



ORIGINAL

E-0000001-14-0023

RECEIVED

P.O. Box 1046, Bullhead City, AZ 86430

2015 DEC -9 A 9: 23

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL


December 8, 2015

Chairman Susan Bitter Smith
Arizona Corporation Commission
Commissioners Wing
1200 W. Washington – 2nd Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85007

(sent via email to ChairmanBitter@azcc.gov)

DOCKETED

DEC 09 2015

DOCKETED BY 

Dear Chairman Bitter Smith:

My name is Lyn R. Opalka. I've been a resident in Mohave County and been a member of the Mohave Electric Cooperative (MEC) since 1966. Currently, and for 20 years, I've been the President of the Board of Mohave Electric. I've worked in a number of businesses in the area and have been active in the community served by Mohave and in its health care, government, as well as was one of the original founders of the Colorado River Republican Women's group.

We cannot understand why Mohave has been included in the generic proceeding before you by the Law Judge. We do not have an active Net Metering filing nor have proposed Net Metering changes in charges. We are not a party to the APS rate filing that initiated the generic proceeding. We are not sure if you are aware that the recent Law Judge order unnecessarily swept up MEC in a matter of significance and relevance only to APS and TEP concerning their net metering and distributed generation issues.

By all measures our service territory economics are depressed. I see it every day. The cost of living is critical in this area. Electricity is a key cost. Our fixed income retirees, which represent a significant number of our membership, can't afford increases in essential services such as electricity. Please do not force our members to unnecessarily spend tens of thousands of dollars in a proceeding that we are not a party to, and cannot be described to our member/voters as reasonable or rational.

Our Cooperative has no issues before the Commission concerning net metering and distributed generation; we cannot reasonably describe to our members why we are a party, we have no data to present, nor analysis of the issues brought by APS or issues of the Commission. We will, just to comply with the ALJ ordered mailed notice to members, be forced to incur the cost of postage (approximately \$20,000 alone) and the cost of labor, which in total may well exceed a dollar per meter; and only serve to confuse our members as we have issue in play. We will spend countless hours explaining why we are being arbitrarily required to publish and communicate to members on an issue that we are not seeking to resolve or change.



Chairman Bitter Smith
December 8, 2015
Page 2

The cost of mailing does not include the expense of hiring consultants to eventually answer questions and provide data/analysis to respond to question of the proceeding. Small utilities like MEC do not have on staff Rate Personnel and only hire consultants when we seek a rate change. There will also be the cost of devoting management time to research the Commission proceeding issues, taking away time from actual MEC issues and programs. The APS and TEP issues in the pending APS and TEP cases are not being sought for resolution by MEC.

Please exclude MEC from the generic proceeding first, because the issues before you do not come from the Cooperative; second, because of the tremendous direct and indirect unnecessary costs that will be inflicted on the Cooperative and its members; and third and lastly, the lack of relevant and significant information to be produced and developed from MEC that would be of benefit to the Commission or the members of the Cooperative.

Please instruct the Judge to exclude Mohave Electric from this proceeding as it provides little or no value to our 33,000 members except raise their costs and confuse them. I am also concerned about the due process elements of the Order that has been issued, but appeal to you for relief.

Sincerely
MOHAVE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.



Lyn R. Opalka
President of the Board

Cc: Commissioners Forese, Little, Stump, Burns (via email)