



PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>

attn: NEM Docket 14-035-114

1 message

Nate Woodward <natwod@gmail.com>

Tue, Jan 27, 2015 at 4:20 PM

To: psc@utah.gov

Dear Commissioners,

Please consider the well-thought-out comments of so many others. You may not deem it the function of your position or the responsibility of Rocky Mountain Power to consider environmental, health, and other costs of discouraging solar and benefits of encouraging it, but those are realities nonetheless.

Even if those are ignored, it is crucial to a thorough study that all aspects of usage be considered, rather than just load comparisons. We need to know how much electricity NEM customers are generating throughout the day, and importantly, how much excess they are feeding onto the grid during each hour. If all we consider is load usage, it will give us a skewed and inaccurate picture of NEM customers' effect on the grid.

What's more, a large part of RMP's original claim is that carrying electricity from NEM customers to their neighbors causes increased wear-and-tear and maintenance on the grid's hardware, more than carrying electricity from the nearest substation. Have they dropped this claim, or is it still part of their argument? If it is, where is the study proving it? We need to have the technical conferences necessary to look at all aspects of this, not just the few RMP would have us look at.

I am confident that any comprehensive, unbiased, and thorough study of NEM customers effect on the grid (and external factors) will find no significant net cost to other customers, and will more likely find a net gain. Even if there somehow was a net cost, it would be pennies. RMP claims that this request is being made solely in fairness to other customers, and will result in net zero income for them. Any honest person examining that claim will seriously question its integrity. Virtually no general customers are clamoring for this fee, statistically no one is complaining about a hypothetical few cents that has not even been proven to be caused by NEM customers (despite RMP's attempt to twist customer feedback in a skewed and misleading survey). So why is RMP so doggedly and vehemently pursuing shifting this hypothetical cost of a few cents from general customers to a nearly \$5 fee for NEM customers? The answer is obvious, we just need to look at what they stand to lose if the fee is denied (since this is supposed to be income neutral). RMP and its parent companies (PacifiCorp and Berkshire Energy) are heavily invested in fossil fuel power generation. The logical answer is that they are trying to discourage growth of the solar NEM model, in favor of their traditional fossil fuel power income.

I can only hope that all 3 of you will be willing to see this in a fair-minded way and deal justly with all customers.

Thank you

Nate Woodward

West Jordan, UT