



0000169405

RECEIVED

2016 APR -1 P 3: 18

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

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

TO: Docket Control

DATE: April 1, 2016

FROM: Chairman Doug Little's Office

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

Chairman Little's office received an additional 46 emails referencing the case with the above Docket Number. The emails can be viewed either in Docket, or on the website via the eDocket link.

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKET CONTROL

APR 1 2016

DOCKET CONTROL
[Handwritten signature]

Andrea Gaston

From: john reeves <john.reeves.nep@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 11:07 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,

john reeves

12576 n. nep lane
marana, AZ 85653

Andrea Gaston

From: Tim Wilson <timwilson@rocketmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 27, 2016 8:26 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,

Tim Wilson

16208 N. Saki Dr
Fountain Hills, AZ 85268

Andrea Gaston

From: Robert Aloe <robaloe@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2016 4:26 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Arizona should be leading the nation in solar energy and embracing the industry to create jobs, improve infrastructure, become energy independent, and even export our solar products and services to other states and countries. Solar represents a real path forward for the citizens of Arizona and its economy.

Unfortunately, utility companies fear solar rather than embrace it. Their efforts to discourage solar energy and the industry is very disappointing, but also concerning. Our state has a chance to be an industry leader, but many citizens and consumers are being deprived of this by reactionary policies of the utility companies that seek to discourage solar progress and destroy any competition to their energy monopoly.

I strongly urge you to stand up for Arizonans and act in the best interests of the state and its citizens. Do not allow utility companies to put profits ahead of solar power for Arizona.

Sincerely,

Robert Aloe

Andrea Gaston

From: Earl Adamy <earladamy@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 8:15 AM
To: Tobin-Web; RBurns-Web; Stump-Web; Little-Web; Forese-Web
Subject: Case Docket: E-04204A-15-0142

I am opposed to the UNS Electric application for increases in base rate and demand charges because it will set bad precedent for electric utility customers throughout the State of Arizona:

- Base charges were designed and intended to offset certain fixed plant and administrative costs. They were not intended to provide a general revenue stream for utilities. The proposed 100% increase in base charges is egregious.
- Arizonan's were heavily encouraged to make the substantial investment (mine was \$18,000 out of pocket) in order to increase the use of renewable energy resources. If the Commission and APS were misguided in establishing public policy which promoted the expansion of rooftop solar, it is now manifestly unfair to punish those who made the investment based on prior public policy.
- Arizona's electric utilities are now hell-bent on changing the the metrics upon which the purchase decision was made. The imposition of a \$50/month charge on rooftop solar by SRP is an egregious example which other State electric utilities are hell-bent on emulating. This is wrong!
- It is very difficult to parse through the effects of implementing demand based charges on PV customers; however it appears that the net effect would be a 150% increase in my annual cost.

Earl Adamy
2863 N 157th Avenue
Goodyear, AZ 85395

Andrea Gaston

From: Ed Hawley <ehawley3@cox.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 6:58 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

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

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

Ed Hawley

8224 S Iguana Rd
Tucson, AZ 85756

Andrea Gaston

From: Caldwell, John <JTCaldwell@dstoutput.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 6:47 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: UNS Electric rate Case Docket: E-04204A-15-0142 --Opposition

Dear Mr. Little;

I'm sending you this email so that you can note another rate payer is totally opposed to the rate hike identified within UNS Electrics proposal to adapt demand charges. This is not appropriate and appears to be highest basic demand changes from any others I've researched. We want to do our part in helping our country become less dependent on fossil fuels, so my wife and I have been thinking of putting in a solar system. These new charges make the overall solar tradeoffs less attractive and will not allow us to share our electrical power generation with others in our community. Please do not allow these charges to be passed, they feel very unfair especially when looking at the compensation allowed to the CEO's of these utility companies.

I am opposed to this rate charge. Thank you for your time.

John Caldwell

Please consider the environment before printing this email and any attachments.

This e-mail and any attachments are intended only for the individual or company to which it is addressed and may contain information which is privileged, confidential and prohibited from disclosure or unauthorized use under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, or copying of this e-mail or the information contained in this e-mail is strictly prohibited by the sender. If you have received this transmission in error, please return the material received to the sender and delete all copies from your system.

Andrea Gaston

From: Richard Schaefer <cephrad@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 6:44 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,

Richard Schaefer

2536 N 53rd St apt8
2536 N 53rd St apt8
Phoenix, AZ 85008

Andrea Gaston

From: Jacob Jones <Jacob.jones2990@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 6:13 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A

Sincerely,

Jacob Jones

2495 E. John L. Ave
Kingman, AZ 86409

Andrea Gaston

From: Michael Lind <Solarviking@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 1:04 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 Lind

2714 w valley view trl
Phoenix, AZ 85086

Andrea Gaston

From: Sue Bohl <sbohl1@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2016 8:32 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Demand Charges

How can you first push solar then do a total reverse & now try to penalize those of us who had it installed. We are trying to clean up the environment yet it seems like you are constantly trying to take advantage of solar users.

I would hope you will stop & take a hard look at this before you pursue any further "charges". Thank you for considering dropping these demand charges!

Sue Bohl
16565 W. Almeria
Goodyear, Az. 85395

Sue Bohl

Andrea Gaston

From: Karen Rife <wjonrii@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2016 5:59 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: ON DEMAND CHARGES

As a retired citizen here in Lake Havasu City, (Mohave county) where your proposed rate hike is mentioned,,,, I want to impress upon you the numbers of retirees who live in this city, not to mention all the Californians who have homes here, and may want to keep "temperate" during summer months while they are here enjoying the lake. They may move on and not come here due to rate hikes. Please consider what you are doing, and do it somewhere else???????? NOT HERE IN OUR LITTLE CITY. THANKS FORYOUR TIME..... WE WILL BE OPPOSED TO THIS IN A BIG WAY..... . KAREN RIFE Resident.

Andrea Gaston

From: Douglas Flatley <dougflatley@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2016 5:19 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,

Douglas Flatley

1354 E Flower St
Phoenix, AZ 85014

Andrea Gaston

From: Robert ollerton <rollerton@pobox.com>
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2016 5:13 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Please 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,

Robert ollerton

po box 1258
53 flux canyon rd
patagonia, AZ 85624

Andrea Gaston

From: Mary Crismore <maryannecris@earthlink.net>
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2016 4:56 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,

Mary Crismore

117 Hazzard ST
Bisbee, AZ 85603

Andrea Gaston

From: G. P. W. <wiskid@citlink.net>
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2016 4:38 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: UNS Demand Charge

Please DO NOT allow this to happen as it will be a killer to anyone living on a tight budget.

I personally believe that this is just a veiled attempt by UNS to increase their bottom line on the backs of good citizens who have invested in solar or taken steps to implement some serious conservation measures on their own.

I personally do not have solar but I have replaced my heating and A/C unit with a more efficient one as well as taken other measures to reduce my electric use. But even during the summer when it is extremely hot here in Lake Havasu City, I still use between 52 and 63 KW/h per day during the hottest months of the year and yes I know this because I have been tracking my electric use on a monthly basis since 2008.

There have been several rate increases of one type or another by UNS during that time which have almost obliterated the savings from the lower usage I strive for.

PLEASE do not approve this sinister attempt by UNS to improve their corporate profits flowing out of the USA to Canada on the backs of US consumers. From what I have read in the local paper and other sources, Mohave County is supposed to be a "test" of the demand charge. However, if they get their foot in the door it will only be a matter of months before they try to impose it across the board.

Thank you for taking the time to read my message.

Respectfully,

Gerald Wisowaty
CWO, US Army (Ret)

Andrea Gaston

From: David Peterson <doogiepete@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2016 4:32 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Demand Charge Case E-04204A-15-0142

Attention: Commissioner Doug Little

Reference: UNS Electric rate Case Docket: E04204A-15-0142

I strongly oppose this electric rate case involving demand charges. I urged the Commission to protect the people they represent against unfair charges and taxes like the ones being proposed in this rate case. 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. 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.

Regards,

Dave Peterson
Goodyear, Arizona

Andrea Gaston

From: janilyn harding <janilynaz@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 27, 2016 5:20 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

we need solar to protect the environment

Sincerely,

janilyn harding

1237 w ellis
mesa, AZ 85201

Andrea Gaston

From: Andy Horine <Jerryhorine@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 26, 2016 8:16 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,

Andy Horine

925 Foothill Ave
Kingman, AZ 86401

Andrea Gaston

From: Janet Day <mahjongg18@gmail.com> on behalf of Dayaz <dayaz@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2016 4:00 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: UNS ELECTRIC RATE CASE DOCKET E-0420A-15-1042

Dear Commissioner,

It is with respect but with a real deep seeded sense of despair that we approach you on an issue that is tantamount to a large and increasing number of Arizonans who at one time, felt confident that you would carefully, thoughtfully, and honestly consider what was best for Arizona.

We refer of course to :- UNS Electric rate case Docket E-0420A-15-1042.

This is in reality is yet another episode in APS's fight against some selected and prejudiced aspects of the development of solar energy in Arizona. We firmly believe that the unintended consequences of conditions relating to their initial acceptance of conditions /commitments to allow them to acquire a fossil fuel fired station has manifested itself in greed driven actions to the detriment of Arizona in general.

To go back to the central issue, and in specifics we believe -

1. The UNS Electric Docket has failed to
 - a) Consult with it's customer before making the proposals put forward in this specific rate case
 - b) Failed to explain that these demand charges do not discriminate against solar customers
 - c) Failed to demonstrate that their proposal will accomplish stated goals

I. 11. The proposed UNS Electric basic service charge would become an extortionate charge, probably the largest anywhere in the USA and, probably causing Arizona to become economically and fiscally non competitive

II. 111. The proposed demand charges appear to unfairly punish individual solar users while APS appears on the other hand to encourage/subsidize, support, of such installations as "covered school parking areas."

We request that you as an Arizona Commissioner reject UNS's Electric Docket and, demand
an Impartial study of the problem and do what is honestly and correctly beneficial for the citizen's
Arizona as opposed to the greed of a hypocritical and prejudiced monopoly.

ou for your consideration of our points.

Thank y

E. & Janet K. Day

David

N. 153rd Drive

3787

G

Goodyear,

AZ 85395-8586

623-

523-4442

Andrea Gaston

From: Steve Waechter <steve.waechter@zeroerrors.net>
Sent: Friday, March 25, 2016 10:57 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: 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: Michael Delleo <mdelleo@cox.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2016 9:52 AM
To: Little-Web; Stump-Web; Forese-Web; Tobin-Web; RBurns-Web
Subject: UNS Electric rate Case Docket: E-04204A-15-0142

Honorable Commissioners:

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

UNS Electric should return to the drawing board and consult its customers before making proposals such as 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 will not unduly discriminate against solar customers, and has not yet shown that these charges will accomplish what the company proposes.

I urge the ACC to protect the people they represent against unfair charges and taxes such as ones being proposed in this rate case.

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 install solar, engage in energy efficiency, and reduce dependence on fossil fuels.

I feel very strongly that 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 economically.

Please reject UNS Electric's proposal to adopt demand charges. Demand charges are unfair, confusing, and make it impossible for the average Arizonan to install solar.

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

Thank you for your kind consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Michael F. Delleo, Jr.

Andrea Gaston

From: Steven Philo <sphilo@ctaz.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2016 6:10 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. I have lived in Lake Havasu City for nearly forty years, and have seen first-hand how a few exceptionally hot days can affect the demand for power. I should NOT have to pay a premium for the entire month based on my peak demand!

Demand charges ambush ratepayers. I will only know when my peak demand has been set after the fact. I will never know whether I have set aside sufficient funds for my monthly electric payment until I receive my bill, and I don't want this hanging over my head every month. I should be charged for the energy I 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. I hope to be able to add solar panels to my home one day soon, and I count on net metering to keep it affordable for me to do so.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Steven Philo

133 Sorrento Lane
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86403-5342

Andrea Gaston

From: Doris Drust <rdddinaz@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 5:06 PM
To: Tobin-Web
Subject: Input on Unisource Energy residential rate raise mandatory demand charges

From: Robert & Doris Drust, Lake Havasu City, AZ

You are asking for our input on Unisource Energy raising electric rates & putting mandatory demand charges on residential electric bills so here is our input - ABSOLUTELY NOT!!

Our rationale is that it is not needed when they are already raking in huge profits for themselves & their investors at our (consumers) expense. The mandatory charges are confusing & unfair to consumers, especially low & fixed income & solar users & are detrimental to the environment by limiting clean solar energy & not giving fair credit to solar users. The "dark money" used to elect seemingly chosen puppet commissioners to protect big corporation interests instead of the consumers they are supposed to protect has not gone unnoticed & will be remembered next election. We need fair-minded commission regulators protecting consumers, not a monopoly with no controls or competition.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Robert & Doris Drust

Andrea Gaston

From: Kim Fox <foxontherun99@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 4:20 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,

Kim Fox

2650 W Union Hills Dr Lot 262
Phoenix, AZ 85027

Andrea Gaston

From: Brooke Franko <Brookefranko@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 8:02 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

This is outrageous in every way to consumers. Solar belongs to the people. It is ours.

Sincerely,

Brooke Franko

10610 E Keystone Road
Tucson, AZ 85730

Andrea Gaston

From: Keegan Jones <keeganh@rocketmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 7:50 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,

Keegan Jones

2495 E John L Ave
Kingman, AZ 86400

Andrea Gaston

From: Kevin Hinz <Wheelman0_0@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 6:56 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,

Kevin Hinz

2013 Rex Allen dr
Kingman, AZ 86409

Andrea Gaston

From: Doug Troxel <wuggles_2000@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 5:55 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 Troxel

AR 86409

Andrea Gaston

From: Thomas Smith <thomasearl2006@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2016 7:13 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,

Thomas Smith

3425 E. Mesquite Trl
Camp Verde, AR 86322

Andrea Gaston

From: Pat Keller <pvkeller@frontiernet.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2016 3:10 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Demand Charges

Chairman Little, my name is Patrick Keller. I am a retired Southern California Edison Manager now living in Lake Havasu City. I recently read an article in our local news paper re: Unisource (our local electric provider) proposing a DEMAND CHARGE on residential bills. The demand charge I am familiar with is for Commercial accounts. These additional charges are intended to cover additional facilities required to supply peak demands. If a commercial enterprise for example consumes say 2000 kwhr per day but has a 250 HP motor used once a day for 15 minutes the 3 phase start-up current will require a larger transformer. It is reasonable to charge this customer for the additional transformer and service capacity. I fail to see how traditional demand charges translate to residential service. It appears to me that Unisource is using the new electronic meters to capture time of use rather than demand or in-rush current. Now that these meters are in place I feel it is up to you and your commission to protect consumers from opportunistic rate increases. After all that is why we vote you and the commission TO PROTECT US.

I and many other residential customers of Unisource look forward to seeing how this plays out.

Thank You, Patrick Keller
pvkeller@frontiernet.net
(928) 855-5624

Andrea Gaston

From: Dru Bacon <drubacon@cox.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2016 1:32 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I Oppose Residential Demand Charges and Basic Service Charge Increases for AZ Electric Utilities

Ref: Docket No. E-04204A-15-0142

I am an Arizona homeowner and voter and I oppose residential electric Demand Charges for both homes with and without solar. I also oppose any increases in Basic Service Charges.

The US and indeed the world is in a rapid transition from fossil fuel and nuclear electric power generation to Solar and Wind.

This transition is being driven by the lower costs of wind and solar. It is also being driven by a growing recognition of the unpaid costs of burning coal and natural gas. In Feb. 2013 the National Institutes of Health published a peer reviewed study that estimated the unpaid health care costs of burning fossil fuels in the US at \$361.7 – 886.5 Billion annually or 0.14 – \$0.35/kWh of electricity. Wind and solar generation eliminates these costs and improves human health.

The International Monetary Fund recently estimated the global environmental and social costs of burning fossil fuels at \$5.3 Trillion annually with the US and China accounting for \$3 Trillion annually. Estimates of direct US tax payer subsidies for fossil fuels vary widely but are most often quoted as \$35 billion per year.

Link to Publication: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23246069>

“Earth Track” published a study in 2011 that found subsidies for Nuclear Power exceed the retail price of power generated at nuclear plants. Tax payers pay more in subsidies for nuclear power than ratepayers pay for that power.

Link to Publication: <https://earthtrack.net/documents/nuclear-power-still-not-viable-without-subsidies>

More than 200 coal fired power plants in the US have been shuttered. Major coal producers in the US are going bankrupt including the 2nd largest producer, Alpha Resources. Peabody Coal, the largest US coal producer and operator of Kayenta Mine in northern Arizona is teetering on bankruptcy.

Current cheap prices for natural gas is the result of “fracking”. Fracking has poisoned ground water in many states and polluted our environment with massive natural gas leaks. Fracking and the associated environmental destruction cannot be sustained.

In October, 2015 “Scientific American” published the results of an investigation revealing that Exxon Oil Co. knew about the life threatening impacts of burning fossil fuels as early as 1977 and spent millions to promote fossil fuel misinformation.

Here is the link to the report:

<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/exxon-knew-about-climate-change-almost-40-years-ago/>

We have the technology available today to end the life threatening use of fossil fuels.

World energy experts such as Amory Lovins, founder of the Rocky Mountain Institute and Professor Mark Jacobson at Stanford say that there are no technical or economic barriers to completely powering our economy with renewable solar and wind energy.

Arizona is the best place in the world for solar energy generation. Yet Arizona electric utilities are either unwilling or unable to transition our state to renewable energy.

The Arizona Corporation Commission has the authority and the responsibility to require electric utilities to use the best generation strategy and technology. There are no credible arguments that solar is not the best source of electric power in Arizona.

Arizona residents and businesses call on the Commission to take the lead in developing such plans and require the utilities to use rate payer funds to bring about the transition to clean, renewable solar energy.

My community in Goodyear has 4,500 houses. 1,121 of those houses have rooftop solar representing a homeowner investment of more than \$30 Million. That large investment was made by Arizona homeowners in good faith. The Arizona Corporation Commission has a responsibility to protect that investment.

Dru Bacon
15679 W Avalon Drive
Goodyear, AZ 85395

Andrea Gaston

From: Margaret Michaelis <kmicha@cox.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2016 12:16 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. I oppose UNS's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

You were elected by the people of Arizona to serve justly in the best interests of utility customers. The UNS proposed demand charges and elimination of net metering is anti-consumer and serves to raise bills while protecting the utility monopoly - neither of which are in the best interests of Arizona citizens.

Demand charges ambush ratepayers. A customer only knows when their peak demand has been set after the fact. Ratepayers should only 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.

Support the people who elected you by voting against the proposed demand charges and the elimination of net metering. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Margaret Michaelis

4214 N 38th St
Phoenix, AZ 85018

Andrea Gaston

From: Gary McGinnis <garyleemcginnis@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2016 9:01 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,

Gary McGinnis

1002 E. Miles St
Tucson, AZ 85719

Andrea Gaston

From: Trudi Wieduwilt <vonwieduwilt@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2016 9:07 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy'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,

Trudi Wieduwilt

582 W Faith Dawn Ct
Tucson, AZ 85704-4681

Andrea Gaston

From: Michelle Greene - PKI <MichelleGreene@jmeagle.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2016 9:20 AM
To: Little-Web
Cc: RBurns-Web; Stump-Web; Forese-Web; Tobin-Web; Mike Kenny - PKI; LPetersen@uesaz.com
Subject: UNS Electric Rate Case Letter
Attachments: UNS Electric Rate Case Letter.pdf

Good Morning Chairman Little,

Please see attached letter to Commission sent on behalf of Mike Kenny, Plant Manager of JM Eagle's Kingman Plant.

UNS Electric Rate Case, Docket No. E-04204A-15-0142

Have A Great Day,

Michelle Greene
Purchasing / Payroll / ISO Coordinator / Accounts Payable
J M Eagle (Kingman, AZ Plant)
Office 928-681-7473 ext. 200
Fax 928-681-7474
email: michellegreene@jmeagle.com



Proprietary and Confidential Information; Unauthorized Distribution is Prohibited.

This e-mail is intended only for the person(s) to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the information contained in or attached to this message is strictly prohibited.

Please notify the sender of the delivery error by replying to this message, and then delete it from your system.

The contents of this e-mail is not intended to represent or form a legally binding offer or an acceptance, nor should the contents otherwise be considered as a contract or interpreted to create a contract or other legally binding obligation on the part of J-M Manufacturing Co, Inc., A.K.A. JMEagle, unless this e-mail expressly states otherwise.

Any opinions or comments are personal to the writer and do not represent the official view of the company which reserves the right to monitor and review the content of all e-mail communications sent and/or received by its employees.

MdcfAvJMEDisclaimRule**

Andrea Gaston

From: Steve <steve.waechter@zeroerrors.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2016 3:23 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Will you be at the meeting in Lake Havasu tomorrow? 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.

Will you be at the meeting tomorrow in Lake Havasu?

There will be a big turnout of local people, and we know what the wholesale costs of baseload power are. The current rates are too high, and we don't want demand metering. If these regulated monopoly utilities find it too difficult to supply our demand at rates that are already way higher than wholesale baseload KWH, they ought to go out of business, and we will replace them with a municipal utility with local regulation.

Steven Waechter
Lake Havasu City

Andrea Gaston

From: Doug Sparks <pidgenbug1@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2016 5:01 PM
Subject: UniSource rate case proposal & "demand charge"

Commissioner,

We oppose both of the above mentioned proposals. These are profit motivated schemes that hurt ALL of Arizona's utility customers for the benefit of the utility companies.

Please use the influence that you have to arrive at fair solutions instead of building profits on the backs of customers (many of whom are on fixed incomes) who are at the mercy of utility monopolies & over whom you wield so much power.

Doug & Judie Sparks

Andrea Gaston

From: carmen Johnson <starri33@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2016 6:25 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Dear Sir/Madam:

Do not approve this request, it will cause needless deaths as our seniors on fixed incomes will not be able to afford their electric bills to keep the house cool. I know that there are programs to help with utilities but just how much is there to go around?

Our federal government is encouraging the use of renewable energy sources, this is something we should be applauding, not penalizing

Thank you.

Sincerely,

carmen Johnson

1162 S. Drake Road
Golden Valley, AZ 86413

Andrea Gaston

From: Mary Holland <mrholland2007@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2016 7:07 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

I oppose the UNS for trying to prevent the use of solar power.

Sincerely

Mary Holland

1480 S Laguna Rd

Golden Valley Az. 86413

Sincerely,

Mary Holland

1480 S Laguna Rd

Golden Valley, AZ 86413

Andrea Gaston

From: Patricia Flanders <Ppattyaz1@cox.net>
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2016 6:32 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,

Patricia Flanders

5060 E. 1st Street
Tucson, AZ 85711

Andrea Gaston

From: Susie Trujillo <susiekt@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2016 4:10 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. I oppose UNS's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

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

Demand charges ambush ratepayers. You only know when your peak demand has been set after the fact. Ratepayers should be charged for the energy they use, not ambushed with exorbitant charges based on a short period within a month.

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

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Susie Trujillo

3326 N. Treat Circle
Tucson, Arizona

Andrea Gaston

From: Linda Hollins <truck1257@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2016 8:22 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,

Linda Hollins

4825 N Mormon Flat Rd
Golden Valley, AZ 86413

Andrea Gaston

From: Wayne Hollins <Kernall@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2016 5:37 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Social Security recipients and military retirees did not receive a cost of living increase this year! Why would Unisource need a fee increase. Using demand period to determine the rate we should pay for all the power we use is very unfair and GREEDY. Please reject Unisource's proposed rate hike. Also I support net metering. This should pay at the same rate we are charged. We should not be penalized or taxed for using the sun's energy either. We need another utility in the area so we have a choice also. No monopoly!

Sincerely,

Wayne Hollins

4825 N Mormon Flat Rd
Golden Valley, AZ 86413

Andrea Gaston

From: Mossie Lierle <mossielierle@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2016 3:50 PM
To: RBurns-Web; Forese-Web; Little-Web; Stump-Web; Tobin-Web
Subject: Proposed Utilities Increase in Mandatory Fees and Demand Charges

The increase in fees that the utility companies in Arizona are proposing to charge us is preposterous.

Because of one hour of high demand use, they are proposing that the consumer be charged the high demand charge for the whole month is highway robbery. It is just another way to take money out of the taxpayers' pockets.

On top of this outrage is the increase in mandatory fees, ie "basic service charge." We all know that this means an added fee that will never go down. This is going to increase by 50%? What about retired people on fixed incomes?

The rates we are charged for power are too high as they are now. Passing these increases will certainly make people think twice before moving here. Arizona was one of the last states to recover from the recession. Why would you add insult to injury when people are just now getting back on their feet?

Mossie Lierle
Phone 602-953-2529
Cell 602-620-0019
Fax 602-953-1779
mossielierle@gmail.com

Andrea Gaston

From: McCue, Monte W <monte.mccue@evoqua.com>
Sent: Friday, April 01, 2016 10:04 AM
To: RBurns-Web; Stump-Web; Little-Web; Forese-Web; Tobin-Web
Subject: UNS Rate Increase and Change in Net Metering -15-0142

Gentlemen

My wife and I attended the meeting last night in Lake Havasu and was disappointed that it got out of control at the start to the point where there was no meeting.

I wished that the commissioners would have continued with the meeting and scheduled another one (as you have planned). In my view it was not important that others standing in line outside the meeting room hear my views on the proposal. It is important that you, the commissioners, hear my (our) views on the proposed increase. I believe you should have continued the meeting.

I was somewhat ashamed by the actions of some of those attending the meeting last night. Several were disrespectful to the commissioners present.

The only positive coming out of the cancelled meeting last night was that how many people are angered by the Unisource proposal.

I urge you to not allow the change in Net Metering retroactive to June 1, 2015. This must not happen.

I also urge you to work with Unisource to come up with an equitable plan for a rate increase that is understandable to the public. A demand charge is not the answer. A rate increase across the board of, for example, 1 cent/kWh is at least understandable and people who have usage history of their dwelling, can estimate the increase in electricity cost and plan accordingly.

Respectfully

Monte McCue

815 Paso Drive

Lake Havasu City, AZ