

From: Ed Gerak [mailto:egerak@bwccd.com]

Sent: Thursday, April 17, 2014 9:07 AM

To: mike@powerauthority.org

Cc: mpowell@ucseng.com

Subject: Draft Plan Comments

Mike(s),

Here are my comments/questions regarding this plan.

- On page 6, (B2 – Amounts of Contingent Capacity & Firm Energy) last paragraph, it is unclear whether the amounts listed are for Arizona or all three states. This should be clarified given the possible time between now and next renewal.
- On page 10, (B3 – Information Workshops...) – Isn't there a code @ unmet demand with regards to triggering this process? Shouldn't it be included in this section somewhere?
- On page 12, (4a – Regulatory Timeline) – Do we need to file a purchase power certificate again? If not, shouldn't this be specified for existing customers?
- On page 13, (4b- Application Requirements) Do we to refile an application of electric service? If not, shouldn't this be specified for existing customers?
- On page 13, (4b(1)-Do we need to list NGS surplus in our application due to its federal power status, but not its long term guarantee?
- On page 14, (4b(6) – How is agricultural load defined?
- On page 14 (4b(7) – Would the APA consider our Effluent contract similar to the CAP contracts with their possible loss and how would that factor into the one alternative that seems to favor Pinal?
- On page 14, (4b) – The time to cure is too short. 7 days is too quick, should be 14 or 30 days.
- On page 15, (4c) – The timeframe between draft and final plan is ambiguous, would clarity or proposed timeframe be beneficial?
- On page 17, (A1) – is there any rationale to ranking these in this order? Wouldn't a generic listing (like alphabetical) be appropriate?
- On page 22, (A2b(1)) – Are these numbers AZ specific or through the 3 states?
- On page 24, (B2) – Who would this be referring to?
- On page 30, (F) – Term should be for 50 years, because of length in the bill, MSCP, bonding & rate stability

- On page 32, Alternative 1 – There should be non 15% increased reduction? This would be far in excess of any PMI that would not have been established by a law. It seems like the primary alternative should match the intent and wording in the original bill
- On page 37, Alternative 5 – I am not sure why this is even being considered. There seems to be some consideration for a bad deal that Pinal county guys made years ago that is penalizing the Maricopa County districts. There seems to be no recognition for the original agreement and the benefits that these districts received in exchange for relinquishment of Ag water. If anyone should be impacted, it should be a shift of Schedule B power from CAWCD to Pinal counties.