

ORIGINAL



0000021716

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED

JEFF HATCH-MILLER  
CHAIRMAN  
WILLIAM A. MUNDELL  
COMMISSIONER  
MARC SPITZER  
COMMISSIONER  
MIKE GLEASON  
COMMISSIONER  
KRISTIN K. MAYES  
COMMISSIONER

2005 JUN 16 10:18

Arizona Corporation Commission  
DOCKETED

AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCUMENT CONTROL

JUN 16 2005

DOCKETED BY

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF  
ARIZONA WATER COMPANY, AN ARIZONA  
CORPORATION, FOR ADJUSTMENTS TO  
ITS RATES AND CHARGES FOR UTILITY  
SERVICE FURNISHED BY ITS WESTERN  
GROUP AND FOR CERTAIN RELATED  
APPROVALS

Docket No. W-01445A-04-0650

NOTICE OF ERRATA

The Residential Utility Consumer Office ("RUCO") hereby files an errata to the  
Surrebuttal Testimony of William A. Rigsby filed May 25, 2005.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 16<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2005.

Daniel W. Pozefsky  
Attorney

AN ORIGINAL AND THIRTEEN COPIES  
of the foregoing filed this 16th day  
of June, 2005 with:

Docket Control  
Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

1 COPIES of the foregoing hand delivered/  
mailed this 16th day of June, 2005 to:

2 Lyn Farmer, Chief Administrative Law  
3 Judge  
Hearing Division  
4 Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington  
5 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Jeffrey W. Crockett  
Deborah R. Scott  
Snell & Wilmer  
One Arizona Center  
400 E. Van Buren  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202

6 Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel  
Legal Division  
7 Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington  
8 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Marvin S. Cohen  
Sacks Tierney, P.A.  
4230 Drinkwater Blvd., 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251

9 Ernest Johnson, Director  
Utilities Division  
10 Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington  
11 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

By Cheryl Fraulob  
Cheryl Fraulob

12 Norman D. James  
Jay L. Shapiro  
13 Fennemore Craig  
3003 North Central Avenue  
14 Suite 2600  
Phoenix, Arizona 85012

15 Robert W. Geake  
16 Vice President and General Counsel  
Arizona Water Company  
17 P. O. Box 29006  
Phoenix, Arizona 85038-9006

18 Joan S. Burke  
19 Osborn Maledon, P.A.  
2929 North Central Avenue  
20 Suite 2100  
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2794

21 K. Scott McCoy  
22 City of Casa Grande City Attorney  
510 E. Florence Blvd.  
23 Casa Grande, AZ 85249

24

1 Delete, Page 11, line 5 through line 28

2 ..... Nowhere in Decision No. 62993 is there any language that adopts  
3 any of the recommendations or views presented in the ACC Staff report or  
4 concludes that the recommendations constitute official ACC policy. Nor is  
5 there an ordering paragraph that actually orders Commission Staff to  
6 implement any of the recommendations contained in the ACC Staff report.  
7 In the final section of the decision, titled "Conclusions of Law," the  
8 Decision states the following:

- 9 1. The Commission as a regulatory body with the longest  
10 history and the primary responsibility over private water  
11 companies should take the lead in seeking a coordinated  
12 solution to the problems of small water companies.
- 13 2. The Commission arranged for the formation of the Task  
14 Force for meetings between representatives of regulatory  
15 agencies, the water providers, and water consumers in order  
16 to address these issues.
- 17 3. The Task Force has issued a report that summarizes the  
18 views of its members.

19 Mr. Garfield and Ms. Hubbard's testimony completely distorts the intent of  
20 Decision No. 62993 and should be given no weight.

21 Insert,

22 While the Commission appears to have approved Staff's  
23 recommendations, Staff recommended that the cost recovery for unused  
24 CAP water should be considered on a case by case basis. The Decision

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

refers to the Vail water case (Decision No. 62450) as an example of the policy that Staff advocates. In that case, the Company was utilizing the CAP allotment for which it was requesting recovery. Consistent with Decision No. 62993, the Commission has considered recovery of deferred CAP costs on a case by case basis and to date has restricted recovery to used and useful CAP water.

Delete, Page 12, line 20 through page 13 line 2

....However, none of these plants exist at this time. Therefore, his testimony is completely irrelevant since the ACC did not set any CAP recovery policy pursuant to Decision No. 62993. In fact, his testimony only reinforces my argument that the recovery of CAP charges should be delayed until the Company is actually providing treated CAP water to the three affected systems.

Insert,

Mr. Whitehead's testimony only reinforces my argument that the recovery of CAP charges should be delayed until the Company is actually providing treated CAP water to the three affected systems.