


BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKETED

JUN 09 2000

2 CARL J. KUNASEK
CHAIRMAN
3 JIM IRVIN
COMMISSIONER
4 WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
COMMISSIONER

DOCKETED BY	
-------------	--

6 IN THE MATTER OF COMPETITION IN THE
PROVISION OF ELECTRIC SERVICES
7 THROUGHOUT THE STATE OF ARIZONA.

DOCKET NO. RE-00000C-94-0 165

8 IN THE MATTER OF THE STRANDED COST
FILING AND REQUEST FOR A WAIVER OF
9 CERTAIN PORTIONS OF THE RULES FILED BY
NAVOPACHE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE.

DOCKET NO. E-01787A-98-0465

DECISION NO. 62612

OPINION AND ORDER

11 DATE OF HEARING: April 5, 2000

12 PLACE OF HEARING: Phoenix, Arizona

13 PRESIDING OFFICER: Jane L. Rodda

14 APPEARANCES: Paul Michaud, Martinez & Curtis PC, on behalf of Navopache Electric
Cooperative, Inc.; and

15 Janet Wagner, Staff Attorney, Legal Division, on behalf of the Utilities
16 Division of the Arizona Corporation Commission.

BY THE COMMISSION:

17 Having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, the
18 Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") finds, concludes, and orders that:

FINDINGS OF FACT

20 1. Navopache Electric Cooperative, Inc, ("Navopache") is a member owned non-profit
21 electric cooperative engaged in the distribution and sale of power and energy to its
22 member/customers in Arizona and New Mexico. Navopache has approximately 24,000 members in
23 Navajo, Apache, Greenlee, and Gila Counties, Arizona and Catron County, New Mexico.

25 2. In Decision No. 61283 (December 14, 1998), The Commission approved Navopache's
26 unbundled rates for distribution service, metering service, meter reading service, billing service, and a
27 public benefits charge. In the same Decision, the Commission approved the use of Navopache's
28 current tariffs as its standard offer tariffs.

1 3. In Decision No. 61969 (September 29, 1999) the Commission adopted the Retail
2 Electric Competition Rules (A.A.C. R14-2-201 *et seq.* and R14-2-1601 *et seq.*) introducing retail
3 electric competition in Arizona.

4 4. In Decision No. 61677 (April 27, 1999), the Commission adopted guidelines for
5 establishing stranded costs and unbundling tariffs for Affected Utilities, as defined in A.A.C. R14-2-
6 1601.

7 5. Navopache is an Affected Utility pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2- 1601.

8 6. Pursuant to Decision No. 61677 and in a Procedural Order dated April 21, 1999, the
9 Commission required Affected Utilities to submit supplements or amendments to their stranded cost
10 filings submitted previously. The April 21, 1999 Procedural Order set dates for filing testimony and
11 conducting hearings.

12 7. On June 14, 1999, Navopache submitted its stranded cost filing in the form of written
13 testimony.

14 8. On August 11, 1999, the Commission's Utilities Division Staff ("Staff") filed written
15 testimony on Navopache's stranded cost filing and standard offer rates.

16 9. On August 25, 1999, Navopache filed rebuttal testimony.

17 10. On January 13, 2000, the Arizona Community Action Association ("ACAA") filed
18 comments concerning Navopache's stranded cost filing.

19 11. Pre-hearing conferences were held on September 24, 1999, December 29, 1999,
20 February 23, 2000 and March 30, 2000, at which time the parties indicated a willingness and desire to
21 attempt to reach a settlement regarding stranded costs and unbundled standard offer rates.

22 12. Pursuant to a Procedural Order dated March 3, 2000, the parties were ordered to file a
23 settlement Agreement, if they had reached one, by March 17, 2000, and a hearing was set for April 5,
24 2000.

25 13. On March 17, 2000, Navopache, Staff and the ACAA filed a proposed Settlement
26 Agreement that resolved all issues concerning stranded costs and unbundled rates. A copy of the
27 Settlement Agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

28 14. Navopache provided notice of the Settlement Agreement to all intervenors and

1 interested parties.

2 15. All intervenors and interested parties were sent notice of all pre-hearing conferences
3 and Procedural Orders concerning the conduct of this proceeding.

4 16. A hearing convened on April 5, 2000, with testimony provided by Dr. David Berry on
5 behalf of Navopache and Ms. Elaine Sanders on behalf of Staff.

6 17. At the time of the hearing, Navopache purchased its power supply and associated
7 transmission and ancillary services on a bundled basis from Plains Electric Generation and
8 Transmission Cooperative, Inc. ("Plains") which is located in New Mexico.

9 18. Navopache's generation-related stranded costs arise from the stranded costs of its
10 power supplier, Plains. During 1998, Plains conducted an auction and sale of its assets. The
11 successful bidder for Plains' assets was a joint proposal of Tri-State Generation and Transmission
12 Association, Inc ("Tri-State") and Public Service Company of New Mexico ("PNM").

13 19. Under the terms of the Tri-State/PNM proposal, Plains will merge with Tri-State and
14 will cease to exist. Plains' member cooperatives, of which Navopache is one, can select either Tri-
15 State or PNM as its power supplier.

16 20. Navopache selected PNM as its power supplier and is negotiating a power supply
17 agreement and transmission agreement with PNM. Navopache selected PNM because it gave
18 Navopache greater flexibility by enabling Navopache to terminate the contract after 10 years instead
19 of 22 years, and the expected cost over ten years under the PNM contract is expected to be lower than
20 the expected costs under a contract with Tri-State.

21 21. Prior to the closing of the Plains/Tri-State merger, Navopache must pay Plains \$234
22 per kW of coincident peak demand during 1998. PNM will advance funds to Navopache to make this
23 payment. The amount of \$234 per kW is intended to keep Tri-State whole as a result of Navopache
24 selecting PNM as its power supplier. Thus, the amount of \$234 per kW represents Navopache's
25 share of Plains' stranded cost.

26 22. Navopache's share of Plains' stranded cost is \$11,785,410.

27 23. Navopache requested to collect its share of Plains' stranded cost over a period of 10
28 years through a Competitive Transition Charge ("CTC") applied to Navopache's distribution

1 customers.

2 24. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement, Navopache will access a CTC of
3 \$0.00605 per kWh in the first contract year. In every year of the PNM contract, the annual amount of
4 Navopache's share of Plains' stranded costs is \$1,775,645. The amount of the CTC, which was
5 determined by dividing the costs by Navopache's forecasted sales, may vary each year. Pursuant to
6 the terms of the Settlement Agreement Navopache may modify the CTC annually as forecasted total
7 kWh sales in its service territory change.

8 25. Under the terms of its power contract with PNM, Navopache's purchased power costs
9 decrease from the amount paid under its contract with Plains. As a result, Navopache's Standard
10 Offer rate to its members/customers will decrease, including the recovery of stranded costs.

11 26. Navopache's stranded costs and unbundled standard offer rate elements as reflected in
12 the Settlement Agreement are just and reasonable and in the public interest and should be approved.

13 27. It is reasonable to require Navopache to submit any proposed changes of its CTC
14 based on revised annual sales forecasts to the Director of the Utilities Division sixty days prior to the
15 date of planned implementation and that if the Director of the Utilities Division takes no action
16 within 30 days of receiving Navopache's revised CTC calculation that the proposed CTC go into
17 effect without further action of the Commission.

18 28. It is reasonable that any under or over collection of stranded costs in any year be
19 factored into the calculation of the CTC for the next year and that at the end of the ten year period
20 any over-collected amount be refunded to Navopache customers.

21 29. Navopache does not at present plan to offer Competitive Services through any
22 competitive electric affiliate or to be a member of any electric cooperative that plans to offer
23 Competitive Services in Arizona. Pursuant to R14-2-1616(A), Navopache is not at present required
24 to file a Code of Conduct.

25 30. Subsequent to the negotiation of the Settlement Agreement, the parties learned that the
26 New Mexico Public Regulation Commission ordered an allocation of the gain in the sale of the Plains
27 assets to Navopache. At the time of the hearing the parties did not know how the gain should be
28 treated for rate making purposes. Staff and Navopache agreed that in order to expeditiously facilitate

1 competition in Navopache’s service territory, the issue should be considered in Navopache’s next rate
2 case. Navopache expects to file a rate case no later than March 31, 2001.

3 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

4 1. Navopache is a public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV of the
5 Arizona Constitution and A.R.S. §§40-202, -203, -250, -321, -322, -336, -361, -365, -367, and under
6 the Arizona Revised Statutes, Title 40, generally.

7 2. The Commission has jurisdiction over Navopache and the subject matter of this
8 proceeding.

9 3. Notice of the proceeding was provided as required by law.

10 4. The Settlement Agreement attached hereto as Exhibit A is just and reasonable and in
11 the public interest and should be approved.

12 5. Navopache should be authorized to implement its Stranded Cost Recovery Plan as set
13 forth in the Settlement Agreement.

14 6. Navopache’s unbundled Standard Offer rates as set forth in the Settlement Agreement
15 are just and reasonable and should be approved.

16 7. Navopache’s Certificate of Convenience and Necessity should be modified in order to
17 permit competitive retail access in Navopache’s service territory.

18 8. The recommendations set forth in Findings of Fact Nos. 27, 28 and 30 are reasonable
19 and should be adopted.

20 ORDER

21 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Settlement Agreement attached hereto as Exhibit A
22 is approved.

23 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Navopache Electric Cooperative, Inc.’s Certificate of
24 Convenience and Necessity is hereby modified to permit competitive retail access consistent with this
25 Decision and the Retail Electric Competition Rules.

26 ...

27 ...

28 ...

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Navopache Electric Cooperative, Inc. shall comply with
2 Findings of Fact Nos. 27, 28 and 30.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.

4 BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION.

5
6   
7 CHAIRMAN COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER
8

9 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, BRIAN C. McNEIL, Executive
10 Secretary of the Arizona Corporation Commission, have
11 hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the
12 Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix,
13 this 9th day of June, 2000.

14 
15 BRIAN C. McNEIL
16 EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1 SERVICE LIST FOR:

NAVOPACHE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.

2 DOCKET NOS.:

RE-00000C-94-0165 and E-01787A-98-0465

3

4 Service List of RE-0000C-94-0165

5 Lyn Farmer, Chief Counsel

LEGAL DIVISION

6 Arizona Corporation Commission

1200 W. Washington Street

7 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

8 Deborah Scott, Director

9 Utilities Division

Arizona Corporation Commission

10 1200 W. Washington Street

Phoenix, Arizona 85007

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

DECISION NO. 62612

EXHIBIT A
SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

April 5, 2000

This settlement agreement (“Agreement”) is entered into on or about April 5, 2000, by Navopache Electric Cooperative, Inc. (“Navopache”), the Arizona Corporation Commission, Utilities Division Staff (“Staff”), and the Arizona Community Action Association (“ACAA”), hereinafter collectively referred to as “the Parties”. The Parties stipulate and agree to the following settlement provisions in connection with matters submitted by Navopache to the Arizona Corporation Commission (“Commission”) regarding Navopache’s implementation plan for stranded cost recovery and unbundled standard offer rates.

RECITALS:

1. Navopache is an electric cooperative engaged in the distribution and sale of power and energy to its members/customers in the States of Arizona and New Mexico.’
2. The Commission has adopted Retail Electric Competition Rules (A.A.C. R14-2-20 1 et **seq.** and R14-2- 160 1 et **seq.**) introducing retail electric competition in Arizona.
3. Navopache currently purchases its power supply and associated transmission and **ancillary** services on a bundled basis **from** Plains Electric Generation and Transmission Cooperative, Inc. (“Plains”), which is located in New Mexico.
4. Navopache intends to purchase its power supply and certain **ancillary** services on a **partially** unbundled basis **from** Public Service Company of New Mexico (“PNM”) and also **from** the Western Area Power Administration. Navopache also intends to purchase transmission **service** and some ancillary services from PNM under a separate

contract. In addition, Navopache will obtain power and energy from renewable resources if mandated by the Commission to do so.

5. In Decision No. 61283, dated December 14, 1998, the Commission approved Navopache's unbundled rates for distribution service, metering service, meter reading service, billing service, and a public benefits charge (system benefits charge). In the same Decision, the Commission approved the use of Navopache's current tariffs as its standard offer tariffs.

6. In Decision No. 61677, and in a Procedural Order dated April 21, 1999, the Commission required **Affected** Utilities, as defined in A.A.C. **R14-2-1601**, to submit supplements or amendments to their stranded cost filings submitted previously. The April 21, 1999 Procedural Order set dates for filing testimony and conducting hearings.

7. Navopache submitted its stranded cost filing in the form of written testimony on June 14, 1999.

8. On August 11, 1999, **Staff** submitted its written testimony on Navopache's stranded cost **filing** and on Navopache's standard offer rates.

9. On August 25, 1999, Navopache filed its rebuttal testimony, responding to Staff's August 11, 1999 testimony.

10. On September 24, 1999, a pre-hearing conference was held, at which time the Hearing **Officer** suggested that the Parties attempt to reach a settlement regarding stranded costs and unbundled standard offer rates.

11. Navopache provided notice to **all** intervenors and interested parties, included on the **service** list in Docket No. **E-01787A-98-0465** regarding Navopache's

stranded cost settlement negotiations, and all interested parties and intervenors had a fair opportunity to participate in the settlement negotiations resulting in this Agreement.

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT:

The Parties agree as follows:

1. Purpose of the Agreement.

1.1 The purpose of this Agreement is to resolve contested matters regarding Navopache's stranded costs and unbundled standard offer rates in a manner consistent with the public interest. Nothing contained in this Agreement is an admission by any Party that any of the positions taken, or that might be taken by each in formal proceedings, is unreasonable. Acceptance of this Agreement by the Parties does not prejudice any Party in these proceedings on any position pertaining to Navopache's stranded costs and unbundled standard offer rates.

1.2 This Agreement constitutes a final and complete resolution of all currently known outstanding issues pertaining to Navopache's stranded costs and standard offer rates.

2. Stranded Costs.

2.1 The Parties agree that Navopache's Implementation Plan for Stranded Cost Recovery, as set forth in Navopache's testimony filed on June 14, 1999 and reflected in Exhibit A to this Agreement, should be approved by the Commission.

2.2 The Parties recognize that there may be circumstances in which the Commission may grant recovery of certain costs related to the implementation of competition. Navopache may request such recovery outside a rate case. Staff will evaluate, at the time such a request is made, whether the application may be appropriately

processed outside a rate case. Examples of such costs are training costs for use of new billing software, the costs of new billing software, or the costs of new metering equipment incurred to meet the requirements of the Commission's Retail Electric Competition Rules.

3. Fair Access for Potential Competitors.

3.1 Fair access by potential competitive suppliers to Navopache's customers is ensured through the nondiscriminatory application of Navopache's unbundled rates.

3.2 Navopache's power sale agreement with PNM recognizes that Arizona has adopted a policy of retail electric competition.

3.3 Pursuant to R14-2-16 16(A), Navopache is not at present required to file a Code of Conduct. Navopache does not, at present, plan to offer Competitive Services through any competitive electric **affiliate**. Additionally, Navopache is not, and does not plan at this time to be, a member of any electric cooperative that plans to offer Competitive Services in Arizona.

3.4 Navopache, at present, has no market power in the electric generation market.

4. Unbundled Standard Offer Tariffs and Bills.

4.1 Navopache does not, at present, have sufficient information to provide unbundled rates for all services.

4.2 Navopache does not, at present, have billing software that can print out unbundled charges. However, Navopache intends to have this **software** in place by July 2000. If Navopache's testing of new **software** indicates that errors in bills may occur, Navopache may extend the intended date for rendering unbundled bills. Navopache will

notify the Commission Staff by letter of the need for any such extensions beyond July 2000.

4.3 Within 20 days of the Commission's issuance of an order approving this Agreement, Navopache will file an unbundled standard offer tariff.

4.3.1 In the **tariff**, Navopache will: a) unbundle its standard offer distribution, metering, meter reading, billing, and public benefits rates (systems benefits charge) as set forth in its approved unbundled services rates, b) indicate that power supply, transmission, and ancillary service costs cannot be unbundled while service is supplied by Plains, c) indicate that power supply, transmission, and ancillary service costs per **kWh** vary from month to month, d) indicate that power supply, transmission, and ancillary service costs will be recovered through the purchased power cost adjustment mechanism, e) indicate that PNM charges for generation, transmission and ancillary services will not be unbundled until Navopache's tariffed rates are addressed in Navopache's next rate case proceeding, and f) set forth the stranded cost recovery charge (also called the Competitive Transition Charge or CTC) of \$0.00605 per **kWh** (effective when **service from** PNM starts and continuing for ten years), which can be automatically modified annually as total **kWh** sales (including **kWh** sales by third parties to Navopache's distribution customers) in its service territory change or which can be automatically reduced at any time if Navopache exercises its right to prepay the remaining principal associated with the Part One Demand Charge as explained on page 7 of Navopache's testimony **filed** on June 14, 1999. Navopache will **notify**

the Commission by letter of changes in the stranded cost recovery charge pursuant to this Section 4.3.1.

4.3.2 Navopache's customers who choose a competitive electric supplier will purchase generation, transmission, and ancillary services from an entity other than Navopache. These customers must obtain necessary distribution and other services from Navopache under Navopache's unbundled tariffs and must pay the stranded cost recovery charge or CTC.

4.3.3 Exhibit B to this Agreement sets forth the standard offer service rate elements, which will appear in Navopache's standard offer service tariff.

4.3.4 Until Navopache has tested and implemented its new billing system, it will not be able to include unbundled rates in its bills. Until unbundled bills are sent to customers, Navopache will include in its monthly newsletter (which is sent out with bills) its unbundled rates so that consumers may compare Navopache's standard offer service with competitive service. After the new billing system is in place, and to the extent allowed by the billing software, charges will be presented as follows: a) for generation, transmission, and ancillary services combined, charges at the current implicit **tariffed** rate, b) for generation, transmission, and ancillary **services** combined, the purchased power adjustment, c) for generation, transmission, and ancillary services combined, the net charge, d) the competition transition charge, e) metering charges, f) meter reading charges, g) distribution service charges (including billing charges), h) system benefits charges, i) the regulatory assessment, and j) applicable taxes.

5. Commission Action

5.1 Each provision of this Agreement is in consideration and support of all other provisions, and expressly conditioned upon acceptance by the Commission without material change. In the event that the Commission fails to adopt this Agreement according to its terms by July 31, 2000, this Agreement will be considered withdrawn and the Parties will be free to pursue their respective positions in any proceedings regarding Navopache's stranded cost and unbundled standard offer rates without prejudice.

5.2 The Parties may, by mutual agreement, extend the date set forth in Section 5.1.

5.3 The Parties must make all reasonable and good faith efforts necessary to obtain final approval of this Agreement by the Commission.

5.4 The Parties will actively defend this Agreement in the event of any challenge to its validity or implementation.

5.5 To the extent any provision of this Agreement is inconsistent with any existing Commission order, rule, or regulation or is inconsistent with the Retail Electric Competition Rules, the provisions of this Agreement will control and the approval of this Agreement by the Commission will be deemed to constitute a Commission-approved variation or exemption to any conflicting provision of the Retail Electric Competition Rules.

6. Limitations.

6.1 The terms and provisions of this Agreement apply solely to and are binding only in the context of the provisions and results of this Agreement, and none of the

positions taken herein by the Parties will be referred to, cited, or relied upon by any other Party in any fashion as precedent or otherwise in any proceeding before the Commission or any other regulatory agency or before any court of law for any purpose except in furtherance of the purposes and results of this Agreement.

6.2 Navopache and PNM have entered into a Power Sale Agreement (“PSA”), and are currently negotiating a Transmission Agreement. Navopache’s stranded cost plan and this Agreement are contingent upon the successful completion and implementation of the PSA and the Transmission Agreement. The PSA is conditioned upon several factors including the successful completion of the merger of Plains and Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association, Inc.

6.2.1. If the PSA between Navopache and **PNM** is not implemented because the conditions for implementation listed in Section 3.3 of the PSA are not met, or the PSA is substantially modified so as to materially affect Navopache’s stranded costs, then Navopache may re-file with the Commission a new stranded cost recovery plan under Commission Decision No. 61677.

6.2.2. Additionally, if Navopache is unable to negotiate a Transmission Agreement to obtain transmission service (ii conjunction with the PSA) on reasonable terms and conditions within 60 days **after** the implementation of the **PSA**, then Navopache may re-file with the Commission a new stranded cost recovery plan under Commission Decision No. 61677.

7. **Miscellaneous Matters.**

7.1 The procedural schedule currently in place in connection with Navopache’s stranded costs and unbundled standard offer rates will be suspended pending the

Commission's consideration of issuing an order approving this Agreement. The procedural schedule currently in place in connection with Navopache's stranded costs and unbundled standard offer rates will be vacated upon the issuance of this order.

7.2 If any portion of the Commission order approving this Agreement or if any provision of this Agreement is declared by a court or regulatory body to be invalid or **unlawful** in any respect, then any Party to this Agreement may, at its sole discretion, have no further obligation or liability under this Agreement.

7.3 In the event of any dispute over the interpretation of this Agreement or the implementation of any of the provisions of this Agreement, the Parties will promptly convene a conference and in good faith shall attempt to resolve such dispute.

7.4 The Parties are aware that there is a rulemaking matter pending before the Commission in Docket No. E-OOOOOA-99-0205 concerning the possible implementation of an Environmental Portfolio Standard.

7.5 On February 22, 2000, the New Mexico Public Regulation Commission ("NMRC") issued a final order in Utility Case No. 2989, which ordered **Tri-State** Generation and Transmission Association, Inc. and Plains to pay to each of Plains' thirteen member cooperatives (**including** Navopache) a share of the \$5.2 million gain **from** Plains' sale of its transmission and other assets to PNM. Navopache's share of the gain is expected to be approximately \$878,000.

7.5.1. Navopache became aware of the **NMRC's final** order in Utility Case No. 2989 on or about March 31, 2000 and immediately informed Commission Staff. This was approximately three business days before the hearing in this matter, currently **scheduled for Wednesday, April 5, 2000. At this time, the parties cannot determine**

whether Navopache's share of the gain from Plains' sale of its transmission and other assets to PNM should apply to Navopache's distribution rates, generation rates, the CTC, or some combination of these.

7.5.2. Navopache intends to file a rate case before the end of the year, and Staff believes that the disposition of Navopache's share of the gain from Plains' sale of its transmission and other assets to PNM and its proper allocation should be dealt with in that proceeding.

7.5.3. Navopache agrees to deposit funds from its share of the gain from Plains' sale of its transmission and other assets to PNM in a separate, interest-bearing account. Navopache shall address this matter in its next rate case filing. Navopache further agrees to file its next rate case no later than March 31, 2001.


8. Resolution of Litigation.

8.1 Upon issuance by the Commission of an order approving this Agreement that is no longer subject to judicial review, Navopache will withdraw with prejudice all pending litigation (if any) concerning the Retail Electric Competition Rules brought by Navopache against the Commission. At present, no litigation is pending.

DATED this 5th day April, 2000.

(Signatures contained on the following page.)

NAVOPACHE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.


By: 
Printed Name: Paul O'Dair
Title: Manager Financial Services
Date: 4/5/00

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION,

UTILITIES DIVISION STAFF

By: 
Printed Name: DEBORAH R. SCOTT
Title: Director, Utilities Division
Date: 4/5/00

ARIZONA COMMUNITY ACTION ASSOCIATION

By: 
Printed Name: JANE STEVENSON
Title: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Date: 4-5-00

**Navopache Electric Cooperative, Inc.
Implementation Plan for Stranded Cost Recovery**

1. Navopache's generation-related stranded costs derive from the stranded costs of its historical power supplier, Plains Electric Generation and Transmission Cooperative, Inc. (Plains).
2. Navopache has not identified any stranded cost associated with regulatory assets.
3. Navopache's share of Plains' compensation for stranded cost is approximately **\$11,785,410**. This amount was determined in a competitive bidding process for Plains' assets conducted during 1998.
4. The winning bidder for Plains' assets is a joint proposal by TriState Generation and Transmission Association, Inc. (Tri-State) and Public Service Company of New Mexico (PNM). Plains **will** be merged into Tri-State.
5. As a result of the bidding process, Navopache is selecting PNM as its power supplier under **a contract** which permits Navopache to terminate the contract in 10 years.
6. Immediately before the merger of **Tri-State** and Plains, PNM is advancing to Plains, **on** Navopache's behalf, Navopache's share of Plains' compensation for stranded cost. PNM recovers Navopache's share of Plains' compensation for stranded cost through the rates it charges to Navopache.
7. Under the PNM contract, Navopache's purchased power costs decrease from \$0.0545 per **kWh** paid in 1998 under the Plains contract to less than **\$0.04** per **kWh**, **including recovery of stranded costs.**
8. On an annualized basis, over **ten** years, Navopache's share of Plains' compensation for stranded cost is **\$1,775,645** per year.
9. Navopache normally reflects changes in its power supply costs through, its purchased power adjustment mechanism which is applied to all customers' **kWh** charges.
10. Navopache proposes to initially recover its share of Plains' compensation for stranded cost from all customers through its purchased power cost adjustment mechanism **on a per kWh** basis. Thus, in compliance with Decision No. 60977, stranded **costs** are **allocated** to customer classes in a manner consistent with the current rate treatment of those classes. This recovery plan may be modified in subsequent rate cases.
11. Navopache proposes to initially assess a stranded cost recovery charge of \$0.00605 per **kWh**. This amount is computed by dividing the annualized amount of **\$1,775,645** by the forecast **kWh** sales in the first contract year in the absence of retail electric competition of 293,390 **MWh**. This charge applies to standard offer service (as part of Navopache's unbundled rates) and to customers who select a competitive power supplier.
12. Navopache further proposes to automatically modify the charge annually as the total **kWh** sales (including **kWh** sales by third parties to Navopache's distribution customers) in its service territory change.
13. Stranded cost recovery related to Navopache's share of Plains' compensation for stranded cost starts at the date of initial service under the PNM contract and ends ten years later.

Navapache's Unbundled Standard Offer Rate Elements

Unbundled Service	1-US (residential)	2-US (small commercial)	3-US (small C&I)	4-US (medium C&I)	5-US (large C&I)	6-US (irrigation & water pumping)
Generation including transaction costs & losses	Generation costs per kWh vary from month to month when Navapache purchases from Plains and when Navapache purchases from PNM. Currently these costs are recovered through the purchased power adjustment mechanism which is based on a bundled rate. Therefore, transmission, generation, and ancillary service charges will continue to be bundled.					
CTC	Proposed at \$0.00605 per kWh; may be revised as kWh sales change over time or if Navapache elects to prepay the remaining principal associated with the Part One Demand Rate.					
Generation related billing & collection	Not applicable. Generation service not offered separately.					
Transmission	With Plains service, transmission charges are bundled with generation charges. With new power supply, transmission costs will be set by tariff or contract and are expected to vary per kWh from month to month. Currently transmission costs are recovered through the purchased power adjustment mechanism which is based on a bundled rate. Therefore, transmission, generation, and ancillary service charges will continue to be bundled.					
Metering*	\$2.85/mo	\$8.05/mo	\$24.76/mo	\$26.88/mo	\$26.88/mo	\$12.30/mo
Meter reading*	\$1.18/mo	\$1.19/mo	\$1.42/mo	\$1.78/mo	\$1.78/mo	\$1.42/mo
Spinning reserve	With Plains service, ancillary service charges are bundled with generation charges. With PNM power supply, spinning reserve is bundled with generation service. Currently, these charges are recovered through the purchased power adjustment mechanism.					
Supplemental reserve	Treated same as spinning reserve service.					
Regulation & frequency response	Treated same as transmission service.					
Energy imbalance	Treated same as spinning reserve service.					
Distribution service*	\$5.13/mo \$0.0224/kWh	\$1.42/mo \$0.0293/kWh	\$46.73/mo \$2.92/kW \$0.0182/kWh	\$44.25/mo \$2.92/kW \$0.0205/kWh	\$42.16/mo \$2.92/kW \$0.0182/kWh	\$1.90/HIP \$0.024/kWh
Scheduling, system control & dispatch	Treated same as transmission service.					
Reactive supply & voltage control	Treated same as transmission service.					
Must run generation	Not applicable - Navapache has no must run generation and there is no must run generation in Navapache's service area.					
System benefits*	\$0.0005/kWh	\$0.0005/kWh	\$0.0005/kWh	\$0.0005/kWh	\$0.0005/kWh	\$0.0005/kWh
Distribution related billing & collection*	\$2.09/mo	\$2.09/mo	\$2.09/mo	\$2.09/mo	\$4.18/mo	\$1.48/mo

Notes: Schedules 7-US and 8-US for security lights and street lighting are not unbundled.

* Unbundled rates approved in Decision No. 61283.