

OPEN MEETING ITEM



0000125109

Executive Director

RECEIVED

COMMISSIONERS
GARY PIERCE - Chairman
BOB STUMP
SANDRA D. KENNEDY
PAUL NEWMAN
BRENDA BURNS

ORIGINAL



ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

Arizona Corporation Commission

2011 MAY -9 A 9:47

DATE: MAY 9, 2011

DOCKETED

DOCKET NO.: W-02052A-10-0020 MAY 9 2011

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

TO ALL PARTIES:

DOCKETED BY

Enclosed please find the recommendation of Administrative Law Judge Dwight D. Nodes. The recommendation has been filed in the form of an Opinion and Order on:

WHY UTILITY COMPANY, INC.
(TRANSFER OF ASSETS/CANCEL CC&N)

Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-110(B), you may file exceptions to the recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge by filing an original and thirteen (13) copies of the exceptions with the Commission's Docket Control at the address listed below by **4:00** p.m. on or before:

MAY 18, 2011

The enclosed is NOT an order of the Commission, but a recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge to the Commissioners. Consideration of this matter has tentatively been scheduled for the Commission's Open Meeting to be held on:

MAY 24, 2011 and MAY 25, 2011

For more information, you may contact Docket Control at (602) 542-3477 or the Hearing Division at (602)542-4250. For information about the Open Meeting, contact the Executive Director's Office at (602) 542-3931.

ERNEST G. JOHNSON
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

1 **BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

2
3 COMMISSIONERS

4 GARY PIERCE - Chairman
5 BOB STUMP
6 SANDRA D. KENNEDY
7 PAUL NEWMAN
8 BRENDA BURNS

9 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
10 WHY UTILITY COMPANY, INC., FOR
11 AUTHORIZATION TO SELL AND TRANSFER
12 WATER SYSTEM ASSETS TO WHY DOMESTIC
13 WATER IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT AND
14 CANCELLATION OF CERTIFICATE OF
15 CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY.

DOCKET NO. W-02052A-10-0020

DECISION NO. _____

OPINION AND ORDER

11 DATES OF HEARING: January 20 and February 10, 2011

12 PLACE OF HEARING: Tucson, Arizona

13 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Belinda Martin¹

14 APPEARANCES: Mr. Stephen R. Cooper, Cooper & Reuter, LLP, on
15 behalf of Why Utility Company, Inc.; and

16 Ms. Ayesha Vohra, Staff Attorney, Legal Division, on
17 behalf of the Utilities Division of the Arizona
18 Corporation Commission.

18 **BY THE COMMISSION:**

19 On January 21, 2010, Why Utility Company, Inc. ("Why" or "Company"), filed with the
20 Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") an application for approval to transfer its assets
21 and operations to the Why Domestic Water Improvement District ("District") and to cancel the
22 Company's Certificate of Convenience and Necessity ("CC&N").

23 On February 22, 2010, the Commission's Utilities Division ("Staff") filed an Insufficiency
24 Letter directing Why to provide additional information regarding the application.

25 On October 25, 2010, the Company filed responses to Staff's information requests.

26 On October 28, 2010, Staff filed a Sufficiency Letter stating that the application met the
27

28 ¹ Administrative Law Judge Belinda Martin conducted the hearing in this matter and Administrative Law Judge Dwight Nodes drafted the Recommended Opinion and Order.

1 sufficiency requirements set forth in the Arizona Administrative Code.

2 On November 8, 2010, a Procedural Order was issued setting the hearing in this matter for
3 January 20, 2011, directing the Company to publish and mail notice of the application and hearing
4 date, and establishing other procedural requirements.

5 On December 23, 2010, Why filed the required affidavits of mailing and publication.

6 On December 23, 2010, Staff filed its Staff Report recommending approval of the application
7 subject to certain conditions.

8 The hearing convened, as scheduled, on January 20, 2011, before a duly authorized
9 Administrative Law Judge at the Commission's offices in Tucson, Arizona. The Company and Staff
10 appeared through counsel. The Company offered the testimony of a consultant, Fred Warren, but no
11 officers or employees of Why were able to attend the hearing due to scheduling conflicts. As a result,
12 the Administrative Law Judge directed that the hearing be reconvened at a later date to hear
13 testimony from a representative of Why in support of the application.

14 On January 24, 2011, a Procedural Order was issued scheduling a date of February 10, 2011
15 for the hearing to reconvene. The Procedural Order indicated that all parties were permitted to
16 participate in the reconvened hearing telephonically.

17 On February 20, 2011, the hearing reconvened. Both Staff and the Company appeared
18 through counsel via telephone. At the hearing, Why provided sworn testimony by the Company's
19 president, Vern Denning, and the Company's bookkeeper, Betty Tibbitt. Staff offered the testimony
20 of Marlin Scott, Jr., Staff Engineer, and Blessing Chukwu, a Staff Executive Consultant.

21 At the conclusion of the hearing, the matter was taken under advisement pending the
22 submission of a Recommended Opinion and Order to the Commission.

23 * * * * *

24 Having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, the
25 Commission finds, concludes, and orders that:

26 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

- 27 1. Why is an Arizona corporation that provides water utility service to approximately 100
28

1 customers in the community of Why, approximately 10 miles south of Ajo, Arizona, in Pima County.
2 The Company's original CC&N was granted by Decision No. 40053 (June 9, 1069). (Ex. S-1, at 1.)
3 The Company's current rates and charges were established in Decision No. 68609 (March 23, 2006).

4 2. The District was created by a vote of the Pima County Board of Supervisors on July
5 14, 2009. As described in the application, "the sole purpose of [forming the District] is to acquire the
6 assets and facilities of Why and provide on-going management to supply the Community of Why,
7 Arizona, with domestic water service and campground facilities for RVers." (*Id.*)

8 3. According to the Staff Engineering Report, Why's water system [prior to acquisition
9 by the District] consisted of two wells (producing 157 gallons per minute), two storage tanks totaling
10 164,000 gallons, and a distribution system serving approximately 100 connections. (*Id.*, Attach. A, at
11 1; Tr. 36.) Staff stated that the water system had adequate well production and storage capacity to
12 serve the existing service connections.

13 4. The Staff Report indicates that Why's assets totaled \$2,765,719. It also appears that,
14 as of the time of the Staff Report, the District had assets of \$578,576 (consisting of land, a new well,
15 and well pump). In addition, Staff indicated that \$109,776 in assets related to an RV park were to be
16 transferred to the District. (*Id.* at 2-3.)

17 5. Staff indicated that, according to an Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
18 ("ADEQ") compliance report dated November 18, 2010, the Company's system (ADEQ Public
19 Water System No. 10-118) was delivering water that met ADEQ water quality standards and
20 regulations. (*Id.* at 4.)

21 6. The Staff Report states that Why is not located in an Arizona Department of Water
22 Resources ("ADWR") Active Management Area ("AMA") and, according to an ADWR compliance
23 status report dated August 18, 2010, the Company was in compliance with ADWR requirements
24 governing water providers and/or community water systems. (*Id.*)

25 7. Staff stated that, according to the Compliance Division database, the Company has no
26 delinquent Commission compliance items. (*Id.*)

27 8. Staff indicated that, based on information set forth in the application, Why had no
28 refunds due on main extension agreements, or on water and service line installations, and that the

1 Company would transfer all customer security deposits to the District following approval by the
2 Commission. (Ex. S-1, at 2.) At the hearing, Company witness Denning testified that Why held
3 \$1,265 in customer security deposits that would be transferred to the District after Commission
4 approval of the application. He indicated that security deposits are normally returned to customers
5 after one year, absent late or missed payments during that time. (Tr. 53-54.)

6 9. In Decision No. 68609 (March 23, 2006), Why was granted a rate increase that
7 resulted in an increase to an average customer of 156 percent, from \$22.32 to \$57.13 per month. The
8 Company was also authorized to incur debt of up to \$185,000 from the Rural Utilities Service
9 (“RUS”) of the United States Department of Agriculture which, in addition to other grants from RUS,
10 was to be used for funding improvements to the Company’s water system. (Decision No. 68609, at 6-
11 7.)

12 10. As described in that Decision, Why’s system experienced a water loss rate of 14.5
13 percent during the test year due to a distribution system that was apparently in disrepair. In addition,
14 the arsenic level of the Company’s wells registered more than 150 parts per billion (“ppb”), 15 times
15 the maximum contaminant level (10 ppb) permitted under the U.S. Environmental Protection
16 Agency’s rules. (*Id.* at 8.)

17 11. During the hearing in this proceeding, the Company’s witnesses, Fred Warren and
18 Vern Denning, indicated that the primary purpose in creating the District² was to allow the Why
19 water system to receive federal grants to correct the arsenic problem and replace the entire system.
20 (Tr. 39, 59.) Mr. Warren stated that the District has received \$5.1 million in federal grants to replace
21 “all pipes, all mains, and all laterals, and the treatment system itself, and the storage tanks.” (*Id.* at 33,
22 39.) He added that the Company would not have been able to obtain the grant money, whereas
23 formation of the District allowed the federal grants to be received. (*Id.* at 14, 16, 18, 34.) Mr. Warren
24 testified that without the grant funding the Company would have been unable make the needed
25 repairs and improvements; and, further, the Why community would have been unable to afford the

26
27 ² According to Mr. Denning, the delay in seeking approval from the Commission of the transfer of the Company’s assets
28 to the District and cancellation of the CC&N was due to the need to quickly act in applying for the limited federal grant
funding, which likely would not have been available if there had been delays in seeking the funds. (*Id.* at 65.) He also
stated that the same officers in charge of Why Utility Company were appointed as the five board members of the new
District when it was formed in July 2009 by the Pima County Board of Supervisors. (Tr. 62-63.)

1 necessary arsenic treatment and system replacements without the grant money received by the
2 District. Mr. Warren indicated that, by forming the District, the Why community has been the
3 beneficiary of \$5.1 million of non-repayable federal funds that have been used to install the treatment
4 system, storage and new water mains and lines. (*Id.* at 18.)

5 12. Staff witnesses Marlin Scott, Jr., and Blessing Chukwu testified that the transfer of
6 Why's assets to the District, and cancellation of the Company's CC&N, is in the public interest and
7 should be approved. (*Id.* at 70-76.) Ms. Chukwu stated that, although Staff prefers that companies
8 seek Commission approval prior to transferring assets, in this case she believes the necessity to obtain
9 grant funding on an expedited basis is understandable. (*Id.* at 75.)

10 13. Accordingly, Staff recommends that the Commission approve Why's application to
11 transfer assets to the District, and to cancel the Company's CC&N, subject to the Company "be[ing]
12 required to file with Docket Control, as a compliance item in this docket, copies of all documentation
13 transferring ownership of its water system and assets to [the District], within 120 days of the effective
14 date of a decision in this matter." (Ex. S-1, at 3.) The Company indicated that it is in agreement with
15 Staff's recommendation and condition of approval. (Tr. 55.)

16 14. Based on the testimony and exhibits presented on the record of this proceeding, we
17 believe Why's application for authority to transfer its water system and assets to the District, and to
18 cancel its CC&N, is in the public interest and should be approved, subject to compliance with Staff's
19 recommendation.

20 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

21 1. Why is a public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV of the Arizona
22 Constitution and A.R.S. §§ 40-281, 40-282 and 40-285.

23 2. The Commission has jurisdiction over Why and the subject matter of the application.

24 3. Notice of the application was provided as required by law.

25 4. There is a continuing need for water utility service in Why's certificated area.

26 5. The District is a fit and proper entity that is ready, willing and able to assume the
27 responsibilities of providing water utility service within Why's existing certificated area.

28 6. Staff's recommendation for approval of the application, subject to compliance with its

1 sole condition, is reasonable and should be adopted.

2 **ORDER**

3 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the application of Why Utility Company, Inc., for
4 authority to transfer its water system and assets to the Why Domestic Water Improvement District,
5 and to cancel its CC&N, is in the public interest and is hereby approved, subject to compliance with
6 Staff's recommendations.

7 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Why Utility Company, Inc., shall file with Docket Control,
8 as a compliance item in this docket, copies of all documentation transferring ownership of its water
9 system and assets to the Why Domestic Water Improvement District, within 120 days of the effective
10 date of this Decision.

11 ...
12 ...
13 ...
14 ...
15 ...
16 ...
17 ...
18 ...
19 ...
20 ...
21 ...
22 ...
23 ...
24 ...
25 ...
26 ...
27 ...
28 ...

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, upon filing of the documentation required by Staff's
2 recommendation, the CC&N of Why Utility Company, Inc., shall be cancelled without further action
3 of the Commission.

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.

5 BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION.

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CHAIRMAN _____ COMMISSIONER _____

COMMISSIONER _____ COMMISSIONER _____ COMMISSIONER _____

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, ERNEST G. JOHNSON,
Executive Director of the Arizona Corporation Commission,
have hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the
Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix,
this _____ day of _____, 2011.

ERNEST G. JOHNSON
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

DISSENT _____

DISSENT _____

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

SERVICE LIST FOR:

WHY UTILITY COMPANY, INC.

DOCKET NOS.:

W-02052A-10-0020

Stephen R. Cooper
COOPER & RUETER, LLP
P. O. Box 15005
Casa Grande, AZ 85130

Janice Alward, Chief Counsel
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Steve Olea, Director
Utilities Division
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007