I read a recent article in the Arizona Republic about APS wanting to pay less per kWh to residences that sell excess solar power back to the grid. That was followed by a "My Turn" guest opinion piece today from the APS CEO.

Something needs to be said ...

Caveats

By the way, I don't have solar panels installed, but have been considering same and, of course, offsetting sale back to the grid is a key factor in any residential solar cost justification.

Also, I am an SRP customer, not APS. But who in their right mind would not expect SRP to follow APS's lead on this?

Opposition To APS Proposal
First, in these scenarios, and even factoring in any up-front incentives, the homeowner is the one putting out the capital investment to be able to shoulder much - if not all - of the electricity generating capacity needed to support his residence.

These are capital and operating expenses that APS would no longer have to absorb. These represent kWhs that can be sold to other non-solar customers and, at least theoretically, mean APS will need that much less future investment in new generating capacity. It also can mean fewer instances, and number of power customers adversely affected by, power outages resulting from excess demand at peak times or other unforeseen causes. Obviously, the more homeowners that take on these capital outlays, the more of such benefit to APS and to its power customers. These savings are not the fruit of investments made by APS - they accrue to everyone directly because of customer solar investments.

Second, the CEO talks about solar customers paying their "fair share" for their use of the grid. As pointed out above, these homeowners have already made a huge investment in their own power generation.

And so the question: Why should solar customers receive less per kWh which they generate back to the grid than they have to pay APS for whatever additional kWhs they purchase from APS during the dark hours?

And, if we're going to start nit-picking fairness issues, why doesn't APS compensate power customers for the lost kWhs they endure during blackouts?

And, while we're at it, all this talk about paying "fair share" for "the grid" begs the question: what part of "the grid" are we talking about? Is APS saying that solar customers who are able to stop or significantly cut their purchase of APS power should keep paying for the high tension distribution lines to communities? Seems to me the only grid costs we would directly incur are from our house to the power pole. Indirect costs of APS for larger distribution and generation plants should be in the kWh rates which we pay when we draw power AND which we would be paid for when we upload our generated power back to the grid.

Third, regarding kWhs sold back to the grid, APS seems to be saying that they should only have to pay the solar customer the same rate they pay other power companies for the extra capacity they need. There are plenty of different rates established for different circumstances - peak hours, off-peak, seasonal, etc. etc. Why should APS solar customers be paid at the same discounted rate as charged by giant power conglomerates for their excess power? The residential solar customer is the "little guy" here - his solar investment is proportionately much higher than it costs SRP or PPG or some other giant to generate kWhs.

Anyway, the compelling reasons APS homeowners want to go solar isn't some "feel good" desire to go green. They want their own power independence because buying from APS (or others) has gotten more and more expensive and the economics to go solar have improved. Also, they may want to reduce their home's exposure to power outages now and in the future. And so, they make the capital investment.

But APS most likely sees solar as a threat to the bottom line. There's no altruism in this rate proposal - it's all about punishing the little guy for figuring out how he can hold the line on, maybe even reduce, his rising energy costs.

I'm reminded of how SRP has been repeatedly mailing us about joining up on their community solar grid farm out here in the Far East Valley. But if you run the numbers - and they readily admit this - it will cost the average participant home materially more money than if they don't participate.

There's no expectation that the solar kWhs you buy will actually come to your home or will power you during an outage ... it's just a clever way to get you to pay more now to underwrite what amounts to a new SRP power plant (albeit solar) for the grid as a whole. Why would I want to do this?

These guys aren't serious about supporting solar ... they're just trying to hold on to a monopoly situation to make as much money as they can.
Please do not give in to their self-serving arguments.

Regards,

Michael O'Hara

Gilbert, AZ 85233

*End of Complaint*

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:
docketed

*End of Comments*
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Arizona Corporate Commission
Utilities Division
1200 West Washington
Phoenix. AZ 85007-2996

Dear Sirs,

Attached is a letter I wrote to APS. Please stop their attempts to destroy the home values of rooftop solar customers.

Thank you.
Jon Wittig

Surprise, AZ 85387
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

APS Energy Innovation Attn., Barbara Lockwood P.O Box 53999
Station #9659
Phoenix. AZ 85072-3933

Dear Ms. Lockwood,

I have received your letter dated 7/12/13 concerning the changes APS is attempting to make for customers who lease rooftop solar systems. I have several questions and concerns regarding the APS position in this situation.

I leased a rooftop solar system from Sunpower last summer. Arizona Solar Concepts was the seller and installer. I am locked into a 20 year lease program for which I pay $82.82 a month. My wife and I are both 67 years old and I doubt that we will own the home for the remaining 19 years on the lease. I noted the information in your letter that existing rooftop solar customers would be "grandfathered" under the existing net metering program for the next 20 years.

The lease I have is fully transferrable to a buyer of our home if and when we decide to sell. However, when I called the APS Green Team. The representative I spoke with informed me that the buyer of our home would not enjoy the same grandfathering protection I have and would not be part of the current net metering program that exists for rooftop solar customers. This has caused my wife and I great concern and anxiety about the ability we will have to sell our home in the future.

When we decided to go solar, we thought we were doing the right thing for the environment and that the solar system would be a great way for us on a fixed income to save money on our electricity bill. The system has not disappointed us and we have enjoyed a good cost saving as well as the satisfaction of knowing we are producing our own power and helping the environment. We are producing more power than we are using which we thought would benefit APS as well. We also thought that the solar system would increase the value of our home and the appraisal we had done when we recently refinanced our mortgage confirmed this as the appraiser said we had increased the home value by about $5,000.

IF APS gets its way on the net metering argument. Our home will be very difficult if not impossible to sell with the solar system and the lease payment included.

No buyer is going to want to assume the $82.82 lease payment and then pay APS another $100 op. top of that. Before I added solar. My monthly average payment to APS was $155/mo. So the new proposal would end up costing me a lot more on my monthly average. The value of our home would be greatly diminished if the APS proposal is approved.

I respectfully request that APS consider what this proposal will do to existing rooftop solar customers. The "grandfather" clause should go with the home and not just with the customers.

I suspect that there are many existing rooftop solar customers who share my
concern. Having had considerable experience in dealing with legal matters, I also suspect that the class action lawyers are circling and licking their chops about potential class action lawsuits for diminution of value. I hope it doesn't come to this but it might if APS gets its way before the ACC.

I thank you for your time and consideration in allowing me to express my concerns.
Very truly yours,
Jon & Rita Wittig
CC Arizona Solar Concepts
*End of Complaint*
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Docketed
*End of Comments*
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Caller is opposed to changes in net metering
*End of Complaint*

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:
docketed
*End of Comments*

Date Completed: 8/1/2013
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion No.</th>
<th>2013 - 111989</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>8/2/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>08A Rate Case Items - Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19Y Other - Elec Dereg - Renewable Resource Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First:</td>
<td>Brian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last:</td>
<td>Appleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Name:</td>
<td>Brian Appleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Company:</td>
<td>Arizona Public Service Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division:</td>
<td>Electric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name:</td>
<td>For assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Complaint:</td>
<td>8/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOCKET NO E-01345A-13-0248  OPPOSED NET METERING CHANGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities' Response:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator's Comments and Disposition:</td>
<td>docketed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Completed:</td>
<td>8/2/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion No.</td>
<td>2013 - 111989</td>
</tr>
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First: Last: Steve Wilson

Account Name: Steve Wilson
Street: n/a
City: n/a
State: AZ Zip: n/a

Utility Company: Arizona Public Service Company
Division: Electric
Contact Name: For assignment

Nature of Complaint:
8/1 DOCKET NO. E-01345A-13-0248 OPPOSED

Caller is opposed to changes for net metering.
*End of Complaint*

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:
Docked
*End of Comments*

Date Completed: 8/1/2013

Opinion No. 2013 - 111987
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Trish Meeter
Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2013 - 112206
Date: 8/12/2013

Complaint Description: 19Y Net Metering
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Complaint By:
First: Sandra
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Account Name: Sandra Jenkins
Street: Glendale
City: Glendale
State: AZ Zip: 85308

Utility Company: Arizona Public Service Company
Division: Electric
Contact Name: For assignment

Nature of Complaint:
8/12 DOCKET NO. E-01345A-13-0248
Caller is in favor of net metering proposals made by the company
*End of Complaint*

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:
docketed
*End of Comments*

Date Completed: 8/12/2013