

From: PUCWeb Notification <Do.Not.Reply@puc.idaho.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 11:01 AM
To: Jan Noriyuki <jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov>
Subject: Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Gaylen Jensen
Submission Time: Mar 29 2023 10:30AM
Email: jenseng@byui.edu
Telephone: 208-313-1081
Address: 980 Westwood Dr
Rexburg, ID 83440

Name of Utility Company: Rocky Mountain Power

Case ID: PAC-E-22-15

Comment: "Please do not approve of the rate change request proposed by this case. I especially object to the customer service charge increase of over 365% over five years. I invested over \$15,000 in solar panels for my home to decrease my monthly power costs. I was disappointed that I had to pay \$5 per month (later \$8) for the privilege of connecting to the grid, but later thought it was reasonable to pay something to be able to connect to the grid. But increasing that privilege cost by so much is unfair. Why penalize those who invest in solar energy? Why discourage the use of a technology that will reduce global warming and save all of our collective "bacons"? I am disappointed in this proposal and urge that it be denied."

[\[Open in the PUC Intranet application\]](#)

From: PUCWeb Notification <Do.Not.Reply@puc.idaho.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 12:00 PM
To: Jan Noriyuki <jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov>
Subject: Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Shane Peterson
Submission Time: Mar 29 2023 11:21AM
Email: shane@dougandrus.com
Telephone: 208-227-1624
Address: 13795 N 15th E
Idaho Falls, ID 83401

Name of Utility Company: Rocky Mountain Power

Case ID: PAC-E-22-15

Comment: "I have a concern with the proposed changes in case PAC-E-22-1. Rocky Mountain Power states that they do not intend to receive any additional funds with these rate changes, therefore their income is not expected to change. The proposed decrease in the variable energy rate (kWh) and increasing the fixed customer service charge will transfer the payment burden from high kWh users to the more conservative users. High energy users will have lower bills and conservative users will have higher bills. Many more customers are high users so the impact to the most conservative users (likely lowest income) will be highest. This decreases the effect a customer can have on their overall bill by being more conservative with energy use. It really appears in part to be an attempt to reduce the value of the grandfathered solar schedule 135 Net Metered users export credits in the name of more even internal income/expense measurement. If that is the case, the already passed Net Billing schedule 136 should be the path for managing solar credits moving forward. "

[\[Open in the PUC Intranet application\]](#)

From: PUCWeb Notification <Do.Not.Reply@puc.idaho.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 1:00 PM

To: Jan Noriyuki <jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov>

Subject: Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Kristin Tupen

Submission Time: Mar 29 2023 12:31PM

Email: kristintupen@icloud.com

Telephone: 530-680-2962

Address: 11 N 3667 E

Rigby, ID 83442

Name of Utility Company: Rocky Mountain Power

Case ID: PAC-E-22-15

Comment: "I participated in Rocky Mountain Power's virtual meeting on March 29th from 10:00-12:00. I found Robert Meredith to be very informative and patient in answering our questions, much appreciated. My main concern, taken from the meeting, is that those of us with alternative methods of energy, natural gas and wood, will be penalized with a higher customer service charge versus what we are charged now. Per Mr. Meredith, those of us that use less than 700 kwh will be charged the full higher monthly service charge over a period of 5 years under this new plan which means if we continue to use less energy per day we may be paying more for our services versus those households that use more electricity and do not have alternative methods of heating, cooking etc... Households with more people or who use more kwh will receive a reduced rate after 5 years with the more energy they use versus those of us that do not use more than 700 kwh. Mr. Meredith stated that they were doing this to be more equitable to those household using more electricity and that are larger but it is the homes

using less electricity with less people that are going to be paying for this equity, which isn't fair to us. Many of us in smaller homes or with less electricity use are senior and on fixed incomes. Inflation and the war on alternative energy sources ie hydropower, nuclear, natural gas, wood have hurt our ability to pay more for higher energy, fuel, grocery etc... and now isn't a good time. It seems like this proposal is about rewarding those that have all electric homes versus those of us that do not and we are caught in the middle of crazy government "green" policies and utility companies who embrace them or are being forced to go "green" by the federal government. The consumer is the one being hurt, not the corporations. Many of us using natural gas or propane, especially in rural areas of Idaho, have had recent rate increases due to the war on them by government and we can not afford another one. I would like the commission to ask Rocky Mountain Power to rethink the whole 700 kwh cut off as it will hurt those of us on fixed incomes ie seniors or small households that are trying to conserve or have put in alternative sources for energy, including solar per the conversation with Mr. Meredith. I appreciate Rocky Mountain Power's interest in hearing from those that will be affected, unlike CA's PG&E, and found the meeting to be informational and his answers candid which I appreciated. "

[\[Open in the PUC Intranet application\]](#)
