

PUCO Case No. 12-2050-EL-ORD Nov. 8, 2017 Proposed Rules Related to Compensation for Net Metered Customers

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO),

Dear Chairman Haque and Commissioners,

As an individual/business invested in a net metered, distributed generation system, I write to ask you to reconsider the November 8, 2017 decision on new, proposed net metering rules. The decision on these rules made progress in several respects, but set a bad precedent on what is considered in net metering credits which are earned by the self-generating customer when their system is producing more electricity than what they are using. Specifically, the PUCO ordered that the net metering credit be calculated for its energy value only, and prohibited the capacity value from being included in the credit.

My system and others across the state provide a capacity resource for the grid, therefore providing a benefit to the distribution utility. While it may be true that distribution utilities, nor the PUCO, have established a standardized monetary value for the capacity that distributed energy resources provide, it is well-established that these systems provide some capacity value.

As an Ohio consumer and net metered utility customer, I appreciate the attention the Commission has recently paid to modernizing our grid and recognizing the important role that distributed generation systems are playing in our state. The number of distributed generation systems, and therefore the number of net metered customers, is projected to continue to increase in Ohio, and I ask you to please consider the importance of properly compensating owners of distributed generation systems for the whole value our systems provide to the grid--both for the raw electrons sent back to the grid, and the capacity value that our systems provide.

Conor Davitt
2959 West Case Road
Dublin, OH 43017

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO),

Dear Chairman Haque and Commissioners,

As an individual/business invested in a net metered, distributed generation system, I write to ask you to reconsider the November 8, 2017 decision on new, proposed net metering rules. The decision on these rules made progress in several respects, but set a bad precedent on what is considered in net metering credits which are earned by the self-generating customer when their system is producing more electricity than what they are using. Specifically, the PUCO ordered that the net metering credit be calculated for its energy value only, and prohibited the capacity value from being included in the credit.

My system and others across the state provide a capacity resource for the grid, therefore providing a benefit to the distribution utility. While it may be true that distribution utilities, nor the PUCO, have established a standardized monetary value for the capacity that distributed energy resources provide, it is well-established that these systems provide some capacity value.

As an Ohio consumer and net metered utility customer, I appreciate the attention the Commission has recently paid to modernizing our grid and recognizing the important role that distributed generation systems are playing in our state. The number of distributed generation systems, and therefore the number of net metered customers, is projected to continue to increase in Ohio, and I ask you to please consider the importance of properly compensating owners of distributed generation systems for the whole value our systems provide to the grid--both for the raw electrons sent back to the grid, and the capacity value that our systems provide.

James Davenport
4838 Rutherford Road
Powell, OH 43065

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO),

Dear Chairman Haque and Commissioners,

As an individual/business invested in a net metered, distributed generation system, I write to ask you to reconsider the November 8, 2017 decision on new, proposed net metering rules. The decision on these rules made progress in several respects, but set a bad precedent on what is considered in net metering credits which are earned by the self-generating customer when their system is producing more electricity than what they are using. Specifically, the PUCO ordered that the net metering credit be calculated for its energy value only, and prohibited the capacity value from being included in the credit.

My system and others across the state provide a capacity resource for the grid, therefore providing a benefit to the distribution utility. While it may be true that distribution utilities, nor the PUCO, have established a standardized monetary value for the capacity that distributed energy resources provide, it is well-established that these systems provide some capacity value.

As an Ohio consumer and net metered utility customer, I appreciate the attention the Commission has recently paid to modernizing our grid and recognizing the important role that distributed generation systems are playing in our state. The number of distributed generation systems, and therefore the number of net metered customers, is projected to continue to increase in Ohio, and I ask you to please consider the importance of properly compensating owners of distributed generation systems for the whole value our systems provide to the grid--both for the raw electrons sent back to the grid, and the capacity value that our systems provide.

William Bosstic
1543 Musgrove Rd.
Chillicothe, OH 45601

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

Consumer Service Division

Memorandum

CASE ID: 00211374

COMPANY:

CUSTOMER: Thomas Cox MD

ADDRESS: 7933 Hidden View Drive, Holland, Ohio 43528

SERVICE ADDRESS: 7933 Hidden View Drive, Holland, OH 43528

AIQ: The Toledo Edison Company

NIQ: (419) 367-1199

DOCKETING CASE #: 12-2050-EL-ORD

SUBJECT: The Toledo Edison Company - Net Metering

Please docket the comments below in the case number above:

I am concerned about something that I have read recently about net metering. It is my understanding that the PUCO rules on this issue may soon be subject to change. I have a net metering system in my house with solar cells. To this point it has not been a major issue to let the utility keep the value that I generate as a negative balance on their books. I would however be concerned if there was no specific requirement for them to reimburse me if I wished to be reimbursed for this amount. Additionally I hope that you will reconsider and include at least a minimum capacity benefit the calculation requirements for net metering system reimbursement. This value is not zero.

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO),

Dear Chairman Haque and Commissioners,

As an individual/business invested in a net metered, distributed generation system, I write to ask you to reconsider the November 8, 2017 decision on new, proposed net metering rules. The decision on these rules made progress in several respects, but set a bad precedent on what is considered in net metering credits which are earned by the self-generating customer when their system is producing more electricity than what they are using. Specifically, the PUCO ordered that the net metering credit be calculated for its energy value only, and prohibited the capacity value from being included in the credit.

My system and others across the state provide a capacity resource for the grid, therefore providing a benefit to the distribution utility. While it may be true that distribution utilities, nor the PUCO, have established a standardized monetary value for the capacity that distributed energy resources provide, it is well-established that these systems provide some capacity value.

As an Ohio consumer and net metered utility customer, I appreciate the attention the Commission has recently paid to modernizing our grid and recognizing the important role that distributed generation systems are playing in our state. The number of distributed generation systems, and therefore the number of net metered customers, is projected to continue to increase in Ohio, and I ask you to please consider the importance of properly compensating owners of distributed generation systems for the whole value our systems provide to the grid--both for the raw electrons sent back to the grid, and the capacity value that our systems provide.

Rebecca Acheson
1451 Grim Road
Athens, OH 45701

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO),

Dear Chairman Haque and Commissioners,

As an individual/business invested in a net metered, distributed generation system, I write to ask you to reconsider the November 8, 2017 decision on new, proposed net metering rules. The decision on these rules made progress in several respects, but set a bad precedent on what is considered in net metering credits which are earned by the self-generating customer when their system is producing more electricity than what they are using. Specifically, the PUCO ordered that the net metering credit be calculated for its energy value only, and prohibited the capacity value from being included in the credit.

My system and others across the state provide a capacity resource for the grid, therefore providing a benefit to the distribution utility. While it may be true that distribution utilities, nor the PUCO, have established a standardized monetary value for the capacity that distributed energy resources provide, it is well-established that these systems provide some capacity value.

As an Ohio consumer and net metered utility customer, I appreciate the attention the Commission has recently paid to modernizing our grid and recognizing the important role that distributed generation systems are playing in our state. The number of distributed generation systems, and therefore the number of net metered customers, is projected to continue to increase in Ohio, and I ask you to please consider the importance of properly compensating owners of distributed generation systems for the whole value our systems provide to the grid--both for the raw electrons sent back to the grid, and the capacity value that our systems provide.

Lakshman Vadlamani
8021 FARM ACRE DR
WEST CHESTER, OH 45069

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

5/31/2018 3:47:41 PM

in

Case No(s). 12-2050-EL-ORD

Summary: Public Comment electronically filed by Docketing Staff on behalf of Docketing.