

W-02113A-07-0551



0000088705

ORIGINAL

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMIS

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

4700

Investigator: Reg Lopez

Phone: 7000 SEP 15 P 2: 28 Fax: (

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

AZ CORP COMMISSION
TICKET CONTROL

Opinion No. 2008 71407

Date: 9/11/2008

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

Complaint By: First: Thomas Last: Jensen

Account Name: Thomas Jensen

Home: (000) 000-0000

Street: 000000000000

Work:

City: Fountain Hills

CBR:

State: AZ Zip: 00000

is: E-Mail

Utility Company: Chaparral City Water Company

Division: Water

Contact Name:

Contact Phone:

Nature of Complaint:

Received the following customer e-mailed OPINION which includes a copy of his 8-17-08 letter to the Fountain Hills Times::

From: T JENSEN I
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2008 12:41 PM
To: Utilities Div - Mailbox
Subject: Docket No. W-02113A-07-0551

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

SEP 15 2008

DOCKETED BY *MM*

Dear sir,

The current owners of the Chaparral City Water Company appear to have purchased the company with a business plan that didn't require due diligence to find hidden expenses like the thirty year old black polyethylene pipe used to connect the water mains to the residents meters. They might have figured they could pay what ever the price and raise the rates until they made a profit. If they made a bad business decision, then let them bleed until they sell the company for a price that the next owner can operate it at a profit. The only thing that would be worse would be if the Town of Fountain Hills tried to run it.

The following is my August 27 letter to the editor of the Fountain Hills Times.

Chaparral Water has come up with numbers for the proposed increase in average residential water bills in

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

dollars. Why not just give us the current rate and the proposed rate for the under twenty-four thousand gallons and over and let us figure it out. I suspect the percentage change would be considerably higher than the thirty-six percent they claim. How much do you want to bet the pool and landscape water that condo owners pay for in their association dues was accidentally left out of the calculation? Their numbers may be accurate but are they honest?

Why is it that when they estimate my bill, typically high, I get charged the high usage rate? If they are not going to figure out exactly what I owe them shouldn't I be paying the low rate? After all it isn't my fault that they don't know what I owe. Imagine a store where the checkout is making mistakes. If all the mistakes are in the stores favor are they really mistakes?

We have just recently had a water rate increase when they went to the two tier rate schedule supposedly to conserve water. I think what they really wanted was to sell existing customers less water for more money so that had more water to sell to someone else for more money. They don't have any water supply problems.

The common theme in all this is revenue enhancement. This deal doesn't pass the smell test.

Sincerely,

Thomas Jensen

Fountain Hills
End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

I replied back to the customer with the following e-mail:

Dear Mr. Jensen:

This is to acknowledge your e-mail regarding the Chaparral City Water Company ("Company") rate case. Your comments will be made a permanent record in the Company's rate application and will be brought to the attention of the Commissioners at the Arizona Corporation Commission. Your comments will be considered before a decision is rendered in this rate application.

The Commission appreciates the time you have taken to express your opinion in this matter. Please contact me at _____ for additional assistance.

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Sincerely,

Reg Lopez

Public Utilities Consumer Analyst II

Utilities Division

9-11 E-mailed Carmen Madrid @ the ACC's Phoenix office to have this docketed towards docket no. W-02113A-07-0551. File closed.

End of Comments

Date Completed: 9/11/2008

Opinion No. 2008 - 71407
