

Commissioners  
Thad LeVar, Chair  
David Clark  
Jordan A. White

Heber M. Wells Building  
160 East 300 South  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Gentlemen,

15 Nov 2016

I have recently read a report in The Salt Lake Tribune about a rate change request for solar household customers. Although the concept is complicated and not entirely comprehensible by the normal electrical user, the reported sought rate change seems excessive and not logical. These comments are concerning that request as reported.

1. The charge that Rocky Mountain Power considers that the net-metering customer (solar owner) receives "a \$400 yearly subsidy" does not seem logical.

Solar owners deliver their generated energy directly to the Rocky Mountain power grid. The solar owner provides the system to do this at the time of installation of their solar system. Rocky Mountain power is in fact buying from *another* provider who just happens to be smaller than other providers – and closer to the end user. Solar owners should not be charged additionally to transmit (transfer really) their solar generated energy to Rocky Mountain's grid/customers.

The solar owner does not need extensive transmission lines with attendant rights-of-way, maintenance, transformers, or any of the other specialized necessary infrastructure required of distance AC electrical transmission.

I doubt that other energy suppliers to Rocky Mountain Power pay for infrastructure costs that Rocky Mountain Power wants to charge solar owners.

When Solar Owners *use* Rocky Mountain power, then they pay rates reflecting the cost of using Rocky Mountain's infrastructure just like everyone else. When they "*sell*" power to Rocky Mountain Power, they should not pay infrastructure fees. The statement that solar owners receive "a \$400 yearly subsidy" appears not to be true.

2. The proposed \$60 application fee for solar users: Currently there is considerable lag in the approval process – mostly by local city officials and Rocky Mountain Power. To charge the user with a fee for a lengthy and inefficient process over which we have no control is onerous. The \$60 application fee for solar customers is excessive. We shouldn't be burdened with inflated costs of an inefficient approval system. Treat it like any other construction approval.
3. The Rocky Mountain power plan to grandfather the old rate to current solar customers is to be commended. I chose solar power not only because of environmental logic but also for its long term dollar benefit. I have already made the investment although the project is not complete and may not be at the time of your hearing decision. As my investment was made considering current rate regulations then it should qualify for grandfathering. Grandfather into the old rate on terms of purchase commitment not terms of completion.

Thank you for your time and consideration.



David F. Johnson



Commissioners  
Thad LeVar, Chair  
David Clark  
Jordan A. White

Heber M. Wells Building  
160 East 300 South  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Gentlemen,

15 Nov 2016

I have recently read a report in The Salt Lake Tribune about a rate change request for solar household customers. Although the concept is complicated and not entirely comprehensible by the normal electrical user, the reported sought rate change seems excessive and not logical. These comments are concerning that request as reported.

1. The charge that Rocky Mountain Power considers that the net-metering customer (solar owner) receives "a \$400 yearly subsidy" does not seem logical.

Solar owners deliver their generated energy directly to the Rocky Mountain power grid. The solar owner provides the system to do this at the time of installation of their solar system. Rocky Mountain power is in fact buying from *another* provider who just happens to be smaller than other providers – and closer to the end user. Solar owners should not be charged additionally to transmit (transfer really) their solar generated energy to Rocky Mountain's grid/customers.

The solar owner does not need extensive transmission lines with attendant rights-of-way, maintenance, transformers, or any of the other specialized necessary infrastructure required of distance AC electrical transmission.

I doubt that other energy suppliers to Rocky Mountain Power pay for infrastructure costs that Rocky Mountain Power wants to charge solar owners.

When Solar Owners *use* Rocky Mountain power, then they pay rates reflecting the cost of using Rocky Mountain's infrastructure just like everyone else. When they "*sell*" power to Rocky Mountain Power, they should not pay infrastructure fees. The statement that solar owners receive "a \$400 yearly subsidy" appears not to be true.

2. The proposed \$60 application fee for solar users: Currently there is considerable lag in the approval process – mostly by local city officials and Rocky Mountain Power. To charge the user with a fee for a lengthy and inefficient process over which we have no control is onerous. The \$60 application fee for solar customers is excessive. We shouldn't be burdened with inflated costs of an inefficient approval system. Treat it like any other construction approval.
3. The Rocky Mountain power plan to grandfather the old rate to current solar customers is to be commended. I chose solar power not only because of environmental logic but also for its long term dollar benefit. I have already made the investment although the project is not complete and may not be at the time of your hearing decision. As my investment was made considering current rate regulations then it should qualify for grandfathering. Grandfather into the old rate on terms of purchase commitment not terms of completion.

Thank you for your time and consideration.



David F. Johnson



Commissioners  
Thad LeVar, Chair  
David Clark  
Jordan A. White

Heber M. Wells Building  
160 East 300 South  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Gentlemen,

15 Nov 2016

I have recently read a report in The Salt Lake Tribune about a rate change request for solar household customers. Although the concept is complicated and not entirely comprehensible by the normal electrical user, the reported sought rate change seems excessive and not logical. These comments are concerning that request as reported.

1. The charge that Rocky Mountain Power considers that the net-metering customer (solar owner) receives “a \$400 yearly subsidy” does not seem logical.

Solar owners deliver their generated energy directly to the Rocky Mountain power grid. The solar owner provides the system to do this at the time of installation of their solar system. Rocky Mountain power is in fact buying from *another* provider who just happens to be smaller than other providers – and closer to the end user. Solar owners should not be charged additionally to transmit (transfer really) their solar generated energy to Rocky Mountain’s grid/customers.

The solar owner does not need extensive transmission lines with attendant rights-of-way, maintenance, transformers, or any of the other specialized necessary infrastructure required of distance AC electrical transmission.

I doubt that other energy suppliers to Rocky Mountain Power pay for infrastructure costs that Rocky Mountain Power wants to charge solar owners.

When Solar Owners *use* Rocky Mountain power, then they pay rates reflecting the cost of using Rocky Mountain’s infrastructure just like everyone else. When they “*sell*” power to Rocky Mountain Power, they should not pay infrastructure fees. The statement that solar owners receive “a \$400 yearly subsidy” appears not to be true.

2. The proposed \$60 application fee for solar users: Currently there is considerable lag in the approval process – mostly by local city officials and Rocky Mountain Power. To charge the user with a fee for a lengthy and inefficient process over which we have no control is onerous. The \$60 application fee for solar customers is excessive. We shouldn’t be burdened with inflated costs of an inefficient approval system. Treat it like any other construction approval.
3. The Rocky Mountain power plan to grandfather the old rate to current solar customers is to be commended. I chose solar power not only because of environmental logic but also for its long term dollar benefit. I have already made the investment although the project is not complete and may not be at the time of your hearing decision. As my investment was made considering current rate regulations then it should qualify for grandfathering. Grandfather into the old rate on terms of purchase commitment not terms of completion.

Thank you for your time and consideration.



David F. Johnson



David F Johnson