

Jean Jewell

From: chisholm3@mindspring.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2012 7:31 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Bill Chisholm, Idaho Energy Education Project follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-12-27
Name: Bill Chisholm, Idaho Energy Education Project
Address: 19073E Hwy 30
City: Buhl
State: Idaho
Zip: 83316
Daytime Telephone: 208-543-4418
Contact E-Mail: chisholm3@mindspring.com Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power Co.
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

Idaho Power seems to forget that in exchange for a monopoly on electrical service in an area of Idaho, they have a public interest requirement. Renewable energy is an important aspect of the public interest and rather than trying to strangle its development Idaho Power should be trying to encourage it. The Idaho Energy Education Project therefore wishes to go on record as asking for a public hearing in this matter. It is too important an issue to come under Modified Procedure.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 209.86.226.19

Jean Jewell

From: bluelightningllc@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2012 9:09 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Greg Olson follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-12-27
Name: Greg Olson
Address: 8399 West Hill Road
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip: 83714
Daytime Telephone: 208-389-9956
Contact E-Mail: bluelightningllc@gmail.com Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

I wish to voice my displeasure in Idaho Power putting Idaho years behind our neighboring states in electrical jobs and training. Do not be fooled by Idaho Power's argument that this is more expensive electricity. This is a jobs and education issue. If we stop installing DC electric systems that include battery backup common in the renewable industry, but also in the computer, electric vehicle, airplane, and telecommunication industries we will have no one in this state qualified to do these systems in the future. Large DC electric systems are more common in ALL these industries and provide high paying jobs in engineering, design, and parts for years to come. Weather you like solar or not this affects a broad spectrum of skilled labor jobs. Idaho is already over 2 years behind our neighboring states due to the legislature not passing DC electric code provisions until well after all our neighbors. We need people trained in these systems and the market/customers need to be able to make a fair decision on the installation of a renewable energy system with out a very large and unwarranted cost bias being placed by a clearly old school interest in last centuries energy sources tipping the scales. Vote NO on Idaho Powers request to raise net metering costs.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 75.92.134.188

Jean Jewell

From: laurie_kuntz@hotmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2012 9:33 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Laurie Kuntz follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-12-27
Name: Laurie Kuntz
Address:
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip: 83713
Daytime Telephone:
Contact E-Mail: laurie_kuntz@hotmail.com Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

I am outraged over this latest proposal by Idaho Power to increase rates for net-metering customers. I am the owner of a solar grid at my home and this rate increase would effectively nullify the benefits that I currently get. I am helping Idaho Power by providing supplemental power to their customers and reducing or postponing the need for Idaho Power to build new infrastructure, and should not be punished for being a responsible citizen who cares about the environment and is actually helping to alleviate Idaho Power's problem of increasing demand for electricity.

Idaho Power's proposal would make it more expensive for consumers to have solar, rather than encouraging people to invest in renewable energy. In many cases the net metered customer's bill would be higher than if they generated no renewable power at all. This is ridiculous and would make net-zero buildings impossible.

Please reject Idaho Power's proposal and organize a public hearing on this issue so that Idaho Power cannot implement these new rules behind closed doors.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 97.121.47.112

Jean Jewell

From: js_weber@hotmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2012 10:31 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment Form

A Comment from John Weber follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-12-27
Name: John Weber
Address:
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip:
Daytime Telephone:
Contact E-Mail: js_weber@hotmail.com
Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:
Dear Staff and Commissioners,

In all my years of commenting on rate cases this has to be the least thoughtfully written case. I believe it should be thrown out the window. I request a public hearing at the very least should be required.

Here is an example of the impact using actual numbers on my own house:

Example for simplicity using 7 cents per kWh

House without net-metering

Annual use 1,361 kWhs (based on Sept. 2011 until Aug. 2012) Annual total= \$95.27 Monthly service charges \$5. Annual total = \$60.00 Total annual cost (not including cost adjustments, efficiency fee, and franchise fees) = \$155.27

Same house with net-metering (if Idaho Power was granted what they asked for) Annual use 1,361 kWhs (based on Sept. 2011 until Aug. 2012) Annual total= \$95.27 Monthly service charges \$20.92. Annual total = \$251.04 Monthly BLC (Basic Load Charge) per kW is \$1.48. For example 1 kW is used = \$17.76 Total annual charges = \$364.07 Total annual production is 1,629 kWhs (based on Sept. 2011 until Aug. 2012) Annual total = \$114.03 Total annual cost (not including cost adjustments, efficiency fee, and franchise fees) = \$250.04

This example does not take into consideration the kWh credit that would be lost at the end of the Dec. billing cycle. The actual total cost for the house with net-metering would be even greater if that were taken into consideration. There is also the \$100.00 that Idaho Power charges to net-meter in the first place. In conclusion: the customer that made/makes an investment in renewable energy that helps the state be more energy independent, creates Idaho jobs, reduces the need for expensive new generation, transmission, and distribution would have to pay a higher electric bill than a customer with the same usage that had made no investment at all.

Thank you,
John Weber

Jean Jewell

From: rsarasua@yahoo.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2012 11:06 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Richard Sarasua follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-12-27
Name: Richard Sarasua
Address:
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip:
Daytime Telephone:
Contact E-Mail: rsarasua@yahoo.com
Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

Homes that use renewable power sources and contribute power back to the grid should not be punished, they should be encouraged.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 71.220.149.136

Jean Jewell

From: waldadam@isu.edu
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2012 3:13 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Adam Waldron follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-12-27
Name: Adam Waldron
Address:
City: Pocatello
State: ID
Zip: 83201
Daytime Telephone:
Contact E-Mail: waldadam@isu.edu
Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

I am adamantly opposed to the proposed rule changes except the request to increase the cumulative nameplate capacity. I would also request that a public hearing be held rather than the application be processed via Modified Procedure.

The press release and customer insert do not provide all the facts that the public and net metering customers should have. The press release honestly seems misleading. I am particularly concerned about the customer insert that will be mailed to existing and slated net metering customers.

Nowhere in the customer insert does it clearly state or explain the new monthly meter or BLC fees. The comparison of rate tables should be included with the customer insert, as well as clear instructions on how to calculate what their payments for the previous year would have been under the new rules.

If customers, renewable energy businesses, and the public clearly understood the impacts of the proposed rule changes, I doubt they would remain docile in their responses. The new rules particularly discourage small scale renewable energy projects by homeowners, as the new fees would outweigh all the financial benefits. In fact customers would end up paying more with a small wind or solar project, than without. The financial margins are already minimal, the new rules would not only completely wipe out any gains, the scales would actually be tipped in the other direction, in essence requiring the customer to pay for the privilege of owning a grid-tied renewable energy system. A payback period would become nonexistent.

As an example we can use the popular skystream wind turbines we see popping up in many backyards across the state. The Skystream wind turbine is rated at 2.1 kW, and can be expected to generate about 200kWh per month or \$14.80 (using an annual average 7.4 cents per kWh for tier 1 residential service). Under the new rules this system would incur a monthly fee of \$24 (including the avg. BLC charge for 2.1kW). To be fair we will subtract the \$5 meter fee already being paid, which brings us to a monthly increase in fees of \$19. You would end up paying Idaho Power \$4.20 more a month than if you did not have the wind turbine! For those who have already invested in net metering systems, this is changing the rules midgame. Such systems were installed based upon payback calculations and in many cases the promise or hope of a zero dollar power bill. All those plans, promises and hopes are now thrown out the window. Some customers will end up in a situation where they would be better off without a renewable energy system, but they have already made the substantial investment.

The expiration of kilowatt-hour credits in December is also disconcerting. The following cold winter months of January, February and March are generally months of least production for solar, and highest electrical consumption due to heating. So customers who have garnered a large amount of credits during the high production summer months would not be able to use those credits when needed most. Most net metering customers are obsessively energy efficient in the hopes of attaining that zero dollar power bill or increasing the credit they receive from the power company. The new rules discourage efficiency as the net metering customer will lose all credits, and not receive financial offsets for fees and service charges. If all kilowatt-hour credits expire in December customers are faced with a use it or lose it scenario, and nobody likes to be on the losing side. Customers instinctively mitigate potential losses by increasing consumption. These types of loss aversion scenarios have been played out, proven and studied countless times. We end up with a scenario where rather than contributing power to the grid, customers are drawing more from it. Solar installations provide the additional benefit of providing the most energy during the mid-day, one of the peak consumption periods, thus offsetting some peak demand from other customers. The new rules make new net metering projects financially impractical and will put an end to new net metering projects. This will not only impact homeowners, but will also be detrimental to the nascent renewable energy industry and business owners who cater to the needs and wishes of homeowners. The filing speaks to trying to remedy a perceived inequity of the many customers supporting the few. But is this not the case with the energy efficiency charge that everyone pays monthly? Not everyone benefits directly from that fee, except for those that have the opportunity or choose to participate in the programs. The public benefits of clean renewable energy, conservation, jobs and economic development outweigh any perceived inequities.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 67.134.57.98

Jean Jewell

From: dlpkmb@spro.net
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2012 6:13 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Kevin Bayhouse follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-12-27
Name: Kevin Bayhouse
Address: 706 Opal St
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip: 83705
Daytime Telephone: (208) 344-6805
Contact E-Mail: dlpkmb@spro.net
Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:
Dear PUC,

I am closely familiar with a real life example of a local construct of a net-zero/solar home and I know the former owner/builder (John Weber). If this new pricing structure were to be implemented, it would make a mockery of ANY claims by the provider (Idaho Power) that they are committed to clean/sustainable power generation. What good does it do to arbitrarily raise prices on solar power (or other) in a billing structure?

John provided the numbers using his own billing history as an example of what would happen-

Net-metering change and impact- Case IPC-E-12-27

Example for simplicity using 7 cents per kWh

House without net-metering

Annual use 1,361 kWhs (based on Sept. 2011 until Aug. 2012) Annual total= \$95.27

Monthly service charges \$5. Annual total = \$60.00

Total annual cost (not including cost adjustments, efficiency fee, and franchise fees) = \$155.27

Same house with net-metering (if Idaho Power was granted what they asked for)

Annual use 1,361 kWhs (based on Sept. 2011 until Aug. 2012) Annual total= \$95.27

Monthly service charges \$20.92. Annual total = \$251.04

Monthly BLC (Basic Load Charge) per kW is \$1.48. For example 1 kW is used = \$17.76

Total annual charges = \$364.07

Total annual production is 1,629 kWhs (based on Sept. 2011 until Aug. 2012) Annual total = \$114.03

Total annual cost (not including cost adjustments, efficiency fee, and franchise fees) = \$250.04

This example is based on real numbers from my house. This example does not take into consideration the kWh credit that would be lost at the end of the Dec. billing cycle. The actual total cost for the house with net-metering would be even greater if that were taken into consideration. There is also the \$100.00 that Idaho Power charges to net-meter in the first place. In conclusion: the customer that made/makes an investment in renewable energy that helps the state be more energy independent, creates Idaho jobs, reduces the need for expensive new generation, transmission, and distribution would have to pay a higher electric bill than a customer with the same usage that had made no investment at all.

So, what exactly is all of this extra charge for?

Most of us who look at energy policy can clearly see that fossil sources are heavily subsidized in many ways. We also hear the howls and cries of the pro-fossil industries as they point fingers at straw man examples like Solyndra (puhhlease) in order to categorically eliminate clean energy from the pallet of choices. Please do not succumb to these vapid charges and claims. Many of us WANT to be able to install alternatives when we get the money and putting arbitrary barriers in front of us is just plain counterproductive.

Thank you,

Kevin Bayhouse
Boise

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 206.207.104.172

Jean Jewell

From: isaac1h@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, December 06, 2012 5:44 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment Form

A Comment from isaac hasselblad follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-12-27
Name: isaac hasselblad
Address: 3439 Shadow Hills Dr.
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip: 83616
Daytime Telephone: 2083339637
Contact E-Mail: isaac1h@yahoo.com
Name of Utility Company: idaho power
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

This proposal would make it not cost effective to build residential solar system. The Idaho Public Utilities Commission should be encouraging it's residents toward solar and other renewable sources. If we stop installing DC electric systems common in the renewable industry, but also in the computer, electric vehicle, airplane, and telecommunication industries we will have no one in this state qualified to do these systems in the future. Large DC electric systems are more common in ALL these industries and provide high paying jobs in engineering, design, and parts for years to come. Weather you like solar or not this affects a broad spectrum of skilled labor jobs. Idaho is already over 2 years behind our neighboring states due to the legislature not passing DC electric code provisions until well after all our neighbors. We need people trained in these systems and the market/customers need to be able to make a fair decision on the installation of a renewable energy system with out a very large and unwarranted cost bias being placed by a clearly old school interest in last centuries energy sources tipping the scales. PLEASE VOTE NO ON IPC-E-12-27

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 71.220.149.149
