

ORIGINAL



0000000909

09 Mar 2004

RECEIVED

Docket Control - W01004B-03-0722  
Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 W. Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007-2996

2004 MAR 11 A 11: 40

AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCUMENT CONTROL

Enclosed please find an original and thirteen copies of a Complainant originated document drafted in response to a 05 Mar 2004 ACC letter s/David M. Roland.

The document is provided in response to an ACC staff request for an extension of time in Docket #W01004B-03-0722 which Complainant does not intend to protest.

Please enter for the record.

Earl M. Hasbrouck  
P. O. Box 1034  
Ash Fork, AZ 86320-1034  
928/637-0302

EMH:mtf

Encl: Orig + 13

Arizona Corporation Commission  
**DOCKETED**

MAR 11 2004

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

ORIGINAL

Tuesday, March 9, 2004

RECEIVED

Arizona Corporation Commission  
DOCKETED

David M. Ronald  
Arizona Corporation Commission Legal Division  
1200 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

2004 MAR 11 A 11: 40  
AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCUMENT CONTROL

MAR 11 2004

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

Re: Staff's Motion For An Extension - Docket #W01004B-03-0722/Ash Fork Water

Dear Mr. Ronald:

As you are aware, due to bureaucratic chicanery this writer entered the above referenced action as a Complainant rather than as an Intervenor on 01 March 2004. For the record, Complainant has no objection to your request to extend the tolling of the statute of limitations in Docket No. W01004B-03-0722.

Complainant does, however, have a number of questions as to the basis for your request. They include:

1. "Who" determined there are arsenic issues present in this case?
2. "What" do the "arsenic issues" complained about consist of?
3. "Where" were the arsenic issues discovered and by whom?
4. "When" was it determined that there are arsenic issues present?
5. "Why" (considering, as you are aware, this writer has been involved in the Ash Fork Water matters since August of 2002) have not the parties to Docket #W01004B-02-0768, Docket #01004B-03-0510 and Docket #01004B-03-0722 been notified or otherwise made aware of "arsenic issues?"
6. "How much" of a percentage of arsenic is present "where?"
7. By what standard(s) of measurement has the presence of arsenic been calculated?
8. Is the presence of the element arsenic a true health issue or is this just one more misleading red herring thrown into the mix by a corrupt regulatory agency?

As a final, separate matter, this Complainant is a little confused. You will recall that shortly after Judge Farmer approved intervention into the Ash Fork Water matters long, long ago, you and I personally discussed the very frustrating fact that both the applicant utility and the regulatory authority seemed to have a peculiar penchant for concealment and secrecy regarding the various activities of each - activities which should have been a matter of public record but clearly were not; activities which, it turned out, neither the utility nor the regulatory authority had any intention of revealing to outsider Intervenor. At the time of that discussion in 2002, you asserted that you were on the staff of another agency which was supposed to represent consumers in rate cases before the Commission. Knowing that I had intended to (at least, partially) turn this whole matter of bureaucratic corruption to the custody and care of that agency, my final question, then, is this:

9. How is that consumer representation agency tied to the Legal Division of the Arizona Corporation Commission?