



0000036951

1

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

2003 FEB 10 P 4: 25

- MARC SPITZER
Chairman
- JIM IRVIN
Commissioner
- WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
Commissioner
- JEFF HATCH-MILLER
Commissioner
- MIKE GLEASON
Commissioner

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

FEB 10 2003

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCUMENT CONTROL

DOCKETED BY *CAF*

IN THE MATTER OF THE GENERIC PROCEEDINGS CONCERNING ELECTRIC RESTRUCTURING ISSUES
IN THE MATTER OF ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY'S REQUEST FOR VARIANCE OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS OF A.A.C. 4-14-2-1606
IN THE MATTER OF THE GENERIC PROCEEDINGS CONCERNING THE ARIZONA INDEPENDENT SCHEDULING ADMINISTRATOR
IN THE MATTER OF TUCSON ELECTRIC COMPANY'S APPLICATION FOR A VARIANCE OF CERTAIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPETITION RULES COMPLIANCE DATES

DOCKET NO. E-00000A-02-0051

DOCKET NO. E-01345A-01-0822

DOCKET NO. E-00000A-01-0630

- E-00000A-02-0051
- E-01345A-01-0822
- E-00000A-01-0630
- E-01933A-02-0069

2

EXCEPTIONS OF PANDA GILA RIVER, L.P.

3

Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-110(B), Panda Gila River, L.P. (PGR) submits the

4

following exceptions to the Proposed Opinion and Order ("Proposed Order") issued by

5

Hearing Officer Teena Wolfe on January 30, 2003. PGR also comments on the Hearing

1 Division's Proposed Amendment #1 which includes the Staff Report and Exhibit S-5 as
2 proposed Exhibits A and B to the Proposed Order.

3 PGR strongly supports the Proposed Order. Hearing Officer Wolfe did an
4 excellent job of parsing through the myriad issues, the thousands of pages of transcripts and
5 the multiple exhibits, and getting to the core issue: what would best support the
6 Commission's pronouncement in Decision 65154 that "requiring some power to be
7 purchased through competitive procurement . . . will encourage a phase-in to competition,
8 encourage the development of a robust wholesale market for generation, and obtain some
9 of the benefits of the new Arizona generation resources, while at the same time protecting
10 Ratepayers." Decision 65154 at 30, lines 13-19. In fact, though styled as "exceptions,"
11 many of PGR's comments go principally to clarifying the language of the Proposed Order
12 in order to make that language fully consistent with the Hearing Officer's findings and
13 Decision 65154's requirements. PGR submits that if the Commission remains steadfast to
14 its objectives, and adopts the clarifying language set forth below, the Commission will have
15 issued an Order upon which a well functioning competitive wholesale market can be built
16 in Arizona, not just for the contemplated initial 2003-2006 solicitation, but for many years
17 to come.

18 **I. DETERMINATION OF PRODUCTS TO BE SOLICITED**

19 On pages 40 through 43, the Proposed Order discusses whether the
20 Commission should require that the utilities solicit specific products and specific lengths of
21 contracts. The Proposed Order accurately states the reasons for soliciting unit contingent
22 bids, along with other bids, i.e., in order to achieve a more accurate portrait of the
23 resources and prices available in the competitive wholesale market. Id. at 40, lines 3

1 through 14.¹ The Proposed Order also correctly finds that “the evidence presented on the
2 record in this proceeding supports finding that both APS and TEP should seriously
3 evaluate and consider a well-balanced mixture of contracts, including long-term contracts,
4 in the competitive solicitation in order to protect ratepayers from future upswings in power
5 prices.” Proposed Order at page 42, beginning at line 25. The Proposed Order goes on to
6 require that APS and TEP make procurement decisions that further the goal of
7 encouraging the development of a vibrant wholesale generation market in Arizona. Id. at
8 43. Unfortunately, though the Proposed Order does not address a principle issue, namely,
9 what the utilities are required to solicit, separate and apart from what they are required to
10 procure.

11 The only way for the utilities to make the appropriate procurement decision is to
12 make the appropriate solicitation decision, i.e., to solicit a full portfolio of products, thus
13 enabling the utility, Staff, the Independent Monitor, and ultimately the Commission, to
14 evaluate all the options available to meet the Commission’s goals. The Commission should
15 express its preference on behalf of ratepayers for the type of power solicited. In light of
16 Staff’s request during the workshop that Staff be given the opportunity to visit power plants
17 under contract,² we believe that the Commission should prefer asset backed, offers (i.e.
18 power plants where one could go and kick the tires) for a substantial share of APS’
19 solicitation and the Commission should therefore require that asset backed unit contingent

¹ In fact, APS’s recent pronouncements of its intent to seek rate base treatment of the PWEC assets makes the solicitation of unit contingent bids even more appropriate as rate-base units are, by their very nature, unit contingent. See, Rebuttal Testimony of Barbara Gomez in Docket No. E-01345A-02-0707, at 5, lines 18-21. See also, Platts, Electric Power Daily, Wednesday, February 5, 2003 at 1-2.

² A request that Commissioner (then Chairman) Mundell also specifically made of each merchant generator at the beginning of the Track A hearing and to which PGR readily agreed.

1 bids be solicited for the majority of capacity and energy reflected as contestable load. To
2 reflect this preference, the Proposed Order should be amended to include the following
3 language:

4 Page 43, line 4, INSERT, as a new sentence, after the sentence ending with “the
5 Track B solicitation.”

6 “To ensure that the utilities are able to fully test the market, we will require that the
7 utilities solicit bids for a variety of products and contract lengths, including, but not
8 limited to, a specific solicitation for unit contingent bids as identified in footnote 18
9 to this Order. Nothing in this solicitation requirement should be read to pre-judge
10 the portfolio of products, or product lengths that the utility must ultimately
11 procure.”

12 Without this additional language, the Commission’s stated goal of using the solicitation to
13 test the alternative supplies available to meet ratepayer needs may go unfulfilled. The
14 requested language revision is attached as PGR Proposed Amendment 1.

15 II. SOLICITATION OF LOAD PREVIOUSLY DESIGNATED AS RMR

16 The Proposed Order correctly determined that APS and TEP load previously
17 designated as being served by reliability must run generations, should be subject to the
18 competitive solicitation process. If the load can be supplied on the terms identified in
19 Finding of Fact 35, then the load is not, in fact, RMR at all. The Proposed Order leaves
20 open, however, the determination of whether the capacity and energy designated as RMR
21 should be solicited in the same or a different solicitation from non-RMR capacity and
22 energy, finding that the determination can be made in the pre-solicitation process described
23 in the Staff Report. Proposed Order at 25, lines 9-12. PGR could agree that the
24 determination could wait for the pre-solicitation process to the extent that the pre-

1 solicitation process contemplated an open forum for the determination of the RFP
2 parameters rather than the process described in the Staff Report, which simply envisions a
3 question and answer session to address whatever solicitation each utility unilaterally chose
4 to adopt. For this reason, and because the initial solicitation is both critical and imminent,
5 PGR believes that it is appropriate for the Commission to instruct the utilities as to the
6 manner in which they should conduct the RMR solicitation; specifically, through a
7 separate, but concurrent solicitation.

8 Only by doing so can the Commission ensure that ratepayers get the best deal
9 possible. Without such instructions, PGR is concerned, for example, that APS could
10 declare Pinnacle West's new West Phoenix units to be the only capacity capable of RMR
11 service (by virtue of its location inside the load pocket) and then, despite the fact that RMR
12 service may be for only a few hours a year, declare new West Phoenix winners for year-
13 round service, regardless of price. By carving out RMR service in RMR hours, in sharp
14 contrast, there can be vigorous competition for non-RMR hours and lower prices are likely.

15 PGR therefore recommends the following change to the Proposed Order:

16 Finding of Fact 38, page 69, line 28, INSERT, after "The utilities shall"

17 "solicit for RMR hours and non-RMR hours concurrently, but
18 through separate RFP's or Auctions and shall thereafter"

19 The Finding of Fact would thus read

20 "38. The utilities shall solicit for RMR hours and non-RMR hours
21 concurrently, but through separate RFP's or Auctions and shall
22 thereafter evaluate RMR and non-RMR bids concurrently, in order to
23 determine their best least-cost portfolio."

24 Page 25, line 9 DELETE, the sentence beginning at line 9 – line 12:

25 "We believe that the issue of whether RMR is included in the same
26 RFP or auction block with non-RMR capacity and energy in this
27 initial solicitation will be adequately addressed during the Pre-
28 Solicitation process described in the Staff Report."

1 The requested language revisions are attached as PGR Proposed Amendment 2.

2 **III. APS'S DEALINGS WITH ITS AFFILIATES**

3 PGR is pleased that the Proposed Order recognizes that the potential for affiliate
4 preference is great and that if such preferences were exercised by APS and its affiliates, the
5 benefits the Commission envisions from a competitive solicitation would be lost. The
6 Proposed Order correctly recognizes that the Commission cannot wait until after an
7 affiliate preference is granted to propose corrective action. PGR fully supports the safety
8 checks recommended by the Proposed Order and in particular the Proposed Order's
9 specific findings that "APS shall treat affiliated generation equally in all respects with non-
10 affiliated generation in the solicitation process" Proposed Order at 71, lines 25-26 and that
11 the list of prohibited activities does not "constitute an all-inclusive list of the restrictions on
12 the type of activities that APS and its affiliates must prevent." Proposed Order at 72, lines
13 18-19. While PGR hopes that APS's assurances that it will not prefer its affiliate will prove
14 to be the case, the Proposed Order appropriately recognizes that the stakes are too great to
15 take a wait and see approach.

16 PGR is also appreciative of the fact that the Proposed Order recognizes that the
17 affiliate preference need not be in the solicitation itself to create an unfair advantage. For
18 this reason, it is both appropriate and necessary to extend the requirement of non-
19 preferential treatment to all contractual arrangements between or among affiliates. PGR is
20 concerned however, that (1) the single example listed in the Proposed Order does not
21 appropriately show the range of contractual arrangements that are subject to the
22 prohibition, and (2) the example may create an unintended loop hole in what appears to be
23 the clear intent of the section to avoid affiliate preferences with respect to access to gas
24 pipeline capacity.

1 As PGR's hearing testimony established, there are many kinds of contractual
2 preferences that can provide an affiliate advantage in the solicitation process. Among those
3 examples discussed at the hearing, in addition to the gas issue discussed below, were the
4 contractual arrangements relating to test energy and to the designation of resources as
5 network resources. Each of these contractual arrangements has the potential to provide an
6 affiliate a preference when bidding in the actual solicitation process. Thus PGR requests
7 that the list of contractual arrangements listed as examples be expanded to include those
8 referenced above and, perhaps even more importantly, that it include, as the Proposed
9 Order does elsewhere, that this list is not exclusive.

10 By listing natural gas tolling, the Proposed Order clearly recognizes that APS can
11 provide a significant affiliate preference in how it uses its contractual rights on the El Paso
12 gas transmission system for purposes of the competitive solicitation. Much like APS'
13 electric transmission system, the rights on the El Paso system are held by APS for the
14 benefit of its ratepayers and are, in fact, paid for by those ratepayers. The Commission has
15 worked diligently to ensure that those ratepayers benefit to the full extent possible from
16 those rights. As the proof at the hearing established, APS asserts it can allocate gas capacity
17 under its contractual rights on El Paso to the winning bidder in the competitive solicitation
18 to the extent that that bidder will be serving APS load. That allocation would normally
19 take the form of a gas tolling arrangement as recognized by the Proposed Order.
20 However, APS also takes the position that its affiliate "has its own rights" under the El
21 Paso contract and that no tolling arrangement is necessary.³ Thus, by limiting the example

³ This issue is currently under submission before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and APS, and Staff to some extent, sought to defer to that body as to how the El Paso capacity should be used for purposes of the competitive solicitation. PGR does not believe, however, that this Commission should defer to the FERC for the rules on how APS and TEP treat their affiliates for purposes of this Commission's competitive solicitation process. Thus, regardless of the outcome of the pending matters at FERC, PGR submits

1 of the type of contractual arrangements to “natural gas tolling,” the Proposed Order may
2 inadvertently limit the restrictions on affiliate preferences. To more fully align the language
3 of the Proposed Order with its apparent intent, PGR proposes that the language of the
4 Proposed Order be clarified through the following modifications:

5 Page 58, line 10, DELETE, following “procurement process”

6 “including natural gas tolling,”

7 and INSERT

8 “including, but not limited to, contracts for test energy, designation of
9 generation as a network resource or access to gas capacity or transportation under APS’s
10 contract with El Paso Natural Gas Company,”

11 Page 58, line 12, INSERT, at the end of the paragraph,

12 “For purposes of clarifying that affiliate preferences will not be permitted in any
13 regard, with respect to access to the gas capacity formerly held solely by APS, to the extent
14 that an APS affiliate will bid in the competitive solicitation process using such gas capacity,
15 APS must make the capacity available, on the same terms as the capacity is available to its
16 affiliate. If, APS is unable to make the gas capacity available on equal terms, the affiliate
17 must bid on the same terms as APS can make the capacity available to such other bidders.”

18 Page 71, line 27, DELETE, following “procurement process”

19 “including natural gas tolling,”

20 and INSERT

21 “including, but not limited to, those described in the body of this Order,”

22 The requested language revision is attached as PGR Proposed Amendment 3.

that this Commission should follow what appears to be the direction of the Proposed Order and define the soliciting utility/affiliate relationship, including use of full requirement rights (or any of those rights as converted by FERC order), for purposes of the competitive solicitation process.

1 IV. INDEPENDENT MONITOR

2 For reasons that are not discussed, the Proposed Order is largely silent on one of
3 the principle issues identified by the parties, the role of the Independent Monitor. As
4 noted above, the language of the order regarding the potential for great harm to the
5 competitive solicitation process from affiliate preferences is also a testament to the need not
6 only for an Independent Monitor, but for an Independent Monitor with teeth.
7 Furthermore, while PGR believes it adequately established that the Independent Monitor
8 should in fact run the initial solicitation for APS, at the very least, the role of the
9 Independent Monitor should be more clearly established. The Proposed Order makes it
10 obvious that the Commission wants to be tough on affiliate abuse by warning the utilities
11 that it will scrutinize the process, reject the outcome if it finds wrongdoing, and re-run the
12 RFP. However, the best way to prevent this outcome, to protect against affiliate abuse and
13 to conserve the Commission's resources, is to have the Monitor actively participating in
14 each step of the solicitation, and not rely solely on an aggressive after-the-fact assessment.
15 In addition, a collaborative process between the utility and the Monitor would (a) help
16 quell the Commission's and Participant's concerns over affiliate abuse, (b) ensure better
17 products for ratepayers, and (c) allow this process to be completed in the anticipated time
18 frame. The Monitor should have the ability to influence the solicitation to get the best
19 results for the ratepayers.

20 In particular, in the edits to the Staff Report that PGR recommends below, PGR
21 believes that the role of the Independent Monitor should be more clearly delineated to
22 include a equal role with the utility in the determination of the products to be solicited
23 (beyond those required by the Commission), an equal role in the determination of bidders
24 who are pre-qualified and a defined role with the utility in the post-bid negotiations.
25 Furthermore, while the Proposed Order continues to leave the utilities with sole discretion

1 to determine which bids to select, at the very least the Independent Monitor, in the report
2 it is required to file with the Commission regarding the solicitation and bid selection,
3 should be required to state whether it endorses or disagrees with the utility's bid selection,
4 and to specify the basis for its conclusions. As explained below, PGR has edited the Staff
5 Report to reflect these points and attaches hereto a revised version of the Staff Report as
6 Exhibit A to PGR Proposed Amendment 4.

7 V. ADOPTION OF THE STAFF REPORT

8 PGR agrees with the finding on page 64, lines 6-11, of the Proposed Order that
9 pages 6-27 of the Staff Report should be adopted⁴ and that the report provides the
10 framework of a competitive solicitation process for Arizona. However, the October 25,
11 2002 Staff Report was a work in progress and, contrary to the inference in Finding of Fact
12 25, cannot be read as being fully reflective of the "solicitation process developed by the
13 parties." Proposed Order at 67, line 27. As was explained at the hearing, Staff drafted a
14 straw proposal and solicited comments from the participating parties, comments which
15 were submitted to Staff confidentially and which were incorporated or not incorporated in
16 the Report at Staff's discretion. On October 18, 2002, Staff filed its Report, incorporating
17 those comments it chose to incorporate and reflecting its vision of the solicitation process.
18 However, even Staff continued to develop its vision of the competitive procurement
19 process in Arizona and expanded beyond the bounds of its initial report as is evident from
20 Staff Exhibit S-5 which revises the chart on page 7 of the Staff Report and Staff's
21 conclusion that capacity and energy previously designated as RMR would be contestable.

22 As PGR stated at the hearing, in its post-hearing briefs, and repeats here, PGR
23 largely supports the Staff Report and the framework it represents for a competitive

⁴ On February 4, 2003, the Hearing Division filed a Proposed Amendment #1 that would make those pages of the Staff Report Exhibit A to the Proposed Order.

1 solicitation process for Arizona. Nevertheless, PGR believes that certain aspects of the Staff
2 Report should be revised. The Proposed Order agrees with this assessment, finding that
3 the Staff Report “shall be interpreted in keeping with [the Commission’s] resolution” of
4 contested issues. Proposed Order at 64, lines 10-11. The Hearing Division’s Proposed
5 Amendment #1, makes it clearer that the Staff Report needs to be edited to reflect the
6 decision in this case by requesting that Finding of Fact 25 be amended to provide that the
7 Staff Report is adopted “as modified by the discussion and Findings of Fact herein.”
8 Proposed Amendment #1 at page 3. However, rather than leave certain parts of the Staff
9 report to “interpretation,” or unspecified “modification” PGR believes that it is appropriate
10 for the Commission now to require specific edits to the Staff Report. PGR was the only
11 party that provided such edits as part of its Track B post-hearing brief. PGR again provides
12 edits to the Staff Report though edits to Exhibit A as presented with the Hearing Division’s
13 Proposed Amendment #1. Those edits are necessary for consistency with the overall
14 findings of the Proposed Order. PGR also believes that a revised report, should be
15 incorporated with the final Order.

16 By eliminating the requirement for interpretation of the Staff Report for
17 consistency with the finding of the Proposed Order, the Commission can eliminate an area of
18 uncertainty and potential conflict. Thus, PGR recommends that the Proposed Order be
19 clarified by the following revisions to page 64 and Finding of Fact 25 on pages 67 and 68, as
20 well as the Staff Report edited as reflected in Exhibit A to PGR’s Proposed Amendment 4.

21 Page 64, line 11, INSERT, after “herein”

22 “and shall be amended to reflect the specific revisions identified
23 below:”

24 “List Commission Revisions to Staff Report:”


1 PGR's proposed revisions to the Staff Report are attached hereto as PGR Proposed
2 Amendment 4.

3 VI. CONCLUSION

4 PGR wishes to again state its strong support for the Proposed Order drafted by
5 Hearing Officer Wolfe. While the Proposed Order represents a significant reduction in the
6 amount of contestable load from that originally required by the Electric Competition
7 Rules, and an even larger reduction in the competitively procured supply each utility is
8 "required" to purchase, the Proposed Order builds positively on the Commission's Track A
9 Decision. The language clarifications attached hereto as PGR Proposed Amendments 1-4,
10 will clarify the language of the Proposed Order, leaving Arizona poised to implement a
11 competitive wholesale market framework that will achieve the Commission's goals of
12 improving the environment, developing a wholesale competitive market and, most
13 importantly, lowering costs for Arizona consumers.

14

Respectfully submitted,



Larry F. Eisenstat

Michael R. Engleman

Frederick D. Ochsenhirt

Dickstein Shapiro Morin & Oshinsky LLP

2101 L Street, NW

Washington, DC 20037

Attorneys for TPS GP, Inc.

Jay L. Shapiro

Fennemore Craig, P.C.

3003 N. Central Ave., Suite 2600

Phoenix, AZ 85012

Attorneys for Panda Gila River, L.P.

1
2 ORIGINAL and 15 copies of the
3 foregoing hand-delivered for filing,
4 Monday, February 10, 2003, 2003:
5
6 Docket Control
7 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
8 1200 West Washington
9 Phoenix, Arizona 85007


10
11
12 Teena Wolfe
13 Hearing Officer
14 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
15 1200 West Washington
16 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

17
18
19 Chris Kempley, Chief Counsel
20 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
21 Legal Division
22 1200 West Washington
23 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

24
25
26 Ernest G. Johnson
27 Director, Utilities Division
28 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
29 1200 West Washington
30 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

31
32
33 COPY of the foregoing was mailed, faxed or
34 Transmitted electronically,
35 Monday, February 10, 2003, to:

36
37 All parties of Record

38
39 
40 Michael R. Engleman

PANDA GILA RIVER, L.P.

Proposed Amendment I To The Proposed Track B Order

Page 43, line 4, INSERT, as a new sentence, after the sentence ending with “the Track B solicitation”

“To ensure that the utilities are able to fully test the market, we will require that the utilities solicit bids for a variety of products and contract lengths, including, but not limited to, a specific solicitation for unit contingent bids as identified in footnote 18 to this Order. Nothing in this solicitation requirement should be read to pre-judge the portfolio of products, or product lengths that the utility must ultimately procure.”

PANDA GILA RIVER, L.P.

Proposed Amendment 2 To The Proposed Track B Order

Finding of Fact 38, page 69, line 28, INSERT, after “The utilities shall”

“solicit for RMR hours and non-RMR hours concurrently, but through separate RFP’s or Auctions and shall thereafter”

Page 25, line 9 DELETE, the sentence beginning at line 9 – line 12:

“We believe that the issue of whether RMR is included in the same RFP or auction block with non-RMR capacity and energy in this initial solicitation will be adequately addressed during the Pre-Solicitation process described in the Staff Report.”

PANDA GILA RIVER, L.P.

Proposed Amendment 3 To The Proposed Track B Order

Page 58, line 10, DELETE, following “procurement process”

“including natural gas tolling,”

and INSERT

“including, but not limited to, contracts for test energy, designation of generation as a network resource or access to gas capacity or transportation under APS’s contract with El Paso Natural Gas Company,”

Page 58, line 12, INSERT, at the end of the paragraph,

“For purposes of clarifying that affiliate preferences will not be permitted in any regard, with respect to access to the gas capacity formerly held solely by APS, to the extent that an APS affiliate will bid in the competitive solicitation process using such gas capacity, APS must make the capacity available, on the same terms as the capacity is available to its affiliate. If, APS is unable to make the gas capacity available on equal terms, the affiliate must bid on the same terms as APS can make the capacity available to such other bidders.”

Page 71, line 27, DELETE, following “procurement process”

“including natural gas tolling,”

and INSERT

“including, but not limited to, those described in the body of this Order,”

PANDA GILA RIVER, L.P.

Proposed Amendment 3 To The Proposed Track B Order

Page 64, line 11, INSERT, after “herein”

“and shall be amended to reflect the specific revisions identified below:”

“List Commission Revisions to Staff Report:”

The following is a list of PGR proposed revisions to the Staff Report as reflected in the red-line version of the Staff Report attached to this Proposed Amendment 4 as Exhibit A. For the convenience of the Hearing Division and the Commission, the Page and Line Number references are to that version of the Staff Report attached to the Hearing Division’s Proposed Amendment 1.

Page 6, line 5, DELETE, after “For”

“2003”

and INSERT,

“2003-2006 Solicitation (the “2003 Solicitation”)”

Page 6, line 7, DELETE, after “September1, 2002,”

“except to the extent that such generation is providing RMR service during RMR hours”

Page 6, line 7, DELETE, after “Solicitation”

“except to the extent that such generation is providing RMR service during RMR hours”

Page 6, line 19, INSERT, after “2003”

“2006”

Page 6, lines 21-22, DELETE, after “long-term contracts.”

“While it is anticipated that during 2003 each utility will primarily require peaking capacity and energy with contract terms of one to three years,”

Page 6, line 27, INSERT, after “risks appropriately”

“, while considering the environmental effects of their procurement decisions, as well as whether their decisions further the Commission’s goal of encouraging the development of a robust competitive wholesale generation market”

Page 7, lines 2-13, DELETE, after “to be”

Charts on lines 3-16 and “The above capacity numbers . . . in this report as Appendix Two.”

And INSERT, either

The charts attached to the Hearing Division’s Amendment #1 as Exhibit B

Or

“as set forth in Exhibit B.”

Page 8, line 1, INSERT, after “the utility”

“, together with the Independent Monitor as set forth below,”

Page 8, line 3, INSERT, after “customers”

“while advancing the goals of the Commission as expressed in the Track B Decision”

Page 10, following line 3, INSERT, new bullet

“with the utility, pre-qualifying bidders;”

Page 10, line 4, DELETE, after “completeness of”
“all”

and INSERT,
“the products to be solicited, the”

Page 10, line 5, INSERT, after “quality of the”
“bid”

Page 10, line 20, DELETE, after “of the solicitation”
“and”

and INSERT
“and bid selection, including a statement as to whether the Monitor endorses or disagrees with the utility’s bid selections, specifying the basis for its conclusions. The Independent Monitor should also provide”

Page 11, line 10, INSERT, following the sentence ending “the solicitation process.”
“The initial status report shall include a statement as to whether the Monitor endorses or disagrees with the utility’s bid selections, specifying the basis for its conclusions.”

Page 12, line 22, INSERT, following “order”
“and meet the Commission’s goals as set forth in the Track B Order”

Page 12, line 22-23, DELETE, following “supporting the”
“determination of products to be solicited and the amount of each product that is needed.”

and INSERT
“solicitation of a full range of products, including the products identified in the Track B Order, for the contestable load identified in the Track B Order.”

Page 15, line 24, DELETE, after “specifics of”
“products to be solicited”
and INSERT
“the”

Page 15, line 26, INSERT, after “utility.”
“The products solicited will be at least those identified in the Track B Order,
together with such other products as the utility deems appropriate to meet all future
needs.”

Page 15, line 27, INSERT, after “the long term”
while considering the environmental effects of their procurement decisions, as well
as whether their decisions further the Commission’s goal of encouraging the
development of a robust competitive wholesale generation market”

Page 16, line 4, INSERT, after “For”
“the”
and INSERT, after “2003”
“Solicitation, as set forth in the Track B Order”
and DELETE, after “utilities”
“may”
and INSERT
“shall”

Page 16, line 6, DELETE, after “contingent supplies”
“, as appropriate”

Page 16, line 11, INSERT, following “to those asserts.”
“For purposes of the solicitation, if any utility affiliate will utilize, either directly or
indirectly, natural gas capacity that is concurrently available to APS under its
contract with El Paso Natural Gas Company, such natural gas capacity shall be made

available to all bidders on the same terms and at the same price as available to those affiliates.”

Page 17, line 10, INSERT, after “delivery points,”

“the availability, and terms of such availability, of natural gas capacity on the El Paso system under APS’ contract,”

Page 20, line 6, DELETE , after “By”

“January”

Page 21, line 9, INSERT, after “utility”

“and the Independent Monitor”

Page 21, line 24, INSERT, after “by the utility”

“and the Independent Monitor”

Page 21, line 24 through Page 26, line 14, DELETE, entire section titled

“E. Terms Required for Staff Recommendation”

EXHIBIT A TO PGR'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT 4**PGR's Red-Line Of Staff Report****D. Detailed Staff Proposed Solicitation Process****I. Scope Of 2003 Solicitation**

For ~~the 2003-2006 solicitation (the "2003 Solicitation"),~~ the solicitation will be for all load and energy requirements not served by generation owned by the utility and included in the utility's rate base as of September 1, 2002, ~~except to the extent that such generation is providing RMR service during RMR hours or by power supplied pursuant to FERC or Commission approved contracts with affiliated and non-affiliated suppliers entered into prior to September 1, 2002. To the extent that affiliated suppliers provide service pursuant to contracts dated on or after September 1, 2002, such service will be subject to competitive solicitation except to the extent that such contract is to provide RMR service during RMR hours.~~ To the extent that load is served pursuant to capacity or energy contracts with Qualifying Facilities or Environmental Portfolio Standard requirements, that load will also not be contestable. Any generation capacity owned by a utility that has not been included in the utility's rate base may be bid by the utility in the initial solicitation on the same terms and conditions as all other bidders, including affiliated bidders. All demand-side management commitments in place as of September 1, 2002, shall be considered in determining contestable load.

For solicitations during ~~2003-2006,~~ each utility may contract for energy and capacity deliveries for differing time periods in order to test the efficiency of this process for acquiring short-term, medium-term and long-term contracts. ~~While it is anticipated that during 2003 each utility will primarily require peaking capacity and energy with contract terms of one to three years,~~ ⁱ If, in the judgment of the utility, market conditions or economic opportunities dictate contract terms longer than three years, it will be the responsibility of the utility to enter into such contracts as are reasonable. For resource planning purposes each utility must demonstrate that its power supply portfolio contract durations are adequately diversified and that its portfolio's

1 structure mitigates both cost and reliability risks appropriately, while considering the
2 environmental effects of their procurement decisions, as well as whether their decisions further
3 the Commission's goal of encouraging the development of a robust competitive wholesale
4 generation market.

EXHIBIT B

Based on information available at this time, contestable loads for each utility for each year through 2006 are estimated to be as set forth on Exhibit B [or insert chart from Exhibit B]:

CAPACITY (MW)

	2003	2004	2005	2006
APS ¹	1951	2289	2628	2898
TEP ²	242	309	441	488

ENERGY (MWH)

	2003	2004	2005	2006
APS ³	6,566,910	7,704,591	8,845,638	9,754,436
TEP ⁴	345,300	345,460	388,460	389,460

The above capacity numbers for APS were provided by APS at the August workshop and were used by Staff to derive the energy numbers. Staff was subsequently informed by APS that the numbers provided at the August workshop required revision. In response to a data request from Staff, APS provided revised capacity and energy numbers on October 23, 2002. Staff has not had time to review and analyze these numbers for inclusion in the Staff report by the October 25, 2002 publication date. APS' response to Staff's data request is included in this report as Appendix Two.

II. Roles & Responsibilities

¹ Source: From data provided by APS at the August Workshop.

² Source: From data provided by TEP at the August Workshop, plus 95 MW of combustion turbines that are not presently in rate base.

³ Assumes 38.6% average annual load factor for all contestable capacity.

⁴ From August data provided by TEP plus 95 MW combustion turbines at 40% average annual load factor.

A. Utility

Absent evidence of abuse, the utility, together with the Independent Monitor as set forth below, will be responsible for preparing the solicitation and conducting the solicitation process. Acquisition of energy and capacity to meet the needs of customers while advancing the goals of the Commission as expressed in the Track B Decision remains the responsibility of the utility, and the utility shall use accepted business standards for acquiring these resources, as it does when it buys all other products used in providing service.

B. Bidders

In order for the Solicitation to attract wide participation, the process must be accepted as fair, open and transparent. To achieve this, prospective bidders, and interested persons who agree to keep certain information confidential, will have the opportunity to review supporting data and draft documents in advance of the solicitation being distributed to bidders. All bidders and other interested persons may provide comments to the utility, the Independent Monitor or the Staff regarding the completeness or quality of the information provided. Bidders and interested parties may also provide comments to the utility, the Independent Monitor or the Staff regarding the process being employed or the decisions made regarding execution of the solicitation process.

All bidders will be required to consent to use appropriate alternative dispute resolution practices, specified by the utility and fully disclosed in the Solicitation materials if a dispute arises.

Each bidder must agree to permit the Commission Staff to inspect any generating facility the bidder owns or controls from which it proposes to provide capacity or energy to any Arizona utility pursuant to any contract awarded as a result of this solicitation.

1. Access to data

Bidders will have the opportunity to review non-restricted information used by the utility in preparation for the solicitation, as well as draft solicitation materials, before the solicitation is released. Bidders may provide comments to the Staff and the Independent Monitor regarding the materials at any time before the bidders' conference.

2. Opportunities to contribute & review

One or more bidders' conferences will be held so that all interested parties will have the opportunity to ask questions directly of the utility as well as to identify any deficiencies in the solicitation documents or supporting data. The bidders' conference will be held at least 10 days before the release of the solicitation.

Each utility shall schedule at least one bidders' conference prior to the distribution of its solicitation materials in final form to answer questions and to receive comments and suggestions regarding the materials to be distributed from interested persons. The first bidders' conference must occur no later than February 15, 2003.

Bidders will be invited to review non-proprietary materials produced by the utility and to address comments or inquiries to the utility, Staff or the Independent Monitor regarding those materials at any time between the release of reports, plans or drafts and the conclusion of the bidders' conference.

C. Independent Monitor

1. Overview

To assist the Staff and to assure all parties to the Solicitation for power supplies that the process employed is conducted in a transparent, effective, efficient and equitable manner, an Independent Monitor will be appointed by the Staff of the Commission to oversee the conduct of

the Solicitation. The Independent Monitor will be selected by the Staff and will work at the Staff's direction. Any person expecting to participate in the solicitation process may suggest to the Staff any individual to serve as the Independent Monitor. The utility will retain the Independent Monitor selected by the Staff and will be responsible for all related costs. The Independent Monitor shall submit all invoices to the Staff for review. The Staff shall forward the invoices to the utility with a recommendation as to payment.

The Independent Monitor will be responsible for:

- monitoring all communications regarding the solicitation by and among the utility and any bidders or potential bidders;
- with the utility, pre-qualifying bidders;
- evaluating the adequacy, accuracy and completeness of the products to be solicited, the all-solicitation materials, and the quality of the bid evaluations conducted;
- monitoring any negotiations conducted by the utility and any bidder;
- assisting the Staff in ~~developing the "prices to beat" and such other~~ tasks as required;
- advising the Staff and the utility of any issue affecting the integrity of the solicitation process and providing the utility an opportunity to remedy the defect identified;
- periodically submitting status reports to the Commission and the Staff on the solicitation being conducted, noting any deficiencies identified in the preparation of solicitation materials, maintenance of records, communications with bidders, or in evaluating or selecting bids;
- advising the Commission and the Staff of significant unresolved issues as they arise;

- after bids have been selected, preparing and submitting a report to the Commission detailing the Independent Monitor's observations and findings relating to the conduct of the solicitation and bid selection, including a statement as to whether the Monitor endorses or disagrees with the utility's bid selections, specifying the basis for its conclusions. The Independent Monitor should also provide ~~and~~ any recommendations for improvements of the solicitation process employed in the initial solicitation; and
- making all written status reports and the final reports to the Commission available to any person having an interest in the solicitation.

The Independent Monitor shall have full access to all materials used in or relating to the Solicitation. The utility shall make its personnel available for consultation with the Independent Monitor as requested. The Independent Monitor shall attend, in person or telephonically, any negotiations conducted with bidders.

Following the bidders conferences and before the distribution of the solicitation materials, the Independent Monitor shall submit a status report to the Commission and the Staff noting any unresolved issues that could impair the equity or appropriateness of the solicitation process.

2. Post Selection Requirements

Subsequent to the final bid selections and prior to announcing the selection of winning bids, the utility shall meet with the Staff and the Independent Monitor to review its bid evaluations and to explain the basis for its selections. Within 3 days of the selection of winning bids, the Independent Monitor will file with the Commission a status report identifying the winning bids and outlining any deficiencies noted in the solicitation process. The initial status report shall include a statement as to whether the Monitor endorses or disagrees with the utility's bid selections, specifying the basis for its conclusions.

The Independent Monitor will also file with the Commission a report on the fairness and effectiveness of the solicitation within 14 days of the selection of winning bids. In that report, the Independent Monitor will describe the process employed and will evaluate the utilities' conformity with the process requirements. If the Independent Monitor finds that the utility unfairly or erroneously conducted the solicitation, the report should so state. If the Independent Monitor believes that the selection process was flawed, the report submitted should detail the Independent Monitor's basis for such belief.

D. Staff

Throughout the solicitation process, the Staff and Independent Monitor will review data, review draft solicitation materials, and monitor the solicitation process. The Staff will observe the solicitation process, but will not approve any action or certify any aspect of the solicitation activities. If any disagreement concerning the solicitation occurs, the Staff or the Independent Monitor will promptly notify the utility of its concern and discuss the matter with the utility.

The Staff, in conjunction with the Independent Monitor, will be responsible for reviewing the resource plans, the price and cost forecasts, and the network transmission assessment to encourage the utility to develop comprehensive supporting data, and advise the Commission should the utility fail to address the information needs of the solicitation process. Also, the Staff and the Independent Monitor will review forecast data provided by interested parties and compare it to the forecasts provided by the utility when assessing the system needs.

E. Commission

The Commission may upon request of the Independent Monitor or at such time or times as it deems appropriate, suspend or terminate the Solicitation in order to remedy any defect in the solicitation process identified by the Independent Monitor. The Commission may order the

utility conducting the Solicitation to make changes to the solicitation process it deems necessary to promote effectiveness, reasonableness, and fairness.

In the event that the Independent Monitor finds that the utility failed to conduct the solicitation in an equitable manner, the Commission, after notice and hearing, may, among other things, disallow the recovery of costs of power incurred pursuant to contracts entered as a result of this Solicitation as well as the costs of conducting the solicitation or bar any bidder inequitably awarded a contract as a result of the solicitation from bidding in any subsequent solicitation. If the Commission finds that the utility failed to conduct an appropriate solicitation, it may order that a new solicitation, conducted by an independent party, be commenced forthwith.

III. Pre-Solicitation

A. Overview of process

In order to be ready to conduct a solicitation by March 1, 2003, as required by the Track A order and meet the Commission's goals as set forth in the Track B Order, the utility must assemble information supporting the solicitation of a full range of products, including the products identified in the Track B Order, for the contestable load identified in the Track B Order.~~determination of products to be solicited and the amount of each product that is needed.~~ The utility must be prepared to evaluate, without delay, all offers presented, including offers to deliver power to points that may differ from the utility's requested points of interconnection. The required data typically collected in the ordinary course of business will serve as the basis for all information to be provided to the Staff, Independent Monitor and bidders, though some will need to be modified to be suitable for the solicitation. To facilitate a timely solicitation, the utility should begin assembling the necessary information without delay.

B. Data Collection

Prior to preparation of solicitation materials, supporting data shall be assembled by the utility and provided to the Staff and the Independent Monitor for their review at the earliest date practicable. These data shall include resource plans, load, price, and cost forecasts, and a network transmission assessment containing such information and in formats acceptable to the Staff, designed to facilitate the solicitation process. Once the Staff and the Independent Monitor have completed their review, the following data shall be made available to bidders expressing intent to bid and who have signed a confidentiality agreement: load forecasts, resource plans, needs assessments, and transmission assessments, as appropriate. Price and cost forecasts for power supplies and fuel costs prepared by, or available to the utility, will not be made available to bidders. Bidders may provide comments to the Staff or Independent Monitor on the quality or completeness of any information provided at any time.

In preparation for the solicitation, each utility shall prepare a list of potential bidders to whom bid materials will be sent. That list should be as expansive as is reasonable. Once assembled, that list is to be provided to the Staff and the Independent Monitor and posted on the solicitation website. Identified potential bidders are to be contacted and invited to submit a letter of intent to bid. Prospective bidders not identified by the utility will be added to the bidders list by submitting a letter of intent to bid.

C. Resource Plans

Prior to the first solicitation, each utility that will solicit power during 2003 must provide to the Staff and the Independent Monitor its current 10-year load and energy forecast and resource plan. Utility personnel must be made available to discuss the load forecast and resource plans with the Staff and the Independent Monitor.

The Resource Plan must describe all power sources currently employed to meet load including: generation owned by the utility, existing power supply contracts with affiliated and

non-affiliated utilities, planned additions and retirements, contract expirations, loads to be met through the use of demand side management and contracts to satisfy the Environmental Portfolio Standard. The Resource Plan should identify RMR plants, the hours during which such plants are RMR, and the criteria employed to determine RMR. Additionally, the Resource Plan should detail the utility's planned outage schedule and any planned unavailability of power from contract suppliers. Planned reserve requirements shall also be specifically identified.

The utility will review with the Staff and the Independent Monitor the adequacy of resources committed to serve expected loads and the reliability of the resources planned to serve that load.

Based on the utility's load and energy forecast and the resource plan, the utility will develop a needs assessment. The needs assessment will be designed to identify specific capacity and energy needs and such other services and/or facilities as may be needed over the term of the load forecast.

The load forecast, resource plan and needs assessment will be reviewed with the Staff and the Independent Monitor.

D. Price & Cost Forecasts

Each utility will provide to the Staff and the Independent Monitor its four-year forecast of its power supply costs from its existing power sources.

Each utility shall provide to the Staff and the Independent Monitor the forecast of fuel prices that the utility used in preparation of its power supply costs and all other fuel forecasts relied on, or reviewed by, the utility.

Additionally, each utility shall provide to the Staff and the Independent Monitor a four-year forecast of the prices of wholesale power products, including both capacity and energy products by season and time period, in Western wholesale markets for delivery in Arizona prepared by an independent source that makes such estimates available in the normal course of

its business. Each utility shall also provide to the Staff and the Independent Monitor copies of all other forecasts of the prices of wholesale power supplies in Western wholesale markets for delivery in Arizona in the possession of or reviewed by the utility. The utility shall identify the source of each such forecast, and explain the strengths and weaknesses of each of the forecasts supplied.

Potential bidders may also submit wholesale price forecasts to the Staff. Those forecasts must clearly identify the source of the forecast and all assumptions relied on in preparing the forecast.

All forecasts provided will remain confidential and will serve as the basis for certain evaluative and review purposes as are discussed later in this document. During the reviews described above, the Staff and the Independent Monitor will examine the assumptions relied on in making the forecasts and assessments presented.

E. Deliverability Qualifications

The utility must provide Staff and the Independent Monitor with a listing of each committed use of its transmission capacity for the period over which resources are to be solicited.

The utility will perform and submit for review by the Staff and the Independent Monitor a network transmission assessment of the maximum resource capacity that can be physically and reliably accommodated simultaneously at all technologically feasible interconnection and delivery points. Such transmission limitations are to be used as a guide in the evaluation of deliverability of specific combinations of bid resource capacity and energy.

Upon completion of this review, the utility will be responsible for preparing and conducting a solicitation that encourages multiple bidders to respond to the solicitation. The specifics of ~~the products to be solicited~~, contract terms and conditions, terms of the confidentiality agreement, and the specific solicitation mechanics to be employed will be at the

discretion of the utility. The products solicited will be at least those identified in the Track B Order, together with such other products as the utility deems appropriate to meet all future needs. In any event, the process must be designed to promote acquisition of reliable power at reasonable costs over the long term while considering the environmental effects of their procurement decisions, as well as whether their decisions further the Commission's goal of encouraging the development of a robust competitive wholesale generation market.

F. Identification of Products

Each utility shall determine the specific products it will contract for in order to maintain an appropriately structured power supply portfolio. For the 2003 solicitation, as set forth in the Track B Order, utilities shall ~~may~~ request bids for firm power (e.g. on-peak and off-peak, annual or seasonal, capacity and energy blocks), and unit contingent supplies, ~~as appropriate.~~ Additionally, to the extent required, solicitations for ancillary services including, but not limited to, load following or spinning reserves, may be undertaken. It is, anticipated that bidders will provide all ancillary services required to support their bids. If the utility provides ancillary services to any generating asset not in its rate base, the utility shall make those ancillary services available to all bidders on the same terms and at the same price as available to those assets. For purposes of the solicitation, if any utility affiliate will utilize, either directly or indirectly, natural gas capacity that is concurrently available to APS under its contract with El Paso Natural Gas Company, such natural gas capacity shall be made available to all bidders on the same terms and at the same price as available to those affiliates.

In identifying the products to be contracted for, the utility will specifically define the capacity and energy sought on a time-differentiated basis and the periods for which services will be purchased. The solicitation materials will contain the terms and conditions proposed by the utility, including the right of the utility to reject all bids and to amend the request for service without notice. The solicitation materials shall include a model contract.

IV. Preparation Of Initial Solicitation

A. Overview

The materials to be provided to potential bidders shall be prepared by the utility and shall be developed in a manner that facilitates the preparation of responsive and competitive bids. The materials must be accurate and sufficiently detailed so that no bidder is afforded an undue advantage. The terms and conditions must be reasonable and commercially acceptable and must be reviewed by the Independent Monitor and the Staff.

B. Solicitation Material Content

The utility will have responsibility for preparing all solicitation materials. The materials will be prepared in a timely manner so that the Staff and the Independent Monitor will have time to review the documents and suggest changes, before they are provided to interested parties for comment.

The utility will prepare bid packages that contain a description of the specific products to be acquired, the capacity and energy to be acquired, the bidding method to be employed (e.g. Request for Proposal or Descending Clock Auction), a copy of the contract to be executed, the preferred delivery points, the availability, and terms of such availability, of natural gas capacity on the El Paso system under APS' contract, the evaluation criteria to be used, bid fees (if any), credit requirements, due dates and such other information as may be appropriate.

It will be the responsibility of the utility to prepare draft solicitation materials and to discuss these drafts with the Staff and the Independent Monitor prior to distributing them in draft form to potential bidders. These drafts will include but will not be limited to: the specific power supply products sought, points of delivery, a model contract and confidentiality agreement, the bid requirements, pre-qualification requirements, creditworthiness requirements, the solicitation

method to be employed, information describing the utility and its forecast load, and the evaluation criteria to be used.

In the Solicitation materials the utility will describe in detail how it will conduct bidding, such as how many rounds of bids will be accepted, Descending Clock Auction procedures, etc. The utility may specify that bids must be firm and for how long bids must be open after the auction is completed. If a Request for Proposal is used, a utility may specify that bids must be valid for up to 30 days.

Price caps or auction reserve prices may be established by the utility. Any caps or auction reserve prices established must be disclosed to and discussed with the Staff and the Independent Monitor before the solicitation occurs. No limitations are to be placed on the maximum or minimum capacity or energy that any bidder may bid for or provide.

The solicitation materials will also describe the criteria to be used to select winning bids and the weighting, if any, to be placed on each criterion.

The following criteria may be used to evaluate bids:

- Delivered price
- Deliverability
- Reliability
- Creditworthiness
- The source(s) of power for unit contingent products
- System benefits
- Exceptions to bid specifications and/or model contract terms and conditions
- Other criteria as appropriate and made publicly available

The bid package prepared by the utility should specify preferred delivery points and, if available, equivalent delivery points and any incremental costs the utility will incur if bidders deliver to those equivalent delivery points. The utility shall disclose to the bidders the existence

of the network transmission assessment previously provided to the Staff and the Independent Monitor, and disclose that the assessment will be used in evaluating equivalent delivery points. The solicitation materials will specify the process the utility will use to identify whether any constraints would be created on its system as a result of deliveries to any alternative delivery point, how it will estimate the cost and time required to relieve the constraint, and the costs a bidder will incur to mitigate the constraint.

The bid materials will also describe the Supplier information to be provided and the dates when such information is due. This requirement may include a demonstration of the bidder's experience in providing services and evidence of the bidder's creditworthiness. Utilities shall require bidders to provide a description of the sources of electricity they intend to use to supply service.

The bid materials will specifically describe the credit support acceptable to the utility both as to form and amount. However, bidders may provide alternative credit support arrangements and, if equivalent to that specified, the utility must evaluate the proposal as it would a conforming bid. Equivalent credit support arrangements may include, but will not be limited to, appropriate parental or affiliate guarantees.

Bid materials will also include:

- A draft Confidentiality Agreement
- Identification of any pre-qualification requirements
- Identification of any bid fees

C. Communications

Only those employees, officers, directors or contractors of the utility or its affiliates specifically assigned by January 1, 2003, to prepare the solicitation materials or to evaluate bids received, may participate in the preparation of solicitation materials or evaluation of bids. All persons assigned to the solicitation by the utility shall be subject to a standard of conduct

established for the purpose of maintaining a separation between the utility and any affiliated entity or person. Persons who work for an affiliate, parent, or part of the utility involved in the sale or marketing of resources from generating assets owned by the utility shall not participate in the solicitation preparation or evaluation of bids, or have any contact regarding the solicitation with any personnel assigned to conduct the solicitation, except on the same terms as any other bidder.

A protocol shall be established for all communications between the utility and all prospective bidders, regardless of whether they are affiliates or third party bidders. The protocol must prohibit the dissemination of any data to an affiliated person that are not provided to all other interested persons on equal terms and at the same time. The utility will identify to the Staff and the Independent Monitor, the information it proposes to restrict access to by bidders and other interested persons.

The Staff and the Independent Monitor will review all draft solicitation materials before they are released to the parties for their review.

Concurrently, the utility will establish the procedures it will employ to communicate with all potential bidders. That communications plan must be designed to maintain confidentiality and to provide equal access to information to all. All bidders, including utility affiliates, must be required to communicate with the utility on equal terms. The approach adopted must be shown to provide no undue advantage to any potential bidder.

By January _____ 1, 2003, each utility shall establish and maintain a solicitation website as the medium for communicating with bidders prior to the bid date, except for confidential exchanges regarding pre-qualification and creditworthiness. Bidders will address all inquiries to the utility on the website. Each inquiry and the utility response thereto shall be posted so that all bidders have equal access to information. The website will also be used to provide timely access to data and other information, such as the bidders list and the form letter of intent to bid that bidders may use to be placed on the bidders list.

Pre-solicitation data shall be posted on the website as soon as it has been reviewed by Staff and the Independent Monitor but in no case less than 5 days before the last bidders' conference.

Bidder inquiries to the Independent Monitor may also be addressed using the solicitation website. All bidder inquiries to the Independent Monitor and the response provided, regardless of how the inquiry is made, will be posted on the solicitation website for review by all bidders.

As part of the communications protocols established by the utility, each utility shall establish a system for logging all contacts between utility personnel and bidders and potential bidders. That protocol must, at a minimum, require recording the date and time of any conversation, whether telephonic or in person, the substance of that discussion and whether the Independent Monitor participated in the contact. The utility shall maintain copies of all e-mails exchanged between the utility and bidders or potential bidders, copies of all correspondence, and all such other communications as may occur regarding the solicitation, for the terms set forth below.

Each utility shall schedule one or more bidders' conferences to answer questions posed by potential bidders and to take comments regarding the adequacy and quality of the information provided to bidders. All bidders' conferences must be completed at least 10 days before the release of the final bid package.

Based on the comments received, the utility, after consultation with the Staff and the Independent Monitor, shall make such changes, as it deems necessary and produce in final form its solicitation materials.

D. Pre-qualification

Participation in pre-qualification shall be a prerequisite to having a bid accepted. The utility and the Independent Monitor shall begin pre-qualifying bidders at the same time it assembles the list of prospective bidders. As bidders indicate their intent to submit a bid, the

utility shall provide all necessary documents to complete the pre-qualification and undertake the review of completed bidder submissions as they are received.

Bidders shall be pre-qualified for:

- Creditworthiness
- Deliverability
- Reliability
- Business reputation and experience

The utility shall notify bidders of their pre-qualification status no less than 14 days before bids are due. Any bidder that has not successfully pre-qualified by that date shall be afforded the opportunity to submit pre-qualification materials or to cure any failure to pre-qualify before the bid date.

The specific pre-qualification requirements are dependent on the products to be contracted for and will be established by the utility and the Independent Monitor. Standards for pre-qualification, including minimum credit worthiness, shall be included in the solicitation materials. Information provided by bidders as part of the pre-qualification process is to be considered confidential.

E. Solicitation Cost

The cost of conducting each solicitation is a business expense to be borne by all bidders in a fair and equitable manner. To that end, bid fees of up to \$10,000 per bidder will be permissible. To the extent that bid fees collected exceed the incremental expenses incurred by the utility to conduct the solicitation, such excess is to be refunded to all non-winning bidders pro rata up to the amount of the bid fee actually paid by the bidder. Any costs incurred by the utility in excess of bid fees collected may be considered in subsequent regulatory proceedings.

Any utility requiring the payment of bid fees will be responsible for their collection and, if required, the refund of any amounts collected in excess of the costs incurred in conducting the solicitation.

Once a solicitation is provided to potential bidders, the utility will employ the steps laid out in the following section (V. Conducting the Solicitation) for each type of solicitation.

V. Conducting The Solicitation

A. Overview

In conducting the solicitation, whether by Request for Proposal or Descending Clock Auction, the utility shall employ standard sets of requirements and evaluative tools, appropriate to the type of solicitation conducted.

Bid evaluation will be conducted by a team of personnel including representatives of the utility and the Independent Monitor. In evaluating bids, the utility shall use a standard set of evaluative criteria, including a single fuel forecast for each type of fuel. The utility will also determine creditworthiness and deliverability using criteria that are unbiased and allow differing means of providing risk mitigation. Final bid selections will be at the sole discretion of the utility.

During the solicitation process, the Independent Monitor will oversee the solicitation process to ensure compliance with process requirements and to assure that evaluations are conducted in an unbiased fashion. The Staff may be present during bid evaluations and may observe the solicitation process at its discretion.

B. Bid Evaluation

Bid evaluations should be conducted in three phases. The first should be to rank order the bids by price using valuation methods that equalize volumetric and or duration differences on

a price basis. In the case of a Descending Clock Auction for firm power at fixed prices, only pre-qualified bids will be rank ordered. In the case of unit contingent Requests for Proposals or for non-conforming offers, approaches to valuing the bids that determine an equivalent per MWh net present value of the cost of the bid to the utility by using approved annuity-based approaches may be employed.

Phase Two should, to the extent not determined during pre-qualification, evaluate deliverability using the network transmission assessment previously provided to the Staff and the Independent Monitor. To the extent practicable, network resource status should be assigned to appropriate bids. Network service is to be provided pursuant to each utility's OATT. Bidders may propose delivery to alternative points (i.e. points other than those specified). In such case, the utility shall determine the deliverability of the capacity and energy bid using its best efforts. If a bid imposes delivery costs on the utility, the bid price as evaluated should be adjusted to reflect those costs and a new rank order established. If the bidder is prepared to mitigate those costs at its expense, no such adjustment need be made. All assessments of alternative delivery points shall be provided to the Staff and the Independent Monitor prior to the selection of winning bids.

During Phase Three all other factors not previously considered are to be evaluated. These include evaluations of creditworthiness, experience and proposed exceptions to model contract terms and/or conditions.

To the extent necessary, the utility may conduct post bid negotiations with selected bidders to clarify bid terms or to resolve issues relating to exceptions noted in submitted bids. Additionally, the utility may conduct final negotiations with selected bidders to resolve any other issues that may arise. All such meetings are to be attended, in person or telephonically, by the Independent Monitor to assure that no undue advantage is afforded any bidder. Based on the evaluations conducted, the utility will, after consultation with the Independent Monitor, and discussion with Staff, select the winning bids.

C. Request for Proposal Bid Evaluation Procedures

Bids in response to a Request for Proposal are confidential and are to be submitted in sealed envelopes to be opened simultaneously at the Commission in the presence of the utility's bid evaluators, assigned Staff personnel, and the Independent Monitor. RUCO may also attend. Bids submitted may not be withdrawn for up to 30 days or until rejected by the utility.

Bid evaluation will be conducted by a team of personnel including representatives of the utility and the Independent Monitor. During the evaluations, the Staff may be present. Final bid selections will be at the sole discretion of the utility.

If the utility determines that all bids submitted are to be rejected, it will notify all bidders of its decision to reject all bids within 21 days of the day bids were opened.

D. Descending Clock Auctions Bid Evaluation Procedures

All bids are confidential and must be firm until the auction has been completed. Electronically submitted bids must be secured and may not be reviewed except in the presence of the Independent Monitor. If feasible, bids will be reviewed at the offices of the Commission. The Staff and RUCO may also attend. However, no person selling or which may sell energy in competitive markets may review the bids (except of course for utility personnel assigned to the solicitation.)

E. Terms Required for Staff Recommendation

~~Based on the utility's forecasts of its power supply cost, the submitted forecast of wholesale power supply in Arizona, and such other information as it deems appropriate, the Staff, assisted by the Independent Monitor, shall establish "prices to beat" for each product solicited for each utility. The "prices to beat" established by the Staff will be used for the purpose of determining whether the Staff will recommend without further analysis a finding that~~

~~prices contained in any contract meeting the conditions outlined below are reasonable. For contracts not meeting the “prices to beat” conditions outlined below, the Staff will, after further analysis, make findings and recommendations relating to prudence, reasonableness and used and usefulness as appropriate in any subsequent proceedings as scheduled by the Commission.~~

~~In any subsequent proceedings to recover the cost of power purchased pursuant to contracts entered as a result of the initial solicitation, the Staff will, without further analysis, recommend the Commission find the prices contained in such contracts are reasonable if the Monitor determines the solicitation was conducted appropriately and the following conditions are met:~~

~~□ For contracts with durations of three years or less, the Staff will recommend without further analysis approving contract prices when such prices in each year of the contract are less than the “prices to beat” established by the Staff and permit, at the utility’s sole discretion, extension of the contract for the same number of years at comparable prices and on the same terms.~~

~~□ For contracts with durations longer than three years but less than eight years, the Staff will recommend without further analysis that the Commission find the prices contained in any contract reasonable when, in each year of the contract delivery period, prices for power are less than the “prices to beat” established by the Staff pursuant to the following schedule:~~

~~-Contracts of 4 years if contract prices are less than the “prices to beat” by 4% or more during each year~~

~~-Contracts of 5 or 6 years if contract prices are less than the “prices to beat” by 6% or more during each year~~

~~Contracts of 7 years if contract prices are less than the “prices to beat” by 10% or more during each year.~~

~~□ For contracts not meeting the conditions outlined above, the Staff reserves the right to challenge the prudence, reasonableness or usefulness of the contract entered.~~

~~The above-described recommendations by the Staff do not constitute a finding by the Staff that any contract was prudent or that the utility’s power supply portfolio was prudently structured. The Staff reserves the right to contest the reasonableness of any recommended contract on its non-price terms or the utility’s portfolio in its entirety in any future proceeding. Additionally, contracts not meeting the above-stated standards will not automatically be viewed by Staff as unreasonable or imprudent. The reasonableness and prudence of contracts not meeting the above criteria will need to be evaluated by Staff in subsequent proceedings.~~

~~The “prices to beat” set by the Staff will not be disclosed. After final bid selections are announced, the Staff will identify those winning bids that have met the conditions set forth above.~~

VI. Post Selection Requirements

Within 14 days of the selection of winning bids, the utility will submit to the Commission a detailed report on the process employed to conduct the solicitation and an explanation of the basis for selecting the winning bids. To the extent that confidential information is to be provided it should be noted.

Within 3 days of the selection of winning bids the Independent Monitor will submit a status report on the solicitation process employed by the utility to the Commission. Within 14 days of the completion of the solicitation, the Independent Monitor will submit to the Commission the report described in Section II C 2 above.

Each utility shall maintain a complete record of all materials developed for, generated during or used in conducting the solicitation for the life of the longest contract, plus 5 years. The retained records shall include, but not be limited to, reports, internal and external communications, analyses, contracts, forecasts, bids submitted, questions received from bidders and the answers provided in response, and resource plans. These materials will be available to the Staff. To the extent that the material is not subject to a confidentiality agreement, these materials will be available to the bidders upon reasonable terms and conditions.

Sometime after the completion of each utility's initial solicitation, the Commission Staff will commence a review of the utility's power supply portfolio to examine the prudence of that utility's planning and procurement practices, and to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of the solicitation process employed.

Also, sometime after the completion of the initial solicitation, the Commission Staff will commence a proceeding to review the solicitation process described in this document and will recommend such changes to the process as may be appropriate. Any refinements will be intended to improve the process and to enhance the development of a robust wholesale energy market in Arizona. Additionally, that proceeding will address the planning for future solicitations at such time and for such amounts of capacity and energy as may be needed.

E. Solicitation Timelines

On the following pages we have presented Solicitation Timelines for the two primary solicitation methodologies discussed at the workshops: The Descending Clock Auction (as proposed by APS in its initial comments on Track B Issues) and a more traditional Request for Proposals approach to power supply acquisitions. The timelines illustrate the time periods during which various required tasks are expected to be completed in order to assure that adequate power supplies are available by July 1, 2003.

The timelines were reviewed with the workshop participants and there was a general consensus that they captured the major tasks that will need to be undertaken and that in the aggregate the tasks could be completed within the allotted timeframes.