Jean Jewell

From: Jean Jewell
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2014 9:08 AM
To: Jean Jewell
Subject: FW: IPC-E-14-09

From: Gene Fadness
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2014 8:56 AM
To: Jean Jewell
Subject: Fwd: IPC-E-14-09

Dear Commissioners,

From your ruling on case IPC-E-12-27 "Moreover, we are concerned that the Company did not seek out or consider customer input before proposing such dramatic changes to the net metering provisions." It seems the same for this case as well. No one that I am aware of was spoken with regarding this filing. How many times will the commissioners have to tell Idaho Power about speaking with stakeholders and interested parties before filing with the PUC? I respectfully request the commissioners dismiss this filing because Idaho Power has not done what the commissioners have requested in the past. If not dismiss it, at least have a public hearing.

Wind, solar, biomass, geothermal, hydro, natural gas, diesel, and coal all have integration costs and benefits. Studies of these kinds should be performed by the regulator (PUC) not the utilities. Allowing the utilities to perform the studies allows them to stack the deck in their own self-interest and not in the interest of the rate payers. It goes without saying that benefits should be studied along with the costs. In some cases the benefits may outweigh the costs. These benefits could include, cleaner air, no fuel costs, reduced healthcare costs, more employment, a more stable grid, and others.

This current solar study looks much like the wind study that Idaho Power did in the past during its first phase of its war on renewable energy. Of course, Idaho Power picks the people that make up the TRC (Technical Review Committee). Looking at the makeup of the TRC, none appear to be technical experts on the integration of solar power and utility grids. This strikes me as strange. In testimony from Mr. DeVol it appears one basis for the study was a wind study. "This report is used as the roadmap for Idaho Power's solar integration study." Solar and wind are very different resources and match Idaho Power's load seasonally and daily in very different ways. I find this strange as well. So, when the coal study comes up next, will the company use a hydro study for its roadmap?

I had e-mailed Idaho Power regarding the TRC and meeting times and days. I suggested if they really wanted to have the public involved they would have some of the meetings after the normal working hours for the public. They did not even do this with their one public meeting.

How many times did Idaho Power say "great and irreparable harm"? They sound so desperate to continue to have record profits. They can only pass through PURPA costs and not get a rate of return like the new gas plant that was just built. It is very possible that the pass through PURPA costs will be less than the costs ratepayers will be paying for the new gas plant when the cost of fuel goes up in the future. Great and irreparable harm sounds like what they are doing by continuing to run their coal generation. If they are honestly concerned for their ratepayers they would plan for and encourage a renewable energy future.

Regards,

John Weber

7855 W Hummel Dr

Boise, Idaho 83709