

ORIGINAL



325

1 **BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

2 COMMISSIONERS

3 JEFF HATCH-MILLER, Chairman 2006 NOV -8 | A 10: 44

4 WILLIAM A. MUNDELL AZ CORP COMMISSION

5 MIKE GLEASON DOCUMENT CONTROL

6 KRISTIN K. MAYES

7 BARRY WONG

8

9 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION

10 OF ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY

11 FOR A HEARING TO DETERMINE THE FAIR

12 VALUE OF THE UTILITY PROPERTY OF THE

13 COMPANY FOR RATEMAKING PURPOSES,

14 TO FIX A JUST AND REASONABLE RATE OF

15 RETURN THEREON, TO APPROVE RATE

16 SCHEDULES DESIGNED TO DEVELOP SUCH

17 RETURN, AND TO AMEND DECISION NO. 67744

DOCKET NO. E-01345A-05-0816
 E-01345A-05-0826
 E-01345A-05-0827

NOTICE OF
 FILING TESTIMONY
 SUMMARIES

18

19

20 Federal Executive Agencies (FEA), by and through the undersigned attorney,

21 representing all Federal customers of Arizona Public Service Company, hereby provides

22 notice of filing the Testimony Summaries of Dr Dennis Goins and Colonel Ronald J.

23 Mozzillo in this proceeding.

24

25 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 8th day of November 2006.

26

27 FEDERAL EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

28

29

30 By: Karen S White

KAREN S. WHITE, Lt Col, USAF
 AZ Bar No. 016820
 Chief, AF Utility Litigation & Negotiation Team
 139 Barnes Drive, Ste 1
 Tyndall AFB FL 32403

31 Arizona Corporation Commission

32 **DOCKETED**

33

34 NOV -8 2006

35

36 DOCKETED BY nr

1 Original and thirteen copies filed this
2 8th day of November 2006, with:
3
4 Docket Control
5 Arizona Corporation Commission
6 1200 West Washington
7 Phoenix, AZ 85007
8
9 Copies of the foregoing hand-delivered
10 This 8th day of November, 2006
11
12 Lyn Farmer, Chief Administrative
13 Law Judge
14 Hearing Division
15 Arizona Corporation Commission
16 1200 West Washington Street
17 Phoenix, Arizona 85007
18
19 Thomas L. Mumaw
20 PINNACLE WEST CAPITAL CORPORATION
21 P.O. Box 53999
22 Phoenix, AZ 85072-3999
23
24 Deborah R. Scott
25 SNELL & WILMER
26 One Arizona Center
27 400 E. VanBuren Street
28 Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202
29
30 Scott S. Wakefield
31 RUCO
32 1110 W. Washington, Ste 220
33 Phoenix, AZ 85007
34
35 C. Webb Crockett
36 FENNEMORE CRAIG
37 3003 North Central Avenue, Ste 2600
38 Phoenix, AZ 85012-2913
39 Attorneys for Phelps Dodge Mining Company and Arizonans for Electric Choice and
40 Competition
41
42 Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel
43 Legal Division
44 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
45 1200 West Washington Street
46 Phoenix, AZ 85007

1 Laura E. Sixkiller
2 Roshka DeWulf & Patten, PLC
3 One Arizona Center
4 400 East Van Buren, Suite 800
5 Phoenix, AZ 85004
6 Attorneys for UniSource Energy Services
7

8 Copies of the foregoing
9 Mailed/*emailed this
10 8th day of November, 2006
11

12 *Dan Austin
13 Comverge, Inc.
14 5509 W. Frye Road, Ste 4
15 Chandler, AZ 85526
16

17 Jim Nelson
18 12621 N. 17th Place
19 Phoenix, AZ 85022
20

21 *Bill Murphy
22 Murphy Consulting
23 5401 N. 25th Street
24 Phoenix, AZ 85016
25

26 *Douglas V. Fant
27 3655 W. Anthem Drive, Ste A109
28 PMB 411
29 Anthem, AZ 85086
30

31 *Michelle Livengood
32 UNISOURCE ENERGY SERVICES
33 One South Church Street, Ste 200
34 Tucson, AZ 85702
35

36 *Timothy M. Hogan
37 ARIZONA CENTER FOR LAW IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST
38 202 E. McDowell Road, Ste 153
39 Phoenix, AZ 85004
40

41 Tracy Spoon
42 SUN CITY TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
43 12630 N. 103rd Ave Ste 144
44 Sun City, AZ 85351
45
46

1 *Walter Meek
2 ARIZONA UTILITY INVESTORS ASSOCIATION
3 2100 N. Central Avenue, Ste 210
4 Phoenix, AZ 85004
5
6 *Michael L. Kurtz
7 *Kurt J. Boehm
8 BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY
9 36 East Seventh Street, Ste 1510
10 Cincinnati, OH 45202
11 Attorneys for The Kroger Co.
12
13 *Donna M. Bronski
14 Deputy City Attorney
15 3939 N. Drinkwater Blvd
16 Scottsdale, AZ 85251
17
18 *Ernest G. Johnson, Director
19 Utilities Division
20 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
21 1200 West Washington
22 Phoenix, AZ 85007
23
24 *Jay I. Moyes
25 Moyes Storey Ltd.
26 1850 N. Central, Suite 1100
27 Phoenix, AZ 85004
28 Attorneys for AzAg Group
29
30 *Kenneth R. Saline, P.E.
31 K.R. Saline & Assoc., PLC
32 160 N. Pasadena, Suite 101
33 Mesa, AZ 85201
34
35 Theodore E. Roberts
36 Sempra Energy Resources
37 101 Ash Street, HQ 12-B
38 San Diego, CA 92101-3017
39 Attorney for Mesquite Power
40
41 *David Berry
42 Western Resource Advocates
43 P.O. Box 1064
44 Scottsdale, AZ 85252-1064
45
46

1 *Eric C. Guidry
2 Western Resource Advocates
3 2260 Baseline Road, Suite 200
4 Boulder, CO 80302
5
6 *Lawrence V. Robertson, Jr.
7 P.O. Box 1448
8 Tubac, AZ 85646
9 Attorney for Southwestern Power Group 11, Bowie Power Station & Mesquite Power
10
11 *Robert W. Geake
12 Vice President and General Counsel
13 Arizona Water Company
14 P.O. Box 29006
15 Phoenix, AZ 85038-9006
16
17 *Michael A. Curtis
18 *William P. Sullivan
19 *K. Russell Romney
20 Curtis, Goodwin, Sullivan, Udall & Schwab
21 2712 North Seventh Street
22 Phoenix, AZ
23 Attorneys for Town of Wickenburg
24
25 Cynthia Zwick
26 Executive Director
27 Arizona Community Action Association
28 2700 N. Third Street, Suite 3040
29 Phoenix, AZ 85004
30
31 Nicholas J. Enoch
32 Jarrett J. Haskovec
33 Lubin & Enoch, P.C.
34 349 North Fourth Avenue
35 Phoenix, AZ 85003
36 Attorneys for IBEW Locals 387, 640, 769
37
38 *Greg Patterson
39 916 West Adams, Suite 3
40 Phoenix, AZ 85007
41
42 S. David Childers
43 Low & Childers, P.C.
44 2999 North 44th Street, Suite 250
45 Phoenix, AZ 85018
46 Attorney for Arizona Competitive Power Alliance


1 George Bien-Willner
2 3641 North 39th Ave
3 Phoenix, AZ 85034

4
5 Amanda Ormond
6 7650 South McClintock
7 Ste 103-282
8 Tempe, AZ 85284

9
10 *Sean Seitz
11 3008 North Civic Center Plaza
12 Scottsdale, AZ 85251

13
14 *Andrew Bettwy
15 Southwest Gas Corporation
16 5241 Spring Mountain Rd
17 Las Vegas, NV 98150

18
19
20
21
22
23

By: 
KAREN S. WHITE, Lt Col, USAF

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Application of Arizona)
Public Service Company for a Hearing to)
Determine the Fair Value of the Utility)
Property of the Company for Ratemaking)
Purposes, to Fix a Just and Reasonable Rate)
of Return Thereon, to Approve Rate)
Schedules Designed to Develop Such Return,)
and to Amend Decision No. 67744)

Docket No. E-01345A-05-0816
E-01345A-05-0826
E-01345A-05-0827

Testimony Summary

Dr Dennis Goins

On behalf of

Federal Executive Agencies

November 8, 2006

DOCKET NO. E-01345A-05-0816

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

DENNIS W. GOINS

I. DIRECT

In my direct testimony, I address 3 principal issues:

1. Allocation of demand-related production costs. Because summer peak demands are the principal drivers of APS' need for generating capacity, I recommend using APS' proposed 4CP methodology to allocate demand-related production costs.
2. Revenue spread. Under APS' proposed revenue spread, rates for the Residential and General Service classes move closer to cost of service (measured by movement towards a unity rate of return index). However, interclass revenue subsidies under APS' revenue spread increase by more than 50 percent—from around \$44.5 million under present rates to more than \$67.2 million under proposed rates. Approximately \$64.3 million of the interclass subsidies created under APS' proposed revenue spread goes to Residential customers. I recommend reducing interclass revenue subsidies under APS' proposed revenue spread by half, subject to no class' receiving an increase greater than 150 percent of the average system rate increase (excluding the EIC).
3. Voltage discounts for Rate E-34. Results from APS' cost-of-service studies indicate that all voltage discounts for Rate E-34 customers should be increased—particularly the Primary Substation discount—relative to voltage discounts proposed by APS. I recommend increasing the discounts to \$4.72 per kW for transmission customers, \$4.04 for customers served directly from a primary substation, and \$0.79 per kW for customers served from primary lines.

II. SURREBUTTAL

In my surrebuttal testimony, I address 3 principal issues:

1. Staff's recommended 4CP&A methodology to allocate fixed production costs. Under Staff's recommended 4CP&A allocation methodology, allocation factors reflect a weighted combination of each class' 4CP demand factor and its average demand factor. The methodology suffers from at least two major flaws: (1) double counting average demand in the peak demand and energy (average demand) components of the 4CP&A allocation factors, and (2) an asymmetrical allocation of fixed and variable production costs that results in higher load factor customer classes subsidizing lower load factor classes. Because of these major flaws, I recommend using APS' proposed 4CP allocation methodology.

2. Allocation of energy-related costs. Results from AECC witness Kevin Higgins' hourly energy cost analysis show that the APS 4CP and Staff 4CP&A cost studies—both of which use kWh consumption unadjusted for hourly cost differentials to allocate energy costs to classes—understate the energy-related cost responsibility of Residential customers and overstate the energy-related cost responsibility of higher load factor General Service customers. I recommend using AECC's method to assign time-differentiated, energy-related production costs to customer classes—especially if the Commission requires APS to allocate fixed production costs using the 4CP&A methodology recommended by Staff.
3. Staff's revenue spread. Staff recommends using results from its 4CP&A cost study as a guide in spreading its proposed revenue increase. Staff's recommended revenue spread relies on results from a seriously flawed cost study. In addition, Staff's revenue spread exacerbates the interclass revenue subsidy problem that I discussed in my direct testimony. In particular, Staff's revenue spread increases the interclass revenue subsidy that Residential customers *receive*—going from around \$38.6 million under present rates to nearly \$43.9 million. This occurs even when the subsidy is measured relative to cost responsibility determined in Staff's recommended 4CP&A cost study. I recommend that the Commission adopt the revenue spread described in my direct testimony.

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Application of Arizona)
Public Service Company for a Hearing to)
Determine the Fair Value of the Utility)
Property of the Company for Ratemaking)
Purposes, to Fix a Just and Reasonable Rate)
of Return Thereon, to Approve Rate)
Schedules Designed to Develop Such Return,)
and to Amend Decision No. 67744)

Docket No. E-01345A-05-0816
E-01345A-05-0826
E-01345A-05-0827

Testimony Summary
Colonel Ronald J. Mozzillo
On behalf of
Federal Executive Agencies

November 8, 2006

Testimony Summary of Colonel Ronald J. Mozzillo, USAF

I am Colonel Ronald J. Mozzillo, Commander, 56th Mission Support Group, Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. I lead seven squadrons encompassing over 1,800 personnel with responsibilities for all areas of base support.

The purpose of my testimony is to identify the economic impact of Luke Air Force Base on the Arizona economy, and highlight the impact of increased utility bills on Luke Air Force Base.

Luke Air Force Base is the Air Force's training ground for F-16 fighter pilots and maintainers. Last year Luke Air Force pilots flew over 50,000 flying hours supporting 36,997 sorties. In addition to our mission of training mission-ready fighter pilots and maintenance personnel, in 2005 Luke Air Force Base deployed 573 Airmen worldwide in support of contingency operations and the Global War on Terror. Luke Air Force Base supports 5377 active duty Air Force members, 1699 Air Force Reserve members and 1248 Department of the Air Force civilian employees..

In addition to the \$ 358 million payroll, Luke Air Force Base employees, as well as nearly 4399 secondary jobs in the local communities have an economic impact on Arizona of approximately \$1 billion per year. Luke Air Force Base executed \$347 million in annual contract awards in Fiscal Year 2005. Of this amount, \$10.452 million was awarded within the state of Arizona and \$35.2 million was awarded to small and disadvantaged businesses, including \$9.6 million to Arizona small and disadvantaged businesses.

Luke Air Force Base takes utility service on the APS E-32 and E-34 Rate Schedules. In fiscal year 2005, Luke Air Force Base paid APS about \$4.2 million for electric utility service.

The funds used to pay for the utility service are operations and maintenance (O&M) funds. These funds are also used to fund military operations and maintenance. Any cost avoidance or reduction in costs Luke pays for utilities ensures funds could be utilized elsewhere for essential military operations and maintenance. Since the funding used to pay utility bills is the same funding used to fund military operations and maintenance, when utility bills increase, we must reduce spending on other areas of our military operations and maintenance. The only mechanism we have to increase our overall funding level is to request additional appropriations from Headquarters Air Force and ultimately, Congress.