



0000076691

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION CO.

COMMISSIONERS

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

AUG 28 2007

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

DOCKETED BY [Signature]

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY FOR
APPROVAL OF A CUSTOMER AGREEMENT
WITH ASARCO, LLC AND SILVER BELL
MINING, LLC.

DOCKET NO. E-01933A-06-0801

DECISION NO. 69873

OPINION AND ORDER

DATE OF HEARING:

May 14, 2007

PLACE OF HEARING:

Tucson, Arizona

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:

Jane L. Rodda

APPEARANCES:

Ms. Michelle Livengood, Legal Division,
Tucson Electric Power Company; Mr.
Raymond Heyman, Senior Vice President
and General Counsel, UniSource Energy
Corporation;

Mr. Lawrence V. Robertson, Munger and
Chadwick, on behalf of ASARCO, LLC
and Silver Bell Mining, LLC; and

Mr. Christopher Kempley, Chief
Counsel, Legal Division, on behalf of the
Utilities Division of the Arizona
Corporation Commission.

BY THE COMMISSION:

* * * * *

Having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, the
Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") finds, concludes, and orders that:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On December 28, 2006, Tucson Electric Power Company ("TEP" or "Company")
submitted for Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") approval, a proposed Electric
Power Supply Agreement ("Proposed Agreement") between TEP, ASARCO, LLC ("Asarco"), and

1 Silver Bell Mining LLC, ("Silver Bell") (collectively "ASARCO"). TEP alleged that the terms of
2 the Proposed Agreement are confidential and provided the Proposed Agreement to Commission
3 Utilities Division Staff ("Staff") pursuant to a Protective Agreement.

4 2. On March 15, 2007, Staff filed a Motion for Procedural Order, believing that certain
5 provisions of the Proposed Agreement are best considered in the context of a hearing. Specifically,
6 Staff expressed concerns about a provision of the contract that would limit ASARCO's participation
7 in Docket No. E-01933A-05-0650.¹

8 3. By Procedural Order dated March 23, 2007, the Commission convened a telephonic
9 Procedural Conference on April 2, 2007, with the purpose of establishing procedures for a hearing in
10 this matter. TEP and Staff participated in the Procedural Conference through counsel.

11 4. By Procedural Order dated April 13, 2007, the matter was set for hearing and notice
12 was sent to the parties to Docket No. E-01933A-05-0650.

13 5. On April 12, 2007, TEP filed with Docket Control a public, redacted, version of the
14 Proposed Agreement.

15 6. On April 21, 2007, Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition ("AECC") filed a
16 Request for Intervention. On April 23, 2007, Asarco and Silver Bell, and the Department of Defense
17 ("DOD") filed Requests to Intervene. On April 27, 2007, Phelps Dodge filed a Request for
18 Intervention.

19 7. On April 24, 2007, Staff filed its Staff Report, recommending approval of the
20 Proposed Agreement with some modifications, which related to the restrictions on participation in
21 another docket as well as the proposed retroactive approval of the contract rates.

22 8. On May 2, 2007, ASARCO filed a Response to the Staff Report. ASARCO states that
23 it and TEP negotiated the Proposed Agreement in good faith and at arms' length, and ASARCO
24 supports the Proposed Agreement as written.

25 9. On May 3, 2007, TEP filed its Response to the Staff Report. TEP objected to Staff's
26 recommendations to alter the terms of the proposed contract.

27
28 ¹ TEP application to amend Decision No. 62103.

1 10. On May 3, 2007, TEP filed a limited objection to the Intervention of AECC, Phelps
2 Dodge and DOD. TEP did not object to the intervention of AECC, Phelps Dodge or DOD provided
3 they are not given access to the confidential and proprietary rate and pricing information in the
4 Proposed Agreement.

5 11. By Procedural Order dated April 13, 2007, the Commission granted intervention to
6 Asarco and Silver Bell, DOD, AECC and Phelps Dodge. The Interventions of DOD, AECC and
7 Phelps Dodge were limited to preclude access to confidential pricing and rate information.

8 12. The hearing convened as scheduled on May 14, 2007, at the Commission's Tucson
9 offices. Ms. Denise Smith, Director of Renewable and Conservation Programs testified for TEP. At
10 the time the Proposed Agreement was negotiated, Ms. Smith was the Director of Commercial
11 Customer Care and was involved in the contract negotiations. Mr. John Low, a Vice President for
12 Mining Operations for ASARCO with responsibility for the Mission Complex and Silver Bell mines,
13 testified for ASARCO. Ms. Barbara Keene, a public utilities analyst manager, and Mr. Elijah
14 Abinah, Assistant Director of the Utilities Division, testified for Staff.

15 13. ASARCO operates copper mining operations at its Mission Complex and at its Silver
16 Bell Mine which both receive electric service from TEP. Over the years, TEP and ASARCO have
17 entered into a series of electric service agreements. The most recent electric service agreement was
18 approved by the Commission in Decision No. 61868 (August 5, 1999), and expired on December 31,
19 2006 (the "1999 ESA").

20 14. In August 2005, ASARCO filed for protection under Chapter 11 of the United States
21 Bankruptcy Code (Case Number 05-21207, Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division).

22 15. TEP's December 28, 2006, filing sought approval of a new electric service agreement
23 with ASARCO that provides that it would be effective retroactively January 1, 2007, through
24 December 31, 2011. When it filed the agreement with the Commission, TEP understood that the
25 Commission would not be able to approve the Agreement in time for the new rates to go into effect
26 on January 1, 2007, upon the expiration of the prior contract. In its filing for approval, TEP sought
27 expedited consideration of the Proposed Agreement.

28 16. TEP has been charging ASARCO the rates under the Proposed Agreement beginning

1 January 1, 2007.

2 17. On March 2, 2007, TEP filed a letter extending the time for the Commission to
3 consider the Proposed Agreement until April 12, 2007.

4 18. Under the Proposed Agreement, the Mission Complex and Silver Bell Mine would
5 purchase, at a minimum, the power requirements specified in the Proposed Agreement from TEP at
6 the energy prices contained in the Time-of-Use ("TOU") Pricing Plan. The TOU pricing structure
7 being used will facilitate the reduction of electric power costs for the Mission Complex and Silver
8 Bell Mine, allowing them to shift loads from on-peak to off-peak or shoulder hours.

9 19. In the absence of the Proposed Agreement, ASARCO would be provided service
10 under the rates, terms and conditions of Tariff Nos. LLP-14 and LLP-90A. Staff estimated the cost
11 of obtaining electric power under the tariff rates and the rates established in the Proposed Agreement
12 for the Mission Complex and Silver Bell mine. Staff determined that the revenue to be received
13 under the Proposed Agreement would cover TEP's marginal costs. Staff believes that the rates
14 under the Proposed Agreement are just and reasonable.

15 20. Compared to TEP's total revenues, Staff concludes that any impact from the Proposed
16 Agreement would be *de minimus*, and any impact on TEP's fair value rate base and rate of return
17 would also be *de minimus*.

18 21. As conditioned herein below, Staff recommends approval of the Proposed Agreement
19 because ASARCO has a possible alternative to buying power from TEP. Without the agreement,
20 TEP would lose net revenues it could otherwise receive. In addition, the agreement is important to
21 ASARCO because electricity costs play an important role in the competitiveness of a copper mine
22 and the proposed rates are less than the tariff rates ASARCO would otherwise pay.

23 22. Section 12.2 of the Proposed Agreement provides as follows:

24 Asarco and Silver Bell Mining represent, warrant and agree that
25 the rates set forth herein are just and reasonable. The rates shall
26 remain in effect during the term of this Agreement and shall not be
27 altered, changed or modified as part of the Commission's final
28 resolution of TEP's Motion to Amend Decision No. 62103 in
doCKET number E-01933A-05-0650. Accordingly, upon approval
of this Agreement by the ACC, Asarco and Silver Bell Mining
shall not directly or indirectly take any action contrary to the
evidence, testimony or positions of TEP in doCKET number E-

1 01933A-05-0650 or any appeal arising from the ACC decision in
2 said docket. In the event that the Commission orders TEP to
3 charge rates to Asarco and Silver Bell Mining that are different
4 than those set forth in this Agreement, any Party hereto may, at its
5 sole discretion, void this Agreement. (emphasis added)

6 23. Staff believes that the limitations set forth in section 12.2 of the Proposed Agreement
7 are not in the public interest. Staff believes that no company or intervenor should be precluded from
8 participating in proceedings before the Commission. Staff recommends that the Commission specify
9 in its Order that the provisions of section 12.2 of the Proposed Agreement shall be null and void upon
10 approval.

11 24. Staff believes that because TEP has been billing ASARCO under the rates in the
12 Proposed Agreement, which rates have not yet been approved, TEP is charging unauthorized rates.
13 Staff recommends that the Commission require TEP to reimburse ASARCO the difference between
14 the rates charged under the 1999 ESA (which expired December 31, 2006) and the rates charged
15 under the Proposed Agreement. Staff believes the reimbursement should extend from January 1,
16 2007, the date on which TEP began charging the Proposed Agreement rates, and should continue for
17 as long as TEP is charging rates not approved by the Commission.

18 25. Finally, Staff recommends that the Commission specify in its Order that approval of
19 the Agreement at this time does not guarantee any future ratemaking treatment for the Proposed
20 Agreement.

21 Applicability of Rates

22 26. TEP argues that Staff's recommendations to charge the expired contract rate pending a
23 new agreement and to void section 12.2 of the Proposed Agreement are without merit and would
24 negate the agreement that the parties negotiated at arms' length.

25 27. TEP argues there is no legal basis for the Commission to order TEP to charge
26 ASARCO the expired rate. With the expiration of the prior contract, TEP is not authorized to charge
27 the prior contract rates. In the absence of a new agreement, TEP asserts the applicable rates would
28 be the Commission-approved tariff rates, which are higher than those agreed to in the Proposed
 Agreement. TEP claims that if the Staff recommendation is approved, parties to contracts will be
 able to ignore the expiration or termination of Commission-approved electric service agreements and

1 perpetuate selective terms, which result, TEP argues, would not be in the public interest.

2 28. TEP notes that all parties, including Staff, recognize that the rates in the Proposed
3 Agreement are just and reasonable, and in the public interest. TEP states that charging the newly
4 proposed rates is an accommodation by TEP for the benefit of ASARCO, and that to penalize TEP by
5 requiring it to refund the difference between the expired rate and the new rates would interfere with
6 the parties' contractual rights, is contrary to the terms of the Decision No. 61868 as well as the
7 Proposed Agreement, and would be unjust and confiscatory. TEP states that if ASARCO had been
8 required to pay for electric service pursuant to Tariffs LLP-14 and LLP-90A, ASARCO would have
9 paid \$709,642 or \$578,965 more, respectively, than what it paid pursuant to the terms of the
10 Proposed Agreement during the period January through April 2007.

11 29. Further, TEP argues that Article 15, Section 3 of the Arizona Constitution states that
12 the Commission has the power only to "prescribe the forms of contracts" used by public service
13 corporations, and that the courts have ruled that this only applies to the actual "form" of the contract,
14 not the content. *Citing Corona De Tucson, Inc. v. Senner*, 92 Ariz. 373, 387, 309 P.2d 309, 319
15 (1962). TEP asserts that Staff's recommendation would impermissibly change the terms of the
16 contract.

17 30. ASARCO states that it and TEP engaged in good faith and arms' length negotiations
18 to arrive at the rates reflected in the Proposed Agreement, and believes that TEP was sufficiently
19 responsive to ASARCO's needs for rates that would allow it to remain viable in the highly
20 competitive world-wide copper market. ASARCO was prepared to pay the negotiated rates as of
21 January 1, 2007, forward at the time it entered into the Agreement, and continues to be willing to do
22 so. As a matter of business ethics, ASARCO does not support the recommendation that TEP
23 reimburse them for the amounts paid in excess of the expired contract rates.

24 31. At the hearing, Staff explained that its recommendation that TEP reimburse ASARCO
25 was intended in lieu of an administrative penalty against TEP for charging unauthorized rates. (Tr at
26 76)

27 32. We find that the proposed date for the new rates to take effect, January 1, 2007, is
28 reasonable under the circumstances. The parties understood that the rates would not be effective until

1 and unless the Commission approved them, but that there was not sufficient time to have the
2 Commission approve the contract prior to the expiration of the previous contract. The tariff rates
3 would apply if the parties had not agreed that Asarco and Silver Bell could take power under the
4 proposed rates pending Commission approval of the contract. There is no evidence the rates are other
5 than just and reasonable, and TEP does not benefit from the contract rates vis-à-vis the tariff rates.
6 Some of the delay in negotiating a new contract was caused by ASARCO's bankruptcy and the start
7 of a new CEO, and there is no allegation or evidence that TEP was responsible for an unreasonable
8 delay. (Tr at 49-50) TEP filed the application for ACC approval prior to beginning to charge the
9 new rates. Consequently, under these circumstances, we find that the proposal to have the rates
10 effective commencing January 1, 2007, is just and reasonable and in the public interest.

11 Section 12.2 – Participation in Other Dockets

12 33. Similar to its opposition to changing the effective date of the contract rates, TEP
13 argued that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to change the terms of section 12.2. TEP asserts
14 several important and valid reasons support of the inclusion of section 12.2. First, TEP states the
15 Proposed Agreement was negotiated at arms' length and in good faith and establishes just and
16 reasonable rates, so there is no reason for ASARCO to try to negotiate a different rate in Docket No.
17 E-01933A-05-0650 or any other docket; and Asarco and Silver Bell want certainty in rates now, not
18 after resolution of the future rate case. Second, the first two sentences of section 12.2 provide that the
19 rates set forth in the Proposed Agreement are just and reasonable and shall remain in effect during the
20 term of the Agreement. TEP believes there is no reason to void this portion of Section 12.2. Third,
21 the last sentence of section 12.2 provides that if the Commission attempts to change the rates, any
22 party can withdraw from the Proposed Agreement. TEP states there is no rationale why this part of
23 section 12.2 should be voided.

24 34. TEP's witness testified that the intent of section 12.2 is to prevent ASARCO from
25 negotiating different rates than it agreed to in this contract as part of a future rate case. (Tr at 28)

26 35. ASARCO believed that if the Proposed Agreement is approved there would be no
27 need to participate in a rate case docket through the term of the Agreement. (Tr at 61) Initially,
28 ASARCO stated that Staff's recommendation concerning section 12.2 was unnecessary and would

1 have little practical effect, since if the Commission approved the contract rates, ASARCO would
2 have no cause or incentive to participate in the rate preceding that may emanate from Docket No. E-
3 01933A-05-0650. However, ASARCO admitted at the hearing, that if in Docket No. E-01933A-05-
4 0650, or a related docket, the Commission were to consider imposing a surcharge on TEP customers,
5 ASARCO might be interested in participating in such docket. (Tr at 64)

6 36. At the hearing, Staff clarified its position in the Staff Report and explained that it is
7 the third sentence of the section 12.2² which Staff finds contrary to the public interest. Staff believes
8 that all companies with a direct interest in a pending matter should be allowed to come before the
9 Commission to express their views. (Tr at 88)

10 37. TEP, ASARCO and Staff agreed at the hearing that if the third sentence of section
11 12.2 were removed, they would find the remainder of section 12. 2 to be acceptable. (Tr at 54, 81,
12 and 95)

13 38. Removing the third sentence of section 12.2 of the Proposed Agreement is in the
14 public interest. Generally, it is not good public policy to allow the imposition of wholesale limits on
15 the participation of interested parties in Commission proceedings. Such restrictions might limit the
16 information available to the Commission in its deliberations as well as prejudice a party who may not
17 recognize the import of signing away its right to participate in a future proceeding. In this case, the
18 offending language is broader than necessary to give effect to the stated purpose of the parties, which
19 is to give certainty and finality to the rates agreed to in this Proposed Agreement. With the removal
20 of the third sentence, the remaining language of section 12.2 provides adequate assurance that the
21 rates agreed to in the Proposed Agreement will not be affected by the impending TEP rate case. The
22 last sentence of section 12.2 acknowledges that the Commission retains authority over the rates TEP
23 charges ASARCO.

24 39. Consequently, we find that the third sentence in section 12.2, highlighted above, shall
25 be removed from the Proposed Agreement.

26
27 ² "Accordingly, upon approval of this Agreement by the ACC, Asarco and Silver Bell Mining shall not directly or
28 indirectly take any action contrary to the evidence, testimony or positions of TEP in docket number E-01933A-05-0650 or
any appeal arising from the ACC decision in said docket."

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1
2 1. TEP is an Arizona public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV,
3 Section 2, of the Arizona Constitution.

4 2. The Commission has jurisdiction over TEP and over the subject matter of the
5 application.

6 3. With the modification of the Proposed Agreement to remove the third sentence of
7 section 12.2, as discussed herein, it is in the public interest to approve the Proposed Agreement.

8 4. Staff's proposed recommendation as set forth in Findings of Fact No. 25 is reasonable
9 and should be adopted.

ORDER

10
11 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Section 12.2 of the agreement for electric service
12 between Tucson Electric Power Company and ASARCO LLC and Silver Bell Mining LLC, shall be
13 modified as discussed herein.

14 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the agreement for electric service between Tucson Electric
15 Power Company and ASARCO LLC and Silver Bell Mining LLC, shall be approved as modified
16 herein.

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Tucson Electric Power Company, ASARCO LLC and
18 Silver Bell Mining LLC, shall submit a subsequent agreement for electric service between Tucson
19 Electric Power Company, ASARCO LLC and Silver Bell Mining, LLC for Commission approval at
20 least 120 days prior to the expiration of the contract approved herein.

21 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED if Tucson Electric Power Company, ASARCO LLC and Silver
22 Bell Mining, LLC are unable to agree upon terms of a subsequent agreement for electric service,
23 Tucson Electric Power Company shall make a filing with the Commission describing the
24 circumstances surrounding attempts to negotiate an agreement. The rates applicable under the
25 agreement for electric service approved herein shall remain in effect until further order of the
26 Commission.


27 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Tucson Electric Power Company, ASARCO LLC and
28 Silver Bell Mining LLC, shall file with Docket Control within 30 days of the effective date of this

1 Decision, as a compliance item in this docket, a revised agreement for electric service that complies
2 with the findings of this Decision. The parties may provide the revised agreement confidentially to
3 the Director of the Utilities Division and shall file a redacted public version of the revised agreement
4 with Docket Control, as a compliance item in this docket.


5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that approval of the agreement for electric service at this time
6 does not guarantee any future ratemaking treatment of the Agreement with ASARCO LLC and Silver
7 Bell Mining LLC.

8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.

9 BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION.

10			
11			
12	CHAIRMAN		COMMISSIONER
13			
14	COMMISSIONER	COMMISSIONER	COMMISSIONER

15
16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, DEAN S. MILLER, Interim
17 Executive Director of the Arizona Corporation Commission,
18 have hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the
19 Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix,
20 this 28 day of August, 2007.

21
22 
23 DEAN S. MILLER
24 INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1 SERVICE LIST FOR: TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY

2 DOCKET NO.: DOCKET NO. E-01933A-06-0801

3
4 Michael W. Patten
5 ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC
6 One Arizona Center
7 400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800
8 Phoenix, AZ 85004

9 Peter Q. Nyce, Jr.
10 General Attorney, Regulatory Law Office
11 Office of the Judge Advocate General
12 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
13 901 North Stuart Street, Room 713
14 Arlington, VA 22203-1644

15 Dan Neidlinger
16 NEIDLINGER & ASSOC.
17 3020 North 17th Drive
18 Phoenix, Arizona 85015

19 C. Webb Crockett
20 Patrick J. Black
21 FENNEMORE CRAIG, PC
22 3003 North Central Avenue, Suite 2600
23 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2913
24 Attorneys for AECC and Phelps Dodge

25 Lawrence Robertson
26 P.O. Box 1448
27 Tubac, Arizona 85646
28 Attorney for Asarco and Silver Bell

Ruth Graham Kern
Senior Associate General Counsel
ASARCO, LLC
8222 South 48th Street, Suite 220
Phoenix, Arizona 85044

Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel
Legal Division
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Ernest Johnson, Director
Utilities Division
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

