



0000164056

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS

Arizona Corporation Commission

SUSAN BITTER SMITH - CHAIRMAN
BOB STUMP
BOB BURNS
DOUG LITTLE
TOM FORESE

DOCKETED

SEP 23 2015

DOCKETED BY

RECEIVED
2015 SEP 23 4:49
AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

DOCKET NO. E-01575A-15-0127

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION
OF SULPHUR SPRINGS VALLEY
ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC. FOR
APPROVAL OF A NET METERING
TARIFF SCHEDULE NM-2 AND
REVISIONS TO THE EXISTING NET
METERING TARIFF SCHEDULE NM.

ORIGINAL

~~DOCKET NO. E-01575A-15-0312~~

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
SULPHUR SPRINGS VALLEY ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE, INC., FOR A HEARING TO
DETERMINE THE FAIR VALUE OF ITS
PROPERTY FOR RATEMAKING PURPOSES,
TO FIX A JUST AND REASONABLE
RETURN THEREON, TO APPROVE RATES
DESIGNED TO DEVELOP SUCH RETURN
AND FOR RELATED APPROVALS.

REPLY TO SSVEC'S OPPOSITION TO
STAFF'S MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE

The Utilities Division ("Staff") of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") hereby files a Reply in support of the Motion to Consolidate filed on September 2, 2015. On September 18, 2015, Sulphur Springs Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("SSVEC" or "Cooperative") filed a response in opposition to Staff's Motion to Consolidate (" Staff's Motion"). The Cooperative argues that the relief requested by Staff's Motion will result in prejudice to the Cooperative as a result of the delay. SSVEC asserts that it filed the Net Metering Application because it must immediately address the serious cost shift that is occurring as a result of the rapid increase in customers installing rooftop photovoltaic ("PV") systems pursuant to the SSVEC's existing net metering tariff. As Staff will explain below, granting Staff's Motion will not prejudice the Cooperative's rights; indeed, the rule cited by the Cooperative, at page 2 of its Response supports the Staff's Motion, instead of the Cooperative's Response. A.A.C. R14-3-109(H) provides as follows:

...

1 Consolidation. The Commission or the presiding officer may consolidate Two or
2 more proceedings in one hearing when it appears that **the issues are substantially**
3 **the same** and that the rights of the parties will not be prejudiced by such procedure.
4 At such consolidated hearing the presiding officer shall determine the order in which
all parties shall introduce their evidence and which party or parties shall open and
close (emphasis added).

5 The Cooperative essentially argues that delay equals prejudice, and presents no other argument to
6 support its contention that granting Staff's Motion will prejudice the Cooperative. However, as Staff
7 pointed out in its opening brief in the Net Metering docket (Docket 15-0127, p.3, lines 11-17), there
8 may be other reasons that SSVEC's unrecovered fixed costs have increased other than the
9 installation of PV systems in its service area. There are a range of options that the Commission may
10 consider for mitigation before arriving at a specific relief measure. *Id.* These issues are best addressed
11 in a full rate case. The Cooperative has not demonstrated that it is being prejudiced by any under
12 recovery of fixed costs resulting solely from the installation of PV systems or that any cost shift is
13 occurring. In other words, the Cooperative has not shown that delay equals prejudice in this case.

14 In addition, the Cooperative maintains that it is filing a rate case to "update its current rate
15 design, which is inadequate to address the recovery of the Cooperative's fixed costs." The
16 Cooperative clearly intends to address the alleged under-recovery of fixed costs and alleged costs
17 shifts in its rate case and its pending net metering filing; the following statement is from SSVEC's
18 Rate Case Application merits repeating:

19 While (the Cooperative) is not withdrawing its application in Docket E-01575A-15-
20 0127 at this time, the proposal in this Application supersedes and replaces the
21 Proposal with respect to net metering set forth in Docket E-01575A-15-0127 (Rate
Case Application at page 5, lines 6-8).

22 Furthermore, the Cooperative makes it clear (Response, pages 4-5, lines 27-3, and lines 6-9)
23 that the Cooperative's main objection to Staff's Motion is that the more comprehensive resolution of
24 the cost shift issue, which only a rate case can provide, and which can only begin (and not finish) in a
25 tariff application, will delay action on the net metering application until the rate case is decided. In
26 other words, SSVEC does not rebut Staff's arguments that a rate case is the best method of
27 addressing the cost shift and underecovery of fixed costs issues.

28

1 It would be difficult to find a case where the issues are more “substantially the same” as the
2 issues in the dockets at issue in these cases. The Cooperative has pointed out, in its Rate Case
3 Application, that its net metering proposal in the Rate Case Application supersedes and replaces the
4 net metering proposal in Docket 15-0127. The Cooperative, therefore, would have the Commission
5 and the other parties litigate the net metering proposal twice, simply to begin to address it in the Net
6 Metering Application without waiting for the rate case to be decided. This would, of course, require
7 the Staff and the other parties to expend their time and limited resources to reach, in effect, a
8 temporary solution that may be completely different from the final outcome.

9 Staff submits that the consolidation of cases such as these is the reason that A.A.C. R14-3-
10 109(H) exists.

11 Staff requests that the Administrative Law Judge reject the Cooperative’s opposition to Staff’s
12 Motion, and grant Staff’s motion to consolidate Docket No. E-01575A-15-0127 with Docket No. E-
13 01575A-15-0312.

14 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 23rd day of September, 2015.

15
16 

17 Robert Geake
18 Wesley C. Van Cleve
19 Attorneys, Legal Division
20 Arizona Corporation Commission
21 1200 West Washington Street
22 Phoenix, Arizona 85007
23 (602) 542-3402

24 (RE: Docket No. E-01575A-15-0137)
25 Original and thirteen (13) copies of the
26 foregoing filed this 23rd day
27 of September, 2015, with:

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

...

...

...

1 Copy of the foregoing mailed this
2 23rd day of September, 2015, to:

3 Jeffrey Crockett
4 CROCKETT LAW GROUP, PLLC
5 1702 East Highland Avenue, Suite 204
6 Phoenix, Arizona 85016
7 Attorneys for Sulphur Springs Valley
8 Electric Cooperative

9 Michael A. Curtis
10 William P. Sullivan
11 Curtis, Goodwin, Sullivan,
12 Udall & Schwab, P.L.C.
13 501 East Thomas Road
14 Phoenix, Arizona 83012
15 Attorneys for Mohave Electric Cooperative,
16 and Navopache Electric Cooperative

17 Tyler Carlson, CEO
18 Mohave Electric Cooperative, Inc.
19 P.O. Box 1045
20 Bullhead City, Arizona 86430


21 Peggy Gillman, Manager of Public Affairs
22 Mohave Electric Cooperative, Inc.
23 P.O. Box 1045
24 Bullhead City, Arizona 86430

25 Paul O'Dair, Manager of Financial Services
26 Navopache Electric Cooperative, Inc.
27 1878 West White Mountain Blvd.
28 Lakeside, Arizona 85929

(RE: Docket No. E-01575A-15-0312)
Copy of the foregoing mailed this
23rd day of September, 2015, to:

Jeffrey Crockett
CROCKETT LAW GROUP, PLLC
1702 East Highland Avenue, Suite 204
Phoenix, Arizona 85016
Attorneys for Sulphur Springs Valley
Electric Cooperative

Kirby Chapman
Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc.
311 E. Wilcox
Sierra Vista, Arizona 85635



Charles Moore, Chief Executive Officer
Navopache Electric Cooperative, Inc.
1878 West White Mountain Blvd.
Lakeside, Arizona 85929

Mark Holohan, Chairman
Arizona Solar Energy Industries Association
2122 West Lone Cactus Drive, Suite 2
Phoenix, Arizona 85027

Court S. Rich
Rose Law Group PC
7144 East Stetson Drive, Suite 300
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251
Attorneys for the Alliance for Solar Choice

Thomas Loquvam
Pinnacle West Capital Corporation
P.O. Box 5399, MS 8695
Phoenix, Arizona 85027

Gregory Bernosky
Arizona Public Service Company
P.O. Box 5399, MS 8695
Phoenix, Arizona 85027