

W. 03514A-10-0117

W. 03514A-10-0116



0000111551

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISS

RECEIVED
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

ORIGINAL

Investigator: Trish Meeter

Phone: 2010 MAY 13 A 8:45

Fax:

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

Opinion No. 2010 86845

Date: 5/11/2010

Complaint Description: 09Z Rates/Tariffs - Other
N/A Not Applicable

Complaint By: First: Eric Last: Pfeifle

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

Account Name: Eric Pfeifle

Home:

MAY 13 2010

Street:

Work:

City: Payson

CBR:

State: AZ Zip: 85541

is:

DOCKETED BY

Utility Company: Payson Water Co., Inc.

Division: Mesa Del Caballo

Contact Name:

Contact Phone:

Nature of Complaint:

5/10

Opinion on Docket #W035 14A-10-01 16 and W03514A-10-01 17

I am a homeowner who has lived in the mesa Del subdivision for 6 years who receives water from the Payson water Co. also known as the Brooke utilities Inc.

As a utilities provider the Payson Water Company (Brooke utilities) should be required to provide every home a minimum monthly allotment of water for basic needs and no enforcement or surcharges should be billed to the consumer unless the consumer exceeds that allotment during a posted water shortage. The rate billed should be staged according to the over usage of water and no disconnection or fines should be imposed.

The population of this subdivision has gotten larger every year with family's having more children, retirees moving in, Rentals. putting more demands on the water system . The demand for water keeps growing, but the water system has not.

In This subdivision each customer about 375 pays a \$16.00 monthly service charge approximately\$72,000 dollars a year just for the meter in addition to the water usage fees . Over the years the water company has known we face these water shortages every summer and every new summer is worse then the previous, in my opinion they should have used this money to update there systems. By drilling deeper, drilling new wells or by whatever opinions necessary to increase production. But it appears there preferred method is to have water hauled in during summer months. And now they what us to pay a surcharge for this . I believe every customer has prepaid the water company for the augmentation surcharge, with the 72,000 dollar service charge they collect from us year after year. And no additional fees should be charge to us.

We go through this problem every year and there proposal to us is more increases in fees and fines, we never hear what they are doing to remedy the problem. The water committee told us that they spent 9 months working with the water company to come up with this augmentation surcharge plan. it seems they spend a lot of time implementing ways to increase fees, and fines but spend so little time to solve the problem by increasing water production.

In my opinion the proposed method for fines, fees and reconnections are unfair, and excessive.

There are many homeowners who use excessive amounts of water while other use just enough to get by. Under the proposal those who have been conserving throughout the year during a stage of enforcement may have to reduce upto 50% this may cause them to not have enough water to meet sanitary conditions. While those who

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

have been using water excessively can reduce and still have enough water to maintain there home and that my be double the usage of there neighbor who will be fined and disconnected.

Every customer should have a standard set minimum allotment of water for basic needs that must be provided on a monthly basis by the water company.(example 4,500 gallons) The water company should only be entitled to recover surcharges "if any" when the customer has exceeded a set allotment. Then those who use excessively will pay more and in return will be more conserving..

The water company should not be allowed to enforce a unfair method of enforcement that may cause some customers to not have enough water for basic needs because of the mandatory water reduction stages and the formula used as proposed.

With the proposed method they read my meter today and minus it against yesterday reading, with that total they calculate what my monthly estimated usage will be. then they look at the pervious months usage and the same month last years usage ,whichever is higher. now I am required depending on what stage to reduce my usage up to 50% from that higher meter reading. With this method Every home will have a different daily usage based off there estimated meter readings and pervious usages.

How is each customer to know how much water they used that day and are allowed to use daily before fined?

Are they going to calculate every homes daily usage and notify each customer what they re allowed to use during each stage so the customer don't exceed this usage to avoid fmes.??

Or is the fines the main puipose of this?

What happen if the meter is read incorrecly example they read a 3 as an 8 that 50 or 500 gallon incorrect meter reading could cause a disconnection. And the customer cant prove it was read incorrecly.

This method is unfair. And should not be allowed for them to enforce.

The water committee are a group of individuals from the mesa del club house who volunteered to commutate between the water company and the residents because the water company was not responding clearly to our concerns. There opinions are there own, and should not be counted as if they are specking for the whole community.

There staging signs are not posted in good visible areas, depending on direction of travel can be missed.

Thank you for allowing me to express my opinions.

Eric Pfeifle

End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

5/10

Trish-

The Docket states that two signs are required in noticeable locations including major entrances to the subdivision. We've installed three signs as a matter of convenience to residents. As provided in the attached map, we have located signs at both major subdivision entrances. There is one minor entrance to Mesa del Caballo that cannot be accessed without driving immediately in front of the main entrance sign location.

I think it's clear that we have more than complied with the tariff and the signs are in visible locations for residents. The Company has received no customer complaints because of sign locations.

RTH

End of Response

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

Docketed W-03514A-10-0116

email to company:

From: Trish Meeter [mailto:TMeeter@azcc.gov]

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2010 9:06 AM
To: Bob Hardcastle
Subject: Mesa del Cabbalo Curtailment Tariff

Good morning Bob,

I received an opinion regarding Docket No. W-03514A-10-0116 from a Mesa del Caballo water customer. In it, he states that staging signs are not in "good visible areas, depending on direction of travel...".

Your current Curtailment Tariff states 2- 4ft.x 4ft. signs are to be placed in noticable locations that include the entrances to major subdivisions.

Is there more than one entrance to the MdC subdivision? Are signs placed at both entrances? At the well site?

Thanks in advance for the verification.

Trish Meeter
Arizona Corporation Commission
Consumer Analyst
Utilities Division

End of Comments

Date Completed: 5/11/2010

Opinion No. 2010 - 86845
