WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION STAFF
RESPONSE TO DATA REQUEST

DATE PREPARED:	August 21, 2012	WITNESS:	Jim Ward, Amy White
DOCKET:	UW-110054	RESPONDER:	Jim Ward, Amy White
REQUESTER:	Bench	TELEPHONE:	(360) 664-1250; 664-1247

BENCH REQUEST NO. 16: (Issued from the Bench at Settlement Hearing on August 14, 2012): Provide copies of customer comments received by the Commission since the Settlement Agreement was filed.

RESPONSE NO. 16:

See Attachment to Bench Request No. 16.

Attachment to Bench Request 16

COMMENT FORM FOR: CHUCK SUNDSMO - ID# 27780

Consumer Information			
		Contact Method	● Email ○ Mail ○ None
Name	CHUCK SUNDSMO		
Organization Company			
Address City, State, Zip Code	11311 80TH AVENUE E PUYALLUP WASHINGTON 98373		
Email	chucksundsmo@msn.com		
Primary Phone #	253 224-4406	Fax #	
Secondary Phone #			

Comment Information			
Theme	Mismanagement, No Alternative	Open Date	06/15/2012
Filing Support	○ Yes ● No ○ Undecided	Closed Date	
Source	○ Email ● Phone ○ In person ○ Mail ○ Web	Web Create Date	
Public Involvement Lead	John Cupp		
Duplicate Comment	○ Yes ● No		
Description	Company has a monopoly. Customer believes all the local wells are being drained to fill Mountain Mist water bottles for Wal Mart and then the local customers must pay increased costs for Rainier View to purchase water from the city of Lakewood for its residential customers.		
Attachments			

Issue Information	
Issue ID	541
Company	Rainier View Water Company, Inc.
Filing	110054
Staff	Amy White

Activites For Chuck Sundsmo

COMMENT FORM FOR: MIKE GALIZIO - ID# 27736

Consumer Information

		Contact Method	● Email ○ Mail ○ None
Name	MIKE GALIZIO		
Organization Company			
Address City, State, Zip Code			
Email	mkstorm@centurytel.net		
Primary Phone #		Fax #	
Secondary Phone #			

Comment Information

Theme		Open Date	05/31/2012
Filing Support	○ Yes ○ No ● Undecided	Closed Date	
Source	○ Email ○ Phone ○ In person ○ Mail ○ Web	Web Create Date	
Public Involvement Lead	John Cupp		
Duplicate Comment	○ Yes ○ No		

Description

5/31, 9:40 am - message to IP:
Hi Mike,

To look in our online records center, go to utc.wa.gov and enter "110054" in the Search Docket tool. The links will lead you to all of the documents filed through our Records Center.

Here is a link to our Water Section page where other documents, such as staff data requests and companies responses to the requests.

I hope this is helpful.

John Cupp
Utilities and Transportation Commission
(360) 664-1113

Attachments

Issue Information

Issue ID	541
Company	Rainier View Water Company, Inc.

COMMENT FORM FOR: PHILIP T. SMITH - ID# 27725

Consumer Information			
		Contact Method	● Email ○ Mail ○ None
Name	PHILIP T. SMITH		
Organization Company			
Address	6811 242ND ST E		
City, State, Zip Code	GRAHAM WASHINGTON 98338-9407		
Email	ptssmith@comcast.net		
Primary Phone #	(253) 847-8481	Fax #	
Secondary Phone #			

Comment Information			
Theme		Open Date	05/15/2012
Filing Support	○ Yes ● No ○ Undecided	Closed Date	
Source	○ Email ○ Phone ○ In person ○ Mail ○ Web	Web Create Date	
Public Involvement Lead	John Cupp		
Duplicate Comment	○ Yes ○ No		

Description

Staff provided customer with a copy of a projected savings letter (see Lakewood vs Tacoma, attached below).

Message to customer, May 16:
Dear Mr. Smith

This message is in response to your letter of May 9, regarding Rainier View Water Company's proposal to add surcharges and a facilities charge to its tariff to pay for a direct pipeline to Lakewood Water District, in order to secure a long term, low cost source for water.

What settlement agreement? Specifically, what unknown settlement was reached, and when was it reached, that, if the surcharge is approved, causes the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission to obligate this household to $1,044.00 in surcharges over the next fifteen (15) years, for which absolutely no known, verifiable, or quantifiable products or services will be forthcoming?
Staff compared the costs of providing water via the current sources (City of Tacoma and Lakewood Water District via City of Tacoma) to water purchased directly from Lakewood. In the long run, buying water directly from Lakewood will result in lower-cost water. I sent you a rate comparison earlier today, which should also help to answer your question.

	As it pertains to protecting the public's interests, what has Rainier View Water Company contractually committed itself to accomplish, to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, to ensure that there will be a net financial benefit to the Rainier View customers paying the proposed surcharges? Please see the attached "Background and Explanation of the Lakewood Pipeline Project." Does the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission consider a 26.6% surcharge acceptable as it pertains to protecting the public's interests? If so what is the upper limit, if any, that the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission is ready to obligate this household to, keeping in mind that I am depending on the Commission to represent me in dealings with the Rainier View Water Company? There is no set "upper limit." Commission staff considers the surcharges to be fair, just, and reasonable; and sufficient to cover the company's costs of the project. In addition to the surcharges, new customers with ¾" connections will pay a facilities charge of $5,756. Any amount collected after payoff of all construction loans and after expiration of the surcharges, will be paid back to existing customers in the form of semi-annual bill credits. Thank you again for taking the time to write to us. I hope this information is helpful to you. Please let me know if you have additional questions. Sincerely, John Cupp Utilities and Transportation Commission (360) 664-1113
Attachments	20120515101055255.pdf Lakewood vs Tacoma 2018 rates.pdf Background and Explanation of the Lakewood Pipeline Project.docx

Issue Information	
Issue ID	541
Company	Rainier View Water Company, Inc.
Filing	110054
Staff	Amy White

Activites For Philip T. Smith

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
1300 S Evergreen Park Dr SW
PO Box 47250
Olympia, WA 98504-7250

May 9, 2012

Ref: Rainier View Water Co June 1, 2012, letter; filing for surcharges

Sirs,

1. The stated justification for the surcharges is "a result of a Settlement Agreement reached between the Company and Commission Staff.".

   Question: What "Settlement Agreement"? Specifically, what unknown settlement was reached, and when was it reached, that, if the surcharge is approved, causes the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission to obligate this household to $1,044.00 in surcharges over the next fifteen (15) years, for which absolutely no known, verifiable, or quantifiable products or services will be forthcoming?

   The Rainier View Water Company's statement, ". . . provides Rainier View customers access to a lower cost source of water." is meaningless in verifying the products or services to be forthcoming in return for the surcharge payments.

   Question: As it pertains to protecting the public's interests, what has the Rainier View Water Company contractually committed itself to accomplish, to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, to ensure that there will be a net financial benefit to the Rainier View customers paying the proposed surcharges?

2. This household has paid $5,813.42 in water bills for the period of January, 1995, through May, 2012, inclusive. This amounts to an average monthly water bill of $27.82. The proposed surcharge, if it is approved, amounts to $7.40 monthly. This is a 26.6% surcharge; over a quarter of this household's average monthly water bill!

   Question: Does the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission consider a 26.6% surcharge acceptable as it pertains to protecting the public's interests? If so, what is the upper limit, if any, that the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission is ready to obligate this household to, keeping in mind that I am depending on the commission to represent me in dealings with the Rainier View Water Company?

From the Rainier View Water Company's letter, I believe that there is a profit motivated business case for connecting to the Lakewood Water District. Nothing in the letter establishes a positive element / financial net gain for the Rainier View customers.

Therefore, pending receipt of the answers to the questions in '1.' and '2.' above from the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission to this Rainier View customer, I strongly request that the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (1) deny the filed surcharges, (2) make the "Settlement Agreement" between the Rainer View Water Company and Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission Staff available to the Rainier View customers, and (3) review and assess all future filings for rate / surcharge / assessment / fee increases by Rainier View Water Company with the Rainier View customers' / public's interests in mind.

For your response and consideration,

Philip T. Smith
6811 242nd St E
Graham, WA 98338-9407
253-847-8481
ptssmith@comcast.net
Rainier View acct # 1.10.087600.00

Atch: Rainier View Water Co April 27, 2012, letter.

COMMENT FORM FOR: TINA CHRISTIANSEN - ID# 27723

Consumer Information			
		Contact Method	○ Email ● Mail ○ None
Name	TINA CHRISTIANSEN		
Organization Company			
Address City, State, Zip Code	19623 71ST AVE CRT E SPANAWAY WASHINGTON 98387		
Email			
Primary Phone #	253-375-6263	Fax #	
Secondary Phone #			

Comment Information			
Theme	Frequent Increases	Open Date	05/11/2012
Filing Support	○ Yes ● No ○ Undecided	Closed Date	
Source	○ Email ● Phone ○ In person ○ Mail ○ Web	Web Create Date	
Public Involvement Lead	John Cupp		
Duplicate Comment	○ Yes ● No		
Description	Cant afford this or any more rate increases.		
Attachments			

Issue Information	
Issue ID	541
Company	Rainier View Water Company, Inc.
Filing	110054
Staff	Amy White

Activites For Tina Christiansen

COMMENT FORM FOR: WILLIAM WILSON - ID# 27715

Consumer Information			
		Contact Method	○ Email ● Mail ○ None
Name	WILLIAM WILSON		
Organization Company			
Address City, State, Zip Code	2602 71ST AVE CT NW GIG HARBOR WASHINGTON 98335		
Email			
Primary Phone #		Fax #	
Secondary Phone #			

Comment Information			
Theme	No Alternative	Open Date	05/07/2012
Filing Support	○ Yes ● No ○ Undecided	Closed Date	
Source	○ Email ○ Phone ○ In person ● Mail ○ Web	Web Create Date	
Public Involvement Lead	John Cupp		
Duplicate Comment	○ Yes ● No		
Description	Opposes surcharge to be used for funding a private pipline connecting Lakewood Water District when Mr lives in Gig Harbor.		
Attachments	William Wilson.pdf		

Issue Information	
Issue ID	541
Company	Rainier View Water Company, Inc.
Filing	110054
Staff	Amy White

Activites For William Wilson

2602 71st Ave. Ct. NW
Gig Harbor, WA 98335
May 4, 2012

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
1300 S Evergreen Park Dr. SW
P.O. Box 47250
Olympia, WA 98504-7250

Dear Sirs:

I was recently notified of the proposed Rainier View Water Co. surcharges to be used for funding a private pipeline connecting to the Lakewood Water District. Surcharges of $2.00 per month (phase I) and $5.40 per month (phase II) will be imposed on all Rainier View customers. I am writing to submit a public comment for consideration by the Commission. I am not opposed to construction of the pipeline; I am not opposed to applying surcharges to those customers who directly benefit from the pipeline; and I am not opposed to a Lakewood Pipeline Facilities Charge that applies to customers who directly benefit from the pipeline. I strongly oppose surcharges being imposed on customers who do not directly benefit from the proposed pipeline.

I live in unincorporated Pierce County on the Gig Harbor Peninsula. Rainier View provides water to the area in which I live. It obtains the water from wells located on the Gig Harbor Peninsula. I am paying them to pump water from local wells, then store, process, and distribute it to me. The proposed Lakewood Pipeline has no direct impact on me. Indirectly the pipeline might have a very small impact on me based on the size of the company's customer base and the general administrative and overhead costs supported by that customer base. This minor impact, if any, cannot justify the large surcharges proposed by the company for customers outside of the impacted area.

I understand you may support the pipeline; you may really want them to do this project. It may offer direct benefits to those in the Lakewood area, and other benefits to those in immediately adjacent areas, but it has no benefit to Rainier View customers located on the other side of Puget Sound. The proposed surcharge is unfair to customers located outside of the impact area. I can appreciate that the cost may be high if apportioned to only those who are directly affected by the pipeline, but that does not justify unfairly penalizing unaffected rate-payers. I would urge the company to find a fairer way to finance the project.

The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission is my only advocate who can intervene when a company is unfairly imposing a surcharge on customers who do not benefit from a proposed project. I urge you to require Rainier View to restructure their proposed surcharges so that project costs are born by direct benefactors. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

William M. Wilson

William M. Wilson

COMMENT FORM FOR: DARREN SCHINDLER - ID# 27713

Consumer Information			
		Contact Method	○ Email ○ Mail ● None
Name	DARREN SCHINDLER		
Organization Company			
Address City, State, Zip Code	8013 207TH STREET COURT EAST SPANAWAY WASHINGTON 98387		
Email	dntn3@comcast.net		
Primary Phone #	2538468038	Fax #	
Secondary Phone #			

Comment Information			
Theme		Open Date	05/03/2012
Filing Support	○ Yes ● No ○ Undecided	Closed Date	
Source	○ Email ○ Phone ○ In person ○ Mail ● Web	Web Create Date	05/03/2012
Public Involvement Lead	John Cupp		
Duplicate Comment	○ Yes ○ No		
Description	I oppose Rainier Water company's proposed rate hike. The last general rate hike was approved January 2012. To be quite honest anytime I hear the plan of phase 1 this or phase 2 that along with a promise that it will go away has never gone away.The costs of this plan do not show any figures as to how much construction costs will be and until that is figured out I feel taking on this project without knowing the estimated costs would be just another increase we all really can't afford in 2012.		
Attachments			

Issue Information	
Issue ID	541
Company	Rainier View Water Company, Inc.
Filing	110054
Staff	Amy White

Activites For Darren Schindler