



0000169273

RECEIVED

MAR 28 2016 P 4: 00

AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL

ORIGINAL

## Memorandum

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

TO: Docket Control

DATE: March 28, 2016

FROM: Chairman Doug Little's Office

SUBJECT: Docket No: E-04204A-15-0142

---

Chairman Little's office received 66 emails opposing the UNS case with the above Docket Number. These emails can be viewed either in Docket, or on the website via the eDocket link.

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

MAR 28 2016

DOCKETED BY	
-------------	--

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** David Samples <tuppdave@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 28, 2016 2:51 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** UNS Electric Proposal Docket # E-04204A-15-0142

Chairman Little,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the UNS Electric proposal to adopt demand charges. This proposal is docket number E-04204A-15-0142.

A recent study by the NREL (technical paper NREL/TP-6A20-64850) estimates that demand charge rate structures would typically add 35% to the monthly bill of a solar customer.

I urge the commission to protect the citizens of Arizona who elected you to guard against unnecessary and undocumented rate increases which do nothing but improve dividends to stockholders.

UNS has failed to prove why this rate change is necessary. It would appear that it is solely intended to punish solar customers.

In summary, I oppose UNS Electric's request to adopt a demand charge rate structure. I urge you to reject the UNS Electric request.

Thank you for your consideration,

David Samples  
2489 N. 164th Dr.  
Goodyear, AZ 85395  
(623) 536-5264

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Jose Palacios <Jpalacios928@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 28, 2016 3:08 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,

Jose Palacios

3822 E. Packard Ave  
Kingman, AZ 86409

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** ellen ryan <becr3@citlink.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 28, 2016 10:52 AM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

this must be stopped...now!

Sincerely,

ellen ryan

po box 1978  
lake havasu city, AZ 86403

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Joan <queenjoan@frontiernet.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 28, 2016 10:28 AM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** demand charge

Mr. Doug Little:

Please do not allow putting a demand charge on our electric bills in Lake Havasu Mohave county based on our highest electric bill. The bill should be measured by the kilowatts used. We are hearing Unisoursce is proposing to put this demand charge on our electric bills.

Thank you for listening

Joan Marthinsson  
Lake Havasu, az.

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Mike Hession <millerlitemike@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 26, 2016 3:29 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** UNS Electric Rate Case Docket: E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Mr. Little,

I am opposed to UNS Electric's proposed increase in its basic service charge from \$10 per month to \$20 per month. This is a huge increase in the basic service charge and it will limit the ability of Arizonans to go solar and to engage in energy efficiency.

The Commission shouldn't adopt demand charges that unfairly seek to punish solar users, and that fail to recognize the value that solar provides to the overall grid.

Sincerely,

Michael J Hession  
2211 N 164th Dr  
Goodyear, AZ 85395

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Jackie <abeleagles@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 26, 2016 4:04 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Hearing on requested rate increase

Commissioner Little,

I have been a resident of Arizona since 1997 and am a proud owner of a solar roof system. My primary motivation for obtaining a solar system is that I wanted to save money, at least \$50/mo., and my secondary motivation was to help the environment by not using as much electricity. I feel both of those goals have been achieved. Now I understand UNS Electric is seeking to double my basic service charge from \$10 to \$20/mo. Although this amount may not seem like a great deal to you, for those of us on a fixed retirement income, it starts to become a problem, especially when there does not appear to be a well thought out justification for this. This increase seems to unduly discriminate against solar customers and the company has not yet shown how these charges will accomplish what they "hope" to accomplish.

I am asking you, as a voting citizen, to reject UNS Electric's proposal to adopt demand charges and to increase the basic service charge. These charges will only hurt solar customers and you, as a commissioner, will be failing to recognize the value that solar provides to the overall grid.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Jackie and Frank Abel  
Goodyear, AZ

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** joe abela <joeabela1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 26, 2016 5:58 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Demand charges.

To whom it may concern,

Unisource energy is trying to impose demand charges on the residential homes in Lake Havasu City. I being a homeowner feel that there is no reason to do this because we are paying by the amount of energy that we use. There should not be any kind of demand charges involved in our electric bill we have been doing it without the demand charges and the bills are high enough as they are. I don't feel that Unisource needs to be gouging the consumer with any more charges on electric bills than we are already paying. We have been doing it this way for many years without demand charges and my feeling of the homeowner is that it should stay the same and they could even lower the kilowatt-hour rate and still make money. Thank you Joe Abela 2461 Stroke Drive Lake Havasu City Arizona.



**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Shirley Laflamme <laflammeshirley62@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 26, 2016 8:02 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** UNS Electric rate Case Docket: E-04204A-15-0142.

Commissioner Little,

I am against the proposed increase.

Thank you,  
Shirley L. Tubbs

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Dennis Yee <dennisyee.cello@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 26, 2016 9:38 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Dennis Yee

6350 N. 78th St  
6350 N. 78th St  
Scottsdale, AZ 85250

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Mac and Pat <maczimb@citlink.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 26, 2016 11:56 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Rate Change

No we do not want this change in Lake Havasu. Our rates fluctuate dramatically and it would be really unfair to charge based on Summer usage.

Many seniors live here on fixed incomes and do not need another rate increase.

Sincerely

Patricia Young.

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Shirley Plassman <shirleyplassman@frontiernet.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 27, 2016 4:55 AM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Demand Charge

As a resident of Lake Havasu city we do not want to pay a Demand Charge.

Shirley Plassman

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Djpldeusterman@aol.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 27, 2016 11:20 AM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Demand charge

No way, just a charge to recover the losses to solar, we the retired can not pay this increase.

Sent from my iPhone

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Thomas Daley <tkdaley@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 27, 2016 11:50 AM  
**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,

Thomas Daley

6412 N 84th Lane  
Glendale, AZ 85305

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Shirley Smith <shirlypebble@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 27, 2016 12:16 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** PROPOSED ELLEC RATE INCREASE

RE: UNS ELECTRIC RATE CASE DOCKET: E-04204A-15-0142

I am appalled that this proposal is being submitted without consulting the customers. It is totally unfair to those who have spent a great deal of money on solar systems with the intent of using natural energy and cutting their monthly bills.

My situation is like those of many senior Arizonans who are on fixed incomes and simply cannot afford a rate increase, especially like this one which would double the service rate.

Please reconsider the UNS Electric's proposal to adopt demand charges, higher tax rates, and basic service charges. Such a move would make using solar services prohibitive to many Arizonans.

Sincerely,

Shirley Smith  
15712 W Fairmount Ave  
Goodyear, AZ 85395

[shirlypebble@cox.net](mailto:shirlypebble@cox.net)

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Theodore Jensen <tedpjensen@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 27, 2016 1:35 PM  
**To:** RBurns-web@axcc.gov; Tobin-Web; Stump-Web; Forese-Web; Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket Rate Increase E-04204A-15-0142

As board members appointed to protect the citizens of Arizona I urge you to defeat this unfair rate increase of 100%. Living in Arizona with such abundance of sunlight makes our state ideal for solar generating electricity. With the encouragement of environmentalist and most Americans we want to encourage clean renewable energy. This potential rate increase will make switching over to solar power less desirable. I realize this decision is a political reward for the power lobby but please this time think of what your vote will do to hurt the solar industry customers.

Respectfully,

Ted Jensen

15930 W. Cambridge Ave

Goodyear, AZ 85395



**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Steve Waechter <steve.waechter@zeroerrors.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 28, 2016 9:08 AM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Resending: Unisource rate increase application with demand metering.

Dear Commissioner Little,

I want to interact with you on the Unisource rate increase application, the one that includes residential demand metering.

Would that be OK?

Steven Waechter  
Lake Havasu City

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Jim Kerins <trailridersmo@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 7:32 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,

Jim Kerins

1800 South Loy Road  
Cornville, AZ 86325

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Nathan Porter <nporter2@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 1:58 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. It is simply anti-consumer and serves to raise bills while protecting the fossil fuel utility monopoly.

I have rooftop solar installed on my home. Utility companies used to have rate plans that encouraged people to install solar and to use electricity wisely.

Demand charges are a backdoor way to impose exorbitant charges based on electricity use in a very short period within a month. There is no reasonable way for the consumer to know what his electricity use is for a single 15-minute period as it happens.

Approving this proposal will discourage ratepayers to go solar. Please think about a sustainable future.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Nathan Porter

7535 E Windsor Ave  
Scottsdale, AZ 85257

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Charles West <caw0224@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 2:20 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 short period within a month.

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

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

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

Also I am hearing more and more stories about APS stalling the hook up of solar panels to there system. A family member of mine had to hire a lawyer to write a letter to APS.

Sincerely,

Charles West

12418 N. La Paloma Ct  
Sun City, AZ 85351

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** steve antonsen <steveninsurprise@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 2:22 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Why are we going to get punished for going solar.? I'm on a fixed income and would NOT want to see my bill rise from APS, just because I'm trying to be efficient and keep my living costs down..! Before you know it, my bill will be up to over \$200 again..! You know they will not stop at a little increase..!

Steve

Sincerely,

steve antonsen

15530 n 159 ct  
surprise, AZ 85374

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Garvin Nix <garvinnix@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 3:31 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** UNS Electric rate Case Docket : E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Commissioner Little,

UNS Electric rate Case Docket: E-04204A-15-0142.

- I am opposed to UNS Electric's proposed increase in its basic service charge from \$10 per month to \$20 per month. This is a huge increase in the basic service charge and it will limit the ability of Arizonans to go solar and to engage in energy efficiency.
- The Commission should reject the UNS Electric basic service charge because it would instantly become one of the largest basic charges in the country, and would make Arizona less competitive.
- Please reject UNS Electric's proposal to adopt demand charges. Demand charges are unfair, confusing, and make it impossible for the average Arizonan to go solar.
- The Commission shouldn't adopt demand charges that unfairly seek to punish solar users, and that fail to recognize the value that solar provides to the overall grid.
- UNS Electric should go back to the drawing board and consult its customers before making proposals like the ones it has put forward in this rate case. The utility has failed to prove to the Commission that the basic service charge and demand charges won't unduly discriminate against solar customers, and hasn't yet shown that these charges will accomplish what the company says they will accomplish.
- We urge the ACC to protect the people they represent against unfair charges and taxes like the ones being proposed in this rate case, and to push back against charges that will clearly limit Arizonans' energy choices, and kill jobs in our recovering economy.

Respectfully,  
Garvin Nix  
Goodyear, Ax.

Sent from my iPad

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Stephen Kreutzberg <skreutzberg@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 3:58 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Stephen Kreutzberg

14273 W. Morning Star Trl  
Surprise, AZ 85374

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Leah Loveday <leah@truthconsciousness.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 4:32 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,  
Leah Loveday  
3325 W. Sweetwater Drive  
Tucson, AZ

Sincerely,

Leah Loveday

3325 W. Sweetwater Drive  
Tucson, AZ 85745



**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Mary Hirsch <sammylhc1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 4:32 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

I oppose this action. I have always tried to use the least electric that I can. I am on a fixed amount now and try and save by paying more each month for the summer. I have the ac at 82 , shaded windows. This could cause me to move from my home and that is a shame all because you want to make up for what solar uses. We are not a business just people trying to live.

Sincerely,

Mary Hirsch

4285 E Wagon Wheel DR  
86404  
Lake Havasu City, AR 86404

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Ed Sampson <bldeagle2@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 4:46 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** APS "Demand Charges"

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to you to express my concerns over the up coming issue of APS wanting your approval to add "another" fee to our electric bill. In particular, I am a Solar user and have done my part to help APS get more "capacity" in generating electric power. I do understand that in the evening between 5 and 8 pm the demand goes up but with all the solar installations in the Phoenix area (specifically Goodyear, AZ) one would think that the capacity would have been planned for and installed over the years. My request is that us Solar users be **exempt** from this demand charge in that we have done our part to help APS with the generating of electrical capacity.

I do hope this does not fall on deaf ears. If it does, the commission is just pushing the issue further for the coming technology to get ALL solar users off the grid totally. As they say, "necessity is the mother of invention". All we need now is for the technology to "store" excess power generated during the day that would allow us to use it after the sun goes down to get us past the 3 hour window from 5 to 8 pm. The nation already does it with hybrid automobiles. And I know of one auto maker who is working on the solar storage design now for residential homes.

Thank you for your understanding and again, my request is that all solar users be **exempt** from the up coming APS request for approval from the commission for "Demand Charges".

Ed Sampson  
623 536 7142

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Charles Young <charlesyoung907@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 5:14 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 short period within a month.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Charles Young

2844 N La Cienega Dr  
Tucson, AZ 85715

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Rose Marie & Joe Eddie Lopez <jermlopez@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 8:28 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

I urge you to vote on the side of consumers and not with utility monopolies! I strongly oppose the move by UNS's proposal to charge all of us consumers demand charges as Nevada is doing! This is not Nevada! Net metering is working in Arizona! We are well aware that those utility companies are trying to control and take over the solar industry for their own self-serving purposes. We need all of these solar companies to continue to thrive and we don't want monopolies! Do your duty and vote for the consumer and for the environment by rejecting UNS's proposal!

Sincerely,

Rose Marie & Joe Eddie Lopez

1133 East Milada Drive  
Phoenix, AZ 85042-7863

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Doug Ayers <drdouglasa@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 26, 2016 1:05 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 short period within a month.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Doug Ayers

AZ 85743

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Sabina Dunton <sabinainsedona@q.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 26, 2016 9:44 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 short period within a month.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Sabina Dunton

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Jack Hugf <Huffjack@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 26, 2016 9:52 AM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

No demand based charges please

Thank You

Jack Huff

Lake Havasu City

Sincerely,

Jack Hugf

124 Wayfarer Ln

Lake Havasu City, AZ 86403

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Thomas Farley <ssbn628blue@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 10:08 AM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Please do the right thing for the environment and the people of AZ and not just for the power companies. Deny the demand charges being requested.

Sincerely,

Thomas Farley

18249 W Paseo Way  
Goodyear, AZ 85338



**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** William McIntyre <Willtyre@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 10:32 AM  
**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,

William McIntyre

8532 E. Sheridan St  
Scottsdale, AZ 85257

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Chester Homan <chesterhoman@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 10:58 AM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Arizona should be a leader in using solar energy not a subject to the greed of others. I strongly urge you to reject UNS Energy's recent proposal to impose demand charges and eliminate net metering.

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Chester Homan

20321 N. 106th Drive  
Peoria, AZ 85382

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Hal Lovejoy <Halovejoy@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 11:02 AM  
**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,

Hal Lovejoy

3907 Comet Dr  
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86406

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Duane Bauer <docredrock@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 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 short period within a month.

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

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

Reject UNS Energy's proposal. It is a power grab that erodes consumer choice and control over bills in order to ensure captive ratepayers for their monopoly. Work for the people of Arizona and reduce our need for fossil fuels and create more jobs in a state that struggles. Don't stifle it further.

Sincerely

Duane Bauer  
Cornville, AZ  
928-399-0240

Sincerely,

Duane Bauer

2640 S Star Trail Ridge  
Cornville, 86325

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** jared gillespie <jared\_gillespie@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2016 5:04 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 short period within a month.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

jared gillespie

3844 e mesquite ct  
gilbert, AZ 85296

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Brandon Guerra <azsightsound01@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2016 5:04 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 short period within a month.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Brandon Guerra

7522 W Tierra Buena Ln  
Peoria, AZ 85382

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** James Hays <Jamesrhays@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2016 5:22 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 short period within a month.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

James Hays

13025 W, Larkspur Rd  
El Mirage, AZ 86335

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Francis Breitweiser <Dbreit1950@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2016 5:40 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,

Francis Breitweiser

3655 sunny point drive  
3655 sunny point drive  
Lake havasu, AZ 86406



**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** William Belden <Asphaltking51@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2016 6:13 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 short period within a month.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

William Belden

25807 W Globe Ave  
Buckeye, AZ 85326

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Heidi Papa <Heidipapa@rocketmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2016 7:25 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

The proposed changes are unfair to customers and businesses that utilize solar energy.

Sincerely,

Heidi Papa

1092 S Verde Santa Fe Pkwy  
Cornville, AZ 86325

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** jane ryan <janeanddick50@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2016 7:34 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,

jane ryan

381 so lynx creek rd  
prescott, AZ 86303

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Thomas Adams <tla85258@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2016 7:34 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 short period within a month.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Thomas Adams

7611 E Bonnie Rose  
Scottsdale, AZ 85250

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Donald Scholtz <donscholtz@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2016 7:38 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Donald Scholtz

9425 E. Palm Tree Dr  
Scottsdale, AZ 85255

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Ilene Celniker <IleneCelniker@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2016 7:58 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,

Ilene Celniker

406 West Ocotillo Road  
Phoenix, AZ 85013

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Deirdre Simmons <deirdrels@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2016 8:04 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 short period within a month.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Deirdre Simmons

2183 East Balboa Drive  
Tempe, AZ 85282

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Ron Purcell <rwp728@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2016 8:16 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Unisource (UNS), a Canadian owned monopoly, is attempting to levy excessive "demand" charges on all of its customers and eliminate solar, just like Nevada has done. Their scheme for computing demand charges is a blatant form of corruption, and must be stopped. As legislators, it is your duty to stand up for the taxpaying citizens and not for powerful monopolies. We expect you to OPPOSE the UNS scheme to impose demand charges. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ron Purcell

7238 N Summer Walk Way  
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315



**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** carol keck <carolkeck@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2016 8:52 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,

carol keck

2761 E Simmons St  
tucson, AZ 85716-1045

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Rebecca Madsen <Beckiemadsen@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2016 9:02 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. You need to encourage Solar growth. I oppose UNS's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

When a Big Oil employee says he would t put his mother on a demand charge rate why is this even being proposed? 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.

Stop ruining the earth for profit!

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,

Rebecca Madsen

1429 e Leland  
Mesa, AZ 85203

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** JACK YOUNG <jajayo@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 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 short period within a month.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

JACK YOUNG

PO Box 2004  
Camp Verde, AZ 86322

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Demaurol Tryon Sr <dftryonaz@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2016 9:52 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,

Demaurol Tryon Sr

4001 w cortez st  
phoenix, AZ 85029

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Warren Woodward <w6345789@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2016 10:55 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. I oppose UNS's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

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.

Sincerely,

Warren Woodward

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** ROBERT Pinto <vrnsk@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 4:52 AM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

u should encourage solar not punish those who have switched to this tech.

Sincerely,

ROBERT Pinto

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Laura Herrero <liherrero@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 24, 2016 11:43 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

I urge you to reject Arizona utilities attempts to jack up fees and kill solar choice.

Sincerely,

Laura Herrero

412 E. Erie Dr  
Tempe, AZ 85282

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Debra A Gibson <debgibsonmt@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 5:34 AM  
**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,

Debra A Gibson

1770 N Mountain Highlands Blvd  
1770 N Mountain Highlands Blvd  
Snowflake, AZ 85937



**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Michael Hegemeyer <michaelhegemeyer@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 7:38 AM  
**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,

Michael Hegemeyer

1660 W. Klamath Dr  
Tucson, AZ 85704

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Henry Twombly <oooanon@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 8:46 AM  
**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,

Henry Twombly

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Barry D'Orazio <bgdorazio@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 28, 2016 9:34 AM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Are our corporation commissioners PRE-PAID? Sure looks that way to me! Just nothing more than APS lackeys!

Sincerely,

Barry D'Orazio

7717 N Siesta Sunset Ln  
Prescott Valley, AZ 86315-7815

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Lisa Ingraham <lingraham@bigplanet.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 27, 2016 8:07 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket Number E-04204A-15-0142

March 27, 2016

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

Re: Docket Number E-04204A-15-0142.

Dear Mr. Little:

My husband and I are residents of an active Retirement Community in Goodyear named PebbleCreek. We are one of many of our neighbors who have invested thousands of dollars on solar for our home. Since that time, it seems that every opportunity that A.P.S. has to raise our rates, impose new taxes, etc. they attempt to take away the benefit of solar. I understand that they do not like that we are producing our own power rather than us buying the power that they produce. But they make enough on charging us to transmit the power from our panels to them and back again.

It is our understanding that Arizona Electric Utilities including A.P.S. are again planning proposals to the A.C.C. that will stop new residential solar installations and significantly increase rates for all ratepayers. Here is a summary of my current understanding of APS' proposal.

- All residential rate payers with or without solar will have Demand Charges added to their bill.
- Demand charges will be based on peak demand, which occurs between 5 and 8 p.m. - APS has said the mandated Demand Charges will be similar to the existing optional "Rate Schedule ECT-2 Residential Service" available on the website.
- Demand Charges will result in significant electric bill increases for rate payers. SRP has adopted similar Demand Charges for solar customers and promised that rates would increase about \$50 per month. SRP customers are actually experiencing more than \$50 increases in winter months and expect \$150 increases in summer. We don't know the exact APS proposal but has been described as similar to SRP and believe it will be requested for all residential ratepayers.

We have also become aware that some small electric utilities are petitioning the A.C.C. for Demand Charges before A.P.S. submits their request. It appears that A.P.S.' strategy is to allow the A.C.C. to rule on small utilities before submitting their proposal. If the A.C.C. approves demand charges for small utilities, A.P.S. will ask for similar treatment.

The first small utility that we are aware of to petition the A.C.C. is UNS Electric. We are opposed to UNS Electric's proposed increase in it's basic service charge from \$10 per month to \$20 per month. This is a huge increase in the basic service charge and it will limit the ability of Arizonans to go solar and to engage in energy efficiency.

- The Commission should reject the UNS Electric basic service charge because it would instantly become one of the largest basic charges in the country, and would make Arizona less competitive.
- Please reject UNS Electric's proposal to adopt demand charges. Demand charges are unfair, confusing, and make it impossible for the average Arizonan to go solar.
- The Commission shouldn't adopt demand charges that unfairly seek to punish solar users, and that fail to recognize the value that solar provides to the overall grid.
- UNS Electric should go back to the drawing board and consult its customers before making proposals like the ones it has put forward in this rate case. The utility has failed to prove to the Commission that the basic service charge and demand charges won't unduly discriminate against solar customers, and hasn't yet shown that these charges will accomplish what the company says they will accomplish.
- We urge the A.C.C. to protect the people they represent against unfair charges and taxes like the ones being proposed in this rate case, and to push back against charges that will clearly limit Arizonans' energy choices, and kill jobs in our recovering economy.

The net effect of Demand Charges for APS will be to totally kill new rooftop solar and to increase their income and earnings. APS has 3 million customers and only 1%, about 35,000, has solar. Here is data from APS [Pinnacle West] financial filings for 2015.

- 2015 Net Earnings: \$437 Million
- 2015 Dividends Paid to Shareholders: \$295 Million
- 2015 Compensation of APS Chairman and CEO: \$3.12 Salary plus 87,000 shares of stock. At current share price of \$72.98 those shares are worth \$6.4 million.

For a regulated monopoly with very little risk and virtually guaranteed income, APS is financially healthy and does not need a huge increase in rates.

We strongly urge you to reject UNS Electric's current rate increase and demand charge request and also to consider our above points when A.P.S. asks for the same.

Sincerely,

Lisa and Lawrence Ingraham  
3458 N. Hogan Dr.  
Goodyear, AZ 85395  
(602)769-4175

---

Lisa Ingraham



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Jackie Barbour <jbarbour55@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 27, 2016 6:58 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,

Jackie Barbour

1445 White Spar Road  
Prescott, AZ 86303

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Sara Gibson <sara7gib@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 27, 2016 8:40 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Sara Gibson

2100 N Fremont Blvd  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Lorna Anderson <zeldadolz@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 28, 2016 9:05 AM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** UNS Electric rate Case Docket: E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Commissioner Little:

I am opposed to UNS Electric's proposed increase in its basic service charge from \$10 to \$20 per month. This increase is nothing more than a penalty on solar customers and a means to discourage future solar customers, all for the sake of profits.

I urge the ACC to reject these types of charges and taxes and to protect the people they serve in AZ.

Respectfully,

Lorna Anderson  
1831 N. 167th Drive  
Goodyear, AZ 85395



**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Joan Hutcheson <jhutcheson@frontiernet.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2016 1:40 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,

Joan Hutcheson

3330 El Dorado Ave N  
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86406

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Randy Dunton <randyd@hawkinsdg.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 28, 2016 1:32 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Randy Dunton

16026 S. 14th. Dr  
Phoenix, AZ 85045

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** SALLY SIMPSON <ssimpson2004@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 28, 2016 12:50 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Mandatory Demand Charge

**Dr. Mr. Little,**

**Please accept this email as an opposition to UniSource trying to charge a mandatory demand charge. With the high utilities we already pay, over \$400 in the summer months, we can't stand another increase. I also feel that the majority of the users of UniSource are paying the majority costs for the solar consumers. UniSource state it is for the upgrades they have done - that is the cost of doing business on their part.**

**Thank you,**

**Mike and Sally Simpson  
2320 Stroke Drive  
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86406**

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Mariamne Moore <mariamne@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 28, 2016 11:22 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 short period within a month.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Mariamne Moore

125 E Carter Rd  
Phoenix, AZ 85042