

ORIGINAL



0000057443

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED

Arizona Corporation Commission

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

COMMISSIONERS

DOCKETED

2006 JUL 26 P 4: 15

Jeff Hatch-Miller, Chairman
William A. Mundell
Marc Spitzer
Mike Gleason
Kristin K. Mayes

JUL 26 2006

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCUMENT CONTROL

DOCKETED BY	ne
-------------	----

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF ARIZONA WATER COMPANY, AN ARIZONA CORPORATION, TO EXEND ITS EXISTING CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY IN THE CITY OF CASA GRANDE AND IN PINAL COUNTY, ARIZONA

Docket No. W-01445A-06-0199

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF PALO VERDE UTILITIES COMPANY FOR AN EXTENSION OF ITS EXISTING CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY.

Docket No. SW-03575A-05-0926

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF SANTA CRUZ WATER COMPANY FOR AN EXTENSION OF ITS EXISTING CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY.

Docket No. W-03576A-05-0926

GLOBAL'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO DISMISS

(Oral Argument scheduled: July 27, 2006 at 10:00 a.m.)

Santa Cruz Water Company, LLC; Palo Verde Utilities Company, LLC; Global Water – Santa Cruz Water Company and Global Water – Palo Verde Utilities Company (collectively, “Global”) reply in support of their Motion to Dismiss the Application filed by Arizona Water Company (“AWC”).

I. Preliminary statement.

As AWC states, a motion to dismiss should be granted if the Applicant is not entitled to relief “under any interpretation of the facts susceptible to proof.” (AWC Response at 3). By applying undisputed facts, the Commission can dismiss AWC’s unprecedented, overreaching

28

1 application. This will spare Staff and other parties the need for a unnecessary and burdensome
2 hearing.

3 The key facts are not in dispute:

- 4 1) AWC's proposed extension area is of an unprecedented size;
- 5 2) AWC has requests for service for 0.3% of this vast area;
- 6 3) AWC has not submitted plans for reusing reclaimed water or for recharging
7 water back into the aquifer;
- 8 4) AWC will finance the entire cost of the area with AIAC;
- 9 5) Part of the extension is already certificated to another water company; and
- 10 6) AWC did not submit some of the financial projections required by
11 Commission rules.

12 Under any interpretation of these undisputed facts, AWC has not met – and cannot meet – its
13 burden showing the public interest would be served by granting a CC&N for the gigantic area it
14 requests. Accordingly, the Commission should dismiss AWC's application.

15 **II. The Commission does not lack the power to dismiss AWC's Application.**

16 **A. The Commission has discretion to dismiss a fatally flawed application.**

17 AWC argues that Global has inappropriately imported concepts from the Arizona Rules of
18 Civil Procedure ("Civil Rules") into a CC&N case. But there is no dispute that the Commission's
19 procedural rules cover this matter. A.A.C. R14-3-101 et seq. And those rules clearly incorporate
20 the Civil Rules. A.A.C. R14-3-101(A). Moreover, the Commission's rules mandate that motions
21 comply with the Civil Rules. A.A.C. R14-3-106(K). Motions to dismiss are a well-recognized
22 part of the Civil Rules, and there is nothing inappropriate about filing one here.

23 AWC argues that the Commission's "sufficiency" process somehow precludes motions to
24 dismiss. But sufficiency review and motions to dismiss are different processes that serve different
25 ends, and they are thus not mutually exclusive. The sufficiency review conducted by Staff is
26 limited to checking "for compliance with the information requirements" specifically listed in the
27 CC&N rule. A.A.C. R14-2-402(A)(3). In contrast, the purpose of a motion to dismiss is to

1 determine whether “under any interpretation of the facts” the Applicants are entitled to relief.¹
2 Thus, the sufficiency process involves reviewing the Application for compliance with a checklist
3 of requirements, and requesting additional information if the checklist is not satisfied. In contrast,
4 a motion to dismiss does not seek new facts but assumes the facts asserted by the Application.

5 More importantly, a motion to dismiss allows the Commission to dispose of applications
6 that are fatally flawed regardless of whether they satisfy the checklist in the CC&N rule. Suppose,
7 for example, the Commission ordered a utility not to file any extensions until it satisfied certain
8 requirements. The order would not affect the CC&N rule, so it would not be reflected in the
9 sufficiency checklist. Thus, if the utility filed an application in violation of the order, it could not
10 be rejected under the sufficiency rule. Yet surely the Commission is not required to process an
11 application that clearly violates an order. A motion to dismiss provides the solution to this
12 problem.

13 The situation here is equally clear cut. The six key facts listed above are not disputed, and
14 the public interest is clearly not served by granting AWC’s Application. Under AWC’s theory, as
15 long as a utility satisfies the minimum requirements of the sufficiency rule, the Commission would
16 be powerless to dismiss an application, no matter how glaring its defects. Staff and other parties
17 would be forced to conduct discovery, prepare witnesses and reports, and participate in a hearing,
18 all for a case where the result is a foregone conclusion based on the Applicant’s own facts. There
19 is no reason for the Commission to place such extraordinary restrictions on its capability to
20 manage its own docket by dismissing merit-less cases upon motion.

21 **B. Collateral estoppel does not apply.**

22 AWC also argues that Global’s motion is barred by “collateral estoppel” (also known as
23 issue preclusion) pointing to a procedural order in another docket that denied a motion to dismiss
24 by Global. AWC lists a four elements of collateral estoppel, citing *Irby Construction Co. v.*
25 *Arizona Department of Revenue*, 184 Ariz. 105, 107, 907 P.2d 74, 76 (App. 1995). But *Irby* lists

26 _____
27 ¹ AWC Response at 3.

1 five elements (the omitted element is in bold): “(1) the issue actually litigated in the previous
2 proceeding; (2) there was a full and fair opportunity to litigate the issue; (3) resolution of the issue
3 was essential to the decision; (4) **there was a valid and final decision on the merits**; (5) there is
4 common identity of the parties.” *Id.* (enumeration and emphasis added). As *Irby* makes clear, a
5 final decision on the merits is necessary before collateral estoppel will apply. Only months ago,
6 the Arizona Supreme Court repeated this requirement. See *In re General Adjudication of All*
7 *Rights to Use Water in the Gila River System and Source*, 212 Ariz. 64, ¶ 14, n. 8, 127 P.3d 882,
8 888 (2006) *reconsideration denied* 212 Ariz. 470, 134 P.3d 375 (2006). Other cases also note the
9 necessity of a final judgment. See e.g. *Brigstone/Firestone North American Tire, LLC v. Naranjo*,
10 206 Ariz. 447, 452 ¶ 19, 79 P.3d 1206, 1211 (App. 2003).

11 The procedural order that AWC relies on was entered in the AWC vs. Global complaint
12 case.² There has been no final Commission decision in that case, so collateral estoppel cannot
13 apply. Moreover, it is not clear what, if anything, the procedural order “decided”, as the order
14 simply held the complaint case in abeyance pending resolution of the pending financing docket.
15 Further, the issues are different. AWC’s complaint had three counts: (1) that various affiliates of
16 Global were acting as public service corporations; (2) that various agreements signed by Global
17 Water Resources, LLC should be banned; and (3) that the Commission should enter an injunction
18 against Global’s speech to potential customers. In this docket, Global’s motion to dismiss does
19 not address any of the three counts from the complaint docket. Because there is no final decision
20 in the complaint case, and because the issues in the cases are different, collateral estoppel does not
21 apply.

22 **III. AWC’s Application is fatally flawed.**

23 There are six key, undisputed facts. Each of these facts shows that AWC’s Application is
24 fatally flawed. Because there is no dispute about these facts, a hearing is not necessary, and
25 AWC’s Application should be dismissed.

26
27 ² Docket Nos. W-01445A-06-0200 et al.

1 **Uncontested Fact # 1: AWC's extension area is of an unprecedented size.** Indeed,
2 AWC recently confirmed that it's even bigger than we first thought. AWC states that the
3 extension area is 70,494 acres.³ That's a **hundred and ten square miles**. AWC estimates a
4 density of four homes per acre.⁴ At that density, the extension area will have 281,976 homes.

5 Granting a permanent property right for such a gigantic area in one case is not wise. There
6 has been no showing of necessity, and it is implausible to assume that this vast area will develop
7 quickly. Indeed, AWC's own master plan assumes that it will still be adding new facilities to
8 serve growth in this area up to the year 2055.⁵ Because necessity cannot be shown for such a large
9 area, the Commission does not grant CC&N extensions of this size.

10 Indeed, this concern has been at the forefront of the Commission's deliberations recently.
11 At Tuesday's open meeting, the Commissioners discussed how prematurely granting a certificate
12 results in irrevocable property rights, which cities or other utilities are then forced to buy years
13 later when development finally comes to pass.

14 Moreover, the huge size of the area magnifies other concerns. Any decision that applies
15 over such a large area will have large impacts. For example, if effective water conservation
16 measures are not implemented in a small area, the result is merely unfortunate. But if effective
17 water conservation measures are not implemented in a gigantic area, the effects could be disastrous
18 for the entire region. There is simply no "do over" for CC&Ns – once they are granted, they are
19 permanent property rights. And once facilities are built and streets are paved, it becomes difficult
20 to put in new infrastructure later. That's why implementing the critical water conservation
21 measures from the very onset is so important.

22 **Uncontested Fact # 2: AWC has requests for service for only 0.3% of the extension**
23 **area.** The requests cover a 197 out of 70,494 acres. Our motion cited numerous Commission
24 orders requiring requests for service, and explained at length why this practice protects both the
25

26 ³ AWC Response to Staff's Insufficiency Letter, filed July 7, 2006, at Attachment B.

27 ⁴ AWC Response to Staff's Insufficiency Letter, filed July 7, 2006, at Attachment A, page 3.

⁵ *Id.* at Attachment A, pages 2-3.

1 public interest and landowner rights. AWC's Response did not dispute these points. AWC
2 offered no defense on this point because it has none – there is simply no excuse for falling so short
3 of Commission standards.

4 **Uncontested Fact # 3: AWC has submitted no plans for reusing reclaimed water or**
5 **for recharging water back into the aquifer.** Effective water conservation measures involve
6 three critical elements, the “triad of conservation”: (1) reusing reclaimed water for non-potable
7 purposes; (2) using renewable surface water where possible; and (3) recharging excess reclaimed
8 and surface water into the aquifer for later use. AWC apparently plans to use surface water to
9 some extent. However, their plans appear to still heavily rely on groundwater.⁶

10 AWC presents no plan for the other two parts of the triad. AWC has not discussed
11 recharging at all. Regarding reclaimed water, AWC does refer to an agreement it has with a
12 Southwest Water Company. Southwest Water Company does not hold a CC&N in Arizona, and it
13 is not authorized to do business as a foreign corporation in Arizona.⁷ In any event, the agreement
14 with Southwest Water does not obligate Southwest to serve any area – AWC simply gives them an
15 “invitation”, which they can decline. Moreover, the agreement was signed in 2002, but has
16 apparently never been used, as Southwest has yet to enter the Arizona market.

17 AWC claims that its agreement with Southwest is “functionally equivalent” to the
18 integrated approach used by Global.⁸ A cursory review shows that they are not equivalent at all.
19 The key provision is Paragraph 2(b). This provision forbids Southwest from selling reclaimed
20 water (effluent) in AWC's service area, except for wholesale sales to AWC. Thus, AWC will
21 presumably resell the reclaimed water. But each sale of reclaimed water will only undermine
22 AWC's sales of more expensive potable water, so they have no incentive to sell. Most of the value
23 of the reclaimed water is created by the treatment, which is done by Southwest and will
24 presumably be included in their wholesale charge to AWC. That leaves AWC with adding a retail
25

26 ⁶ AWC Response to Staff's Insufficiency Letter, filed July 7, 2006, at Attachment A, page 2, noting 26 new wells.

27 ⁷ According to the Commission's Corporations Division website, visited July 18, 2006.

⁸ AWC Response at 8:13.

1 markup and charging for distribution – they simply aren’t going to make much money from
2 reselling reclaimed water, and each gallon they do sell will likely cut down on their sales of
3 potable water. AWC will likely sell to customers who actively seek out reclaimed water (e.g. golf
4 courses) but they will likely not actively promote such sales. This is in stark contrast to the
5 integrated model, where the common management and ownership of the water and wastewater
6 utilities enables them to work together to aggressively promote the sale of reclaimed water, even if
7 it reduces potable water usage.

8 Certainly, AWC will not install purple reclaimed water pipes out to people’s houses, as
9 Global is doing. Indeed, AWC’s master plan includes a plan for distribution mains for potable
10 water, **but there are no plans for reclaimed water distribution mains.**⁹

11 Moreover, the AWC / Southwest agreement cannot be used in the extension area. This is
12 because AWC is legally prohibited from selling reclaimed water in this area. AWC proposes to
13 add the area to its Casa Grande system. The courts have already established that AWC’s Casa
14 Grande CC&N does not include the right to sell reclaimed water.¹⁰ Moreover, AWC has no tariff
15 to sell reclaimed water in this area. AWC’s Casa Grande tariff includes only general service (i.e.
16 potable water) rates.¹¹ AWC also has a separate tariff to sell non-potable water in the area, but it
17 only applies to CAP water, not reclaimed water.¹² Tellingly, AWC does have a tariff to sell
18 reclaimed water, but this tariff is limited to part of its Apache Junction system.¹³ The lack of an
19 equivalent tariff in Casa Grande clearly shows that AWC cannot sell reclaimed water in Casa
20 Grande. Thus, both the courts and AWC’s own tariffs show that AWC cannot sell reclaimed
21 water in Casa Grande. And under the AWC / Southwest agreement, Southwest is forbidden from
22 selling reclaimed water, except to AWC. Thus, if this agreement is put into effect in the extension
23 area, no utility will be authorized to sell reclaimed water.

24
25 ⁹ AWC Response to Staff’s Insufficiency Letter, filed July 7, 2006, at Attachment A, page 3.

26 ¹⁰ The relevant court cases are listed in Footnote 4 of Global’s Motion to Dismiss.

27 ¹¹ AWC Tariff WG-103, filed November 30, 2005.

¹² AWC Tariff No. NP-274, filed November 30, 2005.

¹³ AWC Tariff No. RW-256, filed December 1, 1989.

1 AWC claims that while Global “dreams up marketing buzz words” about conservation,
2 AWC actually “walks the walk” of conservation.¹⁴ As shown above, AWC has no plans for
3 recharge wells, and has no plans for distribution mains for reclaimed water. Moreover, AWC is
4 legally prohibited from selling reclaimed water – the very cornerstone of conservation. And if
5 AWC is really attempting to walk the walk, it is not being very successful. The most recent water
6 usage data for the Casa Grande system shows that AWC pumped 724 gallons of groundwater per
7 customer per day.¹⁵ That compares to 476 gallons for Global in Maricopa.

8 **Uncontested Fact No. 4: AWC plans to finance all facilities in the extension area**
9 **with AIAC.**¹⁶ The dangers of over-reliance on AIAC are well known. This is particularly true
10 when large areas are financed entirely with AIAC. For example, excessive reliance on AIAC is the
11 root cause of the massive rate increases that are facing Arizona-American’s Anthem system.¹⁷
12 AWC’s requested extension area will have about 28 times as many homes as Anthem. Repeating
13 the mistakes of Anthem on a vastly larger scale does not seem advisable.

14 **Uncontested Fact No. 5: Part of the extension area is already certificated to another**
15 **water company.** AWC is aware that CP Water Company holds a certificate for part of the
16 extension area. Yet AWC refuses to amend its application to delete the CP area from its
17 Application. This approach flies in the face of decades of CC&N law, as explained in CP Water
18 Company’s own motion.

19 **Uncontested Fact No. 6: AWC did not submit some of the financial projections**
20 **required by Commission rules.** Specifically, AWC did not submit the “estimated annual
21 operating revenues and expenses that are expected to accrue from the proposed construction” as
22 required by A.A.C. R14-2-402(A)(2).

23
24
25 ¹⁴ AWC Response at 10.

26 ¹⁵ AWC Response to Staff’s Insufficiency Letter, filed July 7, 2006, at Attachment C. 455,678,000 gallons pumped
divided by 20,294 customers is 22,454.

27 ¹⁶ AWC Application at ¶ 9.

¹⁷ See Direct Testimony of Thomas M. Broderick at 9-12 filed in Docket No. WS-01303A-06-0403.

ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC
ONE ARIZONA CENTER
400 EAST VAN BUREN STREET - SUITE 800
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004
TELEPHONE NO 602-256-6100
FACSIMILE 602-256-6800

1 **IV. Conclusion.**

2 Although AWC argues otherwise, the Commission is not forbidden from dismissing
3 CC&N Applications that are without merit. The six uncontested facts discussed above show that
4 AWC's Application is fatally flawed. Under these facts, it is not in the public interest to grant a
5 CC&N to AWC. Because these facts are not in dispute, no hearing is necessary. Accordingly, the
6 Commission should dismiss AWC's Application.

7 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 26th day of July 2006.

8 ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC

9
10 By 
11 Michael W. Patten
12 One Arizona Center
13 400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800
14 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

15 Original + 17 copies of the foregoing
16 filed this 26th day of July 2006, with:

17 Docket Control
18 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
19 1200 West Washington
20 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

21 Copies of the foregoing hand-delivered/mailed
22 this 26th day of July 2006, to:

23 Yvette B. Kinsey, Esq.
24 Administrative Law Judge
25 Hearing Division
26 Arizona Corporation Commission
27 1200 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Christopher C. Kempsey, Esq.
Chief Counsel, Legal Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

ROSHKA DeWULF & PATTEN, PLC
ONE ARIZONA CENTER
400 EAST VAN BUREN STREET - SUITE 800
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004
TELEPHONE NO 602-256-6100
FACSIMILE 602-256-6800

- 1 Ernest G. Johnson, Esq.
Director, Utilities Division
- 2 Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington
- 3 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

- 4 Robert W. Geake, Esq
Arizona Water Company
- 5 3805 North Black Canyon Highway
Phoenix, Arizona 85015

- 6 Steven A. Hirsch, Esq.
7 Rodney W. Ott, Esq.
Bryan Cave LLP
- 8 Two North Central Avenue, Suite 2200
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

- 9 Jeffrey W. Crockett, Esq
10 Marcie Montgomery, Esq.
Snell & Wilmer LLP
- 11 One Arizona Center
400 East Van Buren Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

- 12 Kenneth H. Lowman
13 Manager
KEJE Group, LLC
- 14 7854 West Sahara
15 Las Vegas, Nevada 89117

- 16 Craig Emmerson, Manager
Anderson & Val Vista 6, LLC
- 17 8501 North Scottsdale Road, Suite 260
Scottsdale, Arizona 85253

- 18 Brad Clough
19 Anderson & Barnes 580, LLP
Anderson & Miller 694, LLP
- 20 8501 North Scottsdale Road, Suite 260
Scottsdale, Arizona 85253

- 21 Phillip J. Polich
22 Gallup Financial, LLC
8501 North Scottsdale, #125
- 23 Scottsdale, Arizona 85253

24
25 By 
26
27