

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



ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

Investigator: Tom Davis

Phone 2014 JAN 31 P 3:03

Priority: Respond Within Five Days

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
SECRET CONTROL

Opinion No. 2014 - 114817

Date: 1/31/2014

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

ORIGINAL

Complaint By: First: Gary Last: Sullivan

Account Name: Gary Sullivan & Pamela Castro-Sullivan Home: (000) 000-0000

Street: Work: (000) 000-0000

City: Payson CBR: r

State: AZ Zip: 85541 is: E-Mail

Utility Company: Payson Water Co., Inc.

Division: East Verde Park Estates

Contact Name: Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

Nature of Complaint: OPPOSED W-03514A-13-0111, W-03514A-13-0142
WATER

JAN 31 2014

DOCKETED BY [Signature]

Regarding the pending water rate increase for residents of East Verde Park:

Payson Water Company is proposing a plan that clearly would be punitive to the residents of East Verde Park if it is approved. PWC wants regulation, but there is no accountability when it comes to how much water the company is bringing in to EVP, and how much is being taken out. As such there is no structured plan on the part of PWC, there is only a rigid, punitive plan being proposed for the residents of EVP. Also, there is no structure within the plan for addressing complaints from EVP residents.

Regarding the proposed water hauling surcharge of an estimated \$17/mo. During May through December, again there is no accountability when it comes to how much PWC is hauling in, and how much they are hauling out of EVP. If PWC hauls water out of EVP during any time of the year, then EVP residents should receive a kickback, as they are, in essence, donating water to other communities. Also, EVP has more than one well, so why does water even need to be hauled in? If the wells are inadequate, then the inadequacies should be addressed by PWC, rather than punish the residents of EVP simply because PWC wants to ignore the inadequacies of the EVP well system. In an arid state such as Arizona, to ignore a legitimate water source, such as the EVP well system, is a moral outrage. Clearly, profit is the underlying motive here, and we reject PWCs claim that they will not make any profit on the water hauling surcharge.

Regarding the proposed water curtailment plan, we agree that a curtailment plan is necessary; however, the fees that are being proposed by PWC are exponentially higher than the current fees. Again, the profit motive is clear. We expect a fine for irresponsible usage, but the proposed fees are unreasonable. Also, the formula for mandatory reduction is unfair to part-time residents who already use very little water. Mandatory reductions of 30, 40, or 50 percent would reduce part time residents' water to nothing, thus forcing them to haul their own water while still paying base fees to PWC.

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
UTILITY COMPLAINT FORM

We feel than an increase is reasonable, and to be expected; however, it should be limited, and PWC needs to be transparent and accountable to its customers. We see that the company has been purchased by a multi-millionaire, who resides outside of Arizona, is out of touch with the needs of EVP residents, and is only concerned with profits. The fees proposed by PWC are an example of capitalism at its finest, with profits being made on the backs of its water customers, most of who are living on fixed incomes. Doubling fees within a depressed economy is not just unreasonable, it is a moral outrage. Water is not a luxury commodity. It is a necessity. As such, increases should be limited.

We respectfully request that the commission holds PWC accountable to its customers, demands transparency, and limits the increases, fines, and hauling fees proposed by the company. We also request that PWC be held accountable for maintaining the well system in East Verde Park.

End of Complaint

Utilities' Response:

Investigator's Comments and Disposition:

1/31/14: Entered for the record and docketed

CLOSED

End of Comments

Date Completed: 1/31/2014

Opinion No. 2014 - 114817
