

ORIGINAL



0000169735

RECEIVED

2016 APR 15 P 2:19

**Memorandum**

**From the office of  
Chairman Doug Little**

AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL

**Arizona Corporation Commission**

1200 W. WASHINGTON  
PHOENIX, ARIZONA  
(602) 542-0745

TO: Docket Control  
DATE: April 15, 2016  
FROM: Chairman Doug Little's Office  
SUBJECT: Docket No. E-04204A-15-0142

---

Chairman Little's office received 36 emails referencing the above Docket Number. The emails can be viewed either in Docket, or on the website via the eDocket link.

Arizona Corporation Commission

**DOCKETED**

APR 15 2016

DOCKETED BY	<i>FL</i>
-------------	-----------

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Janet Santiago <janeta2@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 11, 2016 3:16 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,

Janet Santiago

4502 W El Caminito  
Glendale, AZ 85302

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Aaro Weymann <aarondweymann@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 11, 2016 1:44 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

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

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

Aaro Weymann

4183 e rawhide st. Gilbert AZ 85296  
Gilbert, AZ 85296

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Donna Russell <Dawnglow@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 11, 2016 11:04 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-15-0142

Sincerely,  
Donna Russell  
3981 s holland rd  
Flagstaff, AZ

Sincerely,

Donna Russell

3981 s holland rd  
Flagstaff, AZ 86005

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** ROBERT SHELDON <bsheldon5@cox.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 11, 2016 11:08 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,

ROBERT SHELDON

17362 S Indigo Mesa Pass  
Vail, AZ 85641

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Wanda Harper <harpertea@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 11, 2016 1:01 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,

Wanda Harper

150 E. Hardy Rd. #213  
Oro Valley, AZ 85704

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** deborah meek <lakotalady122@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 11, 2016 11:37 AM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

These fees are just so wrong. You are unfairly imposing fees on people who can least afford them, retired and older people who live on fixed incomes. We live in a desert, the same we have lived in for many years. Suddenly you impose fees like something in our environment has changed. You want to dictate what appliances we must choose from minute by minute. Like we have to choose from air conditioning and running my oxygen machine? Or perhaps we should choose between paying for electricity and food or even medications? All in the name of what? Greed??

Sincerely,

deborah meek

170 seminole lane  
170 seminole lane  
lake havasu city, AZ 86404

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Jim Kerins <trailridersmo@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 11, 2016 7:40 AM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Using political influence and money to buy bigger profits and maintain your position is a poor excuse for good business practices. If your only means of staying in business is through underhanded practices you are already lost and will eventually fail.

This country badly needs a coherent energy policy that allows everyone to contribute. Your approach shows that you are only interested in maintaining your position, wealth and power. You do not care about your customers, the state or the country.

Jim Kerins

1800 South Loy Road  
Cornville, AZ 86325

Sincerely,

Jim Kerins

1800 South Loy Road  
Cornville, AZ 86325



## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Donald Scholtz <donscholtz@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 11, 2016 7:26 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,

Donald Scholtz

9425 E. Palm Tree Dr  
Scottsdale, AZ 85255

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Duane Bauer <docredrock@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 10, 2016 8:31 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

It is plain to see that the utility APS is afraid to let go! If we listen to APS, they are in a bad way due to single family roof top solar. They spent thousands of dollars to get our neighbors to shun us for passing on the cost of the grid to be paid for by them. That is crazy and is based on zero facts. I had paid a standard electrical bill for many years so you might think that after 40 years that I have paid for my share of the grid by now!

When you are looking at APS as a investment vehicle, they boast at the money they are making and they will continue to make. So which story are you listening too?

Solar is good for America, and Americans. It is very good for Arizona since we have so much sun all year long. We are doing our part to reduce carbon emissions in our atmosphere, and at the same time helping reduce the need for the utility to spend for Capital Expenditures for energy generation. As well as the fact that this state is not the cheapest state in the Union nor are the highest wage paid here. This is a small economic boost for the individual as well.

Please protect our right to reduce our dependence of fossil fuels, and reduce our personal expenses as well.

Sincerely,

Duane & Catherine Bauer  
989 S Main St, #A-157  
Cottonwood, AZ 86326

Sincerely,

Duane Bauer

989 S Main St, #a-157  
Cottonwood, AZ 86326

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Ellie Bullock <elliebullock9219@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 11, 2016 11:19 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,

Ellie Bullock

3526 E. Thompson  
Kingman, AZ 86409

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Mimi Gifford <mimigifford@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 12, 2016 12:19 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** UniSource Electric rate Case Docket: E-04204A-15-0142

I am at a loss to understand how overloaded grids would be better than solar energy. Initially, people were reminded of the overload and asked to consider solar energy to help minimize the burden on the grids. With a proposed increase of \$20 a month to the UNS Electric's basic charge, it will be a hardship to the many, many retired residents already on fixed income. With the influx of new residents moving to Arizona, an increase in the obvious demand on the grids will, in turn, cause higher rates to sustain the grids. Solar energy is certainly more cost efficient. Should the rate increase be approved, it would appear the only people profiting would be a select few. This would obviously reflect badly on Arizona and their elected officials for promoting such an increase in cost for what has become a necessity of daily living.

I implore the Commission to consider the ramifications of passing such an increase and take into consideration the hardship that this increase will be on their constituents.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Mary Eleanor Gifford  
15073 W. Fairmount Avenue  
Goodyear, AZ 85395

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** Bruce Christopher <humbleheartb@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 12, 2016 9:43 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,

Bruce Christopher

3018 E. Devlin Avenue  
3018 E. Devlin Avenue  
Kingman, AZ 86409

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Ellen Young <ellen.young21@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 12, 2016 6:28 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,

Ellen Young

2380 Palo Verde Blvd. N

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Thomas Tejada <thomasgtejada@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 11, 2016 10:00 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 Tejada

1832 Motor Ave  
1832 Motor Ave  
Kingman, AZ 86401

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Arnold Galvin <Sw1436@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 11, 2016 7:14 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,

Arnold Galvin

3506 e John I Abe  
Kingman, AZ 86409



## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Aaron Ashbaugh <a\_ashbaugh@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 11, 2016 5:49 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,

Aaron Ashbaugh

2891 castaway dr  
Lake havasu citu, AZ 86406

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Shirley Muney <smuney2k@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 11, 2016 5:26 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

I urge you to reject the concept of "demand charges" for solar energy and retain the net metering system presently in use.

In these days of climate change and limited energy resources, we all need to conserve what energy we have. What better way than to use the free energy generated by the sun, and captured by solar panels ? These are already widely in use by homes, businesses, schools, government agencies, parks...just about any place where people gather. It's a clean, cheap way to generate electricity without polluting our atmosphere and waters.

The only reason to limit the use of solar energy by raising its price is to raise the profits of energy utilities at the expense of everyday consumers. This is not only un-American, but short-sighted. Energy efficiency is the wave of the future. Don't strangle it in its birth.

Sincerely,

Shirley Muney

3479 N. Nandina Lane  
3479 N. Nandina Lane  
Tucson, AZ 85712

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** SUE Beilman <suebeilman@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 12, 2016 6:31 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,

SUE Beilman

5292 N Sunny Ridge Ln  
Kingman, AZ 86409

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** RALPH WILBUR <moxel@citlink.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 12, 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,

RALPH WILBUR

2921 Oakridge Dr  
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86404

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Evelyn Verrill <im2valla@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 12, 2016 10:25 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,

Evelyn Verrill

1155 W Fawn Lane  
Prescott, AZ 86305

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** McCue, Monte W <monte.mccue@evoqua.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 13, 2016 8:07 AM  
**To:** RBurns-Web; Stump-Web; Little-Web; Forese-Web; Tobin-Web  
**Subject:** RE: UNS Rate Increase and Change in Net Metering

Gentlemen

I have not received a reply so I thought I would follow-up on the Net Metering issue.

My wife and I purchased my system in October 2015 for approximately \$46,000 cash. With the tax credit, the cost was roughly \$32,000 for a system that will generate approximately 24,000 kWh per year – my actual usage, based on past history, is just over 23,000 kWh.

By my estimation, I will carry approximately 8,000 kWh of credit into the summer (May-Sep). If the Net Metering policy is changed retroactively, I will stand to lose approximately \$468 per year as I would only receive only \$0.0584/kWh for the credits.

Over the expected life of the system – 20 years – I would stand to lose \$9400 which is almost 30% of the initial cost of the system.

Once again I urge you not to change the net metering policy retroactive to June 1, 2015. As I stated below, if you need to change the policy the effective date should be at a time in the future that allows consumers to evaluate the true savings and rate of return before they purchase a system.

Please don't penalize people, retroactively, for trying to do the right thing.

**Monte McCue**

**Lake Havasu City, AZ**

**From:** McCue, Monte W  
**Sent:** Friday, April 01, 2016 10:04 AM  
**To:** 'RBurns-web@azcc.gov' <RBurns-web@azcc.gov>; 'Stump-web@azcc.gov' <Stump-web@azcc.gov>; 'Little-web@azcc.gov' <Little-web@azcc.gov>; 'Forese-web@azcc.gov' <Forese-web@azcc.gov>; 'Tobin-web@azcc.gov' <Tobin-web@azcc.gov>  
**Subject:** UNS Rate Increase and Change in Net Metering

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

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Marcin Kluza <mdkluza@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 13, 2016 4:26 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,

Marcin Kluza

7819 S 5th Dr  
Phoenix, AZ 85041



## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Anne Jones <atjshop@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 13, 2016 11:16 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,

Anne Jones

2510 S Grandview AV  
Tempe, AZ 85282

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Douglas Walsh <djdude1327@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 13, 2016 10:16 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,

Douglas Walsh

17615 W Charter Oak Rd  
Surprise, AZ 85388

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Joseph Cole <jt.cole@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 13, 2016 5:26 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,

Joseph Cole

1112 E. Malibu Dr  
1112 E. Malibu Dr  
Tempe, AZ 85282

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Virgie Halteman <babe1948217@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 13, 2016 7:40 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,

Virgie Halteman

3106 Palo Verde Blvd N  
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86404

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Theodore Fenton <tfentonian1@frontier.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 14, 2016 7:58 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,

Theodore Fenton

2275 Anacapa Pl  
2275 Anacapa Pl  
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86403

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Eric Engel <engel.ericj@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 14, 2016 7:02 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,

Eric Engel

3019 Starline Dr  
Lake Havasu, AZ 86403

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Chessa Frei <chessafrei@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 14, 2016 7:08 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,

Chessa Frei

2409 Ajo Drive  
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86403

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Wade Novy <Wmn2409@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 14, 2016 7:14 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.

This proposal comes at time of great financial turmoil for educators in Lake Havasu City. My wife and I are both teachers, and we are facing an insurance premium rate hike of over \$1100 a month. We decided to install solar last year to help mitigate rising power rates, as well as to be environmentally responsible. Our devotion to our city, our school, our career, and our environment continue to be undermined. It may be impossible for us to continue to afford to live in this great city.

Sincerely,

Wade Novy

2409 Ajo Drive  
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86403



## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Larry Martin <jamlwm@me.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 14, 2016 7:58 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Please reconsider raising the current rates. I do not object to a raise but do object to high useage proposal currently being reviewed. We live in Lake Havasu City. It's 118 outside so I have to turn my ac off to wash clothes so my bill isn't higher. The idiot that decided to do this should be terminated.

Low income people, seniors, and hard working people can not afford this proposal.

Please make note of the complaints.

If you can't do it fairly maybe management needs to be looked at since ther obviously top heavy.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Larry Martin

2125 Mimosa Dr  
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86403

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Robin Cude <dctwodogs@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 15, 2016 9:02 AM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Subject:** Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

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

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

Robin Cude

1550 N. Saddleback Ave  
Tucson, AZ 85715

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Jamie Register <Jregister87@outlook.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 15, 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,

Jamie Register

2560 suffock  
Kingman, AZ 86409

**Andrea Gaston**

---

**From:** David Khalil Jones <red.jones0344@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 14, 2016 5:07 PM  
**To:** Little-Web  
**Cc:** Tobin-Web; Forese-Web; Stump-Web; Burns-Web  
**Subject:** UniSourceEnergy proposed rate change  
**Attachments:** Arizona Corporation Commission.doc

Please consider the following comments on docket # E-04204A-15-0142 & E-04204A-15-0176 .

see attachment

Thank You

David Khalil Jones

**Arizona Corporation Commission**

**Regarding:** UNS Electric Rate Case Docket # E-04204A-15-0142 & E-04204A-15-0176

**Date:** April 14, 2016

**Comments from:**

David Khalil Jones  
144 Acoma Blvd. North  
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86403

**Position:** Against

Dear Chairman Little and all other members of the **Arizona Corporation Commission:**

I am a Lake Havasu City, UniSource (UNS) Energy customer. As a owner and operator of a roof mounted Solar Generation system, I will be directly affected by your decision on this change in utility rates and proposed residential demand structure.

You must surly be aware that if this proposal is adopted it will be the end of growth in the number of customer owned and financed solar power systems in the UNS service area. This is contraire to the public position of fully supporting the development of Solar Power which has been advocated by your commission, the State of Arizona, the Federal Government an UniSource Energy.

The following issues should be considered by the ACC before ruling on this proposal:

1. **Customers with Solar Generation systems are taking advantage of non solar customers:**

This is not a true statement. What is not taken to account is the capital investment the solar systems require and the cost avoidance provided to the utility.

The average cost of each installed solar systems is approximately \$30,000.00. It will take many years for the solar system customer to recoup this investment from the current utility rates and may never be paid back if this proposal is approved.

The other big benefit UNS fails to mention is the cost avoidance they currently benefit from by not having to develop renewable power sources to meet the 22% required by 2020. They currently take full credit for the customer solar systems to meet this ACC mandated requirement. I estimate this to be worth at least \$ 15,000,000.00 in cost avoidance to USN. (5,000 systems at \$30,000.00 each.)

**2. Banking of power on the grid with the net metering method should not be allowed at retail rates:**

Solar systems were allowed to use net metering averaged over a one year period. This proposal will allow UNS to charge customer owned solar systems retail rates for power they deliver but only pay large scale system wholesale rates for power received from the solar system.

UNS should understand that a small scale solar generating system must also be able to earn a reasonable return on investment. They should not be compared to large scale power providers.

UNS should realize that the excess solar power UNS receives occurs during the heat of the day and therefore reduces the peak demand on the UNS system. It should also be mentioned that the customer solar systems are distributed through out the service area lowering distribution loses and cost. This makes the customer supplied solar power worth more than the large scale wholesale rates. Thus the net metering method allows UNS to pay back the more valuable peak demand power used during the heat of the day with cheaper off peak power at night.

**3. UNS states that A 100% increase in basic service rates are required to met UNS expenses:**

UNS claims that they need a 100% increase in their base rate because;

The customers are conserving too much energy with energy efficient lights and appliances that they promote.

To may customers are installing Solar generation systems.

Many of the customers are part time residents. (Snow Birds)

The UNS service area economy is in recession, so their is less power demand.

Maybe UNS should try some conservation and cost control measures of their own first.

4 USN is proposing a unprecedented new rate being called an "optional" residential demand charge:

First, this new rate is "only optional" if you are not a solar generating customer. Every one with new digital meters (All solar generating customers) will be required to use this rate.

This rate will record the maximum KW use during a one hour period of time, from 2:00 pm to 8:00 pm, and then apply this rate for the entire monthly billing period.

This rate will make it nearly impossible for a residential customer to conserve energy.

This rate is designed to hit the residential solar system users the hardest. The time proposed includes the early evening hours when solar output is lowest and residential use is highest.

This rate also goes after the part time residential customer. If a customer uses power for one hour, during one day, during a one month pay period they will be billed the demand charge for the entire pay period.

**This residential demand rate is the most damaging part of the proposal, it goes against all efforts of the ACC, the State of AZ, and the Federal Government to encourage residential conservation of energy and the development of solar energy, This type of rate structure will put an end to energy conservation and solar energy development.**

Thank you  
for your consideration

David Khalil Jones

## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** RALPH WILBUR <moxel@citlink.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 15, 2016 11:38 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,

RALPH WILBUR

2921 Oakridge Dr  
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86404



## Andrea Gaston

---

**From:** Andrew Irons <andrewirons72@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 15, 2016 12:20 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,

Andrew Irons

4026 Blue Canyon Road  
4026 Blue Canyon Road  
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86406