E-01345A-13-0248

ORIGINAL

0000149776

ARIZONA CORPORATION COM

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: [redacted] **Phone:** **Fax:**

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2013 - 113623 **Date:** 11/6/2013

Complaint Description: 19Y Net Metering
19C Other - Company Policy/Procedures

	First:	Last:	
Complaint By:	Theresa	Fitzgerald	
Account Name:	Therese Fitzgerald		**Home:** (000) 000-0000
Street:			**Work:**
City:	Sun City		**CBR:** -
State:	AZ	Zip: 85351	**is:** E-Mail

Utility Company. Arizona Public Service Company
Division: Electric
Contact Name: For assignment **Contact Phone:** [redacted]

RECEIVED
2013 DEC -4 P 3:33
AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

Nature of Complaint:

11/6 DOCKET NO. E-01345A-13-0248 OPPOSED

From: Util-PublicComment
Sent: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 10:15 AM
To: Util-PublicComment
Cc: TFitz4@msn.com
Subject: Public Comment

Name:Therese Fitzgerald
Date:11/7/2013
Address: [redacted]
Phone: [redacted]
CityStateZip:Sun City, AZ 85351
Cell:
Docket:APS-Solar proposal
DocketNo:13-0248
Utility:APS
Email:TFitz4@msn.com

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED
DEC 04 2013
DOCKETED BY

Comments:First of all I want to commend your commission's request for the costs of all the negative ad campaigns that APS has blasted every day on TV. They are using their money to gain future profits for their "For Profit" utility, as well as, making homeowners with solar the enemy. They have been promoting solar for the last several years and then now they are doing a 180 and changing the rules. Isn't that fraud?? You are the voters only means of regulating this utility. Please do what is fair to all homeowners but in particular those seniors who stand the most to lose if APS is approved for this fraud. I would also like to receive a history of how APS has spent all the government money to promote solar as a viable resource. I have heard lots of stories but I'd like to hear the facts. Thank you again for your efforts to promote fair policies of the "For Profit" utilities. They need careful regulation of their monopoly.
End of Complaint

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Utilities' Response:

.

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

docketed
End of Comments

Date Completed: 11/6/2013

Opinion No. 2013 - 113623

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: T **Phone:** **Fax**

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2013 - 114047 **Date:** 12/2/2013

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

	First:	Last:
Complaint By:	Karen	Austermiller
Account Name:	Karen Austermiller	**Home:** (000) 000-0000
Street:		**Work:**
City:	Prescott	**CBR:**
State:	AZ **Zip:** 86305	**is:**

Utility Company. Arizona Public Service Company

Division: Electric

Contact Name: For assignment **Contact Phone:**

Nature of Complaint:

DOCKET NO E-01345A-13-0248 OPPOSED INCREASE NET METERING

November 12, 2013

The Arizona Corporation Commission
Utilities Division
1200 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

RE: APS vs solar energy.....

Dear Commissioners Pierce, Burns, Stump, Bitter-Smith and Burns,

I am enclosing the Nov. 11, 2013 editorial by Mr. Jim Arwood, published in the Prescott Courier.

My purpose of sending it is to offer my agreement with Mr. Arwood's arguments about fairness in managing alternative energy and the regulated utility, APS.

It is well known that APS needed significant prodding from the commission to support thRenewable Energy Standard to begin with, and the current request seems I ke just another form of resistance.

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Solar customers are helping avoid new generation facilities, just as planned. As rural customers, we felt that spending $55K out of our own pocket for a PV system was not only something we'd always wanted, but it helps support the grid in our rural area through the electricity fed back to APS.We already receive minimal "return on investment" for our support to the grid, since we pay retail for electricity used and get a credit at wholesale for excess at the end of the year.

Significant renewable energy in the rate base does change the business model of a major utility, and I expect APS will continue poking around for ways to cling to their historical model, from the pockets of rate payers - either singling out one class or finding ways to discourage everyone. This is not "fairness".

Thank you for your continuing work in support of renewable energy.

R
Karen Austermiller

Prescott,AZ •. 86305
End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

.

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

docketed
End of Comments

Date Completed: 12/2/2013

Opinion No. 2013 - 114047

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: [illegible] **Phone:** [illegible] Fa[illegible]

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2013 - 114068 **Date:** 12/2/2013

Complaint Description: 19Y Net Metering
N/A Not Applicable

	First:	Last:	
Complaint By:	John	Hurley	
Account Name:	John Hurley		**Home:** (000) 000-0000
Street:			**Work:**
City:	Tucson		**CBF**
State:	AZ Zip: 85719		**is:** E-Mail

Utility Company. Arizona Public Service Company

Division: Electric

Contact Name: **Contact Phone** [illegible]

Nature of Complaint:

DOCKET NO .E-01345A-13-0248

As a consumer with a DG system (Solar Power Panels) with net-metering, I find that all purposed solutions are basing the cost on the total size of the system and not on the actual consumption of power off the grid. The cost of the line recovery fee is based on Kwh consumed off the grid. The power being supplied by the DG to a consumer on the grid is already being billed to the consumer of that power as the line recovery fee. The power being pulled off the grid by a net-metering consumer is not being charged the line recovery fee and this would be the only part of the net-metering that the base utility company would not be collecting fees for and is a measurable inenquality between the non net-metering consumer and the net-metering consumer. I would purposed that the power that the net-metering consumer uses off the grid be charged the line recovery only. The power that the Solar power system provides the consumer that is not net-metered should not be used in any billing process as it was producted by the consumer and used by the same consumer and none of that power was on the grid, so no uses of the grid occurred.

TEP figures are $0.11 kwh for power and line recovery fee and $0.082 kwh for porduction cost which makes the line recovery fee $0.028 kwh.

Take my system as an example it is a 5.1 Kw system and last month it produced about 700 kwh. 444 kwh were put onto the grid which another consumer is billed for the line recovery fee by TEP and I consumed 310 kWh off the grid. The power that I consumed that was never on the grid is 700 kwh - 444 kwh = 256 kwh consumed directly from the Solar power system. Not all of the produced power goes onto the grid.

All of the purposals by the utility companys want to charge a fee that includes the power that is consumed by the customer from their own system.

In addtion for the power being put onto the grid the utility companies are already collecting the line recovery fee without producing the power. All of the proposals would be collecting the line recovery fee twice for any power

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

being producted by DG systems, once for the production of the power and then again from the consumer who receives it that is not net-metering.

Thank you for taking the time and reading my concerns.
John P Hurley
End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

.

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

Docketed
End of Comments

Date Completed: 12/2/2013

Opinion No. 2013 - 114068

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: [redacted] **Phone:** **Fax:**

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2013 - 114061 **Date:** 12/2/2013

Complaint Description: 19Y Net Metering
N/A Not Applicable

	First:	Last:
Complaint By:	Brian	Van Dine
Account Name:	Brian Van Dine	**Home:** (000) 000-0000
Street:		**Work:**
City:	Carol Stream	**CBR:**
State:	AZ **Zip:** n/a	**is:**

Utility Company. Arizona Public Service Company
Division: Electric
Contact Name: For assignment **Contact Phone:**

Nature of Complaint:

Docketed E-01345A-13-0248

From: Brian VanDine [[redacted]
Sent: Sunday, November 17, 2013 6:43 PM
To: Utilities Div - Mailbox
Subject: Associated Press Article Re: The Arizona Corporation Commission

Dear Commissioners,

I read with interest the A.P. article about the Arizona Public Service Corporation's battle with Arizona homeowners who have solar panels on their roofs. The article said that the outcome of this battle is being watched by utilities nationwide. It is because of the precedent-setting nature of the Arizona battle that I am writing you.

Currently, I live in Illinois. I have been looking into the possibility of solar and wind energy for residential use. The Commonwealth Edison Policies here and the village building codes make pursuing this very difficult. I'm disheartened by the fact that at the Federal government level, politicians talk of Global Warming as though it were fact, yet, at the local level one obstacle after another is erected to protect the utilities monopolies and to discourage green energy.

Arizona Public Service has argued that homeowners with solar panels are benefitting from the grid's 24/7 power supply but avoid much of the costs of maintaining power plants. This argument makes it seem like the homeowners who have invested in solar power are parasites. This is pure poppycock!

First, solar power investment is very expensive. The Arizona Public Service Corp. hasn't paid a dime towards homeowners' cost of investment in their solar energy generating systems. Yet, the grid benefits from this solar

power when it helps to offset peak power demands for air conditioning, etc. This helps to preserve centralized power plants by helping to keep them from becoming over-taxed by peak demand. The more electricity flowing through the grid that is solar generated, the more shock absorbing potential the grid gains from peak use demand. This prevents brown-outs, or black-outs, minimizes the costs of sending out repair crews, and preserves the life of centralized power plants by keeping them running within normal limits. This saves the centralized power plants money, so, they absolutely do benefit from the home-grown solar energy.

Second, Arizona Public Service Corp. must provide a percentage of the total energy they distribute from, "Green," sources and homeowners with solar panels assist Arizona Public Service Corp. to meet this legal requirement. Green energy credits can be sold on the secondary market to other power companies who have come up short meeting their quota of, "Green," energy. So, if The Arizona Public Service Corp. ended-up with a surplus of solar energy credits, they could sell them and make a profit.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, homeowners with solar panels create a more diversified power generation capacity which protects Arizona residents and businesses from natural disasters and man-made ones. Just as it is wise to have a diversified financial portfolio, it is wise to have multiple points of power generation on the power grid. Severe weather or terrorist attack would likely have less effect on a fully distributed power grid system than compared with a centrally generated grid system.

In summary, the arguments against homeowner generated solar power offered by The Arizona Public Service Corp. are illogical and unfair. Furthermore, their insistence upon more centralized power generation puts the community more at risk. We are currently living in an era of large corporate greed and control and this recent argument by The Arizona Public Service Corporation sounds like just another example of this.

Sincerely

Brian Van Dine

C

End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

.

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

.

Date Completed: 12/2/2013

Opinion No. 2013 - 114061

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: [illegible] | **Phone:** [illegible] | **Fax**

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2013 - 114062 | **Date:** 12/2/2013

Complaint Description: 01H Billing - Smart Meter
N/A Not Applicable

	First:	Last:	
Complaint By:	Gerald	Pauli	
Account Name:	Gerald Pauli		**Home:** (000) 000-0000
Street:	[illegible]d		**Work:**
City:	Sedona		**CBR:**
State:	AZ Zip: 86351		**is:**

Utility Company. Arizona Public Service Company
Division: Electric
Contact Name: [illegible] **Contact Phone:** [illegible]

Nature of Complaint:

Docket No. E-00000C-11-0328

----Original Message-----
From: Gerald Pauli [
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2013 10:27 AM
To: Utilities Div - Mailbox
Subject: Smart Meters

Commissioners,

I agree with this letter. We do not want an opt out fee. We feel these are not good for our health.

Gerald Pauli

Sedona, Arizona
86351
End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

.

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

volumonous blog attachement included w/email. In opposition to smart meters.
End of Comments

Date Completed: 12/2/2013

Opinion No. 2013 - 114062