

W-03512A-07-0362

ORIGINAL



0000075653

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

4700

Investigator: Richard Martinez

Phone:

Fax:

Priority Response Within Five Days

AZ Docket Control

Opinion No. 2007 62022

Date: 7/25/2007

Complaint Description: 08A Rate Case Items - Opposed
N/A Not Applicable

Complaint By: First: P. Last: Mason

Account Name: P. Mason

Home:

Street:

Work:

City:

CBR:

State: AZ

Zip:

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

is:

Utility Company: Pine Water Co., Inc. AUG 02 2007

Division:

Contact Name:

DOCKETED BY

Contact Phone:

Nature of Complaint:

Received the following correspondence:

I am against the Deletion of Territory from the CC&N of Pine Water Company. I am a full time resident and customer of Pine Water Company.

Having read ALL the transcripts posted so far, it would seem that Pine Water Company tried to work with the developers and other well owners, contrary to the comments at public meetings. PWC was charged with finding new water supplies and is also working with PSWID.

I believe Mr. Hardcastle was also told to improve his customer service center and postings of water staging. I am notified via email of any changes in staging status and areas that maybe affected with line repairs. Conservation suggestions are also published. Stage signs posted around the Community are clear and easy to read.

Like everyone else I don't like paying hauling charges and I do my very best to conserve water wherever and whenever I can. I am mindful however, that we are in a severe drought.

It would appear that the same intervener who last criticized Pine and Strawberry Water Companies for making a profit, now says that Mr. Hardcastle spends too much on lawyers. I am sure that having to spend money on lawyers to defend himself from the same parties as last time is not by choice. Likewise does the intervener expect his friends to sell their units at cost? I hardly think so.

It appears Mr. Pugel needs to complete ADEQ testing and prove his well over an extended period of time. If indeed his property is set aside from the CC&R it would seem that he can drawdown any amount of water without restrictions. I therefore present the following questions and concerns:

Will the residents of the 40+ condominiums and 60 RV spaces/campers/horses be supplied with an adequate and long term water supply and what happens if the water supply cannot be sustained?

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

If water can flow with NO restrictions how will this affect the rest of the Community? Will our water supplies be faced with further jeopardy? It would seem that this would be counter to the "public interest."

Why did Mr. Pugel in November of last year write to Gila County Supervisors to take back control of the Pine Strawberry Water Improvement District? Could it be that the board and Pine Water Company were getting close to an agreement to find additional water? If successful would the new K2 well lessen the impact of his Milk Ranch well and his hold over the community?

Mr. Ray Pugel and Mr. Harry Jones are again pushing for the Community to buy Pine and Strawberry Water Companies. The plan one can assume, is that the developers will then say they can sell us their water, and hook into the current system. This would assure them protection if their wells drop down. Of course we would all then be operating with no usage restrictions. Would we then be paying for the main extension, infrastructure, mains water supply and any other additional facilities for their new developments? How much would we be "milked" by Milk Ranch? Would this be an open door to allow more unrestrained growth with an already questionable water supply?

If a Pine/Strawberry Domestic Water District is formed, then the Community no longer comes under the protection of the ACC as to what we pay for water and who and how much it will cost to run the District. Remember the \$12.1 Million quoted to us in 2004? Loren Peterson Strawberry Hollow was quoted as saying that the reaction was "Gee, that's pretty cheap. It's my understanding that most people's bills would actually go down." (Payson Roundup January 13, 2004.) Others estimated it to be approximately \$6.5K per household over time.

We cannot look to Gila County to act sensibly as they are responsible for allowing zoning changes for development. August 2004 when request for zoning change for the RV Park went before Planning and Zoning, Commissioner Walt Smith said "Water is something other entities must resolve." What a concept! Likewise Ron Christensen (who was District I supervisor December 2002) took exception to ACC public information officer Heather Murphy, when she said that the County must accept a good share of the blame for critical water shortages in Pine because of its continuing approval of new development. Mr. Christensen said "She is fabricating a problem that does not exist because of the county's planning, zoning or land use. It's an easy way out for those guys because they don't have a lot of authority, so it's just one way to shift it onto somebody else." (Payson Roundup December 24th 2002) He talked about Portals 4 and Strawberry Hollow amongst others. Portal 4 is looking for additional water right NOW and has very few full time residents. I just drove around Strawberry Hollow and counted 17 houses, some of which are vacation homes. Ron Christensen is now on planning and zoning along with Mark Fumosa.

Honorable Commissioners I have tried to show that authorization for Deletion of Territory from the CC&N will have troublesome consequences for both Communities and is not for the public good.

I thank you for this opportunity to express my concerns.

End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

N/A

End of Response

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

7/25

ACC staff called customer and thanked her for submitting her Opinion. Customer was told that her Opinion would be docketed so that the Commissioners would have an opportunity to read her opinion. CLOSED.

End of Comments

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Date Completed: 7/25/2007

Opinion No. 2007 - 62022
