



0000167670

Arizona Corporation Commission
Utilities Complaint Form

ORIGINAL

Investigator: Trish Meeter Phone: <<< REDACTED >>> Opinion Date: 1/20/2016
Opinion Number: 2016 - 128455 Priority: Respond within 5 business days
Opinion Codes: Other - Solar Closed Date:

First Name: Timothy Last Name: Doyle Account Name: Timothy Doyle
Address: <<< REDACTED >>>
City: Sierra Vista State: AZ Zip Code: 85650

Company: Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc. Division: Electric

Nature Of Opinion

Docket Number: E-01575A-15-0127

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

JAN 27 2016

-----Original Message-----

From: Timothy Doyle [mailto:tedoyle@cox.net]

DOCKETED BY [Signature]

Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 11:49 AM

To: Utilities Div - Mailbox <UtilitiesDiv@azcc.gov>

Subject: Email from Public for Utilities Division Docket #E-01575A-15-0127

RECEIVED
2016 JAN 27 P 12:31
AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

January 16, 2016

2310 E. Suma Dr.

Sierra Vista, AZ 85650

To the Arizona Corporation Commission:

Sirs:

I am a homeowner with solar. I have heard much discussion about the changes that Sulfur Springs Valley Electric proposes to make in its rate structure over the next few years. This has been based on solar homeowners that are net zero. Of the 1300 or so members that have solar, only 700 or so are net zero. SSVEC asserts that ALL solar owners do not pay their fair share of the cost of maintaining the grid.

As one of those who are not net zero I am paying into SSVEC's grid some \$60/month average in electric bills. Am I, or any of those that are not net zero, NOT paying to keep up the electric companies infrastructure? Any customer of any electric company that is not net zero NEEDS to be treated differently than net zero customers. This has not been addressed in SSVEC proposal to the ACC. You should send the whole proposal back to SSVEC to have them justify the \$50 cost to all solar panel users.

If you pass any ruling with out taking this in to account then you are DOUBLE penalizing the non net zero customer. First for having rooftop solar and then for paying their FAIR share into the system. I am just a smaller customer in the system so why am I being charged for having solar panels on my house? I know customers that pay less than I do per month. Should they not be paying the same \$50/month that I would be paying in base charges?

This whole issue has not been thought out and the electric companies are acting prematurely. There have

E-01575A-15-0127

**Arizona Corporation Commission
Utilities Complaint Form**

been independent studies that show that rooftop solar has very little impact on the average electric customer now. Yes it may come to pass that there will be a time when the rate structure will have to change but that will be in the future when the percent of roof top solar is much higher than it is now.

Sincerely,

Timothy Doyle

Solar Homeowner

-----Original Message----- From: Timothy Doyle [mailto:tedoyle@cox.net] Sent: Monday, January 18, 2016 11:49 AM To: Utilities Div - Mailbox Subject: Email from Public for Utilities Division Docket #E-01575A-15-0127 January 16, 2016 2310 E. Suma Dr. Sierra Vista, AZ 85650 To the Arizona Corporation Commission: Sirs: I am a homeowner with solar. I have heard much discussion about the changes that Sulfur Springs Valley Electric proposes to make in its rate structure over the next few years. This has been based on solar homeowners that are net zero. Of the 1300 or so members that have solar, only 700 or so are net zero. SSVEC asserts that ALL solar owners do not pay their fair share of the cost of maintaining the grid. As one of those who are not net zero I am paying into SSVEC's grid some \$60/month average in electric bills. Am I, or any of those that are not net zero, NOT paying to keep up the electric companies infrastructure? Any customer of any electric company that is not net zero NEEDS to be treated differently than net zero customers. This has not been addressed in SSVEC proposal to the ACC. You should send the whole proposal back to SSVEC to have them justify the \$50 cost to all solar panel users. If you pass any ruling with out taking this in to account then you are DOUBLE penalizing the non net zero customer. First for having rooftop solar and then for paying their FAIR share into the system. I am just a smaller customer in the system so why am I being charged for having solar panels on my house? I know customers that pay less than I do per month. Should they not be paying the same \$50/month that I would be paying in base charges? This whole issue has not been thought out and the electric companies are acting prematurely. There have been independent studies that show that rooftop solar has very little impact on the average electric customer now. Yes it may come to pass that there will be a time when the rate structure will have to change but that will be in the future when the percent of roof top solar is much higher than it is now. Sincerely, Timothy Doyle
Solar Homeowner