



0000149399

E-01345A-13-0248

From: thomas morrissey [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 11:12 AM
To: Burns-Web; RBurns-Web; BitterSmith-Web; Pierce-Web; Stump-Web
Subject: Common Sense

Honorable Commissioners,

As the arguments regarding solar energy grow more visible, especially in the ads we are seeing on TV, I can't help but reach the following conclusions:

Although it might be true that APS is supportive of Solar Power and see it as the partial future of power generation, the fact is that they see it as their future, controlling the solar power production. Why should they be allowed to hold the monopoly on this power source? Why should they be the only providers? Why can't we provide for ourselves, while easing the burden on the power grid?

In Germany, the amount of homes with solar panels has helped the German people to avoid the necessity of having to build two new nuclear energy plants. Amounts of sunny days in Germany are a lot less than in Arizona (I know this because I lived in Germany for a year and a half). If rooftop solar power can have that result there, in that climate, just imagine what it can do here in Arizona

Our country has been victimized by OPEC for the last thirty years because of our dependence on them for most of our energy. When coupled with the current war on coal being waged by the Obama administration we find ourselves between a rock and a hard place. Solar energy is one of the more viable ways out of this hard place and in order to help it grow it must be fed by an ingenuity that can be realized in the hands of the individual and not stifled under the control of bureaucratic monopolies.

We have seen this dynamic in our education system with the rise of charter schools, as the answer to a failing bureaucratic public school system. There is a lesson here.

Let's let common sense prevail in this critical issue.

Tom Morrissey
Immediate Past Chairman, AZ GOP

..

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

NOV 07 2013

DOCKETED BY	
-------------	--

RECEIVED
 AZ CORP COMMISSION
 DOCKET CONTROL
 2013 NOV 7 PM 3 35

Mr. Bob Stump, Chairman
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Mr. Stump:

This letter is to express my concerns regarding the application of APS which requests certain changes to the Net Metering costs now in place for residential customers with rooftop solar arrays.

In reviewing the submissions of APS and RUCO; the SAIC report; and the Crossborder Study, it becomes obvious, in my view, that there is simply no accurate or definitive information by which the Commission would be able to make a reasonable, fair and informed decision. Additionally, RUCO's position seems merely to parrot that of APS but does not provide any substantive data in support thereof.

The recent report by the Electricity Innovation Lab and the Rocky Mountain Institute in which a review of no less than 15 distributed PV ("DPV") benefit/cost studies concluded that none of the 15 studies had comprehensively evaluated the benefits and costs of DPV.

As I am sure you are aware, the ACC staff recommends that the Commission NOT approve either of the NM cost-shift solutions presented by APS. I would also urge that the Commission NOT approve the RUCO short term recommendation, which may ultimately be determined to be unfair to customers with rooftop solar. Currently, cost-shifting is based on speculative and predominately self-serving assertions by APS. The proper time and place for such determinations is (as the ACC staff notes) during APS's next general rate case, where all relevant data can be presented to the Commission.

Anthem residents still recall the AZ American Water Co./Pulte fiasco whereby both AZ American Water and Pulte refused to supply relevant data to the Commission, and subsequently were granted a huge rate increase. Immediately thereafter, AZ American Water was sold to EPCOR at a handsome profit, born by the Anthem residents. Please don't make the same mistake this time. It is impossible to unring the bell, as the saying goes.

Please follow the Commission staff recommendation and make NO CHANGES until after a proper rate case hearing can be completed. Thank you.

Sincerely



Dear Commission Members:

November 5, 2103

I am writing in response to the misleading statements that have appeared in articles and television ads by APS stating that solar users do not support the grid.

We have rooftop solar and pay a service charge to SRP each month, just as those without solar panels do. This service charge applies to building and operating equipment for the delivery of electricity a/k/a "The Grid" according to the SRP website. The fact that solar users pay these charges has never been mentioned in any articles about solar. What's always mentioned is the APS claim that solar users do not pay to support the grid, thus increasing expense to non-solar users. This is a false representation of the facts, and an obvious attempt by APS to pit non-solar users against solar.

Another thing I would like to point out is that there are ways consumers can lower their electricity costs, that do not involve solar. They can opt for the various green technologies available today that will lower their electric bills. Of course, those who go this route will also be using the grid and using less kilowatt hours, just as solar users. Should APS be allowed to charge those customers additional fees for using less electricity, as they would like to do to solar users? Should APS be allowed to make statements to the press that consumers without green technology pay more because of those with it? Should APS be allowed to claim that those customers do not help support the grid? Utilities want us to conserve, but penalize us when we do. They tout solar when convenient, but when it becomes popular they disparage the technology and its users.

Solar is the way of the future and people want it. I have solar and I am very happy with it. I am fortunate enough to live in an area with lots of sunshine. I get to lower my electricity bills and help the environment at the same time. Solar technology is making great strides, but it is still new and needs support. If the commission makes decisions that prevent solar from blossoming, particularly in a state where sunshine is so abundant, such a decision would be shortsighted and would prevent others the opportunity to lower their electric costs while helping the environment. That would be a sad day indeed and, in my humble opinion, would bring shame to the commission and the State of Arizona. History would not be kind.

The fact of the matter is, the more people use solar, the more affordable and popular it will become for all who wish to utilize it. I am sure there are many very smart people on your commission and in the solar industry, who must see the value and importance of solar power, who are up to the task of finding ways to help solar flourish in ways that are equitable. The question is whether or not the will is there. I truly hope the commission has the will to make it happen. Thank you for your time.


Marcia Kwederis - Peoria

Ronald H Faut

Nov 1 2013

1520 N PASEO CERCA

Green Valley, AZ 85614

Attn: Mr. Robert Stump, chairman

Arizona Corporate Commission

1200 West Washington

Phoenix, AZ 2996

Subject – Net Metering for roof top solar customers

Net metering is a fair return for rooftop solar owners who have provided the free real estate for a solar system that provides the following benefits:

- 1 – Free maintenance by the owner
- 2 - Provides power to the neighbors
- 3 - Reduces the load on the power grid and local transformers
- 4 - Reduces water and air pollution produced by power plants
- 5 - Reduces the need to mine more coal
- 6 – Supports AZ companies that produce, install and maintain solar panels, inverters and associated hardware (360,000 rooftop solar and 119,000 workers in solar in USA).
- 7 – Produces AZ sales tax revenue from sale, installation and maintenance of solar systems
- 8 – Minimizes new power plant costs and new power grid installations
- 9 – More safety to customers by reducing the power the grid must distribute
- 10 – Reduces the number of local transformers needed
- 11 – Allows for more new homes without increased power lines capability
- 12 – It provides peak power when peak power is required by A/C unites

Roof top solar systems do exactly what the electric company has begged its customers to do for the last 25 years – use less electricity through insulating, more efficient lighting and conserving. Now that the ultimate customer in efficiency has emerged, the electric company wants to cry foul and penalize them for going too far, by charging them full rate for the electricity they use and crediting them with cut rate price for the electricity provided to the grid. On top of this they are pushing for a monthly charge that will all but eliminate the incentive to put solar on any house or business.

A meeting between Green Valley Coordinating Council president, Stan Riddle, TEP and UNS resulted in these statements published in a President to President letter to many HOAs in Green Valley:

“Bottom line – when customers with net metered solar power systems pay less than their fair share of system costs other customers must pay more. Currently, net metering allows homeowners who can afford solar systems to shift their service cost to others including renters and vulnerable low income families. Net metering drives up utility rates, increases the cost of living and makes it harder for Arizona communities to attract and retain businesses and jobs. In addition, net metering subsidizes rooftop systems that largely benefit individual households instead of community scale systems with lower, more equitable costs and shared systems. Currently Arizona Public Service (APS) is challenging the ACC on the net metering of giving full retail credit to customers who deliver their surplus energy from their solar panels to the grid.”

Aside from the fact that these statements are misleading, biased and downright incorrect, my question is why are the electricity companies not embracing the solar boom to meet the 15% 2025 goal or renewable energy and concentrating on utilizing it to the best advantage possible for all the customers and the electric companies. Instead they are wasting our money on a campaign to turn non solar customers against roof top solar owners.

It is interesting that the power company can put delivery and assorted fees, multiple assessments, taxes and surcharges on my bill, but I only get credit per KWH for what I deliver to the grid? I still pay more than \$120 per year just for a connection to the grid whose cost was written off years ago.

I implore you to look at this attempt by the electric companies to kill the solar rooftop trend for what it is: an unfair tax on the common homeowner who cares enough about our environment and is willing to fund and maintain his system as an extension of the power company's delivery system. They are taking a truly beneficial program for the environment and trying to make it look unfair to everyone else.

If the Power Companies were so concerned about poor customers and struggling businesses, they would not be pursuing this effort to penalize rooftop solar owners and solar businesses in Arizona.

Thank you for your attention in this matter and I sincerely hope your heart guides your vote.



Ronald H Faut

Green Valley, AZ

Bob Stump

To: Commissioners of the Arizona Corporation
Commission

APS Deception vs. Solar

APS saying solar customers are going to cost each non-solar customer \$20,000 more without charging solar customers more is a giant deceptive lie.

Does a widow who pays \$70 a month for electricity cost other electric customers \$20,000 and need to pay \$50 to \$100 more each month because she used to pay \$400 a month when her husband and 10 kids were living in the house?

Are electric customers in Northern Arizona costing each Valley customer \$20,000 and need to pay \$50 to \$100 more each month because they don't use air conditioning as much and have only been paying \$100 a month?

No, people who use less electricity are not costing other customers more, and solar customers are like these examples. They just use less net electricity from APS.

Solar customers save utilities the cost of having to build so many more power plants and power lines.

The top 5 executives of APS (Pinnacle) got combined salaries of \$25 million last year, so about \$5 million apiece.

How can corporation commissioners allow such high electric rates that provide such obscenely high salaries? Why does anyone need more than \$120,000 a year?

Please don't let APS kill solar.

Sincerely,

James Lester - Holbrook, Arizona