

ORIGINAL



0000170384

RECEIVED

2016 MAY 16 P 2:52

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: May 16, 2016

FROM: Chairman Doug Little's Office

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

Chairman Little's office has received 26 attached emails opposing the above Docket Number. The emails can be viewed either in Docket, or on the website via the eDocket link.

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

MAY 16 2016

DOCKETED BY	<i>ML</i>
-------------	-----------

Andrea Gaston

From: Steven Elwood <stevene1@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, May 13, 2016 8:05 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. I oppose UNS's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

At it's core Unisource's proposal remains anti-consumer and anti-choice. Please reject UNS proposed mandatory demand charges on solar customers and the elimination of fundamental solar policies, like net metering. UniSource was wrong to propose mandatory demand charges for all, and they are still wrong. Demand charges are confusing and hard to control.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Steven Elwood

14350 S Camino Vallado
Sahuarita, AZ 85629

Andrea Gaston

From: Linda Hardy <Lindahardy@frontier.com>
Sent: Friday, May 13, 2016 3:11 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142 - No on UNS anti-solar proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Unisource was wrong to proposal demand charges on all customers and still wrong to propose discriminatory demand charges on solar customers.

I urge the Commission to preserve the ability of ratepayers to exercise choice when it comes to lowering their bills. Please reject demand charges of any kind and protect net metering. By protecting choice and competition in our energy market, we can create jobs and give consumers energy choice.

Sincerely,

Linda Hardy

3286 Silver Saddle Dr
LHC, AZ 86406

9284862039

Andrea Gaston

From: Scott Miners <scottminers@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 12, 2016 6:58 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Please reject Unisource's anti-consumer proposal. Unisource's proposal imposes mandatory demand charges on solar customers and the elimination of fundamental solar policies, like net metering. UniSource was wrong to propose mandatory demand charges for all, and they are still wrong; At it's core, Unisource's proposal remains anti-consumer and anti-choice.

Demand charges are an anti-consumer billing mechanism designed to confuse ratepayers and disincentivise 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 for choosing sustainable energy.

We know what happens when you eliminate fundamental solar policies. Let's 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,

Scott Miners

4166 E. La Cienega Dr
Tucson, AZ 85712

775-297-3350

Andrea Gaston

From: Roy Holten <royp34@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 12, 2016 3:34 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Please reject Unisource's anti-consumer proposal. Unisource's proposal still imposes mandatory demand charges on solar customers and the elimination of fundamental solar policies, like net metering. UniSource was wrong to propose mandatory demand charges for all, and they are still wrong; At it's core, Unisource's proposal remains anti-consumer and anti-choice.

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,

Roy Holten

4707 E Pierce ST
Phoenix, AZ 85008

6029206528

Andrea Gaston

From: JULIANNE EHR <pooh_bare38@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 12, 2016 10:25 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. I oppose UNS's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

At it's core Unisource's proposal remains anti-consumer and anti-choice. Please reject UNS proposed mandatory demand charges on solar customers and the elimination of fundamental solar policies, like net metering. UniSource was wrong to propose mandatory demand charges for all, and they are still wrong. Demand charges are confusing and hard to control.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

JULIANNE EHR

2726 ARCADIA DR
LAKE HAVASU CITY, AZ 86404

9286805640

Andrea Gaston

From: Terry Evans <timeless4u22@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 12, 2016 9:04 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142 - No on UNS anti-solar proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Unisource was wrong to proposal demand charges on all customers and still wrong to propose discriminatory demand charges on solar customers.

I urge the Commission to preserve the ability of ratepayers to exercise choice when it comes to lowering their bills. Please reject demand charges of any kind and protect net metering. By protecting choice and competition in our energy market, we can create jobs and give consumers energy choice.

Sincerely,

Terry Evans

2841 W. Palmetto St
Tucson, AZ 85705

520-888-5614

Andrea Gaston

From: MaryElizabeth Isom <mbiaccents@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 12, 2016 8:52 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. I oppose UNS's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

At it's core Unisource's proposal remains anti-consumer and anti-choice. Please reject UNS proposed mandatory demand charges on solar customers and the elimination of fundamental solar policies, like net metering. UniSource was wrong to propose mandatory demand charges for all, and they are still wrong. Demand charges are confusing and hard to control.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

MaryElizabeth Isom

1532 n coral bells drive
Tucson, AZ 85745

Andrea Gaston

From: Marsden Griswold <mgriswold@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2016 11:40 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Please reject Unisource's anti-consumer proposal. Unisource's proposal still imposes mandatory demand charges on solar customers and the elimination of fundamental solar policies, like net metering. UniSource was wrong to propose mandatory demand charges for all, and they are still wrong; At it's core, Unisource's proposal remains anti-consumer and anti-choice.

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,

Marsden Griswold

apt. 916 444 West Orange Grove Rd
Tucson, AZ 85704

520 797 6855

Andrea Gaston

From: Pattie Lonnee <Patricialonnee@att.net>
Sent: Friday, May 13, 2016 3:14 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

To Whom It May Concern:

I urge you not to approve demand charges and not to punish the citizens who have invested in solar power. My husband and I moved to AZ to retire and invested in our solar to help control our cost for power when we are on a fixed income. With the extreme heat in the summer months we cannot afford huge power bills as the majority of the residents in AZ. We also invested in solar power to help our environment and again we should not be penalized. Please consider alternative solutions to vouching the consumer!

Sincerely,
Pattie Lonnee
3901 Aloha Ln
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86406

Sincerely,

Pattie Lonnee

3901 Aloha Ln
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86406

714-343-8020

Andrea Gaston

From: William Venker <BILLYROSE1@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, May 13, 2016 11:25 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. I oppose UNS's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

At it's core Unisource's proposal remains anti-consumer and anti-choice. Please reject UNS proposed mandatory demand charges on solar customers and the elimination of fundamental solar policies, like net metering. UniSource was wrong to propose mandatory demand charges for all, and they are still wrong. Demand charges are confusing and hard to control.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

William Venker

4520 S Calle Don Domenico
Tucson
AZ 85646

520-869-6092

Andrea Gaston

From: Debra Crosslin <debbie.crosslin@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 13, 2016 5:43 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142 - No on UNS anti-solar proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Unisource was wrong to proposal demand charges on all customers and still wrong to propose discriminatory demand charges on solar customers.

I urge the Commission to preserve the ability of ratepayers to exercise choice when it comes to lowering their bills. Please reject demand charges of any kind and protect net metering. By protecting choice and competition in our energy market, we can create jobs and give consumers energy choice.

Sincerely,

Debra Crosslin

1730 E Dunbar Dr
Tempe, AZ 85282

3135220450

Andrea Gaston

From: Louise Guest <Louiseguest365@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 14, 2016 5:41 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Please reject Unisource's anti-consumer proposal. Unisource's proposal still imposes mandatory demand charges on solar customers and the elimination of fundamental solar policies, like net metering. UniSource was wrong to propose mandatory demand charges for all, and they are still wrong; At it's core, Unisource's proposal remains anti-consumer and anti-choice.

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, Louise Guest
16630N.ReemsRd. Bldg.No14. Apt.No.1073
Surprise AZ. 85374

Sincerely,

Louise Guest

16630 N.Reems Rd. Bldg.No.14. Apt.No.1073
Surprise, AZ 85374

(623)780-0727

Andrea Gaston

From: James Riedel <jariedel@att.net>
Sent: Saturday, May 14, 2016 7:40 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142 - No on UNS anti-solar proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Unisource was wrong to proposal demand charges on all customers and still wrong to propose discriminatory demand charges on solar customers.

I urge the Commission to preserve the ability of ratepayers to exercise choice when it comes to lowering their bills. Please reject demand charges of any kind and protect net metering. By protecting choice and competition in our energy market, we can create jobs and give consumers energy choice.

Sincerely,

James Riedel

8600 E Broadway Rd, Lot 51
Mesa, AZ 85208

4143501466

Andrea Gaston

From: Dennis DiNaro <dadinaro2@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 14, 2016 6:25 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142 - No on UNS anti-solar proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Unisource was wrong to proposal demand charges on all customers and still wrong to propose discriminatory demand charges on solar customers.

I urge the Commission to preserve the ability of ratepayers to exercise choice when it comes to lowering their bills. Please reject demand charges of any kind and protect net metering. By protecting choice and competition in our energy market, we can create jobs and give consumers energy choice.

Sincerely,

Dennis DiNaro

11129 E RAVENNA AVE
MESA, AZ 85212

Andrea Gaston

From: STEPHEN R FORRESTER <sflowrider@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 15, 2016 11:38 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: UNISOURCE rate hikes

Dear Chairman Doug Little,

I'm writing you and the ACC requesting the Commission to reject any UNISOURCE rate hikes in any form. In my opinion, UNISOURCE has initiated a typical negotiation scheme. The scheme is to ask all Mohave customers to except "Demand Charges" and once that was turned down, ask for all Solar customers to pay higher rates which is what they wanted in the first place. I'm not a mediator, but that's a bad deal. I urge you to not fall for this scheme. Net-Metering should stay as is and energy cost to Solar owners stay the same.

I attended the ACC public meeting in Lake Havasu covering UNISOURCE rate hikes. I was very pleased with the local residents turn-out.

My name is Stephen Forrester, 3577 Desert Garden Drive, Lake Havasu City, AZ. 86404 and a roof top solar owner. Thank-you!

Andrea Gaston

From: Stephen Wilson <Stodd615@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 15, 2016 1:28 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142 - No on UNS anti-solar proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Unisource was wrong to proposal demand charges on all customers and still wrong to propose discriminatory demand charges on solar customers.

I urge the Commission to preserve the ability of ratepayers to exercise choice when it comes to lowering their bills. Please reject demand charges of any kind and protect net metering. By protecting choice and competition in our energy market, we can create jobs and give consumers energy choice.

Sincerely,

Stephen Wilson

3421 Newport Dr
Lake Havasu city, AZ 86406

9282088208

Andrea Gaston

From: Wayne Daniel <wdaniel333@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 15, 2016 2:29 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142 - No on UNS anti-solar proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Unisource was wrong to proposal demand charges on all customers and still wrong to propose discriminatory demand charges on solar customers.

I urge the Commission to preserve the ability of ratepayers to exercise choice when it comes to lowering their bills. Please reject demand charges of any kind and protect net metering. By protecting choice and competition in our energy market, we can create jobs and give consumers energy choice.

Sincerely,

Wayne Daniel

19225 N Cave Creek Rd
Lot 64
Phoenix, AZ 85024-2421

Andrea Gaston

From: Glenn Miller <Glenn.miller27@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 15, 2016 7:52 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142 - No on UNS anti-solar proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Unisource was wrong to proposal demand charges on all customers and still wrong to propose discriminatory demand charges on solar customers.

I urge the Commission to preserve the ability of ratepayers to exercise choice when it comes to lowering their bills. Please reject demand charges of any kind and protect net metering. By protecting choice and competition in our energy market, we can create jobs and give consumers energy choice.

Sincerely,

Glenn Miller

3639 North Sonoran Hills
Mesa, AZ 85207

4802266121

Andrea Gaston

From: charles tillery <777roosstr@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2016 4:04 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142 - No on UNS anti-solar proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Unisource was wrong to proposal demand charges on all customers and still wrong to propose discriminatory demand charges on solar customers.

I urge the Commission to preserve the ability of ratepayers to exercise choice when it comes to lowering their bills. Please reject demand charges of any kind and protect net metering. By protecting choice and competition in our energy market, we can create jobs and give consumers energy choice.

Sincerely,

charles tillery

18

Andrea Gaston

From: R Smedley <rmsmedley@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2016 4:10 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Please reject Unisource's anti-consumer proposal. Unisource's proposal still imposes mandatory demand charges on solar customers and the elimination of fundamental solar policies, like net metering. UniSource was wrong to propose mandatory demand charges for all, and they are still wrong; At it's core, Unisource's proposal remains anti-consumer and anti-choice.

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,

R Smedley

Mitchell St
Tucson, AZ 85719

Andrea Gaston

From: Nicholas Acciardo <nacciardo@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 15, 2016 9:16 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

As a citizen of the United States of America, I feel that you have no right to feel the necessity to raise the fees just because you want to generate more profits! Why is that?

The advent of solar energy production has not nor will not take MONEY out of APS's pockets! It is a disgrace that your organization allows whole heartedly, a private utility, to continue to allow for a repeated onset increases which you never seem to block or challenge. This act of game playing, is criminal...

Please think of US not just yourselves!! Don't allow this criminal act to continue here in Arizona...It is a disgrace!!!

Sincerely,

Nicholas Acciardo

11243 So. Santa Margarita Lane
Goodyear, AZ 85338

602-205-4451

Andrea Gaston

From: Kathryn Sink <rdrose808@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 15, 2016 8:16 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Please do not use Demand Charges. Metering works just fine. My family is low income and Demand Charges would bankrupt us. It's unacceptable in Arizona.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Sink

7424 ESP Speedway blvd
#B-23
Tucson, AZ 85710

Andrea Gaston

From: Lenore Kadish <Bdlks@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 12, 2016 8:19 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Please reject Unisource's anti-consumer proposal. Unisource's proposal still imposes mandatory demand charges on solar customers and the elimination of fundamental solar policies, like net metering. UniSource was wrong to propose mandatory demand charges for all, and they are still wrong; At it's core, Unisource's proposal remains anti-consumer and anti-choice.

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,

Lenore Kadish

1510 e Ram Canyon Dr
Oro Valley, AZ 85737

520-297-9066

Andrea Gaston

From: Bradley Louis <Madbrad48@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 12, 2016 9:31 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142 - No on UNS anti-solar proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Unisource was wrong to proposal demand charges on all customers and still wrong to propose discriminatory demand charges on solar customers.

I urge the Commission to preserve the ability of ratepayers to exercise choice when it comes to lowering their bills. Please reject demand charges of any kind and protect net metering. By protecting choice and competition in our energy market, we can create jobs and give consumers energy choice.

Sincerely,

Bradley Louis

12147 N Kylene Canyon Drive
Oro Valley, AZ 85756

Andrea Gaston

From: Beth Jones <Madsgramma@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, May 13, 2016 7:08 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Stop the hidden and extra charges! My paycheck doesn't keep going up! You all are overcharging us to death!

Sincerely,

Beth Jones

1911 N. Rosemary Blvd
Tucson, 85716

5202069050

Andrea Gaston

From: Anissa Taylor <Anissat1981@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, May 13, 2016 4:32 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: Docket# E-04204A-15-0142. Please Reject UNS Energy's proposal

Dear Chairman Little,

Please reject Unisource's anti-consumer proposal. Unisource's proposal still imposes mandatory demand charges on solar customers and the elimination of fundamental solar policies, like net metering. UniSource was wrong to propose mandatory demand charges for all, and they are still wrong; At it's core, Unisource's proposal remains anti-consumer and anti-choice.

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,

Anissa Taylor

1738 n magnolia rd
Tucson, AZ 85712

5302459492