

ORIGINAL



0000083828

oeme

ICR Water Users Association's Application for Rate Increase;
Docket No. W-02824A-07-0388

I appreciate that you took the time to communicate your opinion concerning the proposed rate increase. I will make your email a part of the official docket in this matter. This matter is scheduled for a hearing on Wednesday, April 16, 2008 at 9:30 a.m. in the Hearing Room at the Commission, located at 1200 West Washington Street. If you are unable to attend the hearing, you can listen by going to the Commission's home page at azcc.gov, click on "Streaming Audio", then click on "Live Audio Phoenix Open Meeting".

Unlike the legislature, a city council, or the board of supervisors, the Arizona Corporation Commission is a quasi-judicial body. We are similar to judges and have different rules and statutes we are required to follow. We can not state how we will vote on an issue until after we have reviewed all the evidence, listened to the arguments of the parties and comments of the public. This will occur at a Commission Open Meeting.

You can visit the Commission's website for information to determine when this matter will be scheduled for final action at the Commission by going to www.azcc.gov. Listed on the Commission's Home Page, click the topic of Schedules, and then double click the subject of Open Meetings.

Thank you for sharing your viewpoint with me. I will give it every consideration. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any other questions.

Sincerely,

William A. Mundell, Commissioner
Arizona Corporation Commission

cc: Docket

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED
APR 10 2008

DOCKETED BY	NR
-------------	----

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

2008 APR 10 P 4:50

RECEIVED

William Mundell

From: Larry & Tina BLIGH [lbligh@msn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 09, 2008 3:13 PM
To: Mayes-WebEmail; Mundell-Web; Hatch-WebEmail; Pierce-Web; Gleason-WebEmail
Subject: ICR Water Users Association

Commissioners Mayes, Mundell, Hatch-Miller, Pierce and Chairman Gleason,

First, we would like to say thank you for the opportunity to share our thoughts, concerns and opinions with you related to the ICR Water Users Association (ICR) Rate Case currently ongoing. Our reason for writing to you today is to express our concern for the requested intervention in the Rate Case by Talking Rock Golf Course (TR Golf) represented by the law firm of Fennemore Craig, Attorney Jay L. Shapiro.

Personally, we find it very interesting that Mr. Shapiro claims that TR Golf now has "a direct and substantial interest in this proceeding." Apparently, this has come about as a result of ACC Staff's recommendations whereby imputed revenue of \$114,290 has been assigned to the ICR for dollars not collected from TR Golf at the approved tariffed rates for water taken from ICR's well, as set in Decision 64360. We also find it very interesting that Mr. Shapiro was one of the attorneys of record that worked on behalf of Talking Rock/Harvard in the development of the Well Agreement that worked to circumvent ACC Decision 64360.

Apparently, Mr. Shapiro's argument is that ICR and TR Golf are "parties to an Amended Well Agreement and a Main Extension Agreement both dated February 25, 2003." As we all know, Decision 64360, the Order by which ICR must operate, is dated January 15, 2002. Clearly, the work done to create the document to circumvent Decision 64360 took place well after the fact and obviously all parties involved should have had a clear understanding of ACC Decision 64360 and what was required by the Commission for compliance.

We also personally find it disturbing that apparently the ICR Board has been working in sharing information with people such as Mr. Shapiro, yet they abruptly cancel regularly scheduled Board meetings where we, the owners of this Association, are left out and disenfranchised from the entire process. The Board is in place to manage the Association and to ensure compliance with orders set out by the ACC. However, it appears to us by their actions, that their concern is more focused on the relationship with TRR/Harvard and not with the best interests of the Association overall and all its owners.

We would also feel it necessary to point out the concern and position council representing ICR took when Dayne Taylor requested Intervener status. Council representing ICR bitterly protested the intervention request of Mr. Taylor. Their position was to say that granting the intervention of Mr. Taylor would result in significant additional expense to ICR and as a result the request should be denied. It is interesting to note that council representing ICR did not raise issues or concerns related to cost or protest in any manner the Intervention request by Mr. Shapiro on behalf of TR Golf. A question I would like to see answered would be exactly how much time has been spent by ICR attorneys in dealing with Mr. Shapiro and this request and how much time has been billed to the Association as a result?

Again, we want to thank you for your time and for your service to our State in working to ensure that rate payers, like us, are given the opportunity to be heard.

Larry & Tina Bligh
13265 N. Iron Hawk Drive
Prescott, AZ 86305
928.776.1937

William Mundell

From: Jimmy Stoner [jimmys@cableone.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 08, 2008 7:27 AM
To: Mayes-WebEmail; Mundell-Web; Hatch-WebEmail; Pierce-Web; Gleason-WebEmail
Cc: Chris Stoner; Jimmy Stoner
Subject: Re: Docket No. W-02824A-07-0388

Docket No. W-02824A-07-0388

ICR Water Users Association, Inc.

Re: Talking Rock Golf Course, LLC, ("TR Golf") Application for Leave to Intervene

Commissioners Mayes, Mundell, Hatch-Miller, Pierce and Chairman Gleason,

It has been brought to our attention the firm of Pennmore Craig, attorney Jay L. Shapiro, had submitted on 3 April, 2008, an application for leave to intervene in behalf of Talking Rock Golf Course, LLC, ("TR Golf") in the current rate case before the ACC. On careful review of the application one is lead to believe that TR Golf's interests were not being represented in this matter. The points supporting this application for intervention present similar arguments to those contained in the rebuttal testimony of Robert M Bush and the exhibits he provided to the commission on 14 March, 2008. It is our opininon that Mr. Bush's testimony was certainly more favorable to TR Golf's interests than the interests of the shareholders of the ICR Water Users Association ("ICR").

The ICR Board of Directors, and Harvard, TR Golf, created an amended Main Extension Agreement and amended Well Agreement, dated 25 February, 2003, which are contrary to the policy decision contained in ACC Decision 64360, dated 15 January, 2002. Their attorney of record on these instruments was Mr. Jay L. Shapiro. They cannot point to an ACC hearing which approved these instruments to be in compliance with Decision 64360. They in fact, submitted these documents purported to be in compliance with Decision 64360, or why would they have filed them? The testimony of your staff and Mr. Dayne Taylor clearly identifies the issues.

As shareholders in ICR, we believe this request for intervention is extremely late and would clearly result in much greater legal expense to the shareholders of ICR. Granting intervention status would certainly prolong the decisions in this case.

We request you deny their application for leave to intervene. One might wonder why Mr. Jay L. Shapiro aided the parties in crafting and executing agreements which were contrary to ACC Policy Directives contained in Decision 64360?

We want to thank you for your continued efforts in behalf of the ICR shareholders and rate payers, and providing us an opportunity to be heard in this matter.

Chris and Jimmy Stoner
13410 N. Iron Hawk Dr.
Prescott, AZ 86305
928-443-1082

4/10/2008

William Mundell

From: Jim or Kitty Stocker [stockerjk@cableone.net]
Sent: Monday, April 07, 2008 10:39 AM
To: Mayes-WebEmail
Cc: Mundell-Web; Hatch-WebEmail; Pierce-Web; Gleason-WebEmail
Subject: ICR Water Users Association Rate Case

Dear Commissioner:

I write as a resident of Inscription Canyon Ranch (ICR) and a member of the ICR Water Users Association with regards to the ongoing case involving ACC Decision 64360.

I am asking for the Commission to uphold the meaning and spirit of ACC Decision 64360. Clearly this decision called for only one water tariff rate for all users within our system. Clearly it delineated that wells number 1 and 2 were to be used by the residents of Inscription Canyon Ranch.

I am asking for the Commission to confirm that the Talking Rock development and their golf course MUST pay the same tariff rate for water as all residents of ICR, and that the well they are to use is the third well to be placed into service, well #3, as called for in the original Decision 64360.

Agreements for rates and use of water outside of the ACC Decision 64360 have been entered into by the ICR Water Board and the Canadian-owned developer of Talking Rock development and golf course. The owners of the ICR Water Users Association were kept out of this decision making process by making all sessions executive sessions. The decisions made are counter to the ACC Decision 64360, and should be voided.

The Talking Rock development and golf course should be obligated to pay for the water they have used over the past five years at the tariff rate as called for.

Water is a precious commodity in Arizona. Secretive deals between large foreign land developers and a non-responsive water board that are clearly made for the sole benefit of a developer in its quest to sell expensive real estate on a golf course should not and can not be tolerated. Potable water must first be made available to our citizens for drinking purposes before we can think about using it to water a golf course that is there only for commercial purposes.

What is at the core of the issue is a water board that ignored, violated and circumvented a clear decision by the ACC. What is clear is that the first two wells, which are the most productive ones, were to be designated for the residents of ICR, and the decision by the ACC was ignored, violated, and circumvented. What is clear is that ALL users of water from our system are to be charged the same rate, and that has been ignored, violated, and circumvented by the ICR Water Board. Water rates for all users could be reduced if the golf course is obligated to pay the tariff rate as called for in the Decision.

Thank you for affirming your original decision and causing the ICR Board to comply and collect money due from underpayment due to faulty rate structures, and finally, thank you for designating wells number 1 and 2 as originally decided to the residents of ICR. We can't waste millions of gallons of our precious drinking water on a speculative foreign-owned real estate venture's golf course.

Thank you.

Dr. James Stocker
13525 N. White Cloud Road
Prescott, AZ 86305-4823
(928) 858-4486
stockerjk@cableone.net

----- Msg sent via CableONE.net MyMail - <http://www.cableone.net>

William Mundell

From: Jerome "Skip" Reid [wmunny@cableone.net]
Sent: Monday, April 07, 2008 6:31 AM
To: Gleason-WebEmail; Mayes-WebEmail; Mundell-Web; Pierce-Web; Hatch-WebEmail
Subject: FW: DOCKET NO. W-02824A-07-0388, ICR Water Users Assn. Rate Case
Attachments: Email1_ICRWUA_111104.doc; Email2_ICRWUA_111104.doc

Commissioners:

I first sent this email to you a week ago today at about 7:30am. I spoke with Alfonso Amezcua in the Utility Division last Thursday because I had received no indication whether the email had been received. Further, it had not been posted on the e-docket for the referenced rate case even though other emails sent at a later date did appear on the e-docket.

I believe my email contains important information about the ICR Water Users Association ("the Company") that would be of interest to those reading the docketed materials, as well as the shareholders of the Company. Please let me know if there is any additional information you need from me in order to include this email on the e-docket.

Thanks,

Jerome "Skip" Reid
 13755 N. Standing Bear Trail
 Prescott, AZ 86305
 (928) 277-4371

From: Jerome "Skip" Reid [mailto:wmunny@cableone.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 7:31 AM
To: gleason-web@azcc.gov; mayes-web@azcc.gov; mundell-web@azcc.gov; pierce-web@azcc.gov; hatch-web@azcc.gov
Subject: FW: DOCKET NO. W-02824A-07-0388, ICR Water Users Assn. Rate Case

Commissioners:

I have attached the emails I mentioned in the first email I sent. They are attached to this email. Please accept my apologies for any confusion.

Jerome "Skip" Reid

From: Jerome Reid [mailto:wmunny@cableone.net] **On Behalf Of** Jerome "Skip" Reid
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 7:27 AM
To: 'gleason-web@azcc.gov'; 'mayes-web@azcc.gov'; 'mundell-web@azcc.gov'; 'pierce-web@azcc.gov'; 'hatch-web@azcc.gov'
Subject: DOCKET NO. W-02824A-07-0388, ICR Water Users Assn. Rate Case

Chairman Gleason and Commissioners Mayes, Mundell, Pierce, and Hatch-Miller:

I have been a resident of Inscription Canyon Ranch ("ICR") since October of 2004 when my wife and I moved into our new home. While our home was under construction (April of

4/8/2008

2003 to October of 2004) I took an interest in the community, including the ICR Water Users Association ("the Company"). That interest was initially manifest in attending and contributing to discussions at Company Board meetings. After listening to the various discussions at these meetings, it became apparent to me that the Board members of the Company were not informed about the Company, the regulatory environment in which it operated, any of the controlling documents, and were blatantly and regularly deferring to the wishes of the Talking Rock Ranch developer, i.e., Harvard/Simon LLP ("the Developer"), instead of discharging their responsibilities as *independent* Board members and consistent with statutes and regulatory rulings.

After one Company Board meeting in 2004, I received a call from Earl Cummings, a Director and Officer of the Water Company at the time. Mr. Cummings questioned my contributions at the meeting, specifically that the Board needed to stop deferring to the Developer in all their decisions and assert their independence. For the next half hour Mr. Cummings regaled me with his fear that the Developer would sue the Company for failing to act in a manner consistent with the Developer's express wishes. I tried to disabuse Mr. Cummings of his fear and suggested that if the Developer was not prepared to "play by the rules" (e.g., comply with Commission Order 64360), there might be little the Board could do to avoid litigation short of abdicating their independence and fiduciary duty to all of the residents served by the Company.

In the fall of 2004, I decided, with encouragement from other ICR residents, to run for an open seat on the Company Board. My mailed nominating ballot did not arrive in a timely fashion, so I sought approval from the Board to run as a write-in candidate. Jim Edens, Chairman of the Board and President of the Company at the time (he signed the Well Agreement with the Developer), approved my write-in candidacy. I sent an email to ICR residents announcing my intention to run as a write-in candidate for one of the open Board seats, stating that my mailed nominating form "had not been handled properly". In response to that email, Mr. Edens sent an email to all the ICR residents taking great exception to my suggestion that anything untoward had been done by the Company with my mailed nomination form (I did not make any such suggestion) and recommending that no one vote for me. I have attached a copy of these emails to this one. I did not win a seat on the Board.

Based on Mr. Edens' and Mr. Cummings' behavior, I became convinced that only those who were willing to "sign up for the program", i.e., defer to the Developer and agree with Messrs. Edens and Cummings on issues before the Board, would be considered worthy candidates for a Board seat. The treatment I received from these two in seeking a Board seat ironically did not discourage them from seeking my counsel in subsequent Board meetings about issues before the Board. For example, when discussing the Well Agreement and implementing it, Mr. Edens asked me my opinion "as an attorney" and someone who had read the various Company agreements. It was clear from the discussion that the Board members neither read the Agreement nor understood its terms. This added to my concern whether the Board was doing anything to represent all the residents or was simply deferring to the Developer.

I have read all the substantive filings in the referenced rate case and agree with the conclusions and recommendations of the Utility Division Staff. I am not surprised that the Company Board and the Developer undertook to avoid complying with the Commission's Order 64360 by entering into the Well Agreement. There is no evidence that the Company Board ever disagreed with the Developer. In fact, there is reason to believe that the Board fundamentally abdicated its duties and responsibilities. At one point in the last couple of years, the Board called a meeting of residents to explain a proposal under consideration that would have divided the Company into two separate water companies, one serving the east side of Williamson Valley Road, i.e., Talking Rock Ranch and the Golf Course, and another to serve the west side of the road, i.e., Inscription Canyon Ranch and Whispering Canyon. I attended

that meeting and listened to Mr. Cummings, Chairman of the Board at that time, offer an explanation of the proposal to split the Company. In the course of doing so, Mr. Cummings introduced an attorney in attendance, who happened to be the Developer's counsel. I asked who was providing legal counsel to and advising the Company Board. To my amazement, Mr. Cummings said that the Company Board was relying on the advice of the Developer's counsel! I questioned the prudence of not having independent counsel for this proposal and was dismissed with the comment that doing so would generate an unnecessary expense to the Company. I then requested financial forecasts for the Company and for the separate entities if the proposed split were to be implemented, not unlike what any routine commercial venture would be advised to generate to analyze such a transaction. I suggested that this information, at the very least, would be required for residents to make an informed decision about the proposal. Mr. Cummings said such information would be provided, but it never materialized and the proposal faded into the mist.

I am sure the Commission is aware of how precious our water resources are here in Arizona. Because my wife and I have made a significant investment in our home in ICR, at least in part in reliance on the representations made that there is a 100 year water supply to ICR, I take a personal interest in who is "running the show" for the Company and whether they appear to be making good decisions based on an informed understanding of all the facts and circumstances. I have concluded that the Company is not making good decisions that represent the interests of all the shareholders of the ICR Water Users Association. To the contrary, the Board is guarding carefully access to decision making that affects the Developer and the residents and is acting in deference to the Developer and making bad decisions.

I vigorously urge you to remove the current Board and approve a "caretaker" Board of Directors made up proportionately of residents from each of the communities served, i.e., Inscription Canyon Ranch (including the Preserve at the Ranch), Talking Rock Ranch, and Whispering Canyon. The proportionality would be based on the total number of residential water "hook-ups" in each community as a percentage of the total residential water "hook-ups" served by the Company. This "caretaker" Board would operate until new elections could be held for a new Board. Prior to holding these new elections, the by-laws for the Company should be amended to reflect this concept of proportionality, to permit the bylaws to be amended by a vote of all residents (only the Board can change the by-laws currently), and to provide term limits for members of the Board. I further recommend that any decision regarding splitting the Company be postponed until a new Board can determine whether such a change is in the best interests of all the residents.

Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to you and your staff for the excellent work that has been done in this rate case. I believe that my suggestions for changes in the Board and the way they are elected would go a long way towards correcting problems identified with the current Board.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerome Reid, MBA/JD/LLM
13755 N. Standing Bear Trail
Prescott, AZ 86305

William Mundell

From: Bob Klauer [maxman@cableone.net]
Sent: Monday, April 07, 2008 7:12 AM
To: Mayes-WebEmail; Mundell-Web; Hatch-WebEmail; "- pierce-web"@azcc.gov; Gleason-WebEmail
Subject: ICR Water Users Association

Commissioners Mayes, Mundell, Hatch-Miller, Pierce and Chairman Gleason

I live in Inscription Canyon Ranch in Prescott. First I want to thank you and your Staff. It appears to me that the ICR Water Users Association Board is in violation of 64360, and is charging Talking Rock Ranch a far lessor water rate for the individual home owners. It is my understanding that these rates should have been the Board negotiated a water contract on 2/25/03 which was after Decision 03-001. Talking Rock now owes the ICRWUA \$114,290. The board now wants to cancel the board cancelled its March meeting and has been meeting in executive session for the purpose of the meetings. I do not trust our current board as they appear to be looking out for Talking Rock happy then looking out for our interests. We as members of the association are concerned of the decisions the board is making in regards to the rate case.

I hope the ACC will continue with their due diligence in this matter and vouch for the ICRWUA surely is not.

Than you for your help and allowing me to be heard.

Robert & Sandra Klauer
13975 N. Wagon Box Place
Prescott, AZ 86305
928-899-4366

FREE Animations for your email - by IncrediMail! [Click Here!](#)



William Mundell

From: Jerome "Skip" Reid [wmunny@cableone.net]
Sent: Monday, April 07, 2008 6:31 AM
To: Gleason-WebEmail; Mayes-WebEmail; Mundell-Web; Pierce-Web; Hatch-WebEmail
Subject: FW: DOCKET NO. W-02824A-07-0388, ICR Water Users Assn. Rate Case
Attachments: Email1_ICRWUA_111104.doc; Email2_ICRWUA_111104.doc

Commissioners:

I first sent this email to you a week ago today at about 7:30am. I spoke with Alfonso Amezcua in the Utility Division last Thursday because I had received no indication whether the email had been received. Further, it had not been posted on the e-docket for the referenced rate case even though other emails sent at a later date did appear on the e-docket.

I believe my email contains important information about the ICR Water Users Association ("the Company") that would be of interest to those reading the docketed materials, as well as the shareholders of the Company. Please let me know if there is any additional information you need from me in order to include this email on the e-docket.

Thanks,

Jerome "Skip" Reid
 13755 N. Standing Bear Trail
 Prescott, AZ 86305
 (928) 277-4371

From: Jerome "Skip" Reid [mailto:wmunny@cableone.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 7:31 AM
To: gleason-web@azcc.gov; mayes-web@azcc.gov; mundell-web@azcc.gov; pierce-web@azcc.gov; hatch-web@azcc.gov
Subject: FW: DOCKET NO. W-02824A-07-0388, ICR Water Users Assn. Rate Case

Commissioners:

I have attached the emails I mentioned in the first email I sent. They are attached to this email. Please accept my apologies for any confusion.

Jerome "Skip" Reid

From: Jerome Reid [mailto:wmunny@cableone.net] **On Behalf Of** Jerome "Skip" Reid
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 7:27 AM
To: 'gleason-web@azcc.gov'; 'mayes-web@azcc.gov'; 'mundell-web@azcc.gov'; 'pierce-web@azcc.gov'; 'hatch-web@azcc.gov'
Subject: DOCKET NO. W-02824A-07-0388, ICR Water Users Assn. Rate Case

Chairman Gleason and Commissioners Mayes, Mundell, Pierce, and Hatch-Miller:

I have been a resident of Inscription Canyon Ranch ("ICR") since October of 2004 when my wife and I moved into our new home. While our home was under construction (April of

4/10/2008

2003 to October of 2004) I took an interest in the community, including the ICR Water Users Association ("the Company"). That interest was initially manifest in attending and contributing to discussions at Company Board meetings. After listening to the various discussions at these meetings, it became apparent to me that the Board members of the Company were not informed about the Company, the regulatory environment in which it operated, any of the controlling documents, and were blatantly and regularly deferring to the wishes of the Talking Rock Ranch developer, i.e., Harvard/Simon LLP ("the Developer"), instead of discharging their responsibilities as *independent* Board members and consistent with statutes and regulatory rulings.

After one Company Board meeting in 2004, I received a call from Earl Cummings, a Director and Officer of the Water Company at the time. Mr. Cummings questioned my contributions at the meeting, specifically that the Board needed to stop deferring to the Developer in all their decisions and assert their independence. For the next half hour Mr. Cummings regaled me with his fear that the Developer would sue the Company for failing to act in a manner consistent with the Developer's express wishes. I tried to disabuse Mr. Cummings of his fear and suggested that if the Developer was not prepared to "play by the rules" (e.g., comply with Commission Order 64360), there might be little the Board could do to avoid litigation short of abdicating their independence and fiduciary duty to all of the residents served by the Company.

In the fall of 2004, I decided, with encouragement from other ICR residents, to run for an open seat on the Company Board. My mailed nominating ballot did not arrive in a timely fashion, so I sought approval from the Board to run as a write-in candidate. Jim Edens, Chairman of the Board and President of the Company at the time (he signed the Well Agreement with the Developer), approved my write-in candidacy. I sent an email to ICR residents announcing my intention to run as a write-in candidate for one of the open Board seats, stating that my mailed nominating form "had not been handled properly". In response to that email, Mr. Edens sent an email to all the ICR residents taking great exception to my suggestion that anything untoward had been done by the Company with my mailed nomination form (I did not make any such suggestion) and recommending that no one vote for me. I have attached a copy of these emails to this one. I did not win a seat on the Board.

Based on Mr. Edens' and Mr. Cummings' behavior, I became convinced that only those who were willing to "sign up for the program", i.e., defer to the Developer and agree with Messrs. Edens and Cummings on issues before the Board, would be considered worthy candidates for a Board seat. The treatment I received from these two in seeking a Board seat ironically did not discourage them from seeking my counsel in subsequent Board meetings about issues before the Board. For example, when discussing the Well Agreement and implementing it, Mr. Edens asked me my opinion "as an attorney" and someone who had read the various Company agreements. It was clear from the discussion that the Board members neither read the Agreement nor understood its terms. This added to my concern whether the Board was doing anything to represent all the residents or was simply deferring to the Developer.

I have read all the substantive filings in the referenced rate case and agree with the conclusions and recommendations of the Utility Division Staff. I am not surprised that the Company Board and the Developer undertook to avoid complying with the Commission's Order 64360 by entering into the Well Agreement. There is no evidence that the Company Board ever disagreed with the Developer. In fact, there is reason to believe that the Board fundamentally abdicated its duties and responsibilities. At one point in the last couple of years, the Board called a meeting of residents to explain a proposal under consideration that would have divided the Company into two separate water companies, one serving the east side of Williamson Valley Road, i.e., Talking Rock Ranch and the Golf Course, and another to serve the west side of the road, i.e., Inscription Canyon Ranch and Whispering Canyon. I attended

that meeting and listened to Mr. Cummings, Chairman of the Board at that time, offer an explanation of the proposal to split the Company. In the course of doing so, Mr. Cummings introduced an attorney in attendance, who happened to be the Developer's counsel. I asked who was providing legal counsel to and advising the Company Board. To my amazement, Mr. Cummings said that the Company Board was relying on the advice of the Developer's counsel! I questioned the prudence of not having independent counsel for this proposal and was dismissed with the comment that doing so would generate an unnecessary expense to the Company. I then requested financial forecasts for the Company and for the separate entities if the proposed split were to be implemented, not unlike what any routine commercial venture would be advised to generate to analyze such a transaction. I suggested that this information, at the very least, would be required for residents to make an informed decision about the proposal. Mr. Cummings said such information would be provided, but it never materialized and the proposal faded into the mist.

I am sure the Commission is aware of how precious our water resources are here in Arizona. Because my wife and I have made a significant investment in our home in ICR, at least in part in reliance on the representations made that there is a 100 year water supply to ICR, I take a personal interest in who is "running the show" for the Company and whether they appear to be making good decisions based on an informed understanding of all the facts and circumstances. I have concluded that the Company is not making good decisions that represent the interests of all the shareholders of the ICR Water Users Association. To the contrary, the Board is guarding carefully access to decision making that affects the Developer and the residents and is acting in deference to the Developer and making bad decisions.

I vigorously urge you to remove the current Board and approve a "caretaker" Board of Directors made up proportionately of residents from each of the communities served, i.e., Inscription Canyon Ranch (including the Preserve at the Ranch), Talking Rock Ranch, and Whispering Canyon. The proportionality would be based on the total number of residential water "hook-ups" in each community as a percentage of the total residential water "hook-ups" served by the Company. This "caretaker" Board would operate until new elections could be held for a new Board. Prior to holding these new elections, the by-laws for the Company should be amended to reflect this concept of proportionality, to permit the bylaws to be amended by a vote of all residents (only the Board can change the by-laws currently), and to provide term limits for members of the Board. I further recommend that any decision regarding splitting the Company be postponed until a new Board can determine whether such a change is in the best interests of all the residents.

Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to you and your staff for the excellent work that has been done in this rate case. I believe that my suggestions for changes in the Board and the way they are elected would go a long way towards correcting problems identified with the current Board.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerome Reid, MBA/JD/LLM
13755 N. Standing Bear Trail
Prescott, AZ 86305

William Mundell

From: Robert Steffensen [steffensen@cableone.net]
Sent: Sunday, April 06, 2008 7:21 AM
To: Gleason-WebEmail; Mayes-WebEmail; Mundell-Web; Hatch-WebEmail; Pierce-Web
Cc: lbligh@msn.com
Subject: FW: ICR Water Users Association

Chairman Gleason and Commissioners Mayes, Mundell, Hatch-Miller, & Pierce

Thank you for the opportunity to express our views on the business of the ICR Water Users Association. I fully agree with the comments made to you recently by Larry Bligh. He has expressed the view of our Users much better than I could.

Respectfully,

Robert Steffensen
 13988 Signal Hill Road
 Prescott, AZ 86305
 928.583.0781

-----Original Message-----

From: Larry & Tina BLIGH [mailto:lbligh@msn.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 9:24 PM
To: edythem@cableone.net; marshall2@aol.com; 1101@cableone.net; annette.mason@att.net; judyjustis@aol.com; vantorrey@hotmail.com; jpuppich@cableone.net; tommccraley@earthlink.net; sixiron@cableone.net; 1medow@cableone.net; j.meinholz@worldnet.att.net; meinholz@swlink.net; lokitiw@commspeed.net; mndnhl@angelfireaz.net; millrml@aol.com; millrpam@aol.com; ClairMillett9@aol.com; icrtrails@yahoo.com; Danielle@Mrdeza.com; jnatal@cableone.net; dnewmanart@msn.com; bethniebuhr@cableone.net; danorkus@hotmail.com; suencharlesob@aol.com; papslp@commspeed.net; parsonsl@cableone.net; karenPatterson7@aol.com; Dan Peterson; Barbaraquilts@msn.com; 75152.500@compuserve.com; Frank & Suzi Postuma; aaq@cableone.net; Skip Reid; jandjrice@cableone.net; roederbert@aol.com; goodmanshar@aol.com; janrooney@cableone.net; saffer@cableone.net; amsagman@cableone.net; axelle@cableone.net; sandfordlm@cableone.net; sanfordddd@cableone.net; sundancerpl@yahoo.com; udogigi@hotmail.com; paul_inaz@hotmail.com; katuck2@pacbell.net; meseineke@msn.com; hnshuford@earthlink.net; geoff_RTS@yahoo.com; steffensen@cableone.net; jsparadise@cableone.net; rogtrishs@hughes.net; Kittystocker@hotmail.com; stockerjk@cableone.net; jimmys@cableone.net; ccstoner@cableone.net; suestr@cableone.net; jan13925@hotmail.com; shakadogwhisk@earthlink.net; GTTHREE@msn.com; Dayne Taylor; prescotttwo@msn.com; dicktracey@cableone.net; bobtrump@cableone.net; Charlie Turney; mturney@cableone.net; Kim_utz@hotmail.com; walkersdwjw@aol.com; cbelle@cableone.net; WardlawB@cableone.net; judiW3826@cableone.net; justjim5@msn.com; awilbur@bmi.net; swilk@us.ibm.com; kelly.julia@worldnet.att.net
Subject: ICR Water Users Association

Commissioners Mayes, Mundell, Hatch-Miller, Pierce and Chairman Gleason,

First, we would like to say thank you for the opportunity to share out thoughts, concerns and opinions with you related to the ICR Water Users Association Rate Case currently underway. The first reason for writing to you today, is to express our appreciation for the excellent work done by

ACC Staff, specifically Charles R. Myhlousen and Jian W. Liu. Their efforts and testimony in the proceeding related to their audit findings and review of standing ACC Decision 64360, is both clear and concise.

Reading through the Amended Testimony of Myhlousen and Liu, lets us, as shareholders in the ICR Water Users Association, have a clear understanding of what has unfortunately taken place within our Association through our Board of Directors, both past and present. We are particularly distressed by the present Board's continued defense of the Association's failure to adhere to the requirements of Decision 64360. The time spent by Staff to analyze the data that had been submitted and arrive at their conclusions has to have been extensive. Unfortunately, it seems apparent that the Water Users Association has had complete disregard for the Commission and its authority through its noncompliance with Decision 64360. It is also unfortunate that the Staff analysis reveals that the Association did not collect \$114,290 from the Talking Rock Golf Course and staff has had to rightfully recommend including this amount as imputed revenue. The Executive Summaries for the testimonies of Myhlousen and Liu give us, as members, a clear understanding of what has taken place.

The second issue that causes us distress with the ICR Water Users Association Board of Directors, is that it appears since Dayne Taylor has received Intervener status in the Rate Case, the Board of Directors has repeatedly met in executive sessions without identifying the purpose of its meetings. Association members are not being informed about the decisions the Board has been making concerning the Rate Case, as well as their responses to Mr. Taylor's submittals or other Rate Case responses. We only get information once it has become public record on the Commission's e-Docket website.

The Board has also canceled its regularly scheduled monthly meeting of March 25th, the only remaining meeting before the April 16th ACC Hearing, thereby, denying members the opportunity to discuss Rate Case issues with the Board. As members of the Association, we feel completely disenfranchised by the Board's actions and believe them to be completely inappropriate.

We want to thank you for your time and for your service to our State in working to ensure that rate payers, like us, are given the opportunity to be heard.

Larry & Tina Bligh
13265 N. Iron Hawk Drive
Prescott, AZ 86305
928.776.1937

William Mundell

From: Robert Steffensen [steffensen@cableone.net]
Sent: Sunday, April 06, 2008 7:21 AM
To: Gleason-WebEmail; Mayes-WebEmail; Mundell-Web; Hatch-WebEmail; Pierce-Web
Cc: lbligh@msn.com
Subject: FW: ICR Water Users Association

Chairman Gleason and Commissioners Mayes, Mundell, Hatch-Miller, & Pierce

Thank you for the opportunity to express our views on the business of the ICR Water Users Association. I fully agree with the comments made to you recently by Larry Bligh. He has expressed the view of our Users much better than I could.

Respectfully,

Robert Steffensen
 13988 Signal Hill Road
 Prescott, AZ 86305
 928.583.0781

-----Original Message-----

From: Larry & Tina BLIGH [mailto:lbligh@msn.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 30, 2008 9:24 PM
To: edythem@cableone.net; marshall2@aol.com; 1101@cableone.net; annette.mason@att.net; judyjustis@aol.com; vantorrey@hotmail.com; jpuppich@cableone.net; tommccraley@earthlink.net; sixiron@cableone.net; 1medow@cableone.net; j.meinholz@worldnet.att.net; meinholz@swlink.net; lokitiw@commspeed.net; mndnhl@angelfireaz.net; millrml@aol.com; millrpam@aol.com; ClairMillett9@aol.com; icrtrails@yahoo.com; Danielle@Mrdeza.com; jnatal@cableone.net; dnewmanart@msn.com; bethniebuhr@cableone.net; danorkus@hotmail.com; suencharlesob@aol.com; papslp@commspeed.net; parsonsl@cableone.net; karenPatterson7@aol.com; Dan Peterson; Barbaraquilts@msn.com; 75152.500@compuserve.com; Frank & Suzi Postuma; aaq@cableone.net; Skip Reid; jandjrice@cableone.net; roederbert@aol.com; goodmanshar@aol.com; janrooney@cableone.net; saffer@cableone.net; amsagman@cableone.net; axelle@cableone.net; sandfordlm@cableone.net; sanfordddd@cableone.net; sundancerpl@yahoo.com; udogigi@hotmail.com; paul_inaz@hotmail.com; katuck2@pacbell.net; meseineke@msn.com; hnshuford@earthlink.net; geoff_RTS@yahoo.com; steffensen@cableone.net; jsparadise@cableone.net; rogtrishs@hughes.net; Kittystocker@hotmail.com; stockerjk@cableone.net; jimmys@cableone.net; ccstoner@cableone.net; suestr@cableone.net; jan13925@hotmail.com; shakadogwhisk@earthlink.net; GTTHREE@msn.com; Dayne Taylor; prescotttwo@msn.com; dicktracey@cableone.net; bobtrump@cableone.net; Charlie Turney; mturney@cableone.net; Kim_utz@hotmail.com; walkersdwjw@aol.com; cbelle@cableone.net; WardlawB@cableone.net; judiW3826@cableone.net; justjim5@msn.com; awilbur@bmi.net; swilk@us.ibm.com; kelly.julia@worldnet.att.net
Subject: ICR Water Users Association

Commissioners Mayes, Mundell, Hatch-Miller, Pierce and Chairman Gleason,

First, we would like to say thank you for the opportunity to share out thoughts, concerns and opinions with you related to the ICR Water Users Association Rate Case currently underway. The first reason for writing to you today, is to express our appreciation for the excellent work done by

ACC Staff, specifically Charles R. Myhlousen and Jian W. Liu. Their efforts and testimony in the proceeding related to their audit findings and review of standing ACC Decision 64360, is both clear and concise.

Reading through the Amended Testimony of Myhlousen and Liu, lets us, as shareholders in the ICR Water Users Association, have a clear understanding of what has unfortunately taken place within our Association through our Board of Directors, both past and present. We are particularly distressed by the present Board's continued defense of the Association's failure to adhere to the requirements of Decision 64360. The time spent by Staff to analyze the data that had been submitted and arrive at their conclusions has to have been extensive. Unfortunately, it seems apparent that the Water Users Association has had complete disregard for the Commission and its authority through its noncompliance with Decision 64360. It is also unfortunate that the Staff analysis reveals that the Association did not collect \$114,290 from the Talking Rock Golf Course and staff has had to rightfully recommend including this amount as imputed revenue. The Executive Summaries for the testimonies of Myhlousen and Liu give us, as members, a clear understanding of what has taken place.

The second issue that causes us distress with the ICR Water Users Association Board of Directors, is that it appears since Dayne Taylor has received Intervener status in the Rate Case, the Board of Directors has repeatedly met in executive sessions without identifying the purpose of its meetings. Association members are not being informed about the decisions the Board has been making concerning the Rate Case, as well as their responses to Mr. Taylor's submittals or other Rate Case responses. We only get information once it has become public record on the Commission's e-Docket website.

The Board has also canceled its regularly scheduled monthly meeting of March 25th, the only remaining meeting before the April 16th ACC Hearing, thereby, denying members the opportunity to discuss Rate Case issues with the Board. As members of the Association, we feel completely disenfranchised by the Board's actions and believe them to be completely inappropriate.

We want to thank you for your time and for your service to our State in working to ensure that rate payers, like us, are given the opportunity to be heard.

Larry & Tina Bligh
13265 N. Iron Hawk Drive
Prescott, AZ 86305
928.776.1937

William Mundell

From: gordon jenkins [gwj2001@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 5:18 PM
To: Mayes-WebEmail; Mundell-Web; Hatch-WebEmail; Pierce-Web; Gleason-WebEmail
Subject: ICR Water Broad

The first reason for writing to you today, is to express our appreciation for the work done by ACC Staff, specifically Charles R. Myhlousen and Jian W. Liu. Their efforts and testimony in the proceeding related to their audit findings and review of standing ACC Decision 64360, is both clear and concise.

The second issue that causes us distress with the ICR Water Users Association Board of Directors, is that it appears since Dayne Taylor has received Intervener status in the Rate Case, the Board of Directors has repeatedly met in executive sessions without identifying the purpose of its meetings. Association members are not being informed about the decisions the Board has been making concerning the Rate Case, as well as their responses to Mr. Taylor's submittals or other Rate Case responses. We only get information once it has become public record on the Commission's e-Docket website.

Gordon Jenkins
5150 Almosta Ranch Rd
Prescott Az 86305

Pack up or back up—use SkyDrive to transfer files or keep extra copies. [Learn how.](#)

William Mundell

From: E&J Moore [icrtrails@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 03, 2008 5:55 PM
To: Mayes-WebEmail; Mundell-Web; Hatch-WebEmail; Pierce-Web; Gleason-WebEmail
Subject: ICR Water Users Association

Commissioners Mayes, Mundell, Hatch-Miller, Pierce and Chairman Gleason:

We live in the Inscription Canyon Ranch Development in Prescott, Arizona. We cannot attend the April 16 ICR Rate Case Hearing; however, we want to express that we are in total support of the efforts of many of residents in this issue. We agree wholeheartedly with the comments below.

/Everett and Julia Moore
6500 West Blackfoot Trail
Prescott, AZ 86305-1576
(928) 858-4349
(323) 574-8238

First, we would like to say thank you for the opportunity to share out thoughts, concerns and opinions with you related to the ICR Water Users Association Rate Case currently underway. The first reason for writing to you today, is to express our appreciation for the excellent work done by ACC Staff, specifically Charles R. Myhlhousen and Jian W. Liu. Their efforts and testimony in the proceeding related to their audit findings and review of standing ACC Decision 64360, is both clear and concise.

Reading through the Amended Testimony of Myhlhousen and Liu, lets us, as shareholders in the ICR Water Users Association, have a clear understanding of what has unfortunately taken place within our Association through our Board of Directors, both past and present. We are particularly distressed by the present Board's continued defense of the Association's failure to adhere to the requirements of Decision 64360. The time spent by Staff to analyze the data that had been submitted and arrive at their conclusions has to have been extensive. Unfortunately, it seems apparent that the Water Users Association has had complete disregard for the Commission and its authority through its noncompliance with Decision 64360. It is also unfortunate that the Staff analysis reveals that the Association did not collect \$114,290 from the Talking Rock Golf Course and staff has had to rightfully recommend including this amount as imputed revenue. The Executive Summaries for the testimonies of Myhlhousen and Liu give us, as members, a clear understanding of what has taken place.

The second issue that causes us distress with the ICR Water Users Association Board of Directors, is that it appears since Dayne Taylor has received Intervener status in the Rate Case, the Board of Directors has repeatedly met in executive sessions without identifying the purpose of its meetings. Association members are not being informed about the decisions the Board has been making concerning the Rate Case, as well as their responses to Mr. Taylor's submittals or other Rate Case responses. We only get information once it has become public record on the Commission's e-Docket website.

The Board has also canceled its regularly scheduled monthly meeting of March 25th, the only remaining meeting before the April 16th ACC Hearing, thereby, denying members the opportunity to discuss Rate Case issues with the Board. As members of the Association, we feel completely disenfranchised by the Board's actions and believe them to be completely

inappropriate.

We want to thank you for your time and for your service to our State in working to ensure that rate payers, like us, are given the opportunity to be heard.

