



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

---

## Docket #16-035-T14 Public Comment

1 message

---

**Robert Loveridge** <LOVERIRO@uvu.edu>  
To: "psc@utah.gov" <psc@utah.gov>

Sat, Dec 10, 2016 at 12:20 AM

Dear Commissioners,

The recent filing of PacifiCorp-RMP's "Advice No. 16-13" has me greatly concerned and I am in complete opposition to the change of the rate structure they propose. I would like to see (ask) the Public Service Commission to suspend the proposed tariff due to go into effect today, November 9, 2016. I meant to get this off earlier, but in preparing for retirement, a mission, six surgeries, and one or two more planned plus its timing right after an election and a major holiday for a due date has made it difficult to get it done.

I don't know what happened today, but I believe this rate proposal by RMP was carefully timed to leave the least amount of time for public comment or for anyone but RMP to be able to provide research or analysis for consideration, and the timing was certainly chosen to shorten and discourage public comment and participation. I hope the PSC put things on hold until more and better information can be gathered which represents a thorough representation of multiple points of view. At a minimum an independent study by a third party should be done, not the self-serving report done by them.

RMP's sister company did something similar in Nevada, and in one year it killed over 90% of the rooftop solar business which in Utah is over a 4,000 job industry. If a similar thing occurred in UT that would be over 3,500 jobs. Rooftop solar If it were a single company it would exceed most large employers in the state. Already, just the filing of their request has dampened new orders by 50%.

RMP has most things in the state going their way on this issue. Putting solar on a roof according to many study actually helps RMP meet high demand and minimize distribution costs since it creates a tighter distribution grid, and I have personally read where independent studies show that rooftop solar helps the power companies.

In my opinion, a homeowner could actually help them (RMP). However, the entire structure in the state is set to discourage homeowner production. It doesn't pay for surplus production at even the wholesale rate, provide a way for the homeowner to use their SRECs (yet if you are in their lottery, they want 50% of them without any form of compensation), but forces owners who over produce to donate to their self-selected charity. They want us to donate funds to help them create their own solar plant(s). In fact, I believe homeowners should be able to take the entire installation as a tax right off like any other "business" which invests in infrastructure and setup. Their new rate structure does everything to disincentivize a homeowner to invest in clean energy by pushing the ROI to around 30 years from the current 12-14.

I could say a lot more, but will leave it to another time. Thanks for consideration. I wish the time for comments and feedback could be extended.

Robert Loveridge  
855 E 200 S  
Orem, UT 84097  
801-361-3306 cell  
[loverio@uvu.edu](mailto:loverio@uvu.edu)/[rll@timpnet.net](mailto:rll@timpnet.net)