

ORIGINAL



0000075525

1 **GLIEGE LAW OFFICES, PLLC**
2 **P.O. Box 1388**
3 **Flagstaff, AZ 86002-1388**
4 **(928) 226-8333**

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

JUL 27 2007

5 **John G. Gliege (#003644)**
6 **Stephanie J. Gliege (#022465)**
7 **Attorneys for the Complainants**

DOCKETED BY 

8 **BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

9 **RAYMOND R. PUGEL AND JULIE B.**
10 **PUGEL, husband and wife as trustees of THE**
11 **RAYMOND R. PUGEL and JULIE B. PUGEL**
12 **FAMILY TRUST,**
13 **and**
14 **ROBERT RANDALL and SALLY RANDALL,**
15 **husband and wife**
16 **Complainants,**
17 **v.**
18 **PINE WATER COMPANY, an Arizona**
19 **Corporation**
20 **Respondent..**

DOCKET NO. W-03512A-06-0407

TESTIMONY OF HARRY JONES

RECEIVED
2007 JUL 27 A 8:58
AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

21 **ASSET TRUST MANAGEMENT, CORP.**
22 **Complainants,**
23 **v.**
24 **PINE WATER COMPANY, an Arizona**
25 **Corporation**
26 **Respondent.**

DOCKET NO. W-03512A-06 -0613

27 **JAMES HILL and SIOUX HILL, husband and**
28 **wife and as trustees of THE HILL FAMILY**
29 **TRUST,**
30 **Complainants,**
31 **v.**
32 **PINE WATER COMPANY, an Arizona**
33 **Corporation**
34 **Respondent.**

DOCKET NO. W-03512A-07-0100

1 **BRENT WEEKES,**
2 **Complainants,**
3 **v.**
4 **PINE WATER COMPANY, an Arizona**
5 **Corporation**
6 **Respondent.**

DOCKET NO. W-03512A-07-0019

7 **INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS**

8
9 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS.**

10 A. My name is Harry D. Jones. My business address is HDJ Management, LLC at HC7, Box 363,
11 Payson, AZ 85541.

12
13 **Q. WHAT IS YOUR PROFESSION AND BACKGROUND?**

14
15 A. I am a general business consultant with a Ph.D. in Finance and Economics from Arizona State
16 University. I have consulted to many small businesses and have completed a major engagement for a
17 New York Stock Exchange firm, and major assignments for the Gila County, Arizona Board of
18 Supervisors. Assignments have ranged from raising new equity or debt required for growth, to
19 assignment for complete restructuring of business units, usually with an emphasis on financial
20 statement analysis; to product/service costing, contract negotiations, and to analysis and coordination
21 of various matters related to management of water issues. I have been involved in numerous merger
22 and acquisition transactions. Over the last 30 years, I have been president of five manufacturing and
23 service firms (one in prefabricated water pumping systems) with 7-350 employees.

24
25 I have been Chairman of the Rim Trail Domestic Water Improvement District located north of
26 Payson Arizona off and on for 27 years. For 15 months in 2003 and 2004 I was engaged by the
27 Board of Supervisors to administer the day-to-day affairs of the Pine/Strawberry Water Improvement
28 District. Since the Pine/Strawberry assignment, I have continued under contract to Gila County to
29 handle various water issues that involve interests of public entities and citizens of Northern Gila

1 County. As of April 2007, I have been the District Manager of Pine Creek Canyon Domestic Water
2 Improvement District at Portal IV in Pine Arizona, the largest of the five water Districts in Northern
3 Gila County. I currently represent Gil County's interest in the Mogollon Rim Water Resources
4 Management Study (a \$600,000 partnership between the County, the Town of Payson, and the
5 Bureau of Reclamation, with assistance from Salt River Project, the Arizona Department of Water
6 Resources, and Tonto National Forest) a project seeking a dependable long-term water supply for
7 Northern Gila County.

8
9 **Q. ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE TESTIFYING IN THIS PROCEEDING?**

10 A. I am testify in this proceeding at the request of the Gila County Board of Supervisor member
11 from District 1 which includes Pine and Strawberry and the majority of northern Gila County,
12 and in behalf of the property owners, residents, business owners, citizens, and tax payers of Gila
13 County.

14 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION OF YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?**

15
16 A. I will testify in support of the facts that (a) Pine Water Co. ("PWCo") is unable to reasonably
17 provide adequate water service at just and reasonable rates to current and potential customers within
18 its Certificate of Convenience and Necessity ("CC&N"), (b) that PWCo has put forth less than
19 adequate and ineffective efforts to locate additional water sources for the CC&N, (c) PWCo has not
20 taken advantage of water resources that are readily available and it is loosing a portion of the water
21 resources previously available under water sharing agreements, (d) that residents, land owners, and
22 business owners within the CC&N are being denied the opportunity to reasonably utilize their
23 properties because of lack of adequate water service, (e) that the citizens, taxpayers, and government
24 of Gila County suffers economically because of the inadequate water service in Pine, (f) the lack of
25 adequate water service with the CC&N is a trend within the other PWCo affiliate companies owned
26 by Brooke Utilities, Inc. and regulated by the ACC, and (g) that I wish to put the ACC on notice that
27 the regulatory decisions made and actions taken in the past are not allowing the PWCo current and
28
29

1 potential customers and property owners the service benefits and fair market costs that are inherent
2 in the issuance of a CC&N.

3
4 In addition to above factual points, my testimony will disclose that the following claims of PWCo
5 (made over the years) are false: (1) there is "no more water" to be found under Pine Arizona, and (2)
6 the reason that PWCo has inadequate supplies of water available to its customers is "the formation of
7 domestic water improvement districts in the Pine" by the Gila County Board of Supervisors.

8
9 Also, I will testify as to the impact I project will occur to property owners, residents, business
10 owners, and to the complainants if the CC&N is reduced in size by deletion of the territories owned
11 by the Complainants.

12
13 **Q. WHY DO BELIEVE THAT PWCo IS UNABLE TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE WATER**
14 **SERVICE AT JUST AND REASONABLE RATES TO CURRENT AND POTENTIAL**
15 **CUSTOMERS WITH ITS CC&N?**

16
17 A. The fact that the ACC has had to order moratoriums on new service connections and main
18 extensions for many years is evidence of inadequate service. The most recent moratorium dated
19 2006, which allowed zero new meters per month, is still in existence, as are the prior moratoriums
20 that prohibited main extensions, both of which apply to all potential customers. In addition, PWCo
21 has nearly every year had numerous days of non-voluntary staged water use restrictions (stage 3 or
22 higher under the ACC approved water use restrictions). During June and July of 2007, there have
23 been numerous days of Stage 3, 4, and 5 restrictions. All stages above Stage 3 requiring complete
24 discontinuance of any outside water use and subjecting current customers to major fines and to
25 significant hauling charges as approved by the ACC. Under the rules of the water augmentation
26 plan, PWCo is required to haul purchased water at a cost many times the price of water produced
27 within Pine.

1 **Q. WHAT SUPPORT DO YOU HAVE FOR YOUR CLAIM THAT PWCO. HAS PUT**
2 **FORTH LESS THAN ADEQUQATE AND INEFFECTIVE EFFORTS TO LOCATE AND**
3 **MAKE AVAILBLE ADDITIONAL WATER RESOURCES TO THE CC&N AREA?**

4
5 A. Historically, over the last 15 years, the four domestic water improvement districts (“DWIDs”) within the Pine community have been able to drill productive wells (and in the case of Pine Water Association DWID to tap surface water sources) to provide existing and future customers with adequate water resources to meet virtually all needs, 24 hours per day 365 per year. In fact, one District (Solitude Trails), has historically (until the last few years), supplied excess waters to PWCo that amounts to 14% to 22% of all the water distributed by PWCo. Solitude Trails believes it continues to have the capacity to supply that proportion of the water to PWCo, but for some reason, the Company has the inability (or has refused) to take all the water Solitude Trails can produce, to the point Solitude Trails has shut down its smaller of two wells for lack of use by PWCo.

14
15 In addition to all the DWIDs having adequate water from wells historically used over the years, two highly productive new deep wells have been drilled and developed that are in deep aquifers in the Pine area. The first deep well in the Strawberry Hollow DWID (well located less than 50 feet from PWCo mains) was drilled in 2001 to a depth of 1,320 feet, with the District able to produce water for 72 homes at the rate of about 60 gpm. The amount of water found (excess water of 45 gpm at full build out of Strawberry Hollow) is enough to approximately serve 25% or more of the existing PWCo customers. This well has been developed to the point of it being granted a 100 year adequacy designation by ADEQ (one of only two communities in Northern Gila County with such a designation). Within the 100 year adequacy application, Strawberry Hollow DWID had offered to supply up to 25 gpm to the Pine community. The owner/developer of Strawberry Hollow, to be able to serve his own subdivision, had to go through legal proceedings to extract itself from the PWCo CC&N since PWCo could not supply water. The District faced lawsuits from PWCo in 2002-2004 but was ultimately allowed to serve all its established geographical areas with adequate water resources, with $\frac{3}{4}$ of the water available to other water purveyors, none of which have required the resources, and PWCo unable to make an arrangement for use of the water. The Strawberry Hollow

1 property is legally outside the CC&N and is now highly successful and sold out, partially due to its
2 excellent water service situation.

3
4 The second deep well owned by Milk Ranch, LLC (developed in 2005-2006) is within the southern
5 end of the PWCo CC&N. It was drilled into what is believed to be the same deep aquifer as the
6 Strawberry Hollow well, to a depth of 1045 feet, with water available at 150 gpm or more based on
7 similar testing that was done to receive the 100 year adequacy at Strawberry Hollow. The Milk
8 Ranch well site is within about 400' of PWCo distribution mains.

9
10 The question is, if four DWIDs and private entrepreneurs that need water can find it within or on
11 lands that abut the CC&N, and at costs and risks they feel are economical and reasonable, why can't
12 PWCo do the same? This lack of effort to explore for new water resources results in significant
13 costs to customers, future customers, and to the businesses in the CC&N.

14
15
16 **Q. WHAT SUPPORT DO YOU HAVE FOR YOUR CLAIMS THAT PWCo HAS NOT**
17 **TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF WATER RESOURCES THAT ARE READILY AVAILABLE**
18 **AND THAT IT IS LOSING A PORTION OF THE WATER RESOURCES PREVIOUSLY**
19 **AVAILABLE UNDER WATER SHARING AGREEMENTS?**

20
21 A. Within the complaint and application of Brent Weeks, as filed in this case on, he has indicated he
22 is not renewing his water sharing agreement with PWCo, under which he has traditionally supplied
23 significant proportions of the total water resources delivered by PWCo to its customers. This
24 reduction in supply is troublesome and may lead to significant additional shortages or use
25 restrictions.

26
27 In a conversation with Bill McKnight on July 22, 2007, he indicated he had notified Strawberry
28 Water Co.(a sister company to PWCo that transports water from his well to the Magnolia pipeline
29 for movement to Pine) that effective May of 2007 he was not renewing his well sharing agreement

1 with the Brooke Utilities, Inc. entities. Historically, for a period of 10 years, he indicates he has
2 provided about 10-12 million gallons per year to the systems of Strawberry and Pine that are
3 connected to each other by the Magnolia pipeline. Total water supplied by PWCo to its customers
4 has been approximately 56 million gallons per year, thus the 10-12 reduction in supplies is
5 significant.

6
7 Solitude Trails DWID ("STDWID") provided testimony to the Commissioners at the Town Hall
8 meeting the ACC held in Pine two months ago. Mr. Fumusa, its Chairman has also filed several
9 written complaints with the ACC that indicate that PWCo has gradually reduced the amount of water
10 taken from the Districts wells over the last five years. Recently only about 50% of the production
11 capacity is being delivered to the PWCo distribution system. Under this agreement PWCo operates
12 the wells and delivers water first to the Solitude DWID tanks, and all excess to the PWCo system.
13 Historically, only about 10% of the water goes to the Solitude system to serve about 35 homes.
14 Because complete day-by-day records of pumping are not available to STDWID, the District does
15 not know exactly when water is pumped, although they believe the wells are pumped heavily on
16 weekend high demand days during the summer. The District believes that substantial more pumping
17 could occur if wells were pumped for days ahead of the anticipated demand, with water stored in
18 tanks for days, weeks, or months before the critical high demand weekends. This lack of storage
19 capacity to cover peak demand spikes therefore forces PWCo to haul water to the Pine community,
20 at costs that historically have been many times the cost of water pumped locally.

21
22 High water hauling costs do not ultimately land on PWCo, but are passed on directly the following
23 month to the rate-payers of the company. The difference in cost of water locally produced under
24 water sharing agreements has been \$.50-\$1.00 per 1,000 gallons versus \$38-\$45/1000 when hauled
25 by truck, thus the non-storage and non use of all locally available low cost water is highly available
26 to the consumers. Commission orders issued in about 2004 required that the company first utilize all
27 the locally available water prior to hauling of any waters into the Pine system.

1 **Q. WHAT SUPPORT DO YOU HAVE THAT THE RESIDENTS, LAND OWNERS,**
2 **BUSINESS OWNERS, AND CITIZENS WITHIN THE CC&N ARE BEING DENIED THE**
3 **OPPORTUNITY TO REASONABLY UTILIZE THEIR PROPERTY BECAUSE OF LACK**
4 **OF ADEQUATE WATER SERVICE?**

5
6 A. As the water issues point person for Gila County, many concerns, questions, and complaints
7 related to water issues are directed to me each week by numerous concerned parties:

- 8
- 9 • Many new and long-term vacant lot owners wondering when they might have water available
10 to their existing home sites.
 - 11 • Lot owners attempting to obtain building permits from Gila County, but being denied
12 because of moratoriums.
 - 13 • Current full-time and part-time homeowners wanting to know what they can do about lack of
14 adequate water service they actually face, or think they may face if they come for the
15 weekend or for longer periods of time.
 - 16 • Frustrated residents that want to know how to effectively complain about excessive incidents
17 of broken mains, water outages, low pressure, lack of meter availability, etc. who are
18 completely frustrated by inadequate responses or actions from PWCo.
 - 19 • Business owners that complain about inadequate water service that causes shut-downs of
20 restaurants, hotel rooms, meeting halls (like at the fire station), etc.
 - 21 • Parcel owners (2-50 acres) wanting to know about water meter and water main availability to
22 the few undivided parcels left in Pine..
 - 23 • Current full-time residents that think they are discriminated against by water staging rules
24 that have water stages at 1 or 2 at the start of the weekend, and gradually move to stages 3 as
25 the weekend progresses, and then goes to Stage 4 during the middle of the week, until the
26 whole staging process starts again on Saturdays, greatly inconveniencing full-timers.
 - 27 • Realtors wanting to know current water situations in specific neighborhoods, or in general, so
28 they know what to advise their clients.
 - 29 • Potential property owners, mainly referred by real estate agents, wanting to understand the
water service problems in the area.
 - Media reports related to the above.

In summary, many residents cannot or do not utilize their properties. Businesses loose important
revenues and parcel owners loose opportunities for timely development of the limited economic
based of the community.

1 **Q. WHY DO YOU FEEL THAT THE LACK OF ADEQUATE WATER SERVICE IN**
2 **THE PINE AREA COSTS THE CITIZENS AND GILA COUNTY GOVERNMENT**
3 **TO SUFFER ECONOMICALLY?**

4 A. Over the years, the Pine area has suffered from significant negative publicity related to water
5 problems. Prior to the County's involvement over the last five-six years, the ACC heard and
6 mainly believed what PWCo documented in annual reports and what it presented in oral
7 arguments and the rate application filed in 2003. During this same time period, the citizens
8 and property owners have become more vocal about the limited use of their properties, and
9 more concerned over what Gila County, the Pine/Strawberry Water District, the ACC and the
10 Company could do about the problem. Thus, the County Supervisors have had to help
11 finance major research projects (Strawberry borehole drilling to 1890' and the Mogollon Rim
12 Water Resources Management Study) and to engage a part-time consultant for water issues, a
13 part-time geologist, and a water attorney to help manage day-to-day water related issues, to
14 evaluate what alternatives and directions to move towards in the future, and to establish a
15 legal basis for working on the short- and long-run issues facing the citizens and property
16 owners. The major focus of these consultants and research efforts has been the
17 Pine/Strawberry area.

18 County management is faced with financing these efforts, which have helped keep the time of
19 other staff and the Supervisors minimized, although the Building Department staff and the
20 permit applicants have to go through many extra hoops to design alternative water systems
21 (usually on-site water tanks that water is hauled to) necessary to get building permits issued.
22 Disgruntled citizens frequently take out their frustration on the County's Building
23 Department counter staff and management.

24 The County has not pushed for high growth, significant economic development programs, or
25 job creation efforts in the CC&N area, but it does realize the importance of the
26 Pine/Strawberry area in terms of additional tax base (property and sales taxes) needed to help
27 finance day-to-day obligations of the County (mostly for required duplicate facilities in both
28 Globe and Payson). Especially pressing is the ability of the County to finance the
29 approximate \$31 million jail and court facilities now being readied for bond and sales tax
elections in the fall of 2007. Only 1/2 of 1% of the land in northern Gila County is private and
subject to taxation, the rest being mainly national forest and tribal lands. No longer does a

1 significant tax base exists in northern Gila County for the timber, ranching, and mining
2 industries, thus tourism and transitional second home resale activities, home remodeling, etc.
3 have become a major economic engine. New home construction is important, but it has been
4 significantly limited by water resources. Only about 10-15 new houses per year were built in
5 the CC&N in the last few years, indicating most of the real estate, surveying, title insurance,
6 home inspection, etc. activities is tied to the high-turnover residential, resale market.
7 Population growth in the area is relatively low, and even in Payson it was recently report by
8 the census to be only one-half of the growth rate of the rest of Arizona.

9
10 The limited residential and commercial properties in the Pine area have been underutilized
11 mainly because of the water situation. Being surrounded by national forests creates a natural
12 barrier to excessive long-term growth, however it is important to the County to have adequate
13 water available so as to create a more progressive environment that allows property owners to
14 fully utilize existing homes and to ultimately access commercial properties, already
15 subdivided lands, and the few small tracts of land owned by the complainants. No doubt
16 tourist business in the Pine/Strawberry area (as explained in numerous letters to the editors) is
17 influenced by the lack of adequate water service.

18
19 **Q. WHY HAVE YOU SUGGESTED THAT SEVERL OTHER COMMUNITIES**
20 **IN THE RIM COUNTRY THAT TEND TO HAVE SIMILAR PROBLEMS**
21 **(ALL SERVED BY BROOKE UTILITIES) HAS ANYTHING TO DO WITH**
22 **THE SITUATION IN PINE WATER CO.**

23 A. I believe the problems in the other communities are a reflection of the trend or general
24 policies of Brooke Utilities in terms of how they tend to look at their responsibilities
25 related to development of long-term sustainable water supplies.

26 Other Brooke served communities with similar problems are:

- 27
28 • Geronimo Estates: This community has been on a full moratorium for 27
29 years. There are about 252 lots, with about 125 homes, and currently about 87
meters installed, with nine of those meters install under Order #68696 issued

1 by the ACC on 5-5-06 (reportedly only the one at the new fire station is being
2 used at this time). During the last month parts of the community were
3 completely out of water, and everyone was on Stage 4-5 for many days during
4 June and July, 2007. A 2,000 gallon trailer tank was parked at the community
5 for about two weeks, as the only source of water for people in the upper
6 portions of the community. The company had temporarily used a
7 homeowner's drive way to deliver water, but was blocked off due to unsafe
8 conditions with the 18 wheeler on the step hill, which had to be pulled out by
9 private trucks after unloading. The exact causes of the water shortages are not
10 known to the residents, but many property owners have written and talked to
11 the ACC about their dilemmas. Attempts to get the ACC engineering staff to
12 come review the infrastructure to determine exact causes were unsuccessful.

- 13 • Whispering Pines: This community has a long history of marginal water
14 availability. Twice in the last year the system has required boiling of water
15 due to contamination. It has been on stage 4 and 5 during much of June and
16 July 2007, with water hauled many days. Residents don't know exact causes
17 of outages and low pressure other than water was "out". Residents greatly
18 objected to being told by operators to stay at Stage 5, for several days after the
19 tanks were refilled. This community's HOA has been unsuccessfully seeking
20 meaningful responses from Brooke Utilities about future plans to capture
21 some of the C.C. Cragin water for their community.
- 22 • Mesa Del Caballo: This community has numerous people upset over
23 downsizing of storage tanks and the fact they were on stage 3-4 many days in
24 June and July. They are upset that one resident was threatened with
25 disconnection for using 35,000 gallons of water (prior to any staging
26 restrictions) to fill his pond that is used for community fire protection.
- 27 • Strawberry: Many of these residents, within a separate sister company from
28 Pine Water Co., seem to feel they have been quietly de-watered over the years
29 by Brooke Utilities in order to keep Pine in water. Until water outages
occurred from late May until July of 2007, this community was not too
concerned, but they have become very active, feeling they have been ignored
and their interests not well protected, especially in light of the terms of the
May 1, 2007 agreement between Pine/Strawberry Water Improvement District
and Pine Water Co. The K2 agreement involves drilling a deep well in
Strawberry so as to make more water available to Pine. Strawberry and Pine
residents have joined together in order to begin recalling four of the members
of PSWID who pushed the most for the K2 agreement.

30 **Q. WHAT DO YOU PROJECT TO BE THE EFFECT ON RATE-PAYERS,
31 RESIDENTS, BUSINESS OWNERS, AND TAXPAYERS IF THE
32 COMMISSION RULES THAT THE COMPLAINANTS ARE NOT
33 ALLOWED TO BE OUTSIDE THE CC&N OF PWC?**

1 A. If the complainants are not allowed to withdraw from the CC&N and PWCo is
2 ordered to bring its own proposed solutions to the table, I believe the full-time and
3 Valley based part-time residents will organize themselves to make other complaints
4 and legal runs to the ACC, demanding solid actions be taken by the Commissioners.
5 The newly active landowners will, I believe, continue to apply pressure to the
6 Commissioners seeking to have the Company make required investments or to have
7 its CC&N revoked. I believe disappointment in past actions of the ACC is high and
8 growing day by day. If the situation is allowed to continue as is, I believe we will see
9 falling real estate values and a declining economy in the Pine/Strawberry area. If
10 consumers see no significant changes, I believe they will be subjected to continued
11 inadequate service and to very significant water hauling charges. Many consumers
12 and property owners have no confidence in PWCo, and the confidence in the ACC is
13 dwindling rapidly. Unless the ACC does something to force new water development
14 by PWCo, I believe the current property owners will be far worse off because of loss
15 of water that had come from water sharing agreement wells that are not renewing
16 contracts with PWCo.

17 **Q. WHAT DO YOU THINK WILL BE THE EFFECT ON THE CONSUMERS,
18 RATE-PAYERS, BUSINESSES, TAXPAYERS, AND COMPLAINANTS IF
19 THE COMPLAINANTS ARE ALLOWED OUTSIDE THE CC&N?**

20 A. I would project no negative effects on the public if the Complainants are granted the
21 relief they seek. Because the Complainants are not customers now and will not likely
22 become volunteer customers (because of a complete lack of confidence in PWC), I
23 see their freedom from the CC&N as not deteriorating the current situation. From a
24 positive point of view, if the Complainants are allowed outside the CC&N, I believe
25 the consumers will see modest development take place in Pine and one or more
26 additional deep wells will be drilled to assure the Complainants have the ability to
27 service themselves. The less than 100 homes/units and businesses that possibly may
28 result would likely provide some stability to the economy (even to the PWCo area)
29 even though no new water will end up in the hands of PWCo. Possibly, the
30 Complainants will want to form a new domestic water improvement district to serve
31 themselves, or to join the existing successful DWIDs that would appreciate alternative
32 supplies. .

33 **Q. WHAT CONCLUSIONS DO YOU DRAW ABOUT THE OVERALL
34 SITUATION OF PINE WATER CO.?**

35 A. In conclusion, I believe the statement made by Judge Nodes and the Commissioners
36 within Order 68696 of the Geronimo case, issued May 5, 2006 is directly applicable to

1 the Pine Water Co. situation. In that case it was stated "We (*the Commission*) are aware
2 that a moratorium creates a disincentive for companies to seek new sources of water and
3 is inconsistent with a public service corporation being required to serve requesting
4 customers in its CC&N area." "However, a public service corporation with an exclusive
5 service area should not be permitted to rely on the existence of a moratorium as a means
6 of avoiding in perpetuity pursuit of new sources of water where additional demand clearly
7 exists." "We recognize that a balancing of interests is necessary to prevent saddling
8 current customers with unreasonable rates while at the same time recognizing the
9 Company's obligation to attempt to serve new customers."
10

11 To put the philosophy expressed by the Judge and the Commissioners into effect will take
12 perseverance, teeth within the Orders, and close follow up by the Commission Staff.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

1 Original and 19 copies mailed/delivered
2 This 24th day of July, 2007 to:

3 Arizona Corporation Commission
4 Attn: Docket Control
5 1200 W. Washington
6 Phoenix, AZ 85007

7 Copies of the foregoing mailed/delivered
8 This 24th day of July, 2007 to:

9 Kevin O. Torrey
10 Attorney, Legal Division
11 Arizona Corporation Commission
12 1200 W. Washington Street
13 Phoenix, AZ 85007
14 ktorrey@azcc.gov

15 Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel
16 Legal Division
17 Arizona Corporation Commission
18 1200 W. Washington Street
19 Phoenix, AZ 85007

20 Ernest G. Johnson, Director
21 Utilities Division
22 Arizona Corporation Commission
23 1200 W. Washington Street
24 Phoenix, AZ 85007

25 Jay L. Shapiro
26 Fennemore Craig
27 3003 North Central Ave. Ste 2600
28 Phoenix, AZ 85012-2913
29 JSHAPIRO@fclaw.com

David W. Davis, ESQ.
Turley, Swan & Childers, P.C.
3101 N. Central, Suite 1300
Phoenix, AZ 85012-2643
ddavis@tsc-law.com

Robert M. Cassaro
PO Box 1522
Pine, AZ 85544

William F. Haney
3018 E. Mallory St.
Mesa, AZ 85213

Barbara Hall
PO Box 2198
Pine, AZ 85544