

COMMISSIONERS
DOUG LITTLE – Chairman
BOB STUMP
BOB BURNS
TOM FORESE
ANDY TOBIN

ORIGINAL



ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

May 9, 2016

To: Docket Control

RE: Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative – Customer Comments

Docket No. E-01575A-15-0312

Please docket the attached two customer comments **OPPOSING** the above filed case.

Customer comments can be reviewed in E-docket under the above docket number.

Filed by: Utilities Division – Consumer Services

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

MAY 09 2016

DOCKETED BY 

RECEIVED
AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL
2016 MAY 9 PM 2 11

E-01575A-15-0312

Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

Investigator: Tom Davis **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>> **Opinion Date:** 5/9/2016
Opinion Number: 2016 - 131450 **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days
Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - Opposed **Closed Date:** 5/9/2016 9:44 AM

First Name: Steve **Last Name:** Sones **Account Name:** Steve Sones
Address: <<< REDACTED >>>
City: Sierra Vista **State:** AZ **Zip Code:** 85650
Cell: <<< REDACTED >>>

Company: Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc. **Division:** Electric

Nature Of Opinion

Docket Number: E-01575A-15-0312

Docket Position: Against

2 things that should be considered -

(1) I purchased my present home with solar panels already installed and paid more for the home since it had those (already installed). Since my house rarely (once or twice or maybe three times) per year achieves Net Zero, I don't see much hope of recovering the extra premium that I paid for the home with the proposed increased monthly cost for existing Net Metered customers who were connected on or before Apr 15, 2015. I wonder how many residents (other than myself) would also be affected by the larger increase in the proposed monthly service availability charge due to having solar esp. those who purchased and paid extra for such homes due to the solar panels already installed. I believe that this proposal if passed as suggested will hurt the resale value of those homes that already have solar installed.

2nd that should be considered:

(2) The price of trees saved (for example) due to less environmental impact from using lessor amounts of coal in producing electricity. In other words, what about the amount saved from future possible carbon tax abated by the use from the public businesses, schools, homes, etc. that produce some or all of their electricity from solar or wind?

Investigation			
Date:	Analyst:	Submitted By:	Type:
5/9/2016	Tom Davis	Other	Investigation

Entered for the record and docketed. CLOSED

E-01575A-15-0312

**Arizona Corporation Commission
Utilities Complaint Form**

Investigator: Trish Meeter **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>> **Opinion Date:** 4/1/2016
Opinion Number: 2016 - 129879 **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days
Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - Opposed **Closed Date:**

First Name: Mark **Last Name:** Phillips **Account Name:** Mark Phillips
Address: <<< REDACTED >>>
City: Huachuca City **State:** AZ **Zip Code:** 85616

Company: Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc. **Division:** Electric

Nature Of Opinion

Docket Number: E-01575A-15-0312

Arizona Corporation Commission

Consumer Services Section

1200 West Washington

Phoenix, Arizona 85007

To Whom It May Concern:

<<< REDACTED >>>

<<< REDACTED >>>

<<< REDACTED >>>

March 4, 2016

I am writing to comment of the proposal by Sulphur Springs Valley Electrical Cooperative Inc. (SSVEC) docket Number E-01575A-15-0312. I am strongly opposed to the proposed increase as submitted. While SSVEC claims that the average rate increase will be 3.5%, those members, such as myself, who have installed solar generating systems will see at least a 400% increase in their bills. Depending on which part of SSVEC's letter to members you use, many members will see no rate increase at all.

Years ago when the regulatory mandates for alternative energy generation were issued to the utility companies; these companies had as I see it, three alternatives open to them to meet these requirements. The utilities could have borrowed money and built an alternative energy production facility; they could have purchased the alternative energy from a company that produced energy in this manner or they could have encouraged their users to install renewable energy systems and give the energy generation credits to the

Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

utility. SSVEC chose to use the third option and encouraged their members to install these systems with small subsidies and a preferential rate structure. SSVEC's members spent millions of dollars of private capital to install the alternative energy systems that allowed SSVEC to meet its regulatory requirements.

After years of encouraging this practice, SSVEC now realizes they chose the wrong approach to meet their mandate alternative energy goals, and are now very concerned with their long term financial wellbeing. SSVEC in this proposal is now asking the Corporation Commission to bail them out of a financial situation that they brought upon themselves. Poor management decisions should not be rewarded by penalizing those individuals, who in good faith spent personal funds to help out both themselves and SSVEC.

Not only does SSVEC want to raise the monthly base fees for solar generators by over 400% per month, but they also unilaterally want to have the commission break the contract they had with these same generators. SSVEC now wants to terminate the contract after a 20 year period. My contract with SSVEC had no termination date. SSVEC also does not mention that they currently collect an additional \$2.70 per month from their solar customers as a charge for the electrical meter that reads both consumption and generation.

In conclusion, I do not support the rate proposal as submitted by SSVEC, and I hope the commission will not reward the utility for making bad business and management decisions. I do realize that the commission can not let the utility fail, so hopefully a compromise can be reached that allows SSVEC generate some additional revenue while not punishing those individuals who spend personal funds to allow the utility to meet its regulatory obligations. I would request that the commission approve the same base rate to solar generators as that applied to the remainder of the utility's customers, or half the amount requested by SSVEC. I also request that I and the other people who spent personal funds to install solar generating systems that benefited SSVEC not have our contract overturned and that my contract will remain the same for life. Lastly, I request that as part of having my base rate increased from \$10.25 to

\$25.00 per month, that the \$2.70 meter fee be dropped. Since non solar customers will see a drop in usage rates, solar generators should receive something as well. If the commission approves SSVEC's proposal as submitted, with a >400% increase in base monthly fees, and a 20 life expectancy for the solar systems current fee structure, I am not sure that I will break even on my investment.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns and suggestions.

Investigation			
Date:	Analyst:	Submitted By:	Type:
4/1/2016 docketed	Trish Meeter	Correspondence	Investigation
