

***CORRECTED Minutes:***  
***Process Standardization Working Group Meeting***

Wednesday, March 21, 2001, 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.  
 APS – 400 N. 5<sup>th</sup> Street  
 Conference Room 2 North

<b><i>Topic</i></b>	<b><i>Lead</i></b>	<b><i>Anticipated Outcome</i></b>	<b><i>Att.</i></b>
1	Welcome, Introductions, Sign-In, and Approval of Minutes  Evelyn Dryer	Ms. Dryer welcomed participants to the full group session of the Process Standardization Working Group meeting. A sign-in sheet was circulated. Participants introduced themselves. Minutes from the March 7, 2001 meeting were approved with changes to section 3, 6, 10 & 11.  Stacy Aguayo (APS) communicated that she will continue managing the meeting minutes and issues through April 2001 and will need a volunteer to handle the Minutes effective May 2001. LeAnn Torkelson (R.W. Beck) volunteered.	1
2	Report from Janie Mollon on revised Change Control Process  Janie Mollon	Janie presented the revised change control process. The group provided comments/changes to the document.  ACC Staff communicated a concern of posting the Change Request Form to their website in a format allowing participants to update online. UDCs offered to look into posting the form on their sites.  <b>Action Item:</b> Janie will incorporate the comments and re-present it at the April 18, 2001 meeting.  Action Item: UDC will determine if they can post the Change Control Process Request Form on their website for Participants to fill out online.	2

Barbara Keene communicated that Staff is still working on the issue. Staff is looking for feedback from the Participants on how their positions in an effort to help direct Staff on this decision.

The group confirmed that there are 2 issues that need to be addressed...

1. What is the definition of a Final Bill and Customer
2. Rules prohibiting estimation of Direct Access Bills and Final Bills – Need flexibility for situations where it is impossible to obtain reads (i.e. damaged meter etc.).

Janie Mollon (New West Energy) – communicated that if they had a customer that had 20 sites, they would count it as 1 customer not 20. If New West Energy discontinued serving one of the sites they do not consider the closing bill for that site a Final Bill because they still serve the “Customer”.

The issue is the rules do not allow a Final Bill to be estimated. New West is stating that under the above scenario they would not consider it a Final Bill thus, if any estimating had to occur due to a faulty meter etc, they would estimate. The UDC however, is unable to estimate since they consider the “customer” at the meter level.

Barbara asked for a list of reasons why a read might not be possible. The group discussed the following reasons:

- Loss of battery
- Performance by MSP or MRSP
- Damaged meter
- Faulty meter
- > 10% of intervals for the month are estimated (approved AZ standard)
- No access to the customer site

**Action Item:** Staff will report at the April 4, 2001 meeting

Issue 100 :  
 What process can be developed to facilitate a customer installing an IDR meter and equipment before DA that allows a customer to move to DA and back with the same equipment.

1 hour discussion

Evelyn  
 Dryer

#### TEP

Evelyn Dryer (TEP) reported on TEP' proposal (attached). TEP will agree to transfer ownership of a meter to the customer/service provider when going DA for average book value for the class and IDR type of the meter being transferred. And allow the meter to be transferred back to TEP when the customer returns to Standard Offer, TEP will pay the utility's average net book value adjusted for the passage of time for the class of meter being transferred plus administrative and service establishment charges. The depreciation will be rounded to the next highest year in the determination of the net book value at which the utility/UDC repurchases the meter from the customer/service provider.

TEP has a list of approved meters to be installed in their territory on their website.

If a Standard Offer customer requests an IDR meter, the customer must pay the incremental costs for that meter and the installation of the meter. TEP will own and maintain the meter. If the customer opts for Direct Access in the future, the customer would be required to go through the process stated above.

[Action Item: Would TEP charge a testing fee to the customer/ESP if the meter had been recently tested?](#)

#### Cooperatives

John Wallace (GCECA) reported on the Cooperative proposal (attached). The Cooperatives reported that they are not able to accommodate issue 100 for several reasons:

1. With the exception to Navopache, the Cooperative territories are not open
2. Significantly higher costs of purchasing, interrogating and maintaining IDR meters that are not being recovered through current rates
3. Would be required to hire and train additional meter personnel to program, interrogate and maintain IDR meters
4. Currently, no way to determine if it would be economically feasible to offer IDR metering to Standard Offer Customers.

Exceptions: Some Cooperatives (i.e. Trico) may be able to accommodate Issue 100 in the future since they are beginning to install IDR meters .

[Action item: UDCs to determine if they want their names listed in the metering handbook.](#)

#### Citizens

LeAnn Torkleson (R.W. Beck/CUC) confirmed that CUC will not be able to provide IDR meters for Standard Offer Customers regardless of load. At such time that CUC offers IDR meters to Standard Offer customers, they will look at proposals to accommodate Issue 100.

4  
cont.

**Action Item:** LeAnn will find out if Citizens has IDRs meters on their approved list of meters that they are willing to [purchase](#).

**SRP**

SRP confirmed that they have a one time only fee for Standard Offer customer to request an IDR meter to be installed.

Next Steps:

**Janie Mollon expressed a concern of how this will be documented to ensure that the UDC will not change their minds at a later date. The group agreed that this issue is closed with the exception of implementation. The group will wait until the draft metering handbook is out to determine how Janie's concerns will be addressed**

- |   |  |                     |  |
|---|--|---------------------|--|
| 5 | <p>Report from Janet Henry regarding action item for Issue 109 <i>New CC&amp;N application needs to be reviewed to verify there are no inconsistencies between what the PSWG has approved.</i></p> | <p>Janet Henry</p>  | <p>Janet Henry (AXON Field Solutions) reported no inconsistencies in the MSP CC&amp;N requirements and suggested the MSP Performance Task Team look at incorporating the requirements into the Performance document.</p> <p>The group agreed to assign the review of the document regarding certifying workers to classification and how this is going to be accomplished. Janet will highlight the document areas that need to be considered in this review.</p>      |
| 6 | <p>Q&amp;A for Task Team Chair addressing Issue 101: MRSP Performance Monitoring and Testing</p>   | <p>Janie Mollon</p> | <p>Janie Mollon (New West Energy) reported that she has received comments back on the Performance document and will be addressing the comments from the March 7, 2001 Policy meeting as well. Janie will have drafts of the requested standard letters available for review by the group at the next Task Team meeting.</p> <p>The next meeting will be held at New West Energy on April 12<sup>th</sup>. An agenda will be sent out confirming the date and time.</p> |
| 7 | <p>Q&amp;A for Task Team Chair addressing Issue 61: MSP Performance Monitoring and Testing</p>   | <p>John Wallace</p> | <p>John Wallace (GCSECA) reported that the next Task Team meeting is set for April 13<sup>th</sup> at New West Energy.</p>   |
| 8 | <p>Q&amp;A for Task Team Chair addressing Issue 107: Develop a document showing all agreed upon Metering business rules</p>  | <p>Stacy Aguayo</p> | <p>Stacy Aguayo (APS) reported that the team is on task to have a draft of the AZ Metering Handbook ready for the April 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.</p>  |

9 Day of Install and Day of Removal Issue 41 and 103 Evelyn Dryer Janie reported on where the VEE group left off before the Holidays regarding this issue. 5

1 hour discussion

The group agreed that a separate Task Team is required to develop the Day of Install and Day of Removal Process covering both MSP and MRSP responsibility. The Task Team will make a recommendation on where the process will reside (i.e. VEE doc, Metering Handbook etc).

The group agreed to allow the MRSP or MSP Performance Task Team (whoever finishes first) to complete the Performance Monitoring document until they are ready to look at Day of Install/Day of Removal. At that time, the MRSP Performance Task Team will be put on hold while the Day of Install/Day of Removal task Team is established to complete the process. Once this process is complete, the MRSP Performance Task Team will re-group to develop the Performance monitoring criteria around Day of Install/Day of Removal. The MSP Performance Monitoring Task Team will also incorporate into their Performance Monitoring into their document.

10 Issue 108 - Inconsistency involving transmission and ancillary services as non Competitive in definitions (1601 29) and C - Competitive in Billing elements(1612 O) and tariffs (1606 C2) (ACC Staff) 1 hour

Barbara Keene communicated that her report back to the Commission on this issue is due April 10<sup>th</sup> 8<sup>th</sup>.

With the exception of APS, all participants agreed to removing "Competitive" and Non Competitive from the Billing Element section (R-14-2-1612 O )

APS will communicate directly to Barbara Keene their position on this issue by March 26, 2001.

The group agreed that Issue 108 is closed.

11 Review Open issues and re-prioritize Evelyn Dryer

The group agreed to defer reviewing Open issues and re-prioritizing to the next meeting

Issue Discussion

**Issue 111 – Approving the change to the 810**

The group agreed that this field is Conditional since a read is only required to be on the bill for Residential customers and not required for Commercial. SRP' has an issue with this since they do not show reads for interval metered customers regardless if it's a Commercial or Residential customer. Gene Slechta will take this back to SRP to re-look at the issue before the group agrees to approve changing the meter read field to Conditional from Mandatory.

12	New Issues	Evelyn Dryer	There were no new issues added to the Master Issue list.	6
13	Meeting Evaluation	Evelyn Dryer	The group provided feedback.	
14	Set Next Agenda	Evelyn Dryer	The group set the next agenda.	
15	Adjourn Meeting	Evelyn Dryer	The meeting was adjourned.	

## PARTICIPANT LIST

PARTICIPANTS AT MARCH 21, 2001  
PROCESS STANDARDIZATION WORKING GROUP

Name	Organization
Aguayo, Stacy	APS
Brown, Debbie	SRP
Dryer, Evelyn	TEP
Flood, Kathy	SRP
Henry, Janet	Axon Field Solutions
Keene, Barbara	Commission Staff
Michaud, Paul	Navopache
Mollon, Janie	New West Energy
Pichoff, Darrel	KR Saline & Associates
Renfro, Shirley	Pinnacle West
Schenk, Jenine	APS
Slechta, Gene	SRP
Taylor, Judy	TEP
Torkelson, LeeAnn	R.W. Beck / Citizens
Wallace, John	GCSECA
Wontor, Jim	APSES