



0000168825

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

**Memorandum**

2016 MAR -4 A 10:46

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

AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL

TO: Docket Control

DATE: March 4, 2016

FROM: Chairman Doug Little's Office

SUBJECT: UNS Electric, Inc.: E-04204A-15-0142


---

Chairman Little's office has received an additional 55 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 04 2016

DOCKETED BY 

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** T Teller <truthteller@cableone.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 10:31 AM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

This is a slippery slope you are headed down if you approve ANY demand charges for ANY electric producer.....

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

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 single 15 minute 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.

Sincerely,

T Teller

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Rick Eisenmann <rickeisenmann@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 10:54 AM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Reject utility proposals for mandatory

Please reject any utility requests for mandatory demand charges.

Rick Eisenmann

***Redscape Miniature Poodles***  
[www.redminiaturepoodles.com](http://www.redminiaturepoodles.com)

***Maine Suspect Maine Coons***  
[www.maineoons.com](http://www.maineoons.com)

[rickeisenmann@gmail.com](mailto:rickeisenmann@gmail.com)

HC 70, Box 3210  
Sahuarita, AZ 85629

(520) 886-1304

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** thomas leander <tdleander@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 10:58 AM  
**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 single 15 minute 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.

As an AZ resident and consumer, I not only installed solar panels, but I reduced my electric consumption by over 30% with new efficient windows, a very efficient hot water heater, LED lights and other energy saving techniques. The use of demand charges negates my attempt to not only save some money, but will prevent others from keeping over 50 tons of CO2 out of the air in AZ from every new solar system that is not installed because of your actions.

Sincerely,

thomas leander

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Anna Hacker <anna.hacker@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 11:20 AM  
**To:** Forese-Web; Little-Web; Stump-Web; RBurns-Web  
**Subject:** Upcoming proposed manadated demand charges by TAP

Dear Commissioners,

I was astonished to hear of the upcoming hearing regarding rate changes/charges. Our State would be the only one in the nation to have these charges, there is no reason to require these changes except to increase the money the utilities are making. The impact of these unfair charges will add a burden to those with a fixed income or low income. Where are they to get the extra charges. Also there is no clear understanding regarding how these charges would be assigned.

I hope to hear from you regarding this upcoming decision, and that you are taking into the account this unrealistic charge. This proposed increase needs to be voted out.

Regards,  
Anna K. Hacker

Anna

Tucson phone 520 722 8682

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** LLillegs@aol.com  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 11:30 AM  
**To:** Tobin-Web; Forese-Web; Little-Web; Stump-Web; Burns-Web  
**Subject:** TEP

Dear Sir,

As a customer of TEP, and with no other alternative, I request you deny their UNC request. I have had the meter changed on my house, not my choice. They actually snuck on to my property, didn't ring the door bell, didn't let me know they were here, first time they removed the "water heater" meter. Then they changed the old meter for the digital one. It now seems that TEP can only make up more ways to increase their profits at the expense of their customers. If I had another choice of an electric company, I would definitely chose the other one. Even if I had solar, I would still have to be connected to TEP. I find it hard to believe they are NOT making a reasonable profit. It is time for this commission to step and say no.

Thank for your time,  
Nancy liames,  
trapped TEP customer.

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Richard Rice <brrice01@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 12:50 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 single 15 minute 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,

Richard Rice

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Terry and Karen Vogler <tvogue1@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 12:49 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Mandatory taing by TEP

I am opposed to the idea of a Mandatory Tax, by TEP!

Terry Vogler  
1942 W via Nuevo Leon  
Green Valley, AZ 85622



## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Janet Wheeler <Janetwheeler@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 12:44 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 single 15 minute 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,

Janet Wheeler

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Josh Leonard <jleonard.chess@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 12:34 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

FOSSIL FUELS ARE NOT JUST DAMAGING TO OUR CLIMATE BUT CAUSE CANCER, EMPHYZEMA, WATER POLLUTION AND AIR POLLUTION. SOLAR ENERGY DOES NOT AND ALSO REDUCES PEAK DEMAND ON THE GRID.

PLEASE CONSIDER THE CONSUMER AND THE ARIZONA CITIZEN IN ADDITION TO THE CANADIAN ENERGY CORPORATION WHEN YOU MAKE YOUR DECISION.

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 single 15 minute 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,

Josh Leonard

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Trudi Wieduwilt <vonwieduwilt@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 12:22 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Here are a few important pieces of information you should consider with links to the original articles.

"A diverse coalition of consumer, environmental, faith, agricultural, environmental justice, and business organizations joined together to applaud the California Public Utilities Commission's (CPUC) decision to preserve net metering, a critical solar policy that gives the state's energy consumers the opportunity to generate their own energy with solar power. In a 3-2 vote, the Commission approved a balanced net metering program that will ensure rooftop solar continues delivering consumer savings, building healthier communities, creating local jobs, and making California a climate leader."

<http://www.nacleanenergy.com/articles/22397/california-public-utilities-commission-expands-solar-net-metering>  
"Last year, the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada issued a report finding that rooftop solar customers actually give back more to the grid than they cost."  
Nevada's commissioners went on to approve an elimination of net-metering despite those findings and are now facing a very real option that state legislators with override it with legislation.

[http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2015/12/23/3734730/nevada-solar-rate-hike/?utm\\_content=buffer66280&utm\\_medium=social&utm\\_source=linkedin.com&utm\\_campaign=buffer](http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2015/12/23/3734730/nevada-solar-rate-hike/?utm_content=buffer66280&utm_medium=social&utm_source=linkedin.com&utm_campaign=buffer)

"What we're finding from countries like Scotland, Denmark, and Germany is that you can have a high percentage of renewable generation on your grid, and it won't affect reliability," said Scott Clausen, a policy and research associate at the American Council on Renewable Energy."  
<http://www.takepart.com/article/2016/01/28/scotland-renewable-energy-leader?cmpid=tpdaily-eml-2016-01-28>

As Arizona's commissioners, you all have a very real and powerful choice here. Either you are going to be leaders, like California and Hawaii, or continue to be the politics as usual and bury your heads in the sand and allow the utilities to control Arizona.  
Even if you do not believe in climate change (watch the UA Science lectures at [uascience.org](http://uascience.org)), give our citizens a chance as less pollution and less health related issues.  
Thank you for keeping clean, green energy alive in Arizona, the Sunshine State, by rejecting any utility company's request to eliminate net-metering and/or demand fees or surcharging solar customers for connection to the grid.

Sincerely,

Trudi Wieduwilt

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Nora Walker <silkyapril@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 1:20 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 single 15 minute 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,

Nora Walker

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Ian Trushell <Trushell@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 1:28 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 single 15 minute 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,

Ian Trushell

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Cullin Pattillo <Cullin.Pattillo@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 12:22 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 single 15 minute 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,

Cullin Pattillo

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Glenn Carter <cartergw@suddenlink.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 12:13 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 single 15 minute 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,

Glenn Carter

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Randy Hunt <ccrofsedona@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 12:10 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 single 15 minute 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,

Randy Hunt



**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** judy mcdonald <judy2195@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 12:04 PM  
**To:** Little-Web; Tobin-Web; Forese-Web; Stump-Web; RBurns-Web  
**Cc:** Judy Mcdonald  
**Subject:** Please vote NO Mandatory Demand Changes

Dear commissioner,

Please vote NO to Mandatory Demand Changes. These will take control of my utility bill out of my hands.

It will also increase anxiety each month as I will never know what to budget.

Also vote NO on raising the usage charge.

Thank you,

Judy McDonald  
Arizona resident.

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Charles Smith <byron@sunizonfamilyfarms.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 3:13 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 single 15 minute 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,

Charles Smith

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Ingrid Hazen <ilhaze58@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 2:48 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Oppose UNS surcharge

Hi Doug,

I am hoping to get you to oppose UNS rate increase our electric bill during the Meeting March 1<sup>st</sup>,2016 In Tucson, AZ

Thank you,

Ingrid Hazen

Tucson, AZ 85743

Trico Electric Coop Member since 1983.

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Bruce Plenk <solarlawyeraz@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 4:02 PM  
**To:** Little-Web; RBurns-Web; Stump-Web; Forese-Web; tobin-web@acc.gov  
**Subject:** UNS Rate Case, Docket #15-0142

Chairman Little and Commissioners-

Thanks for holding the hearings in the UNS case in Tucson where it is much easier for people interested in the case to testify than in Phoenix. Please include these comments in the docket.

I am a TEP ratepayer and Tucson resident. Since it appears that the UNS proposals for drastic rate design change are identical to what TEP has proposed and since the UNS case is being heard first, I wanted to express my opinions regarding some of those proposals. My basic point is that what might be good for UNS (or TEP or Fortis stockholders) is not good for ratepayers of those companies nor for the state of Arizona.

The first and worst idea is doubling the customer charge to an amount (\$20) that is among the highest in the West. There is simply no reason for this dramatic and unprecedented increase. It does not reflect "gradualism," one of the watchwords of utility regulation, and is not based on any reasonable explanation other than to assure a more solid cash flow to UNS. The alleged "new" expenses that would go into such a charge are not appropriate for a customer charge at all. And the UNS rebuttal testimony that agrees to a \$15 charge if a demand charge is added is no better. The UNS request for an increase in its customer charge should be rejected.

The second, and nearly as bad, idea is to charge ALL customers a demand charge, like large businesses have been charged for some time. Again, this seems to be primarily based on an attempt to increase revenues not to better serve our state. While large businesses can hire consultants and purchase equipment to "shave peaks," this is simply beyond the capacity of most residential customers. And even one "forgetful" day of simultaneous use of a few appliances would result in a charge which would likely exceed the customer charge and perhaps even the monthly kWh bill!! I have calculated that an electric water heater could easily result in a monthly demand charge of \$25, and the customer would not even know they had incurred that charge until weeks later when they received their bill!!! There are good reasons why basically no other utilities in the US have a mandatory demand charge. If UNS wishes to propose an optional demand charge like APS has and allows customers who believe they could benefit from such a charge to enroll, that seems reasonable. But not a demand charge for everyone in the residential and small commercial classes.

Third is the barely disguised attempt to reduce the amount of rooftop solar in UNS territory by essentially eliminating net metering. The end of "rollover kWh" and the payment of wholesale rates for energy sent to UNS has the effect of greatly increasing the cost and reducing the benefit of household solar projects. With a longer payback and the prospect of year to year changes in the amount paid for exported energy, it is extremely likely that UNS will see a rerun of the SRP and Nevada experience: fewer solar installations, lost solar jobs, and a reduction in clean energy produced in UNS territory. This cannot be good for Arizona, for our climate, for our state's reputation as a leader in solar, or for our economic growth.

There are other issues in this case but I'll stop here. Please reject the increased customer charge, reject the mandatory demand charge, and keep net metering as is. This will help our economy and our environment and in the end will help UNS too.

Thank you for your consideration.

--

Bruce Plenk  
Solar Possibilities Consulting  
2958 N St Augustine Pl  
Tucson, AZ  
520 909-1389

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Randy French <rtfrench@citlink.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 4:04 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 single 15 minute 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,

Randy French

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** JOSEPH DLUGOSZ <JOESPHOTOS@LIVE.COM>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 01, 2016 5:26 AM  
**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 single 15 minute 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,

JOSEPH DLUGOSZ

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Steven Lewandowski <steven.lewandowski@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 11:30 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 single 15 minute 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,

Steven Lewandowski



## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Dr Susan FOWLER <ladygemini47@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 9:19 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 single 15 minute 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,

Dr Susan FOWLER

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Don Burns <donfire2@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 6:34 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 single 15 minute 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,

Don Burns

## **Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Susan Willis <skmcwillis@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 5:35 PM  
**To:** RBurns-Web; Stump-Web; Little-Web; Forese-Web  
**Subject:** UNS Rate Case

**Docket # E-04204A-15-0142**

**Re: UNS rate case**

Dear Chairman Little and Members of the Arizona Corporation Commission:

I am an electricity ratepayer in the state of Arizona and I am writing to oppose the additional mandatory fees and the attack on rooftop solar, both of which have been proposed by UNS Electric in their rate case.

The UNS rate case is the first of several rate cases to be argued before the ACC this year and next, and could set a negative precedent for most Arizona electricity customers. As a customer of TEP electric, I do not wish to see huge increases in mandatory fees, demand charges on all residential customers, or new penalties on rooftop solar in my service area.

UNS's proposal to raise monthly mandatory fees from \$10 to \$15 and to impose a new 'demand charge' on all customers would have a very negative impact on working class families and those who conserve energy. These new charges would disproportionately increase the electric bills of customers who are least able to pay, and would serve as a disincentive to energy conservation.

Please oppose the new solar fees and penalties proposed by UNS. Making rooftop solar less affordable harms working class families who want to 'go solar,' and increases our state's dependence on dirty, polluting fossil fuels like coal and natural gas. In addition, these new solar fees would be a disincentive for new solar installations, thereby hurting our young solar industries and destroying jobs.

Energy conservation helps Arizona save precious water, reduce pollution, and saves customers money on their electric bills. UNS's proposal to levy large mandatory fees on all customers' bills is a regressive measure that would set a negative precedent, potentially harming customers across the state. Please oppose the mandatory fees, demand charges, and additional rooftop solar penalties as proposed by UNS Electric.

Thank you,

Susan Willis

3275 E. Pima St. #2

Tucson, AZ 85716

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Beverly Hedin <Bsmilealot@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 28, 2016 4:59 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 single 15 minute 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,

Beverly Hedin

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Patrick Marks <Lbpoolservice@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 6:58 AM  
**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 single 15 minute 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,

Patrick Marks

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Char Beltran <Chrbeltran@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 7:20 AM  
**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 single 15 minute 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,

Char Beltran

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Mary CLAUS <truesantaclus@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 9:52 AM  
**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 single 15 minute 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,

Mary CLAUS



**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Dwyer Mary <mlodwyer@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 12:19 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 single 15 minute 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,

Dwyer Mary

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Kianna Wikfors <kiannawikfors@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 12:55 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 single 15 minute 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,

Kianna Wikfors

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Holly Epright <i2canflwithu@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 1:07 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

On my behalf and on behalf of many unsuspecting and unaware consumers, I plead with 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 single 15 minute 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,

Holly Epright

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Debi Denning <edsdebi00@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 4:14 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 single 15 minute 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,

Debi Denning

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** G Michael <Snug\_phx@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 01, 2016 10:07 AM  
**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. Keep SOLAR power great for private investment!!! 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 single 15 minute 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,

G Michael

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Dana Cude <dctwodogs@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 01, 2016 9:43 AM  
**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 single 15 minute 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,

Dana Cude

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Ruben Rivera <Aimrightfirearms@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 01, 2016 9:02 AM  
**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 single 15 minute 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,

Ruben Rivera

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Matt Cline <mateocline@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 01, 2016 8:08 AM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Mandatory Demand Charges

Commissioner Little,

I urge you to vote against Unisource Energy and other utility companies that are requesting the ability to charge their customers 'Mandatory demand charges'. This will be harmful for the majority of Arizonians, from senior citizens to middle class workers that are struggling to make ends meet. Please do the right thing by the people and vote NO.

Thank You,

Matthew Cline  
2905 Arthur St  
Kingman, AZ  
86401



## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Nancy Baer <redrockclass@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 01, 2016 11:07 AM  
**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 single 15 minute 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,

Nancy Baer

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Charles Brown <Huntmasterbrown@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 01, 2016 9:46 AM  
**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 single 15 minute 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,

Charles Brown

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Ann Meister <annmeister55@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 02, 2016 8:20 AM  
**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 single 15 minute 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,

Ann Meister

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Donna Hartson <dhartson2070@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 02, 2016 6:14 AM  
**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 screw 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 single 15 minute 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,

Donna Hartson

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Carl Hitchon <carlhitchon@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 02, 2016 11:38 AM  
**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 single 15 minute 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.

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,

Carl Hitchon

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Philip Allen <sedonalink@outlook.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 03, 2016 10:07 AM  
**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 single 15 minute period within a month.

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,

Philip Allen

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Molly McKasson Morgan <memckasson@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 02, 2016 10:37 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 single 15 minute 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.

This plan turns us backwards. At a time when human created climate change is not only a reality but a terrible threat all over the earth, we should be encouraging not discouraging more alternate modes like solar: decreasing not increasing our use of carbon-based fuels. This is not sane public policy--not financially not environmentally. Please reject this bid from a foreign company, and honor American solar energy providers and users.

Sincerely,

Molly McKasson Morgan

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Dev Galloway <devgalloway@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 03, 2016 12:25 AM  
**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 single 15 minute 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,

Dev Galloway



## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** john lee <leezureacres@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 03, 2016 5:04 AM  
**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 single 15 minute 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,

john lee

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Brandon Cheshire <thecheshirekatz@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 03, 2016 1:44 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Demand charges should not single out solar users without respect to all residential customers. There must be a value of solar study completed before any regulations are implemented. This is an apparent attack to single out the solar industry in an attempt to protect utility monopoly interests.

Sincerely,

Brandon Cheshire

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Ron Kapellusch <rckapellusch@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 03, 2016 4:59 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. I oppose UNS's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Please reject UNS proposed demand charges and elimination of net metering on the grounds that it is anti-consumer and serves to raise bills while protecting the utility monopoly.

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.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Ron Kapellusch

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Geoffrey Brimhall <glbrimhallmusic@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 03, 2016 6:06 PM  
**To:** Little-Web; Tobin-Web; Forese-Web; Stump-Web; RBurns-Web  
**Subject:** UNS hearing comment 1  
**Attachments:** ArizonaUNSHearingComment1.pdf

Dear Arizona Corporation Commision: 3/3/2016

After hearing testimony for UNS explaining the main justification for the on-peak demand charge is to address the capacity peaks that UNS experiences in both winter and summer, I would like to direct the Commission's attention to the following facts that have been provided:

- 1). UNS has repeatedly mentioned that they have significant fixed costs which are not being addressed by the current rate plans,
- 2). UNS has had to purchase facilities and equipment to address the capacity peaks.

### Argument 1:

Questions: Are the equipment and facilities purchased to address the capacity peaks considered fixed costs ? If so, what is the day-to-day operational cost breakdown for these facilities when they satisfy the capacity peaks - are they mostly fixed staffing costs, or is the raw fuel energy cost significant ? What is the final cost that varies in satisfying the day-to-day capacity peaks - is it just the cost of the fuel, the remainder can all be considered close to constant fixed costs ?

Point: If the only final "variation" cost in satisfying the capacity peaks is the fuel cost, and it is insignificant to the total fixed costs (staff + purchase cost for the capacity facilities), why is a on-peak demand charge the best way to address the much more significant fixed costs ? Wouldn't applying a fixed surcharge be a much simpler way to address the fixed costs rather than an on-demand charge, which by definition can vary and be unpredictable ?

### Argument 2:

Questions: UNS and TEP have purchased their own solar based generation facilities. How much power do these plants produce in comparison to the total non-TEP + UNS owned solar generation units ( ie PV generation systems owned by residential and business ) ?

Point: If TEP+UNS's own solar generation is close to even half of the power generated by residential and business PV generation, then their needs to buy facilities to address capacity peaks would be present even if residential and business PV generation was taken out of the discussion because their own solar based generation has the same power production envelope as residential and business PV, where it doesn't produce enough power to address the capacity peaks. Why is it fair to pass this "internal operations" cost to the public as an on-demand charge ?

Thanks for your consideration,  
Geoffrey L Brimhall  
2012 W Calle Placida  
Tucson, AZ 85745  
760-920-6828

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Patricia Ferre <pferreact@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 03, 2016 11:28 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. I oppose UNS's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Please reject UNS proposed demand charges and elimination of net metering on the grounds that it is anti-consumer and serves to HARM CUSTOMERS and raise bills while protecting the utility monopoly.

Demand charges ambush ratepayers. Because they require bio-toxic AMI smart meters and grids, they ambush our DNA, healthy neurological systems and environmental health while they ambush your pocket book!

Like some kind of Russian Roulette, 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, Safe Analog Net Metering is vital to preserving the ability of ratepayers to go solar. It protects thousands of jobs while it protects our environment. Safe Analog Net Metering is a fair policy that abides by A.R.S.40-361.B and ARS40-334.Discrimination A and B.

Please stop AZ electrical service providers from ambushing patrons, employees, public and environment!

Thank you for respecting AZ constitutionally legal Safe Analog Net Metering!

Sincerely,

Patricia Ferre

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Mark Volner <mvsc\_ca@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 03, 2016 2:14 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. I oppose UNS's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

We need more solar on people's rooftops not less.

Please reject UNS proposed demand charges and elimination of net metering on the grounds that it is anti-consumer and serves to raise bills while protecting the utility monopoly.

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.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Mark Volner

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Tania Malven <tmalven@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 03, 2016 2:14 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Stop monopolies, and corporations from screwing customers, the state and the environment!!!!!!!!!!

Sincerely,

Tania Malven

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Clayton Hayward <haywardclayton52@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 03, 2016 4:10 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. I oppose UNS's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Please reject UNS proposed demand charges and elimination of net metering on the grounds that it is anti-consumer and serves to raise bills while protecting the utility monopoly.

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.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Clayton Hayward



## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Cindy Kapellusch <Lhchottie@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 03, 2016 4:50 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. I oppose UNS's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Please reject UNS proposed demand charges and elimination of net metering on the grounds that it is anti-consumer and serves to raise bills while protecting the utility monopoly.

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.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Cindy Kapellusch

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Frank Pitts <ffjrpitts@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 03, 2016 4:57 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Go ahead and impose more restrictions on solar because in the long run it will expedite the development of whole home batteries and the demise of your commission and power companies supreme power. Please slow the development of Arizona's most natural resource, the sun. Do not think down the road about what will make our society, planet and children's future better. Encouraging the growth of solar is too late. With our planets population explosion and America's huge over consumption of resources our fate is already written and we're doomed. Since America is the leader of the world, there is no point in leading the world into sustainability since we're domed anyway. No matter what or why you decide to impose more restrictions on solar, I forgive you.

Sincerely,

Frank Pitts