

**COMMISSIONERS**  
DOUG LITTLE - Chairman  
BOB STUMP  
BOB BURNS  
TOM FORESE  
ANDY TOBIN

**ORIGINAL**



0000169095

**ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

To: Docket Control

RE: UNISOURCE      Docket # E-04204A-15-0142

Please docket the attached 19 customer comments opposing the above filed case.

Customer comments can be reviewed in E-docket under the above docket number.

Filed by: Utilities Division – Consumer Services

Arizona Corporation Commission  
**DOCKETED**

MAR 16 2016

DOCKETED BY *[Signature]*

RECEIVED  
AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL  
2016 MAR 16 PM 1:13

E-04204A-15-0142

## Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

---

Investigator: Tom Davis	Phone: <<< REDACTED >>>	Opinion Date: 3/1/2016
Opinion Number: 2016 - 129092	Priority: Respond within 5 business days	
Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - Opposed	Closed Date: 3/1/2016 2:53 PM	

---

First Name: Greg	Last Name: Eisert	Account Name: Greg Eisert
Address: <<< REDACTED >>>		
City: SUN CITY	State: AZ	Zip Code: 85351
Cell: <<< REDACTED >>>	Email: <<< REDACTED >>>	

---

**Company: Unisource \*\* Energy Services (UNS)**

---

### Nature Of Opinion

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142

**Docket Position:** Against

Honorable Commissioners & ALJ Rodda My name is Greg Eisert. I represent the Sun City Homeowner's Association. Although Sun City is a community of only 38,000 or so and is not contiguous to the area serviced by UNSElectric, we feel the necessity to comment on these proceedings – primarily due to the intervention by APS and various public statements thereof and others; that this case will likely be precedent setting for APS cases to be heard later this year. It is our understanding that the ACC Staff has introduced a rate design essentially abandoning the two part rate design set forth in UNSE's initial application, with a three part design including a mandatory demand rate for all residential ratepayers. Why the ACC Staff offered up a controversial mandatory three part rate design when it wasn't even part of UNSE's request is interesting at best-possibly even problematic. Nevertheless, here we are. So, to move on - MANDATORY is the key word here. I believe most Arizona utilities currently offer options, appropriately so. APS puts it this way: "We offer several service plans so you can find the one that's most convenient for your lifestyle and saves you the most money". I actually ran the available APS, Compare program, and the results listed my choice was indeed the best, for me, and by far the most costly option included the Demand Charge feature. Throughout conversations with various APS personnel and ratepayers, it was evident that there is a lack of understanding of the technologies available and their costs to purchase and properly utilize. There is a propensity toward large variations in monthly costs for ratepayers due to lack of general understanding and in some, if not many instances, an inability to substantially adjust lifestyles to accommodate such mandated necessities due to health, income etc. In other words – a long learning curve..... There is a long road of marketing, training and test programs that need to be made prior to going to a mandatory demand charge residential program. Otherwise, we could have some dire consequences on our hands, particularly over the summer months. It seems the Commission has it pretty much right, already. I don't believe we need to re-invent the wheel here, by introducing the mandatory residential design change...It will prove most problematic to our most vulnerable citizens. Regarding Net Metering - Charge your Staff to get creative...Try some other variable of already existing policy, such as taking the net metering rebate from retail to wholesale; the company keeps say 35%– 40%; the solar ratepayer diverts his share toward reducing the fee set to compensate for grid usage costs – everyone should win here.... That ends my comment. Thank you.

---

<b>Date:</b>	<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Investigation</b>	
3/1/2016	Tom Davis	<b>Submitted By:</b>	<b>Type:</b>
		Other	Investigation

Entered for the record and docketed. CLOSED

---

E-04204A-15-0142

## Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

---

<b>Investigator:</b> Tom Davis	<b>Phone:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>	<b>Opinion Date:</b> 3/2/2016
<b>Opinion Number:</b> 2016 - 129123	<b>Priority:</b> Respond within 5 business days	
<b>Opinion Codes:</b> Rate Case Items - Opposed	<b>Closed Date:</b> 3/2/2016 10:41 AM	

---

<b>First Name:</b> Larry & Jana	<b>Last Name:</b> Curry	<b>Account Name:</b> Larry & Jana Curry
<b>Address:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>		
<b>City:</b> Tucson	<b>State:</b> AZ	<b>Zip Code:</b> 85748

---

<b>Company:</b> Unisource ** Energy Services (UNS)	<b>Division:</b> Electric
--	---------------------------

---

### Nature Of Opinion

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142

**Docket Position:** Against

Re: UNS Rate Increase Hearing in Tucson for Solar

We are unable to attend the hearing today in Tucson downtown, but would like to voice our opposition to any rate increase charged to "current and future" customers who have invested deeply in solar energy in the state of Arizona.

We believe that Arizona has more potential than any other state in the United States for solar energy production. We believe that clean solar is not only a benefit to those schools, businesses and residents who have installed the equipment, but also to all citizens within the area.

We also see many sources of clean energy as an alternative to large centralized utility farms, and many decentralized sources become an enhancement to the civil defense of our nation. If smaller installations for energy production are discouraged and large utilities concentrate and/or centralize their energy production, then electricity for all is more vulnerable to damage and disruption from attack(s).

We also do not believe large utilities should be the only ones who are not discouraged from installing solar energy development; more and different sources of clean and less expensive solar energy in Arizona ensures that all citizens, schools and businesses will have clean and sustainable energy well into the future.

Therefore we oppose any increase in rates that would discourage anyone from investing and installing in solar energy production in the desert state of Arizona. We advocate for a more diverse and more productive future for the many and not the few.

---

<b>Date:</b>	<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Investigation Submitted By:</b>	<b>Type:</b>
3/2/2016	Tom Davis	Other	Investigation

Entered for the record and docketed. CLOSED

---

E-04204A-15-0142

## Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

---

**Investigator:** Tom Davis      **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>>      **Opinion Date:** 3/2/2016  
**Opinion Number:** 2016 - 129111      **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days  
**Opinion Codes:** Rate Case Items - Opposed      **Closed Date:** 3/2/2016 9:50 AM

---

**First Name:** Richard      **Last Name:** Fimbres      **Account Name:** Richard Fimbres  
**Address:** <<< REDACTED >>>  
**City:** Tucson      **State:** AZ      **Zip Code:** 85714  
**Work:** <<< REDACTED >>>      **Email:** <<< REDACTED >>>

---

**Company:** Unisource \*\* Energy Services (UNS)

---

### Nature Of Opinion

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142

**Docket Position:** Against

The proposal would lower rates for businesses and yet raise rates for residential customers, to the tune of \$10 a month. How then does this strengthen our economy when the potential work force who may not be able to pay for any potential increase to their rates. In addition, Arizona should be leading the world with solar energy technology production but this is being stymied by the electric companies.

---

Investigation			
Date:	Analyst:	Submitted By:	Type:
3/2/2016	Tom Davis	Other	Investigation

Entered for the record and docketed. CLOSED

---

# Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

Investigator: Tom Davis      Phone: <<< REDACTED >>>      Opinion Date: 3/2/2016  
 Opinion Number: 2016 - 129116      Priority: Respond within 5 business days  
 Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - Opposed      Closed Date: 3/2/2016 9:36 AM

First Name: Mansur      Last Name: Johnson      Account Name: Mansur Johnson  
 Address: <<< REDACTED >>>  
 City: Tucson      State: AZ      Zip Code: 85741  
 Work: <<< REDACTED >>>      Email: <<< REDACTED >>>

Company: Unisource \*\* Energy Services (UNS)

### Nature Of Opinion

Docket Number: E-04204A-15-0142

Docket Position: Against

The word is out. All the big utilities are piling on this rate case for a minor utility, hoping to set a precedent for the other rate cases. This is a time when the old formula of boosting charges to make up for lost revenue must give way to a new paradigm: lowering rates, holding customer charges unchanged, with no demand charges. For openers, I would request that Mr. Thomas M. Broderick, chief of staff of the Utility Division, recuse himself and his input from this proceeding as his point of view is not in the public interest; rather, it is one sided in favor of the utilities. If I can make a comparison, I'm afraid Arizona's Corporation Commission officials are as oblivious to the economic burden UNSE proposes to levy on its ratepayers as Michigan officials were oblivious to the health and welfare of Flint residents. I, for one, am tired of the "We'll pay you to vote against the public's interest" influence of power company lobbyist's on the Commissioners, one of whom already resigned for conflict of interest. UNSE's proposal to double the Customer Cost on Residential bills from \$10 to \$20 per month is unconscionable. Staff's acceptance of \$15 is ridiculous. No hike is necessary. Rather a rate freeze or rate reduction is indicated. UNSE says its revenues are down because usage is down; hence, a rate increase to recover fixed costs is necessary. This conclusion is wrong. If there were no other solutions, then it would be necessary to increase revenue to cover costs, but new technology is available and can be implemented to reduce, or at least freeze, current costs. Staff—except for Mr. Broderick who does not wish to recognize this point of view--I'm talking to you here: —Make all utilities become competitive with solar energy without de-incentivizing the very power source, solar, the general public wants to make Arizona's primary power source. —Force the utilities to build solar arrays at utility scale to stabilize costs. —Change the rate structure to pay their guaranteed profit as a percent of shared cost reduction, rather than 10% of their purposeful bloating of costs to generate higher profits. Those costs, by the way, include bloated management and employee salaries and shareholder benefits, which are not in the public interest. —Optimize, reduce and stabilize ratepayer costs and increase delivery of quantifiable value, which looks out for the general public. Do it by stabilizing current rates. In these ways Commissioners, make the highly compensated ones you regulate by law actually deliver value to customers and earn their excessive fees set not by competition and the free market, but by you. Please do your part Commissioners to guide and teach Arizona's utilities that no growth is good and in the public interest. Mansur Johnson Tucson

Date:	Analyst:	Investigation Submitted By:	Type:
3/2/2016	Tom Davis	Other	Investigation
Entered for the record and docketed. CLOSED			

E-04204A-15-0142

## Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

---

**Investigator:** Jenny Gomez      **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>>      **Opinion Date:** 3/1/2016  
**Opinion Number:** 2016 - 129091      **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days  
**Opinion Codes:** Rate Case Items - Opposed      **Closed Date:** 3/1/2016 1:43 PM

---

**First Name:** Allen      **Last Name:** Keinert      **Account Name:** Allen Keinert  
**Address:** <<< REDACTED >>>  
**City:** Sahuarita      **State:** AZ      **Zip Code:** 85629  
**Home:** <<< REDACTED >>>

---

**Company:** Unisource \*\* Energy Services (UNS)      **Division:** Electric

### Nature Of Opinion

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142

**Docket Position:** Against

I emphatically urge you to reject the Unisource proposal, docket E-04204A-15-0142, to impose DEMAND CHARGES and to eliminate NET METERING! DEMAND CHARGES unfairly impact residential families. Residential electric service customers should only be charged for the energy they actually use, and NOT be PENALIZED for using "too much" electric energy during a specific period of the day, which is the basis for DEMAND CHARGES. Many thousands of Tucson Electric Power residential electric customers have attempted to contribute to energy conservation, cleaner air, and reduction of burning fossil fuels by installing PV Solar Panels on the roofs of their homes, and the practice has been beneficial for the environment. Now, PV Solar Panel using customers are being told by Unisource that we aren't paying enough towards the infrastructure costs of Tucson Electric Power, and other Arizona electric companies that Unisource controls. As a result, Unisource is proposing the elimination of NET METERING! Allowing DEMAND CHARGES, and eliminating NET METERING, will most likely result in the same devastation to conservation practice and the Solar Industry in Arizona that we have seen happen in the State of Nevada when similar measures were approved and adopted there. This proposal by Unisource is nothing more than CORPORATE HIPOCRACY and CORPORATE GREED and should be rejected as such by the Arizona Corporation Commission!  
Sincerely, Allen Keinert

---

Investigation			
Date:	Analyst:	Submitted By:	Type:
3/2/2016	Jenny Gomez	Telephone	Investigation

Noted and filed for the record in Docket Control. Closed

E-04204A-15-0142

## Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

---

<b>Investigator:</b> Trish Meeter	<b>Phone:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>	<b>Opinion Date:</b> 3/1/2016
<b>Opinion Number:</b> 2016 - 129049	<b>Priority:</b> Respond within 5 business days	
<b>Opinion Codes:</b> Rate Case Items - Opposed		<b>Closed Date:</b> 3/1/2016 9:14 AM

---

<b>First Name:</b> Josh	<b>Last Name:</b> Leonard	<b>Account Name:</b> Josh Leonard
<b>Address:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>		
<b>City:</b> Tucson	<b>State:</b> AZ	<b>Zip Code:</b> 85716
<b>Cell:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>	<b>Email:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>	

---

<b>Company:</b> Unisource ** Energy Services (UNS)	<b>Division:</b> Electric
--	---------------------------

---

### Nature Of Opinion

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142

**Docket Position:** Against

Attacking solar energy is irrational for Arizona and harmful to the consumer. Not only are fossil fuels destructive of the climate but they actually poison consumers, cause cancer, destroy groundwater and demand that we subsidize their profits through tax breaks, health care costs, and direct subsidization of the industry. Solar energy reduces peak demand and is the sensible choice for Arizona and Arizonans. How is it I ask you that Germany has greater use of solar energy per capita than Arizona where we have full sun over 300 days a year? Please consider the priorities of Arizona and Arizonans and not those of an International Fossil Fuels Monopoly! Thank you! Josh Leonard Tucson, Arizona

E-04204A-15-0142

**Arizona Corporation Commission  
Utilities Complaint Form**

---

**Investigator:** Trish Meeter      **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>>      **Opinion Date:** 3/1/2016  
**Opinion Number:** 2016 - 129037      **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days  
**Opinion Codes:** Rate Case Items - Opposed      **Closed Date:** 3/1/2016 9:12 AM

---

**First Name:** Richard      **Last Name:** Mason      **Account Name:** Richard Mason  
**Address:** <<< REDACTED >>>  
**City:** CHANDLER      **State:** AZ      **Zip Code:** 85249  
**Cell:** <<< REDACTED >>>      **Email:** <<< REDACTED >>>

---

**Company:** Unisource \*\* Energy Services (UNS)      **Division:** Electric

---

**Nature Of Opinion**

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142

**Docket Position:** Against

Unisource is requesting that the ACC add demand charges that will kill the solar option for its customer. This move will all but insure that Unisource will protect its monopoly over power. SRP's board of directors in Feb. 2015 added demand charge and the result has been a complete shut down of new solar installation in that territory. SRP's board did not need to seek the approval of the ACC. Being a private utility the SRP board can make such decisions without a regulatory commission. The ACC was established to protect the rate payers and not the share holder. Your task is to keep solar as a viable option for the rate payers. Demand charges is not the way to do that. Demand charges create an uncontrollable cost factor that the rate payer whether solar or standard rate payer have little control over. Picture it is August and you want to cook diner. If you turn on your oven and the A/C should kick on during that time you could be hit with a extremely high demand charge for the entire month even though that only happened for 30 minutes one time during the entire month. That is not fair and that is what you are supposed to protect the rate payer from. Do what you were elected to do by the voters and not for the people who paid for your campaigns to get you here. SAY NO to Unisource's demand charges. Thank you, Richard Mason



E-04204A-15-0142

**Arizona Corporation Commission  
Utilities Complaint Form**

---

<b>Investigator:</b> Trish Meeter	<b>Phone:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>	<b>Opinion Date:</b> 3/2/2016
<b>Opinion Number:</b> 2016 - 129121	<b>Priority:</b> Respond within 5 business days	
<b>Opinion Codes:</b> Rate Case Items - Opposed	<b>Closed Date:</b> 3/2/2016 9:16 AM	
<b>First Name:</b> Kim	<b>Last Name:</b> Hayashi	<b>Account Name:</b> Kim Hayashi
<b>Address:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>		
<b>City:</b>	<b>State:</b> AZ	<b>Zip Code:</b>
<b>Company:</b> Unisource ** Energy Services (UNS)		<b>Division:</b> Electric

---

**Nature Of Opinion**

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142

**From:** <<< REDACTED >>>

**Sent:** Monday, February 29, 2016 11:46 AM

**To:** Hearings Division <HearingDiv@azcc.gov>

**Subject:** Email from Public to Hearing Division

UTILITIES DIVISION, Arizona Corporation Commission

To WHom It May Concern,

This is an email asking you to oppose the upcoming decision regarding the Tucson Electric Power UNS Surcharges at all levels.

As a soon to be retiree, the cost of utility bills are of major concern.

Please OPPOSE any new surcharges requested.

Thank you,

Respectfully,

Kim Hayashi

E-04204A-15-0142

## Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

---

<b>Investigator:</b> Jenny Gomez	<b>Phone:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>	<b>Opinion Date:</b> 3/3/2016
<b>Opinion Number:</b> 2016 - 129145	<b>Priority:</b> Respond within 5 business days	
<b>Opinion Codes:</b> Rate Case Items - Opposed	<b>Closed Date:</b> 3/3/2016 10:42 AM	

---

<b>First Name:</b> Terry	<b>Last Name:</b> Finefrock	<b>Account Name:</b> Terry Finefrock
<b>Address:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>		
<b>City:</b> Tucson	<b>State:</b> AZ	<b>Zip Code:</b> 85718
<b>Cell:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>	<b>Email:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>	

---

<b>Company:</b> Unisource ** Energy Services (UNS)	<b>Division:</b> Electric
--	---------------------------

---

### Nature Of Opinion

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142

**Docket Position:** Against

Although I am a TEP Ratepayer, the requests-principles in this docket are similar to those requested by TEP and will set precedence for TEP & APS dockets. I am opposed to the requested increases and expansion of demand charges to Residential customers. For many years, our utilities have managed Residential demand fluctuations and ALL costs are recovered by current rates-surcharges. It is time that our well compensated utilities evolve and deploy new technology to EARN their compensation by optimizing benefit, controlling and reducing costs, and value to RATEPAYERS(not just shareholders and employees). On 3/4/16, CEO Hutchens stated that there's no opposition to the purchase of NEW Gila River natural gas fueled generation capacity....I disagree! I and many other informed ratepayers believe that when all(Lifetime of Asset)costs are considered, including line loss, potable water usage, methane/heat trapping emissions, O & M and fuel costs, energy transmission loss, transmission infrastructure costs, that the assets are likely to be "Stranded", the Utility will ask ratepayers to reimburse them. This is simply another way for Utility to add to costs and increase their Return on Rate(10% of cost) at Ratepayer expense. Those funds would generate greater Value to ratepayers if over the life of assets invested in LOCAL utility scale fixed and lower cost(lifetime) solar facilities and the deployment of emerging circuit scale energy storage systems. Last year in a published newspaper(ADS)Hutchens promised to provide low, fixed cost solar energy to ALL(Tucson) ratepayers. It's time that he fulfilled that pledge. Commissioners, please act to have our utilities control and reduce the costs of our non-discretionary commodities, energy and water; these constant and significant increases are an enormous economic burden on all ratepayers, many low-fixed income in So. AZ, and our economy.

---

<b>Date:</b>	<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Investigation Submitted By:</b>	<b>Type:</b>
3/3/2016	Jenny Gomez	Telephone	Investigation

---

Noted and filed for the record in Docket Control. Closed

---

E-04204A-15-0142

**Arizona Corporation Commission  
Utilities Complaint Form**

---

<b>Investigator:</b> Jenny Gomez	<b>Phone:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>	<b>Opinion Date:</b> 3/3/2016
<b>Opinion Number:</b> 2016 - 129145	<b>Priority:</b> Respond within 5 business days	
<b>Opinion Codes:</b> Rate Case Items - Opposed	<b>Closed Date:</b> 3/3/2016 10:42 AM	
<b>First Name:</b> Terry	<b>Last Name:</b> Finefrock	<b>Account Name:</b> Terry Finefrock
<b>Address:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>		
<b>City:</b> Tucson	<b>State:</b> AZ	<b>Zip Code:</b> 85718
<b>Cell:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>	<b>Email:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>	
<b>Company:</b> Unisource ** Energy Services (UNS)		<b>Division:</b> Electric

---

**Nature Of Opinion**

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142

**Docket Position:** Against

Although I am a TEP Ratepayer, the requests-principles in this docket are similar to those requested by TEP and will set precedence for TEP & APS dockets. I am opposed to the requested increases and expansion of demand charges to Residential customers. For many years, our utilities have managed Residential demand fluctuations and ALL costs are recovered by current rates-surcharges. It is time that our well compensated utilities evolve and deploy new technology to EARN their compensation by optimizing benefit, controlling and reducing costs, and value to RATEPAYERS(not just shareholders and employees). On 3/4/16, CEO Hutchens stated that there's no opposition to the purchase of NEW Gila River natural gas fueled generation capacity....I disagree! I and many other informed ratepayers believe that when all(Lifetime of Asset)costs are considered, including line loss, potable water usage, methane/heat trapping emissions, O & M and fuel costs, energy transmission loss, transmission infrastructure costs, that the assets are likely to be "Stranded", the Utility will ask ratepayers to reimburse them. This is simply another way for Utility to add to costs and increase their Return on Rate(10% of cost) at Ratepayer expense. Those funds would generate greater Value to ratepayers if over the life of assets invested in LOCAL utility scale fixed and lower cost(lifetime) solar facilities and the deployment of emerging circuit scale energy storage systems. Last year in a published newspaper(ADS)Hutchens promised to provide low, fixed cost solar energy to ALL(Tucson) ratepayers. It's time that he fulfilled that pledge. Commissioners, please act to have our utilities control and reduce the costs of our non-discretionary commodities, energy and water; these constant and significant increases are an enormous economic burden on all ratepayers, many low-fixed income in So. AZ, and our economy.

E-04204A-15-0142

**Arizona Corporation Commission  
Utilities Complaint Form**

---

**Investigator:** Jenny Gomez      **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>>      **Opinion Date:** 3/3/2016  
**Opinion Number:** 2016 - 129159      **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days  
**Opinion Codes:** Rate Case Items - Opposed      **Closed Date:** 3/3/2016 3:48 PM

---

**First Name:** Ronnie      **Last Name:** Campin      **Account Name:** Ronnie Campin  
**Address:**  
**City:**      **State:**      **Zip Code:**

---

**Company:** Unisource \*\* Energy Services (UNS)      **Division:** Electric

---

**Nature Of Opinion**

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Arizona Corporation Commission,

I urge you to reject the Unisource proposal, docket E-04204A-15-0142, to impose demand charges and eliminate net metering.

Demand charges are nearly impossible for customers to understand and control. Demand charges disproportionately impact customers while they are home with their families, cooking dinner, doing laundry, and enjoying the amenities they work hard for. Customers should be charged only for the energy they use, not penalized for using too much energy during a specific period of the day.

No commission in the country has approved mandatory demand charge rates on residential and small business customers. Historically, demand charges have only been imposed on commercial customers, who rely on demand management software and energy engineers to control their peak time usage. Small, residential families cannot be expected to do the same.

In Nevada, a similar type of proposal was recently passed, resulting in devastating impacts to the solar industry and thousands of solar workers.

Please reject Unisource's proposal. It is an obvious attempt to stifle solar growth and overcharge customers.

Sincerely,

Ronnie Campin

9541 E. Rand Place

TUCSON, AZ 85715

5208851554

---

<b>Investigation</b>			
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Submitted By:</b>	<b>Type:</b>
3/3/2016	Jenny Gomez	Telephone	Investigation

Noted and filed for the record in Docket Control.

---

# Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

<b>Investigator:</b> Jenny Gomez	<b>Phone:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>	<b>Opinion Date:</b> 3/4/2016
<b>Opinion Number:</b> 2016 - 129162	<b>Priority:</b> Respond within 5 business days	
<b>Opinion Codes:</b> Rate Case Items - Opposed	<b>Closed Date:</b> 3/4/2016 8:43 AM	
<b>First Name:</b> Mansur	<b>Last Name:</b> Johnson	<b>Account Name:</b> Mansur Johnson
<b>Address:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>		
<b>City:</b> Tucson	<b>State:</b> AZ	<b>Zip Code:</b> 85741
<b>Home:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>	<b>Cell:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>	<b>Email:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>
<b>Company:</b> Unisource ** Energy Services (UNS)		<b>Division:</b> Electric

### Nature Of Opinion

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142

**Docket Position:** Against

The word is out. All the big utilities are piling on this rate case for a minor utility hoping to set a precedent for the other rate cases. This is a time when the old formula of boosting charges to make up for lost revenue must give way to a new paradigm: lowering rates, holding Customer Charges unchanged, and no demand charges. For openers, I would request that Mr. Thomas M. Broderick, chief of staff of the Utility Division, recuse himself and his input from this proceeding as his point of view is not in the public interest; rather, it is one-sided in favor of the utilities. If I can make a comparison, I'm afraid Arizona's Corporation Commission officials are as oblivious to the economic burden UNSE proposes to levy on its ratepayers as Michigan officials were oblivious to the health and welfare of Flint residents. I, for one, am tired of the "We'll pay you to vote against the public's interest" influence of power company lobbyists on the Commissioners, one of whom resigned already for conflict of interest. UNSE's proposal to double the Customer Cost on Residential bills from \$10 to \$20 is unconscionable. Staff's acceptance of \$15 is ridiculous. No hike is necessary. Rather a rate freeze or rate reduction is indicated. UNSE says its revenues are down; hence, a rate increase to recover fixed costs is necessary. This conclusion is wrong. If there were no other solutions, then it would be necessary to increase revenue to cover costs, but new technology is available and can be implemented to reduce, or at least, freeze current costs. Staff--except for Mr. Broderick who does not wish to recognize this point of view--I'm talking to you here: --Make all utilities become competitive with solar energy without de-incentivizing the very power source, solar, the general public wants to make Arizona's primary power source. --Force the utilities to build solar arrays at utility scale to stabilize costs. --Change the rate structure to pay their guaranteed profit as a percent of shared cost reduction, rather than 10% of their purposeful bloating of costs to generate higher profits. Those costs, by the way, include bloated management and employee salaries and shareholder benefits, which are not in the public interest. --Optimize, reduce and stabilize ratepayers costs and increase delivery of quantifiable value, which looks out for the general public. Do it by stabilizing current rates. In these ways Commissioners, make the highly compensated ones you regulate by law actually deliver value to customers and earn their excessive salaries set not by competition and the free market, but by you. Please do your part Commissioners to guide and teach Arizona's utilities that no growth is good and in the public interest. Mansur Johnson, Tucson.

		Investigation	
Date:	Analyst:	Submitted By:	Type:
3/4/2016	Jenny Gomez	Telephone	Investigation
Noted and filed for the record in Docket Control. Closed			

E-04204A-15-0142

## Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

---

<b>Investigator:</b> Michael Buck	<b>Phone:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>	<b>Opinion Date:</b> 3/4/2016
<b>Opinion Number:</b> 2016 - 129167	<b>Priority:</b> Respond within 5 business days	
<b>Opinion Codes:</b> Rate Case Items - Opposed	<b>Closed Date:</b> 3/4/2016 9:50 AM	

---

<b>First Name:</b> Geoffrey	<b>Last Name:</b> Brimhall	<b>Account Name:</b> Geoffrey Brimhall
<b>Address:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>		
<b>City:</b> Tucson	<b>State:</b> AZ	<b>Zip Code:</b> 85745
<b>Cell:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>	<b>Email:</b> <<< REDACTED >>>	

---

**Company:** Unisource \*\* Energy Services (UNS)

---

### Nature Of Opinion

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142

**Docket Position:** Against

3/4/2016

Dear Arizona Corporation Commission:

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

<<< REDACTED >>>

**E-04204A-15-0142**

**Arizona Corporation Commission  
Utilities Complaint Form**

Tucson, Arizona 85745

---

		<b>Investigation</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Submitted By:</b>	<b>Type:</b>
3/4/2016	Michael Buck	Telephone	Investigation
Entered for the record and docketed.			

---

E-04204A-15-0142

## Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

---

Investigator: Michael Buck	Phone: <<< REDACTED >>>	Opinion Date: 3/4/2016
Opinion Number: 2016 - 129175	Priority: Respond within 5 business days	
Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - Opposed		Closed Date: 3/4/2016 2:30 PM

---

First Name: Elizabeth	Last Name: Rice	Account Name: Elizabeth Rice
Address: <<< REDACTED >>>		
City:	State: AZ	Zip Code:
Home: <<< REDACTED >>>	Email: <<< REDACTED >>>	

---

Company: Unisource ** Energy Services (UNS)	Division: Electric
---	--------------------

---

### Nature Of Opinion

Docket Number: E-04204A-15-0142

Docket Position: Against

Dear Arizona Corporation Commission,

I urge you to reject the Unisource proposal, docket E-04204A-15-0142, to impose demand charges and eliminate net metering.

Demand charges are nearly impossible for customers to understand and control. Demand charges disproportionately impact customers while they are home with their families, cooking dinner, doing laundry, and enjoying the amenities they work hard for. Customers should be charged only for the energy they use, not penalized for using too much energy during a specific period of the day.

No commission in the country has approved mandatory demand charge rates on residential and small business customers. Historically, demand charges have only been imposed on commercial customers, who rely on demand management software and energy engineers to control their peak time usage. Small, residential families cannot be expected to do the same.

In Nevada, a similar type of proposal was recently passed, resulting in devastating impacts to the solar industry and thousands of solar workers.

Please reject Unisource's proposal. It is an obvious attempt to stifle solar growth and overcharge customers.

Those of us on a fixed income also wish to do our part for the environment - please do not allow this ridiculous rate increase.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Rice

<<< REDACTED >>>

Tucson, AZ 85735



E-04204A-15-0142

**Arizona Corporation Commission**  
**Utilities Complaint Form**

520-883-6187

---

<b>Date:</b>	<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Investigation</b>	
3/4/2016	Michael Buck	<b>Submitted By:</b>	<b>Type:</b>
		Telephone	Investigation

Entered for the record and docketed.

---

E-04204A-15-0142

**Arizona Corporation Commission  
Utilities Complaint Form**

---

**Investigator:** Jenny Gomez      **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>>      **Opinion Date:** 2/26/2016  
**Opinion Number:** 2016 - 129011      **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days  
**Opinion Codes:** Rate Case Items - Opposed      **Closed Date:** 2/26/2016 11:02 AM

---

**First Name:** Jason      **Last Name:** Dupont      **Account Name:** Jason Dupont  
**Address:** <<< REDACTED >>>  
**City:** Tucson      **State:** AZ      **Zip Code:** 85718  
**Home:** <<< REDACTED >>>

---

**Company:** Unisource \*\* Energy Services (UNS)      **Division:** Electric

---

**Nature Of Opinion**

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142

**Docket Position:** Against

Dear Arizona Corporation Commission,

Hey guys,

Thousands of us made long-term financial decisions based on the current 1:1 net metering. This Unisource proposal, docket E-04204A-15-0142 is essentially a "bite and switch" and if it passes those of us with rooftop solar will end up actually paying more for having done something positive for the environment and American businesses. Please do the right thing and take care of the Arizona people that voted you into office.

Sincerely,

Jason DuPont

---

<b>Investigation</b>			
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Submitted By:</b>	<b>Type:</b>
2/26/2016	Jenny Gomez	Telephone	Investigation

Noted and filed for the record in Docket Control.

E-04204A-15-0142

## Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

---

**Investigator:** Jenny Gomez      **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>>      **Opinion Date:** 2/29/2016  
**Opinion Number:** 2016 - 129059      **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days  
**Opinion Codes:** Rate Case Items - Opposed      **Closed Date:** 2/29/2016 3:36 PM

---

**First Name:** Michael      **Last Name:** Benson      **Account Name:** Michael Benson  
**Address:** <<< REDACTED >>>  
**City:** Tucson      **State:** AZ      **Zip Code:** 85750  
**Home:** <<< REDACTED >>>

---

**Company:** Unisource \*\* Energy Services (UNS)      **Division:** Electric

---

### Nature Of Opinion

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142      **Docket Position:** Against

Dear Arizona Corporation Commission,

I strongly urge the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) to reject Unisource proposal, docket E-04204A-15-0142, to impose demand charges and eliminate net metering.

Demand charges are inherently unfair to solar system owners and designed to punish families that have chosen to go solar. Additionally, the proposal disproportionately impacts all utility customers while they're at home, cooking dinner, doing laundry, and enjoying the amenities they work hard for.

Electrical utility customers should be charged only for the energy they use, not penalized for using too much energy during specific periods of the day. (It's obvious even to the uneducated that these charges affect solar families even more by charging more for utility-provided energy when solar systems are at their lowest peak production times.)

No commission in the country has approved mandatory demand charge rates on residential and small business customers. Historically, demand charges have only been imposed on commercial customers, who rely on demand management software and energy engineers to control their peak time usage. Small, residential families cannot be expected to do the same.

In Nevada, a recently passed similar type of proposal result in devastating impacts to the solar industry and thousands of solar workers.

Please reject Unisource's proposal. It's an obvious attempt to stifle solar growth and overcharge customers for the sake of greater profit-gains. If ACC doesn't reject this proposal, profit-driven utilities will continue to place monetary gains over moving the country into a new era of power sourcing which we desperately need if there is to be anything left for our children and their children.

Thank you for your consideration in this urgent matter.

Lt Col, USAF (Retired)

8390 E. Brookhill Dr.

Tucson, AZ 85750

E-04204A-15-0142

**Arizona Corporation Commission  
Utilities Complaint Form**

Sincerely,

---

<b>Investigation</b>			
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Submitted By:</b>	<b>Type:</b>
2/29/2016	Jenny Gomez	Telephone	Investigation
Noted and filed for the record in Docket Control.			

---

E-04204A-15-0142

## Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

---

**Investigator:** Jenny Gomez      **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>>      **Opinion Date:** 2/29/2016  
**Opinion Number:** 2016 - 129058      **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days  
**Opinion Codes:** Rate Case Items - Opposed      **Closed Date:** 2/29/2016 3:23 PM

---

**First Name:** Deborah      **Last Name:** Bryan      **Account Name:** Deborah Bryan  
**Address:** <<< REDACTED >>>  
**City:** Tucson      **State:** AZ      **Zip Code:** 85711  
**Home:** <<< REDACTED >>>

---

**Company:** Unisource \*\* Energy Services (UNS)      **Division:** Electric

---

### Nature Of Opinion

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142

**Subject:** Reject the Unisource proposal

Dear Arizona Corporation Commission,

WHILE I realize TEP is an investor controlled utility, doesn't the realized power gain offset the need to penalize those with solar capabilities? Solar customers pay for the line usage and maintenance. Is there not a responsibility of a billion dollar operation as Fortis to incorporate this technology into their business and not penalize those who are making an effort to minimize the use of coal. TEP is moving toward solar power plants and away from coal. Why are solar customers being targeted when all customers will eventually be using solar power. The Sundt plant now delivers power from solar arrays; will the Sundt plant customers and future TEP solar customers be charged under the same fee schedule as roof top solar customers?

I urge you to reject the Unisource proposal, docket E-04204A-15-0142, to impose demand charges and eliminate net metering.

Demand charges are nearly impossible for customers to understand and control. Demand charges disproportionately impact customers while they are home with their families, cooking dinner, doing laundry, and enjoying the amenities they work hard for. Customers should be charged only for the energy they use, not penalized for using too much energy during a specific period of the day.

No commission in the country has approved mandatory demand charge rates on residential and small business customers. Historically, demand charges have only been imposed on commercial customers, who rely on demand management software and energy engineers to control their peak time usage. Small, residential families cannot be expected to do the same.

In Nevada, a similar type of proposal was recently passed, resulting in devastating impacts to the solar industry and thousands of solar workers.

Please reject Unisource's proposal. It is an obvious attempt to stifle solar growth and overcharge customers.

Sincerely,

Deborah Bryan

---

Investigation

**E-04204A-15-0142**

**Arizona Corporation Commission  
Utilities Complaint Form**

<b>Date:</b>	<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Submitted By:</b>	<b>Type:</b>
2/29/2016	Jenny Gomez	Telephone	Investigation

Noted and filed for the record in Docket Control. Closed

---

E-04204A-15-0142

**Arizona Corporation Commission  
Utilities Complaint Form**

---

**Investigator:** Jenny Gomez      **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>>      **Opinion Date:** 2/29/2016  
**Opinion Number:** 2016 - 129060      **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days  
**Opinion Codes:** Rate Case Items - Opposed      **Closed Date:** 2/29/2016 3:46 PM

---

**First Name:** Lloyd & Kay      **Last Name:** Bierstaker      **Account Name:** Lloyd & Kay  
Bierstaker  
**Address:** <<< REDACTED >>>  
**City:** Green Valley      **State:** AZ      **Zip Code:** 85614  
**Home:** <<< REDACTED >>>

---

**Company:** Unisource \*\* Energy Services (UNS)      **Division:** Electric

---

**Nature Of Opinion**

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142      **Docket Position:** Against

From: Lloyd and Kay Bierstaker [mailto:lkbier@aol.com]

Sent: Friday, February 26, 2016 4:31 PM

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

Subject: Reject the Unisource proposal

Dear Arizona Corporation Commission,

You MUST reject the Unisource proposal, docket E-04204A-15-0142, to impose demand charges and eliminate net metering.

It is an obviously regressive and restraint-of trade attempt to increase utility income at the expense of families and the entire solar industry. It is a license to steal.

Please reject Unisource's proposal. It is an obvious attempt to stifle solar growth and overcharge customers.

Sincerely,

Green Valley, AZ 85614

---

<b>Date:</b>	<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Investigation</b>	<b>Type:</b>
2/29/2016	Jenny Gomez	Submitted By: Telephone	Investigation

**E-04204A-15-0142**

**Arizona Corporation Commission  
Utilities Complaint Form**

Noted and filed for the record in Docket Control. Closed

---



E-04204A-15-0142

## Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

---

Investigator: Richard Martinez	Phone: <<< REDACTED >>>	Opinion Date: 2/25/2016
Opinion Number: 2016 - 128995	Priority: Respond within 5 business days	
Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - Opposed		Closed Date: 3/3/2016 3:01 PM

---

First Name: Ernest	Last Name: Arevalo	Account Name: Ernest Arevalo
Address: <<< REDACTED >>>		
City: Green Valley	State: AZ	Zip Code: 85614

---

Company: Unisource ** Energy Services (UNS)		
Cara Roll	Phone: <<< REDACTED >>>	Email: <<< REDACTED >>>

---

### Nature Of Opinion

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Sirs or Madam:

I urge you to reject the Unisource proposal, docket E-04204A-15-0142, to impose demand charges and eliminate net metering.

Demand charges are nearly impossible for customers to understand and control. Demand charges disproportionately impact customers while they are home with their families, cooking dinner, doing laundry, and enjoying the amenities they work hard for. Customers should be charged only for the energy they use, not penalized for using too much energy during a specific period of the day.

No commission in the country has approved mandatory demand charge rates on residential and small business customers. Historically, demand charges have only been imposed on commercial customers, who rely on demand management software and energy engineers to control their peak time usage. Small, residential families cannot be expected to do the same.

In Nevada, a similar type of proposal was recently passed, resulting in devastating impacts to the solar industry and thousands of solar workers.

Please reject Unisource's proposal. It is an obvious attempt to stifle solar growth and overcharge customers.

I recently had Solar Panels installed on my home and implementation of the Unisource proposal would diminish the benefits of my solar installation.

Respectfully,

Ernest Arevalo

18393 S. Dawn View Drive

Green Valley AZ 85614

520-625-4801

---

	<b>Investigation</b>		
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Submitted By:</b>	<b>Type:</b>

**E-04204A-15-0142**

**Arizona Corporation Commission  
Utilities Complaint Form**

3/3/2016

Richard Martinez

Telephone

Investigation

Opinion entered into our database for the record and docketed. Closed.

---