

ORIGINAL



0000110261


W-01303A-08-0227
SW-01303A-08-0227

47
CD

April 14, 2010

Dear Commissioner:

Re: Coronado Utilities, Inc.
Docket No. SW-04305A-09-0291



On June 3, 2009, Coronado Utilities, Inc. filed an application (Docket No. SW-04305A-09-0291) for an increase in revenue for sewer service in San Manuel, AZ. As customers, we received notification in September 2009 (from Coronado) that a Public Hearing would be held on March 23, 2010 in Tucson where public comments would be taken regarding this application. The hearing was postponed, however, we were not notified of this postponement. Has there been another Public Hearing scheduled in Tucson? If so, will you please advise the date and time of the Hearing.

In Coronado's latest application, they have requested a 17.6% increase in the residential sewer rate. If this rate increase is approved, it will mean that the San Manuel residential sewer rates have more than doubled since Coronado Utilities took over less than 4 years ago. They are also seeking a similar increase in rates for its commercial customer rates. When will these increases end? In the current depressed economy ANY rate increase cannot be justified nor warranted.


It is amazing that the Corporation Commission would even entertain such an increase by a company that has been delinquent in filing its Annual Reports to the Commission on more than one occasion, the latest being for this past year. Their Annual Report was due 8/18/09 and not received by the Commission until SIX months later on 2/12/10.* This appears to be a pattern for this company, and one they obviously get by with since the penalties imposed by Arizona Law for delinquency of these reports (\$9/month for each month of delinquency) means little to them. After all, if this proposed increase is approved by the Commission, Coronado can recoup their \$54 penalty fee in the very first month the increase is in effect by collecting the monthly billing from just six residential customers! As retirees on a limited income we are already paying extremely high sewer fees not tied to water usage. Please do not approve Coronado's request for an additional rate increase!

Sincerely,

Fred and Sallie Winkler
614 W. 6th Avenue
San Manuel, AZ 85631

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

APR 19 2010




*This information is noted on the Commission's Website

RECEIVED
2010 APR 19 P 4: 03
CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

Mr. Paul Newman, Commissioner
Arizona Corporation Commission
Commissioners Wing
1200 West Washington. 2nd. Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85007-2996

W-01303A-08-0227
SW-01303A-08-0227

Re. Case # 71410



Dear Commissioner:

I am a member of Scottsdale Citizens for Sustainable Water (SWAT). Our group consists of homeowners associations and others living in Scottsdale who are customers of Arizona American Water Company. Our group represents over 1,400 homeowners and approximately twice that many consumers.

I want to express to you and your fellow Commissioners my strong opposition to your recent approval of the Arizona American Water Company's (AAW) rate increase request for the Paradise Valley Water District. Your decision violates every stated and implied goal and objective that the Commission has expressed over the last several years regarding the need to conserve our critical water supply.

A few Scottsdale residents appeared and testified before the Commission on this rate increase request; their recommendations seem to have carried little or no consideration or weight by the Commission or RUCO. In fact, they were apparently ignored.

It is interesting when you consider that 80% of Scottsdale AAW customers consume less than 25 KGM (1000's gallons / month) while 84% of Paradise Valley AWW customers consume over 25 KGM! Users of 10 KGM pay 51% more since your approval while 80 KGM users pay only 15% more than previously. Is this fair? Is this within the boundaries established by the Commission to encourage conservation? I think not! In fact, this approved increase is in contravention of the Commission's **stated** policy.

All governmental agencies make mistakes periodically. Almost all, however, rectify these mistakes. We ask you to reopen this case and rectify the patently unfair increase burden on the lightest users vs. the high consumption users.


Thank you:

Robert Rogers

W-01303A-08-0227
SW-01303A-08-0227

Mr. Paul Newman, Commissioner
Arizona Corporation Commission
Commissioners Wing
1200 West Washington. 2nd. Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85007-2996

Re. Case # 71410



Dear Commissioner:

I am a member of Scottsdale Citizens for Sustainable Water (SWAT). Our group consists of homeowners associations and others living in Scottsdale who are customers of Arizona American Water Company. Our group represents over 1,400 homeowners and approximately twice that many consumers.

I want to express to you and your fellow Commissioners my strong opposition to your recent approval of the Arizona American Water Company's (AAW) rate increase request for the Paradise Valley Water District. Your decision violates every stated and implied goal and objective that the Commission has expressed over the last several years regarding the need to conserve our critical water supply.

A few Scottsdale residents appeared and testified before the Commission on this rate increase request; their recommendations seem to have carried little or no consideration or weight by the Commission or RUCO. In fact, they were apparently ignored.

It is interesting when you consider that 80% of Scottsdale AAW customers consume less than 25 KGM (1000's gallons / month) while 84% of Paradise Valley AWW customers consume over 25 KGM! Users of 10 KGM pay 51% more since your approval while 80 KGM users pay only 15% more than previously. Is this fair? Is this within the boundaries established by the Commission to encourage conservation? I think not! In fact, this approved increase is in contravention of the Commission's **stated** policy.

All governmental agencies make mistakes periodically. Almost all, however, rectify these mistakes. We ask you to reopen this case and rectify the patently unfair increase burden on the lightest users vs. the high consumption users.

Thank you:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "J. A.", followed by a long horizontal line extending to the right.