

ORIGINAL



0000171149

RECEIVED
AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

2016 JUN 22 PM 3 06

Memorandum
From the office of
Chairman Doug Little
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 W. WASHINGTON
PHOENIX, ARIZONA
(602) 542-0745

TO: Docket Control

DATE: June 22, 2016

FROM: Chairman Doug Little's Office

SUBJECT: UNS E -04204A-15-0142

Chairman Little's received 47 emails referencing, and in opposition of, the above docket number. The emails can be viewed under the above docket number, on the website via the docket link, or in Docket.

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED
JUN 22 2016

DOCKETED BY *PL*

Andrea Gaston

From: Richard Eisenmann <rickeisenmann@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 19, 2016 12:22 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,

Richard Eisenmann

14061 S. Avenida Haley
Sahuarita, AZ 85629

Andrea Gaston

From: Ian Robey <Ian_robey@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 19, 2016 6:15 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,

Ian Robey

3508 E. Fairmount
Tucson, AZ 85716

520-795-2541

Andrea Gaston

From: Randy Ripple <Wino1950.rr@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 19, 2016 6:03 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,

Randy Ripple

1460 colina dr
Bullhead city, AZ 86442

4357904879

Andrea Gaston

From: Nicholas Acciaro <nacciaro@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2016 9:56 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,

Nicholas Acciaro

11243 So. Santa Margarita Lane
Goodyear, AZ 85338

602-205-4451

Andrea Gaston

From: Jeanne Gauthier <Jeannegauthier@cox.net>
Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2016 3:56 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,

Jeanne Gauthier

5834 N 46th Pl
Phoenix, AZ 85018

6029529547

Andrea Gaston

From: Robert Klingenfus <pk54@cox.net>
Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2016 2:03 PM
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,

Robert Klingenfus

2201 S. Palm Springs Dr
Tucson, AZ 85710

520_296_3993

Andrea Gaston

From: Phyllis Kegley <Kegleyphyllis@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2016 9:50 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Arizona needs to be encouraging its citizens to go solar not discouraging them by the proposed discriminatory charges. Let's not go backwards in reducing our use of fossil fuels but support the use of alternative energy sources.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Kegley

1911 N Marion Dr
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

Andrea Gaston

From: Jane Kodros <janekodros@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 11:10 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,

Jane Kodros

4992 El Rancharo
Fort Mohave, AZ 86426

Andrea Gaston

From: Bob Pauls <bpauls50@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2016 6:57 PM
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,

Bob Pauls

PO BOX 30752
Flagstaff, AZ 86003-0752

5159919049

Andrea Gaston

From: Irene Mcmillan <Imcmill@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2016 1:16 PM
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,

Irene Mcmillan

2460 e Glen canyon rd
Green valley, AZ 85614

520 284 0615

Andrea Gaston

From: Kim Fox <foxontherun99@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2016 2:26 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,

Kim Fox

2650 W Union Hills Dr lot 262
Phoenix, AZ 85027

6239861337

Andrea Gaston

From: Steve Arbogast <Warpspdsteve@cox.net>
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2016 4:21 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,

Steve Arbogast

1356 calle del ensayador
Sahuarita, AZ 85629

520 625 5711

Andrea Gaston

From: Michael Kutcher <mic2160558@maricopa.edu>
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2016 2:56 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,

Michael Kutcher

5018 e dahlia dr
Scottsdale, AZ 85254

6025551234

Andrea Gaston

From: James Cumberland <jloneduck1969@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 19, 2016 12:44 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,

James Cumberland

3660 E 3rd St
Tucson, AZ 85716

5203583351

Andrea Gaston

From: Mary Brown <Marybrown@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 19, 2016 4:02 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 its 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,

Mary Brown

242 W Calle Nogal
Green Valley, AZ 85614

5206481827

Andrea Gaston

From: Eugene Lewin <Lasparky11@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Sunday, June 19, 2016 4:52 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,

Eugene Lewin

6931 W Mayberry Trail
Peoria, AR 85383

Andrea Gaston

From: Thomas Havican <Thavican@wi.rr.com>
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2016 7:14 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,

Thomas Havican

20402 n 133rd way
Sun City West, AZ 85375

Andrea Gaston

From: Paul Cragle <Paulcragle@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2016 9:02 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.

It is time for the electric companies to start diversifying and investing in on work.

Solar is here to stay and soon people will be getting off the grid. They will have to adapt or go under.

Letting them raise rates just delays the enviable.

Sincerely,

Paul Cragle

2872 w Palmetto st
Tucson, 85705

5202481343

Andrea Gaston

From: Susie Trujillo <susiekt@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 4:15 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,

Susie Trujillo

3326 N. Treat Circle
Tucson, AZ 85716

Andrea Gaston

From: Patricia Lee <pgammonlee@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 1:26 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,

Patricia Lee

10317 west pine springs dr
sun city, AZ 85373

Andrea Gaston

From: Kimberly Pierce <kpierce_2007@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2016 2:02 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,

Kimberly Pierce

4738 South San Joaquin Road
tucson, AZ 857735

5202308260

Andrea Gaston

From: Irene Mcmillan <Imcmill@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2016 7:58 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 its 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,

Irene Mcmillan

2460 e Glen canyon rd
Green valley, AZ 85614

520 284 0615

Andrea Gaston

From: Ann dunbar <courtclr@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2016 7:08 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,

Ann dunbar

2612 N Columbus Blvd
tucson, AZ 85712

5202726722

Andrea Gaston

From: John Sharp <johnnysharp55vots@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2016 1:20 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,

John Sharp

15376 West Post Circle
Surprise, AZ 85374

623 377 5961

Andrea Gaston

From: Julia Flannigan <Ballyverde@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 5:02 PM
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,

Julia Flannigan

6529 W Misty Willow Ln
Glendale, AZ 85310

6238251000

Andrea Gaston

From: Roxana Huggins <qwiji2@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2016 10:16 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,

Roxana Huggins

4948 W. Hardy Rd
Tucson, AZ 85742

5206825086

Andrea Gaston

From: Nicholas Acciaro <nacciardo@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 5:32 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

When are you going to think of US ? That is correct! US...the poor people who work every day! We work hard in order to stay alive and save for tomorrow! Why is it so difficult for you guys to understand this?

The power authorities have made a mockery of every single rate paying individual to date! Now it is your fight with us yet one more time because of solar! I have news for you...Solar isn't free! It does cost money however, you feel unable to control our production...it is a sad day!

Please wake up and smell the coffee people ! Solar energy production is here to stay...If you like it or not!

Don't be so dam greedy...

Sincerely,

Nicholas Acciaro

11243 So. Santa Margarita Lane
Goodyear, AZ 85338

602-205-4451

Andrea Gaston

From: Yumi Wong <Edyumifamily@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 7:50 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,

Yumi Wong

6737 N Corte Calabaza
Tucson, AZ 85704

5204491059

Andrea Gaston

From: Susan Thorpe <Susan3Thorpe@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 8:10 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,

Susan Thorpe

429 E. Lester St
Tucson, AZ 85705

5203129988

Andrea Gaston

From: Kimberly Larsson <kimmerrily@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 8:10 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 its 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,

Kimberly Larsson

5601 W McDowell Rd
Phoenix, AZ 85035

4804898537

Andrea Gaston

From: Cheri Hays <cherisings@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 11:21 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,

Cheri Hays

Tucson, AZ 85711

616-218-2001

Andrea Gaston

From: James Lambert <Jim@bullheadcityairport.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 18, 2016 6:58 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 were tried in this area in the late seventies. They are crippling to small businesses. 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,

James Lambert

5096 S.Antelope Drive
Fort Mohave, AZ 86426

(928) 768-5096

Andrea Gaston

From: Kent Shelton <Kent.j.sheltn@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2016 2:02 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

net metering is working in Arizona. Please represent the voice of the people, not of utility monopolies.

Sincerely,
Kent G Shelton
2335 W Estrella Dr
Chandler, Az

Sincerely,

Kent Shelton

2335 w Estrella dr
Chandler, AZ 85224

480-899-5869

Andrea Gaston

From: margaret Keener <keenerflag@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2016 10:40 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,

margaret Keener

3056 Indian Head Dr
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86406

928-699-7027

Andrea Gaston

From: kenneth simons <keenerflag@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2016 10:44 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,

kenneth simons

3056 Indian Head Dr
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86406

814-572-8495

Andrea Gaston

From: CM Peterson <Echocmcmcm@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2016 9:26 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,

CM Peterson

150

Andrea Gaston

From: Daniel Broadley <Motown3@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2016 3:21 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

A New reliable clean source of energy comes along and you guys have to do all you can do to squelch it and protect your monopoly. Your position is pitiful.

Sincerely,

Daniel Broadley

1666 w. Meseto circle
Mesa, AZ 85202

602-614-9310

Andrea Gaston

From: Shawn Foreman <smftucson@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2016 5:17 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Please do not allow discriminatory charges against solar adoption.

It is imperative that we move AWAY from non-renewable energy sources, and (particularly in Arizona), solar energy is a very compelling solution. By allowing utility companies to essentially price gouge, consumers are being strong-armed into sticking with the traditional providers. This is not right.

Sincerely,

Shawn Foreman

5811 E 33rd St
Tucson, AZ 85711

5203124748

Andrea Gaston

From: kelly gray <ksgrey63@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2016 5:19 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

People choose solar to be able to live without being squeezed to the breaking point. This is dishonest. A slap in the face to us just trying to get by.

Sincerely,

kelly gray

11174 w garfield st
avondale, AZ 85323

Andrea Gaston

From: Mark Whitney <Lifemarrow@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2016 5:33 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

APS serves more than one million customers. I would be willing to say that this company receives \$100 per month per customer. That equates to 100 million dollars per month of revenue. Does this Commission actually believe they need more money? I do not.

Sincerely,

Mark Whitney

1302 West Runion drive
Phoenix, AZ 85027

623 225 5363

Andrea Gaston

From: Rahelio Rodriguez <rahelio@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2016 6:43 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

please respect our right to choose solar energy options. thank you,

Rahelio Rodriguez
130 View dr
Sedona, Az. 86336

Sincerely,

Rahelio Rodriguez

130 View drive
SEDONA, AZ 86336

9285939178

Andrea Gaston

From: Judith Crim <drpepperjc@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2016 9:16 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

This is horrible APS is already charging a too much in my opinion and they are trying to stack the deck against us.

Sincerely,

Judith Crim

13249 West Keystone Drive
Sun City West, AZ 85375

623-748-9745

Andrea Gaston

From: Nicholas Kredit <Nkredit@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2016 3:10 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Rooftop solar is an important part of our local economy. Please don't eliminate jobs with this new proposal. The is creating an even more powerful monopoly for the utility companies.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Kredit

4802 n 28th pl
Phoenix, AZ 85016

Andrea Gaston

From: Robert Cymbor <Rmc127@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2016 10:00 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I fully support UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Please don't be fooled by the solar industry, if you want hooked to the grid, pay your fair share or get off the grid

Sincerely,

Robert Cymbor

18622 W Hatcher Rd
Waddell, AZ 85355

6238108505

Andrea Gaston

From: Nicholas Acciardo <nacciardo@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2016 9:17 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

Let's wake up our heads here people!!! Why do the rich only think about getting richer, while the working class has to continuously fight for our rights! Sorry to say...both democratic and republican common sense here stinks! Remember America was built by US not YOU, and we deserve to be heard!!!

Sincerely,

Nicholas Acciardo

11243 So. Santa Margarita Lane

602-205-4451

Andrea Gaston

From: Stuart Thaler <Stuart_thaler@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2016 10:28 AM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

This will give APS the mandate to raise our utility rates. We need more solar energy not an investment in upgrading conventional energy plants. APS can save money by reducing its CEO's enormous salary.

Sincerely,

Stuart Thaler

7574 w Rock Springs dr
Peoria, AZ 85383

Andrea Gaston

From: Cynthia Correll <Correll32@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2016 8:43 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: I oppose UNS's proposal, regarding Docket# E-04204A-15-0142

Dear Chairman Little,

You should be supporting solar efforts not getting in the way.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Correll

15 Gunsight Hills Dr
Sedona, AZ 86351

9283006889