



Fwd: solar "tax"

1 message

Ron Allen <rallen@utah.gov>
To: PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>

Tue, Jul 29, 2014 at 6:02 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Robert Birch** <birch@xmission.com>
Date: Mon, Jul 28, 2014 at 7:28 PM
Subject: solar "tax"
To: rallen@utah.gov

Dear Mr Allen,

Understand that I have never commented on any legislative issue nor on any PSC issue. This issue is important to me from a fairness point-of-view. For clarification, I am 73y/o and am a homeowner. I likely will not buy the solar panels and ty into the grid. I have read the comments of the RMP position, both proponents and opponents. So I likely would be paying the cost of solar homeowners to ty into the grid if such a cost arose. Consider the following:

1) It seems to me that it is inconsistent for RMP to give refunds for energy saving programs (LED lights, electrical appliances that are energy efficient, and even to fund solar projects with grants) and then ask for a monthly service fee to "continue" to have access to the grid. Perhaps, an analogous situation is to have Questar gas give refunds for homeowners to insulate their homes adequately and turn around and charge a tax for adequately insulated homes.

2) with the continued increase in population, the grid access will have to be increased. Allowing excess energy to be "refunded" by tying into the grid allows a decrease in the necessity to purchase power from external grid sources and (there are enough solar customers in the RMP area), allow RMP to sell the excess to customers, thereby allowing RMP to financially benefit from the increase in solar customers.

3) the philosophical position of having a utility encourage energy saving measures and then charge for those measures is inconsistent at best, and at worst, is irrational.

I cannot close without offering a solution.

The solution: my suggestion is that IF somehow solar customers tying into the grid becomes a financial burden *in the future*, THEN RMP ask for a special levied tax on solar owners. That makes more sense than basing a tax

on a “supposed” problem (based on one theoretical study).

I will be at the public hearing on Tuesday and hope to speak rationally without emotion.

Thank you for your consideration of these points.

Robert D. Birch

Sandy, Utah 84093

—

Ron Allen, Chairman
Utah Public Service Commission