

E-01345A-13-0248

ORIGINAL



0000146824

July 13, 2013

RECEIVED

Dear Mr. Stump;

2013 JUL 16 P 2:44

I never thought that APS was such an incompetent organization as to not be able to project future costs incurred by the use of Solar Power even though it has known since 2006 that it would have to provide 15% of its power through alternative means by 2025. It seems that APS has been rigidly sticking to an antiquated business plan of the 1970's that was predicated upon uninterrupted growth.

AZ CORP COMMISSION DOCKET CONTROL

Now that APS has tempted tens of thousands of customers to conserve energy by subsidizing CFL bulbs, promoting energy audits and offering rebates for solar installation under a mandate that was proposed years ago, APS suddenly realized that each solar user is costing APS \$1,000.00 year and those "losses" were being subsidized by non-solar users. Is APS losing 100's of thousands of dollars because several 10 thousand users went solar? How about the solar farms that APS owns? I think that the math is fictitious.

APS proposes to eliminate net metering. It purchases power from other sources, why not their customers? APS seems to have backtracked by grandfathering present solar users while charging new solar users a penalty of \$50.00 to \$100.00 per month. This is preposterous, especially since the Commission is promoting Solar on their web-site

Is APS that incompetent that it didn't do proper planning or is the greed showing? The value of the stock is important and although that is certainly a valid concern, poor execution of the state mandate by the utility should not result in penalizing those who purchased solar power, for whatever reason.

APS wants to avoid "skyrocketing rates for customers without solar". The questions remains, why are rates skyrocketing? What has changed except an increase in conservation of energy and the use of alternative power which has been promoted by the utilities? Oh yes, I forgot. I just read that the wholesale price of electricity has dropped 20%. That's called supply and demand, however, we are dealing with a monopoly so that doesn't count.

It may be that APS costs of operations have increased, but then it has had price increases along the way. If APS is selling less and charging more, that means it has to make some cuts, not raise prices again. An organization that didn't plan or even anticipate such changes in its operations caused by events that it participated in should be replaced; as should its Board of Directors for their lack of oversight.

Since APS is a monopoly, it is incumbent upon our elected officials at the ACC not to rubber stamp the attempt to increase profits by increasing prices in an obvious obfuscation of the truth. As consumers, we have no choice but to stay with our utility, but as voters, we have a choice. As Commissioners and spokesmen for the electorate, you too have a choice.

Chris Kulpinski
Supplier to APS of Solar Power
602-622-9321 --- chris@kulpinski.net

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

JUL 16 2013

DOCKETED BY NR

E-01345A-13-0248

July 15, 2013

Bram Jacobson and Pamela Franks

[REDACTED]
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Chairman Bob Stump
Arizona Corporation Commission
Commissioners' Wing
1200 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2996

Dear Chairman Stump:

We installed a five kilowatt solar system on the roof of our home in downtown Phoenix. It seemed like the right thing to do. It seemed criminal to not take advantage of our sunny climate to generate electricity, help the environment and do what we could on a personal level to reduce dependence on foreign oil. We love the meter that tells us how many pounds of CO2 we have saved. It inspired us to make our home more energy efficient in other ways, such as better insulation, duct sealing and envelope sealing. We are also now much more conscious of our energy usage and curb that usage whenever possible such as not using the clothes dryer, unless necessary. Of course we also like our much lower electric bills but even under the current watt for watt exchange plan, it will take us many years to recoup our initial investment costs.

We are very upset that APS is now asking the Corporation Commission to change the rules, in a way that will be much more favorable to APS. APS' request to no longer let roof top solar generators like ours "bank" with APS and store the excess watts that we generate for a time when we use more than we generate (nights and summers) will kill solar in Arizona. It will mean it will take a lot longer for us to recoup the money we invested in our system, if we ever actually do so. It seems like a real bait and switch tactic to encourage individual investment in solar with one set of rules and to then change the rules after individuals have made that investment.

Please do not grant APS' request. Please keep the rules for solar as they are so that we can store what we generate and use it when we need it. (As an aside, we pay a flat monthly rate to APS, even in the months when we generate more than we use, just for the privilege of doing business with APS and to pay APS for that service.) Please keep solar alive and growing in Arizona. Arizona's reputation throughout this country and the world will fall even further if a rainless climate like ours abandons solar. Should you grant APS' request, you will become the corporation's commission instead of the watch dog we want you to be, protecting Arizona's environment and her people. Please do the right thing.

Sincerely,

Three handwritten signatures in black ink. The first signature is a stylized 'B', the second is a cursive 'P', and the third is a more complex signature that appears to be 'Pamela Franks'.

Bram Jacobson and Pamela Franks

[Redacted]
[Redacted]