



0000153745

RECEIVED

1 FENNEMORE CRAIG, P.C.
2 Jay L. Shapiro (No. 014850) JUN -5 P 3: 30
3 2394 E. Camelback Road, Suite 600
4 Phoenix, Arizona 85016 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
5 Telephone (602) 916-5000 DOCKET CONTROL

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

JUN 05 2014

6 Attorneys for Payson Water Co., Inc.

DOCKETED BY

7 **BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

8 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION
9 OF PAYSON WATER CO., INC., AN
10 ARIZONA CORPORATION, FOR A
11 DETERMINATION OF THE FAIR VALUE
12 OF ITS UTILITY PLANTS AND
13 PROPERTY AND FOR INCREASES IN ITS
14 WATER RATES AND CHARGES FOR
15 UTILITY SERVICE BASED THEREON.

DOCKET NO: W-03514A-13-0111

ORIGINAL

16 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION
17 OF PAYSON WATER CO., INC., AN
18 ARIZONA CORPORATION, FOR
19 AUTHORITY TO: (1) ISSUE EVIDENCE
20 OF INDEBTEDNESS IN AN AMOUNT
21 NOT TO EXCEED \$1,238,000 IN
22 CONNECTION WITH INFRASTRUCTURE
23 IMPROVEMENTS TO THE UTILITY
24 SYSTEM; AND (2) ENCUMBER REAL
25 PROPERTY AND PLANT AS SECURITY
26 FOR SUCH INDEBTEDNESS.

DOCKET NO: W-03514A-13-0142

27 **PAYSON WATER CO., INC.'S**
28 **EXCEPTIONS TO RECOMMENDED OPINION AND ORDER**
29 **AND NOTICE OF CLARIFICATION**

30 **June 5, 2014**

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

Table of Contents

I.	SUMMARY	1
II.	PWC'S EXCEPTIONS.....	2
A.	The Effective Date of New Rates Should be No Later than May 23, 2014	2
B.	Phase-In of Rates for Gisela	5
III.	CLARIFICATIONS TO COMPLIANCE ITEMS.....	8
A.	Discrepancy Regarding Well No. 55-588967	8
B.	Design Assistance Grant Application.....	9
C.	Reporting Issue with ADWR.....	9
IV.	CONCLUSION	10

9208403.3/073283.0006

1 Payson Water Co., Inc. ("PWC" or the "Company") hereby submits its exceptions
2 to the Recommended Opinion and Order ("ROO") dated May 27, 2014 in this docket.
3 The Company only takes exception to two aspects of the ROO as explained below.
4 In addition, the Company clarifies and updates the Commission regarding certain ongoing
5 matters pertinent to the ROO.

6 **I. SUMMARY**

7 PWC generally agrees with the ROO, which attempts to balance the interests of the
8 Company and all of its customers in light of the evidence in the record and applicable law.
9 PWC's concerns with the ROO are relatively narrow and do not impact the revenue
10 requirement itself; only the timing of collection and the legality of a Commission imposed
11 phase-in without recovery of lost revenues is questioned.

12 First, PWC takes exception to an effective date for new rates of July 1, 2014.
13 The Company requests that the Commission modify the ROO to make the new rates
14 effective on May 23, 2014, the date corresponding to the beginning of the Company's
15 current billing cycle. This modification is necessary for the Commission to more closely
16 adhere to the time clock applicable to this case pursuant to which rates should have been
17 in effect no later than May 1, 2014. The Company should not suffer additional financial
18 harm resulting from the delay in deciding this case.

19 Second, the phase-in of rates recommended for the Gisela system is unlawful
20 because there is no method for the Company to recover the revenues lost during the
21 phase-in period. The Company is broke and certainly not in a position to subsidize the
22 consolidation of its Gisela system at a cost of at least \$11,250 (see explanation below on
23 page 6), nor should it be required to do so. If the Commission wishes to consolidate
24 Gisela with the other seven systems *and* wishes phase-in rates, then provision must be
25 made for the Company to recover the lost revenues and carrying cost. Otherwise, the
26 Commission will violate established Arizona law relating to utility ratemaking and take

1 the Company's revenue without just compensation. It is also possible to consolidate
2 Gisela without a phase-in or loss of revenue to PWC as the Company showed in its
3 May 12, 2014 filing in response to Commissioner Pierce's letter.¹ That rate design
4 provides additional mitigation of the impact of needed rate increases through
5 modifications to the rate design previously proposed by the Company and Staff.²

6 In addition to these two narrow exceptions, PWC also takes this opportunity to
7 respond to and/or satisfy various future compliance items. Specifically, the Company
8 (1) explains the alleged discrepancy with the Arizona Department of Environmental
9 Quality ("ADEQ") regarding Well No. 55-588967, (2) provides an update with regard to
10 the Design Assistance Grant Application submitted to the Water Infrastructure Finance
11 Authority ("WIFA"), and (3) certifies that the issue with the Arizona Department of Water
12 Resources ("ADWR") is resolved.

13 **II. PWC'S EXCEPTIONS**

14 **A. The Effective Date of New Rates Should be No Later than May 23, 2014**

15 It is absolutely vital when considering the fairness of the issue to bear in mind that
16 the Commission ordered the Company to file this rate case because the Commission was
17 concerned about the Company's efforts to address water supply issues, curtailments, and
18 water hauling.³ It is also vital to bear in mind that the Order was directed at the Company
19 under a prior owner – and that the current owners stepped into a significantly troubled
20 system and have, to date, substantially addressed that water shortage. This rate case was
21 also necessary because the Company's costs of service far exceed its revenues, as all the
22 expert testimony clearly and unequivocally proves. PWC filed its rate application on

23 ¹ See Notice of Filing Additional Analysis in Response to Docketed Letters from
24 Commissioner (filed May 12, 2014) at 3 & Exhibit 4.

25 ² With the exception of a three-month phase-in for Gisela, the ROO adopts the rate design
recommended by Staff and the Company in this case.

26 ³ See generally Decision No. 71902 (Sept. 28, 2010).

1 April 22, 2013, and reached sufficiency on June 3, 2013. Originally, hearing on the rate
2 application was set for early December 2013. A final decision would have been due in
3 late February 2014.⁴

4 On August 15, 2013, PWC moved to consolidate and expedite its rate and
5 financing applications so that it could obtain financing necessary to build an
6 interconnection between the Town of Payson and Mesa del Caballo (“MDC-TOP line”).
7 But financing was not going improve the Company’s overall financial health. It was not
8 going to help the Company to pay its bills and perform its core responsibility of providing
9 safe and reliable water utility service. Therefore, the Company proposed that a decision
10 on both applications go before the Commission in December 2013. Instead, the case was
11 bifurcated into two proceedings – Phase 1, addressing PWC’s borrowing of funds from
12 WIFA for the MDC-TOP line and the debt service thereon, and Phase 2, addressing the
13 remaining rate relief.⁵ Two phases meant delayed implementation of new rates; however,
14 the Company worked out a schedule with Staff intended to ensure that new rates would be
15 in effect by May 1, 2014.⁶ Obviously that did not happen.

16 PWC recognizes that this case has been very difficult for the Hearing Division and
17 Commission to process. Although this is a Class C utility, the proceedings became
18 complex with the addition of seven customer-Intervenors that made numerous large
19 filings and resulted in five days of hearing. Judge Nodes’ decision to allow each of seven
20 individual customer-Intervenors to actively participate in every stage of this rate case
21 wisely and appropriately ensured that due process was afforded each and every party.

22 ⁴ A.A.C. R14-2-103(B)(11)(d) (June 3, 2013 + 270 days = February 28, 2014).

23 ⁵ At the rejoinder stage, PWC withdrew its request for any additional Cragin Pipeline
24 financing. See Rejoinder Testimony of Jason Williamson at 5:17 – 6:7.

25 ⁶ Under the Phase 2 schedule proposed by Staff and the Company and approved on
26 September 10, 2013, hearings were set to commence on January 8, 2014. However, the
hearings actually started almost four weeks later, on February 4, 2014. The Company
does not know why this additional delay occurred but asserts it was in no way responsible.

1 The Commission has been presented with a robust evidentiary record, which Judge Nodes
2 had to review and analyze before he could pen a recommendation for the Commission's
3 consideration. Nevertheless, when the Phase 2 timetable was set, it was done with the
4 anticipation and agreement that new rates would be effective before May 1, 2014.⁷

5 Even with PWC's agreement to extend the schedule by 30 days, the Commission's
6 own time clock expired on April 1, 2014. An effective date of July 1, 2014 is simply too
7 late. At the ROO's revenue levels, by July 1 PWC will have lost more than \$47,000 in
8 new revenue from the rate increase since the time clock expired. Lost revenues are
9 always a significant issue for small companies, and in this case, the record is clear that this
10 Company needs every penny if it is ever going to be able to reach the minimum levels of
11 financial stability needed to pay its bills, both ongoing and past, and attract the capital
12 necessary to make the additional improvements customers want. The Commission can
13 remedy this with a simple amendment to make the new rates effective for all service
14 provided by PWC on or after May 23, 2014.⁸ That is the fair and just thing to do under
15 the pressing circumstances of this case.

16 Adopting the ROO, as written, with an effective date of July 1, ignores the
17 Commission's own time clock for rates and, worse still, deprives the Company of
18 revenues that the record clearly establish are needed. Again, the current owners of the
19 Company were not running the system when the well ran dry: They are the ones that
20 promptly found a way to bring more water to Mesa del Caballo without hauling, and have

21
22 ⁷ See Stipulation for Procedural Order Bifurcating Proceeding and Establishing Case
Schedule (filed Sept. 5, 2013) at 2-3.

23 ⁸ The Company's bill cycle end date was May 22. Were rates to become effective on,
24 for example, June 1, there would be no meter read for the days elapsed (May 23 through
25 May 31). The Company would then be forced to estimate usage and have to pro-rate on
26 its next billing, which would complicate matters and might even invite errors. If the
Commission approves a May 23 effective date, PWC would further propose to submit its
customer notice for Staff review within 24 hours of the issuing of the final decision so that
notice can go out to customers of the new rates as expeditiously as possible.

1 worked to solve the regulatory issues that were created under prior ownership. It is
2 simply unjust to deprive the new owners of revenues to which they are entitled under the
3 Commission's own rules, that are proven to be needed to meet their obligations, and that
4 will allow them to continue to improve the Company.

5 **B. Phase-In of Rates for Gisela**

6 The ROO recommends that the rate increase be phased-in for customers in the
7 Gisela system.⁹ The Company takes exception to the recommended phase-in, primarily
8 because it requires the Company to subsidize the consolidation of the Gisela system.
9 PWC does not believe it is necessary for the Commission to phase-in rates in the manner
10 recommended in the ROO because there are lawful and less harmful means of addressing
11 the unique concerns related to Gisela.

12 Briefly, PWC is a collection of eight public water systems formed nearly 15 years
13 ago from two other public service corporations.¹⁰ Such consolidation is not unusual in the
14 water utility industry as stakeholders seek the economies of scale that often follow the
15 consolidation of multiple systems under one umbrella. Here, for instance, it would be far
16 more costly to operate eight separate water systems as separate water companies.¹¹
17 Nevertheless, the transition to a fully consolidated operation is rarely a simple process of
18 going from A to B and as with many other elements in this rate case consolidation has not
19 been a simple matter.

20 For reasons that are not entirely clear to the Company (or its current legal counsel),
21 the Gisela system was not fully consolidated with the other seven systems when the
22 Commission approved the formation of PWC in 1998. As a result, the impact of rate
23 increases necessary for the Company to recover its costs of service generally impact

24 ⁹ ROO at 59-60.

25 ¹⁰ See Decision No. 60972 (June 19, 1998).

26 ¹¹ See, e.g., Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings, Volume I, at 164:20 – 165:6 (Bourassa).

1 customers in the Gisela system more than average customers in the other systems.¹²
2 Gisela customers use nearly twice the amount of water as customers in other parts of the
3 system, and the more rural lifestyle generally associated with this community appears to
4 result in customers having a greater difficulty absorbing seasonal fluctuations in water
5 usage.

6 Judge Nodes undoubtedly recognized these unique facts related to Gisela when he
7 recommended a three-month phase-in for this system. Unfortunately, the recommended
8 remedy takes the shortest road from here to there by imposing revenue losses from that
9 three-month phase-in, ultimately leaving PWC to pay the toll – a loss of at least \$11,250,
10 because the ROO does not provide any mechanism for PWC to recover the lost revenue
11 and carrying costs associated with that Commission imposed phase-in.¹³

12 For starters, PWC does not believe the phase-in is lawful in its present form.
13 The ROO sets a revenue requirement that is just and reasonable and then, in Gisela, sets
14 rates for three months that do not allow the Company to recover that revenue requirement.
15 Rates that do not allow for the recovery of the revenue requirement from which they are
16 derived are, by definition, not just and reasonable.¹⁴

17 The clear message of *Scates* is that rates are *not* just and reasonable if they do not
18 produce sufficient revenue to allow for recovery of reasonable operating expenses and a
19 fair rate of return.¹⁵ “A utility is entitled to a fair rate of return on the fair value of its
20 property, no more and no less.”¹⁶ That is the fundamental principle upon which this

21 ¹² See Reporter’s Transcript of Proceedings, Volume II, at 433 (Bourassa); Reporter’s
22 Transcript of Proceedings, Volume IV, at 703-704, 794 (Brown).

23 ¹³ This is \$3,750 per month assuming revenue collection is spread evenly throughout the
24 year, which it is not since more water usage occurs in the summer months, so the estimate
is conservative.

25 ¹⁴ *Scates v. Ariz. Corp. Comm’n*, 118 Ariz. 531, 534, 578 P.2d 612, 615 (App. 1978).

26 ¹⁵ See generally, *Scates*, 118 Ariz. 531, 578 P.2d 612.

¹⁶ *Litchfield Park Service Co. v. Ariz. Corp. Comm’n*, 178 Ariz. 431, 434, 874 P.2d 988,

1 Commission has set rates for many, many years.

2 Failure to allow PWC to recover the lost revenue resulting from a phase-in would
3 be unfair and unlawful under Arizona law. By law, "what the company is entitled to ask
4 is a fair return upon the value of that which it employs for the public convenience."¹⁷

5 Accordingly, if the Commission wants to phase-in rates, it must allow for the lost
6 revenue to be recovered at a later date, with carrying costs. If this is the approach the
7 Commission decides to take, then PWC recommends that the lost revenue be recovered
8 from Gisela customers over the six-month period that follows the three-month phase-in
9 with a carrying cost equal to the cost of capital approved in this rate case. In this way, the
10 Commission can consolidate Gisela and use a phase-in to lawfully ameliorate the impact
11 of rate increases on customers in the Gisela system.

12 In the alternative, the Commission could take the approach outlined by the
13 Company in response to Commissioner Pierce's May 1, 2014 letter, which would
14 altogether eliminate the need for a rate phase-in.

15 Specifically, at Exhibit 4 of the Company's May 12, 2014 response, the Company
16 illustrated consolidated rates for all systems, however, the monthly minimums have been
17 increased along with the first and second tier gallons for the 5/8 x 3/4 inch meters relative
18 to the rates jointly proposed by Staff and the Company. The first tier gallons are
19 increased from 3,000 gallons to 6,000 gallons, and the second tier gallons are increased
20 from 10,000 gallons to 12,000 gallons. This approach *reduces* the rate increase to the
21 Gisela system, from approximately 140 percent to 102 percent, and the median from
22 approximately 97 percent to 83 percent. Again, of course, this additional revenue will
23 have to be collected from the customers in the other systems who would bear an

24 991 (App. 1994) (internal quote omitted).

25 ¹⁷ *Simms v. Round Valley Light & Power Co.*, 80 Ariz. 145, 149, 294 P.2d 378, 381
26 (1956) (quoting *State of Missouri ex rel. SW Bell Tele. Co. v. Public Service Comm'n*, 262
U.S. 276 (1923)).

1 additional, albeit small, increase in order to lessen the rate impacts in Gisela.

2 The Company also suggests that the Commission consider initiating a pilot
3 program to allow the option for equalized payments for its Gisela system and only its
4 Gisela system. The Company believes such a program would allow customers to avoid
5 seasonal spikes in their bills, and maintain a more regular budget for payment.¹⁸

6 Under the pilot program, PWC would project annual billings for Gisela customers
7 choosing equalized payments option based on the prior year usage and the new rates
8 approved by the Commission. The total annual billings would then be divided by 12 and
9 the customer billed 1/12 each month. There would also be at least one annual true up to
10 ensure that the customer did not overpay, or the Company did not under collect.
11 While such an approach is fairly common with electric utilities, PWC is unaware of a
12 water utility in Arizona using equalized payments. Nonetheless, if the Commission's
13 concern is to address Gisela's concern with high summertime bills, PWC can conduct the
14 State's first water company pilot program for equalized bills in Gisela. In this way,
15 the Commission would cushion the impact of the necessary rate increase on customers in
16 the Gisela system and address the seasonal concerns the Commission heard about during
17 the public comment session in Payson on April 9, 2014.

18 **III. CLARIFICATIONS TO COMPLIANCE ITEMS**

19 **A. Discrepancy Regarding Well No. 55-588967**

20 On March 10, 2014, PWC docketed the Consent Order with ADEQ resolving
21 violations related to third-party owned wells used by the Company under water sharing
22

23 ¹⁸ APS, for example, offers equalized payments as an option to all of its customers.
24 Because of the unique circumstances in Gisela, PWC is willing to take on the additional
25 administrative costs of a limited pilot program. PWC cannot afford to offer this
26 alternative to PWC customers outside of Gisela. Moreover, because the Company would
be required to come in again for new rates in just three years under the current Staff
recommendation, the Commission would have the opportunity then to address
equalization, Gisela, consolidation, and any other related issues at that time.

1 agreements. Subsequently, it was brought to the Company's attention that one of the
2 referenced well numbers (55-588967) in the Consent Order was incorrect – an obvious
3 clerical error on the part of the agency. The Company promptly notified ADEQ, and
4 ADEQ corrected the mistake in a letter dated April 7, 2014 (see Attachment A).¹⁹ The
5 Company, therefore, respectfully suggests that the discussion in the ROO on “Well
6 Numbers,” at 45:21 – 46:4, be amended to reflect that the Company has adequately
7 responded, and that the corresponding Ordering Paragraph at 72:12-14 directing a future
8 compliance filing be deleted.

9 **B. Design Assistance Grant Application**

10 On February 20, 2014, PWC docketed a copy of the Design Assistance Grant
11 Application submitted to WIFA for funding to perform a water supply study on East
12 Verde Park. On May 14, 2014, the Company was informed that it had been awarded a
13 \$35,000 grant to complete the study. See Attachment B. This is great news for the
14 Company and its customers in that the WIFA grant provides non-investor funds for steps
15 that need to be taken before capital improvements can be made. As a result of the grant
16 being received, the Company respectfully suggests amendment of the ROO at 15, n.17 to
17 reflect that the Company has received the grant, and deletion of the Ordering Paragraph at
18 72:16-19, which directs the Company to file a copy of WIFA's response.

19 **C. Reporting Issue with ADWR**

20 An October 2013 ADWR compliance status report indicated that PWC was not in
21 compliance with ADWR requirements due to missing annual water use reports for 2009
22 and 2011. The Company provided these reports to ADWR in February 2014, and ADWR
23 has since confirmed the Company's compliance status. See Attachment C. The
24 Company respectfully suggests amendment of the ROO at 16:16-19 to reflect that
25 subsequent filings were made and the Company is in compliance, and deletion of the

26 ¹⁹ It was only recently that the Company was able to obtain a legible copy of this letter.

1 Ordering Paragraph at 72:20-22, which directs the Company to file documentation
2 showing that the ADWR issue has been resolved.

3 **IV. CONCLUSION**

4 PWC respectfully requests that the Commission adopt these exceptions and modify
5 the ROO as set forth above.

6 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 5th day of June, 2014.

7 FENNEMORE CRAIG, P.C.

8
9 By 

10 Jay L. Shapiro
11 2394 E. Camelback Road
12 Suite 600
13 Phoenix, Arizona 85016
14 Attorneys for Payson Water Co., Inc.

13 **ORIGINAL** and thirteen (13) copies
14 of the foregoing were filed
15 this 5th day of June, 2014, with:

15 Docket Control
16 Arizona Corporation Commission
17 1200 W. Washington Street
18 Phoenix, AZ 85007

19 **COPY** of the foregoing was hand-delivered
20 this 5th day of June, 2014, to:

21 Chairman Bob Stump
22 Arizona Corporation Commission
23 1200 W. Washington Street
24 Phoenix, AZ 85007

25 Commissioner Gary Pierce
26 Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Commissioner Brenda Burns
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

1 Commissioner Bob Burns
Arizona Corporation Commission
2 1200 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

3 Commissioner Susan Bitter Smith
4 Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 W. Washington Street
5 Phoenix, AZ 85007

6 Dwight D. Nodes, Assistant Chief Administrative Law Judge
Arizona Corporation Commission
7 1200 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

8 Robin Mitchell
9 Brian Smith
Arizona Corporation Commission
10 1200 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

11 Steven M. Olea, Director
12 Utilities Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
13 1200 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

14 **COPY** of the foregoing was e-mailed/mailed
15 this 5th day of June, 2014, to:

16 Kathleen M. Reidhead
14406 S. Cholla Canyon Dr.
17 Phoenix, AZ 85044

18 Thomas Bremer
6717 E. Turquoise Ave.
19 Scottsdale, AZ 85253

20 Bill Sheppard
6250 N. Central Ave.
21 Phoenix, AZ 85012

22 J. Stephen Gehring
8157 W. Deadeye Rd.
23 Payson, AZ 85541

24 Suzanne Nee
2051 E. Aspen Dr.
25 Tempe, Arizona 85282

26

1 Glynn Ross
2 405 S. Ponderosa
3 Payson, AZ 85541

4 By: D. Durant

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

ATTACHMENT

A



Janice K. Brewer
Governor

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT
OF
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

1110 West Washington Street • Phoenix, Arizona 85007
(602) 771-2300 • www.azdeq.gov



Henry R. Darwin
Director

April 7, 2014

Jason Williamson, Owner
Payson Water Co., Inc.
P.O. Box 200595
Denver, Colorado 80220

Re: Payson Water Co, Inc. – Consent Order

Dear Mr. Williamson:

The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) entered into Consent Order DW-09-14 with Payson Water Co., Inc. (dba Payson Water – Mesa Del Caballo) (Payson Water) on February 21, 2014. The Consent Order requires Payson Water to submit an application for an Approval to Construct and an Approval of Construction for three unapproved wells currently being used by Payson Water.

The Consent Order identifies one of the unapproved wells as well number 55-588967, which is incorrect; the correct well number is 55-585747.

If you have questions, please contact Vivian Burns, Water Quality Case Manager at (602) 771-4608 or by email at burns.vivian@azdeq.gov.

Sincerely,

Mindi Cross, Manager
Water Quality Compliance Section

Southern Regional Office
400 West Congress Street • Suite 433 • Tucson, AZ 85701
(520) 628-6733

Printed on recycled paper

ATTACHMENT

B

From: Susan Craig [<mailto:SCraig@azwifa.gov>]

Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2014 11:14 AM

To: eiacobs@nogalesaz.gov; grantventures@yahoo.com; townclerk@fredonia.net; jw@jwwater.net; happyholmes904@yahoo.com; stevechrisc@yahoo.com; mayerwaterdistrict@gmail.com

Cc: Melanie Ford; Sandy Sutton; Patricia Incognito; Sara Konrad

Subject: WIFA Awards Grants to Improve Drinking Water and Protect Public Health

Dear grant recipients,

Below is the press release that WIFA sent out about our recent grant awards. Congratulations again! Please keep us in the loop on any press that you might get. We love to see good publicity and are also happy to coordinate with you on media-related items.

Thank you for looking to WIFA for your funding needs and working with us to improve drinking water and protect public health in Arizona.



NEWS RELEASE

WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE AUTHORITY

Arizona's water and wastewater funding source

1110 W. Washington St., Suite 200, Phoenix, Arizona 85007 | arizona.gov | (602) 364-1310

Date: May 14, 2014

Contact: Susan Craig, Communications Director, (602) 364-1236

WIFA Awards Grants to Improve Drinking Water and Protect Public Health

PHOENIX (May 14, 2014) The Water Infrastructure Finance Authority (WIFA) of Arizona recently awarded \$150,000 in grant funds to improve drinking water and protect public health. All seven of the grant awards went to small, rural communities throughout Arizona to complete the planning or design phase of a drinking water infrastructure project.

Grant awards are listed below:

Applicant	Project Title	County	Award Amount
Clay Springs Domestic Water Improvement District	Preliminary Engineering Report for System Improvements and Water Loss Remediation	Navajo	\$14,612
Payson Water Company	East Verde Park Supply Study	Gila	\$35,000
Mayer Domestic Water Improvement District	Production Well Aquifer Study, Energy Efficiency Analysis & SCADA Preliminary Design	Yavapai	\$34,950
Picacho Water Improvement Corporation	Design of Replacement Water System Campus	Pinal	\$21,000
Alpine Domestic Water Improvement District	San Francisco River Waterline Relocation Project	Apache	\$15,900
Town of Fredonia	Filtration Plant Backwash Basin Re-engineering	Coconino	\$18,602
City of Nogales	Extreme West Pressure Zone Storage Tank	Santa Cruz	\$9,936

The purpose of WIFA's Planning and Design Grant Program is to help facilitate future construction of capital improvements related to drinking water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure. "Although WIFA can provide funding to both small and large communities, we give priority to communities with limited resources, those that really need assistance," said WIFA Executive Director, Sandy Sutton. "Receiving funding assistance to take a project through the planning or early design phase is often the key to making the project happen at all. We're happy that WIFA can play a role in making these important projects a reality for Arizona's communities."

WIFA funds roughly \$450,000 per year in infrastructure planning and design projects. Funding comes from the Clean Water and Drinking Water Revolving Funds, which WIFA manages for the state of Arizona. Individual grants of up to \$35,000 are awarded twice a year, while WIFA's low-interest financing (loan program) is available year-round and in any amount. The grant program is designed to complement WIFA's low-interest loan program, which funds construction as well as planning and design.

WIFA is a state agency dedicated to protecting public health and promoting environmental quality through funding and technical assistance programs.

For more information, please visit WIFA's website at www.azwifa.gov.

###

WIFA is on Facebook!

Like our page to learn more about drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs and funding in Arizona.

Susan Craig Communications Director

Water Infrastructure Finance Authority of Arizona



1110 W. Washington Street, Ste. 290, Phoenix, AZ 85007
direct: 602.364.1236 | fax: 602.364.1327 | scraig@azwifa.gov

Arizona's water and wastewater funding source 

 Think green, keep it on your screen-

ATTACHMENT C

From: Jesse Sandoval [<mailto:jsandoval@azwater.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, June 5, 2014 9:51 AM

To: jw@jwwater.net

Subject: FW: 2009 ADWR CWS Reports for Payson - please confirm compliance

From: Jesse Sandoval

Sent: Wednesday, June 04, 2014 3:37 PM

To: 'Debby'

Subject: RE: 2009 ADWR CWS Reports for Payson - please confirm compliance

Hi Debby,

ADWR did receive and reviewed the 2009 and 2011 CWS Annual Water Use Reports for the systems listed below. The systems Annual Reports are marked as being complete.

91-000164.0000

91-000124.0000

91-000131.0000

91-000130.0000

91-000148.0000

91-000132.0000

91-000140.0000

91-000133.0000

If you have any question please feel free to contact me.

Thanks,

Jesse Sandoval

Planning & Data Management

Arizona Department of Water Resources

3550 North Central Avenue

Phoenix, AZ 85012

602.771.8510



PROTECTING ARIZONA'S
WATER SUPPLIES
for ITS NEXT CENTURY