

OPEN MEETING ITEM



0000152036

COMMISSIONERS
BOB STUMP - Chairman
GARY PIERCE
BRENDA BURNS
BOB BURNS
SUSAN BITTER SMITH

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

MAR 26 2014

DOCKETED BY

Arizona Corporation Commission

2014 MAR 26 P 3:21

RECEIVED

ORIGINAL

DATE: MARCH 26, 2014

DOCKET NOS.: W-04254A-12-0204; W-04254A-12-0205; W-04254A-12-0206;
W-04254A-12-0207; W-04254A-11-0323; W-04254A-08-361
AND W-04254A-08-0362

TO ALL PARTIES:

Enclosed please find the recommendation of Administrative Law Judge Sarah N. Harpring. The recommendation has been filed in the form of an Opinion and Order on:

MONTEZUMA RIMROCK WATER COMPANY, LLC
(RATES/FINANCE/COMPLAINT)

Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-110(B), you may file exceptions to the recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge by filing an original and thirteen (13) copies of the exceptions with the Commission's Docket Control at the address listed below by **4:00** p.m. on or before:

APRIL 4, 2014

The enclosed is NOT an order of the Commission, but a recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge to the Commissioners. Consideration of this matter has tentatively been scheduled for the Commission's Open Meeting to be held on:

APRIL 8, 2014 AND APRIL 9, 2014

For more information, you may contact Docket Control at (602) 542-3477 or the Hearing Division at (602) 542-4250. For information about the Open Meeting, contact the Executive Director's Office at (602) 542-3931.

JODI JERICHI
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

1200 WEST WASHINGTON STREET; PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007-2927 / 400 WEST CONGRESS STREET; TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701-1347
www.azcc.gov

This document is available in alternative formats by contacting Shaylin Bernal, ADA Coordinator, voice phone number 602-542-3931, E-mail SABernal@azcc.gov.

1 **BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

2 COMMISSIONERS

3 BOB STUMP - Chairman
4 GARY PIERCE
5 BRENDA BURNS
6 BOB BURNS
7 SUSAN BITTER SMITH

8 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
9 MONTEZUMA RIMROCK WATER COMPANY,
10 LLC FOR APPROVAL OF FINANCING TO
11 INSTALL A WATER LINE FROM THE WELL ON
12 TIEMAN TO WELL NO. 1 ON TOWERS.

DOCKET NO. W-04254A-12-0204

13 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
14 MONTEZUMA RIMROCK WATER COMPANY,
15 LLC FOR APPROVAL OF FINANCING TO
16 PURCHASE THE WELL NO. 4 SITE AND THE
17 COMPANY VEHICLE.

DOCKET NO. W-04254A-12-0205

18 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
19 MONTEZUMA RIMROCK WATER COMPANY,
20 LLC FOR APPROVAL OF FINANCING FOR AN
21 8,000-GALLON HYDRO-PNEUMATIC TANK.

DOCKET NO. W-04254A-12-0206

22 IN THE MATTER OF THE RATE APPLICATION
23 OF MONTEZUMA RIMROCK WATER
24 COMPANY, LLC.

DOCKET NO. W-04254A-12-0207

25 JOHN E. DOUGHERTY,
26
27 COMPLAINANT,

DOCKET NO. W-04254A-11-0323

28 V.
29 MONTEZUMA RIMROCK WATER
30 COMPANY, LLC,
31
32 RESPONDENT.

33 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
34 MONTEZUMA RIMROCK WATER
35 COMPANY, LLC FOR APPROVAL OF A
36 RATE INCREASE.

DOCKET NO. W-04254A-08-0361

37 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
38 MONTEZUMA RIMROCK WATER
39 COMPANY, LLC FOR APPROVAL OF A
40 FINANCING APPLICATION.

DOCKET NO. W-04254A-08-0362

DECISION NO. _____

OPINION AND ORDER

1 DATES OF HEARING: February 7 and May 3, 2013 (Public Comment); June
2 14, 2013 (Prehearing Conference); June 20, 21, 24, 25,
3 and 26, 2013

3 PLACE OF HEARING: Phoenix, Arizona

4 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Sarah N. Harpring

5 APPEARANCES: Mr. Todd C. Wiley, FENNEMORE CRAIG, P.C., Mr.
6 Douglas C. Fitzpatrick, LAW OFFICE OF DOUGLAS
7 C. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. Patricia Olsen, owner, on
8 behalf of Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC;¹
9 Mr. John E. Dougherty, III, Pro Se;
10 Ms. Michelle Wood, on behalf of the RESIDENTIAL
11 UTILITY CONSUMER OFFICE;²
12 Mr. John E. Hestand, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY
13 GENERAL, on behalf of the Arizona Department of
14 Environmental Quality;³ and
15 Mr. Charles O. Hains and Mr. Wesley C. Van Cleve,
16 Staff Attorneys, Legal Division, on behalf of the
17 Utilities Division of the Arizona Corporation
18 Commission.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 ¹ Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC was initially represented by Ms. Patricia Olsen, its owner; was
27 subsequently represented by Mr. Fitzpatrick as counsel; and was ultimately represented by Mr. Wiley as counsel. Mr.
28 Wiley replaced Mr. Fitzpatrick in March 2012, and Mr. Fitzpatrick was then permitted to withdraw as counsel.

² RUCO participated very briefly as an intervenor before withdrawing.

³ Mr. Hestand appeared as counsel for ADEQ; an ADEQ employee was subpoenaed to serve as a witness for Mr. Dougherty.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Table of Contents

DISCUSSION4

I. Background4

 A. The Dockets.....4

 B. The Parties.....6

 C. System Generally7

 D. Arsenic Treatment System8

 E. Well No. 413

II. Procedural History18

III. The 40-252 Requests.....65

IV. The Financing Requests.....66

 A. Rask Docket66

 B. Olsen Docket68

 C. Arias Docket.....71

 D. WIFA Loan.....75

 E. Retroactive Financing Approval Requests79

 1. Commission Authority79

 2. The Leases84

 3. Filing of Invalid Lease Documents90

 4. Resolution.....99

V. The Rate Docket105

VI. The Complaint Docket.....119

 A. Allegation I.....119

 B. Allegation II121

 C. Allegation IV124

 D. Allegation VII.....125

 E. Allegation X126

 F. Allegation XI.....127

 G. Allegation XII.....128

 H. Allegation XV129

 I. Allegation XVII.....131

 J. Remedies134

 K. Conclusion.....136

FINDINGS OF FACT.....137

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW152

ORDER.....154

1 **BY THE COMMISSION:**

2 This case concerns seven dockets involving Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC
 3 (“Montezuma”), a Class D water utility providing service in Yavapai County, and John Dougherty,
 4 III (“Mr. Dougherty”), an owner of residential property located within Montezuma’s service area and
 5 within close proximity of the site for Montezuma’s Well No. 4. This case began with Montezuma’s
 6 request for the Commission to modify, under A.R.S. § 40-252, the financing authority granted in
 7 Decision No. 71317 (October 30, 2009),⁴ in which Montezuma’s current rates and charges were also
 8 established. The case has since expanded to include a formal complaint against Montezuma filed by
 9 Mr. Dougherty, a permanent rate application filed by Montezuma as required by Decision No. 71317,
 10 three separately filed financing applications filed by Montezuma, and three additional financing
 11 applications filed by Montezuma as a supplement to its rate application nearly a year after its rate
 12 application had been filed. Mr. Dougherty has been granted intervention in each of the non-
 13 complaint matters. All of the dockets have been consolidated for resolution in this Decision.

14 **DISCUSSION**15 **I. Background**16 **A. The Dockets**

17 Docket No. W-04254A-08-0361 and W-04254A-08-0362 (jointly the “40-252 Docket”) is the
 18 consolidated docket in which Decision No. 71317 was issued, approving Montezuma’s current rates
 19 and charges and granting Montezuma authority to obtain a loan of up to \$165,000 from the Water
 20 Infrastructure Finance Authority of Arizona (“WIFA”) for purposes of completing an arsenic
 21 treatment project. (See Decision No. 71317.) Decision No. 71317 was Montezuma’s first rate case.
 22 The Commission has reopened the 40-252 Docket at Montezuma’s request, pursuant to A.R.S. § 40-
 23 252, for the purpose of determining whether to modify Decision No. 71317 concerning financing
 24 approval and related provisions.

25 Docket No. W-04254A-11-0323 (“Complaint Docket”) is the docket in which Mr. Dougherty
 26 has filed a formal complaint against Montezuma under A.R.S. § 40-246.

27
 28 ⁴ Official notice is taken of this Decision.

1 Docket No. W-04254A-12-0204 ("Rask Docket") is the docket in which Montezuma has
2 requested approval of financing in the form of a loan agreement in which Montezuma promised to
3 pay Rask Construction the sum of \$68,592, with interest from May 1, 2012, at a rate of 6 percent per
4 year, for installation of a water line from Well No. 4 to Well No. 1.

5 Docket No. W-04254A-12-0205 ("Olsen Docket") is the docket in which Montezuma has
6 requested approval of financing in the form of a loan agreement in which Montezuma promised to
7 pay its owner, Patricia D. Olsen, the sum of \$21,377, with interest from August 30, 2011, at a rate of
8 6 percent per year, for the purchase of the Well No. 4 site and a company vehicle.

9 Docket No. W-04254A-12-0206 ("Arias Docket") is the docket in which Montezuma has
10 requested approval of financing in the form of a loan agreement in which Montezuma promised to
11 pay Sergei Arias, Ms. Olsen's son, the sum of \$15,000, with interest from July 1, 2011, at a rate of 6
12 percent per year, for the purchase of an 8,000-gallon hydro-pneumatic tank to provide additional
13 water storage to the system.

14 Docket No. W-04254A-12-0207 ("Rate Docket") is the docket in which Montezuma has filed
15 a rate application using a 2011 test year ("TY"), to comply with a filing deadline imposed by
16 Decision No. 71317.

17 On July 24, 2012, a Procedural Order was issued consolidating the Rask Docket, the Olsen
18 Docket, the Arias Docket, and the Rate Docket ("Consolidated R&F Docket").

19 On February 26, 2013, a Procedural Order was issued consolidating for all purposes going
20 forward the Consolidated R&F Docket, the Complaint Docket, and the 40-252 Docket (collectively
21 referred to as "this matter").

22 On April 12, 2013, nearly a year after its rate application was filed, Montezuma filed, for
23 consideration with its rate application, three separate Financing Applications: (1) an application
24 requesting approval of a 20-year WIFA Loan, with a principal amount of \$108,000, to be used to
25 purchase and install four 20,000-gallon storage tanks; (2) an application requesting retroactive
26 approval of a 3-year lease with Nile River Leasing, L.L.C. ("Nile River"), with a principal amount of
27 \$8,000, through which Montezuma obtained the building housing its arsenic treatment system; and
28 (3) an application requesting retroactive approval of a 5-year lease with Financial Pacific Leasing,

1 LLC ("Financial Pacific"), with a principal amount of \$38,000, through which Montezuma obtained
2 its arsenic treatment system. (See Ex. A-22.)

3 B. The Parties

4 Montezuma is an Arizona limited liability company, wholly owned by Ms. Olsen, and is a
5 Class D water utility providing service to approximately 205 metered connections in a service area
6 approximately 3/8 of a square mile in size located in the vicinity of Rimrock, Arizona, in Yavapai
7 County. (Ex. S-1.) Most of Montezuma's customers are residential. (Ex. A-2 at 3.)

8 Until 2005, Montezuma's water system was owned by the non-profit Montezuma Estates
9 Property Owners Association ("MEPOA"), which was managed by Ms. Olsen's father as MEPOA
10 President. (Decision No. 67583 (February 15, 2005).⁵) MEPOA's water system, installed by Ned
11 Warren as developer, had major service issues, including regular service outages and excessive water
12 loss.⁶ (Tr. at 696-97.) In Decision No. 67583, the Commission approved the sale of MEPOA's
13 utility assets and the transfer of its Certificate of Convenience and Necessity ("CC&N") to
14 Montezuma, although the Commission's Utilities Division ("Staff") had recommended denial and
15 expressed the belief that MEPOA's utility assets should instead be acquired by Arizona Water
16 Company ("AWC"), which operates a nearby system. (See Decision No. 67583 at 7.) Although
17 AWC may have expressed interest in purchasing MEPOA's water system assets before the system
18 was purchased by Montezuma, AWC did not take any action to purchase the system or to prevent its
19 sale to Montezuma. (See *id.* at 5, 6.) In its Decision, because Montezuma had not previously been
20 involved in the operation of a public utility, and for the purpose of ensuring that Montezuma would
21 meet its obligations under the CC&N, the Commission required Montezuma to procure a
22 performance or surety bond in the amount of \$30,000, to maintain the bond, and to file copies of the
23 bond annually with the Commission on the effective date of the Decision and until further order of
24 the Commission. (See *id.* at 8-10.) At the time Montezuma acquired the system from MEPOA, Ms.
25 Olsen (then known as Patricia Arias) had been serving as its certified operator for at least 2.5 years.
26 (*Id.* at 3.) Ms. Olsen's resume shows that she has served as the water system's Manager/Owner-

27 ⁵ Official notice is taken of this Decision.

28 ⁶ Staff's engineering witness asserted that "Ned Warren systems" were not properly designed, installed, or maintained.
(Tr. at 747.)

1 President/Operator since July 2001.⁷ (Ex. A-1.) Ms. Olsen holds several Arizona Department of
 2 Environmental Quality (“ADEQ”) certifications⁸ and was employed by ADEQ at the time she
 3 acquired the CC&N and system for Montezuma. (See Ex. A-1.)

4 John E. Dougherty, III, owns a home within Montezuma’s service area, but is not a
 5 Montezuma customer. (See Tr. at 763.) Mr. Dougherty’s property is served by a private well, which
 6 previously has had some problems providing an adequate supply of water for the property.⁹ (See Tr.
 7 at 763; Ex. A-26.) Mr. Dougherty has a long history in journalism and is currently Owner/Editor of
 8 InvestigativeMedia, LLC, in which capacity he works as an investigative journalist for various clients
 9 such as *The New York Times*, *The Arizona Republic*, and *Phoenix New Times*. (See Tr. at 758; Ex. C-
 10 101.)

11 There is no history of any relationship or interactions between Mr. Dougherty and either
 12 Montezuma or Ms. Olsen (or members of her family) prior to October 2009 when Mr. Dougherty
 13 observed that Well No. 4 had been installed on a residential property located across from his home in
 14 Rimrock. (See, e.g., Tr. at 638, 856.)

15 C. System Generally

16 Montezuma’s active system consists of Well No. 1, with a pump yield of 55 gallons per
 17 minute (“GPM”); a centralized 150 GPM arsenic treatment system (discussed extensively below);
 18 three storage tanks with a combined capacity of 25,200 gallons; two booster systems; and a
 19 distribution system that was serving 210 service connections at the end of 2011. (Ex. S-1 at att. A at
 20 5, 6.) According to Staff, Montezuma does not have sufficient storage capacity to serve its present
 21 customer base and would need total storage capacity of 87,500 gallons to adequately serve 210
 22 service connections, while accommodating reasonable system growth and fire protection. (Ex. S-1 at
 23 att. A at 12.) Montezuma’s two 10,000-gallon storage tanks are leaking at their bases and have been
 24

25 ⁷ Although Ms. Olsen had been actively involved in running the water system for MEPOA for several years when she
 26 acquired the system as Montezuma, Montezuma has reported to Staff that the documentation for plant additions made
 from 2001 through 2005 are unavailable because MEPOA did not transfer the records to Montezuma at the time of
 acquisition. (See Decision No. 71317 at 7.)

27 ⁸ Ms. Olsen reported that she holds ADEQ certification for Grade 3 Water Treatment Plant Operations, Grade 3
 Wastewater Treatment Plant Operations, Grade 2 Water Distribution, and Grade 2 Wastewater Collections. (Ex. A-1.)

28 ⁹ Mr. Dougherty reported that the well’s production problem was caused by irrigation system valves that did not close
 after the system timer went off and that the problem has been resolved by discontinuing use of that system. (Tr. at 763.)

1 repaired on multiple occasions. (Ex. S-1 at att. A at 8.) Ms. Olsen reported that one of the tanks
2 cannot be fully repaired because of its fragility. (See Tr. at 73-74.)

3 Montezuma is not located in an Arizona Department of Water Resources ("ADWR") Active
4 Management Area. (Ex. S-1 at att. A at 15.) In November 2012, ADWR reported that Montezuma
5 was in compliance with ADWR's requirements governing water providers and/or community water
6 systems. (*Id.*) Montezuma does not have any Best Management Practice tariffs in place. (*Id.*)

7 Montezuma has an approved curtailment tariff that became effective in April 2002 and an
8 approved backflow prevention tariff that became effective in November 1996. (Ex. S-1 at att. A at
9 19.) Montezuma also has an approved Off-Site Facilities and Original Main Replacement Hook-Up
10 Fee Tariff that became effective in December 1996 and was revised in April 2002. (*Id.*)

11 During the 2011 TY, Montezuma's water system had water loss of 5.9 percent, which is
12 within the Commission's standard for water loss to be less than 10 percent. (Ex. S-1 at att. A at 12.)

13 Staff's Consumer Services Section reported that between January 1, 2010, and June 25, 2013,
14 four service-related complaints were received concerning Montezuma, and 10 opinions were received
15 opposing the proposed rate increase. (Ex. S-1 at 6.) Staff reported that all of the service-related
16 complaints had been resolved and closed. (*Id.*) One of the complaints involved an assertion by a
17 customer that his water service had been disconnected without Montezuma's having sent a disconnect
18 notice.¹⁰ (Ex. S-3.) Staff closed the complaint after Montezuma reported that the customer had a
19 history of late payments and nonsufficient payments and that Montezuma had sent the customer an
20 account delinquency and disconnect notice. (*Id.*)

21 D. Arsenic Treatment System

22 Montezuma's water supply has excessive arsenic levels,¹¹ with its active Well No. 1
23 producing untreated water with an arsenic level of 35 ppb and its inactive Well No. 2 producing
24 untreated water with an arsenic level of 43 ppb.¹² (Ex. S-1 at att. A at 5.) Even the water produced
25 by Montezuma's unused Well No. 4, with an arsenic concentration of 16 ppb, exceeds the current

26 ¹⁰ The customer is reportedly a friend of Mr. Dougherty's. (See Tr. at 285.)

27 ¹¹ The maximum contaminant level ("MCL") for arsenic was reduced from 50 parts per billion ("ppb") to 10 ppb in
January 2006. (See Decision No. 67583 at 7.)

28 ¹² Well No. 2 was taken out of service due both to its excessive arsenic level and its low pump yield. (Ex. S-1 at att. A
at 11.)

1 arsenic MCL. (Decision No. 71317 at 5.) When Montezuma acquired the system from MEPOA in
2 2005, Montezuma intended to remediate the arsenic levels using reverse-osmosis point-of-use
3 treatment, at a projected cost of approximately \$50,000. (Decision No. 67583 at 7.) Montezuma had
4 approximately 120 customers at the time. (*Id.* at 3.)

5 By July 2008, when Montezuma filed the rate application and financing application that
6 resulted in Decision No. 71317, Montezuma had not yet remediated its arsenic levels and was
7 requesting approval to obtain a rate increase and a \$150,000 WIFA loan¹³ to enable it to obtain and
8 integrate an arsenic treatment plant into its system. (*See* Decision No. 71317 at 2.) While that
9 rate/financing case was pending, Montezuma completed construction of a new Well No. 4, which was
10 not yet approved for operation. (Decision No. 71317 at 5-6.) Montezuma planned to interconnect
11 Well No. 4 to Well No. 1 with 2,500 feet of transmission main and to construct a 160 GPM arsenic
12 treatment system to treat the combined water from Well No. 1 and Well No. 4. (*Id.*)

13 In December 2008, ADEQ issued a Notice of Violation (“NOV”) to Montezuma for
14 distributing water with arsenic content exceeding the MCL and required Montezuma to submit
15 documentation to ADEQ describing the measures to be taken to remediate the arsenic. (Decision No.
16 71317 at 5; Ex. C-96.) Montezuma’s NOV was one of 68 NOVs issued for arsenic noncompliance at
17 that time. (Tr. at 462.) Montezuma responded to ADEQ by reporting that it was working with WIFA
18 and the Commission to obtain approval for financing to construct arsenic treatment facilities.
19 (Decision No. 71317 at 5.)

20 On October 21, 2009, ADEQ issued Montezuma a voluntary Consent Order, which Ms. Olsen
21 was unwilling to sign because she did not want Montezuma to be required to provide an alternate
22 water source. (Tr. at 467, 473; Ex. C-99.)

23 On October 30, 2009, the Commission issued Decision No. 71317, authorizing Montezuma’s
24 current rates and charges; authorizing Montezuma to obtain a \$165,000 WIFA loan for the purpose of
25 building an arsenic treatment facility and a water line between Montezuma’s Well No. 1 and the new
26 Well No. 4; and authorizing Montezuma to submit an application to implement an arsenic
27

28 ¹³ The request was subsequently increased to \$165,000. (Decision No. 71317 at 3.)

1 remediation surcharge mechanism (“ARSM”) to be used to pay for the WIFA loan. The Decision
2 required Montezuma to file an ADEQ Certificate of Approval of Construction (“AOC”) for Well No.
3 4 by December 31, 2009; to file an AOC for the arsenic treatment project by April 30, 2010; to file a
4 permanent rate application using a 2011 test year by May 31, 2012; and to file the executed WIFA
5 loan documents and the ARSM application within 60 days after executing the WIFA loan documents.

6 On November 12, 2009, ADEQ issued Montezuma a letter requesting that the Consent Order
7 be signed within 10 days and stating that it would be escalated to a unilateral Compliance Order if not
8 signed. (Tr. at 468, 473-74; Ex. C-99.)

9 On November 30, 2009, Ms. Olsen e-mailed a letter to Henry Darwin, ADEQ Director,
10 stating that Montezuma was regulated by the Commission and unable to incur long-term debt without
11 Commission approval; stating that Montezuma needed to wait until December 16, 2009, for WIFA
12 approval; and asserting that ADEQ was not providing Montezuma a “level playing field” regarding
13 arsenic MCL compliance because Montezuma could “find no evidence of aggressive action” toward
14 other referenced water utilities, including two public service corporations and one municipality. (Ex.
15 C-45.) Additionally, Ms. Olsen accused ADEQ employee Vivian Burns of making “off the cuff,
16 unprofessional and derogatory comments” to Ms. Olsen by stating “You must be sleeping with the
17 guys over at the Arizona Corporation Commission for them to be so helpful to you.” (*Id.*)
18 Montezuma requested that its deadline to install and operate its arsenic treatment system be extended
19 to May 30, 2009;¹⁴ that the requirement for it to provide alternate drinking water to its customers be
20 removed; and that it receive “an apology from ADEQ for the insulting comment made by ADEQ
21 staff.” (*Id.*) At hearing, Ms. Burns denied that she had made the alleged statement to Ms. Olsen and
22 said that the allegation had caught her by surprise because she thought that she and Ms. Olsen had
23 always had a good relationship and “just didn’t understand where it was coming from.”¹⁵ (Tr. at 469-
24 70.) Ms. Burns also testified that although the allegation did not cause her problems at work because
25 she has a good reputation in her office for being professional and fair, she was questioned about it by
26

27 ¹⁴ Although the letter requested an extension until May 30, 2009, this appears to have been a typographical error.

28 ¹⁵ Ms. Olsen and Ms. Burns had had a good relationship prior to that time, with Ms. Olsen effusively praising Ms. Burns in a March 26, 2009, email. (*See* Ex. C-97; Tr. at 463-66.)

1 both her manager and the Deputy Director of the Water Division. (Tr. at 469-71.) As far as Ms.
2 Burns is aware, ADEQ never made any apology to Ms. Olsen or Montezuma. (*Id.*)

3 Because Montezuma had not signed the Consent Order, ADEQ issued a Compliance Order on
4 February 25, 2010, which Montezuma appealed on March 24, 2010, resulting in the scheduling of an
5 administrative hearing. (Ex. A-11.) ADEQ and Montezuma reached settlement, however, and a
6 Consent Order was executed as a replacement for the previous Compliance Order, with Montezuma
7 signing on May 27, 2010, and ADEQ signing on June 7, 2010. (Tr. at 474; Ex. A-11.) The Consent
8 Order stated:

9 Notwithstanding [sic] the disposition of the funding request to WIFA,
10 within one year from the effective date of this Order, MRWC shall
11 complete construction of the approved arsenic treatment system and
12 submit an administratively complete application for an Approval of
13 Construction (AOC) for the treatment system described in Section III(B)
14 of this Order.¹⁶

15 The Consent Order further required Montezuma to provide its customers an alternate source
16 of water, which was accomplished by having its customers make appointments to come to
17 Montezuma's office to obtain bottled water. (Ex. A-11 at 4-5; Tr. at 105-08.)

18 ADEQ issued an Approval to Construct ("ATC") for the arsenic treatment system on June 11,
19 2010. (*See* Ex. S-1 at att. A at 8; Ex. A-12; Ex. A-13.) The Consent Order was subsequently
20 amended, on June 2, 2011, to extend until April 7, 2012, Montezuma's deadline to complete
21 construction of the arsenic treatment system and submit an administratively complete application for
22 an AOC for the treatment system. (Ex. A-12.)

23 On April 11, 2012, ADEQ issued Montezuma another NOV, providing Montezuma an
24 opportunity to demonstrate to ADEQ that there was no violation, to submit the documentation needed
25 to complete an application for an AOC, or to meet with ADEQ to discuss the NOV. (Ex. C-46.) A
26 meeting was scheduled to be held at ADEQ on April 26, 2012, with Montezuma, ADEQ
27 representatives, and several members of Staff to attend. (Ex. C-51.) Additionally, a pre-meeting was
28 scheduled to be held at ADEQ on April 17, 2012, for ADEQ representatives and several members of

¹⁶ Ex. A-11 at 4. Ms. Burns testified that this language meant that Montezuma was required to install the treatment plant in compliance with the deadline regardless of whether the Commission approved funding for the plant. (Tr. at 493.)

1 Staff. (*Id.*) The pre-meeting was attended by Ms. Burns, Marcia R. Colquitt, and Mindi Cross from
 2 ADEQ and by Marlin Scott, Jeffrey Michlik, and Nancy Scott from Staff. (*Id.*; Tr. at 479.) The
 3 purpose of the pre-meeting was to discuss Montezuma's compliance status and progress toward
 4 installing the arsenic treatment plant. (Tr. at 479-80.) Ms. Burns reported that no notes were taken at
 5 the pre-meeting, however, and that she was unable to recall specifics.¹⁷ (Tr. at 479-80.) The April
 6 26, 2012, meeting also took place at ADEQ, with Ms. Olsen¹⁸ and the same ADEQ and Commission
 7 attendees. (Ex. C-41; Ex. C-41A.) At the meeting, it was acknowledged that Montezuma was not in
 8 compliance with the Consent Order, that ADEQ could impose penalties, that Montezuma hoped to
 9 use Well No. 4 for backwashing pending its lawsuit with Yavapai County and was already using Well
 10 No. 4 to irrigate vegetation, that ADEQ had received complaints regarding Montezuma's customer
 11 service availability and the availability of alternate water supplies for customers, and that Montezuma
 12 was moving forward with installation of the arsenic treatment plant and expected it to be completed
 13 by June 7, 2012. (*See* Ex. C-41; Ex. C-41A.) Montezuma showed the attendees a copy of a letter
 14 from the installer saying that installation could be completed by June 7, 2012, but would not provide
 15 a copy of the letter. (Ex. C-41; Ex. C-41A.) Ms. Burns seemed to believe that all attendees of the
 16 April 26, 2012, meeting understood Montezuma was moving forward with installation of an arsenic
 17 treatment facility and that the installation would be completed by June 7, 2012. (Tr. at 484-85; 494-
 18 95.) Ms. Olsen stated at the meeting that Montezuma would be able to move forward with the
 19 arsenic treatment plant installation even without using Well No. 4, which was the first time Ms.
 20 Burns had heard that. (Tr. at 511-12.)

21 Montezuma received an AOC¹⁹ for the arsenic treatment system on November 21, 2012,
 22 following a partial final construction inspection conducted on July 17, 2012; water system pressure
 23 and leakage tests conducted on May 16, 2012; and microbiological sample testing on June 7 and
 24

25 ¹⁷ Ms. Burns did not believe that financing had been discussed, as ADEQ "doesn't get involved in financing." (Tr. at
 481.)

26 ¹⁸ At the meeting, Ms. Olsen asserted that she had not received a copy of the NOV via certified mail. (Tr. at 484-85;
 Ex. C-41.)

27 ¹⁹ The AOC is described as a "Partial AOC Permit" for a 1-150 GPM arsenic treatment system and approximately
 28 2,550 linear feet of waterlines and related fittings, authorizing Montezuma to begin operating the arsenic treatment
 system. (Ex. A-13.) The AOC was designated as "Partial" because it does not extend to a 30,000 gallon water storage
 tank that was included in the underlying ATC. (*Id.*)

1 October 17, 2012. (Ex. A-13; Tr. at 103-04.) The arsenic treatment system has been in operation as
2 part of Montezuma's system since November 29, 2012, and has been effective in remediating the
3 arsenic concentration of the water supply. (Ex. A-8; Tr. at 77-79, 104.) On December 19, 2013,
4 ADEQ issued a Drinking Water Compliance Status Report stating that Montezuma was in full
5 compliance with safe drinking water requirements after having submitted a full year of test results
6 showing that its system water is in compliance with the arsenic MCL.²⁰

7 Staff has determined that only 37 percent of the cost of the 150 GPM arsenic treatment system
8 should be recovered through rates because the remaining 63 percent of the arsenic treatment system
9 represents excess capacity. (Ex. S-1 at 13, 28, Sched. GWB-2, att. A at 16; Ex. S-2 at Sched. GWB-
10 2.) Staff recommended at hearing that Montezuma be required to file with the Commission's Docket
11 Control, as a compliance item in this docket, copies of its 2013 quarterly arsenic compliance
12 laboratory results for Staff review and that it be required by January 31, 2014, to file an updated
13 ADEQ Compliance Status Report indicating that the arsenic deficiencies had been resolved and that
14 the system is in full compliance. (Ex. S-1 at att. A at 2; Tr. at 691.) At hearing, Montezuma
15 suggested that it instead be required to file with Docket Control copies of the lab test results that
16 Montezuma must submit to ADEQ on a quarterly basis. (Tr. at 111.)

17 Because Montezuma has recently submitted to the Commission documentation showing that
18 ADEQ has determined its water to be in compliance with safe drinking water standards and its
19 system to be in compliance, the Commission does not currently find it necessary to require additional
20 filings related to such compliance.

21 E. Well No. 4

22 Well No. 4, ADWR Well ID No. 55-213141, is located on a residential parcel known as Lot
23 500 in Lake Montezuma Estates, Unit Two, which was owned by Anna Barbara Brunner until
24 Montezuma purchased the property from Ms. Brunner in 2005 for the price of \$35,000, with the
25 intent of using the site to locate a production well. (See Ex. A-2 at 26; Tr. at 172.) Ms. Olsen
26 testified that no professional appraisal was obtained before Montezuma purchased the property;

27

28 ²⁰ Official notice is taken of the ADEQ Compliance Status Report issued on December 19, 2013, which Montezuma
filed in the docket for this matter on December 27, 2013.

1 instead, she estimated its value based on the prices for other properties in the area and the presence of
2 a well on the property. (See Tr. at 172.) Ms. Brunner had purchased the property for \$7,000 in
3 December 2001. (Ex. C-93 at att. 23.) Ms. Olsen's testimony was unclear regarding who initiated
4 the transaction for Montezuma to purchase the property from Ms. Brunner. (See Tr. at 113-14.)
5 Montezuma agreed to purchase the property from Ms. Brunner for a total of \$35,000, to be paid
6 through a down payment of \$3,000 and then payments made to Ms. Brunner. (Ex. A-2 at 26.) A
7 Warranty Deed from Ms. Brunner to Montezuma was recorded with the Yavapai County Recorder on
8 November 16, 2005. (*Id.*) A Deed of Trust and Assignment of Rents, identifying Montezuma as
9 Trustor and Yavapai Title Agency as Trustee, with Ms. Brunner as Beneficiary, was also recorded to
10 secure payment of indebtedness in the principal sum of \$32,000. (*Id.*; Ex. C-70.) The Deed of Trust
11 and Assignment of Rents referenced a promissory note or notes executed by the Trustor
12 (Montezuma) on the same date, but Ms. Olsen was unable to recall at hearing whether there was a
13 promissory note or a schedule of payments or what the interest rate was for the debt. (Ex. C-70; Tr.
14 at 173-74.) Ms. Olsen testified that the monthly payments made were approximately \$300 and that
15 payments were made both by Montezuma and by herself.²¹ (Tr. at 174.) Ms. Olsen also testified that
16 she did not consider the Brunner property to be an asset of Montezuma and that she had intended to
17 pay cash for the Brunner property because she did not want to incur long-term debt, which she knew
18 was an issue but believed to be defined as debt with a term of more than 5 years. (See Tr. at 114,
19 175.) Ms. Olsen testified that she had intended to pay off the Brunner "note" faster than she did, that
20 she had told her former accountant that she intended to pay cash, that she had switched accountants in
21 2006, and that she had not told her current accountant, John Campbell, that the Brunner note needed
22 to be included on annual reports until about 2010. (Tr. at 115-16.) Ms. Olsen agreed when asked
23 whether the exclusion of Well No. 4 and its well site from rate base or any rate increase (i.e., their
24 status as not used and useful) in this matter meant that any encumbrance on the Well No. 4 property
25 resulting from the Deed of Trust with Ms. Brunner was not an encumbrance on Montezuma's
26 property used to provide service and could not have impaired Montezuma's ability to provide service.

27 _____
28 ²¹ Assuming no interest, it would take more than 106 months to pay off a \$32,000 debt with payments of \$300 per month.

1 (See Tr. at 115-17.) In August 2011, Ms. Olsen made out a check to the National Bank of Arizona in
2 the amount of \$16,757.89, for "Yavapai Title." (Ex. C-78.) On August 15, 2011, National Bank of
3 Arizona, on behalf of Patricia Olsen, issued a Cashier's Check payable to Yavapai Title Agency in
4 the amount of \$16,757.89. (Ex. A-20.) Also on August 15, 2011, a Deed of Release and Full
5 Reconveyance was executed by Yavapai Title Agency stating that Montezuma's indebtedness
6 secured by the Deed of Trust of October 19, 2005, had been paid in full and that title to the subject
7 property had been released and reconveyed. (Ex. A-21.) Ms. Olsen testified that the funds for the
8 check came from her personal account. (See Tr. at 67-69.) Mr. Dougherty testified that Ms. Brunner
9 is a friend of Ms. Olsen's who served on the MEPOA board at the time that MEPOA sold the water
10 system to Montezuma. (Ex. C-92 at 14.)

11 Montezuma had Well No. 4 drilled, to a depth of 400 feet, in August 2006 pursuant to
12 authority issued by ADWR for replacement of an exempt well on the residential parcel. (Ex. A-28.)
13 Montezuma did not have an ATC from ADEQ at the time, something that Ms. Olsen testified is not
14 an uncommon practice because of the cost associated with obtaining an ATC and the possibility that
15 a well will not be viable.²² (Tr. at 429-31.) At the time the well was drilled, Montezuma also did not
16 have a use permit from Yavapai County ("County") allowing Montezuma to use the residential parcel
17 for a commercial purpose. (Tr. at 254.) In October 2009, Mr. Dougherty observed that a six foot
18 fence topped with triple strands of barbed wire had been installed around the entire perimeter of the
19 parcel across from his Rimrock house and that the lot also contained an elevated platform surrounded
20 by an earthen berm and boulders, a sight that Mr. Dougherty described as "an industrial facility in the
21 middle of a residential neighborhood." (Tr. at 638, 834-35.) Mr. Dougherty took a closer look,
22 found a sign for Montezuma, with which he was unfamiliar, and called the County to determine
23 whether Montezuma had a use permit to operate a business on the lot. (Tr. at 638.) When he was
24 told by the County that Montezuma did not have a use permit, Mr. Dougherty made a complaint.
25 (*Id.*) As a result of this complaint, Yavapai County Development Services ("YCDS") issued a Notice
26 of Violation for the use on October 7, 2009, and scheduled a hearing for December 11, 2009. (*Id.* at

27

28 ²² Ms. Olsen testified that it costs approximately \$1,500 to obtain an ATC, as opposed to approximately \$25,000 to drill a well. (Tr. at 430-31.)

1 638-39; Ex. C-1.)

2 On October 28, 2009, ADEQ issued an ATC for Well No. 4. (Ex. S-1 at att. 1 at 7.)

3 In December 2009, Montezuma applied to YCDS for a use permit. (See Ex. C-2.) The
4 Yavapai County Planning and Zoning Commission ("Zoning Commission") deferred consideration of
5 Montezuma's use permit request from January to February 2010 and, on February 17, 2010,
6 recommended approval of the use permit with five stipulations. (Ex. A-17.) Meanwhile, Montezuma
7 filed a pump installation completion report with ADWR stating that installation of a submersible
8 pump with an electric motor had been completed in September 2008 and that the well had been tested
9 in February to March 2009 and had produced 150 GPM. (Ex. A-28.) On March 15, 2010, the
10 Yavapai County Board of Supervisors ("YCBOS") voted to approve Montezuma's use permit,
11 subject to the five stipulations recommended by the Zoning Commission, which included, *inter alia*,
12 a requirement for the site to be developed in accordance with all applicable codes, regulations, and
13 ordinance requirements and that a Certificate of Compliance be issued within one year demonstrating
14 that the standard had been met. (Ex. A-17.) The use permit authorized Montezuma to place on the
15 parcel, subject to the stipulations, a well site to serve its water system. (Ex. A-17.) After the use
16 permit was approved, Mr. Dougherty filed, in Yavapai County Superior Court, a lawsuit against
17 YCBOS and Montezuma, charging that YCBOS had not enforced the Yavapai County Water Well
18 Code setback requirement when it granted the use permit; Montezuma filed a counterclaim. (See Tr.
19 at 134-35, 260-65; Ex. A-26; Ex. C-57.²³) The Court determined that Montezuma's placement of
20 Well No. 4 did not comply with the Water Well Code,²⁴ and on November 13, 2012, Montezuma was
21 ordered to return the well site property to vacant land by December 20, 2012. (See Tr. at 261-65; Ex.
22 S-1 at att. A at 7.) When Montezuma did not remove all of the improvements from the well site
23 property by the Court's deadline, Mr. Dougherty brought this to the County's attention, and
24 Montezuma was fined \$10,000. (See Tr. 265-70; Ex. C-47.) In May 2013, the fine was reduced to

25 ²³ Official notice is taken of the Yavapai Superior Court's Under Advisement Ruling issued on September 20, 2012, in
26 *Dougherty v. Yavapai County Board of Supervisors*, Case No. P1300CV201000585, in which the Court found that
27 Montezuma's legal argument in its Counterclaim and Cross-Claim for Declaratory Relief "both misinterpret[ed] and
28 misapplie[d] ARS § 49-106." For the sake of convenience, this public document is referenced as Ex. C-57, as Mr.
Dougherty labeled it as such but did not use or offer it at hearing.

²⁴ Ms. Olsen maintains that the placement of the well complied with an exception in the Water Well Code. (Tr. at 263-
65.)

1 \$5,000 after Montezuma had removed concrete pads from the well site. (See Tr. at 265-70; Ex. C-
2 47.)

3 At the time of the hearing in this matter, Montezuma did not have legal authority to operate
4 Well No. 4 for its system, and Well No. 4 was not in use. (See, e.g., Tr. at 116.) Although
5 Montezuma previously had indicated that it would be pursuing condemnation to obtain the setback
6 needed to comply with the Water Well Code, Ms. Olsen testified at hearing that Montezuma was in
7 the process of obtaining an easement from the owners of the parcel for which setback requirements
8 had been determined not to have been met. (See Ex. A-2 at 27; Tr. at 118-19.) With its closing brief,
9 filed on August 30, 2013, Montezuma included a copy of an Easement Agreement dated July 23,
10 2013, granting Montezuma "a perpetual, nine (9) foot wide non-exclusive easement . . . for purposes
11 of obtaining a fifty (50) foot setback from the installation, construction, maintenance, operation, use,
12 repair and replacement of a water well on the Montezuma Property."²⁵ No additional information has
13 been provided to indicate that Montezuma has been authorized to use the well site property or to use
14 Well No. 4 in its operations.

15 Ms. Olsen asserts that Montezuma and its customers would benefit from the operation of Well
16 No. 4 because Montezuma has no back-up wells on its system. (Ex. A-2 at 28.) Ms. Olsen testified
17 that Montezuma's Well No. 1 has been in operation since the system was created and "has had no
18 maintenance or improvements to ensure its continued operation." (*Id.*) Ms. Olsen also asserted that
19 Montezuma's customers would be benefited by Well No. 4 because it could provide an ample water
20 supply for fire protection. (*Id.*)

21 Staff determined that Well No. 4 is not currently used or useful and did not include it in plant
22 for purposes of setting rates in this matter. (Tr. at 703-04, 713.) Mr. Scott testified that although
23 adding Well No. 4 could result in excess capacity for Montezuma, Staff always considers it beneficial
24 to have a second well. (Tr. at 710-12.) Mr. Scott also testified that he has seen ATCs obtained
25 before drilling and after drilling and did not see anything wrong with what Montezuma did in this
26

27 _____
28 ²⁵ Official notice is taken of this Easement Agreement, which is a public record filed in the Official Records of Yavapai County on July 30, 2013, and available through the Yavapai County Recorder's website.

1 case regarding Well No. 4. (Tr. at 692.) Mr. Scott was uncertain whether ADEQ actually requires an
2 ATC to be obtained before a well is drilled. (Tr. at 734-35.)

3 Mr. Dougherty strenuously objects to having Montezuma use Well No. 4 for its system
4 because he believes the commercial use is incompatible with the residential locale, because he is
5 concerned that Well No. 4 may adversely impact his own and other private wells, because he is
6 concerned that Well No. 4 may adversely impact Montezuma Well and Wet Beaver Creek, and
7 because Montezuma drilled the well and attempted to place the well into service for the water system
8 without first having obtained all state and county permissions and after having allegedly provided
9 inaccurate information to county and state authorities. (*See, e.g.*, Tr. at 832-39.)

10 **II. Procedural History**

11 On December 11, 2009, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma filed a request to extend the filing
12 deadline for the AOC for Well No. 4 from December 31, 2009, to June 30, 2010.

13 On February 3, 2010, in the 40-252 Docket, Staff issued a Memorandum recommending that
14 the Well No. 4 AOC filing deadline be extended as requested by Montezuma, to June 30, 2010.

15 On February 11, 2010, in the 40-252 Docket, a Recommended Order was issued, which
16 would have extended the Well No. 4 AOC filing deadline to June 30, 2010, as requested by
17 Montezuma and recommended by Staff. The Recommended Order was issued for consideration by
18 the Commission at its regular Open Meeting on March 2 and 3, 2010.

19 On February 19, 2010, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty, who had not previously
20 participated in the 40-252 Docket, filed an "exception" to the Recommended Order. Mr. Dougherty
21 asserted that WIFA had suspended the loan to Montezuma due to concerns about Well No. 4's
22 possibly causing environmental impacts on Montezuma Well National Monument and Wet Beaver
23 Creek; that WIFA was requiring Montezuma to submit an Environmental Information Document
24 ("EID") and additional information under the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"); that
25 Montezuma had been cited by YCDS in October 2009 for operating a commercial business (Well No.
26 4) in a residentially zoned neighborhood and had been forced to file for a use permit for the Well No.
27 4 well site; that the Planning and Zoning Commission had recommended approval of the use permit;
28 that the YCBOS was to consider the issue in mid-March 2010; that Montezuma was out of

1 compliance with drinking water standards; and that ADEQ had presented Montezuma with a Consent
2 Order, which Montezuma had rejected. Mr. Dougherty attributed Montezuma's situation to "poor
3 management decisions," requested that the Commission reject Montezuma's requested extension, and
4 advocated for Montezuma's service area to be absorbed by AWC.

5 On February 26, 2010, in the 40-252 Docket, Steven M. Olea, Director of the Utilities
6 Division, issued a letter to Montezuma stating that Staff understood Montezuma was out of
7 compliance with the arsenic MCL; that Staff was concerned about this noncompliance; and that
8 Montezuma needed to submit to Staff, within 60 days, a detailed plan to address and resolve
9 Montezuma's noncompliance. The letter further stated that Montezuma's failure to submit such a
10 plan would result in referral to the Commission's Legal Division for possible enforcement action.

11 On March 2, 2010, at the Commission's regular Open Meeting, Mr. Dougherty provided
12 public comment opposing the Recommended Order issued in the 40-252 Docket. The Commission
13 did not approve the Recommended Order.

14 On March 30, 2010, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma submitted to Mr. Olea a letter setting
15 forth the steps already taken by Montezuma and those then underway to bring Montezuma into
16 compliance with ADEQ requirements. With its letter, Montezuma included attachments, among
17 them a copy of a letter from the YCBOS reporting that the YCBOS had, on March 15, 2010, voted to
18 approve Montezuma's use permit for the Well No. 4 wellsite. The letter, with attachments, was
19 docketed in the 40-252 Docket on April 5, 2010.

20 On April 13, 2010, someone docketed in the 40-252 Docket a copy of a Complaint filed
21 against the YCBOS by Mr. Dougherty and Frederick Shute in Yavapai County Superior Court,
22 challenging the YCBOS's approval of Montezuma's use permit as unsupported by evidence, contrary
23 to law, arbitrary, capricious, and/or an abuse of discretion and seeking reversal of the YCBOS's
24 decision ("Yavapai County lawsuit").

25 On October 1, 2010, someone docketed in the 40-252 Docket a copy of "White Paper #1:
26 Wells and Water Use Near Montezuma Well Nat'l Monument," by Robin G. Weesner, R.G., dated
27 April 6, 2010.

28

1 On January 24, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma filed a request, under A.R.S. § 40-
2 252, to have Decision No. 71317 amended to allow Montezuma to seek funding for its arsenic
3 treatment project from a private financial institution rather than WIFA, so that Montezuma would be
4 able to complete its arsenic treatment facility by June 2011. Montezuma stated that WIFA had
5 decided to require an Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") for the WIFA loan and that the EIS
6 would take one to two years to complete at a cost of more than \$100,000.

7 On February 10, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Staff filed a Memorandum providing an update
8 on Montezuma's situation. Staff reported that Montezuma had provided an EID to WIFA; that WIFA
9 had had the EID reviewed by a consultant, AZTEC Engineering, and the EPA; that AZTEC
10 Engineering and the EPA had both reviewed the EID and both recommended that WIFA consider an
11 EIS; and that WIFA had notified Montezuma on November 22, 2010, that an EIS would be required
12 for Montezuma to receive WIFA funding for its arsenic treatment project. Staff stated that
13 Montezuma thus had needed to choose whether to continue pursuing the WIFA loan, with the
14 substantial EIS expense, or instead to request modification of Decision No. 71317 to allow for
15 alternate financing. Staff stated that Montezuma had decided to request modification of Decision No.
16 71317 pursuant to A.R.S. § 40-252. Staff also stated that Staff was not recommending that any action
17 be taken against Montezuma because Montezuma had been cooperating with state agencies and was
18 "seriously attempting to fulfill its arsenic treatment mandate to comply with ADEQ and the
19 Commission."

20 On March 14, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed written opposition to
21 Montezuma's request for amendment of Decision No. 71317 under A.R.S. § 40-252. Mr. Dougherty
22 characterized Montezuma's request as "seek[ing] a blank check" and advocated for the Commission
23 to schedule an Order to Show Cause ("OSC") Hearing to consider revoking Montezuma's CC&N.
24 Mr. Dougherty asserted that Montezuma had unlawfully connected Well No. 4 to its system and
25 included a copy of a letter emailed by him to ADEQ in which he had made that assertion and
26 provided photographs of what he had observed.

27 On April 7, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a letter requesting to be included
28 on the service list for the 40-252 Docket and providing several documents in support of his March 14,

1 2011, filing, including copies of a letter to WIFA from AZTEC Engineering regarding the EIS, a
2 letter to WIFA from the National Park Service regarding the EID, and a letter to Montezuma from the
3 Arizona Game and Fish Department regarding biological issues for Well No. 4.

4 Between April 22 and 26, 2011, comments were filed in the 40-252 Docket by five
5 individuals identifying themselves as customers of Montezuma, all of whom expressed support for
6 arsenic treatment.

7 On April 27, 2011, at its Staff Open Meeting, the Commission granted Montezuma's request
8 for Decision No. 71317 to be reopened under A.R.S. § 40-252, for the purpose of determining
9 whether to modify the Decision concerning financing approval and related provisions. The
10 Commission directed the Hearing Division to schedule a procedural conference to discuss the process
11 for the 40-252 proceeding. Montezuma attended the Staff Open Meeting via telephone, and Mr.
12 Dougherty attended in person.

13 On April 27, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, someone filed a stream of emails from Mr.
14 Dougherty to Staff and Commission employees in which Mr. Dougherty asserted that Montezuma
15 had been illegally collecting arsenic surcharges and that the Commission needed to take action by
16 issuing a cease and desist order to stop Montezuma's construction of a pipeline between Well No. 4
17 and the proposed location for the arsenic treatment facility.

18 On April 28, 2011, a Procedural Order was issued in the 40-252 Docket scheduling a
19 procedural conference to be held on May 16, 2011. The Procedural Order included standard
20 language indicating that any motion not ruled upon by the Commission within 20 days would be
21 deemed denied.

22 On May 10, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma filed a letter alleging harassment of
23 Montezuma and its owner by Mr. Dougherty and Ivo Buddeke. Montezuma asserted that installation
24 of the arsenic treatment system had been suspended due to "Buddeke and Dougherty's allegations
25 and harassment." Montezuma included a copy of a "Declaration of Patricia Olsen" filed in the
26 Yavapai County lawsuit, with attachments. The Declaration indicated that Montezuma had been
27 added to the Yavapai County lawsuit as a party defendant.

28

1 On May 16, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, a procedural conference was held at which
2 Montezuma stated that it had applied for a bank loan, Staff stated that there was not yet enough
3 information to complete a Staff Report, and it was determined that a Procedural Order would be
4 issued with filing dates.

5 On May 16, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, a Procedural Order was issued requiring
6 Montezuma, by June 16, 2011, to file an update providing the status and details of its bank loan
7 application along with an alternate plan for financing in case the loan was disapproved; requiring
8 Staff to file a Memorandum analyzing Montezuma's update; and requiring any Motions to Intervene
9 to be filed by June 16, 2011.

10 On June 9, 2011, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Intervene in the 40-252 Docket, stating that
11 he owned property within 300 feet of Well No. 4 and was served by a private well.

12 On June 14, 2011, Mr. Dougherty filed an amendment to his Motion to Intervene in the 40-
13 252 Docket, expressly requesting that a hearing be held.

14 On June 15, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma docketed a letter from Sunwest Bank
15 denying Montezuma a \$165,000 loan and stating that Montezuma would need a revenue increase of
16 \$37,536 to support the loan.

17 No filing was made to oppose Mr. Dougherty's Motion to Intervene in the 40-252 Docket.

18 On June 29, 2011, a Procedural Order was issued scheduling a procedural conference in the
19 40-252 Docket for July 22, 2011; suspending Staff's filing obligation; and granting Mr. Dougherty
20 intervention.

21 On July 20, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion requesting that
22 Commission Staff prepare an OSC hearing to revoke Montezuma's CC&N.

23 On July 21, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, a Notice of Appearance was filed by Douglas C.
24 Fitzpatrick as counsel for Montezuma.

25 On July 22, 2011, Commissioner Paul Newman filed a Memorandum in the 40-252 Docket
26 urging that an evidentiary hearing be ordered due to the Federal-Native American nexus in the case.

27 On July 22, 2011, a procedural conference was held in the 40-252 Docket. At the beginning
28 of the procedural conference, Mr. Dougherty was prevented from coming to the hearing room by the

1 Commission's security guard, to whom Ms. Olsen had provided a copy of a July 18, 2011, Verde
2 Valley Justice Court Injunction Against Harassment ("Injunction"), stating that Mr. Dougherty could
3 have no contact with Ms. Olsen except through attorneys, legal process, and court hearings. The
4 Injunction also stated that it did not prohibit Mr. Dougherty from attending public meetings. The
5 Injunction had not been docketed or provided to Staff or the Administrative Law Judge. A brief
6 recess was held for copies of the Injunction to be provided and reviewed and for Mr. Dougherty to
7 enter a separate room, equipped with a monitor and telephone, so that he could watch, hear, and
8 participate in the proceeding from another room while the impact of the Injunction was discussed.
9 After the recess, counsel for Montezuma and Ms. Olsen both stated on the record that Mr.
10 Dougherty's attendance and participation at the procedural conference would not violate the
11 Injunction, as the procedural conference was a public meeting. Mr. Dougherty was then permitted to
12 enter the hearing room to participate in the remainder of the procedural conference in person.
13 Montezuma reported that it was still pursuing a bank loan and, additionally, that it planned to file an
14 emergency rate application if that loan were denied. Montezuma also reported that ADEQ had
15 extended its arsenic MCL compliance deadline to April 2012. Mr. Dougherty advocated for a
16 hearing and an OSC. Staff stated that there was no plan to initiate an OSC and that Staff would be
17 filing copies of a letter Staff had sent to Montezuma directing Montezuma to cease collecting an
18 unauthorized arsenic surcharge. Staff also suggested that Mr. Dougherty's issues might be better
19 addressed through a formal complaint, and Mr. Dougherty was provided the statutory citation for
20 formal complaints. It was determined that Montezuma would be given another 60 days to file its plan
21 for financing the arsenic treatment project.

22 On July 25, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Staff filed a copy of an informal complaint report
23 generated by Staff's Consumer Services Section regarding Montezuma's having charged customers
24 an unauthorized arsenic surcharge.

25 On July 25, 2011, a redacted copy of the Injunction was docketed in the 40-252 Docket by the
26 Hearing Division.

27 On July 25, 2011, a Procedural Order was issued in the 40-252 Docket requiring Staff to file a
28 copy of the letter sent to Montezuma regarding unauthorized arsenic surcharges; requiring

1 Montezuma to file, by September 22, 2011, either an explanation of and documentation for its
2 financing of the arsenic treatment facilities or an explanation of how Montezuma would remedy its
3 arsenic MCL exceedance if it could not obtain financing; requiring Staff to make a filing, by
4 September 30, 2011, regarding whether Montezuma had provided sufficient information for Staff to
5 make a substantive recommendation regarding modification of Decision No. 71317 and proposing a
6 procedural schedule; and requiring Montezuma and Mr. Dougherty each, by October 7, 2011, to
7 make a filing responsive to Staff's filing.

8 On August 23, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Compel
9 Montezuma to produce records requested in Mr. Dougherty's First Set of Data Requests.

10 Also on August 23, 2011, Mr. Dougherty and Nicholas Kopko filed, in a new Docket No. W-
11 04254A-11-0323 ("Complaint Docket"), a Formal Complaint against Montezuma, including 14
12 allegations and supporting attachments.

13 On August 24, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, a Procedural Order was issued finding that Mr.
14 Dougherty's Motion to Compel had been insufficient as filed, ordering Mr. Dougherty to engage in
15 personal consultation with counsel for Montezuma and to make good faith efforts to resolve the
16 current and any other discovery dispute before filing another Motion to Compel, and ordering
17 Montezuma to respond fully and candidly to each discovery request received by it.

18 On August 31, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Notice of Filing Formal
19 Complaint against Montezuma and Motion to Stay, requesting that the Commission stay all
20 proceedings under the 40-252 Docket until the allegations raised in the Complaint Docket had been
21 fully answered by Montezuma.

22 On August 31, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed additional exhibits.

23 On August 31, 2011, a Procedural Order was issued in the 40-252 Docket, the Emergency
24 Rate Docket,²⁶ and the Complaint Docket scheduling a joint procedural conference to be held on
25 September 13, 2011.

26 _____
27 ²⁶ Montezuma had filed an Emergency Rate Application, in a new Docket No. W-04254A-11-0296 ("Emergency Rate
28 Docket"), on July 25, 2011. On September 29, 2011, Montezuma filed a Motion to Withdraw Application in the
Emergency Rate Docket, stating that it had found a way to comply with the arsenic standard without the expense of
constructing arsenic treatment facilities. On October 12, 2011, a Procedural Order was issued granting Montezuma's

1 On September 9, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, Mr. Kopko filed a Notice of Withdrawal.

2 On September 13, 2011, the joint procedural conference was held as scheduled for the 40-252
3 Docket, the Emergency Rate Docket, and the Complaint Docket. Staff explained that it had been
4 mistaken and that no letter had been sent to Montezuma regarding unauthorized arsenic surcharges.
5 Montezuma and Staff both opposed Mr. Dougherty's Motion to Stay in the 40-252 Docket.
6 Montezuma acknowledged having received the Complaint on September 9, 2011. Montezuma and
7 Mr. Dougherty's discovery dispute was discussed, a recess was taken for them to discuss their
8 discovery dispute off the record, and they reached an agreement for Mr. Dougherty to review and
9 make copies of Montezuma's records at the office of Montezuma's counsel on September 19, 2011.
10 Montezuma also stated for the first time that its premises had been burglarized on three separate
11 occasions, with records removed each time, and that its computer system had been hacked on two
12 separate occasions, rendering some billing records unavailable. Montezuma admitted that it had
13 never filed a police report. The possibility of consolidating the 40-252 Docket, the Emergency Rate
14 Docket, and the Complaint Docket was discussed, with no party supporting consolidation. No ruling
15 was made on Mr. Dougherty's Motion to Stay in the 40-252 Docket.

16 On September 13, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Modify
17 Formal Complaint with Additional Allegation and Two Additional Remedies; Notice of Submission
18 of Two Exhibits. The additional allegation was Allegation XV.

19 On September 14, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, a Procedural Order was issued denying Mr.
20 Dougherty's Motion to Stay.

21 On September 14, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, a Procedural Order was issued granting
22 amendment of the Complaint to include Allegation XV, directing Montezuma to answer the
23 Complaint as amended, and accepting Mr. Kopko's withdrawal and directing that he be deleted from
24 the caption for the Complaint Docket.

25
26
27
28 Motion to Withdraw Application and closing the Emergency Rate Docket. The Emergency Rate Docket is not at issue in this matter.

1 On September 19, 2011, in the Emergency Rate Docket, the U.S. Department of the Interior's
2 National Park Service ("National Park Service") filed a letter to the Commission expressing concerns
3 about Well No. 4 and requesting that a hearing be held.

4 On September 19, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma filed a Report in response to the
5 August 24, 2011, Procedural Order, to detail how it proposed to finance construction of an arsenic
6 treatment facility. The proposal included costs of \$165,000; a \$165,000 loan from Sunwest Bank; a
7 rate increase of \$15.64 per customer per month to increase revenues by \$37,536; a security interest
8 granted to Sunwest Bank; a trust account to segregate the loan funds and ARSM surcharge funds; and
9 periodic accountings to the Commission regarding the trust account.

10 On September 26, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed another Motion to
11 Modify Formal Complaint, requesting to add an Allegation XVI.

12 On September 30, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, Montezuma filed an Answer to Complaint.

13 On September 30, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion for Evidentiary
14 Hearing.

15 On October 3, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion for Evidentiary
16 Hearing.

17 On October 4, 2011, a Procedural Order was issued in the 40-252 Docket requiring
18 Montezuma to file a detailed explanation of how and when it would resolve its arsenic problem and a
19 response to Mr. Dougherty's Motion for Hearing; requiring Staff to make a filing responding to
20 Montezuma's filing and Mr. Dougherty's Motion for Hearing and providing a recommendation for
21 the process to be followed; and vacating the requirements for filings to have been made pursuant to
22 the Procedural Order of July 25, 2011.

23 On October 6, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma filed a Response to Mr. Dougherty's
24 Motion for Hearing, stating that no hearing was needed and that Montezuma no longer needed to
25 fund construction of an arsenic treatment facility because Montezuma was instead working to
26 formalize a lease of arsenic treatment equipment. Montezuma stated that the details of the lease were
27 not yet available but would be provided when they became available.

28

1 On October 12, 2011, Montezuma filed in the 40-252 Docket a Proposed Plan for Arsenic
2 Abatement, stating that Montezuma would be leasing arsenic treatment facilities from GEcom Water
3 Solutions, Inc. and expected to execute the lease within two weeks and would file an executed copy
4 of the lease thereafter.

5 On October 12, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, a Procedural Order was issued granting Mr.
6 Dougherty's requested amendment of the Complaint to add Allegation XVI; scheduling a procedural
7 conference for October 25, 2011; requiring the parties to exchange, before the procedural conference,
8 documents and information gathered in discovery, copies of exhibits to be used, and witness lists and
9 testimony subject areas; requiring Montezuma to provide discovery of "all of the records necessary to
10 [give] complete and authentic information as to its properties and operations"; requiring Staff to
11 participate fully in the matter, take a position as to each allegation in the Complaint, and state
12 whether Staff would be issuing an OSC; and requiring all parties to be prepared to discuss a
13 procedural schedule.

14 On October 17, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, someone filed a letter regarding Montezuma
15 written by Mr. Buddeke to the Director of ADEQ's Water Quality Division.

16 On October 18, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Response to Company's
17 Arsenic Treatment Plan; Motion for Sanctions; Motion to Suspend Lease Agreement.

18 On October 25, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma filed a Supplemental and Amended
19 Proposed Plan for Arsenic Abatement, in which Montezuma stated the following: "When the
20 Company has a proposed lease from GEcom, it will docket the lease and provide additional financial
21 information which relates to the lease. It will not execute the lease or move forward with
22 construction of the treatment plant until the commission has signed off on the proposed plan."

23 On October 25, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, Montezuma filed a Motion to Strike
24 Subpoena Duces Tecum, concerning a Subpoena that had been served on Ms. Olsen.

25 On October 25, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, Montezuma filed Montezuma's Witnesses
26 and Exhibits, stating that Montezuma intended to call as witnesses Ms. Olsen, John Campbell, and
27 Mr. Dougherty and further stating that Montezuma had not yet determined its hearing exhibits.

28

1 On October 25, 2011, the procedural conference in the Complaint Docket was held as
2 scheduled. The Subpoena Duces Tecum issued to Ms. Olsen was quashed; Mr. Dougherty and
3 Montezuma agreed to allow Mr. Dougherty to review contested documents at the office of
4 Montezuma's counsel beginning on October 31, 2011; Staff provided its assessment of the Complaint
5 allegations and stated that it did not intend to initiate an OSC; a discussion occurred regarding Ms.
6 Olsen's concerns for her security at future proceedings;²⁷ and it was established that a status
7 conference would be held in approximately 45 days to determine the status of discovery and whether
8 a hearing could be scheduled at that time. Montezuma also agreed to docket a copy of the Felony
9 Release Conditions and Release Order that had led to the discussion regarding Ms. Olsen's security.
10 The parties were also reminded that they were expected to cooperate fully in discovery.

11 On October 25, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma filed a Motion to Compel Discovery,
12 requesting that Mr. Dougherty be ordered to produce all communications, including print copies of e-
13 mails, between Mr. Dougherty and Ivo Buddeke and further requesting that Mr. Dougherty be
14 required to pay Montezuma's attorney fees for the Motion. Montezuma also filed a Certificate of
15 Counsel in Support of Discovery Motion.

16 On October 28, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed three different discovery-
17 related Motions, along with associated Certificates of Intervenor in Support of Motion:

- 18 • A Motion to Compel Discovery; Motion to Set Deadline for Production of Documents,
19 requesting that the Commission order Montezuma to produce, by a date certain, all
20 records responsive to Mr. Dougherty's Second Data Request and requesting that
21 Montezuma be required to pay Mr. Dougherty reasonable fees for expenses related to
22 preparation and submission of the Motion;

23
24
25 ²⁷ The security issue was addressed after Mr. Buddeke arrived at the procedural conference as a spectator, and Ms.
26 Olsen called the police to respond. At the time, Mr. Buddeke faced felony charges originating in Verde Valley Justice
27 Court case CR201103826, and a July 12, 2011, Felony Release Conditions and Release Order directed Mr. Buddeke not
28 to contact in any manner several alleged victims, including Ms. Olsen. After discussions with Capitol Police, Mr.
Buddeke left the building. Because Mr. Dougherty had indicated that he intended to call Mr. Buddeke as a witness, there
was a discussion of the accommodations necessary to allow for Mr. Buddeke's live testimony. Mr. Buddeke was
ultimately acquitted of the criminal charges originating in the Verde Valley Justice Court.

- 1 • A Motion for Protective Order, requesting that a protective order be issued to prevent the
2 annoyance, oppression, invasion of privacy, harassment, and undue burden and expense of
3 Montezuma's demand for emails between Mr. Dougherty and Mr. Buddeke; and
- 4 • A Motion to Deny Company's Motion to Compel, requesting that Montezuma's Motion to
5 Compel be denied, that Montezuma be required to bear all attorney fees from the
6 preparation and submission of its Motion, and that Montezuma be required to pay Mr.
7 Dougherty reasonable fees for the preparation and submission of the Motion to Deny.

8 On October 28, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Compel
9 Discovery; Motion to Set Deadline for Production of Documents or Face Contempt along with a
10 Certificate of Complainant in Support of Discovery Motion. Mr. Dougherty stated that he had served
11 additional data requests on Montezuma on October 25, 2011; that Montezuma had responded by
12 asserting that the data requests violated the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure but confirming the
13 previously agreed scheduled time for Mr. Dougherty to review records; that Mr. Dougherty had
14 emailed to determine whether the records from the new data requests would be available for review;
15 that Mr. Dougherty had then telephoned and spoken to Montezuma's counsel to try to reach
16 agreement as to the data requests; and that Montezuma had then canceled the scheduled time for
17 review of records via email the next day, stating that Montezuma would be seeking a Protective
18 Order. Mr. Dougherty filed a correction to this Motion on October 31, 2011.

19 On October 31, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Staff filed a Response to Procedural Order,
20 stating that Montezuma planned to enter into an operating lease with GEcom for arsenic treatment
21 equipment, that operating leases are not capital leases and do not require Commission approval, that
22 Staff understood Ms. Olsen would be paying for the operating lease with her own funds, that there
23 thus was no longer any need for Decision No. 71317 to be modified, that there was no need for an
24 evidentiary hearing, and that the 40-252 Docket could be brought to a close and retained solely for
25 compliance filings from Montezuma.

26 On November 2, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, Montezuma filed a Motion for Protective
27 Order, acknowledging that Ms. Olsen had used Montezuma's business account to pay some personal
28 expenses, but requesting that Ms. Olsen's personal financial records be protected from discovery, that

1 limitations be placed on Mr. Dougherty's discovery requests, and that Montezuma be instructed
2 which data requests it needed to answer. *Inter alia*, Montezuma also requested that Mr. Dougherty be
3 precluded from submitting duplicate data requests in the Complaint Docket and 40-252 Docket.

4 On November 2, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma filed a Notice along with the
5 Felony Release Conditions and Release Order entered on July 12, 2011, by the Verde Valley Justice
6 Court, for the pending criminal case against Mr. Buddeke. The Release Order stated that Mr.
7 Buddeke could "not contact in any manner the alleged victim[s]," who included Ms. Olsen and Norm
8 Rask. Montezuma stated that Mr. Dougherty had identified both Mr. Buddeke and Mr. Rask as
9 witnesses and that the court had expressed concern that Ms. Olsen would be in the hearing room
10 when Mr. Buddeke testified.

11 On November 2, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma also filed a Response to Motion to
12 Compel Discovery, stating that Mr. Dougherty's data requests that were the subject of the motion
13 were the same as those submitted in the Complaint Docket and Emergency Rate Docket as well as an
14 Administrative Subpoena Duces Tecum in the Complaint Docket. Montezuma stated that Mr.
15 Dougherty's numerous identical discovery requests had caused Montezuma undue burden, expense,
16 and annoyance, and Montezuma adopted by reference the arguments set forth in its Motion for
17 Protective Order filed in the Complaint Docket.

18 On November 3, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Investigate Ex
19 Parte Communications, alleging that Staff had engaged in ex parte communications, in violation of
20 A.A.C. R14-3-113(C)(2), by communicating with Montezuma regarding its arsenic abatement plan.
21 Mr. Dougherty also filed a Supplemental to Motion to Investigate Ex Parte Communications.

22 On November 4, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Reply to Staff's
23 Recommendation to Close Docket; Motion to Require Disclosure of Proposed Lease and Continued
24 Discovery, stating that Staff's recommendation to close the docket was premature because it was not
25 yet possible to determine whether the GEcom lease was an operating lease or a capital lease, as the
26 lease had not yet been filed. Mr. Dougherty referenced the test to determine whether a lease is a
27 capital lease, as set forth in Financial Accounting Standards Board Statement No. 13, Accounting for
28 Leases. Mr. Dougherty moved for the Commission to order Montezuma to fully disclose the terms of

1 the lease and, further, for the Commission to continue the proceedings in the 40-252 Docket and hold
2 an evidentiary hearing at a suitable time.

3 On November 7, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Staff filed a Response to Mr. Dougherty's
4 Motion to Investigate Ex Parte Communications, explaining Staff's role as a party litigator, not a
5 decision-maker, in the matter and asserting that Mr. Dougherty's motion should be denied.

6 On November 7, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Second Supplemental to
7 Motion to Investigate Ex Parte Communications; Motion to Stay Proceedings; Motion for
8 Independent Investigation, providing copies of email communications between Montezuma and
9 various members of Staff and asserting that the proceeding should be stayed, Montezuma ordered not
10 to move forward with construction of the arsenic treatment facility, and an independent investigation
11 completed concerning the communications.

12 On November 7, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Modify
13 Formal Complaint with Additional Allegation XVII, requesting that the Complaint be modified to
14 add an allegation that Montezuma and Staff had engaged in unauthorized communications in
15 violation of the Ex Parte Rule.

16 On November 9, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Staff filed Staff's Response to Mr. Dougherty's
17 Second Supplemental, which included a request for a procedural conference to dispel further
18 confusion and clarify the record.

19 On November 9, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, a Procedural Order was issued explaining the
20 Ex Parte Rule and that Mr. Dougherty's allegations did not describe a violation of the Rule; denying
21 Mr. Dougherty's motions related to the Rule; requiring Montezuma to make a filing explaining the
22 material terms of the intended lease and the source and ownership of the funds to be used for lease
23 payments, analyzing whether the lease was a capital lease or an operating lease under applicable
24 accounting standards, and explaining Montezuma's intentions related to pursuing modification of
25 Decision No. 71317; establishing a deadline for any response to Montezuma's filing; establishing that
26 Mr. Dougherty's Motion for Hearing and Motion for Sanctions and Suspension had been deemed
27 denied; denying Mr. Dougherty's Motion to Investigate; denying Mr. Dougherty's Motion for
28 Disclosure and Discovery; denying Mr. Dougherty's Motion to Stay; and holding in abeyance

1 Montezuma's Motion to Compel, Mr. Dougherty's Motion to Compel, Mr. Dougherty's Motion for
2 Protective Order, and Mr. Dougherty's Motion to Deny. The Procedural Order further dictated that a
3 party not file a motion in the matter unless the party had made a reasonable inquiry and determined
4 the motion to be well grounded in fact and warranted by existing law or a good faith argument for the
5 extension, modification, or reversal of existing law.

6 On November 10, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, a Procedural Order was issued explaining
7 the Ex Parte Rule and denying as without merit Mr. Dougherty's Motion to Modify Formal
8 Complaint with Additional Allegation XVII; scheduling a procedural conference to be held on
9 November 23, 2011; requiring the parties to arrive to the hearing room at least one hour early to
10 engage in discussions in an earnest attempt to settle the discovery dispute themselves; requiring Mr.
11 Dougherty and Montezuma to be prepared to explain their positions as to each individual disputed
12 request; and requiring each party to be prepared to discuss and make a proposal regarding future
13 scheduling.

14 On November 23, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, the procedural conference was held as
15 scheduled. At the procedural conference, Mr. Dougherty and Montezuma reported that most of the
16 discovery issues had been resolved; they were asked for the resolution as to each item in Mr.
17 Dougherty's first and second data requests; and alternate methods for Mr. Dougherty to obtain some
18 of the information sought were discussed briefly. Ultimately, it was determined that Mr. Dougherty
19 would be permitted to review records at the office of Montezuma's counsel on November 29, 2011;
20 that Mr. Dougherty would prepare requests for admission as to some desired information; that Mr.
21 Dougherty would seek bank records from Chase Bank using a release to be provided by Montezuma;
22 that Mr. Dougherty would seek records from Yavapai County Development Services through a public
23 records request; and that another procedural conference would be held in approximately two months
24 to obtain updates and discuss the scheduling and process for the matter going forward. It was also
25 determined that Montezuma would make a filing regarding the dates Ms. Olsen would be unavailable
26 due to the Buddeke trial.

27
28

1 On November 30, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, Montezuma filed a Notice of
2 Unavailability, identifying periods during which Ms. Olsen expected to be unavailable due to her
3 status as a witness in the Buddeke trial.

4 On December 5, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, Staff made a filing regarding availability of a
5 telephone bridge line for future procedural conferences.

6 On December 5, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, the National Park Service filed a letter
7 requesting that the Commission hold an evidentiary hearing on Montezuma's request for an operating
8 lease to fund an arsenic treatment facility and urging that Montezuma be required to complete an EIS
9 as a condition of funding the arsenic treatment facility project.

10 On December 7, 2011, in the Complaint Docket, a Procedural Order was issued scheduling a
11 procedural conference to be held on January 18, 2012, and directing the parties to be prepared to
12 provide updates regarding discovery and to discuss and make proposals as to future scheduling.

13 On December 7, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma filed an Interim Report stating that
14 Montezuma had not yet received the written lease from GEcom, but that Montezuma expected
15 Odyssey Equipment Financing Company ("Odyssey") to provide financing for the lease payments.
16 Montezuma stated: "Construction is in process for building the plant." Montezuma further stated
17 that Ms. Olsen, personally, was expected to enter the lease with GEcom; to make the payments to
18 GEcom or Odyssey with her own personal funds; and then to sublease the system to Montezuma.
19 Montezuma further stated that because it had not yet had access to the lease agreement or prepared
20 the sublease agreement, Montezuma was not in a position to offer meaningful analysis of whether
21 either lease should be characterized as a capital lease or an operating lease. Montezuma requested an
22 extension of the deadline to submit its lease analysis. Montezuma further asserted that there was no
23 longer a need to pursue modification of Decision No. 71317 and that the matter could be brought to a
24 close and the 40-252 Docket left open only for compliance filings.

25 On December 15, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Response to
26 Montezuma's Interim Report; Motion to Deny Extension of Deadline; Motion for Evidentiary
27 Hearing. Regarding the Interim Report, Mr. Dougherty asserted, *inter alia*, that the description of the
28 intended lease in the Interim Report suggested a capital lease and that Montezuma had begun

1 construction of the arsenic treatment plant in spite of its previously having stated in a filing of
2 October 25, 2011, that it would “not move forward with construction of the treatment plant until the
3 commission has signed off on the proposed plan.” Mr. Dougherty requested that the Commission
4 deny the requested filing date extension and schedule an evidentiary hearing to consider
5 Montezuma’s financing plan, Montezuma’s apparent insolvency, and whether to revoke
6 Montezuma’s CC&N; Mr. Dougherty also asserted that the 40-252 Docket should be left open until
7 the Commission either approved or disapproved Montezuma’s final financing plan.

8 On December 22, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Petition Requesting the
9 Commission Require an Environmental Impact Statement, including 1,072 signatures gathered
10 online.

11 On January 4, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, a Procedural Order was issued denying Mr.
12 Dougherty’s Motion for an Evidentiary Hearing, scheduling a procedural conference to be held
13 jointly with the Complaint Docket, requiring Montezuma to be prepared at the procedural conference
14 to explain the status of the lease agreement arrangement for the arsenic treatment facilities and
15 building, and requiring Montezuma to “file copies of any and all written lease documents for the
16 arsenic treatment plant and building as soon as such documents come into Montezuma Rimrock’s
17 possession and . . . provide courtesy copies of those documents to Mr. Dougherty and Staff through
18 electronic mail.” The parties were also instructed, if the lease documents were made available to
19 them at least 24 hours before the procedural conference, to prepare analyses concerning the
20 categorization of the lease, the need for Commission approval of the lease, whether the 40-252
21 Docket should remain open, and whether an evidentiary hearing should be held for the 40-252
22 Docket. Montezuma was directed to be able to identify at the procedural conference the date by
23 which the lease documents would be made available, if the lease documents were not available at
24 least 24 hours before the procedural conference.

25 On January 6, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Ms. Olsen personally filed a Request to Have John
26 Dougherty Removed as Intervener, requesting that Mr. Dougherty be removed as an intervenor from
27 all dockets involving Montezuma. In the Request, Ms. Olsen made a number of allegations against
28 Mr. Dougherty, including that Mr. Dougherty had violated an Injunction by sending Ms. Olsen an e-

1 mail on December 4, 2011, and that Mr. Dougherty was aware that he was not permitted to contact
2 Ms. Olsen due to the Injunction.

3 Also on January 6, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Douglas Fitzpatrick, counsel for Montezuma,
4 filed a Motion to Withdraw, with client consent. Counsel cited the “excessive and burdensome
5 barrage of motions and discovery requests submitted” by Mr. Dougherty, which resulted in
6 “significant time demands . . . and . . . bills for legal services which are onerous.”

7 On January 6, 2012, in the Complaint Docket, Mr. Fitzpatrick filed a Motion to Withdraw,
8 with client consent, for the same reasons stated in the Motion to Withdraw filed in the 40-252
9 Docket.

10 On January 11, 2012, a Procedural Order was issued in the 40-252 Docket stating that Ms.
11 Olsen’s Request was improper and would not be considered because Montezuma had been
12 represented by counsel at the time Ms. Olsen’s Request was filed and continued to be represented by
13 counsel. The Procedural Order determined that Ms. Olsen had no right to make filings on behalf of
14 Montezuma as its representative and had no right to conduct any aspect of the litigation of the case
15 except through counsel until such time as Montezuma was no longer represented by counsel.²⁸ The
16 Procedural Order also denied Mr. Fitzpatrick’s Motion to Withdraw, in that counsel had not
17 established therein that the withdrawal would not interfere with the administration of justice and
18 would not prejudice any party to the matter, due to the existing Injunction Against Harassment issued
19 by the Verde Valley Justice Court, under which Mr. Dougherty was prohibited from having any
20 contact with Ms. Olsen “except through attorneys, legal process, and court hearings.” The Procedural
21 Order pointed out that the Injunction did not clarify whether Mr. Dougherty could engage in any of
22 the communications (outside of a formal proceeding at the Commission) that would be typical
23 between parties in a contested case and necessary for the matter to move forward with Mr. Dougherty
24 continuing to appear *pro se* and Montezuma not represented by counsel. The Procedural Order stated
25 that the Motion to Withdraw could not and would not be granted until either Montezuma provided
26 notice that it had retained replacement counsel or Ms. Olsen provided documentation establishing
27

28 ²⁸ The Procedural Order cited *Lincoln v. Lincoln*, 155 Ariz. 272, 746 P.2d 13 (Ariz. Ct. App. 1987).

1 that she was qualified to serve as Montezuma's representative under Arizona Supreme Court Rule
2 31(d)(28) and that, pursuant to an Order issued by the Verde Valley Justice Court, Mr. Dougherty
3 could communicate directly with Ms. Olsen, or the Injunction Against Harassment had been
4 dismissed. The Procedural Order denied the Motion to Withdraw, without prejudice; continued the
5 scheduled procedural conference; and established a deadline for Montezuma to make the described
6 filing.

7 On January 11, 2012, in the Complaint Docket, a Procedural Order was issued denying Mr.
8 Fitzpatrick's Motion to Withdraw, for the same reasons cited in the Procedural Order issued in the
9 40-252 Docket; continuing the procedural conference scheduled for January 18, 2012, until further
10 order of the Commission; and establishing the same requirements related to Montezuma's
11 representation as had been established in the Procedural Order issued in the 40-252 Docket.

12 On February 7, 2012, in the Complaint Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Compel
13 Discovery, recounting communication efforts made with Mr. Fitzpatrick to gain discovery of records
14 requested in Mr. Dougherty's Third Data Request and requesting that Montezuma be ordered
15 immediately to produce the records. Mr. Dougherty also filed a Certificate of Complainant in
16 Support of Discovery Motion.

17 On February 21, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Ms. Olsen made a filing that included a January
18 27, 2012, cover letter from Kevlor Design Group, LLC, ("Kevlor") to Ms. Olsen regarding Proposal
19 ID KDG012712, along with an unexecuted "Contract for: Arsenic Treatment System With Patricia
20 Olsen Owner/Operator of Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC" showing a total project cost
21 of \$46,000 for design; manufacturing; delivery; and installation of an arsenic removal system up to
22 the wellhead at Well No. 1, with installation including tie-ins with shut-off valves, manual by-pass
23 valves, and coupling spools or tees. The filing also included an unexecuted Water Services
24 Agreement between Ms. Olsen and Montezuma, under which Montezuma would pay Ms. Olsen for
25 arsenic treatment (including installation, maintenance, and ownership of the facilities) for 20 years
26 and would be required to buy the arsenic treatment system for \$1 at the end of the 20-year period.
27 The monthly payments to Ms. Olsen under the Water Services Agreement would be \$1,500 per
28 month as a "Monthly Standby Fee" to recover the cost of constructing the facilities, plus a \$400 per

1 acre foot treatment fee and, to the extent more than 42 acre feet of water were treated in a year,
2 another \$400 additional treatment fee per acre-foot. The filing also included four pages of an
3 unexecuted "5 Page Lease Agreement" form showing Financial Pacific Leasing, LLC ("Financial
4 Pacific") as Lessor, not identifying a Lessee, and bearing the identifier "App# 365512, 092007C" in
5 its footer.

6 On February 27, 2012, in the Complaint Docket, a Procedural Order was issued holding in
7 abeyance Mr. Dougherty's Motion to Compel Discovery, until further Order of the Commission, due
8 to the unresolved issue related to Montezuma's representation. Additionally, the Procedural Order
9 stated the following:

10 Meanwhile, the parties are reminded that each party has a duty to
11 deal with the other in good faith. The continuing disputes between these
12 parties suggest a failure to honor this duty. The parties are strongly urged
13 to make additional efforts to resolve their current discovery dispute
without involving the Commission. The parties have previously shown
that they are capable of resolving their own discovery disputes with a little
bit of effort.²⁹

14 On March 9, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma filed Notice of Replacement Counsel,
15 stating that Montezuma would be represented by Todd C. Wiley of Fennemore Craig, P.C.

16 On March 12, 2012, in the Complaint Docket, Montezuma filed Notice of Replacement
17 Counsel, stating that Montezuma would be represented by Mr. Wiley.

18 On March 12, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, a Procedural Order was issued granting the Motion
19 to Withdraw previously denied without prejudice for Montezuma's counsel; scheduling a joint
20 procedural conference for April 13, 2012; and ordering as follows:

21 [I]f Montezuma Rimrock has executed any contractual documents
22 related to purchase, construction, installation, operation, or maintenance of
23 an arsenic treatment facility to treat the water from its Well # 1 and/or
Well # 4, Montezuma Rimrock shall, by March 30, 2012, file a copy of all
such contractual documents in this docket.

24 On March 13, 2012, in the Complaint Docket, a Procedural Order was issued granting Mr.
25 Fitzpatrick's Motion to Withdraw; scheduling a joint procedural conference to be held for both the
26 Complaint Docket and the 40-252 Docket on April 13, 2012; and requiring Montezuma and Mr.

27 ²⁹ Procedural Order of February 27, 2012, issued in the Complaint Docket. The quoted text was directly followed by
28 the following footnote text: "This was evidenced by the parties' resolution of their then-existing discovery dispute
through the relatively brief discussions held prior to the most recent procedural conference."

1 Dougherty either to make a joint filing before April 13, 2012, indicating that their discovery dispute
2 had been resolved and that Mr. Dougherty's Motion to Compel was withdrawn or to arrive for the
3 procedural conference at least one hour early to engage in discussions in an earnest attempt to settle
4 the discovery dispute themselves. The Procedural Order also explained what would be required
5 during the procedural conference if no resolution of the dispute had been reached and required each
6 party to be prepared to discuss and make a proposal as to future scheduling for the matter.

7 On March 13, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Bar Execution of
8 Arsenic Treatment Contract, requesting the Commission to bar Montezuma from entering into any
9 contract in connection with arsenic treatment facilities or, in the alternative, to bar Montezuma from
10 implementing any contract that had already been signed, until after the other parties had an
11 opportunity to analyze and comment on the contract and the Commission approved the contract.

12 On March 14, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, original counsel for Montezuma filed a Notice of
13 Withdrawal of Motion to Withdraw.

14 On March 19, 2012, Ms. Olsen made a filing in the 40-252 Docket, this time including an e-
15 mail sent to Ms. Olsen; a "Statement to the Arizona Corporation Commission" from "Gregory S.
16 Olsen, Hydrologist"; two executed one-page lease agreements between Ms. Olsen and Nile River,
17 one a 36-month lease for arsenic building plant and the other a 60-month lease for arsenic removal
18 water treatment system, and both apparently signed by Ms. Olsen and "Robin Richards" on March
19 16, 2012; an unexecuted Water Services Agreement between Ms. Olsen and Montezuma, with the
20 same material terms as filed in the previous filing by Ms. Olsen; and a Kevlor "Contract for: Arsenic
21 Treatment System With Patricia Olsen Owner/Operator of Montezuma Rimrock Water Company,
22 LLC" regarding Proposal ID KDG012712 with an executed Contract Acceptance Form apparently
23 signed on January 27, 2012, by Kelvin Duffy for Kevlor and on February 28, 2012, by Ms. Olsen.

24 On March 20, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma filed a Response to Motion to Bar
25 Execution of Arsenic Treatment Contract, stating that the Motion should be summarily denied as
26 contrary to law, unsupported, and frivolous. The Response further stated that Montezuma's current
27 arsenic treatment plan was to have Ms. Olsen, in her individual capacity, enter into a contract with
28 Kevlor for construction and operation of arsenic treatment facilities; for Ms. Olsen to finance those

1 facilities through a lease agreement with Odyssey; and for Ms. Olsen to enter into a Water Services
2 Agreement with Montezuma under which Ms. Olsen would lease the arsenic treatment facilities to
3 Montezuma. Montezuma stated that the terms and conditions of the Kevlor contract, and the terms of
4 the Water Services Agreement, had been filed with the Commission on February 21, 2012, and that
5 the contracts and lease agreement were in the process of final execution and would be filed as soon as
6 possible. Montezuma further stated that the Commission had no authority over the agreement
7 between Ms. Olsen and Kevlor, the agreement between Ms. Olsen and Odyssey, or the Water
8 Services Agreement between Ms. Olsen and Montezuma, because there was no debt issuance
9 involved. Montezuma acknowledged that operational expenses could be reviewed by the
10 Commission or Staff as part of a rate case.

11 On March 21, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Response to Company's
12 Signed Purchase, Lease and Sublease Agreements; Supplement to Motion to Bar Implementation of
13 Signed Contracts, taking issue with the material terms of the various agreements filed on March 20,
14 2012, and stating that Montezuma was entering into a capital lease agreement and that Ms. Olsen's
15 role essentially should be ignored as a "ploy to sidestep regulatory oversight." Mr. Dougherty
16 requested that the Commission bar implementation of the signed purchase agreement, lease
17 agreement, and water services agreement until the agreements received full Commission approval.

18 On March 21, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty also filed a Motion to Deny
19 Counsel's Notice of Withdrawal of Motion to Withdraw, based upon the expense of having
20 Montezuma retain and pay two attorneys.

21 On April 6, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Reschedule April 13
22 Hearing, requesting rescheduling based on Mr. Dougherty's need to travel out of state due to an
23 unforeseen family medical situation and then business.

24 On April 6, 2012, in the Complaint Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Reschedule
25 April 13 Hearing, for the same reasons as stated in the 40-252 Docket request.

26 On April 9, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, a Procedural Order was issued vacating the joint
27 procedural conference scheduled for April 13, 2012; scheduling a joint procedural conference to be
28 held on April 30, 2012; requiring Montezuma, through counsel, to file, by April 13, 2012, complete

1 copies of any and all executed agreements by Ms. Olsen or Montezuma for arsenic treatment; and
2 requiring the parties to file, by April 27, 2012, an analysis of each document, a position on whether
3 the 40-252 Docket should remain open, and a position on whether an evidentiary hearing should be
4 held in the 40-252 Docket. The Procedural Order noted that both Mr. Dougherty's March 13, 2012,
5 Motion to Bar Execution of Arsenic Treatment Contract and the March 14, 2012, Notice of
6 Withdrawal of Motion to Withdraw filed by Montezuma's original counsel had been deemed denied.

7 On April 9, 2012, in the Complaint Docket, a Procedural Order was issued vacating the joint
8 procedural conference scheduled for April 13, 2012; scheduling a joint procedural conference to be
9 held on April 30, 2012; requiring the parties to arrive an hour early to engage in discovery dispute
10 settlement discussions before the procedural conference if they had not made a joint filing as to its
11 resolution before that date; and requiring the parties to be prepared to discuss scheduling.

12 On April 13, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma filed a Notice of Filing including the
13 following documents: a "Water Services Agreement between the Company and Ms. Olsen dated
14 March 16, 2012"; the "Terms and Conditions of Lease between Ms. Olsen and Nile River Leasing
15 dated March 16, 2012"; and a "Contract for Arsenic Treatment System between Ms. Olsen and
16 Kevlor Design Group dated February 28, 2012." Montezuma stated that the documents had
17 previously been filed on March 19, 2012. The Water Services Agreement copy filed showed
18 execution by Ms. Olsen as both lessor and lessee on March 16, 2012. The Nile River leases showed
19 execution by Ms. Olsen and "Robin Richards" on March 16, 2012. The Kevlor contract showed
20 acceptance by Kevlor on January 27, 2012, and by Ms. Olsen on February 28, 2012.

21 On April 13, 2012, in the Complaint Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Submission of Exhibit
22 11A in Support of Allegations IV & VIII of the Complaint. The document attached was an April 10,
23 2012, letter from YCDS notifying Ms. Olsen that the administrative extension for Montezuma's
24 approved Use Permit had expired on April 5, 2012, because no Certificate of Compliance had been
25 obtained, and further stating that the Use Permit to allow the operation of Well No. 4 as part of the
26 Montezuma Rimrock Water Company had been revoked as of April 5, 2012.

27 On April 20, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Stay, stating that
28 the YCDS had revoked Montezuma's Use Permit for Well No. 4 on April 9, 2012; that Montezuma

1 had filed a cross-claim in the Yavapai County lawsuit seeking to have the Yavapai County Water
2 Code ruled invalid; that ADEQ had issued a NOV to Montezuma for failure to comply with Consent
3 Order No. DW-36-10, which required for the arsenic treatment plant to be installed by April 7, 2012;
4 and that it thus was not in the best interests of Montezuma, its customers, or the public for
5 proceedings in the 40-252 Docket to continue. Mr. Dougherty requested that the Commission stay all
6 proceedings in the 40-252 Docket until the pending legal and administrative issues regarding
7 Montezuma's Use Permit were settled in Yavapai County and the ADEQ NOV was resolved. Mr.
8 Dougherty included copies of the referenced documents.

9 On April 27, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Staff filed Staff's Notice of Response to Procedural
10 Order, analyzing the Water Services Agreement and determining that it was a capital lease agreement
11 requiring Commission approval, stating that the 40-252 Docket should remain open to evaluate
12 whether to modify Decision No. 71317 to allow for the Water Services Agreement, and stating that
13 there was no need for a hearing on the Water Services Agreement. Staff included a Memorandum by
14 a Staff Analyst.

15 On April 27, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma filed a Legal Brief stating that "the
16 three agreements at issue speak for themselves"; that the Kevlor contract was strictly between Ms.
17 Olsen and Kevlor and thus not subject to Commission jurisdiction or in need of Commission
18 approval; that the lease between Ms. Olsen and Nile River was strictly between Ms. Olsen and Nile
19 River and thus not subject to Commission jurisdiction or in need of Commission approval; and that
20 the Water Services Agreement was an operational agreement, with an option to purchase, and not an
21 issuance of indebtedness requiring Commission approval under A.R.S. § 40-301 *et seq.* Montezuma
22 asserted that modification of Decision No. 71317 was no longer necessary and that the 40-252
23 Docket should be closed and Montezuma permitted to go forward with the implementation of its
24 agreements.

25 On April 27, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Response to Procedural
26 Order, stating that the Water Services Agreement was a capital lease needing Commission approval,
27 that the 40-252 Docket should remain open, and that an evidentiary hearing should be held in the 40-
28

1 252 Docket before the Commission allowed any modification of Decision No. 71317 or approved any
2 alternate financing method for Montezuma's arsenic treatment facilities.

3 On April 30, 2012, a joint procedural conference was held in the 40-252 Docket and the
4 Complaint Docket. During the procedural conference, Montezuma asserted that there was no need to
5 revise Decision No. 71317 because Montezuma no longer desired to obtain a private loan; Staff
6 asserted that Decision No. 71317 would still need to be revised if Montezuma wanted to implement
7 an ARSM; Montezuma stated that Well No. 4 was to be used only for backwash and that such use
8 was permissible according to both Yavapai County and ADEQ; Mr. Dougherty disputed
9 Montezuma's assertions regarding the County and ADEQ; Montezuma acknowledged that the Water
10 Services Agreement would be considered a capital lease under Generally Acceptable Accounting
11 ("GAAP") Standards; Montezuma stated that it expected to file a new rate case in the next couple of
12 weeks; Mr. Dougherty stated that he might withdraw his Complaint in the Complaint Docket if he
13 were granted intervention in the rate case; and Montezuma was instructed that it needed to determine,
14 and make appropriate filings regarding, how it desired to finance its arsenic treatment facilities in
15 light of the different requirements for Commission approval that would result from different chosen
16 paths. Additionally, Mr. Dougherty's Motion to Compel and Motion to Stay in the 40-252 Docket
17 were denied.

18 On May 16, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed an Emergency Motion for
19 Temporary Restraining Order and Order to Show Cause, stating that he had witnessed construction of
20 an arsenic treatment facility at Well No. 1 on May 15, 2012; that records he obtained from ADEQ
21 showed that there had been an April 26, 2012, meeting between ADEQ, Staff, and Montezuma at
22 which Montezuma stated that it would have the arsenic facilities installed by June 7, 2012, to meet an
23 ADEQ compliance deadline; and that irreparable harm would be done if the arsenic treatment facility
24 were allowed to continue and an injunction was necessary to preserve the status quo until Montezuma
25 submitted proposed financing and operational plans, contingent on the inability to use Well No. 4,
26 and the Commission determined whether the financing plans needed formal approval. Mr. Dougherty
27 included an ADEQ document memorializing the April 26, 2012, meeting and a May 1, 2012, letter
28 constituting Montezuma's application for appeal of the revocation of its Use Permit by YCDS.

1 On May 25, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed notice that the Verde Valley
2 Justice Court had, on May 23, 2012, dismissed the Injunction Against Harassment Order obtained
3 against him by Ms. Olsen. Mr. Dougherty included a copy of the Court Order.

4 On May 31, 2012, Montezuma filed, in the Rask Docket, an application for approval of
5 financing in the form of a loan agreement in which Montezuma promised to pay Rask Construction
6 ("Rask") the sum of \$68,592, with interest from May 1, 2012, at a rate of 6 percent per year, for
7 Rask's installation of a water line from the well on Tiemann (Well No. 4) to Well No. 1 on Towers.

8 On May 31, 2012, Montezuma filed, in the Olsen Docket, an application for approval of
9 financing in the form of a loan agreement in which Montezuma promised to pay Ms. Olsen the sum
10 of \$21,377, with interest from August 30, 2011, at a rate of 6 percent per year, for the purchase of the
11 Well No. 4 site and a company vehicle.

12 On May 31, 2012, Montezuma filed, in the Arias Docket, an application for approval of
13 financing in the form of a loan agreement in which Montezuma promised to pay Sergei Arias the sum
14 of \$15,000, with interest from July 1, 2011, at a rate of 6 percent per year, for the purchase of an
15 8,000-gallon hydro-pneumatic tank to provide additional water storage to the system.

16 On May 31, 2012, in the Rate Docket, Montezuma filed a rate application using a 2011 test
17 year ("TY"), to comply with the filing deadline imposed by Decision No. 71317, although
18 Montezuma acknowledged that the application was not sufficient.

19 On June 7, 2012, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Intervene in the Rask Docket, a Motion to
20 Intervene in the Olsen Docket, a Motion to Intervene in the Arias Docket, and a Motion to Intervene
21 in the Rate Docket. Mr. Dougherty also requested consolidation of the Rask Docket, the Olsen
22 Docket, the Arias Docket, and the Rate Docket and that an evidentiary hearing be held.

23 On June 14, 2012, in the Olsen Docket, a comment was filed expressing opposition to the
24 Olsen Docket's request to approve financing for Montezuma to purchase a vehicle.

25 No response or objection was filed to any of Mr. Dougherty's Motions to Intervene.

26 On June 25, 2012, a Procedural Order was issued in the Rask Docket granting Mr.
27 Dougherty's Motion to Intervene, requiring Montezuma and Staff to file responses to Mr.

28

1 Dougherty's requests for consolidation and for an evidentiary hearing, and requiring Montezuma to
2 identify its representative for the Rask Docket.

3 On June 25, 2012, Procedural Orders were issued in the Olsen Docket, the Arias Docket, and
4 the Rate Docket with the same provisions as in the Procedural Order for the Rask Docket.

5 On July 2, 2012, in the Rate Docket, Staff issued a Letter of Insufficiency.

6 On July 2, 2012, in the Rask Docket and the Olsen Docket, Mr. Buddeke filed comments
7 opposing Montezuma's applications, stating that Montezuma had built "a pipeline to nowhere" at
8 ratepayer expense.

9 On July 9, 2012, in the Rask Docket, the Olsen Docket, and the Arias Docket, Pamela
10 Benetos filed comments opposing Montezuma's applications.

11 On July 16, 2012, in the Rask Docket, the Olsen Docket, the Arias Docket, and the Rate
12 Docket, Ms. Olsen filed letters stating that Montezuma opposed an evidentiary hearing and opposed
13 consolidation.

14 On July 16, 2012, in the Rask Docket, the Olsen Docket, the Arias Docket, and the Rate
15 Docket, Staff filed Staff's Response to Procedural Order, stating that Staff supported consolidation of
16 the Rate Docket with the Rask Docket, the Olsen Docket, and the Arias Docket and that Staff was
17 taking no position on whether an evidentiary hearing should be held.

18 On July 24, 2012, a Procedural Order was issued consolidating the Rask Docket, the Olsen
19 Docket, the Arias Docket, and the Rate Docket into the Consolidated R&F Docket; ordering that an
20 evidentiary hearing would be held in the Consolidated R&F Docket; ordering Montezuma to file a
21 Notice of Appearance if it intended to be represented by an attorney or another eligible individual;
22 and establishing general procedural requirements.

23 On August 3, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Ms. Olsen filed for Montezuma a
24 document stating that Montezuma had not received Staff's Letter of Insufficiency until July 27, 2012,
25 when it was sent by e-mail, and requesting a 30-day extension to respond to Staff's data requests.

26 On August 8, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Staff filed Staff's Response to Request
27 for Extension, stating that Staff had mailed the Letter of Insufficiency by certified mail on July 3,
28 2012, and had received it back as unclaimed mail on July 25, 2012. Staff expressed concern that the

1 Letter of Insufficiency had been returned as unclaimed when it had been sent by certified mail to the
2 main address on file for Montezuma.³⁰ Staff also stated, however, that it did not object to
3 Montezuma's requested 30-day extension.

4 On August 9, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, a Procedural Order was issued stating
5 that the Hearing Division generally does not become involved with extension requests filed before an
6 application is determined to be sufficient by Staff and that, under A.A.C. R14-2-103(B), Staff could
7 exercise discretion regarding the amount of time an applicant could be permitted to respond to a
8 Letter of Insufficiency and Data Request. The Procedural Order did, however, require Montezuma to
9 make a filing clarifying the mailing address for documents sent to it.

10 On August 14, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Ms. Olsen filed a document stating
11 that Montezuma's mailing address continued to be the same.³¹

12 On September 4, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Ms. Olsen filed Montezuma's
13 responses to the Letter of Insufficiency, which included amended rate application pages along with a
14 number of supporting documents. The amended application pages showed that Montezuma was
15 requesting an increase in revenue of \$43,400, which Montezuma estimated would result in a rate
16 increase of approximately \$18.08 per month for each of its 202 metered customers.

17 On September 14, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Ms. Olsen filed an amended plant
18 summary page for Montezuma's rate application.

19 On October 9, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Ms. Olsen filed several amended pages
20 for Montezuma's rate application, along with supporting documents. The amended application pages
21 showed that Montezuma was requesting an increase in revenue of \$76,800, which Montezuma
22 estimated would result in a rate increase of approximately \$32.00 per month for each of its 202
23 metered customers. Montezuma further requested a "JD Legal Surcharge" of \$6.57 per customer per
24 month for legal fees that Montezuma attributed to Mr. Dougherty's intervention, which Montezuma
25 stated amounted to \$47,298.09 over a three-year period.

26
27
28 ³⁰ The address used was P.O. Box 10, Rimrock, Arizona 86335.

³¹ The address identified was P.O. Box 10, Rimrock, Arizona 86335.

1 On October 10, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion
2 requesting that Montezuma be ordered to provide Mr. Dougherty with copies of all past and future
3 filings made by Montezuma in the Consolidated R&F Docket. Mr. Dougherty stated that Montezuma
4 had failed to provide copies of documents filed in the Consolidated R&F Docket on July 16, August
5 3, August 14, September 4, September 14, and October 9. Mr. Dougherty also stated that
6 Montezuma had failed to provide Mr. Dougherty copies of motions and responses filed in the
7 Financing I, Financing II, and Financing III Dockets.

8 On October 25, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Ms. Olsen filed an affidavit stating
9 that the Statements in Support of Rate Request, Current and Proposed Rates and Charges, and
10 Narrative Description of Application for Rate Adjustment pages from its amended application had
11 been mailed to Montezuma's customers on October 12, 2012.

12 On October 26, 2012, in the Complaint Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Notice of Filing
13 Additional Exhibits; Motion to Set Hearing, including an excerpt from June 18, 2012, YCBOS
14 meeting minutes upholding revocation of Montezuma's Use Permit for Well No. 4; a September 20,
15 2012, Yavapai County Superior Court ruling upholding the Yavapai County Water Code; and an
16 October 2, 2012, Yavapai County Notice of Violation for non-permitted use on the parcel containing
17 Well No. 4. Mr. Dougherty requested that a hearing be set on the Complaint, as amended, at the
18 soonest possible date.³²

19 On October 29, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, a Procedural Order was issued
20 requiring Montezuma to serve upon Mr. Dougherty, by November 10, 2012, a copy of each filing
21 made by Montezuma to date in each docket underlying the Consolidated R&F Docket; requiring
22 Montezuma to file proof of service upon Mr. Dougherty; and requiring Montezuma to include in all
23 future filings proof of service conforming to the requirements of A.A.C. R14-3-107(C).

24 On November 2, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Staff filed a Letter of Sufficiency,
25 stating that Montezuma's rate application had met the sufficiency requirements outlined in A.A.C.
26 R14-2-103 and had been classified as a Class D utility.

27 _____
28 ³² No response was filed to Mr. Dougherty's Motion to Set Hearing filed in the Complaint Docket; it was deemed
denied as of November 15, 2012.

1 On November 5, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Montezuma filed several amended
2 rate application pages, including amended proposed rates and charges representing a larger increase
3 than previously requested.

4 On November 8, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, a Rate Case Procedural Order was
5 issued scheduling a hearing to commence on February 7, 2013, and establishing other procedural
6 requirements and deadlines.

7 Also on November 8, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Staff filed a Request for
8 Procedural Schedule, requesting that a scheduling Procedural Order be issued and providing several
9 suggested procedural deadlines, not including a hearing date.³³

10 On November 9, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, the Residential Utility Consumer
11 Office ("RUCO") filed RUCO's Application to Intervene.

12 On November 15, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Montezuma filed a Response to
13 Procedural Orders stating that the October 29, 2012, Procedural Order had been received on
14 November 13, 2012, and that Montezuma had mailed all of the required filings to Mr. Dougherty on
15 November 14, 2012, via certified mail, for which Montezuma provided a copy of a receipt as proof of
16 service. Montezuma also requested an extension of time to file its response to the Staff Report and of
17 the deadline for new discovery requests, stating that Ms. Olsen needed to be available both before
18 and during Mr. Buddeke's criminal trial, set to take four days, commencing on January 24, 2013.
19 Montezuma further stated that it had received no data requests from Mr. Dougherty, but believed that
20 they would be onerous and would necessitate three weeks to respond.

21 On November 23, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, a Procedural Order was issued
22 granting RUCO's Application to Intervene, to which no objection had been filed.

23 On November 26, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Montezuma filed an amendment to
24 its rate application, newly requesting a surcharge of \$6.04 per customer per month to replace two
25 storage tanks that Montezuma stated had been repaired repeatedly and had become beyond repair.

26
27
28 ³³ The Procedural Order was filed at 2:38 p.m., and Staff's Request for Procedural Schedule was filed at 4:10 p.m.,
apparently prior to Staff's having received its distributed copy of the Procedural Order.

1 Montezuma included a copy of an estimate from Cashion Tank & Steel Co. showing that the cost to
2 build two 30,000-gallon water storage tanks would be \$58,000.

3 On November 30, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed both a
4 Certificate of Intervener in Support of Discovery Motion and a document entitled "Notice of Filing
5 First Data Request to Montezuma Rimrock; Motion to Compel Production of Records requested in
6 First Data Request; Notice of Filing Second Data Request to Montezuma Rimrock; Notice of
7 Montezuma Rimrock Violating Oct. 29 Procedural Order requiring Company to Comply with A.A.C.
8 R14-3-107(C) and Motion for Sanctions; Notice of Filing Yavapai County Judgment Case No:
9 V32012000758 vs. Montezuma Rimrock." In the document, Mr. Dougherty asserted that he had sent
10 his First Data Request to Montezuma on October 26, 2012, by both e-mail and first class mail and
11 that he had followed up with Montezuma with voicemail messages left on two different Montezuma
12 phone lines on October 29, 2012, and again on November 5, 2012. Mr. Dougherty further asserted
13 that he had sent a second e-mail on November 5, 2012, to request compliance with the First Data
14 Request. Mr. Dougherty asserted that on November 20, 2012, he received the first copies of
15 Montezuma's filings in this consolidated matter, which included the November 15, 2012, statement
16 that Montezuma had not received any data requests from Mr. Dougherty. Mr. Dougherty stated that
17 all future Data Requests would be filed in the Consolidated R&F Docket as well as sent to
18 Montezuma by mail and e-mail and, further, that he would also provide Montezuma notice by
19 telephone. Mr. Dougherty also provided notice that he had mailed and e-mailed a Second Data
20 Request to Montezuma on November 28, 2012. Mr. Dougherty also asserted that Montezuma's filing
21 of November 26, 2012, had not included proof of service on Mr. Dougherty, in violation of the
22 Procedural Order of October 29, 2012. Mr. Dougherty also provided notice of a November 13, 2012,
23 YCDS judgment against Montezuma for a zoning violation, which judgment imposed a \$100 fine and
24 conditionally imposed a \$10,000 civil penalty, to become due if Montezuma were not to cease all
25 uses on the property and return it to vacant land by December 20, 2012. Mr. Dougherty asserted that
26 the parcel in question was the property containing Montezuma's Well No. 4. Mr. Dougherty
27 requested that the Commission order Montezuma to comply immediately with Mr. Dougherty's First
28 Data Request by delivering all records to Mr. Dougherty by December 10, 2012, and further that the

1 Commission impose appropriate sanctions against Montezuma for violating the October 29
2 Procedural Order. Mr. Dougherty included certification that the filing had been mailed to
3 Montezuma, but did not indicate that it had been mailed either to Staff or to RUCO.

4 On December 3, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Montezuma re-filed its November
5 26, 2012, Amendment to Application along with Proof of Service on RUCO and Mr. Dougherty, but
6 not Staff.

7 Also on December 3, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Montezuma filed a Request for
8 Procedural Conference and Additional Rate Case Information. In its filing, Montezuma requested a
9 procedural conference to discuss the Procedural Order of November 8, 2012, due to Montezuma's
10 understanding that "small water companies are not required to submit testimony and in the past have
11 not been required to submit testimony" and its belief that the Procedural Order gave "no information .
12 . . as to the type, nature, and requirements regarding the testimony request." Montezuma's Request
13 included the names and addresses for Mr. Dougherty and RUCO, which was understood to indicate
14 that service had been made upon them.

15 On December 4, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Ms. Olsen filed a copy of an ADEQ AOC-
16 Partial Approval for Montezuma's arsenic treatment facility. The AOC, issued by ADEQ on
17 November 21, 2012, stated that it authorized Montezuma to begin operating the arsenic treatment
18 facility as represented in the approved plan on file with ADEQ. The AOC also stated that the AOC
19 was not applicable for the 30,000-gallon water storage tank per ATC Permit and that Montezuma had
20 until June 11, 2013, to install a 30,000-gallon water storage tank or a new ATC application would be
21 required.

22 On December 4, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Ms. Olsen filed a letter requesting the
23 "withdrawal of [Montezuma's] WIFA loan request and the submittal requirements." The request was
24 disregarded as improperly filed by Ms. Olsen rather than Montezuma's counsel.

25 On December 4, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Ms. Olsen filed a bundle of documents
26 captioned "Approval of Construction for Well #4 Extension." The request was disregarded as
27 improperly filed by Ms. Olsen rather than Montezuma's counsel.

28

1 On December 7, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, a Procedural Order was issued
2 scheduling a procedural conference to be held therein on January 2, 2013; requiring Montezuma,
3 before the procedural conference, to provide as to each portion of Mr. Dougherty's First Data
4 Request and Second Data Request a good faith and complete response or, if Montezuma had a valid
5 legal rationale for doing so, to file an objection explaining the rationale or, in the alternate, to reach
6 an agreement with Mr. Dougherty regarding the information to be provided. The Procedural Order
7 further required Montezuma to thoroughly review the Commission's Rules in A.A.C. Title 14,
8 Chapter 3, Article 1 and to use the Commission's e-Docket function to review direct testimony filed
9 in other water utility cases. The Procedural Order further directed each party to ensure service of
10 documents on each other party and to include proof of service on filings. The Procedural Order also
11 vacated the procedural schedule established in the Procedural Order of November 8, 2012; required
12 Montezuma to make a filing indicating whether Montezuma had provided notice of the February 7,
13 2013, hearing date; indicated that if Montezuma had provided such notice, a public comment
14 proceeding would be held on that date; and suspended the Commission's time frame to issue a
15 decision in the Consolidated R&F Docket.

16 On December 14, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Montezuma made a filing
17 including a Certificate of Public Notice showing that notice of the February 7, 2013, hearing date had
18 been mailed to each of its customers on December 1, 2012, and an Affidavit of Publication showing
19 that the notice had been published in *The Camp Verde Journal* on December 5, 2012.

20 On December 14, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a request to
21 attend the January 2, 2013, procedural conference telephonically, as Mr. Dougherty had made
22 international travel plans, or alternatively, to have the procedural conference postponed to a date no
23 earlier than January 31, 2013. Mr. Dougherty also requested that Montezuma not receive an
24 extension of its discovery response deadline, set at January 2, 2013.

25 On December 17, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, a Procedural Order was issued
26 vacating the procedural conference scheduled for January 2, 2013; ordering that a public comment
27 proceeding would convene at the time previously set for hearing on February 7, 2013, and that a
28

1 procedural conference be held immediately thereafter; and extending to January 16, 2013,
2 Montezuma's deadline to respond to Mr. Dougherty's discovery requests.

3 On December 21, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Montezuma filed a Request for
4 Additional Time to Respond to ACC Staff's Data Request, stating that Montezuma's accountant had
5 sent an attached letter³⁴ stating that he would need until January 17, 2013, to respond to Staff data
6 requests.

7 On January 10, 2013, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Montezuma filed a Response to John
8 Dougherty Data Request, including a number of attached documents.

9 On January 14, 2013, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion for
10 Procedural Conference to Resolve Discovery Dispute, stating that Montezuma's Response to John
11 Dougherty Data Request had failed to produce records for the majority of the items sought, providing
12 no valid legal rationale for withholding the records. Mr. Dougherty further stated that his efforts to
13 communicate with Ms. Olsen had been unsuccessful and that Ms. Olsen had refused to pick up from
14 the Rimrock Post Office the certified mail including Mr. Dougherty's Second Data Request. Mr.
15 Dougherty requested that a procedural conference be scheduled to address the discovery issues. Mr.
16 Dougherty also filed a Certificate of Intervenor in Support of Discovery Motion.

17 On January 14, 2013, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Mr. Dougherty also filed a document
18 entitled "Motion to Hold Montezuma in Contempt of the Commission; Motion to Bar Montezuma
19 from Expending Ratepayer Funds for Unapproved Capital Leases; Motion to Require Patricia Olsen
20 to Refund Company Payments Made on Unapproved Capital Leases; Motion for Criminal Referral;
21 Motion to Revoke Montezuma's CC&N." Mr. Dougherty requested that Montezuma be held in
22 contempt of the Commission and A.R.S. § 40-424 for violating two Procedural Orders in the 40-252
23 Docket; that Montezuma be barred from spending any more company funds on the "unapproved
24 Capital leases" for an arsenic treatment building and arsenic treatment system, "entered into by the
25 Company in violation of A.R.S. [§] 40-302(A)"; that Ms. Olsen be required personally to refund
26 Montezuma for all payments made on those leases; that the Commission, under A.R.S. § 40-421(A)-

27 _____
28 ³⁴ The letter was printed on plain paper rather than letterhead, with no return address or other contact information shown for the accountant, no signature, and no date.

1 (B), make a criminal referral to the Attorney General and/or the Yavapai County Attorney for
2 “fraudulent statements to the Commission asserting that Ms. Olsen, as an individual, was entering
3 into the lease agreements”; and that Montezuma’s CC&N be revoked “for knowingly deceiving the
4 Commission” as to the entity entering into the lease agreements and the status of the execution of
5 those lease agreements. Mr. Dougherty attached to the filing exhibits including two different sets of
6 executed lease agreements with Nile River, one identifying Ms. Olsen as the lessee and the other
7 identifying Montezuma as the lessee.

8 On January 14, 2013, in the 40-252 Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Bar Olsen’s
9 Submittals and Imposition Of Appropriate Penalties, requesting that Ms. Olsen’s filings of December
10 4, 2012, be rejected as improper in light of the Procedural Order of January 11, 2012; that notice be
11 issued in the 40-252 Docket confirming that they will not be considered; and that Ms. Olsen be
12 sanctioned for violating the January 11, 2012, Procedural Order, found in Contempt of the
13 Commission, and penalized under A.R.S. § 40-424.

14 On January 15, 2013, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Notice of
15 Filing Third Data Request with Montezuma, which included as an attachment a copy of a UCC
16 Financing Statement filing made with the Secretary of State on May 9, 2012, showing for a lease
17 dated April 3, 2012, that the debtor was Montezuma, the Secured Party/Lessor was Wells Fargo
18 Capital Finance, LLC, and the Assignor was Financial Pacific Leasing, LLC.

19 On January 15, 2013, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Mr. Dougherty also filed a “Notice of
20 Filing Additional Exhibit in Support of Intervener’s Motions Docketed on January 14, 2013; Motion
21 to Require Company to Submit Capital Leases to Commission for Approval.” In the document, Mr.
22 Dougherty asserted that Montezuma and its counsel had violated Procedural Orders and submitted
23 false statements in an April 27, 2012, Legal Brief. Mr. Dougherty included again the UCC Financing
24 Statement filing included with his Third Data Request, as well as another UCC Financing Statement
25 filing made with the Secretary of State on August 31, 2012, showing Montezuma as debtor, Nile
26 River as the Secured Party/Lessor, and an arsenic building plant, with electrical connection, as
27 collateral.

28

1 On January 23, 2013, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Montezuma filed a "Response to John
2 Dougherty Data Request – Additional Information," including a copy of each public records request
3 submitted to ADEQ by Mr. Dougherty in 2012, along with a copy of each Request to Review Public
4 Records Form created with a request and describing the materials released to Mr. Dougherty for
5 review.

6 On January 28, 2013, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Todd C. Wiley, Fennemore Craig,
7 entered a Notice of Appearance as counsel for Montezuma. The Notice stated that Ms. Olsen would
8 be unavailable for the procedural conference scheduled for February 7, 2013, and included a copy of
9 a subpoena issued January 18, 2013, which ordered Ms. Olsen to appear as a witness for the
10 prosecution in the Buddeke criminal trial on February 6, 2013.

11 On January 30, 2013, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to
12 Reschedule Feb. 7 Procedural Conference, requesting for the procedural conference to be rescheduled
13 because he was to serve as a defense witness in the Buddeke criminal trial scheduled to begin on
14 February 5, 2013, and to last approximately three to four days.

15 On January 31, 2013, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, a Procedural Order was issued
16 vacating the procedural conference scheduled for February 7, 2013, and scheduling a procedural
17 conference to take place on February 25, 2013. The Procedural Order further required the parties to
18 be prepared to make proposals regarding a new procedural schedule and to discuss how the 40-252
19 Docket and Complaint Docket should progress toward resolution and whether either or both should
20 be consolidated with the Consolidated R&F Docket or administratively closed.

21 On February 1, 2013, a Procedural Order was issued in the 40-252 Docket stating that the
22 Olsen filings had been improper because Montezuma was represented by counsel; scheduling a joint
23 procedural conference to be held on February 25, 2013, for the 40-252 Docket, the Complaint
24 Docket, and the Consolidated R&F Docket; and denying Mr. Dougherty's Motion to the extent that it
25 requested initiation of a contempt and penalty proceeding under A.R.S. § 40-424.

26 On February 1, 2013, a Procedural Order was issued in the Complaint Docket scheduling a
27 joint procedural conference to be held on February 25, 2013, to discuss the procedural schedule for
28 the Consolidated R&F Docket, how the Complaint Docket and the 40-252 Docket should progress

1 toward resolution; and whether any of the dockets should be consolidated with the Consolidated R&F
2 Docket or administratively closed.

3 On February 7, 2013, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, a public comment proceeding was
4 held at the Commission's offices in Phoenix. Commissioner Brenda Burns attended, and
5 Montezuma, RUCO, and Staff appeared through counsel. One individual, an owner of rental
6 properties in Montezuma's service area and served by Montezuma, provided comment, stating that
7 Montezuma's requested rate increase was too high, that the proposed rate increase would decrease the
8 value of his rental properties, and that he would prefer to receive service from AWC.

9 On February 8, 2013, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, a comment opposing Montezuma's
10 requested rate increase was filed, citing Montezuma's failure to put in an arsenic treatment plant
11 years earlier and expressing displeasure with Montezuma's treatment of its customers.

12 On February 12, 2013, in the Complaint Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Add
13 Allegation XVII.

14 On February 19, 2013, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, another comment opposing
15 Montezuma's requested rate increase was filed, with the commenter complaining about Montezuma's
16 failure to put in an arsenic treatment plant years earlier and about Montezuma's treatment of its
17 customers.

18 On February 21, 2013, in the Complaint Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed Exhibits 8 & 9 in
19 Support of Allegation XVII; Submission of Newspaper Article and Editorial on Buddeke Acquittal;
20 Correction to Paragraphs 15 and 16 in Statement of Facts in Support of Allegation XVII Docketed
21 February 12, 2013; Correction to Paragraph C under Allegation XVII Docketed February 12, 2013.

22 On February 25, 2013, in the Complaint Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed Exhibit 10 in Support of
23 Allegation XVII.

24 On February 25, 2013, a joint procedural conference was held in the 40-252 Docket, the
25 Complaint Docket, and the Consolidated R&F Docket. Montezuma stated that the arsenic treatment
26 facility was operating at Well No. 1, with the water meeting ADEQ standards; that Well No. 4 was
27 not being operated; and that Montezuma was using a condemnation process to get an easement so
28 that it could meet Yavapai County requirements. Mr. Dougherty stated that Yavapai County would

1 be issuing a Notice of Noncompliance because the site for Well No. 4 had not yet been cleared as
2 ordered. Montezuma identified the lease with Nile River and the lease with Financial Pacific as the
3 genuine leases and was unwilling to characterize them as capital leases. Mr. Dougherty stated that
4 Montezuma had committed fraud with its prior lease filings because the leases are capital leases and
5 were signed on March 22, 2012, with the UCC filing made on April 3, 2012. Mr. Dougherty also
6 stated that Ms. Olsen had made a filing on October 25, 2012, and had failed to provide service of the
7 filing on the other parties. Mr. Dougherty's Motion to Add Allegation XVII to his Complaint was
8 discussed but not ruled upon. Mr. Dougherty stated that he would file an Amended Complaint by the
9 end of the week, Montezuma was directed to file a response within 20 days, and Staff was also
10 directed to file a response. The parties were told that there would be a hearing in the Complaint
11 Docket and that prefiled testimony would be required in the Consolidated R&F Docket.

12 On February 26, 2013, a Procedural Order was issued consolidating for all purposes going
13 forward the Consolidated R&F Docket, the Complaint Docket, and the 40-252 Docket into this
14 matter; scheduling a hearing to commence on May 3, 2013; scheduling a prehearing conference for
15 April 29, 2013; and establishing notice and filing requirements and deadlines. *Inter alia*, the
16 Procedural Order required Mr. Dougherty to file, by March 1, 2013, an Amended Complaint intended
17 to replace his prior complaint as modified to date. The Procedural Order also notified Montezuma
18 that it had the burden of proof as to the requests made by it in the Consolidated R&F Docket and the
19 40-252 Docket and notified Mr. Dougherty that he had the burden of proof as to the allegations made
20 by him in the Complaint Docket.

21 On February 27, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed an Amended Formal Complaint; Motion to Add
22 Allegation XVII. Therein, Mr. Dougherty asserted that Montezuma had admitted to the following
23 Allegations from the original Complaint, in whole or in part, and Mr. Dougherty incorporated them
24 by reference, with Montezuma's admissions, in the Amended Complaint: Allegations I, IV, VII, XI,
25 XII, XIII, and XV. Mr. Dougherty withdrew Allegations III, V, VI, and XVI without prejudice and
26 withdrew Allegations VII, IX, XIII, and XIV with prejudice. Mr. Dougherty then recited anew
27 Allegations I, II, VIII, and X and moved for five claims to be accepted as Allegation XVII.

28

1 On February 28, 2013, a Procedural Order was issued correcting a typographical error
2 contained in the notice language in the Procedural Order issued on February 26, 2013, and directing
3 Montezuma to provide notice using the corrected language.

4 On February 28, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed corrections to his Amended Complaint, clarifying
5 that Allegation VII was not incorporated by reference in the Amended Complaint.

6 On March 1, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed two documents described as sworn affidavits from
7 Nile River member John Torbenson and administrative assistant Robin L. Richards.

8 On March 6, 2013, counsel for Montezuma filed Notice of Change of Firm Address.

9 On March 7, 2013, a Procedural Order was issued granting Mr. Dougherty's motion to
10 include Allegation XVII in his Amended Complaint.

11 On March 12, 2013, RUCO filed RUCO's Notice of Withdrawal from this matter.

12 On March 15, 2013, Montezuma filed a Joint Request for Extension, on behalf of itself and
13 Staff, stating that Montezuma intended to make amended rate case filings related to financing
14 approvals and to update certain filings in the rate case and requesting that the hearing date and
15 testimony filing deadlines be extended by 30-45 days. Montezuma stated that Mr. Dougherty had
16 been consulted by Staff and was opposed to the extension.

17 On March 18, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Deny RUCO's Motion to Withdraw as
18 Intervener, stating that Montezuma's rate case required RUCO's full participation.

19 On March 18, 2013, Montezuma filed an Answer to Amended Formal Complaint, identifying
20 Allegations I, II, IV, VII, VIII, X, XI, XII, XV, and XVII as those remaining at issue; asserting that
21 the other Allegations should be dismissed; and providing Montezuma's responses to the remaining
22 Allegations.

23 On March 21, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed a "Notice of filing additional exhibits; Response to
24 Staff's and Company's Joint Filing to Extend Schedule; Motion to Maintain Complaint portion of
25 Docket under Current Hearing Schedule." Mr. Dougherty stated that he was providing a replacement
26 affidavit for Robin Richards, along with other documents; objected to the joint motion for an
27 extension; and moved for the hearing schedule previously established to be retained for the Amended
28 Formal Complaint portion of this matter.

1 On March 21, 2013, a Procedural Order was issued granting RUCO's withdrawal from this
2 matter; modifying the prior procedural schedule to include a hearing commencing on June 20, 2013,
3 along with other corresponding dates and requirements; vacating the hearing dates of May 6-9, 2013;
4 requiring Montezuma to make a filing regarding whether public notice had been provided regarding
5 the May 3, 2013, hearing date; and establishing requirements to apply if Montezuma had not yet
6 provided public notice.

7 On April 3, 2013, Montezuma filed Notice that public notice as prescribed in the February
8 Procedural Orders had been sent to customers via a billing insert and had been published in the *Camp*
9 *Verde Journal* on March 13, 2013. Montezuma further stated that after the March 21, 2013,
10 Procedural Order, Montezuma had sent revised public notice in customer billings sent out on March
11 28, 2013, and that it was in the process of having revised notice published in a local newspaper.

12 On April 3, 2013, Montezuma also filed a Motion to Compel, asserting that Mr. Dougherty
13 had refused to answer a number of Montezuma's data requests and requesting that he be compelled to
14 do so and, that if he failed to respond and/or refused to produce requested materials, Mr. Dougherty
15 be precluded from presenting any testimony or evidence in this matter. Montezuma further requested
16 that any oral argument on the motion be scheduled as quickly as possible.

17 On April 4, 2013, a Procedural Order was issued explaining that counsel for Montezuma had
18 failed to include a separate statement of moving counsel certifying that counsel had been unable to
19 satisfactorily resolve the disputed discovery matter after personal consultation and good faith efforts
20 to do so; directing counsel for Montezuma to engage in such personal consultation and good faith
21 efforts to resolve the current and any other discovery dispute before filing another Motion to Compel;
22 directing Mr. Dougherty, as to each portion of Montezuma's first data request, to provide a good faith
23 and complete response or, if he had a valid legal rationale for doing so, to file an objection explaining
24 the legal rationale; requiring the parties to attempt to settle discovery disputes through informal,
25 good-faith negotiations before seeking Commission resolution of the controversy; instructing the
26 parties that they could contact the Commission's Hearing Division to request a date for a procedural
27 conference, in the alternative to filing a written discovery motion; and ordering that a public
28 comment proceeding would be held on May 3, 2013, at the time previously set for hearing.

1 On April 5, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Deny Company's Motion to Compel;
2 Motion for Protective Order, as well as a Certification of Intervenor/Complainant in Support of
3 Motion for Protective Order. Mr. Dougherty opposed Montezuma's Motion to Compel and sought a
4 protective order to "protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue
5 burden or expense."

6 On April 8, 2013, a Procedural Order was issued scheduling a procedural conference to be
7 held on April 15, 2013, and directing Montezuma and Mr. Dougherty to be prepared to support their
8 positions as to the discovery dispute.

9 On April 12, 2013, Montezuma filed Notice of Filing Financing Applications, including three
10 separate financing applications: Exhibit A, pertaining to a \$108,000 promissory note for a WIFA
11 loan to cover the costs of four 20,000-gallon storage tanks; Exhibit B, pertaining to an \$8,000
12 promissory note for a lease with Nile River, dated March 22, 2012, to cover the costs for an arsenic
13 treatment building, for which a delivery and acceptance certificate was included showing that Ms.
14 Olsen had signed on May 10, 2012; and Exhibit C, pertaining to a \$38,000 promissory note for a
15 lease with Financial Pacific Leasing, dated May 2, 2012, to cover the costs of an arsenic treatment
16 facility, and for which a Guarantee and Delivery and Acceptance Authorization were signed on
17 March 22, 2012. Montezuma requested that the financing applications be reviewed and approved in
18 the pending rate case and asserted that it did not believe that the lease with Nile River was a capital
19 lease.

20 On April 15, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion for Partial Summary Judgment Allegation
21 XVII Amended Formal Complaint, requesting summary judgment as to Allegation XVII(A), (B), and
22 (C) and asserting that the requested relief could be dispositive as to the Complaint in its entirety. Mr.
23 Dougherty requested that Montezuma and Ms. Olsen be found in contempt of the Commission in
24 violation of A.R.S. § 40-424, be found to have violated A.R.S. § 40-425 by docketing three
25 fraudulent leases, and be found to have violated A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302 by entering into capital
26 leases without Commission authorization; that the Commission make a criminal referral to the
27 Attorney General or County Attorney under A.R.S. § 40-421(A) and (B) for the "fraud violations"
28 described; that Montezuma's CC&N be revoked; and that Mr. Dougherty be granted such other and

1 further relief as the Commission deemed just, equitable, or proper. Mr. Dougherty also filed a
2 Statement of Facts in Support of Intervenor/Complainant's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment,
3 including eight attached exhibits.

4 In addition, on April 15, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Bar Rate Application,
5 asserting that Montezuma's application violated A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302 and thus should be
6 barred because Montezuma had already entered into capital lease agreements and was seeking
7 retroactive approval for long-term debt (the leases), which Mr. Dougherty asserted could not legally
8 be granted. Mr. Dougherty included in his motion filing a Memorandum of Points and Authorities
9 with five attached exhibits.

10 On April 15, 2013, a procedural conference in this matter was held at the Commission's
11 offices in Phoenix, with Montezuma and Staff appearing through counsel and Mr. Dougherty
12 appearing *pro se*. It was determined that Montezuma would respond to the Motion for Partial
13 Summary Judgment by May 15, 2013, and to the Motion to Bar Rate Application by May 3, 2013.
14 Montezuma and Mr. Dougherty reported that they had made no progress toward resolving their
15 discovery dispute and further stated that they did not believe additional discussions would help them
16 to resolve the dispute themselves. The disputed discovery requests were discussed at length, with
17 both Montezuma and Mr. Dougherty providing their positions as to each. Montezuma and Mr.
18 Dougherty were able to reach agreement as to some of the disputed data requests, a number of which
19 were withdrawn or narrowed by Montezuma, and rulings were made from the bench on most of the
20 remaining disputed data requests. One disputed data request (MRWC 1.9) was discussed at length,
21 with no resolution reached or ruling made at the procedural conference.

22 On April 24, 2013, Montezuma filed an Affidavit of Publication showing that notice of this
23 matter and the June 20, 2013, hearing date had been published in the *Camp Verde Journal* on April
24 10, 2013; an Affidavit of Publication showing that notice of the May 3, 2013, hearing date had been
25 published in the *Camp Verde Journal* on March 13, 2013; and a Certificate of Notice stating that
26 public notices regarding the requested financings had been mailed to customers along with their
27 billing statements on April 12, 2013.

28

1 On April 25, 2013, a Procedural Order was issued analyzing MRWC 1.9 and finding that
2 Montezuma had failed to establish that MRWC 1.9 met the threshold requirement of relevancy and,
3 even assuming that it had, Montezuma had not established either a substantial need for the
4 information or that substantially equivalent information was unavailable to Montezuma without
5 undue hardship. It was ordered that the information requested in MRWC 1.9 was not relevant to this
6 matter and that Mr. Dougherty was not required to provide any additional response to MRWC 1.9.

7 On April 29, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed a Notice of Montezuma's Violation of Procedural
8 Orders; Motion for Revised Public Notice of a Rate Hearing. Mr. Dougherty asserted that
9 Montezuma had failed to provide a concise, accurate, and complete disclosure of its rate application
10 in the Notice of Rate Hearing and requested that the Commission issue a revised Notice of Rate
11 Hearing to include, *inter alia*, the true and complete Nile River and Financial Pacific leases, and
12 require Montezuma to publish the revised Notice and to send it to its customers via mail.

13 On May 3, 2013, Montezuma filed a Response to Motion to Bar Rate Application, asserting
14 that it should be denied because A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302 do not preclude the Commission from
15 retroactively approving a capital lease and because the Commission has routinely approved financial
16 transactions retroactively. Montezuma further asserted that Mr. Dougherty had filed more than 40
17 motions in this matter, in an "attempt to bury the Company in motions and legal filings."

18 On May 3, 2013, a public comment proceeding was held at the Commission's offices in
19 Phoenix, with Montezuma and Staff appearing through counsel. The hearing date of June 20, 2013,
20 was announced. No members of the public appeared to provide comment.

21 On May 15, 2013, Montezuma filed its Response to Motion for Partial Summary Judgment,
22 asserting that Allegation XVII was not ripe for summary judgment and that Montezuma contested
23 some of the factual allegations made by Mr. Dougherty and, further, making a number of arguments
24 as to the lack of legal bases for granting summary judgment and the inappropriateness of Mr.
25 Dougherty's requested remedies. Montezuma included, in support, an unsworn declaration by Ms.
26 Olsen. Montezuma also filed a Response to Statement of Facts, disputing a number of the statements
27 made by Mr. Dougherty.

28

1 On May 21, 2013, Staff filed a Request for Filing Extension, requesting a one-day extension
2 to file its Staff Report. Staff asserted that Montezuma had no objection to the request, but that Staff
3 had not yet received a response from Mr. Dougherty.

4 On May 22, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed his Direct Testimony.

5 Also on May 22, 2013, a Procedural Order was issued extending the filing deadline for Direct
6 Testimony and Exhibits to May 24, 2013.³⁵

7 On May 24, 2013, a Procedural Order was issued discussing and resolving three separate
8 motions filed by Mr. Dougherty: the Motion for Partial Summary Judgment as to Allegation XVII,
9 which was denied due to the existence of genuine issues of material fact as to the assertions in
10 Allegation XVII; the Motion to Bar Rate Application, which was interpreted to be a legal brief
11 arguing against retroactive Commission approval of the financing agreements, and premature, rather
12 than a request to bar the Commission's consideration of the financing agreements, as Mr. Dougherty
13 apparently desired to litigate the nature, validity, and legality of the various leases; and the Motion
14 for Revised Public Notice of a Rate Hearing, which was denied as without merit due to the notices
15 that had already been provided in this matter.³⁶

16 On May 24, 2013, Montezuma filed Ms. Olsen's Direct Testimony, and Staff filed Gerald
17 Becker's Direct Testimony.

18 On June 3, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Order Staff to File Response to Formal
19 Complaint; Motion to Order Staff to Determine Whether March 22, 2012, Leases Are Capital Leases.
20 Mr. Dougherty requested that Staff be required to file such response and analysis by June 10, 2013.

21 On June 4, 2013, Staff filed a Staff Response to Motion to Order Staff to File Response to
22 Formal Complaint, requesting that Mr. Dougherty's Motion be denied because the Procedural Order
23 of February 26, 2013, had directed that Staff was not required to file a response to the Amended
24 Complaint.

25 On June 6, 2013, Montezuma filed Ms. Olsen's Rebuttal Testimony.

26 ³⁵ Although Mr. Dougherty's Direct Testimony was filed approximately 1.5 hours before the Procedural Order was
27 issued, the Procedural Order was issued before a copy of Mr. Dougherty's Direct Testimony had been received in the
Hearing Division.

28 ³⁶ The Procedural Order noted that the Motion for Revised Notice had been deemed denied as of May 20, 2013, but was
dealt with substantively in the Procedural Order for the sake of clarity.

1 On June 6, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Withdraw Motion to Order Staff to File
2 Response to Formal Complaint.

3 On June 6, 2013, Mr. Dougherty also filed his Responsive Testimony.

4 On June 6, 2013, Staff filed Mr. Becker's Responsive Testimony.

5 On June 10, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed a Notice of Filing Supplemental Exhibits, including
6 several documents to supplement the Exhibit 24 included with his Responsive Testimony.

7 On June 14, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed a Second Notice of Filing Supplemental Exhibits,
8 including a new Exhibit No. 26 in support of his Direct Testimony and Responsive Testimony.

9 On June 14, 2013, Montezuma filed Montezuma Rimrock Water Company Objections and
10 Motion to Strike, objecting to specified portions of Mr. Dougherty's Direct Testimony and
11 Responsive Testimony as legal argument, legal analysis, and opinion testimony offered without
12 proper qualifications or personal knowledge and requesting that the specified portions be stricken.

13 On June 14, 2013, the prehearing conference in this matter was held, with Montezuma and
14 Staff appearing through counsel and Mr. Dougherty appearing *pro se*. Montezuma's Motion to Strike
15 was discussed, and Mr. Dougherty agreed to have a specific portion of his Direct Testimony stricken
16 as legal argument. Mr. Dougherty's subpoena for Jeffrey Michlik was quashed, subject to
17 reconsideration after other witness testimony had been presented. Several other subpoenas issued at
18 Mr. Dougherty's request were discussed, without being quashed. Additionally, the parties were given
19 instructions concerning documents to provide for hearing and witness summaries, and the order of
20 witnesses was established.

21 On June 17, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed a Notice of Filing Subpoenaed Witnesses, Documents
22 and Testimony.

23 On June 18, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed a Motion to Reschedule Witness Appearances, stating
24 that John Torbenson and Robin Richards would be unavailable on June 24, 2013, and requesting that
25 their testimony be offered on June 26, 2013, instead. Mr. Dougherty asserted that Montezuma and
26 Staff had no objection to the change.

27 On June 18, 2013, a Procedural Order was issued granting Mr. Dougherty's Motion to
28 Reschedule Witness Appearances.

1 On June 18, 2013, Assistant Attorney General John T. Hestand filed a Notice of Appearance,
2 stating that he would appear on behalf of ADEQ in this matter.

3 The evidentiary hearing in this matter was held before a duly authorized Administrative Law
4 Judge of the Commission, at the Commission's offices in Phoenix, Arizona, on June 20, 21, 24, 25,
5 and 26, 2013. Montezuma and Staff appeared through counsel, and Mr. Dougherty appeared *pro se*.
6 Testimony was provided by Ms. Olsen; Vivian Burns, Environmental Program Specialist/Case
7 Manager for ADEQ; John Campbell, Montezuma's accountant; Mr. Dougherty; Marlin Scott, Jr.,
8 Staff Utilities Engineer; Gerald Becker, Staff Executive Consultant; John Torbenson, owner of
9 Odyssey and Nile River; and Robin Richards, former administrator assistant/leasing administrator for
10 Odyssey.

11 On June 20, 2013, a letter from John Campbell was filed, in which Mr. Campbell requested
12 that his subpoena be quashed, as he had a scheduling conflict on June 24, 2013. Mr. Campbell also
13 made a number of assertions as to his accounting activities on behalf of Montezuma.

14 On June 28, 2013, a letter from Mr. Campbell was docketed, in which Mr. Campbell made
15 assertions concerning Montezuma's and Ms. Olsen's tax returns, which he stated were intended "to
16 add to the hearing record."

17 On July 2, 2013, a letter was filed from Tim Hardy, in which Mr. Hardy made assertions
18 regarding interactions between Mr. Dougherty and Ms. Olsen witnessed in April 2011 while Mr.
19 Hardy was part of a crew installing a line between Montezuma's Well No. 1 and Well No. 4.

20 On July 2, 2013, a letter was filed from Don Barnes, in which Mr. Barnes described Ms.
21 Olsen's account of May 2012 contact between Mr. Dougherty and Ms. Olsen, and Mr. Barnes
22 expressed adverse opinions regarding Mr. Dougherty's character and behavior.

23 On July 2, 2013, a letter was filed from Rose Mary Barnes, who described herself as the
24 President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer of MEPOA since June 2010. Ms. Barnes asserted
25 that MEPOA had collected no membership dues since 2009, that it had approximately \$3,500 in its
26 accounts, and that it was not in a position to purchase Montezuma.

27 On July 8, 2013, Staff filed Staff's Late Filed Exhibit S-5, which included several revised
28 ratemaking schedules.

1 On August 30, 2013, Montezuma filed its Closing Brief, Mr. Dougherty filed his Closing
2 Brief, and Staff filed its Opening Brief.

3 On September 20, 2013, Staff filed a Notice of Filing Staff's Reply, stating that Staff stood by
4 the arguments provided in its Opening Brief on all issues regarding the Rate Docket, the Complaint
5 Docket, and the three questions posed by the Administrative Law Judge. Staff characterized Mr.
6 Dougherty's Closing Brief as addressing only the three questions posed and stated that Staff reserved
7 the right to file a supplemental brief if Mr. Dougherty's reply brief addressed issues and arguments
8 not addressed in his Closing Brief.

9 Also on September 20, 2013, Montezuma filed its Reply Brief, and Mr. Dougherty filed his
10 Reply Brief.

11 On September 26, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed corrections to his Reply Brief.

12 On October 4, 2013, Staff filed Notice of Filing Staff's Supplemental Reply Brief, which
13 Staff described as "extraordinary and owing solely to Mr. Dougherty's choice to file a concatenated
14 initial brief and then file a comprehensive brief only upon reply." Staff stated that if its Supplemental
15 Reply Brief were not accepted, Staff alternatively joined in Montezuma's assertion that Mr.
16 Dougherty had waived his ability to argue issues that he failed to assert in his initial brief.

17 On October 29, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed a document entitled "Notice of Legal Remedy
18 Available to Interim Manager," in which Mr. Dougherty stated that he was bringing to the
19 Commission's attention the provisions of A.R.S. § 49-355(B)(5) and (C), regarding WIFA's
20 authority, upon Commission recommendation, to approve a grant to a small water system's interim
21 operator or interim manager for the purpose of repairing or rehabilitating the small water system to
22 correct or avoid an interruption in water service. Mr. Dougherty included a copy of the statute.

23 On December 27, 2013, Montezuma filed a Notice of Filing Compliance Status Report,
24 stating that Montezuma was in compliance with ADEQ's Administrative Order relating to arsenic
25 levels and testing and including a copy of a December 19, 2013, ADEQ Drinking Water Compliance
26 Status Report³⁷ showing that Montezuma had no major deficiencies and that it was in compliance
27

28 ³⁷ Official notice is taken of this document.

1 with and delivering water meeting the water quality standards required by 40 C.F.R. 141 and A.A.C.
2 Title 18, Chapter 4. The ADEQ Report also stated that Montezuma had a minor deficiency for
3 inadequate water storage and that it needed a storage tank.

4 On January 9, 2014, Ms. Brunner filed a comment expressing displeasure that the rate case
5 had not yet been resolved and essentially accusing the Commission of disrupting Montezuma's water
6 supply by not yet providing it a rate increase to allow it to connect Well No. 4 to its system.

7 On March 7, 2014, Montezuma filed a Request for Emergency/Interim Relief, asserting that
8 Montezuma is in financial distress, that Montezuma lacks sufficient revenue to make the lease
9 payments for its arsenic treatment facility, and that Financial Pacific and Nile River have requested
10 voluntary surrender of the arsenic treatment facility for nonpayment. The filing did not include any
11 documentation supporting Montezuma's assertions as to Financial Pacific and Nile River.

12 On March 11, 2014, Mr. Dougherty filed a Response to Montezuma's Motion for
13 Emergency/Interim Relief; Motion to Install Interim Manager, opposing Montezuma's Request as
14 frivolous and unsupported by law and requesting that an interim manager be appointed.

15 To date, no filing has been made in the docket to indicate that the County has issued a permit
16 allowing Montezuma to use the property containing Well No. 4 for commercial purposes.

17 **III. The 40-252 Requests**

18 As described above, the Commission opened the 40-252 Docket for the purpose of
19 determining whether to modify Decision No. 71317 concerning financing approval and related
20 provisions.

21 On brief, Montezuma asserts that the 40-252 Docket should be closed because all of the
22 remaining issues in dispute can be resolved as part of the current rate case and/or Mr. Dougherty's
23 complaint proceeding.

24 Neither Staff nor Mr. Dougherty addressed in their briefs the requests made in the 40-252
25 Docket. In prefiled testimony, however, Staff recommended that Montezuma's request to revise
26 Decision No. 71317 to authorize Montezuma to borrow up to \$165,000 from a source other than
27 WIFA be denied and, further, that Montezuma's authority to incur debt up to \$165,000 from WIFA
28 as approved in Decision No. 71317 be revoked. (Ex. S-1 at 27.) Additionally, Staff recommended

1 that Montezuma be relieved of the requirements therein for Montezuma to file an ADEQ AOC for
 2 Well No. 4 and an arsenic remediation surcharge, as circumstances have rendered them outdated in
 3 nature. (*Id.* at 28.)

4 Montezuma no longer seeks modification of Decision No. 71317 to authorize alternate
 5 financing of the arsenic treatment system facilities, and we agree that it is reasonable and appropriate
 6 in this matter not to take any action to modify Decision No. 71317 to authorize alternate financing of
 7 any kind. However, in an abundance of caution, we will adopt a provision declaring that the WIFA
 8 debt authorization approved in Decision No. 71317 has expired, that Montezuma is no longer
 9 authorized to apply for an arsenic remediation surcharge as provided in that Decision, and that
 10 Montezuma is no longer required to file an AOC for Well No. 4 or for the arsenic treatment project
 11 described in that Decision.

12 **IV. The Financing Requests**

13 Montezuma has filed applications requesting approval for six different financings, each of
 14 which is discussed below.

15 **A. Rask Docket**

16 In The Rask Docket, Montezuma requested approval to enter into a loan agreement dated
 17 April 20, 2012, in which Montezuma promised to pay Rask Construction the amount of \$68,592,
 18 with interest from May 1, 2012, at a rate of 6 percent per year, with monthly payments of \$1,326.08
 19 to be made beginning on April 20, 2012, and ending on April 20, 2017, for installation of the water
 20 line connecting Well No. 4 to Well No. 1. (Ex. C-75.) The loan agreement filed in the Rask Docket
 21 was not signed and did not include a signature page consistent with the loan agreements filed by
 22 Montezuma in the other dockets. (*See id.*; Ex. C-76; Ex. C-77.) As an attachment to the Rask
 23 Docket financing application, Montezuma included a proposal from Rask Construction dated April
 24 12, 2012, and signed as accepted by Ms. Olsen on April 20, 2012, showing that Rask Construction
 25 proposed to complete the following work items:

- 26 #2 Provide the necessary equipment & labor to install the Water line from
 27 the well on tieman to well #1 on towers.
 28 Pressure test & sanitize the new line.

#3 Connecting of the transfer line by others.³⁸

1 The proposal as submitted by Montezuma in the Rask Docket bears signs of alteration to eliminate
 2 the first item in the list of work--unevenness in the line preceding item #2, traces of text visible above
 3 the line preceding item #2, and the fact that the first item listed is labeled as #2.³⁹ (See Ex. C-75.)
 4 The proposal shows that Rask proposed to charge \$68,592 for the work and that Rask had already
 5 received \$7,000, leaving a balance of \$61,592. (*Id.*) The proposal does not include a breakdown of
 6 the costs per item. (*Id.*)

7
 8 In her prefiled direct testimony, Ms. Olsen stated that it would be in the best interests of
 9 Montezuma and its ratepayers for the costs associated with Well No. 4 to be included in this rate case
 10 but that, if the Commission were to exclude those costs due to Well No. 4's currently not being used,
 11 Montezuma would reserve the right to seek recovery in a future rate case once Well No. 4 is being
 12 used. (Ex. A-2 at 23.)

13 At hearing, Ms. Olsen testified that the work by Rask Construction was actually completed on
 14 April 18, 2011, based upon an earlier proposal, the location of which Ms. Olsen did not know. (Tr. at
 15 224-25.) Ms. Olsen stated that she had requested another proposal from Mr. Rask and that this
 16 proposal is the one submitted to the Commission. (Tr. at 225.) Ms. Olsen further stated that she had
 17 paid Rask Construction \$7,000 out of her own personal funds; that no Montezuma funds had been
 18 expended for the work; that no encumbrance of Montezuma's property had been created because the
 19 loan agreement was not signed; and that she had drawn up the loan agreement essentially to show that
 20 Montezuma had an account payable to Rask Construction for approximately \$61,000. (See Tr. at
 21 225-26, 529-30.) Ms. Olsen confirmed that the prior bid from Rask Construction, in the amount of
 22 \$42,870, had been obtained in 2009 and included in the WIFA loan request approved in Decision No.
 23 71317. (Tr. at 226-27.) Ms. Olsen attributed the approximately \$25,000 increase in the cost of the
 24 transmission line work to prices increasing over time, Rask Construction's having completed the line
 25 in a shorter period of time with a larger crew than originally planned and overtime, the need to
 26 complete the line because Mr. Dougherty had filed for a Temporary Restraining Order to stop

27 ³⁸ Ex. C-75.

28 ³⁹ Testimony was not elicited about this at hearing, although Ms. Olsen was asked if the pressure tank at issue in the
 Arias Docket had been purchased from Mr. Rask. (See Tr. at 222-26.)

1 construction of the line, and the incident in which Mr. Buddeke allegedly threatened Ms. Olsen and
2 workers from Rask Construction with a shotgun. (Tr. at 227-32.) When asked whether the
3 transmission line actually needed to be completed quickly because the ATC for it was about to
4 expire, Ms. Olsen stated that she could not recall. (Tr. at 230-31.)

5 Mr. Dougherty opposed the Rask Docket financing request in his prefiled testimony and at
6 hearing, but did not directly address it in his briefs. (*See, e.g.*, Ex. C-93 at 13.)

7 In prefiled direct testimony, Mr. Becker characterized the Rask Docket financing request as
8 Montezuma's seeking retroactive authority to borrow \$68,592 from Rask Construction. (Ex. S-1 at
9 16.) Staff recommended denial of the request because Well No. 4's status renders the transmission
10 line between Well No. 4 and Well No. 1 neither used nor useful and, in addition, the transmission line
11 is not connected to the water system. (Ex. S-1 at 16, att. A at 2, 20.) Staff maintained this position at
12 hearing and did not discuss the Rask Docket financing request in its brief.

13 At hearing, counsel for Montezuma asserted that Montezuma had withdrawn the financing
14 request from the Rask Docket and, when questioned regarding that assertion, stated that
15 Montezuma's accepting Staff's recommendation for denial was the "functional equivalent" of having
16 withdrawn the Rask Docket financing application. (*See* Tr. at 1036-37.)

17 We find that the transmission line resulting in the debt represented by the Rask Docket
18 financing application is neither used nor useful and that it would be inappropriate for the Commission
19 to approve such debt at this time. Additionally, because the proposal from Rask Construction, as
20 submitted to the Commission with the Rask Docket financing application, was altered to omit a line
21 item, we direct Montezuma that any future request to obtain recovery of the costs of the transmission
22 line must be accompanied by documentation, in the form of a detailed invoice, created by Rask
23 Construction, breaking down the costs for labor, materials, and all other items and an accompanying
24 affidavit from Mr. Rask attesting to the accuracy and completeness of the invoice.

25 B. Olsen Docket

26 In the Olsen Docket, Montezuma requested approval to incur the debt resulting from a loan
27 agreement in which Montezuma promised to pay Ms. Olsen the amount of \$21,377, with interest at a
28 rate of 6 percent per year, through monthly payments of \$413.28 beginning on August 30, 2011, and

1 ending on April 30, 2016, for the purchase of the Well No. 4 site and the company vehicle. (Ex. C-
2 76.) Ms. Olsen signed the loan agreement as both borrower and lender on August 30, 2011. (*Id.*)
3 The Olsen Docket financing application does not include any supporting documentation for either the
4 purchase of the Well No. 4 site or the company vehicle or any payments made by Ms. Olsen
5 personally as to either of these. (*See id.*)

6 In her direct testimony, Ms. Olsen stated that the loan agreement in the Olsen Docket was “for
7 purchase of assets relating to Well No. 4” and that she used her own “personal, separate, and private
8 funds to pay the final debt . . . on the assets and property.” (Ex. A-2 at 23.) Ms. Olsen acknowledged
9 that Well No. 4 is not in use and stated that if the Commission were not to approve the loan
10 agreement in the Olsen Docket in this matter, Montezuma reserved the right to seek recovery in a
11 future rate case once Well No. 4 was being used. (*Id.*) At hearing, Ms. Olsen stated that there was no
12 loan agreement in effect between herself and Montezuma, that she created the loan agreement
13 document to memorialize the money owed to her by Montezuma, that none of Montezuma’s assets
14 were encumbered as a result of her purchasing the Well No. 4 site, and that Montezuma has not made
15 any payments to her for the Well No. 4 site. (Tr. at 524-26.) Regarding the PT Cruiser, Ms. Olsen
16 testified at hearing that she personally had purchased the vehicle, that the vehicle had been titled to
17 her until the lien on it was released, that the vehicle was used “99 percent” for Montezuma business,
18 and that the vehicle’s title was transferred to Montezuma after the lien on it was released. (Tr. at 526-
19 28.) Ms. Olsen also testified that some of the loan payments on the vehicle had been made by
20 Montezuma. (Tr. at 403, 528.) Ms. Olsen acknowledged that Staff had recommended that the
21 vehicle be included in rate base. (*Id.*)

22 In its briefs, Montezuma states that the financing application from the Olsen Docket is “no
23 longer at issue because Well No. 4 is not currently being used for utility service and the Company is
24 not seeking financing approval of the . . . Well No. 4 property.” (Montezuma Brief at 1; Montezuma
25 Reply Brief at 18 n.58.)

26 In his prefiled responsive testimony, Mr. Dougherty opposed approval of the Olsen Docket
27 financing, asserting that Montezuma’s ratepayers should not be required to pay for the personal
28 vehicle Ms. Olsen uses to commute approximately 50 miles between her home in Flagstaff and the

1 system in Rimrock, when the system's service area is less than 2/3 of a square mile in size, and that
2 the vehicle also should not be included in rate base. (Ex. C-93 at 13.) Mr. Dougherty also asserted
3 that the financing should not be approved because Well No. 4 is not used or useful due to the lack of
4 a valid use permit. (*Id.*) In his brief, Mr. Dougherty continues to oppose the financing request in the
5 Olsen Docket, asserting that Ms. Olsen has already been repaid \$20,647 by Montezuma for these
6 assets through draws she has taken from the company, as reflected in the long-term debt balances
7 included in Montezuma's annual reports to the Commission and discussed in Mr. Campbell's
8 testimony. (*See* Dougherty Brief at 6-12, 13-15.)

9 According to Staff, the Olsen Docket financing application requested reimbursement of
10 \$16,758 used to pay for the site for Well No. 4 and \$6,056 used to purchase a 2008 Chrysler PT
11 Cruiser as a company vehicle. (Ex. S-1 at 17-18, att. A at 20.) Staff visited the site for Well No. 4
12 and determined that all structures other than Well No. 4 itself had been removed, as ordered by the
13 County, rendering the site neither used nor useful. (Ex. S-1 at 17, att. A at 20.) As a result, Staff
14 determined that incurring debt to purchase the well site was neither reasonable nor appropriate and
15 recommended denial as to that portion of the request. (Ex. S-1 at 17, ex. A at 20.) Regarding the
16 vehicle, Staff stated that although purchase of the company vehicle was appropriate, the vehicle had
17 been added to Montezuma's Utility Plant in Service in 2010 at an original cost of \$11,180. (Ex. S-1
18 at 17-18.) Because the vehicle was already included in Montezuma's rate base, Staff recommended
19 denial of the financing as to the vehicle. (Ex. S-1 at 18.)

20 On brief, Staff maintained that the Olsen Docket financing should not be approved, stating
21 both that Staff considered the financing applications filed on April 12, 2013, to be corrections to the
22 original financing applications rather than new financing applications and that approval of the
23 financing requests related to the Well No. 4 site and the company vehicle would be inappropriate for
24 the reasons described above. (Staff Brief at 10, 24.)

25 We find that it would be neither reasonable nor appropriate to approve the loan agreement
26 included within the Olsen Docket. As acknowledged by the parties, Well No. 4 is neither used nor
27 useful at this time, and Montezuma's ratepayers should not be held responsible for any debt incurred
28 as a result of its purchase. Because the purchase price for the vehicle has already been paid in full,

1 Montezuma holds title to the vehicle, and the vehicle has already been included in plant in service for
2 purposes of establishing rate base, it would not be appropriate for the Commission to authorize
3 payments to Ms. Olsen for the vehicle. Ms. Olsen should, in the future, have Montezuma directly
4 purchase equipment such as vehicles so that Montezuma holds title to the equipment, Montezuma is
5 the entity responsible for any debt associated with the equipment's purchase,⁴⁰ and the equipment is
6 accounted for in the appropriate National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners
7 ("NARUC") account from the time of its acquisition.

8 C. Arias Docket

9 In the Arias Docket, Montezuma requests approval to incur debt resulting from a loan
10 agreement in which Montezuma promised to pay Sergei Arias, Ms. Olsen's son, the amount of
11 \$15,000, with interest at a rate of 6 percent per year, through monthly payments of \$289.99 beginning
12 on July 1, 2011, and ending on July 1, 2016, for the purchase of an 8,000-gallon hydro-pneumatic
13 tank (also referred to as a pressure tank). (Ex. C-77.) The Arias Docket financing application states
14 that the hydro-pneumatic tank provides an additional 8,000 gallons of water storage to the system.
15 (*Id.*) The only document included to support the purchase of the pressure tank is a June 19, 2011,
16 invoice from Sergei Arias to Montezuma, showing \$15,000 due on receipt. (*Id.*) The loan agreement
17 was signed by Ms. Olsen for Montezuma as borrower on June 30, 2011, and by Sergei Arias
18 ("Sergei") as lender. (*Id.*)

19 In her prefiled direct testimony, Ms. Olsen testified that Montezuma's two 2,000-gallon
20 hydro-pneumatic tanks have been repaired twice, are not epoxy coated, and are subject to corrosion.
21 (Ex. A-2 at 24.) Ms. Olsen testified that the tank at Well No. 2 does not operate properly and must be
22 replaced, and that she intends to move the Well No. 1 pressure tank to Well No. 2 and to install the
23 newer 8,000-gallon pressure tank at Well No. 1. (*Id.*) Ms. Olsen further asserted that adding a well-
24 maintained 8,000-gallon epoxy-coated pressure tank at a cost of \$15,000 is reasonable because the
25 volume of water held by a pressure tank may be less than 50 percent of the tank's stated capacity due
26 to the need for a pressure tank to hold a balanced amount of water and compressed air. (*Id.*) Ms.

27

28 ⁴⁰ This debt must receive prior Commission approval if it is long-term debt.

1 Olsen also opined that a brand new 2,000-gallon pressure tank costs \$40,000 to \$80,000. (*Id.*) Ms.
2 Olsen further asserted that the 8,000-gallon pressure tank is necessary to reduce pump operations, to
3 replace the current tank with a longer-lasting tank, and to assist future fire flow demands. (*Id.*)

4 At hearing, Ms. Olsen explained that she located the used tank for sale on an Internet auction
5 site and that she asked her son to purchase it because she did not have the funds to purchase it. (Tr. at
6 191-92, 215.) Ms. Olsen denied that Sergei had purchased the tank from Mr. Rask. (Tr. at 222.) Ms.
7 Olsen did not have a receipt from Sergei showing his purchase of the tank and was unable to recall
8 how much he paid for the tank, what year the tank was manufactured, the brand of the tank, or where
9 the tank had been used previously. (Tr. at 188-89, 191.) She said that the \$15,000 price for the tank
10 was based on how much her son paid for it and its value. (Tr. at 189.) Ms. Olsen did not have the
11 tank professionally inspected either before or after it was purchased, but did look at it herself and
12 have a welder/"pump guy" look at it after it was acquired, and he concluded that the tank was in good
13 condition and would be usable on Montezuma's system after some piping modifications. (Tr. at 189-
14 90, 215-16.) The tank is stored at Rask Construction's premises. (Tr. at 185.) Ms. Olsen testified
15 that Montezuma has not connected the tank to its system because it has not received authority to incur
16 the debt to complete its purchase of the tank. (Tr. at 191-92.) Montezuma did not file a financing
17 application to obtain that authority in 2011 because it wanted to do so with the rate case. (Tr. at 192.)

18 On August 26, 2011, Montezuma issued Sergei (under his first name of Arnold) a check for
19 \$2,581.70, drawn from Montezuma's Hook-Up Account, with the notation "For Hydro Tank." (*See*
20 Ex. C-74; Tr. at 187.) Ms. Olsen initially agreed that Montezuma had made one principal payment
21 on the pressure tank loan agreement, but then stated that the payment was not a principal payment,
22 merely a payment made so that Sergei would hold the tank and not sell the tank to someone else. (Tr.
23 at 186, 219.) She also stated that Sergei is a student at Northern Arizona University and needed some
24 funds for the semester. (Tr. at 440.) When asked whether she really believed that her son would sell
25 the tank to someone else, she stated that he might if he needed the money. (Tr. at 439-41.) Ms.
26 Olsen testified that she did not believe the loan agreement was long-term debt because it was only for
27 five years. (Tr. at 186.)

28 On brief, Montezuma reiterated that the Arias Docket financing application should be

1 approved, asserting that the financing is for a lawful purpose, within the corporate powers of
2 Montezuma as a public utility, consistent with the public interest, compliant with sound financial
3 practices as a utility, and not a hindrance to Montezuma's ability to provide utility service to its
4 customers. (Montezuma Brief at 5.) Montezuma also characterized the transaction as "an arms'
5 length transaction that will benefit Montezuma and its customers." (*Id.*)

6 In his prefiled responsive testimony, Mr. Dougherty opposed approval of the Arias Docket
7 financing application, asserting that the need for the pressure tank could be eliminated if
8 Montezuma's CC&N were revoked, or if Montezuma were sold to AWC. (Ex. C-93 at 13.) At
9 hearing, Mr. Dougherty acknowledged that he is not qualified to determine whether Montezuma
10 needs an 8,000-gallon pressure tank to operate its water system. (Tr. at 831.) Mr. Dougherty also
11 expressed concern about whether the pressure tank, obtained from Ms. Olsen's son without any
12 supporting documentation, is a proper expense for ratepayers to bear. (Tr. at 841.)

13 On brief, Mr. Dougherty does not discuss the Arias Docket financing application specifically,
14 but generally asserts that the "Commission should dismiss the . . . financing applications because the
15 Company is not in Compliance with Commission regulations and statutes." (Dougherty Reply Brief
16 at 25.)

17 In its prefiled testimony, Staff asserted that addition of the 8,000-gallon pressure tank to
18 Montezuma's system is reasonable and appropriate and recommended that Montezuma be permitted
19 to recover not just the requested financing amount of \$15,000, but also an additional \$3,541 to cover
20 installation costs, for a total of \$18,541. (Ex. S-1 at 18-19, att. A at 20.) Staff's engineer stated that
21 the used 8,000-gallon pressure tank would replace the old 2,000-gallon pressure tank at the site for
22 Well No. 1 and that the use of the 8,000-gallon pressure tank for this purpose is reasonable and
23 appropriate. (Ex. S-1 at att. A at 20.) Staff stated that the estimated monthly payment for financing
24 of \$18,541 over five years would be \$358.45 per month and recommended that this amount be
25 funded through a surcharge that would terminate after 60 months of collection. (Ex. S-1 at 19.) Staff
26 did not specify in its prefiled testimony what procedure, if any, Montezuma should be required to
27 follow before it would be able to implement the recommended surcharge. (*See id.*; Ex. S-2 at 5.) In
28 its schedules, Staff provided a cash flow analysis and a financial analysis both with and without debt

1 incurred as a result of the Arias Docket financing and with and without an associated surcharge. (Ex.
2 S-2 at Sched. GWB-4 Resp., Sched. GWB-5 Resp.)

3 At hearing, Mr. Becker recommended approval of the financing for the pressure tank and of a
4 surcharge to cover the costs of that financing, but clarified that his prefiled schedules had not
5 provided a typical bill analysis to show the estimated impact of the recommended surcharge on
6 customer bills. (Tr. at 890-91, 1033-34.) Mr. Becker also clarified Staff's recommendation that to
7 implement the surcharge, Montezuma be required to file an implementation request for Commission
8 approval, which would be followed by Staff's calculation of the appropriate surcharge (based on the
9 actual loan debt service payments and the current customer count) and preparation and filing of a
10 recommended order, within 30 days of Montezuma's implementation request, for Commission
11 consideration. (Tr. at 1056-57, 1077-78; see Ex. S-1 at 29.) Staff's late-filed exhibit showed that the
12 surcharge associated with the Arias Docket financing was estimated to be approximately \$1.65 per
13 customer per month. (LFE S-5.) Mr. Becker also testified that he did not know the brand of the
14 pressure tank and had not seen the pressure tank or any documentation supporting the pressure tank
15 purchase, aside from the Arias Docket financing application, but that he did not consider it
16 uncommon for a closely held company to borrow money from a family member to purchase company
17 assets. (Tr. at 1033-34.) Mr. Scott also testified that the 8,000-gallon pressure tank would benefit
18 Montezuma's system operations and recommended that the financing for it be approved. (Tr. at 695-
19 96.) Mr. Scott testified that a brand new 8,000-gallon pressure tank would cost approximately
20 \$18,000 and that a used 8,000-gallon pressure tank in good serviceable condition would cost
21 approximately \$12,000 to \$15,000. (Tr. at 733.)

22 On brief, Staff maintained that the Arias Docket financing should be approved and that a
23 surcharge should be approved to support it. (Staff Brief at 11, 23-24.)

24 While there is evidence that Montezuma's system may benefit from addition of a new
25 pressure tank, there is not sufficient evidence in this record to establish that the \$15,000 price for the
26 used 8,000-gallon pressure tank purchased by Sergei Arias in 2011 is reasonable and appropriate and
27 that Montezuma's ratepayers should be required to pay it. Moreover, there is not sufficient evidence
28 to establish that Staff's additional recommended amount of \$3,541 to cover installation costs is

1 accurate or that ratepayers should be required to cover it. There is absolutely no evidence in the
 2 record to establish the age of the tank, which would have bearing on its value, or the price that was
 3 actually paid for the tank, which could have been significantly lower than \$15,000.⁴¹ Ms. Olsen's
 4 testimony that she does not recall the price paid for the pressure tank, which she also said she located
 5 on an auction site and asked her son to buy because she lacked the funds, is simply not credible.
 6 Additionally, Mr. Scott's testimony as to the cost of new and used pressure tanks of that size did not
 7 support Ms. Olsen's estimate that a new pressure tank of that size would cost \$40,000 to \$80,000 to
 8 purchase. Without sufficient credible evidence of the actual price paid for the pressure tank, in the
 9 form of third-party documentation such as an invoice, and an actual estimate for the cost to make any
 10 necessary modifications to the tank and install it on the system, we find that it would be neither
 11 reasonable nor appropriate to approve the Arias Docket financing application, and we will not do so.

12 D. WIFA Loan

13 In one of its new financing applications filed in this matter in April 2013, Montezuma
 14 requests authority to obtain a WIFA loan in the amount of \$108,000, to cover the cost of purchasing
 15 four 20,000-gallon storage tanks from Cashion Tank & Steel Co. ("Cashion"), at \$22,000 each, plus
 16 an additional \$20,000 for engineering, permitting, and installation of the storage tanks ("WIFA
 17 Loan"). (Ex. A-22.) To support the WIFA Loan application, Montezuma submitted a March 21,
 18 2013, quote from Cashion for the construction of one 20,000-gallon water storage tank 12' x 24' high
 19 in Cashion's yard, sandblasted, epoxy coated on the inside, and painted on the outside. (Ex. A-22.)
 20 Cashion quoted a price of \$22,000, plus delivery, for one tank and would require a down payment of
 21 50 percent with the remainder due on completion. (*Id.*) The quote is not signed by Montezuma. (*See*
 22 *id.*) Additionally, Montezuma included an April 11, 2013, printout of its application submitted to
 23 WIFA, which indicated that Montezuma desired to begin construction on the project on October 30,
 24 2013. (*Id.*)

25 In prefiled testimony, Ms. Olsen stated that while Staff had determined that Montezuma needs
 26 two 40,000-gallon storage tanks to meet customer demand during fire flow demand, Ms. Olsen

27 _____
 28 ⁴¹ Ms. Olsen alluded to the auction site purchase price of the pressure tank having been different than the \$15,000 price for which it is currently available to Montezuma, when she stated that its price was set based on both its cost and value.

1 believed it more appropriate to add four 20,000-gallon storage tanks because more storage capacity
2 would remain available should any of the four tanks need to be taken out of service for any length of
3 time for maintenance or repair. (Ex. A-2 at 20.) Ms. Olsen further stated that the presence of
4 overhead power lines at the Well No. 1 site would impose height and width limitations on a 40,000-
5 gallon storage tank. (*Id.*) Ms. Olsen stated that the storage tanks are necessary, and thus approval of
6 the WIFA Loan is necessary, to allow Montezuma to provide adequate water service and meet fire
7 flow demand (500 GPM). (*Id.*) Ms. Olsen also testified that the current storage tanks at Well No. 1
8 and Well No. 2 leak extensively and predicted that they will no longer be able to store water within
9 the next year, which would leave only one 5,000-gallon storage tank for the entire system. (*Id.* at 20-
10 21.) At hearing, Ms. Olsen asserted that the requested WIFA Loan would be for a lawful purpose, in
11 the public interest, and consistent with sound financial practices; that it would not impair
12 Montezuma's ability to provide utility service; and that it would enhance Montezuma's ability to
13 provide that service. (Tr. at 127-28.) Ms. Olsen also testified that Montezuma may not actually need
14 all four tanks if Well No. 4 becomes available for use on the system. (Tr. at 418-19.) Ms. Olsen
15 stated that she intends to have the tanks constructed one at a time, not all at once, so Montezuma may
16 not need to spend the full amount approved for the WIFA Loan. (*See id.*) Additionally, Montezuma
17 provided evidence that Montezuma's storage tank project has been placed on WIFA's Drinking
18 Water Project Priority List, as of June 19, 2013. (Ex. A-27; Tr. at 132-33.)

19 On brief, Montezuma maintained that the WIFA Loan should be approved, along with the
20 surcharge, because the storage tank replacement project will benefit Montezuma's customers.
21 (Montezuma Brief at 7-8.)

22 In his prefiled testimony and on brief, Mr. Dougherty opposed approval of Montezuma's
23 requested WIFA Loan because Montezuma is not in compliance with Commission regulations and
24 statutes, and Montezuma would not need additional storage tanks if it no longer held a CC&N for the
25 service area. (*See, e.g.,* Ex. C-93 at 12; Dougherty Reply Brief at 25.) Mr. Dougherty acknowledged
26 at hearing that he does not have the expertise to determine whether Montezuma needs the additional
27 storage tanks for its system operations. (Tr. at 831.)

28 In its prefiled testimony, Staff indicated that the proposed financing for four 20,000-gallon

1 storage tanks is reasonable and appropriate, as the new tanks will replace two old, deteriorated, and
2 leaking tanks and will provide additional storage capacity that Montezuma's system needs. (Ex. S-1
3 at att. A at 2-3, 21.) Regarding the WIFA Loan, Staff recommended the following:

- 4 • That Montezuma be granted authority to incur an 18- to 22-year amortizing loan in an
5 amount not to exceed \$108,000 pursuant to a loan agreement with WIFA and at an interest
6 rate not to exceed that available from WIFA, for the purpose of installing additional
7 storage tanks;
- 8 • That Montezuma be required, within 30 days after executing the WIFA Loan, to provide
9 Staff's Utilities Division Director a copy of any WIFA Loan documents executed and to
10 file with Docket Control a letter verifying that the WIFA Loan documents have been so
11 provided;
- 12 • That Montezuma be required to file, as a compliance item in this Docket, within 30 days
13 after executing any financing transaction authorized herein, a notice confirming that the
14 execution has occurred and a certification by an authorized Montezuma representative that
15 the terms of the financing fully comply with the authorizations granted;
- 16 • That any unused authorization to incur debt authorized herein expire on December 31,
17 2015;
- 18 • That Montezuma be authorized to charge an infrastructure surcharge to meet its WIFA
19 Loan debt service and associated loan obligation, with the surcharge to become effective
20 at a date and in a manner subsequently authorized by the Commission;
- 21 • That Montezuma be directed to file in this Docket, upon filing of the loan closing notice
22 and upon providing the loan documents to Staff, an application requesting to implement
23 an associated surcharge;
- 24 • That Staff be directed, within 30 days of Montezuma's filing of a surcharge
25 implementation request, to calculate the appropriate WIFA surcharge, based on the actual
26 loan debt service (interest and principal) payments and using the current customer count at
27 the time of the loan closing to provide the cash flow adopted in this proceeding, and
28 prepare and file a recommended order for Commission consideration;

- 1 • That Montezuma be authorized to pledge its assets in the State of Arizona pursuant to
- 2 A.R.S. § 40-285 and A.A.C. R18-15-104 in connection with the WIFA Loan; and
- 3 • That Montezuma be authorized to engage in any transaction and to execute any documents
- 4 necessary to effectuate the authorizations. (Ex. S-1 at 28-29.)

5 At hearing, Mr. Scott testified that the four 20,000-gallon storage tanks are necessary for
 6 Montezuma's system and recommended approval of the financing for those because the tanks will
 7 benefit the system and the financing thus would help system operations. (Tr. at 695-96.) Mr. Scott
 8 explained that Montezuma's system has been modified since its last rate case so that it now has two
 9 different pressure zones, and additional storage capacity is needed at each pressure zone to meet fire
 10 flow requirements. (Tr. at 710.) Mr. Scott acknowledged that if Well No. 4 were to become part of
 11 the system, two of the four 20,000 gallon storage tanks may not be needed, but also agreed that
 12 obtaining approval for the WIFA Loan to get the four storage tanks would serve as a good "safety
 13 net" should Montezuma not be able to obtain approval to use Well No. 4. (Tr. at 740-41.) Mr.
 14 Becker also reiterated Staff's support for the WIFA Loan to finance the four storage tanks. (Tr. at
 15 891.)

16 In its late-filed exhibit, Staff estimated that the WIFA Loan surcharge would be
 17 approximately \$3.01 per customer per month. (LFE S-5.) Additionally, Staff set forth its cash flow
 18 analysis and financial analysis, showing that Montezuma would be able to pay the WIFA Loan, even
 19 without the WIFA Loan surcharge, if Staff's recommended rates and charges were approved.⁴² (LFE
 20 S-5 at Sched. GWB-5.) On brief, Staff maintained its support for the storage tank project, the WIFA
 21 Loan, and the associated surcharge. (Staff Brief at 17, 23.)

22 Both Staff's engineer and Ms. Olsen, who has technical expertise in water system facility
 23 operations, assert that Montezuma's system needs additional storage capacity both in order to serve
 24 its current customers and to meet fire flow requirements. Montezuma's proposal to add four 20,000-

25 ⁴² Staff's analysis shows that Montezuma would have a debt service coverage ratio ("DSC") of 1.34 and a times interest
 26 earned ratio ("TIER") of 1.35 if Staff's rates and charges, the Arias Docket loan, the Arias Docket surcharge, and the
 27 WIFA Loan (without a WIFA Loan surcharge) were approved. (LFE S-5 at Sched. GWB-5.) Mr. Becker testified that a
 28 DSC or TIER above 1.0 means that a utility can afford to pay its debts. (Tr. at 1050-51.) Staff's analysis further shows
 that if the Arias Docket financing and surcharge were not approved, and the WIFA Loan and WIFA Loan surcharge were
 approved, assuming Staff's recommended rates and charges were also approved, Montezuma would have a DSC of 2.52
 and a TIER of 2.51. (LFE S-5 at Sched. GWB-5.)

1 gallon storage tanks, in stages, is a reasonable and appropriate plan to address the storage capacity
2 issue, particularly as Montezuma may at some point be able to add Well No. 4 to its system.
3 Montezuma has provided a quote from a third-party vendor for the construction of the storage tanks,
4 and Staff has found the quoted costs related to the purchase of the storage tanks to be reasonable. Mr.
5 Dougherty has not provided any evidence to dispute the appropriateness of either the addition of the
6 four storage tanks themselves or the costs related to the proposed project. Also, WIFA has prioritized
7 Montezuma's WIFA Loan request. In light of these factors, we find that it is reasonable and
8 appropriate to approve Montezuma's WIFA Loan request, subject to the conditions enumerated in
9 Staff's recommendations described above. Additionally, we find that it is appropriate to authorize a
10 WIFA Loan surcharge, subject to the implementation approval process enumerated in Staff's
11 recommendations, and three additional conditions: (1) Montezuma must segregate all funds collected
12 under the WIFA Loan surcharge in a separate account and may use those funds only for the purpose
13 of making debt service payments for the actual WIFA Loan debt service (principal and interest); (2)
14 the WIFA Loan surcharge will expire automatically upon the end of the term for the WIFA Loan,
15 unless the WIFA Loan surcharge is first reduced or otherwise modified by Commission Order; and
16 (3) if, when the WIFA Loan surcharge ends, Montezuma has collected more funds through the WIFA
17 Loan surcharge than were needed to make the WIFA Loan debt service payments, Montezuma shall
18 credit the amount of the overage in its next monthly billing, with each customer receiving an equal
19 portion of the overage amount, and Montezuma shall file a notice with the Commission showing that
20 such credits have been made. Montezuma's customers now and in the future will benefit from the
21 addition of the storage tanks, which will enhance both the availability of water to customers for
22 general purposes and the availability of water for fire flow purposes, and it is appropriate to ensure
23 that Montezuma has designated funds available to pay the WIFA Loan.

24 E. Retroactive Financing Approval Requests

25 1. Commission Authority

26 Mr. Dougherty asserts that the Commission has no legal authority to grant retroactive
27 approval of long-term debt, citing both A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302 to support his position that
28 public service corporation long-term debt may only legally be approved by the Commission before it

1 is incurred. Montezuma and Staff disagree with Mr. Dougherty's position and assert that the
 2 Commission has legal authority to grant retroactive approval of long-term debt, with Montezuma and
 3 Staff both citing the Commission's exclusive and plenary ratemaking authority under Article XV, § 3
 4 of the Arizona Constitution as well as prior Commission Decisions.

5 Because two of the financings for which Montezuma has requested authorization in this
 6 matter are for lease agreements executed by Montezuma in 2012, without prior Commission
 7 approval, and a determination that the Commission lacked legal authority to approve the debt created
 8 by those lease agreements would be dispositive, it is appropriate to address the legal issue before
 9 addressing the specifics of those financing arrangements.

10 A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302 provide as follows:

11 **40-301. Issuance of stocks and bonds; authorized purposes**

12 **A.** The power of public service corporations to issue stocks and stock
 13 certificates, bonds, notes and other evidences of indebtedness, and to
 14 create liens on their property located within this state is a special privilege,
 the right of supervision, restriction and control of which is vested in the
 state, and such power shall be exercised as provided by law and under
 rules, regulations and orders of the commission.

15 **B.** A public service corporation may issue stocks and stock
 16 certificates, bonds, notes and other evidences of indebtedness payable at
 periods of more than twelve months after the date thereof, only when
 authorized by an order of the commission.

17 **C.** The commission shall not make any order or supplemental order
 18 granting any application as provided by this article unless it finds that such
 issue is for lawful purposes which are within the corporate powers of the
 applicant, are compatible with the public interest, with sound financial
 19 practices, and with the proper performance by the applicant of service as a
 public service corporation and will not impair its ability to perform that
 20 service.

21 **D.** The provisions of this article shall not apply to foreign public
 22 service corporations providing communications service within this state
 whose physical facilities are also used in providing communications
 service in interstate commerce.

23 **40-302. Order authorizing issuance of stocks, bonds or other**
 24 **evidences of debt; hearing on application to issue; amount of issue;**
 25 **issuance of short term notes without commission order; capitalization**
of certain items prohibited; accounting for proceeds of issues

26 **A.** Before a public service corporation issues stocks and stock
 27 certificates, bonds, notes and other evidences of indebtedness, it shall first
 secure from the commission an order authorizing such issue and stating
 the amount thereof, the purposes to which the issue or proceeds thereof are
 to be applied, and that, in the opinion of the commission, the issue is
 28 reasonably necessary or appropriate for the purposes specified in the

1 order, pursuant to section 40-301, and that, except as otherwise permitted
 2 in the order, such purposes are not, wholly or in part, reasonably
 3 chargeable to operative expenses or to income. Before an order is issued
 4 under this section, notice of the filing of the application for such order
 5 shall be given by the commission or the applicant in such form and
 6 manner as the commission deems appropriate. The commission may hold
 7 a hearing, and make inquiry or investigation, and examine witnesses,
 8 books, papers and documents, and require filing data it deems of
 9 assistance.

10 **B.** The commission may grant or refuse permission for the issue of
 11 evidences of indebtedness or grant the permission to issue them in a lesser
 12 amount, and may attach to its permission conditions it deems reasonable
 13 and necessary. The commission may authorize issues less than, equivalent
 14 to or greater than the authorized or subscribed capital stock of the
 15 corporation, and the provisions of the general laws of the state with
 16 reference thereto have no application to public service corporations.

17 **C.** A public service corporation shall not, without consent of the
 18 commission, apply the issue of any stock or stock certificate, bond, note or
 19 other evidence of indebtedness, or any part thereof, or any proceeds
 20 thereof, to any purpose not specified in the commission's order, or to any
 21 purpose specified in the commission's order in excess of the amount
 22 authorized for the purpose, or issue or dispose of the proceeds of such
 23 issuance on any terms less favorable than those specified in the order.

24 **D.** A public service corporation may issue notes, not exceeding seven
 25 per cent of total capitalization if operating revenues exceed two hundred
 26 fifty thousand dollars, for proper purposes and not in violation of law
 27 payable at periods of not more than twelve months after date of issuance,
 28 without consent of the commission, but no such note shall, wholly or in
 part, be refunded by any issue of stocks or stock certificates, bonds, notes
 or any other evidence of indebtedness without consent of the commission.

E. The commission may not authorize the capitalization of the
 corporate franchise, or of any franchise or permit whatever, or the right to
 own, operate or enjoy any such franchise or permit, in excess of the
 amount, exclusive of taxes or annual charges, actually paid to the state or
 to a political subdivision thereof as the consideration for the grant of the
 franchise, permit or right, nor shall any contract for consolidation or lease
 be capitalized, nor shall any public service corporation issue any bonds,
 notes or other evidences of indebtedness against or as a lien upon any
 contract for consolidation or merger.

F. The commission may require public service corporations to
 account for the disposition of the proceeds of all sales of stocks and stock
 certificates, bonds, notes and other evidences of indebtedness, in the form
 and detail it deems advisable, and may establish rules and regulations it
 deems reasonable and necessary to insure the disposition of such proceeds
 for the purpose specified in its order.

24 Montezuma asserts that the Commission has authority under the Arizona Constitution, Title
 25 40 of the Arizona Revised Statutes, and controlling precedent to grant retroactive approval of
 26 Montezuma's leases. (Montezuma Brief at 68.) Montezuma argues that A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-
 27 302 do not prohibit the Commission from granting retroactive approval and are not "one-strike
 28

1 statutes forever penalizing a utility that fails to initially comply” with them. (*Id.* at 69.) Montezuma
2 further states that the Commission has plenary authority over ratemaking and exercises control over
3 utility expenditures through financing approvals and through rate regulation and that prohibiting the
4 Commission from granting retroactive review and approval of financing and debt transactions would
5 violate the Commission’s plenary authority over ratemaking. (*Id.*) Montezuma asserts: “The
6 legislature, let alone Mr. Dougherty, cannot override the Commission’s constitutional ratemaking
7 authority.” (*Id.*) Montezuma further asserts that the Commission’s authority to grant retroactive
8 financing approval is “evidenced and supported by its long-standing precedent and practice of doing
9 exactly that.”⁴³ (*Id.* at 70.) Montezuma further asserted that a finding that the Commission lacks
10 authority to grant retroactive approval of long-term debt would render all of the decisions in which
11 the Commission has granted such authority contrary to law and in need of rescission and
12 modification. (*Id.* at 71.)

13 Mr. Dougherty asserts that while the Commission has previously granted retroactive approval
14 of long-term debt, it has done so only rarely and “reluctantly,” without citation to the specific legal
15 authority to do so, and without expressly citing A.R.S. § 40-301(C) in the Conclusions of Law
16 paragraph in which the Commission enumerates and concludes that the long-term debt at issue is
17 consistent with the standards set out in A.R.S. § 40-301(C).⁴⁴ (Dougherty Brief at 16-17.) Mr.
18 Dougherty also notes that no Intervenor or Complainant opposed retroactive approval in those cases
19 and that the Commission generally also admonished or penalized the public service corporation that
20 had failed to obtain prior approval. (*See id.* at 16-18.) Mr. Dougherty asserts that the law
21 (specifically A.R.S. § 40-302(A)) is clear that public service corporations are required to obtain
22 Commission approval before entering into long-term debt. (*Id.* at 18.) Mr. Dougherty states that
23 “nothing expressly stated in ARS 40-301 (C) . . . gives the Commission the authority to ignore the
24

25 ⁴³ Montezuma cited a number of cases between 1993 and 2012 and stated that there are “many, many” such decisions.
(Montezuma Brief at 70-71.)

26 ⁴⁴ Mr. Dougherty’s focus on the omission of a statutory citation to A.R.S. § 40-301(C) in such a paragraph, or at all, is
27 misplaced. The Commission generally cites to applicable legal authority in the first Conclusions of Law (“COL”)
28 paragraph rather than in each individual COL paragraph. (*See, e.g.,* Decision No. 72667 at 15-16, COL ¶ 1.) The statute
instructs the Commission to make certain substantive determinations related to a financing being approved; the
effectiveness of those substantive determinations is not negated if the Commission does not include a citation to the
statute.

1 fundamental requirement in ARS 40-302 (A) that a public service corporation receive Commission
2 approval BEFORE issuing notes or other evidences of indebtedness.” (*Id.* at 18-19.) Mr. Dougherty
3 requests that the Commission deny retroactive approval because there is no legal basis for granting it.
4 (*Id.* at 19.) In response to Staff’s assertion that the Commission has constitutional authority to grant
5 retroactive approval of long-term debt, Mr. Dougherty asserts that Montezuma does not deserve to
6 benefit from the Commission’s discretionary power, if the Commission has such power, which Mr.
7 Dougherty believes it does not. (Dougherty Reply Brief at 9.)

8 Like Montezuma, Staff asserts that the Commission has often provided retroactive approval of
9 debt. (Staff Brief at 14.) Staff also observes that A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302 are directed to the
10 obligations of the utility to obtain Commission approval and do not prohibit the Commission from
11 granting retroactive approval or express any limitation on the Commission’s approval authority and
12 that the statutes place no time limits on the Commission’s ability to grant such approval. (*Id.*) Staff
13 pointed out that the Arizona Constitution grants the Commission plenary authority to set rates and
14 take any necessary step in the ratemaking process, which would include approving debt that is to be
15 funded by rates the Commission approves, and that any interpretation of A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-
16 302 that would curb the Commission’s ability to approve financings would also curb the
17 Commission’s constitutional ratemaking authority and would be unconstitutional. (*Id.* at 15.)
18 Because a statute must be interpreted so as to render it lawful, if possible, Staff reasoned, A.R.S. §§
19 40-301 and 40-302 should not be interpreted to produce such a result. (*Id.*)

20 Consistent with the arguments of Montezuma and Staff, and with the actions taken in the prior
21 Commission decisions cited and others, we find that the Commission has the legal authority to grant
22 (or deny) retroactive approval of long-term debt and other financings for which a public service
23 corporation is required to obtain approval under A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302. Article 15, § 3 of the
24 Arizona Constitution grants the Commission exclusive and plenary authority over ratemaking, and
25 Arizona courts have confirmed that this authority extends to all necessary steps in ratemaking, as
26 determined in the Commission’s discretion. The financing of utility facilities through long-term debt
27 (or otherwise) has a significant impact upon a utility’s financial condition and on the revenue
28 available for the utility to remain viable and maintain adequate and reliable service to its customers at

1 reasonable rates. If the Commission were unable to authorize recovery for long-term debt
 2 retroactively, a utility and its customers could face dire consequences, even if the utility only
 3 inadvertently failed to file a timely request for approval of financing. Such a result would not be
 4 consistent with the Commission's constitutional authority and, moreover, would not be in the public
 5 interest. Thus, because approval or disapproval of a utility's long-term debt and other forms of
 6 financing is a necessary step in ratemaking, the Commission must and does have authority under
 7 Article 15, § 3 of the Arizona Constitution, to retroactively approve or disapprove long-term debt and
 8 other forms of financing. This determination is not intended to and does not negate a public service
 9 corporation's legal obligation under A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302 to apply to the Commission for
 10 prior approval of long-term debt and other forms of financing. Rather, it recognizes that the
 11 Commission's hands are not tied if a public service corporation fails to meet that obligation. The
 12 Commission can take other appropriate action against a public service corporation that fails to
 13 comply with the law.

14 2. The Leases

15 Montezuma is requesting approval of the long-term debt created through a lease agreement
 16 with Nile River, which was executed by Montezuma on March 22, 2012, and by Mr. Torbenson for
 17 Nile River on March 23, 2012, and in which Montezuma promised to pay a deposit of \$734.46, and
 18 to make monthly payments of \$342.09 each over a period of 36 months, to cover the \$8,000 cost of
 19 an arsenic treatment system building constructed at the site for Well No. 1, for which Montezuma
 20 accepted delivery on May 10, 2012.⁴⁵ (Ex. A-22 at ex. B; Ex. A-2 at 21-22.)

21 Montezuma is also requesting approval of the long-term debt created through a lease
 22 agreement with Financial Pacific, which was executed by Montezuma on March 22, 2012, and in
 23 which Montezuma promised to pay an initial amount of \$2,691.92, and to make monthly payments of
 24 \$1,135.96 each over a period of 60 months, to cover the \$38,000 cost of an arsenic treatment system
 25 obtained from Kevlor Design Group, LLC.⁴⁶ (Ex. A-22 at ex. C; Ex. A-10.) The Financial Pacific

26 _____
 27 ⁴⁵ This results in total payment of \$13,049.70, which represents total interest expense of \$5,049.70 on the principal of
 \$8,000.

28 ⁴⁶ This results in total payment of \$70,849.52, which represents total interest expense of \$32,849.52 on the principal of
 \$38,000.

1 lease also shows that Montezuma will have an option to purchase the equipment at the end of the
2 lease term for \$1.00. (Ex. A-22 at ex. C; Ex. A-10.)

3 Montezuma first requested approval of the long-term debt created through these leases when
4 it docketed a Notice of Filing Financing Applications in this matter on April 12, 2013, although it
5 stated the following in a footnote to that Notice of Filing:

6 MRWC does not believe that the Nile River Lease qualifies as a capital
7 lease, but the Company is willing to submit that lease to the Commission
8 for review and approval. It also should be noted that, on January 14, 2013,
9 intervenor Mr. Dougherty requested that the Company be required to
submit the Nile River and Financial Pacific lease agreement [sic] for
approval by the Commission as part of the ongoing rate case application.⁴⁷

10 Although Montezuma requested approval of the Nile River lease in this Financing Application filed
11 on April 12, 2013, Montezuma did not include the last page of the lease agreement in the
12 Application, and it was only revealed when provided by Mr. Dougherty in a Motion filed on April 15,
13 2013.⁴⁸ (See Ex. A-22; Ex. A-9.) The last page of the lease agreement, headed "Rider No. 2," which
14 was signed by Ms. Olsen for Montezuma, provides Montezuma the option to purchase the equipment
15 (i.e., the building) at the end of the original term of the lease, for \$1.00. (See Ex. A-9; Ex. C-20.)
16 While the parties have all now acknowledged that the Nile River lease is a capital lease, which
17 creates long-term debt, rather than an operating lease, which creates only operating expenses, without
18 Rider No. 2, the status of the lease as a capital lease was less apparent.⁴⁹ (See, e.g., Tr. at 353, 355,
19 938-39.) Ms. Olsen testified that she did not have a copy of Rider No. 2 in her files, although she

20 _____
⁴⁷ Ex. A-22 at 2.

21 ⁴⁸ On April 15, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed in this matter a complete copy of the Nile River lease, including Rider No. 2,
22 and a complete copy of the 5-page Financial Pacific lease dated April 2, 2012, and including a first payment due date of
23 April 15, 2012, on page 1 of 5. Official notice is taken of Mr. Dougherty's Statement of Facts in Support of
Intervenor/Complainant's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, docketed April 15, 2013 ("Dougherty SOF 4/15/13").

24 ⁴⁹ Official notice is taken of Staff's Notice of Filing Response to Procedural Order, filed in the 40-252 Docket on April
25 27, 2012, setting forth the test for whether a lease is a capital lease or an operating lease. Staff explained that a lease is a
26 capital lease if any of the following criteria are met:

- (1) the lease conveys ownership to the lessee at the end of the lease term; (2) the lessee has
an option to purchase the asset at a bargain price at the end of the lease term; (3) the term
of the lease is 75 percent or more of the economic life of the asset; and (4) the present
value of the rents, using the lessee's incremental borrowing rate, is 90 percent or more of
the fair market value of the asset.

(Staff's Notice of Filing at 2.) Staff determined that the "Water Services Agreement" that had been filed by Montezuma
was a capital lease because the transfer of the assets for \$1 at the end of the lease term met the second criterion. (*Id.*)
Staff further stated that the Water Services Agreement also met the third criterion, but that Staff needed to obtain
additional information from Montezuma to determine whether the fourth criterion was also met. (*Id.*)

1 confirmed that she had signed it. (Tr. at 327.)

2 The copy of the Financial Pacific Lease agreement filed by Montezuma on April 12, 2013,
3 includes all of the pages of the agreement, but shows a signature date of “5/2/2012” for Ms. Olsen’s
4 signature on page 1 of 5 and, on the same page, does not include a date for the first payment to be
5 made under the lease.⁵⁰ (See Ex. A-22 at ex. C.) Another copy of the lease provided by Montezuma
6 as an exhibit hereto has the date under Ms. Olsen’s signature on page 1 of 5 redacted, but includes a
7 first payment due date of (“4/15/2012”) on the same page. (See Ex. A-10.) Ms. Olsen testified that
8 she signed two different versions of the Financial Pacific lease. (Tr. at 95-96.) Montezuma is
9 requesting approval of the Financial Pacific lease dated May 2, 2012, which Ms. Olsen testified is,
10 except for the dates, the same as the April 2012 agreement with Financial Pacific. (Ex. A-2. at 22.)

11 Ms. Olsen testified that ADEQ “essentially order[ed]” Montezuma to install and operate an
12 arsenic treatment system and that the Financial Pacific lease is in the best interests of Montezuma and
13 its customers because it provided the funds to pay for the arsenic treatment plant so that Montezuma
14 could continue to provide its current and future customers water that meets applicable drinking water
15 standards. (Ex. A-2. at 22.) Ms. Olsen testified that the Financial Pacific lease benefits her
16 customers in many ways because the arsenic treatment system was installed by July 2012 and was in
17 use in November 2012. (Tr. at 101-03.)

18 In her prefiled testimony and at hearing, Ms. Olsen testified that she always intended to have
19 the Financial Pacific and Nile River leases approved by the Commission as part of the rate case. (Ex.
20 A-2 at 12, 14; Tr. at 93.) At hearing, Ms. Olsen also testified that she understands there is a statutory
21 requirement for financial arrangements such as the leases to be submitted to the Commission
22 beforehand, for review and approval. (Tr. at 93-94.) Ms. Olsen stated that this did not occur with the
23 leases because she was “under an enormous amount of pressure from the county and from ADEQ to
24

25 ⁵⁰ The area in which the payment due date would appear (and does appear in another copy of the lease provided by
26 Montezuma as an exhibit hereto) has signs of alteration, in that a portion of “1st” appears to have been whited out. (See
27 Ex. A-22 at ex. C.) On March 21, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed a complete copy of the Financial Pacific lease, obtained
28 from Financial Pacific, showing on page 1 of 5 a typed first payment due date of April 15, 2012; showing a typed date of
April 2, 2012, under Ms. Olsen’s signature on page 1 of 5; and including an Equipment List showing a typed date of April
2, 2012, under Ms. Olsen’s signature. Official notice is taken of Mr. Dougherty’s Notice of Filing Additional Exhibits;
Response to Staff’s and Company’s Joint Filing to Extend Schedule; Motion to Maintain Complaint Portion of Docket
under Current Hearing Schedule, docketed March 21, 2013 (“Dougherty NOF 3/21/13”).

1 install the arsenic treatment system regardless of whether there was or was not funding available.”
2 (Tr. at 98-99.) Ms. Olsen also agreed when asked by Montezuma’s counsel whether she had been
3 confused about the leases and the approval process. (Tr. at 99.)

4 Ms. Olsen testified that the costs under the leases are fair and reasonable and that they
5 compare favorably to the amount approved for WIFA funding in Decision No. 71317. (Ex. A-3 at
6 12.) Ms. Olsen testified that the arsenic treatment system is necessary because it makes it possible
7 for Montezuma to provide safe drinking water and that the building is necessary because the arsenic
8 treatment system is composed of two composite fiberglass tanks and schedule 80 PVC pipe, all of
9 which would be damaged or destroyed by sun exposure.⁵¹ (Ex. A-3 at 12; Ex. A-2 at 21.) Ms. Olsen
10 testified that approval of the leases will provide Montezuma the funds needed to keep the system
11 operating so that the water provided to current and future customers meets applicable drinking water
12 standards, which is in the best interests of Montezuma and its customers. (See Ex. A-2 at 21; Tr. at
13 78.) Ms. Olsen testified, and Montezuma provided documentation to show, that payments were being
14 made to both Financial Pacific for the Financial Pacific lease and to Odyssey Equipment Financing
15 for the Nile River lease.⁵² (Tr. at 105; Ex. A-15; Ex. A-16.)

16 As described above, Mr. Dougherty opposes Commission approval of the Nile River lease
17 because such approval would be retroactive and, he asserts, unlawful. In his prefiled testimony and at
18 hearing, Mr. Dougherty also opposed approval of the leases because he believes that the arsenic
19 treatment facilities would not be necessary if the Commission were to revoke Montezuma’s CC&N
20 and because the interest rate for the leases is “usurious.” (See Ex. C-93 at 12; Tr. at 829-30.) Mr.
21 Dougherty states that Montezuma is only providing adequate water service to its customers because
22 “it committed a Class 4 felony by deceiving the Staff and this Commission on the obtaining of the
23 leases for those arsenic treatment plants.” (Tr. at 864.) Mr. Dougherty testified that the presence of
24 the arsenic treatment system does not mean that ratepayers have benefited, but that they have been

25 ⁵¹ Ms. Olsen recounted that all of the PVC pipe for an arsenic treatment system in Tubac had to be replaced after having
26 been exposed to the elements for one year. (Ex. A-2 at 21.)

27 ⁵² For the Financial Pacific lease, the documentation included Payment Authorization Notice memos from Financial
28 Pacific showing payments made by Patricia Olsen using a bank card on November 21, 2012; December 20, 2012; January
22, 2013; February 20, 2013; March 21, 2013; and April 22, 2013. (Ex. A-15.) For the Nile River lease, the
documentation included receipts showing bank card payments made by Patricia Olsen on December 14, 2012; February
28, 2013; April 29, 2013; May 28, 2013; and June 10, 2013. (Ex. A-16.)

1 “conned.” (Tr. at 868.) On brief, Mr. Dougherty requests that the Commission declare the leases
2 void under A.R.S. § 40-303(A). (Dougherty Brief at 26; Dougherty Reply Brief at 26) Mr.
3 Dougherty also characterizes retroactive approval of the long-term debt as rewarding Montezuma for
4 bad behavior. (See Dougherty Reply Brief at 9.) Mr. Dougherty asserts that if Montezuma cannot
5 afford to pay for the capital leases because of its failure to abide by Commission orders, then
6 Montezuma must find additional capital to pay for the arsenic treatment facilities; sell the assets of
7 the company to an entity capable of providing adequate water service at a reasonable rate; or “face
8 the consequences of its business decisions.” (Dougherty Reply Brief at 18.) Mr. Dougherty argues
9 that Staff does not have the authority to ignore Montezuma’s violations of Commission requirements
10 and that “it is not the Commission’s responsibility to assist corrupt Companies that fail to meet
11 regulatory standards by ignoring Procedural orders, Commission regulations and state statutes and
12 dismissing them as merely paperwork.” (*Id.* at 19.)

13 Staff recommends that the Commission approve the leases. Mr. Becker testified that Staff is
14 in full support of Montezuma’s installing the arsenic treatment system and complying with safe
15 drinking water standards, that the leases meet the appropriate approval requirements, and that Staff
16 would have conducted the same analysis and made the same recommendation for approval if the
17 leases had been presented in March 2012. (Tr. at 887-88.) Mr. Becker stated that he was aware of
18 the testimony presented regarding the existence of versions of the leases with different lessors and
19 different dates, but stated that the financial terms of the leases have been constant. (Tr. at 889.) Mr.
20 Becker did, however, disagree with the suggestion that the terms of the leases are comparable to the
21 terms of the WIFA loan that was authorized in Decision No. 71317, because the WIFA loan had a
22 lower interest rate and was for a longer period and, all else being equal, financing the arsenic
23 treatment system with the WIFA loan would have resulted in lower monthly payments. (Tr. at 892-
24 94.) Mr. Becker did agree that the monthly payments expected with the WIFA loan authorized in
25 Decision No. 71317 and for the combined capital leases are in the “same ballpark” and asserted that
26 there is some benefit from the shorter duration for the leases. (See Tr. at 892-93.)

27 Staff determined that the capital leases are just and reasonable and in the public interest
28 because they were “crucial” to getting the arsenic level remediated, and Montezuma had no

1 alternative means of financing the arsenic treatment system. (Tr. at 1058.) Mr. Becker agreed that
2 the embedded interest rates for the capital leases are "very high," at between 27 percent and 35
3 percent,⁵³ but asserted that they seemed to be Montezuma's only option. (Tr. at 1057-58.) Mr.
4 Becker stated that Montezuma is obligated to repay the two leases and will have outstanding debt
5 service requirements therefrom. (Tr. at 1065.)

6 When questioned about the typical consequences of the Commission's denying retroactive
7 approval of long-term debt, Mr. Becker explained that the plant acquired through the unapproved
8 debt would still go into rate base, but the capital supporting it would be treated as paid-in capital
9 instead of debt. (Tr. at 1045-46.) With a utility that has its rates set based on rate of return on rate
10 base, that treatment would impact the authorized rate of return because it would affect the capital
11 structure and thus the weighted average cost of capital. (Tr. at 1046-48.) Mr. Becker testified that in
12 this case, however, because Staff's recommended rates were set on the basis of cash flow and
13 operating margin as opposed to rate of return on rate base, if the Commission were to adopt Staff's
14 recommended rates, a Commission refusal to approve the capital leases would not automatically
15 impact the revenue requirement and the rates recommended by Staff. (Tr. at 1066.) Staff used cash
16 flow and operating margin to determine its recommended revenue requirement and rates because
17 Montezuma's rate base is low, and Staff believed that application of a typical rate of return would
18 result in insufficient cash flow to cover Montezuma's obligations. (See Tr. at 1068-70.) Staff
19 essentially treated the lease payment obligations as operating expenses by including them as line
20 items in its cash flow analysis. (See Tr. at 1073-74.) Staff asserts that Montezuma should be
21 authorized sufficient revenue to pay the leases because the arsenic treatment system is used to provide
22 safe water, which is in the public interest. (Tr. at 1074.) Mr. Becker clarified, however, that Staff's
23 recommended revenue requirement, without the recommended Arias Docket and WIFA loan
24 surcharges, results in no leftover cash and no unallocated depreciation expense, which Mr. Becker
25 explained is unusual because ordinarily an owner would be able to take depreciation expense as cash.
26 (Tr. at 1081, 1087.) Staff's goal is to keep Montezuma going by providing it enough cash to pay its
27

28 ⁵³ In contrast, the typical interest rate for a 20-year WIFA loan is currently approximately 4 to 5 percent. (Tr. at 1059.)

1 bills. (Tr. at 1085-87.)

2 Mr. Becker acknowledged that there were “competing priorities” in this matter, but stated the
3 following regarding Staff’s position:

4 [W]hen all is said and done and at the end of the day, we put public safety
5 over getting the paperwork in. And we think that it was more important
6 for the company to get the arsenic treatment plant in when she got it in. . .
7 . [T]hat’s the standard way it has been around here for quite awhile. . . .
8 Under certain circumstances . . . there has to be an order of priority. And
9 if getting the plant in had to come before getting the paperwork done, it is
10 reasonable. [W]e are more concerned with getting the arsenic treatment
11 system in place than we are with . . . getting the capital lease and the
12 associated debt approved.⁵⁴

13 When asked, Mr. Becker also acknowledged, however, that Staff is not in a position to excuse a
14 company for violating or potentially violating a Procedural Order. (Tr. at 931.)

11 3. Filing of Invalid Lease Documents

12 As noted above, Montezuma has, at different times, provided the Commission with different
13 versions of leases associated with procuring the arsenic treatment system and the building to house
14 the arsenic treatment system, and Montezuma has taken different positions at different times as to the
15 Commission’s authority to review and approve the leases. The specifics of these events are as
16 follows:

- 17 • On October 6, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma made a filing stating that it
18 would be leasing arsenic treatment equipment.
- 19 • On October 12, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma filed a Proposed Plan for
20 Arsenic Abatement stating that it would be leasing arsenic treatment facilities from
21 GEcom Water Solutions, Inc. and would file a copy of the executed lease.
- 22 • On October 25, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma filed an amended plan stating
23 that it would not execute the lease or move forward with construction of the arsenic
24 treatment plant until the Commission had signed off on the plan.
- 25 • On November 9, 2011, a Procedural Order issued in the 40-252 Docket directed
26 Montezuma, inter alia, to make a filing explaining the material terms of the lease, the
27 source and ownership of the funds to be used for lease payments, and an analysis
28 whether the lease was a capital lease or an operating lease.
- On December 7, 2011, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma filed an Interim Report
stating that it had not yet received the lease from GEcom, but expected Odyssey
Equipment Financing to provide financing for the lease payments, and that Ms. Olsen
was planning to enter the lease with GEcom and would make payments to GEcom or

⁵⁴ Tr. at 926-32.

1 Odyssey with her own personal funds and then sublease the system to Montezuma.
2 Montezuma asked for more time to analyze the lease arrangement because it did not yet
3 have the documents.

- 4 • On January 4, 2012, a Procedural Order was issued in the 40-252 Docket requiring,
5 inter alia, that Montezuma file copies of any and all written lease agreements for the
6 arsenic treatment plant and building as soon as such documents came into
7 Montezuma's possession and provide courtesy copies of those documents to Mr.
8 Dougherty and Staff through electronic mail.
- 9 • On February 21, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Ms. Olsen made a filing including a cover
10 letter from Kevlor Design Group, LLC; an unexecuted "Contract for Arsenic Treatment
11 System" at a cost of \$46,000; and an unexecuted Water Services Agreement between
12 Ms. Olsen and Montezuma that would require Montezuma to pay Ms. Olsen a monthly
13 fee of \$1500 plus a treatment fee per acre foot for arsenic treatment for 20 years and to
14 buy the arsenic treatment system for \$1 at the end of the 20 years. The filing also
15 included four pages of an unexecuted "5 Page Lease Agreement" form showing
16 Financial Pacific Leasing as lessor and not identifying a lessee.
- 17 • On March 12, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, a Procedural Order was issued that, inter
18 alia, required Montezuma, by March 30, 2012, to file a copy of any contractual
19 documents related to purchase, construction, installation, operation, or maintenance of
20 an arsenic treatment facility to treat the water from Well No. 1 and/or Well No. 4.
- 21 • On March 19, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Ms. Olsen made a filing that included two
22 executed one-page lease agreements between Ms. Olsen personally and Nile River:
23 one a 36-month lease for an arsenic building plant and the other a 60-month lease for
24 an arsenic removal water treatment system, both with signatures of Ms. Olsen and
25 "Robin Richards" on March 16, 2012. The filing also included an unexecuted Water
26 Services Agreement between Ms. Olsen and Montezuma, with the same material terms
27 as filed in the previous filing by Ms. Olsen, and a Contract for Arsenic Treatment
28 System with an executed Contract Acceptance Form with signatures of Kelvin Duffy
for Kevlor on January 27, 2012, and Ms. Olsen on February 28, 2012.
- On March 20, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma filed a Response to a Motion by
Mr. Dougherty, asserting that Montezuma's current arsenic treatment plan was to have
Ms. Olsen, in her individual capacity, enter into a contract with Kevlor for construction
and operation of arsenic treatment facilities; for Ms. Olsen to finance those facilities
through a personal lease agreement with Odyssey; and for Ms. Olsen to enter into a
Water Services Agreement with Montezuma through which Ms. Olsen would lease the
arsenic treatment facilities to Montezuma. Montezuma stated that the terms and
conditions of the Kevlor contract and the Water Services Agreement had been filed
with the Commission on February 21, 2012, and that the contracts were in the process
of final execution and would be filed as soon as possible. Montezuma further stated
that the Commission had no authority over the agreements because there was no debt
issuance involved. Montezuma acknowledged that operational expenses could be
reviewed by the Commission as part of a rate case.
- On April 9, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, a Procedural Order was issued requiring
Montezuma, through counsel, to file, by April 13, 2012, complete copies of any and all
executed agreements by Ms. Olsen or Montezuma for arsenic treatment; and requiring
the parties to file, by April 27, 2012, an analysis of each document.
- On April 13, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket, Montezuma filed a Notice including a Water
Services Agreement executed by Ms. Olsen as both lessor and lessee on March 16,
2012; two Nile River leases signed by Ms. Olsen and "Robin Richards" on March 16,

1 2012; and the Kevlor contract signed for Kevlor on January 27, 2012, and by Ms.
 2 Olsen on February 28, 2012. Montezuma stated that the documents had been filed
 3 previously on March 19, 2012.

- 4 • On April 27, 2012, in the 40-252 Docket,⁵⁵ Montezuma filed a Legal Brief stating that
 5 the Commission did not have jurisdiction over the Kevlor contract, the two Nile River
 6 leases, or the Water Services Agreement because the Kevlor contract and Nile River
 7 leases had been entered into by Ms. Olsen rather than Montezuma, and the Water
 8 Services Agreement was an operational agreement with a purchase option and not an
 9 issuance of indebtedness.
- 10 • On April 30, 2012, at a joint procedural conference in the 40-252 Docket and the
 11 Complaint Docket, Montezuma acknowledged that the Water Services Agreement
 12 would be considered a capital lease, and Montezuma indicated that it would be making
 13 a choice, following by appropriate filings, concerning how it desired to finance its
 14 arsenic treatment facilities.
- 15 • On October 25, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Ms. Olsen filed Insufficiency
 16 Submittals & Amendments to its rate application, including an affidavit regarding the
 17 notice to its customers of its amended rate application, and an attachment labeled
 18 "Lease Agreement," including a copy of the Nile River lease signed by Ms. Olsen for
 19 Montezuma on March 22, 2012, and by Mr. Torbenson for Nile River on March 23,
 20 2012, but omitting Rider No. 2, and a copy of the Financial Pacific lease signed by Ms.
 21 Olsen on May 2, 2012, with no first payment due date on page 1 of 5 and no page 5 of
 22 5. The document did not include a service list, and it was not filed by counsel.
- 23 • On January 14, 2013, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Mr. Dougherty made an
 24 extensive filing that included, inter alia, two different sets of executed lease agreements
 25 with Nile River, one identifying Ms. Olsen as the lessee and the other identifying
 26 Montezuma as the lessee.
- 27 • On January 15, 2013, in the Consolidated R&F Docket, Mr. Dougherty filed, inter alia,
 28 a copy of a UCC Financing Statement filed with the Secretary of State on May 9, 2012,
 showing the existence of a lease dated April 3, 2012, with Montezuma as the debtor,
 Wells Fargo Capital Finance, LLC, as the secured party/lessor, and Financial Pacific as
 the assignor. Mr. Dougherty also made another filing including a copy of a UCC
 Financing Statement filed with the Secretary of State on August 31, 2012, showing the
 existence of a lease with Montezuma as the debtor, Nile River as the secured
 party/lessor, and an arsenic building as collateral.
- On February 25, 2013, at a joint procedural conference held in the 40-252 Docket, the
 Complaint Docket, and the Consolidated R&F Docket, Montezuma stated that the
 arsenic treatment facility was operating and that its water supply was meeting ADEQ
 standards; identified the Nile River lease and the Financial Pacific lease as the genuine
 leases; and was unwilling to characterize the leases as capital leases. The cases were
 consolidated for all purposes going forward the next day.
- On March 21, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed in this matter a complete copy of the 5-page
 Financial Pacific lease dated April 2, 2012, and including a first payment due date of
 April 15, 2012, on page 1 of 5, as well as an Equipment List page.⁵⁶
- On April 12, 2013, Montezuma filed in this matter a Notice of Filing Financing

⁵⁵ On the same date in the same docket, Staff filed Staff's Notice of Response to Procedural Order analyzing the Water Services Agreement and determining that it was a capital lease agreement requiring Commission approval.

⁵⁶ Dougherty NOF 3/21/13

1 Applications, including a copy of the Nile River lease without Rider No. 2 and a copy
 2 of the Financial Pacific lease dated May 2, 2012, and not including a payment due date
 for the first payment on page 1 of 5, but including page 5 of 5. Montezuma stated that
 the Nile River lease was not a capital lease.

- 3 • On April 15, 2013, Mr. Dougherty filed in this matter a complete copy of the Nile
 4 River lease, including Rider No. 2, and a complete copy of the 5-page Financial Pacific
 lease dated April 2, 2012, and including a first payment due date of April 15, 2012, on
 5 page 1 of 5.⁵⁷
- 6 • As hearing exhibits, Montezuma for the first time provided copies of the Nile River
 lease with Rider No. 2 and of the Financial Pacific lease with all five pages and a first
 7 payment due date of April 15, 2012, on page 1 of 5.⁵⁸

8 Ms. Olsen testified that she worked with Odyssey Financial to obtain financing for the arsenic
 9 treatment facilities and requested that the leases be personal leases in Ms. Olsen's name, because she
 10 wanted to make sure she could "meet the deadlines." (Tr. at 90-92.) She stated that when she
 11 received the original leases, there were two of them, both with Nile River. (Tr. at 92.) Then, she
 12 says, she received another set of leases, one for Nile River and the other for Financial Pacific
 13 (although she says she did not see Financial Pacific named on it). (Tr. at 92.) Ms. Olsen stated that
 14 one set of leases came in the mail and one set in an email, but did not remember from whom. (Tr. at
 15 92.) Ms. Olsen asserted that neither she nor Montezuma had any role in drafting or writing the terms
 16 of the leases and that neither she nor Montezuma had tried to "pull a fast one" with the Commission.
 17 (Tr. at 92-93.) Ms. Olsen asserted that Odyssey Financial never explained to her that the lease
 18 agreements would be with Nile River and Financial Pacific, and that when the leases came in the
 19 mail, she did not know that they had come from Odyssey, but felt that she was "forced to sign
 20 whatever they would give [her]." (Tr. at 92-93.) Ms. Olsen further stated that she did not know who
 21 signed for Nile River on the Nile River lease agreement dated March 16, 2012, and that she believed
 22 the signature for Nile River was an authorized signature. (Ex. A-2 at 33.) Ms. Olsen acknowledged,
 23 however, that the actual Nile River lease agreement is the one dated March 22, 2012, and signed by
 24 John Torbenson for Nile River and by Ms. Olsen for Montezuma. (*Id.*) Ms. Olsen provided the
 25 following explanation of the circumstances surrounding the different versions of the Nile River lease
 26 agreement:

27 ⁵⁷ Dougherty SOF 4/15/13.

28 ⁵⁸ The copies provided by Montezuma did not include the Equipment List for and had obscured the other typed date on
 the first page of the Financial Pacific lease. (*See* Ex. A-10.)

1 At that time, MRWC faced substantial pressure from ADEQ to address the
 2 arsenic problem. MRWC attempted to find financing for the arsenic
 3 treatment facilities and Odyssey Financial provided the only available
 4 option. In turn, I signed both lease agreements with Nile River dated
 5 March 16, 2012. As originally proposed, I intended to proceed with the
 6 personal leases with Nile River in order to expedite the financing and
 7 construction of the arsenic facilities. Subsequently, however, Nile River
 8 informed me that it could not enter a lease with me personally and that the
 9 Company needed to be party to the agreement. Odyssey Financial then
 10 provided the March 22, 2012 lease agreement between MRWC and Nile
 11 River.

12 I acknowledge that the Company should have docketed the March
 13 22, 2012 lease agreement between MRWC and Nile River and sought
 14 Commission approval. MRWC apologizes for that omission. The
 15 Company also acknowledges that the Nile River lease agreement is a
 16 capital lease based on Rider 2. Unfortunately, MRWC did not have a
 17 copy of Rider 2 in its files. In any event, the Company submitted the
 18 March 22, 2012 Nile River lease agreement for Commission approval in
 19 its Notice of Filing Financing Applications on April 12, 2013. MRWC
 20 also docketed that lease agreement and the May 2, 2012 lease agreement
 21 with Financial Pacific with the Commission on October 26, 2012 in
 22 Docket No. 12-0204.⁵⁹

23 Ms. Olsen testified that during the period of February 2012 through final installation of the
 24 arsenic treatment system in November 2012, she was “getting approximately 5 hours of sleep each
 25 week due to the stress caused by the arsenic issues and Mr. Dougherty’s efforts to undermine the
 26 Company.” (Ex. A-2 at 34.) Ms. Olsen stated that during the period when the lease agreements were
 27 signed, Montezuma was “under immediate orders and pressure from ADEQ to install an arsenic
 28 treatment system” and had been told by ADEQ that it would be fined \$150,000 if it failed to do so.
 (Id. at 35.) Ms. Olsen stated that Montezuma did not actually start paying on the leases until later,
 with payments to Financial Pacific commencing in October 23, 2012, and payments to Nile River
 commencing on December 17, 2012. (Id.) Prior to that date, she stated, she paid on the leases out of
 her personal checking account; she also stated that the deposits for the leases were paid out of her
 checking account. (Id.)

To explain how there came to be two versions of the Financial Pacific lease, dated April 2012
 and May 2012, Ms. Olsen stated:

Both of those lease agreements were provided to MRWC and me by
 Financial Pacific. I did not draft those lease documents—rather they were
 provided by Financial Pacific. That lease is not a contract document or
 form created by MRWC. Odyssey Financial had originally provided an

⁵⁹ Ex. A-2 at 33-34.

1 undated lease agreement to MRWC, which was signed by me.
 2 Subsequently, I spoke with a representative of Financial Pacific and was
 3 advised that it would take 30-60 days to finalize the agreement. As a
 4 result, Financial Pacific provided two copies of the lease agreements dated
 5 April 2, 2012 and May 2, 2012. Representatives of Financial Pacific
 6 advised me that the agreement could be dated in April or May. At the
 7 time, MRWC focused on getting the financing in place for the arsenic
 8 treatment plant. For these reasons, I considered the May 2012 Financial
 9 Pacific lease as the final agreement. I should also mention that the April
 10 2012 and May 2012 Financial Pacific lease agreements have identical
 11 terms and conditions.

12 The Company acknowledges that the Company should have docketed
 13 the lease agreements and apologizes for the mistake. The Company did
 14 not have any ulterior or improper motive. MRWC corrected that omission
 15 by docketing those agreements in October 2012 and then seeking
 16 financing approval for those leases in April 2013. The Company was
 17 subject to sanctions and penalties by ADEQ for failure to resolve the
 18 arsenic treatment problem and believed that it was necessary to enter the
 19 lease agreements for the arsenic treatment facility. Further, neither the
 20 Commission nor any customers have suffered any harm as a result of the
 21 lease agreements with Nile River Financial Pacific [sic] and, in fact,
 22 customers have benefitted from construction and operation of the arsenic
 23 treatment facility. The Company intended that the Commission would
 24 review the terms and conditions of that lease in its pending rate case.
 25 MRWC also contacted staff to inform them that the personal leases were
 26 not preferable because Mr. Dougherty raised objections about lack of
 27 Commission review. In turn, the Company entered the leases with the
 28 clear intent of submitting them for Commission review and approval.⁶⁰

Both Mr. Torbenson and Ms. Richards from Odyssey⁶¹ testified at the hearing in this matter.

16 Mr. Torbenson, the owner of both Odyssey and Nile River, explained that Odyssey serves as a broker
 17 and Nile River as a lender. (Tr. at 979-80.) Odyssey's process begins when an equipment dealer
 18 calls about a potential client for financing and provides information for a credit decision. (*Id.*) Mr.
 19 Torbenson makes the credit decision for Nile River, and Financial Pacific, which does larger deals,
 20 makes its own credit decision. (*Id.*) Odyssey then creates the financing documents and emails them
 21 to the client for signature. (*Id.*) The client signs the documents and then sends them back to
 22 Odyssey, generally by mail. (Tr. at 979-80; 988-89.) After the signed documents are received back,
 23 Nile River and/or Financial Pacific send the dealer any funds required up front, the equipment is
 24 installed through the dealer, and the client notifies Nile River and Financial Pacific that the
 25 equipment has been installed and that it is okay to pay the balance. (Tr. at 979-80.) Nile River and

27 ⁶⁰ Ex. A-2 at 35-36.

28 ⁶¹ As of the hearing, Ms. Richards no longer worked for Odyssey, but instead for a different financial company. (Tr. at 990-91.)

1 Financial Pacific then pay the dealer the balance due. (*Id.*)

2 Mr. Torbenson recalled that Ms. Olsen requested for the leases to be created in her name
3 personally, to allow her to rent the facilities to her company, but that Odyssey's attorney told Mr.
4 Torbenson that personal leases could not be done. (*See* Tr. at 965, 980.) Mr. Torbenson recalled that
5 Ms. Olsen was sent an unsigned personal lease agreement with Nile River for the arsenic treatment
6 building, but he was not sure whether such a lease agreement had been sent for the arsenic treatment
7 system because it was funded by Financial Pacific, and Nile River does not usually do leases that
8 large. (*See* Tr. at 965, 981.) Mr. Torbenson testified that Ms. Richards handled all the
9 documentation, but he believed documents are sent to every client by email, so that the clients can
10 print them off, sign them, and send back an original in hard copy. (Tr. at 981-82.) Mr. Torbenson
11 stated that he notified Ms. Olsen that the personal leases could not be done and then sent her the
12 leases for Montezuma. (Tr. at 965-66.) Mr. Torbenson stated that he had seen the two personal
13 leases between Ms. Olsen and Nile River in the file, signed by Ms. Olsen and signed by someone else
14 whose signature he did not recognize but who was not from his company. (Tr. at 975-76, 982-83,
15 987-88.) Mr. Torbenson explained that only he is authorized to sign for his company, and it is not his
16 signature. (Tr. at 975-76, 983.) Mr. Torbenson stated that both the Financial Pacific lease and the
17 Nile River lease for Montezuma were emailed to Ms. Olsen and then returned to Odyssey after
18 having been signed. (Tr. at 966.) Mr. Torbenson then signed the Nile River lease, and the Financial
19 Pacific lease was sent along to Financial Pacific. (Tr. at 967.) Mr. Torbenson generally dates an
20 agreement with the date that he signs it. (Tr. at 984.) Odyssey generally does not send its customers
21 a copy of their lease agreements unless requested to do so. (Tr. at 967-68.) According to Mr.
22 Torbenson, the March 22, 2012, lease between Nile River and Montezuma is the effective lease, and
23 Financial Pacific has not complained to him about its lease with Montezuma. (Tr. at 972, 978; see
24 Ex. C-20.)

25 Ms. Richards recalled that she created the personal lease agreements to send to Ms. Olsen
26 because Mr. Torbenson requested that she do so, and that she emailed only the first pages of the
27 personal lease agreements to Ms. Olsen along with the complete multipage lease agreements for
28 Montezuma, although she had been informed by Mr. Torbenson that only the Montezuma leases were

1 to be executed. (Tr. at 993-94, 998, 1000-01.) Ms. Richards stated that Mr. Torbenson would have
 2 informed Ms. Olsen about not being able to use the personal leases. (Tr. at 994.) Ms. Richards also
 3 stated that Odyssey did not have any copies of the personal leases until Mr. Dougherty contacted
 4 Odyssey and provided them, as signed by Ms. Olsen and signed with what appears to be "Robin
 5 Richards." (Tr. at 992, 995, 999-1000.) Ms. Richards stated that she did not sign the personal lease
 6 agreements and that she did not know who did sign them. (Tr. at 992.)

7 At Mr. Dougherty's request, a Commission subpoena was issued to Financial Pacific to obtain
 8 its records regarding its lease with Montezuma. (See Ex. C-49.) According to the cover letter and
 9 attached lease agreement provided by Financial Pacific, Montezuma's lease with Financial Pacific
 10 has an April 2, 2012, date under Ms. Olsen's signature on the first page and contains a first payment
 11 due date of April 15, 2012, on the first page. (See Ex. C-14.) The lease agreement was signed by
 12 Ms. Olsen and Gregory Olsen as guarantors on March 22, 2012. (See *id.*) The lease agreement also
 13 includes an Equipment List page that was signed by Ms. Olsen for Montezuma and is dated April 2,
 14 2012. (See *id.*) The cover letter from Financial Pacific's Legal Department indicates the following
 15 regarding the date of its lease with Montezuma and a copy of a May 2, 2012, Financial Pacific lease
 16 agreement that Mr. Dougherty had provided to Financial Pacific:

17 Please note the verbiage on our UCC states the agreement was dated April
 18 3, 2012, however this is the date the agreement was booked. As you can
 19 see on page 5 of the agreement, the lease was actually dated March 22,
 20 2012. The front page of the agreement has a typed date of 4/2/12. It is
 our policy to use the date on the confirm call to fill in any date fields left
 blank at the time of signing. I have included a copy of the confirm call for
 your reference.

21 The enclosed lease agreement is the only lease agreement we have on file
 22 for Montezuma Rimrock Water Company. The agreement you provided
 23 with a typed date of 5/2/2012 appears to be an unauthorized modified
 24 version of the original. We did not type the date of 5/2/2012 on this
 agreement.⁶² The lease you sent me is also missing page 5 of the
 agreement.

25 In an email sent to Mr. Dougherty by Financial Pacific's Legal Department, Financial Pacific stated
 26 that Odyssey sent the documents to Financial Pacific without any typed dates on them and that

27
 28 ⁶² Ex. C-14.

1 Financial Pacific completed the confirm call in house and then used the confirm call date to fill in the
2 blank date fields on the lease agreement. (Ex. C-49.) Financial Pacific also stated that only one lease
3 agreement was provided to its customer, not one for April and one for May; that the April 2, 2012,
4 agreement is the true and correct copy of the lease; that any other lease document is an "unauthorized
5 modified version of the original lease"; and that Ms. Olsen's assertion that representatives of
6 Financial Pacific had told her that the agreement could be dated in April or May was "not a true
7 statement." (Ex. C-49.)

8 Ms. Olsen has not explained why she signed both the one-page personal leases between
9 herself and Nile River and the multipage Nile River and Financial Pacific leases, but only sent the
10 signed and dated multipage Nile River and Financial Pacific leases back for the lessors. Ms. Richards
11 testified that the lease documents were all sent to Ms. Olsen in a single email and that Odyssey did
12 not have a signed copy of the personal leases in its files until a copy was sent by Mr. Dougherty. Ms.
13 Olsen has not explained why the personal leases were only provided to the Commission, not to
14 Odyssey. Nor has Ms. Olsen explained how the one-page personal leases came to be signed by
15 "Robin Richards," when they had been sent to her unsigned in an email from Robin Richards, whose
16 testimony was credible. Ms. Olsen was the person who had control over the documents after they had
17 been emailed to Montezuma and after they had been signed by her. Ms. Olsen also has not explained
18 why Montezuma did not have a copy of Rider No. 2 in its files, when Ms. Olsen had received Rider
19 No. 2 and signed it with the other lease documents, or why she and Montezuma provided the
20 Commission incomplete copies of the Financial Pacific lease with dates that did not match the dates
21 of the official Financial Pacific lease. Financial Pacific identified the lease documents with the May
22 2, 2012, date as an "unauthorized modified version" of the lease and Ms. Olsen's assertion that she
23 had been told either April or May was an option "not a true statement." No one has questioned the
24 validity of the correspondence from Financial Pacific as to the facts of the lease arrangement between
25 it and Montezuma.

26 The evidence supports Mr. Dougherty's assertion that the invalid one-page lease documents
27 were signed by Ms. Olsen and filed with the Commission to avoid the appearance that Montezuma
28 had entered into capital leases creating long-term debt that required Commission approval, at a time

1 when Montezuma was desperate to comply with the ADEQ Consent Order deadline of April 7, 2012,
2 for Montezuma to complete construction of the arsenic treatment system and submit an
3 administratively complete application for an AOC for the treatment system. When Montezuma
4 missed the deadline and received another NOV from ADEQ on April 11, 2012, Montezuma received
5 another brief extension, but was also aware that adverse action would be taken by ADEQ if it did not
6 comply. This is the context in which Montezuma failed to reveal the true capital leases to the
7 Commission and apparently also its own legal counsel, who filed a completely invalid Legal Brief
8 based upon the personal lease agreements and the Water Services Agreement on April 27, 2012, and
9 also took a completely spurious position at a procedural conference on April 30, 2012.⁶³ Montezuma
10 did not reveal the leases with Nile River and Financial Pacific until incomplete and modified copies
11 were filed with the Commission (and not copied to Mr. Dougherty in spite of his Intervenor status) on
12 October 25, 2012, in the Consolidated R&F Docket. By this time, the arsenic treatment system had
13 been completed and was on the verge of receiving an AOC. Had Mr. Dougherty not investigated
14 further, obtaining copies of the valid and complete lease documents from the lessors and also their
15 input as to the different versions of the leases, the Commission might never have seen or considered
16 the true and complete capital leases that had been executed by Ms. Olsen for Montezuma in March
17 2012.

18 4. Resolution

19 Montezuma has entered into two separate lease agreements that have enabled Montezuma to
20 install an arsenic treatment system and a building to house that system. As of the date of the
21 evidentiary hearing, Montezuma had been making payments to both Nile River and Financial Pacific
22 under those two leases. Both Nile River and Financial Pacific have provided to the vendor the funds
23 made available under those leases, in return for which Nile River and Financial Pacific both have
24 been promised repayment, with substantial interest.

25

26

27 ⁶³ Ms. Olsen has testified that she did not inform her attorney when she signed the leases for Montezuma, and she
28 provided unclear testimony regarding whether she reviewed the brief before it was filed with the Commission. (Ex. A-2
at 12; Tr. at 349-55.)

1 Under A.R.S. § 40-301, as set forth previously, the Commission may not grant approval for a
2 public service corporation to enter into long-term debt such as that represented by the lease
3 agreements with Nile River and Financial Pacific, “unless it finds that such issue is for lawful
4 purposes which are within the corporate powers of the applicant, are compatible with the public
5 interest, with sound financial practices, and with the proper performance by the applicant of service
6 as a public service corporation and will not impair its ability to perform that service.” (A.R.S. § 40-
7 301(C).) Additionally, A.R.S. § 40-302(A) requires the Commission to find that the issuance of
8 indebtedness is reasonably necessary or appropriate for the purposes specified in the Commission’s
9 order, which are not, except as permitted in the order, wholly or in part reasonably chargeable to
10 operative expenses or to income.

11 As a result of these statutory provisions, in order to approve the long-term debt created by the
12 Nile River and Financial Pacific leases, the Commission would need to find (1) that the debt was
13 issued for lawful purposes which are within the corporate powers of the applicant, (2) that the
14 purposes of the debt are compatible with the public interest, (3) that the debt is compatible with
15 sound financial practices, (4) that the debt is compatible with the proper performance by the applicant
16 of service as a public service corporation and will not impair its ability to perform that service, (5)
17 that the issuance of indebtedness is reasonably necessary or appropriate for the purposes specified in
18 the Commission’s order, and (6) that the purposes specified in the order are not chargeable to
19 operative expenses or to income. To reach a conclusion, we will look at each of these in turn.

20 The debt created by the leases was issued for a lawful purpose within the corporate powers of
21 the applicant—namely, to bring Montezuma’s water into compliance with safe drinking water
22 standards enforced by ADEQ. Thus, the first criterion is met.

23 The purposes of the debt are compatible with the public interest because the public interest is
24 served by having Montezuma’s customers provided with water that does not have arsenic
25 concentrations exceeding the MCL for arsenic. Thus, the second criterion is also met.

26 Whether the debt is compatible with sound financial practices is a more complex issue. The
27 law does not define “sound financial practices,” and no Arizona cases directly address the issue, but
28 we can look to prior Commission Decisions to determine the analysis that has previously been

1 employed when this criterion was at issue. In the past, based upon Staff analysis, the Commission
2 has looked primarily to the results the debt would have on a public service corporation's debt service
3 coverage ratio ("DSC") and times interest earned ratio ("TIER"); the results the debt would have on
4 the public service corporation's capital structure; and, in the context of arsenic MCL compliance, the
5 public service corporation's access to capital and its need to comply promptly with changing
6 regulations. (See, e.g., Decision No. 68693 (May 5, 2006).⁶⁴) In this case, Staff has recommended
7 adoption of rates and charges that have been created specifically to cover the lease payments,
8 essentially as though they were operating expenses rather than long-term debt payments. (See Tr. at
9 1073-74.) As a result, Staff has not provided a schedule calculating the DSC and TIER that would
10 result if rates were set in the usual manner⁶⁵ and lease payments were factored in as long-term debt
11 payments. Based upon TY total operating revenue of \$101,276 and minimally adjusted TY total
12 operating expenses of \$83,266,⁶⁶ however, it appears that the \$17,736.60 in total lease payments
13 would result in operating income of \$313.40. (See Ex. S-2 at Sched. GWB-1, Sched. GWB-3.) If
14 Montezuma's TY depreciation expense were considered as available cash rather than an expense that
15 must be paid, that would increase the amount available to Montezuma for operations by another
16 \$7,367. These figures suggest that Montezuma would still be able to break even with the debt from
17 the two leases, even if its rates were not increased to cover them. This does not, however, factor in
18 the cost of arsenic media, which Staff estimated at \$8,851 per year. (See Ex. S-2 at Sched. GWB-3.)

19 Staff has concluded that the long-term debt created by the lease agreements is compatible
20 with sound financial practices. (See Ex. S-1 at 22, att. A at 21.) However, the terms of the leases (36
21 months for the arsenic treatment building and 60 months for the arsenic treatment system) do not
22 provide for good maturity matching, i.e., the lengths of the financings do not approximately equal the
23 lives of the assets acquired. Nevertheless, in consideration of the high interest rates available to
24 Montezuma for financing the arsenic treatment system and building, the choice of shorter financing
25 terms was reasonable, provided that Montezuma can generate sufficient cash flows to meet the

26 ⁶⁴ Official notice is taken of this decision.

27 ⁶⁵ By this, we mean through applying a fair value rate of return to a fair value rate base to establish a revenue requirement.

28 ⁶⁶ This figure is determined by taking Montezuma's unadjusted TY expenses and adjusting only to remove \$10,291 in sales tax collections from operating expenses, as these are pass-through amounts only. (See Ex. S-1 at Sched. GWB-3.)

1 obligations. As further discussed below, under the rates authorized herein, Montezuma will have the
2 capacity to meet its obligations for the portion of both leases we are currently recognizing in rate
3 base, and without any surcharge or other ratepayer subsidy. Thus, the financings are compatible with
4 sound financial practices.

5 Further, as noted above, in the context of arsenic MCL compliance, the Commission
6 previously has considered a public service corporation's access to capital and its need to comply
7 promptly with changing regulations when analyzing the financial soundness of the public service
8 corporation's proposed debt. In this case, the evidence establishes that when Montezuma chose to
9 obtain financing through Odyssey, Montezuma had the choice of attempting to start over with WIFA
10 (as Montezuma's project had changed because it could not use Well No. 4) or obtaining financing
11 through Odyssey. Montezuma had attempted to obtain a private bank loan, but had been
12 unsuccessful.⁶⁷ There is no evidence to suggest that Montezuma had another option for funding
13 construction of the arsenic treatment system at that time, as Montezuma's access to capital is very
14 limited. ADEQ was pressuring Montezuma to comply with the law or face an unquantified penalty⁶⁸
15 because of Montezuma's delay in coming into compliance with the arsenic MCL, and Montezuma
16 chose to go with the most expedient⁶⁹ financing process available, which was Odyssey.

17 Because the debt has enabled Montezuma to begin providing proper service from a public
18 health perspective, the long-term debt created by the leases is compatible with Montezuma's proper
19 performance of service as a public service corporation, and will not impair its ability to perform that
20 service. For years, Montezuma has been providing its customers water that did not comply with the
21 EPA and ADEQ MCL for arsenic. The adequacy of Montezuma's service has undeniably been
22 improved because its water supply now complies with safe drinking water standards. The fourth
23 criterion is also met.

24 As to the fifth criterion, we find that the issuance of the indebtedness was reasonably
25 necessary or appropriate under the circumstances because, as stated above, Montezuma's actions had

26 ⁶⁷ Contrary to Montezuma's assertions to the contrary, the evidence does not support that Montezuma was able to
27 obtain private financing for its arsenic treatment plan without increasing its revenues.

⁶⁸ There is no credible evidence that ADEQ had threatened Montezuma with a particular amount.

28 ⁶⁹ Montezuma was certainly aware that WIFA would not have provided Montezuma with funding until after the
Commission had approved the long-term debt associated with the funding.

1 put it in a position where an unquantified penalty would have placed an additional economic burden
2 on Montezuma and potentially its customers.

3 Finally, as to the sixth criterion, we find that none of the long-term debt created by the Nile
4 River lease or created by the Financial Pacific lease was chargeable to operating expenses. Staff
5 determined that \$16,280 of the \$38,000 cost for the arsenic treatment system was attributable to
6 arsenic media costs and should be recovered through chemical expenses (over a period of two years,
7 consistent with its estimated life) rather than in rate base. (See Ex. S-2 at 5; Ex. S-1 at 8.) This
8 would indicate that those arsenic media costs were included in operating expenses. Because the
9 arsenic media has an expected life exceeding 12 months, however, and a cost that is financially
10 material to Montezuma, the NARUC Uniform System of Accounts ("NARUC USOA") indicates that
11 it should be capitalized rather than expensed. (NARUC USOA.⁷⁰) Additionally, as noted above,
12 Staff has determined that only 37 percent of the cost of the 150 GPM arsenic treatment system itself
13 should be recovered through rates because the remaining 63 percent of the arsenic treatment system
14 represents excess capacity. (Ex. S-1 at 13, 28, Sched. GWB-2, att. A at 16; Ex. S-2 at Sched. GWB-
15 2.)

16 Based upon the analysis that the Commission generally uses to determine whether long-term
17 debt should be approved, the Commission would approve at least a portion of the \$46,000 of
18 Montezuma's long-term debt to obtain and install an arsenic treatment system and a building to house
19 that arsenic treatment system. In this matter, however, the Commission must also consider the
20 manner in which Montezuma ultimately revealed this long-term debt to the Commission and
21 requested approval for it, and whether "rewarding" the company for the way it has gone about its
22 duties as a public service corporation is in the public interest. We have serious concerns, including
23 that Montezuma, and Ms. Olsen individually, misled the Commission both actively and through
24 omission by providing incorrect information about Montezuma's plan to remediate its arsenic level
25 and about the status of its leases; by filing personal leases that Ms. Olsen knew were not valid and
26 contained forged signatures; by failing to reveal that Montezuma had entered into leases and having

27 ⁷⁰ Official notice is taken of the provisions of the NARUC USOA for Class C Water Utilities, with which the
28 Commission's rules require Class D water utilities such as Montezuma to comply. Under the NARUC USOA, a utility
with annual water operating revenues of less than \$200,000 is classified as Class C.

1 counsel make factual assertions that Montezuma and Ms. Olsen knew not to be true and arguments
2 that Montezuma and Ms. Olsen knew to be invalid; by filing incomplete leases; and by filing leases
3 with altered dates. While Ms. Olsen has professed that she is innocent of any wrongdoing, has
4 attempted to explain how there came to be multiple versions of leases, and has testified that she
5 desires to know as much as anyone who signed the personal leases as "Robin Richards," Ms. Olsen's
6 testimony in this area is not credible.

7 Mr. Dougherty aptly describes the Commission's need to make a "difficult choice" between,
8 on the one hand, retroactively approving the debt that supports the arsenic treatment system and
9 provides safe drinking water to the public and, on the other hand, denying approval of the debt based
10 upon Montezuma's failure to comply with Commission statutes, regulations, and Procedural Orders.
11 (*See* Dougherty Reply Brief at 18.) Mr. Dougherty asserts that denial would represent the
12 Commission's "enforcing its laws and regulations and therefore the integrity of the agency" and,
13 further, that denial would keep Montezuma from attaining compliance and would render Montezuma
14 unable to obtain future rate increases, which he asserts would result in a benefit to ratepayers because
15 ratepayers benefit from not being burdened with rate increases. (*Id.*)

16 In any case in which a public service corporation may have engaged in conduct of
17 questionable ethics, such as the Commission sees with companies that engage in self-dealing or that
18 file with the Commission documents that are incomplete or false, there is a tension between the
19 Commission's desire and need to enforce its own economic regulatory requirements, which are
20 designed to protect the public interest, and the Commission's desire and need to ensure that persons
21 within a public service corporation's service area continue to receive adequate service at reasonable
22 rates. This tension requires the Commission to balance the benefit of penalizing a public service
23 corporation, to deter further misconduct, against the adverse impacts that may occur if the penalty
24 jeopardizes the public service corporation's continued viability and thus the service upon which its
25 ratepayers rely, thereby damaging the blameless ratepayers. In this case, although Montezuma and its
26 owner have been not been honest with the Commission, and have taken spurious positions through
27
28

1 counsel as well,⁷¹ we conclude that the public health benefits to Montezuma's ratepayers from
2 Montezuma's obtaining financing of the arsenic treatment system and associated building outweigh
3 Montezuma's failure to comply with its obligation to obtain Commission approval prior to taking on
4 long-term debt. Thus, although Montezuma violated A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302, we find that
5 retroactive approval of a portion of the financing is appropriate.

6 While Staff has recommended that the long-term debt represented by the leases be approved
7 as to the entire amount, this recommendation is not consistent with Staff's determination that only 37
8 percent of the cost of the arsenic treatment system itself (*i.e.*, 37 percent of the \$21,720 that is left
9 when the arsenic media cost of \$16,280 is deducted) should be included in rate base as used and
10 useful, non-excessive plant. It is not consistent with standard ratemaking principles to approve the
11 long-term debt associated with plant considered to constitute excess capacity. Thus, we will disallow
12 \$13,684 (63 percent of \$21,720) of the \$46,000 financing request. Accordingly, while we find that
13 Montezuma violated A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302, for the reasons set forth herein, we will approve
14 financing in the amount of \$24,316 as to the arsenic treatment system and in the amount of \$8,000 for
15 the arsenic treatment system building.

16 **V. The Rate Docket**

17 In its rate application, as amended, Montezuma used a 2011 test year ("TY") and showed TY
18 revenue of \$101,276 and total operating expenses of \$93,557, resulting in operating income of
19 \$7,719. (Ex. A-4; Ex. A-6.) Prior to accepting Staff's recommendations, Montezuma proposed a
20 revenue increase of \$76,800, or 75.83 percent over TY revenues. (Ex. A-6; Ex. A-23.) Ms. Olsen
21 testified that Montezuma's proposed revenue increase was based on operating expenses and operating
22 margin and that Montezuma needs a rate increase to cover the costs and expenses associated with
23 obtaining its arsenic treatment system, replacing its storage tanks, obtaining a pressure tank, adding
24 Well No. 4 to its system, and upgrading infrastructure dating from 1969. (Ex. A-2 at 5-6.)
25 Montezuma also asserted that it had no operating margin, no funds available for normal maintenance
26 and repairs, and no funds available for employee wages and employee-related expenses. (*Id.* at 9.)

27 ⁷¹ Ms. Olsen has testified that she did not inform her attorney when she signed the leases for Montezuma, and she
28 provided unclear testimony regarding whether she reviewed the brief before it was filed with the Commission. (Ex. A-2
at 12; Tr. at 349-55.)

1 Although Montezuma initially did not propose specific rates, it ultimately proposed to have the
2 monthly service charge for all but one meter size increased by \$30⁷² and to have each commodity rate
3 increased by \$0.50 per thousand gallons. (Ex. A-6; Ex. A-23.) Montezuma also proposed a “JD
4 Legal Surcharge” of \$6.57 per customer per month to cover legal expenses of \$47,298.09 that
5 Montezuma claimed it had accrued over a three-year period beginning in January 2010 and that it
6 stated were attributable to Mr. Dougherty’s intervention in this matter. (Ex. A-6 at 4; Ex. A-23.)

7 Montezuma requested to have its fair value rate base (“FVRB”) determined using its original
8 cost rate base (“OCRB”). (Ex. A-6.) In its last rate case, Montezuma’s OCRB/FVRB was
9 determined to be \$4,084 and too low to be useful in establishing its rates. (Decision No. 71317 at
10 10.) Montezuma asserted herein that system improvements with a total cost of approximately
11 \$175,000 had been made since its last rate case, in the form of an arsenic treatment system, a storage
12 building to house the arsenic treatment system, infrastructure for Well No. 4, line replacement, and
13 fire hydrant installation. (Ex. A-2 at 7.)

14 After making a number of rate base adjustments, Staff determined Montezuma’s adjusted
15 OCRB/FVRB to be \$67,414. (Ex. S-2 at Sched. GWB-2.) Staff reduced plant in service by \$91,286
16 overall through adjustments that included removing the site for Well No. 4; adding the arsenic
17 treatment facility building; removing Well No. 2, which is no longer in service; adding a small
18 amount of pumping equipment; reclassifying water treatment equipment to water treatment plant;
19 adding 37 percent of the arsenic treatment facility costs to water treatment plant, to exclude media
20 and exclude the portion of the arsenic treatment facility that Staff classified as excess capacity; and
21 reclassifying distribution reservoirs and standpipes to storage tanks. (Ex. S-1 at 10-14, Sched. GWB-
22 2; Ex. S-2 at Sched. GWB-2.) Staff also decreased accumulated depreciation, eliminated advances in
23 aid of construction (“AIAC”), decreased customer deposits, increased accumulated amortization of
24 contributions in aid of construction (“CIAC”), and included working capital calculated using the
25 formula method. (See Ex. S-1 at 10, Sched. GWB-2; Ex. S-2 at 4, Sched. GWB-2.)

26 Except as to the adjustment made to exclude arsenic media, as mentioned above, we agree
27

28 ⁷² The monthly minimum charge increase proposed for 2” meters was \$20.

1 with Staff's adjustments of rate base items. Because the arsenic media has an expected life exceeding
2 12 months, and a cost that is financially material to Montezuma, the NARUC USOA indicates that it
3 should be capitalized rather than expensed. Thus we will include the \$16,280 representing the
4 arsenic media cost in rate base, to be depreciated 50 percent per year. As a result, we find that
5 Montezuma's FVRB is equivalent to its OCRB and is \$83,694.

6 Staff agreed with Montezuma's TY revenue figure of \$101,276, but recommended a number
7 of TY operating expense adjustments, increasing overall TY operating expenses by \$32,895 and
8 resulting in a TY operating loss of \$25,176. (Ex. S-2 at Sched. GWB-3.) Staff's adjustments
9 included an increase in salaries and wages to reflect what Staff described as a normalized level of
10 salary expense;⁷³ reclassification of purchased water expense to office supplies and expense; a
11 decrease in purchased power expense to reflect the amount supported by Montezuma's
12 documentation; an increase in chemicals expense to include a normalized amount of arsenic media
13 costs; a decrease in office supplies and expense to reflect the amount supported by Montezuma's
14 documentation; an increase in outside services expense to reflect annualized non-legal expenses
15 supported by Montezuma's documentation, plus approximately 75 percent of the legal expenses
16 reported by Montezuma and determined by Staff to be attributable to legal matters aside from the rate
17 case, which Staff amortized over four years; an increase in water testing expense to reflect Staff's
18 calculation of a normalized water testing cost; a decrease in general liability insurance expense to
19 reflect the amount supported by Montezuma's documentation; an increase in rate case expense to
20 reflect a normalized level of estimated rate case expense; an increase in depreciation expense to
21 reflect Staff's recommended depreciation rates and plant balances; elimination of taxes other than
22 income to reflect sales taxes as a pass-through rather than an operating expense; and an increase in
23 income tax expenses in accordance with the Commission's recently adopted policy to allow income
24 tax expenses for pass-through entities such as limited liability companies. (Ex. S-1 at 10-12, Sched.
25 GWB-3; Ex. S-2 at 4, Sched. GWB-3; Ex. S-4.) Additionally, Staff has recommended that a

26 ⁷³ Ms. Olsen testified that Montezuma did not pay any salaries and wages during the TY. (Tr. at 388-94; Ex. C-83.)
27 However, payments were made to Ms. Olsen as "Patricia Arias" as an independent contractor under a separate NARUC
28 account. (See *id.*) Additionally, Ms. Olsen made numerous payments for private expenses directly from Montezuma
accounts as a way of paying herself in kind for services provided to Montezuma and as a means of drawing cash out as
the owner of Montezuma. (See, e.g., Tr. at 401-12.)

1 requirement imposed in Decision No. 67583, for Montezuma to obtain and maintain a \$30,000
2 performance or surety bond, be eliminated so that Montezuma will no longer incur the expense for
3 that bond, which was expected to increase to \$4,500 per year. (*See* Tr. at 109-10, 1032-33.)

4 We agree with Staff that there should be annual operating expense allowed for salaries and
5 wages, because Ms. Olsen, and others, provide regular services to Montezuma and should be
6 compensated for those services. It is not appropriate for Montezuma to pay Ms. Olsen as an
7 independent contractor, and we instruct Montezuma to cease that practice. As Montezuma's
8 accountant informed Ms. Olsen, payments made by a business to the owner of the business should be
9 reported as wages, draws against the capital account, or repayment of loans from the owner to the
10 business. (*See* Ex. C-111.) In 2012, Montezuma issued 50 checks to Patricia Arias for a total of
11 \$15,410, in the account for contractual services-other. (*Id.*) We find that the \$19,772 recommended
12 by Staff is a reasonable and appropriate amount for salaries and wages, and we will approve it and
13 further will prohibit Montezuma from making "outside services" payments to Ms. Olsen/Ms. Arias or
14 any of her family members, all of whom must be paid through salaries (at an established and
15 documented level for specific and documented work responsibilities) or wages (at an established and
16 documented hourly rate and for specific and documented hourly work performed).

17 As stated previously, we find that arsenic media costs should not be treated as chemical
18 expenses, and we will instead capitalize and include the arsenic media costs in rate base and adopt a
19 depreciation rate of 50 percent to coincide with the estimated life of the arsenic media. This does not
20 impact Montezuma's projected total operating expenses, however, because the depreciation on the
21 arsenic media is equivalent to the chemical expense level recommended by Staff.

22 We also will modify Staff's allowance for non-rate case legal expenses. Staff has
23 recommended that Montezuma be permitted to recover a total of \$41,339.58 in non-rate case legal
24 expenses over a period of four years, amounting to \$10,334.89 per year. (Ex. S-4.) This represents
25 approximately 75 percent of the total expense requested by Montezuma, which included \$29,032.50
26 billed by Montezuma's former counsel and \$25,669.15 billed by Montezuma's current counsel. The
27 breakdown provided by Staff for these expenses was as follows:

28 ...

	Total Requested	Staff Allowed	Staff Allowed
Douglas Fitzpatrick			
Matter 1: ADEQ/Yavapai County Matters	\$1,085.00	50%	\$542.50
Matter 2: ACC proceedings ATS/financing issues	\$16,467.75	100%	\$16,467.75
Matter 3: Superior court suit brought by John Dougherty & Fred Shute	\$10,737.25	100%	\$10,737.25
Matter 4: Justice Court Proceedings, Order of protection against John Dougherty	\$742.50	100%	\$742.50
Total	\$29,032.50		\$28,490.00
Fennemore Craig			
Matter 1: ADEQ/Yavapai County Matters	\$13,884.55	50%	\$6,942.28
Matter 2: ACC complaint re: ATS and financing issues	\$11,814.60	50%	\$5,907.30
Total	\$25,699.15		\$12,849.58

While we realize that Montezuma has incurred an unusual amount of legal expenses over the past several years, and that it is appropriate to allow Montezuma some recovery for those legal expenses through its rates, we do not agree with Staff's determination of the amounts that should be allowed. To a great extent, Montezuma's non-rate case legal expenses are directly attributable to actions taken by Montezuma, or by Ms. Olsen, and it is unfair for Montezuma's ratepayers to suffer the consequences of choices made by Montezuma that proved to be expensive due to the disputes and legal and regulatory activities that they engendered, exacerbated, or prolonged.

Regarding Matter 1, we find that Montezuma should be permitted to recover only 30 percent of the legal expenses through rates. While Montezuma would have had some interaction with ADEQ for purposes of obtaining approval of its arsenic treatment system, the majority of the ADEQ-related activity can be attributed to Montezuma's failure to come into compliance with the arsenic MCL in a timely fashion, a status that had already occurred when Montezuma first encountered Mr. Dougherty late in 2009 and thus which cannot be attributed to him. As for the Yavapai County portion of the expenses related to Matter 1, those came about as a direct result of Montezuma's having placed Well No. 4 on the property obtained from Ms. Brunner without first having obtained a use permit authorizing commercial use of the property. Montezuma's customers should not be required to pay even 50 percent of the expenses incurred as a result of Montezuma's failure to comply with the law. We find that only 30 percent of the expenses associated with Matter 1 should be recoverable, amounting to \$4,490.87.

1 Regarding Matter 2, described as the Commission proceedings regarding the arsenic treatment
2 facility and financing issues, while Montezuma asserts that Mr. Dougherty has caused most of the
3 expenses associated with this matter, as we have described above in reference to the leases,
4 Montezuma has repeatedly made filings and taken positions that only created more questions and
5 caused more activity in this matter. Had Montezuma chosen to be forthright and presented only
6 complete and reliable information during the pendency of this matter, Montezuma's expenses
7 incurred would have been dramatically reduced. Likewise, if Montezuma had not engaged in
8 gamesmanship⁷⁴ in terms of discovery activities and otherwise, Montezuma would have incurred
9 much lower legal expenses as to Matter 2. In light of the extent to which Montezuma's expenses
10 associated with Matter 2 can be attributed to Montezuma's not having participated in this matter in a
11 forthright, courteous, and honorable manner, we find that only 30 percent of the expenses associated
12 with Matter 2 should be recoverable, amounting to \$8,484.71.

13 Regarding Matter 3, which is the lawsuit filed by John Dougherty and Fred Shute in Yavapai
14 County Superior Court, asserting that the Yavapai County Board of Supervisors did not comply with
15 the law when Montezuma was granted a conditional use permit for Well No. 4, in which Montezuma
16 was named as a defendant and filed a counterclaim, we find that Montezuma should be permitted to
17 recover 30 percent of the associated expense. While Montezuma had a right to defend itself, this
18 lawsuit is another result of Montezuma's decision not to obtain a use permit from Yavapai County
19 prior to installing Well No. 4, and Montezuma made a conscious decision to incur additional costs by
20 bringing a counterclaim asserting that the Yavapai County Water Well Code was unenforceable
21 under state law, an argument that was found to be without merit.⁷⁵ Thus, only \$3,221.18 should be
22 recoverable through rates.

23 Finally, regarding Matter 4, which was the Justice Court proceeding involving the Injunction
24 Against Harassment as to Mr. Dougherty, we find that Montezuma should receive no recovery from

25 ⁷⁴ An example of Montezuma's conduct is Montezuma's agreeing at an October 2011 procedural conference regarding
26 a discovery dispute to allow Mr. Dougherty to review its records at counsel's office, and then rescinding that agreement,
27 which provoked numerous filings and ultimately resulted in another procedural conference regarding the discovery
28 dispute in November 2011. Other examples of Montezuma conduct that has resulted in delay and additional expense, not
specifically related to discovery, are Montezuma's failure to claim its certified mail and Montezuma's failure to serve
other parties with its filings.

⁷⁵ See Ex. C-57.

1 ratepayers. As the Justice Court determined when the Injunction was dismissed, and as was evident
 2 in the proceedings before the Commission, Ms. Olsen "abused" this Injunction, using it "as a sword"
 3 rather than a shield and as a way to prevent interactions with Montezuma.⁷⁶ The Injunction served as
 4 an obstacle to the orderly process of this matter, resulting in delay and complications due to the
 5 manner in which Ms. Olsen chose to wield it.⁷⁷ Ratepayers should not be held responsible for the
 6 expense associated with obtaining and misusing this device.⁷⁸

7 As a result of these determinations, we find that \$16,196.76 is a reasonable level of non-rate
 8 case legal expenses in this matter, which shall be normalized over a period of four years, resulting in
 9 an annual expense of \$4,049.19.

10 Staff also allowed a total of \$57,000 in rate case expense, amortized over a period of four
 11 years, resulting in annual rate case expense of \$14,250. (Ex. S-1 at 15; Ex. S-2 at Sched. GWB-3.)
 12 While Montezuma has asserted that it accepts Staff's recommendations, Montezuma also has argued
 13 that it should be allowed a rate case expense of \$92,725.50, amortized over five years, for a rate case
 14 expense of \$23,181.38 per year. (Montezuma Brief at 9.) Montezuma argues that it was the decision
 15 to consolidate the rate case with the rest of this matter, to hold an evidentiary hearing, and to require
 16 briefs, coupled with Mr. Dougherty's involvement, that caused the legal expenses in this matter
 17 "through no fault of MRWC or its counsel" and in spite of "MRWC ma[king] every effort to avoid
 18 increased legal costs in the rate case."⁷⁹ (Montezuma Brief at 9-10.) While it is true that this matter
 19 is far more complicated and extended than the typical Class D rate case, "it would be patently unfair
 20 and unjust to force"⁸⁰ Montezuma's ratepayers to shoulder the entire responsibility for Montezuma's
 21

22 ⁷⁶ See Ex. C-109 at 17, 27.

23 ⁷⁷ As described previously, Ms. Olsen first revealed the Injunction to the Commission's security guard, resulting in
 delay at a Commission proceeding. Ms. Olsen also used the Injunction to attempt to have Mr. Dougherty prosecuted for
 sending her an email. (See Ex. C-59A; Tr. at 668.)

24 ⁷⁸ We note for the record that twice during the evidentiary hearing in this matter, Mr. Dougherty earnestly requested
 that the Administrative Law Judge stop Ms. Olsen from winking at him or making faces at him. (Tr. at 655-56, 661.) Her
 25 "snarkiness" toward Mr. Dougherty was also noted during the hearing. (See Tr. at 351, 661.) Ms. Olsen's assertions that
 she feared or fears Mr. Dougherty lack credibility.

26 ⁷⁹ Among other things, Montezuma does not recognize that its rate case expenses were also increased as a result of its
 having filed three financing applications for consideration in the rate case, after the rate application had already been
 27 determined sufficient, and its having presented arguments as to the characterization of the Nile River and Financial
 Pacific leases that were not based in fact. These factors all increase the amount of rate case expense incurred by
 Montezuma, through no fault of Montezuma's ratepayers.

28 ⁸⁰ See Montezuma Brief at 10.

1 rate case expenses in this matter, because Montezuma's own conduct in this matter increased the
 2 level of Mr. Dougherty's concerns and thus filings⁸¹ and created the need for an evidentiary hearing
 3 to include consideration of the rate case so that the Commission could obtain, to the extent possible,
 4 accurate and complete information upon which to decide what would be just and reasonable rates for
 5 Montezuma. We find that an appropriate level of rate case expense in this matter is \$46,362.75. We
 6 approve recovery of this rate case expense through normalization over a period of four years, which
 7 results in an annual rate case expense of \$11,590.69.

8 Staff recommended a revenue increase of \$27,946 or 27.59 percent over TY revenues, which
 9 would produce total operating revenues of \$129,222, and operating income of \$2,770, for a 4.11-
 10 percent rate of return on Staff's adjusted OCRB/FVRB for Montezuma of \$67,414. (Ex. S-2 at 4.)
 11 This revenue increase does not take into account the two surcharges for which Staff has also
 12 recommended approval.⁸² Staff stated that its aim was to provide Montezuma adequate cash flow to
 13 pay its bills, including the full amount due for its arsenic treatment system, and Staff determined its
 14 total revenue requirement using a cash flow analysis. (See Ex. S-1 at 7; Ex. S-2 at 5, Sched. GWB-
 15 4.) Staff's cash flow analysis showed that Staff's recommended revenue requirement would result in
 16 an operating margin of 2.14 percent when the Nile River lease and Financial Pacific lease obligations
 17 were considered, if the two surcharges were not authorized, and would result in an operating margin
 18 of 10.56 percent if surcharges for both the Arias and WIFA loans were authorized. (Ex. S-2 at Sched.
 19 GWB-4; LFE S-5 at Sched. GWB-4.) Staff also determined that Staff's recommended revenue
 20 requirement with the two surcharges would result in a TIER of 2.84 and a DSC of 1.98. (Ex. S-2 at
 21 Sched. GWB-5.)

22 Notwithstanding its argument for additional rate case expenses, Montezuma has accepted
 23 Staff's recommended rates and charges, as well as the other recommendations made by Staff in its
 24 responsive testimony. (See, e.g., Tr. at 109.)

25 ⁸¹ For example, Mr. Dougherty's activities increased after Ms. Olsen and Montezuma filed invalid and incomplete lease
 26 documents and during the periods when Montezuma was less than forthcoming and also cut off Mr. Dougherty during
 discovery.

27 ⁸² Staff has recommended approval of a surcharge intended to cover the annual cost for \$18,541 in debt related to
 28 pressure tanks ("Arias Loan Surcharge") and has recommended approval of a surcharge intended to cover the annual cost
 for \$108,000 in WIFA debt for additional storage tanks ("WIFA Loan Surcharge"). (See Ex. S-2 at 5, Sched. GWB-4.)
 Staff estimated the Arias Loan Surcharge at \$1.65 per month and the WIFA Loan Surcharge at \$3.01 per month.

Montezuma's present rates and the rates proposed by Montezuma and Staff are as follows:⁸³

<u>MONTHLY USAGE CHARGE:</u>	<u>Present Rates</u>	<u>Proposed Rates</u>
5/8" x 3/4" Meter	\$ 27.25	\$ 30.00
3/4" Meter	40.88	45.00
1" Meter	68.13	75.00
1 1/2" Meter	136.25	150.00
2" Meter	218.00	240.00
3" Meter	436.00	480.00
4" Meter	681.25	750.00
6" Meter	1,362.50	1,500.00

COMMODITY RATES:
(per 1,000 gallons)

All Meter Sizes

First Tier - 1 to 4,000 gallons	\$1.50	
Second Tier - 4,001 to 10,000 gallons	2.50	
Third Tier - Over 10,000 gallons	4.00	
First Tier - 1 to 3,000 gallons		\$2.50
Second Tier - 3,001 to 9,000 gallons		4.17
Third Tier - Over 9,000 gallons		6.67

SERVICE LINE & METER INSTALLATION CHARGES:

(Refundable pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-405)

	<u>Current & Proposed Charges</u>		
	<u>Service Line</u>	<u>Meter</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>5/8" x 3/4" Meter</u>			
Same side of road	\$ 370.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 500.00
Other side of road	670.00	130.00	800.00
<u>3/4" Meter</u>			
Same side of road	370.00	180.00	550.00
Other side of road	695.00	180.00	875.00
<u>1" Meter</u>			
Same side of road	400.00	225.00	625.00
Other side of road	775.00	225.00	1,000.00
<u>1 1/2" Meter</u>			
Same side of road	450.00	450.00	900.00
Other side of road	975.00	450.00	1,425.00
<u>2" Meter Turbo</u>			
Same side of road	550.00	900.00	1,450.00
Other side of road	1,450.00	900.00	2,350.00
<u>2" Meter Compound</u>			
Same side of road	550.00	1,575.00	2,125.00
Other side of road	1,825.00	1,575.00	3,400.00
<u>3" Meter Turbo</u>			
Same side of road	765.00	1,210.00	1,975.00
Other side of road	1,965.00	1,210.00	3,175.00

⁸³ See Decision No. 71317; LFE S-5. Mr. Dougherty did not propose rates and charges.

<u>3" Meter Compound</u>				
1	Same side of road	795.00	1,955.00	2,750.00
2	Other side of road	2,420.00	1,955.00	4,375.00
<u>4" Meter Turbo</u>				
3	Same side of road	1,055.00	2,120.00	3,175.00
4	Other side of road	2,980.00	2,120.00	5,100.00
<u>4" Meter Compound</u>				
5	Same side of road	1,095.00	2,930.00	4,025.00
6	Other side of road	3,495.00	2,930.00	6,425.00
<u>6" Meter Turbo</u>				
7	Same side of road	1,600.00	4,425.00	6,025.00
8	Other side of road	5,200.00	4,425.00	9,625.00
<u>6" Meter Compound</u>				
9	Same side of road	1,730.00	6,120.00	7,850.00
10	Other side of road	6,430.00	6,120.00	12,550.00

Charges differentiated by whether on same side of road as water main

SERVICE CHARGES:

	<u>Present</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
	<u>Rates</u>	<u>Rates</u>
10 Establishment	\$40.00	\$40.00
11 Establishment (After Hours)	\$60.00	N/A
12 Reconnection (Delinquent)	\$50.00	\$50.00
13 Service Charge—After Hours at Customer Request	N/A	\$35.00
14 Meter Test (If Correct)	\$30.00	\$30.00
15 Deposit	*	*
16 Deposit Interest	*	*
17 Reestablishment (Within 12 Months)	**	**
18 NSF Check	\$25.00	\$25.00
19 Deferred Payment (Per Month)	1.50%	1.50%
20 Meter Re-Read (If Correct)	\$15.00	\$15.00
21 Late Fee (Per Month)	***	***
22 Monthly Service Charge for Fire Sprinkler (All Meter Sizes)	****	*****

* Per Commission rule A.A.C. R14-2-403(B)

** Months off system times the monthly minimum, per Commission rule A.A.C. R14-2-403(D)

*** 1.50% of the unpaid balance, after 15 days

**** 1.00% of the monthly minimum for a comparably sized meter connection, but no less than \$5.00 per month. The service charge for fire sprinklers is only applicable for service lines separate and distinct from the primary water service line.

***** 2.00% of the monthly minimum for a comparably sized meter connection, but no less than \$10.00 per month. The service charge for fire sprinklers is only applicable for service lines separate and distinct from the primary water service line.

The typical monthly bill for a customer served by a 5/8" x 3/4" meter, with median or average usage, under Staff and Montezuma's proposed rates and charges (without surcharges), as compared to the current monthly bill for such usage, would be as follows:

...

Current	Proposed	Dollar	Percentage
---------	----------	--------	------------

	Bill	Bill	Increase	Increase
Average (5,192 gallons)	\$36.23	\$46.64	\$10.41	28.73%
Median (4,112 gallons)	\$33.53	\$42.14	\$8.61	25.68%

As discussed above, these proposed rates and charges include recovery for the Nile River and Financial Pacific lease payments, except as to arsenic media (for which recovery is also included, but on an annualized basis as an operating expense).

Rather than establishing rates for Montezuma based upon a cash flow analysis, we find that it just and reasonable and in the public interest to set Montezuma's rates using a traditional rate of return methodology, as Montezuma's rate base is sufficient for such purposes. Additionally, as stated previously, while we are adopting Staff's recommendations related to the WIFA Loan and authorization of a surcharge to pay such loan, with additional conditions imposed, we are not approving the Arias Docket financing herein and thus are not approving the associated surcharge recommended by Staff.

As a result of the adjustments that we are adopting herein, we find that the following are just and reasonable for Montezuma, and are in the public interest, and we will adopt them:

OCRB/FVRB:	\$81,567
Adjusted TY Revenues:	\$101,276
Adjusted TY Operating Expenses:	\$117,577
Adjusted TY Operating Income:	(\$16,301)
Total Operating Revenues:	\$126,783
Total Operating Expenses:	\$117,577
Total Operating Income:	\$9,206
Revenue Increase:	\$25,507
Percentage Increase:	25.18%
Rate of Return on FVRB:	11.29%

MONTHLY USAGE CHARGE:

5/8" x 3/4" Meter	\$ 28.00
3/4" Meter	42.00
1" Meter	70.00
1 1/2" Meter	140.00
2" Meter	224.00
3" Meter	448.00
4" Meter	700.00
6" Meter	1,400.00

COMMODITY RATES:

(per 1,000 gallons)

5/8 x 3/4" & 3/4" Meter

First Tier – 1 to 3,000 gallons	\$2.45
Second Tier – 3,001 to 9,000 gallons	4.95
Third Tier – Over 9,000 gallons	6.25

1" Meter

First Tier – 1 to 24,000 gallons	\$4.95
Second Tier – Over 24,000 gallons	6.25

1 1/2" Meter

First Tier – 1 to 62,000 gallons	\$4.95
Second Tier – Over 62,000 gallons	6.25

2" Meter

First Tier – 1 to 101,000 gallons	\$4.95
Second Tier – Over 101,000 gallons	6.25

3" Meter

First Tier – 1 to 218,000 gallons	\$4.95
Second Tier – Over 218,000 gallons	6.25

4" Meter

First Tier – 1 to 329,000 gallons	\$4.95
Second Tier – Over 329,000 gallons	6.25

6" Meter

First Tier – 1 to 695,000 gallons	\$4.95
Second Tier – Over 695,000 gallons	6.25

SERVICE LINE & METER INSTALLATION CHARGES:

(Refundable pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-405)

	<u>Service Line</u>	<u>Meter</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>5/8" x 3/4" Meter</u>			
Same side of road	\$ 370.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 500.00
Other side of road	670.00	130.00	800.00
<u>3/4" Meter</u>			
Same side of road	370.00	180.00	550.00
Other side of road	695.00	180.00	875.00
<u>1" Meter</u>			
Same side of road	400.00	225.00	625.00
Other side of road	775.00	225.00	1,000.00
<u>1 1/2" Meter</u>			
Same side of road	450.00	450.00	900.00
Other side of road	975.00	450.00	1,425.00
<u>2" Meter Turbo</u>			
Same side of road	550.00	900.00	1,450.00
Other side of road	1,450.00	900.00	2,350.00
<u>2" Meter Compound</u>			
Same side of road	550.00	1,575.00	2,125.00
Other side of road	1,825.00	1,575.00	3,400.00

1	<u>3" Meter Turbo</u>			
	Same side of road	765.00	1,210.00	1,975.00
	Other side of road	1,965.00	1,210.00	3,175.00
2	<u>3" Meter Compound</u>			
	Same side of road	795.00	1,955.00	2,750.00
3	Other side of road	2,420.00	1,955.00	4,375.00
4	<u>4" Meter Turbo</u>			
	Same side of road	1,055.00	2,120.00	3,175.00
	Other side of road	2,980.00	2,120.00	5,100.00
5	<u>4" Meter Compound</u>			
	Same side of road	1,095.00	2,930.00	4,025.00
6	Other side of road	3,495.00	2,930.00	6,425.00
7	<u>6" Meter Turbo</u>			
	Same side of road	1,600.00	4,425.00	6,025.00
	Other side of road	5,200.00	4,425.00	9,625.00
8	<u>6" Meter Compound</u>			
	Same side of road	1,730.00	6,120.00	7,850.00
9	Other side of road	6,430.00	6,120.00	12,550.00

10 Charges differentiated by whether on same side of road as water main

11 SERVICE CHARGES:

12	Establishment	\$40.00
13	Reconnection (Delinquent)	\$50.00
	Service Charge—After Hours at Customer Request	\$35.00
14	Meter Test (If Correct)	\$30.00
	Deposit	*
15	Deposit Interest	*
	Reestablishment (Within 12 Months)	**
16	NSF Check	\$25.00
	Deferred Payment (Per Month)	1.50%
17	Meter Re-Read (If Correct)	\$15.00
	Late Fee (Per Month)	***
18	Monthly Service Charge for Fire Sprinkler	****
	(All Meter Sizes)	
19	* Per Commission rule A.A.C. R14-2-403(B)	
20	** Months off system times the monthly minimum, per Commission rule A.A.C. R14-2-403(D)	
21	*** 1.50% of the unpaid balance, after 15 days	
22	**** 2.00% of the monthly minimum for a comparably sized meter connection, but no less than \$10.00 per month. The service charge for fire sprinklers is only applicable for service lines separate and distinct from the primary water service line.	

23 The typical monthly bill for a customer served by a 5/8" x 3/4" meter, with median or average
 24 usage, under the rates adopted herein (without surcharges), as compared to the current monthly bill
 25 for such usage, would be as follows:

26

27 ...

28	Bill	Impacts	without	Current	New	Dollar	Percentage
----	------	---------	---------	---------	-----	--------	------------

Surcharges	Bill	Bill	Increase	Increase
Average (5,192 gallons)	\$36.23	\$46.20	\$9.97	27.52%
Median (4,112 gallons)	\$33.53	\$40.85	\$7.32	21.84%

In addition to its recommendations as to the rates and charges that should be approved for Montezuma, Staff recommended:

- That Montezuma be permitted to collect from its customers a proportionate share of any privilege, sales, or use tax, per A.A.C. R14-2-409(D)(5);
- That Montezuma be directed to docket with the Commission a schedule of its approved rates and charges within 30 days after the date the Decision in this matter is issued;
- That Montezuma be directed to use the depreciation rates by individual NARUC account presented in Table B of Staff's Engineering Report;
- That Montezuma be directed, as a compliance item in this matter, to notify its customers of the authorized rates and charges approved in this proceeding, and their effective date, in a form acceptable to Staff, by means of an insert in its next regularly scheduled billing and to file copies with Docket Control within 10 days of the date notice is sent to customers;
- That Montezuma be directed to file a new rate case no later than June 30, 2017, using a test year ending no later than December 31, 2016;
- That Montezuma be required to file with Docket Control, as a compliance item in this matter and within 90 days after the effective date of the Decision in this matter, for the Commission's review and consideration, at least three BMPs in the form of tariffs that substantially conform to the templates created by Staff, which are available on the Commission's website; and
- That Montezuma be authorized in its next rate case to request recovery of the actual costs associated with the BMPs implemented.⁸⁴

Montezuma did not object to any of Staff's recommendations listed above, but did express some concerns about the expense of implementing BMPs. (Tr. at 111-13.)

Although the Commission continues to believe that the implementation of BMPs is valuable

⁸⁴ Ex. S-1 at 27-28.

1 and in the public interest, in light of both Montezuma's acceptable level of water loss and its need to
 2 concentrate its efforts on improving its bookkeeping and recordkeeping practices and making the
 3 system improvements for which long-term debt is approved herein, it is reasonable and appropriate in
 4 this matter not to impose upon Montezuma a requirement to adopt BMPs.

5 **VI. The Complaint Docket**

6 The remaining Allegations of Mr. Dougherty's Complaint are Allegations I, II, IV, VII, X, XI,
 7 XII, XV, and XVII.⁸⁵ (Ex. C-92.) Each of these is discussed below.

8 A. Allegation I

9 The Company did [not] seek or obtain Commission approval to enter into
 10 a long-term, \$32,000 debt in 2005 to acquire property for Well No. 4 in
 11 violation of ARS S40-301 and ARS S40-302. As a result, the Company
 has willfully encumbered or spent Ratepayer funds to pay for the
 undisclosed loan from 2005 through 2011 in violation of ARS S40-423
 and ARS S40-424.⁸⁶

12 To support Allegation I, Mr. Dougherty provided copies of Montezuma's Annual Reports
 13 filed in 2006 through 2011, as well as documentation of Montezuma's purchase of the Brunner
 14 property in November 2005, at a purchase price of \$35,000, with a \$3,000 down payment and
 15 outstanding "indebtedness in the principal sum of \$32,000.00 evidenced by a Promissory Note or
 16 Notes"; and showing that the deed of trust for the property was fully released in August 2011. (See
 17 Ex. C-92; Ex. C-25; Ex. C-26; Ex. C-27; Ex. C-32; Ex. C-33; Ex. C-34; Ex. C-35; Ex. C-36; Ex. C-
 18 69; Ex. C-70; Ex. C-71.)

19 As recounted previously in the section pertaining to Well No. 4, Ms. Olsen has acknowledged
 20 that the Brunner property was purchased by Montezuma in 2005, has asserted that she believed long-
 21 term debt was only incurred if an obligation was to last longer than five years, has asserted that no
 22 assets of Montezuma were encumbered as a result of the Brunner debt, and has asserted that she
 23 neglected to tell her accountant, Mr. Campbell, to include the Brunner debt on Montezuma's Annual
 24 Reports until approximately 2010.

25 ⁸⁵ Montezuma and Staff also briefed Allegation VIII, but Mr. Dougherty did not include Allegation VIII as a remaining
 26 allegation of the Amended Formal Complaint in his direct testimony. (See Ex. C-92.)

27 ⁸⁶ Amended Complaint filed in this matter on February 27, 2013, as corrected by Corrected Amended Formal
 28 Complaint filed in this matter on February 28, 2013. Official notice is taken of these documents, which shall be referred
 to collectively as the "Amended Complaint." The Amended Complaint incorporated by reference prior filed versions of
 Mr. Dougherty's Formal Complaint, initially filed on August 23, 2011, and subsequently amended. Official notice is
 taken of these documents as well.

1 Montezuma argues that Allegation I should be dismissed because Montezuma did not
 2 unlawfully encumber any utility asset when the Well No. 4 property was purchased, the purchase
 3 price for the property has been paid in full, and any alleged violation of Commission statutes related
 4 to incurring debt did not result in any harm to Montezuma or its ratepayers. (Montezuma Brief at
 5 53.)

6 Staff argues initially that Mr. Dougherty lacks standing to pursue any of the allegations
 7 relating to obtaining approvals for financing and mischarging of rates by Montezuma because Mr.
 8 Dougherty is not a ratepayer and thus suffers no "injury in fact."⁸⁷ (Staff Brief at 26-27.) On the
 9 substance of Allegation I, Staff argues that: (1) Mr. Dougherty has failed to establish a violation
 10 because it is unclear that long-term debt was used to acquire the site for Well No. 4; (2) Staff does not
 11 rely upon the information provided in Annual Reports and expects them to be imprecise; (3) any
 12 alleged inaccuracy in the Annual Reports was not material; (4) the only entity harmed by not
 13 revealing the long-term debt would be Montezuma because it was unable to recover the costs of the
 14 unapproved debt through rates; (5) there is sufficient evidence to conclude that any inaccuracy in the
 15 Annual Reports was unintentional; and (6) Mr. Dougherty as a non-ratepayer has not been asked to
 16 bear a share of recovering any amount of utility expense whether it was appropriately reported or not.
 17 (Staff Brief at 28-29.)

18 The evidence provided in this matter establishes that Montezuma entered into a long-term
 19 debt when the Well No. 4 site was purchased, that Montezuma had not requested or obtained prior
 20 approval of that long-term debt, and that Montezuma did not reveal that long-term debt in its Annual

21 _____
 22 ⁸⁷ Staff acknowledged both that Mr. Dougherty had been granted intervention and that Staff did not oppose the
 23 intervention, but stated that access to the forum does not grant a party sufficient stake in a matter to confer standing to
 24 press a claim with regard to that matter. (Staff Brief at 26.) We note that A.R.S. § 40-246 does not require that a
 25 complainant be a ratepayer or suffer an injury in fact in order to pursue a complaint. In pertinent part, A.R.S. § 40-246
 26 states the following:

24 Complaint may be made by the commission of its own motion, or by any person . . . by . . .
 25 . . . complaint in writing, setting forth any act or thing done or omitted to be done by any
 26 public service corporation in violation, or claimed to be in violation, of any provision of
 law or any order or rule of the commission The commission need not dismiss a
 complaint because of the absence of direct damage to the complainant.

27 The plain language of the statute is clear, and neither Staff nor Montezuma has provided a colorable argument or legal
 28 authority to dispute the plain meaning of the statute, which results in our determination that Mr. Dougherty was
 authorized to pursue his Complaint. Thus, although the parties raised the standing issue in reference to multiple
 allegations in Mr. Dougherty's Complaint, we will not address it further.

1 Reports filed in 2006 through 2011. It does not, however, establish that Montezuma has used any
 2 ratepayer funds to pay the unapproved debt. As Montezuma is wholly owned by Ms. Olsen,
 3 Montezuma's ratepayers have no stake in its assets, and Montezuma does not spend ratepayer funds.
 4 Rather, Montezuma used capital that would have been available for other utility purposes and may
 5 have precluded or at least diminished its ability to acquire capital at reasonable rates going forward.
 6 Montezuma's failure to obtain approval from the Commission before entering into the long-term debt
 7 was a violation of A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302. As A.R.S. §§ 40-423 and 40-424 speak to the
 8 consequences of violating the law, they do not create requirements that can be violated. Allegation I
 9 is substantiated to the extent that it alleged Montezuma's failure to obtain approval from the
 10 Commission before entering into the long-term debt was a violation of A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302.

11 B. Allegation II

12 The Company did not disclose material financial information to
 13 Commission staff during a 2009 audit – a \$32,000 long term debt – that
 14 was used to calculate a permanent rate increase and whether the company
 15 could qualify for a \$165,000 WIFA loan. The staff audit formed the basis
 for Decision No. 71317 Docketed on Oct. 30, 2009 in W-04254A-[08]-
 0361, 0362. The failure to disclose the debt to staff when the Company
 submitted its 2007 annual report is a violation ARS S40-301, ARS S40-
 302, R14-2-411 D (1,2) and Commission Order 67583.⁸⁸

16 To support Allegation II, Mr. Dougherty essentially provided the same evidence as for
 17 Allegation I, and additionally referred to Decision No. 71317 and the June 2009 Staff Report
 18 preceding it. There is no indication in Montezuma's application in the 2008-2009 rate case, the June
 19 2009 Staff Report, or Decision No. 71317 that Montezuma had any pre-existing long-term debt.⁸⁹

20 As discussed above, A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302 require a public service corporation to
 21 obtain approval from the Commission before entering into long-term debt. They do not speak to the
 22 information that a public service corporation must provide to Staff during a rate case audit.

23 Regarding accounting and recordkeeping requirements, however, A.A.C. R14-2-411(D)(1)
 24 and (2) provide:

25 D. Accounts and records

- 26 1. Each utility shall keep general and auxiliary accounting
 records reflecting the cost of its properties, operating income and expense,

27 ⁸⁸ Amended Complaint.

28 ⁸⁹ Official notice is taken of this Staff Report, which was filed in the 40-252 Docket on June 15, 2009. Official notice
 is also taken of Montezuma's application filed on July 16, 2008, in the same docket.

1 assets and liabilities, and all other accounting and statistical data necessary
2 to give complete and authentic information as to its properties and
3 operations.

4 2. Each utility shall maintain its books and records in
5 conformity with the NARUC Uniform Systems of Accounts for Class A,
6 B, C and D Water Utilities.

7 Likewise, Decision No. 67583 required Montezuma to keep its books and records in compliance with
8 the NARUC USOA. (Decision No. 67583 at 9, 11.)

9 Decision No. 71317 stated that Staff used Annual Reports for purposes of establishing plant
10 balances for the years 2001 through 2005 because Montezuma had not obtained MEPOA's records
11 for those years when the system was purchased. (See Decision No. 71317 at 7.) This absence of
12 records alone suggests a failure by Montezuma (or Ms. Olsen) to comply with A.A.C. R14-2-
13 411(D)(1) and (2) because no records have been maintained as to an extended period of time. Any
14 assertion that Montezuma or Ms. Olsen lacked any control over that situation would be undermined
15 by Ms. Olsen's having been involved in MEPOA's system operations for several years before
16 Montezuma purchased the system and also by Ms. Olsen's father having been in control of
17 MEPOA's system prior to that time.

18 Montezuma argues that Allegation II should be dismissed for the same reasons as stated in
19 relation to Allegation I and, additionally, because Staff has not raised any issues relating to the 2009
20 audit, and Mr. Becker testified that he does not rely on utility Annual Reports for Class D utilities
21 like Montezuma when evaluating rate cases. (Montezuma Brief at 54.) Montezuma further asserts
22 that it did not violate A.A.C. R14-2-411(D)(1)-(2) or Decision No. 67583.

23 Mr. Becker testified at length that he and other Staff analysts do not rely greatly upon the
24 information provided in Annual Reports. (See, e.g., Tr. at 882.) Staff argues that Mr. Dougherty has
25 failed to meet any of the elements to demonstrate a violation under Allegation II, stating that
26 Montezuma alone would bear the cost of not having revealed a long-term debt because its rates
27 would not be set to recover any unrevealed debt; no entity other than Montezuma would be harmed as
28 a result of Montezuma's not revealing the long-term debt in the rate case; failure to notify Staff of a
debt is not a violation of A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302; and determining whether A.A.C. R14-2-
411(D)(1)-(2) have been violated is subjective, and the state of Montezuma's records, although "less

1 than perfect,” does not rise to the level of a violation of that rule. (Staff Brief at 30-31.)

2 We have determined that Montezuma did not obtain Commission approval of the \$32,000
3 long-term debt, and the evidence supports a conclusion that Montezuma did not reveal the long-term
4 debt during its 2008-2009 rate case in its annual report for the test year or otherwise. Montezuma’s
5 failure to reveal the long-term debt during its rate case resulted in the Commission’s not factoring
6 Montezuma’s pre-existing debt-related obligations into the Commission’s determination that
7 authorizing the \$165,000 WIFA debt was consistent with sound financial practices and also into the
8 Commission’s determination of just and reasonable rates and charges. This had the potential to be
9 detrimental to both Montezuma and its ratepayers.⁹⁰ While Montezuma’s failure to notify Staff of the
10 long-term debt during its rate case audit is not appropriately characterized as a violation of A.R.S. §§
11 40-301 and 40-302, it is a violation of both A.A.C. R14-2-411(D)(1)-(2) and Decision No. 67583 for
12 a public service corporation’s records to be so inaccurate or incomplete as to make long-term debt
13 undetectable during a rate case audit. Montezuma’s rate application for the 2008-2009 rate case did
14 not reveal the long-term debt. If Montezuma’s books and records had been maintained in accordance
15 with the NARUC USOA, and thus A.A.C. R14-2-411(D)(1) and (2) and Decision No. 67583, the
16 existence of the long-term debt would have been readily apparent in Montezuma’s books and records.
17 The fact that it was not mentioned at all in the Staff Report that led to Decision No. 71317 indicates
18 either that it was not recorded in Montezuma’s books and records at all or that it was not recorded
19 accurately and in compliance with the NARUC USOA, A.A.C. R14-2-411(D)(1) and (2), and
20 Decision No. 67583. This conclusion is consistent with Ms. Olsen’s testimony that she did not tell
21 her accountant to include the Brunner debt on the company’s annual reports until 2010, as the
22 existence of the debt also would already have been apparent to her accountant from Montezuma’s
23 books and records, had it been properly accounted for in accordance with the NARUC USOA. We
24 note also that a company’s Annual Reports to the Commission are properly considered to be books
25 and records under A.A.C. R14-2-411(D)(1) and (2). We find that Allegation II is substantiated to the
26 extent that it alleges Montezuma failed to maintain its books and records in compliance with the

27 ⁹⁰ By using debt to finance the Well No. 4 site property, which was not used and useful, Montezuma diminished its
28 ability to cover the costs associated with its approved financing and also diminished its ability to obtain future financing
on the most favorable terms.

1 NARUC USOA, which is a violation of Decision No. 67583 as well as A.A.C. R14-2-411(D)(1) and
2 (2).

3 C. Allegation IV

4 The Company's inclusion of Well No. 4 as part of its "Water Company
5 Plant Description" in the 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010 Annual Reports
6 knowing it never had and still lacks final Yavapai County zoning approval
7 to operate the Well violates Commission Decision Nos. 67583 and 71317
8 and R14-2-411 D (1,2).⁹¹

9 To support Allegation IV, Mr. Dougherty provided the Annual Reports for the years in
10 question and, in addition, provided documentation of the proceedings related to and status of
11 Montezuma's obtaining a permit from the County to use the Well No. 4 site for commercial purposes.
12

13 As discussed previously, the evidence presented in this matter shows that Montezuma does
14 not have a County permit allowing it to use the Well No. 4 site (and thus allowing it to use Well No.
15 4) for commercial purposes. (See, e.g., Ex. C-1.) In addition, the Annual Reports in evidence show
16 that Well No. 4 was listed in plant. (See Ex. C-32; Ex. C-33; Ex. C-34; Ex. C-35; see also Ex. C-27.)
17

18 Montezuma argues that Allegation IV should be dismissed because Mr. Dougherty did not
19 present any evidence on Allegation IV at hearing, Montezuma has executed an easement agreement
20 with the property owner adjacent to Well No 4 and is in the process of seeking a County use permit,
21 Well No. 4 is "excluded from the rate case," and including Well No. 4 on prior Annual Reports has
22 no bearing on any issues in this case. (Montezuma Brief at 54-55.)
23

24 Staff argues that Allegation IV does not indicate a violation of A.A.C. R14-2-411(D) for the
25 same reasons as stated for Allegations I and II; that Decision No. 67583 was not violated by
26 Montezuma's including Well No. 4 on its Annual Reports, although the Well No. 4 site lacked
27 regulatory approval for use from the County, because NARUC standards do not address "outside
28 regulatory treatment of plant assets"; and that no provision of Decision No. 71317 is implicated by
Allegation IV.

Although NARUC standards do not address outside regulatory treatment of plant assets, they
do require the exclusion from plant in service of plant that is not used and useful. Montezuma's
Annual Reports in question include Well No. 4 in Montezuma's Water Company Plant Description

⁹¹ Formal Complaint.

1 but do not include Well No. 4 either as Account 121 Non-Utility Property or Account 105
 2 Construction Work in Progress ("CWIP"), either of which would be acceptable under the NARUC
 3 USOA for plant that is not yet used and useful but nonetheless is owned by a utility.⁹² (See Ex. C-32;
 4 Ex. C-33; Ex. C-34; Ex. C-35; *see also* Ex. C-27.) As a result, we must conclude that Montezuma
 5 included Well No. 4 in plant in service, which is not consistent with the NARUC USOA and thus is a
 6 violation of both Decision No. 67583 and A.A.C. R14-2-411(D)(1) and (2). Allegation IV is
 7 substantiated to the extent that Montezuma failed to maintain its Annual Reports, which are company
 8 records, in compliance with the NARUC USOA, which is a violation of Decision No. 67583 as well
 9 as A.A.C. R14-2-411(D)(1) and (2).

10 D. Allegation VII

11 The Company is in violation of state and federal safe water standards and is operating
 12 under an Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) Consent Order
 (since June 2010) requiring customers to make an appointment to obtain bottled water
 from the Company.

13 The Company's failure to cure the deficiency is a violation of R-14-2-407 (A) and
 14 (C).⁹³

15 Montezuma has acknowledged that it was in violation of safe drinking water standards and
 16 subject to an ADEQ Consent Order that required Montezuma to provide its customers bottled water.
 17 Montezuma is now in compliance with safe drinking water standards.

18 A.A.C. R14-2-407 (A) and (C) state:

- 19 A. Utility responsibility. Each utility shall be responsible for
 providing potable water to the customer's point of delivery.
- 20 C. Continuity of service. Each utility shall make reasonable efforts to
 supply a satisfactory and continuous level of service. However, no
 21 utility shall be responsible for any damage or claim of damage
 attributable to any interruption or discontinuation of service
 resulting from:
- 22 1. Any cause against which the utility could not have
 23 reasonably foreseen or made provision for, i.e., force
 majeure
 - 24 2. Intentional service interruptions to make repairs or perform
 routine maintenance
 - 25 3. Curtailment.

26 Montezuma argues that Allegation VII should be dismissed because Mr. Dougherty, as a non-

27 ⁹² Nor is Well No. 4 included as Account 103 Property Held for Future Use, which would be a questionable
 categorization but still more accurate than including it within Account 101 Utility Plant in Service.

28 ⁹³ Formal Complaint.

1 ratepayer, did not have standing⁹⁴ to assert that Montezuma failed to provide adequate service to its
 2 customers by providing water in violation of federal and state arsenic standards, and because
 3 Montezuma is now in compliance with the arsenic MCL and providing water in compliance with safe
 4 drinking water standards. (Montezuma Brief at 55.) Montezuma further argued that Mr. Dougherty
 5 “has unclean hands” on this issue because of actions he took to prevent construction and operation of
 6 the arsenic treatment system. (*Id.*)

7 Staff argues that Mr. Dougherty lacks standing⁹⁵ to make this allegation because he is not a
 8 ratepayer and, further, states that Montezuma is not in violation of state and federal arsenic standards
 9 now and, effectively, was not out of compliance with arsenic standards previously because ADEQ
 10 had entered into consent orders with Montezuma that extended its deadline to come into compliance.
 11 (Staff Brief at 32.)

12 The evidence is uncontroverted that Montezuma, for a period of several years, did not provide
 13 its customers, at point of delivery, potable water that met federal and state safe drinking water
 14 standards. The evidence is equally uncontroverted that Montezuma now does provide its customers
 15 such water, because it has installed and is operating an arsenic treatment system. Allegation VII has
 16 been rendered moot, and it is dismissed with prejudice.

17 E. Allegation X

18 The Company provided incomplete and misleading statements to
 19 Commission investigators in January 2010 concerning its Yavapai County
 20 zoning issues related to Well No. 4. The Company’s incomplete and
 21 misleading statements to ACC investigators is a violation of R 14-2-411.⁹⁶

22 To support Allegation X, Mr. Dougherty referred to an attachment to his original Formal
 23 Complaint. That attachment, labeled as exhibit 18 to the Formal Complaint, was not presented at
 24 hearing, and no testimony was elicited specifically with regard to it. The document itself appears to
 25 be an undated partial copy of a Commission Utility Complaint Form.

26 In contrast, Montezuma provided an exhibit showing that Yavapai County had approved a site
 27 plan allowing Montezuma to drill Well No. 4 as a replacement well for an existing domestic well.
 28 (*See* Ex. A-28.) Ms. Olsen testified that she believed Yavapai County had approved the drilling of

⁹⁴ See note 87.

⁹⁵ See note 87.

⁹⁶ Amended Complaint.

1 the well, based upon a site plan. (Tr. at 122-24, 432.)

2 Montezuma argues that Allegation X should be dismissed for a lack of evidence, because Mr.
3 Dougherty did not present any evidence on this Allegation at hearing. (Montezuma Brief at 56.)
4 Montezuma further argues that A.A.C. R14-2-411 addresses administrative and hearing requirements
5 related to customer service complaints and other administrative issues, but Mr. Dougherty is not a
6 customer. (*Id.*)

7 Staff argues that Mr. Dougherty lacks standing⁹⁷ regarding Allegation X; that Staff as the
8 party allegedly deceived is not seeking any relief related to the alleged misleading statements; and
9 that there was a bona fide legal uncertainty regarding whether Yavapai County approval was
10 necessary, which prevents a conclusion that Montezuma deliberately deceived Staff. (Staff Brief at
11 33.) Staff argues that Mr. Dougherty has failed to make the necessary showing to demonstrate a
12 violation of A.A.C. R14-2-411 as to Allegation X. (*Id.*)

13 Because the evidentiary record does not establish what statements were made to Commission
14 investigators in January 2010 related to this Allegation, Mr. Dougherty has failed to meet the burden
15 of proof as to Allegation X. Allegation X is dismissed with prejudice.

16 F. Allegation XI

17 The Company illegally collected an arsenic surcharge from its customers
18 in December 2009 in violation of Commission Decision No. 71317.⁹⁸

19 Montezuma has admitted that this collection was made right after the current rates were
20 approved and, further, that the arsenic surcharges collected in 2009 were never refunded to customers
21 and were ultimately used for Montezuma's operations. (Ex. A-2 at 31; Tr. at 438-39.) Montezuma
22 has acknowledged also that it lacked authority to collect the arsenic surcharge at that time. (*See* Tr. at
23 438-39.)

24 Montezuma argues that Allegation XI should be dismissed because Montezuma
25 acknowledges that it improperly invoiced customers for arsenic surcharges, and Mr. Dougherty did
26 not present any evidence at hearing on this issue or suggest or request any relief related thereto.
27 (Montezuma Brief at 57.) Montezuma further argues that Mr. Dougherty does not have any

28 ⁹⁷ See note 87.

⁹⁸ Formal Complaint.

1 standing⁹⁹ to seek relief on this issue because he is not a customer. (*Id.*)

2 Staff argues that Allegation XI should be dismissed because Mr. Dougherty, as a non-
3 ratepayer, lacks standing¹⁰⁰ to pursue the issue; no consumer complained about the mischarge; and
4 Mr. Dougherty has not supplied any evidence in the record to substantiate that a ratepayer actually
5 paid the improper charge. (Staff Brief at 33-34.) Staff further argues that if the Commission
6 concludes an overcharge occurred, a refund to the customers overcharged could be an appropriate
7 remedy. (*Id.*)

8 Mr. Dougherty did not present as evidence at hearing a copy of the customer bills showing the
9 \$10.11 arsenic surcharge that appeared on an unnamed customer's December 2009 bill and not on the
10 customer's January 2010 bill, although he had included a copy of the bills in his Formal Complaint.
11 (*See* Formal Complaint at ex. 19.) However, Ms. Olsen testified that the surcharge was not just
12 invoiced but was collected and that the money collected through the surcharge was originally set
13 aside and then later spent on operations. (*See* Tr. at 438-39.) Ms. Olsen testified that no one told her
14 to refund the surcharge funds collected in 2009. (*Id.*)

15 In light of Ms. Olsen's testimony, coupled with the customer bills that were included in Mr.
16 Dougherty's Formal Complaint,¹⁰¹ the evidence establishes that an arsenic surcharge of \$10.11 per
17 account was invoiced in and collected from the December 2009 billing, which was unlawful and in
18 violation of Decision No. 71317, and that the surcharge funds so collected were never refunded to
19 Montezuma's customers. Allegation XI is substantiated.

20 G. Allegation XII

21 For the second time, the Company illegally collected an arsenic surcharge
22 from its customers when it billed customers in April 2011 in violation of
Commission Decision No. 71317.¹⁰²

23 To support Allegation XII, Mr. Dougherty provided a copy of the Utility Complaint Form,
24 including Montezuma's responses and Staff's investigative notes, which Staff filed in the 40-252
25 Docket in July 2011. (Ex. C-39.) Ms. Olsen acknowledged the authenticity of the Montezuma
26 responses in her testimony at hearing and had previously acknowledged in her prefiled testimony that

27 ⁹⁹ See note 87.

¹⁰⁰ See note 87.

¹⁰¹ Official notice has been taken of the Formal Complaint.

¹⁰² Formal Complaint.

1 the arsenic surcharge had been collected, without authority, from customers in Montezuma's April
2 2011 billing. (Tr. at 285-90; Ex. A-2 at 31.)

3 Montezuma argues that Mr. Dougherty did not present any evidence on this issue at hearing
4 and did not suggest or request any relief and, further, that he lacks standing¹⁰³ to seek any relief
5 because he is not a customer of Montezuma. (Montezuma Brief at 57.) Montezuma further argues
6 that Ms. Olsen explained the surcharges in her testimony and that the underlying record does not
7 support any action against Montezuma as to this Allegation.

8 Staff argues that Mr. Dougherty lacks standing¹⁰⁴ to press this claim because he is not a
9 ratepayer and was not charged the alleged mischarge. (Staff Brief at 34.) Staff further argues that the
10 mischarge has already been addressed through the informal complaint received and the refund
11 provided and, thus, that Mr. Dougherty has failed to establish any merit to Allegation XII. (*Id.*)

12 The evidence establishes that an arsenic surcharge of \$15.00 per account was invoiced in and
13 collected from the April 2011 billing, unlawfully and in violation of Decision No. 71317, and that the
14 surcharge funds so collected were refunded to Montezuma's customers. Allegation XII is
15 substantiated.

16 H. Allegation XV

17 The Company failed to immediately report to the Commission that
18 Company's records had been stolen during a series of burglaries that
19 allegedly began in October 2009 and continued into 2010. Despite the
20 serious impact to the Company from records being stolen, the Company
21 failed to notify the police and make formal reports of the thefts.

22
23 The Company's failure to timely disclose that Company's records have
24 been stolen and the Company's computer compromised is a violation of
25 Commission Decision 67583 and raises serious questions over the
26 accuracy of the Company's financial statements and its Annual Reports
27 filed for 2009 and 2010.¹⁰⁵

28 To support this allegation, Mr. Dougherty referred in his prefiled testimony to statements
made by Montezuma at a September 12, 2011, procedural conference in the emergency rate case
docket. (Ex. C-92 at 11-12.) Mr. Dougherty did not provide any other exhibits related to this
allegation. Ms. Olsen has acknowledged that she believes Montezuma records were stolen from its

¹⁰³ See note 87.

¹⁰⁴ See note 87.

¹⁰⁵ Motion to Modify Formal Complaint, September 13, 2011.

1 offices and that no police report was filed.¹⁰⁶ (See A-2 at 32; Tr. at 419-20.) The specific records
2 alleged to have been stolen have not been identified.

3 Montezuma argues that Allegation XV is frivolous and should be dismissed because Mr.
4 Dougherty did not present any evidence on this issue at hearing, because Montezuma does not have
5 an obligation to report burglaries to the Commission or to the police, and because Montezuma's
6 failure to report such incidents to either is not a violation of any requirement and thus not an
7 actionable complaint item.

8 Staff argues that a utility has no duty to report thefts to the Commission, that no such duty is
9 created by the requirement to comply with NARUC standards, and that Mr. Dougherty has not
10 provided evidence sufficient to show a violation of any legal requirement.

11 Mr. Dougherty did not provide any legal authority to demonstrate a requirement for
12 Montezuma to make such a report to the Commission or to police.

13 Montezuma and Staff are correct that Montezuma did not have a legal obligation to report to
14 the Commission its belief that its records had been stolen. Nor are we aware of any legal obligation
15 for Montezuma to report such theft to the police.

16 The alleged theft of its records does, however, call into question Montezuma's compliance
17 with A.A.C. R14-2-411(D)(1)'s requirement for a utility to "keep general and auxiliary accounting
18 records reflecting the cost of its properties, operating income and expense, assets and liabilities, and
19 all other accounting and statistical data necessary to give complete and authentic information as to its
20 properties and operations." While Montezuma cannot fairly be held responsible for the criminal acts
21 of third parties, Montezuma does have a duty to maintain complete and authentic records, and that
22 necessitates maintaining back-up records to ensure that complete and authentic information is
23 available even in the event of an unexpected event, such as computer failure, damage from water or
24 fire, or theft. Thus, while we do not substantiate Allegation XV under the circumstances herein, we
25 direct Montezuma that it needs to take reasonable measures to ensure the security of its original

26 ¹⁰⁶ Ms. Olsen further testified that Montezuma's offices were also broken into, and that the company's back-up hard
27 drive was stolen, after a portion of the company office was moved to her Flagstaff home. (Tr. at 419-20.) Ms. Olsen
28 testified that a police report was filed after the incident in Flagstaff. (*Id.*) Mr. Dougherty provided a copy of the report
from the Flagstaff Police Department, dated June 21, 2012, because he had been listed as an investigative lead. (See Ex.
C-103; Tr. at 678-79.)

1 records and to maintain back-up records in the event its original records become unavailable.
 2 Because there is insufficient evidence to establish that the theft of its records resulted in
 3 Montezuma's failure to maintain its records in accordance with the NARUC USOA and thus a
 4 violation of Decision No. 67583, Allegation XV is dismissed with prejudice.

5 I. Allegation XVII

- 6 A. Montezuma knowingly and willfully violated the January 4, 2012,
 7 March 12, 2012 and April 9, 2012 Procedural Orders in Docket W-
 8 4254A-08-361, W-4254A-08-362 by failing to docket a March 22,
 9 2012 Capital Lease agreement between Montezuma and Nile River
 10 Leasing, LLC for an Arsenic Treatment Building. Instead, the
 11 Company docketed a fraudulent March 16, 2012 lease agreement
 12 between Mrs. Patricia Olsen, personally, and Nile River Leasing for
 13 the building. This action was undertaken to circumvent Commission
 14 approval of Capital Leases in violation of ARS S40-301, ARS S40-
 15 302, ARS S40-424 and ARS S40-425.
- 16 B. Montezuma knowingly and willfully violated the January 4, 2012,
 17 March 12, 2012 and April 9, 2012 Procedural Orders in Docket W-
 18 4254A-08-361, W-4254A-08-362 by failing to docket a Capital Lease
 19 agreement with Financial Pacific Leasing, LLC for an Arsenic
 20 Treatment Facility signed on or about April 3, 2012. Instead, the
 21 Company docketed a fraudulent March 16, 2012 lease agreement
 22 between Mrs. Patricia Olsen, personally, and Nile River Leasing, for
 23 the Arsenic treatment equipment. This action was taken to circumvent
 24 Commission approval of Capital Leases in violation of ARS S40-301,
 25 ARS S40-302, ARS S40-424 and ARS S40-425.
- 26 C. Ms. Patricia Olsen knowingly and willfully docketed a fraudulent lease
 27 agreement between Montezuma and Financial Pacific Leasing for an
 28 Arsenic Treatment Facility dated on or about May 2, 2012 in an
 October 25, 2012 filing docketed in W-04254A-12-0204 et seq. when,
 in fact, the Company had entered into an effective lease agreement
 with Financial Pacific Leasing on or about April 3, 2012. This action
 was taken to circumvent Commission approval of Capital leases in
 violation of ARS S40-301, ARS S40-302, ARS S40-424 and ARS
 S40-425.
- D. The Company has willfully spent or encumbered Ratepayer funds in
 connection with the execution of the unauthorized Capital Leases for
 the Arsenic Treatment building and Arsenic treatment equipment
 entered into by the Company in violation of ARS S40-423, ARS S40-
 424 and ARS S40-425.
- E. Contrary to Montezuma Counsel's April 27, 2012 Legal Brief, the
 Company, rather than Ms. Olsen, entered into a purchase agreement
 with Kevlor Design Group, LLC for the Arsenic Treatment Equipment
 in violation of ARS S40-301, ARS S40-302, ARS S40-424 and ARS
 S40-425.¹⁰⁷

26 The evidence as to the filing of invalid lease documents has been described at length above,
 27 and it is unnecessary to recount that information here. Although the evidence establishes what

28 ¹⁰⁷ Amended Complaint.

1 happened, in terms of valid documents not having been filed and invalid documents having been filed
2 by Montezuma in response to Procedural Orders, and establishes that the position taken in the April
3 27, 2012, Legal Brief was not based in fact, Ms. Olsen has not admitted either to having created the
4 invalid documents herself or having known that they were invalid at the time that they were filed with
5 the Commission. Nor has Ms. Olsen admitted to acting pursuant to a scheme to circumvent
6 Commission approval of the valid lease agreements. Additionally, as noted previously, Montezuma's
7 ratepayers do not have an ownership interest in the funds held by Montezuma, so their funds cannot
8 be spent by Montezuma. As to the brief, Ms. Olsen has testified that she did not inform her attorney
9 when she signed the leases for Montezuma, and she provided unclear testimony regarding whether
10 she reviewed the brief before it was filed with the Commission. (Ex. A-2 at 12; Tr. at 349-55.)

11 Montezuma argues that Allegation XVII does not warrant any actions or sanctions against
12 Montezuma; that Montezuma acknowledges that it violated the Procedural Orders; that Montezuma
13 did not intentionally violate those Procedural Orders; that Montezuma always intended to have the
14 Commission review and approve the Nile River and Financial Pacific leases; and that Staff was aware
15 of the leases and supported Montezuma's decision to install the arsenic treatment system before the
16 debt created by the leases was approved. (Montezuma Brief at 58.) Montezuma further argues that
17 Staff does not have any problem with Montezuma's having filed the wrong leases with the
18 Commission. (*Id.* at 58-59.) Montezuma emphasizes that the actions taken were in the best interests
19 of its customers. (*Id.* at 59.) Montezuma argues that Mr. Dougherty's suggestion that Montezuma
20 committed fraud is "silly and based on a misunderstanding of fraud under Arizona law" and contrary
21 to the underlying facts. (*Id.* at 59-60.) Montezuma argues that taking any adverse action against it
22 would not benefit the Commission or customers and would be counterproductive and against the
23 public interest. (*Id.* at 59.)

24 Staff argues that although the Commission has the authority to grant retroactive approval of
25 long-term debt, as discussed previously, Staff agrees that Montezuma could be viewed as having
26 violated A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302, although Staff believes that it is premature to pursue a
27 violation of those statutes when a request for retroactive approval of the debt is pending. (Staff Brief
28 at 35.) Staff also argues that it is not possible to violate A.R.S. §§ 40-424 and 40-425 because they

1 do not establish requirements with which a utility must comply. (*Id.*)

2 The evidence establishes that Montezuma entered into long-term debt, in the form of the
3 capital leases with Nile River and Financial Pacific, in March 2012, without first having obtained
4 approval from the Commission. This was a violation of A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302.

5 The evidence also establishes that Montezuma filed false or misleading information with the
6 Commission on April 13, 2012, April 27, 2012, and October 25, 2012, when it filed invalid lease
7 documents and made false or misleading statements presented as fact. In doing so, Montezuma
8 violated the Procedural Order issued on April 9, 2012.¹⁰⁸

9 Ms. Olsen's testimony as to her beliefs and knowledge concerning the validity of the personal
10 one-page leases signed by her and by "Robin Richards" are not credible, and the evidence indicating
11 alteration of some of the Montezuma leases filed with the Commission, noted previously, is
12 troubling. It is especially problematic that partial Montezuma leases were filed with the Commission,
13 particularly because the omission of Rider No. 2 obscured that the Nile River lease was a capital
14 lease. Ms. Olsen is the person who had control of the documents and who is ultimately responsible
15 for the documents' having been signed for "Robin Richards," for altered documents' being filed with
16 the Commission, and for incomplete documents' being filed with the Commission. Ms. Olsen has
17 testified to being confused about the leases, being mystified about the "Robin Richards" signatures,
18 and not being able to remember myriad events due to her stress and sleep deprivation during the
19 times in question. While it may be true that Ms. Olsen was confused, stressed, and sleep deprived,
20 she is ultimately responsible for Montezuma's actions, and Montezuma provided false and
21 misleading information to the Commission under circumstances that indicate it was done willfully
22 and with knowledge of the falsity/misleading nature of the information, specifically to avoid the
23 requirement for Commission approval of the long-term debt represented by the leases.¹⁰⁹

24 As stated previously, A.R.S. §§ 40-423 and 40-424 speak to the consequences of violating the
25 law and do not create requirements that can be violated by a public service corporation.

26 _____
27 ¹⁰⁸ It is unclear on what date Montezuma actually obtained possession of the lease documents to be executed by
Montezuma, but it had clearly happened by March 22, 2012, and thus before April 9, 2012.

28 ¹⁰⁹ Knowingly making false statements or representations to the Commission in relation to a financing can be a felony
under A.R.S. § 40-303(C). Any criminal prosecution would occur in a venue other than the Commission.

1 Allegation XVII is substantiated to the extent that it alleged a violation of A.R.S. §§ 40-301
2 and 40-302 and a violation of the Procedural Order issued on April 9, 2012. The remaining
3 provisions of the Allegation are dismissed with prejudice.

4 J. Remedies

5 Mr. Dougherty asserts that because Montezuma does not operate legally and in the public
6 interest, Montezuma, Ms. Olsen, and Montezuma's counsel should be found in contempt of the
7 Commission for withholding the capital leases and submitting invalid leases in their place. (Ex. C-92
8 at 18.) Mr. Dougherty further asserts that Montezuma's CC&N should be revoked, or rescinded
9 under Decision No. 67583. (*Id.*) In addition, Mr. Dougherty asserts that forgery has been established
10 and that the Commission should refer the matter to the Attorney General's office or the County
11 Attorney's office for further investigation. (Ex. C-92 at 20.)

12 Montezuma argues that, as a matter of law, the Commission cannot lawfully rescind or revoke
13 Montezuma's CC&N because Montezuma is providing adequate water service to its customers at a
14 reasonable rate. (Montezuma Brief at 61 (citing *James P. Paul Water Co. v. Arizona Corp. Comm'n*,
15 137 Ariz. 426, 429, 671 P.2d 404, 407 (1983)).) Montezuma argues that not only is Montezuma
16 providing adequate water service, but Ms. Olsen has dramatically improved water service to
17 Montezuma's customers since she acquired the system. (*Id.*)

18 Montezuma further argues that the Commission cannot transfer Montezuma's CC&N to
19 AWC, which is not interested in taking over the system unless Montezuma desires the sale or
20 transfer, which it does not. (*Id.* at 62.) Montezuma further argues that even if AWC were appointed
21 as an interim operator, or the Commission "unlawfully" awarded Montezuma's service area to AWC,
22 Ms. Olsen would still own all of the utility facilities, and there would be a regulatory taking for which
23 Ms. Olsen would need to receive just compensation. (*Id.*) Montezuma also argued that the
24 Commission cannot lawfully transfer a CC&N from one entity to another.¹¹⁰ (*Id.* at 63.)

25 Regarding holding Montezuma or Ms. Olsen in contempt under A.R.S. § 40-424 or penalizing
26 Montezuma or Ms. Olsen under A.R.S. § 40-425, Montezuma argues that Ms. Olsen cannot be

27 _____
28 ¹¹⁰ Montezuma cited *Tonto Creek Estates Homeowners Ass'n v. Arizona Corp. Comm'n*, 177 Ariz. 49, 56, 864 P.2d
1081, 1088 (App. 1993).

1 penalized because the Commission lacks jurisdiction over her personally and, additionally, that
2 Montezuma should not be fined or otherwise penalized because the only party proposing such action
3 is Mr. Dougherty, Montezuma did not have any ulterior or improper motives related to filing and
4 approvals of the lease agreements and violations of Procedural Orders, and imposing a financial
5 penalty upon a small and financially weak water utility would be counterproductive. (*Id.* at 71-72.)

6 Staff recommended that the Commission find that Mr. Dougherty had failed to meet his
7 burden in establishing the elements of any of his allegations. (Staff Brief at 36.) Staff argued that
8 Mr. Dougherty did not allege in his complaint that Montezuma had violated Decision No. 67583 by
9 encumbering assets of the utility without prior Commission approval and, thus, that Montezuma was
10 not adequately noticed that its CC&N rights might be rescinded on that basis. (*Id.*) Staff further
11 argued that rescinding Montezuma's CC&N would be directly at odds with the *James P. Paul* case
12 because Montezuma is providing service superior to that provided by MEPOA and, additionally, that
13 MEPOA is not a party to this proceeding and may not be willing to take the CC&N back after a
14 rescission. (*Id.*) Staff also argued that AWC is not a party to this matter and cannot be forced to have
15 the CC&N, in which it has not expressed an interest. (*Id.* at 13-14.)

16 Regarding the imposition of fines, Staff argued that the Commission has several sources of
17 fining authority, including Article XV, §§ 16 and 19 of the Arizona Constitution as well as A.R.S. §§
18 40-424 and 40-425. (*Id.* at 15-16.) Staff stated that if the Commission were to determine that the
19 facts in this matter demonstrate the violation of Commission rules, statutes, or decisions, it has the
20 authority to issue fines. (*Id.* at 16.) Staff argued that there is also a "colorable argument" that the
21 Commission could impose a fine based upon violation of a Procedural Order, using the
22 Commission's contempt authority under A.R.S. § 40-424. (*Id.*) Staff argued that Montezuma is "not
23 a suitable candidate for enforcement," however, because pursuing enforcement "would send a
24 message that Staff assists struggling utilities only to assail them when they are on the precipice of
25 achieving compliance." (*Id.* at 17.) Staff also expressed the following concern:

26 [E]nforcement actions do not always accelerate the process of achieving
27 ultimate compliance owing to the tendency of the subject utility to devote
28 its resources to defending the enforcement action rather than curing the
issue that prompted the noncompliance. This concern is particularly acute
in the case of small class D and E water utilities and is illustrated here by

1 the extraordinary degree of legal expenses incurred by the Company in the
2 present case in proportion to the overall revenue requirement.¹¹¹

3 K. Conclusion

4 We have concluded that, at least in part, Allegation I, Allegation II, Allegation IV, Allegation
5 XI, Allegation XII, and Allegation XVII are substantiated by the evidence. The remaining portions
6 of these Allegations, as described above, and the remaining Allegations are being dismissed with
7 prejudice.

8 As to Allegation XI, because Montezuma unlawfully collected \$10.11 in the form of an
9 arsenic surcharge from each of its customers, and Montezuma has not refunded those unlawfully
10 collected funds from its customers, it is reasonable and appropriate to require Montezuma, in the first
11 billing after the effective date of this Decision, to provide each of its customer accounts a credit of
12 \$10.11, which shall be listed separately on each customer bill as a "2009 unlawful arsenic surcharge
13 refund." While we are cognizant that Montezuma's customer base may have changed somewhat
14 since the arsenic surcharge amount was unlawfully collected in 2009, we find that this is a just and
15 reasonable remedy as to this Allegation. Montezuma should have made the refunds as soon as the
16 billing error was detected, and we trust that it will do so promptly should any type of billing error be
17 detected in the future. We will require Montezuma to make a filing, within 60 days after the effective
18 date of this Decision, as a compliance item in this docket, demonstrating that its customers have
19 received the credit in their bills as required herein.

20 Mr. Dougherty has spent many hours and has expended much in the form of energy and
21 personal resources to make the Commission aware of these allegations. There is evidence in the
22 record herein that Mr. Dougherty's involvement in this matter with Montezuma has been at some
23 personal cost, economically and otherwise, as Mr. Dougherty has been subjected to criticism, public
24 allegations of ethnic prejudice,¹¹² and even criminal investigation.¹¹³ The dispute between Mr.
25 Dougherty and Montezuma has been vitriolic and personal, and we do not find credible Ms. Olsen's

26 ¹¹¹ Staff Brief at 17.

27 ¹¹² Ms. Olsen has publicly accused Mr. Dougherty of making a derogatory remark to her that suggested ethnic prejudice
28 and testified that she believes he is motivated by ethnic prejudice in this matter. (See Tr. at 433.) Mr. Dougherty denies
that he ever made such a remark. (Tr. at 665.)

¹¹³ Ms. Olsen accused Mr. Dougherty of hitting her with his motorcycle on May 16, 2012, but the investigating officer
from the Yavapai County Sheriff's Office concluded that the physical evidence did not support her account of the incident
and that "the incident did not occur as Patricia said it did." (Ex. C-50.)

1 assertions that Mr. Dougherty has been motivated by ethnic prejudice in his investigation of
2 Montezuma's operations. As stated previously, this dispute may have been avoided altogether had
3 Montezuma complied with the law and obtained a use permit for Well No. 4 before it began
4 modifying the well site for commercial use. Likewise, if Montezuma had never filed invalid,
5 incomplete, or false/misleading documents with the Commission, this matter would have been
6 resolved long ago.

7 The Commission has the legal authority to impose fines upon Montezuma and has the
8 discretion not to impose fines if the imposition of fines is not believed to be in the public interest. In
9 this case, due to the financial burdens already placed upon Montezuma, the Commission believes that
10 the public interest, and the interests of Montezuma's ratepayers, would not be best served by the
11 Commission's imposition of fines at this time. However, Montezuma is put on notice that future
12 misconduct will result in adverse actions against it, and may include initiation of an Order to Show
13 Cause proceeding to explore what would best serve the public interest, including whether Montezuma
14 and/or its owner should be fined and whether Montezuma's ratepayers would be better served by
15 having its system operated by an interim operator.

16 * * * * *

17 Having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, the
18 Commission finds, concludes, and orders that:

19 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

20 1. Montezuma is an Arizona limited liability company, wholly owned by Patricia Olsen,
21 and is a Class D water utility providing service to approximately 205 mostly residential metered
22 connections in a service area approximately 3/8 of a square mile in size located in the vicinity of
23 Rimrock, Arizona, in Yavapai County.

24 2. Until 2005, Montezuma's water system was owned by the non-profit MEPOA, of
25 which Ms. Olsen's father was President.

26 3. In Decision No. 67583, the Commission approved the sale of MEPOA's utility assets
27 and the transfer of its CC&N to Montezuma, although Staff had recommended denial and expressed
28 the belief that MEPOA's utility assets should instead be acquired by AWC, which operates a nearby

1 system. AWC did not take any action to purchase the system or to prevent its sale to Montezuma.
2 The Commission required Montezuma to procure a performance or surety bond in the amount of
3 \$30,000, to maintain the bond, and to file copies of the bond annually with the Commission on the
4 effective date of the Decision and until further order of the Commission.

5 4. Montezuma's active system consists of Well No. 1, with a pump yield of 55 GPM; a
6 centralized 150 GPM arsenic treatment system; three storage tanks with a combined capacity of
7 25,200 gallons; two booster systems; and a distribution system that was serving 210 service
8 connections at the end of 2011. Staff has determined that Montezuma does not have sufficient
9 storage capacity to serve its present customer base and accommodate reasonable system growth and
10 fire protection.

11 5. Montezuma's water supply has excessive arsenic levels, with its active Well No. 1
12 producing untreated water with an arsenic level of 35 ppb and its inactive Well No. 2 producing
13 untreated water with an arsenic level of 43 ppb. Even the water produced by Montezuma's unused
14 Well No. 4, with an arsenic concentration of 16 ppb, exceeds the current arsenic MCL.

15 6. On October 30, 2009, the Commission issued Decision No. 71317, authorizing
16 Montezuma's current rates and charges; authorizing Montezuma to obtain a \$165,000 WIFA loan for
17 the purpose of building an arsenic treatment facility and a water line between Montezuma's Well No.
18 1 and a new Well No. 4; and authorizing Montezuma to submit an application to implement an
19 ARSM to be used to pay for the WIFA loan. The Decision required Montezuma to file an AOC for
20 Well No. 4 by December 31, 2009; to file an AOC for the arsenic treatment project by April 30,
21 2010; to file a permanent rate application using a 2011 test year by May 31, 2012; and to file the
22 executed WIFA loan documents and the ARSM application within 60 days after executing the WIFA
23 loan documents.

24 7. John E. Dougherty, III, owns a home within Montezuma's service area, but is not a
25 Montezuma customer. Mr. Dougherty's property is served by a private well. Mr. Dougherty became
26 involved with Montezuma after observing in October 2009 that Well No. 4 and associated structures
27 had been installed on a residential property located across from his home in Rimrock. Mr. Dougherty
28 first became involved with Montezuma's proceedings before the Commission in February 2010 in

1 relation to a Recommended Order that would have granted Montezuma an extension of a deadline in
2 Decision No. 71317.

3 8. The procedural history in this matter is unusually complex and extensive and is as
4 described in the Discussion portion of this Decision.

5 9. This matter involves the following dockets, all of which were consolidated for all
6 purposes going forward in a Procedural Order issued on February 26, 2013:

- 7 a. The 40-252 Docket, opened at Montezuma's request for the purpose of
8 determining whether to modify Decision No. 71317 concerning financing
9 approval and related provisions;
- 10 b. The Complaint Docket, in which Mr. Dougherty has filed a formal complaint
11 against Montezuma under A.R.S. § 40-246;
- 12 c. The Rask Docket, concerning a loan agreement in which Montezuma promised
13 to pay Rask Construction the sum of \$68,592, with interest from May 1, 2012,
14 at a rate of 6 percent per year, for installation of a water line from Well No. 4
15 to Well No. 1;
- 16 d. The Olsen Docket, concerning a loan agreement in which Montezuma
17 promised to pay Ms. Olsen the sum of \$21,377, with interest from August 30,
18 2011, at a rate of 6 percent per year, for the purchase of the Well No. 4 site and
19 a company vehicle;
- 20 e. The Arias Docket, concerning a loan agreement in which Montezuma
21 promised to pay Sergei Arias, Ms. Olsen's son, the sum of \$15,000, with
22 interest from July 1, 2011, at a rate of 6 percent per year, for the purchase of an
23 8,000-gallon hydro-pneumatic tank; and
- 24 f. The Rate Docket, in which Montezuma has requested a permanent rate
25 increase as well as approval of three separate financings for which applications
26 were filed in April 2013:
- 27 i. A 20-year WIFA Loan, with a principal amount of \$108,000, to be used
28 to purchase and install four 20,000-gallon storage tanks;

1 ii. A 3-year lease with Nile River, with a principal amount of \$8,000,
2 through which Montezuma obtained the building housing its arsenic
3 treatment system; and

4 iii. A 5-year lease with Financial Pacific, with a principal amount of
5 \$38,000, through which Montezuma obtained its arsenic treatment
6 system.

7 10. Mr. Dougherty has been granted intervention as to the dockets in this matter other than
8 the Complaint Docket.

9 11. The Nile River lease and Financial Pacific lease, both of which are capital leases, were
10 entered into by Montezuma in March 2012, without prior Commission review and approval of the
11 associated long-term debt.

12 12. Montezuma is requesting retroactive approval for the long-term debt associated with
13 the Nile River lease and Financial Pacific lease.

14 13. Montezuma has installed a 150 GPM arsenic treatment system to treat the water from
15 Well No. 1 and received an AOC for the arsenic treatment system on November 21, 2012. The
16 arsenic treatment system has been operating as part of Montezuma's water system since November
17 29, 2012, and has been effective in remediating the arsenic levels in Montezuma's water supply.

18 14. On December 19, 2013, ADEQ issued a Drinking Water Compliance Status Report
19 stating that Montezuma was in full compliance with safe drinking water requirements after having
20 submitted a full year of test results showing that its system water is in compliance with the arsenic
21 MCL.

22 15. A significant portion (63 percent) of the 150 GPM arsenic treatment system represents
23 excess capacity.

24 16. Montezuma does not have legal authority to operate Well No. 4 for its system, and
25 Well No. 4 is not in use.

26 17. Since October 2009, Montezuma, Ms. Olsen, and Mr. Dougherty have been involved
27 in an extended disagreement concerning Well No. 4 and Montezuma's operations and business
28 practices. The disagreement has been acrimonious.

1 18. Montezuma no longer seeks modification of Decision No. 71317 to authorize alternate
2 financing of the arsenic treatment system facilities. It is reasonable and appropriate not to modify
3 Decision No. 71317 to authorize alternate financing of any kind, but to adopt a provision declaring
4 that the WIFA debt authorization approved in Decision No. 71317 has expired, that Montezuma is no
5 longer authorized to apply for an arsenic remediation surcharge as provided in that Decision, and that
6 Montezuma is no longer required to file an AOC for Well No. 4 or for the arsenic treatment project
7 described in that Decision.

8 19. The transmission line resulting in the debt represented by the Rask Docket financing
9 application is neither used nor useful, and it would be inappropriate for the Commission to approve
10 such debt at this time. Additionally, because the proposal from Rask Construction, as submitted to
11 the Commission with the Rask Docket financing application, appears to have been altered to omit a
12 line item, any future request to obtain recovery of the costs of the transmission line must be
13 accompanied by documentation, in the form of a detailed invoice, created by Rask Construction,
14 breaking down the costs for labor, materials, and all other items and an accompanying affidavit from
15 Mr. Rask attesting to the accuracy and completeness of the invoice.

16 20. It would be neither reasonable nor appropriate to approve the loan agreement included
17 within the Olsen Docket because Well No. 4 is neither used nor useful at this time, and Montezuma
18 should not be held responsible for any debt incurred as a result of its purchase, and the purchase price
19 for the vehicle has already been paid in full, and the vehicle itself has already been included in plant
20 in service for purposes of establishing rate base.

21 21. Regarding the Arias Docket, there is not sufficient evidence in this record to establish
22 that the \$15,000 price for the used 8,000-gallon pressure tank purchased by Sergei Arias in 2011 is
23 reasonable and appropriate and that Montezuma's ratepayers should be required to pay it, or that that
24 Staff's additional recommended amount of \$3,541 to cover installation costs is accurate or that
25 ratepayers should be required to cover it. Without sufficient credible evidence of the actual price
26 paid for the pressure tank, in the form of third-party documentation such as an invoice, and an actual
27 estimate for the cost to make any necessary modifications to the tank and install it on the system, it
28 would be neither reasonable nor appropriate to approve the Arias Docket financing application, and

1 overage amount, and Montezuma shall file a notice with the Commission
2 showing that such credits have been made.

3 25. Montezuma's customers now and in the future will benefit from the addition of the
4 storage tanks, which will enhance both the availability of water to customers for general purposes and
5 the availability of water for fire flow purposes, and it is appropriate to ensure that Montezuma has
6 designated funds available to pay the WIFA Loan.

7 26. Approval or disapproval of a utility's long-term debt and other forms of financing is a
8 necessary step in ratemaking, and the Commission has constitutional authority under Article 15, § 3
9 of the Arizona Constitution to retroactively approve or disapprove long-term debt and other forms of
10 financing.

11 27. Montezuma is requesting retroactive approval of the long-term debt created through a
12 lease agreement with Nile River, which was executed by Montezuma on March 22, 2012, and by Mr.
13 Torbenson for Nile River on March 23, 2012, and in which Montezuma promised to pay a deposit of
14 \$734.46, and to make monthly payments of \$342.09 each over a period of 36 months, to cover the
15 \$8,000 cost of an arsenic treatment system building constructed at the site for Well No. 1, for which
16 Montezuma accepted delivery on May 10, 2012.

17 28. Montezuma is requesting retroactive approval of the long-term debt created through a
18 lease agreement with Financial Pacific, which was executed by Montezuma on March 22, 2012, and
19 in which Montezuma promised to pay an initial amount of \$2,691.92, and to make monthly payments
20 of \$1,135.96 each over a period of 60 months, to cover the \$38,000 cost of an arsenic treatment
21 system obtained from Kevlor Design Group, LLC. The Financial Pacific lease also shows that
22 Montezuma will have an option to purchase the equipment at the end of the lease term for \$1.00.

23 29. The Nile River lease and Financial Pacific lease are capital leases that create long-term
24 debt, for which Commission approval is required.

25 30. In regard to the Nile River lease and Financial Pacific lease, Montezuma and its owner
26 have filed invalid and incomplete documents and have espoused positions and made legal arguments
27 based on inaccurate information, with the result that Mr. Dougherty and the Commission have at
28

1 times been misled. Montezuma's conduct in this regard has increased the extent of the filings made
2 by Mr. Dougherty and the duration and complexity of this matter.

3 31. For the reasons described in the Discussion portion of this Decision, it is just and
4 reasonable to disallow a significant portion of the legal expenses incurred by Montezuma and Ms.
5 Olsen, because of the actions of Montezuma and Ms. Olsen that have increased the costs of this
6 matter and because of the extent to which Montezuma's need for legal services has been caused by
7 Montezuma and Ms. Olsen.

8 32. Montezuma's ratepayers have been benefited overall by Montezuma's obtaining
9 financing of the arsenic treatment system and associated building, and it is reasonable and appropriate
10 for the Commission to approve that portion of the \$46,000 in long-term debt created by the Nile
11 River and Financial Pacific leases that is associated with non-excessive plant and with arsenic media.
12 It would not be consistent with standard ratemaking principles to approve the long-term debt
13 associated with plant considered to constitute excess capacity, and we will not do so.

14 33. As discussed herein, it is reasonable and appropriate to capitalize the \$16,280 cost for
15 arsenic media reflected in the Financial Pacific lease, rather than including the cost as a chemical
16 expense, and to allow depreciation of the capitalized arsenic media at the rate of 50 percent per year.

17 34. As a result of the adjustments that we are adopting herein, we find that the following
18 are just and reasonable for Montezuma, and are in the public interest, and we will adopt them:

19	OCRB/FVRB:	\$81,567
	Adjusted TY Revenues:	\$101,276
20	Adjusted TY Operating Expenses:	\$117,577
21	Adjusted TY Operating Income:	(\$16,301)
	Total Operating Revenues:	\$126,783
22	Total Operating Expenses:	\$117,577
	Total Operating Income:	\$9,206
23	Revenue Increase:	\$25,507
24	Percentage Increase:	25.18%
	Rate of Return on FVRB:	11.29%

25

26 **MONTHLY USAGE CHARGE:**

27	5/8" x 3/4" Meter	\$ 28.00
28	3/4" Meter	42.00

1 we will not do so.

2 22. Montezuma requests authority to obtain a WIFA loan in the amount of \$108,000, to
3 cover the cost of purchasing four 20,000-gallon storage tanks from Cashion at \$22,000 each, plus an
4 additional \$20,000 for engineering, permitting, and installation of the storage tanks. The request was
5 supported by a quote from Cashion.

6 23. Regarding the WIFA Loan, Staff recommended the following:

- 7 a. That Montezuma be granted authority to incur an 18- to 22-year amortizing
8 loan in an amount not to exceed \$108,000 pursuant to a loan agreement with
9 WIFA and at an interest rate not to exceed that available from WIFA, for the
10 purpose of installing additional storage tanks;
- 11 b. That Montezuma be required, within 30 days after executing the WIFA Loan,
12 to provide Staff's Utilities Division Director a copy of any WIFA Loan
13 documents executed and to file with Docket Control a letter verifying that the
14 WIFA Loan documents have been so provided;
- 15 c. That Montezuma be required to file, as a compliance item in this Docket,
16 within 30 days after executing any financing transaction authorized herein, a
17 notice confirming that the execution has occurred and a certification by an
18 authorized Montezuma representative that the terms of the financing fully
19 comply with the authorizations granted;
- 20 d. That any unused authorization to incur debt authorized herein expire on
21 December 31, 2015;
- 22 e. That Montezuma be authorized to charge an infrastructure surcharge to meet
23 its WIFA Loan debt service and associated loan obligation, with the surcharge
24 to become effective at a date and in a manner subsequently authorized by the
25 Commission;
- 26 f. That Montezuma be directed to file in this Docket, upon filing of the loan
27 closing notice and upon providing the loan documents to Staff, an application
28 requesting to implement an associated surcharge;

1 g. That Staff be directed, within 30 days of Montezuma's filing of a surcharge
2 implementation request, to calculate the appropriate WIFA surcharge, based on
3 the actual loan debt service (interest and principal) payments and using the
4 current customer count at the time of the loan closing to provide the cash flow
5 adopted in this proceeding, and prepare and file a recommended order for
6 Commission consideration;

7 h. That Montezuma be authorized to pledge its assets in the State of Arizona
8 pursuant to A.R.S. § 40-285 and A.A.C. R18-15-104 in connection with the
9 WIFA Loan; and

10 i. That Montezuma be authorized to engage in any transaction and to execute any
11 documents necessary to effectuate the authorizations. (Ex. S-1 at 28-29.)

12 24. It is reasonable and appropriate to approve Montezuma's WIFA Loan request, subject
13 to the conditions enumerated in Staff's recommendations described in Findings of Fact No. 23,
14 modified to require Montezuma to file a copy of the executed WIFA Loan documents with the
15 Commission's Docket Control rather than Staff's Utilities Division Director. Additionally, we find
16 that it is appropriate to authorize a WIFA Loan surcharge, subject to the implementation approval
17 process enumerated in Staff's recommendations, and three additional conditions:

18 a. Montezuma must segregate all funds collected under the WIFA Loan
19 surcharge in a separate account and may use those funds only for the purpose
20 of making debt service payments for the actual WIFA Loan debt service
21 (principal and interest);

22 b. The WIFA Loan surcharge will expire automatically upon the end of the term
23 for the WIFA Loan, unless the WIFA Loan surcharge is first reduced or
24 otherwise modified by Commission Order; and

25 c. If, when the WIFA Loan surcharge ends, Montezuma has collected more funds
26 through the WIFA Loan surcharge than were needed to make the WIFA Loan
27 debt service payments, Montezuma shall credit the amount of the overage in its
28 next monthly billing, with each customer receiving an equal portion of the

1	1" Meter	70.00
1	1 1/2" Meter	140.00
2	2" Meter	224.00
2	3" Meter	448.00
3	4" Meter	700.00
3	6" Meter	1,400.00

4 **COMMODITY RATES:**
5 (per 1,000 gallons)

6 **5/8 x 3/4" & 3/4" Meter**

6	First Tier - 1 to 3,000 gallons	\$2.45
7	Second Tier - 3,001 to 9,000 gallons	4.95
7	Third Tier - Over 9,000 gallons	6.25

8 **1" Meter**

9	First Tier - 1 to 24,000 gallons	\$4.95
9	Second Tier - Over 24,000 gallons	6.25

10 **1 1/2" Meter**

11	First Tier - 1 to 62,000 gallons	\$4.95
11	Second Tier - Over 62,000 gallons	6.25

12 **2" Meter**

13	First Tier - 1 to 101,000 gallons	\$4.95
13	Second Tier - Over 101,000 gallons	6.25

14 **3" Meter**

15	First Tier - 1 to 218,000 gallons	\$4.95
15	Second Tier - Over 218,000 gallons	6.25

16 **4" Meter**

17	First Tier - 1 to 329,000 gallons	\$4.95
17	Second Tier - Over 329,000 gallons	6.25

18 **6" Meter**

19	First Tier - 1 to 695,000 gallons	\$4.95
19	Second Tier - Over 695,000 gallons	6.25

20 **SERVICE LINE & METER INSTALLATION CHARGES:**

21 (Refundable pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-405)

	<u>Service Line</u>	<u>Meter</u>	<u>Total</u>
23	<u>5/8" x 3/4" Meter</u>		
24	Same side of road	\$ 370.00	\$ 130.00
24	Other side of road	670.00	130.00
25	<u>3/4" Meter</u>		
25	Same side of road	370.00	180.00
25	Other side of road	695.00	180.00
26	<u>1" Meter</u>		
27	Same side of road	400.00	225.00
27	Other side of road	775.00	225.00
28	<u>1 1/2" Meter</u>		
28	Same side of road	450.00	450.00

1	Other side of road	975.00	450.00	1,425.00
	<u>2" Meter Turbo</u>			
2	Same side of road	550.00	900.00	1,450.00
	Other side of road	1,450.00	900.00	2,350.00
3	<u>2" Meter Compound</u>			
	Same side of road	550.00	1,575.00	2,125.00
4	Other side of road	1,825.00	1,575.00	3,400.00
	<u>3" Meter Turbo</u>			
5	Same side of road	765.00	1,210.00	1,975.00
	Other side of road	1,965.00	1,210.00	3,175.00
6	<u>3" Meter Compound</u>			
	Same side of road	795.00	1,955.00	2,750.00
7	Other side of road	2,420.00	1,955.00	4,375.00
	<u>4" Meter Turbo</u>			
8	Same side of road	1,055.00	2,120.00	3,175.00
	Other side of road	2,980.00	2,120.00	5,100.00
9	<u>4" Meter Compound</u>			
	Same side of road	1,095.00	2,930.00	4,025.00
10	Other side of road	3,495.00	2,930.00	6,425.00
	<u>6" Meter Turbo</u>			
11	Same side of road	1,600.00	4,425.00	6,025.00
	Other side of road	5,200.00	4,425.00	9,625.00
12	<u>6" Meter Compound</u>			
	Same side of road	1,730.00	6,120.00	7,850.00
13	Other side of road	6,430.00	6,120.00	12,550.00

Charges differentiated by whether on same side of road as water main
SERVICE CHARGES:

15	Establishment	\$40.00
16	Reconnection (Delinquent)	\$50.00
	Service Charge—After Hours at Customer Request	\$35.00
17	Meter Test (If Correct)	\$30.00
	Deposit	*
18	Deposit Interest	*
	Reestablishment (Within 12 Months)	**
19	NSF Check	\$25.00
	Deferred Payment (Per Month)	1.50%
20	Meter Re-Read (If Correct)	\$15.00
	Late Fee (Per Month)	***
21	Monthly Service Charge for Fire Sprinkler (All Meter Sizes)	****
22	* Per Commission rule A.A.C. R14-2-403(B)	
23	** Months off system times the monthly minimum, per Commission rule A.A.C. R14-2-403(D)	
24	*** 1.50% of the unpaid balance, after 15 days	
25	**** 2.00% of the monthly minimum for a comparably sized meter connection, but no less than \$10.00 per month. The service charge for fire sprinklers is only applicable for service lines separate and distinct from the primary water service line.	

26 35. In addition to its recommendations as to the rates and charges that should be approved

27 for Montezuma, Staff recommended:

28

- 1 a. That Montezuma be permitted to collect from its customers a proportionate
2 share of any privilege, sales, or use tax, per A.A.C. R14-2-409(D)(5);
- 3 b. That Montezuma be directed to docket with the Commission a schedule of its
4 approved rates and charges within 30 days after the date the Decision in this
5 matter is issued;
- 6 c. That Montezuma be directed to use the depreciation rates by individual
7 NARUC account presented in Table B of Staff's Engineering Report;
- 8 d. That Montezuma be directed, as a compliance item in this matter, to notify its
9 customers of the authorized rates and charges approved in this proceeding, and
10 their effective date, in a form acceptable to Staff, by means of an insert in its
11 next regularly scheduled billing and to file copies with Docket Control within
12 10 days of the date notice is sent to customers;
- 13 e. That Montezuma be directed to file a new rate case no later than June 30, 2017,
14 using a test year ending no later than December 31, 2016;
- 15 f. That Montezuma be required to file with Docket Control, as a compliance item
16 in this matter and within 90 days after the effective date of the Decision in this
17 matter, for the Commission's review and consideration, at least three BMPs in
18 the form of tariffs that substantially conform to the templates created by Staff,
19 which are available on the Commission's website; and
- 20 g. That Montezuma be authorized in its next rate case to request recovery of the
21 actual costs associated with the BMPs implemented.

22 36. Staff's recommendations set forth in Findings of Fact No. 35(a) through (e) are
23 reasonable and appropriate and should be adopted. Although the Commission continues to believe
24 that the implementation of BMPs is valuable and in the public interest, in light of both Montezuma's
25 acceptable level of water loss and its need to concentrate its efforts on improving its bookkeeping and
26 recordkeeping practices and making the system improvements for which long-term debt is approved
27 herein, it is reasonable and appropriate in this matter not to impose upon Montezuma a requirement to
28 adopt BMPs.

1 37. Montezuma's failure to obtain approval from the Commission before entering into
2 \$32,000 in long-term debt in 2005 to purchase the site for Well No. 4 was a violation of A.R.S. §§
3 40-301 and 40-302. Allegation I is substantiated to the extent that it alleged a violation of A.R.S. §§
4 40-301 and 40-302.

5 38. The evidence indicates that Montezuma's books and records reviewed during the rate
6 case audit for its 2008-2009 rate case, which included its annual report for the 2007 test year, failed
7 to reveal Montezuma's \$32,000 long-term debt. This establishes that Montezuma failed to maintain
8 its books and records in compliance with the NARUC USOA, which is a violation of Decision No.
9 67583 as well as A.A.C. R14-2-411(D)(1) and (2). Allegation II is substantiated to the extent that it
10 alleged Montezuma failed to maintain its books and records in compliance with the NARUC USOA,
11 which is a violation of Decision No. 67583 and A.A.C. R14-2-411(D)(1) and (2).

12 39. Montezuma included Well No. 4 as plant in service on its Annual Reports in 2007
13 through 2010, although Well No. 4 was not in service. By including Well No. 4 in plant in service in
14 its Annual Reports, which are company records, Montezuma failed to maintain its records in
15 compliance with the NARUC USOA, which is a violation of Decision No. 67583 and A.A.C. R14-2-
16 411(D)(1) and (2). Allegation IV is substantiated to the extent that it alleged Montezuma failed to
17 maintain its Annual Reports in compliance with the NARUC USOA, which was a violation of
18 Decision No. 67583 and A.A.C. R14-2-411(D)(1) and (2).

19 40. Montezuma, for a period of several years, did not provide its customers, at point of
20 delivery, potable water that met federal and state safe drinking water standards, due to the water's
21 exceeding the ADEQ and EPA MCL for arsenic and Montezuma's failure to treat the water.
22 Montezuma now is providing its customers potable water that meets federal and state safe drinking
23 water standards because it has installed and is operating an arsenic treatment system that is
24 effectively remediating the arsenic concentration in the water. Allegation VII has been rendered
25 moot, and it is dismissed with prejudice.

26 41. The evidence does not establish what statements Montezuma made to Commission
27 investigators in January 2010 concerning Montezuma's Yavapai County zoning issues related to Well
28 No. 4. As a result, Mr. Dougherty has failed to meet the burden of proof as to Allegation X, and

1 Allegation X is dismissed with prejudice.

2 42. In its December 2009 billing, Montezuma invoiced an unauthorized arsenic surcharge
3 of \$10.11 per account, Montezuma collected this unauthorized surcharge from customers pursuant to
4 that billing, and the surcharge funds so collected were not refunded to Montezuma's customers.
5 Montezuma's charging of the unauthorized arsenic surcharge was a violation of Decision No. 71317.

6 Allegation XI is substantiated.

7 43. In its April 2011 billing, Montezuma invoiced an unauthorized arsenic surcharge of
8 \$15.00 per account, Montezuma collected this unauthorized surcharge from customers pursuant to
9 that billing, and the surcharge funds collected were refunded to Montezuma's customers after Staff
10 directed Montezuma to issue refunds. Montezuma's charging of the unauthorized surcharge was a
11 violation of Decision No. 71317. Allegation XII is substantiated.

12 44. Montezuma has alleged that records have been stolen from its offices in a series of
13 burglaries beginning in October 2009 and continuing into 2010, and that its computer system has
14 been compromised. Montezuma did not report these alleged events to the Commission and did not
15 report these alleged thefts and intrusions to the police. Montezuma did not have a legal obligation to
16 report to the police or to the Commission its belief that its records had been stolen or its computer
17 system compromised. While Montezuma cannot fairly be held responsible for the criminal acts of
18 third parties, Montezuma does have a duty to maintain complete and authentic records, and that
19 necessitates maintaining back-up records to ensure that complete and authentic information is
20 available even after an unexpected event, such as computer failure, damage from water or fire, or
21 theft. Thus, while we do not substantiate Allegation XV under the circumstances herein, Montezuma
22 is directed that it needs to take reasonable measures to ensure the security of its original records and
23 to maintain back-up records in the event its original records become unavailable. Because there is
24 insufficient evidence to establish that the alleged theft of its records resulted in Montezuma's failure
25 to maintain its records in accordance with the NARUC USOA and thus a violation of Decision No.
26 67583, Allegation XV is dismissed with prejudice.

27 45. Montezuma entered into long-term debt, in the form of the capital leases with Nile
28 River and Financial Pacific, in March 2012, without first having obtained approval from the

1 Commission. This was a violation of A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302.

2 46. Montezuma filed false or misleading information with the Commission on April 13,
3 2012, April 27, 2012, and October 25, 2012, when it filed invalid lease documents and made false or
4 misleading statements presented as fact in a Legal Brief. In doing so, Montezuma violated the
5 Procedural Order issued on April 9, 2012. Ms. Olsen's testimony as to her beliefs and knowledge
6 concerning the validity of the personal one-page leases signed by her and by "Robin Richards" are
7 not credible, and altered and incomplete lease documents were filed with the Commission by and on
8 behalf of Montezuma. The circumstances indicate that this was done willfully and with knowledge
9 of the falsity/misleading nature of the information. Allegation XVII is substantiated to the extent that
10 it alleged a violation of A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302 and a violation of the Procedural Order issued
11 on April 9, 2012. The remaining provisions of Allegation XVII are dismissed with prejudice.

12 47. Montezuma unlawfully collected \$10.11 in the form of an arsenic surcharge from each
13 of its customers and has not refunded those unlawfully collected funds. Thus, it is reasonable and
14 appropriate to require Montezuma, in the first billing after the effective date of this Decision, to
15 provide each of its customer accounts a credit of \$10.11, which shall be listed separately on each
16 customer bill as a "2009 unlawful arsenic surcharge refund." We find that this is a just and
17 reasonable remedy as to Allegation XI. We further find that it is just and reasonable to require
18 Montezuma to make a filing, within 60 days after the effective date of this Decision, as a compliance
19 item in this docket, demonstrating that its customers have received the credit in their bills as required
20 herein.

21 48. The Commission has the legal authority to impose fines upon Montezuma and has the
22 discretion not to impose fines if the imposition of fines is not believed to be in the public interest. In
23 this case, due to the financial burdens already placed upon Montezuma, the Commission believes that
24 the public interest, and the interests of Montezuma's ratepayers, would not be best served by the
25 Commission's imposition of fines at this time. However, we find that if Montezuma is found to
26 engage in further misconduct, it would be reasonable and appropriate for the Commission to take
27 adverse action against Montezuma, which could include initiation of an Order to Show Cause
28 proceeding to explore what would best serve the public interest, including whether Montezuma

1 and/or its owner should be fined and whether Montezuma's ratepayers would be better served by
2 having its system operated by an interim operator.

3 49. To ensure that the Commission is apprised of Montezuma's performance and conduct,
4 we will require Staff to monitor Montezuma's compliance with this Decision and, to file in this
5 docket, one year after the effective date of this Decision, a report detailing the status of Montezuma's
6 compliance with this Decision and with all applicable Commission statutes, rules, Decisions, and
7 Orders, and making a recommendation concerning whether additional monitoring should be
8 conducted and whether an Order to Show Cause proceeding should be initiated or other adverse
9 action should be taken.

10 50. Because an allowance for property tax expense is included in Montezuma's rates and
11 will be collected from its customers, the Commission seeks assurances from Montezuma that any
12 taxes collected from ratepayers have been remitted to the appropriate taxing authority. It has come to
13 the Commission's attention that a number of water companies have been unwilling or unable to fulfill
14 their obligation to pay the taxes that were collected from ratepayers, some for as many as 20 years. It
15 is reasonable, therefore, that as a preventive measure, Montezuma shall annually file, as part of its
16 annual report, an affidavit with the Utilities Division attesting that Montezuma is current in paying its
17 property taxes in Arizona.

18 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

19 1. Montezuma is a public service corporation pursuant to Article XV of the Arizona
20 Constitution and A.R.S. Title 40.

21 2. Mr. Dougherty, as a person, was authorized to make a complaint against Montezuma
22 under A.R.S. § 40-246, which does not require either that a complainant be a customer of the public
23 service corporation or directly damaged.

24 3. The Commission has jurisdiction over Montezuma and the subject matter of this
25 matter.

26 4. Notice of this matter was provided in accordance with the law.

27 5. The Nile River lease and Financial Pacific lease are capital leases that create long-term
28 debt, for which Commission approval is required.

1 6. Approval or disapproval of a utility's long-term debt and other forms of financing is a
2 necessary step in ratemaking, and the Commission has constitutional authority under Article 15, § 3
3 of the Arizona Constitution to retroactively approve or disapprove long-term debt and other forms of
4 financing.

5 7. The rates and charges authorized herein are just and reasonable and in the public
6 interest.

7 8. The financings approved herein are for lawful purposes, within Montezuma's powers,
8 compatible with the public interest, with sound financial practices, and with the proper performance
9 by Montezuma of service as a public service corporation, and will not impair Montezuma's ability to
10 perform that service.

11 9. The financings approved herein are for the purposes stated in the applications related
12 thereto and described herein and are reasonably necessary for those purposes, which are not wholly
13 or in part reasonably chargeable to operating expenses or to income.

14 10. Regarding Mr. Dougherty's Complaint, we conclude as follows:

15 a. Allegation I is substantiated to the extent that it alleged Montezuma's failure to
16 obtain approval from the Commission before entering into the long-term debt
17 was a violation of A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302.

18 b. Allegation II is substantiated to the extent that it alleged Montezuma failed to
19 maintain its books and records in compliance with the NARUC USOA, which
20 was a violation of Decision No. 67583 as well as A.A.C. R14-2-411(D)(1) and
21 (2).

22 c. Allegation IV is substantiated to the extent that Montezuma failed to maintain
23 its Annual Reports, which are company records, in compliance with the
24 NARUC USOA, which was a violation of Decision No. 67583 as well as
25 A.A.C. R14-2-411(D)(1) and (2).

26 d. Allegation VII has been rendered moot, and it is dismissed with prejudice.

27 e. Mr. Dougherty has failed to meet the burden of proof as to Allegation X, and it
28 is dismissed with prejudice.

- f. Allegation XI is substantiated. The evidence establishes that an arsenic surcharge of \$10.11 per account was invoiced in and collected from the December 2009 billing, unlawfully and in violation of Decision No. 71317.
- g. Allegation XII is substantiated. The evidence establishes that an arsenic surcharge of \$15.00 per account was invoiced in and collected from the April 2011 billing, unlawfully and in violation of Decision No. 71317.
- h. Allegation XV is dismissed with prejudice because there is insufficient evidence to establish that the theft of its records resulted in Montezuma's failure to maintain its records in accordance with the NARUC USOA and thus in a violation of Decision No. 67583.
- i. Allegation XVII is substantiated to the extent that it alleged a violation of A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302 and a violation of the Procedural Order issued on April 9, 2012. The remaining provisions of the Allegation are dismissed with prejudice.

11. It is just and reasonable and in the public interest to take the actions described in Findings of Fact Nos. 18 through 24, 31 through 34, 36, and 46 through 50.

ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC shall file with Docket Control, as a compliance item in this docket, before May 1, 2014, revised rate schedules setting forth the following rates and charges:

MONTHLY USAGE CHARGE:

5/8" x 3/4" Meter	\$ 28.00
3/4" Meter	42.00
1" Meter	70.00
1 1/2" Meter	140.00
2" Meter	224.00
3" Meter	448.00
4" Meter	700.00
6" Meter	1,400.00

COMMODITY RATES:

(per 1,000 gallons)

5/8 x 3/4" & 3/4" Meter

First Tier – 1 to 3,000 gallons	\$2.45
Second Tier – 3,001 to 9,000 gallons	4.95
Third Tier – Over 9,000 gallons	6.25

1" Meter

First Tier – 1 to 24,000 gallons	\$4.95
Second Tier – Over 24,000 gallons	6.25

1 1/2" Meter

First Tier – 1 to 62,000 gallons	\$4.95
Second Tier – Over 62,000 gallons	6.25

2" Meter

First Tier – 1 to 101,000 gallons	\$4.95
Second Tier – Over 101,000 gallons	6.25

3" Meter

First Tier – 1 to 218,000 gallons	\$4.95
Second Tier – Over 218,000 gallons	6.25

4" Meter

First Tier – 1 to 329,000 gallons	\$4.95
Second Tier – Over 329,000 gallons	6.25

6" Meter

First Tier – 1 to 695,000 gallons	\$4.95
Second Tier – Over 695,000 gallons	6.25

SERVICE LINE & METER INSTALLATION CHARGES:

(Refundable pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-405)

	<u>Service Line</u>	<u>Meter</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>5/8" x 3/4" Meter</u>			
Same side of road	\$ 370.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 500.00
Other side of road	670.00	130.00	800.00
<u>3/4" Meter</u>			
Same side of road	370.00	180.00	550.00
Other side of road	695.00	180.00	875.00
<u>1" Meter</u>			
Same side of road	400.00	225.00	625.00
Other side of road	775.00	225.00	1,000.00
<u>1 1/2" Meter</u>			
Same side of road	450.00	450.00	900.00
Other side of road	975.00	450.00	1,425.00
<u>2" Meter Turbo</u>			
Same side of road	550.00	900.00	1,450.00
Other side of road	1,450.00	900.00	2,350.00
<u>2" Meter Compound</u>			
Same side of road	550.00	1,575.00	2,125.00
Other side of road	1,825.00	1,575.00	3,400.00

<u>3" Meter Turbo</u>				
1	Same side of road	765.00	1,210.00	1,975.00
	Other side of road	1,965.00	1,210.00	3,175.00
<u>3" Meter Compound</u>				
2	Same side of road	795.00	1,955.00	2,750.00
3	Other side of road	2,420.00	1,955.00	4,375.00
<u>4" Meter Turbo</u>				
4	Same side of road	1,055.00	2,120.00	3,175.00
	Other side of road	2,980.00	2,120.00	5,100.00
<u>4" Meter Compound</u>				
5	Same side of road	1,095.00	2,930.00	4,025.00
6	Other side of road	3,495.00	2,930.00	6,425.00
<u>6" Meter Turbo</u>				
7	Same side of road	1,600.00	4,425.00	6,025.00
	Other side of road	5,200.00	4,425.00	9,625.00
<u>6" Meter Compound</u>				
8	Same side of road	1,730.00	6,120.00	7,850.00
9	Other side of road	6,430.00	6,120.00	12,550.00

10 Charges differentiated by whether on same side of road as water main

11 **SERVICE CHARGES:**

12	Establishment	\$40.00
	Reconnection (Delinquent)	\$50.00
13	Service Charge—After Hours at Customer Request	\$35.00
	Meter Test (If Correct)	\$30.00
14	Deposit	*
	Deposit Interest	*
15	Reestablishment (Within 12 Months)	**
	NSF Check	\$25.00
16	Deferred Payment (Per Month)	1.50%
	Meter Re-Read (If Correct)	\$15.00
17	Late Fee (Per Month)	***
	Monthly Service Charge for Fire Sprinkler	****

18 (All Meter Sizes)

* Per Commission rule A.A.C. R14-2-403(B)

** Months off system times the monthly minimum, per Commission rule A.A.C. R14-2-403(D)

20 *** 1.50% of the unpaid balance, after 15 days

21 **** 2.00% of the monthly minimum for a comparably sized meter connection, but no less than \$10.00 per month. The service charge for fire sprinklers is only applicable for service lines separate and distinct from the primary water service line.

22 The Company may collect from its customers a proportionate share of any privilege, sales, or use tax, per A.A.C. R14-2-409(D)(5).

24 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the above rates and charges shall be effective for all service
25 provided on and after May 1, 2014.

26 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC shall, as a
27 compliance item in this matter, notify its customers of the rates and charges authorized herein and
28 their effective date, in a form acceptable to the Commission's Utilities Division Staff, by means of an

1 insert in its next regularly scheduled billing and, within 10 days after the notice is sent to its
2 customers, docket copies of the notice with the Commission's Docket Control.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC shall use the
4 depreciation rates by individual NARUC account presented in Table B of Staff's Engineering Report,
5 and the separate depreciation rate for arsenic media authorized herein.

6 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC shall, by June
7 30, 2017, file with the Commission a new permanent rate case application that uses a test year ending
8 no later than December 31, 2016.

9 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the authorizations and obligations granted to and required
10 of Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC in Decision No. 71317 are modified as follows: the
11 authority to obtain a WIFA loan has expired, the authority to apply for an arsenic remediation
12 surcharge is expired, and the obligation to file an Approval of Construction for Well No. 4 or for the
13 arsenic treatment project described in that Decision is eliminated.

14 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC's request for
15 approval of financing in the form of a loan agreement in which Montezuma promised to pay Rask
16 Construction the sum of \$68,592, with interest from May 1, 2012, at a rate of 6 percent per year, for
17 installation of a water line from Well No. 4 to Well No. 1 is hereby denied.

18 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC desires in
19 the future to request recovery of the costs of the transmission line between Well No. 4 and Well No.
20 1, Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC shall include with its request documentation, in the
21 form of a detailed invoice, created by Rask Construction, breaking down the costs for labor,
22 materials, and all other items and an accompanying affidavit from Mr. Rask attesting to the accuracy
23 and completeness of the invoice.

24 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC's request for
25 approval of financing in the form of a loan agreement in which Montezuma promised to pay its
26 owner, Patricia D. Olsen, the sum of \$21,377, with interest from August 30, 2011, at a rate of 6
27 percent per year, for the purchase of the Well No. 4 site and a company vehicle, is hereby denied.

28

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC's request for
2 approval of financing in the form of a loan agreement in which Montezuma promised to pay Sergei
3 Arias the sum of \$15,000, with interest from July 1, 2011, at a rate of 6 percent per year, for the
4 purchase of an 8,000-gallon hydro-pneumatic tank, is hereby denied.

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, with regard to Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC's
6 request for approval of financing in the form of a loan agreement with the Water Infrastructure
7 Finance Authority of Arizona, that:

- 8 1. Montezuma is authorized to incur an 18- to 22-year amortizing loan in an amount not
9 to exceed \$108,000 pursuant to a loan agreement with WIFA, at an interest rate not to
10 exceed that available from WIFA, for the purpose of installing storage tanks;
- 11 2. Montezuma shall, within 30 days after executing the WIFA loan, file with the
12 Commission's Docket Control, as a compliance item in this docket, a true and
13 complete copy of all WIFA loan documents executed;
- 14 3. Montezuma shall, within 30 days after executing any financing transaction authorized
15 herein, file with the Commission's Docket Control, as a compliance item in this
16 docket, a notice confirming that the execution has occurred and a certification by an
17 authorized Montezuma representative that the terms of the financing fully comply with
18 the authorizations granted;
- 19 4. Any unused authorization to incur debt authorized herein shall expire on December
20 31, 2015;
- 21 5. Montezuma is authorized, subject to the requirement for a surcharge implementation
22 application to be filed and a surcharge amount and effective date to be approved by the
23 Commission, to charge a WIFA loan surcharge to meet its WIFA loan debt service and
24 associated loan obligation;
- 25 6. After having filed in this docket a true and complete copy of all WIFA loan documents
26 executed, Montezuma shall file in this docket an application requesting permission to
27 implement the associated WIFA loan surcharge;
- 28

- 1 7. Staff shall, within 30 days after Montezuma files an application requesting permission
2 to implement the surcharge, calculate the appropriate WIFA loan surcharge, based on
3 the actual loan debt service (interest and principal) payments and using the current
4 customer count at the time of the loan closing, to provide the cash flow adopted in this
5 proceeding, and prepare and file a recommended order for Commission consideration;
- 6 8. Montezuma is authorized, in connection with the WIFA loan approved herein, to
7 pledge its assets in the State of Arizona pursuant to A.R.S. § 40-285 and A.A.C. R18-
8 15-104;
- 9 9. Montezuma is authorized to engage in any transaction and to execute any documents
10 necessary to effectuate the authorizations as to the WIFA loan approved herein;
- 11 10. Montezuma shall segregate all funds collected under the WIFA loan surcharge in a
12 separate account and may use those funds only for the purpose of making the debt
13 service payments for the actual WIFA loan debt service (principal and interest);
- 14 11. The WIFA loan surcharge will expire automatically upon the end of the term for the
15 WIFA loan, unless the WIFA loan surcharge is first reduced or otherwise modified by
16 Commission Order; and
- 17 12. If, when the WIFA loan surcharge ends, Montezuma has collected more funds through
18 the WIFA loan surcharge than were needed to make the WIFA loan debt service
19 payments, Montezuma shall credit the amount of the overage in its next monthly
20 billing, with each customer receiving an equal portion of the overage amount, and
21 Montezuma shall file a notice with the Commission showing that such credits have
22 been made.

23 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC's request for
24 retroactive approval of long-term debt resulting from a 3-year lease with Nile River Leasing, L.L.C.,
25 with a principal amount of \$8,000, through which Montezuma obtained the building housing its
26 arsenic treatment system, is hereby approved.

27 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC's request for
28 retroactive approval of long-term debt resulting from a 5-year lease with Financial Pacific Leasing,

1 LLC, with a principal amount of \$38,000, through which Montezuma obtained its arsenic treatment
2 system, is hereby approved except as to \$13,684, which represents excess capacity in the arsenic
3 treatment system.

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC shall
5 capitalize the cost of its arsenic media and depreciate such arsenic media cost at a rate of 50 percent
6 per year.

7 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, as to John E. Dougherty's Formal Complaint against
8 Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC, that:

- 9 1. Allegation I is substantiated to the extent that it alleged Montezuma's failure to obtain
10 approval from the Commission before entering into the long-term debt was a violation
11 of A.R.S. §§ 40-301 and 40-302.
- 12 2. Allegation II is substantiated to the extent that it alleged Montezuma failed to maintain
13 its books and records in compliance with the NARUC USOA, which was a violation
14 of Decision No. 67583 as well as A.A.C. R14-2-411(D)(1) and (2).
- 15 3. Allegation IV is substantiated to the extent that Montezuma failed to maintain its
16 Annual Reports, which are company records, in compliance with the NARUC USOA,
17 which was a violation of Decision No. 67583 as well as A.A.C. R14-2-411(D)(1) and
18 (2).
- 19 4. Allegation VII has been rendered moot, and it is dismissed with prejudice.
- 20 5. Mr. Dougherty has failed to meet the burden of proof as to Allegation X, and it is
21 dismissed with prejudice.
- 22 6. Allegation XI is substantiated. The evidence establishes that an arsenic surcharge of
23 \$10.11 per account was invoiced in and collected from the December 2009 billing,
24 unlawfully and in violation of Decision No. 71317.
- 25 7. Allegation XII is substantiated. The evidence establishes that an arsenic surcharge of
26 \$15.00 per account was invoiced in and collected from the April 2011 billing,
27 unlawfully and in violation of Decision No. 71317.

28

1 8. Allegation XV is dismissed with prejudice because there is insufficient evidence to
2 establish that the theft of its records resulted in Montezuma's failure to maintain its
3 records in accordance with the NARUC USOA and thus in a violation of Decision No.
4 67583.

5 9. Allegation XVII is substantiated to the extent that it alleged a violation of A.R.S. §§
6 40-301 and 40-302 and a violation of the Procedural Order issued on April 9, 2012.

7 The remaining provisions of the Allegation are dismissed with prejudice.

8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC shall, in its
9 first billing after the effective date of this Decision, provide each of its customer accounts a credit of
10 \$10.11, which shall be listed separately on each customer bill as a "2009 unlawful arsenic surcharge
11 refund."

12 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC shall, within
13 60 days after the effective date of this Decision, file with the Commission's Docket Control, as a
14 compliance item in this docket, documentation demonstrating that all of its customers have received
15 the \$10.11 "2009 unlawful arsenic surcharge refund" credit in their bills as required herein.

16 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that although the Commission has determined, in its discretion,
17 that the public interest and the interests of Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC's ratepayers
18 would not be best served by imposing fines or otherwise taking adverse action against Montezuma
19 Rimrock Water Company, LLC, at this time, Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC is hereby
20 put on notice that future misconduct will result in adverse actions against it, and may include
21 initiation of an Order to Show Cause proceeding to explore what would best serve the public interest,
22 including whether Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC and/or its owner should be fined and
23 whether Montezuma Rimrock Water Company LLC's ratepayers would be better served by having its
24 system operated by an interim operator.

25 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that to ensure the Commission is apprised of Montezuma
26 Rimrock Water Company, LLC's performance and conduct, the Commission's Utilities Division
27 shall monitor Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC's compliance with this Decision for the
28 next year and shall file with the Commission's Docket Control, in this docket, one year after the

1 effective date of this Decision, a report detailing the status of Montezuma Rimrock Water Company,
2 LLC's compliance with this Decision and with all applicable Commission statutes, rules, Decisions,
3 and Orders, and making a recommendation concerning whether additional monitoring should be
4 conducted and whether an Order to Show Cause proceeding should be initiated or other adverse
5 action should be taken.

6 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.

7 BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION.
8
9

10 CHAIRMAN

COMMISSIONER

11
12 COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER

13
14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, JODI JERICH, Executive
15 Director of the Arizona Corporation Commission, have
16 hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the
17 Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix,
18 this _____ day of _____ 2014.

19
20 _____
21 JODI JERICH
22 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1 SERVICE LIST FOR: MONTEZUMA RIMROCK WATER COMPANY
2 DOCKET NOS.: W-04254A-12-0204; W-04254A-12-0205; W-04254A-
3 12-0206; W-04254A-12-0207; W-04254A-11-0323; W-
4 04254A-08-0361; and W-04254A-08-0362
5
6 Todd C. Wiley
7 FENNEMORE CRAIG
8 2394 E. Camelback Road, Suite 600
9 Phoenix, AZ 85016-3429
10 Attorney for Montezuma Rimrock Water Company, LLC
11
12 Patricia Olsen
13 MONTEZUMA RIMROCK
14 WATER CO., LLC
15 P.O. Box 10
16 Rimrock, AZ 86335
17
18 John E. Dougherty, III
19 P.O. Box 501
20 Rimrock, AZ 86335
21
22 Janice Alward, Chief Counsel, Legal Division
23 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
24 1200 West Washington Street
25 Phoenix, AZ 85007-292
26
27 Steven Olea, Director, Utilities Division
28 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007-2927