

Jean Jewell

From: Alternate_Power_Designs [info@alternatepowerdesigns.com]
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2013 3:48 PM
To: Jean Jewell
Cc: Inordstrom@idahopower.com; mlarkin@idahopower.com; gsaid@idahopower.com; Karl Klein; botto@idahoconservation.org; ca@powerworks.com; peter@richardsonandoleary.com; jsteiner@rtci.net; boiseattorney@cityofhoise.org; jrh@battfisher.com; kmiller@snakeriveralliance.org; joe@mcdevitt-miller.com; info@alternatepowerdesigns.com
Subject: Response: IPC-E-12-27 / Notice of Workshops/ Order No. 32767
Attachments: NetMetering IPUC PCC-E-12-27 Public Comments Categorized.pdf

Dear Commissioners,

In response to notice of Public Workshop Order 32767 concerning IPC-E-12-27 Net Metering case.

I'm concerned at how few of the 353 net metering customers have submitted comments as of 3/22/13. This may indicate that many of them may not actively be aware or understand the consequences to them if IPC's request were to be fully implemented. It is easy to overlook or forget about a single letter mailed from IPC on 11/30/12, especially when it didn't have red flags or urgent notice to indicate the detrimental significance to net metering customers. The letter had a very benign introduction saying... "requesting authority to modify its net metering service provisions to facilitate continued growth in the program."

From the public comments posted between 12/06/13 & 3/22/13, I summarized the total number of public comments and assigned them into 5 categories. The data is shown in the attached PDF. The following is a summary of the 290 comments...

- 197- General Points, comments that are short or simply supportive of green power without details of the IPC case.
- 39- Detailed Points, comments that address specific details of the case or have other detailed info on net metering.
- 12- Future Net-Meter Customer, comments that contain relevant detail and likely to become a net metering customer under favorable conditions.
- 39- Current Net Meter Customer, Comments for people that are currently net metering, most have detailed comments, 2 or 3 are not IPC customers.
- 3- Installer/Rep, Comments from individuals or company that install net metering systems or represents the interest of them.

I would like to suggest that IPC or the IPUC that has the contact information of the net metering customers send additional notices updating them of the recent actions by the IPUC and notifying them of the public workshop. It has been almost 4 months since the net metering customer were mailed notices.

Sincerely,

Scott Moore
Alternate Power Designs, LLC
info@alternatepowerdesigns.com

NetMetering IPUC PCC-E-12-27 Public Comments Categorized

By Scott Moore (Alternate Power Designs, LLC) info@alternatepowerdesigns.com

Comment File	Total	General Point	Detailed Point	Future NetMeter	Current NetMeter	Installer / Rep.
Comment Totals	290	197	39	12	39	3
20121206COMMENTS(8).PDF	8	2	5		1	
20121210COMMENTS(3).PDF	3		1		2	
20121211COMMENTS(2).PDF	2				2	
20121212COMMENTS(2).PDF	2		1		1	
20121213COMMENT(1).PDF	1				1	
20121217COMMENTS(4).PDF	4	1	1		2	
20121218COMMENTS(3).PDF	3	2			1	
20121219COMMENTS(3).PDF	3		2		1	
20121220COMMENT(1).PDF	1			1		
20121221COMMENT(1).PDF	1				1	
20121226COMMENT(1).PDF	1	1				
20121227COMMENT(1).PDF	1				1	
20130102COMMENT(1).PDF	1				1	
20130103COMMENT(1).PDF	1			1		
20130107COMMENT(1).PDF	1				1	
20130108COMMENT(1).PDF	1		1			
20130108COMMENT1(1).PDF	1				1	
20130109COMMENTS (3).PDF	3		2		1	
20130110COMMENTS (3).PDF	3	2			1	
20130111COMMENT(1).PDF	1		1			
20130114COMMENTS (4).PDF	4	1	1		1	1
20130115COMMENT(1).PDF	1				1	
20130115COMMENTS (2).PDF	2	2				
20130117COMMENTS (2).PDF	2			1	1	
20130122COMMENTS (2).PDF	2		1	1		
20130124COMMENTS (3).PDF	3	1	1			1
20130125COMMENT(1).PDF	1	1				
20130128COMMENT(1).PDF	1		1			
20130128COMMENT1(1).PDF	1				1	
20130129COMMENTS (16).PDF	16	16				
20130129COMMENTS (100).PDF	100	93	4	1	2	
20130130COMMENTS (21).PDF	21	18	1		2	
20130131COMMENTS (19).PDF	19	13	3	1	2	
20130201COMMENTS (7).PDF	7	5		1	1	
20130204COMMENTS (11).PDF	11	6	2	2	1	
20130205COMMENTS (3).PDF	3	2			1	
20130206COMMENTS (3).PDF	3	3				
20130207COMMENTS (2).PDF	2		1	1		
20130208COMMENTS (2).PDF	2	1		1		
20130211COMMENT(1).PDF	1	1				
20130213COMMENT(1).PDF	1	1				
20130215COMMENT(1).PDF	1		1			
20130219COMMENTS (2).PDF	2	1			1	
20130220COMMENT(1).PDF	1	1				
20130221COMMENT(1).PDF	1	1				
20130222COMMENTS (3).PDF	3		1		2	
20130225COMMENTS (2).PDF	2				2	
20130226COMMENT(1).PDF	1	1				
20130227COMMENT(1).PDF	1		1			
20130227COMMENT1(1).PDF	1		1			
20130228ADDENDUM TO COMMENTS(1).PDF	1		1			
20130228COMMENT(1).PDF	1	1				
20130305COMMENT(1).PDF	1				1	
20130307COMMENTS (2).PDF	2	1				1
20130311COMMENTS (2).PDF	2	1			1	
20130313COMMENTS (2).PDF	2	2				
20130318COMMENTS (2).PDF	2	1	1			
20130319COMMENTS (8).PDF	8	6	1		1	
20130320COMMENTS (10).PDF	10	7	2	1		
20130322COMMENT(1).pdf	1	1				
20130322COMMENTS (2).pdf	2	1	1			

Jean Jewell

From: ds2k@msn.com
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2013 7:49 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Del Dickerson follows:

Case Number: IPC-E-12-27
Name: Del Dickerson
Address: 1035 Beverly Drive
City: Eagle
State: ID
Zip: 83616
Daytime Telephone:
Contact E-Mail: ds2k@msn.com
Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

Del Dickerson
1035 Beverly Drive
Eagle, ID 83616

22 March 2013

Jean Jewell
Commission Secretary Idaho Public Utilities Commission PO Box 83720 Boise, Idaho 83720

Dear Sir,

This comment is an addition to the one that I submitted on 12/19/2012.

After reading nearly all of the hundreds of comments submitted for consideration in this case, I've not read one that is not in favor of incentivizing green energy development, contrary to the IPC proposal.

The 150+ page Larkin testimony attempts to make the case that the 350 current net-metering customers are having such a Draconian effect on the other 495,570 IPC customers (IPC website) that the rates for net-metering customers need to be dramatically increased. You don't need a 150 page document to realize that this is laughable ($350/495,570 = 0.07\%$).

Larkin also attempts to make the case that consumer-produced electrons flowing up-stream are not billed fairly because of demand-related issues. It seems to me that it would be a simple matter to calculate how much it costs to build and maintain a connection to the grid, and charge each customer accordingly, regardless of demand.

I think that what is actually happening is that the "lights" have come on in the IPC corporate suite, and the bean counters realize that if alternative energy development, especially solar, gains traction in IPC's service area under the current net-metering policy, their bottom line could take a major hit. It's their job to make sure that doesn't happen.

Hopefully, the IPUC won't be complicit in this endeavor.

Respectfully,

Del Dickerson

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 174.27.124.15
