

**From:** [Fraser, Kelcey](#)  
**To:** [PECBoard](#)  
**Subject:** FW: meeting comments (update for typos)  
**Date:** Thursday, January 14, 2021 10:07:49 AM

---

Please see the member's board comments below.

Thank you,

**Kelcey Fraser**

Member Relations Engagement Specialist

P: (888) 554-4732 x4645 | M: (830) 330-0883

The information contained in this e-mail, including any attachments, is confidential and may be legally privileged; it is intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s). Subsequent use and distribution is governed by the confidentiality of the information. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution, or use of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, contact the number or email address in this message and destroy all copies of the original message.

---

**From:** harry sawyer [mailto:fromnewark@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 14, 2021 1:13 AM  
**To:** Fraser, Kelcey <Kelcey.Fraser@peci.com>  
**Subject:** meeting comments (update for typos)

<p><b>WARNING:</b> This email originated outside of Pedernales Electric Cooperative. <b>DO NOT</b> click any links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.</p>
--

Kelcey,

I can't submit my comments via the webpage because it only allows 500 characters, or a few sentences.. can you please replace with what i typed below? thank you!

**COMMENTS:**

The board has recently approved changes to the distribution rates which discriminate against members that produce their own energy. My delivery charge for Dec would be increased from \$40 (without solar) to \$129 (with solar). How is this fair and equitable? The reason for this is the misguided attempt to recover the distribution charges through a "Demand Capacity Charge" which results in \$5.15 x (kW\_peak\_demand), to replace the distribution charge. This should not be confused with the transmission 4CP charges which align customer peak with transmission peak load. While i agree with the concern that interconnection (solar) members should contribute to the distribution costs, it makes no sense to burden them with MUCH higher costs than they would without the solar.

Also, you have approved new transmission tariffs for which the costs are not even yet defined. These new transmission charges (undefined) seem to be only applicable the members that have interconnected solar. The solar members are the only members actively reducing the 4CP cost by producing power when the loads are highest.

The fees for interconnecting solar went from \$0 to \$650. Again, it might be reasonable to collect some charges for paper processing, but the PEC has not been transparent in how these charges were developed. In the monthly meeting video, one PEC manager stated that an engineering study would be performed for each solar system regardless of size. This make little to no sense - does the PEC perform engineering studies when someone installs a stove, or gets a new AC, or purchases an EV? A blanket study and charge seems like a waste of the members money. Perhaps on the larger systems this would make more sense.

I'm surprised that the board approved rates for 2022, for which the software technology does not even exist yet. Why wouldn't the PEC publish and engage the membership first to receive feedback, and then once properly vetted bring the end result to the board for approval when things are ready? In a regular utility rate changes must be approved by a public board of utilities or PUC, but our only defense at the coop against these poorly designed rates are the board who are elected to represent the members. It seems to this member that proper due diligence has not been performed.

I strongly urge the board to withdrawl approval of the new rates until the impact to the existing 5000 members that have solar can be clearly understood.

The board should not adopt rates that unfairly treat solar members, and to discourage members from supplying their own clean power. To the contrary, the use of member solar should be encouraged for the clear benefit it provides. No one disputes the benefits of adding distributed solar. I can't see why the PEC would make changes that discourage its use. This is exactly what these changes will do. They burden the solar member with higher distribution costs, require that the solar member reduce and managed demand, and this will ultimately delay the transition to cleaner energy sources.

I believe the PEC likely has the right intention to make adjustments to the rates for adapting to the changing times, but what you have approved does not achieve this goal.

Regards,  
Harry Sawyer  
Dripping Springs, TX  
512-660-9471

**From:** [notifications@wpengine.com](mailto:notifications@wpengine.com)  
**To:** [PECBoard](#)  
**Subject:** New submission from COVID-19 Board Comments  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 13, 2021 11:52:56 PM

---

**WARNING:** This email originated outside of Pedernales Electric Cooperative.  
**DO NOT** click any links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

#### Your information

##### Name

harry sawyer

##### Are you a PEC member?

Yes

##### Contact via

Phone

##### Phone

(512) 660-9471

#### Your message for the board

##### Topic

rate changes

##### Remarks

please see email. the webform only allows for a few sentences in comments.. not enough to convey important feedback. i hope the PEC admin receiving the email will replace this text with my comments. 500 characters might be enough for twitter but no enough to provide feedback to the PEC.