

W.01431A-09-0360
W.01431A-09-0361



0000112579

ORIGINAL

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMIS
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

47
6

Investigator: Guadalupe Ortiz Phone: Fax:

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2010 87176 Date: 6/1/2010

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

Complaint By: First: Mercedes & Richard Last: Hughes

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED

Account Name: Mercedes & Richard Hughes

Home:

Street:

Work:

JUN - 2 2010

City: Nogales

CBR:

State: AZ Zip:

is:

DOCKETED BY

Utility Company. Valle Verde Water Company

Division: Water

Contact Name:

Contact Phone: ()

Nature of Complaint:

*****ALSO REFER TO ACC INQUIRY NO. 2010 - 87177*****

EMAIL RECEIVED - OPINION OPPOSED:

RE: Docket No. W-01431A-09-0360
W-01431A-09-0361

2010 JUN - 2 A 9:39
RECEIVED
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

Ms. Ortiz..

My husband, Richard and I will be out of town on June 2nd and will not be in attendance for the 6:00 pm meeting. We very much wanted to attend this meeting to express our concerns and discontent on the rate increase that the management company for Valle Verde Water Company wants to the Arizona Corporate Commission to approve and impose on us. We hope that by means of this letter, our discontent and concerns are taken into consideration.

We have lived at this same address in Valle Verde Subdivision since August 1983. Our children were born and raised in this neighborhood. As a child, I lived with my parents in the same neighborhood and as did my bothers and sisters. Some are still residents. We have suffered through the multitudes of water being turned off due to broken water lines for a very very long time. And we are still suffering the consequences. Just a few days ago, as I was in the shower, the water flow was lost. I had to shampoo my hair and rinse it with a trickle of water. How much more frustration can we cope with? Next came the contaminated water. All these years, we have drank, washed our dishes, our laundry and ourselves with this water. Our pets have been given this water to drink. Our plants. What I am saying is that the contaminated water has probably already done the damage it was meant to do. Could the contaminated water be blamed for the some of the people and pets that have passed away? When the question was brought up, we were told that a scientific investigation had not been considered; therefore not a probability.

Mr. Randall at the time did not seem too concern about fixing the old pipes that were installed back in the mid

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

50's.

We found pieces of the old piping when repairs were being done on broken lines. These pipes were made of asbestos. We mentioned this to the Mayor of Nogales, Mr. Ignacio Barraza, when he was so adamantly trying to help the consumers of Valle Verde Water.

He took these piece of pipe to contemplate opening an investigation. Unfortunately, his passing came too soon and what ever he had hoped to accomplish was gone, along with ours. We were hopeful, that the City of Nogales would take over the Valle Verde Water Company. Then, maybe water hydrates would be installed, which are so desperately needed. Valle Verde and Mi Casa Subdivision do not have water hydrates. I believe the closest hydrates are on Apache Boulevard and North Grand Avenue before Country Club Drive. Fortunately there has not been a house fire in this area.

In 2008, after the new management took over the billing for Valle Verde Water Company, we were slapped with a SC2 aka Service Charge 2. Besides the regular water bill, U1 & pub until, the SC2 was the same amount as the W2, duplicating our water bill.

I called and questioned this extra charge and I was told that Valle Verde Water Company was in the red and the increase SC2 was to necessary to help get them out of the red, fix the broken water lines, and well contamination, filter etc. As much as I confronted this charge, it was very clear that they would not do any thing in favor of the residents. My main complaint and concern was that they had not the courtesy of notifying us of the increase.

Now they want to suck (pardon my language) it to us again, by increasing the water service to 200% if not more. How can they consciously draw blood from the already financial burden families? It's not a luxury item, which we can do with out. Where are these monies going to? The pipes have not been replaced. Where are the water hydrates? How can we be sure the water is good to consume? Can we take a shower without the water being turned off? Our past experience has not been that of a favorable one for the Valle Verde Water consumers. You would have to live here as long as we have to fully understand our position.

Ms. Ortiz, I strongly believe that this increase, besides not being merited by the water company, will put our citizens into dire straights. The economy in Nogales has for many years been negatively affected. Since the peso devaluation in the late 70's, Nogales had not been able to recuperate. Some of the local produce businesses and the maquilas industry, the companies with the decent paying jobs, have packed up and left the area. Jobs lost to other countries or just closed due to financial problems. The recession has not made it any better. And now, this SB1070 law, going into effect this summer, will certainly cause Nogales and it's residents more financial problems.

It is not the time to burden our community with higher water rates. At such a rate of 200%.

We appreciate your assistance and thank you for your time and consideration to this matter. We hope that the Arizona Coporate Commission would consider our plight and not award the increase to the management company of the Valle Verde Water Company.

Mercedes & Richard Hughes

Nogales, Arizona

Tel:

--

Mercy

End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

Opinion docketed with the Docket Control Center of the Commission to be made part of the record. CLOSED

End of Comments

Date Completed: 6/1/2010

Opinion No. 2010 - 87176
