

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.

Regards,

Sean McGovern
1372 Norris Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43224

Sean McGovern
1372 NORRIS DRIVE
COLUMBUS, OH 43224

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO),

Dear Asim and fellow Commissioners,

(First off, a personal congratulations to Asim for being named to head the PUCO.)

It's only fair that we are careful about changing the rules out from under those of us with sunk costs in long-term electrical power investments. Normally people talk about publicly traded power companies when they mention rules for long term investments. The same fairness should also apply to thousands of Ohio home owners and businesses that invested in solar generation, possibly years ago, with long payback periods. The first panels we put on our farmhouse in 2007 have an 18 year payback period under net-metering as we knew it when the panels were commissioned. None of the panels we have added since then have paid for themselves yet, but we do enjoy nearly zero power bills in the summer.

Changes to net metering will have an adverse impact on us, but what's worse, it will have an adverse impact on AEP. The extra power we make at 2:00 in the afternoon (local solar noon) currently goes into the grid to help AEP run countless air conditioners in my neighborhood, which is full of large houses and all of them have AC. In the evening we need that power back to make dinner and charge the car into the night. If net metering changes, I will no longer have full incentive to give AEP our excess power all afternoon. Instead I will have incentive to invest in a storage system and AEP won't see afternoon power coming from us in the heat of the day, nor will they see us charging the car at night. We won't be completely off-grid year around, but we won't be providing them extra power when they really want it (summer afternoons into evening) nor will we be taking power when they'd rather provide it (after dark).

I 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.

Sincerely,

Neil Kirby

Neil Kirby
4653 Reynoldsburg New Albany Rd
New Albany, OH 43054

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.

George Menyhert
10021 Morganstrace Drive
Loveland, OH 45140

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.

Chris Orban
1414 Hamlet St
Columbus, OH 43201

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.

Andrea Dannenberg
4178 Paxton Woods Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45209

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

6/5/2018 8:49:25 AM

in

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

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