



0000041681

412
OPEN MEETING

ORIGINAL

MEMORANDUM

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

RECEIVED

2002 MAR -1 P 1:32

TO: THE COMMISSION

MAR 01 2002

FROM: Utilities Division

DOCKETED BY 

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCUMENT CONTROL

DATE: February 28, 2002

RE: THE EXAMINATION OF ARIZONA ELECTRIC POWER COOPERATIVE, INC.'S PURCHASED POWER AND FUEL ADJUSTOR CLAUSE (DOCKET NO. E-01773A-01-0833)

Introduction

On October 11, 2000, Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. ("AEP" or "the Cooperative") filed an application for approval and confirmation of various transactions enabling the Cooperative to restructure into three affiliated entities. As part of the application, AEP also requested Commission authorization to forgive the under-collected purchased power and fuel adjustor clause ("PPFAC") bank balance as of the effective date of the restructuring and to eliminate its PPFAC on an on-going basis.

In-Decision No 63868, dated July 25, 2001, the Commission approved AEP's restructuring. The Commission also approved forgiveness of the December 31, 2000 under-collected PPFAC balance of approximately \$6.0 million. The Commission also authorized Staff

"to open a docket and request a procedural order be issued within 90 days from the decision in this docket. The purpose of the docket would be to examine AEP's PPFAC. Staff would perform an audit of AEP's PPFAC filings and balance to verify the balance and verify AEP's compliance with previous Commission orders. At that time Staff will also make a recommendation regarding the continuation or discontinuation of the PPFAC and a recommendation regarding the balance forgiven."

On July 31, 2001, AEP's restructuring transactions closed.

On October 23, 2001, Staff filed a Notice of Opening Docket and Request for Procedural Order requesting that Docket Control open a docket to examine AEP's PPFAC and requesting Hearing Division to issue a procedural order directing Staff to file its preliminary report on its examination of AEP's PPFAC by January 31, 2002. Staff members Linda Jaress and John Thornton performed an audit of the adjustor mechanism on October 29 and 30, 2001.

Finally, on January 24, 2002, AEPCO sent a letter to Chief Administrative Law Judge Lyn Farmer setting forth certain requests. AEPCO requested cancellation of the current PPFAC, authorization to explore a revised PPFAC with Staff to be implemented at a future date and authorization of a surcharge to recover the \$8.3 million under-collection in the PPFAC balance as of July 31, 2001 (the day before the reorganization of AEPCO). AEPCO also requested that the Hearing Division extend the due date of Staff's recommendations from January 31, 2002 to March 5, 2002.

Historical Background of the PPFAC

Traditionally, AEPCO's fuel and purchased power expenses have comprised over 60 percent of AEPCO's total operating expenses. Because AEPCO cannot raise rates without a full rate case, wide swings in those expenses could significantly affect AEPCO's cash balances and net margins. The purpose of AEPCO's PPFAC, then, is to protect AEPCO's financial health by allowing expedited recovery of fuel and purchased power expenses when those expenses fluctuate. AEPCO's PPFAC also allows for a reduction in customers' bills when its expenses fall below a pre-set base rate.

Each month, AEPCO makes a PPFAC filing with the Utilities Division on "Form A2". Form A2 distills monthly information regarding AEPCO's customers, generating units, revenues and costs of wheeling, fuel and purchased power into eight pages and computes a monthly over or under-collected "bank balance". Form A2, and the Commission's requirement that AEPCO use it, originated in Decision No. 53034, dated May 21, 1982.

Although the adjustor mechanism originated in the 1982 Decision, a new energy charge, base rate and adjustor was set in the Commission's last full rate case decision for AEPCO, Decision No. 58405, dated September 3, 1993. At that time, the adjustor was set at zero and the base cost of fuel and purchased power was set at \$0.01714. A second decision on outstanding rate case issues in the same case, Decision No. 58792, dated September 21, 1994, ordered AEPCO to file testimony in its next rate case discussing retention or elimination of the PPFAC. AEPCO has not filed a rate case since then.

AEPCO's adjustor mechanism works as follows: A base cost of fuel and purchased power (\$0.01714 per kWh) is recovered through AEPCO's monthly base rates to its Class A members, the six distribution cooperatives. Each month, AEPCO determines the amount of fuel and purchased power expenses applicable to the Class A members which were not recovered through the base rate and tracks and accumulates these totals.

Decision No. 58405 required AEPCO to determine the amount of fuel and purchased power expenses that should be allocated to the Class A members in a complex manner that suited AEPCO's contracts, rates and operations at the time. Briefly, AEPCO determines the various costs of fuel (coal and gas) used by each generator and the costs of purchased power. The most expensive fuel and purchased power is allocated to non-firm, non-jurisdictional customers, then to firm-non-jurisdictional customers with some specified exceptions. Then, the total costs

allocated to the firm and non-firm non-jurisdictional customers is subtracted from total fuel and purchased power expense, leaving the remainder to be recovered from the Class A members.

Previous Controversy

In 1994 through 1996, Commission Staff members and AEPCO representatives held meetings and exchanged correspondence regarding AEPCO's method of calculating its PPFAC. Staff's concerns at that time centered on whether AEPCO's Class A members were receiving their fair allocation of the least-cost generation.

AEPCO had been determining the average cost of fuel and purchased power allocated to firm, non-jurisdictional customers differently from that allocated to non-firm non-jurisdictional customers, a process that AEPCO termed "illogical". On February 14, 1994, AEPCO notified the Commission's Chief of Accounting and Rates that it was correcting "inconsistencies" in the logic used to develop the pools of marginal costs applicable to non-firm and firm non-jurisdictional sales and from that day forward would continue the new calculation.

Staff reviewed the surviving memos, letters and work papers of both Staff and AEPCO to determine the source of the controversy. Indeed, when AEPCO made the allocation methods conform under the new calculation, the result was a significant increase in costs allocated to Class A customers.

Staff reviewed the Decision that created the PPFAC mechanism in 1982 along with other Commission Decisions that addressed the PPFAC and the adjustor and can find no specific references to or directions for determining or allocating the fuel and purchased power expenses among the Class A and non-Class A customers that AEPCO may have violated. Staff believes that although the change in the calculation method instituted by AEPCO in 1994 may not have benefited the Class A members, it is a method of computing and allocating costs that is not prohibited by any Commission Decision. Thus, Staff believes that the change made in 1994 was within the purview of AEPCO to make. Furthermore, none of AEPCO's Class A members, have objected to the change in the method used.

Staff's Audit

Staff focused its attention on auditing the January, 2001 adjustor filing. January was chosen because it began with zero balance as it was the first filing after the forgiveness of the under-collected balance making it the most straightforward monthly PPFAC filing to audit and verify. Previous to Staff's visit, AEPCO was not aware of the month Staff selected to audit.

Staff began with January 31st calculated bank balance, traced it back through the PPFAC calculations to randomly selected general ledger entries and, finally, to randomly selected invoices. No discrepancies were found. Staff's audit was particularly efficient given AEPCO's cooperation. Staff interviewed finance, accounting, marketing, and energy procurement employees of the company in the course of the audit.

Staff's audit revealed no unreasonable or imprudent accounting practices related to the PPFAC. Staff concluded that problems with the PPFAC lie not with the application of the existing structure, but rather the problems are within the structure of the mechanism itself.

Incompatibility of Form A2 with the Current Operations of AEPCO

At the time of the 1982 Decision, AEPCO was a much different cooperative than it is today. AEPCO's 1982 revenues of \$125.9 million were derived from the sale of 2.5 billion kWhs. In contrast, for the year ending December 31, 2000, AEPCO's revenues were \$229.0 million and kWh sales totaled 4.6 billion. Currently, AEPCO has more members and its revenues are comprised of a significantly greater proportion of contract and non-member sales than in 1982. The most significant event since the 1982 adoption of Form A2 is the recent restructuring of AEPCO and the transfer of its transmission assets to Sierra Southwest.

Included in Form A2 is a section entitled Supplement B-Purchased Power and Wheeling Costs that computes the difference between wheeling costs included in base rates with wheeling costs incurred during the reporting period. Since the restructuring and the transfer of the transmission assets, AEPCO no longer pays wheeling costs. Thus, the restructuring created an inconsistency between Form A2 and AEPCO's actual operations.

The decision from AEPCO's last rate case set rates to AEPCO's Class A members at \$15.25 per kW of billing demand and \$0.02228 per kWh. The Decision also determined that the base cost of fuel and purchased power included within the revenue requirements to be \$0.01714. The adjustor was set at zero. Since then, AEPCO's adjustor has remained unchanged. In the recent restructuring docket, the Commission authorized AEPCO to change its rates to \$12.44 per kW of billing demand plus \$0.01989 per kWh. Unfortunately, the new rates did not result in a new base rate for the PPFAC. The PPFAC base cost remains at \$0.01714. It is highly unlikely that AEPCO's base cost of fuel and purchased power is still the same \$0.01714 it was in 1993.

Further drawing the accuracy of the base rate and the adjustor mechanism into question is the lack of a fully-allocated cost-of-service study supporting AEPCO's rate design when the base rate and energy charge were set in 1993. Without a thorough review of a cost of service study, it is impossible to determine the proportion or amount of fuel and purchased power costs, if any, that are included in the demand charge and how much are included in the energy charge. Thus, the incompatibility of the PPFAC and AEPCO's rate structure and current operations is further emphasized by the lack of a relevant cost of service study.

The New PPFAC Bank Balance of \$8,294,176

On the December 31, 2000 financial statements, AEPCO wrote-off the \$6.7 million undercollection of its PPFAC bank balance and forgave repayment of that amount by its members. Since that time until August 1, 2001, AEPCO has tracked PPFAC bank balance but has not "booked" PPFAC deferred revenues in anticipation of the adjustor's elimination.

Between January 1, 2001, and July 31, 2001, the day before the restructuring was effectuated, a new bank balance of \$8,294,176 accumulated. AEPCO asserts that unexpected generating unit outages in the Spring of 2001 forced AEPCO to buy replacement power at the higher prices prevailing at that time.

AEPCO's Current Request

AEPCO requested authorization of a "surcharge" of \$0.02 per kWh, through a docketed letter to the Chief Administrative Law Judge. AEPCO also submitted a resolution from its Board of Directors that gave AEPCO authority to request termination of the PPFAC and to seek collection of the "\$8.2 million under-collected balance as of July 31, 2001 at a rate not to exceed 2 mills per kWh". Because AEPCO's Board is primarily composed of Directors of the Class A member cooperatives, Staff believes that the Board Resolution constitutes notice to AEPCO's Class A members.

AEPCO also requested in its letter authorization to "explore a revised PPFAC with Staff which could be implemented at a future date."

Analysis

As an attachment to its letter, AEPCO filed the analysis that computed the July 31, 2001 undercollection of \$8,294,176. However, the Resolution for the Board of Directors also filed with the letter approves recovery of \$8.2 million. Staff believes that for AEPCO to collect the additional \$94,176, that AEPCO should file another Board Resolution including that amount.

Staff believes that what AEPCO refers to as the 2 mill "surcharge" is more appropriately called an adjustor within the construct of the mechanism. The proposed 2 mill adjustor would collect the \$8,294,176 million over approximately 27 months, a period much longer than the seven month period over which it accumulated. The charge would be passed through to the Class A members' customers through the Class A members individual purchased power adjustors.

The Cooperative indicated that the undercollection accumulated primarily from an unusual generator outage. This further highlights another area of improvement for the existing adjustor mechanism. A mechanism should contain some element which only passes normalized costs on to customers rather than costs incurred on an irregular basis. AEPCO's adjustor mechanism has no such normalization feature.

Staff believes that an order from the Commission is not necessary for AEPCO to "explore a revised PPFAC with Staff which could be implemented at a future date." AEPCO and Staff are free to meet about the new adjustor at any time, without an order of the Commission. Staff is willing to explore an improved mechanism for the Company to be considered at AEPCO's next rate case.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Staff believes that the intrinsic weaknesses of AEPCO's adjustor mechanism along with AEPCO's restructuring require the abolition of the existing mechanism. The continuation of the adjustor mechanism would only exacerbate the inconsistencies between the adjustor and AEPCO's operations. Staff recommends the discontinuation of the mechanism as of August 1, 2001 without a hearing.

Staff also recommends that AEPCO be allowed to recover \$8.2 million of the remaining under-collected bank balance as of August 1, 2001, authorized by its Board of Directors through a \$0.02 per kWh adjustor from its Class A members until the balance is zero.

Staff further recommends that AEPCO file a quarterly report with the Director of the Utilities Division until the full \$8.2 million is collected. The report should indicate the kWhs sold to the Class A members, the amount collected by the adjustor and the remaining balance for the quarter.



Ernest G. Johnson
Director
Utilities Division

EGJ:LAJ:JST:nms/

ORIGINATORS: Linda Jaress and John Thornton

1 **BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

2 WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
Chairman
3 JIM IRVIN
Commissioner
4 MARC SPITZER
Commissioner
5

6 IN THE MATTER OF THE EXAMINATION OF)
ARIZONA ELECTRIC POWER COOPERATIVE,)
7 INC.'S PURCHASED POWER AND FUEL)
ADJUSTOR CLAUSE)
8

DOCKET NO. E-01773A-01-0833

DECISION NO. _____

ORDER

9 Open Meeting
March 19 and 20, 2002
10 Phoenix, Arizona

11 BY THE COMMISSION:

12 FINDINGS OF FACT

13 1. On October 11, 2000, Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. ("AEPCO" or "the
14 Cooperative") filed an application for approval and confirmation of various transactions enabling the
15 Cooperative to restructure into three affiliated entities. As part of the application, AEPCO also
16 requested Commission authorization to forgive the under-collected purchased power and fuel adjustor
17 clause ("PPFAC") bank balance as of the effective date of the restructuring and to eliminate its PPFAC
18 on an on-going basis.

19 2. On July 31, 2001, AEPCO's restructuring transactions closed.

20 3. In Decision No 63868, dated July 25, 2001, the Commission approved AEPCO's
21 restructuring. The Commission also approved forgiveness of the December 31, 2000 under-collected
22 PPFAC balance of approximately \$6.0 million.

23 4. The Commission also authorized Staff "to open a docket and request a procedural
24 order be issued within 90 days from the decision in this docket. The purpose of the docket would be
25 to examine AEPCO's PPFAC. Staff would perform an audit of AEPCO's PPFAC filings and balance
26 to verify the balance and verify AEPCO's compliance with previous Commission orders. At that time,
27 Staff will also make a recommendation regarding the continuation or discontinuation of the PPFAC
28 and a recommendation regarding the balance forgiven."

1 5. On October 23, 2001, Staff filed a Notice of Opening Docket and Request for
2 Procedural Order requesting that Docket Control open a docket to examine AEPCO's PPFAC and
3 requesting Hearing Division to issue a procedural order directing Staff to file its preliminary report on
4 its examination of AEPCO's PPFAC by January 31, 2002.

5 6. On January 24, 2002 AEPCO sent a letter to Chief Administrative Law Judge Lyn
6 Farmer setting forth certain requests. AEPCO requested cancellation of the current PPFAC,
7 authorization to explore a revised PPFAC with Staff to be implemented at a future date, and
8 authorization of a surcharge to recover the \$8.3 million under-collection in the PPFAC balance as of
9 July 31, 2001 (the day before the reorganization of AEPCO).

10 7. AEPCO also requested that the Hearing Division extend the due date of Staff's
11 recommendations from January 31, 2002 to March 5, 2002.

12 8. Each month, AEPCO makes a PPFAC filing with the Utilities Division on "Form A2".
13 Form A2 distills monthly information regarding AEPCO's customers, generating units, revenues and
14 costs of wheeling, fuel and purchased power into eight pages and computes a monthly over- or under-
15 collected "bank balance".

16 9. Form A2, and the Commission's requirement that AEPCO use it, originated in Decision
17 No. 53034, dated May 21, 1982.

18 10. Although the adjustor mechanism originated in the 1982 Decision, a new energy
19 charge, base rate and adjustor was established in the Commission's last full rate case decision for
20 AEPCO, Decision No. 58405, dated September 3, 1993. At that time, the adjustor was set at zero and
21 the base cost of fuel and purchased power was set at \$0.01714.

22 11. A second decision on outstanding rate case issues in the same case, Decision No. 58792,
23 dated September 21, 1994, ordered AEPCO to file testimony in its next rate case discussing retention
24 or elimination of the PPFAC. AEPCO has not filed a rate case since then.

25 12. Decision No. 58405 required AEPCO to determine the amount of fuel and purchased
26 power expenses that should be allocated to the Class A members in a manner suitable to AEPCO's
27 rates, contracts and operations at that time.

28

1 13. AEPCO determines the various costs of fuel (coal and gas) used by each generator and
2 the costs of purchased power. The most expensive fuel and purchased power are allocated to non-firm,
3 non-jurisdictional customers, then to firm-non-jurisdictional customers with some specified
4 exceptions. Then, the total costs allocated to the firm and non-firm non-jurisdictional customers is
5 subtracted from total fuel and purchased power expense, leaving the remainder to be recovered from
6 the Class A members.

7 14. In 1994 through 1996, Commission Staff members and AEPCO representatives held
8 meetings and exchanged correspondence regarding AEPCO's method of calculating its PPFAC. Staff's
9 concerns at that time centered on whether AEPCO's Class A members were receiving their fair
10 allocation of the least-cost generation.

11 15. AEPCO had been determining the average cost of fuel and purchased power allocated
12 to firm, non-jurisdictional customers differently from that allocated to non-firm non-jurisdictional
13 customers, a process that AEPCO termed "illogical".

14 16. On February 14, 1994, AEPCO notified the Commission's Chief of Accounting and
15 Rates that it was correcting "inconsistencies" in the logic used to develop the pools of marginal costs
16 applicable to non-firm and firm non-jurisdictional sales and from that day forward would continue the
17 new calculation.

18 17. Staff reviewed the surviving memos, letters and workpapers of both Staff and AEPCO
19 to determined the source of the controversy. When AEPCO made the allocation methods conform
20 under the new calculation, the result was a significant increase in costs allocated to Class A customers.

21 18. Staff also reviewed the Decision that created the PPFAC mechanism in 1982 along
22 with other Commission Decisions that addressed the PPFAC and the adjustor and can find no specific
23 references to or directions for determining or allocating the fuel and purchased power expenses among
24 the Class A and non-Class A customers that AEPCO may have violated.

25 19. Staff believes that although the change in the calculation method instituted by AEPCO
26 in 1994 may not have benefited the Class A members, it is a method of computing and allocating costs
27 that is not prohibited by any Commission Decision. Thus, Staff believes that the change made in 1994
28 was within the purview of AEPCO to make.

1 20. Furthermore, none of AEPCO's Class A members have objected to the change in the
2 method used.

3 21. Staff focused its attention on auditing the January, 2001 adjustor filing. January was
4 chosen because it began with zero balance as it was the first filing after the forgiveness of the under-
5 collected balance, making it the most straightforward monthly PPFAC filing to audit and verify.
6 Previous to Staff's visit, AEPCO was not aware of the month Staff selected to audit.

7 22. Staff began with January 31st calculated bank balance, traced it back through the
8 PPFAC calculations to randomly selected general ledger entries and, finally, to randomly selected
9 invoices. No discrepancies were found. Staff's audit was particularly efficient given AEPCO's
10 cooperation. Staff interviewed finance, accounting, marketing, and energy procurement employees
11 of the company in the course of the audit.

12 23. Staff's audit revealed no unreasonable or imprudent accounting practices related to the
13 PPFAC. Staff concluded that problems with the PPFAC lie not with the application of the existing
14 structure, but rather the problems are within the structure of the mechanism itself.

15 24. At the time of the 1982 Decision, AEPCO was a much different cooperative than it is
16 today. AEPCO's 1982 revenues of \$125.9 million were derived from the sale of 2.5 billion kWhs. In
17 contrast, for the year ending December 31, 2000, AEPCO's revenues were \$229.0 million and kWh
18 sales totaled 4.6 billion. Currently, AEPCO has more members and its revenues are comprised of a
19 significantly greater proportion of contract and non-member sales than in 1982.

20 25. The most significant event since the 1982 adoption of Form A2 is the recent
21 restructuring of AEPCO and the transfer of its transmission assets to Sierra Southwest.

22 26. Included in Form A2 is a section entitled Supplement B-Purchased Power and
23 Wheeling Costs that computes the difference between wheeling costs included in base rates with
24 wheeling costs incurred during the reporting period. Since the restructuring and the transfer of the
25 transmission assets, AEPCO no longer pays wheeling costs. Thus, the restructuring created an
26 inconsistency between Form A2 and AEPCO's actual operations.

27 ...

28 ...

1 27. The decision from AEPCO's last rate case set rates to AEPCO's Class A members at
2 \$15.25 per kW of billing demand and \$0.02228 per kWh. The Decision also determined that the base
3 cost of fuel and purchased power included within the revenue requirements to be \$0.01714. The
4 adjustor was set at zero. Since then, AEPCO's adjustor has remained unchanged.

5 28. In the recent restructuring docket, the Commission authorized AEPCO to change its
6 rates to \$12.44 per kW of billing demand plus \$0.01989 per kWh. Unfortunately, the new rates were
7 adopted without consideration of a new base rate for the PPFAC. It is highly unlikely that AEPCO's
8 base cost of fuel and purchased power is still the same \$0.01714 it was in 1993.

9 29. Further drawing the accuracy of the base rate and the adjustor mechanism into question
10 is the lack of a fully-allocated cost-of-service study supporting AEPCO's rate design when the base
11 rate and energy charge were set in 1993. The incompatibility of the PPFAC and AEPCO's current rate
12 structure and operations is further emphasized by the lack of a relevant cost of service study.

13 30. On the December 31, 2000 financial statements, AEPCO wrote-off the \$6.7 million
14 under-collection of its PPFAC bank balance and forgave repayment of that amount by its members.

15 31. Since that time until August 1, 2001, AEPCO has tracked PPFAC bank balance but has
16 not "booked" the PPFAC deferred revenues in anticipation of the adjustor's elimination.

17 32. Between January 31, 2001, and July 31, 2001, the day before the restructuring was
18 effectuated, a new bank balance of \$8,294,176 accumulated.

19 33. AEPCO asserts that unexpected generating unit outages in the spring of 2001 forced
20 AEPCO to buy replacement power at the higher prices prevailing at that time.

21 34. AEPCO requested authorization of a "surcharge" of \$0.02 per kWh, through the
22 docketed letter to the Chief Administrative Law Judge. AEPCO also submitted a resolution from its
23 Board of Directors, that gave AEPCO authority to request termination of the PPFAC and to seek
24 collection of the "\$8,294,176 million under-collected balance as of July 31, 2001 at a rate not to
25 exceed 2 mills per kWh".

26 35. Because AEPCO's Board is primarily composed of Directors of the Class A member
27 cooperatives, Staff believes that the Board Resolution constitutes notice to AEPCO's Class A
28 members.

1 36. AEPCO also requested in its letter authorization to "explore a revised PPFAC with
2 Staff that could be implemented at a future date".

3 37. Staff believes that an order from the Commission is not necessary for AEPCO to
4 "explore a revised PPFAC with Staff which could be implemented at a future date." AEPCO and Staff
5 are free to meet about the new adjustor at any time, without an order of the Commission.

6 38. As an attachment to its letter, AEPCO filed the analysis that computed the July 31,
7 2001 under-collection of \$8,294,176.

8 39. Staff believes that what AEPCO refers to as the "surcharge" is more appropriately
9 called an adjustor within the construct of the mechanism.

10 40. The proposed 2-mill adjustor would collect the \$8,294,176 million over approximately
11 27 months, a period much longer than the seven-month period over which it accumulated. The charge
12 would be passed through to the Class A members' customers through the Class A members individual
13 purchased power adjustors.

14 41. The Cooperative indicated that the under-collection accumulated primarily from an
15 unusual generator outage.

16 42. This further highlights another area for improvement in the existing adjustor
17 mechanism. A mechanism should contain some element that only passes normalized costs on to
18 customers rather than costs incurred on an irregular basis. AEPCO's adjustor mechanism has no such
19 normalization feature.

20 43. Staff believes that the intrinsic weaknesses of AEPCO's adjustor mechanism along
21 with AEPCO's restructuring require the abolition of the existing mechanism. The continuation of the
22 adjustor mechanism would only exacerbate the inconsistency between the adjustor and AEPCO's
23 operations.

24 44. Staff recommends the discontinuation of the mechanism as of August 1, 2001 without
25 a hearing.

26 45. Staff also recommends that AEPCO be allowed to recover \$8,294,176 million of the
27 remaining under-collected bank balance as of August 1, 2001, as authorized by its Board of Directors
28 through a \$0.002 per kWh adjustor from its Class A members until the balance is zero.

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that AEPCO file a quarterly report with the Director of the
 2 Utilities Division until the full \$8,294,176 million is collected. The report should indicate the kWhs
 3 sold to the Class A members, the amount collected by the adjustor and the remaining balance for the
 4 quarter. The first quarterly report should be filed by July 31, 2002 for the period ending June 30, 2002.
 5 Subsequent reports should be filed within 30 days following the calendar quarter.

6 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Order shall become effective immediately.

7 **BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

8
 9
 10 CHAIRMAN COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER

11
 12 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, BRIAN C. McNEIL, Executive
 13 Secretary of the Arizona Corporation Commission, have
 14 hereunto, set my hand and caused the official seal of this
 Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of
 Phoenix, this _____ day of _____, 2002.

15
 16
 17 _____
 BRIAN C. McNEIL
 Executive Secretary

18
 19 DISSENT: _____

20 EGJ:LAJ:JST:nms/JMA

21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

1 SERVICE LIST FOR: ARIZONA ELECTRIC POWER COOPERATIVE, INC.
2 DOCKET NO. E-01773A-01-0833

3 Mr. Thomas L. Mumaw
4 Snell and Wilmer
5 One Arizona Center
6 400 East Van Buren Street
7 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202

8 Mr. Michael M Grant
9 Gallagher & Kennedy, P.A.
10 2575 East Camelback Road
11 Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225

12 Mr. Dirk Minson, CFO
13 Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.
14 Post Office Box 670
15 Benson, Arizona 85602

16 Mr. Ernest G. Johnson
17 Director, Utilities Division
18 Arizona Corporation Commission
19 1200 West Washington
20 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

21 Mr. Christopher C. Kempley
22 Chief Counsel
23 Arizona Corporation Commission
24 1200 West Washington
25 Phoenix, Arizona 85007
26
27
28