

ORIGINAL



0000171223

RECEIVED

2016 JUN 24 P 1:45

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

Memorandum
From the office of
Chairman Doug Little
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 W. WASHINGTON
PHOENIX, ARIZONA
(602) 542-0745


TO: Docket Control
DATE: June 24, 2016
FROM: Chairman Doug Little's Office
SUBJECT: APS E-01345A-16-0036

Chairman Little's office received the attached 2 emails, referencing and 1 in opposition of the above docket number. The attached emails can be viewed under the above docket number, on the website via the docket link, or in Docket.

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

JUN 24 2016

DOCKETED BY 

Andrea Gaston

From: Tim Lyon <tlyon2222@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, June 24, 2016 8:23 AM
To: Tobin-Web; Forese-Web; Little-Web; Stump-Web; RBurns-Web
Subject: Re: APS second filing of errata on 23 Jun 2016

E-01315A-16-0036

Commissioners,

The Arizona Public Service Company's Second Filing of Errata (Jun 23 2016) states the following;

"A single number on Page 1, Column B, Line 5 of the filed E-5 inadvertently shows the net addition to net plant as "521,774" when it should actually show "500,277." **This errata was not substantive**, it did not alter the net balances before and after the test year in that row."

This error is under "Net Plant Includible in Rate Base"

I find it very telling that APS does not consider an overage of \$21,497 in its rate case figures to raise our rates as "not substantive" Also, it does appear to alter the net balances in the test year ended balance in that row by \$21,497.

Timothy M. Lyon

Capt. USAF, Ret.

Andrea Gaston

From: Mark DiCocco <markdcoco@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2016 2:38 PM
To: Little-Web
Subject: APS Increase E .01345-16-0036 /oppose

Doug,
I hope this finds you well. I contacted you previously through your "Concealed Carry" email and you were kind enough to respond.

I wanted to state my (our) opinion regarding the proposed APS increase that is currently under consideration. While we don't begrudge anyone the right to make a profit, the increase that they are asking for seems very high as a one time jump. Would it make more sense to space out smaller increases over time in order to get where they believe they need to be? With the state of the current economy under this presidential regime, an immediate jump to their proposed rate would be very detrimental. I understand they are also trying to do harm to the alternative power generation groups. I'm not knowledgeable on this, but would be interested in knowing more. Is there a link to their proposal you can share?

Thank you for your service and watching out for us.

Regards,

Mark DiCocco

"When wealth is lost, nothing is lost. When health is lost, something is lost. When character is lost, everything is lost."
Billy Graham