# ORIGINAL

# ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMI UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM



Investigator: Deb Reagan

Phone: 2012 DEC 12 P 3: 56

Fax: (

**Priority: Respond Within Five Days** 

- 107320 No. 2012

DOCKET CONTROL

COMMISSION

Date: 12/10/2012

**Complaint Description:** 

08A Rate Case Items - Opposed

N/A Not Applicable

First:

Last:

Complaint By:

**Dale and Gayle** 

Gerry

Account Name:

Dale and Gayle Gerry

Home:

Street:

**Opinion** 

Work:

City:

Yuma

CBR:

State:

ΑZ

Zip: 85367

is:

**Utility Company.** 

Far West Water & Sewer, Inc.

Division:

Water

**Contact Name:** 

Roxanne Fiddes

**Contact Phone:** 

**Nature of Complaint:** 

\*\*\*\*\*WS-03478A-12-0307 \*\*\*\*\*

Customer sent the following -

Arizona Corporation Commission, **Consumer Services Section** 1200 West Washington Phoenix, AZ85007

Arizona Corporation Commission DOCKETED

DEC 1 2 2012

DOCKLIED BY

RE: Docket No. WS-03478A-12-0307 (Far West Water & Sewer, Inc.)

I wish to protest the requested rate increase proposed by Far West. I feel that this requested rate increase far exceeds a reasonable rate for a residential property wastewater service.

This proposed rate increase is in excess of any major city in the State of Arizona. Yuma and the Foothills are in one of the Nations highest unemployment areas and the Foothills in particular is made up of a large percentage of senior homeowners on limited fixed retirement incomes. This proposed rate increase would be an exceptionally hard impact on these people, including me. These residents are not only elderly but many are also "winter visitors" and therefore are only here a small portion of the year and yet pay wastewater rates year-round. These Seniors are paying for services they do not receive for a large portion of the year which is an added bonus for the Far West company over many similar wastewater treatment facilities in Arizona. The Company should enjoy a larger surplus of funds because of the low use rate for a large portion of the year.

### ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

#### UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

My research into this subject led me to the Water Infrastructure Finance Authority of Arizona Report for 2011 with a effective date of January 1, 2012, which indicated that the Median Residential rate for the State of Arizona for waste water is \$27.20 per month (page 33) and the Yuma County Median rate is \$30.50 (page 38). This data would certainly indicate that the proposed rate of nearly \$63.00 by Far West is far above reasonable or within the realm of other waste water treatment facilities in the area.

It would appear that in order to need this large of an increase all at once, that the Company is being poorly managed or poorly using the funds that they are currently collecting. If the company is in need of additional facilities, these should have been planned for and budgeted into the planning and financing to at least help offset the cost of the project. Are we being asked to pay larger rates to offset poor management and poor budgeting or miss-use of fimds collected or are we being asked to help offset other bad investments by the company owners? Should the Commission consider the need for this system to be handled by a public authority instead of profit motivated private company?

I feel that this large of a proposed rate increase is an undue hardship on me and my family as well as our friends and neighbors. My fixed income retirement income receiving barely a one percent increase this year. Thus, I would be severely impacted by this 188.05o/o rate increase. My standard of living will be further limited as my ability to pay this fee as well as all the additional increase in health care and food costs will reduce my ability to pay all these increases.

I respectfully reguest that this proposed increase be denied.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter

Dale R. Gerry and Gayle L. Gerry

Yuma, AZ 85367 \*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: 12/10/2012** 

Opinion No. 2012 - 107320