

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Carol Hughes  
Submission Time: Nov 6 2023 8:13PM  
Email: [cghughes@pacbell.net](mailto:cghughes@pacbell.net)  
Telephone: 925-212-2895  
Address: 216 Elkhorn Road  
Sun Valley, ID 83353

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "We installed 17 solar panels on our roof in May 2022 costing \$17,000. We did this to reduce our energy costs, decrease our dependence on the grid and fossil fuels, and to reduce our impact on climate change.

Idaho Power's proposal to change its compensation structure will undermine our energy savings, discourage other residents from installing solar, and ultimately increase our dependence on fossil fuels. At a minimum, I urge you to adopt a system like Nevada and Arizona that locks in the initial Export Credit Rate for 10 years in order to provide financial stability for this major, long-term investment. This would help to encourage people to install solar panels and assist in paying off the large expense incurred when a solar system is purchased.

Please reject Idaho Power's current proposal to change the solar credit system."

-----

Name: Jack Garrett  
Submission Time: Nov 6 2023 8:34PM  
Email: [fugal\\_frames0n@icloud.com](mailto:fugal_frames0n@icloud.com)  
Telephone: 208-918-4523  
Address: 2025 E Chateau Dr  
Meridian, ID 83646

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "Dear Idaho Public Utility Commissioners,

Amid inflation, rising energy costs and grid instability, it's clear that Idaho Power should be doing a whole lot more to promote rooftop solar. Instead, the utility has submitted a proposal (Case Number IPC-E-23-14) that would make going solar harder and more expensive.

Idaho Power is proposing a drastic overhaul to net metering with a complicated set of charges and credits. If these proposals are approved by the Public Service Commission, they will make solar unaffordable and inaccessible for you, and our working families.

Net metering is a billing policy that ensures solar customers receive full, fair retail credit from their utility for the excess energy they produce. People and businesses in Idaho Power's coverage area rely on net metering so they can use solar to produce their own energy. No one that has solar makes money off of it. In turn, they receive a bill credit for the electricity they send back to the grid and share with their neighbors. The proposed changes to net metering would have a devastating impact on customers who have already gone solar or are thinking about going solar, at a time when they can least afford it.

Additionally, the proposed reduction and/or potential elimination of net metering diminishes the economic potential for the rooftop solar industry to grow and create local jobs. Net metering is the keystone policy that keeps solar economically viable and helps solar customers earn a return on their investment in clean energy. It takes years to get the return as well.

I urge you to oppose Idaho Power (Case Number IPC-E-23-14) proposal that would diminish the benefits of rooftop solar and prevent more families from going solar.

Thank you for your consideration."

-----  
Name: Dexter Pitman  
Submission Time: Nov 6 2023 8:56PM  
Email: [dvpitman2@outlook.com](mailto:dvpitman2@outlook.com)  
Telephone: 208-241-0041  
Address: 13689 N MARBLE DR  
Pocatello, ID 83202

Name of Utility Company: private party

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "I am opposed to approval of this IPC proposal by the Commission. Doing so will continue to allow IPC and other public utilities to set Idaho Energy Policy by their business plans rather than the Idaho Office of Energy and Mineral Resources, Idaho Strategic Energy Alliance and ultimately the Idaho Public Utilities Commission. "the primary thrust of net metering is to provide customers the opportunity offset their own load and energy requirements. ...However that it may reconsider the way net metering customers receive credit for excess energy." IDA COR needs revenue to maintain their stock status (IDA Security Review). Interest Payments are not well covered by earnings; Dividend is not well covered. I get it! IPC Calculation of Revenue Impact. Table page 329. Percent change base to base: Residential Service On-Site Generation 60.82 %' Small Service On-Site Generation 70.39%. All other classes 0.00%. This is company business policy not Idaho Energy Resilience Policy. Even as a Legacy Customer I will begin paying more with planned fixed monthly service charges than my pre-roof top solar power bill to IPC. Absolutely no program by IPC to encourage roof top solar as potential energy sourcing for the future. No industry. No Jobs related to RRTS unless one goes off-the-grid. What a waste. My RRTS investment will not make 3.16% Annually as my equivalent IDA Security. It will be a freebee for IPC. The IPUC regulates investor owned electric...utilities..To ensure adequate service, just reasonable and sufficient rates. I see nothing just, reasonable or reliable about this IPC rate case proposal. Only sufficient (RRTS Rate Payer Subsidy) for Ida Corp Business Plan. Thank You for the opportunity to express my reaction."

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Bert Hughes  
Submission Time: Nov 7 2023 8:36AM  
Email: [hrhughes62g@gmail.com](mailto:hrhughes62g@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 925-640-9915  
Address: 215 Elkhorn Rd  
Sun Valley , ID 83353

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "Please reject Idaho Power's proposal to change the Solar Credit rates. We installed solar panels on our roof at a net cost of approximately \$17,000 in May 2022. We began the process almost immediately after purchasing our home because we believe in reducing our net power consumption. I understand that Nevada and Arizona lock in the Export Credit Rate for solar power for a period of 10 years. This seems very reasonable, and I think it's important to maintain good incentives for people to install solar panels and reduce their dependence on fossil fuel.

Herbert R Hughes  
Sun Valley ID 83353"

---

**From:** LISA HECHT <[heartfeltson@msn.com](mailto:heartfeltson@msn.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 6, 2023 5:37 PM  
**To:** Jan Noriyuki  
**Cc:** LISA HECHT <[heartfeltson@msn.com](mailto:heartfeltson@msn.com)>  
**Subject:** IPC-E-23-14 Case Comments

Dear Idaho PUC,

Please submit my comments below for case IPC-E-23-14, which are due before November 8.

Lisa Hecht

\*\*\*

Dear Idaho PUC Commissioners,

Thank you for your service, and for extending the opportunities for Idaho Power customers to provide input on IPC-E-23-14.

I live in Boise. I am an Idaho Power customer since 1980, a retired electrical engineer, a shareholder since 1959, and a mother of a 30-year-old and a 27-year-old, who will inherit the earth we leave to them. I've attended Idaho Power IRP meetings for decades. I've had solar panels on my roof since 2016, so have personal experience with the functioning and financial aspects of that decision.

As commissioners, you are charged with setting fair and reasonable rates and protecting customers where utility monopolies provide services such as electricity, gas, and water. The decisions you make will impact customer financial well-being, the financial well-being of our business communities (both Idaho Power and solar installers, for example), and our energy future and sovereignty; our ability to use the solar, wind and other natural energy resources with which Idaho is blessed.

Having read most of the Application submitted by Idaho Power and attended a hearing in Boise, my comments follow.

1. **Energy netting intervals:** IPC is using hourly netting for META's and Micron's self-generation; but proposes instantaneous for Residents and Small Generation customers. Why are these customer classes being treated differently?
2. **Include Independent Third-Party Valuations:** Allowing Idaho Power, the filer of this proposal, to suggest the value of customer exports, is a case of the fox guarding the henhouse. They will be inherently biased on tilting rates (ECR, etc.) in their favor, with their inside knowledge. Please give full and fair consideration of the differences between what IPC is proposing and how it differs from what a third party, Crossborder, proposes for ECR and other valuations related to this case. I've seen solar valuations from 26 states, and they include many more (and higher) values of customer-generated solar than are being included here.
3. **Respect Customer ROI:** Idaho Power proposes to update the ECR frequently. While the ECR should reflect energy values as they change (e.g., with more solar and less coal generation), customers who invest their hard-earned money in solar should have rates existing at the time of their PV installation apply for at least 5 years. Hearings I've attended on this always included retirees attempting to reduce their ongoing energy

costs. Who will invest in adding this capacity to Idaho Power's total generation if they can't even estimate Return on Investment (ROI) or Break-Even-Time (BET)?

4. **Time-of-Day Pricing and Granularity:** I am pleased to see that Idaho Power's proposed ECR includes peak and off-peak pricing, which could be even more granular in the future to shave peaks and reduce overall cost. I'm pleased that the ECR valuation is much higher during seasonal peaks, reflecting costs then.
5. **Lower Fixed Connect Fees:** Many studies around the U.S. have shown that fixed and high connect fees discourage both energy efficiency and investment in customer solar. This is the wrong message to send to the potentially very large market for solar and energy conservation, when Idaho and the U.S. will be needing more of both. Minimize connect fees. Transmission and distribution costs may change in the future with more microgrids. Residential and Small Generation Investments in solar reduce the need for IPC's investment in transmission, batteries, wind and solar.
6. **Include externalities** which all IPC customers will pay if not accounted for in rates. Our energy economics must value those most important things that support human and other life: a habitable planet, with clean air and water. Those are better accounted for in the Crossborder study. There are means to monetize the renewable energy attributes of solar; please maintain a placeholder for that and re-evaluate those values annually.
7. **Lastly, I ask the PUC commissioners to consider how this and other rate-design decisions will affect the grid of the future such that it benefits all.** If customer solar generation is not fairly valued, customers will either stop purchasing solar PV systems, or will install batteries to keep the energy that IPC is undervaluing. This results in transmission and distribution losses because instead of local, distributed resources, energy will be generated far away, and line losses will be greater. This also reduces opportunities for microgrids and a more locally resilient system. ECR 43 in the Application asserts: "The product that customer generators are exporting to Idaho Power system is inherently different than the service Idaho Power is providing to its customers." In one respect it is superior, in that my excess exported energy goes directly to my neighbors, with no transmission loss and minimal distribution loss. It is also less impacted by outage events farther away. It's also superior in that customers can use our rooftops to generate energy, reducing the need to put panels in farm fields that could be better used for growing food or for open space for Idaho's amazing wildlife. If customer solar generation is appropriately valued, we will be able to harness the power of customer investment, the free market.

Thank you for your service and for reading and considering my comments in your decision.

Sincerely,

Lisa Hecht  
4920 E Sagewood Drive  
Boise, ID. 83716

---

**From:** Kaye Turner <[kytietyner@gmail.com](mailto:kytietyner@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, November 6, 2023 5:50 PM

**To:** Jan Noriyuki

**Subject:** Case IPC-E-23-14 comments

Thank-you for this opportunity to comment on the Idaho Power request for a rate hike to home solar users.

The IPUC should reject the rate hike proposed to solar system owners. If approved it would result in a future rate hike to all customers. This is because when homeowners review such a rate hike, they will not acquire solar systems at anywhere near the percentage that do now. With this reduced contribution of solar power to the grid, it would necessitate Idaho power to compensate this loss by buying power by traditional sources, including coal and natural gas sources. But these traditional sources cost significantly more than the low cost of managing the solar power input to the grid. (Which is the basis of this rate hike request. )

After all, the home-owners themselves buy the solar system that adds power to the grid! Granted, Idaho Power must meter the system and manage it so it is not totally free but it is certainly less costly than the alternative: which is paying for power from coal and natural gas! ( Idaho Power charges homeowners \$5.21 a month- a fee to recover Idaho Power's solar management costs.)

It should be noted by the IPUC that home-owners are very keen about reviewing their power usage and comparing the cost of solar vs reduced monthly bills before purchasing a system. The tipping point on this decision is very tight and will be changed by the rate hike, such that much, much fewer home-owners will purchase a system.

Therefore the current Earned Credit System, using monthly balances is the simplest and fairest system, one that in the long run saves all customers of Idaho Power.

Therefore the IPUC should keep Idaho Power's existing monthly billing and compensation rate.

Thank-you  
Kaye Turner  
838 W. Bonneville St.  
Pocatello, ID 83204  
[kytietyner@gmail.com](mailto:kytietyner@gmail.com)

---

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Darrell Calton  
Submission Time: Nov 7 2023 9:08AM  
Email: [herkcalton@gmail.com](mailto:herkcalton@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 208-954-3166  
Address: 671 W White Sands Dr  
Meridian, ID 83646

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "Idaho Power is attempting to unfairly change net metering in Idaho to scrape in more money for the utility at a cost that is nearly undefineable to Idaho customers that have invested heavily in our economic and ecological futures. As a senior citizen, on the cusp of retirement, I and many like me, pulled hard earned savings, retirement funds in some cases, to prepay our electricity usage in what is supposed to be our golden years, through the upside of net metering. Will Idaho Power return my entire investment of \$52,000 after they again "move the goalposts"? There will be long term damages if regulators approve this. "

-----

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Lila Dressen  
Submission Time: Nov 7 2023 10:28AM  
Email: [lstamps2@aol.com](mailto:lstamps2@aol.com)  
Telephone: 530-601-6038  
Address: 4453 N 2157 E  
Filer, ID 83328-5095

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "Idaho Power's justifies their request for a reduction in the compensation structure of excess energy production provided by roof top solar by saying they want to make sure the pricing of power is fair for all customers. They claim the current pricing policy overcompensate customers with solar at the expense of customers without. I have a hard time understanding that logic. Everyone is pushing green energy. Those of us who have gone along with the idea of solar have spent between \$40,000 and \$50,000 to install systems on our roofs with the idea of receiving some kind of benefit for the investment. Under current policy that return takes at least 10 years. If you installed solar before December 20, 2019 you will continue to get that benefit...if you are after that date you missed the boat. Is Idaho Power not benefiting from our roof top units in the same manner as units installed before December 20, 2019? Idaho power doesn't have to provide us power five to six months out of the year and we are providing them our excess power during these period. Doesn't that delay the need for them to build additional power sources to meet everyone's needs? Surely that should be worth a even exchange in what they give us for our excess power. Installing solar in a major investment. With a even

credit the payback period is already atleast 10 years. By allowing Idaho Power to reduct that amount by a large amount moves that payback to 20 years or more. They are in effect trying to put solar companies out of business to their benefit as the move for solar grows. Returns that far out don't encourage people to make the investment in solar. Any adjustments in the net metering policy should be based on a review made by an independent, non partisan group. Please don't let Idaho Power divide us in to those who have and those who haven't installed solar as a reason for this adjustment to the net-metering policy.  
Thank you.

---

**From:** daniel farrell <[dwfjef@gmail.com](mailto:dwfjef@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 7, 2023 11:25 AM  
**To:** Jan Noriyuki  
**Subject:** comments on IPC-E-23-14

Please add the following comments to case IPC-E-23-14

Dan Farrell

3621 S Basilica Way, Meridian, ID 83642

Note: I shared some of the comments below in the Oct 24 public meeting; however, was unable to cover all the topics in the 3 minutes allotted. Here is the full text of what I wanted to say.

I am a homeowner who installed a 5.8KW Grid tied system in July 2020. I did it for the same reasons as others before me: help the environment and save some money in the long run. I installed the system in spite of the uncertainty created by the effort to change the terms for on-site generation because I felt home solar was the right thing to do.

While the effort went on to change the terms of on-site generation, my system has produced a total of 30.1 MWh, exported a total of 18.6 MWh with a net export over my home usage of 1.3 MWh. That is so exciting to me and makes me glad I didn't wait in spite of the uncertainty. Now that IPC-E-23-14 has been proposed I am concerned that the changes therein hurt those who have already installed solar by significantly increasing our costs. It also disincentivizes those who are considering solar by creating uncertainty in their operating costs and the economic evaluation that anyone investing in residential solar considers.

Here are some my issues with IPC-E-23-14:

1. My monthly operating costs (bill from Idaho power) due to IPC-E-23-14 will go up from \$5/month to \$12/month – an additional \$1,680 over the 20 year life of my system. That's a 15% increase in my overall system cost over its lifetime. And I'm one of the lucky ones with western facing panels that generate power during the proposed peak summer hours. Others will see a much larger increase.



2. I don't trust the annual avoided cost credit (ACC) and export credit rate (ECR). I've seen wildly different numbers proposed for the ACC and ECR. That variability leads me to think it hasn't been adequately vetted. Here are my questions and concerns:

- a. Is it relatively stable or highly volatile? What would the value of the ACC/ECR have been over the past 10 years if it had been in place? What is the projected value of the ACC/ECR for the next few years?
- b. What are the factors in and out of Idaho Power's control that can influence the ACC/ECR?
- c. How will different Idaho power initiatives (infrastructure/accounting/etc.) impact the ACC/ECR? How will the ACC/ECR change when energy storage systems are brought online?
- d. What factors are missing from the ACC/ECR that need to be included? Is the value of the ACC/ECR low because of these missing factors? Who has decided not to include them and why?
- e. Will this calculation be automatically done every year and applied without commission or customer review? Is that wise given the fact this is a new, untested metric? I think there should be a review/approval any time its value is changed.
- f. The uncertainty in the ACC/ECR is a huge disincentive to residential solar as it makes the calculation of operating costs a guess.

2. I am thoroughly confused by the fact that IPC-E-23-14 is being considered concurrently with IPC-E-23-11 (GRC) and that the GRC schedules do not reflect the new provisions of IPC-E-23-14. The rates in 23-14 are only set until May 31, 2024, the GRC rates will be the ones that matter and, for me, the test case on the effect of the changes on residential solar owners. And when I looked at the new proposed GRC (IPC-E-23-11) to see what might be coming down the road, I was stunned by what I saw – a complete upheaval in the pricing including a change to impose a service charge to recover fixed costs as opposed a charge in the volumetric rates. This change alone would mean much higher costs to low volume users like me. Since I only use 400kWh/month on average, my volumetric rate would need to go down by  $\$10/400 = 2.5\text{cents/kWh}$  if the service charge increased to  $\$15/\text{month}$  for my pricing to stay the same ( $30/400 = 7.5\text{cents/kWh}$  when the service charge hits  $\$35/\text{month}$ ). Did the price of residential power decrease in IPC-E-23-11? I looked at the proposed rates to see how much my rate would go down and instead saw it go up! There was nothing there to offset the higher service charge! I could easily see my 20-year operating costs increase by  $\$7,200$  or more by only the service charge provision of IPC-E-23-11 when it hits  $\$35/\text{month}$ . High service charges are a bad idea for all customers and an especially bad idea for residential generators.

3. Idaho power argued that the recovery of fixed costs through a service charge was a modernization of their rate structure and that it brought greater fairness into the rates. Yes, recovery of fixed costs through volumetric charges is a very old idea. However, it has worked wonderfully for centuries at stores, gas stations and power companies. Consider a gas station that has decided to charge a monthly service charge to any who wants their gas. And what would they get for that service charge? The privilege of getting as much gas as they wanted – with a small discount! The station across the street sells gas at a slightly higher price – without a service charge. Where are you going to shop? Large volume users may well opt for the new station if it saves them money. However, small volume users will stay with the station without the service charge as it saves them money. It's no different for our power. Unfortunately, we

don't have the option of choice as Idaho Power is our only service provider. Please protect us from this!

4. One final observation. Overall, the increase in revenue for schedule 6 in IPC-E-23-14 for all customers is 62% from \$8.9M to \$14.4M (\$5.5M) without any decrease to any other schedule. Does the \$5.5M simply become additional profit? Or is it refunded back somehow to Schedule 1 users? I couldn't find the answer in the proposal but suspect that the increased revenue simply goes to the bottom line of Idaho Power.

So, here are my requests with regard to IPC-E-23-14:

1. IPC-E-23-14 is bad for residential solar and should be rejected on that basis alone.
2. Don't adopt the current proposed ACC/ECR without additional due diligence.
3. Put in place mechanisms to have a formal review/approval of annual ACC/ECR changes.
4. Make sure any increased funds from IPC-E-23-14 are paid to Schedule 1 customers.
5. Don't move recovery of fixed costs from volumetric rates to customer service fees.
6. Complete IPC-E-23-11 and then adjust IPC-E-23-14 based on the approved GRC.

---

I'm not sure the Commission received this public comment due to a typo in the Commission email address and thought it best to bring it to your attention.

**From:** Rose McDonald <[rosemcdonald@nnu.edu](mailto:rosemcdonald@nnu.edu)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 7, 2023 11:26 AM

**To:** [secretart@puc.idaho.gov](mailto:secretart@puc.idaho.gov); Nordstrom, Lisa  
Megan

IPCDockets

Goicoechea Allen,

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Case #IPC-E-23-14

Dear Idaho Public Utility Commission:

We purchased our solar panels under certain conditions just over a year ago and that is what we expect for the life of the contract. It seems to us that we could be working in tandem with Idaho power to help solve some of our power deficit problems but proposing such net metering policies I believe would push

a lot of solar customers to purchase batteries so that they are not connected to Idaho Power. If we did buy batteries we would not have to worry about such policies changing in the future and Idaho Power would not be benefiting from our panels in any way. I know we are now considering a battery system as this is the second time within our first year of being solar customers that Idaho Power is attempting to change what we signed up for. It was a huge investment for our family but one we felt would help not only our bottom line but also the environment. These terms should not be allowed to affect anyone who is already a customer, it is not a productive move for Idaho Power.

We urge you to deny Idaho Power's proposal and continue to allow Idahoans the freedom to generate their own energy.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Rose and Brian McDonald  
New Plymouth, Idaho  
208-570-7916

---

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Jan Long  
Submission Time: Nov 7 2023 11:36AM  
Email: [janfreemanlong@gmail.com](mailto:janfreemanlong@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 707-484-9703  
Address: 5479 W Rosslare Dr  
Eagle, ID 83616

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power Company

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "My comment is directed to the issue of Idaho Power Company customers who have invested in home solar panels. My retired husband and I moved to Idaho in 2017, and in January 2022 we had pulled together the funds to invest in solar panels for our home. We obviously will not be grandfathered in to any existing agreement to help us out financially, and now we have learned that Idaho Power Company is renegeing on the information we were given while researching whether or not it made sense to invest in solar panels.

As well, I fail to see how other Idahoans are having to pay extra because of solar panels being installed by some of IPC's customers. Please factor in the substantial investment made by those of us who have panels. In our case, it was approximately \$30,000. When we did our math before making a final decision, we factored in what we were told by IPC. Now, you want to change your system substantially. It appears that because we who have solar panels on our roofs are in the minority, we now have no voice in the

matter. And, we somehow jeopardize the billing structure for those without solar panels even as we add free power to the system. As well, our willingness to invest in renewable energy is now going to be punished. I hope you will take the time and fairly assess how this affects owners of solar panels, many of us on fixed incomes. Please factor in the full story.

Thank you,  
Jan Long"

---

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Del Dickerson  
Submission Time: Nov 7 2023 12:41PM  
Email: [ds2k@msn.com](mailto:ds2k@msn.com)  
Telephone: 208-858-8850  
Address: 1035 Beverly Dr  
Eagle, ID 83616

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "Dear Commissioners,

I write in opposition Idaho Power's proposed changes to the net metering rate structure.

As you know, Idaho Power has been trying to undermine the incentives for residential rooftop solar for many years. This, their latest attempt, tries to make the case that rooftop solar shifts the burden for grid maintenance onto customers don't have rooftop solar.

I find this laughable. Idaho Power is a publicly traded company. The only clients that they care about are their shareholders. Idaho Power does not give a rat about customers who don't have rooftop solar. What they do care about is their bottom line, and residential solar generators have the potential to turn their business model on its head. They want to sell power, or, as in this case, buy it at rates favorable to them.

Idaho Power pays my neighbors and I to turn off our irrigation pump on summer evenings when demand is high (see Peak Rewards program), but they don't want to pay me market rates for my solar power during these same periods.

Idaho Power is all for solar - as long as they're the producers! Are Idaho Power's solar arrays also unfair to residential customers who don't have rooftop solar?

Please vote to oppose this proposal. Thank you for your consideration.

---

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Leroy Kerby  
Submission Time: Nov 7 2023 1:12PM  
Email: [lckerby@msn.com](mailto:lckerby@msn.com)  
Telephone: 208-340-9819  
Address: 997 Cow Horse Drive  
Kuna, ID 83634

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "I am opposed to Idaho Powers request to remove net metering and moving to their proposed hourly tru-up. This is not fair to consumers and is only being sought to increase revenue and profits at customers expense. It will greatly deminish the ROI on solar panels, which they are using the power generated and selling at full price for a profit. "

---

Name: john decker  
Submission Time: Nov 7 2023 1:28PM  
Email: [k9decker@gmail.com](mailto:k9decker@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 206-713-0804  
Address: P.O. Box 430  
Cald , ID 83606

Name of Utility Company: Idaho power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "I have solar power and love it.  
We had solar installed to do our share to protect the environment and to help Idaho power.  
Please do not change the rate!  
Thank you"

---

Name: Jeremy Fort  
Submission Time: Nov 7 2023 1:46PM  
Email: [jeremyfort@hotmail.com](mailto:jeremyfort@hotmail.com)  
Telephone: 602-405-8008  
Address: 601 S Eisenhower St  
Jerome, ID 83338

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "We am requesting IPUC to reject Idaho Power's proposal to reduce solar energy compensation. Just a year ago, we completed the installation of rooftop solar panels and batteries to reduce our energy costs and create clean energy. My wife and I took this action to lower our power costs, and we believed that selling power back to Idaho Power would help them offset large infrastructure costs incurred because Idaho's population is growing.

Given my experience in the public sector, I am aware that utilities will craft proposals that are weighted in their favor. We ask that you reject the current proposal and mandate that Idaho Power institute a minimum 10-year guarantee to preserve the credit rate at the time of installation.

We made a major investment that we believed would benefit us and Idaho Power, and now we are at the mercy of IPUC to protect home generators such as ourselves. Please act on our behalf to reject Idaho Power's proposal and protect our credit rates."

-----

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Jeffrey Stevenson  
Submission Time: Nov 7 2023 2:28PM  
Email: [allawishish.steve@gmail.com](mailto:allawishish.steve@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 406-212-1268  
Address: 22624 Aura Vista Way  
Caldwell, ID 83607

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "ID  
The kind of incentive / rate structure currently offered for Residential Solar Generators by Idaho Power does many things but the most important is to promote Residential Solar Generation which is very important. Please deny the change they request. It could kill Residential Solar Generation! Thank you"

-----

**From:** [john@bluebirdsolaridaho.com](mailto:john@bluebirdsolaridaho.com) <[john@bluebirdsolaridaho.com](mailto:john@bluebirdsolaridaho.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 7, 2023 3:48 PM  
**To:** Jan Noriyuki  
**Subject:** IPC-E-23-14 comment

Hello,

My name is John Reuter. I've run a small solar company in Hailey, ID since 2016. Please don't let Idaho Power kill residential solar power. Help this state be a renewable energy leader. Give citizens a right to

produce their own energy. Help Idaho be a leader in conservation. Please. We all know the rate proposal from Idaho Power is terrible...it will be the death of residential solar in this state.

Please.

Thank you.

John Reuter

126 S Main St, Suite B4

Hailey, ID 83333

[www.johnreutergreenworks.com](http://www.johnreutergreenworks.com)

208.721.2922

To IPUC,

I have been following the news articles of late regarding Idaho Powers proposed net metering rate schedule. We have this scenario due to the fact this same IPUC members voted to allow Idaho Power to request this proposed rate schedule by disallowing a neutral report versus the one Idaho Power was allowed to conduct. Gee, no conflict of interest there right?

So, now we are at the next phase of the process, and hoping this time around the people with solar are listened to and use their thoughts and info to help produce what Idaho Power keeps claiming their trying to do "which is make it fair to all." That is if you believe Idaho Powers talk? If they really wanted to make it fair, Idaho Power would start undoing those grandfathered in under the legacy program. Because Idaho Powers argument is that those on solar are causing those not with solar to cover more of the infrastructure costs. So, let us start with those with solar who have nothing to worry about if Idaho Power really is trying to make it fair for all. I know this is not a reality, but it goes to show you Idaho Powers hypocrisy with this issue.

People on solar are benefitting the power companies, not costing them money. It would be different if Idaho Power were paying and installing solar on people's houses, but they are not. The homeowner is bearing all the costs. And Idaho Power is reaping all the benefits by not having the added infrastructure costs yet take all the excess power generated and sell on the open market or use it to power other local homes. And this process allows Idaho Power to reduce their costs because they are not needing to purchase additional power from the open market or have the added costs of trying to produce in demand power from their already existing power producing infrastructure.

All Idaho Power is trying to do is increase their revenue bottom line, at the expense of those trying to do the right thing by going solar. Idaho Power should be encouraging more people to go solar, do to the fact it will lessen Idaho Powers need to spend money on additional power producing entities, but instead just use all the excess power all the roof top solar that will be produced moving forward.

Idaho Power is not trying to make it fair for all, just trying to increase more money for the shareholders, and that is all its about. People with solar are not causing any more costs for Idaho Power that were not already there prior to that individual deciding to go solar. It is the opposite, because now the person with solar is generating power for themselves, and hopefully producing a little extra for Idaho Powers use. Which is a benefit not a detriment to Idaho Power.

Sincerely yours

Jeff Iverson



**From:** [jeff iverson](#)  
**To:** [Jan Noriyuki](#)  
**Subject:** RE: proposed solar changes  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 7, 2023 11:14:29 AM

---

**CAUTION: This email originated outside the State of Idaho network. Verify links and attachments BEFORE you click or open, even if you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact your agency service desk with any concerns.**

---

Yes, I am submitting this under the current case, I am an idaho power customer with solar.

Address 3720 w quaker ridge dr meridian idaho 83646

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

On Tue, Nov 7, 2023 at 10:13 AM, Jan Noriyuki  
<[jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov](mailto:jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov)> wrote:

Mr. Iverson,

Please confirm that you are submitting this letter as a public comment in Case No. IPC-E-23-14. In order for your comments to be added to the record in this matter, please reference the case number you're commenting on, verify that you are an Idaho Power customer, and provide your home address. Please note that when submitting a comment in a current case, the comment constitutes a public record under Idaho Code 74-101(13). All information you provide is available for public and media inspection and may be reviewed by the utility.

Sincerely,

**Jan Noriyuki**

**Commission Secretary**