

Konrad Jackson

From: Paul Seaton <pkseaton@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2026 12:46 PM
To: Senate Labor and Commerce
Subject: SB150 public testimony 2026-3-20

I support SB150.

I agree with the detailed testimony research product submitted by Erin McKritick.

The major effect on the electrical system is that installations will be made of larger KW capacity. That is because the credits can be rolled forward to following months and consumers will want to maximize their bill reduction. Since actual production can not be specifically determined, the tendency will be to be sure you have enough which would be above the annual usage ending March 31. That is a good target end date as it is the end of winter season where credits would be mostly used.

The real State benefit is the reduction in generator fuel required on the annual basis. I do not believe the state should pay the utility for any "loss of revenue" from encouraging home weatherization to use less fuel, or from net metering which encourages using less fuel. So the payment under Sec. 42.05.395 (d) or the creation of the Fund in Section 3 AS42.45.015 is not necessary. If that remains, I suggest adding a provision that the utility "loss" can only be computed from the difference of average projected current net metering and the projected reduced sales with the annual net metering provided in this bill.

Additionally, please recognize that Sec. 42.05.395 (a)(2) "unused credit expires" should be incorporated into the calculation of any "loss" to a "load-serving entity." All those credit kilowatts will be free to the utility and were sold at retail price to other users on the system with no generating fuel cost so served as an offset to any perceived "loss".