

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



ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

ORIGINAL

August 5, 2016

To: Docket Control

RE: UNISOURCE ENERGY SERVICES (UNS) – Customer Comments

Docket No: E-04204A-15-0142

Please docket the attached 1 opinions (including 5 Petitions) with 120 customer signatures 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

JUL 29 2016

DOCKETED BY *KA*

RECEIVED  
AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL  
2016 JUL 29 P 2:54

**E-04204A-15-0142**

**Arizona Corporation Commission  
Utilities Complaint Form**

---

**Investigator:** Roxanne Best      **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>>      **Opinion Date:** 7/28/2016  
**Opinion Number:** 2016 - 133542      **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days  
**Opinion Codes:** Other - Net Metering      **Closed Date:** 7/28/2016 4:12 PM  
Rate Case Items - Demand/ Opposed

---

**First Name:** PETITION      **Last Name:** PETITION 10      **Account Name:** PETITION  
PETITION 10

**Address:** <<< REDACTED >>>

**City:** Scottsdale      **State:** AZ      **Zip Code:** 85258

---

**Company:** Unisource \*\* Energy Services (UNS)\*      **Division:** Electric

---

**Nature Of Opinion**

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142

**Docket Position:** Against

10 opposed with the same letter as follows:

Dear Arizona Corporation Commission,

Please reject UniSource Energy's proposal (Docket E-04204A-15-0142) to eliminate net metering and impose discriminatory demand charges on solar customers.

UniSource is attempting to make these changes retroactive to customers who installed distributed generation systems after June 1, 2015, punishing customers who made substantial investments over a year ago. The ACC must protect these customers, and ensure that future customers maintain their right to go solar without financial repercussions.

To date, no ACC-commissioned studies have indicated that net metering in Arizona is harmful to customers, and no convincing evidence has been presented by UniSource to indicate that net metering needs to change. States across the country have conducted studies that show net metering to be an equitable policy that provides substantial benefits to all ratepayers. Changing net metering without supporting evidence, and implementing rates that would make solar uneconomic, would be an enormous disservice to all UniSource customers.

UniSource Energy received such immense public opposition in response to their proposal for demand charges for all customers that they were forced to revert back to their original proposal to impose demand charges on solar customers only. Demand charges disproportionately impact customers while they are home with their families, cooking dinner, doing laundry, and enjoying the amenities they work hard for. In fact, demand charges more severely impact low energy users, like solar customers, who have made substantial investments to reduce their overall energy use while reducing costs for all ratepayers.

Please join the hundreds of Arizonans who have spoken out against UniSource's discriminatory, unsubstantiated, and unfair proposal and please reject UniSource's obvious attempt to overcharge solar customers and stifle solar growth and innovation in Arizona.

**E-04204A-15-0142**

**Arizona Corporation Commission  
Utilities Complaint Form**

Signed:

Bruce Senkow      Joseph Lee  
Diane Jones      Reynaldo Gradillas  
ed rogers      Sally Pullen  
JD Gallegos      Simone Lopes  
Jeffrey Bergeron      Thomas Connor

---

<b>Investigation</b>			
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Submitted By:</b>	<b>Type:</b>
7/28/2016	Roxanne Best	Email	Investigation
Comments noted for record and docketed. Closed.			

---

E-04204A-15-0142

## Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

---

**Investigator:** Roxanne Best      **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>>      **Opinion Date:** 7/27/2016  
**Opinion Number:** 2016 - 133504      **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days  
**Opinion Codes:** Other - Net Metering      **Closed Date:** 7/27/2016 4:15 PM  
Rate Case Items - Demand/ Opposed

---

**First Name:** PETITION      **Last Name:** PETITION 7      **Account Name:** PETITION  
PETITION 7  
**Address:** <<< REDACTED >>>  
**City:** Mesa      **State:** AZ      **Zip Code:** 85201

---

**Company:** Unisource \*\* Energy Services (UNS)\*      **Division:** Electric

---

### Nature Of Opinion

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142      **Docket Position:** Against

7 opposed with same letter as follows:

Dear Arizona Corporation Commission,

Please reject UniSource Energy's proposal (Docket E-04204A-15-0142) to eliminate net metering and impose discriminatory demand charges on solar customers.

UniSource is attempting to make these changes retroactive to customers who installed distributed generation systems after June 1, 2015, punishing customers who made substantial investments over a year ago. The ACC must protect these customers, and ensure that future customers maintain their right to go solar without financial repercussions.

To date, no ACC-commissioned studies have indicated that net metering in Arizona is harmful to customers, and no convincing evidence has been presented by UniSource to indicate that net metering needs to change. States across the country have conducted studies that show net metering to be an equitable policy that provides substantial benefits to all ratepayers. Changing net metering without supporting evidence, and implementing rates that would make solar uneconomic, would be an enormous disservice to all UniSource customers.

UniSource Energy received such immense public opposition in response to their proposal for demand charges for all customers that they were forced to revert back to their original proposal to impose demand charges on solar customers only. Demand charges disproportionately impact customers while they are home with their families, cooking dinner, doing laundry, and enjoying the amenities they work hard for. In fact, demand charges more severely impact low energy users, like solar customers, who have made substantial investments to reduce their overall energy use while reducing costs for all ratepayers.

Please join the hundreds of Arizonans who have spoken out against UniSource's discriminatory, unsubstantiated, and unfair proposal and please reject UniSource's obvious attempt to overcharge solar customers and stifle solar growth and innovation in Arizona.

E-04204A-15-0142

**Arizona Corporation Commission  
Utilities Complaint Form**

Signed:

James Atwood      Reid Lowery

Cynthia Sanden      Lois Ramias

Glen Dotson      Kathy Burlingame

Freda Cunningham

---

<b>Investigation</b>			
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Submitted By:</b>	<b>Type:</b>
7/27/2016	Roxanne Best	Email	Investigation

Comments noted for record and docketed. Closed.

---

E-04204A-15-0142

**Arizona Corporation Commission  
Utilities Complaint Form**

---

**Investigator:** Roxanne Best      **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>>      **Opinion Date:** 7/26/2016  
**Opinion Number:** 2016 - 133446      **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days  
**Opinion Codes:** Other - Net Metering      **Closed Date:** 7/26/2016 4:15 PM  
Rate Case Items - Demand/ Opposed

---

**First Name:** PETITION      **Last Name:** PETITION 10      **Account Name:** PETITION  
PETITION 10  
**Address:** <<< REDACTED >>>  
**City:** Phoenix      **State:** AZ      **Zip Code:** 85022

---

**Company:** Unisource \*\* Energy Services (UNS)\*      **Division:** Electric

---

**Nature Of Opinion**

**Docket Number:** E-04204A-15-0142      **Docket Position:** Against

10 opposed with same letter as follows:

Dear Arizona Corporation Commission,

Please reject UniSource Energy's proposal (Docket E-04204A-15-0142) to eliminate net metering and impose discriminatory demand charges on solar customers.

UniSource is attempting to make these changes retroactive to customers who installed distributed generation systems after June 1, 2015, punishing customers who made substantial investments over a year ago. The ACC must protect these customers, and ensure that future customers maintain their right to go solar without financial repercussions.

To date, no ACC-commissioned studies have indicated that net metering in Arizona is harmful to customers, and no convincing evidence has been presented by UniSource to indicate that net metering needs to change. States across the country have conducted studies that show net metering to be an equitable policy that provides substantial benefits to all ratepayers. Changing net metering without supporting evidence, and implementing rates that would make solar uneconomic, would be an enormous disservice to all UniSource customers.

UniSource Energy received such immense public opposition in response to their proposal for demand charges for all customers that they were forced to revert back to their original proposal to impose demand charges on solar customers only. Demand charges disproportionately impact customers while they are home with their families, cooking dinner, doing laundry, and enjoying the amenities they work hard for. In fact, demand charges more severely impact low energy users, like solar customers, who have made substantial investments to reduce their overall energy use while reducing costs for all ratepayers.

Please join the hundreds of Arizonans who have spoken out against UniSource's discriminatory, unsubstantiated, and unfair proposal and please reject UniSource's obvious attempt to overcharge solar customers and stifle solar growth and innovation in Arizona.

E-04204A-15-0142

**Arizona Corporation Commission  
Utilities Complaint Form**

Signed:

Angela Vertuccio	Joan Gessay
Carol Papalas	Kathy Navarro
Craig Spencer	Robert Mulhausen
James Gourlay	Stephen Taber
<b>Bess Walker</b>	<b>Michael Underwood</b>

---

<b>Date:</b>	<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Investigation</b>	<b>Submitted By:</b>	<b>Type:</b>
7/26/2016	Roxanne Best	Email		Investigation
Comments noted for record and docketed. Closed.				

---



**E-04204A-15-0142**

**Arizona Corporation Commission  
Utilities Complaint Form**

Signed:

Ann Cobban	Eric Goll
Ann Helms	Pedro Ampuero
Barbara Rice	Ron Rathnow
Allen Fogel	Donna Norris
Gerald Reed	Jeri ahrens

---

<b>Investigation</b>			
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Submitted By:</b>	<b>Type:</b>
7/22/2016	Roxanne Best	Email	Investigation

Comments noted for record and docketed. Closed.

---





## Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

Submitted by: 1. Larry Romo 2. Kenneth Kurtz 3. Marla Erhart 4. Martin Wagner 5. Jerald Unaitis 6. Raymond Millenbaugh 7. Claudia Huff 8. Irene Sumas 9. Margret Schreck 10. Jerry Millis 11. Jacqueline Legge 12. Michael Trimeloni 13. Robert Mark 14. Ellen Anderson 15. Deb Sandness 16. Richard Ott 17. Sue Hubenthal 18. Tammi Agosta 19. Julie Zemojtel 20. Marilyn Sieckmann 21. Nili Asarawala 22. John Riley 23. Hunter Bachrach 24. James Price 25. Stephen Newman 26. Dorothy Neddermeyer 27. Edna Roberts 28. Autum Perry-Sevilla 29. Patricia Nix 30. James Riedel 31. Judith Shaw 32. Daniel Ciskal 33. Ingrid Irwin 34. Carrie Gillon 35. Don King 36. Mary McGuirk 37. Barbara Manning 38. Jodette Wilmot 39. Kathy Sacks 40. Bonnie Tait 41. Matthew Gaspar 42. Ryan Cox 43. Karen Wagley 44. Jim Fiemann 45. Michael McMillan 46. Eric Jennings 47. Paula Fuhst 48. Nancy Spinelli 49. Louis Paff 50. Diana Ervin 51. Bonnie Meinhausen 52. Karl Ford 53. Thomas Cook 54. Jacqueline Whalen 55. Anna Dent 56. Donna Chisum 57. Katherine Kelling 58. James Jack 59. Ghia Griffin 60. Edna Kennedy 61. William Melichar 62. Teresa Brownyard 63. Mark Rogers 64. Cheryl Underwood 65. Margaret Ertl 66. Martinez Skinner 67. Mark Pikus 68. Alan McCarter 69. Mary Grayeske 70. Richard Whitehouse 71. Holly McLean-Aldis 72. Marshall Jones 73. Theresa Gerten 74. Phillip Schaffer 75. Diane Jones-Zakrajsek 76. Carl Kroop 77. May Matysik 78. Delores Stoesser 79. David Alvarado 80. Shirley Cupani 81. Louise Freshley 82. Tom McCarthy

---

<b>Investigation</b>			
<b>Date:</b>	<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Submitted By:</b>	<b>Type:</b>
7/28/2016	Mary Mee	Telephone	Investigation
Comments noted for the record and docketed. CLOSED			

---