



---

## solar panel fees - fair, sort of

1 message

---

**Mike Duncan** <mikeduncan@citlink.net>

Thu, Aug 7, 2014 at 12:31 PM

To: psc@utah.gov

Dear Public Service Commission,

Please add my comments to the pile.

I'm a retired electronics engineer who installed my own panels and appreciate the fact that RMP power is there 24/7 whereas solar panels aren't, so I have some sympathy for RMP's argument.

I went through the bills and math for my smallish 2.5 kW system over the last 15 months and found that to cover RMP's 27%-of-total fixed cost, my sporadic exported power (and re-imported in subsequent months - like most people, I don't run an annual surplus) should be assessed about \$6/mo at 9 cents/kWh.

So I can live with their proposal, but note a few qualifications that make me a little testy about it:

- All RMP users are already assessed a \$5/mo "basic" and \$2/mo "minimum" fee, quite obviously going towards fixed costs. Why then another \$5 fee?
- There is in fact an argument that encouraging (subsidizing, to some extent) renewable energy is a worthwhile societal goal. So many examples, and good reasons why.
- Rather than assessing big and little users with a flat fee, they should compute a monthly "cover fixed expenses" fee (monthly exported power x retail price x fraction assigned to fixed costs). This will keep the little guy from being penalized.
- Solar installations could be pointed SW which will improve their output 4-7 PM in the summer. Should these installations be assessed the same amount? I think not.
- Since large amounts of renewable energy will require new energy storage facilities (gas-turbine generation, pumpback systems, etc), RMP should apply for revenue to cover these investments separately.

Best,  
Mike Duncan  
579 Rosetree  
Moab, Utah 84532  
[435.259.0246](tel:435.259.0246)