



PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>

## Rocky Mountain Power

1 message

**Kathleen Oswald** <KathleenOswald@comcast.net>  
To: psc@utah.gov

Tue, Sep 19, 2017 at 9:15 AM

I was reading the article in the Tribune this morning in regard to the agreement between Rocky Mountain Power, and the solar industry.

I've had numerous phone calls from companies wanting to install solar on the roof of my home in the last few months. My husband and I had installed solar on our house in Simi Valley over 30 years ago. At that time it did lower our electric

bill. It also gave the power company a return on my investment. One of the reasons that we have not put in solar here is the fact that from what I've read, and heard in regard to Rocky Mountain Power they have not been as magnanimous

in regard to the return to the people who have installed solar, and to their customers. The cost to me as a retired person would be a burden for whatever remainder of years I have in this home.

I would caution this commission to take a long hard look at Rocky Mountain Powers insistence that this agreement go through, and what actual benefit goes to me as a consumer. I do not want to see my electric bill go up due to the fact that

Rocky Mountain Power made this agreement, and wants to pass on the cost to me the consumer and customer. Any business looks at absorbing costs for improvements, and what is rational to pass on to their customers, but just passing it

on because they do not want to absorb the cost in detrimental to me as a customer.

This state is notorious for allowing businesses to get tax credits for coming here, and then allowing the business to have write offs. Please look at this objectively - and do not pass a huge increase on to me as a consumer.

Kathleen A. Oswald



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)



PublicService Commission &lt;psc@utah.gov&gt;

---

## Docket #14-035-114 comments

1 message

---

**Bill Hanewinkel** <bhanewin@comcast.net>  
To: psc@utah.gov  
Cc: Barbara Brown <barbara.brown@fcs.utah.edu>

Tue, Sep 19, 2017 at 10:21 AM

Dear Commissioners,

Please accept my comments regarding Docket #14-035-114. Our family is a RMP net metered customer with an array of solar voltaic generators on our roof.

Just in the past month, a new proposal has come about between solar advocates and RMP. These were presented yesterday, Monday, Sept. 18th. My comments are working from three Salt Lake Tribune news articles, one published this morning and the other two published Aug. 29th and Sept. 11th. I acknowledge the difficult work on all sides to get an agreeable proposal at all.

While negotiations between sides has been going on for +9 months, the real negotiating only seems to have gone on for 30 calendar days under pressure to get something agreed upon. I have real concerns about this proposal.

I believe it is important to preserve rooftop solar and a distributed power model. I also believe that rooftop solar has real value to RMP, that it is not a subsidy, and has true monetary as well as environmental value. Although the environment has not been allowed in this conversation, RMP was certainly glad that EPA clean energy rules were being fought by the State of Utah via lawsuit, wherein hundreds of millions of dollars are at stake versus cleaner air at their Hunter and Huntington power plants.

The stipulating proposal seems to do the following.

-agrees that Rooftop solar has been subsidized by RMP customers by the admittance that RMP will charge non-solar customers an additional cost. *I don't agree with this and it puts an onus on rooftop solar customers that we are somehow harming everyone else in the customer base by going along with this proposal.*

-that on the one hand rooftop solar has no value and on the other hand RMP provides unused energy credits to low-income customers. I am not opposed to this contribution. However, this is something that I have not heard before. Are these credits correctly audited for that purpose? Does RMP get an additional charity tax deduction for this activity? Are these credits one-for-one or are there cost stipulations for peak period, using more power than base tariff cost, etc.?

-there is no recognition that RMP gets a sweetheart deal not having to invest in rooftop solar initial cost. Net metering customers have generated significant cost savings to RMP customers by incurring the initial cost of bringing thousands of small power plants on line that benefit all including our immediate neighbors on hot summer days. This is a local benefit as opposed to the cost and inefficiency of bringing electric power generated hundreds of miles away.

My final thoughts are that RMP has raised this whole issue as an emergency that somehow needs to be settled very soon. It is not an emergency. RMP is profitable and electric power delivery is reliable. Please take the time required to assess this negotiated proposal and consider that it is a starting point rather than an end all.

Thank you for considering my thoughts.

Sincerely,

Bill Hanewinkel  
1332 Dover Road  
Salt Lake City, UT 84108  
[801.897.5241](tel:801.897.5241)



PublicService Commission &lt;psc@utah.gov&gt;

---

## Solar Power

1 message

---

**Gene** <geneoakes@msn.com>  
To: "psc@utah.gov" <psc@utah.gov>

Sat, Oct 7, 2017 at 10:34 AM

I invested in rooftop solar panels at my home 1 year ago. It is the best feeling to be independent and doing something real to help the environment. The spirit of self-reliance is synonymous with Utah. We should have the opportunity to use the energy I produce on my roof within my own home and not be penalized for it.

Please continue to support solar energy at the homeowner level. It is good for everyone. Don't let the giant power company put an end to so much good.

*Gene Oakes*

Centerville, UT