

ORIGINAL
OPEN MEETING AGENDA ITEM



0000038302

EXCEPTION

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED

2006 JAN 13 P 2:16

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCUMENT CONTROL

- 1
- 2 JEFF HATCH-MILLER
CHAIRMAN
- 3 WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
COMMISSIONER
- 4 MARC SPITZER
COMMISSIONER
- 5 MIKE GLEASON
COMMISSIONER
- 6 KRISTIN K. MAYES
COMMISSIONER
- 7

8 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION
9 OF ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE
10 COMPANY FOR A HEARING TO
11 DETERMINE THE FAIR VALUE OF THE
12 UTILITY PROPERTY OF THE COMPANY
13 FOR RATEMAKING PURPOSES, TO FIX
14 A JUST AND REASONABLE RATE OF
15 RETURN THEREON, TO APPROVE RATE
16 SCHEDULES DESIGNED TO DEVELOP
17 SUCH RETURN, AND FOR APPROVAL
18 OF PURCHASED POWER CONTRACT.

Docket No. E-01345A-03-0437

19 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION
20 OF ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE
21 COMPANY FOR APPROVAL OF A
22 POWER SUPPLY ADJUSTOR
23 SURCHARGE.

Docket No. E-01345A-05-0526

17 **RUCO'S EXCEPTIONS**

18 The Recommended Opinion and Order ("ROO") concludes that the Arizona Corporation
19 Commission ("Commission") intended to create two separate balancing accounts when it
20 adopted the power supply adjustor ("PSA")—one to "comprehensively track the ongoing inputs
21 and outputs used to calculate the PSA 'bank balance'," and another to separately "record the
22 'carryover' amounts resulting from the application of the [4 mil] bandwidths."¹ However,
23 regardless of the Commission's intention when it adopted the PSA in April 2005, subsequent

24

¹ ROO at 9, quoting Staff's Closing brief pg. 7.

1 events and new information regarding the importance of the timing of recovery of the rapidly
2 growing PSA balance warrant the approval of the \$80 million surcharge at this time.

4 **Subsequent events**

5 Since the Commission's approval of the PSA last March, a number of events have
6 occurred which exacerbate the consequences of delaying the beginning of the recovery of
7 APS's PSA balance. These include continuing increases in fuel costs, a confusing signal over
8 whether the Commission will expeditiously process APS's rate case, a downgrade of APS's
9 debt rating to one notch above junk bond, and an indication that further downgrade to junk
10 status is likely if the undercollected balance is not addressed at least in part soon. Taken
11 together, these events warrant approval of the surcharge at this time rather than a few months
12 from now, to avert the costly consequences of an imminent downgrade of APS's debt rating.

13 The only fuel and purchased power costs currently being collected from APS customers
14 is the base cost, which was set based on 2003 actual costs. These costs have increased
15 dramatically since 2003.² As a result, as of August 31, 2005, APS had deferred for future
16 collection from customers \$115.2 million (post-90/10 sharing).³ That amount had increased to
17 \$150 million as of the end of October 2005.⁴ Because of these increased fuel and purchased
18 power costs, it is unlikely that the PSA's undercollected balance will fall below \$100 million,
19 even with approval of a surcharge to collect \$80 million over 2 years.⁵

20 On November 4, APS filed a new rate case application seeking an increase of \$405
21 million, based on a test year ending December 31, 2004. On the date that the Commission
22

23 ² Gehlen Direct at 10-11 (Exh. S-2) (58% increase in natural gas prices and 45% increase in purchased
24 power prices during the period 2003 through third quarter 2005).

³ Gehlen Direct at 8 (Exh. S-2).

⁴ Tr. at 341 (Wheeler).

⁵ Gehlen direct at 8 (Exh. S-2).

1 Staff was due to make a filing indicating whether APS's filing met the Commission's sufficiency
2 requirement, Staff filed a letter that neither indicated the filing was sufficient nor insufficient, but
3 stated that the Company had agreed to file updated financial information through September
4 30, 2004. To clear up confusion of whether the timeclock to process the application should
5 begin or not, the Chief Administrative Law Judge convened a procedural conference on
6 December 22, 2005.

7 On December 21, 2005, Standard & Poor's ("S&P") downgraded APS's debt rating to
8 one level above junk, but indicated that its outlook was stable due to its expectation that the
9 Commission would "resolve at least a portion of APS's increasing deferred power costs in
10 January 2006" and that progress would be made in addressing the Company's recent rate
11 case filing. S&P stated that "any adverse regulatory development" could result in a downward
12 revision of the outlook or an adverse rating action.⁶

13 APS asserted in its recent application for emergency rate relief that a downgrade of its
14 debt rating would cost an additional \$10 to \$15 million in interest expense each year initially,
15 and those annual increased costs could grow wildly in future years.⁷

17 **Acting Now Avoids Serious Dangers**

18 Because the PSA specifically allows prudently incurred deferred fuel and purchased
19 power costs to be passed on to customers, the resolution of this matter will only have an
20 impact on the timing of recovery and not on whether costs are recoverable. Initially, the only
21 apparent impact of those timing differences was additional interest that would accrue during
22 the period of non-recovery. However, the above-cited events reveal additional impacts from

24 ⁶ Application for Emergency Interim Rate Increase, Docket No. E-01345A-06-0009, at 4.
⁷ Exhibit A to Application (Affidavit of Donald E. Brandt at para. 20) filed January 6, 2006 in Docket No. E-01345A-06-0009.


1 deferring recovery that could have significant negative consequences to both the Company
2 and its customers. In its emergency rate application, APS suggests that a downgrade to junk
3 status could cost customers hundreds of millions of dollars and could threaten APS's ability to
4 provide service in its rapidly growing service territory. Rather than face these possibilities, the
5 Commission should authorize the surcharge now. The few month delay in a surcharge until
6 April 1, 2006 is not worth the risk of the consequences of an additional downgrade to junk
7 status.

8 Granting the surcharge now presents other advantages to customers. First, it sends a
9 more accurate price signal to customers that the cost of energy has increased and continues
10 to increase. Currently, the price signal consumers are receiving is based on 2003 costs.
11 Implementing the surcharge signals to customers to begin to modify their electric usage
12 accordingly prior to the beginning of the high-usage summer months. Further, initiating the
13 surcharge minimizes the accrued interest that customers will ultimately pay on the
14 unrecovered PSA balance. As with any costs that flow through the PSA, prudence can be
15 reviewed in subsequent proceedings, and any necessary true-ups can be handled through the
16 PSA's normal operation. The remaining aspects of APS's larger requests for emergency
17 (\$299 million) and permanent (preliminarily, \$405 million) rate increases can be evaluated in
18 their respective proceedings.

19 The ROO exposes what may have been a miscommunication between the parties to
20 APS's rate settlement agreement and the Commission. However, the Commission should not
21 lose sight of what is in the best interest of the public at this time, based on what is known
22 today. Rather than fixating on what expectations were nine months ago, the Commission can
23 act now in consumers' long run interests, and minimize the risks of dire consequences due to
24 putting off the unfortunate reality of increasing energy costs.

1 RUCO has attached as Exhibit A a proposed amendment to alter the outcome of the
2 ROO to approve the surcharge at this time.

3
4 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 13th day of January, 2006.

5
6
7
8

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
Scott S. Wakefield
Chief Counsel

9 AN ORIGINAL AND FIFTEEN COPIES
10 of the foregoing filed this 13th day
11 of January, 2006 with:

11 Docket Control
12 Arizona Corporation Commission
13 1200 West Washington
14 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

15 COPIES of the foregoing hand delivered/
16 mailed this 13th day of January, 2006 to:

17 Lyn Farmer, Chief Administrative Law
18 Judge
19 Hearing Division
20 Arizona Corporation Commission
21 1200 West Washington
22 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

23 Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel
24 Legal Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Ernest Johnson, Director
Utilities Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Thomas L. Mumaw
Pinnacle West Capital Corp.
Law Department
PO Box 53999, MS 8695
Phoenix, Arizona 85072-3999

C. Webb Crockett
Patrick J. Black
Jay L. Shapiro
Fennemore Craig, P.C.
3003 North Central Avenue
Suite 2600
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2913

Major Allen G. Erickson
AFCES A/ULT
139 Barnes Drive
Suite 1
Tyndall AFB, Florida 32403-5319

1	Michael L. Kurtz Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry	Michael A. Curtis Curtis, Goodwin, Sullivan, Udall & Schwab, P.L.C.
2	36 East 7 th Street Suite 2110	2712 North 7 th Street
3	Cincinnati, Ohio 45202	Phoenix, Arizona 85006-1090
4	Walter W. Meek, President Arizona Utility Investors Association	Raymond S. Heyman, Esq. Sr. Vice President & General Counsel
5	2100 N. Central Avenue, Suite 210 Phoenix, Arizona 85004	UniSource Energy Corporation One South Church Street Suite 1820
6	Donna M. Bronski Deputy City Attorney	Tucson, AZ 85701
7	City Attorney's Office 3939 Drinkwater Blvd. Scottsdale, AZ 85251	Michael Patten Roshka DeWulf & Patten 400 E. Van Buren, Suite 800 Phoenix, AZ 85004
8	Nicholas J. Enoch Lubin & Enoch	J. William Moore 1144 East Jefferson Phoenix, Arizona 85034
9	349 North 4 th Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85003	Marvin S. Cohen Sacks Tierney P.A. 4250 North Drinkwater Blvd. 4 th Floor Scottsdale, Arizona 85251
10	Bill Murphy Murphy Consulting	Cynthia Zwick Arizona Community Action Association 2627 North 3 rd Street Suite 2 Phoenix, Arizona 85004
11	2422 East Palo Verde Drive Phoenix, Arizona 85016	S. David Childers Low & Childers 2999 North 44 th Street Suite 250 Phoenix, Arizona 85018
12	Robert W. Geake Arizona Water Company P.O. Box 29006 Phoenix, Arizona 85038-9006	James M. Van Nostrand Katherine A. McDowell George M. Galloway Stoel Rives 900 SW 5 th Avenue Suite 2600 Portland, Oregon 97204
13	Andrew W. Bettwy Bridget A. Branigan	
14	Southwest Gas Corporation 5241 Spring Mountain Road Las Vegas, Nevada 89150	
15	Timothy M. Hogan Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest 202 East McDowell Road Suite 153 Phoenix, Arizona 85004	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

1 Greg Patterson
 Arizona Competitive Power Alliance
 2 916 West Adams
 Suite 3
 3 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

4 Rebecca C. Salisbury
 56th Fighter Wing JA
 5 7383 North Litchfield Road
 Luke AFB, Arizona 85309-1540

6 Jon Poston
 7 AARP Electric Rate Project
 6733 East Dale Lane
 8 Cave Creek, Arizona 85331

9 Paul R. Michaud
 Michaud Law Firm PLC
 10 46 Eastham Bridge Rd.
 East Hampton, CT 06424-1375

11 Coralette Hannon
 12 AARP Department of State Affairs
 6705 Reedy Creek Road
 13 Charlotte, North Carolina 28215

14 Lawrence V. Robertson, Jr.
 P. O. Box 1448
 15 Tubac, AZ 85646

16 David Berry
 Western Resource Advocates
 17 P.O. Box 1064
 Scottsdale, Arizona 85252-1064

18 Jay I. Moyes, Esq.
 19 Moyes Storey Ltd.
 1850 N. Central Avenue
 20 Suite 1100
 Phoenix, AZ 85004

21 Kenneth R. Saline, P.E.
 22 K.R. Saline & Assoc., PLC
 160 N. Pasadena, Suite 101
 23 Mesa, AZ 85201

24

Kimberly Grouse
 Snell & Wilmer
 One Arizona Center
 400 E. Van Buren Street
 Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202

Jeff Schlegel
 Sweep Arizona Representative
 1167 W. Samalawca Drive
 Tucson, AZ 85704

Jesse A. Dillon
 PPL Services Corp.
 Two N. Ninth Street
 Allentown, PA 18101

Robert Annan
 Annan Group
 6605 E. Evening Glow Drive
 Phoenix, AZ 85262

Douglas V. Fant
 AZCOGEN Assoc.
 80 E. Columbus
 Phoenix, AZ 85012

Sean Seitz
 ARISEIA
 5056 S. 40th Street, Suite C
 Phoenix, Arizona 85040


By 
 Ernestine Gamble
 Secretary to Scott Wakefield

EXHIBIT A
RUCO's PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Page 14, lines 15-28 DELETE PARAGRAPH

Page 15, lines 1-7 DELETE PARAGRAPH

Page 15, line 24 INSERT NEW PARAGRAPH as follows:

However, as discussed below in our evaluation of the surcharge application, we believe that new circumstances merit the granting of the surcharge regardless of our intention in April 2005.

Page 15, line 24 to Page 16, line 20 DELETE

Page 19, line 15 to Page 20, line 9 DELETE and REPLACE with:

As discussed above, our determination based solely on expectations at the time we adopted Decision No. 67744 may have concluded that the surcharge application is premature and should be denied because it precedes the implementation of the first annual adjustment of the PSA. However, we find that events subsequent to our adoption of Decision No. 67744 compel us to implement the surcharge at this time in order to avoid dire consequences of waiting until the annual adjustor in April 2006. The continued escalation of fuel and purchased power costs and the size of the resulting unrecovered PSA balance has resulted in a downgrade of APS's debt rating to one level above junk. Our creation of the PSA essentially concluded that it was appropriate to pass through to customers the costs of fuel and purchased power, subject to the 90/10 sharing mechanism. Continued delay in beginning recovery of the PSA balance is likely to result in unnecessarily higher costs to finance ongoing capital expenditures to meet the demands of APS's growing service territory.¹ Therefore we will adopt a surcharge of \$0.001416 per kWh for 24 months, or until it collects \$80 million, whichever occurs first.

Further amendments to conform

¹ We take administrative notice of APS's Application for Emergency Interim Rate Increase, Docket No. E-01345A-06-0009, filed January 6, 2006, which indicates that further downgrading of APS's debt would increase interest expense \$10 million to \$15 million annually.