



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment**

1 message

**Sutorius, Michael** <MSutorius@wescodist.com>

Thu, Nov 17, 2016 at 5:05 PM

To: "psc@utah.gov" &lt;psc@utah.gov&gt;

Dear Commissioners –

I am contacting you in unequivocal opposition to PacifiCorp-RMP's "Advice No. 16-13", filed Nov 9, 2016, that is seeking to dramatically change the rate structure for rooftop solar customers. This action alone would effectively squash this environmentally-necessary industry in Utah.

The fees are among the highest proposed by any utility around the nation on rooftop solar customers. The company that I work for has a presence across the country with many, many major markets. These fees are only in the interest of PacifiCorp's bottom line.

The solar industry provides almost 4000 jobs in the state and hundreds of millions of dollars in economic activity. All of which will be negatively affected if these fees are put into place. You only have to look toward Nevada to see the effect. Their commission imposed outrageous fees on owners and overnight thousands of solar industry jobs were lost. My personal job, the jobs of hundreds of those that I work with, and the ability to support and raise our families are directly affected by this decision.

Utah prides itself as an economic development state, an environmentally responsible state, and one that cares about the livelihood of its citizens. If these fees are imposed one of the fastest growing industries in the state will be greatly harmed.

Your prudent involvement on this issue is critical. Thank you for your time.

**Mike Sutorius**, Branch Manager[msutorius@wesco.com](mailto:msutorius@wesco.com)

Phone: 801-975-0600 Cell: 385-313-2853

---

**WESCO Distribution, Inc.**

3210 South 900 West, Salt Lake City, UT 84121

---

The information contained in and transmitted with this electronic message is intended only for the recipient(s) designated above, it is protected by law and it may contain information which is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution,

copying or use of this message is unauthorized and strictly prohibited.





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

---

**DOCKET #16-035-T14 PUBLIC COMMENT**

1 message

---

**Julie DeLong** <JulieDeLong522@hotmail.com>

Thu, Nov 17, 2016 at 5:12 PM

To: "psc@utah.gov" &lt;psc@utah.gov&gt;

Commissioners,

We installed 16 solar panels on our house in Sandy in 2013 at a cost of about \$14,000 after incentives. We never expected that our personal decision (and economic investment!) to help the local environment would result in an unfair rate increase on us who are among those doing the most to benefit the greater good. The panels will eventually pay for themselves and we, as do thousands of others with solar panels, don't deserve increased electric rates.

**Solar power has many benefits:**

1. Rooftop solar saves money for the households and businesses that install it
2. The generated power is consumed in the neighborhood
3. Increased resiliency in the event of power outages
4. LESS POLLUTION in our frequently polluted valley:
  - A. Less significant health hazards for children and the elderly
  - B. New businesses will be attracted to Utah
5. **Creates more Jobs in a new clean energy industry**

Julie and Jeff DeLong

8539 S. Sugarloaf Lane

Sandy, UT 84093



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment**

1 message

**Rodney Dueck** <rrdueck@gmail.com>

Thu, Nov 17, 2016 at 5:31 PM

To: psc@utah.gov

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to PacifiCorp-RMP's "Advice No. 16-13", filed November 9, 2016 that would change the rate structure for rooftop solar customers. I urge the PSC to deny the utility's request and require it to use the normal rate-making process for its proposed changes. The sudden need RMP is suggesting for quick action is not justified by anything other than a disingenuous strategy to avoid accountability. This is not the first time they have engaged in such behavior

My standing in this situation: I invested \$44,518 at the end of 2015 installing home roof top solar. I also leased an all electric Nissan Leaf and use solar to power that vehicle. Why? After careful study of the science I decided that global climate change is the single most serious threat to the human race. And its not just me. This is a widely held view that is based on legitimate science. I consider it my duty and commitment to future generations to avoid as much as possible contributing to the problem. I have a friend getting an advanced degree in atmospheric physics who along with me believes in the laws of chemistry and physics. Those who are willing to live in a fact based world recognize the urgency.

Given current and expected rate increases my hope/expectation is to break even in about 10-12 years. Although I am not doing this for economic reasons I do not believe I should have to be penalized for doing the right thing. What is galling about this is that if you approve their actions I will be forced to pay additional money to reward irresponsible corporate greed. They are not entitled to have their profits protected from innovation, business risk or the reality of climate change.

During my first year I will pay \$107.92 for basic fees plus about \$140 for additional electricity in the summer plus the confiscation of 350 KWh last March. Furthermore they collect my excess production during peak hours and sell it for full price while providing partial payback by providing electricity to me at night when the demand is at minimum. Keep in mind, they sell my contributed electricity without fuel or long distance transmission costs during peak hours. In a fair trade it is possible they should be paying me, not the reverse.

I estimate that for the first year they will gain at least \$285 in cash plus their gain on the trade of electrical power every day. I ask you to look into the economic benefit of this day to night trade in electricity and the size of the benefit to them. I would not be surprised if state wide it is huge. In addition to the daily savings they can use old power plants longer and delay additional plant construction.

I understand the fossil fuel industry's desire to milk their cash cow as long as possible but it is not my responsibility and nor is it the PUC's to coddle their amoral greed and monopolistic impulses. The world is changing and this involves business risk. They have no right to repress the legitimate impulse to save our atmosphere and life on earth from the worst effects of human activity.

So I sincerely ask you to deny their "under the cover of election news gambit". Use the normal process for evaluating their requests / demands. Justice calls out for the light of day .

Thank you for your consideration

Rodney Dueck MD





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

## Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment

1 message

**Todd Sangster** <sangsterta@gmail.com>

Thu, Nov 17, 2016 at 5:54 PM

To: psc@utah.gov

Cc: jessica.c.s.brown@gmail.com

Dear Commissioners -

We are writing to oppose PacificCorp - Rocky Mountain Power's ("RMP") "Advice No 16-13", filed Nov 9, 2016. We are current net metering customers of RMP and would therefore be grandfathered into the current schedule. However whether this grandfathering is permanent is unclear from RMP's filing; similarly, it is not clear whether we would still be grandfathered if we chose to expand our solar array. Therefore, we feel that we may be personally impacted by the proposed changes.

While the time given for public comment is too short for a full review of RMP's filing, we have the following specific objections:

1. **It is unclear whether the proposed demand charge is based on total demand or net demand.** If based on total demand over a 1 hour window the charge is clearly not just and reasonable - a customer could exactly match generation and demand and still be hit with the demand charge while imposing no costs on the grid. If based on net demand, we would ask that RMP replace "demand" throughout its proposal with "net demand".
2. **It is unclear why the proposed rate schedule should apply only to net metering customers.** Assuming that we accept RMP's cost allocations, it seems only just and reasonable that the same rate schedule should apply to all residential customers. This is not the case under RMP's proposal. For instance, why should the fixed monthly charge for net metering customers be \$15 while the basic fixed charge for other customers is \$6? It seems unreasonable that a customer who switches to net metering should immediately increase their fixed costs to the system by 150%. Another hypothetical illustrates this problem: imagine a customer signs up for net metering but does not activate their solar array. A truly just and reasonable schedule would have this customer's bill be unchanged given that their demand and generation (zero) would both be unchanged.
3. **RMP's calculations exclude financial benefits it gains from net metering.** Our current solar array generates more power than we use - we export an average excess of 130kWh per month to RMP. RMP gives us credits for the excess power; however, these credits expire unused and therefore cost RMP nothing. However, RMP is free to sell the excess power we generate. We cannot find where the financial benefit of selling this excess power is included in RMP's calculations.
4. **The study RMP relies on is flawed.** While we have not had time to completely review the data RMP presents, Figures 2 and 3 in the testimony of Joelle Steward reveal flaws in the study. These figures compare the load profiles of net metering customers with other residential customers. It is clear that this is a comparison of apples and oranges - the average power used by the net metering customers is higher than that used by other customers. We would hypothesize that net metering customers are on average wealthier and have larger homes. RMP uses this flawed comparison to allocate higher costs to the net metering customers, artificially inflating the charges on the proposed schedule. A properly controlled comparison would examine the average change in the load profile of individual net metering customers before and after net metering was activated.
5. **RMP's proposal results in adverse incentives which may undermine its objectives.** Were we subject to the proposed rate schedule, we believe that it would be favorable for us to install battery storage and disconnect from the grid. RMP's costs would be little affected - it would still have to maintain the same distribution system, power plants, etc - but those costs would be spread among one fewer customer. RMP would also lose the financial benefit of the excess energy we send to the grid; this energy would instead be wasted. Should other net metering customers make the same choice (as we would advocate, given the rapidly decreasing cost of storage), RMP's rate base would be hollowed out while its cost structure would be maintained, shifting even more costs than today

onto non-solar customers. Other net metering customers who do not generate sufficient power to fully meet their needs may find it advantageous to disconnect from the grid and use their own generator, with negative consequences for energy efficiency and air quality.

A full review of RMP's proposal would presumably reveal additional flaws.

In sum, we humbly request that the Commission deny RMP's request to use a fast-track process and require it to use the normal rate-setting process for its changes. We hope that RMP will return with a true just and reasonable allocation of costs and reassess its investments and business model in light of the rapidly changing marketplace for electrical service.

Sincerely,

Todd A. Sangster  
Jessica C. S. Brown  
Salt Lake City



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment**

1 message

---

**Steve MacKenzie** <steve@mackenzi.org>

Thu, Nov 17, 2016 at 5:54 PM

To: psc@utah.gov

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to voice my opposition to PacifiCorp-RMP's "Advice No. 16-13, filed Nov 9, 2016, which would change the rate structure for rooftop solar customers. I request that the PSC deny the utility's fast-track request and require use of the normal rate-making process for any proposed changes.

The effect of this rate change would be to discourage the installation of additional residential solar generation systems, which, in my opinion, is the wrong thing to do. Residential solar generation helps us, as a nation, move away from non-renewable resources toward clean, renewable power

Rocky Mountain Power (RMP) claims that solar customers are not paying their fair share of infrastructure costs, and that these costs are being shifted to non-solar customers. RMP's cost model does not address all relevant factors. If those factors are considered, it most likely will find that residential rooftop solar implementation decreases infrastructure cost - excess solar produced electricity is likely consumed in the neighborhood by local non-solar customers, thus transport infrastructure needs are reduced. Local rooftop solar production reduces the need for building more power plants to meet peak need, thus reducing long term capital costs, as well as the cost of fuel.

An even more important effect of this request, and the likely decrease of solar power generation if granted, is the impact on the environment. Global warming due to the use of non-renewable fossil fuels is real, and this request and underlying strategy is going in the wrong direction. Utah is geographically ideal for solar generation. We should think globally, and act locally to encourage widespread implementation of locally generated solar power.

The "cost of power" is not only the costs RMP incurs in generating, transporting, and delivering power. Those costs are relatively easy to determine, but should not be the only factor in the decision on how rates are set and how RMP satisfies needs. Other major costs, less easily determined, is the effect of using non-renewables such as coal and oil on the environment and public health, not to mention the depletion of limited resources.

Thank you for accepting and considering public input on this request, however the deadline for response should be extended. This fast-track process looks like RMP is trying to pull a "fast one" on the Utah public. Certainly RMP spent a lot more time preparing this request than the 13 days allowed for response. I respectfully request that the PSC, in the interest of rate payers and the Utah public, to reject PacifiCorp-RMP's current rate change request.

Sincerely,

Steve MacKenzie  
Ivins, Utah  
[steve@mackenzi.org](mailto:steve@mackenzi.org)



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14**

1 message

---

**Alan Baggaley** <lococuendo@gmail.com>

Thu, Nov 17, 2016 at 6:01 PM

To: PSC@utah.gov

I purchased a solar system over the summer with the goal of being responsible to help out with the need to use sustainable energy. This has been a big priority to me my whole life. When I heard that Rocky Mountain Power was trying to make solar unattractive by charging outrageous fees, I was shocked. Burning coal and natural gas will keep us going for many years, not not forever We have NO choice but to start transitioning to wiser, renewable energy sources. If Rocky Mountain Power is struggling, they should increase the rates for those not otherwise contributing to the grid rather than punishing those of us who have sacrificed to get a responsible rooftop system that DECREASES the need to burn coal and natural gas. I recommend that RMP start really investing in the future themselves instead of promoting a business model of insustainability and pollution.

Thank you for letting me make my voice heard.

Alan Baggaley



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment**

1 message

**CClark** <dr\_carolyn@yahoo.com>

Thu, Nov 17, 2016 at 6:46 PM

Reply-To: CClark &lt;dr\_carolyn@yahoo.com&gt;

To: "psc@utah.gov" &lt;psc@utah.gov&gt;

I tried submitting my comments before, but I think I used the wrong subject line. Just to be sure, I am re-sending. Thanks.

Dear Commissioners:

I would like to state that I oppose Advice # 16-035-T14, which was filed Nov 9, 2016 by PacifiCorp-Rocky Mountain Power regarding changing the rate structure for rooftop solar customers. Please do not grant fast-track decision making on this item. It is only fair to follow the normal rate-making process. Also please extend the public comment period beyond November 22.

It is inequitable to allow a fast-track process, especially when the rates of so many customers are at stake. There is no reason that this item has to be rushed, unless the utility wants to prevent evidence from being heard. A rush decision shortcuts the democratic process and should not be condoned in our great state of Utah. Circumventing the established process would create a black mark on our record. If there is to be a rate hike, it needs to be thoughtfully considered during a normal timetable. Besides, a decision that is railroaded through would leave the decision open to continual challenge and perhaps lawsuits on the basis of improper procedure.

Moreover, the utility has not demonstrated proper care and correctness with its measures and statistics. "Behind the meter" consumption and energy production have not yet been adequately measured. No rate hikes should be allowed before complete data has been collected and analyzed. That could lead to an unsound decision that would just have to be researched and reviewed again.

The claims of the utility are not logical. Solar customers are helping to add power to the grid. Because the power we create can be used by our neighbors, we reduce transmission costs. We are not a nuisance; we are contributors to a better power system. We have spent large sums of money to install our rooftop solar arrays. We should not be penalized for improving, diversifying, and modernizing our utility's power sources. Rather than having to pay extra fees, we should be compensated for the additional energy we add to the grid.

Solar rooftop users are doing our part to clean the air and reduce particulate emissions, thus improving the health and quality of life of all Utahns. These contributions can only be partially measured in monetary terms. The sense of well-being created by cleaner air is a spiritual value that can't quite be quantified, but must not be shoved under the rug. Clean air should be a goal for the power company as well. Why is the power company trying to charge more on the very individuals who are doing the most to clear our air? Don't let the power company bite the hand that feeds them and is doing the right thing.

A rate hike would be likely to set us many steps backward in our progress toward cleaner emissions. This may drive out of Utah several of our productive solar companies, by creating unfair obstacles to

their business models. Even Governor Herbert is trying to encourage clean companies to locate in Utah.

In sum, there are many reasons why this rate hike would be a very bad idea for everyone except the executives of the utility company. I understand that your mission is to ensure safe, reliable, adequate, and reasonably priced utility service. If you allow an expedited decision on this proposed rate hike, it will create the appearance of favoritism and lack of fiduciary responsibility. I exhort you to uphold your mission by serving the best interests of your many solar constituents.

Please oppose Advice #16-035-T14 . Do not allow this fast-track decision for rate-hikes on solar customers.

Sincerely  
Carolyn Clark  
573 E 12th Ave



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14**

1 message

**Amber Edwards** <amber@jadelouisedesigns.com>

Thu, Nov 17, 2016 at 9:34 PM

To: PSC@utah.gov

to whom it may concern,

We are new members of the solar customers in Utah area. We just installed our solar panels this spring and have been very excited to take part of the tax credits of installing. And we are very much looking forward to the possible savings from using solar energy. We also very much love the easy/clean source of energy to power our home.

That said, we are also very concerned about the RMP's rate proposal.

As a solar power consumer, this rate proposal will make all the hard earned money we have put into installing our solar panels a moot point and completely wasted. Our solar company will leave the state. Our solar panels will become useless. And we will be out thousands of dollars where we are merely trying to be efficient.

This proposal will hurt thousands of hard working Utah citizens.

We ask that you please ST OP RMP's rate proposal.

thank you,

**Amber Edwards - Busy Creating Memories**Email: [amber@jadelouisedesigns.com](mailto:amber@jadelouisedesigns.com)Website: <http://busycreatingmemories.com>



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment**

1 message

**Goldstein** <goldstein@sisna.com>

Thu, Nov 17, 2016 at 9:35 PM

To: psc@utah.gov

Cc: "goldstein@sisna.com" &lt;goldstein@sisna.com&gt;

We'd like you to know that we strongly oppose this proposal to make rooftop solar more expensive. We don't have it on our roof, but it seems that the PSC should be encouraging more rooftop solar rather than entertaining proposals that discourage its adoption. We'd like to see less pollution in the Salt Lake valley air that we breathe daily and this proposal instead moves public policy in the opposite direction. We don't need to have RMP have a reason to build another power plant to supply the power that could have been supplied by more rather than less rooftop power. We want to incentivize rather than discourage the public to adopt this technology.

Marvin and Jeanne Goldstein

4834 Naniloa Drive

Salt Lake City, Utah 84117





PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>

---

## Docket# 16-035-T14 Rocky Mountain Power

1 message

---

**Mike Oaks** <mikeoaksrn@yahoo.com>

Thu, Nov 17, 2016 at 10:29 PM

To: psc@utah.gov

I am very opposed to Rocky Mountain Power's proposed changes for solar customers in Utah.

Please represent the people of Utah, and stand up for solar and not Pacificorp.

Sincerely,

Mike Oaks  
Herriman, Utah



PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>

---

## Docket#16-035-T14

1 message

---

**Amy Southwick** <avsouthwick@gmail.com>

Thu, Nov 17, 2016 at 10:40 PM

To: PSC@utah.gov

Please!



PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>

---

## Docket# 16-035-T1

1 message

---

**D Derricott** <dderricott@gmail.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 6:11 AM

To: psc@utah.gov

Thwarting consumer autonomy is directly opposite the purpose of the PSC. Do not let the Warren Buffet monopoly prevail at consumer expense.

Please help spread awareness of this issue. If at all possible, please send an email to with the subject line 4 to share your thoughts and objections. Sent from my iPhone



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment**

1 message

**Chris Hill** <chris@biochem.utah.edu>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 7:25 AM

To: "psc@utah.gov" &lt;psc@utah.gov&gt;

Dear Commissioner s,

I am outraged by PacifiCorp-RMP's "Advice No. 16-13", filed No v. 9, 2016, that would change the rate structure for rooftop solar customers. You should deny this ridiculous request and, at the very least, require use the normal rate-making process to be followed.

The request is absolutely absurd. The solar panels that recently were installed on our house generate ~95% as much electricity as we use in a year. Nevertheless, by some miracle of "mathematics" and "logic", RMP calculates that we should pay \$42-/mo, which is almost as much as we did before installing the panels. In other words, they "calculate" that all of the one-households-worth of electricity that we provide (which now also includes an electric car!) is of almost no value. That is obviously a complete load of nonsense! Moreover, the electricity from solar is disproportionately generated on hot summer afternoons when the cost that RMP is paying for electricity to be generated is at its maximum value. Thus, rooftop solar power must be of disproportionately high economic value to RMP. How RMP can think that a reasonable person could view their request as being anything other than dishonest beggars the imagination.

In addition to the simple economic argument, the considerable social advantages of solar power, including for our local air quality, should be part of the economic equation and should be incentivized. Needless to say, the current proposal does the complete opposite.

Another weakness in the RMP approach is that it does not adequately tier pricing based upon usage. This would be a simple and effective way to curb the excessive spikes in peak demand that drive up the cost of electricity for all consumers. Even better would be a real-time approach to pricing, which I believe has been shown to work well in some parts of the country, would be very fair, make demand responsive to true cost, drive down overall costs for all, and seems like the only sensible approach for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

I appreciate your willingness to accept public input. I am confident that you, and anyone with an ounce of common sense, will see the absurdity of the RMP request and treat it with the contempt that it deserves. Given the extreme nature of the request, I further urge that you greatly extend the deadline for public comment.

Sincerely,

11/19/2016

State of Utah Mail - Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment

Christopher Hill

Salt Lake City

UT 84103

[chris@biochem.utah.edu](mailto:chris@biochem.utah.edu)



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14**

1 message

---

**Jazmyn Roseburg** <jazmyn@rjtechnicalservices.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 8:15 AM

To: PSC@utah.gov

To whom it may concern:

My name is Jazmyn Roseburg and I work as the Human Resources Generalist at R&J Technical Services. Our company is in the solar industry because we do solar system installations. If Rocky Mountain Power's rate proposal is passed it will have an extremely negative impact on our business, if not put us out of business completely. Homeowners will no longer be purchasing systems because they will not be able to afford them. If they are not purchasing systems we will not be installing them. I depend on my job greatly. I am a single mother and I just bought a townhouse for myself and my baby this year. If I lose my job because a monopoly (Rocky Mountain Power) needs even more profits than it already receives then I could potentially lose my townhouse. It's not only me but also my 9 month old daughter that would be suffering, and we are just one of the many families that would be tremendously hurt by this rate proposal. Please stop help stop this from happening. Thank you for your time.

**Jazmyn Roseburg**

HR Generalist

☎ 801-546-1970

📠 801-513-4262

📠 801-546-0431

📍 3250 N 750 E, Layton, UT 84010

[jazmyn@rjtechnicalservices.com](mailto:jazmyn@rjtechnicalservices.com)

This message (and any associated files) may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient or authorized to receive this for the intended recipient, you must not use, copy, disclose or take any action based on this message or any information herein. If you have received this message in error, please advise the sender immediately by sending a reply e-mail and delete this message. Thank you for your cooperation.



PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>

---

## Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment

1 message

---

**William Nissen** <winissen@yahoo.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 9:40 AM

Reply-To: William Nissen <winissen@yahoo.com>

To: "psc@utah.gov" <psc@utah.gov>

Dear Commissioners,

I am a solar homeowner with a net metering contract with Rocky Mountain Power. I would like to see more renewable energy and less air pollution.

William I. Nissen  
3097 Teton Drive  
Salt Lake City, UT 84109  
Phone-[801-484-4015](tel:801-484-4015)



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14**

1 message

---

**Kipton Norris** <kipnorris@gmail.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 10:21 AM

To: PSC@utah.gov

Dear Utah Public Service Commission,

I am writing to ask that you stop Rocky Mountain Powers rate proposal for solar power users. I feel it's not fair to penalize those who are trying to be environmentally friendly and have made a huge financial investment to do so. I have only had solar panels placed 2 months. Yes, I will benefit from the federal and state tax breaks, however, I have taken on a large loan to help pay for the remaining balance. I, along with thousands of Utah resident solar users plead for your support. To allow Rocky Mountain Power to move forward with these rising rates on solar users is wrong and I hope you will not allow this to take place.

Thank you for your time,

Kipton J. Norris





PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>

---

## Docket #16-035-T14

1 message

---

**Shane Aardema** <shaneaardema@gmail.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 10:30 AM

To: PSC@utah.gov

I am a Solar Net Metering customer, and I find it outraging that RMP is trying to prohibit clean alternative sources, that frankly I paid good money for to help the environment and our Utah Air Quality. Please help our environment and those that have staked their future on a clean renewable energy source.

Sincerely,

Shane C Aardema



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14**

1 message

---

**Colette Marx** <colette@altaraysolar.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 10:32 AM

To: PSC@utah.gov

To Whom it May Concern,

Please stop Rocky Mountain Power's rate proposal. This move will affect many citizens of Utah in a negative way. For me personally, I have helped to grow a solar company from the ground up and will soon be able to reap some of the rewards. If this rate hike takes place...I will be having to look for a new job, and that would directly impact my family .

Another way this impacts me and others around me, is the fact that I am strongly considering placing solar panels on my own roof, but I am scared to with this possible rate hike in which I will be punished for doing so.

Rocky Mountain Power has had a monopoly for so many years and they don't like having competition in the market place with them. If power were cheaper like it is in other states/companies, then solar wouldn't be able to compete. There is plenty of business that everyone should be able to benefit from, but if you let a power house come in and push their weight around, only the little guys get hurt.

Please strongly consider declining Docket #16-035-T14 to help watch out for everyone's interest.

Sincerely,

Colette Marx



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment**1 message

---

**Jennifer Bodine** <jenniferbodine@weberedu>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 11:09 AM

To: psc@utah.gov

Dear PSC members,

I am writing to express my concern over the net meter rate schedule proposed by Rocky Mountain Power

As outlined in your report, there are real issues going forward investing in a grid that works under the distributed model of renewable energy, and I encourage Rocky Mountain Power to continue to plan for that future. Individual investing in rooftop solar are allies in this cause, and as residential storage technology improves, will help Rocky Mountain Power create a robust and sustainable power grid.

This proposed rate increase stands to cripple the roof top solar industry in Utah. The pricing structure ensures the solar installations would rarely recoup the initial investment. Further, the peak power demand charge, modeled after commercial solar installations, penalizes residential grid-tied customers. The proposal would also penalize owners of both solar panels and electric cars, discouraging such an investment just when it is crucial that we get tailpipes out of the valley to improve air quality. There are quite a few other fee models that could be proposed that don't use commercial solar as a model.

I agree that solar users benefit from the current net meter fee structure, but everyone else benefits from more renewables on the grid, meaning better air quality for everyone. The last thing we should do is discourage people from investing their own money in roof top solar

**As it stands, I cannot support this plan and I would encourage you to extend the public comment period so that all stakeholders can adequately review your proposal.**

Sincerely,

Jenn Bodine  
5083 Fillmore Ave.  
Ogden, UT 84403

—



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment**

1 message

---

**Heather** <ericarhiza@gmail.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 11:08 AM

To: psc@utah.gov

Dear PSC,

I am emailing to express my concern over the net meter rate schedule proposed by Rocky Mountain Power

As outlined in your report, there are real issues going forward investing in a grid that works under the distributed model of renewable energy, and I encourage Rocky Mountain Power to continue to plan for that future. Individual investing in rooftop solar are allies in this cause, and as residential storage technology improves, will help Rocky Mountain Power create a robust and sustainable power grid.

This plan stands to cripple the roof top solar industry in Utah. The pricing structure ensures that solar installation would rarely recoup the large initial investment. Furthermore, the peak power demand charge, modeled after commercial solar installations, penalizes residential grid-tied customers. The proposal would also penalize owners of both solar panels and electric cars, discouraging such an investment just when it is crucial that we get tailpipes out of the valley to improve air quality. There are quite a few other fee models that could be proposed that don't use commercial solar as a model.

I agree that solar users benefit from the current net meter fee structure, but everyone else benefits from more renewables on the grid, meaning better air quality for everyone. The last thing we should do is discourage people from investing their own money in roof top solar

As it stands, I cannot support this plan and I would encourage you to extend the public comment period so that stakeholders can adequately review your proposal.

Respectfully

Heather Root, Ogden, Utah



PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>

---

## "Docket #16-035-T14"

1 message

---

**Alan Stokes** <alanlynnea@gmail.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 11:16 AM

To: PSC@utah.gov

Public Service Commission:

It has come to my attention that Rocky Mountain Power wants to increase fees and changing utility rates on net-metering. This will severely hurt people who are concerned about the environment and the movement to be "green." We have just completed a solar panel project for our home with the idea of keeping costs down and promoting the concept of "going green." Please do not allow these fees and rate increases to happen. I believe it would be a step in the wrong direction.

Thank you for your consideration.

Alan N. and Lynnea T. Stokes



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

---

**docket 16-035-T14**

1 message

---

**Betty Manaster** <bjmanaster@icloud.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 11:44 AM

To: psc@utah.gov

I would like to comment on your proposed increased rates to any new net metering customers using solar energy . I am strongly opposed to your \$9/KW "demand charge" for peak use. I do not currently have solar power, but have considered adding it. However, this rate increase decreases the likelihood that I would do so because it would significantly reduce the savings.

Solar power needs to be encouraged rather than discouraged in this state. For such a beautiful place, the pollution is significant and affects both the mental and physical health of Utah residents. If yours is a responsible company , you should be looking for ways to partner with solar users rather than making it too expensive to use. Please reconsider this action.



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

## Docket 16-035-T14/14-035-114 Public Comment

1 message

Alice Mulder <amulder@weber.edu>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 11:45 AM

To: psc@utah.gov

Dear Public Service Commisioners,

I am emailing to express my concern over the net meter rate schedule proposed by Rocky Mountain Power.

As outlined in your report, there are real issues going forward investing in a grid that works under the distributed model of renewable energy and I encourage Rocky Mountain Power to continue to plan for that future. But please recognize that individuals investing in rooftop solar are allies in this cause, and as residential storage technology improves, they will help Rocky Mountain Power create a robust and sustainable power grid. And they will help in our long-road as a society to transition to a cleaner, more renewable power base for the future.

This plan, as proposed, stands to cripple the roof top solar industry in Utah. The pricing structure ensures that solar installations would rarely recoup the large initial investment. Furthermore, the peak power demand charge, modeled after commercial solar installations, penalizes residential grid-tied customers. **Importantly, the proposal would also penalize owners of both solar panels and electric cars, discouraging such an investment just when it is crucial that we get tailpipes out of the valley to improve air quality** There are quite a few other fee models that could be proposed that don't use commercial solar as a model.

I agree that solar users benefit from the current net meter fee structure, but everyone else benefits from more renewables on the grid, meaning better air quality for everyone. The last thing we should do is discourage people from investing their own money in roof top solar

I cannot support this current plan and I would **encourage you to extend the public comment period** so that all stakeholders can adequately review your proposal.

Sincerely,

Alice Mulder  
Ogden, Utah



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment**

1 message

**Anthony Gibson** <anthony@cesolar.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 12:19 PM

To: psc@utah.gov

Dear Commissioners,

The reason for this email is to express my concerns towards Rocky Mountain Power's proposal for a new rate structure on solar energy customers.

My biggest issue with this rate structure is it would ultimately put an end to CLEAN solar energy in the state of Utah, if the proposed rate structure is approved. I think that it is important to keep in mind the many economic benefits that solar brought to our state, bringing in over 3,000 jobs. If passed many of these jobs will come to an immediate end putting many Utah families in a financial bind, to include my own. In addition to mass job loss in our state we need to keep in mind the clean air quality that solar brings to the list of benefits. It is no secret the Utah has poor air quality so why not do all that we can to better it?

I would like to thank you for taking the time out of your busy schedule for accepting public input on this matter , though I feel the deadline should be extended. I do hope that my reasons for wanting to reject this Docket are strongly considered.

**Anthony Gibson**

Purchasing Manager | Creative Energies Solar

[anthony@CESolar.com](mailto:anthony@CESolar.com) | 435.592.5865[CESolar.com](http://CESolar.com) | Utah • Wyoming • Idaho**CREATIVE  
ENERGIES**





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

---

**RE: Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment**

1 message

---

**Chris @ The Oasis** <info@oasismontana.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 12:35 PM

To: psc@utah.gov

To whom it may concern:

I am a solar business located in western Montana, and we sell solar power and pumping systems all over the west. We have 60+ customers in Utah that have purchased either solar water pumping or power systems from us. Americans across the country, in a non-partisan fashion, want more clean cost-effective solar power.

The Rocky Mountain Power proposal to, after December 9th, have new customers be placed on a new rate (that has not yet been decided) will negatively affect small businesses such as mine. Not knowing if I can offer solar equipment to my Utah customers will, in effect, halt my business dealings in the state.

I hope you will reject Rocky Mountain Power's proposal and help keep Utah's friendly business and clean-energy status in the west. I do feel I should remind you that the solar industry employs many people with good jobs across the U.S. -- more than either the coal or steel industries.

Sincerely,

Chris Daum  
Oasis Montana Inc.  
436 Red Fox Lane  
Stevensville, MT 59870  
[406-777-4309](tel:406-777-4309)  
[www.oasismontana.com](http://www.oasismontana.com)



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14**

1 message

---

**Jonathan Taylor** <taylojonathan@gmail.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 12:56 PM

To: PSC@utah.gov

Hello,

I recently had a rooftop solar array installed on my house. I am loving it for a few reasons- #1, I feel like I am doing my part to cut down on pollution and to contribute to sustainable energy. #2, my electric bills are awesome now. #3 I feel like this is a viable alternative to the sole utility provider in my area. I am worried about the lack of competition that Rocky Mountain Power has (I take it they are worried about competition). I think it would be a big mistake to approve their new rate proposal and it would really put a dent in Utah's clean energy leadership in the nation. Please do not approve the changes proposed by RMP.

—  
Warm Regards,  
Jonathan Taylor, LCSW, CSAT, CMAT  
Program Director  
Healing Paths, Inc.  
www.healingpathsrecovery.com  
[www.jontaylorlcsw.com](http://www.jontaylorlcsw.com)  
[801-682-0581](tel:801-682-0581)



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

---

## Oppose Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment

1 message

---

**Jake Weston** <jakeweston1@outlook.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 1:20 PM

To: "psc@utah.gov" &lt;psc@utah.gov&gt;

I adamantly oppose PacifiCorp's "Advice No. 16-13", (Nov 9, 2016), proposing changes to the rate structure for residential solar customers. As a Utah citizen, I strongly urge my Public Service Commission to reject, what appears to be RMP's inappropriately cloaked and rushed request. Further I request the PSC to require RMP to use the normal, and applicable, rate-making process for any proposed changes.

Clean, renewable and cost effective energy that is realistically available to every day homeowners is the end goal for government, industry and ultimately society as a whole. What PacifiCorp/RMP is proposing is completely contrary to this movement. RMP's proposal directly and in-proportionately penalizes those citizens willing to invest their hard earned money into solar and a more sustainable energy option.

I, personally, have invested over \$8000, out of pocket, to install a net-metering residential solar system capable of supplying enough energy to cover my home needs, including surplus energy which RMP takes at no cost. If these proposed higher fees and rate structure were placed at the time I designed and paid for this system, I most certainly would not have made the decision. Both Federal and State agencies see the value in advancing solar initiatives, including residential home use. RMP's proposal will drastically and negatively impact these initiatives.

Again, I respectfully request, in the interests of ratepayers and the Utah public, that the PSC reject PacifiCorp-RMP's current rate change request. I appreciate the PSC, and specifically the Commissioners, for considering this feedback and taking public input.

Jake Weston

Plain City, Utah

[jakeweston1@outlook.com](mailto:jakeweston1@outlook.com)



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

---

## RMP rooftop solar increase--Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment

1 message

---

**Sptsman4@aol.com** <Sptsman4@aol.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 2:21 PM

To: psc@utah.gov

Cc: kstevenson1@weber.edu, d31hayner@comcast.net

Please extend the public comment period on this action to allow for more input from customers. Due to inadequate notification of existing customers, many are not aware of what RMP is proposing in docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment. This is a thinly-veiled attempt to put rooftop solar out of business to the detriment of all opposed to the growing problems associated with fossil-fuel generation of power

Wake up! Climate change is real and may or may not spell disaster for the current generation but please think of future generations. This is purely an attempt to maintain RMP's existing monopoly on power generation. They pay lip service to renewable energy but only if it's their renewable energy.

Rooftop solar provides jobs to thousands of people and prevents thousands, if not millions, of tons of CO2 and particulates from being released into our atmosphere. In the polluted Wasatch front environment, every small measure of curtailing pollutants can make a difference. It is not just a future problem, thousand of people along the Wasatch front are currently afflicted with breathing and other problems associated with our Winter inversions and climate change will have a very real and potentially negative effect on our state.

Please stand up for the individuals that are trying to make our air, and our state, better by participating in rooftop solar. They definitely should not be penalized for trying, even one household at a time, to make Utah and the nation a better place to live.



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

---

## Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment

1 message

---

**Pete McCoy** <pete@rldrealestate.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 2:26 PM

To: psc@utah.gov

I am DEEPLY concerned about Rocky Mountain Power's new proposed fee to Solar Power users. I am reasonable and realize the need for Rocky Mountain Power to be financially sustainable, but it is so crucial for our community to be forward thinking towards our future, instead of stuck in the past. Solar power and other renewable energies are what our country and world needs as our climate is changing and population continues to grow. Solar power provides Utah with quality, high paying jobs and helps our environment at the same time. Instead of new fees which will serve to discourage solar, we should be providing generous financial incentives to encourage residential and business customers to adopt renewable energy.

Please extend the deadline for public comment on this important issue and please consider more incentives for solar as opposed to discouraging fees. Thank you very much.

Pete McCoy

[801-580-7383](tel:801-580-7383)



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

---

## Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment

1 message

---

**Brent Olsen** <csmeutah@gmail.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 2:30 PM

Reply-To: bolsen@byu.net

To: psc@utah.gov

Commissioners,

I am outraged at the recent attempt by PacifiCorp-RMP's to fleece the citizens of Utah rather than to proactively adapt to a rapidly changing environment. Once again we see the bizarre behavior of a monopoly in the face of changing technology. I plead with you to deny the fast-track request and force the utility to use the normal rate-making process for any proposed changes. I would also recommend that the commission force the utility to earmark funds and set a deadline for RMP to produce a long term solution to the evolving electricity market as opposing to bilking their customers for a short term cash flow fix.

Thank you for this chance to public input. Please bring us some sanity in this matter!

—

Thanks,

Brent Olsen CPA, CMA, CITP

[801.369.4535](tel:801.369.4535)



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment**

1 message

**Emily Smith** <emily.smith@hci.utah.edu>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 2:53 PM

Reply-To: emily.smith@hci.utah.edu

To: Utah Public Service Commission &lt;psc@utah.gov&gt;

Dear Public Service Commission,

Please reject Rocky Mountain Power's proposal to implement demand charges on solar customers. Demand charges are confusing and extreme and a blatant attempt to discourage energy independence. At the very least, that's unpatriotic, at least for the next few weeks. After that it's burn, baby, burn until we die.

Across twelve states, all investor owned utility proposals to implement demand charges on residential or solar customers have either been rejected by the state's regulatory body or withdrawn entirely.

Solar customers and businesses need certainty. RMP's proposal puts local solar jobs across the state at risk. Please reject RMP's demand charges proposal and keep existing rates for rooftop solar customers.

Regards,  
Emily Smith  
1225 S 400 E  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111



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

---

**Comment on 16-035-T14**

1 message

---

**Claire Bensard** <claire.bensard@biochem.utah.edu>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 2:55 PM

To: "psc@utah.gov" &lt;psc@utah.gov&gt;

Hello Commissioners,

I am a current homeowner with rooftop solar capacity designed to meet 97-99% of my annual energy needs. My motivation to pay for the panels, the updated electrical systems, and switch to net metering was two-fold: cost-benefit to my home value and daily costs and a chance to reduce energy consumption from non-renewable sources. For other homeowners in Utah interested in residential solar, I am commenting on this tariff as it is imperative that the sole electric provider maintain a big picture view of recruiting rooftop solar producers. Upon reviewing the studies provided by Rocky Mountain Power and the PacifiCorps groups, I urge the Commission to oppose the utility's fast-track proposal and to evaluate closely the costs presented by the studies. I am strongly opposed to treating customer generators as high-impact customers, with a shift in rate structures that disproportionately affect residential demand from a rooftop producer.

I understand the need for improved infrastructure to match the increase in energy load from residential production, so the base cost of service for a rooftop customer is justifiable from \$9 to \$15. However, I do not see the value in reducing the credits to the producer while also increasing the cost of energy rates, except in the profit of Rocky Mountain Power. Most rooftop producers do not completely offset their energy use, so it is flawed to penalize residential production by charging more for peak energy than the credit for the same amount of energy. It is also important to denote that residential solar producers are investing equitably into the infrastructure that provides RMP with additional revenue. I maintain my own panels, I bought my own panels, and I may receive a tax credit for doing so, but RMP does not reimburse my infrastructure investment into what they harness as their product. RMP, by discouraging rooftop solar with poorly thought-out fee structures, is refusing to take a free expansion of production, with some upfront upgrades to the existing infrastructure. I simply cannot understand why RMP wants to restrict the number of producers, particularly in our wonderfully sunny state. It is important to consider how the community benefits from participating in energy production and intrinsically learns more about their own energy use by doing so. On RMP's own website, they advocate for economic development. Rooftop solar is exploding as an economic development, attracting new panel manufacturers, installation businesses, and provides the opportunity for RMP to provide jobs in innovating community infrastructure and grids that would be world-class. Let's take that opportunity and allow RMP to see the bigger picture and economic vitality in enhancing, not discouraging rooftop solar.

Claire Bensard  
MD-PhD Candidate  
Rutter Lab  
Department of Biochemistry  
University of Utah School of Medicine  
[claire.bensard@biochem.utah.edu](mailto:claire.bensard@biochem.utah.edu)





Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment

1 message

**Emily Booth** <emily.booth@utah.edu>  
Reply-To: emily.booth@utah.edu  
To: Utah Public Service Commission <psc@utah.gov>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 2:59 PM

Dear Public Service Commission,

Reject Rocky Mountain Power's proposal to implement unfair demand charges on solar customers.

Across twelve states, all investor owned utility proposals to implement demand charges on residential or solar customers have either been rejected by the state's regulatory body or withdrawn entirely.

Solar customers and businesses need certainty . RMP's proposal puts local solar jobs across the state at risk. Please reject RMP's demand charges proposal and keep existing rates for rooftop solar customers.

Regards,  
Emily Booth

Salt Lake City, UT 84102



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment**

1 message

**Suzanne Stensaas** <suzanne.stensaas@hsc.utah.edu>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 2:59 PM

Reply-To: suzanne.stensaas@hsc.utah.edu

To: Utah Public Service Commission &lt;psc@utah.gov&gt;

Dear Public Service Commission,

As a ratepayer in Utah, I urge you to please reject Rocky Mountain Power's solar proposal, which will endanger the growth of the solar industry and threaten local jobs across the state. RMP's extreme demand charge proposal will make it difficult for me and my family to control our energy bills.

Another Berkshire Hathaway subsidiary, NV Energy, proposed similar demand charges on solar customers last year, and the Nevada Public Utilities Commission rejected the implementation of those charges. Across twelve states, all investor owned utility proposals to implement demand charges on residential or solar customers have either been rejected by the state's regulatory body or withdrawn entirely.

Please reject Rocky Mountain Power's proposal to implement these unprecedented and unpredictable charges on solar customers. I urge you to support balanced policies that will spur market competition and local economic growth, and bolster consumer choice.

Regards,  
Suzanne Stensaas

Salt Lake City, UT 84109



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

---

## Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment

1 message

---

Nia Sherar <nia@ofdc.org>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 3:02 PM

To: psc@utah.gov

Dear Commissioners,

I am a roof top solar, net meter customer and I am against RMP's "Advice No. 16-13", filed Nov. 9, 2016, that would change the rate structure for rooftop solar customers. Please deny RMP's fast-track request and require them to use the normal rate-making process for its proposed changes.

RMP is trying to circumvent the normal rate-setting process, which includes opportunities for expert testimony, in-depth examination of evidence, and public hearings. Its proposal should be thoughtfully considered in the next general rate case, not in a hastily arranged substitute for normal procedure.

The utility wants to impose increased rooftop solar fees on a newly-created, experimental class of solar customers [those applying after Dec. 9], then see in June 2017 whether such fees were justified...essentially putting the cart before the horse.

It is my understanding that the mission of the PSC is "to ensure safe, reliable, adequate, and reasonably priced utility service." An expedited vetting of the utility's proposed rate changes will not assure that this primary responsibility to the public has been served.

RMP has had problems with its net metering-related research from the start, from difficulties with sample size and composition to metering equipment limitations to the actual research methodology. The science underlying the proposed rate changes warrants closer examination.

The utility has again failed to measure "behind the meter" energy production and consumption by rooftop solar customers to see how that actually reduces the grid's power demand during peak load periods. RMP's data and charts do not show this.

One reason that existing rooftop solar customers were "grandfathered" [at least for now] is that most do not have the newer, more sophisticated equipment that the utility wants installed with the post- December 9th transitional [a.k.a. experimental] solar group. RMP implicitly admits that it previously lacked equipment necessary for the load study it wants to initiate now.

Cost-shifting within the grid:

RMP argues that solar customers are not paying their fair share of infrastructure costs, and that these costs are being shifted to non-solar customers. The cost shift is more likely in the other direction. The utility's cost-of-service model does not address all relevant costs.

The utility continues to ignore rooftop solar's contributions to reducing its peak capacity requirements, which reduces the need for building more power plants and burning more fuel.

Because rooftop solar is consumed near its source --usually by non-solar next door neighbors-- the utility avoids transmission line energy losses and transformer wear and tear.

Cost-shifting outside the grid:

This is the "externality" issues set --the elephant in the room-- that the PSC has until now allowed RMP to avoid. Externalities are the environmental, public health, and economic damages [costs] that are caused by fossil fuel combustion, but reduced by clean energy like solar.

More rooftop solar means less carbon dioxide and particulate emissions from traditional power plants. Until now, the utility and traditional grid customers have passed the costs of climate change and respiratory illnesses to the general public.

The over 3,000 solar jobs in Utah would be put in jeopardy by RMP's move to halt the growth of non-utility [i.e. rooftop] solar. The utility prefers to concentrate Utah's future solar growth in limited-scale solar programs [e.g. Subscriber Solar] it can control. RMP would be pleased to keep solar energy at 1% of Utah's energy mix. That's no surprise. PacifiCorp's 20-year resource plan calls for reducing the percentage of renewables in the corporation-wide energy mix.

Thank you for your time to hear my voice today and in the past.

Thank your for accepting public input. Please extend the deadline so more people can participate and give their input.

Regards,  
Nia Z Sherar  
Salt Lake City, UT 84105

—

Nia Z. Sherar  
Founder/Chair & General Administrator  
OFDC (Opportunity Fund for Developing Countries)  
1338 Emerson Ave  
Salt Lake City, UT 84105  
[801-487-9380](tel:8014879380)

Celebrating over *17 volunteer-powered years*- thank you!

It is business as usual as we wind down over the next few years.

Watch our 5 minute video: <http://www.ofdc.org>

Read our blog: <http://ofdcorg.wordpress.com>

LIKE us on facebook: <http://www.facebook.com/Pages/OFDC/105028766224448>

**PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>**

---

**Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment**

1 message

**James McCormick** <jmccormick@hydroblaster.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 3:02 PM

Reply-To: jmccormick@hydroblaster.com

To: Utah Public Service Commission &lt;psc@utah.gov&gt;

Dear Public Service Commission,

As a ratepayer in Utah, I urge you to please reject Rocky Mountain Power's solar proposal, which will endanger the growth of the solar industry and threaten local jobs across the state. RMP's extreme demand charge proposal will make it difficult for me and my family to control our energy bills.

Another Berkshire Hathaway subsidiary, NV Energy, proposed similar demand charges on solar customers last year, and the Nevada Public Utilities Commission rejected the implementation of those charges. Across twelve states, all investor owned utility proposals to implement demand charges on residential or solar customers have either been rejected by the state's regulatory body or withdrawn entirely.

Please reject Rocky Mountain Power's proposal to implement these unprecedented and unpredictable charges on solar customers. I urge you to support balanced policies that will spur market competition and local economic growth, and bolster consumer choice.

Regards,  
James McCormick

Sandy, UT 84092



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment**

1 message

---

**Teresa Clawson** <teresa.clawson@utah.edu>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 3:18 PM

Reply-To: teresa.clawson@utah.edu

To: Utah Public Service Commission &lt;psc@utah.gov&gt;

Dear Public Service Commission,

Please reject Rocky Mountain Power's proposal to implement demand charges on solar customers. Demand charges are confusing and extreme.

Across twelve states, all investor owned utility proposals to implement demand charges on residential or solar customers have either been rejected by the state's regulatory body or withdrawn entirely.

Solar customers and businesses need certainty. RMP's proposal puts local solar jobs across the state at risk. Please reject RMP's demand charges proposal and keep existing rates for rooftop solar customers.

Regards,  
Teresa Clawson

Salt Lake City, UT 84109



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

## Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment

1 message

Christina Beckwith &lt;beckwithrushton@yahoo.com&gt;

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 3:42 PM

Reply-To: Christina Beckwith &lt;wapitimama@camphobekids.org&gt;

To: "psc@utah.gov" &lt;psc@utah.gov&gt;

Dear Commissioners,

I am a rooftop solar customer of PacifiCorp / Rocky Mountain Power (RMP). I installed my system in Fall 2014, so I am 'grandfathered' under the current proposal. I am opposed to both PacifiCorp / RMP's request to change the rate structure for new rooftop solar customers, and to their request to fast-track the decision on this item. Although their current request does not affect me, approving it would set a precedent for future unfair and punitive rate changes to myself and others in my class.

**The demand fees proposed by PacifiCorp / RMP are patently unfair as they are proposing their application to rooftop solar customers.** The intent of demand fees was initially to encourage electricity users to conserve electricity and reduce load at peak demand times. PacifiCorp / RMP currently offers a **voluntary** program (Time of Day) to their customers whereby customers may opt to reduce their peak electricity use during the summer months by shifting use to lower demand times. In return for shifting their electricity use, customers in this program are billed a lower price for off-peak use (basic service rate minus 1.6334 cents/kilowatt-hour) and a higher price for on-peak use (basic service rate plus 4.356 cents/kilowatt-hour). Customers who enroll in this voluntary program are educated by PacifiCorp / RMP about practices they may use to shift their electricity use (eg, run dishwasher at low demand times, wash clothes at low demand times). PacifiCorp / RMP also provides these customers with a detailed schedule of the on-peak and off-peak times for their geographic area. For the state of Utah, the Time of Day program runs from May through September (5 months of the year), on-peak times are Monday through Friday from 1PM to 8PM, and weekends are off-peak.

**The demand fees proposed are unfairly penalizing rooftop solar customers!** These fees will selectively apply to a small group of residential customers. In addition, the demand fees are not applied to these customers in the same manner that such rates are applied to nonsolar residential customers. Here's why:

- Demand fees are involuntary for rooftop solar users, while the Time of Day program is voluntary for nonsolar customers.
- Demand fees will apply to rooftop solar users for a much greater period of time than for nonsolar users, both from the standpoint of how many days per year and from that of how many hours per year
  - Demand fees will apply year-round (12 months) for rooftop solar users and from May to September (5 months for nonsolar users).
  - During weekday afternoons / evenings: demand fees will apply year-round from 3PM to 8PM for rooftop solar users, and **only** from May to September from 1PM to 8PM for nonsolar customers. This calculates out to 1,300 hours of on-peak time for rooftop solar users vs. 700 hours of on-peak time for nonsolar customers.
  - During weekday mornings: demand fees will apply October to April (7 months) from 8AM to 10AM for rooftop solar users. No morning demand fees will apply for nonsolar customers. This calculates out to ~300 hours of on-peak time for rooftop solar users vs. 0 hours of on-peak time for nonsolar customers.

- Overall, demand fees will be applied to rooftop solar users during 1,600 hours of on-peak time and to nonsolar customers during 700 hours of on-peak time, or more than double the number of hours throughout the entire year
- Rooftop solar users will not receive a discount from their basic service rate for on-peak use, while nonsolar customers participating in the voluntary Time of Day program will receive such a discount.

**PacifiCorp / RMP offers no alternative for customers who wish to avoid the rooftop solar fee.**

Currently rooftop solar power is the only feasible alternative for utility customers who want renewable energy. PacifiCorp / RMP states that they want customers who desire solar to invest in their solar farm. However, subscriptions are sold out, making this option unavailable.

**PacifiCorp / RMP does not account for the contribution of rooftop solar to reduce on-peak demand.**

The proposal from PacifiCorp / RMP neglects to factor in that rooftop solar users are feeding power back into the system (for use by nonsolar users) during daylight hours, including daylight hours of peak demand. This, in turn, helps reduce the overall load on the system's infrastructure for both solar and nonsolar users and helps reduce fluctuations in power demand.

**No independent reviewer has evaluated the overall effects of rooftop solar on usage.**

PacifiCorp / RMP is basing their request for the rate change on a usage study that they themselves conducted. Not surprisingly the study concluded that PacifiCorp / RMP should charge rooftop solar users more. I must ask whether an independent study conducted by parties not affiliated with PacifiCorp / RMP, would draw the same conclusions. . . There is no way of knowing that answer. And without knowing the answer definitively, the process for requesting and implementing the rate change again becomes unfair to all consumers, but especially to the small group of rooftop solar users.

In summary I request that the public comment period for this issue be extended past November 22, 2016, **and** that the proposed fees be denied on the grounds that both requests by PacifiCorp / RMP are patently unfair to the end-user. Thank you for reading my request.

Sincerely,

M. Christina Beckwith, PharmD  
Salt Lake City, UT 84106





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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14**

1 message

---

**Travis Smith** <tandttravis@hotmail.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 4:30 PM

To: "PSC@utah.gov" &lt;PSC@utah.gov&gt;

As a high performance home builder,I DO NOT support the rate structure increase that Rocky Mountain Power is proposing. Onsite renewable energy should be encouraged, not penalized. I do agree that net metering customers probably need to be paying an increased "grid connection fee" to help offset the power company's cost of maintaining the grid. What that cost is is up for debate. I'm not a solar contractor, so my interests don't lie in protecting my business, but my clients are typically interested in solar and other onsite renewable s, so I'd like to maintain their ROI

Best,

**Travis Smith***T&T Mountain Builders**PO BOX 980547**Park City, UT 84098**(435) 640-3057*



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14**

1 message

---

**John Aldrich** <chivas@xmission.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 4:39 PM

To: psc@utah.gov

To the Public Service Commission:

We invested in roof top Solar Power in 2014. We are pleased that we have been able to do our part in producing clean energy and reducing the impact of emissions in the environment.

We hope that the full impact of the proposal from Rocky Mountain power will be fully revealed to the users of Solar Power. It would be important that the wording of the proposal be in lay terms for us to understand the full extend of the additional monthly fees.

Utah has been in the fore front in bringing affordable roof top solar on line and in creating jobs.

It appears that the public comment period is very short and request that it be extended past November 22 to give solar users an opportunity to study the RMP proposal in more detail.

Sincerely,

Virginia & John Aldrich  
3711 Eastcliff Drive  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84124



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

---

**Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment**

1 message

**Tomi Smith** <tsmith@sesgroupinc.com>

Fri, Nov 18, 2016 at 4:41 PM

To: "psc@utah.gov" &lt;psc@utah.gov&gt;

Greeting: Dear Commissioners,

Regarding Docket #16-035-T14 filed Nov 9, 2016. The utility wants to impose increased rooftop solar fees on a newly-created, experimental class of solar customers [those applying after Dec. 9], then see in June 2017 whether such fees were justified...essentially putting the cart before the horse. I am writing to urge the PSCD to deny the utility's fast-track request and require it to use the normal rate-making process for its proposed changes.

Personally I understand RMP position and agree on the Application fee and a low monthly fee, if the Solar Roof Top truly cost money to operate. In fact we have already been educating our clients of these possibilities. However, to implement current changes this will not only personally hurt our growth as a company, but many others as well, because solar will no longer be feasible to clients. Solar is about 30% of our revenue and the speed in which they are requested these changes will have major Financial impact in our business. SES will lose orders on current sales in process or will have demands from clients to be compensated because they did not know about the changes before the sale. Without any time to prepare, slow down, or get ready to stop sales currently in process this impact may result in a shutdown of our company all together. After 7 years in business and Utah's state goal to grow business here in Utah, it is hard for me to believe this is the right action.

Thank you for accepting public input; however the deadline should be extended. I respectfully request the PSC, in the interest of rate payers and the Utah public, to reject PacifiCorp-RMP's current rate change request.

Please feel free to reach out to me for further comments or questions.

*Tomi L Smith***Tomi Smith**

President/CEO

[tsmith@sesgroupinc.com](mailto:tsmith@sesgroupinc.com)

2750 West Rasmussen Rd #101

Park City, UT 84098

[435-615-2844](tel:435-615-2844)Office[801-234-0309](tel:801-234-0309)Mobile



*Your General and Electrical Contractor*

*Keeping Energy Efficiency/Green Build in Mind First!*

