

SRP Price Process Comments

Week ending January 4, 2025

SRP Public Price Process

Comments from: 12/29/2024

Name: Charyl DeAlva

Record Number: 59878ccb

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

This plan change and increase would not only eliminate the Tou plan for me but it will also drastically increase my electric bill. Since your last increase my bill has increase almost \$10 a month. This increase will make my bill even higher which I then will not be able to afford. Please reconsider this and your elimination of the tou plan.

Name: David Carlson

Record Number: 19a5ecbf

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Please explain "average of daily on-peak kW" for E-16 and E-28. It is also phrased as "average of the daily on-peak maximum demand." Since this says kW, I assume this means that the 30-minute peak kW usage during the on-peak period for each day of the month is determined and then the average of these values is calculated. But, no mention of the 30-minute period is included, unlike current plans. So, how is it really calculated? This should be carefully explained to everyone who reads these plans. It also says "The mechanics of this price plan allow customers to manage their on-peak maximum demand on a daily basis." How do you expect customers to do this?


Name: Ashton Byrd

Record Number: f68582e0

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Dear Board, For the sole use of EV charging it would be good to have a meter service that would be limited to 50 or 100 amps. This would allow enough power to destination charge EVs, but reduce the potential demand from each service meter. Along with the reduced monthly meter charges, low rates during the ~8am-3pm time. Eliminating demand charges with very high charges during peak hours. The intent of these meters is to be in work area parking lot as a stand alone meter intended for EV charging. With lighting attached to the meter, but little else. Not intended for a living area. Thanks,



Name: Chee Y Leong

Record Number: 44d1fb43

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Why SRP not utilize Arizona heat to generate more energy to grid instead of price increase to consumer? Why high energy industry bear the upgrade cost?

Name: David Hooker

Record Number: 5a4b2629

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

All of these price increases are killing us! Utility companies, too, are some of the groups who raise prices way too often. Part of this, I'm sure, is to comply with very dubious "clean and green" energy mandates foisted upon you and us by the Federal Govt. Most of the mandates just make energy MUCH more expensive than it need be. I'm all for solar panels, but these wind turbines are awful: they deface the environment, kill birds, and are highly inefficient and expensive (and impossible to recycle). The costs are, again, borne by taxpayers. You need to advocate for, and promote, more nuclear power as a reliable and cheaper alternative to the so-called "renewables." Check out the Documentary video from Oliver Stone (a liberal, but excellent filmmaker) called "Nuclear Now." He documents how the time for more nuclear power is NOW. Nuclear = carbon free emissions, too. France and Sweden get 80% of their baseline power from nuclear. Why don't we? You guys need to make every effort to keep costs DOWN for us ordinary folks. The "carbon free" by 2050 initiatives out there (foisted on the US by international globalist entities, like the WEF) are nothing more than a pipe dream. Give it up!! We need a diverse energy base (including natural gas - remember a few years ago when it was touted as a clean alternative energy source?), but one in which nuclear eventually comprises the majority for the sources of our electric power. It has risks, of course (disposal of the spent rods, reliable and safe uranium mining sources), but so does every energy source. However, these are risks that we simply need to take as our population keeps growing. We cannot afford not to.

SRP Public Price Process

Comments from: 12/30/2024

Name: Tom Kertis

Record Number: 3134c4ba

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Srp donates money to nonprofit organizations. Another way to look at that is that Srp overcharges its customers and then direct money to nonprofits. I believe that's wrong. Srp should offer the best price to their customers and let the customers decide if they want to donate from their savings to the nonprofits.

Name: Mike Swoverland

Record Number: e3909ac8

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

I am against any increase in Prices, this will be a burden on those of us on a fixed income and we struggle enough daily to cover all the increases in prices.

Name: Teresa Orozco

Record Number: 9ece5108

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Why is the increase higher for residential homes with solar panels? I thought SRP was promoting saving energy and the environment. Homeowners have made the financial decision and effort to go solar but getting charged more for using power from SRP??

Name: JP Harrison

Record Number: d214f88e

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

My opinion on this in a word-NO! Have you looked at the cost of living lately? EVERYTHING has gone up-except wages. So, of course now is just a great time to raise our utilities. Please postpone this increase until things economically, politically have settled down a bit. But to throw this at us at this time is another strain on most folks budgets at a time when so many other things have brutally hit. There is more homelessness now that ever before and the numbers are increasing. This is getting scary and will probably get worse with the new Administration. Spare us from another increase, please.

Name: Ed Werner

Record Number: 41fb30c1

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Seems like SRP is sticking it to the solar users. The vary people who invested to help with the overall load SRP is trying to keep up with. Doesn't sound fair.

Name: Alex Beberman

Record Number: 11131103

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

SRP quit gouging customers especially in the summer when people can least afford it. This ridiculous that you would even consider raising rates when people are struggling. ABSOLUTELY APPALLING

SRP Public Price Process

Comments from: 12/31/2024

Name: Wendy Gould

Record Number: 85d26ba7

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

I have been reading about the proposed price increases and plan changes.
Please keep the EV program where charging is available from 11pm to 5am.

Name: Rosemary Cyr

Record Number: 8c583c32

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

When we leave for the summer from May to November, we turn off all power. What will the new rate be? It seems we already pay enough and use no power at all already.

Name: wolfe

Record Number: dfdb8aae

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Prices should not be raised. According to your annual reports, you are setting new records in revenue and your operating expenses are also down compared to 2023. You continue to have predatory practices towards solar power, rather than prioritizing sustainability. As a company, you've also raised the rates at a questionable speed- increasing the rate by 9.6% in 2023 alone. With the addition of the 3.9% raise in 2024, you clients are already paying 13% more for necessities than they did in 2022. Without having progressive programs for sustainable design and not having an extraordinary amount of extra labor compared to previous years, you are increasing profit and decreasing value. Every small increase is painful for millions in the valley, and will be felt and acted on accordingly.

Name: Laura

Record Number: 94d5ddcd

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Please tell us who pays for the costs of attracting "large" customers to SRP territory. How much expenses did SRP incur in the last 12 months for attracting these "large" customers in terms of hosting them to events, concerts, games, meals? And how are these costs allocated? Who pays for them?

Name: mark morales

Record Number: cf58843c

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

please don't raise electricity prices. i work for a non profit and people can barely afford electricity now. i myself can barely afford it. please don't raise electricity prices.

SRP Public Price Process Comments from: 1/1/2025

Name: Alena Mkva

Record Number: 76fb68bf

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

You've made record profits while increasing your prices and hurting families struggling to pay. I'm 100% against price hikes, especially in a time of mass inflation and rising unemployment.

Name: Nathan Schaner

Record Number: 9f41c103

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Why do solar customers see a higher increase when compared to non solar customers every time there is a price change? The most recent price change had a higher average impact and now does this one. This is discriminatory and sends a message that alternative sources of energy are discouraged by SRP. When customers commit to a solar system, it's long term, and seeing prices changes that affect solar customers more than non solar customers is a complete rug pull.

SRP Public Price Process Comments from: 1/2/2025

Name: Cindy Barnes

Record Number: d398f728

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Can you tell me what your plan is on weekends for Time of Use? It sounds like it's 8 am to 3 pm daily when currently weekends and major holidays are off peak. I have been on the time of use for years and we leave in summer and set our AC to 85 and still have a \$285.00 bill..I really feel like Srp has been raising their fees a lot in last few years. Wish the board was not doing this.

Name: Philip T. Demarest

Record Number: 57edd066

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

We Solar Owners who export power to the grid NEED to be paid more than \$.03 per kW!!! SRP charges me \$.07 to \$.28 per kW when I draw from the grid. I feel this is not sufficient enough for the FREE power I am giving SRP.

SRP Public Price Process

Comments from: 1/3/2025

Name: Donna Zimmerman

Record Number: 5bd72136

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

I really wish SRP would stop raising rates. I recently signed a petition to lower the amount charged for electricity. The rates keep climbing even though people are already struggling to pay their bills. I know our electric bill was higher this year than it has ever been. We are very cautious with our power and mindful of when we use it. We hang our clothes outside to dry and only use the dryer to fluff them. We have been dealing with record breaking summers meaning more electricity is being used. I understand this is causing more work for SRP, but it is also allowing for more profits. I do not understand why the power companies are permitted to keep their profits and raise rates for customers to pay for upgrades. In any other business profits would be used to pay for upgrades which would in turn allow for more profits. Whereas it appears SRP keeps profits, has customers pay for upgrades, and then keeps even more profits while customers are choosing between life-saving air-conditioning or buying food. Cities are creating "cooling centers" for people experiencing homelessness while power companies are raising rates that are contributing to that homelessness. I am asking SRP to do what every person is required to do at this time which is cut back on profits to make ends meet. Every person I have spoken with is facing the same terror of the power bills. Even people who have upgraded to new "energy efficient" air conditioners, which we also have done this year, are claiming higher power bills when they should have gone down. By the way... I take great offense that the only way I can obtain a rebate from SRP for this upgrade is if I agree to give SRP full access to control the temperature in my house without my knowledge or agreement. Sorry, but my privacy is not for sale. I truly hope you will take this into consideration before you put in another rate increase or at least allow people to recuperate slightly from the last rate increase that we are still reeling from. Sincerely, Donna Zimmerman

Name: Steve Neil

Record Number: MI6836615

Delivery Method: Email to Corporate Secretary

Attachments: SRP Management Response to Steve Neils Second Request for Information_SN02 ROUND3.pdf

**To receive a copy of Attachments please contact the Corporate Secretary's Office and Reference Record #MI6836615*

Comment:

Good afternoon. This email begins Round 3 on this request about E-28. Please send the attached PDF with questions about their responses or lack of response to the appropriate staff. I let Brandon Shoemaker know to expect this.

SRP Management Response to

Steve Neil's Second Request for Information Regarding

SRP's Proposed Changes to its Electric Rate Schedules

1. This request for information is a follow on to my request of December 2 that you have coded as Public Comment #32346cdd. To restate for clarity, this is about the unexplained differences between the proposed E-28 price plan and the current E-28 pilot price plan. Your reply is appreciated, but it didn't address the substantive differences in the winter kWh pricing of the E-28 Pilot Price Plan and the proposed E-28 to be made into a standard price plan i.e. the on-peak kWh price raised 30%, the off-peak kWh price raised 18%, and the super off-peak price lowered 27%. The E-28 section of the Blue Book does not have a Customer Bill Impacts section, so it seems appropriate to request detail on the bill impact on a variety of usage profiles such as 20% on-peak, 40% off-peak, and 40% super off-peak, and say another 5 percentage mixes that you deem to be typical.

SRP Response:

The proposal includes ending the existing E-28 pilot and replacing it with a new price plan, also called E-28. Because it is a new price plan, the proposal does not include bill impacts or summary of the changes.

The current and proposed prices were provided as a courtesy for parties interested in the price process to see the pilot E-28 prices and the proposed standard E-28 prices. As hours have expanded in every season, the prices are not intended for a 1:1 comparison.

No percentage change in bills was calculated for existing E-28 pilot customers who could be moved to the new E-28 price plan.

As reference, here is the percent of usage by period that was used in the design of the proposed new E-28 rate:

Season	On-Peak kWh	Off-Peak kWh	Super Off-Peak kWh
Summer	11.8%	57.0%	31.2%
Peak	Totally illogical that On-peak is lower than Summer!! Please justify/explain. 11.4%	57.5%	31.1%
Winter	10.5%	59.8%	29.7%

This is lower on-peak and higher off-peak than I was thinking. And they didn't provide tranche examples as requested!

2. And for the monthly service charge, stating the percentage in each tier of your residential customer base, and the resulting average monthly service charge.

SRP Response:

Per the Cost Allocation Study, this is the percentage of each tier and the resulting proposed average monthly service charge (MSC):

Tier	Percent of residential customers	MSC
1	20.3%	\$20.00
2	76.6%	\$30.00
3	3.1%	\$40.00

The weighted average MSC of the above group is \$28.28.

The Cost Allocation Study MSC percentages are based on actual customers who have 12 months of usage data under a price plan. Price plan impacts include only customers with 12 months of usage history, to ensure seasonal price changes are reflected accurately.

When we include data that includes all customers for a single month, such as the November 2024 billing cycle customers, the percentage in each tier is as follows:

Tier	Percent of residential customers	MSC
1	28.2%	\$20.00
2	68.4%	\$30.00
3	3.4%	\$40.00

How is it possible that there is such a difference in the tier percentages between the prev.12 months dataset and the Nov24 dataset?

The weighted average MSC of the above group is \$27.51.

3. And for these 6 time-of-use mixes, the percentage change in the bill \$\$\$. I understand that a number of customers in each of the 6 mixes is not practical for this example, and future participation in E-28 cannot be predicted.

[No bill impact given in this entire list of responses! Please provide something like what I requested.](#)

SRP Response:

Please see response to Question 1.

4. Your response nor the Blue Book give any explanation for the proposed changes in winter on-peak hours, the pivot from the current plan's statement that "There are no on-peak hours from November 1 through April 30" to an on-peak price that is proposed to be 30% higher than the pilot's off-peak price. Please explain in detail.

SRP Response:

Customer feedback typically indicates a preference that peak hours are consistent year-round. In the interest of simplicity, the proposed new E-28 rate will have year-round on-peak hours. Marginal cost differences between hours form the basis for the creation of time-of-use periods.

["Typically" meaning that SRP didn't actually ask/survey? And what consumer would say that they did not like the inconsistency of being charged less in the winter half? Please have your experts weigh in and explain.](#)

5. What was the rationale for choosing kWh monetary credit rather than monthly net metering? And this explanation will need detailed examples showing why monthly net metering was unacceptable to management, such examples I'm sure would have already been created in the due diligence of choosing one approach over the other.

For below, the proposed solar export price \$0.0345 and prop. E-28 summer super off-peak \$0.0401=.0056 diff. E-16 diff is .0048. Call it half a cent. These small diffs significantly undermine your premise.

SRP Response: Assuming 1000kWh/month, 31% super off peak per above table, on sunniest days, say 100kWh exported per month = \$3.45 credit less 20% imported on cloudy days = \$4.00. 55 cents customer cost. Zero monthly net = \$0. Please disagree and show your math.

For E-15 and E-27, the energy charge was set very close to the marginal cost of energy, with the demand charge collecting the demand-related costs. For other price plans, the energy charge collects both energy-related and demand-related costs.

The demand charge in the proposed E-16 price plan does not collect the entire demand-related costs associated with service. The energy charge collects the remaining demand-related costs. The proposed E-28 energy charge collects the entirety of both energy and demand-related costs.

To have net metering on either E-16 or E-28 would require energy to again be set at the marginal cost price. To collect the remaining demand-related costs could include designs such as a much higher demand charge or a higher monthly service charge.

As proposed, the export credit for E-16 and E-28 will be adjusted every fiscal year based on the actual 3-year average of the CAISO ELAP price during rooftop solar export hours, which is SRP's avoided cost for generation and export that occurs during the applicable hours.

Regardless of the mechanism of crediting for excess solar generation that is exported to the grid, the customer's bill savings will be highest when they use their own solar energy on-site, including with the use of customer-owned battery systems.

[No examples as requested about monthly net metering credit vs. instantaneous export credit.](#)

6. And a simple one - please explain a bit about how your billing cycles are defined and enough

examples to show all the possible start & end dates that could constitute a “November billing cycle”.

SRP Response:

The billing cycle month is determined by the ending monthly scheduled read date for the cycle. The November billing cycle has scheduled read dates of November 1 through November 30. For example, 10-2-24 through 11-1-24, 10-15-24 through 11-14-24 and 10-29-24 through 11-28-24 are all considered November bill cycles.

"Read date" does not appear on a standard bill, nor is it a term explained on your website so not clear. I think it is the day after the billing cycle ends. For example, my account's read date is always the first of the month and is also the bill for that month and the service date range is the previous month's day 1 to day last. So, as I understand it, my November bill has a read date of Nov 1 and is for Oct 1 through Oct 31. Correct? Also wondering about the last example you gave of 10-29 to 11-28 which would mean the read date was the 11-29. Do you actually have read dates on the 29th and 30th of months? What happens in February?

--Steve

See attached with markup and questions from SRP's Response to prior comment/questions.

SRP Public Price Process Comments from: 1/4/2025

Name: Karen Mcbroom

Record Number: 88d1e3ed

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Concerned about the increased rates that you are proposing we got Solar as it should've been a benefit to our rates. Now you are looking to increase those higher than other people when you were using my Solar to offset Power on the grid technically, you're screwing your customers not happy.

Name: Vikram Shah

Record Number: 925e1c7a

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

I am on TOD plan. How is it changing. Also super off peak plan for EV charging staying or being done away. Also what are KWH charges at different time of day. Love SRP, it is a great utility company being a customer for pas 40 years.

Name: Amanda Cross

Record Number: 9d6e5327

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

My Comment - SRPs current pricing for electricity is already too high. I am NOT in favor of managements proposal of an "overall average increase of 2.4% to annual revenues" that would be applied to customers October or November 2025 billing cycle. I am not in favor of any rate increase to my electricity bill.

Name: David Haka

Record Number: b1ac82c4

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

Why do you discriminate against residential solar panel owners? You see it as solar households getting a better deal than regular households. I disagree with that. Solar households reduce the amount of energy you need to produce. But that is not in your business plan. You make more money building new facilities and solar get stuck with the higher costs to pay for these facilities. You need to reduce the monthly access charge so it is equal to residential and eliminate this ridiculous on demand monthly charge.

Name: Caryn Potter

Record Number: MI6841808

Delivery Method: Email to Corporate Secretary

Attachments: SWEEP 1st Data Request - SRP 2025 Pricing Proceeding_.pdf

**To receive a copy of Attachments please contact the Corporate Secretary's Office and Reference Record #MI6841808*

Comment:

Southwest Energy Efficiency Project Data Requests To Salt River Project Regarding Its 2025 Pricing Proceeding Process

1. Please provide customer characteristics information for price plans E-16 and E-28, similar to the example shown for price plan E-15 below:
2. Please identify the number of customers that would fit into each of the three-tiered Monthly Service Charge categories:
 - a. Single units in Multi-family housing Types.
 - b. Single-family housing types with 225 amps or less.
 - c. Single-family housing types with more than 225 amps.
3. Does SRP anticipate all residential customers fitting into one of the three-tiered Monthly Service categories? If not, please explain why.
4. Is SRP planning for the E-28 TOU Price Plan to become the default rate for residential customers? If not, please clarify which price plan is the default for residential customers.
5. Please provide a narrative explaining the rationale behind the minimal changes to the price differential between the three pricing seasons, on-peak and off-peak periods in the E-28 TOU price plan. Specifically, why was the decision to collapse the summer and winter rates into the same price, and is the current E-28 plan differentiated between seasons as described on Pages 91-93? Additionally, why does the winter on-peak and off-peak rate show no difference, while the summer peak-to-off-peak ratio is 4:1 instead of the ideal 3:1?
6. Please provide hourly residential customer usage data or billing determinants used to determine the E-16 and E-18 proposed rates in Excel

with working formulas and links.

7. Please provide the following source reports mentioned in the Cost Allocation Study:

- a. FP25 6-Year Financial Plan (FY26)
- b. FP2025 Revenue Model (FY26)
- c. FP25 Customer Systems Study

8. Please provide the Schedule SBC: Derivation of System Benefits Charge in Excel with working formulas and links.

9. Did SRP consider consolidating the E-28 TOU rate for residential customers and moving these customers onto the rate as a default? Why or why not?

10. What efforts does SRP plan to undertake to ensure a smooth rollout of the proposed rates? Does SRP have an education plan outlined for preparing customers for the proposed rates?

11. Has SRP conducted any evaluations or studies on the effectiveness of the TOU rate in reducing peak demand (both coincident and noncoincident)?

- a. If yes, please provide all studies, work papers, and other supporting documentation used in these studies or evaluations.
- b. If not, please describe why such studies have not yet been performed.

12. For SRP's Customer Programs, please provide the following information by year:

- a. Planned budget and actual spending for the next five years, broken out by year and program.
- b. Planned demand savings (kW) and actual demand savings (kW) by year and program.
- c. SRP's projected peak demand growth for the next 15 years before and after energy efficiency.
- d. SRP's projected peak demand growth for the next 15 years before and after demand response.

13. Does SRP require customers enrolled in the E-67 Standard Price Plan for Large Load Substation Large General Service to participate in Demand Response and Energy Efficiency Programs? If not, why?

14. Provide the current status of SRP's interconnection request queue and the request allocation by customer class.

Name: Steven Neil

Record Number: 7b6b6359

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

This request is about the “exported kWh credit” and seeks answers regarding its calculation and the proposed changes from the "Intercontinental Exchange Palo Verde Peak index" to the "CAISO External Load Aggregation Point price" (ELAP). (Quotations are from your pricing process documents) The “Management's Complete Proposal” document and the “Appendix A” document and the “Cost Allocation Study” have not a single word of explanation about this proposed change. So I have a few questions about this. And because some of my prior questions have not been answered, could you please be sure to review every question and then verify your response is fully responsive? 1. For many years, your ratebook has stated that the net metering credit is based on the “Intercontinental Exchange Palo Verde Peak index”. However, the Intercontinental Exchange website, ice.com, has no index with that exact name. 1a. What is the Intercontinental Exchange name for the data you use? 1b. What is the online link where a person can freely obtain adequately granular data to verify your calculation of the “Annual Average Market Price” as defined in your “Renewable Net Metering Rider”? 2. The same questions as #1 for the CAISO ELAP node? 3. The same questions as #1 for the CAISO Palo Verde node? 4. If your descriptions of the various indices or nodes do not contrast differences between them, what are the differences? 5. What is or are the complete reason(s) for the proposal to switch to CAISO ELAP? The new and proposed residential price plans, E-16 and E-28, contain a section that is not in any other price plan and it is entitled “Per Exported kWh Credit” and gives details about how and when you propose to recalculate the credit. 6. What is the data needed to make this average calculation? Please provide the actual data for the last six years of calculation. 7. What is the calculation and price when the customer does not meet the “entire 12 months” specification? 8. You state that the “Residential Solar Loss Factor is 5.67%.” How was this value determined? Is there empirical data that supports your determination? If so, please provide in complete detail. In view of your 12-30-24 proposed modifications to the proposal: 9. What is the CAISO Palo Verde node price over time that would have been used in such a calculation? Please provide the actual data for the last six years of calculation or the online link to freely available data. 10. Who reported to SRP this erroneous use of the CAISO Palo Verde price? And when? 11. I see that for the existing export plans, E-13, E-14, E-29, etc., you do not propose an annual recalculation. I understand that you propose sunseting these plans and others around November 2029. Why no annual recalculation over that period? With the

export credit calculation for E-16 and E-28 being recalculated annually, you will undoubtedly have two exported kWh credit prices. Why? 12. Since the annual recalculation of the exported kWh credit is proposed to be effective starting with the May billing cycle of each year, and you propose the price to first be effective in November 2025, why do you propose first recalculating it for May 2026 bills instead of recalculating it for May 2025 which would be applied to November 2025 to April 2026 bills? 13. For any data requested above, if not already provided, where, when and how can a member of the public obtain it at no charge? If an internet location, what are the exact links?

Name: Paul Carruthers

Record Number: d965514d

Delivery Method: Digital Submission

Comment:

U've got to be kidding! Proposing to raise Electric rates 3.4%! I'm sure SRP Executives will be getting a larger Raise than 3.4%! Please justify the rationale for the Raise! As a Public Consumer Electric Provider, your rates should be set on usage not some ratio that your Financial Advisors think is appropriate. When was your last Raise? It should be in increments of 1% every 4-5 years. Of course, the Valley is growing, and there are only 2 choices: SRP & APS. There should be a Special Rate for Elderly- 62 & up, most of us are careful at what electric & water we use, so we should have some benefit for our being careful. It is easy to forget those who have to count pennies to be able to survive. Just because Social Security gives a % increase, doesn't mean that there is enough to go around to all of the expenses older people have. It's tough for EVERYBODY! Families, Singles, all of us. Please use a 'compassion' filter before you request the Corporation Commission to increase our Rates!
