



0000147753

E-01345A-13-0248

ORIGINAL

Bob Stump, Cr
Arizona Corpo.
Commissioners Wing
1200 W. Washington - 2nd Floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

RECEIVED

2013 AUG 29 P 1:23

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

Arizona Corporation Commission
August 28 2013

DOCKETED

AUG 29 2013

DOCKETED BY
ne

Dear Chairman Stump,

This past year my wife and I contracted for the installation of a solar system on the roof of our home in Payson, AZ. I want to share with you information related to our deciding to make this investment, and why I now feel that the corporations involved are failing to stand behind the representations made by them to induce me to participate.

A most harmful aspect of the situation that I find my family to be in now, is a major fight between Arizona Public Service (APS) and the solar industry. These corporations are making many conflicting claims and allegations attacking each other, with the individual residential customer like myself caught in the middle. I and thousands of similar Arizona customers are being used as pawns in a contest that we did not have the ability to foresee, do not want to participate in, and are not equipped to deal with. Only the Arizona Corporation Commission can serve to represent us at a level that can bring common sense and citizen's interest to the table.

As you know, there has been an ongoing effort for many years to find ways to meet the growing nation-wide demand for electrical energy. Major utility companies, including APS, **have chosen** to participate in alternative energy production initiatives as a way to meet their responsibility to serve the growing demand. In concert with an emerging solar industry, APS has very actively encouraged its private consumers to consider residential roof-top solar production. Up-front financial incentives in the form of rebates, and continuing incentives in the form of net-metering and transferability upon sale have been heavily marketed to the customers of APS.

My wife and I are a retired couple living on a fixed income. We strive to find ways to stabilize our long term fixed living expenses while protecting our home investment in the case of unforeseen illness or other factors that may cause us to move to a smaller residence. We also are committed to the idea that we should all be part of the solution to nationwide energy use and supply.

Given the marketing push and "facts" presented to us primarily by APS, and secondarily by roof-top solar system providers, we decided to make an up-front investment from our limited savings. A key element of this decision was a 20-year commitment required by APS. My statistical life expectancy does not span 20 years, although my wife's does. Therefore we carefully analyzed the long term projections and moved forward on corporate representations leading us to believe that any investment in our home for solar would be fully transferable/beneficial to a future buyer of the residence. Net-rate metering was also a big part of the consideration giving us a projected "break even" on the investment in approximately eight years. Accordingly we spent over \$8,000 dollars for a fully pre-paid 20-year lease of a system approved by APS.

Now here is the rub. APS would have the ACC believe that this \$8,000 investment sitting on our roof is not part of their infrastructure. The facts are, it is part of their infrastructure for the following reasons: First, by contractual agreement with APS I am not allowed to disconnect from their system and operate "off-grid". In other words, if I am not generating power as part of their grid, I may not generate power at all. Secondly, power generated on my roof in excess of my immediate usage is in effect delivered to my neighbors using a bare minimum of APS infrastructure and thereby reduces the load on distribution area transformers, switching gear, high voltage transmission lines, etc. The APS infrastructure maintenance and investment costs are reduced, due to my private investment. Lastly, as intended by the alternative energy concept at its most basic level, my investment of \$8,000 means that APS does not have to make its own investment in additional power source generation/purchase.

The bottom line is that if you authorize any changes to the short and long-term incentives that APS used to induce our participation, my wife and I will find ourselves in a 20 year financial trap with no way out. I am completely dependent on your official representation of the citizens of Arizona and your role in protecting us all from the corporate manipulations of a de facto monopoly. I urgently request that you reject APS requests for changes to net-rate metering and new discriminatory fees aimed at a unique group of customers gained through questionable representations of "fact" and misleading marketing. I also request that you reject any efforts to harm seniors by way of APS's unreasonable suggestion that net-rate grandfathering not be transferable to future purchasers of homes with existing systems/contracts.


Harold K Baas

1117 S Mud Springs Rd
Payson, AZ 85541