

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Dan Hartigan
Submission Time: Oct 31 2023 9:15AM
Email: ruff-04.nets@icloud.com
Telephone: 208-275-9901
Address: 267 E Schmeizer Ln
Boise, ID 83706

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "Commissioners, I am not sure how to begin a meaningful analysis or comment on this case until IPC-E-23-11, general rate case, is resolved. That case is under sealed provisional settlement and no comment period deadline. Please vacate the comment deadline until IPC-E-23-11 is settled and then proceed with this case. Thank you."

Name: Caren DeAngelis
Submission Time: Oct 31 2023 9:18AM
Email: carendeangelis@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-890-9448
Address: 214 Sunrise Drive East
Sun Valley, ID 83353

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "Idaho Power is making a power play! Their proposed net metering is disingenuous to customers that already have solar panels. Their argument that solar customers don't pay "their fare share" is simply ridiculous! Solar customers DO pay for the grid but we also assist the grid- which in our neighborhood is strained at peak times. We are investing in the grid by spending on solar panels! Idaho Power is being greedy, dishonest and should not be permitted to ask for even more!"

Name: Sue Krohn
Submission Time: Oct 31 2023 9:40AM
Email: sjkrohn@rocketmail.com
Telephone: 108-505-7958
Address: 1811 W Sunny Slope Dr
Meridian, ID 83642-4338

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "When I got my solar panels, probably about 5 years ago, it was to make my electric bill lower so I could continue to afford it through my retirement years. However, only the first 2 years did I see a real difference. And it sounds like I am now going to have to split my "lower bill" with those who don't have it to be fair to them. I do not agree with this as "they" have not had the expense of putting in solar to save money, nor do I feel it is fair to take away what little I now get and divide it up with all those who don't have it. Am I completely wrong in my assumption?"

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Chad Miller
Submission Time: Oct 31 2023 11:11AM
Email: cmiller@petersoncars.com
Telephone: 208-323-5109
Address: 6375 W. Tobi Dr
BOISE, ID 83714

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "I read the article in Sunday's Idaho Press about the case before the PUC regarding reimbursement rates for customers generating their own power. I have been approached by companies supplying solar panels and my impression is that it is more profitable for those companies than for the consumers. I read the position of Idaho Power stated by Jordan Rodriguez and I agree with the position of Idaho Power. I support the freedom of consumers installing solar power but I believe the proposed changes in rates will be more fair to all of the Idaho Power customers."

Name: Samuel Davidson
Submission Time: Oct 31 2023 11:23AM
Email: sdavidson0819@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-298-7334
Address: 1402 Everett Street
Caldwell, ID 83605

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "I am a homeowner who is months away from purchasing solar panels, and it is apparent that the proposed changes to the compensation structure (from net metering to net billing) is, at best, an attempt to discourage future installation of solar generators. More likely, it is a short-term money grab and a long-term attempt to prolong the unsustainable status quo.

Surely the benefit of being recognized as a public utility, namely a guaranteed customer base for the foreseeable future, outweighs the costs, and as such, the primary consideration of any such entity should be the public good. I sincerely hope this ideal is at the heart of any decisions made by the PUC.

As I understand it, under the current net-metering system, homeowners who wish to stay connected to the grid still have to pay a nominal monthly fee for the privilege. If, as Idaho Power ostensibly claims, homes with solar panels shift the cost of maintenance to the rest of the customers, this monthly fee is the mechanism through which those costs should be recouped. The proposed net-billing structure is overly complicated and its primary goal seems to be the minimization of compensation for solar-generating homes, and consequently the minimization of solar panel installation.

I urge the commission to consider the public good that would be provided by widespread adoption of solar panels. Especially when these panels are coupled with on-site battery storage, the reduction in blackouts and brownouts is immense, almost to the point where such events could be eliminated completely. It's not much of an exaggeration to call this a matter of life and death, as many in-home medical patients rely on uninterrupted electric power to stay alive, not to mention the rest of the population who needs heat in the winter. A smart grid of decentralized power generation, the technology for which is *already built-in* to many current battery solutions, could sense local power outages and help to temporarily meet the needs of those affected. This is the future of electricity generation, and net-billing serves mainly to delay that future."
