

ORIGINAL



0000069077

RECEIVED

06

2007 MAR 21 A 10: 05

W-01303A-05-0405

W-01303A-05-0910

March 19, 2007

AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCUMENT CONTROL

Chairman Mike Gleason  
Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Arizona Corporation Commission  
**DOCKETED**

MAR 21 2007

DOCKETED BY *nr*

Subject: Paradise Valley Water Company Proposed Rate Increase  
Case No. 05-0405  
Decision: 68858

As residents of the Town of Paradise Valley, we are writing to request that you reopen the case whereby Paradise Valley Water Company has requested a public safety surcharge to cover the cost of up-sizing its system to increase fire flow, and also a high block usage surcharge to penalize high usage customers. It is our understanding that this latter surcharge in essence will be a contribution towards the construction of the fire flow system upgrade.


Per the testimony of Marylee Diaz Cortez on behalf of the Residential Utility Consumer Office on January 17, 2006 before your commission, it is questionable whether the Paradise Valley Water Company has the right to upgrade the fire flow system for the town of Paradise Valley since the Arizona Corporation Commission does not require Arizona regulated water utilities to meet the proposed fire flow level of 1500 gallons per minute. Obviously, it is in the interest of the water company to take such an initiative since it increases their return on equity, and it is just as obvious that the customers of the water company will pay much higher water usage fees for an upgrade that is not necessary. Also, the method being recommended to recover the costs of the upgrade are being skewed towards higher users in the form of the high block usage surcharge. One would think that if an upgrade was necessary for fire safety then the costs should be allocated or charged according to one's investment being covered. The larger your residence, the more you should be expected to pay to fund the upgrade. Why should homeowners with large properties and expensive homes be spared their burden of the cost simply because of lower water usage versus someone who may have a smaller property but higher water usage?

Per the above referenced testimony of Ms. Cortez, we find the project as proposed and as funded to be unnecessary, and if the Commission still feels it has merit then we request that it require the water company to eliminate the high block usage surcharge since it is

not being equitably applied, and will place a very significant financial burden on some residents of the Town of Paradise Valley without regard to the amount of invested property for which the fire flow project is intended to protect.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,



Ron & Cathy Tisch  
6809 N. Tatum Blvd  
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

cc: Commissioner Kristen Mayes  
Commissioner William A. Mundell  
Commissioner Gary Pierce  
Commissioner Jeff Hatch-Miller