

✓ Gen. Hek
sent 9/18/06

✓ To AV.

✓ To Commus.
s H

Jean Jewell

From: Tonya Clark
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2006 8:18 AM
To: Jean Jewell
Cc: Gene Fadness
Subject: Case No. IPC-E-06-17

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

From: Ed [mailto:ed.howell1@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2006 8:03 AM
To: Tonya Clark
Subject: here you go

Dear commissioners Kjellander, Smith, and Hansen,

Case No. IPC-E-06-17

I don't believe the proposal is fair and equitable. I do believe it could be with some minor changes. One change could be to exempt all systems under 5 KW. Another would be to address all surpluses on an annual basis, not monthly. Another would be to exempt solar systems. The last would be to pay solar net metering 100% of the monthly average non-firm on-peak price because that is what they would have to pay to buy it on the market.

I made a decision to invest \$20,000 in a grid connected solar system based on the tariffs at the time. If I were aware of Idaho Power's proposed tariff revisions I would have invested much less money in solar electric and much more in solar heating. It is not fair to change the rules once someone has made such a big investment. On Feb. 2 of this year it was up and running. My goal was to get as close as possible to net-zero (to use as much power as I produce annually). In order to do this I need to have surpluses in the summer months to offset my heating in the winter months. My goal is not to make money selling electricity but to try to break even at the end of the year. According to Scott Gates at Idaho Power I am the only surplus producer of solar power. I received a \$2.05 credit in May, a \$1.21 credit in June, a \$2.30 credit in July, and a \$6.04 credit in August. These will all be used up the first cold month. These credits can't be considered material for a company the size of Idaho Power. Let us see the facts! I can't find any in the application, just words like: contends, perhaps, and may.

I paid for all the installation and connection, including a \$100 fee to Idaho Power. I am complying with all their rules and regulations. I still pay a monthly service charge. Idaho Power incurs no generation, transmission, or distribution costs as my surplus power is used and billed to my neighbor. Currently my system is more reliable than Idaho Power's, as I can't produce power when their grid is down.

In other states the power companies pay thousand of dollars to help lower the cost of solar installation to the customer. As an additional benefit in other states electricity is billed at on-peak and off-peak rates. In other

words during the day when I am producing surplus power I would be paid the on-peak price and at night when I use power I would pay the off-peak price.

Why does Idaho Power paid for , install for free, and give a credit to the for the ac cycling switches? I believe it's to reduce peak power demand on those hot summer afternoons. The same time my systems is at it's best feeding power into the grid to help satisfy demand. And now they want give me even less money. I don't get it. Why shouldn't I get a credit too?!

Idaho Power contends that the current pricing " pays customers more than the actual value of the generation itself". I would disagree with this for solar and would like to see some hard facts to back up this statement. Shouldn't decisions be based on facts? I believe Idaho Power does recover it's full costs and then some from it's solar net metering customers. On July 24 of this year the non-firm on-peak cost according to the Mid-Columbia Electricity Price Index was 23.679 cents per KWH. I sold my surplus to Idaho Power for 5.4251 cents (which was actually less than the 5.428 cent winter rate). Ask Idaho Power what it cost them per KWH to run their natural gas peaking plants. When I use electricity, I use the cheaper to produce off-peak power.

On page 1 & 2 of the application Idaho Power states "The Company supports net metering and allowing all participating customers to realize the value of their generation. Therefore, the Company is proposing modifications to its net metering provisions to eliminate certain financial barriers to participation, to reduce cost-shifting to non-participating customer, and to treat all net metering customers in a fair, just and equitable manner." It is not fair, just, or equitable to treat all net metering the same. The cost of a solar system is much more than a small wind or hydro system. The benefit is also higher. All solar production comes during on peak hours (6am-10pm according to the Dow Jones Index) in the peak months. This is of much greater value than producing in off peak hours or off peak months. The Idaho PUC and utilities should encourage diverse, "made in Idaho", zero emissions power ,that creates local jobs, no? Other customers also benefit from this reliable, zero emissions, local, low cost peak electricity source.

On page 7 of the application it states there are only "26 Idaho net metering customer from all rate classes". It is my understanding this is all about a couple of big surplus hydro customers. If this is true ,exempt the 5 KW and below systems or the solar systems. It is not fair to punish everyone because of a couple. Is it?

Please do not approve case no. IPC-E-06-17 as it currently reads.

Thank you,

John Weber

9535 W Cory

Boise, ID 83704

Js_weber@hotmail.com

208-321-4998

PS: Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

FYI: Idaho Power's definition of "Avoided Energy Cost is the monthly weighted average of the daily on-peak and off-peak Dow Jones Mid-Columbia Electricity Price Index prices for non-firm energy " to subscribe to this information costs \$1,500 a year according to Ernest Onukogo from Dow Jones. Solar is 100% on-peak and 0% off-peak. I am just an average guy trying to walk the walk making Idaho a better place for all to live.