

Energ-2025-3-10-organization

To: Minnesota State Senators

Ref. SF1142

My name is Dennis Hass of Becker County Minnesota in Toad Lake township.

My wife and I invested in a 40KW solar system in 2023, and we are happy with this venture. The system is performing as we anticipated, it is paying our utility bills. We have 2 primary aggregate meters 1 on each property, but only 1 meter gets the solar generation applied to it. Then we must collect the credit from that meter and apply it to the second property's meter.

In listening to the house committee meeting there was concern that the utilities and REA's were distorting facts when there was more than 1 primary aggregate meter per solar generator. We own one of these solar systems. The utilities and REAs were claiming an inflated loss by stating they paid out large net metering checks; not accounting for a large majority of rural solar customers own more than 1 building sight.

At the time when we were looking at purchasing this system, we used the KW rate that we were paying to determine the size of the credit that we could apply to our second meter, for proper sizing.

This bill that is before you, SF1142, is taking away that KW rate. There is not a defined rate that the utilities and REA's are required to use. They need to be policed!! Changing this rate will break our original contracts. We are opposed to this.

I believe that takes away from the intent of the original bill that keeps the same KW rate that the utilities and REA's pay to what they credit.

The big picture of the original bill was promoting clean energy in Minnesota, and it is working. Let's not fix what isn't broke.

There was a lot of discussion about a .02 cent /KW unapplied cost of operating that the utilities and REA's were feeling that they're being shorted in the present bill [SF1142].

I am questioning that, as when we put electricity back on the grid it goes to the next member on the line and the utilities and REA's collect it at their full rate from them, including the .02 cent unapplied operating cost.

They didn't generate it or pay for it; they just collected it.

Electricity flows both ways on the grid.

The other customers, and I, use what we produce and are paying that 0.02cents/KW unapplied operating fee as the electricity is used.

I believe that the utilities and REA's need to reevaluate their facts.

I feel they are trying to double dip.

The REA news is stating that they and Great River Energy have partnered to install a 2.4 Mega Watt solar array with a \$800 million USDA grant, [approximant]

that is awesome, they are promoting solar.

The question I have is, how is the .02cent/KW calculated in this endeavor?

Section 4 of the bill shows that unused credits will be eliminated at the end of each calendar year and the credit starts over for the next year.

This is not practical because we are expected to do all the leg work, when they have the ability to apply credits to all primary aggregate meters that we have on file, with their computers.

Again, we are very much opposed to the SF1142 bill as it is written.

Sincerely,

Dennis & Kathryn Hass

18915 County Highway 39

Frazee, MN 56544

218-841-8347