

ORIGINAL



0000056968

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

19c

RECEIVED

COMMISSIONERS

JEFF HATCH-MILLER – Chairman
WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
MARC SPITZER
MIKE GLEASON
KRISTIN K. MAYES

2006 JUL 20 P 3:31

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCUMENT CONTROL

IN THE MATTER OF THE INQUIRY INTO THE) DOCKET NO. G-04204A-05-0831
PRUDENCE OF THE GAS PROCUREMENT)
PRACTICES OF UNS GAS, INC.) **MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE**

UNS Gas, Inc. (“UNS Gas” or “Company”), respectfully requests that the Arizona Corporation Commission (“Commission”) consolidate Docket Nos. G-04204A-06-0013 (the “PGA Case”), G-04204A-05-0831 (the “Prudence Case”) and G-04204A-06-0463 (the “Rate Case”). In support of this Motion to Consolidate (“Motion”), UNS Gas states as follows:

I. Preliminary Statement.

This Motion seeks to consolidate three cases. The primary case is UNS Gas’ recently filed rate case. The other two cases, the PGA Case and the Prudence Case, involve issues that are traditionally addressed in rate cases. Consolidation of the three cases is in the public interest because the resources of the Commission and participants will be best utilized by dealing with these interrelated matters in one proceeding. Consolidation is favored when cases have a common set of facts, are governed by the same standards and utilize the same witnesses. These are the very factors that warrant the consolidation of the PGA Case and the Prudence Case into the Rate Case. Moreover, while consolidation will be beneficial to the Commission and participants, no person will be prejudiced by joining these cases together.

II. These cases should be consolidated because they are interrelated.

The Commission’s rules provide for the consolidation of cases such as the PGA Case, the Prudence Case and the Rate Case when the “issues are substantially the same.”¹ Accordingly, the

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED
JUL 20 2006

¹ A.A.C. R14-3-109(H).

DOCKETED BY ne

1 Commission has consolidated cases that “rely upon the same law, facts, and witnesses.”² The
2 Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure also provide for the consolidation of cases that have a “common
3 question of law or fact”.³

4 The issues to be addressed in the PGA Case and Prudence Case are part and parcel of the
5 Rate Case. UNS Gas’ gas purchase costs and the prudence of its investments are prerequisite
6 considerations the Commission will evaluate in reaching its determination of “just and reasonable
7 rates”. The PGA Case concerns modifications to UNS Gas’ purchase gas adjustor (“PGA”). UNS
8 Gas requested several modifications to improve the functioning of the PGA in light of increased
9 volatility and other changes in the natural gas markets, and to rectify problems that have become
10 evident during the history of the PGA. In particular, UNS Gas requested that the Commission
11 modify the PGA by: (1) increasing the “bandwidth” of the PGA so that it can more accurately send
12 price signals to customers about the cost of their gas, and to avoid running up large bank balances
13 that customers will have to pay back later; (2) increasing the interest on the bank balance to match
14 the interest rate UNS Gas actually pays when funding the bank balance; (3) when the PGA bank
15 balance exceeds two times the threshold level, the bank balance should earn a return equal to the
16 Company’s weighted average cost of capital, thus recognizing that the Company’s investment in
17 funding the bank balance is no longer short-term when the bank balance is that large; (4) changing
18 the PGA threshold to so that the threshold for over-collected and under-collected bank balances
19 are the same; (5) holding UNS Gas harmless from any changes to the Company’s capital structure
20 resulting from the PGA bank balance; and (6) approving adequate surcharges when needed. The
21 direct testimony filed with UNS Gas’ Rate Case Application covers the same ground. The
22 Prudence Case concerns the prudence of the Company’s gas purchases. A prudence review
23 involves determining whether the expenses were reasonable in light of the information known at
24
25

26 ² See *Utility Source, LLC*, Decision No. 67446 (Jan. 4, 2005) at 2.

27 ³ Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 42(a). These rules are incorporated in the Commission’s Rules. See A.A.C. R14-3-101(A).

1 the time.⁴ In addition, there is a presumption that the Company's purchases are prudent.⁵ The
2 prudence of the Company's gas purchases, and the standards to be used in evaluating that
3 prudence, are also addressed in the Company's direct testimony. Thus, all three cases are
4 interrelated, arise out of a common set of facts, and will involve overlapping facts and witnesses.

5 UNS Gas' direct testimony (filed with the Rate Case Application) addresses the
6 Company's PGA and prudence related issues. UNS Gas would use the same witnesses who filed
7 direct testimony in the Rate Case to address these issues in the PGA Case and Prudence Case.
8 Other parties would likely use the same witnesses for those issues in the different cases.
9 Moreover, each of the cases is at an early stage. No procedural schedule has been issued in any of
10 the cases. Thus, while no party will be prejudiced by consolidation, judicial and administrative
11 economy will be served by avoiding the litigation of multiple cases on the same topic with the
12 same witnesses.

13 The Commission has expressed a preference that prudence and PGA issues be resolved in
14 rate cases. For example, in discussing the prudence of Arizona Public Service Company's action
15 relative to the Sundance Power Plant, the Commission stated that the prudence of a "transaction
16 may only properly be reviewed in the context of an overall rate base determination."⁶ Similarly,
17 the Commission recently rejected a request to modify a PGA based on Staff's position that "a rate
18 case [is] a more appropriate venue for making [a] substantive change to the mechanics of how the
19 PGA mechanism operates."⁷ Finally, the Commission recently approved PGA modifications in
20 two recent gas rate cases.⁸

21
22
23 ⁴ See A.A.C. R14-2-103(A)(1); *Generic Examination of Purchas Gas Adjustor Mechanisms*, Decision No. 61225
(October 30, 1998) at Findings of Fact Nos. 7 and 8; Staff Report dated June 1, 2001 in Docket No. G-00000C-98-
0568 at 3.

24 ⁵ A.A.C. R14-2-103(A)(1); *State ex rel Associated Natural Gas Co. v. Public Service Comm'n of the State of*
25 *Missouri*, 954 S.W.2d 520, 528 (Mo. App. 1997).

26 ⁶ *Arizona Public Service Co.*, Decision No. 67504 (January 20, 2005).

27 ⁷ *Energy West, Inc.*, Decision No. 68814 (June 29, 2006) at 1.

⁸ *Southwest Gas Corp.*, Decision No. 68487 (February 23, 2006); *Duncan Rural Services Corp.* Decision No. 68599
(March 23, 2006).

ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC
ONE ARIZONA CENTER
400 EAST VAN BUREN STREET - SUITE 800
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004
TELEPHONE NO 602-256-6100
FACSIMILE 602-256-6800

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

III. Conclusion.

The Rate Case, the Prudence Case and the PGA Case are the very type of proceedings that should be consolidated. The cases arise out of a common set of facts, the law and witnesses overlap, and traditionally these matters have been addressed in a rate case. Administrative and judicial economy will be served by addressing these interrelated proceedings at one time and resolving issues in one decision. Accordingly, UNS Gas respectfully requests that the Prudence Case and the PGA Case be consolidated with the Rate Case.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 20th day of July 2006.

UNS Gas, Inc.

By 
Michael W. Patten
ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC.
One Arizona Center
400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

and

Michelle Livengood
UniSource Energy Services
One South Church Avenue
Tucson, Arizona 85701

Attorneys for UNS Gas, Inc.

Original and thirteen copies of the foregoing filed this 20th day of July, 2006, with:

Docket Control
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Copy of the foregoing hand-delivered this 20th day of July, 2006, to:

Chairman Jeff Hatch-Miller
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

ROSHKA DeWULF & PATTEN, PLC

ONE ARIZONA CENTER
400 EAST VAN BUREN STREET - SUITE 800
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004
TELEPHONE NO 602-256-6100
FACSIMILE 602-256-6800

- 1 Commissioner William A. Mundell
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
- 2
- 3
- 4 Commissioner Marc Spitzer
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
- 5
- 6 Commissioner Mike Gleason
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
- 7
- 8
- 9 Commissioner Kristen K. Mayes
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
- 10
- 11 Lyn A. Farmer, Esq.
Chief Administrative Law Judge
Hearing Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
- 12
- 13
- 14 Christopher Kempley, Esq.
Chief Counsel, Legal Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
- 15
- 16
- 17 Ernest Johnson
Director, Utilities Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
- 18
- 19
- 20

21
22 By 
23
24
25
26
27