

COMMENT FORM FOR: THOMAS M BURG - ID# 3006

| Consumer Information | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Confidential Comment | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No |
| Contact Method | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Email <input type="radio"/> Mail <input type="radio"/> None |
| Name | THOMAS M BURG |
| Organization Company | |
| Address | [REDACTED] |
| City, State, Zip Code | EASTSOUND WASHINGTON 98245 |
| Email | [REDACTED] |
| Primary Phone # | [REDACTED] |
| Fax # | |
| Secondary Phone # | [REDACTED] |

| Comment Information | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Theme | Open Date 05/17/2007 |
| Filing Support | <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Undecided |
| Closed Date | |
| Source | <input type="radio"/> Email <input type="radio"/> Mail <input type="radio"/> Phone <input checked="" type="radio"/> Web |
| Web Create Date | 05/15/2007 |
| Public Involvement Lead | Lynda Johnson |
| Duplicate Comment | <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No |

Description We received a letter from the utility in which an online source for review of their rate increase was listed. The letter was dated the 10th of the month and arrived on the 15th; however there appears to be no online source or reference to the rate increase - why?

Second comment 5/15/07; 3:01pm
 The rate currently established is as a result of a petition made by myself and another Rosario resident at the last rate increase hearing - we asked that meter readings and billings be based upon a per gallon basis since all meters read in gallons and it was accepted as a valid means of recording and billing. Why then are they seeking to reverse that and implement a 100 gallon+ basis for which you pay regardless of usage?

The most equitable means of billing/measuring remains as a per gallon basis with rates per gallon aligned along an increase in cost for abusers of the water (i.e. those who do not conserve but have high usage. The current request deviates from the more equitable approach and in fact puts the highest costs on the conservation minded low end users and not the high end, this is contradictory to the present goal for the state to award conservation and penalize the high end users? Why would this be acceptable?

Third comment 5/16/07; 10:00am
 The current application is not posted on the active list. In addition there is very little

information available upon which to refute the request for increase. A previous submittal has not been added to public comment for this docket.

Fourth comment, 5/24:

In documents filed by the utility and presented to customers the utility has noted that they lost money in two of the years since the last rate increase. Rather than seek another increase following the reduction in connections anticipated by the utility, they waited even longer?

They filed documents at that time and used their calculations and cost projections for that - just as they have done for this increase - why should the consumer believe that the figures are any better calculated? They have not demonstrated an appropriate ability to operate and maintain a utility or instilled any consumer confidence while providing service. In addition they continued to demonstrate fiscal misappropriation of expenses by not seeking to lower high rate loans?

Prior to finding a potential buyer they announced that they would have to, and were going to, build a new plant that would complete the treatment needs for full residential and resort build out. In fact we were told by the utility that they had acquired the appropriate approval for the loan to build. Despite the fact that it would have provided more revenue, made the utility more valuable, and the Resort property more valuable they failed to implement this capital improvement which could guarantee sales interest.

The financial information needed for a proper review of how the utility has managed funds, repairs, loans, etc. are unavailable to the very customer they serve (not an unusual experience over the years) making any examination of their filing impossible? Why would they need to withhold this from the review process, even if they have a pending sale, unless the information would impact the filings and the decision? Why would the potential buyer request a non-disclosure? Is it the intent of the WUTC, who is the regulatory authority and "our" only source of fair play, to promote one more layer of misinformation?

If the facts surrounding the operation of this utility and then the new owner are mired in obscurity, how will we ever know what the real costs and requirements are to fairly evaluate current/future rate requests?

Since the utility can seek and be approved for a 12% profit - a figure that many businesses would love to have as a guarantee - why can we not put all the cards on the table and arrive at a fair and equitable rate for consumers and resort use based on metering by the gallon and with an all in cost per gallon. This would guarantee that every gallon used would be billed at a rate that could reflect a conservation incentive based rate scale which would include the funds for operation, maintenance, loans, etc.. Even the intermittent seasonal user can be accommodated with a monthly billing amount that they pay when not using water.

Attachments

Follow-Up Information

Other Follow-Up Information