

FACEBOOK.COM/HLOPINIONS • TWITTER.COM/HL OPINIONS

I am 86 and haven't the energy to attend this meeting

but I agree 100% with this aritcal Alice Ruth Brady 607 Seattle Dr Lexington, K

KU hike bad for consumers, clean-energy use

*Keep Temp 68° winter too cool to save on my bill
" " 80° summer ok*

BY DICK SHORE

I write on behalf of the approximately 1,500 members of the Bluegrass Group of the Sierra Club. We strongly oppose the latest proposal from Kentucky Utilities to drastically increase the fixed customer charge for electricity — the monthly fee that KU charges its customers just for being a customer, independent of their energy use.

KU has filed a rate case with the Public Service Commission seeking to raise that basic service charge to residential customers from \$10.75 per month to \$22 per month — a greater than 100 percent increase overnight.

KU's proposal would transfer costs from high-energy users to low-energy users, would discourage energy efficiency and the use of clean energy, and would disproportionately impact the financially disadvantaged and those living on a fixed income.

This anti-consumer proposal

Related: Herald-Leader article, "Public Service Commission sets public meetings in utility rate case"

not only seeks to hike company profits at the expense of Kentucky households, but also rewards energy waste while penalizing those who work hard to be efficient or to generate their own energy.

Lower-income customers tend to use less energy and therefore stand to lose more under a rate structure that more than doubles fixed monthly charges.

Under KU's proposal, a home using 500 kilowatt-hour/month would be hit with a whopping 17 percent higher bill; while a home using 1,500 kwh/month would see only a four-percent increase.

Jonathan Wallach of Resource Insight, a consultant with decades of expertise in the electric power sector, has found that low-energy users are al-



Herald-Leader photo

ready subsidizing high-energy users under the current KU rate structure. The increase in base rates would add insult to injury by dramatically escalating the existing unfair subsidy.

We further oppose the increase in the base rate because it would also undermine progress toward energy efficiency. Wallach estimates that KU's plan would result in an approximately 3 percent increase in energy consumption due to the disincentive for efficiency built into KU's request.

Thus, the hiked customer charge would increase energy waste and counter more than 15 years of work by utilities to reduce energy consumption.

This would stymie efficiency efforts in our state just when they are urgently needed.

For decades now, the Public Service Commission has argued for energy efficiency. Approving this increase in base rates would be a serious blow to this goal. An increase in the fixed customer charge would also set back efforts to diversify our energy sources.

Currently, the solar industry employs at least twice as many people as the coal industry. In 2016, the rate of increase in solar industry jobs was more than 17 times the rate in the rest of the economy.

Unfortunately, Kentucky's share in this economic boom has been severely limited due to an unfortunate absence in our state of the incentives that are benefiting job growth as well as clean, affordable energy in other states.

KU's proposal is another obstacle in the path of solar and other sustainable technologies because Kentuckians who adopt cleaner energy sources, such as solar panels, while remaining

connected to the grid would suddenly see a great decline in cost savings due to the large increase in fixed monthly charges.

It is clear that KU's rate restructuring proposal would hurt fixed-income customers, discourage energy efficiency, and inhibit customers from investing in clean, cost-saving technology like rooftop solar installations.

Several organizations and individuals, including the Community Action Council and the Kentucky attorney general, have joined with the Sierra Club to oppose KU's rate restructuring request.

The Public Service Commission has scheduled a meeting on April 18 in Lexington, at 5:30 pm in the Lexington Public Library, to obtain feedback from the public. We need to make it known loud and clear that we oppose KU's proposal.

Dick Shore is chair of the Bluegrass Group, The Sierra Club.

Andy McDonald
7134 Owenton Rd.
Frankfort, KY 40601
April 18, 2017

Kentucky Public Service Commission
Re: PSC Case 2016-00370

To whom it may concern:

I am a customer of Kentucky Utilities and a net metering customer. I am writing to voice my opposition to KU's proposed rate changes in case number 2016-370. KU's proposal to raise the basic service charge for electric and natural gas customers would have several negative consequences:

- This change would penalize customers who have made energy conservation and efficiency improvements to their homes and customers who have low energy consumption, and net metering customers who generate their own renewable power.
- The change would discourage future investments in energy efficiency, conservation, and renewable energy by reducing the financial benefit of these actions.
- The change would harm lower-income customers by increasing basic monthly living costs and reducing their control over those costs.
- The change is contrary to long-standing state public policy, which recognizes conservation and energy efficiency as beneficial to all customers and the Commonwealth. PSC support of demand side management programs and state programs to promote energy efficiency show clearly that the state recognizes this as a public benefit.
- By discouraging the use of conservation, efficiency, and renewable energy, the proposed rates raise a roadblock to the expansion of businesses working in this sector. As this is one of the fastest growing sectors in the US economy and Kentucky is in great need of economic development, these rates are not in the interest of the general public.

My own circumstance illustrates the negative impact the proposed rates will have on customers. My family operates a small farm in Franklin County and we have made a conscious effort to practice energy conservation and use energy efficiently. When we bought our farm we set the goal of being a net-zero energy home and farm and we have achieved that goal. With a 2 kilowatt solar PV array we generate all of the electricity needed for our home and farm and each month our electric bill is under \$12 (the basic service fee). Under KU's proposed rates, our monthly electric bill would nearly double, despite all of the efforts and investments we have made to reduce our consumption and generate our own power on-site with renewable energy.

Reducing energy consumption, producing power from renewable energy, and distributed renewable generation provide valuable benefits to all ratepayers and the general public. Electric and gas rates are a powerful tool for influencing people's behavior. KU's proposed rates will encourage greater energy use and discourage investments in distributed renewable energy. The rates will also do harm to the most vulnerable members of the population and weaken a resource they have to improve their lives. Please reject KU's proposed electric and gas rates and direct them to develop rates that actively encourage conservation, efficiency, and distributed renewable energy.

Thank you for your consideration of my views.

Sincerely,



PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Mail your comments to:
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard, P.O. Box 615
Frankfort, KY 40602.
Or fax to: (502) 564-3460

Name: Zina R. Merkin

Address: 120 Victory Ave, Lexington 40502

Case: 2016-00370

COMMENTS: This is a totally regressive
rate structure, rednary the cost to energy hogs
and hurting low income and fixed income citizens.
It reduces the feasibility of solar and other alternative energy
sources, and it takes ~~us~~ this state in the wrong direction.
This should not be approved, not one nickel!

PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Mail your comments to:
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard, P.O. Box 615
Frankfort, KY 40602.
Or fax to: (502) 564-3460

Name: Vicki Ritchie

Address: 613 Wichita Lex KY 40503

Case: 2016-00370

COMMENTS: _____

I am concerned about the effect of the monthly charge increase on small residence & lower income family utility bills. They will bear the higher added costs and are least able to support the increases in many cases.

Additionally, I am concerned about the cumulative effect of the increase from 2015 added to this one so soon after.

PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Mail your comments to:
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard, P.O. Box 615
Frankfort, KY 40602.
Or fax to: (502) 564-3460

Name: Christian Torp
Address: 552 Elm Tree Ln, Lexington, KY 40508
Case: 2016-00370

COMMENTS: This rate increase is
regressive and disproportionately impacts
those least able to bear it.

My wife is the executive director
of a non-profit serving single mothers
12-24 years old. Those women's
lives are hard enough, to more than
double an unavoidable cost they
all incur and have no choice in
is unconscionable.

We all have a right to health,
safety and welfare, this structure
is intentionally designed to disproportionately
affect those least able to bear this
burden, while simultaneously disincentivising
efficiency.

KU's model of centralized power
generation and non-renewable fossil
fuels are antiquated technology to
enable them to limp along ~~and~~
while still making a profit is as
good as stealing my son's future.

PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Mail your comments to:
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard, P.O. Box 615
Frankfort, KY 40602.
Or fax to: (502) 564-3460

Name: Pamela B. Mitchell

Address: 2941 Candlelight Way 40502 LGSE

Case: Kentucky Utilities #20-00370, 2016 ↓
00371

COMMENTS: Oppose the monthly fixed charge being raised from \$10.75 per month to \$22 per month. Something is wrong when a home using 500 kWh would pay a 17% higher bill than a home using 1,500 kWh would see only a 4% increase. This proposed increase would unfairly impact lower income customers who tend to use less energy and will lose more. Under this rate schedule, that more than doubles fixed monthly charges. By doing this proposal it would also take customers ^{longer} to recover the costs of energy saving technologies such as insulation, new furnace, and solar panels.

The rate increase was substantial two years ago in 2015. For people on a set income, these increases are difficult.

We need to focus on also becoming more energy efficient.

PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Mail your comments to:
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard, P.O. Box 615
Frankfort, KY 40602.
Or fax to: (502) 564-3460

Name: Michael Kerwin

Address: 1225 Cooper Drive, Lexington, KY 40502

Case: 2016-00370

COMMENTS: For a retired person on a
Fixed income, this increase is a shock!
I'm sure it's also a shock for any
low income person. IF this is indeed
a needed increase, it should be
implemented over a period of time.
Isn't this a principle of PSC?
This is especially true since
KU received a major increase in
2015 — 2 years ago.

The second disagreement is in regard
to how the rate is being changed.
As a very conservative user, my rates
are going up at a disproportionate rate.
I was taught to be a good steward
of the earth's resources. I turn off
the lights when they're not needed. This
charge change discourages conservation.
It should not be approved as
proposed.

PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Mail your comments to:
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard, P.O. Box 615
Frankfort, KY 40602.
Or fax to: (502) 564-3460

Name: Dr. Rita and Douglas Swan

Address: 136 Blue Heron Pl.

Case: KU + LGE's request for a rate increase 2016-00370

COMMENTS:

We oppose this doubling of the monthly service charge, which discourages conservation and penalizes the poor.

KU and the state legislature are not favorable to renewables.

KU should have announced goals of getting a significant amount of power from renewable sources by a certain date.

It is pathetic that KU will buy only 30 kw each month from a home owner's solar power. In Indiana the utility companies buy 1000 kw each month from a home owner's solar power.

PS The woman from Fairfield IA is likely a Maharishi. They have very bizarre religious beliefs and health care practices.

My name is Dick Shore. I live at 205 Catalpa Rd, Lexington 40502

My wife and I are rate payers to Kentucky Utilities.

I strongly oppose this latest proposal from Kentucky Utilities
to double the monthly fee that we pay
just to be a KU customer
before we use any electricity at all. Double.

I oppose for several reasons.

First it would transfer costs from high-energy users to low-energy users.

Second it would discourage energy efficiency and the use of clean energy.

Third it would disproportionately hit the financially disadvantaged.

Finally it would set back efforts to diversify our energy sources.

This anti-consumer proposal would increase company profits
at the expense of Kentucky households.

It would reward energy waste.

It would penalize those who work hard to be efficient
or to generate their own energy.

Low-energy users are already subsidizing high-energy users.

This proposal would increase that subsidy

For decades now, the Public Service Commission has argued for energy efficiency.

This higher base rate would mask the monetary benefit to the rate payer
of using less energy and counter more than 15 years of work by utilities
to reduce energy consumption..

Lets talk Jobs. In 2016, the jobs in the solar industry increased
17 times faster than the rest of the economy.

But Kentucky's share in this economic boom has been severely limited;
our state lacks the incentives that are benefitting other states
for job growth in clean, affordable energy.

KU's proposal is yet another obstacle to those jobs

because Kentuckians who add cleaner energy sources, such as solar panels,
would face an even larger penalty, a doubled fixed monthly charge.

Because KU's rate proposal would hurt low and fixed-income customers,
because it would discourage energy efficiency,
because it would deter customers from investing in clean,
cost-saving, job creating technology,

I urge you to oppose this proposal.

PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Mail your comments to:
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard, P.O. Box 615
Frankfort, KY 40602.
Or fax to: (502) 564-3460

Name: Stanley A Houston

Address: 1804 Blue Ridge Dr. Lexington Ky
40505

Case: _____

COMMENTS: Prior to this meeting KU has bragged
it has a way to ID the location of an outage quick.
This was news several years ago when KU requested
a rate increase, I called KU to ask if the new
program would pin point the problem of my
KU power going off all the time. KU said NO!

I sent the PSC the newspaper article along with
a copy of the conversations I had with KU.

KU again is telling the same story in
2017 attempting to get another bogus rate
increase.

After the PSC-KU public hearing at
Bryan Station High School several years back
two KU employees rushed to me to ask
about what I said to the PSC. I told
them what they wanted to know. I was told
they would get back to me. Guess what,
they never did. Typical!!!

PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Mail your comments to:
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard, P.O. Box 615
Frankfort, KY 40602.
Or fax to: (502) 564-3460

Name: Catherine Clanea

Address: 212 Preston Ave.

Case: 2016-00370

COMMENTS: I oppose the proposed
increase in the BSC from
\$10.75 to \$22.00.

This is a backwards thinking
policy. It hurts low, fixed income
customers & apartment dwellers &
people who attempt to conserve
energy.

A wise rate structure should
be tied to energy use & users
should have control over their
energy bill.

A wise rate structure should
encourage not discourage energy
use. This policy disincentivizes energy
conservation & renewable energy
investment.

P.S.

I strongly resent KUC sending out
the completely misleading Elser that falsely
describes "benefits" of this rate (Feb. 2017)
structure (who paid for that Elser?)

David L. Krimm
3161 Hyde Park Drive
Lexington, KY 40503
859-224-4905 Home
859-457-0191 Cell

Dr. Talina R. Mathews
Executive Director
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Blvd.
Frankfort, KY 40601

Re: Kentucky Utilities Rate Case 2016-00370

Dear Dr. Mathews,

I would like to express to you my displeasure upon reading the details of the proposed rate hike. I understand inflation and that periodic inflation related rate hike are necessary, and that rate hikes are also necessary to cover increases in the costs of materials and services that KU incurs. The proposed rate hike increases the base (fixed charge) 120 percent while decreasing the (variable) usage charge 10%. This latest proposal represents some of the worst that corporate American greed has to offer:

1. The proposed rate change hits those who are least able to pay with the biggest percentage increase.
2. The proposed rate proves that all of the KU conservation propaganda is insincere because the proposed rate change also hits those who actually conserve with the biggest percentage increase.

If KU needs (and deserves) a rate increase, then that is fine. However, when I pay my electric bill, my intent is to honestly pay for electricity and the service necessary to provide that electricity. I expect the same honesty from KU. I should not be billed for huge CEO salaries, nor should I pay for the costs of KU's "social agenda".

Thanks,



Dave

William H Wheeler
187 Jesselin Dr
Lexington, KY 40503

PSC

4/18/2017

To: Kentucky Public Service Commission
Re: Kentucky Utilities Company Rate Case 2016-00370

Kentucky Utilities Company's proposal to the KY Public Service Commission for a revenue increase included in its notice to the public in the Herald-Leader dated November 16, 2016 several estimates concerning the residential class that I will address:

1. The annual bill increase will be 6%. This is important as I will point out shortly.
2. The monthly ^{dollar} ~~bill~~ increase will be approximately \$7.
3. The average monthly usage is 1,179 kWh which annualizes to 14,000.

I have made a chart that compares several annual usages and shows three pricing categories: Current Pricing; KU Example Pricing shown by KU in its enclosure with the February bill that increases the kWh rate and keeps the current fixed rate of \$10.75; and Proposed Pricing that reduces the kWh rate and increases the fixed rate to \$22.

One item on the chart is an annual usage of 14,000 kWh which KU says is average. And the annual % increase is 6 as shown in KU's notice. And the monthly bill increase is \$7 as shown in KU's notice. So for the average customer there is confirmation of the estimates in the notice.

HOWEVER, other annual usages tell a different story. Remember 14,000 kWh is average. 18,000 kWh shows only 4% bill increase instead of 6%. And the dollar cost increase is only \$5.70 per month instead of \$7.00. 22,000 kWh shows only 2.6% bill increase instead of 6% and the dollar cost increase is only \$4.50 per month instead of \$7.00.

So the only way KU can achieve 6% revenue increase is by charging the below average or low usage customers more than 6%. 10,000 kWh users will have a 9.6% bill increase instead of 6% and the dollar cost increase is \$8.17 per month instead of \$7.00. 6,000 kWh users will have a 17.1% bill increase instead of 6% and the dollar cost increase will be \$9.40 per month instead of \$7.00.

Thus, KU can be fair to low usage customers by canceling the proposal for the fixed rate increase and asking the PSC to approve a kWh increase from .0887 to .095 as suggested in its enclosure with the February bill.

Two years ago KU requested a fixed rate increase to \$18.00 but dropped that plan in a settlement with the PSC. It was the wrong thing to do then and is wrong to do now.

**COMPARISONS OF KU PROPOSED REVISED PRICING USING VARIOUS ANNUAL kWh USAGES
REFERENCING THE FORMAT ON KU'S ENCLOSURE TO ITS FEBRUARY 10 BILLING STATEMENT**

SHOWING % CHANGE KU PROPOSED PRICING TO CURRENT PRICING AND TO EXAMPLE

(14,148 kWh is AVERAGE ANNUAL USAGE FOR KU RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS)

ANNUAL kWh Usage	CURRENT PRICING			KU EXAMPLE PRICING				KU PROPOSED PRICING				Monthly Bill Increase
	D kWh	E Fixed Charge	F D + E KU Total Charges	H kWh	I Fixed Charge	J H + I KU Total Charges	% Change	L kWh	M Fixed Charge	N L + M KU Total Charges	% Change	
	\$0.0887	\$10.75	\$2,435	\$0.095	\$10.75	\$2,599		\$0.085	\$22.00	\$2,474		
26,000	\$2,306	\$129	\$2,435	\$2,470	\$129	\$2,599		\$2,210	\$264	\$2,474		\$3.23
			\$2,435			\$2,599	6.1%					Example : Current
			\$2,435							\$2,474	1.6%	Proposed : Current
						\$2,599				\$2,474	-4.8%	Proposed : Example
=====												
22,000	\$1,951	\$129	\$2,080	\$2,090	\$129	\$2,219		\$1,870	\$264	\$2,134		\$4.47
			\$2,080			\$2,219	6.1%					Example : Current
			\$2,080							\$2,134	2.6%	Proposed : Current
						\$2,219				\$2,134	-3.8%	Proposed : Example
=====												
18,000	\$1,597	\$129	\$1,726	\$1,710	\$129	\$1,839		\$1,530	\$264	\$1,794		\$5.70
			\$1,726			\$1,839	6.1%					Example : Current
			\$1,726							\$1,794	4.0%	Proposed : Current
						\$1,839				\$1,794	-2.4%	Proposed : Example
=====												
Average 14,148	\$1,255	\$129	\$1,384	\$1,344	\$129	\$1,473		\$1,203	\$264	\$1,467		\$6.89
			\$1,384			\$1,473	6.1%					Example : Current
			\$1,384							\$1,467	6.0%	Proposed : Current
						\$1,473				\$1,467	-0.4%	Proposed : Example
=====												
10,000	\$887	\$129	\$1,016	\$950	\$129	\$1,079		\$850	\$264	\$1,114		\$8.17
			\$1,016			\$1,079	6.1%					Example : Current
			\$1,016							\$1,114	9.6%	Proposed : Current
						\$1,079				\$1,114	3.2%	Proposed : Example
=====												
6,000	\$532	\$129	\$661	\$570	\$129	\$699		\$510	\$264	\$774		\$9.40
			\$661			\$699	6.1%					Example : Current
			\$661							\$774	17.1%	Proposed : Current
						\$699				\$774	10.7%	Proposed : Example

**COMPARISONS OF KU PROPOSED REVISED PRICING USING VARIOUS ANNUAL kWh USAGES
REFERENCING THE FORMAT ON KU'S ENCLOSURE TO ITS FEBRUARY 10 BILLING STATEMENT**

SHOWING THE RATIO OF BASIC SERVICE (FIXED) CHARGE TO KU TOTAL CHARGES

(14,148 kWh is AVERAGE ANNUAL USAGE FOR KU RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS)

ANNUAL kWh Usage	CURRENT PRICING				KU EXAMPLE PRICING				KU PROPOSED PRICING				Monthly Bill Increase	
	D kWh Cost @ \$0.0887	E Fixed Charge \$10.75	F D + E KU Total Charges	Ratio Column E to F %	H kWh Cost @ \$0.095	I Fixed Charge \$10.75	J H + I KU Total Charges	Ratio Column I to J %	L kWh Cost @ \$0.085	M Fixed Charge \$22.00	N L + M KU Total Charges	Ratio Column M to N %		
26,000	\$2,306	\$129	\$2,435	5%	\$2,470	\$129	\$2,599	5%	\$2,210	\$264	\$2,474	11%	Fixed to Total	\$3.23
22,000	\$1,951	\$129	\$2,080	6%	\$2,090	\$129	\$2,219	6%	\$1,870	\$264	\$2,134	12%	Fixed to Total	\$4.47
18,000	\$1,597	\$129	\$1,726	7%	\$1,710	\$129	\$1,839	7%	\$1,530	\$264	\$1,794	15%	Fixed to Total	\$5.70
KU Average 14,148	\$1,255	\$129	\$1,384	9%	\$1,344	\$129	\$1,473	9%	\$1,203	\$264	\$1,467	18%	Fixed to Total	\$6.89
10,000	\$887	\$129	\$1,016	13%	\$950	\$129	\$1,079	12%	\$850	\$264	\$1,114	24%	Fixed to Total	\$8.17
Wheeler Actual Mar '16- Feb '17 8,555	\$759	\$129	\$888	15%	\$813	\$129	\$942	14%	\$727	\$264	\$991	27%	Fixed to Total	\$8.61
6,000	\$532	\$129	\$661	20%	\$570	\$129	\$699	18%	\$510	\$264	\$774	34%	Fixed to Total	\$9.40

WHAT % OF TOTAL REVENUE IS RESIDENTIAL?

WILL INSTALLATION OF "SMART" METERS ALLOW A UTILITY TO READ METERS REMOTELY BY COMPUTER OR IN OTHER WORDS TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE 2 WAY COMMUNICATION CAPABILITY OF THE NEW METERS?

IT IS UNFORTUNATE THAT PEOPLE WHO HAVE MADE INVESTMENTS IN ENERGY EFFICIENCY ARE FEELING FRUSTRATED BY THIS PROPOSED RATE STRUCTURE. IT IS ^{EVEN} MORE UNFORTUNATE THAT THOSE WHO WILL ~~BE~~ EXPERIENCE THE MAJORITY OF THE PAIN & REAL ~~DISFRANCHISE~~ DIFFICULTY OF SUCH A POLICY ARE THOSE WHO HAVE NEVER HAD ~~ANY EXTRA~~ THE MONEY TO THINK ABOUT HOME IMPROVEMENT.

PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Mail your comments to:
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard, P.O. Box 615
Frankfort, KY 40602.
Or fax to: (502) 564-3460

Name: Reva Russell English

Address: 1107 N. Limestone Lexington, KY 40505

Case: _____

COMMENTS: Keeping up w/technology is not to be entered into lightly - especially for basic needs like utilities. While it may seem at the outset that getting smart readers to view & record usage & rates via the cloud is a good & cost-effective business move - especially since it will eliminate jobs & the cost of "upgrading" is born ~~not~~ by the consumer.

I disagree with this approach & consider it reckless. In addition to the cybersecurity concerns that arise, trying to maintain software & hardware inside a tech industry that is distancing itself today from what its making tomorrow, will be very difficult. What company is making these devices? How can we guarantee they will still be in business in three years. As tech keeps changing, will we have another rate hike in 2 years for another upgrade?

NOV

Secondly, this proposal benefits those who use the most energy & whose use of it also tends to cause the most harm to our environment. &

PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Mail your comments to:
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard, P.O. Box 615
Frankfort, KY 40602.
Or fax to: (502) 564-3460

Name: Jan Stallones

Address: 709 Cooper Drive 40502

Case: 2016-00370

COMMENTS: I'm here to represent neighbors in
Montclair who could not attend tonight

I'm concerned about the fee doubling.

I'm concerned about the undue burden on
small users and not on larger users.

My neighbors are concerned about these things
as well as impact on fixed income households
and the disincentive of exploring new energy
sources.

I was surprised, moving here, to learn that
I had to wait to get an energy audit.

I bought an energy-star electric dryer and
was shocked to learn there was no rebate
for energy saving dryers.

I am used to zero interest loans to make homes
energy-efficient and far greater payments to
sign up for programs that cycle power in high
use times. I've lived in Austin, TX and
the L.A. area & am^{so} surprised at how far
behind this area is in energy efficiency
and exploration of solar, wind, etc., and in
working with homeowners in the area.

(\$200
savings)
not
\$20!

(over)

→

Questions

- parameters
- 1) what are you doing to determine cost burden effects on lower income & regular residents vs. what is "reasonable" for retailers & large industrial who have profits and a commitment to the community.
 - 2) What are you ^{exploring what more} doing to help residents & particularly large users to become more efficient?

low ~~income~~ income folks
being represented ✓

there are programs, (but they are not aggressive & forward-thinking enough.)

- * look at Austin, TX
- * look at Southern California
- * look at solar