

ORIGINAL



0000019725

3052

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

Arizona Corporation Commission

- 1
- 2 MARC SPITZER  
Chairman
- 3 JIM IRVIN  
Commissioner
- 4 WILLIAM A. MUNDELL  
Commissioner
- 5 JEFF HATCH-MILLER  
Commissioner
- 6 MIKE GLEASON  
Commissioner
- 7
- 8
- 9

DOCKETED

MAY 20 2005

DOCKETED BY [Signature]

AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCUMENT CONTROL

2005 MAY 20 P 1:59

RECEIVED

10 IN THE MATTER OF THE GENERIC  
11 PROCEEDINGS CONCERNING ELECTRIC  
RESTRUCTURING ISSUES

Docket No. E-00000A-02-0051

12 IN THE MATTER OF ARIZONA PUBLIC  
13 SERVICE COMPANY'S REQUEST FOR A  
14 VARIANCE OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS OF  
A.A.C. R14-2-1606

Docket No. E-01345A-01-0822

15 IN THE MATTER OF THE GENERIC  
16 PROCEEDING CONCERNING THE ARIZONA  
INDEPENDENT SCHEDULING  
ADMINISTRATOR

Docket No. E-00000A-01-0630

17 IN THE MATTER OF TUCSON ELECTRIC  
18 POWER COMPANY'S APPLICATION FOR A  
19 VARIANCE OF CERTAIN ELECTRIC  
COMPETITION RULES COMPLIANCE DATES

Docket No. E-01933A-02-0069

**REQUEST FOR PROCEDURAL  
ORDER AND RESPONSE TO TEP'S  
ACTION FOR DECLARATORY  
ORDER**

20

21

22 The Arizona Corporation Commission Staff ("Staff") hereby requests that the Commission

23 deny Tucson Electric Power Company's Motion for Declaratory Order, filed on May 4, 2005. In the

24 alternative, Staff requests that the Commission order TEP to file prefiled testimony in support of its

25 Motion. Staff also requests that the Commission modify the procedural order that governs TEP's

26 pending rate case, Docket No. E-01933A-04-0408, to allow an indefinite continuance in that case. A

27 continuance is desirable to allow Staff and other interested parties to avoid preparing and filing

28 testimony that may be mooted by TEP's supplemental filings.

1 **I. TEP'S MOTION FOR DECLARATORY ORDER SHOULD BE DENIED.**

2 In its May 4<sup>th</sup> filing, TEP asks the Commission to clarify its intentions for the post-2008  
3 ratemaking treatment of TEP's generation services. (TEP's Mot. for Dec. Ord. at 4). Specifically,  
4 TEP's Motion seeks to determine whether the Commission will "adhere to the TEP 1999 Settlement  
5 Agreement's foundational premise" that TEP's post 2008 generation rates will be determined "based  
6 upon the Market Generation Credit formula." (TEP's Mot. Dec. Ord. at 5). Contrary to TEP's  
7 assertions, TEP's 1999 settlement agreement does not appear to be based upon such a "foundational  
8 premise."

9 TEP's settlement agreement required TEP to transfer its generation assets to a subsidiary on  
10 or before December 31, 2002. (Settlement Agreement at 7). After the transfer, TEP would have been  
11 required to obtain generation to serve its standard offer customers from the wholesale market in  
12 accordance with the Commission's electric competition rules. (Settlement Agreement at 7-8). The  
13 Settlement Agreement is silent as to how the Commission was to set standard offer rates after 2008.  
14 Given this silence, there is no reason to presume that the Commission intended to depart from the  
15 provisions of the electric competition rules. Those rules classify "standard offer service" as a non-  
16 competitive service and provide that standard offer rates "shall reflect the costs of providing the  
17 service." AAC R14-2-1601(30), -1606(c)(4). Accordingly, Staff does not agree with TEP's  
18 description of the 1999 Settlement Agreement's "foundational premise."

19 Even if TEP's description of the settlement agreement's "foundational premise" were  
20 undisputed, which it is not, it has been erased by Decision No. 65154, commonly referred to as the  
21 Track A order. In that order, the Commission specifically prohibited TEP from transferring its  
22 generation assets. The Commission took this action to prevent ratepayers from being subjected to the  
23 volatility of the wholesale market. There is no reason to believe that the Commission would prohibit  
24 TEP from transferring its generation assets but at the same time allow TEP to charge its customers  
25 market rates for that generation, as the latter action would cancel the protections inherent in the first.  
26 In summary, the question of how TEP's rates will be set post 2008 has been answered: Track A  
27 contemplates that TEP will retain its generation assets and that those assets will be dedicated to  
28 serving its customers on a traditional cost-of-service basis. See Decision No. 65154 at 22-25.

1 TEP's assertions in its Motion appear to be inconsistent with both the Track A order and the  
2 1999 Settlement Agreement. Accordingly, there is no basis for the Commission to award TEP the  
3 relief that it seeks.

4 **II. IF THE COMMISSION CHOOSES TO ENTERTAIN TEP'S ACTION FOR**  
5 **DECLARATORY ORDER, TEP SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO FILE TESTIMONY**  
6 **TO EXPLAIN AND SUPPORT ITS ALLEGATIONS.**

7 Many Commission proceedings commonly require prefiled testimony, especially when those  
8 proceedings implicate substantial issues. Given the scope of the inquiry suggested by TEP's Motion,  
9 TEP should be required to file prefiled testimony that describes the specific factual basis of its  
10 allegations, identifies the specific relief that it requests, and explains why its requested relief is  
11 justified by its factual allegations. Staff believes that TEP's Motion lacks this degree of specificity.

12 For example, TEP's May 4, 2005 pleading does not explain why TEP has concluded that its  
13 current rates are market-based. This allegation appears to directly contradict TEP's 1999 Settlement  
14 Agreement, which states that the Market Generation Methodology is related to the recovery of  
15 stranded costs. (Settlement Agreement at 4-5). By definition, allowing stranded cost recovery is an  
16 indication of cost-based ratemaking. If TEP now contends that its current rates were not intended to  
17 incorporate recovery of stranded costs, contrary to the express terms of its 1999 settlement  
18 agreement, some testimony that specifically explains the basis for TEP's conclusion would be  
19 helpful.

20 TEP further alleges that a Commission denial of its Motion will have "immediate  
21 consequences" for the 1999 Settlement Agreement, the 2004 Rate Review, and any future TEP rate  
22 cases. (TEP's Mot. Dec. Ord. at 3). This sweeping conclusion is not further elucidated, except for  
23 TEP's cryptic assurance that, if the Commission were to apply "some other rate methodology" to  
24 TEP's generation, then TEP will amend its 2004 filing, will propose adjustments to its amortization  
25 rates and schedules in future rate cases, and will seek to revise its 1999 Settlement Agreement.  
26 (TEP's Mot. Dec. Ord. at 5). These allegations do not contain enough information to allow a  
27 thorough analysis of TEP's Motion, even if one could identify with certainty the specific factual or  
28 legal theory that TEP intends to advance.

In summary, TEP's Motion appears to merely identify potential issues without setting forth

1 the underlying factual basis and/or legal analysis that might support its requested relief. In these  
2 circumstances, the Commission should require TEP to file prefiled testimony if the Commission  
3 wishes to entertain TEP's Motion.

4 **III. TEP'S MAY 4<sup>th</sup> MOTION WARRANTS AN EXTENSION OF THE PROCEDURAL**  
5 **DEADLINES GOVERNING ITS PENDING RATE CASE.**

6 A.A.C. R14-2-103(B)(11)(e) provides that the Commission may extend the time periods  
7 prescribed by the rate case processing rules in either of two circumstances: 1) the filing of any  
8 amendment that changes the amount sought or alters the facts used as the basis for a rate request or 2)  
9 the occurrence of an extraordinary event. Staff believes that an extension of the time periods  
10 governing TEP's pending rate case is appropriate whether the Commission grants TEP's Motion,  
11 denies it, or orders TEP to prefile testimony.

12 In its May 4<sup>th</sup> Motion, TEP implies that it will supplement its June 1, 2004 rate case filing if the  
13 Commission does not grant the relief that it seeks. (TEP's Mot. Dec. Ord. at 5). Therefore, if the  
14 Commission denies TEP's Motion, as Staff is urging in this Response, then it appears that TEP will  
15 supplement its rate case filing. (TEP's Mot. Dec. Ord. at 5). If, on the other hand, the Commission  
16 adopts Staff's alternative request, then TEP will file testimony in support of its May 4<sup>th</sup> filing. In  
17 either case, such additional information will require additional analysis and therefore justify an  
18 extension of time pursuant to R14-2-103(B)(11)(e).

19 This situation places Staff and the other parties to this proceeding in a quandary: it appears  
20 highly likely that TEP will make some additional filing, either in the form of testimony supporting its  
21 Motion for Declaratory Order or in the form of a supplement to its pending rate case. These  
22 additional filings are likely to occur sometime in the near future, but probably not before June 13,  
23 2005, the due date for Staff and intervener testimony in the current rate case. Staff therefore finds  
24 itself in the position of having to develop and file its rate case testimony by June 13<sup>th</sup>, even though it  
25 appears highly likely that TEP will soon file information that may render that analysis moot.


26 In these circumstances, Staff suggests that an indefinite continuance of the filing deadlines in  
27 TEP's pending rate case is warranted at least until TEP has clarified its intentions, either by filing  
28 whatever supplemental information it intends to file or by indicating that it does not intend to do so.

1 Accordingly, Staff requests that the Commission immediately and indefinitely continue the filing  
2 deadlines in TEP's current rate case at least until the Commission can convene a procedural  
3 conference to address these matters.

4 **IV. CONCLUSION.**

5 Staff requests that the Commission deny TEP's May 4<sup>th</sup> Motion, because the Commission's  
6 Track A order has already dealt with these issues. In the alternative, Staff requests that the  
7 Commission require TEP to file testimony in support of its Motion. Finally, Staff requests that the  
8 Commission immediately and indefinitely extend the rate case deadlines until TEP indicates its  
9 intentions regarding any additional filings.

10 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 20th day of May, 2005.

11  
12  
13   
14 Christopher C. Kempley, Chief Counsel  
15 Janet F. Wagner, Attorney  
16 Arizona Corporation Commission  
17 1200 West Washington  
18 Phoenix, Arizona 85007  
19 (602) 542-3402

20 Original and Nineteen copies of the foregoing  
21 filed this 20<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2005, with:

22 Docket Control  
23 Arizona Corporation Commission  
24 1200 West Washington  
25 Phoenix, AZ 85007

26 Copy of the foregoing mailed this  
27 20<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2005, to:

28 MICHAEL A CURTIS  
WILLIAM P SULLIVAN  
CURTIS, GOODWIN, SULLIVAN, UDALL & SCHWAB, PLC  
2712 N 7TH STREET  
PHOENIX ARIZONA 85006-1090

SCOTT WAKEFIELD  
RUCO  
1110 W WASHINGTON, SUITE 220  
PHOENIX ARIZONA 85007

1 WALTER W MEEK  
ARIZONA UTILITY INVESTOR ASSOCIATION  
2 2100 N CENTRAL AVE SUITE 210  
PHOENIX ARIZONA 85004  
3  
4 JANA BRANDT  
KELLY BARR  
SALT RIVER PROJECT  
5 P O BOX 52025 PAB221  
PHOENIX ARIZONA 85072-2025  
6  
7 C WEBB CROCKETT  
JAY L. SHAPIRO  
PATRICK J. BLACK  
8 FENNEMORE CRAIG  
3003 N CENTRAL AVE SUITE 2600  
9 PHOENIX ARIZONA 85012-2913  
10  
11 LAWRENCE V ROBERTSON JR  
MUNGER CHADWICK PLC  
333 N WILMOT SUITE 300  
TUCSON ARIZONA 85711-2634  
12  
13 MICHAEL GRANT  
GALLAGHER & KENNEDY  
2575 E CAMELBACK RD  
14 PHOENIX ARIZONA 85016-9225  
15  
16 CHRISTOPHER HITCHCOCK  
LAW OFFICES OF CHRISTOPHER HITCHCOCK  
P O BOX AT  
17 BISBEE ARIZONA 85603-0115  
18  
19 RUSSELL JONES  
D. MICHAEL MANDIG  
WATERFALL ECONOMIDIS CALDWELL HANSHAW & VILLAMANA, P.C.  
20 5210 E WILLIAMS CIRCLE STE 800  
TUCSON ARIZONA 85711  
21  
22 STEVEN C GROSS  
PORTER SIMON  
40200 TRUCKEE AIRPORT RD  
TRUCKEE CALIFORNIA 96161  
23  
24 RAYMOND HEYMAN  
MICHAEL PATTEN  
ROSHKA HEYMAN & DEWULF  
400 E VAN BUREN SUITE 800  
25 PHOENIX ARIZONA 85004  
26  
27 WILLIAM D. BAKER  
ELLIS & BAKER, PC  
7310 N 16TH STREET SUITE 320  
28 PHOENIX ARIZONA 85020

1 BARRY GOLDWATER, JR.  
3104 E CAMELBACK RD., SUITE 274  
2 PHOENIX ARIZONA 85016

3 DEBORAH R. SCOTT  
KIMBERLY A. GROUSE  
4 SNELL & WILMER  
ONE ARIZONA CENTER  
5 400 E VAN BUREN STREET  
PHOENIX ARIZONA 85004-2202  
6

7 JOHN WALLACE  
GRAND CANYON STATE ELECTRIC CO-OP ASS'N. INC.  
120 N 44TH STREET SUITE 100  
8 PHOENIX ARIZONA 85034-1822

9 DENNIS L. DELANEY  
K.R. SALINE & ASSOCIATES  
10 160 N PASADENA, SUITE 101  
MESA ARIZONA 85201-6764  
11

12 KEVIN C. HIGGINS  
ENERGY STRATEGIES LLC  
30 MARKET STREET SUITE 200  
13 SALT LAKE CITY UTAH 84101

14 ROGER K FERLAND  
QUARLES & BRADY STREICH LANG LLP  
15 RENAISSANCE ONE  
TWO N CENTRAL AVENUE  
16 PHOENIX ARIZONA 85004-2391

17 JANA VAN NESS  
APS  
18 MAIL STATION 9908  
P O BOX 53999  
19 PHOENIX ARIZONA 85072-3999

20 MICHAL A TRENTEL  
PATRICK W BURNETT  
21 PANDA ENERGY INT'L INC  
4100 SPRING VALLEY SUITE 1010  
22 DALLAS TEXAS 75244

23 PETER VAN HAREN  
JESSE W SEARS  
24 CITY OF PHOENIX  
200 W WASHINGTON STREET SUITE 1300  
25 PHOENIX ARIZONA 85003-1611

26 LAURIE WOODALL  
ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT SECTION  
27 OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
15 S 15TH AVENUE  
28 PHOENIX ARIZONA 85007

1 DONNA M. BRONSKI  
CITY OF SCOTTSDALE  
2 CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE  
3939 N. DRINKWATER BLVD.  
3 SCOTTSDALE ARIZONA 85251

4 THEODORE E ROBERTS  
SEMPRA ENERGY RESOURCES  
5 101 ASH STREET HQ 12-B  
6 SAN DIEGO CALIFORNIA 92101-3017

7 ROBERT S. LYNCH  
340 E PALM LANE, STE. 140  
8 PHOENIX AZ 85004-4603

9 DAVID COUTURE  
TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER CO.  
ONE SOUTH CHURCH STREET  
10 TUCSON AZ 85701

11 THOMAS MUMAW  
KARILEE RAMALEY  
12 PINNACLE WEST CAPITAL CORPORATION  
400 N. 5TH STREET, STE. 8695  
13 PHOENIX AZ 85004

14 STACY AGUAYO  
APS ENERGY SERVICES  
15 400 E. VAN BUREN STREET, STE. 750  
16 PHOENIX AZ 85004

17 STEVE MENDOZA  
ARIZONA POWER AUTHORITY  
18 1810 W. ADAMS  
PHOENIX AZ 85007-2697

19 JAY I. MOYES  
MOYES STOREY  
20 1850 N CENTRAL AVENUE, #1100  
21 PHOENIX AZ 85004-4541

22 ARIZONA REPORTING SERVICE, INC.  
2627 N. THIRD STREET, STE. THREE  
23 PHOENIX AZ 85004-1104

24 PATRICK J. SANDERSON  
ARIZONA INDEPENDENT SCHEDULING ADMINISTRATOR ASSOC.  
4397 W. BETHANY HOME ROAD, #1025  
25 PHOENIX AZ 85301

26 JERRY COFFEY  
ERIC BRONNER  
27 PO BOX 111  
28 TAMPA FL 33602

1 KEN BAGLEY  
RW BECK  
2 14635 N. KIERLAND BLVD., STE. 130  
3 SCOTTSDALE ARIZONA 85256-2769

4 *Kayn Christine*  
5

- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28