

SRP Price Process Comments Week ending January 11, 2025

SRP Public Price Process

Comments from: 1/5/2025

Name: Hazel Clift

Record Number: 0130fbfa

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Why is the current revenue insufficient to cover the cost of infrastructure maintenance? Why has SRP not accounted for this? I am a senior citizen who has already used the COLA from Social Security for the increases to both my Homeowners and Auto insurance premiums. I am now at a deficit where any more increases for basics is concerned. And I know that my income is larger than a lot of other seniors who are already struggling. You may think that \$5 isn't a lot but when every bill goes up by \$5+ it means that there is something you have to cut back or cut out of your budget. Please consider the effects of this on seniors and low-income households. The thing they cut could be medications or AC in the summer.

SRP Public Price Process

Comments from: 1/6/2025

Name: Dinnetta Chase

Record Number: MI6845177

Delivery Method: Mailed to SRP

Attachments: PriceProcessComment_Received_20250106_Chase.pdf

**To receive a copy of Attachments please
contact the Corporate Secretary's Office and Reference
Record #MI6845177*

Comment:

12/25/24

Dear SRP,

I appreciate your hard work to provide vital services to the community. I use AC electric to cook, wash, fans, clothes, take my blood pressure, make phone calls, take my medications, watch TV, to receive important information alerts/weather storms. Read information. I pay \$1355.00 for a studio apt 300 sq feet. I'm on a fixed income. I can't afford an increase on utilities. The rent, insurances are going up every year or every two years. Food and medication done went up plus household supplies. Would you please have mercy on the customers. We are just getting by. Thank you.

Dinnetta Chase

I use electricity to keep the grocery cold. I go out and feed the homeless cold sandwiches, water, chips, apples, lettuce, tomatoes. I use my own resources to share. Thank you. I catch the bus to go feed homeless at the parks. From Dinnetta Chase.

P.S. Please do not increase the electric bill.

God prosper everyone!

Name: Jamie Velez

Record Number: AR182ff645

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 182ff645

Original Comment Date: 12/2/2024

Original Response Date: 12/8/2024

Name: Roger Olson

Record Number: AR3949c3e6

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 3949c3e6

Original Comment Date: 12/2/2024

Original Response Date: 12/8/2024

Name: Nathaniel Taylor

Record Number: AR4a4b6294

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 4a4b6294

Original Comment Date: 12/2/2024

Original Response Date: 12/5/2024

Name: Arabah Woodberry

Record Number: AR1b3ae639

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 1b3ae639

Original Comment Date: 12/2/2024

Original Response Date: 12/20/2024

Name: John Oleksey Jr

Record Number: AR86c5ef8e

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 86c5ef8e

Original Comment Date: 12/2/2024

Original Response Date: 12/17/2024

Name: Michael J Nowak

Record Number: AR6149dd01

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 6149dd01

Original Comment Date: 12/2/2024

Original Response Date: 12/4/2024

Name: Michael Lembo

Record Number: AR04973840

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 04973840

Original Comment Date: 12/2/2024

Original Response Date: 12/11/2024

Name: Roger Storms

Record Number: AR485f438c

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 485f438c

Original Comment Date: 12/2/2024

Original Response Date: 12/20/2024

Name: Joyce Lucas

Record Number: AR51bc04f0

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 51bc04f0

Original Comment Date: 12/3/2024

Original Response Date: 12/5/2024

Name: Kelly Harris

Record Number: AR8694ac91

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 8694ac91

Original Comment Date: 12/4/2024

Original Response Date: 12/14/2024

Name: K Losey

Record Number: AR3a4317ca

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 3a4317ca

Original Comment Date: 12/4/2024

Original Response Date: 12/14/2024

Name: Kenneth G Hummel

Record Number: ARdb963de7

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: db963de7

Original Comment Date: 12/3/2024

Original Response Date: 12/20/2024

Name: Chris Hammer

Record Number: ARa063281e

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: a063281e

Original Comment Date: 12/4/2024

Original Response Date: 12/20/2024

Name: Joseph Bonamo

Record Number: AR9184cc82

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 9184cc82

Original Comment Date: 12/4/2024

Original Response Date: 12/17/2024

Name: Caroline Carney

Record Number: AR2f981672

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 2f981672

Original Comment Date: 12/4/2024

Original Response Date: 12/11/2024

Name: Matt Haines

Record Number: AR0664bfe7

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 0664bfe7

Original Comment Date: 12/3/2024

Original Response Date: 12/17/2024

Name: Justin Walker

Record Number: AR25d01505

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 25d01505

Original Comment Date: 12/3/2024

Original Response Date: 12/14/2024

Name: John Tayeh

Record Number: AR003ba081

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 003ba081

Original Comment Date: 12/2/2024

Original Response Date: 12/11/2024

Name: Sheila Thomas

Record Number: AR3752a6cc

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 3752a6cc

Original Comment Date: 12/2/2024

Original Response Date: 12/14/2024

Name: Jo Gambosi

Record Number: AR88a9cdd1

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 88a9cdd1

Original Comment Date: 12/4/2024

Original Response Date: 12/9/2024

Name: Charles L Wilkinson Sr

Record Number: ARcf7fc6da

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: cf7fc6da

Original Comment Date: 12/5/2024

Original Response Date: 12/17/2024

Name: Jenny Jones

Record Number: AR276b3269

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 276b3269

Original Comment Date: 12/5/2024

Original Response Date: 12/9/2024

Name: Rebecca Ghena

Record Number: AR898fafea

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 898fafea

Original Comment Date: 12/8/2024

Original Response Date: 12/14/2024

Name: Larry Snitzer

Record Number: AR0c185a5e

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 0c185a5e

Original Comment Date: 12/9/2024

Original Response Date: 12/14/2024

Name: Nancy Damone

Record Number: AR5e627a3c

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 5e627a3c

Original Comment Date: 12/10/2024

Original Response Date: 12/11/2024

Name: Madison Reynolds

Record Number: ARcaa943ff

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: caa943ff

Original Comment Date: 12/10/2024

Original Response Date: 12/13/2024

Name: Albert Prano

Record Number: AR9059542c

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Comment requiring an amended response from SRP due to Modifications
SRP made to its Pricing Proposal on 12/30/2024.

Record Number: 9059542c

Original Comment Date: 12/11/2024

Original Response Date: 12/20/2024

Name: Royce Paulsen

Record Number: 11eda5e3

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

This is in regard to the proposed price increase for your services. I am going to be 77 years old this summer, and my income is VERY limited, and I am on a fixed, very strict budget. I am very concerned that this increase will force me out of my home of the last 25 years. With grocery prices up, I have no more money left at the end of the month. A price increase from SRP would put added burden on my already stretched thin budget. Please reconsider this price increase, or offer some sort of solution to those of us who have worked hard and honest our whole lives, and are retired and living off of meager social security checks. Thank you.

Name: Ralph G Baca

Record Number: ea3bf796

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Seems like those of us with solar installations are being discriminated against for trying to conserve energy ? What is the reasoning behind charging more for solar installations ? The amount SRP pays for unused electricity has already been reduced to less than a 1 for 1 amount. Isn't that enough of a benefit for SRP as they can turn around and charge more ? Why are we being gouged for trying to do the right thing ? It doesn't make sense to me in fact we should be getting more of an incentive than what SRP now offers.

SRP Public Price Process

Comments from: 1/7/2025

Name: Erik Vaughan

Record Number: e8c8899d

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Not a fan of proposed changes. It takes simple plans currently in effect and makes them complicated. I am a single occupant homeowner with the 3p-6pm peak hour plan, and budget billing (same bill amount each month). This works for me. I don't see a plan going forward that is similar to this. If your proposal passes, please make sure representatives reach out to each SRP residential customer to review changes and have them help select the plan closest to what they had. The way you word the proposal that customers will see a \$5.61 average increase to their monthly bill is misleading. I do not think that will be the case. Before the pandemic, my monthly bill was \$47. Today, my monthly bill is \$91. Mind you, I live by myself, and my energy consumption has not changed. There have ALREADY been annual rate increases. Now, there is a proposal for yet another one, but this one also includes substantial changes to the parameters of usage time and on-peak-off-peak. One plan is from 9am-5pm, almost the entire day!? How is one not supposed to use the Appliances and air conditioning for 8hrs? That is ridiculous! That is an unreasonable time frame to use for people, especially in the Summer. It tells me that SRP is willing to "give me a break" on energy cost if I can refrain from using heavy appliances and air conditioning for 8hrs each day. This might work for a good portion of people who have 9a-5p jobs, but I work a swing shift, so I don't go into work until afternoon, and get home at night. I use appliances in the daytime before work, including the air conditioner. This proposal is not reasonable for some of your customers. Please rethink your proposal and make changes more reasonable. And, again, if proposals go into effect in November, please have SRP reps contact each residential customer to have them help understand and review changes, and to help them find a price plan that will best suit them. Erik Vaughan

Name: Steven Neil

Record Number: 1e6860d6

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

In regard to the price process document entitled "Price Process Review" produced by Christensen Associates, will you please provide all of the information you provided to them? And all the communications between you two? And please exclude anything regarding the monetary aspects of the consulting arrangement. If the quantity is too large for emails and pdfs, I can swing by your offices and pick up the information on a thumb drive or SD card.

Name: Pamela Strowman

Record Number: d1267657

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

There was a price increase in 2024 and now another in 2025. I am low income, but not low enough to apply for assistance. I am on the 3 - 6 plan. The house gets so hot during that time in the summer months. I don't use the heat in the winter no matter how cold it gets. Someone is making money and it's not me. Please be considerate of the elderly, those that have an average income or below average. These people struggle to make ends meet.

Name: Allison Daring

Record Number: 1a74a06f

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

The justification for the increase to be offset onto the consumer is not there. We already pay astronomical rates for things outside of the actual service used by said consumer. The consumer cannot take increases otherwise we will not be able to buy necessities such as food and water. Offset the bonuses of your executives and other staff to obtain whatever needed funds instead of detrimentally impacting your customers.

Name: Sharon Lee

Record Number: f087e5ee

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Please do not keep increasing the prices! People can not afford to pay for costs of daily living as it is! Stop increasing prices on us.

Name: Steve Wolfel - Inergy Systems

Record Number: 5e7177b3

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

SRP's website has 2 of Inergy Systems Demand Management systems listed for \$250 rebate, if installed by an SRP Preferred Solar Installer. The systems support E-27 & E-27P & E-15. The proposed rates include a Demand Averaging rate with On Peak of 5 PM - 10 PM Mon - Fri. (E-16) I am one of the Managing Partners of the company. Our team is interested to know if the demand averaging method will be the same as E-15? And if the cost per On Peak kW will be set prices for every kW E-15 has Summer \$19.29 - Summer Peak \$21.94 - Winter \$8.13 Or if the cost per On Peak kW will be tiered similar to E-27 & E-27P? We will be attending the Open House session on January 9th. Best Regards, Steve Wolfel

Name: Glenn Rainey

Record Number: 30de6a34

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Before anyone expresses a complaint about utility costs in Arizona, take a moment to research what our neighbors to the west have to tolerate.

Name: Kerri Jones

Record Number: 1d6ff506

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

We pay enough for electric. Utility costs in this state are out of control. Cut back on high wage earners, reduce your footprint and allow people to work from home, manage your office supplies, get rid of extras. Do whatever you have to do but you are charging consumers enough. Stop gouging us.

Name: Brian

Record Number: e3790052

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

I don't agree with an increase again with our utilities. I can barely afford food. Every company, hoa, state permits, etc sells the idea as a slight increase only X.xx more dollars a month. That has added up to too much. Learn to do more with less like all of us please. This is not the economy to do this to.

Name: TuesDay Fletcher

Record Number: 19cec980

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

The increase is not a good thing. Most people in our park live on a fixed income and cannot afford any increase. It is hard enough in the summer time when the bills are 3 and 400 dollars to even keep up with it. I myself will be devastated with this change in pricing and not sure. I will be able to keep my electric on if this happens. Please consider leaving it the way it is. Or lowering it but Not an increase at this point.

Name: Brandyn Barton

Record Number: 48852d50

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

What is SRP doing with the existing funds they have received from the price increase that occurred within the last few years? Why is there now a requirement to increase the prices again? Is the money being put into the grid and ensuring power is available and supplied without interruption at any point throughout the year, most importantly during the peak of summer? In my neighborhood and area there were handedly close to 6 outages within a few week span during the peak of summer. Yet when contacted SRP said the power kept going out due to the heat in Arizona. Unless there is a clear plan and proper use of the funds to enhance the grid and power services, I will be ensuring the corporate commission is reviewing this increase proposal as it is unwarranted given the increase that has already been levied. Increases are understandable when there is proper usage of the funds and we as the consumers can see the difference, but as of yet, I haven't seen that.

Name: Maurice Plant

Record Number: 673c77db

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

I doesn't matter what feedback customers provide about price increases. Board members are more concerned their bottom line and their yearly salary increases. I sweat my butt off in the summer trying to save money on my electric bill. Moved here 14 years ago from South Carolina and never recalled suffering like a do here in order to pay the crazy high electric bills. My current bill for winter is \$130... that would be my high in SC in the summer. We constantly get ripped off. These messages about SRP wanting to hear from customers is "bull" in my opinion. But, you have my feedback now. Oh, and the 3.4% increase average per month (\$5.51 per month)that is some funky math. I'm tired of the high electric bills and can't move out of here fast enough.

Name: Victoria Williamson

Record Number: c31cefd7

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Please leave as is! Don't make any changes! Everything is expensive enough already!

Name: Steve Neil

Record Number: MI688801

Delivery Method: Other

Comment:

A response request for additional information on SN01 from 12/5

Name: Alma Smith

Record Number: MI6889483

Delivery Method: Mailed to SRP

Attachments: 20250107_PriceProcess_Comment_Mail_AlmaSmith.pdf

**To receive a copy of Attachments please
contact the Corporate Secretary's Office and Reference
Record #MI6889483*

Comment:

January 6, 2025

ALMA SMITH

To: BOARD AT SALT RIVER PROJECT:

I understand you are having a meeting about increasing our bills. I will not be able to attend I am 82 years old and only receive Social Security and ask that you read my letter at this meeting. I have been a resident in this valley and a Salt River Project since 1976 and am asking you to reconsider for the following reasons. Our cost of living is already beyond reasonable. We have a government that has no clue how ordinary people live because they have become wealthy for not doing their jobs and causing harm to the rest of us. We have a terrible cost of living - RECESSION - and while we can't get regular food items or gas at decent prices our increase in our income does not even being to pay for it. My Social Security increased \$30 a month. WHAT A JOKE! I was in business and worked 48 years - 10 of those years 2 jobs.

If your increase is caused by new homes and new customers pass the cost on to them. Large corporations and local government want the extra money from the influx of new people but don't care what it does to the ones that supported them most of their lives. Look at what the glut of new homes do to our water problems. We don't have enough to go around now, but the cities don't care - just want the extra money.

I am including a list of what I have done to my home that shows the items I have done from your criteria. Please know that increasing costs during a recession is not fair to your customers that are just trying to survive.

NO MATTER WHAT OUR LYING POLITICIANS SAY THIS IS A RECESSION!!! GO TO THE GROCERY STORE, GAS STATION OR ANYTHING ELSE REQUIRED TO LIVE.

I am on the EZ-3 Plan and do the follow the times of use.

1. I have newer appliances
2. Replaced 2 Heat-Cool units 2-3 years ago
3. I have electric blinds on east facing windows. Regular inside blinds west side. Extensive Overhangs front and back.
4. Do not run dishwasher during EZ-3 and only 1 time per week.
5. Do not run washer or dryer during EZ-3 and only in a 2-week period.

Thank you for any help in reconsidering the increase.

Sincerely,

Alma (Sally) Smith

Name: Hazekamp

Record Number: b04f6c69

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Completely tone deaf given the struggles of those in the Valley trying to deal with the inflation overhang that plagues us all. No relief for those that work from home.

Name: Celia Islas

Record Number: 752d234f

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Mas dinero para los CEO ya lo creo y el cliente paga para eso, cual mejor servicio? Hay que pagar por los que ya han cambiado para Solar Panels .. y los retirados son los más amolados, todo sube menos el retiro ...

Name: anthony mckenzie

Record Number: fe2a3ef6

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Regarding SRP's Proposed Rate Increases: Why does SRP continue to impose higher rates on customers who have invested in solar panels? SRP has publicly committed to supporting alternative energy sources like solar and wind. In fact, many of your customers have made substantial investments in solar panels and batteries, totaling thousands of dollars. These investments help SRP by reducing reliance on the grid, particularly during peak demand times. This allows SRP to allocate more power to areas with higher grid demands. However, despite these efforts, solar customers are not receiving the savings they were promised. Instead, SRP imposes excessive service fees and double-bills us for electricity. Solar customers are charged a monthly service fee, a demand charge, as well as both on-peak and off-peak energy charges. The electricity we use from the grid is billed through the on-peak and off-peak charges. SRP solar customers are also charged again (double billed) for the same energy usage through the demand charge, which uses a separate formula. Rather than being rewarded for our investment in solar power, SRP's solar customers are being penalized for using electricity from sources outside of SRP's grid. If SRP continues to impose these burdensome charges, should we consider sending the excess electricity we generate into the ground, instead of contributing back to the grid? Unlike APS, SRP operates without oversight from the Arizona Corporation Commission, leaving customers with limited options and often forcing them to resort to expensive litigation. While SRP has created a platform for public feedback, many of us feel the decision has already been made, and that the rate increases will move forward regardless of customer input. SRP will likely offer a lengthy, corporate-driven explanation to justify the hike, but in today's environment, price increases are more often driven by greed than actual necessity. Finally, if SRP is genuinely committed to supporting alternative energy, then the solar power and other alternative forms of electricity generated by your customers should be rewarded, not burdened them with additional fees and charges

Name: Melissa Hamilton

Record Number: 3997e425

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Our aps bill is our highest bill every month, the fees are 3x more then our actual cost of our energy use... Elderly people are going to die because they won't be able to pay and will go without ac or heat in order to be able to afford other bills... It's crazy, with all the solar fields you have out here in buckeye and tonopah why is it always the residents who get stuck paying more??? It's crazy and needs to stop

Name: Alex Farlow

Record Number: 2334718a

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Please do not in increase the price.

SRP Public Price Process

Comments from: 1/8/2025

Name: David Bender

Record Number: 4541e71a

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

These questions and requests continue from the 9 submitted on December 11, 2024 (submission confirmation number: ecb014ee) that we have not net received responses to. 10. Produce all spreadsheets, workpapers, and underlying data in unlocked electronic format, with all formulas, functions and underlying data intact, supporting your “Proposed Adjustments to SRP's Standard Electric Price Plans Effective with the November 2025 Billing Cycle and Appendix A to Proposed Adjustments to SRP's Standard Electric Price Plans Effective with the November 2025 Billing Cycle: Proposed Standard Electric Plans and Riders” dated December 30, 2024 (“December 2024 Adjustments”). This includes, but is not limited to the spreadsheets used to create Figure 5, Figure 6, Table 1, Table 3, Figure 9, Table 8, Figure 10, and Table 10. 11. Confirm that the per kilowatt hour credit for electricity delivered by residential customers with solar generation to SRP are subtracted from proposed revenues used to calculate the figures and values in the December 2024 Adjustments, including but not limited to those in Figure 5, Figure 6, Table 1, Table 3, Figure 9, Table 8, Figure 10, and Table 10. 12. Provide the amount of per kilowatt hour credits (total kilowatt hours and price per kilowatt hour) for electricity delivered by residential customers with solar generation assumed in the calculations in the December 2024 Adjustments. 13. Please provide the values for Figure 5, Figure 6, Table 1, Table 3, Figure 9, Table 8, Figure 10, and Table 10 in the December 2024 Adjustments if the per kilowatt hour credit for electricity delivered by residential customers with solar generation to SRP are not subtracted from (i.e., do not decrease) current and proposed revenues. 14. Please confirm that, following implementation of the proposed price plan changes, residential customers with solar generation will be permitted to move to the E-23 if they choose to do so. 15. Please confirm that customers on a price plan that will be sunset are permitted to move to any price plan they choose and for which they are qualified, rather than the default price plan SRP proposes to move those customers to. If so, will customers be permitted to move to their preferred plan prior to 2029? 16. Do SRP's estimated bill impacts, including in Figure 5, Figure 6, Table 1, Table 3, Figure 9, Table 8, Figure 10, and Table 10 in the December 2024 Adjustments, account for adjusters and riders, or base rates only? 17. The Cost Allocation Study uses an LOLP-weighted peak for purposes of

generation cost allocation. a. How many hours are used in this calculation? b. Please provide hourly LOLP data in electronic, unlocked, format with all internal functions, data, and cross-references intact.

Name: Derek Engle

Record Number: 8f8ae7ab

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Can you provide a detailed comparison of service costs incurred by SRP per proposed residential 'tier' that justifies the additional MSC to customers with existing single-family homes? Everything I'm seeing in the Cost Allocation Study is broken down by price plan with no reference to tiers (unless I'm missing something). Although I can easily see an argument for different costs to connect to new construction single-family homes vs. new construction apartments--for example, more and longer feeders for homes, but larger feeders and metering and distribution enclosures for apartments--I am failing to see how *existing* single-family homes would be more expensive to *maintain service to* than existing apartments. (If anything, I'd expect apartments with individual unit metering will incur more customer service costs as residents more frequently move in and out, generating more service start and stop requests). Additionally, I don't see why townhomes are in the same tier as apartments. Aren't they more like single-family homes in terms of feeder sizes and lengths, metering, service drop sizes, and customer service costs than apartments? I would expect homes served with aerial service to have higher maintenance costs than those with underground; yet this is not reflected in the tiers? Without a detailed study, it's all guesswork. If service costs are related primarily to the size of service drop (as suggested on pg. 10 Selected Electric Utility Trends, Concentric Energy Advisors 2-2-24), then MSCs should be based on service drop size rather than residence type (so the proposed plan could have 2 tiers: 225A or less and above 225A, or 3 tiers: 100A or less, 101-225A, and above 225A). Additionally, if the goal is to recover more basic service costs via MSCs instead of per kWh charges, I would expect MSCs to increase across all tiers while per kWh charges decrease. Without a detailed study of service costs incurred by SRP per proposed tier, the structure of the new tier pricing appears arbitrary and unjustified. Please provide this study, if you have it. If not, a study should be completed and made available to the public prior to introducing a new tier system. I am not against a tiered system for MSCs based on service costs, but it needs to be justified by a detailed study. It cannot be arbitrary, based on speculation, or based on prioritizing favored types of development.

Name: anthony mckenzie

Record Number: ab7ff610

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Currently, SRP has the flexibility to sell electricity on the open market at market rates, but for SRP's solar customers, the situation is different. Solar customers can only sell their excess electricity back to SRP at a rate determined by SRP. That excess power, whether it's all or just part of it, is often repurchased later [REDACTED] usually at night when no solar energy is being generated. So why don't solar customers have the option to set the rate at which they sell their electricity back to SRP? If SRP's buyback rate is too low, we should have the freedom to simply not sell it back, since, after all, the SRP solar customer owns that electricity. Another issue is the way the on-demand charge works. When solar customers sell back electricity to SRP and then later repurchase it, that on-demand charge doesn't take into account the electricity they've sold to SRP. There should be some kind of adjustment in the demand charge to account for the electricity that is sold back to SRP and then bought by the customer. It just makes sense that the demand charge take into account the electricity generated by the SRP solar customer that is sold and returned to us.

Name: Randolph Halbedl

Record Number: 101a20c8

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

I am against any rate increases for 2025-2027 given the current economic situation and want SRP to use other means to distribute power delivery cost increases via solar implementation and credits to lighten the load on the Phoenix valley power grid. For example, natural gas is plentiful and cheap within the USA so please use cheaper means such as these to keep your cost of production down.

Name: Steven Neil

Record Number: c3a19bef

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

SRP has stated in this price process that it intends to seek board of directors approval for a new program that will financially compensate those with rooftop solar who transfer or sell their system's Renewable Energy Certificates to SRP. In regard to the questions below, please do not state that this is not part of the price process, because it is SRP that publicized this in this price process. And please answer as to the current plans, which of course are subject to change by management and subject to board amendment or rejection. 1. Can you be more specific about the envisioned timing of this action? 2. Do you plan on adopting the industry standard of 1 Solar REC (SREC) is equal to 1 MWh of generation? 3. Will you be offering this for all DG interconnected to SRP? 4. Did customers who received financial incentives from SRP toward their DG system (the time period remembered by me as roughly 2009 to 2014), did these customers sign over their RECs to SRP to receive the incentive? If not RECs, what did they assign to SRP, if anything? 5. If a customer previously received an incentive for assigning RECs to SRP, will they be eligible for this new program? 6. Other than what you may have described above, is there any solar generation that will not be included in this program? 7. I'm sure you have writeups about this program. Please include them in your reply.

Name: Aaron Richards

Record Number: 90c601a4

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

This is insane. 1. You make no mention of the cost of use from 3pm to 5 or 6pm. Considering the recent history of time of use, we can assume it will be just a few pennies less per kwh than the "on-peak", essentially extending peak hours by 2-3 hours per day. 2. You are charging more to the people who "can afford it" to offset more \$25 rebates for low income. This is socialism! It is completely unacceptable. Why not try incentivizing low income homes to conserve rather than making the rest of us pay for their power? 3. The peak hours of your new time of use is during dinner preparation time. Are we supposed to not use our oven or stove from 5 or 6pm to 9 or 10pm? This targets families as the new primary "cash cow". 4. How much were your bonuses this year? There should be no bonuses if the business can't afford to continue operating without a rate increase. This is poor leadership. Your estimate of an increase of \$5-6 per month is ridiculously low. The jump from \$20 to \$30 for a single family home is \$10 alone! Who does your math? This is no more than a knee-jerk reaction to the days remaining hotter for longer and SRP trying to capitalize on this. Our SRP bill has never crested \$400 per month. By the time I let my EZ-3 time of use plan expire in 2029 (as you have stated) the summer bills will likely be over \$500 per month. This is unacceptable. You are doing a disservice to everyone and especially those not receiving the \$25 vouchers. Rethink this plan, or change your leadership team. Arizona says no!

SRP Public Price Process

Comments from: 1/9/2025

Name: STEPHEN SHAVER

Record Number: d87eaf7b

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

At a time when the economy is getting hit hard with price increases all around, I can't fathom why SRP would put profit and greed above the welfare of those who are having a hard enough time making ends meet. Find other ways and solutions such as NO price increases but rather better structure and restructuring within the organization itself.

Name: Robert Rinne

Record Number: d43d7308

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

My comments were never posted the first time, so I'm trying again.....I have not increased my power usage over the past few years, yet my bill continues to go up. Number one, I don't own an electric vehicle, so why am I to be responsible for paying higher prices per KWH because of those people who had increased their power usage by charging their cars at the rate of a 4-ton AC Unit? I should not be penalized for them using more power. Nor should I have to pay for everyone's EV Chargers, because SRP is handing them out like candy, and basically charging me for the EV owner's Charger. That is unethical business practices. Number two, you put smart meters on all the houses to save money, but my bill kept going up, what's up with that? Now you don't have people going out to read the meters, yet the per KWH rate keeps rising. If I want to reinstall a mechanical meter someone would have to physically read my meter, and then you want to charge me \$45 per month more, for a read every other month. But when you got rid of the mechanical meters and went to smart meters, you didn't give me a discount on my bill of \$45 per month. Once again, unethical business practices. Number three, everything has been going up in the past 4 years except my pay. I had to cut corners and tighten up the belt, so, SRP can do the same. Why should I be charged more due to your inability to cut your corners. Oh, just charge the customer more? Is this your logic? Once again, unethical business practices. Number four, every time it rains hard, three days later our power goes off, yet I don't get a discount on my bill. This has happened 5 times in a 15-month span. SRP fails to deliver, yet I still must pay full price. I called and was told that because the power is off, I am not being charge during that time. Really, I know that. The problem is the AC must run twice as long to make up for all the heat which is now in the house in the summertime. And it takes more energy to cool down the house than if the power didn't go off at all. The reason for the power going off is a failure of direct burial cables. Once SRP does replace the cables, they use direct burial cables again, you know, the ones that fail. Once again, unethical business practices. Number five, I wanted to replace my electrical panel on my house, but SRP just cuts the cable and splices it back, the cable coming up to the panel. I have known many people that had issues after this was done. Splicing 40-year-old direct burial cable is NOT the proper repair, it WILL fail. And when it fails, it usually burns out electronic devices and SRP does not take responsibility for the electronic devices, the customer must cover their own cost. Once again, unethical business practices. So, SRP can do what the rest of the us must do, tighten up the belt and do more for less. No Rate increase, SRP has not earned.

Name: Harold Melamed

Record Number: fe70684a

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Why do you hate solar customers so much? Stop your greedy ways and give your solar customers some fair pricing.

SRP Public Price Process

Comments from: 1/10/2025

Name: Kelly Molloy

Record Number: 78af1f0d

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

I am opposed to the proposed residential price increase, given the current economic stressors being endured by the community in virtually every aspect of our lives. While I appreciate that SRP's plans include a focus on being able to meet the resources needed for our ever - expanding state, the current plan is lacking in transparency as to how much of the financial burden is being placed on residential customers rather than business customers, or how much of the increase is due to Arizona's recent push to woo IT businesses (which place disproportionate strain on SRP's and other utilities' resources, but appear to bear little to none of the economic repercussions). I believe that residential price increases should be the last resort, only after businesses, particularly those that are heavy utilizers of power, water, etc, have had their utility costs adjusted. The review on SRPs website reviewing the proposed business changes is incredibly vague, and offers no assurance that the residential increase is anything other than a means of offsetting the cost of practices favoring business over people. I am grateful for the services SRP provides to all of us, but I am concerned that further residential price increases will quite literally harm people, especially in the summer, when someone's inability to afford air conditioning becomes a matter of life and death. What is SRP doing specifically regarding the heavy new demands placed on it by businesses, especially those in the tech industry? If this residential price increase is implemented, is the money strictly used for addressing the needs of residential customers?

Name: Steven Neil

Record Number: b5c8cc5f

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

This is a followup to "SRP Corporate Pricing Response to Public Comment #MI6435429" that I received 12-31. I reask two of the questions I asked on 12-5: 7. Regarding the S5 statement in Sep 2023, "we have different price plan comparison tools and calculators online, and call center representatives are available", what are all the tools and calculators, both online for customers and only available to SRP employees, the tool or calculator name, the URL if available to customers, the customer types or classes available to, the date ranges the tool or calculators have been available, the time granularity of the data e.g. how many minutes, hours or days does the kWh data represent, the length of the period calculated e.g. in years, etc.? Sounds like a table would be the best way to provide this information. SRP Response: Due to the meter programming requirements for rooftop solar, which are specific depending on bill options including Net Metering, Export, or Customer Generation, SRP does not currently have an online tool on its website for customers with solar to compare price plans. Non-solar residential customers, with more generic meter programs, receive a comparison message on their bill. As you can see, I did not say a thing about "rooftop solar". And there is no response to my question. 9. The Blue Book's proposed adjustments will result in an increase in the number of plans available for a residential customer to choose from, and the plans offer a greater diversity in variables for the customer to consider. The adjustments will also result in a short timeframe of about 8 months for customers to choose a possible lower cost plan before 10 legacy plans are frozen from new participation and will no longer be an option they can choose. What is management's plan, in detail and including timeframes please, to assist customers in making an informed choice about the cost of the various plans? SRP Response: If SRP's Board of Directors approves the price changes, SRP will publish those changes on its website within one business day after the Board's approval. SRP will also notify all customers of the changes, by mail and-or email, before the first billing under the new prices. I'd like to give management another opportunity to address this question.

Name: Steven Neil

Record Number: 4303a425

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Hi. Might I suggest a small change to how you name each week's pdf of comments received and responses? The links texts is worded like this: "... Week of Dec 30" However, the title page of the pdf document it links to is worded like this: "... Week ending January 4, 2025" For clarity, I suggest making the links text also use the wording of "week ending xxxxxxxx x, xxxx". I also note that if you wanted to state the start date of the week, it would have said "Week of Dec 29", the Sunday, as the "Week Ending January 4, 2025" date is a Saturday. Same issue exists for link text "Week of Dec 16" and "Week of Dec 23". NNTR (no need to reply)

Name: Danetta Romero

Record Number: 86399324

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Please consider NOT raising rates! Many people work nights and sleep days thus making it impossible to use the off peak hours. We have 4 schedules in our home, school,work,therapies, useing off peak hours would certainly NOT work for us and thousands of others. To increase rates in a city that already has unbearable heat, where air conditioning is crucial for LIFE, it borders on tyrannical governance. PLEASE consider NOT raising the rates for another year.

SRP Public Price Process

Comments from: 1/11/2025

Name: Shirley caldwell

Record Number: 0801e688

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Summer of 2023 my SRP bill was over 200.00\$ with most everything turned off just 2 people in my residence (adult) very conservative people I'm on SS so try and wrap your head around that we live on very limited food no \$ for groceries !!!

Name: Tracie Costenbader

Record Number: 59eb61d0

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

I do not want a price increase. Food, auto repairs, sewer, water rates, have all been increased. We pay enough in the summer as it is already.

Name: Brian Cantoni

Record Number: cb26626d

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

I am surprised and disappointed that SRP is moving Super-Off Peak hours away from where they used to be, during the middle of the night (when I would think demand is lowest by businesses. I have the EV plan now, which allows (in fact encourages) me to charge overnight - when my car is at home. Moving it to 8 AM - 3 PM is not when my car will be home, and I feel like it will become a much larger expense. This significantly changes the value proposition of having an electric vehicle now.

Name: Gary Fortney

Record Number: f426408c

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

I already am stretched financially to be able to pay bills any increase in cost would make it even more strenuous. We are on a limited income and this can cause a hardship.

Name: Mary (Mrs. Delton) Ressler

Record Number: ef69c8c9

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

I am currently a solar customer and have the following questions: Why is the increase planned more expensive for the solar customer? Also it was mentioned that some TOU plans are proposed to be added, kept, or changed to something else. I currently have Customer Generation Plan in use with my solar. What would be the proposed future of this plan or the substituting proposal for the most economical use?

Name: Ronen Berechman

Record Number: 52cb8c1a

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

I attended the open house and used the simulator to calculate my expected price under the proposed price increase. I was dismayed to learn that as a solar owner I will see an over 10% price increase, much more than any of the published residential average increases. If SRP wants to lower customer evening demand, how about assist solar owners installing home battery storage instead of unfair price hikes. Make solar owners part of the solution. A couple other comments - - Please make the simulator available to the public so customers can see their potential impact or how they can benefit from changing to a TOU plan. - Utility solar with storage is not only already a proven and price competitive technology, cost continues to go down - reliability is just a matter of building more solar for a state with over 80% sunny days. Make AZ a literal powerhouse for all the datacenters and advanced manufacturing looking for cheap, clean energy. Regards, Ronen Berechman
