



0000112591

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED
AZ CORP COMMISSION

DEC 3 4 38 PM '98

DOCUMENT CONTROL

JIM IRVIN
COMMISSIONER-CHAIRMAN
RENZ D. JENNINGS
COMMISSIONER
CARL J. KUNASEK
COMMISSIONER

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION) DOCKET NO. E-01933A-98-0471
OF TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER)
COMPANY FOR APPROVAL OF ITS)
STRANDED COST RECOVERY)

IN THE MATTER OF THE FILING OF) DOCKET NO. E-01933A-97-0772
TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY)
OF UNBUNDLED TARIFFS PURSUANT)
TO A.A.C.R14-2-1601 et seq.)


IN THE MATTER OF COMPETITION IN) DOCKET NO. RE-00000C-94-0165
THE PROVISION OF ELECTRIC)
SERVICES THROUGHOUT THE STATE)
OF ARIZONA)

NOTICE OF FILING

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

DEC 03 1998

DOCKETED BY 

The Department of Defense (the "DOD") hereby files the original and ten (10) copies of the direct testimony of Dan L. Neidlinger on the proposed Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") between the ACC Staff and Tucson Electric Power Company ("TEP") with reference to the above dockets. Copies of this testimony have been faxed and mailed to the attached Service List.

Respectfully submitted this 30th day of November, 1998.

Sincerely,



Peter Q. Nyce Jr.
General Attorney
Regulatory Law Office
United States Army Legal Services Agency
901 North Stuart Street
Arlington, VA 22203-1837

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

**PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT ("AGREEMENT") BETWEEN THE
STAFF OF THE ACC AND TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY ("TEP")**

DOCKET NO. E-019133A-98-0471, et al.

Direct Testimony of Dan L. Neidlinger

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, ADDRESS AND OCCUPATION.

A. My name is Dan L. Neidlinger. My business address is 3020 North 17th Drive, Phoenix, Arizona. I am President of Neidlinger & Associates, Ltd., a consulting firm specializing in utility rate economics.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE.

A. A summary of my professional qualifications and experience is included in the attached Statement of Qualifications. In addition to the Arizona Corporation Commission ("ACC" or the "Commission"), I have presented expert testimony before regulatory commissions and agencies in Alaska, Colorado, Guam, Idaho, New Mexico, Nevada, Texas, Utah, Wyoming and the Province of Alberta, Canada.

Q. ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU APPEARING IN THIS PROCEEDING?

A. I am appearing on behalf of the interests of the United States Department of Defense, and all other Federal Executive Agencies (hereinafter referred to as the "DOD"). The DOD facilities affected by the proposed Agreement in this proceeding are Fort Huachuca, located near Sierra Vista, Arizona and Davis-Monthan Air Force Base in Tucson. Both of these installations currently receive service from TEP under Rate Schedule 14, the Large Light & Power rate.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to discuss certain provisions of the proposed Agreement between the ACC Staff and TEP. More specifically, my testimony addresses the anticompetitive aspects of the Agreement, the conflicts between the Agreement and the Commission's generic

decision on stranded costs, Decision No. 60977, and the imbalance with respect to the interests of TEP's customers.

Q. HAVE YOU BEEN PROVIDED ADEQUATE TIME IN THIS CASE TO ANALYZE AND REVIEW THE DETAILS OF THE PROPOSED AGREEMENT?

A. No. In past rate proceedings for TEP, a period of four to six months would normally be provided to conduct discovery, analyze in depth all aspects of the rate proposal and to prepare direct testimony. In this case, a case that involves decisions on dollar amounts that are conceivably 15 to 20 times greater than any prior rate proceeding, intervenors have been provided only a few days to complete the same activities. The apparent prejudicial provisions of the Agreement have been extended to the hearing process.

Q. HAVE YOU REACHED ANY CONCLUSIONS BASED ON YOUR LIMITED REVIEW?

A. Yes. My conclusions are as follows:

- 1.) The Agreement will not provide for any meaningful competition in Arizona;
- 2.) TEP's interim transition charge ("ITC") will recover millions of dollars that are not stranded costs;
- 3.) TEP's Market Generation Credit ("MGC") adder is not a pure market adder, in contrast with the adder proposed by Arizona Public Service Company ("APS");
- 4.) The Agreement does not provide for a balancing of interests of stakeholders, as required by Decision No. 60977; and
- 5.) The Agreement could result in the recovery from TEP's ratepayers of more than 100% of TEP's stranded costs.

Q. STAFF WITNESS WILLIAMSON IMPLIES ON PAGE 2 OF HIS PREPARED TESTIMONY THAT THE AGREEMENT WILL "FOSTER THE DEVELOPMENT OF ROBUST AND MEANINGFUL COMPETITION AT THE EARLIEST POSSIBLE DATE". DO YOU AGREE?

A. No. TEP's proposed methodology for calculating ITCs will provide an effective barrier for competition for at least two years. Under the Generation Rates ("GRs") proposed by TEP

for Rate 14 customers and using its ITC calculation method, Fort Huachuca's direct access total charges would be approximately 7 cents per kilowatt-hour ("KWH") for the first quarter of 1999 in contrast with the 6.3 cents per KWH that would be experienced under TEP's standard offer Rate 14. This would represent an 11% increase in the Fort's power bill for this period.

Q. APS WITNESS DAVIS HAS ASSUMED THAT THE AVERAGE MARKET PRICE FOR POWER IN 1999 WILL BE 2.6 CENTS PER KWH. WHAT WOULD BE THE EFFECT OF THE FORT'S ANNUAL 1999 BILL AS A DIRECT ACCESS CUSTOMER UNDER THIS ASSUMPTION?

A. Under Mr. Davis's assumption that the market price of power for 1999 will average 2.6 cents per KWH, the Fort's annual bill under direct access would be approximately \$647,000 or 9.8% greater than the bill under the standard offer rate.

Q. WHAT DO YOU CONCLUDE FROM THIS ANALYSIS?

A. I conclude that the Fort will be unable to compete its load beginning in 1999 since alternative power suppliers will be unable to even match, let alone beat, TEP's current standard offer rate.

Q. WILL ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SERVICE PROVIDERS ("ESPs") BE ANXIOUS TO COMPETE IN TEP'S SERVICE TERRITORY UNDER THIS AGREEMENT?

A. No. It is unlikely, in my view, that alternative ESPs will interested in bidding on any of TEP's current loads under the proposed direct access ratemaking scheme since there is little opportunity to provide the customer with lower power bills. Since APS's proposed ITC calculation is comparable to TEP's, from an end result perspective, a similar response (non-response) may be experienced by customers in APS's service territory. Under TEP's proposed method for calculating ITCs, there will be no meaningful competition for at least two years.

Q. THE COMMISSION HAS PROCLAIMED TIME AND AGAIN THAT IT WANTS COMPETITION IN ARIZONA BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 1999. HOW CAN THIS BE ACHIEVED IN TEP'S SERVICE AREA?

A. Competition can become a reality beginning in 1999 if TEP's proposed GRs are reduced to levels that approximate, on an interim basis, TEP's stranded generation costs. As discussed later, the recalculation of TEP's GRs could push forward the targeted January 1, 1999 date to February or March of 1999.

Q. HOW WERE TEP'S GRs DEVELOPED?

A. The GRs were developed by deducting allocated distribution and transmission costs from average, currently approved, standard offer rates. They produce ITCs that are not even a reasonable facsimile of TEP's stranded costs. One would expect to see a calculation methodology, for instance, that produces an ITC at or near the 1.8 cents per KWH permanent CTC shown on Schedule 4 of TEP's Stranded Cost Filing. Instead, TEP's ITCs for Rate 14 customers will probably be in the range of 2.5 to 2.8 cents except during one or two summer months. Assuming Mr. Davis's average market price of 2.6 cents for 1999, TEP's ITC for Rate 14 customers averages 2.7 cents.

Q. DID TEP OR THE ACC STAFF ATTEMPT TO IDENTIFY OR ESTIMATE TEP'S STRANDED COSTS ON AN INTERIM BASIS AND ALLOCATE THESE COSTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH DECISION NO. 60977?

A. No. The proposed GR for Rate 14 customers, for instance, is 5.78 cents per KWH. As previously discussed, this rate is a calculated amount with no underpinnings from a cost of service standpoint. It was developed using a multiple timeframes for the determination of class allocation factors, FERC jurisdictional allocations, operating expenses and class billing units. It is impossible to tie or reconcile the costs included in the 5.78 cent GR to defined time period or to TEP's accounting records. There was no attempt made by TEP or the Staff to estimate TEP's current stranded generation costs and allocate them in accordance with Decision No. 60977. It is clear, however, that the 5.78 cent GR includes tens of millions of dollars of costs, including general and administrative costs, that are not stranded costs. Accordingly, TEP's proposed GRs are excessive and produce ITCs that are overstated.

Q. ASSUMING THAT 1.8 CENTS PER KWH IS A REASONABLE ESTIMATE OF TEP'S STRANDED COSTS, WHAT IS THE MAGNITUDE OF THE OVERCOLLECTIONS UNDER TEP'S PROPOSED ITCs FOR TEP'S INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS?

A. If 1.8 cents per KWH is assumed as a reasonable proxy for TEP's stranded costs, the annual overcollections of stranded costs under TEP's proposed ITCs range from \$17 to \$20 million for Large Light & Power Customers, including special contracts. Direct access overcharges for stranded costs to Fort Huachuca are in the range of \$700,000 to \$1,000,000 annually under this assumption. Since ESPs will not absorb these excessive charges, there will be no competitive marketplace for these large customers. These facts totally contradict the notion that the "big dogs will eat first and eat well".

Q. HOW SHOULD THIS DEFICIENCY BE CORRECTED?

A. First, I suggest that the Commission abandoned the "not too high, not too low, but just right" approach for setting MGCs advocated by Staff witness Smith. There is too much at stake to be tweaking and "fiddling" with these credit amounts to achieve a preconceived outcome. I might add, it is not clear from either Mr. Smith's testimony or Mr. Williamson's testimony how they view that outcome. Next, TEP's GRs should be recalculated by estimating TEP's stranded generation costs using 1998 rate base and operating expenses and allocating these costs to customer classes based on the allocation methodology prescribed in Decision No. 60977. As previously mentioned, the result of this recalculation should be at or near the estimated 1.8 cents per KWH permanent CTC provided in TEP's stranded cost filing. This additional analysis could be completed in January, 1999 and would delay the initiation of competition by only two to three months.

Q. SHOULD THE RECALCULATION OF TEP'S GRS INCLUDE A RECALCULATION OF TRANSMISSION COSTS?

A. Yes. TEP's cost of ancillary transmission services should be segregated in the cost allocation and not included in its GRs. APS's proposed market "adder" for high load factor customers is pure market adder of 2.7 mills per KWH compared with TEP's 2.6 mills. TEP's adder, however, is for ancillary transmission services and not a pure market adder. Since Fort Huachuca's ancillary transmission costs are approximately 1.7 mills per KWH, the effective pure

market adder for the Fort is only 0.9 mills. The Commission should be consistent in the manner in which these adders are calculated and applied if it wishes to encourage competition through this mechanism.

Q. DOES THE AGREEMENT PROVIDE FOR A BALANCING OF INTERESTS OF THE VARIOUS STAKEHOLDERS?

A. No, it does not. Finding No. 26 of Decision No. 60977 states: "Any stranded cost recovery methodology must balance the interests of Affected Utilities, ratepayers, and a move toward competition." The Agreement is completely contrary to this finding since none of the interests of the ratepayers have been considered. The recent minor rate concessions provided by TEP are not part of this Agreement but authorized pursuant to another Commission decision. Further, the Agreement is in conflict with Finding No. 18 which states: "Affected Utilities should have a reasonable opportunity to collect 100 percent of their unmitigated stranded costs." and Finding No. 20 which states: "Traditional regulation does not guarantee 100 percent recovery of costs but only a reasonable opportunity to recover costs." The Agreement essentially provides a guarantee that all stranded costs will be recovered from the ratepayers. The traditional ratemaking concept of "reasonable opportunity" has been abandoned.

Q. DOES THE AGREEMENT REQUIRE TEP TO UNDERTAKE SPECIFIC ACTIONS TO MITIGATE STRANDED COSTS?

A. No, it does not. The Agreement is silent with respect to stranded cost mitigation efforts mandated on TEP other than a partial divestiture of its generation assets. The Agreement assures that TEP will fully recover all costs, prior to divestiture, through standard offer rates or the ITCs.

Q. WHAT ABOUT THE PROVISION TO GIVE TEP THE FIRST 35% OF ANY NEGATIVE STRANDED COSTS RESULTING FROM THE DIVESTITURE OF GENERATION ASSETS?

A. This is another example of a complete disregard for the interests of TEP's ratepayers -- blatant discrimination. In all fairness, TEP should be required to absorb the first 35% of any

positive stranded costs resulting from divestiture activities. Another "heads I win, tails you lose" provision.

Q. WHAT ABOUT THE PROPOSED SWAP OF TEP'S NAVAJO AND FOUR CORNERS GENERATING FACILITIES FOR SOME OF APS'S TRANSMISSION FACILITIES AT BOOK VALUE?

A. I have not had time to evaluate in detail this proposed swap. However, in all likelihood, the Navajo and Four Corners facilities would auction at a premium over book value whereas the Springerville generating facilities may not realize a premium. Should this be the case, TEP would recover more than 100% of its stranded costs unless an adjustment is made to reflect the premiums that would accrue from the auctioning of the Navajo and Four Corners facilities.

Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY CONCLUDING COMMENTS?

A. Yes. In summary, it is my view that the proposed Agreement fails to accomplish any of the Commission's stated objectives in this endeavor such as the development of robust competitive market, a "level playing field" for all participants or a balancing of interests of the stakeholders. The Commission should not be hurried into making a decision involving hundreds of millions of dollars that will affect TEP's ratepayers for the next 10 years. It should take the time needed to evaluate in depth every aspect of the Agreement. There is not adequate time between now and December 31st to conduct a prudent and thorough investigation.

Q. DOES THAT CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

A. Yes, it does.

DAN L. NEIDLINGER

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS

I. General:

Mr. Neidlinger is President of Neidlinger & Associates, Ltd., a Phoenix consulting firm specializing in utility rate economics and financial management. During his consulting career, he has managed and performed numerous assignments related to utility ratemaking and energy management.

II. Education:

Mr. Neidlinger was graduated from Purdue University with a Bachelor of Science degree in Electrical Engineering. He also holds a Master of Science degree in Industrial Management from Purdue's Krannert Graduate School of Management. He is a licensed Certified Public Accountant in Arizona and Ohio.

III. Consulting Experience:

Mr. Neidlinger has presented expert testimony on financial, accounting, cost of service and rate design issues in regulatory proceedings throughout the western United States involving companies from every segment of the utility industry. Testimony presented to these regulatory agencies has been on behalf of commission staffs, applicant utilities, industrial intervenors and consumer agencies. He has also testified in a number of civil litigation matters involving utility ratemaking and once served as a Special Master to a Nevada court in a law suit involving a Nevada public utility.

Mr. Neidlinger has performed numerous feasibility studies related to energy management including cogeneration, self-generation, peak shaving and load-shifting analyses for clients with large electric loads. In addition, he has conducted electric and gas privatization studies for U. S. Army installations and assisted these and other consumer clients in contract negotiations with utility providers of electric, gas and wastewater service.

Mr. Neidlinger has extensive experience in the costing and pricing of utility services. During his consulting career, he has been responsible for the design and implementation of utility rates for over 30 electric, gas, water and wastewater utility clients ranging in size from 50 to 25,000 customers.

IV. Professional Affiliations:

Professional affiliations include the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and the Association of Energy Engineers.

Docket Control
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Jerry Rudibaugh, Chief Hearing Officer
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Ray T. Williamson
Acting Director, Utilities Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 W. Washington Street, Room 206
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Greg Patterson
Residential Utility Consumer Office
2828 N. Central Ave., Suite 1200
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Bradley Carroll
TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER CO.
P.O. BOX 711
Tucson, AZ 85702

Douglas C. Nelson
DOUGLAS C. NELSON, P.C.
7000 N. 16th Street, Suite 120-307
Phoenix, AZ 85020
Attorneys for Electric Competition Coalition, ENRON Corp.
and ENRON Energy Services

Michael M. Grant
GALLAGHER & KENNEDY
2600 N. Central Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85004
Attorneys for AEPSCO, Graham County Electric Cooperative,
Duncan Valley Electric Cooperative

Sam DeFraw
Department of Navy
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Navy Rate Intervention
901 M. Street SE, Bldg. 212
Washington, DC. 20374

Betty Pruitt
ARIZONA COMMUNITY ACTION ASSOCIATION
2627 North 3rd Street, Suite Two
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Paul Bullis, Chief Counsel
Legal Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Barbara A. Klemstine
Arizona Public Service Company
P.O. Box 53999, M.S. 9909
Phoenix, AZ 85072-3999

Craig A. Marks
CITIZENS UTILITIES COMPANY
2901 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1660
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Phyllis Rowe
ARIZONA CONSUMERS COUNCIL
6841 N. 15th Place
Phoenix, AZ 85014

C. Webb Crockett
FENNEMORE CRAIG, P.C.
3003 North Central Avenue, Suite 2600
Phoenix, AZ 85012-2913
Attorneys for ASARCO, Inc., Cyprus Climax Metals Co.,
AAEC and Arizonans For Electric Choice & Competition

Lex J. Smith
Michael Pattern
BROWN & BAIN, P.C.
2901 N. Central Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85001-0400
Attorneys for Morenci Water & Electric, Ajo Improvement
Phelps Dodge Corp., and Illinova Energy Partners

Lawrence V. Robertson Jr.
MUNGER CHADWICK, PLC
333 North Wilmot, Suite 300
Tucson, AZ 85711-2634
Attorneys for PG&E Energy and Arizona School Boards
Assn.

Michael A. Curtis
MARTINEZ & CURTIS, P.C.
2712 North 7th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85006-1003
Attorneys for Arizona Municipal Power Users' Association

Walter W. Meek, President
ARIZONA UTILITY INVESTORS ASSOCIATION
2100 N. Central Avenue, Suite 210
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Charles R. Huggins
ARIZONA STATE AFL-CIO
5818 N. 7th Street, Suite 200
Phoenix, AZ 85014-8511

Karen Glennon
19037 N. 44th Avenue
Glendale, AZ 85308

Thomas C. Horne
Michael S. Dulberg
HORNE, KAPLAN & BISTROW, P.C.
40 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2800
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Debra Jackson
Andrew Bettwy
SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATION
5241 Spring Mountain Rd.
Las Vegas, NV 89102

Steve Brittle
DON'T WASTE ARIZONA, INC.
6205 South 12th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85040

COLUMBUS ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.
P.O. BOX 631
Deming, NM. 88031

DIXIE ESCALANTE RURAL ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION
CR Box 95
Beryl, Utah 84714

MOHAVE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.
P.O. BOX 1045
Bullhead City, AZ 86430

ARIZONA DEPT. OF COMMERCE
ENERGY OFFICE
3800 North Central Avenue, 12th floor
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Creden Huber
SULPHUR SPRINGS VALLEY
ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE
P.O. BOX 820
Willcox, AZ 85644

A.B. Baardson
NORDIC POWER
4281 N. Summerset
Tucson, AZ 85715

Rick Gilliam
LAND AND WATER FUND OF THE ROCKIES
2260 Baseline Road, Suite 200
Boulder, CO. 80302

David C. Kennedy
ATTORNEY AT LAW
2001 N. 3rd Street, Suite 212
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Norman J. Furuta
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
900 Commodore Drive, Bldg. 107
P.O. Box 272 (Attn: Code 90C)
San Bruno, CA. 94066-0720
Attorneys for Secretary Of Defense

Barbara S. Bush
COALITION FOR RESPONSIBLE ENERGY
EDUCATION
315 West Riviera Drive
Tempe, AZ 85252

Rick Lavis
ARIZONA COTTON GROWERS ASSOCIATION
4139 East Broadway Road
Phoenix, AZ 85040

AJO IMPROVEMENT COMPANY
P.O. Drawer 9
Ajo, AZ 85321

CONTINENTAL DIVIDE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE
P.O. BOX 1087
Grants, NM. 87020

GARKANE POWER ASSOCIATION, INC.
P.O. BOX 790
Richfield, Utah 84701

MORENCI WATER AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
P.O. BOX 68
Morenci, AZ 85540

Choi Lee
PHELPS DODGE CORP.
2600 N. Central Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85004-3014

Mick McElrath
CYPRUS CLIMAX METALS CO.
P.O. Box 22015
Tempe, AZ 85285-2015

Michael Rowley
c/o CALPINE POWER SERVICES
50 West San Fernando, Suite 550
San Jose, CA. 95113

Dan Neidlinger
3020 N. 17th Drive
Phoenix, AZ 85015

Patricia Cooper
Arizona Electric Power Cooperative
P.O. Box 670
Benson, AZ 85602-0670

Marv Athey
TRICO ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE
P.O. Box 35970
Tucson, AZ 85740

Wayne Retzlaff
NAVOPACHE ELECTRIC CO-OP INC.
P.O. BOX 308
Lakeside, AZ 85929

Jack Shilling
DUNCAN VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE
P.O. BOX 440
Duncan, AZ 85534

Barry Huddleston
DESTEC ENERGY
P.O. Box 4411
Houston, TX. 77210-4411

Terry Ross
CENTER FOR ENERGY
AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
P.O. Box 288
Franktown, CO. 80116

K.R. Saline
Jeff Woner
K.R. SALINE & ASSOCIATES
Consulting Engineers
160 N. Pasadena, #101
Mesa, AZ 85201-6764

Peter Q. Nyce, Jr.
Regulatory Law Office
Department of the Army
JALS-RL, Suite 713
901 No. Stuart Street
Arlington, VA 22203-1837

Ellen Corkhill
AARP
5606 North 17th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85016

Larry McGraw
USDA-RUS
6266 Weeping Willow
Rio Rancho, NM. 87124

Jessica Youle
Jane D. Alfano
SALT RIVER PROJECT
P.O. Box 52025 - PAB 300
Phoenix, AZ 85072-2025

Clifford Cauthen
GRAHAM COUNTY ELECTRIC CO-OP
P.O. Drawer B
Pima, AZ 85543

Joe Eichelberger
MAGMA COPPER COMPANY
P.O. BOX 37
Superior, AZ 85273

Steve Kean
ENRON
P.O. BOX 1188
Houston, TX. 77251-1188

Nancy Russell
ARIZONA ASSOCIATION OF INDUSTRIES
1111 North 3rd Street
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Steve Montgomery
JOHNSON CONTROLS
2032 West 4th Street
Tempe, AZ 85281

George Allen
Michelle Ahlmer
ARIZONA RETAILERS ASSOCIATION
137 E. University Drive
Mesa, AZ 85201

Louis A. Stahl
STREICH LANG
2 North Central Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Sheryl Johnson
TEXAS-NEW MEXICO POWER CO.
4100 International Plaza
Forth Worth, TX. 76109

Andrew Gregorich
BHP COPPER
P.O. BOX M
San Manuel, AZ 85631-0460

Jim Driscoll
ARIZONA CITIZEN ACTION
2430 S. Mill, Suite 237
Tempe, AZ 85282

William Baker
ELECTRICAL DISTRICT NO. 6
P.O. BOX 16450
Phoenix, AZ 85011

Wallace Tillman, Chief Counsel
NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION
4301 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22203-1860

Robert S. Lynch
340 E. Palm Lane, Suite 140
Phoenix, AZ 85004-4529
Attorneys for Arizona Transmission Dependent Utility Group
Irrigation and Electric District of Arizona

Michael Block
Goldwater Institute
Bank One Center
201 North Central
Concourse Level
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Carl Robert Aron
Executive Vice President and COO
Itron, Inc.
2818 N. Sullivan Road
Spokane, WA 99216

Albert Sterman
ARIZONA CONSUMERS COUNCIL
2849 East 8th Street
Tucson, AZ 85716

Steven M. Wheeler
Thomas M. Mumaw
SNELL & WILMER
One Arizona Center
400 E. Van Buren Street
Phoenix, AZ 85004-0001
Attorneys for APS

William Sullivan
MARTINEZ & CURTIS, P.C.
2716 N. 7th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85006
Attorneys for Mohave Electric Cooperative
and Navopache Electric Coop.

Roderick G. McDougall, City Attorney
Jesse Sears, Assistant Chief Counsel
City of Phoenix
200 W. Washington St., Suite 1300
Phoenix, AZ 85003-1611

John Jay List
General Counsel
NATIONAL RURAL UTILITIES
COOPERATIVE FINANCE CORP.
2201 Cooperative Way
Herndon, VA 21071

Robert Julian
PPG
1500 Merrell Lane
Beigrade, MT 59714

Douglas A. Oglesby
Vantus Energy Corporation
353 Sacramento Street, Suite 1900
San Francisco, CA 94111

Stan Barnes
Copper State Consulting Group
100 W. Washington Street, Suite 1415
Phoenix, AZ 85003

Tom Broderick
PG & E
6900 East Camelback Rd. #700
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

Vinnie Hunt
CITY OF TUCSON
Department of Operations
4004 S. Park Avenue, Bldg. #2
Tucson, AZ 85714

Larry K. Udall
Arizona Municipal Power User's Assoc.
2712 N. 7th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85006-1090

Elizabeth S. Firkins
INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD
OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, L.U. #1116
750 S. Tucson Blvd.
Tucson, AZ 85716-5698

Barry, Hetzer, Stickle & Schutzman
Court Reporters
2627 N. Third Street, Suite 3
Phoenix, AZ 85004-1103

Carl W. Dabelstein
2211 E. Edna Avenue
Phoenix, AZ. 85002

Thomas W. Pickrell
Arizona School Board Association, Inc.
2100 North Central Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Christopher Hitchcock
HITCHCOCK, HICKS & CONLOGUE
Copper Queen Plaza
P.O. Box 87
Bisbee, AZ 85603-0087
Attorneys for Sulphur Springs Valley
and Electric Cooperative Inc.

Fredda J. Bisman
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
3939 Civic Center Blvd.
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

Michael B. Day
Goodin, McBride, Squeri, Schlotz & Ritchie
505 Sansome Street, Suite 900
San Francisco, CA 94111

Bradford A. Borman
PacifiCorp
One Utah Center, Suite 800
201 South Main Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84140

Dr. Mark Cooper
Citizens Research
504 Highgate Terrace
Silver Spring, MD 20904

John T. Travers
William H. Nau
272 Market Square, Suite 2724
Lake Forest, Illinois 60045

Chuck Miessner
New Energy Ventures
P.O. Box 711, mailstop-DA308
Tucson, AZ 85702

Raymond S. Heyman
Darlene M. Wauro
ROSHKA, HEYMAN & DEWULF, PLC
Two Arizona Center
400 North 5th Streets, Suite 1000
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Kenneth C. Sundlof
Jennings, Strouss & Salmon, PLC
Two North Central Avenue, 16th Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85004

William J. Murphy
200 W. Washington St., Suite 1400
Phoenix, AZ 85003-1611

Russell E. Jones
O'CONNOR, CAVANAGH, MOLLOY, JONES
33 N. Stone Ave., Suite 2100
P.O. Box 2268
Tucson, AZ 85702
Attorneys for Trico Electric Cooperative, Inc.

Myron L. Scott
Attorney at Law
1628 E. Southern Avenue, No. 9-328
Tempe, AZ 85252-2179
Attorneys for Arizona for a Better Environment

Peter Glaser
DOHERTY, RUMBLE & BUTLER, PA
1401 New York Ave., N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005

Suzanne M. Dallimore
Antitrust Unit Chief
ARIZONA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
1275 West Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

James C. Paine
Stoel Rives, LLP
Standard Insurance Center
900 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2300
Portland, OR 97204-1268
Attorneys for PacifiCorp

Barbara Sherman
Chairman Watchdog Committee
120 E. McKellips Road
Tempe, AZ 85281-1118

Timothy Michael Toy
Winthrop, Stimson, Putnam & Roberts
One Battery Park Plaza
New York, New York 10004-1490

Jeffrey Walker Martin
New Energy Ventures
1000 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 500
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Steven C. Gross
PORTER & SIMON
40200 Truckee Airport Road
Truckee, CA 96161
(Attorney for M-S-R Public Power Agency)

Timothy M. Hogan
Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest
202 E. McDowell Rd., Suite 153
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Marcia Weeks
18970 North 116th Lane
Surprise, AZ 85374

Stephanie A. Conaghan
DUANE, MORRIS & HECKSCHER LLP
1667 K Street N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006-1608