

E-01345A-13-0248

ORIGINAL



0000146694

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMM

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Deb Reagan

Phone:

Fax:

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2013 - 111889

Date: 7/29/2013

Complaint Description: 19Y Other -  
08A Rate Case Items - Opposed

First:

Last:

Complaint By: John and Sally Chesterman

Account Name: John and Sally Chesterman

Home:

Street:

Work:

City: Peoria

CBR:

State: AZ Zip: 85383

is:

Utility Company: Arizona Public Service Company

Division: Electric

Contact Name: For assignment

Arizona Corporation Commission

Contact Phone:

Nature of Complaint:

\*\*\*\*\* E-01345A-13-0248 \*\*\*\*\*

DOCKETED

JUL 29 2013

DOCKETED BY  
nr

2013 JUL 29 P 3:20

RECORDED

Customer sent the following -

Subject: Re: APS Solar Proposals

We wish to have this input presented as part of public comment regarding APS' recent proposals to change roof top solar rates and charges and associated rules.

We are AZ residents. Our home is at \_\_\_\_\_, Peoria, AZ 85383. Phone contact:

We urge the commission to not allow APS proposed rule and rate changes. The proposals are unfair to existing, particularly recent, home solar producers, and undermine AZ production of solar energy in the face of the likelihood of reduced electrical production by the Hoover Dam / Lake Mead facility. Specifically:

1. The grandfathering of roof top customers should minimally be changed to "rooftop units". Don't tie the grandfathering clause to the present owners. We purchased / leased our units based on a 20 year financial outlook. This included the ability to transfer the benefits of our units to future purchasers of our homes. If the benefits cease and added non-grandfathering fees are assessed at time of sale, the new owner is penalized. Therefore the value of our home at sale will need to be discounted. Equally, if rooftop solar becomes less attractive economically, older persons keeping their homes will find general solar equipped home values decreased, thereby undermining reverse mortgage proceeds on which an increasing number of retirees depend.

2. Adding a "\$50 to 100" infrastructure fee to rooftop solar installations will from our experience, erase nearly 2/3 of the value produced by (our) rooftop solar installation and will convert our payback (if any) to over 20 years! This amounts to substantially undermining new installations and makes a sham out of the purchases many of us

**ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**  
**UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM**

---

have recently made.

3. Rules and rates should encourage rooftop solar in that each installation actually CONTRIBUTES to APS infrastructure cost mitigation by reducing peak period electrical generation grid demands and provides a "relief valve" to help minimize the need for building more (fossil fuel) generating capacity or replacing lost hydro capacity as Lake Mead production is lost due to Colorado River issues (siltation, water usage and drought).

4. AZ should be a national leader in solar production (not number 2) taking full advantage of our leading natural resource: sunshine.

5. The Corporation Commission should be considering raising the 15% solar mandate and determining that a reasonable percentage of that solar production come from commercial and home roof-top installations - not just huge corporate solar arrays. An involved population creates a population more committed to conservation - a goal the ACC and the State will find of overarching benefit.

It would appear that many of the rooftop solar leases and purchasers are retirees, many of whom call AZ home because of climate advantages. APS' proposal, as written, places the AZ retirement community at financial risk by undermining the economics of recent acquisitions of rooftop solar. This is not advantageous to AZ or APS and other utilities as it makes AZ less attractive and discourages immigration from other regions of the US.

Please enter this into the record.

Individual copies of this message have been conveyed to the AZ governor, both AZ senators and the electronic media

\*End of Complaint\*

**Utilities' Response:**

**Investigator's Comments and Disposition:**

Customer comments entered for the record and filed with Docket Control.

\*End of Comments\*

**Date Completed: 7/29/2013**

**Opinion No. 2013 - 111889**

---

E-01345A-13-0248

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Deb Reagan

Phone:

Fax:

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2013 - 111890

Date: 7/29/2013

Complaint Description: 19Y Other - Elec Dereg - Renewable Resource Portfolio  
08A Rate Case Items - Opposed

First:

Last:

Complaint By: Bruce and Pat

Strand

Account Name:

Home:

Street: 27388 N. 125th Ave.

Work:

City: Peoria

CBR:

State: AZ Zip: 85383

is:

Utility Company: Arizona Public Service Company

Division: Electric

Contact Name: For assignment

Contact Phone:

Nature of Complaint:

\*\*\*\*\* E-01345A-13-0248 \*\*\*\*\*

Customer sent the following -

Subject: Re: APS Solar Proposals

We wish to have this input presented as part of public comment regarding APS' recent proposals to change roof top solar rates and charges and associated rules.

We are AZ residents. Our home is at \_\_\_\_\_, Peoria, AZ 85383. Phone contact:

We urge the commission to not allow APS proposed rule and rate changes. The proposals are unfair to existing, particularly recent, home solar producers, and undermine AZ production of solar energy in the face of the likelihood of reduced electrical production by the Hoover Dam / Lake Mead facility. Specifically:

1. The grandfathering of roof top customers should minimally be changed to "rooftop units". Don't tie the grandfathering clause to the present owners. We purchased / leased our units based on a 20 year financial outlook. This included the ability to transfer the benefits of our units to future purchasers of our homes. If the benefits cease and added non-grandfathering fees are assessed at time of sale, the new owner is penalized. Therefore the value of our home at sale will need to be discounted. Equally, if rooftop solar becomes less attractive economically, older persons keeping their homes will find general solar equipped home values decreased, thereby undermining reverse mortgage proceeds on which an increasing number of retirees depend.

2. Adding a "\$50 to 100" infrastructure fee to rooftop solar installations will from our experience, erase nearly 2/3 of the value produced by (our) rooftop solar installation and will convert our payback (if any) to over 20 years! This amounts to substantially undermining new installations and makes a sham out of the purchases many of us

**ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**  
**UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM**

---

have recently made.

3. Rules and rates should encourage rooftop solar in that each installation actually CONTRIBUTES to APS infrastructure cost mitigation by reducing peak period electrical generation grid demands and provides a "relief valve" to help minimize the need for building more (fossil fuel) generating capacity or replacing lost hydro capacity as Lake Mead production is lost due to Colorado River issues (siltation, water usage and drought).

4. AZ should be a national leader in solar production (not number 2) taking full advantage of our leading natural resource: sunshine.

5. The Corporation Commission should be considering raising the 15% solar mandate and determining that a reasonable percentage of that solar production come from commercial and home roof-top installations - not just huge corporate solar arrays. An involved population creates a population more committed to conservation - a goal the ACC and the State will find of overarching benefit.

It would appear that many of the rooftop solar leases and purchasers are retirees, many of whom call AZ home because of climate advantages. APS' proposal, as written, places the AZ retirement community at financial risk by undermining the economics of recent acquisitions of rooftop solar. This is not advantageous to AZ or APS and other utilities as it makes AZ less attractive and discourages immigration from other regions of the US.

Please enter this into the record.

Bruce and Pat Strand

Individual copies of this message have been conveyed to the AZ governor, both AZ senators and the electronic media

\*End of Complaint\*

**Utilities' Response:**

**Investigator's Comments and Disposition:**

Customer comments entered for the record and filed with Docket Control.

\*End of Comments\*

**Date Completed: 7/29/2013**

**Opinion No. 2013 - 111890**

---