

ORIGINAL 

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
Powering Arizona's Future

Utilities Division

RECEIVED
AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

2018 APR 16 A 11:31



0000187517

BOB DUNN
Andy Tobin
Boyd Dunn
Justin Olson

To: Docket Control

RE: ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE

Docket #E-01345A-18-0002

Please docket the attached 2 customer comments IN FAVOR of the above filed case.

Customer comments can be reviewed in E-docket under the above docket number.

Filed by: Utilities Division – Consumer Services

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

APR 16 2018

DOCKETED BY



Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

Investigator: Roxanne Best **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>> **Opinion Date:** 4/13/2018
Opinion Number: 2018 - 149299 **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days
Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - In Favor **Closed Date:** 4/13/2018 11:54 AM

First Name: Scott **Last Name:** Erickson **Account Name:** Scott Erickson
Address: <<< REDACTED >>>
City: Phoenix **State:** AZ **Zip Code:** 85032
Cell: <<< REDACTED >>> **Email:** <<< REDACTED >>>

Company: Arizona Public Service Company **Division:** Electric

Nature Of Opinion

Docket Number: E-01345A-18-0002

Docket Position: For

I just got my new APS bill, first one under new rates. \$188.87 for 1237kWh, a blended rate of \$0.1527/kWh. 109kWh were on-peak, or 8.8% of the total. Same billing period last year in 2017, \$122.86 for 1133kWh, a blended rate of \$0.1084. 172kWh were on-peak, or 15.2% of the total. So I used slightly more power, but used less on-peak power, and my bill increased by nearly 55%. APS customer service shrugs their shoulders, after all, it's my 'choice' now. This rate increase is absolutely unacceptable. How is a 50%+ rate increase justified? And that's after the tax credit related to the latest tax reform act. I will vote you out of office.

Investigation			
Date:	Analyst:	Submitted By:	Type:
4/13/2018	Roxanne Best	Web Submission	Investigation

Comments noted for record and docketed. Closed.

Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

Investigator: Roxanne Best **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>> **Opinion Date:** 4/13/2018
Opinion Number: 2018 - 149297 **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days
Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - In Favor **Closed Date:** 4/13/2018 1:18 PM

First Name: Judy **Last Name:** Staab **Account Name:** Judy Staab
Address:
City: **State:** **Zip Code:**
Email: <<< REDACTED >>> **Email:** <<< REDACTED >>>

Company: Arizona Public Service Company **Division:** Electric

Nature Of Opinion

Docket Number: E-01345A-18-0002 **Docket Position:** For

From: Judy Staab [mailto: <<< REDACTED >>>]

Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2018 10:27 PM

To: Utilities Div Service by Email <UtilDivServicebyEmail@azcc.gov>; Wesley Van Cleve <WVancleve@azcc.gov>; Legal Div - Mailbox <legaldiv@azcc.gov>; Maureen Scott <msscott@azcc.gov>; Charles Hains <CHains@azcc.gov>; Terri Ford <TFord@azcc.gov>; Eric M. Van Epps <EVanEpps@azcc.gov>; Constance Fitzsimmons <CFitzsimmons@azcc.gov>; Karyn Christine <KChristine@azcc.gov>; Elijah Abinah <EAbinah@azcc.gov>; procedural@azruco.gov; dpozefsky@azruco.gov; jfuentes@azruco.gov; cfraulob@azruco.gov; dtenney@azruco.gov; Kerri.Carnes@aps.com; Thomas.Loquvam@pinnaclewest.com; Melissa.Krueger@pinnaclewest.com; Amanda.Ho@pinnaclewest.com; Debra.Orr@aps.com; Thomas.Mumaw@pinnaclewest.com; Dunn-Web <Dunn-Web@azcc.gov>; Forese-Web <forese-web@azcc.gov>; Olson-Web <Olson-Web@azcc.gov>; RBurns-Web <rburns-web@azcc.gov>; Tobin-Web Tobin-Web@azcc.gov

Subject: New Mexico regulators stood up for public health and to do no harm ~ will you?

From Arthur Firstenberg of the Cellular Phone Task Force in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

This is what happens when a state has honest regulators.

The following is the latest news release from our neighbor to the East. They have reviewed the information, checked into the TRUTH and made a decision based solely on the FACTS presented and verified. Isn't it about time AZ realizes that good decisions based on solid evidence protects those you are sworn to protect and serve! Isn't it time to re-evaluate everything that has been presented and make a decision based on the truth - and provide the level of protection and safety NM has for its residents?

Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

Since there has always been viable alternatives to AMI technology which protect the populace, and many have been brought repeatedly at ACC open forums, none were ever considered, even of those offered by the residents themselves to provide. There are system that will do everything a smart meter will do using a electro-mechanical analog meter except allow the utility to remotely shut off the power. Whole house monitoring systems provide continual 24/7/365 usage and can transmit the data to the utility over the internet on a secure server. These systems pose absolutely NO danger to the inhabitants of a home or business from the dangers of EMF/RF microwave transmissions that smart meters do.

Today we won a victory in the fight against radiation in New Mexico. The Public Regulation Commission has denied PNM's application for Smart Meters. "The plan presented in the Application does not provide a net public benefit and it does not promote the public interest," wrote the Commission.

The Commission accepted the Hearing Examiner's recommended decision without alteration. It ruled that:

- PNM did not demonstrate that smart meters will save money.
- PNM did not demonstrate that smart meters will produce energy efficiency.
- PNM did not show that customers want smart meters.
- PNM did not evaluate alternatives.
- PNM did not say how it would protect customer data privacy.
- Cybersecurity issues need to be addressed.
- 125 good, high-paying jobs would be lost.
- Proposed opt-out fees were unreasonable.
- There was insufficient public input.
- There was insufficient response by PNM to public objections.

EVIDENCE ABOUT HEALTH EFFECTS was discussed at length. "Customers who have strong feelings about the health effects of the meters should be allowed to protect their stated health concerns without a prohibitively high cost."

The decision goes on to state: "The conditions of the portion of the population who believe they are electromagnetically sensitive deserve acknowledgment and consideration as decisions are made regarding the implementation of an AMI Project. Accommodations could include reasonable opt-out provisions and fees and perhaps the selection of technologies that minimize the impacts on such people. Such accommodations may be desirable to minimize health risks to customers and address the needs and preferences of PNM's customers. These are issues that can and should be addressed in a public input process of the sort PNM stated in its 2012 Report that it would conduct before bringing a smart meter proposal to the Commission for approval."

The decision means there will not be smart meters in the near future in New Mexico's metropolitan areas: Santa Fe, Albuquerque, Las Vegas, Clayton, Ruidoso, Tularosa, Alamogordo, Silver City, Lordsburg and Deming.

Arthur

E-01345A-18-0002

Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

Customer requested: Please make it part of the formal complaint against APS and it is not an opinion it is fact based.

Investigation			
Date:	Analyst:	Submitted By:	Type:
4/13/2018	Roxanne Best	Email	Investigation
Comments noted for record and docketed. Closed.			
