

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Ashley Quick
Submission Time: May 18 2023 4:56PM
Email: ashleysilvernell@gmail.com
Telephone: 303-475-4664
Address: 1011 E GREENWOOD CIR
BOISE, ID 83706-5136

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "Changing the compensation structure for on-site generated solar power yet again is absolutely ridiculous, and an obvious money grab by Idaho Power. There is less and less financial incentive for people to install their own solar. During the 100 degree heat-dome weeks when there's a desperate need for power and AC, you are going to need us to help stabilize the power supply. We're trying to help support the grid, and Idaho Power is nickel and diming us rather than working with the community. "

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: McKay Barlow
Submission Time: May 18 2023 5:18PM
Email: julzandmckay@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-539-9861
Address: 2424 Blick Lane
Twin Falls, ID 83301

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "We installed solar in our home in 2018 because we felt it was good for the environment and, in the long term, a good financial investment. This decision was based on rules and costs established by Idaho Power. Since then, Idaho Power has continued to change the rules making it less rewarding to use solar power and making consumers more dependent on them. The most recent changes proposed to Idaho Public Utilities Commission (reducing the compensation for electrical power produced by solar customers) clearly benefit Idaho Power but are based on a study PERFORMED BY IDAHO POWER! This is clearly a conflict of interest. Before any proposed changes are made, a study should be completed by an independent third party. "

Name: Crystal Emery
Submission Time: May 18 2023 5:50PM
Email: crystal.emery06@gmail.com

Telephone: 208-447-8112
Address: 116 Key Hole Dr
Jerome, ID 83338

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "To Whom it May Concern:

I received a letter about the proposed changes to the compensation structure for on-site generation and my husband and I as residential customers are against what is being proposed. We went into solar with the hopes of being a little more independent as our cost of electrical was astronomical getting as high at \$600-\$700 in the winter using our heat sparingly because of cost. We were cold most nights to preserve our power bill. It was our choice for solar but with the hope that we could be a little more comfortable. Because we decided to get more panels to offset cost of electricity if you go through with this proposed change it will affect us financially in a significant way. There will be no bank for us come winter as we understand it. The cost of paying off solar combined with paying Idaho Power will affect our family of 5. There has to be a better compromise available. I don't expect Idaho Power not to take something from us since we are still on the grid but for us to generate so much power in the summer and expect a lot less for us in the winter we will be paying 2 x as much. Please take young families like ours into consideration as we were trying to make things a little easier and warmer come winter.

Thank you for your time,
Curtis and Crystal Emery"

Name: Thomas Martin
Submission Time: May 18 2023 6:55PM
Email: tpm9709@yahoo.com
Telephone: 208-631-2934
Address: 9709 W CASCADE ST
Boise, ID 83704-9777

Name of Utility Company: Ada County

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "I have installed solar panels, on-site generation and have spent over \$17,000.00 in hope that my investment might break even in 15 years or so. With this new proposal, it would appear that the payoff period will become 20, 25 or maybe even 30-years. Who knows, as much of the information provided so far is vague and couched in terms of annual reevaluation to the ECR.

I believe the Idaho Power proposal before your commission greatly benefits Idaho Power Co and has intent to harm on-site power generation of its Idaho Power customers. Further, it will greatly reduce future installations of on-site generation systems (homeowners).

From the communications I received and the testimony I've reviewed, I can't calculate how moving to a financial credit system will change my bill, other than it will be larger (I'm unsure how much) and may change yearly based on an Idaho Power Co annual ECR request for change with parameters that are ill defined.

As many commentors have noted, there does not seem to be oversight of if credits are being properly applied. I've noticed that IP's billing statements don't appear to align with my current meter readings. I have concerns that "real-time net billing" likely is problematic and have concerns, without oversight, "rounding and other errors" likely will extend to who is calculating the bill, i.e.: Idaho Power Co.

To my way of thinking, any excess power I'm generating jumps from my house to a next-door neighbor (I'm the only one generating on-site power for any of the houses nearby). The idea of power loss and additional overhead costs seem highly overstated (VODER study) based on the number of on-site power generation sites now and into the foreseeable future.

The Federal and State governments believe on-site Solar Power generation to be valuable as they compensate individuals to take a chance on installation of costly systems. Idaho Power even suggests that power generated during peak demand is hugely valuable, yet they wish to "rig" the compensation away from Net-Metering to a vague compensation plan that they will provide annual ECR requests to modify, and these modifications most likely will favor them, and not their customers.

Idaho Power is generating large profits under the current rate structure, and it is difficult for me to believe that on-site power generation is harming Idaho Power or its Idaho Power customer base. The VODER study cited fairness to non-on-site power generation customers, but I believe the evidence provided was weak and failed to show any significant harm to any of its customers and likely discounted benefits of on-site generation customers keeping power demands lower and providing power onto the grid at near par value.

I would encourage the current board, with all of its new members, to reject changing from the current Net-Meter plan. The proposed plan favors Idaho Power Co. at the expense of its existing, non-grandfathered on-site power generation customers.

Thanks, Tom"

Name: Brian Fortuin
Submission Time: May 18 2023 7:03PM
Email: brian42in@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-308-2596
Address: 3819N 2538E
Twin Falls, ID 83301

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "I am writing to comment on Idaho Power's proposed change to how solar producers are treated. I am not a lawyer or an energy expert, but a consumer. I have lived in Idaho and purchased power from Idaho power since 1997. I had solar installed in 2022 and will add to my system this year.

I do not pretend to know the intricacies of how traditional power companies interact with sustainable power producers, but I do know why I installed solar and what factors went into that decision. I purchased solar to lighten the grid load, to reduce my carbon footprint and to, ultimately, save money. Idaho Power's proposal to move away from net metering towards billable reimbursement undermines the consumer's ability to invest, save and plan their power usage. All that a time differentiated export credit rate will accomplish is to allow Idaho Power to whipsaw small producers in an effort to increase Idaho Power's multimillion dollar profit.

To my mind, energy (KWH) is the commodity and trading energy for energy is the most fair, equitable and time honored approach. Perhaps, the trade should not be one-to-one due to the cost of "storing" the power and redelivering it at a different time; however, to change to a complex dollar reimbursement system lends itself to abuse. Idaho Power is a massive corporation that makes profit by selling energy. They have the expertise to invest in algorithms that take from the small, powerless residential producer in a manner that we cannot contest. Furthermore, the amount of work needed to ensure that all the credits were given properly would be massively more than using a strict KWH for KWH (or fraction thereof) methodology.

I implore the commission to see the perspective of Idahoans who have lived here for decades. We love our state and love the benefits of living here. One of those benefits is leadership that understands Idaho and its residents. Please avoid the temptation to acquiesce to a multimillion dollar company and support those of us who saved our money to buy a renewable energy system for the betterment of ourselves and our state.

Sincerely,
Brian Fortuin, MD"

Name: Kenneth Gough
Submission Time: May 18 2023 9:07PM
Email: drkengough@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-565-7918
Address: 6705 Joe Lane
Nampa, ID 83687

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "We spent \$40,000 1 year ago on a solar system that we have to pay off for 25 years and it doesn't even give us enough power. This proposal will penalize us and everyone else with solar systems. The power company needs to account for how much we have to spend to make it. We are still a producer and they use our power as we over-generate in sunny months. "

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Tom Weltner

Submission Time: May 19 2023 7:00AM

Email: tomweltner@hotmail.com

Telephone: 208-250-5555

Address: 21603 Tucker Road
Greenleaf, ID 83626

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "I am firmly against Idaho Power's proposed changes to compensation structure for in-site power generation. Like many who have installed solar generating systems, financial calculations were made based on the current compensation structure. The current compensation structure is simple and easy for the homeowner to understand. It would be difficult, if not impossible, for me to forecast my compensation under the proposed plan.

I urge the Idaho Public Utilities Commission to decline Idaho Power's request for changes to the compensation structure"
