



0000050833

ORIGINAL
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISS

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

4700

Investigator: Brad Morton

Phone: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2006 - 52417

Date: 5/30/2006

Complaint Description: 08A Rate Case Items - Opposed

Complaint By: First: Tom Last: Kadlec

Account Name: Tom & Suzanne Kadlec

Home: [REDACTED]

Street: [REDACTED]

Work:

City: Gold Canyon

CBR:

State: AZ Zip: 85218

is:

Utility Company: Gold Canyon Sewer Company

Division: Sewer

Contact Name: [REDACTED]

Contact Phone: [REDACTED]

Nature of Complaint:

Docket No. SW 02519A-06-0015

CRUSH RIDICULOUS FLUSHING FEES!!!

Mr. Morton and Commissioners:

This letter is regarding the Gold Canyon Sewer/Algonquin Power Income Fund's proposed 100% increase to \$70 per month....GCWWTF Case Docket No. SW-02519A-OO-0638. It is difficult to comprehend how any company can justify the current \$35 per month when surrounding communities are paying under \$20 per month. I/We find this proposed increase ludicrous as many Gold Canyon residents are retired and live on fixed incomes. Furthermore, this community was promised better management after the 2003 increase you

- It seems perhaps that Algonquin Power Income Fund may have "over" invested a hefty sum to expand their outdated facilities and "to attempt" the correction of local unpleasant odorous situations. But---does this give them the right to take advantage of a situation where we have no other alternative??? The answer to this question is "NO"! There are still odor issues & we shouldn't have to pay for their expansion to a sewer system they chose to over-extend! !!! Your attention to this matter is appreciated.

Gold Can Property Owner
End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

May 30, 2006

RECEIVED
2006 MAY 31 P 4: 39
AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCUMENT CONTROL

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

RE: GOLD CANYON SEWER COMPANY

Dear Sewer Customer:

Your letter regarding the Gold Canyon Sewer Company ("GCSC") rate case will be placed on file with the Docket Control Center of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") to be made part of the record. The Commission will consider your comments before a decision is rendered in the GCSC application.

The concerns raised in letters received from customers will assist the Commission in the investigation and review of the rate application. The Commission's independent analysis of the utility and its rate request attempts to balance the interest of the utility and its customers.

Commission Staff is very sensitive to the burden that high utility rates can place on the consumer, and though constitutionally required to allow a fair return to the utility, does everything within its authority to protect the consumer.

Staff appreciates your comments and the interest taken on the proposed rate increase. If you should have any questions relating to this issue, please call me toll free at (800) 222-7000.

Sincerely,
Bradley G. Morton
Public Utilities Consumer Analyst II
Utilities Division
End of Comments

Date Completed: 5/30/2006

Opinion No. 2006 - 52417

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Brad Morton

Phone: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2006 - 52420

Date: 5/30/2006

Complaint Description: 08A Rate Case Items - Opposed

First:

Last:

Complaint By: Victor

Gonda

Account Name: Victor & Carole Gonda

Home: [REDACTED]

Street: [REDACTED]

Work:

City: Gold Canyon

CBR:

State: AZ Zip: 85218

is:

Utility Company: Gold Canyon Sewer Company

Division: Sewer

Contact Name: [REDACTED]

Contact Phone: [REDACTED]

Nature of Complaint:

Docket No. SW 02519A-06-0015

CRUSH RIDICULOUS FLUSHING FEES!!!

Mr. Morton and Commissioners:

This letter is regarding the Gold Canyon Sewer/Algonquin Power Income Fund's proposed 100% increase to \$70 per month...GCWWTF Case Docket No. SW-02519A-00-0638. It is difficult to comprehend how any company can justify the current \$35 per month when surrounding communities are paying under \$20 per month. I/We find this proposed increase ludicrous as many Gold Canyon residents are retired and live on fixed incomes. Furthermore, this community was promised former management after the 2003 increase you

- It seems perhaps that Algonquin Power Income Fund may have "over" invested a hefty sum to expand their outdated facilities and "to attempt" the correction of local unpleasant odorous situations. But---does this give them right to take advantage of a situation where we have no other alternative??? The answer to this question is "NO"! There are still odor issues & we shouldn't have to pay for their expansion to a sewer system they chose to over-extend! !!! Your attention to this matter is appreciated.

Gold Can Property Owner

End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

May 30, 2006

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

RE: GOLD CANYON SEWER COMPANY

Dear Sewer Customer:

Your letter regarding the Gold Canyon Sewer Company ("GCSC") rate case will be placed on file with the Docket Control Center of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") to be made part of the record. The Commission will consider your comments before a decision is rendered in the GCSC application.

The concerns raised in letters received from customers will assist the Commission in the investigation and review of the rate application. The Commission's independent analysis of the utility and its rate request attempts to balance the interest of the utility and its customers.

Commission Staff is very sensitive to the burden that high utility rates can place on the consumer, and though constitutionally required to allow a fair return to the utility, does everything within its authority to protect the consumer.

Staff appreciates your comments and the interest taken on the proposed rate increase. If you should have any questions relating to this issue, please call me toll free at (800) 222-7000.

☐☐☐☐☐ Sincerely,
☐☐☐☐☐ Bradley G. Morton
☐☐☐☐☐ Public Utilities Consumer Analyst II
☐☐☐☐☐ Utilities Division
End of Comments

Date Completed: 5/30/2006

Opinion No. 2006 - 52420

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Brad Morton

Phone: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2006 - 52434

Date: 5/30/2006

Complaint Description: 08A Rate Case Items - Opposed

First:

Last:

Complaint By: Sarah

Kamyszek

Account Name: Sarah Kamyszek

Home: [REDACTED]

Street: [REDACTED]

Work:

City: Gold Canyon

CBR:

State: AZ Zip: 85218

is:

Utility Company: Gold Canyon Sewer Company

Division: Sewer

Contact Name: [REDACTED]

Contact Phone: [REDACTED]

Nature of Complaint:

Docket No. SW02519A-06-0015

Consumer against rate increase.

End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

Explained docketing and rate case process in voicemail.

End of Comments

Date Completed: 5/30/2006

Opinion No. 2006 - 52434

SW 02519A-06-0015

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Brad Morton

Phone: (602) 942-8888

Fax: (602) 942-8888

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2006 - 52415

Date: 5/30/2006

Complaint Description: 08A Rate Case Items - Opposed

First:

Last:

Complaint By: Vern

Aaroen

Account Name: Vern & Peggy Aaroen

Home: [REDACTED]

Street: n/a

Work:

City: Gold Canyon

CBR:

State: AZ Zip: 85218

is:

Utility Company: Gold Canyon Sewer Company

Division: Sewer

Contact Name: Mike Weber

Contact Phone: (623) 935-9367

Nature of Complaint:

Docket No. SW 02519A-06-0015

Commissioner Jeff Hatch-Miller, Chairman
Arizona Corporation Commission
Utilities Division
1200 W. Washington street
Phoenix, AZ 85007
GCSC Case Docket No. SW-025 19A-06-0015

Dear Commissioner Miller,

We are writing this letter in regard to the proposed increase in our sewer bill. We live in MountainBrook and have for the past 9 years since we retired. We came here after working in Wisconsin and bought homes to spend our last years here. It just isn't right that a sewer company can come in and change so many peoples lives simply because of their greed.

We are retired and on a fixed income and have experienced one increase already in 2003. We are very dissappointed the sewer company lied to us stating there would be no increase after the 2003 increase. To issue another increase to the tune of over 100% is totally unfair. The sewer company may have overextended themselves in an attempt to correct the terrible odor emitting from the system but they do not have the right to take advantage of a situation where we have no other alternative. Price gouging! The surrounding communities are paying less then us at our current price of \$35. For your information, the odors still exist.

The sewer company should be responsible for their own expansion cost and not dump it on our shoulders. This is a very serious situation and we are unable to make the kind of monthly payments they are requesting of us. There are many others in the same situation here.

We ask you to consider our concerns when voting about the proposed increase to us.

Aaroen

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Gold Canyon property owner
480-288-7526
Sincerely
End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

May 30, 2006

RE: GOLD CANYON SEWER COMPANY

Dear Sewer Customer:

Your letter regarding the Gold Canyon Sewer Company ("GCSC") rate case will be placed on file with the Docket Control Center of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") to be made part of the record. The Commission will consider your comments before a decision is rendered in the GCSC application.

The concerns raised in letters received from customers will assist the Commission in the investigation and review of the rate application. The Commission's independent analysis of the utility and its rate request attempts to balance the interest of the utility and its customers.

Commission Staff is very sensitive to the burden that high utility rates can place on the consumer, and though constitutionally required to allow a fair return to the utility, does everything within its authority to protect the consumer.

Staff appreciates your comments and the interest taken on the proposed rate increase. If you should have any questions relating to this issue, please call me toll free at (800) 222-7000.

Sincerely,
Bradley G. Morton
Public Utilities Consumer Analyst II
Utilities Division
End of Comments

Date Completed: 5/30/2006

Opinion No. 2006 - 52415

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Brad Morton

Phone: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2006 - 52410

Date: 5/30/2006

Complaint Description: 08A Rate Case Items - Opposed

First:

Last:

Complaint By: Lawrence

McMann

Account Name: Lawrence McMann

Home: (480) 000-0000

Street: n/a

Work:

City: Gold Canyon

CBR:

State: AZ Zip: 85218

is:

Utility Company: Gold Canyon Sewer Company

Division: Sewer

Contact Name: [REDACTED]

Contact Phone: [REDACTED]

Nature of Complaint:

Docket No SW 02519A-06-0015

[REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2006 6:52 AM
To: Bradley Morton
Subject: From the Sunday L A times

This has reference to the private company doubling the rates on the homeowners in Gold Canyon.

I object tot he rate increase.

Lawrence Mc Mann

INDIANAPOLIS - In recent years, cities across the U.S. have turned over a vital public service - providing safe drinking water - to private enterprise.

Driving the trend was the idea that for-profit companies, mainly European conglomerates, could operate water and sewer systems efficiently, keeping water quality high and costs low.

In some places, private-sector management helped trim bureaucracies and replace decaying infrastructure, local officials say. But in Indianapolis, New Orleans, Atlanta and other cities, privatization has been accompanied by corruption scandals, environmental violations and a torrent of customer complaints.

In Atlanta, residents began complaining of brown, brackish drinking water soon after the French company Suez and a subsidiary began running the water system under a \$428-million, 20-year contract. It later emerged that Suez had treated then-Mayor Bill Campbell, who championed the contract, to a \$12,000 Parisian holiday.

In New Orleans, officials blamed a subsidiary of Veolia Environnement, another French company, for illegally discharging sewage into the Mississippi River on dozens of occasions. The president of a related Veolia

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

their public systems in poor shape.

In 1993, the failure of Milwaukee's waterworks to screen out a parasite led to a flu-like outbreak that sickened 400,000 people and killed more than 100.

Two years ago, Los Angeles agreed to a \$2-billion sewer upgrade to settle allegations that the city had allowed thousands of spills.

Mayor Dean Mazarrella of Leominster, Mass., said private-sector expertise was a boon to his city of 44,000, which was struggling with a leaking waterworks until it struck a deal a decade ago with USFilter. The company designed and built a new treatment plant, and now Veolia, which bought USFilter, oversees Leominster's water and sewer operations.

"We've got nothing but good things to say," Mazarrella said.

"They're such a big company, they have the ability to tap into a larger talent pool, to reach for people on the cutting edge of technology and understanding."

Water rights groups doubt such success stories will be widely repeated. Privatization breeds corruption and reduces accountability, they contend.

Earlier this year, residents of Toms River and Camden, N.J., complained about a lack of accountability after United Water admitted it had failed to warn customers about contamination of drinking water.

In Toms River, the company neglected to notify some customers for six months of elevated levels of naturally occurring radium in the water. In Camden, the company delayed reporting high readings of TCE, an industrial solvent that may cause cancer and liver damage.

New Jersey regulators fined the company \$4,000 in Camden and \$64,000 in Toms River.

Rich Henning, a United Water spokesman, said the reporting failure in Toms River was the result of confusion over a change in testing protocols. The company has replaced its local manager and is conducting an internal investigation.

"We have apologized profusely," he said. "We're doing everything we can to make sure that the water that gets to our customers meets all the requirements for safe drinking water."

Henning conceded that some privatization deals have disappointed customers because, in the push to win contracts, some companies took on too much risk. "We were kind of hitting each other in the head to get that next contract," Henning said. "I think now the companies that are still in pursuit of this marketplace are doing so in a much more refined, less risky and more mature way."

The industry's prospects for growth may hinge on whether Veolia's \$1.5-billion contract with Indianapolis is judged a success.

Tim Hewitt, who took over as president of Veolia Water Indianapolis a year into the contract, said the company's early difficulties stemmed from a flawed billing system and other inherited problems that took time to fix.

But troubles have persisted, including the shutdown of the White River Treatment Plant in January 2005 and the federal grand jury investigation.

Roger Edlin, then the night shift operator at the White River plant, said the emergency developed when a computer glitch turned off a pump that adds disinfectants to the water. The problem overwhelmed the system, Edlin said, because Veolia had taken two reservoirs out of service and cut back on cleaning and repairing the plant's filters.

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

The water companies say long-term contracts allow them to spread capital improvement and operating expenses over decades and provide lower-cost service. With the IRS change, the number of "public-private" water partnerships in the United States rose from about 400 in 1997 to 1,100 in 2003.

In pursuit of contracts, water companies have lobbied hardest at the local level, treating office holders to dinners, sports tickets, free trips and campaign contributions.

Companies competing to manage Atlanta's water and sewer systems in 1999 stocked their management teams with former city officials and political fundraisers for Campbell.

The City Council approved the \$428-million contract with Suez and United Water in the hope that it would control costs and help the city comply with a federal consent decree aimed at stopping sewage overflows into the Chattahoochee River. The companies shifted hundreds of city water and sewer workers onto their payrolls.

Campbell called it "a great victory for the people of Atlanta," predicting that "every city in America will go to privately run water systems."

A few months later, Suez bankrolled a \$12,000 holiday for Campbell and a companion in Paris, where the mayor posed for snapshots at Napoleon's Tomb and the Arc de Triomphe. Suez executives later said they'd intended Campbell's visit as a legitimate business trip, but Campbell met with company officials for just 2 1/2 hours during his five-day stay.

Meanwhile, complaints about water quality and unresponsive service proliferated, peaking in the summer of 2002.

Gordon Certain, president of a north Atlanta neighborhood association, said poor maintenance and equipment failures caused recurrent water main breaks and boil-water alerts, at times producing tap water "the color of very well-brewed tea."

Mayor Shirley Franklin, who succeeded Campbell in early 2002, said United Water and Suez neglected basic repairs, violated federal drinking water standards, failed to regularly flush impurities out of the system and billed the city for work not done.

Company officials blamed old pipes and power outages and said haphazard city records had made it impossible to calculate how much it would cost to run the system before they signed the deal.

The two sides agreed to terminate the 20-year contract in 2003, after four years. By then, FBI investigators were focusing on Campbell's relationships with a wide number of city contractors, including Suez.

In February 2006, during Campbell's corruption trial in federal court, a handwriting expert testified that Campbell had signed secret amendments to the contract that would have been worth as much as \$80 million to Suez over the life of the deal. Campbell denied signing the documents or otherwise approving the \$80-million increase.

In March, a jury acquitted him of taking bribes but convicted him of three counts of tax evasion, charges that prosecutors had supported with testimony about his extravagant lifestyle and trips paid for by Suez and other companies.

Suez officials say that their dealings with Campbell were proper and that he did not receive favors for helping the company on its contract.

Atlanta runs its own water system again and is spending \$3.9 billion to upgrade the water-sewer infrastructure.

Atlanta and other cities looked to private companies after years of mismanagement and budgetary neglect left

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

subsidiary was convicted in 2002 of bribing a New Orleans sewer board member to support renewal of its contract.

In Milwaukee, a Suez subsidiary caused 107 million gallons of untreated sewage to be discharged into streams and Lake Michigan, a 2002 state audit found. The company triggered a series of overflows by shutting off sewer tunnel pumps during hours of peak electricity demand, saving itself \$515,000, the audit said.

A lawsuit by Wisconsin's attorney general blames inadequate maintenance for an even bigger discharge in May 2004, when more than a billion gallons of sewage gushed into local waters.

Indianapolis reached a \$1.5-billion, 20-year agreement with Veolia to run the city's waterworks in 2002. The contract is the largest of its kind in North America.

Within the first year, customer complaints nearly tripled and the company admitted mailing more than 15,000 incorrect bills. Inadequate maintenance caused hundreds of fire hydrants to freeze, hampering efforts to put out fires that consumed a church and other buildings.

Then, on Jan. 6, 2005, heavy rains swelled the White River and triggered a chain of system failures at the White River Treatment Plant. Officials issued a boil-water advisory, 40,000 schoolchildren took an unscheduled holiday and residents of the nation's 12th largest city learned they could no longer take their tap water for granted.

A federal grand jury, meanwhile, is investigating allegations that Veolia's Indianapolis unit falsified water-quality data.

Peter Gleick, president of the Pacific Institute, an Oakland think tank that studies water issues, said the rhetoric of privatization "has run into the brick wall of reality."

"I'm not opposed to privatization. I'm opposed to bad privatization," Gleick said. "If privatization is going to work, there really needs to be clear protection of the public good and clear standards for performance."

The water companies say the vast majority of cities are satisfied with their performance. In recent years, they say, more than 90% of municipalities with private water or sewer operators extended their contracts when they came up for renewal.

"We've had some jobs where we haven't done a fantastic job," said Scott Edwards, a vice president of Veolia Water North America. "But we have largely done a fabulous job.. We believe in what we do. We believe our story and we believe in the day-to-day results."

Veolia and Suez, the world's two largest water companies, moved aggressively into the American market in 1999.

Veolia spent \$6 billion to acquire the nation's largest water company, USFilter. Suez, which already owned a third of United Water, a private firm based in Harrington Park, N.J., spent \$1 billion to buy the entire company.

In 2003, Germany's RWE AG purchased American Water Works Co., based in Vorhees, N.J.

The European companies touted their size, financial wherewithal and expertise and they cultivated friends in city halls, state legislatures and Congress. They promised to provide solutions for cities struggling with aging pipes, tight budgets and tough environmental regulations. Over the last decade, major water firms have made more than \$4 million in federal campaign contributions, according to the nonpartisan Center for Responsive Politics. The industry also has given generously to the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

The mayors' conference helped spark the industry's growth by lobbying the Clinton administration to strike an Internal Revenue Service rule that limited municipal utility management contracts to five years. The 1997 rule change cleared the way for 20-year deals.

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

The company blamed Edlin for the shutdown and fired him.

Edlin contends in a lawsuit that Veolia executives brought on the crisis by slashing maintenance and staffing to boost their bottom line.

Seven other current and former employees said in interviews that Veolia's budget tightening had left the waterworks in poor condition.

"You're sitting there holding your breath, hoping that your last pump didn't go down," said Jim Bullington, a plant operator who took early retirement in December 2004.

The company said its detractors simply can't accept the technological and managerial innovations Veolia brought to a tradition-bound work environment. Evidence of the company's progress, Veolia officials said, can be seen in a 2004 customer survey that showed 83% of customers were "totally" or "mostly" satisfied.

Hewitt said Veolia has invested in new equipment and fine-tuned operating procedures, improving water quality and allaying customers' long-standing concerns about the taste and odor of their tap water.

Federal and state authorities, however, are investigating whether the company has accurately reported results of water-quality testing.

Concerns about the company's testing prompted the Indiana Department of Environmental Management to conduct its own tests last fall.

Although the agency said it found no violations of safety standards, Thomas Easterly, head of the department, expressed concern that the readings showed higher concentrations of disinfection byproducts than the company had reported from its own tests for at least four years. The trace chemicals "raise a potential health concern," Easterly said.

Hewitt said he was confident the probe would find no wrongdoing.

Indianapolis is a showpiece for Veolia as it markets itself around the world, he said, and the company wouldn't jeopardize such an important contract by cutting corners.

"We have a lot at stake here," he said. "When our senior managers go to Beijing, they talk about Indianapolis. When they go to India, they talk about Indianapolis."

Times researcher Janet Lundblad contributed to this report.

End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

From: Bradley Morton

Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2006 7:36 AM

Subject: RE: From the Sunday L A times

Dear Mr McMann,

I am in receipt of your opinion regarding the Gold Canyon Sewer Company rate case and I will docket it so it is part of the case and the Commissioners will be made aware of your concerns. If you have further issues please

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

contact me.

Sincerely

Bradley G. Morton
Public Utilities Consumer Analyst II
End of Comments

Date Completed: 5/30/2006

Opinion No. 2006 - 52410

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Brad Morton**Phone:** [REDACTED]**Fax:** [REDACTED]**Priority:** Respond Within Five Days**Opinion No.** 2006 - 52422**Date:** 5/30/2006**Complaint Description:** 08A Rate Case Items - Opposed**First:****Last:****Complaint By:** Jack

Atchason

Account Name: Jack Atchason**Home:** (480) 000-0000**Street:** n/a**Work:****City:** Gold Canyon**CBR:****State:** AZ **Zip:** 85218**is:****Utility Company:** Gold Canyon Sewer Company**Division:** Sewer**Contact Name:** [REDACTED]**Contact Phone:** [REDACTED]**Nature of Complaint:**

Docket No. SW 02519A-06-0015

Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2006 10:26 AM

To: Bradley Morton

Subject: Gold Canyon Sewer Rate Increase

Mr. Morton,

I am writing to voice my strong opposition to this proposed rate increase by Gold canyon Sewer Services.

I find it appalling that a company that has voiced time over time that this improvement or expansion in service would be paid for by internal capital improvement funds, but now has changed their story and wants it to be funded by us, the consumers. This company stands to benefit from these improvements and needs it as the population increases. This will raise their profits automatically. The president himself said there would be no rate increase.

We already pay a un fair tax rate as opposed to other nearby communities. This should not be allowed.

Jack Atchason
 West Region Business Manager
 Idenix Pharmaceuticals
 End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:**Investigator's Comments and Disposition:**

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

From: Bradley Morton
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2006 11:45 AM
To: 'Atchason, Jack'
Subject: RE: Gold Canyon Sewer Rate Increase

Dear Mr Atchason,

I am in receipt of your opinion regarding the Gold Canyon Sewer Company rate case and will docket it so it is part of the case and the Commissioners will be aware of your concerns. Please contact me should you have further issues.

Bradley G. Morton
Public Utilities Consumer Analyst II
End of Comments

Date Completed: 5/30/2006

Opinion No. 2006 - 52422

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Brad Morton

Phone: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2006 - 52416

Date: 5/30/2006

Complaint Description: 08A Rate Case Items - Opposed

First:

Last:

Complaint By: Karen Lou

Adamski

Account Name: Karen Lou Adamski & Larry Bartoszek

Home: [REDACTED]

Street: [REDACTED]

Work:

City: Gold Canyon

CBR:

State: AZ Zip: 85218

is:

Utility Company: Gold Canyon Sewer Company

Division: Sewer

Contact Name: [REDACTED]

Contact Phone: [REDACTED]

Nature of Complaint:

Docket No. SW 02519A-06-0015

KAREN LOU ADAMSKI
 LARRY W. BARTOSZEK
 4588 S. DUSTY COYOTE TRAIL
 GOLD CANYON, AZ. 85218
 May 24, 2006
 Mr. Brad Morton, Arizona Corporation
 Commission, Utilities Division
 1200 W. Washington Street
 Phoenix, AZ S5007-2996

Dear Mr. Morton and Commissioners:

This letter is regarding the Gold Canyon Sewer/Algonquin Power Income Fund's prpsed 100%! mcrease to \$70 per month... It is difficult to comprehend how any company can justify the current \$35 per month when surrounding communities are paying under \$20 per month. I/We find this proposed increase ludicrous as many Gold Canyon residents are retired and living on fixed incomes, including us.

Furthermore, this Community was promised by former management that there would be no further increases after the 2003 Increase you granted to Gold Canyon Sewer.

It seems perhaps that Algonquin Power Income Fund may have "over" invested a hefty sum to expand their out-dated facilities and "to attempt" the correction of local unpleasant odorous situations. But--does this give them the right to take advantage of a situation where we have no other alternative???? The answer to this question is "no"!!! & we shouldn't have to pay for their expansion to a sewer system they chose to over-extend!!!! Your attentio, to this matter is appreciated.

Karen Adamski

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Larry Bartoszek
Cc: Kristin K. Mayes
William Mundeli
Jeff Hatch-Miller
Marc Spilzer
Mike Gleason
End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

May 30, 2006

RE: GOLD CANYON SEWER COMPANY

Dear Sewer Customer:

Your letter regarding the Gold Canyon Sewer Company ("GCSC") rate case will be placed on file with the Docket Control Center of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") to be made part of the record. The Commission will consider your comments before a decision is rendered in the GCSC application.

The concerns raised in letters received from customers will assist the Commission in the investigation and review of the rate application. The Commission's independent analysis of the utility and its rate request attempts to balance the interest of the utility and its customers.

Commission Staff is very sensitive to the burden that high utility rates can place on the consumer, and though constitutionally required to allow a fair return to the utility, does everything within its authority to protect the consumer.

Staff appreciates your comments and the interest taken on the proposed rate increase. If you should have any questions relating to this issue, please call me toll free at (800) 222-7000.

☐☐☐☐☐ Sincerely,
☐☐☐☐☐ Bradley G. Morton
☐☐☐☐☐ Public Utilities Consumer Analyst II
☐☐☐☐☐ Utilities Division
End of Comments

Date Completed: 5/30/2006

Opinion No. 2006 - 52416

SW 02519 - 06 - 0015

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Brad Morton

Phone: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2006 - 52421

Date: 5/30/2006

Complaint Description: 08A Rate Case Items - Opposed

First:

Last:

Complaint By: Janet A.

Bruning

Account Name: Janet A. Bruning

Home: [REDACTED]

Street: [REDACTED]

Work:

City: Gold Canyon

CBR:

State: AZ Zip: 85218

is:

Utility Company: Gold Canyon Sewer Company

Division: Sewer

Contact Name: [REDACTED]

Contact Phone: [REDACTED]

Nature of Complaint:

Docket No. SW 02519A-06-0015

CRUSH RIDICULOUS FLUSHING FEES!!!

Mr. Morton and Commissioners:

This letter is regarding the Gold Canyon Sewer/Algonquin Power Income Fund's proposed 100% increase to \$70 per month....GCWWTF Case Docket No. SW-02519A-OO-0638. It is difficult to comprehend how any company can justify the current \$35 per month when surrounding communities are paying under \$20 per month. I/We find this proposed increase ludicrous as many Gold Canyon residents are retired and live on fixed incomes. Furthermore, this community was promised better management after the 2003 increase you

- It seems perhaps that Algonquin Power Income Fund may have "over" invested a hefty sum to expand their outdated facilities and "to attempt" the correction of local unpleasant odorous situations. But--does this give them right to take advantage of a situation where we have no other alternative??? The answer to this question is "NO"! There are still odor issues & we shouldn't have to pay for their expansion to a sewer system they chose to over-extend! !!! Your attention to this matter is appreciated.

Gold Can Property Owner

End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

May 30, 2006

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

RE: GOLD CANYON SEWER COMPANY

Dear Sewer Customer:

Your letter regarding the Gold Canyon Sewer Company ("GCSC") rate case will be placed on file with the Docket Control Center of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") to be made part of the record. The Commission will consider your comments before a decision is rendered in the GCSC application.

The concerns raised in letters received from customers will assist the Commission in the investigation and review of the rate application. The Commission's independent analysis of the utility and its rate request attempts to balance the interest of the utility and its customers.

Commission Staff is very sensitive to the burden that high utility rates can place on the consumer, and though constitutionally required to allow a fair return to the utility, does everything within its authority to protect the consumer.

Staff appreciates your comments and the interest taken on the proposed rate increase. If you should have any questions relating to this issue, please call me toll free at (800) 222-7000.

☐☐☐☐☐ Sincerely,
☐☐☐☐☐ Bradley G. Morton
☐☐☐☐☐ Public Utilities Consumer Analyst II
☐☐☐☐☐ Utilities Division
End of Comments

Date Completed: 5/30/2006

Opinion No. 2006 - 52421

**ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM**

Investigator: Brad Morton

Phone: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2006 - 52419

Date: 5/30/2006

Complaint Description: 08A Rate Case Items - Opposed

First:

Last:

Complaint By: Jerry

Smith

Account Name: Jerry & Brenda Smith

Home: [REDACTED]

Street: [REDACTED]

Work:

City: Gold Canyon

CBR:

State: AZ **Zip:** 85218

is:

Utility Company: Gold Canyon Sewer Company

Division: Sewer

Contact Name: [REDACTED]

Contact Phone: [REDACTED]

Nature of Complaint:

Docket No. SW 02519A-06-0015

CRUSH RIDICULOUS FLUSHING FEES!!!

Mr. Morton and Commissioners:

This letter is regarding the Gold Canyon Sewer/Algonquin Power Income Fund's proposed 100% increase to \$70 per month....GCWWTF Case Docket No. SW-02519A-OO-0638. It is difficult to comprehend how any company can justify the current \$35 per month when surrounding communities are paying under \$20 per month. I/We find this proposed increase ludicrous as many Gold Canyon residents are retired and live on fixed incomes. Furthermore, this community was promised better management after the 2003 increase you

- It seems perhaps that Algonquin Power Income Fund may have "over" invested a hefty sum to expand their outdated facilities and "to attempt" the correction of local unpleasant odorous situations. But---does this give them right to take advantage of a situation where we have no other alternative??? The answer to this question is "NO"! There are still odor issues & we shouldn't have to pay for their expansion to a sewer system they chose to over-extend! !!! Your attention to this matter is appreciated.

Gold Canyon Property Owner
End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

May 30, 2006

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

RE: GOLD CANYON SEWER COMPANY

Dear Sewer Customer:

Your letter regarding the Gold Canyon Sewer Company ("GCSC") rate case will be placed on file with the Docket Control Center of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") to be made part of the record. The Commission will consider your comments before a decision is rendered in the GCSC application.

The concerns raised in letters received from customers will assist the Commission in the investigation and review of the rate application. The Commission's independent analysis of the utility and its rate request attempts to balance the interest of the utility and its customers.

Commission Staff is very sensitive to the burden that high utility rates can place on the consumer, and though constitutionally required to allow a fair return to the utility, does everything within its authority to protect the consumer.

Staff appreciates your comments and the interest taken on the proposed rate increase. If you should have any questions relating to this issue, please call me toll free at (800) 222-7000.

Sincerely,
Bradley G. Morton
Public Utilities Consumer Analyst II
Utilities Division
End of Comments

Date Completed: 5/30/2006

Opinion No. 2006 - 52419

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Brad Morton**Phone:** [REDACTED]**Fax:** [REDACTED]**Priority:** Respond Within Five Days**Opinion No.** 2006 - 52414**Date:** 5/30/2006**Complaint Description:** 08A Rate Case Items - Opposed**First:****Last:****Complaint By:** Lewis

Stichter

Account Name: Lewis & Doris Stichter**Home:** [REDACTED]**Street:** [REDACTED]**Work:****City:** Gold Canyon**CBR:****State:** AZ **Zip:** 85218**is:****Utility Company:** Gold Canyon Sewer Company**Division:** Sewer**Contact Name:** [REDACTED]**Contact Phone:** [REDACTED]**Nature of Complaint:**

Docket No. SW 02519A-06-0015

Arizona Corporate Commission
 Mr. Jeff Hatch-Miller, Chairman
 1200 W. Washington St.
 Phoenix, AZ 85007

Dear Mr. Hatch-Miller,

We are writing to you to protest the extremely unreasonable rate increase request filed by the Gold Canyon Sewer Company on Docket No SW.-02519A-06-0015.

We understand considerable work was done on their waste water processing equipment. But, why?? First, was the requirement to bring their Plant up to minimum standards to properly process the waste. Nobody seems to know how they got by so many years with substandard equipment. Second. they substantially increased capacity to serve additional customers.

There has been no change in the amount of waste processed for us. It certainly is not reasonable for existing customers to reimburse a company to add capacity so they can bring in new customers. That investment and related costs should twn profitable with the revenue generated by new customers.

Their rate increase request has all the appearances of throwing a bunch of numbers up in the air, then grabbing a ridiculous number with the hope of getting a lesser rate approved that still exceeds reason.

What is wrong with an organization that can't provide a service at costs similar to other communities? We have lived in many communities in the MidWest and South and never paid sewer rates close to our existing rate of \$35.00 per month--and now they want more. In our community of over 1600 homes, Mountainbrook Village, at least 40 per cent of the residents vacate their homes 4 to 5 months each summer and we see no offer by the Sewer Company to reduce rates when the waste processing costs are reduced.

This is a very uncomfortable box to be in with no place else to go for service. First the Drug Companies, then the

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

oil industry and now a basic service like waste disposal are doing their utmost to unbalance our economy. Please use your expertise to keep our waste water rates reasonable, preferably no more than the present level.
End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

May 30, 2006

RE: GOLD CANYON SEWER COMPANY

Dear Sewer Customer:

Your letter regarding the Gold Canyon Sewer Company ("GCSC") rate case will be placed on file with the Docket Control Center of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") to be made part of the record. The Commission will consider your comments before a decision is rendered in the GCSC application.

The concerns raised in letters received from customers will assist the Commission in the investigation and review of the rate application. The Commission's independent analysis of the utility and its rate request attempts to balance the interest of the utility and its customers.

Commission Staff is very sensitive to the burden that high utility rates can place on the consumer, and though constitutionally required to allow a fair return to the utility, does everything within its authority to protect the consumer.

Staff appreciates your comments and the interest taken on the proposed rate increase. If you should have any questions relating to this issue, please call me toll free at (800) 222-7000.

Sincerely,
Bradley G. Morton
Public Utilities Consumer Analyst II
Utilities Division
End of Comments

Date Completed: 5/30/2006

Opinion No. 2006 - 52414
