

E-01575A-15-0127



0000170051

ORIGINAL

Arizona Corporation Commis Utilities Complaint Form

Investigator: Al Amezcua Phone: <<< REDACTED >>> Opinion Date: 4/29/2016
 Opinion Number: 2016 - 130350 Priority: Respond within 5 business days
 Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - Demand/ Opposed Closed Date: 4/29/2016 3:23 PM

First Name: Denie B Last Name: Gilbert Account Name: Denie B Gilbert
 Address: <<< REDACTED >>>
 City: Sierra Vista State: AZ Zip Code: 85650

Company: Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc. Division: Electric
 Lainie Keltner Phone: <<< REDACTED >>> Email: <<< REDACTED >>>

Nature Of Opinion

Docket Number: E-01575A-15-0127

Docket Position: Against

Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 W. Washington
 Phoenix, AZ 85007

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

MAY 02 2016

Subject: Docket No. E-01575A-15-0127

Members of the Arizona Corporation Commission;

DOCKETED BY

RECEIVED
 016 MAY -2 A 11:30
 AZ CORP. COMMISSION
 DOCKET CONTROL

SSVEC is in the process of making its case for changes in DG and for a rate increase for the 39,000 residential members (where approximately 1250 have rooftop solar) who currently pay a monthly rate of \$10.25. When questioned about what the roof top solar installations were costing SSVEC, our little group of solar folks was told that SSVEC estimated this cost to be \$1.1 million a year. Definitely a cost that needed to be recovered. However, when you divide the \$1.1 million by 12 months and then again by the 39,000 current \$10.25/month ratepayers the actual additional cost comes out to \$2.35/month. SSVEC is asking for a first year increase that will see this go to \$18.25 a month and in the second year the request is for this rate to go to 27.00/month. If the actual loss is \$2.35/month, where is the justification for these increases?

Please keep in mind that we invested the money to install our systems, are responsible for the maintenance of the systems and that these 1250 roof top systems cost more than \$2.5 million to install. This is money that SSVEC DID NOT need to invest in infrastructure! In addition, the power generated by these roof top installations was power that SSVEC did not have to purchase from their supplier. From this point of view both solar and non-solar residential members of the Co-Op benefited. Our group understands the need to cover the reported \$1.1 million revenues loss claimed by SSVEC, but lets raise the monthly rate to \$12.60 the first year and not to the \$18.25 SSVEC is requesting. This can be re-visited in the second year for adjustment if needed. I would also like to point out that in 2015 SSVEC covered all costs and had a surplus of approximately \$600,000; another consideration on your part when you rule on the rate case.

E-01575A-15-0127

**Arizona Corporation Commission
Utilities Complaint Form**

As far as the excess power generation compensation is concerned, we feel we should be compensated at the same rate we pay for the power we receive in the non-generating hours. But, we would be willing to accept an 8 to 9 cent rate from what we currently generate which would be less than the 12.6 cents we now receive. Come "True Up" time, we have no problem with the SSVEC proposed compensation program.

In conclusion, our group of roof top solar owners feel that the rate request is well in excess of the loss SSVEC is claiming. and the program we currently have with SSVEC should remain. We took the initiative to buy into the roof top program when it was offered and should not now be penalized for being a willing participant.

Thank you for your consideration

Dennie B Gilbert

<<< REDACTED >>>

<<< REDACTED >>>

		Investigation	
Date:	Analyst:	Submitted By:	Type:
4/29/2016	Al Amezcua	Telephone	Investigation
Comments noted for the record and docketed. CLOSED.			
