

Jean Jewell

From: edntucker@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 19, 2012 4:49 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Ed Wardwell follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-12-27
Name: Ed Wardwell
Address: 13268 DechambeauWay
City: Boise
State: Idaho
Zip: 83714
Daytime Telephone: 208 229 8778
Contact E-Mail: edntucker@gmail.com
Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

After reading the Idaho Power Company proposal on Net Metering, IPC-E-12-27, I knew that this must have a public hearing from the PUC. It is a direct contradiction to the Idaho Energy Plan. The Idaho Energy plan calls for development of alternative clean energy. The IPC-E-12-27 rate increases does just the opposite. The Idaho Energy plan states that we should "minimize emissions and harmful pollutants". The IPC-E-12-27 eliminates the incentive to put up residential alternative energy that would replace harmful lead, mercury emissions and climate changing gases from our fossil fuel generators.

The value of clean energy is greater that the retail rate that IPC opposes to pay back to non-utility providers. If the true costs of burning the 9 million tons of coal at Jim Bridger were calculated into the cost, IPC should be paying a lot more than the nominal 7 cents to the net metering providers. A wise and prudent PUC would see this for what it really is: an attempt to not just put the brakes on green energy but to go backwards. Decision like this must be brought out into the light of day and not made in back room deals like the one sided Idaho legislature.

There are too many flaws and false assumptions in the one sided IPC arguments. The shortsighted ideas of a few powerful people in IPC could undermine the marginally adequate net metering system currently in place. IPC-E-12-27 is a breach of trust and contract with the net metered customers. Most of the people at IPC do a great job providing energy at a low rate and they are to be commended but their leaders are taking Idaho and America backwards instead of forward. Our children and the unborn need wise direction from the PUC and the public. There must be a public hearing on this issue.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 66.232.82.175

Jean Jewell

From: 5skibums@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2012 1:55 PM
To: Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Kolay Johnson follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-12-27
Name: Kolay Johnson
Address:
City: Inkom
State: ID
Zip: 83245
Daytime Telephone: 2087753223
Contact E-Mail: 5skibums@gmail.com
Name of Utility Company: Kolay Custom Sewing
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

Last week I received a letter from Idaho Power saying that a new regulation might be adopted next Oct. 2013. Where we who receive kilowatt-hour credit from producing electricity. Will not be able to receive financial payment and more disturbing at the end of the calender year any credit that we have will be dropped. This is very troublesome to me for in the summer months I build kilowatt-hour credit that I then use in the winter. And by ending the credit in Dec.

I will be paying when I would have had plenty of credit. I hope that you will reconsider this whole regulation because it does not seem fair. Thank you for taking the time to read this Sincerely Kolay Johnson

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 205.185.84.239

Jean Jewell

From: dkb.mathman@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2012 9:36 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Daniel Burton follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-12-27
Name: Daniel Burton
Address:
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip: 83706
Daytime Telephone:
Contact E-Mail: dkb.mathman@gmail.com
Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:
Salutations,

A friend of mine recently made me aware of Idaho Power's proposal to increase rates on domestic users of solar, wind, or other alternative energy sources.

I think this is a seriously poor decision on the part of Idaho Power. Most users of domestic alternative energy sources shoulder the costs of installation and maintenance, resulting in no additional costs to Idaho Power. I am at a loss to think of how a rate increase can be justified, when in point of fact, it can only be understood as a cost increase to offset a loss of revenue, caused by customers supplementing their domestic power supply with alternative, "off grid" sources.

In this light, this rate increase, in the public-eye, can only be understood as a punitive measure, which results in discouraging Idaho Power customers from using alternative power sources, such as solar.

I do not understand why Idaho Power would want to work against alternative power and against power innovation. The use of solar, wind, and other alternative energy sources should be promoted, not discouraged.

Given Idaho Power's role in the local power market, if this policy is implemented, I would not be surprised if someone files a lawsuit against Idaho Power claiming noncompetitive business practices.

Granted, Idaho Power is not infringing on the rights of other businesses, but as the primary power provider in Idaho, they are infringing on the rights of customers to not be or to be less of a customer. Idaho Power customers that use solar will have no choice in market whether or not they want to pay these rate increases.

Idaho Power should be encouraging innovation and moving toward the future, not padding its profits with punitive rate increases on progressive, forward thinking consumers.

Thanks for listening.

_Daniel