

**From:** PUCWeb Notification <[Do.Not.Reply@puc.idaho.gov](mailto:Do.Not.Reply@puc.idaho.gov)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 21, 2023 11:00 AM  
**To:** Jan Noriyuki <[jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov](mailto:jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov)>  
**Subject:** Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Jeff Rhees  
Submission Time: Mar 21 2023 10:47AM  
Email: [bobcat747@hotmail.com](mailto:bobcat747@hotmail.com)  
Telephone: 208-945-3234  
Address: 531 Hymas Lane  
Ovid, ID 83254

Name of Utility Company: Rocky Mountain Power

Case ID: PAC-E-22-15

Comment: "I am NOT in favor of Rocky Mountain Power proposed rate schedule changes. 1- It will substantially increase my monthly cost. 2- It will reward large users and penalize small users It appears the "break even point" is at 880 kw. So users greater than this will have lower power bills, but users less than this will pay more. As a user, that is generally less than this point, I will pay more. But in thinking about other people, also in smaller houses or retired, this will affect them substantially. Also, the current "tier" rate tries to reward or promote users to try to conserve or use less. I think this is a good idea! The new rates do away with this. (My current bill of \$44.87, @402kw, would become \$58.25 an increase of 30%) "

-----

**From:** PUCWeb Notification <[Do.Not.Reply@puc.idaho.gov](mailto:Do.Not.Reply@puc.idaho.gov)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 21, 2023 12:00 PM  
**To:** Jan Noriyuki <[jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov](mailto:jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov)>  
**Subject:** Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Kevin Kelley  
Submission Time: Mar 21 2023 11:54AM  
Email: [kelleyk@byui.edu](mailto:kelleyk@byui.edu)  
Telephone: 208-403-1891  
Address: 311 SEAGULL DRIVE  
REXBURG, ID 83440

Name of Utility Company: Rocky Mountain Power

Case ID: ~~PAC-E-22-01~~ **PAC-E-22-15**

Comment: "Please note that Rocky Mountain Power's proposed rate changes will penalize customers who attempt to reduce their energy use, while subsidizing those who use more. Consider the following two scenarios: Customer A, who is doing their part to conserve energy, uses 400 kWh of electricity each month. Customer B, who is not taking steps to reduce electricity use, uses 1000 kWh each month. For the purposes of this example, I'll use the summer season rates. Under the present pricing structure, Customer A would pay the \$8.00 monthly fee plus \$44.79 in energy charges (all energy use is in tier 1), for a total of \$52.79. Customer B would pay the \$8.00 monthly fee plus \$78.38 for the 700 kWh in tier 1, plus \$39.30 for 300 kWh in tier 2, for a total of \$125.68. In year five of the proposed pricing structure, Customer A would now pay a \$29.25 monthly charge, plus \$34.63 for the 400 kWh used, for a total of \$63.88: an increase of \$11.09 per month, or a 21% increase on their bill. On the other hand, Customer B now pays a \$29.25 monthly charge, plus \$86.57 for the electricity (tiers have been done away with) for a total of \$115.82: a decrease of \$9.86, or a 7.8% decrease. Consequently, the conscientious customer who is doing their part to reduce electricity consumption is penalized with a 21% increase on their energy bill, while the customer using excessive amounts of electricity sees a reduction of 7.8% in their costs. This is shifting the cost burden from those who are less responsible in their energy use to those who are doing their part. This proposed rate structure will remove incentives for energy conservation, contrary to the general goals of society. For these reasons, I recommend that this proposal be denied. "

-----