

ORIGINAL



0000168718

RECEIVED

2016 MAR 15 P 2:03

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

Memorandum
From the office of
Chairman Doug Little
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 W. WASHINGTON
PHOENIX, ARIZONA
(602) 542-0745

TO: Docket Control

DATE: March 15, 2016

FROM: Chairman Doug Little's Office

SUBJECT: E-04204A-15-0142

Chairman Little's office received 15 additional emails referencing the above docket number. The emails can be viewed in Docket Control or on the website, via the eDocket link.

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

MAR 15 2016

DOCKETED BY *ML*

Andrea Gaston

From: Havey Rodman <Namdorh@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 10, 2016 8:38 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

I strongly urge you to reject UNS Energy's recent proposal to impose demand charges and eliminate net metering.

Demand charges are an anti-consumer billing mechanism designed to confuse ratepayers and disincentivize conservation and energy efficiency. Demand charges ambush ratepayers. You only know when your peak demand has been set after the fact. Ratepayers should be charged for the energy they use, not ambushed with exorbitant charges based on a short period within a month.

In addition, net metering is vital to preserving the ability of ratepayers to go solar and protecting thousands of jobs. Net metering is a fair policy that creates jobs and gives consumers energy choice.

We know what happens when you eliminate fundamental solar policies. Do not let what happened in Nevada happen in Arizona.

Reject UNS Energy's proposal. It is a power grab that erodes consumer choice and control over bills in order to ensure captive ratepayers for their monopoly.

Sincerely,

Havey Rodman

Andrea Gaston

From: Darrylwlanaster <darrylwlanaster@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2016 11:17 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Public for Utilities Division - UniSource Rate Increase 15-0142

Without a more thorough explanation from Unisource I would like to present my objections to the proposed Unisource rate increase.

The Unisource monthly bill currently includes a Customer Delivery Charge of \$10, an increase from \$8 several years ago.

It was my understanding this is the cost to maintain the infrastructure needed to deliver services to every customer, even if they delivered no energy.

If this cost does not cover the cost of maintaining the infrastructure Unisource should request a rate increase, not propose a new charge.

The increased Solar installations on houses should in no way impact this fee. The fee is to maintain the infrastructure regardless of whether energy is delivered or not.

It would seem the infrastructure costs may even decrease because the amount of power to be delivered decreases with more solar installations.

As a regulated monopoly Unisource should be allowed to make a reasonable profit but should not gouge the consumer with unreasonable fees.

The infrastructure charges do not change throughout the day if I draw more power at 1PM than I do at 3PM so I should not be charged differently. I pay for this through my usage charges based on the amount of energy I consume.

I hope the ACC continues to protect the consumer as they have done in the past.

Thank You

Darryl Lancaster,

2843 Jamaica Blvd S
LHC AZ 86406

Andrea Gaston

From: badlands1@wildblue.net
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2016 2:50 PM
To: Utilities Div - Mailbox; Forese-Web; Little-Web; Stump-Web; RBurns-Web
Subject: UniSource Energy Rate Increase Application

Arizona Corporation Commission
Commissioners Wing
1200 West Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007-2996

Re: UniSource Energy Rate Increase Application 15-0142

Dear Commissioners:

It has recently come to my attention that UniSource Energy has applied to the Arizona Corporation Commission for several rate increases to electric service. The first rate case proposal is regarding a "Basic Service Charge" - a charge that the utility company wants to increase by 50%, from \$10 to \$15 each month - making it one of the highest in the country.

This "Basic Service Charge" is nothing but a euphemism for "mandatory fee." It is something that customers pay every month, no matter what. This is a terrible policy, especially for seniors, poor people, and people on fixed incomes because there is nothing a consumer can do to reduce that fee. Even if you turn off all your lights, minimize your electricity use, or are hospitalized for a month and your home electricity use is severely curtailed, you still have to pay this discriminatory fee.

The second proposal involves another new mandatory charge called a "demand charge" - a charge that, to my knowledge, no other utility company in the country requires residential customers to pay. Instead of charging how much energy is used in total, this mandatory demand charge costs consumers for the maximum amount used at a given time. For example if an individual turns on his washing machine and dishwasher at the same time his air conditioner is running, then his demand charge will be very high and will be set for the entire month based on electricity use in just this one hour. This pricing scheme isn't practical or logical; it's no more than a pricing scheme to take advantage of consumers.

My husband and I own a home in Golden Valley and we receive our electric service from UniSource Energy. We are both retired and live on a fixed income as we receive only Social Security benefits. Golden Valley is home to a large number of elderly, retired and disabled people who are also on fixed incomes. Social Security did not provide a cost-of-living increase this year, but UniSource Energy is requesting a 50% increase in basic monthly service alone.

Millions of families in America are struggling financially in the current dismal economy and are barely able to scrape by and pay their bills from month to month. UniSource Energy's rate case proposal is hundreds of pages in length and undeniably required the services of untold numbers of high-priced attorneys and accountants to compile. In addition, Arizona Public Service Electric Company (APS) is collaborating with UniSource Energy by retaining expert witnesses to testify and participate in hearings to promote the rate increases in hopes of using the same scheme on their customers if UniSource Energy is successful in its bid to raise rates. All of these costs will ultimately be deferred

to their customers through the higher rate fees to pay for these efforts in retaining counsel and experts at the consumers' expense.

These rate increase proposals are quite obviously being promoted by the executives of UniSource Energy and APS as a way to increase their own corporate profits and extort additional money from their customers. This is an attempt by the utility companies to use the force of government regulations to enrich themselves and their executive officers by placing an additional financial burden on the backs of their customers.

In summary, UniSource Energy's policies are substantially unproductive in encouraging its customers to conserve electricity and are only being utilized in a scheme to increase its profit share. I am totally opposed to both the increase in the "Basic Service Charge" and the "demand charge" being requested by UniSource Energy, and I respectfully request that you **DENY** UniSource Energy's application for these rate increases.

Sincerely,

Lynda Watt
Golden Valley, AZ

Andrea Gaston

From: susanw1905@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2016 9:40 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Unisource fee hike -15-0147

Mr. Little,

I am very concerned regarding the potential of Unisource being granted approval for the proposed rate hike. The utility is a legal monopoly with no regulation . This is just another example of corporate greed placed on the backs of the consumer with little or no choice in the outcome. I would expect the Corporation Committee to take a firm stand on this.

Your help would be appreciated.



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com

Andrea Gaston

From: Marti and Al Johnson <alandmartij@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2016 9:21 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Future Rate Increases
UNS 15-0142

I am a senior citizen writing to voice my concern about the upcoming utility increase. As someone who is elected by the public, I am assuming you appreciate input from those that elected you. We are on a fixed income and an additional \$2 a month we could handle. However, when the temporary credit expires next year, that combined with the current \$2 would be a burden to our fixed income. As retirees, we have been hit with many additional taxes as a result of The Affordable Carer Act and those taxes continue to increase.

I am asking Unisource to reconsider their proposed increase due to their substantial profit margins. We appreciate them maintaining the equipment and know there is a cost associated with that. However, I do believe their current financial situation can handle those expenses without the proposed increase. As senior citizens on a fixed income, we cannot continue to have our cost-of-living increase, especially when we do not get a raise in our Social Security.

Thank you for your consideration.

Al and Marti Johnson
3600 Kiowa Circle
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86404
928-566-1685

Andrea Gaston

From: John Hazen <SHAZEN@CITLINK.NET>
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2016 8:39 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Unisource - 15-0142

Please deny Unisource request to initiate demand charge for electrical users in the Lake Havasu City Area. As I understand the demand charge was needed to cover cost they incurred in maintaining and upgrading their distribution system. If they can justify their required rate increase I believe it should be as a charge per kilowatt. Demand charges do not pass costs through in an equal manner.

Extremely high heat during the summer is difficult to deal with but trying to stay cool and not run my air because I am in the "Demand" charge hour would be tough for retired folks like us both physically and costly.

Have never had demand charge in my many years of purchasing electricity and see no reason to start now. Again if they can justify a rate increase, ok.

Thank you

John Hazen

Andrea Gaston

From: Nora Cronin <chgo22phx@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, March 13, 2016 11:59 AM
To: Tobin-Web; Forese-Web; Little-Web; Stump-Web; RBurns-Web
Subject: demand charge - UNS - 15-d42

To all the members of the AZ Corporation Commission:

I have been reading with alarm news of the new "demand charge" that may be coming to APS monthly bills. Considering that no other utility in the country is contemplating such a charge and the fact that this charge is also being advocated by the head of the Arizona Corporation Commission's Utilities Division, one can only conclude that this is an orchestrated attempt at defrauding a captive population of the people of this state for the benefit of a few. That the CC would be colluding in this is beyond the pale.

We are a couple who will soon be on a fixed income and the way that this charge will be applied will make our electric bills unaffordable. If this becomes a reality, we will be moving from the state for our retirement. We have live here happily for twenty one years but are really getting tired of the type of changes that we are seeing that seem to have no other reason other than fleecing the consumer and ignoring the voters. This really is nothing more than taking advantage for money.

That a public utility that has been granted a monopoly to do this is bad enough, for a public commission that has been mandated with protecting the consumer to be encouraging it is reprehensible. I understand that APS (Pinnacle West) is beholden to its stockholders; the commission is beholden to us.

Or are all the things that I have been reading about concerning APS stacking the deck on the commission true? If it is, shame on you.

NL Cronin
Phoenix

Andrea Gaston

From: Eldon Henninger <ehenninger2@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 13, 2016 10:15 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: UTILITIES DEMAND CHARGES 15-0142

Please do not allow the utilities to get away with their underhanded dealings trying to get higher "basic service charges-mandatory fees" and demand charges. This is about the most illogical thing I have ever heard. This will lead to extremely high charges and perhaps some people even dying-trying to save money by not using a/c in the summer, all to satisfy stockholders to get richer at the expense of the customers. What a scam!! Do not allow this to happen....
Eldon Henninger

Andrea Gaston

From: Edward Lenik Jr. <prariedogn99@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 13, 2016 9:35 AM
To: Forese-Web; Little-Web; Stump-Web; RBurns-Web
Subject: New Rate Proposal by Unisource Electric

15-0142

Gentlemen,

I would like to take a moment to say that the new rate structure being advanced by Unisource Electric must be refused! Punishing the poor, elderly, and those on a fixed income is heartless, brutal, and WRONG.

The electric utilities across the country are going to have to embrace solar energy, not stifle it. Here in Arizona, we have an opportunity to lead the country, and to be a showplace for how it can be implemented.

So, please let these greedy people at Unisource know that as Arizonans, we will not stand by and let them take away incentives promoting solar power and the solar industry in AZ. We will not stand by while they implement charges that are unfair and that will further stagnate an already sluggish economy.

Yours,

Edward J Lenik Jr.
Kingman, AZ
prariedogn99@gmail.com

Andrea Gaston

From: David Whitehead <davercc@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 12, 2016 11:31 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Dear ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION,

I strongly urge you to reject UNS Energy's recent proposal to impose demand charges and eliminate net metering.

Demand charges are an anti-consumer billing mechanism designed to confuse ratepayers and disincentivize conservation and energy efficiency. Demand charges ambush ratepayers. You only know when your peak demand has been set after the fact. Ratepayers should be charged for the energy they use, not ambushed with exorbitant charges based on a short period within a month.

In addition, net metering is vital to preserving the ability of ratepayers to go solar and protecting thousands of jobs. Net metering is a fair policy that creates jobs and gives consumers energy choice.

We know what happens when you eliminate fundamental solar policies. Do not let what happened in Nevada happen in Arizona.

Reject UNS Energy's proposal. It is a power grab that erodes consumer choice and control over bills in order to ensure captive ratepayers for their monopoly.

Sincerely,

David Whitehead

Sincerely,

David Whitehead

Andrea Gaston

From: bill bohl <wbohl@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2016 1:40 PM
To: Little-Web; Stump-Web; RBurns-Web; Tobin-Web; Forese-Web
Subject: Unisource Electric

- 15-0142

I see that you are looking at a basic service charge fee and a new mandatory charge called demand charge, I am concerned that if you pass these for Unisource that the next electric company to ask for these will be APS which I use. We as consumers do not have choices on who we can select for our electricity and we depend on you to make good choices for us when it comes to setting or changing rate charges .

thank you

William r bohl
Goodyear az

Andrea Gaston

From: Janet Adams <havasuvian@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2016 4:57 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Demand Charges 15-0142

Dear Chairman Little:

I strongly, vehemently object to the demand charges Unisource is proposing to charge its customers. My utility bill is outrageous as it is, and I'm quite sure our monopoly is making a fine profit. Please look out for the little guy and deny this additional charge.

Thank you.

Janet Adams

Andrea Gaston

From: Patricia Jenner <desertratscubagirl@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2016 4:20 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

It is unbelievable to me that the entire state of Arizona hasn't been in the front of our nation making solar the norm. Please stop Unisource.

Sincerely,

Patricia Jenner

Andrea Gaston

From: mike northrup <mnorthrup2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2016 7:50 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Unisource 15-0142

Dear Mr. Little
Please keep the people in mind when You make Your decision.
Thanks
Mike and Nan Northrup
371 Islander Lane
Lake Havasu City AZ
928-453-4026

Andrea Gaston

From: Elaine Grant <ea1grant@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2016 3:03 PM
To: Little-Web; Burns-Web; Forese-Web; Stump-Web; Tobin-Web
Subject: We oppose 15-0142

an increase in the "basic service charge" from \$10 a month to \$15, and the imposition of a "demand" charge for the use of electricity. The latter is more troubling to us because it does not encourage conservation, it's just a money grab.

Elaine Grant and Larry McDonald, Sun City