

RE: Case No. IPC-E-23-14

-----Original Message-----

From: Mari Knutson <[mariknutson@hotmail.com](mailto:mariknutson@hotmail.com)>

Sent: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 4:08 PM

To: Jan Noriyuki

Subject: Idaho Power Rate Changes

Dear Members of the Public Utility Commission, My husband and I are retirees and made the decision to install rooftop solar, using much of our retirement savings to do so. When people were curious about how long it would take to pay off, we would smile and say, "Probably not in our lifetime!" We were (mostly) ok with that, because we were limiting our reliance on the grid AND helping our neighbors by adding our power to the grid. We felt we were getting a "fair deal" for our generated power. It was also a simple trade, kWh for kWh. No fancy "calculations" or accounting trickery, just a simple exchange. Now IP wants to take our contributions to the grid at a wholesale price - and charge anything they choose to charge us when we need to draw that power back! The "study" this scheme was based on was conducted by the Idaho Power! This is a conflict of interest, really shady, and against all Idaho citizens sense of fairness. At the very least ALL current residents contributing to the power grid with home solar panels should be "GRANDFATHERED" in to the simple exchange we agreed to when we installed our systems. Residents who install new systems AFTER the new rate schedules are adopted may be subject to the new rate schedules, because at least they will know for what they are contactually agreeing to. IP wants to be seen as a public Trust - beneficial to our State - when in fact it is behaving like a harmful MONOPOLY. The PUC must protect us from their corporate greed!

Sincerely,

Marvin and Mari Knutson

2429 Hillcrest Way

Nampa, Idaho 83686

-----

-----Original Message-----

From: Ron Reagan <[ronreagan@gmail.com](mailto:ronreagan@gmail.com)>

Sent: Tuesday, November 7, 2023 4:11 PM

To: Jan Noriyuki

Subject: IPC-E-23-14

Attention;

I urge the PUC to vote "NO" on Idaho Powers proposal.

I'm writing this letter in response to Idaho Powers threat to Customer Generation and storage of clean energy produced by solar power.

Idaho Power is struggling to meet its own clean energy goals and yet they are doing everything in their power to prevent Idaho citizens from benefiting from their own investments in solar power and storage.

I own solar panels and storage batteries not to deprive Idaho Power but to make a personal contribution to clean energy and help protect our environment. I'm willing to make this large investment to do my part in reducing global warming.

Idaho Power should be welcoming these investments by the customers to help the growing need for power in our state. These are investments that Idaho Power is NOT making. Yet, Idaho Power wants to make the access unfair for future customers thus reducing the possibility they might invest in solar panels and batteries. By taking away customer benefits in investments in solar it will severely reduce installation of individual solar products.

Idaho Power should welcome the diversity of energy profile that individual solar installation provides in a sustainable way, plus it provides resilience to remote communities and stabilizes the grid!

Personal investment in these clean energy solar projects helps Idaho Power meet its clean energy goals without huge investments by that company.

Lastly, individual solar installation helps Idaho preserve our gorgeous outdoor spaces that are threatened by many of Idaho Powers other energy sources.

Many of our surrounding states promote, encourage and in some cases require homeowners to install energy producing and storage systems.

I ask why doesn't Idaho Power encourage installation and storage of these systems by homeowners rather than doing everything possible to discourage this financial and environmental investment?

Thank you, Ron Reagan

Sent from my iPhone

---

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Margo Conitz  
Submission Time: Nov 7 2023 4:00PM  
Email: [twinpeaksnursery@twinpeaksnursery.com](mailto:twinpeaksnursery@twinpeaksnursery.com)  
Telephone: 208-630-4300  
Address: 14075 Morell Road  
McCall, ID 83638

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "Please do not discourage rooftop power by reducing or denying compensation to individuals who have or are wanting to install solar panels. The need for power is not going away, it is increasing, and we can use power from all the sources we can get it from. "

---

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: William Ward  
Submission Time: Nov 7 2023 5:01PM  
Email: [sailorgriz@gmail.com](mailto:sailorgriz@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 208-997-8510  
Address: 5368 N 18th E  
Mountain Home, ID 83647

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "Dear Idaho Public Utilities Commission,

I don't understand. Almost every time one turns on the TV, watches the news, reads a paper, or listens to news on the radio, someone is talking about the need to get more renewable energy in order to save the planet. Dispersed solar seems like a great candidate for adding to the nation's (and world's) renewable energy generation. It's a good idea and should be encouraged.

But now, if I understand it correctly, Idaho Power is trying to make dispersed solar more expensive. Maybe prohibitively expensive. And, if I understand it correctly, the IPUC is considering letting Idaho Power do just that--make dispersed solar much more expensive.

If the price of something goes up, there will be fewer people willing to invest in it. Fewer people willing to invest in dispersed solar means less installed renewable energy--and that is exactly the wrong approach! Well, according to continuing commentary on virtually all news outlets that we need more renewable energy it is the wrong approach.

I don't understand. Are virtually all the news outlets wrong? Is renewable energy not a good idea? Should we burn more fossil fuels instead? I'm just a humble utility customer. I don't know the answers to The Big Questions. But it sure seems to me that making dispersed solar more expensive and, thereby, limiting future installations, is the exact wrong thing to do.

I encourage the IPUC to reject Idaho Power's grab for more profits at the expense of the Planet.

Thank you and regards,

William Ward"

---

Name: Carl Erling  
Submission Time: Nov 7 2023 8:09PM  
Email: [erlingcb@mac.com](mailto:erlingcb@mac.com)

Telephone: 206-579-7285  
Address: 2608 S Canonero Way  
Boise, ID 83709

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "The Idaho PUC, I assume, has a responsibility to the public, and is not "in the pocket" of the power companies such as Idaho Power. Solar Panel customers producing local power save Idaho Power R&D costs. Additionally, this is clean power that produces no CO2, and benefits the present generation and generations to come. These customers have paid their dues by financing their power generation. They should not sustain an increase in Idaho Power's basic charge. Such an increase sends the message, "Idaho PUC does not value you or your considerable investment in clean energy for the present and the future." Idaho PUC apparently takes no responsibility for the welfare of future generations."

-----

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Joseph McCormick  
Submission Time: Nov 8 2023 8:40AM  
Email: [joemccormick9@gmail.com](mailto:joemccormick9@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 208-401-4728  
Address: 811 Terry Dr  
Emmett, ID 83617

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "The proposed changes from Idaho Power do not promote a more stable grid solution and instead is limiting clean energy solutions. Please do not approve of Idaho Powers proposal."

-----

**From:** David Garman <[dkgarman@gmail.com](mailto:dkgarman@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 7, 2023 6:44 PM  
**To:** Jan Noriyuki  
**Subject:** IPC-E-23-14

Dear Public Utility Commission:

I am an Idaho Power ratepayer and an Idaho resident and taxpayer. Before moving to Idaho, I served in a variety of professional and voluntary positions related to the subject matter of this proceeding, including:

- Professional Staff, Subcommittee on Energy Research and Development, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate;

- Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, U.S. Department of Energy;
- Under Secretary, U.S. Department of Energy;
- Chair, Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) Advisory Council
- Member, Carnegie Mellon Electricity Industry Center advisory board
- Member, National Renewable Energy Laboratory Energy Systems Integration Facility Advisory Committee
- Member, National Academy of Sciences committee evaluating policies to accelerate the deployment of cleaner energy technologies.

I have two homes in Idaho, both of which have a grid-connected solar power generation system. One of these homes is a net-zero energy home. The process of integrating my on-site generation with Idaho Power's system was seamless and efficient, and I am grateful to Idaho Power and the Public Utilities Commission for making the process easy to implement.

However, when I read Idaho Power's Value of Distributed Energy Resources (VODER) study, I was struck by its lack of rigor and sophistication. It relies on simple, econometric Excel spreadsheet studies for its analysis, and its assumptions are suspect as illustrated by the third party study undertaken by Crossborder Energy. As I know from my own work on the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's Energy Systems Integration Advisory Committee, there are far more sophisticated tools that could have been employed to characterize and model the issues of interest in calculating the value of on-site solar generation to Idaho Power ratepayers.

I strongly believe the Public Utility Commission (PUC) needs to completely reevaluate its approach in this matter.

First, the PUC must resolve Idaho Power's General Rate Case. An accurate "value of solar" study cannot be undertaken without resolution of that case.

Second, the PUC should instruct Idaho Power to return to the drawing board with regard to its VODER study. There are far better tools, including modeling and simulation software that could accommodate "what if?" questions and alternative scenarios that would be valuable to the Commission and the public.

Third, I would require "Red Teaming" or alternative, third party analysis. Throughout my time in both the nation's energy and intelligence communities, we depended on "Red Teams" to challenge lazy analysis and misguided assumptions. In short, competitive analysis never failed to yield a better analytical product at the end of the day.

I regret that I was unable to attend the public session on this matter where I had fully intended to in order to raise the points offered above, which leads to my fourth and final recommendation: the accommodation of virtual participation in the public process. This is an important option for individuals who wish to be heard, but may not be able to make a specific in-person meeting due to travel or other considerations.

Thank you for your consideration of these recommendations.

Sincerely,  
David Garman  
4923 E Sagewood Drive  
Boise, ID 93716

224 Rapid River Vista  
Riggins, ID 83547

-----  
The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Mary Hofle  
Submission Time: Nov 8 2023 9:14AM  
Email: [mhofle@gmail.com](mailto:mhofle@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 208-220-2621  
Address: 95 Drake Ave  
Pocatello, ID 83201

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "8 November 2023  
Case Number IPC-E-23-14

To the IPUC:

I am a customer of Idaho Power, a shareowner in IDACORP, and installed rooftop solar panels on my home in 2019. I am part of the "legacy" credit system. I have to say that the plan proposed by Idaho Power will harm Idaho and its citizenry. Instead of collaborating with the solar industry to bring more jobs to Idaho by encouraging the people of Idaho in our fine state to move to solar, they want to send the message to anyone wanting to install solar that they will be penalized. What a negative incentive!

I wonder:

- What individual will want to invest in solar or any other renewable energy?
- What renewable energy companies, offering job opportunities to Idahoans, will want to build their business here?
- What does this say to the people of Idaho, the nation, and the world regarding the impact on the environment, increase in consumption, and corporate greed?

What it says is Idaho Power doesn't care!

I'm not against companies making money. But to plan to get free/low cost energy from individual producers allows Idaho Power to sell this energy on the open market making significantly more money than what they compensate the producers from the sale of this energy is not just unfair compensation but truly contemptible.

Many more Idahoans would like to be solar powered and this will make that transition more difficult. I ask that the IPUC keep our economy strong by bringing solar jobs and regulating Idaho Power to move in the direction of their 100% renewable commitment.

I encourage the IPUC to vote against the current proposal and against any other proposals that would hinder solar development in Idaho.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Mary M. Hofle  
95 Drake Ave.  
Pocatello, ID 83201  
[mhofle@gmail.com](mailto:mhofle@gmail.com)

---

Name: David Adams  
Submission Time: Nov 8 2023 9:26AM  
Email: [dadams32843@gmail.com](mailto:dadams32843@gmail.com)  
Telephone: 208-703-1530  
Address: 13281 Kind Way  
Nampa, ID 83686

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "Good Morning! I imagine you have received many comments reference the proposed changes to those Idaho Power customers with Solar systems. I would start by simply requesting you vote NO on the proposals. My wife and I paid \$38,000 to install our roof system over 2 years ago in 2021, and apart from the minimal cost to IP to switch out the meter, they have paid almost nothing to maintain the service to us, while we are helping to relieve the stress on their system. IP informed us our payments would go up at least \$360 per year based on last years usage - when we were gone several months and used very little power. Instead of only considering one study that recommended drastically increasing the monthly payments, this proposal needs to have at least three independent studies to be fair. Last thought - To be fair to all those that purchased systems in the past, IF you vote to institute this proposal, it should start with those installing Solar starting Jan 2024, NOT to those only after 2019. Why are those before 2019 special? This would be fair to all users, as everyone would know what to expect. Thanks for considering our input.."

---

**From:** Bob <[f4raggs@gmail.com](mailto:f4raggs@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 8, 2023 10:51 AM  
**To:** Jan Noriyuki  
**Cc:** Robert Pearson <[robertpearson726@gmail.com](mailto:robertpearson726@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Rooftop solar proposed changes

There are several reasons why Idaho Power should not change the solar panel rate structure:

It Disincentivizes solar adoption: The proposed changes would make it less financially attractive for Idahoans to install solar panels, which would slow the growth of the solar industry in the state. This would be a missed opportunity for Idaho to create jobs, reduce reliance on fossil fuels, and combat climate change.

Creates unfairness for existing solar customers:

The proposed changes would retroactively apply to existing solar customers, which would be unfair and could lead to financial hardship for many families. It minimizes the fact that rooftop solar produces energy during peak demand times and uses power from the grid during lower demand periods.

Damages Idaho's reputation as a renewable energy leader: Idaho has made significant progress in developing renewable energy sources, and the proposed changes would send a message that the state is not serious about its clean energy goals.

Undermines consumer choice: Idahoans should have the freedom to choose how they generate their electricity, and the proposed changes would limit that choice.

Contributes to higher energy costs: In the long run, the proposed changes would likely lead to higher energy costs for all Idahoans, as they would reduce the amount of solar energy being generated and increase the reliance on fossil fuels.

In addition to these reasons, there is also a strong moral argument for keeping the current solar panel rate structure in place. Solar energy is a clean, renewable source of energy that has the potential to help us address the climate crisis. Making it more difficult for people to install solar panels is a step in the wrong direction.

I urge Idaho Power to reconsider its proposed changes to the solar panel rate structure. The current structure is fair, equitable, and in the best interests of Idaho's economy, environment, and residents.

Robert Pearson  
855 Spy Glass PT  
Pocatello, ID 83204

---

**From:** Kevin Kitz <[kevin@kitzworks.com](mailto:kevin@kitzworks.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 8, 2023 8:23 AM  
**To:** Jan Noriyuki  
**Subject:** IPC-E-23-14 Comments on Idaho Power rooftop solar proposal

Dear PUC,

I am writing in regards to the Idaho Power rooftop solar proposal.

**Support for One element of the Fee Structure (peak and off-peak)**



I support the structure of the fee proposal. The components make sense to me.

- 1) Any power generation system has value in part based on its ELCC. Rooftop solar on average will have less ELCC than utility grade solar because of the variation in orientation. I've seen solar panels behind trees and with tall chimneys to their southwest. My own system points to the Southeast, and while I am a legacy rooftop solar owner, my output curve shows that my rooftop solar contributes very little to late afternoon generation. So I believe that a peak hour value is appropriate, and is fair to those Idaho Power customers who do not have rooftop solar and would otherwise have to pay for the rooftop solar customer's share of peaking resources.
- 2) The lower value for other hours also makes sense on an annual average basis. Solar output in the spring and fall are very high and load is very low. Idaho power has shown in previous IRPs a relationship between load and system average air temperature. Load is very low at temperatures when solar panels are at maximum output. This power is of low value, and has to be recognized and accounted for in a single annual value.
- 3) So as far as the payment structure goes, I have no issue, and think it is overall fair to Idaho Power's total customer base.
  - a. As a side note, it seems likely that this rate structure will encourage the installation of future PV on the westerly side of buildings. If so, then the rate structure will have properly incentivized design that provides maximum benefit to both the panel owner and Idaho Power's ratepayers.

#### **Opposition (variable pricing is unfinanceable)**

However, that said, there is one glaring failure in this proposed rate structure, as I understand it, and that is that the price paid to each PV system owner will be adjusted on some basis. If I understand this correctly, then I must recommend that the PUC reject Idaho Power's current proposal until they fix this.

Rooftop solar is a grid-serving capital investment no different (in fact far more expensive) than any other power plant. Idaho Power knows that they would get zero responses if they issued an RFP that required the proponent to supply all the capital and operating expense, and in return for that up-front investment and ongoing expense Idaho Power would let them know each year what they were going to get paid, and that they should expect to get paid less as time goes on. In short, such an RFP would invite the construction of new power plants to serve in a merchant role. Such a PPA would be completely unfinanceable and so Idaho Power would get no new capacity built. Is it possible that this is the exact strategy being proposed for rooftop solar customers? It is false to state that rooftop solar is an option, if it is well-known that customer-owned PV would be such a poor and uncertain investment that deployment will effectively cease. Any argument about declining future solar prices is irrelevant. It is declining because more is being installed. It is not appropriate to penalize those who made the up-front investments. Again, this is not the practice in utility-scale PPAs. Once a PPA is signed, then changes to the market are irrelevant to the future price. Idaho power has many PPAs that have diverged from future value (higher and lower) and none of those prices change. In fact it would be a breach of contract for Idaho Power to do so. The same should be true of a rooftop (effective) PPA.

#### **Solution (for Full Support)**

Thus, the solution to make rooftop solar on parity with other PPAs is that the customer should get a period of fixed pricing 20 years is reasonable, but perhaps 15 years and then a phase-in to current pricing with some floor/ceiling (e.g. 60% to 125%) would also be financeable. The offering price could be updated every 2 years and be valid for any application submitted during that following 2 years. There

are other pricing options, but any option should be made with strong consideration of financeability, just the same as any other PPA pricing structure. If the change to pricing is made so that projects have price-certainty and are financeable, I am in support of approval. If not, then I encourage the PUC to reject this application until it is fixed.

Respectfully,

**Kevin Kitz, P.E.**

=====

KitzWorks LLC

[kevin@kitzworks.com](mailto:kevin@kitzworks.com)

208-761-3442 (cell)

-----

**From:** Carol J Henry <[carol.henry9@gmail.com](mailto:carol.henry9@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 8, 2023 11:09 AM

**To:** Jan Noriyuki <[jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov](mailto:jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov)>

**Cc:** Climate Action Coalition Wood River Valley <[cacwrv@gmail.com](mailto:cacwrv@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Rooftop Solar in Idaho: Comments on PUC Case IPC-E-23-14

As a resident of Idaho, I must raise objections to the Idaho Public Utility Commission's proposed actions on solar rooftop regulations.

I'm very concerned about Idaho Power's proposal to slash rooftop solar compensation rates, making rooftop solar further out of reach for Idahoans. Rooftop solar provides so many benefits to Idaho Power and all its customers, yet Idaho Power's calculations don't capture that full value.

A) Please resolve Idaho Power's General Rate Case first, to allow for a more accurate assessment and understanding of this case for rooftop solar customers and regulators alike.

B) Please look to Vote Solar's expert recommendations to correct Idaho Power's calculations (on Generation Capacity, Line Losses, Transmission & Distribution Deferral, Fuel Price Hedge, & Environmental Compliance) and provide customers with an initial Export Credit Rate of at least 10 ¢/kWh.

C) Please also adopt Vote Solar's recommendation for customers to lock-in their initial rate for at least a 10-year period (as is done in NV and AZ) for financial stability and planning.

Lastly, please improve the public process by adding a virtual testimony option (as is provided at Public Service Commissions in all neighboring states) to help ensure you can hear the important perspectives from everyone who will be impacted by Idaho Power's changes.

Thank you.

Regards,  
Carol J Henry  
Hailey, ID 83333

---

Re: Case No. IPC-E-23-14

**From:** Evelyn Hitchcock <[hitcevel@gmail.com](mailto:hitcevel@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 8, 2023 11:27 AM  
**To:** Jan Noriyuki  
**Subject:** Comments on PUC Case Number IPC-E-23-24.

The Idaho Power company is allowed to have a monopoly in the electricity market in Idaho because it is subject to the regulation of the IPUC which in turn is supposed to ensure that it operates in the public interest. The current changes are supposedly justified because they will be more fair to the ratepayers that cannot afford to install solar panels. That implies that those of us who do install solar systems are wealthier than those who do not. I am a solar customer who is a single fixed income senior in my seventies who qualifies for the circuit breaker tax break. So I'm hardly wealthy.

There is another financial reason the proposal disproportionately harms poor people. The proposed change to increase the **fixed connection charge** by as much as sevenfold from the current charge is unfair to small users like me. It is higher than my actual electricity usage in some months and effectively negates the Legacy status of my system. It amounts to a regressive tax. The Idaho PUC should prevent this from happening.

Sometimes less affluent people are willing to make sacrifices to do our part to fight Global warming. The Idaho Power Company should be forced to give a higher priority to do the same thing instead of favoring investors. It is the PUC who has the responsibility to ensure it does.

Evelyn Hitchcock  
1492 Los Altos Way  
Pocatello Idaho 8320

---

**From:** Anne Stringfellow-Brookman <[annesb2001@gmail.com](mailto:annesb2001@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 8, 2023 11:47 AM

**To:** Jan Noriyuki

**Subject:** comments on PUC case #IPC-E-23-14

Dear PUC,

I am a rooftop solar owner in Pocatello, Idaho and am *distressed* by the proposals by Idaho Power to *raise* my Monthly Fixed Charge and *lower* my Compensation for the Energy Generated by my panels. **We Idahoans deserve fair access to solar power=turn down Idaho Power's proposal!**

I installed my solar panels at great personal cost (without any help from Idaho Power!) because I wanted to do the right thing and now ***Idaho Power proposes to penalize me with higher fees and lower Net Metering rates, even though the power my panels provide to the utility company helps to stabilize the power grid.*** Talk about a slap in the face!

I ask the PUC to reject Idaho Power's greedy proposals motivated by the hope of increasing profits for Idaho Power share holders rather than their responsibility to be fair to their customers.

Please require fair monthly fees and net metering rates for the good citizens of Idaho who take on the personal cost of installing solar panels. Don't allow Idaho Power to raise monthly rates and lower net metering, thereby discouraging folks from putting in solar. Idaho Power's bad faith behavior (if you allow it) will ultimately encourage those determined to install rooftop solar to also purchase batteries allowing them to disconnect from the power grid entirely.

**PUC: Please support fair compensation for rooftop solar in SE Idaho and turn down Idaho Power's attempt to destroy it!**

Sincerely,

Anne Stringfellow-Brookman

20 Purdue Ave

208-705-9711

-----  
The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Bryan Passmore

Submission Time: Nov 8 2023 11:34AM

Email: [passmore.bryan@gmail.com](mailto:passmore.bryan@gmail.com)

Telephone: 208-509-2409

Address: 4503 W. Irving st

Boise, ID 83706

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "I don't think we should be disincentivizing clean, home power generation for a few reasons:  
1. Efficient land use - solar on roofs means one parcel of land not only houses people but powers our grid  
2. Distributed power generation could bolster system resiliency  
3. Idaho Power relies heavily on hydroelectric, which is great but vulnerable to low-snowpack years and as well as growing interest in decommissioning dams. We should encourage home-based solar generation to reduce demand for such sources.  
4. Idaho Power relies on coal & natural gas, which are less clean than solar on the balance. We should encourage home-based solar generation to reduce demand for such sources. "

---

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Jim Crawford  
Submission Time: Nov 8 2023 12:17PM  
Email: [twinpeaksnursery@twinpeaksnursery.com](mailto:twinpeaksnursery@twinpeaksnursery.com)  
Telephone: 208-630-3260  
Address: 51 East Lake Fork Road  
McCall, ID 83638

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "We recently installed a solar system at our nursery, with full expectations that we would be compensated for the power we would be supplying to the grid. We feel that Idaho Power should compensate solar producers for the power they supply. This additional electricity helps offset shortages from the high demand on hydroelectric power."

---

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Randall Harville  
Submission Time: Nov 8 2023 1:10PM  
Email: [leeheadingwest@aol.com](mailto:leeheadingwest@aol.com)  
Telephone: 208-906-5793  
Address: 1168 N Little Camas Ave  
Star, ID 83669

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "I have roof-top solar generation and the system went live in 2017, so I am considered "grandfathered" status and Idaho Power has treated me very well. I have a large credit built up that I never hope to recoup but that is fine with me. I know this went to good use while sparing perhaps a tiny bit of our wonderful state's resources. I know, and you know that the minds that matter in this decision,

in this case, have been made up. To resist roof top solar no matter what; no matter that it would benefit each and every Idahoan; no matter that it would help protect what makes Idaho special; no matter that economically it would benefit Idaho Power and every taxpayer in Idaho. The reason I felt compelled to comment is that I have never heard anyone from Idaho Power explain: why? I drive by these tens of thousands of square feet of baking roof tops that have been built over the past decade and imagine each one of them collecting what God so bountifully provides us, imagine Idaho as the idol of the nation, and provider of excess energy to an ever growing list of clients. California, Little low? We got you! Washington, grid upgrades got you down? We got you! I imagine how Idaho today could have been the Alaska of the 70's with just a little foresight and imagination. Why? I imagine property taxes, like Alaska even today, are a thing of the past. The pipeline was so successful some folks even get a rebate still today. Why could they be forward thinking when we cannot? Is it greed? Political patronage? The yoke of the big energy companies? Or perhaps the fight against solar is based on sound logic that I do not see and I am open to hearing those arguments. But to date I have not heard, why? Why something that will lessen the burden our grid, help keep the skies so that I can see the mountains from Star, lower Idaho Power cost, and ensure that Idaho never has power issues can be harmful? Thank you. "

-----

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Donald Reid  
Submission Time: Nov 8 2023 2:02PM  
Email: [don@drdonreid.com](mailto:don@drdonreid.com)  
Telephone: 530-448-7026  
Address: 11951 w pinewood river lane  
Star, ID 83669

Name of Utility Company: Self

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "It's in everyone's' best interest ,you DO NOT reduce solar benefit compensation !  
Thank you  
Dr Reid"

-----

Name: Kenneth Jensen  
Submission Time: Nov 8 2023 2:14PM  
Email: [kajensen@q.com](mailto:kajensen@q.com)  
Telephone: 541-881-9247  
Address: 2436 11th Ave E  
vale, OR 97918

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "As an irrigation customer with over 20 meters and 800Kw of solar in the net metering program, in my reading Idaho Powers documents I don't think they gave fair representation to the

Irrigation customers. Irrigation customers pay a demand charge, which is quite a large portion of the irrigation bill that residential customers don't pay, hence from a revenue standpoint, the two classes of customers should have different net metering payment numbers for excess generation.

Thanks,  
Kenneth Jensen  
Jensen Farms LLC

---

Name: Lon Stewart  
Submission Time: Nov 8 2023 2:46PM  
Email: [afreeeagle@yahoo.com](mailto:afreeeagle@yahoo.com)  
Telephone: 208-841-3929  
Address: 3477 Shadow Hills Dr  
Eagle, ID 83616

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-23-14

Comment: "The proposed rate structure by Idaho Power is unfair to individuals producing their own power and should not be approved.

Part of the purpose of the Public Utility Commission (PUC) is to protect the citizens of the State from undue utility costs. The PUC should be advocating for the citizen rather than the stockholders of the public utilities. The proposed rate case for Idaho Power seems to benefit Idaho Power and its stockholders rather than the citizens who generate and export power to the grid.

Idaho Power states they want to be supplying 100% clean energy by 2045. Anybody generating their own power is contributing to this goal. Yet Idaho Power only wants to supply this power on their terms. Idaho Power is willing to spend millions of dollars to construct a solar farm or a natural gas plant plus the transmission facilities to deliver electricity to the customer and in so doing reap large corporate profits. Yet individuals are willing (and have) put up their own money to generate power for their own consumption and to export to the grid. Individuals are not installing systems out of greed but out of a conscience effort to help the environment, lower their monthly electric costs, or provide a reliable backup power supply. Many of these systems will probably never realize an economic payout to the purchaser. But give us some hope! Reducing the rate of compensation to the individual makes the economics look worse and may not be at all viable to install a system.

Just think if Idaho Power contributed to individuals for their installed distributed generation. How many systems could Idaho Power reimburse compared to the cost of a huge power plant? Or compensated individuals based on computed line losses from distant generating facilities. Individual systems may not provide the proper base load, but would definitely cut down on the load required for the system thereby further reducing Idaho Power's operating costs. An added benefit of distributed energy would be virtually no line loss (hence lost revenue) as the power being exported into the system would be used by the next customer down the line.

Idaho Power's rate case should encourage individuals to install distributed generation by providing more incentives such as:

Increase the length of summer period to receive premium compensation (say from Mid May to Mid October); Pay an amount in non summer period equal to current net metering values; Eliminate the time of day metering since no other rate structure uses this method of sales and is further discrimination against individual power producers.

I installed solar panels this year. Each kilowatt generated by my panels is all the same whether it was generated on or off peak season and I should be compensated the same year round. I am opposed to the rate compensation as proposed by Idaho Power and ask the PUC to reject it.

Respectfully submitted,  
Lon Stewart  
3477 Shadow Hills Dr  
Eagle, ID 83616

-----