

OPEN MEETING AGENDA ITEM
BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION



0000099763

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

COMMISSIONERS
Kristin K. Mayes, Chairman
Gary Pierce
Sandra D. Kennedy
Paul Newman
Bob Stump

RECEIVED

2009 JUN 23 A 9:46

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

DOCKETED BY

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
UNS ELECTRIC, INC. FOR APPROVAL OF ITS
DEMAND SIDE MANAGEMENT COMPACT
FLUORESCENT LAMP BUY-DOWN PROGRAM

Docket No. E-04204A-08-0341

ACC Decision No. 70556

**REPLY TO RESPONSE TO THE UNS ELECTRIC REPORT CONCERNING AN
ALTERNATIVE CFL COUPON PROGRAM AND CLF DSM PROGRAM
APPLICATION**

22 JUNE 2009

This filing contains a Reply to UNS Electric's Response of this date to the Magruder Response to the UNS Electric's study and report concerning an Alternative CFL Coupon Program and the UNS Electric's CLF DSM Program Application for additional funding based only on results of other utility companies.

This reply clarifies statements in today's UNSE Response to my 17 June 2009 filing.

First, the Commission never had an opportunity to evaluate the "coupon" program before Decision No. 70556, as the Staff Report's author never saw my earlier filing that made the coupon proposal, thus the Commission requested that the company review and compare its proposed program with others including the Magruder coupon approach.

Second, no figures in my Response were challenged as being in error.

Third, my Response discussed differences between Santa Cruz and Mohave service areas. (Attach A, para 3.1.1a, 3.1.1b, 3.1.1d. Only para 3.1.1c focused on Santa Cruz area)

Fourth, a rebuttal was provided with respect to the superior quality control features that the coupon program would have compared to the "open shelf" approach advocated by the company. (Attach A, para 3.3.2)

Fifth, studies cited by the company were in a different situational environment that relevance and applicability were challenged. (Attach A, para 3.2.5)

Sixth, "Magruder vigorously argues for the adoption of his method" is not true.

1 My conclusion was that "the key results for both programs were very close, maybe a
2 few percentage points of difference in terms of cost per lamp and energy savings." (see
3 Summary in Attach A) and that I stated "this difference is a judgment issue that only the
4 Commissioners can determine." (page 1)

5
6 Respectfully submitted on this 22th day of June 2009.

7
8 MARSHALL MAGRUDER

9 By _____

10 Marshall Magruder
11 PO Box 1267
12 Tubac, Arizona 85646-1267
13 (520) 398-8587
14 marshall@magruder.org

15 **Service List**

16
17 Original and 16 copies are filed this date:

18 **Docket Control** (13 copies)
19 **Arizona Corporation Commission**
20 1200 West Washington Street
21 Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2927

22 **Ernest G. Johnson**, Director Utilities Division (1 copy)
23 **Janice M. Alward**, Chief Legal Counsel (1 copy)
24 **Maureen Scott**, Senior Staff Counsel (1 copy)

25 Additional Distribution (1 copy each):

26 **Michael W. Patten**
27 Roshka, DeWulf & Patten, PLC
28 One Arizona Center
29 400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800
30 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2262

31 **Michelle Livengood**
32 UniSource Energy Services
33 One South Church Avenue
34 Tucson, Arizona 85702
35