

W-02514A-14-0343



0000165709

# Arizona Corporation Commis

## Utilities Complaint Form

Investigator: Trish Meeter

Phone: <<< REDACTED >>>

Completion Date: 7/31/2015 2:49 PM

Priority: Please respond within 5 business days

Opinion Number: 2015 - 123604

Opinion Codes:

Opinion Date: 7/31/2015 2:40 PM

Rate Case Items - Opposed

First Name: SueAnn & Walter

Last Name: Obremski

Account Name: SueAnn & Walter  
Obremski

Street Address: <<< REDACTED >>>

Arizona Corporation Commission

City:

State: AZ

**DOCKETED** Zip Code: 85614

<<< REDACTED >>>

AUG 10 2015

**ORIGINAL**

RECEIVED  
2015 AUG 10 A 9:38  
AZ CORPORATION COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL

Company: Quail Creek Water Co., Inc.

DOCKETED BY

Division: Water

Nature Of Opinion:

Docket Number: W-02514A-14-0343

Docket Position:

Docket# W-02514A-14-0343 SueAnn Obremski

I am against the proposed rate hike submitted by the Quail Creek Water Company (QCWC) for the following reasons:

1) To encourage water conservation water charges should be based purely upon consumption (which we have full control over) and be a tiered system.

2) The so called "base charges" (I assume they are administrative fees and infrastructure support) should be equally applied to all Quail Creek residents.

3) Any non-Quail Creek supplied consumers should pay a higher base fee and water surcharges since they chose NOT to provide their own water supplies.

The proposed rate structure seems to be ill conceived and based upon poor logic and or data. To charge

1" water connection users a higher base and consumption fees defies logic. To suggest that I could potentially use more water than the average user is dumb. Yes, I certainly could. But based upon data from QCWC, the average Quail Creek homeowner uses approximately 5700 monthly. Our average ACTUAL use over the last 7 months has been about 4200 gallons. So, here we are conserving water use, are connected to a 1" water line, and pay more for our water than the 5/8" household. Not very logical.

I would suggest that a tiered system for water consumption be based upon users exceeding the average water consumption rate (by 180%) be charged an increased use fee.

Abandon this crazy notion that 1" users should be charged a higher base fee based upon some illogical data.

And lastly, if QCWC wants to provide water to non-Quail Creek entities, than those consumers should pay a premium for that privilege.

W-02514A-14-0343

## Arizona Corporation Commission

### Utilities Complaint Form

Docket# W-02514A-14-0343 Walter Obremski

I am against the proposed rate structure for water delivery by the Quail Creek Water Co. here at Quail Creek.

The proposal seems to be inaccurately calculated and based upon poor assumptions or incorrect data. The "base fee" should be assessed to all customers equally. Singling out 1" water meter delivery systems

for higher base rates is absurd. Most (if not all) of these consumers are residential home owners with similar use characteristics of the other QC homeowners using a 5/8th inch meter delivery system. If we are a typical user, our water use seems to be less than the "average" stated by QCWC or the AZCC (our last seven months have averaged 4172 gallon per month and most of these are high consumption months) yet it is assumed we are not only average, but high use residents as well. I'd suggest we are NOT average and we are paying a premium for BELOW average use.

An increase of approximately 80% to the base rate (as suggested by the ACC) for approximately 150 homes while the other 1800 or so customers are given a 20% base rate increase defies logic. Any base rate increase, and for that matter, any base rate charge at all, should be allocated upon connection to the water system by any service delivery method by QCWC and equally distributed to all residents.

Further, while a tiered rate system for consumption may be in place, charging 1" connection meters a higher rate for consumption equally defies logic. As mentioned above, we are a two person home using less than the "average" QC resident yet we pay a higher rate for delivery. Why should that be true? For abnormally high consumption (and I would suggest 180% or greater) a higher rate structure may be "necessary". But, we are typical QC residents (two person household) using what seems to a below average consumption and yet are faced with not only a higher base rate structure, but also a higher rate tier structure.

As mentioned previously, the proposed rate structure is highly discriminatory and seems to be fully inaccurate based upon either bad source data or highly inaccurate assumptions.

This proposed rate structure needs to go back to the drawing board and be reevaluated for proper application to QCWC consumers.