

ORIGINAL



0000148523

September 23, 2013

Arizona Corporation Commission
Consumer Services Division
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

RECEIVED
2013 SEP 26 P 2:35
CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED
SEP 26 2013

Re: Docket No. W-03514A-13-0111
Re: Docket No. W-03514A-13-0142

DOCKETED BY 

Dear Commissioner:

I am writing as a concerned customer of the Payson Water Company, formerly Brooke Utilities, Inc. The proposed rate increase seems ridiculously disproportionate to the services provided in our area. I am a resident of Whispering Pines, one of the communities that was originally part of United Utilities. There have been no changes to our system, significant or otherwise, nor does the application suggest any proposed changes. The services provided to Whispering Pines include pump maintenance, water testing, chlorination, meter reading, billing, and periodic repairs of mainline leaks. All of this appears to me to be routine operation and maintenance of a water system.

Since the company has not had a rate increase for thirteen years, I agree that an increase would be appropriate, but it should be more in line with the services provided and the actual cost of those services to the company. The cost of such commodities has probably increased during that time, but certainly not the proposed approximately 125%.

I strongly object to consolidation of the eight communities that compose Payson Water Company. This would be a mistake from the customer's standpoint. These communities each have significantly different geographical and physical properties and, therefore, different water system resources. Nowhere in Mr. Hardcastle's application did I see a cost/benefit statement listed by individual communities. Yet he stated clearly that part of his supposed deficit is such things as litigation, primarily from Mesa Del Caballo (MDC).

MDC has had a water problem throughout its history. MDC is part of the original United Utilities and as such is listed in the statements provided showing PWC's funding deficit. Where is this deficit listed by community? Why would it be appropriate to consolidate the areas without providing proof that individual communities have a cost/benefit deficit?

Personally, I am happy that MDC will finally have their water problems solved. However, I do not want to help pay for their system. It is pointed out in the application

that MDC residents will pay an additional surcharge to pay for the WIFA loan, but consolidating the eight communities and charging an exorbitant rate for all customers will effectively result in all customers paying for the MDC system.

I am certain that consolidating the separate areas would streamline the company's administration and maintenance operations, but it is a nightmare for customers. I respectfully, but strongly urge you to deny the request for consolidation of the various subsystems within PWC, and consider a rate increase that is more consistent with actual increases in PWC's cost for services within each community.

Thank you for your consideration of these requests.

Respectfully,

Evelyn Wilkerson
Evelyn Wilkerson

[REDACTED]
Payson, Arizona 85541

[REDACTED]