



PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>

Public Comment Regarding Hearing On Residential Rooftop Solar Customers Billing Docket 14-035-114

1 message

Robert Clayton <robert.clayton@comcast.net>
To: psc@utah.gov

Mon, Jul 31, 2017 at 10:10 PM

I'm writing in regards to the upcoming hearing on how Rocky Mountain Power bills their rooftop solar customers. I have been a Rocky Mountain Power customer for over 20 years. I have been happy with their service and rates in the past. I have been a rooftop solar customer for just over a year. I made the decision to invest in roof top solar after receiving regular mailings from Rocky Mountain Power on reducing my energy consumption and comparisons showing that I was using more energy than my comparable neighbors. I participated in a ceiling insulation and duct sealing program to reduce my energy consumption which I received a rebate check from Rocky Mountain Power to defray the costs. I also changed my lightbulbs to CFL bulbs using a Rocky Mountain Power provided lightbulb kit. These rebates and lightbulbs were subsidized by all Rocky Mountain Power customers. However I did not receive a rebate for subsidy from Rocky Mountain Power for my rooftop solar system. It was installed at my expenses with state and federal tax rebates.

The net metering concept is a Rocky Mountain Power specified concept. To get a permit from Rocky Mountain Power to install Rooftop Solar, I had to sign a contract with them, under their terms, before my installers could install the solar system. After installation, Rocky Mountain Power had to inspect the installation and install the new net meters before I was allowed to connect the rooftop solar to my homes power and subsequently, their grid. We choose not to install storage devices because we were helping Rocky Mountain Power by feeding unused power back into their network during peak power periods, saving them from having to buy additional power at higher rates. It was supposed to be a win-win situation for both of us.

Apparently, Rocky Mountain Power now feels that we are not paying our fair share in using their grid because their business model for paying for grid usage apparently is based on power consumption. Since I'm now conserving energy, the revenue is not coming from me anymore because I don't use the same amount of power as a non-solar customer. However, they fail to mention that I pay a minimum connection fee each month which is supposed to cover that cost. Shouldn't the business model be changed for all customers, not just solar customers, to account for grid costs without penalizing energy conservation. Also keep in mind, that I'm paying for grid usage when buying and selling power. Yes I bank power in the summer months but my credits end in March, a bonus for Rocky Mountain Power and loss for me. If we are going to change rates, maybe my excess power credits should carryover until expended instead of resetting to zero each year.

Rocky Mountain Power is also arguing that they have to buy the power from me at a higher rate than other distributors which now include organic wind and solar power farms. I don't understand that reasoning since it's a one for one exchange. Is what they really want is my excess power for free since they may have overextended in their development of wind and solar farms?

I as a consumer have no options at this point. I can add storage devices, but eventually will have to come back to the grid during long periods of inclement weather. The current agreement with Rocky Mountain Power is my solar system only powers my home if their grid is up. They require the connection to be wired as such that the solar system shuts down if their power grid fails. Because it cannot be wired like other emergency power devices, my solar system is not a viable emergency power system. It's kind of stupid that when the lights go out, my house has power but we can't use it. I understand the rationale to prevent accidental energizing of the grid while someone may be working on it, but can't we wire it to isolate the home from the grid like an emergency generator instead of isolating the solar system?

If we are truly getting our solar energy at the expense of other customers, then maybe changes should be made. Things like service charges for new net meters, or a grid fee that is applicable to all users. Targeting only solar customers is wrong, and with Rocky Mountain Power operating as a monopoly, gives us the consumers, few options in seeking other sources of power that would be available in normal supply and demand competition..

Please carefully review their proposal, disapprove those requests based on false or misleading information and poor business decisions made by Rocky Mountain Power. We as consumers are relying on you for a fair and equitable decision that benefits the consumer and Rocky Mountain Power.

Sincerely,

Bob Clayton
(801) 399-2557
robert.clayton@comcast.net



PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>

Public Comments on Docket No. 14-035-114 in opposition to proposed rate change

1 message

Dale Green (twodale@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Tue, Aug 1, 2017 at 10:29 AM

<automail@knowwho.com>

To: psc@utah.gov

Dear UT PSC,

Dear Utah Public Service Commission Chair LeVar, Commissioners Clark and White,

I strongly urge you to deny Rocky Mountain Power's request to impose punitive rates that would unfairly penalize Utah's rooftop solar customers.

Rooftop solar benefits all customers by reducing the need to build new polluting power plants, saving all customers money. Rooftop solar also protects our air and water by using clean, free sunshine as opposed to dirty fossil fuels. These benefits far outweigh the cost shifts alleged by Rocky Mountain Power, which at most amount to only a penny or two per month for average non-solar customers.

Utah should learn from neighboring states that have been down this road before. States where utilities succeeded in implementing similarly discriminatory rate designs like the one proposed by Rocky Mountain Power have suffered a near complete loss of rooftop solar development. This loss has meant less economic growth and fewer choices for customers. Rocky Mountain Power's plan to kill rooftop solar is the wrong path for Utah, a bad deal for customers, and hobbles Utah's vibrant solar industry.

Please reject Rocky Mountain Power's punitive rates for rooftop solar customers in favor of a rate structure that recognizes the enormous benefits that rooftop solar provides to all customers. Don't let Rocky Mountain Power's monopoly take away our rooftop solar!

cc: Cindy Crane, President and CEO, Rocky Mountain Power

Sincerely,

Dale Green
1683 N Sage Ln
Saratoga Springs, UT 84045
twodale@gmail.com
(801) 361-8785

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.



PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>

Public Comments on Docket No. 14-035-114 in opposition to proposed rate change

1 message

Lyndsey Anderson (lyndsey.fox@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message

Tue, Aug 1, 2017 at 10:51 AM

<automail@knowwho.com>

To: psc@utah.gov

Dear UT PSC,

Dear Utah Public Service Commission Chair LeVar, Commissioners Clark and White,

I strongly urge you to deny Rocky Mountain Power's request to impose punitive rates that would unfairly penalize Utah's rooftop solar customers.

Rooftop solar benefits all customers by reducing the need to build new polluting power plants, saving all customers money. Rooftop solar also protects our air and water by using clean, free sunshine as opposed to dirty fossil fuels. These benefits far outweigh the cost shifts alleged by Rocky Mountain Power, which at most amount to only a penny or two per month for average non-solar customers.

Utah should learn from neighboring states that have been down this road before. States where utilities succeeded in implementing similarly discriminatory rate designs like the one proposed by Rocky Mountain Power have suffered a near complete loss of rooftop solar development. This loss has meant less economic growth and fewer choices for customers. Rocky Mountain Power's plan to kill rooftop solar is the wrong path for Utah, a bad deal for customers, and hobbles Utah's vibrant solar industry.

Please reject Rocky Mountain Power's punitive rates for rooftop solar customers in favor of a rate structure that recognizes the enormous benefits that rooftop solar provides to all customers. Don't let Rocky Mountain Power's monopoly take away our rooftop solar!

cc: Cindy Crane, President and CEO, Rocky Mountain Power

Sincerely,

Lyndsey Anderson
187 R Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84103
lyndsey.fox@gmail.com
(928) 814-2268

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider only, on behalf of the individual noted in the sender information.



PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>

Docket 14-035-114 and "Here we go, again!"

1 message

Tom Newbery <newberythomasusafret@yahoo.com>
 Reply-To: Tom Newbery <newberythomasusafret@yahoo.com>
 To: "psc@utah.gov" <psc@utah.gov>

Tue, Aug 1, 2017 at 12:00 PM

RE: Docket 14-035-114

I've had a 5kW array installed on my home for almost a year, so I have a vested interest in the PSC's decision in this matter. My request is this - Make your decision apply equally across the board... for instance, if you allow Dominion to charge a monthly fee by the installed panel or kilowatt- generated to the grid, or for whatever the trumped up reason, EVERYONE owning solar panels hooked into the grid, e.g. person, corporation, church, legal entity, or state-owned entity should be charged the same amount/rate, NO EXCEPTIONS, even for Dominion and THEIR solar panel installations! That's "FAIR"!

In light of RMP's (Dominion's) recent rate increase request(s) for solar panel array grid-connected users, I find it interesting that the government effectively forced us to swap out our incandescents for CFL's by killing off production of the 60 watt incandescent bulb. How come Dominion (formerly Rocky Mountain Power) wasn't screaming bloody murder when that occurred? Gee, could that have been beneficial to the power companies? Ya think?

Then, we were (and still are) all encouraged to use LED technology. CFL's turned out to be a nightmare for disposal due to their mercury content and leds were more efficient, too. The outcry is, "SAVE ELECTRICITY, SAVE ELECTRICITY!" So we do our part and what.... we get stabbed in the back!

Now, some universities, area colleges, and even small businesses are installing/leasing solar panel arrays on their properties and bragging about it (saving "millions of dollars!"). (I count OWATC in Ogden as having installed approximately 3759 panels [see Google Earth] and at approx 250 watts [low-ball figure] per panel that's damned near a 1 Megawatt array! That's probably more generation capacity than all the private owners in Ogden and probably Weber County, combined!) Why wouldn't Dominion be up in arms concerning those installations, then? Surely their huge installations are more a threat to them than us lil' ol' peon homeowners with our humongous (18 panels [5 kW in my case) arrays! If the rates proposed by Dominion are approved, then those businesses and "small systems" should be "penalized" in the same manner using the same rate structure(s) as we common folk. Nine bucks per kilowat/hour, indeed! It's all about the money and killing off the competition, and nothing else. Look at what happened in Nevada!

In my opinion, solar panel array users and large array owners are reducing the over-loading of high-tension lines, the burning of coal and natural gas and the use of precious water resources by hydro-electric generation, thus extending their service lives, especially in the summer time when air conditioning is at it's peak in the daytime! Well, that's when solar panels are at their peak of generation! So what's the problem! We owners do still get nicked with a "base fee" and all those little taxes/fees appended to our bill.

If I had my d'ruthers, I'd buy a bank of Nickel-Iron batteries and cut the cord.... oh, but that's illegal, isn't it, thanks to our "legislators"? I still may do it.... (on a side note, some electric companies are using arrays of used electric car batteries to store their solar-generated electricity to be later used in the dark times!)

And then there are the acres and acres of solar panels now being installed by the power companies themselves, all over the place, and I'll just bet they'll charge a premium price for "green" power! Kinda like the "Blue Skies" program... come on, if anything is intermittent, it's wind generation! And solar power isn't intermittent? If Solar power is such a bad thing, how come the electric power companies are piling on, too. They want total control!

The PSC, in exchange for Dominion's monopoly and a guaranteed rate of return to it, is supposed to hold Dominion in check, so the company does not screw the consumer! Something else that has always stuck in my craw.... why do the large consumers of Dominion's power get a price break on their electricity rates? And how about those large businesses who choose to go solar.... Shouldn't they be hit with the same new solar panel penalties/rates if approved by the PSC? If not, why not? How do (would) the PSC and the electricity producer(s) justify their priviledged rate structure?

How come if we use in excess of xxx number of kW hours we get charged more? It costs the same to produce those kilowatt hours! What the heck is the reason for "summer" blocks vs "winter" blocks. Oh, it's a chance for more money!

8/1/2017

State of Utah Mail - Docket 14-035-114 and "Here we go, again!"

Signature: F16/SPAMCAN



PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>

Docket 14-035-114

1 message

Ken Jameson <kpjameson@gmail.com>
To: "psc@utah.gov" <psc@utah.gov>

Tue, Aug 1, 2017 at 4:15 PM

I write "not to bury Rocky Mountain Power, but to praise the Public Service Commission."

RMP is doing fine, overearning and in no way threatened by the 9800 rooftop solar customers in 2016, perhaps 1% of their total customers. Their seeming alarm, which occasioned their 2014 surcharge request and their punitive rate proposals of November, 2016 and July, 2017, is far overblown. They have already protected their position, since the uncertainty their proposals caused has greatly slowed the growth of the solar industry in the state. One important solar company indicated that this year it had laid off 20 percent of its personnel as a result.

And as shown in the technical testimony, the company has been unable to make a convincing case that the current NEM system does not allow them to cover their cost of service to those customers. Their assertions to the contrary are based on a 36 installation sample, which is described as "stale" at best, and scientifically flawed at worst. And even then their results rely on treating "bill credits" as a cost, which is incorrect in a cost benefit study, as several intervenors have noted. And they have not dealt with the result of their own IRP that indicates Distributed Generation can reduce the Present Value of Required Revenues by hundreds of millions of dollars, i.e. lowering the customer charges needed for them to attain their rate of return.

So I urge the Commission to reject RMP's rate proposal out of hand.

I come now to my praise of the PSC. Since the initial proposal by RMP, you have proceeded in a sensitive and careful manner to address the concerns of all involved parties. You were certainly correct in rejecting the initial RMP proposal and then in requiring the cost benefit study as a basis for further rate proposals. It is unfortunate that the study was so inadequate, but there is always a learning process; and you have contributed to it.

After rejecting the RMP rate proposal, I encourage you to continue in this role and to initiate a process that will allow extensive data collection on DG and non-DG customers and thereby on the real cost of service. We live in a time of "big data," and a sample of 36 looks ludicrous in that context. Any movement away from monthly net metering will require different metering, and new DG and non-DG customers can be the basis for compiling the type of data needed for careful analysis.

I also encourage you to start an education effort, perhaps through the DPU and OCS, on our changing electricity industry where, over time, we are likely to move to a time-of-use rate system and where RMP, like its Berkshire-Hathaway parent, will be primarily in the distribution business. For example, I had asked about the peak load at my substation, and was told that I had no access to this information. So how can I adjust my behavior to aid the system without such information? Another contribution you could make would be to sponsor legislation that would allow specific inclusion of externalities, such as environmental effects, in these proceedings.

In summary, I hope that the PSC continues in its careful, deliberative mode, requiring much more information before it accedes to any of RMP's requests. The end result will be a better electric system for all of the citizens of Utah.

Sincerely,
Kenneth P. Jameson
1801 S 2600 E
Salt Lake City, Utah