

Diane Holt

From: smithland8@hotmail.com
Sent: Sunday, August 6, 2017 3:20 PM
To: Beverly Barker; Diane Holt; Matthew Evans
Subject: Case Comment Form: Steve Smith

Name: Steve Smith
Case Number: *JPC - E - 17 - 13*
Email: smithland8@hotmail.com
Telephone: 2083172829
Address: 10286 E. Red Rock Rd.
Swanlake Idaho, 83281

Name of Utility Company: None

Comment: Idaho Power's Opinion about fairness needs a little straightening out. The comment that Net Metering customers receive a full retail credit on their bill for energy they send to the grid should say they receive a full retail credit on their bill for energy they use up at a set later time but any extra power they produce over that amount is not given full retail credit. The Point was brought out in an Idaho State Journal op-ed that it cost Idaho Power \$65/month to provide service to each customer. Other than Net Metering customers there are other customers that do not pay the \$65 /month What about all the customers who don't have at least a \$60 power bill?

What about those customers that paid attention to all the ads that the power company put out telling one how to cut their power bills by conserving power and by buying energy efficient lights and appliances? Should they have to pay the \$60? How about those customers that by themselves, or got help, added insulation and energy efficient windows to cut their power bills? Should they have to pay the \$60? How about those customers that never had nor don't plan on using \$60 worth of Power? Should they have to pay the \$60?

Now that same Power Company is trying to tell us that it cost them \$60 regardless of how much power a customer uses to maintain the power grid and bill them every month. Will those same customers get billed that \$60 next time the Power Company needs money? Will there be a minimum Power bill for every one? Why not reward those that use less power?

When the state and federal Governments spent all that money and time trying to educate the public on saving energy then passed the PURPA law of 1979 some people went out and purchased renewable energy systems with the promise of Net Metering and the idea that maybe this would pencil out and help the environment at the same time.

Now costs are coming down and it does indeed pencil out, so more and more folks are installing Renewable energy systems. Some Public Utilities, and I emphasize this, are working with their customers to develop strategies to utilize this new Power with smart technologies that recognize the low power factor to their advantage as well as being able to hold off purchasing new infrastructure. Other Public Utilities are fighting with all their might to stop any new resource that they don't have power over. Remember these are Public Utilities that are guaranteed a profit, as well as, their own areas of operation that no competition can disrupt. That is called a Monopoly. These companies are given these favorable conditions in exchange for doing what is best for the Public good. Is it in the Public interest to reduce new power plants and new power lines? How about the environmental issues with air and water?

While it can be a hard pill to swallow after having your own way for 100+ years "the penetration of renewables and energy efficiency on the U.S. power grid is energizing utilities, regulators, and energy companies to re-evaluate how they do business." Perhaps it is time for this practice in Socialism to be reconsidered for the public good and deregulate the Power companies like the Airlines, the Telephone companies, Railroads and the Buss Companies.

If this commission agrees with the Power Company and accepts a new rate structure for net Metered customers I would like to suggest some points to be considered.

1. All customers not meeting there minimum cost of service should have a rate structure different from the standard-service rates. Not just Net Metered customers.

2. Tier rates for Power usage should be developed in Idaho, such as California and other states, to reward not fine, small users of power and charge the heavy residential users that add more infrastructure costs.
3. Smart Inverters should be required as long as the power company learns how to use them to help in their power distribution scenarios.
4. Net metered customers can not only help with peak loads but can utilize Battery storage on site to help balance out power surges. New inverters today have this function; in fact most of the new products have the AC/DC capabilities. If Net Metered customers must pay the \$60 fee then how about a way for them to make that up with say providing power during peak times at an enhanced rate. This can be done with today's inverters and Storage. Also, allowing the power companies to draw from that storage at any time they need extra power. This is what smart inverters can do.

Unique Identifier: 66.160.248.20

Diane Holt

From: bethelandi@gmail.com
Sent: Sunday, August 6, 2017 5:51 PM
To: Beverly Barker; Diane Holt; Matthew Evans
Subject: Case Comment Form: Beth Landis

Name: Beth Landis
Case Number: *IPC-E-17-13*
Email: bethelandi@gmail.com
Telephone:
Address:
Eagle ID, 83616

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Comment: I am submitting a comment about net metering and increasing the charges. The information sent to us was not correct when it said that net metering is supplemented by others that pay higher costs. The Brookings Institute report states it differently. Also, please, please, look at power generation with a big perspective, Think outside the box. Think about the future. Vision a new future for our children and grandchildren, to 7 generations. Look at states and countries that are making different choices. Think about sustainability. Thank you

Unique Identifier: 63.155.19.245