

E-00000J-14-0023



0000167894

ORIGINAL **Arizona Corporation Commi**
Utilities Complaint Form

Investigator: Richard Martinez **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>> **Opinion Date:** 1/11/2016
Opinion Number: 2016 - 128273 **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days
Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - Opposed **Closed Date:** 1/11/2016 2:52 PM

First Name: Brooks **Last Name:** White **Account Name:** Brooks White
Address: <<< REDACTED >>>
City: Tucson **State:** AZ **Zip Code:** 85749
Home: <<< REDACTED >>> **Email:** <<< REDACTED >>>

Company: Tucson Electric Power Company
Cara Roll **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>> **Email:** <<< REDACTED >>>

Nature Of Opinion

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

Docket Position: Against

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

2016 JAN 12 A 8:15

RECEIVED

This is in reference to: Docket No. E-00000J-14-0023 **JAN 12 2016**

DOCKETED BY

It seems extraordinary and unconscionable to me that Tucson Electric Power can now ask for rate relief for the Company's unforeseen losses supposedly sustained as a result of customer use of solar power to generate electricity when it was TEP who incentivized that use in the first place. For example, we installed our system on April 20, 2011 based largely on TEP's incentive program touted by them at that time. Section D of our Up Front Incentive Renewable Energy Purchase Agreement (available upon request) clearly states: "To further Company's [TEP's] continuing commitment to develop and encourage the use of renewable energy resources and to better ensure compliance with regulatory requirements, Company has implemented a REC purchase program to provide financial incentives to its customers to install renewable generating equipment...." Accordingly, we received a \$12,360 incentive payment from TEP which was applied to our cost of \$38,934 for system installation. There is nothing whatsoever in the contract we signed indicating that TEP will raise rates to offset any future company losses due to customer generation of solar energy. If TEP is permitted to raise rates or apply solar surcharges to systems already in place, thus eroding our payback calculations and our system's financial functionality, then we should be permitted to cancel our 20 year contract with them, remove our system, and be reimbursed for our investment losses. This only seems fair if the original cost-saving advantages are no longer to be in effect for us. The Company's failure to foresee the impact of their solar incentivizing program should not be a solar customer problem nor does it seem equitable to pass on any Company losses to other customers who do not have solar facilities. Rate increases made necessary by increases in non solar related Company costs are an entirely different issue than increases that derive from the Company's apparent misjudgment of the bottom line impact of this renewable energy technology. I strongly oppose any rate relief the Company seeks as a result of its avoidable and foreseeable solar related losses.

Investigation

Date: **Analyst:** **Submitted By:** **Type:**

Arizona Corporation Commission
Utilities Complaint Form

1/11/2016

Richard Martinez

Telephone

Investigation

Entered for the record and docketed.

E-00000J-14-0023



0000167894

ORIGINAL **Arizona Corporation Commi**
Utilities Complaint Form

Investigator: Richard Martinez **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>> **Opinion Date:** 1/11/2016
Opinion Number: 2016 - 128273 **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days
Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - Opposed **Closed Date:** 1/11/2016 2:52 PM

First Name: Brooks **Last Name:** White **Account Name:** Brooks White
Address: <<< REDACTED >>>
City: Tucson **State:** AZ **Zip Code:** 85749
Home: <<< REDACTED >>> **Email:** <<< REDACTED >>>

Company: Tucson Electric Power Company
Cara Roll **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>> **Email:** <<< REDACTED >>>

Nature Of Opinion

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

Docket Position: Against

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

2016 JAN 12 A 8:15

RECEIVED

This is in reference to: Docket No. E-00000J-14-0023 **JAN 12 2016**

DOCKETED BY

It seems extraordinary and unconscionable to me that Tucson Electric Power can now ask for rate relief for the Company's unforeseen losses supposedly sustained as a result of customer use of solar power to generate electricity when it was TEP who incentivized that use in the first place. For example, we installed our system on April 20, 2011 based largely on TEP's incentive program touted by them at that time. Section D of our Up Front Incentive Renewable Energy Purchase Agreement (available upon request) clearly states: "To further Company's [TEP's] continuing commitment to develop and encourage the use of renewable energy resources and to better ensure compliance with regulatory requirements, Company has implemented a REC purchase program to provide financial incentives to its customers to install renewable generating equipment...." Accordingly, we received a \$12,360 incentive payment from TEP which was applied to our cost of \$38,934 for system installation. There is nothing whatsoever in the contract we signed indicating that TEP will raise rates to offset any future company losses due to customer generation of solar energy. If TEP is permitted to raise rates or apply solar surcharges to systems already in place, thus eroding our payback calculations and our system's financial functionality, then we should be permitted to cancel our 20 year contract with them, remove our system, and be reimbursed for our investment losses. This only seems fair if the original cost-saving advantages are no longer to be in effect for us. The Company's failure to foresee the impact of their solar incentivizing program should not be a solar customer problem nor does it seem equitable to pass on any Company losses to other customers who do not have solar facilities. Rate increases made necessary by increases in non solar related Company costs are an entirely different issue than increases that derive from the Company's apparent misjudgment of the bottom line impact of this renewable energy technology. I strongly oppose any rate relief the Company seeks as a result of its avoidable and foreseeable solar related losses.

Investigation

Date: **Analyst:** **Submitted By:** **Type:**

Arizona Corporation Commission
Utilities Complaint Form

1/11/2016

Richard Martinez

Telephone

Investigation

Entered for the record and docketed.

E-00000J-14-0023



0000167894

ORIGINAL **Arizona Corporation Commi**
Utilities Complaint Form

Investigator: Richard Martinez **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>> **Opinion Date:** 1/11/2016
Opinion Number: 2016 - 128273 **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days
Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - Opposed **Closed Date:** 1/11/2016 2:52 PM

First Name: Brooks **Last Name:** White **Account Name:** Brooks White
Address: <<< REDACTED >>>
City: Tucson **State:** AZ **Zip Code:** 85749
Home: <<< REDACTED >>> **Email:** <<< REDACTED >>>

Company: Tucson Electric Power Company
Cara Roll **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>> **Email:** <<< REDACTED >>>

Nature Of Opinion

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

Docket Position: Against

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

2016 JAN 12 A 8:15

RECEIVED

This is in reference to: Docket No. E-00000J-14-0023 **JAN 12 2016**

DOCKETED BY

It seems extraordinary and unconscionable to me that Tucson Electric Power can now ask for rate relief for the Company's unforeseen losses supposedly sustained as a result of customer use of solar power to generate electricity when it was TEP who incentivized that use in the first place. For example, we installed our system on April 20, 2011 based largely on TEP's incentive program touted by them at that time. Section D of our Up Front Incentive Renewable Energy Purchase Agreement (available upon request) clearly states: "To further Company's [TEP's] continuing commitment to develop and encourage the use of renewable energy resources and to better ensure compliance with regulatory requirements, Company has implemented a REC purchase program to provide financial incentives to its customers to install renewable generating equipment...." Accordingly, we received a \$12,360 incentive payment from TEP which was applied to our cost of \$38,934 for system installation. There is nothing whatsoever in the contract we signed indicating that TEP will raise rates to offset any future company losses due to customer generation of solar energy. If TEP is permitted to raise rates or apply solar surcharges to systems already in place, thus eroding our payback calculations and our system's financial functionality, then we should be permitted to cancel our 20 year contract with them, remove our system, and be reimbursed for our investment losses. This only seems fair if the original cost-saving advantages are no longer to be in effect for us. The Company's failure to foresee the impact of their solar incentivizing program should not be a solar customer problem nor does it seem equitable to pass on any Company losses to other customers who do not have solar facilities. Rate increases made necessary by increases in non solar related Company costs are an entirely different issue than increases that derive from the Company's apparent misjudgment of the bottom line impact of this renewable energy technology. I strongly oppose any rate relief the Company seeks as a result of its avoidable and foreseeable solar related losses.

Investigation

Date: **Analyst:** **Submitted By:** **Type:**

Arizona Corporation Commission
Utilities Complaint Form

1/11/2016

Richard Martinez

Telephone

Investigation

Entered for the record and docketed.

E-00000J-14-0023



0000167894

ORIGINAL **Arizona Corporation Commi**
Utilities Complaint Form

Investigator: Richard Martinez **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>> **Opinion Date:** 1/11/2016
Opinion Number: 2016 - 128273 **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days
Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - Opposed **Closed Date:** 1/11/2016 2:52 PM

First Name: Brooks **Last Name:** White **Account Name:** Brooks White
Address: <<< REDACTED >>>
City: Tucson **State:** AZ **Zip Code:** 85749
Home: <<< REDACTED >>> **Email:** <<< REDACTED >>>

Company: Tucson Electric Power Company
Cara Roll **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>> **Email:** <<< REDACTED >>>

Nature Of Opinion

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

Docket Position: Against

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

2016 JAN 12 A 8:15

RECEIVED

This is in reference to: Docket No. E-00000J-14-0023 **JAN 12 2016**

DOCKETED BY

It seems extraordinary and unconscionable to me that Tucson Electric Power can now ask for rate relief for the Company's unforeseen losses supposedly sustained as a result of customer use of solar power to generate electricity when it was TEP who incentivized that use in the first place. For example, we installed our system on April 20, 2011 based largely on TEP's incentive program touted by them at that time. Section D of our Up Front Incentive Renewable Energy Purchase Agreement (available upon request) clearly states: "To further Company's [TEP's] continuing commitment to develop and encourage the use of renewable energy resources and to better ensure compliance with regulatory requirements, Company has implemented a REC purchase program to provide financial incentives to its customers to install renewable generating equipment...." Accordingly, we received a \$12,360 incentive payment from TEP which was applied to our cost of \$38,934 for system installation. There is nothing whatsoever in the contract we signed indicating that TEP will raise rates to offset any future company losses due to customer generation of solar energy. If TEP is permitted to raise rates or apply solar surcharges to systems already in place, thus eroding our payback calculations and our system's financial functionality, then we should be permitted to cancel our 20 year contract with them, remove our system, and be reimbursed for our investment losses. This only seems fair if the original cost-saving advantages are no longer to be in effect for us. The Company's failure to foresee the impact of their solar incentivizing program should not be a solar customer problem nor does it seem equitable to pass on any Company losses to other customers who do not have solar facilities. Rate increases made necessary by increases in non solar related Company costs are an entirely different issue than increases that derive from the Company's apparent misjudgment of the bottom line impact of this renewable energy technology. I strongly oppose any rate relief the Company seeks as a result of its avoidable and foreseeable solar related losses.

Investigation

Date: **Analyst:** **Submitted By:** **Type:**

Arizona Corporation Commission
Utilities Complaint Form

1/11/2016

Richard Martinez

Telephone

Investigation

Entered for the record and docketed.

E-00000J-14-0023



0000167894

ORIGINAL **Arizona Corporation Commi**
Utilities Complaint Form

Investigator: Richard Martinez **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>> **Opinion Date:** 1/11/2016
Opinion Number: 2016 - 128273 **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days
Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - Opposed **Closed Date:** 1/11/2016 2:52 PM

First Name: Brooks **Last Name:** White **Account Name:** Brooks White
Address: <<< REDACTED >>>
City: Tucson **State:** AZ **Zip Code:** 85749
Home: <<< REDACTED >>> **Email:** <<< REDACTED >>>

Company: Tucson Electric Power Company
Cara Roll **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>> **Email:** <<< REDACTED >>>

Nature Of Opinion

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

Docket Position: Against

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

2016 JAN 12 A 8:15

RECEIVED

This is in reference to: Docket No. E-00000J-14-0023 **JAN 12 2016**

DOCKETED BY

It seems extraordinary and unconscionable to me that Tucson Electric Power can now ask for rate relief for the Company's unforeseen losses supposedly sustained as a result of customer use of solar power to generate electricity when it was TEP who incentivized that use in the first place. For example, we installed our system on April 20, 2011 based largely on TEP's incentive program touted by them at that time. Section D of our Up Front Incentive Renewable Energy Purchase Agreement (available upon request) clearly states: "To further Company's [TEP's] continuing commitment to develop and encourage the use of renewable energy resources and to better ensure compliance with regulatory requirements, Company has implemented a REC purchase program to provide financial incentives to its customers to install renewable generating equipment...." Accordingly, we received a \$12,360 incentive payment from TEP which was applied to our cost of \$38,934 for system installation. There is nothing whatsoever in the contract we signed indicating that TEP will raise rates to offset any future company losses due to customer generation of solar energy. If TEP is permitted to raise rates or apply solar surcharges to systems already in place, thus eroding our payback calculations and our system's financial functionality, then we should be permitted to cancel our 20 year contract with them, remove our system, and be reimbursed for our investment losses. This only seems fair if the original cost-saving advantages are no longer to be in effect for us. The Company's failure to foresee the impact of their solar incentivizing program should not be a solar customer problem nor does it seem equitable to pass on any Company losses to other customers who do not have solar facilities. Rate increases made necessary by increases in non solar related Company costs are an entirely different issue than increases that derive from the Company's apparent misjudgment of the bottom line impact of this renewable energy technology. I strongly oppose any rate relief the Company seeks as a result of its avoidable and foreseeable solar related losses.

Investigation

Date: **Analyst:** **Submitted By:** **Type:**

Arizona Corporation Commission
Utilities Complaint Form

1/11/2016

Richard Martinez

Telephone

Investigation

Entered for the record and docketed.

E-00000J-14-0023



0000167894

ORIGINAL **Arizona Corporation Commi**
Utilities Complaint Form

Investigator: Richard Martinez **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>> **Opinion Date:** 1/11/2016
Opinion Number: 2016 - 128273 **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days
Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - Opposed **Closed Date:** 1/11/2016 2:52 PM

First Name: Brooks **Last Name:** White **Account Name:** Brooks White
Address: <<< REDACTED >>>
City: Tucson **State:** AZ **Zip Code:** 85749
Home: <<< REDACTED >>> **Email:** <<< REDACTED >>>

Company: Tucson Electric Power Company
Cara Roll **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>> **Email:** <<< REDACTED >>>

Nature Of Opinion

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

Docket Position: Against

RECEIVED
2016 JAN 12 A 8:15
AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

This is in reference to: Docket No. E-00000J-14-0023 **JAN 12 2016**

DOCKETED BY

It seems extraordinary and unconscionable to me that Tucson Electric Power can now ask for rate relief for the Company's unforeseen losses supposedly sustained as a result of customer use of solar power to generate electricity when it was TEP who incentivized that use in the first place. For example, we installed our system on April 20, 2011 based largely on TEP's incentive program touted by them at that time. Section D of our Up Front Incentive Renewable Energy Purchase Agreement (available upon request) clearly states: "To further Company's [TEP's] continuing commitment to develop and encourage the use of renewable energy resources and to better ensure compliance with regulatory requirements, Company has implemented a REC purchase program to provide financial incentives to its customers to install renewable generating equipment...." Accordingly, we received a \$12,360 incentive payment from TEP which was applied to our cost of \$38,934 for system installation. There is nothing whatsoever in the contract we signed indicating that TEP will raise rates to offset any future company losses due to customer generation of solar energy. If TEP is permitted to raise rates or apply solar surcharges to systems already in place, thus eroding our payback calculations and our system's financial functionality, then we should be permitted to cancel our 20 year contract with them, remove our system, and be reimbursed for our investment losses. This only seems fair if the original cost-saving advantages are no longer to be in effect for us. The Company's failure to foresee the impact of their solar incentivizing program should not be a solar customer problem nor does it seem equitable to pass on any Company losses to other customers who do not have solar facilities. Rate increases made necessary by increases in non solar related Company costs are an entirely different issue than increases that derive from the Company's apparent misjudgment of the bottom line impact of this renewable energy technology. I strongly oppose any rate relief the Company seeks as a result of its avoidable and foreseeable solar related losses.

Investigation

Date: **Analyst:** **Submitted By:** **Type:**

Arizona Corporation Commission
Utilities Complaint Form

1/11/2016

Richard Martinez

Telephone

Investigation

Entered for the record and docketed.
