

E-01575A-09-0429



0000107480

ORIGINAL

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

RECEIVED

10

Investigator: Carmen Madrid

Phone: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

2009 JAN -4 A 11:13
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

Opinion No. 2009 83971 Date: 12/23/2009

Complaint Description: 08A Rate Case Items - Opposed
N/A Not Applicable

Complaint By: First: Tims Last: Storer

Account Name: Tims Storer Home: (000) 000-0000

Street: n/a Work: (000) 000-0000

City: Sonoita CBR: [REDACTED]

State: AZ Zip: 00000 is: E-Mail

Utility Company: Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc.

Division: Electric

Contact Name: [REDACTED] Contact Phone: [REDACTED]

Nature of Complaint: Arizona Corporation Commission
*****RECEIVED FROM CHAIRMAN MAYES' OFFICE***** DOCKETED

From: tim storer [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, December 21, 2009 8:42 PM
To: Mayes-WebEmail
Subject: SSVEC Rest Hearing

JAN -4 2010

DOCKETED BY [Signature]

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.

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

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
End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

12/23/09 Opinion noted and filed in Docket No. E-01575A-09-0429. closed
End of Comments

Date Completed: 12/31/2009

Opinion No. 2009 - 83971
