

ORIGINAL



0000077638

RECEIVED

1

IONY

OCT 10 2007

RECEIVED

OR
KAYCEE CONGER
ON BEHALF OF

ARIZONA CORP. COMM
400 W CONGRESS STE 218 TUCSON AZ 85701

2007 OCT 11 P 12:12

LAS QUINTAS SERENAS WATER CO.

(DOCKET NO. W-01583A-04-0178, W-01583A-05-0326, W-01583A-05-0340)

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

Q.1 Please state your name and your business address.

A.1 Kaycee Conger. My business address is 75 W. Calle de las Tiendas, Suite 115-B, Green Valley Arizona, 85614.

Q.2 Are you employed by Las Quintas Serenas Water Co. ("LQS") and, if so, in what capacity?

A.2 Yes. I am the Administrative Manager for LQS.

Q.3 Please describe the responsibilities and functions associated with that position.

A.3 My responsibility areas include the following: Office/Administrative Management of Day-to-Day Operations; Public Relations; Budget; Scheduling; Contracts/Agreements; Primary Interface with Professional Services Entities, Regulatory Agencies, and State-County-Town Offices; Company Regulatory Compliance; Submittal of Compliance Reports (such as Payroll, Tax, Agency); Vulnerability Assessment and Emergency Response Plans; and Publication of Company Policies, Procedures, and Manuals.

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

Q.4 How long have you been employed by LQS?

OCT 11 2007

A.4 8 - 1/2 years.

DOCKETED BY *MM*

Q.5 Are you familiar with the Fire Sprinkler Service Tariff being proposed by LQS?

A.5 Yes. I was LQS' principal point of contact with the neighboring water companies as well as the company's engineering consultant and legal counsel in connection with (i) researching the subject, (ii) preparing the proposed tariff and (iii) presenting the proposed tariff to the LQS Board of Directors for approval.

The proposed Fire Sprinkler Service Tariff for LQS was generally patterned after a similar tariff included in the rate schedules of Community Water of Green Valley. However, certain revisions and significant language additions were made to the LQS tariff in order to specifically address the current capacity limitations of

LAWRENCE V. ROBERTSON, JR.
ATTORNEY AT LAW
P.O. Box 1448
Tubac, Arizona 85646
(520) 398-0411

28

1 the LQS system. Of particular significance in this regard are the terms and
2 conditions in the sections on "Area of Availability," "Limited Applicability" and
3 "Special Provisions," which are prerequisites to receiving service under LQS'
4 proposed tariff.

5 **Q.6 Does LQS expect the customers with fire sprinkler systems to**
6 **continue to pay the monthly service charge and the arsenic**
7 **remediation surcharge they currently pay should the proposed**
8 **tariff be approved?**

9 A.6 No. If the proposed Fire Sprinkler Service Tariff is accepted and approved by the
10 Commission, those customers with fire sprinkler systems who opt and qualify to
11 receive service under the tariff would only be responsible for those charges listed
12 within the tariff. They would no longer pay a monthly minimum, based on meter
13 size, or monthly ARSM Surcharge.

14 **Q.7 Would Commission approval of the proposed Fire Sprinkler Service**
15 **Tariff affect the level of revenue LQS would otherwise receive from its**
16 **customers; and, if so, how and why?**

17 A.7 Approval of the proposed Fire Sprinkler Service Tariff would result in a reduction
18 in the level of revenues received by LQS. This is because LQS would no longer
19 receive the monthly minimum and the monthly ARSM Surcharge associated with
20 those water system connections which transferred to the new Fire Sprinkler
21 Service Tariff. The revenues which would result from the new tariff, as to those
22 service connections, would be substantially less than those currently received
23 from the applicable monthly minimum and monthly ARSM Surcharges.

24 **Q.8 How will LQS meet those expenses it would otherwise have paid from**
25 **those "lost" revenues?**

26 A.8 It will have to pay those expenses from other revenues generated on its water
27 system.

28 **Q.9 How long is it anticipated that this revenue "shortfall" will last?**

Until LQS' next rate case.

Q.10 When does the company expect to submit its next rate case?

Early 2009.

LAWRENCE V. ROBERTSON, JR.
ATTORNEY AT LAW
P.O. Box 1448
Tubac, Arizona 85646
(520) 398-0411

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
28

Q.11 Why does LQS believe that it can continue to fully pay its operating expenses until 2009, given this potential revenue “shortfall”?

A.11 LQS anticipates only a small number of its current and currently foreseeable customers will both have a desire, and qualify for, fire sprinkler service under the proposed tariff. Thus, it believes that the revenue “shortfall” resulting from Commission approval of the proposed Fire Sprinkler Service Tariff would be relatively small within the context of LQS’ overall water system revenues, and thus manageable. However, it should be recognized that this is a calculated risk, based on certain assumptions.

Q.12 What was the catalyst that caused LQS to consider proposing a Fire Sprinkler Service Tariff at this time rather than at the company’s next rate case, as is the usual practice?

A.12 Although the company was anticipating submitting a proposed Fire Sprinkler Service Tariff in its next rate case, the recently expressed interest of the Commissioners in considering the subject at this point in time accelerated LQS’ presentation of such a proposal.

Q.13 Does that complete your testimony?

A.13 Yes.