

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** lundys@fmtc.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 08, 2013 4:32 PM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from scott lundy follows:

-----  
Case Number: IPC-E-12-27  
Name: scott lundy  
Address: 5066 Barnard Ln  
City: Fruitland  
State: Idaho  
Zip: 83619  
Daytime Telephone: 208-452-5410  
Contact E-Mail: [lundys@fmtc.com](mailto:lundys@fmtc.com)  
Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

To Whom It May Concern:

Regarding the proposal for new fees/charges for net metering customers, I have a few comments.

1. It is retroactive. It's one thing to be told ahead of time that a charge will be assessed, so that all costs can be taken into account before making an investment in alternative energy. As it was, we were barely able to justify making that investment - with a significant amount of financial pain. But now that we're 'on board' we are told that we have some fiscal surprises which cause this investment in green energy to be a complete loser.
2. It is punitive. Utilities often talk in terms of percentages. Try these: the proposed charges would have increased our November home meter payment along the lines of 80%. Last June, it would have increased it by around 500%! Wouldn't that qualify as significant? Perhaps painful? Certainly makes one glad to have invested responsibly.
3. It is shady. My conversations with Idaho Power employees turned up an interesting fact: the proposed charges are based on an average of the two highest periods of usage recorded on the meter during the year, but the meter doesn't actually record whether that highest amount of electricity passing through is coming or going. In other words, we could potentially be charged according to a highest 'usage' which was actually our production.
4. It is unjust. As solar producers, we generate most of our electricity when Idaho Power needs it most. From late morning to early evening during the summer months, we produce FAR more electricity than we use, and so are pouring it back into the grid for other users. What a coincidence; just when Idaho Power needs it the most, we are operating as a supplier. But instead of being rewarded, we are being given the smackdown. Makes you want to go right out and do more good deeds!
5. It is unfair. It doesn't cost Idaho Power any more to collect the data on a net meter than it does a regular meter. If there are additional costs associated with hook-ups on net meters, then charge a corresponding hook-up fee when service is initiated. However, don't come around later looking for easy revenue from a group just because it is assumed to be too small to have any significant political pull.

6. It is a job-killer. These fees will put a serious crimp on an already-tenuous, barely-budding alternative energy sector in Idaho. We were barely able to justify the costs of installing solar as it was. If these fees had already been in place there is no way that we would have been able to justify the investment. If people aren't installing systems, then the installers are out of business. It's just that simple.

7. It is highly anti-green. While I myself am not a hyper-environmentalist, it is a red-hot, politically-correct issue, and for the reasons cited above in [6.] it is clear that these proposed fees would move people AWAY from alternative energy investments and a more responsible, 'greener' lifestyle. That's not going to sell well in the public square. The media loves to get ahold of stuff like this.

Thank you for your patience with my comments. I wish to request a public hearing on this issue. We're not looking for special treatment, but I ask, as the powerless widow did in Luke 18:3: 'Grant me justice against my adversary.'

Respectfully yours,  
Scott Lundy

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 208.98.140.6

-----

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** johnrryan@cableone.net  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 09, 2013 12:54 AM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from John Ryan follows:

-----  
Case Number: IPC-E-12-27  
Name: John Ryan  
Address:  
City: Boise  
State: ID  
Zip: 83706  
Daytime Telephone: 2088710948  
Contact E-Mail: [johnrryan@cableone.net](mailto:johnrryan@cableone.net)  
Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:  
To the Idaho Public Utilities Commission Staff:

I urge the Commission to reject Idaho Power's request "Modifications to Net Metering Service" (IPC-E-12-27) for the following reasons.

1. Idaho Power's Testimony (Larkin) regarding the proposal explains that all customers benefit from their distribution system, whether or not they provide supplemental generation through a net metering installation. Larkin's testimony proceeds to explain that Idaho Power has fixed costs related to the distribution system, but that an opportunity exists for net metering customers to "unduly reduce collection of these costs for which they are partly responsible". The testimony further goes on to imply that net metering has detrimental impacts to standard service customers, accuses net metering customers of introducing a potential "inequity" in relation to standard service customers, and alarmingly suggest that standard service customers are left to compensate for IP's revenue shortfall created by net metering. This testimony is false.

In fact, net metering customers' investments in residential power generation saves all ratepayers substantially. This fact is well understood, and even appears on IPUC's own website outlining Tiered Rates (<http://www.puc.state.id.us/hot/tiered%20rates.htm>) , which explains:

"...When Idaho Power cannot produce enough electricity to serve customers with its lower- cost hydro and coal plants, it must either start up its more expensive gas-fired turbines or buy electricity on the market. This results in higher rates for all customers. Further, less consumption will delay the need for Idaho Power to build costly new generating facilities. That also saves all customers considerable expense."

Clearly, a residential solar installation has the same beneficial effect on Idaho Power. As we all know, when the sun is shining, solar installations reduce the need for Idaho Power to start up its more expensive gas-fired turbines and limit its need to buy electricity on the market, thereby resulting in lower rates for all customers. This reduced consumption driven by solar and other net metering systems also delays the need for IP to build costly new generating facilities, thereby saving all customers considerable expense.

2. Given that solar installations and other net metering systems reduce the need for IP to build costly new generating facilities, their proposal to increase the monthly service charge for net metering customers from \$5.00 to \$20.92 makes no sense. Rather than punishing net metering customers, IP should lower their monthly service charges for helping them delay the considerable expense of costly new generating facilities. If IP feels that net metering customers are not paying enough to cover the expenses for basic services and fixed costs attributable to being connected to IP's distribution system, then they should propose a level increase in the monthly service charge to all customers, with net metering customers at a lower or equal rate (but certainly not a higher rate than standard customers).

3. Idaho Power proposes to confiscate excess power produced by net metering customers annually. Paired with the increased monthly service charge, this aspect of IP's proposal is clearly designed to further limit access and viability of net metering for all Idahoans.

4. Idaho Power's proposal to increase the net metering cap from 2.9MW to 5.8MW is admirable at first glance, but it is unacceptable as part of the overall proposal. As well, it is clear that this insignificant increase does not have the capacity to meet the dramatically growing interest in net metering under the current program which is apparent from Larkin's testimony. I encourage the Commission to approve any proposals to substantially increase the cap (preferably well above 5.8MW) that are not tied to the other parts of this proposal.

Taken as a whole, Idaho Power's proposal is designed to make net metering unaffordable to Idahoans. Please reject it.

Respectfully submitted,  
John Ryan

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 24.116.140.179

-----

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** kevinkluckhohn@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 09, 2013 2:36 AM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Kevin Kluckhohn follows:

-----  
Case Number: IPC-E-12-27  
Name: Kevin Kluckhohn  
Address: 3377 W. Wave Dr.  
City: Meridian  
State: ID  
Zip: 83642  
Daytime Telephone: 208-371-1669  
Contact E-Mail: [kevinkluckhohn@gmail.com](mailto:kevinkluckhohn@gmail.com) Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

I am an Idaho Power rate payer. Though I am not a net metering customer, I am opposed to case # IPC-E-12-27 and believe it is harmful to all Idaho Power rate payers. I strongly urge the IPUC to disapprove the proposed rate changes to net metering customers. Reasons include:

Managing the peak demand for power drives the future cost of energy in Idaho. People who invest in solar help diminish those costs. They reduce the need for expensive new transmission lines and generation power, the cost of which gets passed on to me as a rate payer. I'd like to see Idaho encourage people to invest in solar, but at minimum Idaho Power should not be permitted to discourage it.

It bothers me that 40-50% of Idaho Power's generation comes from coal. As a rate payer, I face the risk that some form of carbon tax could significantly increase our costs. People who invest in renewable energy help reduce that risk. Idaho Power should not be allowed to discourage those investments and put my future rates at greater risk.

This proposal hurts Idaho's reputation. As other states are creating jobs and focused on solutions related to wind and solar, it saddens me to see Idaho Power building a reputation for its animosity toward wind and solar.

In its opposition to wind, Idaho Power has emphasized that wind doesn't help manage peak demand. It's hypocritical for Idaho Power to now discourage solar as well. I would like to see Idaho Power focused on ways to work with solar rather than penalize people who have invested in it.

I am offended that Idaho Power is investing this much attorney time, administrative time, and the IPUC's time to target a financially insignificant subset of customers. They have 500,000 customers and far bigger issues and opportunities to address. Better serving us rate payers means better managing peak demand, not creating fees to discourage people from investing in solar.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 24.116.170.81