

ORIGINAL



0000171074

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

2 COMMISSIONERS

Arizona Corporation Commission

RECEIVED

DOCKETED

3 DOUG LITTLE – Chairman
4 BOB STUMP
4 BOB BURNS
5 TOM FORESE
5 ANDY TOBIN

JUN 17 2016

JUN 17 2016 A 10: 57

DOCKETED BY *JA*

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

7 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
7 NAVOPACHE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.
8 FOR A DETERMINATION OF THE FAIR VALUE
8 OF ITS PROPERTY FOR RATEMAKING
9 PURPOSES, TO FIX A JUST AND REASONABLE
9 RETURN THEREON, TO APPROVE RATES
10 DESIGNED TO DEVELOP SUCH RETURN, AND
10 FOR RELATED APPROVALS.

DOCKET NO. E-01787A-16-0144

PROCEDURAL ORDER
(Grants Intervention)

11 **BY THE COMMISSION:**

12 On April 29, 2016, Navopache Electric Cooperative, Inc. (“NEC” or “Co-op”) filed a Request
13 for Docket Number and Notice of Filing Proposed Form of Customer Notice with the Arizona
14 Corporation Commission (“Commission”).

15 NEC filed a Notice of Mailing Customer Notice on May 19, 2016, stating that the Co-op had
16 mailed to its customers notices advising them that NEC intended to file a streamlined rate application
17 on or about May 26, 2016, pursuant to A.R.S. § 40-250 and Arizona Administrative Code (“A.A.C.”)
18 R14-2-107.

19 On May 20, 2016, Larry K. Nuzum filed a letter requesting to intervene in this docket. Mr.
20 Nuzum, who is a customer of NEC, stated: “I intend to ask their engineering & purchasing departments
21 my concerns about their buying practice. At one time the AZCC considered making public utilities go
22 non-competitive to competitive. Utilities should be doing that on their own on all products.”

23 On May 26, 2016, NEC filed its Application to Increase Rate and Charges Pursuant to A.A.C.
24 R14-2-107.

25 On June 1, 2016, NEC filed its Opposition to Request to Intervene. The Co-op contends that
26 the issues Mr. Nuzum wishes to raise are beyond the scope of a streamline rate case.

27 There is nothing in the A.A.C. regarding the nature of issues that can be raised in a streamlined
28

1 rate case. As in all cases, the questions are whether the person seeking to intervene has an interest in
2 the matter, and whether the issues raised would unduly broaden the scope of the proceeding.

3 After reviewing Mr. Nuzum's request, we note that his intended inquiries appear to be in the
4 nature of competitive purchasing practices, and not whether Arizona public utilities should be subject
5 to competition. As such, Mr. Nuzum's intervention request should be granted.

6 On June 3, 2016, Navopache customer, Richard Hamlin, filed an opinion opposing NEC's use
7 of the streamlined rate application process and requested intervention in the docket. Navopache did not
8 object to Mr. Hamlin's intervention, and his request should be granted.

9 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that **intervention in Docket No. E-01787A-16-0144 is**
10 **granted to Larry Nuzum and Richard Hamlin.**

11 DATED this 17th day of June, 2016.



BELINDA A. MARTIN
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

15 Copies of the foregoing mailed
16 this 17th day of June, 2016 to:

17 Larry K. Nuzum
18 5780 Forty Niner Way
19 Pinetop, AZ 85935

19 Richard Hamlin
20 3336 East Sequoia Trail
21 Phoenix, AZ 85044

21 William P. Sullivan
22 LAW OFFICES OF
23 WILLIAM P. SULLIVAN, PLLC
24 501 East Thomas Road
25 Phoenix, AZ 85012

Janice Alward, Chief Counsel
Legal Division
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Thomas Broderick, Director
Utilities Division
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

24 By: 
25 Rebecca Tallman
26 Assistant to Belinda A. Martin