

Peter J. Mattheis  
Matthew J. Jones  
BRICKFIELD, BURCHETTE & RITTS, P.C.  
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.  
800 West Tower  
Washington, D.C. 20007  
Telephone: (202) 342-0800

Glen E. Davies  
PARSONS, DAVIES, KINGHORN & PETERS, P.C.  
185 South State Street  
Suite 700  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
Telephone: (801) 363-4300

ATTORNEYS FOR NUCOR STEEL, A DIVISION OF NUCOR CORPORATION  
**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH**

---

In the Matter of the Application of ) Docket No. 98-2035-04  
PACIFICORP and SCOTTISH POWER PLC )  
for an Order Approving the Issuance of ) NUCOR STEEL'S RESPONSE  
PACIFICORP Common Stock ) TO APPLICANTS'  
 ) ISSUES MEMORANDUM

---

Pursuant to the Public Service Commission of Utah's (the "Commission") April 2, 1999 Order issued in this docket (the "Order"), Nucor Steel, a Division of Nucor Corporation ("Nucor") hereby submits this response to *Applicants' Issues Memorandum*, filed on April 12, 1999. In support of this Response, Nucor states as follows:

**I. General Concerns**

The lists of issues submitted by parties to this proceeding for consideration by the Commission are, by their very nature, general and non-specific. The issues in this proceeding are only just now being developed, and will be further formed and refined as we move towards the hearing. At this stage in the process, issues lists represent little more than areas in which various participants have concern, and items they believe they may want to address at hearing. This is particularly true with issues as general as "competition" - a very general concern, some portion of

which falls within the purview of federal regulatory agencies, some of which falls within the purview of state regulatory agencies. As the parties move forward, the issues each party will pursue naturally shrinks. In this context, Nucor urges the Commission to take an expansive view as it considers appropriate potential issues for this proceeding.

Moreover, Nucor is concerned that Applicants' suggestions as to a number of "issues" (*e.g.*, industry restructuring, divestiture) represent an attempt to limit potential conditions that may be applied by the Commission to remedy problems caused by the acquisition. For example, there are numerous concepts contained within the rubric of "industry restructuring," such as unbundling of tariffs, functional unbundling, corporate/affiliate reorganization, transmission system reorganization, and transmission access, that may be suggested as appropriate conditions on the merger. Nucor asks the Commission to decline to take potential remedies off the table at this stage in the process. Clear development of the issues is lacking at this time, and the identification of appropriate remedies as to any problems identified lags further behind. While Nucor did not submit an issues list in this proceeding, Nucor intends to participate, and is concerned with any attempt by the Applicants to unnecessarily limit the issues to be heard, or the remedies/conditions that may be imposed.

## **II. Special Contract Issues**

The Commission ordered the Applicants to provide a memorandum "in which the Applicants shall identify all issues, which have previously been identified in any of the parties' Issue list submissions, that the Applicants contend are irrelevant to the considerations which the Commission must make in determining whether to grant or deny the Applicants' Joint Application," as well as identify issues as to which the Applicants contend that "other parties, rather than the Applicants, have the burden of proof." Order at pp. 1-2. The Applicants', in their Issues Memorandum, argue

that, “the parties have raised, in relatively cursory fashion, some issues which require speculation regarding future events, including potential changes in the existing statutory framework. Applicants’ submit that the parties who raised those issues should have the burden to show that the transaction has either a beneficial or harmful impact on those issues.” *Applicants’ Issues Memorandum*, at p. 8. This response to the issues lists is likewise cursory in nature, oversimplifies issues to suit their purposes, and, in characterizing certain issues as speculative, attempts to use the very nature of issues in a forward-looking proceeding as the basis for excluding issues.

Of particular concern to Nucor is Applicants’ designation of special contract issues as “speculative,” and therefore subject to a shift in the burden of proof. In their *Statement of Additional Issues*, the Large Customer Group and the Utah Industrial Energy Consumers listed as issues for the proceeding, among others, “the impacts of the merger on special contract customers,” and the “merger conditions . . . necessary or appropriate to protect special contract customers, as well as all Utah ratepayers, from potential risks or adverse consequences of the merger.” *LGC and UIEC Statement of Additional Issues*, at p. 2. Similarly, the DPU questioned whether Scottish Power will assume PacifiCorp’s existing obligations, including special contracts, and if so for how long. *Division of Public Utilities Statement of Issues*, at ¶4.e. The Committee of Consumer Services likewise identifies “ScottishPower’s corporate policy on special contracts” as an issue. *Committee of Consumer Services Statement of Issues*, at p. 4. In a similar vein, the Committee identifies the following issue to be considered:

Cost-benefit analysis detailing the impact of the merger on Utah. Such analysis should include: economic development; low income programs; environmental stewardship; energy conservation initiatives; community presence; etc.

*Committee of Consumer Services Statement of Issues*, at p. 4. As economic development is one of the reasons for entering into and perpetuating special contracts, the impact of the merger on economic development necessarily implicates special contracts.

The Applicants dismiss the relevance of issues related to special contract customers by (1) noting the Applicants' statement that it "will honor all existing contractual obligations" and (2) noting the existence of the task force considering special contracts, which process, the Applicants assert, "will determine the offer, renewal, availability and terms for future special contracts in Utah." *Applicants' Issues Memorandum*, at p. 9. As a result of these conclusions, as well as the speculative nature of the concern, the Applicants conclude that as to special contracts the burden of proof should shift to other parties to show that special contracts are harmed by the acquisition. *Id.* It is unclear to Nucor what "burden of proof" the Applicants believe they are proposing to shift, but Nucor does not know of any reason why special contract customers should be singled out for disparate treatment. The Applicants seem to suggest that the burden on them is to show that the acquisition would provide net positive benefits to customers, except that they do not need to consider the impact on special contract customers in making their case. Nucor suggests that the Applicants' view is unfairly limiting. The Applicants have done nothing to demonstrate why special contract customers, as a class, should be singled out for treatment different from other classes of ratepayers.

Examined in isolation, the impact of the acquisition on any class of PacifiCorp customers is speculative. But it is the impact on customers that is of importance to the Commission in determining whether the proposed transaction provides a net positive benefit. Special contract customers should be viewed no differently from the tariffed ratepayers in terms of the potential impacts of the proposed transaction, and should be considered along with all of PacifiCorp's

ratepayers in evaluating the net positive benefits of the acquisition on customers. To this end, the Commission, in language set forth in the Applicant's pleading, stated:

However, Applicants do carry the burden in all areas subject to our jurisdiction to show that on balance the merger will be beneficial and those areas will be our primary focus in this case.

Commission Report and Order, Docket No. 87-035-27 (the *Utah Power/PacifiCorp* merger).

Nothing in the Applicants' Memorandum details why the burden of proof should shift with respect to the impact of the acquisition on special contract customers. The impact of the acquisition on special contracts (including the economic development aspects of those types of contracts) is as relevant to the net positive benefits analysis as the impact on any class, and it would be inappropriate at this stage of the process to shift the burden of proof away from the Applicants as to how the acquisition impacts any ratepayer class.

WHEREFORE, for the reasons set forth above, Nucor requests that the Commission take an expansive view of the issues to be considered in this proceeding and the remedies and conditions available, and that specifically the Commission decline to single out special contract customers and shift the Applicants' burden of proof with respect to special contract issues as requested by Applicants.

DATED this 29<sup>th</sup> day of April, 1999.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Glen E. Davies  
PARSONS, DAVIES, KINGHORN & PETERS, P.C.  
185 South State Street, Suite 700  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
(801) 363-4300

Peter J. Mattheis  
Matthew J. Jones  
BRICKFIELD, BURCHETTE & RITTS, P.C.  
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.  
800 West Tower  
Washington, D.C. 20007  
(202) 342-0800  
(202) 342-0807 -- Telefax

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of April, 1999, I caused to be mailed, first class, postage prepaid, a true and correct copy of NUCOR STEEL'S RESPONSE TO APPLICANTS' ISSUES MEMORANDUM to:

Michael Ginsberg  
Assistant Attorney General  
Utah Division of Public Utilities  
160 East 300 South  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

2260 Baseline, Suite 200  
Boulder, CO 80302

Doug Tingey  
Assistant Attorney General  
Committee of Consumer Services  
160 East 300 South  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Edward A. Hunter  
Stoel Rives Boley Jones & Grey  
201 South Main Street, #1100  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Stephen R. Randle  
Randle, Deamer, Zarr, Romrell & Lee, P.C.  
139 East South Temple, Suite 330  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111-1004

Brian W. Burnett  
Callister, Nebeker & McCullough  
10 East South Temple, #800  
Salt Lake City, UT 84133

Daniel Moquin  
Assistant Attorney General  
1594 West North Temple, Suite 300  
Salt Lake City, UT 84116

Dr. Charles E. Johnson  
1338 Foothill Boulevard, Suite 134  
Salt Lake City, UT 84108

Eric Blank  
Land and Water Fund of the Rockies

Lee R. Brown  
V.P. Contracts, Human Resources  
Public & Government Affairs  
238 North 2200 West

Salt Lake City, UT 84116

Gary A. Dodge  
Parr Waddoups Brown Gee & Loveless  
185 South State Street, Suite 1300  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111-1536

F. Robert Reeder  
William J. Evans  
Parsons Behle & Latimer  
201 South Main Street, Suite 1800  
P.O. Box 45898  
Salt Lake City, UT 84145-0898

Matthew F. McNulty, III  
Van Cott, Bagley, Cornwall & McCarthy  
50 South Main Street, Suite 1600  
P.O. Box 45340  
Salt Lake City, UT 84145

Douglas O. Hunter  
General Manager  
Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems  
2825 East Cottonwood Parkway, Suite 200  
Salt Lake City, UT 84121

David F. Crabtree  
Deseret Generation & Transmission Co.  
5295 South 300 West, Suite 500  
Murray, UT 84107

Brian L. Farr  
Assistant Attorney General  
160 East 300 South  
P.O. Box 140857  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0857

Steven Allred  
Salt Lake City Corp. Law Dept.  
451 South State Street, Suite 505  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Roger O. Tew  
60 South 600 East, Suite 200  
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

Paul T. Morris  
3600 Constitution Boulevard  
West Valley City, UT 84119

---

Glen E. Davies