

Speak Up!

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Complaint of Larry Fagen against Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light & Power Association. | CG-16-241

Closed Jun 02, 2016 · Discussion · 3 Participants · 5 Topics · 3 Answers · 1 Replies · 1 Votes

3

PARTICIPANTS

5

TOPICS

3

ANSWERS

1

REPLIES

1

VOTES

SUMMARY OF TOPICS

ANY OTHER DOCKET-RELATED ISSUES OR CONCERNS. 3

Answers · 1 Replies

Gary Schettl · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Apr 09, 2016 4:28 pm
1 Votes

To the Public Utilities Commission and electric utility... Please consider that electricity is the only form of "clean" energy, (potentially). Penalizing electric utility customers who are generating clean electricity via solar or wind power ultimately slows the necessary shift toward clean energy, sometimes state wide. Generating clean energy is critical to keeping the earth hospitable for humans. Promoting clean energy is the best way to curtail or reverse the upward trend in destructive billion dollar weather events that are rooted in carbon intensive power generation.

I believe it is acceptable to charge a reasonable one time fee to connect a clean energy producer to the electric grid, since this is likely the last time a system owner will require any personal attention from the electric utility. However, after the connection is made and the account settings are adjusted to record two-way energy flow, there should be no additional monthly fee, and the clean power producer should be compensated at the same dollar/kilowatt rate charged by the electric utility.

Respectfully, Gary Schettl (rooftop solar owner)

Complaint of Larry Fagen against Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light & Power Association. | CG-16-241

Closed Jun 02, 2016 · Discussion · 3 Participants · 5 Topics · 3 Answers · 1 Replies · 1 Votes

Lori Read · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · May 19, 2016 12:24 pm
0 Votes

Dear Mr. Schettl, as a consumer using and paying for the same power lines that you use to receive power, why should you not pay a fee to send the excess power over those same lines that you have generated and received payment for at the retail rate? Basically you are making me pay for your upkeep on those power lines. Isn't that penalizing me for your profit? How fair is that?

Response:

Mike Woodley · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · May 20, 2016 5:59 pm
Lori...I am in the solar industry and also perform LED lighting audits.....Of my 64 solar customers in MN, IA and Wi...everyone of them only reduces their kWh consumption from their utility or coop...the net result is similar to when my customers swap out to LED lighting or install more efficient appliances. They all pay monthly service fees and have for years prior to installing solar. I am still waiting to see any conclusive study that shows how this could possibly affect you. Have you seen one? I would love to see it. While my customers may be paying the Cooperative 50% less then prior to installing solar. solar also can assist a cooperative as solar is only generated during the day during peak demand. If you would like to have a discussion about this that is based on facts, I would be happy to engage. Solar may not be your choice...but it is the choice of several members of cooperatives who just want to lower thier kWh consumption and remain competitive in their business..

IS IT PERMISSIBLE FOR A COOPERATIVE ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION TO REQUIRE A CUSTOMER TO BE COMPENSATED USING THE “KWH CARRY FORWARD” METHOD, MINN. STAT. §216B.164 SUBD. 3(F)? 0

Answers · 0 Replies


DOES MINNESOTA VALLEY’S COMPENSATION OPTION OF “THE KWH RATE CALCULATED FROM THE COOPERATIVE’S PREVIOUS YEAR’S AVERAGE WHOLESALE POWER COST FIGURES” COMPLY WITH MINN. STAT. §216B.164 SUBD.

3(D) AND MINN. RULES 7835.3300, SUBD. 1? 0

Answers · 0 Replies

Complaint of Larry Fagen against Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light & Power Association. | CG-16-241

Closed Jun 02, 2016 · Discussion · 3 Participants · 5 Topics · 3 Answers · 1 Replies · 1 Votes

IF A CUSTOMER INSTALLED A SOLAR SYSTEM PRIOR TO JULY 1, 2015 AND EXPANDED IT AFTER JULY 1, 2015, IS ALL, PART, OR NONE OF THE COMBINED SYSTEM SUBJECT TO THE 2015 AMENDMENTS TO MINN. STAT. §216B.164?  0 Answers · 0 Replies

IS IT PERMISSIBLE FOR A UTILITY TO WAIVE OR REDUCE OTHER FEES TO ENCOURAGE QFS TO ELECT A SPECIFIC METHOD OF COMPENSATION FOR EXCESS ENERGY, SUCH AS THE KWH CARRY FORWARD METHOD?  0 Answers · 0 Replies

