

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Mary Stewart
Submission Time: Jun 1 2023 11:00AM
Email: mste0195@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-440-5291
Address: 1254 E Whig Dr
Kuna, ID 83634

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "I am writing to express my disapproval of the request by Idaho Power to change its on-site generation offering. There has been a significant push for residents to transition to solar energy, which many residents have done. This change is an obvious attempt to recoup money lost by Idaho Power. By that I mean, they are receiving less money from customers who are now generating their own power. They can no longer raise rates on us, so they are attempting to do that with these changes. The idea that customers without solar are subsidizing the rates for self-generating customers is ridiculous. Self-generating customers are reducing the demand for power generated by Idaho Power, which reduces the demand on the grid during peak power times, including summer. I respectfully request that you deny this request by Idaho Power. "

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Matthew Stalker
Submission Time: Jun 1 2023 12:31PM
Email: purdumatt@yahoo.com
Telephone: 208-721-3141
Address: 12170 State Highway 75
Hailey, ID 83333

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "Please append the following comment to my comment from 5-23-23:

...

But a functioning grid is a foundation for all other assumptions herein, and incentivizing (or at least not penalizing) distributed resources is critical to Idaho's future. Forward-thinking about preparedness is critical to IPUC's mission and to remove that capability from IPUC's hands in the future is not something I want to see happen.

Last, in the public interest is conservation. Idaho Power puts out hundreds of thousands of impressions on conserving electricity and doing our part. Yet they do not apply the same framework to the solar generators providing additional power at peak temperature events. This double standard is to be noted.

The Idaho public would also benefit from diversified sources of jobs. Technological innovation, industry development, and energy independence align with residential solar.
Thank You.

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Kelly Mooney
Submission Time: Jun 1 2023 1:52PM
Email: jksm01@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-850-8369
Address: 7153 E Highland Valley Rd
Boise, ID 83716

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "As a residential on-site generation customer, I am opposed to the proposed changes in the compensation structure. I made a personal financial decision of great magnitude (\$86K) to install rooftop solar. That decision was based on the current compensation structure and the business case outlined by the solar installation company. I agreed with their financial analysis, based on the current arrangements for on-site solar generation and my unique property details. To now change that financial dynamic for "non-legacy" customers is patently unfair.

If the PUC determines this proposed change from Idaho Power is appropriate, it should NOT be levied on customers that made business decisions before the changes were enacted. Further, the Idaho Power claim that is outlined in IPC-E-22-22 stating that customers such as myself are being subsidized by other ratepayers is very difficult to follow, which greatly diminishes the credibility of the Idaho Power claim. As your IPUC news release stated, "The primary objective of the on-site generation study and corresponding modifications to the program is to establish a sustainable on-site generation program that is fair and equitable. Ideally, the parameters of the program should minimize or eliminate cross-subsidies that could exist between participants and non-participants of on-site generation." I challenge the PUC to claim that my on-site generation is a 'cross-subsidy' benefiting me personally at the expense of non-participants or the very profitable Idaho Power Corporation.

Idaho Power should be pursuing efficient operations and dividends for their shareholders but NOT at the expense of on-site generation customers that made financial calculations based on the current compensation structure. Changing it without amending the "non-legacy" status of customers is unjust and your duty as a commission is to deny the Idaho Power proposal."

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Rick Aldinger
Submission Time: Jun 1 2023 3:34PM
Email: radinger8@outlook.com

Telephone: 208-870-4950
Address: 9433 W Deerfawn Dr
Star, ID 83669

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "I oppose the "Proposed changes to the compensation structure for on-site generation" that was outlined in Idaho Powers letter to customers with on-site generation.

1. Isn't the goal to be less energy dependent and as Idaho Power states on their web site, 'cleaner today, tomorrow, working together and caring for the environment'? On-site generation/solar systems are reducing usage during peak hours, as well as reducing some of the strain on the grid/infrastructure. The solar systems also provide Idaho Power with the ability to sell excess power that hopefully benefits other Idaho Power customers and/or cover their costs for additional rebates, incentives, etc.

2. Idaho Power provides all kinds of incentives, rebates and credits for installing energy efficient appliances, insulation, doors, windows, weatherization programs, and Easy Savings coupons for a free electric furnace or heat pump tune-up. All of these programs help reduce energy usage and dependence. Are these customers penalized for using less electricity? Technically they see a kWh for kWh when reducing power usage. Roof top solar generation provides similar benefits as all of the programs Idaho Power promotes and subsidizes, potentially providing more benefits to Idaho Power and their customers.

3. The new compensation proposal for solar systems/on-site generation, is very complicated, vague and difficult to follow/understand. Following is an excerpt from the letter: 'maybe valued around 10 cents (?), time differentiated financial bill (?); ranging from approximately 5 to 20 cents (?), updated annually, no carry over, maybe some?

4. Bottom line, the new pricing is not fair. Look at the 'average monthly bill impact' chart they proposed; customers using the least amount of power would pay more than 30% increase, i.e. \$5 to \$12 or \$23 to \$35 is more than a 30% increase. Majority of solar customers are at the lower tier of solar usage. Why are customers with installed solar systems who are using less energy being penalized for providing additional benefits to Idaho Power?

5. It is unfortunate that there are only 3,754 customers generating power via roof top solar systems (see Idaho Power Chart). The population and energy usage in Idaho is going to increase. Idaho and Idaho Power should be leading the way to promote more solar usage, not penalizing households that install solar.

Summary, Idaho Powers new proposal is discriminatory towards solar installations, one sided, arbitrary, complicated, vague, confusing, and very penalizing for current as well as future solar owners. Actually, the VODER study is contradictory to other studies. The new proposal does not talk about the costs moving to a new system. Does it require new equipment, additional equipment, major administrative changes, etc?

Let's actually work Together and help Idaho Power move towards their goal "Clean Today. Cleaner Tomorrow[®], 100% clean energy by 2045". Maybe current/future solar installations can help improve the date as well as meet various goals Idaho Power has stated on their web site.

Thank you for your time.

Rick
