this situation, looking out for the interests of Idaho citizens, and helping us make reasonably informed decisions about power. This was the case when older systems were previously grandfathered in.

While the VODER study has some discussion of the environmental benefit of solar, there is no value assigned to it. The IPUC should not allow for this benefit to be ignored.

When we installed our system in 2022, we understood that Idaho Power was actively fighting against the current Net Metering agreement. However, we could only make decisions based on known information. That information includes the apparent State and Federal government support to increase the number of these systems, the high initial investment of the system, and the expected payback period based on net metering.

We strongly urge IPUC to extend the legacy agreement to all existing systems and allow consumers to make knowledgeable decisions about adding new systems.

Increasing the cost to operate a residential solar system can only discourage future installations, but at least those customers will have the ability to analyze the cost/payback equation. If existing non legacy systems are not included, then we are being retroactively penalized for doing the very thing that our government encouraged us to do.

Sincerely,  
Greg and Laura Blodgett

-----

-----Original Message-----

From: PUCWeb Notification <[Do.Not.Reply@puc.idaho.gov](mailto:Do.Not.Reply@puc.idaho.gov)>

Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2023 2:00 PM

To: Jan Noriyuki <[jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov](mailto:jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov)>

Subject: Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Kirt Sloan

Submission Time: May 16 2023 1:28PM

Email: [farmerkirt@icloud.com](mailto:farmerkirt@icloud.com)

Telephone: 208-404-9046

Address: 551 Lochsa Road

Twin Falls, ID 83301

Name of Utility Company: IDAHO POWER

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "ID

I have read the information sent about changing the rates paid to Customer Generated Power. We installed our system in the Fall of 2022. We invested over \$19,000 after the tax credits were applied. This is a significant expense to generate renewable energy for our home and back to the grid. The decision to do this was based on the conditions when we installed the system. I understand fairness to all rate payers however we made the investment and need to recoup that investment. My concern is if you keep moving the goal posts over time, it will raise our cost of energy in opposition of our initial investment.

I could accept a grandfathered policy starting January 2023.

That way the excess power generated would be applied against the power we use at the same rate. This is a fair solution. If we generate power sent to the grid at a lower rate and then are charged for power we use during peak hours at a higher rate it makes little sense to make the investment in customer generated power. Rates continually adjusted can be factored in the Utilities favor penalizing the customers who made the investment toward renewable generation.

Sincerely

Kirt Sloan

Twin Falls, Idaho

208-404-9046"

-----

Name: Pete Friedman  
Submission Time: May 16 2023 1:55PM  
Email: [pfaicp@yahoo.com](mailto:pfaicp@yahoo.com)  
Telephone: 208-869-4969  
Address: 4088 W. Quail Ridge Dr.  
Boise, ID 83703

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "Dear Commissioners,  
We are writing to express our displeasure and opposition to the proposed application by Idaho Power and request these comments be made a part of the record of the commission proceedings.

We will try to be succinct.

Although it is too late, we object to the Commission's acceptance the Idaho Power's Cost Analysis. In our previous testimony, we suggested that the Commission identify objective independent parties for the applicant hire to do the study. Absent that, we suggested that the Commission hire an entity to conduct a peer review of the study. Neither occurred and we were left feeling that the acceptance was like having the tobacco industry write it own report on the safety of nicotine or big pharma conducting a study on the safety of opioids. As we all know, in the case of that latter, that did occur we know that turned out.

Now to the proposed compensation for us residential generators. There is much in the proposed rate structure that intuitively makes little sense.

As proposed, the peak hour compensation is for the hours of 3:00pm -11:00 pm. Our issue is that depending on the time of year and average daylight much of this time will be after sunset! For example on June 21st, sunset occurs around 9:20 pm. During the winter, much earlier, so we are not really receiving a real break.

We write these comments at approximately 1:36pm our system is generating some of the peak performance of the next few hours.

Conversely, the proposal to pay the reduced compensation from sunrise until 3:00pm seems disingenuous. During the spring and summer our system is actively generating from 10:00 am onward and sometimes earlier. Yet, until 3:00pm we will be compensated at the much lower rate.

It is also interesting to note, that Idaho Power has requested a rate increase due rising costs for generation due to the rise in natural gas prices, reduced hydraulic flows and increased cost for purchasing power elsewhere. It seems illogical that to disincentivize residential solar generation here at home. They should be doing all they can to make it more affordable and accessible.

Two years ago we invested a significant amount to go solar. As retirees we struggled with the decision for a couple of years. It was expensive, but in our minds worth it as a commitment to future of our grandchildren.

Our provider/contractor was an experienced company with many years of experience and a great reputation. They have subsequently left the Treasury Vally and Idaho. In conversations with the company president that individual stated that there were a few factors and the Idaho Power proposal was not the deciding factor, but certainly weighed heavily in that decision.

Given the information we have on the instant proposal, Idaho Power's "commitment to green/ clean energy rings hollow to us.

In summary, we request that the Commission deny the specific proposal and in the alternative adjust the peak hours to longer and more realistic times as well as increase the compensation for off peak hours.

Sincerely,

Pete and Betsy Friedman  
Boise

-----