

ORIGINAL



0000009412

256M

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS

2004 FEB 11 P 12:54

MARC SPITZER, Chairman
WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
JEFF HATCH-MILLER
MIKE GLEASON
KRISTIN K. MAYES

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCUMENT CONTROL

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF ARIZONA-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY, INC., AN ARIZONA CORPORATION, FOR A DETERMINATION OF THE CURRENT FAIR VALUE OF ITS UTILITY PLANT AND PROPERTY AND FOR INCREASES IN ITS RATES AND CHARGES BASED THEREON FOR UTILITY SERVICE BY ITS SUN CITY WEST WATER AND WASTEWATER DISTRICTS.

DOCKET NO. WS-01303A-02-0867

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF ARIZONA-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY, INC., AN ARIZONA CORPORATION, FOR A DETERMINATION OF THE CURRENT FAIR VALUE OF ITS UTILITY PLANT AND PROPERTY AND FOR INCREASES IN ITS RATES AND CHARGES BASED THEREON FOR UTILITY SERVICE BY ITS SUN CITY WATER AND WASTEWATER DISTRICTS.

DOCKET NO. WS-01303A-02-0868

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF ARIZONA-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY, INC., AN ARIZONA CORPORATION, FOR A DETERMINATION OF THE CURRENT FAIR VALUE OF ITS UTILITY PLANT AND PROPERTY AND FOR INCREASES IN ITS RATES AND CHARGES BASED THEREON FOR UTILITY SERVICE BY ITS MOHAVE WATER DISTRICT AND ITS HAVASU WATER DISTRICT.

DOCKET NO. W-01303A-02-0869

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF ARIZONA-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY, INC., AN ARIZONA CORPORATION, FOR A DETERMINATION OF THE CURRENT FAIR VALUE OF ITS UTILITY PLANT AND PROPERTY AND FOR INCREASES IN ITS RATES AND CHARGES BASED THEREON FOR UTILITY SERVICE BY ITS ANTHEM WATER DISTRICT, ITS AGUA FRIA WATER DISTRICT, AND ITS ANTHEM/AGUA FRIA WASTEWATER DISTRICT.

DOCKET NO. WS-01303A-02-0870

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

FEB 11 2004

DOCKETED BY

1 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
2 ARIZONA-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY,
3 INC., AN ARIZONA CORPORATION, FOR A
4 DETERMINATION OF THE CURRENT FAIR
5 VALUE OF ITS UTILITY PLANT AND
6 PROPERTY AND FOR INCREASES IN ITS
7 RATES AND CHARGES BASED THEREON FOR
8 UTILITY SERVICE BY ITS TUBAC WATER
9 DISTRICT.

PROCEDURAL ORDER

BY THE COMMISSION:

7 On November 22, and December 13, 2002, Arizona-American Water Company, Inc.
8 (“Arizona-American” or “Company”) filed with the Arizona Corporation Commission
9 (“Commission”) applications in the above-captioned dockets for rate increases in the Applicant’s
10 water and wastewater districts.

11 A hearing on the consolidated applications was held as scheduled, concluding on December
12 23, 2004. A post-hearing briefing schedule was set, with initial closing briefs due February 4, 2004,
13 and reply briefs due February 18, 2004.

14 On February 4, 2004, Arizona-American filed, along with its initial closing brief, a Motion to
15 Supplement the Record to Include Illustrative Schedules on Inverted-Block Rate Design (“Motion”).
16 The rate design schedules in question were filed as an exhibit to the Company’s initial closing brief
17 and addressed therein. The Motion states that while the Company believes it is unnecessary to
18 address the rate design for its water districts in this proceeding, the Company developed the inverted-
19 block rate design schedules in response to Commissioner Mundell’s comments to the Company on
20 the first day of the hearing. The Motion further states that it provided the inverted-block rate design
21 schedules to the other parties to this proceeding on January 27, 2004.

22 The initial reply briefs filed on February 4, 2004 by the Town of Youngtown, Sun Health
23 Corporation, and Mr. Frank Grimmelman all acknowledge, without objection, Arizona-American’s
24 inverted-block rate design schedules. Staff stated in its February 4, 2004 initial closing brief that it
25 has no objection to the admission of the Company’s updated rate structure, but that Staff would
26 reserve the right to address it, and to provide its own updated rate design proposal, in its reply brief.

27 On February 6, 2004, the Residential Utility Consumer Office (“RUCO”) filed a Response to
28

1 Arizona-American's Motion. RUCO states that it generally opposes the admission of evidence after
2 the close of the record because there is no opportunity for cross-examination and offering of rebuttal
3 evidence. RUCO further states, however, that it respects the Company's desire to offer an alternative
4 rate design in response to the Commissioner's comments at the commencement of the hearing, and
5 that given the timing of the comments, the late filing of a supplemental rate design appears
6 appropriate in this case. RUCO asserts that while it should not be required to waive the process to
7 which it is otherwise entitled, it intends to respond to the supplemental rate design in its reply brief,
8 and is therefore not requesting additional process.

9 On February 9, 2004, the Commission's Utilities Division Staff ("Staff") filed a Response to
10 Arizona-American's Motion. Staff's Response states that given the unusual circumstances, Staff
11 does not oppose Arizona-American's Motion as long as all other parties will have the opportunity to
12 supplement the record with their responses to the schedules in their own briefs, and that counsel for
13 the Company indicated to Staff that it does not oppose such responses.

14 No other responses to the Motion have been filed.

15 Under the circumstances, Arizona-American's request for leave to supplement the record to
16 include illustrative schedules on inverted-block rate design is reasonable and should be granted. The
17 other parties to this proceeding should likewise be allowed to supplement the record in response. No
18 parties have requested additional time to respond to the Company's inverted-block rate design
19 schedules. A response to the inverted-block rate design schedules in reply briefs, as indicated by
20 Staff and RUCO, is reasonable.

21 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the February 4, 2004 Motion to Supplement the Record
22 to Include Illustrative Schedules on Inverted-Block Rate Design filed by Arizona-American Water
23 Company, Inc. is hereby granted.

24 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that those parties wishing to respond to the inverted-block rate
25 design schedules and related issues raised in Arizona-American Water Company, Inc.'s February 4,
26 2004 Motion shall respond thereto in their February 18, 2004 closing briefs.

27 ...

28 ...

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the ex parte rule remains in effect.

2 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Presiding Officer may rescind, alter, amend, or waive
3 any portion of this Procedural Order by subsequent Procedural Order.

4 DATED this 11th day of February 2004.

5
6 
7 TEENA WOLFE
8 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

9 Copies of the foregoing mailed/delivered
10 this 11 day of February, 2004 to:

11 Norman D. James
12 Jay L. Shapiro
13 FENNEMORE CRAIG
14 3003 N. Central Avenue, Ste. 2600
15 Phoenix, AZ 85012
16 Attorneys for AZ-American Water Co.

17 Daniel Pozefsky
18 RUCO
19 1110 W. Washington, Ste. 220
20 Phoenix, AZ 85007

21 Carlton G. Young
22 3203 W. Steinbeck Drive
23 Anthem, Arizona 85068-1540

24 Frank J. Grimmelmann
25 42441 N. Cross Timbers Court
26 Anthem, Arizona 85086

27 Raymond E. Dare
28 SUN CITY TAXPAYERS' ASSOCIATION
12611 N. 103rd Avenue, Suite D
Sun City, Arizona 85351-3467

William P. Sullivan
Larry K. Udall
MARTINEZ & CURTIS
2712 N. 7th Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85006
Attorneys for the Town of Youngtown


1 Walter W. Meek
2 AUIA
3 2100 N. Central Avenue, Suite 210
4 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

4 John A. Buric
5 WARNER ANGLE HALLAM JACKSON & FORMANEK, PLC
6 3550 North Central Avenue, Ste. 1500
7 Phoenix, AZ 85012
8 Attorneys for Fiesta RV Resort Limited Partnership

7 Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel
8 Legal Division
9 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
10 1200 West Washington Street
11 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

10 Ernest Johnson, Director
11 Utilities Division
12 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
13 1200 West Washington Street
14 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

15 By:



16 Molly Johnson
17 Secretary to Teena Wolfe

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28