

ORIGINAL



0000110628

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED

2010 MAY -4 P 2:11

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

- 1
- 2 KRISTIN K. MAYES
CHAIRMAN
- 3 GARY PIERCE
COMMISSIONER
- 4 SANDRA D. KENNEDY
COMMISSIONER
- 5 PAUL NEWMAN
COMMISSIONER
- 6 BOB STUMP
COMMISSIONER
- 7

8 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
 9 ARIZONA-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY,
 10 AN ARIZONA CORORATION, FOR A
 11 DETERMINATION OF THE CURRENT FAIR
 12 VALUE OF ITS UTILITY PLANT AND
 PROPERTY AND FOR INCREASES IN ITS
 RATES AND CHARGES BASED THEREON
 FOR UTILITY SERVICE BY ITS ANTHEM
 WATER DISTRICT AND ITS SUN CITY
 WATER DISTRICT.

Docket No. W-01303A-09-0343

13 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
 14 ARIZONA-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY,
 15 AN ARIZONA CORORATION, FOR A
 16 DETERMINATION OF THE CURRENT FAIR
 17 VALUE OF ITS UTILITY PLANT AND
 18 PROPERTY AND FOR INCREASES IN ITS
 RATES AND CHARGES BASED THEREON
 FOR UTILITY SERVICE BY ITS
 ANTHEM/AGUA FRIA WASTEWATER
 DISTRICT, ITS SUN CITY WASTEWATER
 DISTRICT AND ITS SUN CITY WEST
 WASTEWATER DISTRICT.

Docket No. SW-01303A-09-0343

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

MAY - 4 2010

DOCKETED BY	<i>[Signature]</i>
-------------	--------------------


RUCO'S NOTICE OF ERRATA

- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24

30

1 The Residential Utility Consumer Office ("RUCO") hereby files this Notice of Errata
2 in the above-referenced matter. Attached is page 23 of the Rate Consolidation Direct
3 Testimony of Jodi A. Jerich, on behalf of RUCO, which was inadvertently left out of
4 RUCO's filing on May 3, 2010.

5 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 4th day of May, 2010.
6

7
8 
9 Daniel W. Pozefsky
10 Chief Counsel

11
12 AN ORIGINAL AND THIRTEEN COPIES
13 of the foregoing filed this 4th day
14 of May, 2010 with:

15 Docket Control
16 Arizona Corporation Commission
17 1200 West Washington
18 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

19 COPIES of the foregoing hand delivered/
20 mailed this 4th day of May, 2010 to:

21 Teena Wolfe
22 Administrative Law Judge
23 Hearing Division
24 Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Janice Alward, Chief Counsel
Legal Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Steve Olea, Director
Utilities Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Thomas H. Campbell
Michael T. Hallam
Lewis and Roca LLP
40 North Central Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85004

1 Judith M. Dworkin
Sacks Tierney PA
2 4250 N. Drinkwater Blvd., 4th Floor
Scottsdale, AZ 85251-3693
3
4 Lawrence V. Robertson, Jr.
P.O. Box 1448
Tubac, AZ 85646-1448
5
6 Larry D. Woods, President
Property Owners and Residents Assoc.
13815 East Camino Del Sol
7 Sun City West, AZ 85375
8
9 W. R. Hansen
12302 West Swallow Drive
Sun City, AZ 85024
10
11 Greg Patterson
916 W. Adams, Suite 3
Phoenix, AZ 85007
12
13 Jeff Crockett, Esq.
Robert Metli, Esq.
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
One Arizona Center
14 400 East Van Buren Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202
15
16 Bradley J. Herrema
Robert Saperstein
Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP
17 21 East Carrillo Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93 10 1
18
19 Andrew M. Miller
Town of Paradise Valley
6401 E. Lincoln Drive
20 Paradise Valley, AZ 85253
21
22 Marshall Magruder
P. O. Box 1267
Tubac, AZ 85646-1267

Norman D. James
Fennemore Craig, P.C.
3003 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2600
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Larry D. Woods
15141 West Horseman Lane
Sun City West, AZ 85375

Joan S. Burke
Law Office of Joan S. Burke
1650 N. First Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85003

Philip H. Cook
10122 West Signal Butte Circle
Sun City, AZ 85373

By 
Ernestine Gamble

1 bandwidth where RUCO believes there would be little ratepayer opposition to
2 consolidated rates. As you can see from Exhibit B, there are many more red and
3 orange districts than yellow districts.

4
5 The point of this exercise is to leave the general and philosophical debate of rate
6 consolidation and to bring to the forefront an examination of its financial impact on
7 residential ratepayers. At this time, ratepayers in Sun City are aware (and strongly
8 oppose) rate consolidation. But RUCO does not believe ratepayers in Paradise
9 Valley and Mohave have any real idea that the notice they received as a bill insert
10 regarding rate consolidation will have the actual financial impact as shown in Exhibit
11 B.⁶

12
13 **Q. What are your thoughts regarding the three step phased-in proposal offered**
14 **by Ms. Heppenstall's rebuttal testimony on behalf of Arizona-American?**

15 **A.** RUCO appreciates the Company's attempt to mitigate rate shock for certain
16 ratepayers. Clearly, in these times of economic duress, postponing rate increases is
17 certainly helpful to the pocketbook. However, RUCO does not support this proposal
18 for the following reasons:

19

⁶ The notice that was sent to all Arizona-American ratepayers states, "If approved by the Commission, this (rate consolidation) proposal may impact the rates of every Arizona-American water and wastewater customer – either increase or decrease."