

ORIGINAL



0000133500

RECEIVED

2012 JAN 18 P 2:58

LAWRENCE V. ROBERTSON, JR.

ATTORNEY AT LAW


P. O. Box 1448
TUBAC, ARIZONA 85646

(520) 398-0411
FAX: (520) 398-0412
EMAIL: TUBACLAWYER@AOL.COM

AZ CORP COMMISSION
OF COUNSEL TO
MUNGER CHADWICK
DOCKET CONTROL

ADMITTED TO PRACTICE IN:
ARIZONA, COLORADO, MONTANA,
NEVADA, TEXAS, WYOMING,
DISTRICT OF COLOMBIA

January 18, 2012



JAN 18 2012

DOCKETED
Arizona Corporation Commission

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

Re: Arizona Public Service Company
Docket No. E-01345A-11-0224

To Whom It May Concern:

Enclosed for filing in the above-referenced proceeding are the original and thirteen (13) copies of Mary Lynch's Direct Testimony in support of the Settlement Agreement and proposed Rate Schedule AG-1 on behalf of Noble Americas Energy Solutions LLC, Constellation NewEnergy, Inc., Direct Energy, LLC and Shell Energy North America (US), L.P.

Thank you for your assistance. Please advise me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Angela R. Trujillo
Assistant to
Lawrence V. Robertson, Jr.

RECEIVED

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

COMMISSIONERS

GARY PIERCE, Chairman
BOB STUMP
SANDRA D. KENNEDY
PAUL NEWMAN
BRENDA BURNS

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)


DOCKET NO. E-01345A-11-0224

NOTICE OF FILING OF
PREPARED DIRECT
TESTIMONY OF MARY
LYNCH IN SUPPORT OF THE
SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT
AND RATE SCHEDULE AG-1

Noble Americas Energy Solutions LLC, Constellation NewEnergy, Inc., Direct Energy, LLC and Shell Energy North America (US), L.P. hereby provide notice of filing of the Direct Testimony of Mary Lynch in support of the Settlement Agreement and Rate Schedule AG-1.

Dated this 18th day of January 2012.

Respectfully submitted,



Lawrence V. Robertson, Jr.
Attorney for Noble Americas Energy Solutions LLC, Constellation NewEnergy, Inc., Direct Energy, LLC and Shell Energy North America (US), L.P.

1 The original and thirteen (13) copies
2 of the foregoing will be filed this 18th
3 day of January 2012 with:

4 Docket Control Division
5 Arizona Corporation Commission
6 1200 West Washington Street
7 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

8 A copy of the same served by e-mail or first
9 class mail this same date to:

10 All Parties of Record
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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

**GARY PIERCE, Chairman
BOB STUMP
SANDRA D. KENNEDY
PAUL NEWMAN
BRENDA BURNS**

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)

DOCKET NO. E-01345A-11-0224

**PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY
OF
MARY LYNCH
IN SUPPORT OF THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT
AND RATE SCHEDULE AG-1**

1 **Q.1 Please state your name and business address.**

2 A.1 My name is Mary Lynch. I am based in El Dorado Hills, California where I work
3 from a home office. My corporate address is 100 Constellation Way, Suite 500,
4 Baltimore, Maryland 21202.
5

6
7 **Q.2 By whom are you employed and in what capacity?**

8 A.2 I am employed by Constellation NewEnergy, Inc. ("CNE") as Vice President,
9 Regulatory and Legislative Affairs, West Region. In this capacity, I am
10 responsible for CNE's regulatory and legislative affairs in the WECC region, with
11 a particular focus on market development issues, including retail choice, resource
12 adequacy, capacity markets, utility procurement practices, and emerging
13 environmental requirements.
14

15
16 **Q.3 Please describe your educational background and experience.**

17 A.3 I graduated from California State University at Northridge with a Bachelor of Arts
18 degree in Biology in 1981 and from Northeastern University (Boston,
19 Massachusetts) with a Masters in Business Administration in 1985. Prior to
20 assuming my current responsibilities in the West in 2005, I had lead regulatory
21 responsibilities for CNE's business in the PJM region, and participated extensively
22 in working groups and committees at PJM that focused on electric market design
23 and operation. I have also participated extensively in state regulatory proceedings
24 dealing with the development and design of wholesale competitive energy
25
26

1 procurement practices in Maryland, New Jersey, the District of Columbia,
2 Pennsylvania, Illinois, Delaware, Ohio, and New York.

3 Prior to joining CNE, from 1998 through May of 2002, I served as a vice
4 president with Orion Power Holdings with responsibility for managing the
5 procurement of fossil fuel supplies as well as managing regulatory affairs, with a
6 primary focus on the New York state electric markets. From 1983 through 1998, I
7 held various positions with New England Power Company and U.S. Generating
8 Company managing natural gas supplies procurement operations.
9

10
11
12 **Q.4 Upon whose behalf are you testifying in this proceeding?**

13 A.4 I am testifying on behalf of Noble Americas Energy Solutions LLC, Constellation
14 NewEnergy, Inc., Direct Energy, LLC and Shell Energy North America (US), L.P.
15 (“GSP Parties”). I am providing testimony in support of proposed Rate Schedule
16 AG-1, which is Attachment “J” to the Settlement Agreement.
17

18
19 **Q.5 Are the GSP Parties signatory parties to the January 6, 2012 Settlement**
20 **Agreement?**

21
22 A.5 Yes.
23

24 **Q.6 Please summarize the nature of the testimony that you are presenting.**

25 A.6 My testimony addresses various topics relative to the proposed Experimental Rate
26

1 Rider Schedule AG-1 (“Rate Schedule AG-1”) from the perspective of prospective
2 Generation Service Providers (“GSP”), as that term is defined in Rate Schedule
3 AG-1. If Rate Schedule AG-1 is approved by the Commission, as currently
4 proposed, each of the companies on whose behalf I am testifying has a commercial
5 interest in participating as a GSP. My testimony does not discuss the nature or
6 details of proposed Rate Schedule AG-1, as the APS’ witness has provided that
7 detailed review, making it unnecessary and unproductive for me to simply duplicate
8 the same.
9

10
11
12 **Q.7 Please provide an overview of your testimony.**

13 A.7 In the testimony that follows, I will describe (i) how the GSP Parties intend to
14 proceed in offering service to prospective customers under the Rate Schedule AG-1
15 program and (ii) the potential benefits to prospective customers and the general
16 public under the Rate Schedule AG-1 program. In addition, given the fact that
17 Section 17.1 of the Settlement Agreement expressly states that the Rate Schedule
18 AG-1 program “does not address the subject of retail electric competition,” I will
19 explain later in this testimony how the Rate Schedule AG-1 program differs from
20 retail electric competition as it exists in other jurisdictions.
21
22

23
24 **Q.8 Please describe how the GSP Parties, as prospective GSPs, would proceed in**
25 **offering service to prospective customers under the Rate Schedule AG-1**
26

1 **program.**

2 A.8 The are two parallel sets of activities that will occur in connection with offering
3 service to prospective customers under Rate Schedule AG-1. First, the GSP
4 Parties, as prospective GSPs, will work with other interested parties to finalize the
5 operational details of Rate Schedule AG-1. Specifically, there are references in
6 Rate Schedule AG-1 to "program guidelines" that will address the details of the
7 customer enrollment process, APS's provision of Imbalance Energy, billing by the
8 GSP to APS for energy deliveries, and energy scheduling protocols. The GSP
9 Parties anticipate that preparation of the program guidelines will be accomplished
10 through a collaborative effort of APS, prospective GSPs, and customer
11 representatives, with input and oversight from Commission Staff.

12
13
14 Second, competitive commercial activities will occur. With respect to these
15 activities, Rate Schedule AG-1 allows GSPs to provide wholesale power to APS on
16 behalf of specific customers, who will pay APS for this alternative supply in lieu of
17 other generation related charges to which they are otherwise subject under APS's
18 approved tariffs. The approval of Rate Schedule AG-1 will initiate a highly
19 competitive process during which prospective GSPs will work with interested,
20 eligible customers to structure wholesale supply agreements that meet the
21 customers' pricing and risk management requirements, and that meet contracting
22 and pricing requirements established by Rate Schedule AG-1. The manner in
23 which each prospective GSP approaches this competitive activity is, of course,
24
25
26

1 proprietary to each company and will likely differ to some extent for each
2 prospective GSP. Generally speaking, however, prospective GSPs will work with
3 customers to (i) assist with identifying their metered accounts that can be
4 aggregated for service under Rate Schedule AG-1, (ii) analyze the historic energy
5 usage of those accounts, and (iii) review with them the different types of supply
6 structures and value propositions that the prospective GSP can offer. The goal of
7 these commercial activities will be to reach commercial terms acceptable to both
8 parties for a contract that the GSP will execute with APS for wholesale delivery of
9 energy to APS on the AG-1 eligible customer's behalf.
10
11

12
13 **Q.9 Do the GSP Parties anticipate that there will be active interest in the Rate**
14 **Schedule AG-1 program by qualifying customers?**

15 A.9 It is not possible at this time to predict with certainty the level of interest that
16 eligible customers will have in taking service under Rate Schedule AG-1. Each
17 customer's decision will be predicated upon market conditions that exist at the time
18 they become eligible for service, and whether the prospective GSP is able to offer a
19 value proposition to the eligible customer. Nevertheless, based on customer
20 interest in other Western states that have somewhat similar programs, the GSP
21 Parties anticipate that there will be substantial interest on the part of eligible
22 customers for service under Rate Schedule AG-1.
23
24
25

1 **Q.10 Upon what information or experience is that anticipation based?**

2 A.10 There are several reasons why the GSP Parties have an expectation of substantial
3 customer interest in service under Rate Schedule AG-1:

- 4
- 5 • First, APS has indicated in responses to data requests submitted by
6 the GSP Parties during the discovery phase of the rate case
7 proceeding that (i) “the Company generally anticipates that Schedule
8 AG-1 would be available to retail customers that are currently
9 receiving power from the APS grid,” (ii) “APS anticipates the
10 aggregation provision would allow a significant number of customers
11 to be eligible” and (iii) as of October 31, 2011, APS had estimated
12 potential participation under Rate Schedule AG-1 to include “14
13 customer entities comprising 496 metered accounts and roughly
14 1,650,000 MWh per year.”
15
 - 16 • Second, evidence from other states where the ability for customers to
17 choose alternative, competitively procured electricity has been
18 introduced suggests that there will be significant customer interest and
19 enrollment. For instance, here in the West, California, ground zero
20 for the energy crisis, lifted its suspension of retail choice in 2010 and
21 offered commercial and industrial customers four separate phases in
22 which customers not currently procuring their electricity in a
23 competitive manner could submit notices to procure their electricity
24
25
26

1 needs separate from the utility standard offer. Each phase had a
2 customer participation cap with requests to participate accepted on a
3 first come, first served basis. Each of the first three phases garnered
4 so much customer interest that they were fully subscribed within
5 minutes, and in some cases, within a few seconds. The fourth phase
6 was conducted on January 13, 2012 and the results of that phase are
7 not yet known.

- 9 • Third, Rate Schedule AG-1 service is limited to very large
10 commercial and industrial customers, many of whom have
11 nationwide operations and already have experience shopping for
12 competitively priced electricity in other states. Those same
13 customers, who have accounts in the APS service territory that would
14 be eligible for service under Rate Schedule AG-1, are expected to
15 have a proclivity toward evaluating electricity supply alternatives to
16 determine whether or not their Arizona operations will benefit from
17 enrollment in service under Rate Schedule AG-1. Moreover, these
18 same customers are experienced in stimulating competition among
19 prospective suppliers in order to get “the best deal” possible.
20
21 • Fourth, the Settlement Agreement itself has been signed by several
22 entities that represent likely eligible customers or who are themselves
23 likely to be eligible customers, including Arizona Competitive Power
24
25
26

1 Alliance ("AzCPA"), Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition
2 ("AECC"), Freeport-McMoran Copper and Gold, Inc. ("Freeport-
3 McMoran"), The Kroger Co. ("Kroger"), Wal-Mart Stores, Inc and
4 Sam's West, Inc. ("Wal-Mart"). It is our understanding that several
5 of those parties, including AzCPA, AECC, Freeport McMoRan,
6 Kroger and Wal-Mart, are submitting statements and/or testimony in
7 support of the Settlement Agreement and of Rate Schedule AG-1.
8
9

10
11 **Q.11 Please discuss from the perspective of the GSP Parties, as prospective GSPs,**
12 **what you believe are the potential benefits to (i) prospective customers and (ii)**
13 **the general public under the Rate Schedule AG-1 program.**

14 A.11 A significant potential benefit to customers who will be eligible for service under
15 Rate Schedule AG-1 includes the ability to better manage their energy-related
16 expenses by fixing the pricing of the generation portion of their energy needs by
17 means of the contract executed between APS and the GSP on their behalf. That is,
18 customers who take service under Rate Schedule AG-1 will not be subject to the
19 variability that could otherwise occur with APS' tariffs, such as the E-32-L, E-32
20 TOU-L, E-34, and E-35 rate schedules and various approved APS adjusters
21 applicable to those rate schedules. In addition, competition among GSPs to
22 provide service to eligible Rate Schedule AG-1 customers will create downward
23 pressure on prices and spur the development of innovative energy products and
24
25
26

1 services. Finally, any savings that customers achieve while taking service under
2 Rate Schedule AG-1 can be used to support other aspects of their business,
3 increasing their competitiveness and contribution to the Arizona economy.
4

5
6 **Q.12 Is there a risk that APS' residential customers could be asked in APS' next**
7 **rate case to compensate APS for any unrecovered fixed generation costs that**
8 **APS might experience as a consequence of the Rate Schedule AG-1 program?**

9 A.12 No. Section 17.2 of the Settlement Agreement is expressly worded to preclude that
10 possibility.
11

12
13 **Q.13 Given that the Settlement Agreement expressly states that Rate Schedule AG-**
14 **1 "does not address the subject of retail electric competition," please describe**
15 **the differences between the Rate Schedule AG-1 program and retail electric**
16 **competition.**
17

18 A.13 There are at least two significant differences between retail electric competition as
19 contemplated under Arizona law and the electric service that is provided for under
20 Rate Schedule AG-1. First and foremost, the GSP will transfer title to the
21 electricity the GSP bought, at the direction of an eligible Rate Schedule AG-1
22 customer, to APS at a delivery point outside of APS' network delivery. Upon
23 taking title to the electricity, APS remains the transmission and distribution
24 provider for the Rate Schedule AG-1 customer. In essence, service under Rate
25

1 Schedule AG-1 is not unlike the type of contractual hedging that APS performs to
2 manage its system-wide portfolio of energy costs, except that the contract executed
3 between the GSP and APS pursuant to Rate Schedule AG-1 will be "earmarked"
4 on behalf of a specific customer, who will be billed for energy at the price the Rate
5 Schedule AG-1 customer in question negotiated with the GSP, thereby bypassing
6 the unbundled generation component of their otherwise applicable APS rate
7 schedule.
8

9 A second significant difference between service under Rate Schedule AG-1
10 and retail electric competition is that in Arizona, the retail supplier is required to
11 have first obtained a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity ("CC&N") for that
12 purpose from the Commission, because the retail supplier under retail electric
13 competition is considered to be the load serving entity of the end use customer. A
14 GSP providing energy to APS pursuant to Rate Schedule AG-1 is not required to
15 secure a CC&N because the electricity that the GSP is providing is delivered to
16 APS at a wholesale delivery point; and, as noted above, title to the electricity
17 passes to APS at that time. In that regard, the GSP is NOT utilizing nor paying for
18 access to APS' transmission and distribution network, and APS remains the load
19 serving entity for the retail customer providing all services, including the
20 generation delivery and billing under a Commission approved rate schedule. In
21 this instance, that rate schedule would be Rate Schedule AG-1.
22
23
24
25

26 This structure described above, while significantly different from the

1 typical retail model as implemented across the United States, does contain many
2 program similarities that are in place in a few other states in the West, most notably
3 in Washington and Montana.
4

5
6 **Q.14 Please summarize the program similarities between the proposed AG-1 rate**
7 **schedule and the customer choice programs implemented in Washington and**
8 **Montana.**

9 A.14 Both Washington and Montana are similar to Arizona in that the utilities in those
10 states do not belong to an organized regional transmission organization. Proposed
11 Rate Schedule AG-1 is similar to Puget Sound Energy's Electric Schedule 449 in
12 Washington State and Northwestern Energy's rate schedule CESGTC-1 in
13 Montana.
14

15 Schedule 449 was implemented in 2003 for the largest industrial customers
16 of Puget Sound Energy. These customers are free to negotiate wholesale power
17 deliveries to Puget Sound Energy. Wholesale energy providers, acting on behalf of
18 the customer(s) are not required by the Washington Utilities and Transportation
19 Commission to register, obtain a license or certificate or obtain Commission
20 approval to participate in the program. Puget Sound Energy remains both the
21 balancing authority and the load serving entity.
22

23 In the state on Montana, Northwestern Energy offers their largest industrial
24 customers the opportunity to bypass Northwestern Energy's energy procurement
25

1 portfolio and arrange wholesale energy deliveries with wholesale energy providers
2 under rate schedule CESGTC-1. Similar to Puget Sound Energy's program,
3 Northwestern Energy remains both the balancing authority and the load serving
4 entity. The Montana Public Service Commission does not register, license nor
5 certificate the wholesale energy providers that arrange for electricity deliveries on a
6 wholesale basis.
7

8
9 **Q.15 Do you have any further comments with respect to Rate Schedule AG-1, as**
10 **now proposed?**

11
12 A.15 Yes. The GSP Parties believe that APS's introduction of Rate Schedule AG-1 was
13 a constructive feature of APS's Application. The subsequent modifications and
14 additions to the original rate schedule, which occurred as a result of the settlement
15 negotiations involving parties having an interest in the successful deployment of
16 this type of service, have served to ensure that Rate Schedule AG-1, as now
17 proposed, is in the public interest and should be approved by the Commission.
18

19
20
21 **Q.16 Does that complete your Direct Testimony in support of Rate Schedule AG-1,**
22 **as attached to the Settlement Agreement as Attachment "J"?**

23 A.16 Yes, it does.
24
25

c:\users\angela\documents\larry\aps\2010 rate case 11-0224\noble-constellation-direct-shell\direct test of m. lynch.doc