

ORIGINAL

E-01575A 09-0429

Sheila Stoeller

From: tim storer [timstorer@cox.net]
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2009 8:42 PM
To: Mayes-WebEmail
Subject: SSVEC Rest Hearing



Dear Chairman Mayes:

Since I cannot attend the hearing set for SSVEC's REST hearing set for Tuesday, Dec. 22, I ask that you enter this Email into the record for consideration by the ACC.

I am a residential home owner in Sonoita. In 2008, I added a 6.3 Kwh photovoltaic system to my home. I did so at a time when I was assured by SSVEC staff that net metering would be in place around November of 2008.

Thirteen months later, there is still no net metering in place. While this may partly be due to the ACC hearing schedule, I feel that I was also misled by staff at SSVEC. Based on my consumption record, my solar supplier, Net Zero Solar of Tucson, has estimated I could be receiving about \$65.00 on average monthly from SSVEC. Instead, these last 13 months i have been charged an average of about 45\$ monthly for my electric usage. All extra self-generated power is being donated to SSVEC.

I ask that the Commission put an end to this situation as soon as possible, as I feel SSVEC is dragging their feet on the issue of renewable energy.

In the schedule submitted by SSVEC to the ACC, under the section titled MONTHLY SERVICE AVAILABILITY CHARGE, I request the Commission to deny the residential "fixed cost for each rate class" charge submitted by SSVEC. The \$23.31 residential fixed charge requested by the utility stands as a poison pill for small residential customers. I installed a \$40,000. system at my home (before rebates), which, based on my average usage will generate about \$65. monthly average credit. The charge proposed by the utility is about a 35%tax on my credit. What about the homeowner who, say, breaks even each month on a Net Zero account with SSVEC? They would have to pay the \$23.31 charge. This is hardly a policy that favors alternative energy development. And it is not a charge levied by Tucson Electric Power.

To sum up, I ask that the Commission deny what appears to be a regressive request by the utility, that comes from a regressive mind-set that is contrary to forward thinking about renewable energy development.

Sincerely
Tim Storer

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

DEC 23 2009

DOCKETED BY

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

2009 DEC 23 1:25 P

RECEIVED