

SW-04305A-09-0291



0000110225

ORIGINAL

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

47
CD

Investigator: Jenny Gomez

Phone:

Fax:

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2010 86390

Date: 4/16/2010

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

Complaint By: **First:** Barbara **Last:** Stuart

Account Name: Barbara Stuart

Home: (000) 000-0000

Street:

Work:

Arizona Corporation Commission

City: San Manuel

CBR:

DOCKETED

State: AZ **Zip:** 85631

is:

APR 16 2010

Utility Company: Coronado Utilities, Inc.

Division: Sewer-water

DOCKETED BY

Contact Name:

Contact Phone:

Nature of Complaint:

DOCKET NUMBER SW-04305A-09-0291

REFERENCE: CORONADO UTILITIES, INC.

REFERRED BY: OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL - TUCSON

April 2, 201

Letter to the Editor: Exactly what type of JOKE is Coronado Utilities, Inc. pulling?

Editor, San Manuel Miner:

A San Manuel family of 4 with a pool. They must be laughing hysterically at Coronado when they write their monthly sewer check for \$46.65.

A single retired resident, using 1,000 gallons of water a month isn't laughing hysterically paying Coronado the same monthly sewer fee of \$46.65! It's a JOKE... right?

Coronado states it's a "utility". Coronado has the incorporated protection to run and ramrod anything they think they can get away with. Reality - "One flat fee for each house regardless of water usage".

WHY did Arizona Corporate Commissioners Newman, Pierce, Kennedy & Stump agreed to the flat fee? Spokes person for ACC Consumer Affairs Bradley Morton himself pays a flat sewer fee and stated it is totally fair. I failed to ask Bradley if he had a pool.

Where is the logic in this action? Hopefully the ACC 6 can stand tall and proud with the Coronado one fee decision they agreed upon, affecting an entire San Manuel community.

RECEIVED
2010 APR 16 P 4:46
AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

JAN 16 2010

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Jason Williamson of Coronado stated he did not consider metering the community because of the cost. WHY? This attitude completely negates any common business and mathematical sense.

This is: "A fictitious creative Example Only. Any Company stated it wants to be a sewer utility in Small Town. It states to the powers to be its so called undercapitalized position, with incompetent accountability systems. It becomes obvious to Any Company it must seek any means to extort monies from Small Town. As well, Any Company has a future need, to keep the poor mouth perpetuation going to the regulative powers, year after year, enabling Any Company to eventually achieve its end result." The above was a fictitious creative example only.

Questions need to be answered. If San Manuel is such a bad deal, with countless hurdles to overcome, why did Coronado come here? What was the inducement to Coronado? What are the names of the people involved? Was there an exchange of monies? Why the relentless enthusiasm of the ACC to back any Coronado position or fee decisions?

Legitimate "Utilities" are responsible components of our San Manuel community. They realize they serve the community. They realize their position in helping their customers and derive a respectable standing in the community. Equally, a resident should pay the monthly utility bill when received from a responsible Utility.

A few heavy hand people are running your pocket book San Manuel, so this letter is being mailed to: Utility Division Director Steven M. Olea, ACC Commissioners: Paul Newman, Gary Pierce, Sandra K. Kennedy, Bob Stump, Chairman Kristin K. Mayes, Consumer Affairs Bradley Morton, and Attorney General Terry Goddard who is an elected official. E-mail the ACC at www.azcc.gov/divisions/utilities and call Bradley Morton at 1.800.222.7000. Reach Goddard at: agin@azag.gov, phone 520.628.6504.

San Manuel is overrun and overlooked. This needs to STOP now.

/s/ Barbara Stuart, San Manuel resident
End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

N/A
End of Response

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

Opinion noted and filed in Docket Control.
End of Comments

Date Completed: 4/16/2010

Opinion No. 2010 - 86390
