

ORIGINAL



0000100806

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
Chairman
JIM IRVIN
Commissioner
MARC SPITZER
Commissioner

RECEIVED
2002 MAY 21 P 4: 06
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCUMENT CONTROL

IN THE MATTER OF THE GENERIC PROCEEDINGS CONCERNING ELECTRIC RESTRUCTURING.

DOCKET NO. E-00000-02-0051

IN THE MATTER OF ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY'S REQUEST FOR VARIANCE OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS OF A.A.C. R14-2-1606

DOCKET NO. E-01345-01-0822

IN THE MATTER OF THE GENERIC PROCEEDINGS CONCERNING THE ARIZONA INDEPENDENT SCHEDULING ADMINISTRATOR.

DOCKET NO. E-00000A-01-0630

IN THE MATTER OF TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY'S APPLICATION FOR A VARIANCE OF CERTAIN ELECTRIC COMPETITION RULES COMPLIANCE DATES

DOCKET NO. E-01933A-02-0069

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY FOR APPROVAL OF ITS STRANDED COST RECOVERY

DOCKET NO. E-01933A-98-0471

HARQUAHALA GENERATING COMPANY'S COMMENTS TO UTILITY DIVISION STAFF'S TOPICS

Harquahala Generating Company, LLC ("HGC"), by and through its attorneys, hereby provides Staff with comments on item #4 of the Utility Division Staff's ("Staff") topics listed in Staff's May 13, 2002 Request for A Procedural Order. HGC asked Mr. Alan Taylor, President of

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

MAY 21 2002

DOCKETED BY

1 Sedway Consulting, Inc. and a nationally-recognized expert competitive bidding for wholesale
2 electric power, to address item #4. The following is his response:

3
4 **RESPONSE OF ALAN S. TAYLOR TO STAFF ITEM #4**

5
6 **4. Description of the Various Types of Competitive Solicitations and their
Attributes.**

7 Power supplies that are acquired through competitive bidding processes are usually
8 obtained through one of two methods:

- 9 1. solicitation through a request for proposals (RFP), and
10 2. participation in a formalized auction.

11 A solicitation process is initiated with the issuance of an RFP that specifies needs that the
12 buyer seeks to fill. In some solicitations, a pre-bid conference is held so that interested suppliers
13 can ask questions and gain additional insights into the buyer's needs. Once the buyer receives
14 responses to the RFP, an evaluation process is undertaken. This may involve utility system
15 simulation modeling or other analytic procedures to determine the best proposed power supply
16 contract(s). The buyer then selects a short list of top bidders with whom to commence
17 negotiations. Usually, this short list includes more supply than the buyer is seeking – thereby
18 providing some maneuvering room if negotiations with one or more of the suppliers prove
19 unsuccessful.

20 An auction process entails a centralized, more automated approach to selecting power
21 providers. Frequently, power supply auctions are conducted electronically on the Internet. Most
22 such auctions to date have been part of short-term selection processes (e.g., day-ahead or hour-
23 ahead procurement decisions by power exchanges). One exception involves a power supply
24 auction that was recently conducted in New Jersey, whereby suppliers were selected to supply 12
25 month's of basic generation service for the state's electric distribution companies.

26

1 **Advantages and Disadvantages**

2 The two different competitive power approaches have various advantages and
3 disadvantages. For example, the RFP-based solicitation process is more readily customized to
4 meet specific buyer needs or address specific regional constraints. Also, it is faster to develop
5 and less expensive to conduct for a single solicitation. However, the evaluation, selection, and
6 negotiation process is usually more time-consuming.

7 The auction process, on the other hand, involves more up-front development (resulting in
8 a greater investment of time and money) but is faster to conduct – once the process has been set
9 up. It is ideally suited for instances where power transactions are going to be solicited and
10 evaluated repeatedly (e.g., in scheduling daily supplies in power pools or power exchanges).
11 Thus, the up-front investment pays off in streamlining multiple evaluation and selection
12 processes. Consequently, the product that is the subject of the auction must be standardized so
13 that all offers can be quickly compared on a common metric. Assuming that all bidders have
14 passed specific prequalifying requirements and have posted the necessary financial deposits, all
15 participants are considered equal – except for a single price (or product quantity) that represents
16 their complete bid and serves as the sole differentiating attribute of their proposals.

17
18 **Recommendation**

19 Given the circumstances faced by the Arizona Corporation Commission and Arizona's
20 utilities, the RFP-based solicitation process probably makes most sense. The selection of the best
21 resources to serve Arizona's electric customers over the next several years will require careful
22 consideration of regional transmission constraints, new transmission projects that are likely to
23 relieve some or all of those constraints within certain time-frames, and the specific ancillary
24 services that must be acquired to operate the state's electric system reliably.

25 In New Jersey, the recent auction was successful in no small part because of the strongly
26 interconnected transmission system and tight power pool operations of the Pennsylvania-Jersey-

1 Maryland Independent System Operator (PJM ISO). Although transmission bottlenecks can
2 occur in this power pool, there is sufficient generation on either side of these bottlenecks to
3 address such congestion through redispatching. Also, there are well-developed rules and markets
4 for ancillary services. The New Jersey auction sought "slices-of-system," whereby suppliers
5 assumed responsibility for providing all capacity, energy, transmission services, and ancillary
6 services for a set percentage of an electric distribution company's loads in each and every hour.
7 This was only possible because of the well-developed scheduling, operating, and settlement
8 procedures of the PJM ISO.

9 Also, the deregulation policies that were developed for the New Jersey electricity market
10 had sufficiently addressed market power concerns and minimized the possibility for price
11 manipulation in the auction. First, most of the New Jersey utilities completely divested their
12 generation over the last several years – selling it to numerous non-affiliated generation
13 companies. Second, the PJM market is accessible to many generation companies throughout the
14 northeast. Thus, no one generation company has a dominant position in the regional market.

15 It may be possible for Arizona to adopt a "slice-of-system" auction-based power
16 procurement process, but not until an independent regional transmission operator (RTO) or ISO
17 similar to PJM has been established in the region and sufficient diversity of generation ownership
18 has been achieved to address market power concerns. Until then, an RFP-based solicitation
19 approach holds the best promise for unlocking the benefits of a competitive wholesale market for
20 Arizona's electric customers. In such a process, suppliers can offer whatever services they can
21 best provide (e.g., baseload energy, intermediate generation, peaking services, ancillary services).
22 Assuming that the buyer's minimum system requirements are well-defined, the evaluation team
23 can determine the best, lowest-cost/lowest-risk portfolio of resources that meet those
24 requirements. Those requirements should be specified in the RFP and should include the amount
25
26

1 of peak system capacity and the amount of each relevant category of ancillary services that the
2 buyer seeks.

3 Lastly, an RFP-based solicitation is usually undertaken to entertain offers with terms of
4 more than a year. In fact, a final portfolio of contracts may include a mixture of 1-year, 3-year, 5-
5 year, and 10-year contracts. Such a blend is likely to provide the necessary flexibility for
6 reformulating Arizona electric customers' power supplies over the rest of this decade.

7 THE FOREGOING COMMENTS OF ALAN S. TAYLOR ARE RESPECTFULLY
8 SUBMITTED this 21st day of May, 2002, by the undersigned on behalf of Harquahala Generating
9 Company, LLC.

10
11 QUARLES & BRADY STREICH LANG LLP
12 Renaissance One
13 Two North Central Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2391

14
15 By 
16 Roger K. Ferland
602.229.5607
17 Attorneys for Harquahala Generating Company, LLC

18 ORIGINAL and 10 COPIES filed May 21, 2002, with:

19 Docket Control
20 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
21 1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

1 **COPIES** hand-delivered without a copy of the Service List May 21, 2002, to:

2 Chairman William Mundell
3 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
4 1200 West Washington Street
5 Phoenix, AZ 85007

6 Commissioner Jim Irvin
7 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
8 1200 West Washington Street
9 Phoenix, AZ 85007

10 Commission Marc Spitzer
11 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
12 1200 West Washington Street
13 Phoenix, AZ 85007

14 Lyn A. Farmer, Esq.
15 Chief Administrative Law Judge
16 Hearing Division
17 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
18 1200 West Washington Street
19 Phoenix, AZ 85007

20 Christopher Kempley, Esq.
21 Chief Counsel, Legal Division
22 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
23 1200 West Washington Street
24 Phoenix, AZ 85007

25 Ernest G. Johnson, Utilities Division
26 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

27 **COPIES** mailed without a copy of the Service List May 21, 2002, to:

28 All parties of record on the service list for
29 Consolidated Docket Nos. E-00000A-01-0051;
30 E-1345A-01-0822; E-00000A-01-0630;
31 E-01933A-02-0069; and E-01933A-98-0471

32 By Sarah Menne