



0000090608

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

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

COMMISSIONERS

MIKE GLEASON - Chairman  
WILLIAM A. MUNDELL  
JEFF HATCH-MILLER  
KRISTIN K. MAYES  
GARY PIERCE

Arizona Corporation Commission

**DOCKETED**

NOV 19 2008

DOCKETED BY  
KIC ne

~~IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF  
GROOM CREEK WATER USERS ASSOCIATION  
FOR AN INCREASE IN RATES.~~

DOCKET NO. W-01865A-07-0385

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF  
GROOM CREEK WATER USERS ASSOCIATION  
FOR APPROVAL OF FINANCING AND RATE  
CHANGES

DOCKET NO. W-01865A-07-0384

DECISION NO. 70627

**OPINION AND ORDER**

DATES OF HEARING:

March 5, 2008 (Procedural Conference), May 15, 2008  
and July 21, 2008

PLACE OF HEARING:

Phoenix, Arizona

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:

Yvette B. Kinsey

APPEARANCES:

Mssrs. Jerry D. Hodgson, President, Kal Miller,  
Secretary, and Loren Greenberg, Treasurer on behalf of  
the Groom Creek Water Users Association; and,

Mr. Kevin Torrey, Staff Attorney, Legal Division, on  
behalf of the Utilities Division of the Arizona  
Corporation Commission.

**BY THE COMMISSION:**

On June 25, 2007, Groom Creek Water Users Association ("Applicant" or "Groom Creek")  
filed with the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") an application for a permanent  
increase in its water rates.

On the same date, Groom Creek filed an application in Docket No. W-01865A-07-0384  
requesting approval for financing and providing notice of customer notification on the rate  
application.

Between July 9, 2007 and July 18, 2007, Jonathan Hoover, John and Marian Cree, Patty  
Berry, Mary Turbyfill, Majorie Navarro, Robert Schulz, and Donald Muller filed Motions to

1 Intervene in Docket No. W-01865A-07-0385.

2 On July 25, 2007, the Commission's Utilities Division ("Staff") filed an Insufficiency Letter  
3 in Docket No. W-01865A-07-0385.

4 On August 10, 2007, Staff filed a Letter of Sufficiency in Docket No. W-01865A-07-0385,  
5 indicating the Applicant's rate increase application had met the sufficiency requirements as outlined  
6 in the Arizona Administrative Code ("A.A.C.").

7 On August 22, 2007, a Procedural Order was issued in Docket No. W-01865A-07-0385,  
8 granting the Motions to Intervene.

9 On October 2, 2007, Staff filed a Motion for an Extension of Time to file its Staff Report until  
10 November 5, 2007, in Docket No. W-01865A-07-0385. No objections to Staff's Motion were filed.

11 On October 29, 2007, Staff filed a Motion to Consolidate the above-captioned matters.

12 On November 30, 2007, by Procedural Order, the two dockets were consolidated and Staff  
13 was granted additional time, until December 17, 2007, to file its Staff Report on the consolidated  
14 dockets and the timeclock in this matter was suspended.

15 On December 3, 2007, Groom Creek filed a copy of a special report sent to all Association  
16 members regarding a major water main break that occurred in October, 2007.

17 On December 14, 2007, Applicant docketed a Response in support of Staff's request for  
18 additional time, and requested that Staff be given until December 31, 2007, to file its Staff Report.

19 On December 17, 2007, Staff filed its Response to Groom Creek's Letter concurring with the  
20 request for additional time until December 31, 2007, to file its Staff Report.

21 On December 19, 2007, by Procedural Order, Staff was granted additional time, until January  
22 4, 2008, to file its Staff Report.

23 On December 21, 2007, Staff filed a Clarification to Staff's Response to Groom Creek's  
24 Letter. In its filing, Staff requested additional time to file its Staff Report until January 31, 2008,  
25 stating the engineering analysis filed by Groom Creek on December 14, 2007, required Staff to issue  
26 additional data requests.

27 On December 27, 2007, by Procedural Order, Staff was granted additional time, until January  
28 31, 2008, to file its Staff Report.

1 On January 31, 2008, Staff filed its Staff Report recommending approval of Groom Creek's  
2 application for a permanent rate increase and approval for alternative financing.

3 On February 5, 2008, Staff filed a Notice of Errata to the Staff Report.

4 On February 11, 2008, Groom Creek filed its Response to the Staff Report, objecting to the  
5 recommended base rate increase, as well as other increases recommended by Staff.

6 On February 22, 2008, by Procedural Order, a Procedural Conference was scheduled for  
7 March 5, 2008, to determine whether the matter should continue as a non-hearing item. The  
8 timeclock remained suspended.

9 On March 5, 2008, Staff appeared at the Procedural Conference through counsel, and Mr.  
10 Jerry Hodgson, President of the Board of Directors for Groom Creek appeared on behalf of the  
11 Applicant. During the Procedural Conference the parties were given time to discuss settlement of  
12 the issues. After a period, both parties stated that they believed the issues in the case should be  
13 resolved through a hearing. The parties also stated that they believed there were some issues that  
14 might be resolved prior to a hearing in this matter.

15 On March 18, 2008, by Procedural Order, the hearing was scheduled for May 15, 2008.

16 On April 4, 2008, Groom docketed notice of providing customer notification regarding the  
17 financing application.

18 On May 5, 2008, Groom Creek docketed an Affidavit of Publication showing notice of the  
19 rate application and financing application had been published in the *Prescott Daily Courier*, a  
20 newspaper of general circulation on March 30, March 31, April 3, and April 4, 2008. Groom Creek  
21 also provided certification of the mailing to all customers in its service territory.

22 On May 15, 2008, a full public hearing was commenced before a duly authorized  
23 Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") of the Commission at its offices in Phoenix, Arizona. Staff  
24 appeared through counsel, Mr. Jerry D. Hodgson appeared on behalf of the Applicant, and members  
25 of the public presented public comment. It was determined that additional time was needed to hear  
26 the evidence in this matter and the ALJ continued the hearing until May 22, 2008.

27 On May 21, 2008, a Telephonic Procedural Conference was held with the parties and the  
28

1 parties requested that the hearing date be reset to help facilitate settlement of the issues.

2 On May 21, 2008, by Procedural Order, the hearing on the consolidated dockets was  
3 continued to July 21, 2008. The Procedural Order also directed Staff to file a Supplemental Staff  
4 Report by July 5, 2008 and for the Applicant to file responses to the Supplemental Staff Report by  
5 July 14, 2008.

6 On July 7, 2008, Staff filed a Supplemental Staff Report continuing to recommend approval  
7 of the permanent rate increase and approval for alternative financing.

8 Applicant did not file objections to Staff's Supplemental Staff Report.

9 On July 21, 2008, the hearing in this matter reconvened. Staff appeared through counsel, Mr.  
10 Jerry D. Hodgson appeared on behalf of the Applicant and members of the public presented public  
11 comment. Staff presented evidence and testimony at the hearing. The Applicant presented  
12 testimony. At the conclusion of the hearing the parties were directed to file late-filed exhibits related  
13 to the testimony given during the hearing.

14 On July 30, 2008, by Procedural Order, Staff was directed to file as a late-filed exhibit,  
15 corrections to the Supplemental Staff Report, and an additional analysis and alternative schedules  
16 related to the capital improvement projects proposed by Groom Creek, on or before August 15, 2008.  
17 Further, the Applicant and intervenors were directed to file responses to the late-filed exhibits by  
18 August 29, 2008.

19 On August 15, 2008, Staff filed its late-filed exhibit as directed in the July 30, 2008,  
20 Procedural Order.

21 The Applicant did not file a response or objections to Staff's late-filed exhibit. Several  
22 additional comments were filed by the customers/homeowners of Groom Creek.

23 After receipt of the late-filed exhibits and customer/homeowner comments filed by August  
24 29, 2008, the matter was taken under advisement pending submission of a Recommended Opinion  
25 and Order to the Commission.

26 \* \* \* \* \*

27 Having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, the  
28

1 Commission finds, concludes, and orders that:

2 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

3 1. Groom Creek is an Arizona Association engaged in the business of providing water  
4 utility services to an area located near Prescott, Arizona, in Yavapai County.

5 2. The Groom Creek Water User Association was formed in 1982 and received its initial  
6 CC&N on June 9, 1982, in Commission Decision No. 53067.

7 3. Groom Creek has been classified as a Class D utility.

8 4. Groom Creek currently charges rates approved in Decision No. 62619 (June 9, 2000).

9 5. Groom Creek serves approximately 228 customers.

10 6. Groom Creek is currently in compliance with the Utilities Division and Corporations  
11 Division's requirement on filing an annual report.

12 7. Groom Creek is current on its sales and property tax payments.

13 8. The service area for Groom Creek is not in an Active Management Area ("AMA") and  
14 therefore Groom Creek has no AMA reporting and conservation requirements.

15 9. Groom Creek has an approved curtailment tariff which became effective  
16 May 25, 2005.

17 10. On June 25, 2007, Groom Creek filed an application with the Commission for a  
18 permanent rate increase, using a test year ending December 31, 2006, and stating that the proposed  
19 rate increase is necessary to do needed upgrades and repairs to its water system and that Groom  
20 Creek's previous rate increase in 2000 was limited a commodity change, but the base rate remained  
21 the same.<sup>1</sup>

22 11. On the same date, in Docket No. W-01865A-07-0384 Groom Creek filed an  
23 application requesting authorization to obtain a line of credit in the amount of \$500,000 to fund a  
24 capital improvement project to replace the water mains in its system.<sup>2</sup>

25 12. Subsequent to the filing of the applications, the dockets were consolidated.

26 13. On January 31, 2008, Staff filed a Staff Report recommending approval of Groom  
27

28 <sup>1</sup> Applicant's application pg. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Applicant's application.

1 Creek's application for a permanent rate increase, but recommending alternative rates and charges.  
2 Staff also recommended that the Commission deny Groom Creek's request for authority to obtain a  
3 line of credit, and recommended that the Applicant obtain a Water Infrastructure Financing Authority  
4 ("WIFA") loan instead.

5 14. Groom Creek filed objections to the Staff Report and to Staff's recommended rate  
6 base increases, proposed charges and alternative financing.

7 15. After the filing of Groom Creek's objections to the Staff Report, a Procedural  
8 Conference was held to determine if the issues raised in the consolidated dockets could be resolved as  
9 a non-hearing item.

10 16. At the Procedural Conference, settlement discussions were held between the parties,  
11 and the parties agreed that the issues raised in the consolidated dockets needed to be resolved through  
12 an evidentiary hearing. At the conclusion of the Procedural Conference, and in a subsequent  
13 Procedural Order, the parties were directed to continue settlement negotiations, until the hearing in  
14 this matter was convened.

15 17. Subsequent to the Procedural Conference, Staff and the Applicant docketed a joint  
16 filing outlining all of the issues that the parties agreed upon. The joint filing also stated that the  
17 parties believed there were other issues that could be resolved prior to the hearing.

18 18. On May 15, 2008, the hearing was held as scheduled. Staff appeared through counsel,  
19 Mr. Jerry D. Hodgson appeared on behalf of the Applicant, and members of the public presented  
20 public comment. Following the May 15, 2008, hearing Staff was directed to file a Supplemental  
21 Staff Report and indicate whether the parties were in agreement with Staff's revised  
22 recommendations.

23 19. Staff docketed a Supplemental Staff Report recommending approval of the  
24 applications and stating its current position on the proposed rates, charges and financing  
25 recommendations. Staff's Supplemental Staff Report also stated that it was Staff's belief that Groom  
26 Creek was in agreement with Staff's proposed recommendations on the applications.

27 20. Groom Creek did not file objections to the Supplemental Staff Report.

28 21. On July 21, 2008, the hearing in the consolidated dockets reconvened. The Applicant

1 appeared and presented evidence and testimony. Staff appeared through counsel and presented  
2 testimony and evidence. Nine members of the public appeared to give comments on the applications.  
3 Four members of the public were in favor of the proposed rates, charges and alternative financing,  
4 three were opposed, and two were in favor of an increase in rates, but not rates as high as those being  
5 recommended.

6 22. Post hearing, Staff docketed an exhibit stating that prior to July 2, 2008, 32 opinions  
7 had been filed in the consolidated dockets opposing the proposed rate case and 67 had been filed in  
8 favor of the rate case. As of July 25, 2008, Staff reported that there were 33 opinions filed in  
9 opposition to the rate case and 71 in favor, for a total of 104.

10 **Financing**

11 23. Groom Creek initially filed a financing application requesting Commission approval  
12 to obtain a \$500,000 line of credit to be used to replace water mains, valves, service lines and meters  
13 within its water system. Groom Creek's application stated that it wanted to complete the capital  
14 projects in advance of Yavapai County's project to pave the roads in the Groom Creek area.<sup>3</sup> Since  
15 the filing of the financing application, Yavapai County has agreed to postpone the paving project to  
16 allow Groom Creek to make the necessary improvements to its system and not incur the additional  
17 cost of having to trench through the roads to make the improvements. (Tr. Pg. 185, lines 1-10)

18 24. In its initial Staff Report, Staff recommended denial of Groom Creek's request to use a  
19 line of credit to finance the capital improvement projects. Staff witness, Mr. Gordon Fox, Public  
20 Utilities Analyst Manager, testified that Staff opposed the line of credit because in terms of financing  
21 Staff likes to see material matching between the life of the loan and the life of the assets. Mr. Fox  
22 testified that it is preferential that the length of the loan be shorter than the life of the assets, to ensure  
23 that existing ratepayers are not burdened with paying for a loan for which the benefits will be  
24 received by future customers. Mr. Fox also testified that a longer loan term ensures that everyone  
25 pays their appropriate share of the fixed cost to replace the system. (Tr. Pg. 233, lines 11-25, pg. 234,  
26 lines 1-6)

27

28 <sup>3</sup> Applicant's application, pg. 1.

1           25. Mr. Fox explained that Staff believes the WIFA loan program provides a better  
2 alternative to a line of credit for water companies to fund capital improvement projects. He further  
3 explained that the WIFA loan program allows the water company to have construction of the projects  
4 completed and then invoices are submitted to WIFA for release of the funds to the contractor.  
5 According to Mr. Fox, the WIFA loan program allows the water company to build equity by  
6 requiring a "set-aside" amount for the first five years of the loan, which would allow the water  
7 company to be able to fund one year's debt service on the loan. Additionally, Mr. Fox explained that  
8 under the WIFA program, continuing "set-asides" are required after the first five years for the benefit  
9 of the water company to be able to make improvements and repairs to the system. (Tr. Pg. 235, lines  
10 1-18)

11           26. Groom Creek has retained an engineering consultant through WIFA, who has  
12 provided a preliminary engineering report to look at the estimated costs for replacing the system and  
13 evaluating the existing distribution system, wells and need for fire flow protection.  
14 (Tr. Pg. 162, lines 11-20)

15           27. Groom Creek's engineering witness, Ms. Christine Close, of the engineering firm  
16 DSWA, testified that she has been an engineer for 14 years and is registered as a professional  
17 engineer with the State of Arizona. She further testified that she has been designing water systems for  
18 approximately eight to ten years. (Tr. Pg. 162, lines 11-14)

19           28. Ms. Close stated that her firm made recommendations to Groom Creek regarding  
20 upgrading and improving its two booster stations, adding an additional water storage tank, replacing  
21 all water lines with PVC material, replacing water meters throughout the system, and putting in new  
22 valves and boxes for the meters. (Tr. Pg. 181, lines 11-24)

23           29. After discussions with Staff and the engineering consultant, Groom Creek concluded  
24 that the \$500,000 request for a line of credit was insufficient to fund the first phase of its capital  
25 improvement projects.

26           30. Ms. Close testified that after her evaluation of the Groom Creek water system, she  
27 presented four separate alternatives, based on industry standards, to address the water systems' aging  
28 distribution lines and the adequacy of storage for the community. (Tr. Pg. 163, lines 1-18)

1           31.     Ms. Close stated that her research of the Groom Creek water system revealed that the  
2 system's distribution lines consist mainly of transite pipes and sections of the transite pipes have been  
3 in the ground since the 1960s and 1970s. She stated that the transite pipes are made of asbestos  
4 cement material and when there are breaks in the pipes, asbestos fibers become moveable and if  
5 breathed in poses a health risk. (Tr. Pg 183, lines15-25 and pg. 184, lines 1-2) She further stated that  
6 the expected life of transite pipe is approximately 30-60 years. (Tr. Pg. 164, lines 1-14) However,  
7 because Groom Creek has been experiencing longitudinal fractures or breaks in the transite pipes, she  
8 testified that it is more economically feasible to look towards replacing the systems transite pipes  
9 with PVC pipe material. (Tr. Pg. 164, lines 15-25 and pg. 165, lines 1-5)

10           32.     Ms. Close testified that in light of the occurrence of several breaks in Groom Creek's  
11 pipes over the last two to three years, it is more cost effective to replace the transite pipe with C-900,  
12 PVC pipe because the cost to repair transite pipe per lineal foot is more expensive. She stated that  
13 Groom Creek has been paying \$135 per lineal foot for repairs to the transite pipes, where replacing  
14 the transite pipe with C-900, PVC pipe material would cost approximately \$70 to \$80 per lineal foot.  
15 (Tr. Pg. 177, lines 1-5)

16           33.     Utilities Engineer Mr. Marlin Scott, testified the problem with replacing transite pipe  
17 is that the pipe comes in 10-foot segments and when breaks in the pipes occur they are often lineal or  
18 longitudinal cracks. (Tr. Pg. 205, lines 10-25) For example, he explained that when a crack occurs in  
19 a three or four foot section of the transite pipe, the entire ten foot section has to be replaced because  
20 of the way the pipes are constructed. (Tr. Pg. 206, lines 1-4) He further testified that transite pipe is  
21 no longer being used in the water industry because when cracks occur, asbestos fibers are released  
22 and the asbestos poses a health risk. (Tr. Pg. 205, lines 18-25)

23           34.     Ms. Close recommends that all of Groom Creek's pipes be replaced with PVC pipe  
24 material because PVC pipe has a life expectancy of 30-50 years, it is a newer material that is being  
25 used in water systems similar to Groom Creek's, the PVC pipe does not contain asbestos fibers, the  
26 cost to replace the transite pipe with PVC pipe is less expensive, and transite pipe is no long being  
27 produced. (Tr. Pg. 178, lines 4-25 and Pg. 179, lines 1-7)

28           35.     Staff's witness agreed with Ms. Close's recommendation that Groom Creek's pipes

1 should be replaced with PVC pipe and stated that 90 percent of water companies today use PVC pipe.  
2 (Tr. Pg. 206, lines, 20-25, Pg, 207, lines 1-4)

3 36. In regards to the storage issues, Ms. Close testified that Groom Creek has one well  
4 (Well No. 1) that has a production of 20-30 gallons per minute ("GPM") and Well No. 2 has about  
5 half that production. She stated that during peak demand times, the more stress that is put on the  
6 wells, the longer time it takes for the wells to recover and that additional storage would provide some  
7 relief during those peak times. (Tr. Pg. 182, lines, 1-20) Further, she testified that it is recommended  
8 that Groom Creek consider constructing an additional well so there is a back up water supply when  
9 the system has to be shut down to complete repairs. (Tr. Pg. 182, lines 21-25)

10 37. Ms. Close noted that the recommended replacement pipes for the Groom Creek water  
11 system and the additional storage would be sufficient to handle fire protection if Groom Creek  
12 decided to add it in the future. (Tr. Pg. 188, lines 1-14) However, she stated that if Groom Creek  
13 chooses not to do stubouts for the fire hydrants, the stubouts will need to be added to the lines and  
14 would require trenching in addition to the cost of each fire hydrant and its installation. She stated the  
15 cost estimate for installing the fire hydrants, with stub-outs is \$3,200. ( Tr. Pg 188, lines, 7-23)

16 38. According to Ms. Close, the primary cost for the first phase of the capital  
17 improvement projects, including the stubouts for fire flow protection, is a projected \$1.8 million. (Tr.  
18 Pg. 189, lines 16-25) She estimated that the proposed capital improvement projects would take  
19 approximately two years to complete. (Tr. Pg. 192, lines 1-10)

20 39. Staff recommends financing for capital improvement projects totaling approximately  
21 \$1.6 million, based on the engineering report for the first phase of the projects and Groom Creek's  
22 immediate needs to upgrade its water system.<sup>4</sup> Staff testified that the \$1.6 million estimate for the  
23 first phase of the capital projects was provided by Groom Creek for Staff's review and that the  
24 estimated costs include the additional storage needed, a 60,000 gallon storage tank, to meet fire flow  
25 requirements, but does not include taps for the distribution system or fire hydrants.  
26 (Tr. Pg. 201, lines 6-11)

27  
28

<sup>4</sup> Exhibit S-2, attached as Exhibit A to this Decision.

1       40. Staff reviewed the cost estimates for the primary capital improvement projects  
2 submitted in Groom Creek's engineering report and found them to be reasonable and appropriate.  
3 However, Staff made no "used and useful" determination of the proposed plant and stated no  
4 particular future treatment should be inferred for rate-making or rate base purposes.

5       41. Staff performed a financial analysis based on Groom Creek's financial statements  
6 dated December 31, 2006 and recommended the Commission authorize Groom Creek to obtain a loan  
7 for no more than \$1.6 million to finance the first phase of its capital improvement projects.

8       42. Staff analyzed the pro forma effect of a new \$1.6 million, 20-year amortizing loan at  
9 a rate of 4.9 percent per annum combined with Staff's recommended revenues and expenses  
10 (discussed below) from the rate case.

11       43. Staff's Supplemental Staff Report states that as of December 31, 2006, Groom Creek  
12 had a capital structure of 3.8 percent short term debt, 77.8 percent long-term debt, and 18.4 percent  
13 equity. If Groom Creek draws the entire \$1.6 million proposed loan, Groom Creek's capital structure  
14 will consist of 3.2 percent short term debt, 94.9 percent long term debt and 1.9 percent equity.

15       44. Staff also analyzed the effects of the proposed financing on Groom Creek's Times  
16 Interest Earned Ratio ("TIER") and Debt Service Coverage ("DSC") ratio.<sup>5</sup> The pro forma effect of  
17 Groom Creek obtaining a \$1.6 million, 18 to 30 year amortizing loan, at an interest rate not to exceed  
18 5.25 percent, and implementing rates recommended by Staff in this matter, would produce a TIER of  
19 2.09 and a 1.25 DSC.

20       45. Staff states that the DSC and TIER ratios indicate that Staff's recommended  
21 permanent rates would produce sufficient earnings and operating cash flow for Groom Creek to meet  
22 its long-term debt obligations under the \$1.6 million loan.

23       46. Staff recommends:

24       a. That the Commission authorize Groom Creek to obtain an 18 to 30 year  
25 amortizing loan for an amount not to exceed \$1.6 million at a rate not to exceed 5.25  
26 percent to finance the Staff recommended capital improvements and to deny the  
27 request for authority to obtain a \$500,000 line of credit.

28       b. That any Commission authorization granted in this matter to incur long-term

<sup>5</sup> According to Staff's Supplemental Staff Report, a DSC greater than 1.0 means operating cash flow is sufficient to cover debt obligations and a TIER less than 1.0 means that debt obligations are not sustainable in the long term, but may be in the short term.

debt which remains unused by December 31, 2012, terminate on that date.

- c. That the Commission require Groom Creek to engage in any transactions and to execute any documents necessary to effectuate the authorizations granted.
- d. That Groom Creek submit copies of all Approvals to Construct and Approvals of Construction as they are obtained from ADEQ for all projects covered by this financing.
- e. That all Approvals of Construction be submitted to Docket Control by no later than December 31, 2010.
- f. That Groom Creek file a copy of the executed loan documents with Docket Control, as a compliance item in this docket, within 60 days of the execution of any transactions.

47. Staff's recommendations regarding the financing application are reasonable and will be adopted.

**Rate Case**

48. In the test year, as adjusted by Staff, Groom Creek collected a total operating revenue of \$62,223 and an operating income of \$16,697 on an Original Cost Rate Base ("OCRB") of \$31,757, for 52.58 percent return.

49. Groom Creek's application states that the OCRB should be used to determine the Fair Value Rate Base ("FVRB"), and that the Applicant waives its right to use Reconstruction Cost New as a basis for determining FVRB. Groom Creek's OCRB of \$31,757 shall therefore also be its FVRB for purposes of setting rates in this case.

50. Groom Creek's proposed rates would produce total operating revenue of \$151,316 and operating income of \$106,992, for a 178.27 percent return on its proposed OCRB of \$60,018.

51. As stated above, Staff recommended adjustments to the Applicant's proposed rate base totaling \$28,261, for an OCRB of \$31,757. Staff recommends rates that would produce total operating revenues of \$222,369 and operating income of \$176,843, for a 556.86 percent return on FVRB.<sup>6</sup>

52. The water rates and charges for Groom Creek at present, as proposed in the application, and as recommended by Staff are as follows:

...

---

<sup>6</sup> Due to the need to incorporate Groom Creek's financing request into rates (see discussion below), as well as the Applicant's relatively low rate base, Staff set its recommended revenue requirement based on a operating margin of 79.53 percent (Ex. S-1, Sched. BCA-1).

	Present Rates	- Proposed Rates -		
<u>MONTHLY USAGE CHARGE</u>		<u>Association</u>	<u>Staff</u>	
1				
2	5/8" x 3/4" Meter	\$14.00	\$42.00	\$ 50.00
	3/4" Meter	17.25	N/A	50.00
3	1" Meter	28.75	N/A	125.00
	1-1/2" Meter	57.50	N/A	250.00
4	2" Meter	92.00	N/A	400.00
	3" Meter	172.50	N/A	800.00
5	4" Meter	287.50	N/A	1,250.00
	6" Meter	575.00	N/A	2,500.00
6				
	Gallons Included in Minimum	-0-	1,000	-0-
7				
	<u>5/8 X 3/4-inch meters</u>			
8	0 - 3,000 gallons	\$ 3.00		\$11.00
	3,001 - 6,000 gallons	3.50		13.00
9	6,001 - 10,000 gallons	4.00		15.50
	Over 10,000 gallons	8.00		31.00
10				
	1,001 - 6,000 gallons		\$5.50	
	6,001 - 10,000 gallons		8.00	
11	10,001 - 20,000 gallons		10.00	
	Over 20,000 gallons		12.00	
12				
	<u>3/4" Meter</u>			
13	0 - 3,000 gallons	\$ 3.00		\$11.00
	3,001 - 6,000 gallons	3.50		13.00
14	6,001 - 10,000 gallons	4.00		15.50
	Over 10,000 gallons	8.00		31.00
15				
	1,001 - 6,000 gallons		\$5.50	
	6,001 - 10,000 gallons		8.00	
16	10,001 - 20,000 gallons		10.00	
	Over 20,000 gallons		12.00	
17				
	<u>1" Meter</u>			
18	0 - 3,000 gallons	\$3.00		
	3,001 - 6,000 gallons	3.50		
19	6,001 - 10,000 gallons	4.00		
	Over 10,000 gallons	8.00		
20				
	1,001 - 6,000 gallons		\$5.50	
	6,001 - 10,000 gallons		8.00	
21	10,001 - 20,000 gallons		10.00	
	Over 20,000 gallons		12.00	
22				
	0 - 12,000 gallons			\$ 15.50
23	Over 12,000 gallons			31.00
24				
	<u>1-1/2" Meter</u>			
	0 - 3,000 gallons	\$3.00		
	3,001 - 6,000 gallons	3.50		
25	6,001 - 10,000 gallons	4.00		
	Over 10,000 gallons	8.00		
26				
	1,001 - 6,000 gallons		\$3.50	
	6,001 - 10,000 gallons		8.00	
27	10,001 - 20,000 gallons		10.00	
	Over 20,000 gallons		12.00	
28				

	0 – 18,000 gallons			\$15.50
1	Over 18,000 gallons			31.00
2	<u>2" Meter</u>			
	0 – 3,000 gallons	\$3.00		
3	3,001 – 6,000 gallons	3.50		
	6,001 – 10,000 gallons	4.00		
4	Over 10,000 gallons	8.00		
	1,001 – 6,000 gallons		\$5.50	
5	6,001 – 10,000 gallons		8.00	
	10,001 – 20,000 gallons		10.00	
6	Over 20,000 gallons		12.00	
	0 – 25,000 gallons			\$15.50
7	Over 25,000 gallons			31.00
8	<u>3" Meter</u>			
	0 – 3,000 gallons	\$3.00		
9	3,001 – 6,000 gallons	3.50		
	6,001 – 10,000 gallons	4.00		
10	Over 10,000 gallons	8.00		
	1,001 – 6,000 gallons		\$5.50	
11	6,001 – 10,000 gallons		8.00	
	10,001 – 20,000 gallons		10.00	
12	Over 20,000 gallons		12.00	
	0 – 43,000 gallons			\$15.50
13	Over 43,000 gallons			31.00
14	<u>4" Meter</u>			
	0 – 3,000 gallons	\$3.00		
15	3,001 – 6,000 gallons	3.50		
	6,001 – 10,000 gallons	4.00		
16	Over 10,000 gallons	8.00		
	1,001 – 6,000 gallons		\$5.50	
17	6,001 – 10,000 gallons		8.00	
	10,001 – 20,000 gallons		10.00	
18	Over 20,000 gallons		12.00	
	0 – 63,000 gallons			\$15.50
19	Over 63,000 gallons			31.00
20	<u>6" Meter</u>			
	0 – 3,000 gallons	\$3.00		
21	3,001 – 6,000 gallons	3.50		
	6,001 – 10,000 gallons	4.00		
22	Over 10,000 gallons	8.00		
	1,001 – 6,000 gallons		\$5.50	
23	6,001 – 10,000 gallons		8.00	
	10,001 – 20,000 gallons		10.00	
24	Over 20,000 gallons		12.00	
	0 – 123,000 gallons			\$15.50
25	Over 123,000 gallons			31.00
26				
27				
28				

SERVICE LINE AND METER INSTALLATION CHARGES:  
(Refundable pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-405)

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

	Present Rates	Association Proposed Charges	Service Line Charge	Staff Recommended Meter Charge	Staff Recommended Total Charge
5/8 x 3/4" Meter	\$ 450.00	\$7,500.00	\$1,700.00	\$ 300.00	\$2,000.00
3/4" Meter	515.00	N/A	1,700.00	380.00	2,080.00
1" Meter	590.00	N/A	1,750.00	420.00	2,170.00
1-1/2" Meter	820.00	N/A	1,785.00	630.00	2,415.00
2" Meter	1,380.00	N/A	1,945.00	1,130.00	3,075.00
3" Meter	1,935.00	N/A	2,120.00	1,635.00	3,755.00
4" Meter	3,030.00	N/A	2,485.00	2,515.00	5,000.00
6" Meter	5,535.00	N/A	3,045.00	4,710.00	7,755.00

	Present Rates	Association Proposed Charges	Staff Recommended Charge
<u>SERVICE CHARGES:</u>			
Establishment	\$10.00	\$ 75.00	\$ 30.00
Establishment (After Hours)	0.00	0.00	40.00
Reconnection (Delinquent)	10.00	50.00	30.00
Meter Test (If Correct)	7.50	25.00	25.00
Deposit	*	*	*
Deposit Interest Per Annum	*	*	*
Reestablishment (Within 12 Months)	14.00	75.00	**
NSF Check	25.00	40.00	25.00
Deferred Payment (Per Month)	5.00	10.00	1.50%
Meter Re-Read (If Correct)	5.00	25.00	25.00
Late Payment Charge (Per Month)	0.00	10.00	1.50%

FIRE SPRINKLER MONTHLY SERVICE

CHARGE :

4" or Smaller	\$ 0.00	\$0.00	***
6"	0.00	0.00	***
8"	0.00	0.00	***
10"	0.00	0.00	***
Larger than 10"	0.00	0.00	***

\* Per Commission rule A.A.C. R-14-2-403(B).

\*\* Number of months off system times the Monthly Minimum, per Commission rule A.A.C. R14-2-403(D).

1           \*\*\*    1.00% of Monthly Minimum for a Comparable Sized meter Connection,  
2                    but no less than \$5 per month. The Service Charge for Fire Sprinklers is  
3                    only applicable for service lines separate and distinct from the primary  
4                    water service line.

5           53.    Staff's adjustments to rate base decreased Groom Creek's proposed rate base by  
6           \$28,261 from \$60,018 to \$31,757.

7           54.    Staff adjusted the Applicant's proposed \$60,018 rate base balance downward by  
8           \$28,261 for a balance of \$31,757. Staff stated the downward adjustments totaling \$13,364 reflect  
9           beginning balances authorized in the prior rate case (Decision No. 62619), and remove plant  
10           additions and retirements claimed since 1998 (end of prior test year) through 2006 (end of the current  
11           test year), which Staff could not verify. Further, Staff stated that an increase of \$400 was made to  
12           power operated equipment to reflect the total invoices supporting plant additions.

13           55.    Staff proposed upward adjustments in the amount of \$20,279 to Groom Creek's  
14           Accumulated Depreciation by beginning with the balances authorized in the prior rate case (Decision  
15           No. 62619) and applying the authorized depreciation rates to Staff's recommended plant balances for  
16           the years between 2000 through 2006. Staff calculated total Accumulated Depreciation in the amount  
17           of \$257,909.

18           56.    Staff calculated a Cash Working Capital allowance in the amount of \$4,982, using the  
19           formula method based on its recommended level of operating expenses.

20           57.    Staff's proposed adjustments to rate base are reasonable and should be adopted.

21           58.    The Applicant proposed test year operating revenue of \$57,132. Staff proposed an  
22           upward adjustment of \$5,091 to reflect revenue produced by the Applicant's metered water bill count  
23           during the test year. This adjustment is reasonable and will be adopted for total test year operating  
24           revenue of \$62,223.

25           59.    Staff proposed a net increase of \$1,201 to the Applicant's proposed test year  
26           Operating Expenses of \$44,324. Staff adjustments included the following: A reduction to Purchased  
27           Water in the amount of \$50 to reflect the aggregate of the test year purchased power invoices; a  
28           \$1,316 increase in Repairs and Maintenance to recognize the total supported expenses during the test  
          year; a \$592 decrease in Office Supplies & Expenses to reflect the documented test year expenses; a  
          \$6,365 increase for Outside Services to remove \$60 for unsupported bills, to add \$252 for

1 \$6,365 increase for Outside Services to remove \$60 for unsupported bills, to add \$252 for  
2 reclassification of water testing expenses, to add \$3,071 and \$3,102 for annualizing of accounting  
3 costs and water operator services, respectively; a \$252 decrease for Water Testing to reclassify  
4 invoices to outside services; a \$4,008 decrease in Depreciation Expense to reflect Staff's  
5 recommended level of depreciation expense; and a \$1,578 decrease to remove income tax expenses  
6 because Groom Creek is exempt under Federal laws.

7 60. Staff's recommended adjustments to Groom Creek's Operating Expenses resulted in  
8 total operating expenses of \$45,526. Staff's proposed adjustments to test year Operating Expenses  
9 are reasonable and will be adopted.

10 61. Subtracting total Operating Expenses of \$45,526 from total Operating Revenue of  
11 \$62,223 resulted in a net income for Groom Creek of \$16,697 during the test year.

12 62. Staff's recommended revenue produces a pro forma 1.25 Debt Service Coverage  
13 ("DSC") on the Applicant's current outstanding loan of \$145,438 and the new proposed \$1.6 million  
14 20-year amortizing loan at a rate of 4.9 percent, would produce sufficient cash flow for Groom Creek  
15 to meet its financial obligations.

16 63. Groom Creek's application proposes the continued use of a four-tier rate structure,  
17 with breakover points at 6,000, 10,000 and 20,000 gallons for all meter sizes with 1,000 gallons in  
18 the minimum. The Applicant's proposed rates would increase the median usage (1,532 gallon) 5/8" x  
19 3/4-inch meter residential customer's bill from \$18.60 to \$44.93, an increase of \$26.33 or 141.6  
20 percent.

21 64. Staff recommends a four-tier, inverted rate structure for 5/8" x 3/4-inch and 3/4-inch  
22 meters and a two-tier, inverted rate structure for larger meters.

23 65. Based on the 2006 test year, all of Groom Creek's customers are being served by a  
24 5/8" x 3/4 -inch meter size.

25 66. Staff recommends breakover points of 3,000, 6,000 and 10,000 gallons for 5/8" x 3/4  
26 inch customers.

27 67. Staff's proposed rates would increase the median usage (1,532 gallons) 5/8 X 3/4 -inch  
28 meter size residential customer's bill from \$18.60 to \$66.85 per month, an increase of \$48.25 or a

1 259.4 percent increase.

2 68. Staff's witness, Mr. Gordon Fox, discussed Staff's reasoning for recommending the no  
3 gallons included in the minimum usage charge. Mr. Fox explained under the specific circumstances  
4 of this case where the consumption is fairly low (1,532 gallons) the Commission wants to send a  
5 message that there is a cost to providing water and there is a need to generate the revenues from the  
6 sale of that water. (Tr. Pg. 242, lines 12-25)

7 69. Mr. Fox explained that in Groom Creek's case, the \$50 minimum charge  
8 recommended by Staff represents the equivalent of 62 percent of the revenue requirement, where as  
9 in a typical rate design, the minimum charge would represent 30 or 40 percent of the revenue coming  
10 from the minimum charge. (Tr. Pg. 243, lines 1-14)

11 70. Mr. Fox further testified that Staff's recommended \$50 minimum charge is beneficial  
12 for several reasons. First, Staff's recommended rate design is driven by a revenue requirement that  
13 has a debt service to cover payments for a \$1.6 million loan, and those payments will be made on a  
14 monthly basis, which will make it easier for the company to manage its cash flow if it generates the  
15 bulk of its revenues on a monthly basis. Second, because a large portion of Groom Creek's customers  
16 are seasonal and the revenue is being generated to cover the fixed costs of replacing the system, the  
17 fixed minimum charge has to be in place so that seasonal customers are paying their fair share of the  
18 replacement costs for the system. (Tr. Pg. 243, lines 15-25, Pg. 244, lines 1-7)

19 71. We find Staff's proposed rate design reasonable and will adopt it.

20 72. Due to the large rate increase we will require Groom Creek to file, by December 31,  
21 2008, a low-income tariff for Commission review and possible approval.

22 73. Staff recommends and adopts several of the charges proposed by the Applicant. Staff  
23 adopted the Applicant's proposed charges for Meter Tests and Meter Re-read, finding that they were  
24 a reasonable and normal charge. Staff also recommended that Groom Creek separate charges for  
25 service line and meter installations to ensure that future installation of meters on existing service lines  
26 reflect only that cost.

27 74. Staff recommends alternative service charges for the remaining items as set forth in  
28 Finding of Fact No. 52.

1 75. We find Staff's recommendations for service charges reasonable and will adopt them.

2 76. Staff also recommends :

3 a. Groom Creek collect, from its customers, in addition to its regular rates and  
4 charges, a proportionate share of any privilege, sales or use tax per Commission Rule  
(R-14-2-409D.5).

5 b. Authorization of the depreciation rates shown in Table B of the Revised  
Engineering Report.

6 c. That Groom Creek maintain its records in accordance with the National  
7 Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners ("NARUC") Uniform System of  
Accounts ("USOA").

8 d. That Groom Creek file with Docket Control, as a compliance item in this  
9 docket, a schedule of its approved rates and charges within 30 days of the effective  
date of a Decision in this matter.

10 e. That Groom Creek be required to contact customers that are not shown as  
11 having paid advances, requesting that the customers provide documentation showing  
12 their name, date, and amount paid for meter and service line installations. If  
customers have the documentation, then the Association should adjust its records and  
refund the customers the amounts due, calculated in accordance with Commission  
rules within 60 days.

13 77. Staff's recommendations are reasonable and will be adopted.

14 **Existing Water System**

15 78. Groom Creek's existing water system consists of two well sites, two booster systems,  
16 and a distribution system serving approximately 228 customers.<sup>7</sup>

17 79. Staff inspected the Groom Creek water system on August 21, 2007. Staff's inspection  
18 determined that:

19 a. Groom Creek's non-account water loss of 7 percent is within Staff's acceptable  
range for non-account water loss of no more than 10 percent.

20 b. Groom Creek's two well sources and storage capacity are adequate to serve its  
existing customer base and reasonable growth.

21 c. ADEQ has determined that Groom Creek's water system is delivering water  
22 that meets water quality standards as required by the Arizona Administrative Code  
("A.A.C").

23 d. The arsenic levels in Groom Creek's two wells are less than 1 part per billion  
24 ("ppb") and meet the new Environmental Protection Agency's ("EPA") maximum  
containment level of no more than 10 ppb.

25 e. Groom Creek's service area is not located within an Active Management Area  
26 ("AMA") and therefore is not subject to AMA reporting and conservation  
requirements.

27 f. Groom Creek has no outstanding compliance issues with the ACC.

28 <sup>7</sup> Staff's Corrected/Revised Engineering Report, dated July 31, 2008.

1 g. Groom Creek's curtailment tariff was approved by the Commission on May  
25, 2005.

2 h. Groom Creek's backflow prevention tariff was approved by the Commission  
on March 16, 2008.

3 80. Because an allowance for property tax expense is included in Groom Creek's rates and  
4 will be collected from its customers, the Commission seeks assurances from Groom Creek that any  
5 taxes collected from ratepayers have been remitted to the appropriate taxing authority. It has come to  
6 the Commission's attention that a number of water companies have been unwilling or unable to fulfill  
7 their obligation to pay the taxes that were collected from ratepayers, some for as many as twenty  
8 years. It is reasonable, therefore, that as a preventive measure Groom Creek shall annually file, as  
9 part of its annual report, an affidavit with the Utilities Division attesting that the Company is current  
10 in paying its property taxes in Arizona.

11 81. Staff's recommendations contained herein are reasonable and should be adopted.

12 82. The Commission is concerned with the potential effects of the proposed rate increase  
13 on low-income and fixed-income Groom Creek customers. In order to protect these customers the  
14 Commission finds that a rate freeze for customers who meet two times the Federal Poverty Line is a  
15 necessary component of this application.

16 **CONCLUSION OF LAW**

17 1. Groom Creek Water Users Association is a public service corporation within the  
18 meaning of Article XV of the Arizona Constitution and A.R.S. Sections 40-250 and 40-241.

19 2. The Commission has jurisdiction over Groom Creek and the subject matter of the  
20 applications.

21 3. Notice of the applications was provided in the manner prescribed by law.

22 4. The rates and charges established herein are just and reasonable and in the public  
23 interest.

24 5. The financing approved herein is for lawful purposes, within Groom Creek Water  
25 Users Association corporate powers, is compatible with the public interest, with sound financial  
26 practices, with proper performance by Groom Creek of service as a public service corporation, and  
27 will not impair Groom Creek's ability to perform that service.  
28



1	Over 63,000 gallons	31.00
	<u>6" Meter</u>	
2	0 - 123,000 gallons	\$ 15.50
3	Over 123,000 gallons	31.00

4 SERVICE LINE AND METER INSTALLATION CHARGES:  
 5 (Refundable pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-405)

	<u>Service Line</u> <u>Charge</u>	<u>Meter</u> <u>Charge</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Charge</u>
6			
7	5/8 x 3/4" Meter	\$ 1,700.00	\$ 300.00
	3/4" Meter	1,700.00	380.00
	1" Meter	1,750.00	420.00
8	1-1/2" Meter	1,785.00	630.00
	2" Meter	1,945.00	1,130.00
9	3" Meter	2,120.00	1,635.00
	4" Meter	2,485.00	2,515.00
10	6" Meter	3,045.00	4,710.00
			7,755.00

11 SERVICE CHARGES:

12	Establishment	\$ 30.00
	Establishment (After Hours)	40.00
13	Reconnection (Delinquent)	30.00
	Meter Test (If Correct)	25.00
14	Deposit	*
	Deposit Interest Per Annum	*
15	Reestablishment (Within 12 Months)	**
	NSF Check	25.00
16	Deferred Payment (Per Month)	1.50%
	Meter Re-Read (If Correct)	25.00
17	Late Payment Charge (Per Month)	1.50%

18 FIRE SPRINKLER MONTHLY SERVICE CHARGE :

19	4" or Smaller	***
	6"	***
20	8"	***
	10"	***
21	Larger than 10"	***

- \* Per Commission rule A.A.C. R-14-2-403(B).
- \*\* Number of months off system times the Monthly Minimum, per Commission rule A.A.C. R14-2-403(D).
- \*\*\* 1.00% of Monthly Minimum for a Comparable Sized meter Connection, but no less than \$5 per month. The Service Charge for Fire Sprinklers is only applicable for service lines separate and distinct from the primary water service line.

26 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the above rates and charges shall be effective for all service  
 27 provided on or after January 1, 2009.

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Groom Creek Water Users Association customers at or  
2 below two times the Federal Poverty Line will be held harmless from the rate increase.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that due to the large rate increase we will require Groom Creek  
4 Water Users Association to file, by December 31, 2008, a low-income tariff for Commission review  
5 and possible approval.

6 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Groom Creek Water Users Association shall notify its  
7 customers of the revised tariffs, rates, and charges authorized herein, and their effective date, in a  
8 form acceptable to the Commission's Utilities Division Staff, by means of an insert in its next  
9 regularly scheduled billing.

10 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that in addition to the collection of its regular rates and charges  
11 Groom Creek Water Users Association shall collect from its customers a proportionate share of any  
12 privilege, sales or use tax per Commission Rule R-14-2-409(D).

13 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Groom Creek Water Users Association shall use the  
14 depreciation rates delineated in Table B of the Revised Engineering Report filed in this case on a  
15 going forward basis.

16 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Groom Creek Water Users Association shall maintain its  
17 records in accordance with the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners Uniform  
18 System of Accounts on a going forward basis.

19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Groom Creek Water Users Association shall inquire of its  
20 customers that are not currently reported as having paid advances whether they have written  
21 documentation showing their name, date and amount paid for meter and service line installations. If  
22 customers have the documentation, then Groom Creek Water Users Association shall adjust its  
23 records and refund the customers the amounts due, calculated in accordance with Commission rules  
24 within 60 days of the effective date of this Decision.

25 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Groom Creek Water Users Association is hereby  
26 authorized to obtain a 18-30-year amortizing loan for an amount not to exceed \$1.6 million at a rate  
27 not to exceed 5.25 percent to finance the Staff recommended capital improvement projects.  
28

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the financing authority granted herein is expressly  
2 contingent on Groom Creek Water Users Association's use of the proceeds for the capital  
3 improvement projects set forth in attached Exhibit A.

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any authorization granted in this Order to incur long-term  
5 debt which remains unused as of December 31, 2012, shall terminate as of that date.

6 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Groom Creek Water Users Association is authorized to  
7 engage in any transactions and execute any documents necessary to effectuate the financing  
8 authorizations granted herein.

9 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that approval of the financing set forth hereinabove does not  
10 constitute or imply approval or disapproval by the Commission of any particular expenditure of the  
11 proceeds derived thereby for purposes of establishing just and reasonable rates.

12 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Groom Creek Water Users Association shall file with  
13 Docket Control, as a compliance item in this docket, a copy of the fully executed loan documents,  
14 within 60 days of the execution of any transactions.

15 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Groom Creek Water Users Association shall file, with  
16 Docket Control, as a compliance item in this docket, all Approvals to Construct and Approvals of  
17 Construction, as they are obtained from the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, but no  
18 later than 30 days after their receipt, for all projects covered by this financing.

19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Groom Creek Water Users Association shall file with  
20 Docket Control, as a compliance item in this docket, all Approvals of Construction by December 31,  
21 2010.

22 ...

23 ...

24 ...

25 ...

26 ...

27 ...

28 ...

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Groom Creek Water Users Association shall annually file  
2 as part of its annual report, an affidavit with the Utilities Division attesting that it is current on paying  
3 its property taxes in Arizona.

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.

5 BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION.  
6

7  
8 *Lawrence Blum* for William C. Mundell by *Kim Fre Dir*  
CHAIRMAN COMMISSIONER

9  
10 *Jeffrey H. Hatch-Peller* *[Signature]* *Gary J. Pien*  
COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER

11  
12 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, BRIAN C. McNEIL, Executive  
13 Director of the Arizona Corporation Commission, have  
14 hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the  
15 Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix,  
16 this 19<sup>th</sup> day of Nov., 2008.

17  
18 *[Signature]*  
BRIAN C. McNEIL  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

19  
20 DISSENT \_\_\_\_\_

21  
22 DISSENT \_\_\_\_\_

23  
24 YBK:db

25  
26  
27  
28

- 1 SERVICE LIST FOR: GROOM CREEK WATER USERS ASSOCIATION
- 2 DOCKET NOS.: W-01865A-07-0385 and W-01865A-07-0384
- 3
- 4 Jerry D. Hodgson, President  
GROOM CREEK WATER USERS ASSOCIATION  
4209 South Adeline Drive  
5 Prescott, AZ 85303
- 6 Jonathan S. Hoover  
1615 Palmcroft Drive SE  
7 Phoenix, AZ 85007-1735
- 8 John and Marian Cree  
1016 East Wagon Wheel Drive  
9 Prescott, AZ 86303
- 10 Patty Berry  
8332 N. 16<sup>th</sup> Street  
11 Phoenix, AZ 85020
- 12 Mary E. Turbyfill  
4168 Stagecoach Road  
13 Prescott, AZ 86303
- 14 Marjorie Navarro  
1074 East Wagon Wheel Drive  
15 Prescott, AZ 86303
- 16 Robert Schulz  
1075 East Wagon Wheel Drive  
17 Prescott, AZ 86303
- 18 Donald P. Muller  
4491 South Spur Lane  
19 Prescott, AZ 86303
- 20 Janice Alward, Chief Counsel  
Legal Division  
21 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
1200 West Washington Street  
22 Phoenix, AZ 85007
- 23 Ernest G. Johnson, Director  
Utilities Division  
24 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
1200 West Washington Street  
25 Phoenix, AZ 85007
- 26
- 27
- 28

## EXHIBIT A

Groom Creek Water Users Association									
Water System Improvements									
					Storage Tank	Booster System	Distribution System		Totals
1. Mobilization					4,370	3,842	31,788		40,000
2. Earthwork									
	Trenching, bedding & backfill						250,000		
	Pavement replacement						24,400		
	Site work				8,250				
3. Concrete									
	Tank foundation				12,750				
	Wash crossing						8,500		
	Thrust work						1,900		
	Valve boxes						13,300		
	Meter boxes						43,750		
5. Building - pump room								9,750	
10. Specialities									
	Painting							7,500	
11. Equipment									
	Booster pump station							30,000	
	hydropneumatic tank							10,000	
13. Special Construction									
	Flow meters							40,625	
	Welded storage tank				82,500				
15. Mechanical									
	C-900 PVC pipe							238,325	
	Copper pipe							49,458	
	Saddle with corp stop							54,200	
	Misc. valves & fittings							28,500	
16. Electrical									
								33,750	
<b>TOTALS:</b>					<b>107,870</b>	<b>94,842</b>	<b>784,746</b>		<b>987,458</b>
	Contingency (12%)				12,944	11,381	94,170		118,495
	Hard Dig contingency						71,250		
	<b>Subtotal:</b>				<b>120,814</b>	<b>106,223</b>	<b>950,166</b>		<b>1,177,203</b>
	Contractors O&P	22.0%			26,579	23,369	209,036		258,985
	Regulatory Impacts	0.25%			302	266	2,375		2,943
	Bonding & Insurance	1.5%			1,812	1,593	14,252		17,658
	Surveying & Utility location	5%			6,041	5,311	47,508		58,860
	Engineering	0.0%							
	Construction management	5.0%			6,041	5,311	47,508		58,860
	<b>TOTALS:</b>				<b>161,589</b>	<b>142,073</b>	<b>1,270,846</b>		<b>1,574,509</b>
					10%	9%	81%		100%