

ORIGINAL



W-03443A-08-0177
W-03443A-08-0313

Sheila Stoeller

From: Rromley@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, April 25, 2009 6:40 PM
To: Mayes-WebEmail
Subject: Appaloosa Water Co

RECEIVED

2009 APR 28 P 3: 58

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

Kris
It was nice to see you again at the hearing last week. First off, I want to tell you that both Cheri and I were very impressed with the work your staff did in evaluating Appaloosa Water Co's request. The Judge did her homework and we were also very impressive as to her knowledge of the situation. I felt that a thorough and comprehensive examination was done by everyone.

There were a few items that were left unanswered at the hearing which I feel is important to put into the equation.

1st - You ask the question about the name of the developer of the 170+/- acres which is to possibly utilize the water from the Appaloosa Water Co's wells. That question was never answered. The developer is Joe Cordovana who owns the water company. That is why so many questions were asked and concern was expressed about the Appaloosa Water Co's wells. This system was only designed for approximately 350 homes. He is now adding a dense neighborhood on his 179 Ac's including duplex's, a hotel, commercial buildings, apartment complex, and an assisted living facility, not including the commercial nursery, Clubhouse, and his own private home. All coming out of the two wells that are currently serving over 250 homes. His service to the existing homes has not been that great and to include an additional 1200+ connections leave the existing customers with service and pressure concerns. I was especially surprised when he stated that he has 7 existing wells located on the property he is going to develop. Yet he is going to pipe water approximately one mile north to facilitate his needs. This doesn't equate to a rational decision especially when it could jeopardize his existing customers. This decision only confirms his statement that he does not know anything about a water company.

2nd - The question of the backflow prevention unit for the illegal 6 inch line which crosses Rd 4 N. No one working for the town has ever seen it, and really don't think that it is in place. A 6" backflow unit is a very large unit and they still can't find it. Mark Homes the Town's Water Director feels that Cordovana probably thinks that the air gap between the top of the lake and the water fill pipe is what Cordovana is considering as the backflow unit. If this is true, this still leaves the existing customers with an open ended system which is a health and safety hazard.

3rd - During testimony, Cordovana stated that it took between 6 months and one year to get plan approval of the crossing on 4 north from the town. I asked the Town Engineer about this statement. He stated that it took Cordovana over a year to file the proper plans and paperwork for review. He stated it took about 6 weeks for his department to approve the engineers drawings and return them to Cordovana with a notice to proceed, and then he didn't build it the way the drawings were approved.

Lastly - Cheri had an additional concern; when she talked to Mr. Carlson from the ACC, he stated he did not believe Mr. Cordovana had ever turned the water line on (which crossed Rd 4N). She is concerned that the ACC did not know that he has been operating this water line crossing at the risk of jeopardizing the health and safety of the current customers. We just wanted you and the Commission to know that he had been operating the water line going across Rd 4 North for approximately 9 months to a year. Cordovana only shut the water line down approximately a month before the hearing. The town has been waiting for ADEQ to order that he shut the crossing down until the backflow unit and the sanitation of the water has been installed, tested and approved. To date, this has never happened. The total amount of water that went through the Rd 4N crossing was not metered. This is also a concern to the home owners because all the water that is being pumped through a non metered system, plus our homes, is arsenic treated and the commission is in the process of determining the actual costs in determining a rate that should be applicable for reimbursement of the newly installed and required maintenance of the arsenic facilities. An un-metered 6 inch pipe will put out a lot of treated water, and will definitely skew the results as to what the home owners should be required to pay on their monthly bill.

Thanks again for your input and concerns. We will be looking forward to seeing you at the formal hearing

Ron and Cheri Romley
828 Talia Place
Chino Valley AZ 86323

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

APR 28 2009

DOCKETED BY