

ORIGINAL



0000067129

RECEIVED

2522

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

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS

JEFF HATCH-MILLER, *Chairman*  
WILLIAM A. MUNDELL  
MIKE GLEASON  
KRISTIN K. MAYES  
GARY PIERCE

AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCUMENT CONTROL

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

Arizona Corporation Commission  
**DOCKETED**

FEB 16 2007

DOCKETED BY *nr*

IN THE MATTER OF THE INQUIRY INTO  
THE FREQUENCY OF UNPLANNED  
OUTAGES DURING 2005 AT PALO VERDE  
NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, THE  
CAUSES OF THE OUTAGES, THE  
PROCUREMENT OF REPLACEMENT  
POWER AND THE IMPACT OF THE  
OUTAGES ON ARIZONA PUBLIC  
SERVICE CUSTOMERS

Docket No. E-1345A-05-0826

IN THE MATTER OF THE AUDIT OF THE  
FUEL AND PURCHASED POWER  
PRACTICES AND COSTS OF THE  
ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY


Docket No. E-1345A-05-0827

**NOTICE OF FILING OF PHELPS DODGE  
MINING COMPANY AND ARIZONANS FOR  
ELECTRIC CHOICE AND COMPETITION  
REPLY BRIEF**

1 Phelps Dodge Mining Company and Arizonans for Electric Choice and  
2 Competition ("AECC"), hereby submits its Closing Brief in the above captioned Docket.

3 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 16<sup>th</sup> day of February 2007.

4 FENNEMORE CRAIG, P.C.

5  
6 By: 

C. Webb Crockett  
Patrick J. Black  
3003 North Central Ave., #2600  
Phoenix, AZ 85012

7  
8 Attorneys for Phelps Dodge Mining  
9 Company and Arizonans for Electric Choice  
and Competition

10  
11 ORIGINAL and 17 COPIES of the foregoing  
12 FILED this 16th day of February 2007 with:

13 Docket Control  
14 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
1200 West Washington  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

15  
16 COPIES HAND-DELIVERED this  
17 16th day of February 2007 to:

18 JEFF HATCH-MILLER, Chairman  
19 Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

20 Dean Miller  
21 Advisor to Chairman Jeff Hatch-Miller  
22 Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

23 WILLIAM A. MUNDELL, Commissioner  
24 Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington  
25 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

26

- 1 Adam Stafford  
Advisor to Commissioner William A. Mundell
- 2 Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington
- 3 Phoenix, Arizona 85007
  
- 4 MIKE GLEASON, Commissioner  
Arizona Corporation Commission
- 5 1200 West Washington  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
  
- 6 Ken Rozen  
Advisor to Commissioner Mike Gleason
- 7 Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington
- 8 Phoenix, Arizona 85007
  
- 9 KRISTIN K. MAYES, Commissioner  
Arizona Corporation Commission
- 10 1200 West Washington  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
  
- 11 Matt Derr  
Advisor to Commissioner Kristin K. Mayes
- 12 Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington
- 13 Phoenix, Arizona 85007
  
- 14 GARY PIERCE, Commissioner  
Arizona Corporation Commission
- 15 1200 West Washington  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
  
- 16 John LeSueur  
Advisor to Commissioner Gary Pierce
- 17 Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington
- 18 Phoenix, Arizona 85007
  
- 19 Christopher Kempsey, Chief Counsel  
Legal Division
- 20 Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington
- 21 Phoenix, Arizona 85007
  
- 22 Ernest Johnson, Director  
Utilities Division
- 23 Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington
- 24 Phoenix, Arizona 85007
  
- 25
- 26

1 **COPY HAND-DELIVERED**

16th day of February 2007 to:

2 Lyn Farmer  
3 Hearing Division  
4 Arizona Corporation Commission  
5 1200 West Washington  
6 Phoenix, AZ 85007  
7 [lfarmer@azcc.gov](mailto:lfarmer@azcc.gov)

8 **COPIES Hand-Delivered/Mailed**

16th day of February 2007 to:

9 Thomas L. Mumaw  
10 Karilee S. Ramaley  
11 Pinnacle West Capital Corporation  
12 P.O. Box 53999, MS 8695  
13 Phoenix, AZ 85072-3999  
14 [thomas.mumaw@pinnaclewest.com](mailto:thomas.mumaw@pinnaclewest.com)

15 -and-

16 Deborah R. Scott  
17 Kimberly A. Grouse  
18 Snell & Wilmer  
19 One Arizona Center  
20 400 E. Van Buren Street  
21 Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202  
22 [drscott@swlaw.com](mailto:drscott@swlaw.com)  
23 *Attorneys for Arizona Public Service Company*

24 Jana Van Ness  
25 Arizona Public Service Company  
26 400 North 5<sup>th</sup> Street, MS 8695  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Brian Brumfield  
Supervisor of Regulatory Affairs  
Arizona Public Service Company  
Mail Station 9708  
P.O. Box 53999  
Phoenix, Arizona 85072-3999

Timothy M. Hogan  
Arizona Center for Law  
in the Public Interest  
202 East McDowell Rd., Ste. 153  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
[thogan@aclpi.org](mailto:thogan@aclpi.org)  
*Attorneys for Southwest Energy Efficiency Project  
and Western Resource Advocates*

- 1 Michael W. Patten  
2 Roshka, DeWulf & Patten  
3 One Arizona Center  
4 400 East Van Buren St., Ste. 800  
5 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-3906  
6 [mpatten@rdp-law.com](mailto:mpatten@rdp-law.com)
- 7 Gary Yaquinto  
8 Arizona Utility Investors Association  
9 2100 North Central Ave., Ste. 210  
10 Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
11 [gyaquinto@aui.org](mailto:gyaquinto@aui.org)
- 12 Michael M. Grant  
13 Gallagher & Kennedy, P.A.  
14 2572 East Camelback Road  
15 Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225  
16 [mmg@gknet.com](mailto:mmg@gknet.com)  
17 *Attorneys for AUIA*
- 18 Scott Wakefield  
19 RUCO  
20 1110 West Washington St., Ste. 220  
21 Phoenix, Arizona 85007
- 22 Dan Austin  
23 Comverge, Inc.  
24 6509 West Frye Rd., Ste. 4  
25 Chandler, Arizona 85226
- 26 Jim Nelson  
12621 North 17<sup>th</sup> Place  
Phoenix, Arizona 85022
- Bill Murphy  
Murphy Consulting  
5401 North 25<sup>th</sup> Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85016
- Douglas V. Fant  
3655 West Anthem Way  
Suite A-109  
PMB 411  
Anthem, Arizona 85086
- Michelle Livengood  
UniSource Energy Services  
One South Church St., Ste. 200  
Tucson, Arizona 85702

- 1 Tracy Spoon  
2 Sun City Taxpayers Association  
3 12630 North 103<sup>rd</sup> Ave., Ste. 144  
4 Sun City, Arizona 85351
- 5 Michael L. Kurtz  
6 Kurt J. Boehm  
7 Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry  
8 36 East Seventh St., Ste. 1510  
9 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
10 *Attorneys for The Kroger Co.*
- 11 Steven B. Bennett  
12 Deputy City Attorney  
13 City of Scottsdale  
14 City Attorney's Office  
15 3939 Drinkwater Blvd.  
16 Scottsdale, Arizona 85251  
17 [sbennett@scottsdaleaz.gov](mailto:sbennett@scottsdaleaz.gov)
- 18 Robert W. Geake  
19 Arizona Water Company  
20 P.O. Box 29006  
21 Phoenix, Arizona 85038-9006
- 22 Lieutenant Colonel Karen S. White  
23 Chief, Air Force Utility Litigation Team  
24 AFLSA/JACL-ULT  
25 139 Barnes Drive  
26 Tyndall AFB, Florida 32403
- 27 Lawrence Robertson, Jr.  
28 Munger Chadwick  
29 P.O. Box 1448  
30 Tubac, Arizona 85646  
31 *Attorneys for Mesquite Power, LLC*  
32 *Southwestern Power Group, II, LLC, and*  
33 *Bowie Power Station, LLC*
- 34 George Bien-Willner  
35 3641 North 39<sup>th</sup> Ave.  
36 Phoenix, Arizona 85034
- 37 Amanda Ormond  
38 Interwest Energy Alliance  
39 7650 South McClintock, Ste. 103-282  
40 Tempe, Arizona 85284
- 41
- 42

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

Greg Patterson  
916 West Adams - 3  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Sean Seitz  
3008 North Civic Center Plaza  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251  
sean@americanpv.com  
*Attorneys for Arizona Solar Energy Industries Association*

Kenneth R. Saline  
K. R. Saline & Associates, PLC  
160 North Pasadena - 101  
Mesa, Arizona 85201


Jay I. Moyes Storey  
1850 North Central Ave. - 1100  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
jimoyes@lawms.com

Andrew W. Bettwy  
Karen S. Haller  
Debra S. Jacobson  
Legal Affairs Department  
Southwest Gas Corporation  
5241 Spring Mountain Rd.  
Las Vegas, Nevada 98150

Tammie Woody  
10825 W. Laurie Lane  
Peoria, Arizona 85345

David Kennedy  
818 East Osborne Road, Ste. 103  
Phoenix, Arizona 85014  
*Attorney for Arizona Interfaith Coalition on Energy*

Joseph Knauer, President  
Jewish Community of Sedona  
100 Meadowlark Drive  
P. O. Box 10242  
Sedona, Arizona 86339

  
1884869

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

**BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

**COMMISSIONERS**

**JEFF HATCH-MILLER, Chairman**  
**WILLIAM A. MUNDELL**  
**MIKE GLEASON**  
**KRISTIN K. MAYES**  
**GARY PIERCE**

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

IN THE MATTER OF THE INQUIRY INTO  
THE FREQUENCY OF UNPLANNED  
OUTAGES DURING 2005 AT PALO VERDE  
NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION, THE  
CAUSES OF THE OUTAGES, THE  
PROCUREMENT OF REPLACEMENT  
POWER AND THE IMPACT OF THE  
OUTAGES ON ARIZONA PUBLIC  
SERVICE CUSTOMERS.

Docket No. E-1345A-05-0826

IN THE MATTER OF THE AUDIT OF THE  
FUEL AND PURCHASED POWER  
PRACTICES AND COSTS OF THE  
ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY.

Docket No. E-1345A-05-0827

**PHELPS DODGE MINING COMPANY AND  
ARIZONANS FOR ELECTRIC CHOICE AND COMPETITION**

**REPLY BRIEF**

**February 16, 2007**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

Page

I. APS CORRECTLY DEPICTS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ITS RECOMMENDATION FOR SETTING BASE FUEL COST, AND AECC'S RECOMMENDATION, AS BEING PRIMARILY RELATED TO THE SELECTION OF THE APPROPRIATE YEAR..... 1

II. APS'S PROPOSAL FOR EXCEPTIONS TO THE 90/10 SHARING MECHANISM IN THE PSA IS NOT COMPARABLE TO AECC'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES IN RATE DESIGN ..... 2

III. THE USE OF THE PROJECTED BENEFIT OBLIGATION ("PBO") IN BALANCE SHEET ACCOUNTING DOES NOT JUSTIFY THE RAISING OF RATES TO TODAY'S CUSTOMERS MAINLY TO PAY FOR PROJECTED PENSION COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH FUTURE SALARY INCREASES..... 3

IV. APS' ARGUMENT ON TRANSMISSION RATE DESIGN RESTATES THE COMPANY'S PRE-FILED TESTIMONY, BUT OVERLOOKS THE PROGRESS THAT WAS MADE IN RESOLVING THIS ISSUE AT HEARING ..... 4

V. ALL PARTIES STATING AN OPINION HAVE EITHER EXPRESSED SUPPORT FOR, OR NON-OPPOSITION TO, AECC'S PROPOSAL TO ALLOCATE APS' HOURLY FUEL AND PURCHASED POWER COSTS BASED ON EACH CLASS'S ACTUAL USAGE FOR EACH OF THE 8,760 HOURS OF THE TEST YEAR. .... 5

VI. STAFF'S PROPOSAL TO MODIFY THE CURRENT PSA GOES TOO FAR BY REJECTING ALL RESTRAINTS ON PRICE VARIATIONS RATEPAYERS CAN BE EXPOSED TO..... 6

1 Phelps Dodge Mining Company and Arizonans for Electric Choice and  
2 Competition (“AECC”), through undersigned counsel, hereby submits its Reply Brief in  
3 the above-captioned docket.

4 **DISCUSSION**

5 This Reply Brief addresses final positions set forth in Arizona Public Service  
6 Company’s (“APS” or “Company”) closing brief filed on January 22, 2007 relative to four  
7 specific issues: (1) the establishment of Base Fuel Costs for APS, (2) exceptions to the  
8 90/10 sharing mechanism in the APS Power Supply Adjustor (“PSA”), (3) APS’s  
9 proposal to accelerate recovery of its underfunded pension liability, and (4) transmission  
10 rate design.

11 In addition, this Reply Brief discusses the lack of opposition *by any party* to  
12 AECC’s proposal to allocate APS’ hourly fuel and purchased power costs based on each  
13 class’s actual usage for each of the 8,760 hours of the test year<sup>1</sup>, as well as why Staff’s  
14 proposal to modify APS’s PSA (adopting a prospective component to rate recovery) is not  
15 in the public interest.

16 **I. APS CORRECTLY DEPICTS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ITS  
17 RECOMMENDATION FOR SETTING BASE FUEL COST, AND AECC’S  
18 RECOMMENDATION, AS BEING PRIMARILY RELATED TO THE  
19 SELECTION OF THE APPROPRIATE YEAR.**

19 AECC’s recommendation for setting Base Fuel Cost is based on APS’s analysis for  
20 2006, which is the period of analysis APS presented in its direct case. However, APS’s  
21 final recommendation for Base Fuel Cost is based on the Company’s projections for 2007.  
22 On page 33 of its Closing Brief, APS indicates that this difference in the choice of year for  
23 the analysis is the primary reason for the difference between AECC’s recommended Base  
24 Fuel Cost and that of the Company. AECC can agree that, for the purpose of establishing  
25

26 <sup>1</sup> AECC asserts that, based on the Chief Administrative Law Judge’s instructions to the parties, if a specific issue is not addressed in a closing brief, the filing party is deemed to have taken no position thereon.

1 the Base Fuel Cost, APS changed the test year from 2006 in its original filing to 2007.  
2 AECC does not believe, however, that APS's mid-proceeding change in test year for Base  
3 Fuel Cost is appropriate, known or measurable. Since costs were reflective of price  
4 estimates throughout 2006, this historical data provides a reasonable basis for setting the  
5 base rate.

6 **II. APS'S PROPOSAL FOR EXCEPTIONS TO THE 90/10 SHARING**  
7 **MECHANISM IN THE PSA IS NOT COMPARABLE TO AECC'S**  
8 **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES IN RATE DESIGN.**

9 AECC objects to APS's proposed exceptions to the 90/10 sharing mechanism in  
10 the PSA on the grounds that such piecemeal alterations in APS's favor undermines the  
11 PSA package that was negotiated by many of the parties in the previous APS rate  
12 proceeding. Having secured an agreement for adoption of this controversial adjustor  
13 mechanism, APS now attempts to further improve the benefit to the Company beyond  
14 what was obtained in the previous settlement by jettisoning some of the provisions it finds  
15 disadvantageous. AECC recommends that the Commission not grant such changes.  
16 APS's proposed exceptions to the 90/10 sharing provision would change the balance of  
17 benefits in the PSA from what was negotiated by the parties in the previous settlement.

18 APS argues that AECC's contention that the 90/10 sharing provision in the PSA  
19 not be altered "rings particularly hollow" because AECC has made rate design proposals  
20 in this proceeding that differ from what was adopted in the previous settlement. [APS  
21 Initial Brief at 37.]. This comparison is inapt. AECC does not maintain that there cannot  
22 be changes from the prior settlement since, obviously, the overall rate increase APS is  
23 seeking in this proceeding represents just such a change. Rather, AECC views the PSA as  
24 a mechanism that was designed with its own balance of interests – the approval of the  
25 mechanism as a whole was largely to benefit APS, while various of its features (such as  
26 the 90/10 sharing) represent concessions to other stakeholders. AECC urges the  
Commission not to alter piecemeal the composition of the PSA to benefit *one* of the

1 stakeholders, as this would not be in the public interest.

2 **III. THE USE OF THE PROJECTED BENEFIT OBLIGATION (“PBO”) IN**  
3 **BALANCE SHEET ACCOUNTING DOES NOT JUSTIFY THE RAISING**  
4 **OF RATES TO TODAY’S CUSTOMERS MAINLY TO PAY FOR**  
5 **PROJECTED PENSION COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH FUTURE SALARY**  
6 **INCREASES.**

7 APS relies on the recently-issued Financial Accounting Standard 158 to justify the  
8 Company’s proposal to raise rates \$41.2 million per year to recover its underfunded  
9 pension liability, as measured by the PBO. [APS Initial Brief at 59-61]. According to  
10 APS, Financial Accounting Standard 158 requires companies to reflect the PBO on their  
11 financial statements [Tr. Vol IV at p. 776-777]. However, the PBO includes the pension  
12 cost associated with projected future salary increases. [Direct Testimony of Kevin C.  
13 Higgins at 11]. In the case of APS, the portion of PBO associated with future salary  
14 increases is \$233 million, comprising the majority of its underfunded pension liability.  
15 [Id.] While including the projected impact of future salary increases on pension liability  
16 may now have a role in balance sheet accounting, it does not follow that this new  
17 reporting requirement should trump sound ratemaking principles. By definition, the  
18 future salary increases have not yet occurred. Having today’s ratepayers recover  
19 “underfunded” pension costs associated with salary increases that have not yet occurred  
20 results in inter-generational inequities across ratepayers. Such a practice is inconsistent  
21 with good ratemaking.

22 Instead, for ratemaking purposes, regulators are better served by focusing on the  
23 accumulated benefit obligation (“ABO”), which is identical to the PBO except for the  
24 treatment of future salary increases. [Id.] APS’ underfunded pension liability as  
25 measured by the ABO is less than half the size of the PBO. [Id.] Further, the ABO will  
26 be adjusted each year to reflect *actual* salaries as these salaries change over time. [Tr. Vol  
II, p. 423, line 23 – p. 424, line 6]. In this way, measurement of underfunded pension  
liability for ratemaking purposes will appropriately reflect current – and not future –

1 salaries, preserving intergenerational equity in the setting of current rates.

2 **IV. APS' ARGUMENT ON TRANSMISSION RATE DESIGN RESTATES THE**  
3 **COMPANY'S PRE-FILED TESTIMONY, BUT OVERLOOKS THE**  
4 **PROGRESS THAT WAS MADE IN RESOLVING THIS ISSUE AT**  
5 **HEARING.**

6 At hearing, APS witness Rumolo and AECC witness Higgins agreed that an  
7 appropriate resolution of the differences in their respective pre-filed positions on  
8 transmission rate design would be to set the retail rate for transmission service equal to the  
9 rates in Schedule 11 of APS' Open-Access Transmission Tariff ("OATT"), with some  
10 provision for the smallest E-32 customers to be billed on an energy-only basis. [Tr. at  
11 Vol. XIV, p. 2790, lines 2-9; Vol. XV, p. 3070, line 15 - p. 3071, line 2]. However, APS'  
12 Initial Brief fails to acknowledge the progress that was made in resolving this issue and  
13 reverts to a restatement of the Company's pre-filed position.

14 By its own terms, APS' restatement of its pre-filed position in its Initial Brief is  
15 fraught with contradictions. At page 91, APS states that "Because production-related and  
16 *transmission-related* assets, and their associated costs, are generally designed and built to  
17 enable the Company to meet its system peak load, they are *allocated on the basis of the*  
18 *average of the system peak demands occurring in the months of June, July, August, and*  
19 *September ("4 CP")*. [Emphasis added]. Yet, at page 89, APS defends its use of an  
20 "energy-only" transmission charge and objects to AECC's allocation of transmission costs  
21 on a 4 CP basis by stating that "'allocation" of OATT charges in applying a demand  
22 allocator, such as the 4 CP allocator, does not reflect an accurate representation of how the  
23 costs are incurred to provide transmission service and is, therefore, inappropriate." These  
24 two statements are in direct contradiction. If the proper method for allocating  
25 transmission costs is the 4 CP method, as APS states on page 91, then it is appropriate to  
26 allocate costs this way. Moreover, APS's reliance on the OATT as a justification for an  
energy-only charge is itself a contradiction: the OATT sets retail transmission rates for

1 non-residential customers greater than 20 kW based on *demand* (as AECC and others  
2 recommend) and *not* on energy.

3 The obvious resolution to this issue is the one that AECC and APS proposed at  
4 hearing: simply set retail transmission rates equal to the rates in Schedule 11 of APS's  
5 OATT, while providing for the smallest E-32 customers (i.e., those with billing demands  
6 less than 100 kW) to be billed on an energy-only basis, per the OATT rate for small  
7 General Service customers. As testified by APS witness Rumolo, the OATT rates are the  
8 very charges that APS must pay for transmission service for its retail customers. There is  
9 no more straightforward means for properly recovering these costs than to charge these  
10 very same rates to the retail customers themselves.

11 **V. ALL PARTIES STATING AN OPINION HAVE EITHER EXPRESSED**  
12 **SUPPORT FOR, OR NON-OPPOSITION TO, AECC'S PROPOSAL TO**  
13 **ALLOCATE APS' HOURLY FUEL AND PURCHASED POWER COSTS**  
14 **BASED ON EACH CLASS'S ACTUAL USAGE FOR EACH OF THE 8,760**  
15 **HOURS OF THE TEST YEAR.**


16 AECC's enhancement to APS's cost-of-service study better aligns the allocation of  
17 APS' energy cost with cost causation. [AECC Initial Brief at p. 21.] Referring to  
18 AECC's proposal, Kroger witness Baron testified that "it is indisputable that that would  
19 be a more precise measure of the responsibility for energy related costs of each class."  
20 [FEA Post Hearing Brief at p. 7] AECC's proposal is strongly supported by FEA, which  
21 recommends unequivocally that "The Commission should adopt the hourly energy cost  
22 allocator proposed by PDMC/AECC witness Kevin Higgins." [*Id.* at p. 6]. Further, APS  
23 states that the Company "does not oppose this adjustment to its cost of service study."  
24 [APS Initial Brief at p. 92]. Neither Commission Staff, RUCO nor any other party  
25 commented on AECC's proposal in their closing briefs. In short, there is strong support  
26 for, and no opposition to, AECC's proposal in the record of this proceeding. AECC urges  
the Commission to adopt the proposal.

1 VI. STAFF'S PROPOSAL TO MODIFY THE CURRENT PSA GOES TOO FAR  
2 BY REJECTING ALL RESTRAINTS ON PRICE VARIATIONS  
3 RATEPAYERS CAN BE EXPOSED TO.

4 AECC's main concerns with Staff's proposed form of PSA involve its  
5 "prospective" component, which the Commission: (1) has not utilized in the past, (2) is  
6 unfamiliar with in administering, and (3) most of all, abolishes bargained-for benefits by  
7 parties to the Settlement Agreement that have been refined into a workable adjustor. As  
8 set forth in RUCO's Initial Post Hearing Brief, "It would be premature to discard those  
9 efforts and adopt a PSA that is based on a completely different philosophical  
10 underpinnings than the current PSA." RUCO Initial Brief at 40, lines 10 - 12. Staff  
11 proposes to eliminate the 90/10 sharing mechanism, which currently acts as a strong  
12 incentive to making prudent energy transactions. Staff's position on this matter is indeed  
13 out of touch with recent Commission decisions concerning adjustor mechanisms. *Id.* at  
14 43. AECC supports RUCO's position concerning Staff's proposed PSA for many of the  
15 reasons set forth in its Initial Post-Hearing Brief.

16 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 16<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2007.

17 FENNEMORE CRAIG, P.C.

18 By 

19 C. Webb Crockett  
20 Patrick J. Black  
21 3003 N. Central Avenue, Ste. 2600  
22 Phoenix, AZ 85012-2913

23 Attorneys for Phelps Dodge Mining Company and  
24 Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition

25 1883416.2/23040.041

26