

E-01345A-11-0224



0000130694

ORIGINAL

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Deb Reagan

Phone:

Fax:

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2011 100286

Date: 10/24/2011

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

Complaint By: First: Milagro Last: Chawen

Arizona Corporation Commission  
**DOCKETED**

Account Name: Milagro Chawen

Home:

OCT 25 2011

Street:

Work:

City: Phoenix

CBR:

State: AZ Zip: 85085

is:

DOCKETED BY [Signature]

Utility Company: Arizona Public Service Company

Division: Electric

Contact Name: For assignment

Contact Phone:

Nature of Complaint:

\*\*\*\*\* REFERRED FROM COMMISSIONER NEWMAN'S OFFICE \*\*\*\*\*

RECEIVED  
2011 OCT 25 A 10:55  
AZ PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL

Customer sent the following -

Dear Mr. Newman:

I received the public notice of hearing in January on APS's application for an increase. I was disappointed by the 6.6% number, more so than the idea of the increase itself. I do understand it will vary depending upon the type and quantity of the service.

Given the fact that I and hundreds of thousands of others in town have been unemployed for up to two years, AND some of us were unable to obtain our full 99 weeks of unemployment as allowed by our federal government because Arizona didn't have the money, I am amazed at the announcement and timing of this increase with so many of us struggling to pay our bills because of the economic situation at hand. In addition, we are also paying a food tax which I think is terrible news and unfair for the unemployed heads of households struggling to keep their homes at the same time that they need to feed their children. I find it very disappointing that the increase would also be so high for electricity on top of all these other bills. We are being squeezed from every direction and not slowly, but in leaps and bounds in the percentages. Even the employed are not getting raises that come close to the increased cost of living. How can we squeeze blood from a turnip?

I do understand that companies have bills to pay also and employees to cover. What precipitates this email is the fact that the notice we received from APS with our bills was written on a level that would require the reader to be either an engineer or person who works in the electric utility industry to understand the lingo. I have a college degree with honors but I see that the consumers unfortunately are not getting meaningful information to help us understand why the increase of 6.6% is necessary. I read the second paragraph, which explains the three parts, at least four times trying to understand it. As an example "a non-fuel increase"--what kind of increase would that then be? Why so vague? "Certain assets now being recovered" or expected to be

**ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**  
**UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM**

---

recovered like what? What types of assets are those that will be paid for by the Renewable Energy Surcharge? What then happens to the Renewable Energy concept, whatever it is? What utility disincentives are being removed? Give me an example of a disincentive. Throw in the reference to customer credit related to PSAs and it leaves the reader's head either empty or ready to explode. Please don't let us be overwhelmed by notifications we can't understand. That does not constitute notification in my opinion. We should be able to receive what we can reasonably understand. It might be less upsetting if we could understand why we are expected to face yet another hike when our incomes are zero or "just plain scraping to get by."

Please ask APS to enlighten me and the other consumers in another insert with our next bill that would be understandable. I would truly appreciate and look forward to a response from you. Thank you in advance for your time and attention to my request.

Sincerely,

Milagro Chawen  
\*End of Complaint\*

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

Comments entered for the record and filed with Docket Control.  
\*End of Comments\*

Date Completed:

Opinion No. 2011 - 100286

---