



Arizona Corporation Commis  
Utilities Complaint Form

ORIGINAL

Investigator: Michael Buck

Phone: <<< REDACTED >>>

Opinion Date: 4/13/2016

Opinion Number: 2016 - 130094

DOCKETED

Priority: Respond within 5 business days

Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - Opposed

Closed Date: 4/13/2016 10:19 AM

First Name: Linda

Last Name: Stewart

Account Name: Linda Stewart

Address: <<< REDACTED >>>

DOCKETED BY [Signature]

City: Sierra Vista

State: AZ

Zip Code: 85650

Home: <<< REDACTED >>>

Email: <<< REDACTED >>>

Company: Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc.

Division: Electric

RECEIVED  
2016 APR 13 A 11:37  
AZ CORPORATION  
DOCKET CONTROL

Nature Of Opinion

Docket Number: E-01575A-15-0312

Docket Position: Against

Linda K. (Lynn) Stewart (REDACTED) 13 April 2016 Comments for the ACC regarding the Sulphur Springs Valley Electrical Cooperative rate case Members of the Arizona Corporation Commission: I am a member of SSVEC. We installed 30 panels in our yard in 2015. It powers our house, and this year during "even up," we will determine how close we come to equal production and use. As we researched this installation, SSVEC exhibited positive enthusiasm about solar generation. We were never given any hint that the program would significantly change in the future. We invested about \$30,000 of our savings, and as a retired State of Arizona worker and a retired teacher, we are obviously not wealthy people. We invested our savings, anticipating that we would recoup our investment over 5-10 years and stabilize our expenses over the 20-30 year life of our panels. We take pride in reducing our carbon footprint. As Co-op members we also felt that we were helping the Co-op in its EPA-mandated carbon reduction program. Since our installation SSVEC has changed its story. SSVEC is in the process of making their case for changes in DG and for a rate increase for all 39,000 residential members. Only 1250 of us have solar generation. Our base rate is approximately \$10.25 per month. SSVEC claims that our solar installations are costing them \$1.1 million per year, and that this cost needs to be recovered. If we run the numbers: \$1.1 million / 12 months, then divide again by 39,000 ratepayers at \$10.25 basic charge per month. The additional cost comes to \$2.35 per month. SSVEC has requested a first year increase to \$18.25 per month, then second year to \$27.00 per month. If the true loss per customer base is only \$2.35/month, SSVEC cannot justify their request. Furthermore, the economics of our solar investment has not been taken into consideration. In effect, we have, in effect, donated \$30,000 to SSVEC. They do not need to invest in more infrastructure, nor do they need to purchase more electricity from their supplier during high use times---the same time when we produce the most power. Our investment benefits both solar and non-solar members of our Co-op. We understand that the SSVEC reported loss of \$1.1 million requires some increase in rates. So, if we add the \$2.35 or even \$3.00 to the current \$10.25, in the first year we will make our Co-op whole. After the first year this amount can be adjusted if needed. In 2015, SSVEC covered all their costs and announced a surplus of about \$600,000. Please consider this surplus when you rule on the SSVEC rate case. SSVEC has offered to "grandfather" the agreements for 20 years from the date of installation. This changes the rules retroactively, which isn't fair. The current program should be continued as long as the current owner retains possession of the home. If the home is sold, the new policies could be applied to the new owner. This would be fair. If we generate excess power, SSVEC should compensate us as the same rate that we pay for power when we are not generating power. A few cents less per kilowatt hour would also be reasonable. We are waiting to discover our "true up" time results. This is new to us. Our system was a little larger than originally estimated because we were converting from propane for domestic hot water, pool heating, and full house heat. The rate increase requested by SSVEC is excessive. The current program is reasonable as long as we own the home. We invested in solar generating and should not now be penalized for willingly participating. We are

E-01575A-15-0312

## Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

also contributing to better air quality for future generations. (Have you seen the brown cloud in the Sulphur Springs Valley as it sits against the mountains to the east of Douglas? It's as ugly as Phoenix.) Thank you for considering my input. If you wish any further information, our contact information is above. Sincerely,  
Linda K. (Lynn) Stewart

---

<b>Investigation</b>			
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Submitted By:</b>	<b>Type:</b>
4/13/2016	Michael Buck	Telephone	Investigation
Entered for the record and docketed. Closed.			

---