

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Barry Martin
Submission Time: Jun 9 2023 6:45PM
Email: njoyrvue@msn.com
Telephone: 208-585-8917
Address: 11464 W Rosette Dr
Nampa, ID 83686

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "As retires on a fixed income, we wanted to fix or reduce our utility expenses. Based on current guidelines we installed solar on our home in 2022. The proposed changes would have a significant increase to our utility bill. We currently have payments to the solar company for the panels. For this reason we are opposed to changes in the compensation structure. "

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: TIMOTHY BARBOUR
Submission Time: Jun 11 2023 8:07AM
Email: Dinosaurjr679@aol.com
Telephone: 540-478-5332
Address: 9747 West Jadewood Drive
Boise, ID 83709

Name of Utility Company: Idaho power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "Idaho powers preposed change to solar net metering will do nothing but hurt individuals to generate revenue. Many of us invested in solar pannels without being informed of this potential change and as such did not factor into our system sizing or budgets.

This change if it goes thru will keep people from installing new systems."

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Joshua Van Dyke
Submission Time: Jun 11 2023 1:12PM
Email: jlvd1214@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-933-2666
Address: 3640A North 1000 East

Buhl, ID 83316

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power unfortunately

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "There are so many problems with the current Idaho Power (IP) proposal that I don't even know where to begin.

1. IP hypocritically wants customers to pay for system maintenance costs, yet there is no compensation for customers who maintain their power generation systems (solar).
2. Solar is NOT a different product-its all electrical energy in the end.
3. Who verifies the proposed annual appraisal and impact of reliability to assess new ECR?-without creating a conflict of interest?
4. The Voder study was NOT created in coordination with any affiliated parties nor the public-that's called manipulation.
5. Adjusting the ECR as proposed contradicts the IP 'green agenda' by decreasing the value of solar produced energy (thereby DISincentivising people to actually 'go green'.
6. Through these proposed changes, IP is also 'punishing' owners of solar systems for their efforts to be sustainable and who are actually in alliance with many green policies-it's a HUGE double standard!
7. There is an overall lack of checks and balances, and the proposals are based on rigged information. DO NOT ALLOW THESE PROPOSED CHANGES TO HAPPEN!"

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: James Obland
Submission Time: Jun 12 2023 10:17AM
Email: hogauge1@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-392-9432
Address: 407 Elk Creek Road
Idaho City, ID 83631

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "I don't believe that the power company should be allowed to cut the rates that apply to solar generators. In fact, I believe that the rates should be raised during peak hours. They charge more for power during peak periods for users but do not pay more to suppliers. So they pocket all the profits during these times. They want to be carbon-free, so they should generously compensate the solar generators."

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Ryan Williamson

Submission Time: Jun 12 2023 11:13AM

Email: gmouse11c@outlook.com

Telephone: 360-928-5285

Address: 30 Tamarack Ct

Garden Valley, ID 83622

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "I can't help but notice that this proposal provides a very tiny window of opportunity for customers to generate "on-peak" electricity, and an extremely large window for crediting customers half of today's rates.

- Tiny Window of Opportunity - There are 8760 hours in a year. The proposed "on-peak" window only offers an opportunity for solar customers to generate "On-Peak" rates for 618 of the 8760 hours per year (or ~7% of total billable hours annually). This is an impossibly small window to try to make the higher rates. And that's of course if you get lucky and it's sunny during those times.
- Impossible to make daily On-Peak rates for the majority of customers - This model pays a higher rate for customer generation from 3 pm – 11 pm (and doesn't include Sunday's OR holidays)? Half of these daily hours, the sun isn't shining so the vast majority of customers (who are grid-tie only) will have no option to take advantage of the higher on-peak credit rate. If they are lucky, they may make a higher rate for two or three hours per day for just 12 weeks out of the year (minus Sundays and holidays of course)!

Telling customers you'll credit them at a higher rate for energy they produce at 10 pm at night sure seems odd since undoubtedly most of your customer generation comes from solar (as opposed to other renewable sources that produce all hours of the day) and the sun doesn't shine at 10 pm at night(?) Its like giving someone an incentive for something they can't possibly achieve. Isn't that a bit cruel?

And why even build a higher credit tier if it only applies to 7% of your annual potential creditable hours (and really it's only ~4% because PV panels don't produce for almost half of the hours in the daily window (8pm-11pm)? It's almost pointless to even have the "On-Peak" tier because it hardly ever has to pay out. Why bother??

There are times in life when someone pisses down your back and tells you it's raining (be happy!). This definitely seems like one of those moments. "Thanks customer for investing all that money in solar to partner with us to help us meet our renewable energy goals! As a thank you, we're going to credit you half of what we normally compensate you, and then we'll give you a lottery ticket (On-Peak) as a consolation prize. Good luck!!"

Frustration aside, if I'm actually understanding this properly, this does seem like Idaho Power wants to credit us significantly less going forward for 95% of the potential creditable hours annually. I really wish I had known this was coming when we invested in the design and implementation of our quite expensive system 2 years ago. Our return on investment is now going to take a couple of decades with this change.

I make a point to never complain without offering potential solutions to the problem. Here are some thoughts that I'd like to add to the conversation with this group.

Possible Solutions:

- Increase "On Peak" opportunity window so it's easier to achieve - This could be realized through increasing On-Peak hours per day (12 pm-8pm maybe?) and also by increasing beyond 3 months out of the year (to maybe 4 months or 5 months out of the year?).
- Build a Third Tier – Design an additional tier that splits the difference between "On-Peak" and "Off-Peak". (Mid-Tier?) This might credit customers at ~12 cents and would kick in earlier in the day, maybe from 12 pm-3 pm or something along those lines.
- Just Stick With A Flat Rate Credit Model - Get rid of the hourly tiering system if it's not going to be implemented in a meaningful way to the vast majority of your customers. Go with a flat rate that is equitable to all solar customers; including all the people who have grid-tie only systems. (Systems with battery backup can potentially feed the grid after the sun goes down, but most solar customers do not have a battery/storage solution)

I strongly encourage you to reconsider the details and fundamentals used in this new proposed model. It's not fair to any of us who have tried to do the right thing by investing in renewable energy.

Sincerely,
Ryan W"
