

ORIGINAL



0000150383

Referring to Document 0000149150, Suzanne Nee, "SN", ~~has a motion to~~  
Intervene on October 28, 2013.

RECEIVED

SN is a long-standing residential customer served by the Public Service Utility  
Company, Payson Water Company, "PWC", residing part-time within the boundaries  
of the Mead Ranch, "MR", that is part of the former Brooke Utilities and has a vested  
interest in the ramifications of these proceeding.

2013 DEC 6 P 3:26  
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
SECRET CONTROL

First I would like to submit a complaint about PWC's mailing of their **Public Notice of Applications**. Exhibit A is my August billing from PWC. The return address is clearly marked Payson Water Company, Inc., c/o JW Water Holding, LLC, Denver, CO 80230. Exhibit B is my September PWC billing. The return address is C/O 5135 E. Ingram St., Mesa, AZ 85205. (I am not aware of this being an address of PWC, why did they use this address?) No company is named in the return address. Marked as such, I placed this on my "junk mail" pile to be gone through at a later time. When I heard from other Mead Ranch residents via email of the proposed rate increases, I went through this junk pile. Only after the public meeting had taken place, discovered my PWC September bill and the **Public Notice of Applications by Payson Water Company, Inc., Docket Nos. W-03514A-13-0111 and W-03514A-13-0142 (consolidated)**. Mailing a bill and public notice in an unmarked envelope is very unprofessional from a public utility at the least and possibly an attempt to not fully comply with Procedural Order of Public Notice issued September 10, 2013. If it had the company name "Payson Water Company", or the Denver address, I would have recognized it as such.

SN and other residents of Mead Ranch (Robert Mollere, Ronald and Darlene George, Sandra Holko, George M. Turner, Jerald Reid, Darlene Cline, Jack and Karen Ramson, Scherry L. Duncan have submitted public comments in opposition to the proposed rate increases in documents section of Docket Nos.W-03514A-13-0111 and W-03514A-13-0142) are firmly opposed to consolidation of the 8 communities for ratemaking purposes. According to Document 0000148385, pages 4 & 5, Finding of Facts, Mead Ranch customers compose only 4.6% of the 2012 test year total customers and consumed only 2.14% of the water provided by Payson Water Company. Mead Ranch has its own well and infrastructure that are not interconnected with any other service area and is self-sufficient. In a similar consolidated rate structure case, Docket # W-01303A-09-0343, "Deconsolidation of the Anthem/Aqua Fria Wastewater District", the Commission order in Decision 73227, "that the system-wide rate filing shall include full cost of service studies and other information supporting consolidation sufficient for all parties to make their own reasoned proposals either for or against consolidation, or deconsolidation, consistent with sound ratemaking principles." Decision 73227, Section B- Cost of Service/Public Policy, Page 16, states: "RUCO argues that separate rates for separate systems respect the principle of traditional cost of service ratemaking and ensure that those who use utility services pay for them, and that only when policies in support of rate consolidation outweigh the principle of cost of service ratemaking should rates be consolidated." In this rate case, the sole reason for the utility to seek

Arizona Corporation Commission  
DOCKETED

DEC 06 2013

1

DOCKETED BY

consolidation is to spread the expense of providing the water needs of the largest service area, Mesa del Caballo, to the seven smaller and in some cases self-sufficient communities. This not only goes against "Traditional Cost of Service Ratemaking Policy" but also goes against Arizona Law A.R.S 40-361, in relevant part: "Charges demanded or received by a public service corporation for any commodity or service shall be just and reasonable. Every unjust charge demanded or received is prohibited and unlawful".

Accordingly, SN proposes that each community be treated separately for ratemaking, based on each community's separate costs of service. Many of the Mead Ranch residents are retired or only in the community part time. Many of us carry our own drinking water in to not put a strain on the community well. Personally, I think customers who only use the minimum should see some reward for conservation, not the over a 200% proposed increase in fee. This would seem to be counter-productive to Best Management Practices (BMP) of conservation that PWC has agreed with the ACC to support.

We feel that the proposed monthly minimum charge from \$16 to \$39.24/\$470.88 per year or a 245.25% increase, and the average monthly usage of 2,856 gallons increase of \$25.58 per month/ \$306.96 per year or 118.90% are not reasonable and should be prohibited.

# EXHIBIT A

Payson Water Company, Inc.  
c/o JW Water Holdings, LLC  
7581 E Academy Blvd. Suite 229  
Denver, CO 80230

CHANGE SERVICE REQUESTED

SUZANNE NEE  
2051 E ASPEN DR  
TEMPE, AZ 85282-2908

PRESORTED  
FIRST-CLASS  
MAIL  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
TMBI

GMV-EP1 85282



# EXHIBIT B

C/O 5135 E. Ingram St.  
Mesa, AZ 85205

SUZANNE NEE  
2057 E ASPEN DR  
TEMPE, AZ 85282-2908

HIGRTESS2 85282

