

✓ Ken Ack  
sent 10/12/06

✓ To A.V.

✓ To Commis.  
; H

October 11, 2006

RECEIVED

Jack Goodman  
4148 N. 1100 E.  
Buhl, ID 83316

2006 OCT 12 AM 8:15

IDAHO PUBLIC  
UTILITIES COMMISSION

Commission Secretary  
Idaho Public Utilities Commission  
P.O. Box 83720  
Boise, Idaho 83720-0074

Re: Case No. IPC-E-06-17

Dear Commission,

My neighbor and I are fortunate enough to have property on a site that is suitable for hydro-electric generation. After researching the project for some time, including the IPUC approved Schedule 84 Customer Energy Production Net Metering policy, we decided to proceed with developing the site. We spent over \$60,000 in installing state-of-the-art equipment to insure that we would have reliable production, and three years of labor in building the installation. This most definitely was not a get-rich scheme, but based on the cost of the installation and the income guaranteed under Schedule 84, we figured it could pay back (exclusive of our labor) our costs in six to eight years.

In addition, we thought that this was a way we could do our part to contribute to the development of much needed alternative energy sources. Our project is a completely non-consumptive, non-polluting, renewable source of energy that produces enough electricity to power six to eight average homes.

Idaho Power is proposing a revision of Schedule 84 that will penalize us for our investment in the future of Idaho, a revision that will surely discourage other developers from applying their initiative and their time and money to develop these sources of energy.

In a time when other countries and other states in this country are doing what they can to reduce their dependence on foreign oil, on coal-fired plants, on depleting our stores of non-renewable energy, is Idaho going to take a step backwards by penalizing those who are willing to take the risk of trying to accomplish this? Idaho Power is giving lip service to the development of "Green Power" in their advertising. How much greener can power be than what is developed by these small, privately developed sites?

I can imagine what the public reaction will be if this revision is allowed.

Sincerely,