



PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>

Docket #14-035-114

1 message

Carolyn Chase <carolyn.r.chase@gmail.com>

Thu, Aug 17, 2017 at 6:43 PM

To: psc@utah.gov

Dear Commission,

Particularly given a mandate to have renewable energy be a large portion of their source, it strikes me as unreasonable of Rocky Mountain to penalize customers who, at their own expense, install solar panels and contribute to the grid. I feel strongly that they should not add any additional fees. From the testimony I heard prior to needing to leave a lot of the studies are suspect, and don't accurately reflect the costs or benefits to Rocky Mountain. There seems to be a conflict of interest in the manner they were done. Obviously there are some costs to participating in the grid, but these should already be accommodated by what is already being charged.

Given the larger picture of the goal of reduction of pollution in the Salt Lake Valley, and the effect of reduction of use of fossil fuels in general, such as emissions from vehicles, Rocky Mountain's position seems even less attractive and short sighted. Given the detrimental effect to the employment in solar that their penalties would have, it also seems less than helpful for the area in general in terms of the economy.

It also seems as though there is a very targeted group, Solar users, that has been targeted, and the studies don't look at the whole picture. Until a lot more equitable evaluation of the whole situation has been done, It doesn't seem reasonable to grant Rocky Mountain Power their request.

Thanks,
Carolyn

https://www.sendoutcards.com/cares_cards



PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>

Docket #14-035-114 Commen

1 message

Monica Kohler <2monicakohler@gmail.com>
To: psc@utah.gov, ucare@xmission.com

Fri, Aug 18, 2017 at 7:36 AM

Dear Public Service Commission,

After more thought concerning the request for increased net metering fees by PacifiCorp, I would like to add this comment:

The underlying problem with this proposal is that it disproportionately favors larger energy vendors over individual vendors. When individuals sell their excess power, they are not customers, they are now vendors, and PacifiCorp does not require larger vendors to pay them for the ability to sell their energy. This is antithetical to the concept of free market, or fair market economics.

Regardless of whether PacifiCorp is buying energy from coal, natural gas, or from vendors that are solely providing renewable energies, the requirement for small vendors to pay, what amounts to a kickback, to sell in the energy marketplace will diminish free market competition for other energy companies to emerge or for other forms of energy to be used by individual vendors beyond solar.

At this point, the Public Service Commission should carefully consider whether individual energy providers, or groups of providers, should be disadvantaged in the marketplace based on the amount of energy they are able to sell to PacifiCorp, or whether all energy producers should be treated equally. Given that these individual vendors are also customers, they should be treated no differently as any non-energy producing customer when they are not selling energy. There should be no differentiation between the treatment of customers as a class, and no differentiation between the treatment of energy producers as a class.

Thank you,

Monica Kohler - 84116