

OPEN MEETING AGENDA ITEM

Kelly Aceto

W-01303A-09-0343 + SW-01303A-09-0343

From: Bob Golembe <poocha@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2014 7:32 AM
To: Burns-Web
Cc: Stump-Web; Bob Burns; Susan Bitter Smith; Pierci
Subject: Comment on Burns Amendment for: SW-01303A-09-0343
Attachments: Burns Amendment.pdf



ORIGINAL

Dear Commissioner Brenda Burns,

In my review of EPCOR docketed filings to date in the instant case, it appears that they have yet to address the three (3) items listed in your **Proposed Amendment No.1** for the instant case submitted and approved at the Open Meeting of July 22, 2014.

This amendment is attached for review and consideration by all Commissioners at the forthcoming September 9, 2014 Open Meeting. I have taken the liberty to highlight in yellow a cost-of-service requirement stated in Item No. 3.

Thank you,

Bob Golembe
Anthem

Arizona Corporation Commission
DOCKETED
SEP 11 2014

DOCKETED BY

RECEIVED
2014 SEP 11 P 12:03
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL



0000154901

NDA BURNS PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 1

TIME/DATE PREPARED: Monday, July 21, 2014

ORIGINAL

COMPANY: EPCOR Water Arizona Inc.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 23

DOCKET NO(S). SW-01303A-09-0343
W-01303A-09-0343

OPEN MEETING DATE: July 22, 2014

RECEIVED

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

The purpose of this proposed amendment is to explore further options and be mindful of what answers we are trying to achieve and what unintended consequences we are trying to avoid.

The first item concerns the issue involving "cost causers." What happens when all districts are consolidated but one district needs a substantial improvement in plant. Even though that district is the only one using this plant, should all other ratepayers also pay for it?

The second item is for policy-making discussion. For example, are there any good reasons why districts in disparate geographical locations such as Tubac, Paradise Valley, and Sun City be consolidated?

The third item serves the purpose of making sure we have the most recent and up-to-date information when assessing various scenario calculations.

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

JUL 21 2014

INSERT at Page 8, line 23, After "warranted."

DOCKETED BY

Discussion and analysis should address, when the circumstances in one district necessitate a substantive investment for new plant and/or infrastructure improvements, for only that district.

INSERT at Page 8, line 25

1. Discussion and analysis as to whether consolidation is warranted, when there is no nexus between districts that do not share contiguous service territorial borders, weather conditions, urban or rural locations, farming factors and/or water supply needs.

INSERT at Page 9, line 4

- g. Any recent calculations by EPCOR, which have previously identified potential alternative options, must be updated and must also add any new calculations if the next rate case moves forward as scheduled.

PLEASE MAKE ALL CONFORMING CHANGES.

| | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| THIS AMENDMENT: | | | |
| _____ Passed _____ | Passed as amended by _____ | | |
| _____ Failed _____ | _____ Not Offered _____ | _____ Withdrawn _____ | |