IGINAL BEFORE THE A COMMISSIONERS	ARIZONA COF Arizona Corporatic DOCK	on Commission	00001675
DOUG LITTLE, Interim Chairman BOB STUMP ROBERT BURNS TOM FORESE IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLIC UNS ELECTRIC, INC. FOR THE	JAN 2 S	9 2016 V RE VOI6 J	CEIVED AN 29 P 12: 52 REFERENTINGSION KETEROLIA2
ESTABLISHMENT OF JUST AND REASONABLE RATES AND CHA DESIGNED TO REALIZE A REAS RATE OF RETURN ON THE FAIR THE PROPERTIES OF UNS ELECT DEVOTED TO ITS OPERATIONS THROUGHOUT THE STATE OF A AND FOR RELATED APPROVAL	RGES ONABLE VALUE OF TRIC, INC. ARIZONA	REPLY IN SU MOTION TO	PPORT OF
The Arizona Utility Ratepaye	er Alliance, ("AU	RA"), hereby repli	es in support of its
January 26, 2016, Motion to Extend	Procedural Sched	lule.	
AURA has two important poi	nts. The first por	int is that AURA is	s more concerned than
ever that due process requires signific	cantly more time	for the parties to e	valuate UNSE's rate-
design proposal, conduct discovery, a	and prepare testir	nony than the few	weeks remaining before
the February 19, 2016, deadline. The	e lack of notice to	o affected parties is	also a significant
concern. AURA need not repeat its i	nitial argument,	nor those of the pa	rties that support
AURA's motion. The only thing to a	idd is that it woul	ld hardly be in UN	SE's interest if the
Commission's Decision in this docke	t were reversed o	on appeal because	parties were not afforded
due process, either because the proce	dural schedule w	as not extended, or	r because affected parties
did not receive sufficient notice of U	NSE's significan	tly revised rate-des	sign proposal. ¹
Second, AURA is not asking	for delay for dela	ay's sake. AURA	understands the need to
honor the time clock and provide time	ely rate relief for	UNSE, if warrant	ed. But there is no need
to rush to judgment.			

1.000

¹ UNSE argues that it in effect warned the parties that demand charges could be an issue, so parties should not be surprised about changing residential rate design to include demand charges. The short response is that no party would rationally pay consultants and attorneys to evaluate the possibility of this radical change. UNSE did not actually propose demand charges for residential customers until just ten days ago.

The goals of due process and timely rate relief need not be in opposition. Both goals can be accommodated if this proceeding is split into two phases. The first phase would determine UNSE's revenue requirement, with hearings held as scheduled. All rate-design issues would be deferred until a second phase of this case. Phase I would conclude with a Commission Decision authorizing new rates, <u>based on UNSE's existing rate design</u>, as approved by Commission Decision No. 74235 (December 31, 2013).

Phase II would consider all rate design issues, including those that concern renewableresource advocates and residential customers (including low-income ones). UNSE would provide new notice to customers in a form approved by Hearing Division. This would eliminate all due-process concerns. In the ensuing hearing, the parties would also have the benefit of the Commission's generic investigation in Docket No. E-00000J-14-0023. Finally, the additional time would allow the parties to perhaps engage in discussions to resolve some or even all of their rate-design issues. At the conclusion of Phase II, the Commission would then approve a rate design and authorize new rates based on the revenue requirement determined in Phase I.

Respectfully submitted on January 29, 2016, by:

none G. Mank

Craig A. Marks Craig A. Marks, PLC 10645 N. Tatum Blvd., Suite 200-676 Phoenix, AZ 85028 (480) 367-1956 <u>Craig.Marks@azbar.org</u> Attorney for Arizona Utility Ratepayer Alliance

Original and 13 copies **filed** on January 29, 2016, with:

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

Copies mailed or emailed. on January 29, 2016, to:

Service List

1

2