



0000172950

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED
AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

ORIG

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 AUG 29 P 4: 20

COMMISSIONERS

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

AUG 29 2016

DOUG LITTLE – Chairman
BOB STUMP
BOB BURNS
TOM FORESE
ANDY TOBIN

DOCKETED BY 

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY
FOR APPROVAL OF ITS 2016 RENEWABLE
ENERGY STANDARD AND TARIFF
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.

DOCKET NO. E-01933A-15-0239

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY
FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF JUST AND
REASONABLE RATES AND CHARGES
DESIGNED TO REALIZE A REASONABLE
RATE OF RETURN ON THE FAIR VALUE OF
THE PROPERTIES OF TUCSON ELECTRIC
POWER COMPANY DEVOTED TO ITS
OPERATIONS THROUGHOUT THE STATE
OF ARIZONA AND FOR RELATED
APPROVALS

DOCKET NO. E-01933A-15-0322

**SOLON CORPORATION'S REPLY
TO ITS MOTION TO COMPEL
DISCLOSURE OF DATA REQUEST
SERVED ON TEP**

(Procedural Conference Requested)

SOLON Corporation ("SOLON"), through its undersigned counsel, hereby files this Reply to its Motion to Compel Disclosure of Data Request, and again respectfully requests that this Court issue an order compelling Tucson Electric Power Company (the "Company") to disclose the data requested in SOLON's Data Request to the Company, number 4.5.

In this Reply, SOLON will address the two main objections that the Company had with respect to SOLON's request: 1) that the information sought is not relevant, and 2) that the request, even as narrowed, is too burdensome. Both arguments are meritless

1 under basic principle that the “rules of discovery should be broadly and liberally
2 construed to facilitate identifying issues, promote justice, provide for more efficient and
3 speedy disposition of cases, avoid surprise, and prevent trial of lawsuit from becoming
4 guessing game.” *U-Totem Store v. Walker* 142 Ariz. 549, 691 P.2d 315 (App. 1984)
5 (citations omitted).

6 **1. SOLON seeks data from the Company that is instrumental to its ability to**
7 **analyze the impact of the Company’s application to commercial customers.**

8 The scope of discovery is undeniably broad under Rule 26(b) of the Arizona Rules
9 of Civil Procedure. For instance, “information [that] may not be admissible at trial does
10 not make it non-discoverable, providing it ‘appears reasonably calculated to lead to the
11 discovery of admissible evidence.’” *Indus. Comm’n v. Super. Ct. in and for Maricopa*
12 *County*, 122 Ariz. 374, 376, 595 P.2d 166, 168 (1979) (quoting Ariz. R. Civ. P. 26(b)).
13 “The requirement of relevancy at discovery stage is more loosely construed than that
14 required at trial.” *Brown v. Super. Ct. in and for Maricopa County*, 137 Ariz. 327, 332,
15 670 P.2d 725, 730 (1983).

16 The Company argues that the information sought is irrelevant because “SOLON’s
17 request for this information seeks data well beyond that which is necessary to evaluate
18 the Company’s rate proposal.” (TEP’s Resp. in Opp’n to SOLON Mot. to Compel [“TEP
19 Resp.”] at 3:12-14). SOLON could not disagree more. It has maintained throughout these
20 proceedings that unaltered and non-aggregated commercial customer data is essential to
21 properly evaluate the impact on commercial customers of the Company’s application,
22 which, if accepted, would force them onto a rate plan that may result in unpredictable
23 charges, and, at times, astronomical increases in rates. (*See, e.g.,* Attachment A,
24 Surrebuttal of Brian A. Seibel on Behalf of SOLON Corporation [“Seibel Surrebuttal”],
25 August 25, 2016, at 5-15). The Procedural Order dated August 22, 2016 deferred part of
26 the evidentiary hearing to address changes to net metering and the mandatory three-part

1 rates for new DG customers to a second phase. With this deferral the *interval* data
2 requested is not needed until the second phase. Therefore, the Company has ample time
3 to provide this data. However, SOLON still requests immediate disclosure of *monthly*
4 kWh and kW data for 4,088 MGS and 348 LGS customers for it is relevant for its
5 position on the mandatory rate change in this first phase. (See Attachment B, TEP App.
6 Vol. 2, Direct Testimony of Craig A. Jones, at 37:20.) The Company's general wish to
7 limit its presentation of the data so that it does not include a representative sample of
8 customers who will be on the proposed MGS plan, and no sample of customers who will
9 be on the proposed LGS plans, hardly makes the request irrelevant. Even with a small
10 sample, the interval data shows an arbitrary, severe, and flawed impact on commercial
11 customers of the Company's proposal, which is hardly an irrelevant or even minor issue
12 in this matter.

13 The Company also argues that SOLON may obtain this information from its own
14 customers. (TEP Resp. at 3:15-25 and 4:1-8). SOLON's intervention is not limited to
15 ascertaining and promoting transparency regarding the effects of the Company's
16 application on only its customers as of today, but also its customer base and potential
17 customers, which, at this time, focuses on schools, colleges, municipalities, non-profits,
18 utilities, and health care facilities. It is not limited in its discovery to only obtaining
19 information from its current customers. Additionally, the Company's argument that
20 SOLON may have its customers "request their hourly load data from TEP and it will be
21 provided" (TEP Resp. at 4:5-6) seems in of itself burdensome – why have several
22 hundred or thousand customers request data individually from the Company when it
23 already has developed an SAS code to run the code, and could do so again?

24
25
26

1 **2. The Company has not met its burden to show that the information requested**
2 **is unduly burdensome.**

3 Rule 26(b)(1)(B) states, in full:

4 A party need not provide discovery of electronically stored
5 information from sources that the party identifies as not reasonably
6 accessible because of undue burden or expense. On motion to
7 compel discovery or for a protective order, the party from whom
8 discovery is sought must show that the information is not reasonably
9 accessible because of undue burden or expense. If that showing is
10 made, the court may nonetheless order disclosure or discovery from
11 such sources if the requesting party shows good cause considering
 the limitations in the final paragraph of subsection (b)(1) of this
 Rule. The court may specify conditions for the disclosure or
 discovery.

12 Ariz. R. Civ. P. 26 (Emphasis added). The final paragraph of Rule 26(b)(1) allows for
13 limited discovery when “the discovery is unduly burdensome or expensive, given the
14 needs of the case, the amount in controversy, limitations on the parties' resources, and the
15 importance of the issues at stake in the litigation.” *Id.* (Emphasis added). Even if this
16 court is inclined to find that the request is unduly burdensome, and SOLON maintains
17 that it is not, the court may still nevertheless grant SOLON’s motion upon a showing of
18 good cause. Therefore, it is not sufficient to find that the information sought is not easily
19 accessible; a court has ample discretion to allow for its disclosure with or without
20 limitations.

21 SOLON contends that this information is central to its analysis of the Company’s
22 application. Its relevancy and importance are irrefutable. In addition, in a rate case of
23 this magnitude and importance, with the resources available to the Company, such a
24 request is not extraordinary. The Company has responded to over 3,200 data requests
25 (TEP Resp. at 2:16), and, has responded to requests of similar magnitude throughout the
26 entire proceeding. Thus, SOLON does not dispute that the request would result in large

1 amount of data, but a large amount of data does not inherently make it unduly
2 burdensome, especially in light of what is at issue here for customers who will be forced
3 onto the MGS and LGS plans.

4 The Company also argues that any random sample may not necessarily provide
5 more than the data for the 32 customers in the sample provided to Vote Solar in its
6 request. (See Seibel Surrebuttal at 4:1-9 for explanation of change in profiles from 39 to
7 32). However, Vote Solar specifically asked for “SGS customers that would be eligible to
8 remain on the GS-10 rate plan if the Company’s MGS proposal is approved.”
9 (Attachment C, TEP Resp. to Vote Solar’s Data Request). SOLON is asking for the
10 corresponding data in Vote Solar’s request, the commercial customers who will
11 involuntarily be moved to MGS. Regardless, SOLON’s efforts to negotiate and propose
12 alternative solutions should not result in an unjustified refusal to release the data.

13 **Conclusion**

14 SOLON respectfully requests that the Administrative Law Judge in this
15 proceeding grant its Motion to Compel filed on August 19, 2016, and find that the data
16 SOLON requested is relevant and not unduly burdensome to procure.

17 DATED this 29th day of August, 2016.

18 //
19 //
20 //
21 //
22 //
23 //
24 //
25 //
26 //

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

GAMMAGE & BURNHAM, PLC

By 

Camila Alarcon

Email: calarcon@gblaw.com

Attorneys for SOLON Corporation

LAW OFFICES OF MICHELE VAN
QUATHAM, PLLC

By 

Michele L. Van Quathem

Email: mvq@mvqlaw.com

Attorneys for SOLON Corporation

ORIGINAL and 13 copies filed on this
29th day of August, 2016 with:

Docket Control
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

1 I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document on all of
2 the parties of record in this proceeding a copy thereof, by electronic and/or regular mail,
3 properly addressed with first class postage prepaid to:

4 Michael W. Patten
5 Jason D. Gellman
6 SNELL & WILMER, LLP
7 One Arizona Center, Suite 1900
8 Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202
9 mpatten@swlaw.com;
10 bcarroll@tep.com
11 jhoward@swlaw.com
12 docket@swlaw.com
13 **Consented to Service by Email**

Lawrence V. Robertson, Jr
NOBLE SOLUTIONS
PO Box 1448
Tucson, AZ 85646
Attorney for Noble & SAHBA

Scott Wakefield
HIENTON & CURRAY PLLC
5045 n. 12th Street, Suite 110
Phoenix, AZ 85014-3302
Attorneys for Wal-Mart
swakefield@hslawgroup.com

11 Daniel Pozefsky
12 RUCO
13 1110 West Washington, Suite 220
14 Phoenix, AZ 85007
15 DPozefsky@azruco.gov

Steve Chriss
Senior Manager, Energy Regulatory
Analysis
WAL-MART STORES, INC.
2011 S.E. 10th Street
Bentonville, AK 72716
stephen.chriss@wal-mart.com

16 Barbara LaWall, Pima County Attorney
17 Charles Wesselhoft, Deputy County Attorney
18 PIMA COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
19 32 North Stone Avenue, Suite 2100
20 Tucson, AZ 85701
21 Charles.Wesselhoft@pcoa.pima.gov

Meghan H. Grabel
OSBORN MALEDON, PA
2929 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2100
Phoenix, AZ 85012
Attorneys for Arizona Investment Counsel
mgrabel@omlaw.com
Consented to Service by Email

21 C. Webb Crockett
22 FENNEMORE CRAIG, PC
23 2394 E. Camelback Rd., Ste 600
24 Phoenix, AZ 85016
25 Attorneys for Freeport and AECC
26 wcrocket@fclaw.com
Consented to Service by Email

Gary Yaquinto
ARIZONA INVESTMENT COUNCIL
2100 North Central Avenue, Suite 210
Phoenix, AZ 85004
gyaquinto@arizonaic.org
Consented to Service by Email

1 Kevin Higgins, Principal
2 Energy Strategies, LLC
3 215 South State Street, Ste 200
4 Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Timothy Hogan
ARIZONA CENTER FOR LAW IN THE
PUBLIC INTEREST
202 E. McDowell Rd., Ste 153
Phoenix, AZ 85004
Attorney for Vote Solar, ACAA, WRA and
SWEEP
thogan@aclpi.org
Consented to Service by Email

7 Nicholas Enoch
8 Jarrett J. Haskovek
9 Emily A. Tornabene
10 LUBIN & ENOCH, PC
11 349 N. Fourth Ave.
12 Phoenix, AZ 85003
13 Attorneys for IBEW Local 1116

Jeff Schlegel
SWEEP ARIZONA REPRESENTATIVE
1167 W. Samalayuca Dr.
Tucson, AZ 85704-3224
schlegelj@aol.com

12 Cynthia Zwick, Executive Director
13 ARIZONA COMMUNITY ACTION
14 ASSOCIATION
15 2700 N. 3rd St., Ste 3040
16 Phoenix, AZ 85004
17 czwick@azcaa.org

Kerri A. Carnes
ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY
P O Box 53072, MS 9712
Phoenix, AZ 85072-3999
Kerri.Carnes@pas.com
Consented to Service by Email

18 Ken Wilson
19 WESTERN RESOURCE ADVOCATES
20 2260 Baseline Road, Suite 200
21 Boulder, CO 80302
22 ken.wilson@westernresources.org

Travis Ritchie
SIERRA CLUB ENVIRONMENTAL LAW
PROGRAM
2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300
Oakland, CA 94612
travis.ritchi@sierraclub.org
Consented to Service by Email

23 Rick Gilliam
24 Director of Research and Analysis
25 THE VOTE SOLAR INITIATIVE
26 1120 Pearl St, Ste 200
Boulder, CO 80302
rick@votesolar.org
Consented to Service by Email

Court Rich
ROSE LAW GROUP, PC
7144 E. Stetson Drive, Suite 300
Scottsdale, AZ 85251
crich@roselawgroup.com
Consented to Service by Email

1 Briana Kobor
2 Program Director – DG Regulatory Policy
3 VOTE SOLAR
4 360 22nd St. Suite 730
5 Oakland, CA 94602
6 briana@votesolar.org
7 **Consented to Service by Email**

Jeffrey Shinder
CONSTANTINE CANNON LLP
335 Madison Avenue, 9th Floor
New York, NY 10017

5 Michael Hiatt
6 EARTHJUSTICE
7 633 17th Street, Suite 1600
8 Denver, CO 80202
9 mhiatt@earthjustice.org
10 **Consented to Service by Email**

Richard O. Levine
CONSTANTINE CANNON LLP
1001 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Suite 1300 North
Washington, DC 20004

9 Craig Marks
10 CRAIG A. MARKS, PLC
11 10645 N. Tatum Blvd., Suite 200-676
12 Phoenix, AZ 85028
13 Attorney for AURA
14 Craig.marks@azbar.org
15 **Consented to Service by Email**

Kurt J. Boehm
BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY
36 E. Seventh Street, Ste 1510
Cincinnati, OH 45202
Attorneys for The Kroger Co.

14 Pat Quinn
15 QUINN AND ASSOCIATES, LLC
16 ARIZONA UTILITY RATEPAYER ALLIANCE
17 5521 East Cholla Street
18 Scottsdale, AZ 85254

John William Moore, Jr.
MOORE BENHAM & BEAVER, PLC
7321 North 16th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85020
Attorney for Kroger

18 THE KROGER CO.
19 Attn: Corporate Energy Manager (G09)
20 1014 Vine Street
21 Cincinnati, OH 45202

21 Thomas Loquvam
22 PINNACLE WEST CAPITAL
23 CORPORATION
24 P.O. Box 53999, MS 8695
25 Phoenix, AZ 85072
26 thomas.loquvam@pinnaclewest.com
Consented to Service by Email

Stephen J. Baron
J. KENNEDY & ASSOCIATES
570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305
Roswell, GA 30075
Consultant for Kroger

1 Tom Harris
2 ARIZONA SOLAR ENERGY INDUSTRIES
3 ASSOCIATION
4 2122 W. Lone Cactus Dr. Suite 2
5 Phoenix, AZ 85027
6 Tom.Harris@AriSeia.org
7 **Consented to Service by Email**

8 Bryan Lovitt
9 3301 West Cinnamon Drive
10 Tucson, AZ 85741

11 Kevin Koch
12 P.O. Box 42103
13 Tucson, AZ 85733

14 Bruce Plenk
15 2958 N. St Augustine Pl
16 Tucson, AZ 85712

17 Greg Patterson
18 MUNGER CHADWICK
19 916 West Adams, Suite 3
20 Phoenix, AZ 85007
21 Attorneys for Arizona Competitive Power
22 Alliance
23
24
25
26

Karen White
AFLOA/JACL-ULT
139 Barnes Drive, Suite 1
Tyndall Air Force Base, FL 32403
Attorney for DOD/FEA
Karen.white.13@us.af.mil
Consented to Service by Email

Janice Alward
Dwight Nodes
Thomas Broderick
Michele Finical
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007
jalward@azcc.gov; dnodes@azcc.gov;
tbroderick@azcc.gov; rmitchell@azcc.gov;
wvancleve@azcc.gov; besmith@azcc.gov;
MFinical@azcc.gov; legaldiv@azcc.gov
Consented to Service by Email

Ellen Zuckerman
SWEEP SENIOR ASSOCIATION
1627 Oak View Ave.
Kensington, CA 94707

Garry D. Hays
LAW OFFICES OF GARY D. HAYS, PC
2198 E. Camelback Rd, Suite 305
Phoenix, AZ 85016
Attorney for ASDA

1 Jeffrey W. Crockett
2 CROCKETT LAW GROUP, PLLC
3 2198 E. Camelback Road, Suite 305
4 Phoenix, AZ 85061
5 Attorneys for Tucson Meadows, LLC

6 Kyle J. Smith
7 9275 Gunston Road (JALS RL/IP)
8 Suite 1300
9 Fort Belvoir, VA 22060
10 Attorneys for DOD/FEA
11 Kyle.j.smith124.civ@mail.mil
12 **Consented to Service by Email**

13 COASH & COASH
14 COURT REPORTING, VIDEO AND VIDEOCONFERENCING
15 1802 North 7th Street
16 Phoenix, AZ 85006
17 (602) 258-1440
18 staff@coashandcoash.com

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
Dated at Maricopa County, Arizona, this 29th day of August, 2016

By Bush J. St. Clair

ATTACHMENT A

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

DOUG LITTLE – Chairman
BOB STUMP
BOB BURNS
TOM FORESE
ANDY TOBIN

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION
OF TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER
COMPANY FOR APPROVAL OF ITS 2016
RENEWABLE ENERGY STANDARD
AND TARIFF IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.

DOCKET NO. E-01933A-15-0239

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION
OF TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER
COMPANY FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT
OF JUST AND REASONABLE RATES
AND CHARGES DESIGNED TO REALIZE
A REASONABLE RATE OF RETURN ON
THE FAIR VALUE OF THE PROPERTIES
OF TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER
COMPANY DEVOTED TO ITS
OPERATIONS THROUGHOUT THE
STATE OF ARIZONA AND FOR
RELATED APPROVALS

DOCKET NO. E-01933A-15-0322

**NOTICE OF FILING
DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
BRIAN A. SEIBEL ON BEHALF
OF SOLON CORPORATION**

Intervenor SOLON Corporation, through undersigned counsel, hereby provides
notice of filing the Direct Testimony of Brian A. Seibel in the above-described
proceedings.

///
///

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

SOLON's customer base within the Company's service territory includes Southern Arizona elementary, middle, and high schools; colleges; municipalities; non-profits; utilities; and health care facilities. A brief list of SOLON customers is provided below:

- Tanque Verde School District
- Joint Technical Education District
- Pima Community College
- Fort Huachuca School District
- Pima County
- YMCA of Southern Arizona
- Marana Health Center
- Tucson Electric Power
- Unisource Energy Services
- Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative
- Trico
- University of Arizona

SOLON has constructed over 50 MW of commercial and utility scale projects throughout Arizona and over 25 MW within the THE COMPANY's service territory. SOLON's diverse project portfolio keeps it intimately connected with the metropolitan Tucson community.

Q.

Why is SOLON intervening in this rate case?

A.

SOLON is intervening with the hope its testimony sparks a transparent, real world discussion of the Company's proposal and the projected bill impacts using actual customer data.

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

SOLON is not intervening to blindly disagree with all of the Company's proposed changes; this is actually the first time SOLON has ever intervened in a rate case. After reviewing the Company's wide ranging and drastic proposals, local businesses are left with no other choice than to intervene and argue for fairness and gradualism. SOLON places a high value on its relationships within the local Tucson community, including its relationship with the Company.

Q. What are the purposes of your testimony?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide the Commission with a reliable analysis of the bill impacts to all residential and commercial customers, with and without Distributed Generation ("DG"). I will address the Company's proposal of retroactive rate making and its damaging, chilling effects on local businesses. I will argue the Company must release actual commercial customer interval data for analysis. I will evaluate the Company's current methods for estimating customer bill impact, provide suggestions for improvements, and depict the wide ranging results the Commission can expect should the Company's proposals be approved. I will offer detailed analysis and an opinion on how the Company's proposals stray from basic rate design principles. Lastly, I will address how I believe the Company's proposals will impact Southern Arizona's renewable energy market and the economy.

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

Q. What are the conclusions of your testimony?

A. My conclusions are as follows:

- Retroactive rate making, including Net Metering policies,
- The Company's modified data and customer profiles are misleading and unrealistic
- The Company's proposed three-part rate plans result in highly uncertain customer rates and unfairness
- Inadequate information exists to assess rate plan impacts to commercial customers
- Proposed ratchets result in bills wholly disassociated from actual customer demand
- Low usage homes are poorly understood and do not provide a foundation for the Company's proposals
- Gradualism is ignored
- The Southern Arizona solar market will be detrimentally impacted

Q. Do you use any trade terms in your testimony?

A. Yes. To avoid confusion, I have listed trade terms and my intended definitions in Exhibit B.

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

III. Rate Design Principles and Analysis

Q. What is your knowledge of the generally accepted principles of rate design?

A. First, Arizona's Constitution requires rates be "just and reasonable," with "no discrimination in charges." Ariz. Const. Art. XV, §12.

Second, well-recognized rate design principles are often referenced throughout the Company's testimony from James Bonbright's *Principles of Public Utility Rates*. In my testimony, I will address the below specific principles from Bonbright's book:

1. Rates should reflect the related, "practical" attributes of simplicity, understandability, public acceptability, and feasibility of application
2. Rates should promote freedom from controversies as to proper interpretation
3. Rates should create revenue stability and predictability from year to year for the utility, but this stability and predictability should create a minimum of unexpected changes seriously adverse to existing customers
4. Rates should avoid "undue discrimination" in rate relationships

Third, as stated by the Commission, and documented later in my testimony, it is important to disallow any precedent for retroactive rate making in any form.

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

Fourth, I support the Arizona Corporation Commission's five-year strategic plan and its stated goals for utilities. The ACC's second goal is particularly applicable to the Company's application.

ACC Utility Goals:

1. To ensure that utility service within the Commission's jurisdiction is available to all consumers at authorized rates
2. **To promote the transition of the telecommunications and electricity generation markets from the current regulated monopoly structure to one of competition while ensuring safe and reliable service**
3. To maximize the Division's operating efficiency through modernization of electronic processing and enhancing the Division's information technology
4. To maintain public involvement, accessibility, and regulatory oversight by conducting workshops, forums, and community outreach programs

(Five Year Strategic Plan, Strategic Plan 2014-2019, Arizona Corporation Commission)

Q. In your opinion, how would you analyze proposed rate plan impacts and determine how closely the proposals adhere to generally accepted rate design principles?

A. The effort required for a responsible analysis will vary from utility to utility depending on the utility's level of sophistication, available resources, and how significantly their proposals vary from the current rate structures. The

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

Company in this rate case, Tucson Electric Power, is a sophisticated, mostly urban utility with a large, diverse customer base. The Company anticipates securing approximately \$1B of yearly revenue selling energy to approximately 430,000 customers. The Company has shown its sophistication by installing advanced metering equipment for all customers. As I will show in my testimony, the Company's rate design proposals severely deviate from their current rate structures.

Given these facts, it is reasonable to expect the Company has access to their customer usage patterns on an hourly basis, and a responsible, fulsome analysis would include substantial customer data from the test year, unaltered in any way. I recommend at least 30% of each rate class be represented, with the selected customers evenly dispersed between the minimum and maximum load factor for each rate class.

Q: How many unaltered, actual customer hourly load profiles did the Company use in the analysis of their residential and commercial rate design proposals?

A. Zero.

1 **IV.**

Retroactive Net Metering Rider Changes

2
3 **Q.**

Do you have an opinion regarding the Company's proposal to retroactively change net metering for customers who installed DG after June 1, 2015?

4
5
6 **A.**

Yes. Dallas Dukes, starting on page 2 of his Direct Testimony, proposes a new net metering rider applicable to net metering DG customers who submitted an approved interconnection application after June 1, 2015.

7
8 While I support the Company's proposal to grandfather previous customers and keep existing customers on the R-4 Rider through May 31, 2035, I
9 absolutely oppose changing any customer to the Company's proposed R-15
10 Rider before any new rates go into effect at the conclusion of this case or
11 longer. The differences between the current R-4 rider and the proposed R-
12 15 are so drastic, ratepayers deserve this topic to be heard by the
13 Commission through due process.
14
15

16
17 While SOLON realizes the net metering rider may change in some way for
18 future customers as a result of the Commission decision in this case, I
19 absolutely oppose any change to the Company's rates that would be
20 retroactive, and so should the Commission. Retroactive ratemaking,
21 whether customers had notice of the potential for this dangerous precedent
22 or not, clearly violates a core principle of rate design: rates should be fair,
23 simple and free from controversy. Historically, the Commission has never
24 supported retroactive rate making, and, in the interest of gradualism, should
25 allow Tucsonans and the Southern Arizona solar market proper notification
26 periods **after** changes to Net Metering or other policies have been heard

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

and approved by the Commission via the normal rate making process. I believe a proper, fair notification period is one year.

Q. Do you have any background information specifically related to retroactive Net Metering requests?

A. Yes. This case demonstrates why the Commission should not allow retroactive rate changes, including the Company's net-metering rider proposals.

On March 25, 2015, the Company applied to the Commission in Docket No. E-01933A-15-0100 for approval of a new net metering tariff for future net metered customers and approval of a partial waiver of the Commission's net metering rules. After significant concerns were expressed that the proposed changes should be determined as part of a rate case, the Company withdrew its application. However, the Company still posted a notice on its website of its intent to seek the same changes in an upcoming rate case. The notice implied the Company would seek retroactive rate changes to June 1, 2015, even though it had withdrawn its earlier application. The Company was ordered to change its disclosure language to remove the reference to the retroactive date in Commission Decision No. 75224.

If the Commission were to adopt the Company current proposal to retroactively change rates previously approved by the Commission as of June 1, 2015, such a change would send an unfair signal to both utilities and customers that utilities have the power and the Commission's blessing

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

to go back and change a customer's economic burden without a fair hearing before the change is applied.

Customers should have the right to rely upon Commission-approved tariffs until there is a new hearing and the tariffs are subsequently changed. The Commission should reject any retroactive change to the net-metering rider, and should make any future changes applicable only to customers that submit interconnection applications one year after the effective date of the Commission's decision at the end of this case.

Q. Why is it important to reject any retroactive changes to the net metering rider?

A. DG customers must make many long-term investment decisions based upon the information that is available to them at the time of installation, including both the certainty of the current approved tariff, the Commission's hearing process, and the uncertainty of future changes developed through the process. If the Commission adopts proposals that create instability and uncertainty in commission approved rates, it has a chilling effect on local investment in our community just as uncertain regulations damage any other industry.

Q. Is net metering critical to an economical solar project?

A. Without net metering, almost all of our customers have informed SOLON they cannot consider any future renewable projects because the financial viability are significantly reduced and unstable.

1 **Q. Please explain how the Company threat of retroactive rate making has**
2 **hurt local businesses.**

3 A. I will start by explaining the process from a solar customer's standpoint
4 using the example of the Company's disclaimer described above, starting at
5 the submission of an interconnection application.
6

7 **Q. What is an interconnection application?**

8 A. One of the first steps in completing a solar project is submitting an
9 interconnection application signed by the customer. A typical
10 interconnection application requires basic information about the solar
11 project such as the project location, size, other technical information about
12 the solar equipment and whether the customer intends to select the
13 Company's current Net Metering Rider. A copy of the Company's current
14 interconnection application is attached to my testimony as Exhibit D.
15

16 **Q. What did the Company change on the interconnection application after**
17 **June 1st, 2015?**

18 A. The Company added Attachment A to its interconnection application,
19 which threatens customers with the possibility of net metering being taken
20 away, even if their solar project was commissioned by the Company many
21 months in advance of an ACC decision. The local solar industry, customers
22 and SOLON watched as solar applications came to a screeching halt with
23 the Company's continued pursuit of retroactive rate making and its updated
24 interconnection application. The Company requires a customer to sign this
25 acknowledgement before it will accept an interconnection application.
26

1 **Q. Was any part of Attachment A, the new document attached to the**
2 **interconnection application, confusing?**
3 **A.** There are numerous facets of Attachment A that are vague and confusing,
4 especially to potential solar customers. First, the application does not
5 clearly specify what exactly the Company has proposed with regard to the
6 net metering rider, how it would affect solar savings, and the effective date
7 of the proposed changes. Second, the notice especially as it originally
8 appeared on the Company's website implied the concept of retroactive rate
9 making – a concept that caused a great deal of uncertainty. It is deeply
10 disturbing for a regulated utility to distribute, and require a customer to
11 sign, a disclaimer acknowledging the possibility of retroactive rates or other
12 unexplained changes.
13
14 **Q. Has the Company's retroactive rate request damaged SOLON's**
15 **business since June 1st, 2015?**
16 **A.** Yes, SOLON and many other local companies that are involved in the solar
17 industry have been affected. It will continue to be challenging until this
18 case is resolved, especially given the Company's continued intent to pursue
19 a retroactive change in the net metering tariff and reduce solar installations.
20 Although the concept of retroactive rates is unprecedented and harmful to
21 business, customers do not know yet if the Commission will adopt the
22 Company's proposal. If one of our customers were to submit an
23 interconnection application after June 1st, 2015, complete construction, and
24 energize the solar project prior to the final decision in this matter, the
25 project could then have net metering taken away well after the project's
26 completion if the Company's retroactive request was approved by the ACC.

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

Even if a customer submitted an interconnection application on or subsequent to June 2nd, 2015, we often do not receive customer approval to begin construction activities because the Commission's decision remains unknown. Remember, the Company forces customers to sign Attachment A in order to have a completed interconnection application.

The Company's actions throughout 2015 and 2016 have effectively put solar projects on hold by threatening questionable net-metering proposals, such as those found in Attachment A.

A small number of customers have chosen to move their solar projects forward even though there is the possibility that the ACC could approve the Company's retroactive request. It is unfathomable that customers who submitted an interconnection application after June 1st, 2015 and completed their project shortly thereafter would have net metering taken away from them approximately 18 months or longer after a decision is made by the ACC.

Q. Has the number of new commercial interconnection applications been reduced since the Company now requires prospective commercial solar customers to sign Attachment A and pursues retroactive changes to June 1st, 2015?

A. Yes. According to the Company, there were 158 commercial interconnection applications received and approved in the first 6 months of 2015. In stark contrast, in the second 6 months of 2015, when the

ATTACHMENT B

ORIGINAL

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
27

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

COMMISSIONERS

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

NOV 5 2015

DOCKETED BY	<i>[Signature]</i>
-------------	--------------------

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF) DOCKET NO. E-01933A-15-0322
TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY FOR)
THE ESTABLISHMENT OF JUST AND)
REASONABLE RATES AND CHARGES)
DESIGNED TO REALIZE A REASONABLE)
RATE OF RETURN ON THE FAIR VALUE OF)
THE PROPERTIES OF TUCSON ELECTRIC)
POWER COMPANY DEVOTED TO ITS)
OPERATIONS THROUGHOUT THE STATE OF)
ARIZONA, AND FOR RELATED APPROVALS.)

TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY

RECEIVED
2015 NOV -5 P 2:31
AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

APPLICATION
TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS

VOLUME 2 of 4

NOVEMBER 5, 2015

**Direct Testimony of
Craig A. Jones**

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
27

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....1

II. Cost of Service Analysis.....8

 A. Cost of Service and Economic Theory12

 B. Marginal Cost of Service Study.....26

III. Rate Design.....32

 A. Overall Objectives of Updated Rate Design.....32

 B. Specific Rate Design Changes.....36

 1. Residential Rates43

 a. Monthly Charge43

 b. Volumetric Rate.....44

 2. Non-Residential Rates45

 a. Monthly Charges – Basic Service Charge and Demand Charges..46

 b. Calculation of Demand Charges.....49

 c. Volumetric Rates51

 3. TOU Rates52

 4. Lighting Rates.....53

 5. Community Solar Rate54

 6. 138kV Rate54

 7. Interruptible Rates57

 8. Economic Development Rate57

 9. Lifeline Rates.....57

 10. Prepay Rate.....60

 11. Alternative Generation Service Experimental Rider61

 C. Bill Impacts.....64

1	IV.	Proposed Tariffs.....	66
2	V.	Pro Forma Adjustments	66
3	A.	Weather Normalization Adjustment	66
4	B.	Customer Annualization Adjustment	71
5	C.	Transmission Expense Adjustment.....	73
6	VI.	Service Fees	74
7	VII.	Modifications to Adjustor Mechanisms.....	76
8	A.	Purchased Power and Fuel Adjustment Clause	77
9	B.	Lost Fixed Cost Recovery Mechanism.....	77
10	C.	Environmental Cost Adjustor	81
11	D.	Demand Side Management Surcharge.....	82

12 **Exhibits**

13	Exhibit CAJ-1	Marginal Cost Study
	Exhibit CAJ-2	Bill Impact Summary
14	Exhibit CAJ-3	Clean version of Tariffs
	Exhibit CAJ-4	Redlined version of Tariffs
15	Exhibit CAJ-5	LFCR - Plan of Administration (Clean and redline)
16	Exhibit CAJ-6	ECA - Plan of Administration (Clean and redline)

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

1 to change the residential DSM and ECA charges to percentage based adjustments. These
2 changes will be discussed more thoroughly later in my testimony.

3
4 Third, for TOU customers, the Company is proposing to add a tier to the rates where the
5 non-TOU option contains a tier. In TEP's last rate case, the Company proposed to
6 eliminate the tiers for TOU customers in the hope that the simplified rate would be more
7 appealing to the customers. This inadvertently created a perverse situation where the
8 largest usage customers could benefit from lower average rates and as a result, a lower
9 bill without changing their consumption to off-peak from on-peak times. This unintended
10 consequence can be rectified by adding a tier back to the appropriate TOU rates.

11
12 Fourth, for most non-interruptible classes with a Demand Charge, the Company proposes
13 to establish minimum and/or maximum demand amounts (billing demand levels) in order
14 for a customer to become and remain eligible in the individual classes. This should
15 provide for better parity within the classes and thus less intra-class inequity which will
16 make it easier for customers to stay on a particular rate.

17
18 Fifth, the Company's current SGS and Large Power Service ("LPS") rates will be
19 redesigned. The Company is proposing to create a new MGS rate that will contain
20 approximately 3,995 former SGS customers and 93 former Large General Service
21 ("LGS") customers, but will be limited to only those customers who the Company has
22 estimated, based on test year data, to use a combined total of 24,000 kWh or more in any
23 two consecutive months or who the Company has calculated will have a minimum
24 demand of greater than 20 kW. Those migrating customers will also be tested to
25 determine if their demand will exceed 250 kW in any month. If so, they will be moved to
26 either the LGS or LGS-TOU rate, as appropriate. Other than the minimum and maximum
27 demand amounts, the design of the new MGS rates (standard and TOU) will be generally

ATTACHMENT C

**TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO VOTE SOLAR'S
EIGHTH SET OF DATA REQUESTS REGARDING THE 2015 TEP RATE CASE**

DOCKET NO. E-01933A-15-0322

July 20, 2016

VS 8.1

Please provide a sample of customer hourly usage data from the test year for TEP's SGS customers that would be eligible to remain on the GS-10 rate plan if the Company's MGS proposal is approved. Please provide data in Excel or CSV format and remove any confidential customer information. If possible, please provide hourly data for the same sample of customers that was used as the basis for TEP 2015 SGS Load-PV Data.xlsx tab "TY2015 Hrly Data." If that is not possible, please provide a comparable sample. If TEP is unable to differentiate between SGS customers who will, and will not, be eligible to remain on the GS-10 rate, please provide the requested information without this distinction.

RESPONSE:

Please see VS 8.1 Raw SGS Data.csv for the requested information. The CSV file is not identified by Bates numbers.

RESPONDENT:

Rick Bachmeier/Greg Strang

WITNESS:

Craig Jones