



ORIGINAL

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

4700

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: John La Porta

Phone: [REDACTED]

Fax: [REDACTED]

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2007 63777

Date: 10/11/2007

Complaint Description: 08E Rate Cases Items - In Favor  
N/A Not Applicable

First:

Last:

Complaint By: Steve

Steinfelt

Account Name: Steve Steinfelt

Home: (000) 000-0000

Street: [REDACTED]

Work: (000) 000-0000

City: Yarnell

CBR:

State: AZ Zip: 85362

is:

Utility Company: Yarnell Water Improvement Association, Inc.

Division: Water

Contact Name: [REDACTED]

Contact Phone: [REDACTED]

Nature of Complaint:

CUSTOMER SENT THE FOLLOWING CORRESPONDENCE TO THE COMMISSION.

Steve Steinfelt  
[REDACTED]  
Yarnell, AZ 85362

Arizona Corporation Commission  
DOCKETED

OCT 12 2007

Arizona Corporation Commission  
Utilities Division  
1200 West Washington St  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

DOCKETED BY  
KK ne

RECEIVED  
2007 OCT 12 P 3:57  
AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL

Re: Yarnell Water Users Association

Please consider my comments regarding the Yarnell Water Users Association request for rate ,notification dated 28 September, 2007.

Although it is obvious that the Assodation must cover its costs to continue operating and to update service and equipment, I have some concerns regarding the logic of the rate requests proposed. I have marked and numbered items on the enclosed rate increase listing that I ask you to think about.

1. The base rate for for monthly meter should not increase. There is no increase in cost for meters already installed. Repairs, monthly readings, and updates should be covered by the rate increases to water usage amounts. (Isn't that the purpose of those increases?) Unless this base rate would include more gallons, there is no reason for an increase. The base rate is the same for NO water usage as for up to 1000 gallons, an opportunity for revenue that does not exist in every business.

2. Tier levels are not well organized. I'm not sure that the Commission has anything to do with this, but I ask you to consider the gaps in Tier increments between levels 2 and 3, as well as the larger increases in the rates for

**ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**  
**UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM**

---

level 3, a likely spot for many home users., especially in summer. Tier 1 and 2 gallon levels could be higher, a new tier between 2 and 3, and larger increases above tier 3 as an incentive to save water.

Once again, I support an increase to cover operating costs as long as it is determined that the Association is doing all it can to keep expenses to a minimum. Thank you for accepting my comments

Steve Steinfelt  
10/9/07  
\*End of Complaint\*

**Utilities' Response:**

N/A  
\*End of Response\*

**Investigator's Comments and Disposition:**

10/12/07-Sent the customer the following response.

October 12, 2007

Mr. Steve Steinfelt  
[REDACTED]  
Yarnell, AZ 85362

RE: YARNELL WATER USERS ASSOCIATION

Dear Mr. Steinfelt:

Your letter regarding the Yarnell Water Users Association ("Yarnell") rate case will be placed on file with the Docket Control Center of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") to be made part of the record. The Commission will consider your comments before a decision is rendered in the Yarnell rate application.

The concerns raised in letters received from customers will assist the Commission in the investigation and review of the rate application. The Commission's independent analysis of the utility and its rate request attempts to balance the interest of the utility and its customers.

Commission Staff is very sensitive to the burden that high utility rates can place on the consumer, and though constitutionally required to allow a fair return to the utility, does everything within its authority to protect the consumer.

Staff appreciates your comments and the interest taken on the proposed rate increase. If you should have any questions relating to this issue, please call me toll free at (800) 222-7000.

Sincerely,  
John D. La Porta  
Public Utilities Consumer Analyst  
Utilities Division

CLOSED  
\*End of Comments\*

**Date Completed: 10/12/2007**

**Opinion No. 2007 - 63777**