

ORIGINAL



0000077774

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED

28

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

**COMMISSIONERS**

MIKE GLEASON, Chairman 2007 OCT 12 P 11: 02  
WILLIAM A. MUNDELL  
JEFF HATCH-MILLER AZ CORP COMMISSION  
KRISTIN K. MAYES DOCKET CONTROL  
GARY PIERCE

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION  
OF WATER UTILITY OF GREATER  
TONOPAH, INC. FOR APPROVAL OF AN  
EXTENSION OF ITS CERTIFICATE OF  
CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY TO  
PROVIDE WATER UTILITY SERVICE IN  
MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA

Docket No. W-02450A-06-0626

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION  
OF HASSYAMPA UTILITY COMPANY,  
INC., FOR APPROVAL OF AN EXTENSION  
OF ITS CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE  
AND NECESSITY TO PROVIDE  
WASTEWATER UTILITY SERVICE IN  
MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA

Docket No. SW-20422A-06-0566

Arizona Corporation Commission  
**DOCKETED**  
OCT 12 2007

DOCKETED BY [Signature]

**RESPONSE TO STAFF REPORT**

Water Utility of Greater Tonopah, Inc. ("WUGT" or "Tonopah") and Hassayampa Utility Company ("HUC" or "Hassayampa")(collectively, the "Global Utilities") respectfully submit these responses to the September 28, 2008 Staff Report in this matter regarding Hassayampa.

**I. Condition No. 2 (Franchise).**

This condition is not necessary because Hassayampa will have a franchise by the time of the hearing. Accordingly, this condition should be deleted once evidence of the franchise is submitted at the hearing.

**II. Condition No. 3 (Water Reclamation Facility ATC).**

This condition requires Hassayampa to obtain an "Approval to Construct" or "ATC" for the planned Campus 1 Water Reclamation Facility ("WRF"). Hassayampa suggests that the condition not specify the exact facility to be constructed. Instead, HUC suggests that the condition be modified to require Hassayampa to file an ATC for a WRF with capacity sufficient to meet the

1 requirements of the initial phase of development. The key point is that sufficient capacity be  
2 available to serve customers, not the identity or location of the WRF. Hassayampa's master plan  
3 for the region includes several WRFs. Although at this time, Hassayampa plans to construct the  
4 Campus 1 WRF first, those plans may change. Depending on where development occurs first, it  
5 may be prudent to construct one of the other WRF first. In addition, Hassayampa's parent  
6 company, Global Water, Inc., recently signed an agreement to acquire a neighboring wastewater  
7 utility, Balterra Sewer Corp. The Balterra transaction will not close without an approval or waiver  
8 from the Commission. If the Commission allows the Balterra transaction to go forward,  
9 Hassayampa's regional plans could change. It may be more efficient and economical for HUC to  
10 purchase capacity from Balterra, or to construct a shared facility with Balterra. Or it may be better  
11 for Hassayampa to construct one of the other WRFs first. Hassayampa should follow the most  
12 practical and efficient method of obtaining the needed capacity – an approach that will benefit the  
13 ratepayers in the long run. The alternative approach of specifying the exact facility and its location  
14 is too rigid and therefore may result in less-than-optimal facilities being constructed simply to  
15 comply with the requirement. Hassayampa believes that the public interest requires that sufficient  
16 capacity be available, but does not require that specific plants be constructed in a specific  
17 sequence. The same Maricopa County Environmental Services Department and Arizona  
18 Department of Environmental Quality approvals are required regardless of the location associated  
19 with the initial treatment site.

20 In addition, based on current estimates of development activity and permitting process  
21 times, Hassayampa recommends that this requirement be due in two years from the effective date  
22 of the Commission's order.

23 Therefore, Hassayampa proposes the following alternative condition: "To require  
24 Hassayampa to file with Docket Control, as a compliance item in this docket, a copy of the ATC  
25 issued by MCESD for a WRF with sufficient capacity to serve the initial phase of development of  
26 the extension area."  
27

1 **III. Condition No. 4 (ATC for sewer tie-in).**

2 The proposed Campus 1 WRF is not located in the extension area. Thus, this condition  
3 requires an ATC for a sewer tie-in between Campus 1 WRF and the extension area. However, as  
4 noted above, constructing Campus 1 first may or may not be the best approach. HUC requests  
5 flexibility as to this condition. If a WRF is constructed within this extension area, then no tie-in is  
6 necessary. And if one of the other WRFs is constructed first, or a WRF is built in the Balterra  
7 area, then the tie-in would be with a different facility. In addition, as with condition 3,  
8 Hassayampa believes that two years is a better deadline for this condition. Thus, Hassayampa  
9 proposes that this condition be modified as follows: "To require Hassayampa to file with Docket  
10 Control, as a compliance item in this docket, a copy of the ATC issued by MCESD for the sewer  
11 tie-in between the extension area and the WRF specified in condition 3 within two years of the  
12 effective date of this decision, unless the WRF is constructed within the extension area, in which  
13 case Hassayampa shall file a notice to that effect with Docket Control, as a compliance item in this  
14 docket, within two years of the effective date of this decision."

15 **IV. Condition No. 5 (APP or AZPDES).**

16 This condition requires Hassayamapa to file an APP and/or AZPDES "for the WRF  
17 Campus No. 1." As discussed above, Hassayamapa requests the flexibility to not proceed with  
18 Campus 1 right away if other alternatives prove more economical and are better suited to the  
19 regional plan. Therefore, Hassayampa requests that this condition be modified as follows: "to  
20 require Hassayampa to file with Docket Control as a compliance item in this docket, copies of the  
21 APP and/or AZPDES issued by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality for the WRF  
22 specified in Condition No. 3."

23 **V. Condition No. 6 (previous decisions).**

24 This condition requires that Hassayampa follow the requirements and conditions in  
25 Decision No. 68922 (August 29, 2006), as modified by the Commission's Procedural Order dated  
26 June 18, 2007 in that docket. This is an unusual condition. Staff has not specified any unusual  
27 circumstances which would require this condition. The previous decision can stand on its own

1 feet, and there is therefore no need to incorporate it by reference in this case. Moreover, it may  
2 create unnecessary complexity and confusion. For example, will Hassayamapa be required to file  
3 proof of compliance in both dockets?

4 **VI. Additional comments regarding July 23, 2007 Staff Report.**

5 WUGT makes the following additional points regarding the July 23, 2007 Staff Report.  
6 Regarding the first condition, the concept is fine, but the wording does have a minor technical  
7 problem. The phrase “stating that there is adequate water for the area being requested” does not  
8 match the wording used by ADWR in its DAWS. The DAWS will instead mention a specific  
9 quantity of water. However, the DAWS will typically include a reference to the Commission  
10 Decision Number(s) that it applies to. The quoted language should be replaced with “relating to  
11 this CC&N extension.” In addition, WUGT requests the flexibility to submit either a DAWS or a  
12 Certificate of Assured Water Supply (“CAWS”).

13 Regarding Condition 3, as noted in WUGT’s August 6 response, WUGT requests that the  
14 deadline be set at three years. In addition, WUGT has discovered a potential ambiguity in this  
15 condition regarding the definition of “Phase I”. Staff’s engineering memorandum refers to Phase I  
16 on page 4, and notes that certain facilities are anticipated to be operational in 2009, and other  
17 facilities in Phase I are expected to be operational by 2012 (e.g. the surface water treatment plant).  
18 The 2009 facilities may be referred to as “Phase I.A” and the 2012 facilities as “Phase I.B.” The  
19 staff report recommends that an AOC be filed for Phase I within two years. WUGT believes that  
20 Staff is referring to Phase I.A, because Phase I.B will not be operational until 2012. Thus, this  
21 condition should be clarified. And again, WUGT requests that the deadline for AOC for Phase I.A  
22 be three years, not two years.

23  
24  
25  
26  
27

ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC  
ONE ARIZONA CENTER  
400 EAST VAN BUREN STREET - SUITE 800  
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004  
TELEPHONE NO 602-256-6100  
FACSIMILE 602-256-6800

1 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 12<sup>th</sup> day of October 2006.

2 ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC

3  
4 By 

5 Michael W. Patten  
6 Timothy J. Sabo  
7 One Arizona Center  
8 400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800  
9 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

8 Original + 15 copies of the foregoing  
9 filed this 12<sup>th</sup> day of October 2007, with:

10 Docket Control  
11 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
12 1200 West Washington  
13 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

13 Copies of the foregoing hand-delivered/mailed  
14 This 12<sup>th</sup> day of October 2007, to:

14 Lyn A. Farmer, Esq.  
15 Chief Administrative Law Judge  
16 Hearing Division  
17 Arizona Corporation Commission  
18 1200 West Washington  
19 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

18 Christopher C. Kempley, Esq.  
19 Chief Counsel, Legal Division  
20 Arizona Corporation Commission  
21 1200 West Washington  
22 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

21 Ernest G. Johnson, Esq.  
22 Director, Utilities Division  
23 Arizona Corporation Commission  
24 1200 West Washington  
25 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

24 Todd C. Wiley, Esq.  
25 Fennemore Craig  
26 3003 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2600  
27 Phoenix, AZ 85012

