

W-03514A-13-0111
W-03514A-13-0142

ORIGINAL



0000148565

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMM

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Carmen Madrid

Phone:

Fax:

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2013 - 112969

Date: 9/25/2013

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

First:

Last:

Complaint By: Mort

Buckley

Account Name: Mort Buckley

Home:

Street:

Work: (000) 000-0000

City: Avondale

CBR:

State: AZ Zip: 85392

is:

Utility Company: Payson Water Co., Inc.

Division: Geronimo Estates

Contact Name:

Contact Phone:

Nature of Complaint:

From: h
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 9:03 AM
To: Utilities Div - Mailbox
Subject: Public comment on Docket W-03514A-13-0111

September 25, 2013

Arizona Corporation Commission
Consumer Services Section
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix Arizona 85007

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

To Whom It May Concern:

I, as a home owner in Geronimo Estates, would not personally begrudge Payson Water Company a sensible rate hike as needed to deliver our water service in an improved manner. I personally believe that the proposed increase of nearly 120% is unjustified by any stretch of the imagination.

If such a request was granted, the families of Geronimo Estates would suffer more than just the financial weight of an increased water bill. Many of the families depend on the ability to grow much of their own food as a means to supplement their fixed incomes. A rate hike of this magnitude would impair this ability.

Historically, water utility service for Geronimo Estates and Elusive Acres has been extremely poor. Water shortages and restrictions have not only imposed temporary hardships in the ability to produce much needed food; these shortages have also resulted in the permanent loss of valuable fruit trees.

2013 SEP 21 A 9:21
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

It is my understanding that PWC intends to combine all of its accounts into one customer base, with one common price rate in spite of the fact that each community has unique needs and overhead costs. One example would be Mesa Del Caballo which requires an expensive pipe line from Payson in order to satisfy PWC's desires. I find it extremely unfair to place any financial burden of this project on the communities that have already paid their own connection expenses in years past.

I do believe that it would be fair to request documented assurance as to what PWC intends to do for our specific community provided a rate increase of any amount is granted by the Corporation Commission. We, the residents of Geronimo Estates and Elusive Acres respectfully request that you consider our best interests in making your decision.

Sincerely,

Mort Buckley

Avondale, AZ85392

End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

Opinion noted and filed in Docket No. W-03514A-13-0111. closed

End of Comments

Date Completed: 9/25/2013

Opinion No. 2013 - 112969

W-03514A-13-0111

W-03514A-13-0142

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Carmen Madrid

Phone:

Fax:

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

Opinion No. 2013 - 112968

Date: 9/25/2013

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

First:

Last:

Complaint By: Michael

Armstrong

Account Name: Michael Armstrong

Home:

Street:

Work: (000) 000-0000

City: Payson

CBR:

State: AZ Zip: 85541

is:

Utility Company: Payson Water Co., Inc.

Division: Mesa Del Caballo

Contact Name:

Contact Phone:

Nature of Complaint:

From: Util-PublicComment
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 12:07 PM
To: Util-PublicComment
Cc:
Subject: Public Comment

Name: Michael Armstrong

Date: 9-25-2013

Address

Phone

CityStateZip: Payson, AZ 85541

Cell:

Docket: Financing Application

DocketNo: W-03514A13-0111 and W-03514A-13-0142 (consolidated)

Utility: Payson Water Co., Inc

Position: Other

Email: mrarmstrong@q.com

Comments: Payson Water Company Hearing 9-25-2013 PWC rate case Phase I expedited financing approval. Good Morning, I am Michael Armstrong of Payson Deer Creek Village and a PWC customer. Thank you commissioners and Judge Nodes for time to address this issue. We will hear a lot about hurry to approve this filing. I think that we can do more than one thing at a time. Let's look at this funding as well as the later consequences and help Mesa del with the water problem. Late notice. Mr. Williamson mentions ADEQ may not allow use of connection? Without certain approval, this issue should not even be on the docket. Assuming approval for use, I will continue. While this hearing will focus on PWC and Mesa del Caballo, I want to offer comments regarding Phase I that, by this application, pose a threat to spill over into ALL other PWC service areas. Cost of Mesa del improvements are NOT limited to Mesa del Caballo water service area. Throughout this application, surcharges and fees are predicted to roll over to base rate at the next rate case. Legal Notice is confusing. Notice asks for \$1,238,000 Filing application request \$1,150,000 from WIFA page 15 PWC Executive

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Board authorizes \$1,430,000 Staff recommends \$274,345 see page 25 Staff recommendations would approve funding of initial start (I don't know how much is needed) for up to \$275K There is no design proposal in filing for construction funding. I hope Mr Liu has been given more information than is furnished by this application. ie; route, depth, materials, tie in fee(s), right(s) of way, etc. PWC Debt recovery surcharge \$30.75 per month per customer and rolls over to base rate at next rate case, per page 79 line 4 thru 6 Debt Recovery Surcharge Staff recommendation 2) \$7.44 per month x 363 customers for 20 years. Other items that will spill over is the O&M (SRP and TOP) CC Cragin pipeline surcharge and Commodity Cost Recovery Surcharge Mechanism Commission Staff recommendations do not refer to these surcharges. In conclusion, I want to thank the commission and staff. I know that you will work to find a solution to the problem without impacting other customers. I look forward to Phase II of this case in January. Thank you. *Footnotes for reference to application RTH Hardcastle testimony regarding water cost recovery surcharge page 56 line 14-15 TJB page 79 line 10-20 O&M surcharge for CC Cragin pipeline (Mesa del) of \$18.34 and will roll into base rate at next rate case. Exhibit TJB-RB-DT5 and DT6 Surcharges in the Filing application Mr. Shapiro page 4 annual (12) and O&M (13) surcharge and a Commodity Cost Recovery Surcharge Mechanism Jason Williamson direct testimony page 13 line 20-21 quote "Mr Hardcastle, who previously filed testimony, which testimony I will be adopting" unquote. This indicates that Mr. Williamson supports the direct testimony of Mr. Hardcastle and his conclusions in the original filing. JW rebuttal testimony ADEQ prohibition page 9 line 2-3 O&M Surcharge to be rolled over to base rate at next rate case per TJB page 80 line 14-15 Debt Recovery Surcharge TJB page 78 line 13-14 Rate case fee of \$195,000 page 70 line 11 Mr. Hardcastle testimony contradicts end of hauling surcharges. Page 56 line 17 Water to Mesa del by SRP, TOP or existing wells or both? Three tier rate and TOP fixed rate included in this phase? Need to know confusion and billing disputes Water hauling recovery fee to end when ?? Staff recommends at once. Filing says to continue. Water hauling may need to continue per Mr, Hardcastle Dt at 9:16-10:1 and Mr. Bourassa page 76 line 21 thru 23
End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

.

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

Opinion noted and filed in Docket No. :W-03541A13-0111 and W-03514A-13-0142. closed
End of Comments

Date Completed: 9/25/2013

Opinion No. 2013 - 112968
