

Public Comments by Case

Total Comments: 466**In Favor:** 0**Opposed:** 466**Undecided:** 0

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
No			
	Abigail latner	Web	The proposed rate increase is astronomical- a majority of people who use cascadia would have trouble paying their water bill with this increase. Cascadia is asking for way too much and a smaller rate increase or no increase should be considered
	Adam Shantz	E-mail	<p>I wanted to reach out to you to let you know that these very steep rate increases affect our quality of life and our community at large. It would be one thing if policy allowed for a manageable increase for both the consumer and the water utility and capped it at a certain threshold increase over a period of time. As it is, there is little transparency, required on the part of the utility in terms of the cost of maintenance and improvements of the utility's infrastructure and, therefore, they can raise our usage rates by an alarming amount, apparently, every other year. Something reasonable needs to be done. We were here two years ago and here we are again. We intend to fight it again and we do have a representative in place and are retaining counsel, but the underlying issue is that the utility can just raise our rates by unscrupulous amounts. Please help us and be a voice for a more stable policy regarding water usage costs.</p>
	Alex Ayoub	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>As the final opportunity for ratepayers to comment approaches, we urge you to consider our concerns. Cascadia has failed to justify their \$6.5M+ capital improvements, and the proposed rate increases are neither necessary nor beneficial. Public Counsel Tad O'Neill's remarks highlight the importance of rejecting this rate filing, emphasizing that shareholders should bear the burden of Cascadia's mismanagement, not ratepayers.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no evidence that consolidation or single tariff pricing benefits ratepayers, as proven in the previous rate case, UW-200979. The only difference in case UW-240151 is Cascadia's uncontrolled expenses aimed at maximizing profits. This would result in the largest rate increase in a decade, with base rates potentially doubling and per cubic foot costs skyrocketing.</p> <p>Lastly, it is crucial to remember that Whidbey Island is a Superfund clean-up site with PFAS contamination. Future</p>

			<p>costs could be substantial, and no ratepayer should be burdened by these decisions or subsidize systems from which they receive no benefit. Each system must bear its own costs for capital improvements.</p> <p>We request the UTC to support local citizens and taxpayers who are at risk of yet another corporate attack on our pocketbooks. Water is a sacred resource for local communities and should be treated as such.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, Alex Ayoub</p>
	Ali Deatherage	Web	<p>Opposition to Proposed Rate Increase by Cascadia Water in Lake Alyson Community</p> <p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues. I cannot wash my hands and run my dishwasher at the same time. This seems ridiculous already and especially ridiculous given the high rate increases</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter</p>
	Allen and Pam Balla	E-mail	<p>I feel trapped with rising costs in an already inflationary economy. I understand Cascadia wants to recapture expenditures but we were never part of that conversation. Improvements made to a water system they purchased are just part of normal business practices that is what I do when I make improvements to my home but I don't ask my neighbors to pay for them. Please protect us from these extreme increases.</p> <p>Thank you, Allen and Pam Balla</p>
	Allen Balla	E-mail	<p>So here we go again. 94% asked for increase I assume they are shooting high and hoping a 50% will sound real good to us. Listen, I get it they made some improvements but that's the cost of doing business. I make home improvements and it increases my equity, but I don't ask my neighbors to pay for it! They need to ask us first if the improvements they want to make are justified (they did not).</p> <p>Help us as you are all we have, Allen Balla</p>

	Alwyn L Wheeler	Web	Increases of 101% for a public resource in my opinion is way to much. I understand the cost and upkeep on the water system need to be kept reasonable to the consumer. I ask that you disapprove this outrageous increase.
	Amanda Payne	E-mail	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I'm writing to you today about a proposed water rate increase that I received from Cascadia Water, our residential water service. We are a part of the Lake Alyson Water District, and are a single residential community of around 50 homes. This service was provided by Northwest Water Services until Cascadia purchased them. Before that, it was provided by a small company in Arlington run by a single woman who knew all our names and was genuinely honest about the services she provided.</p> <p>Since we purchased our home in 2015, we have gone from a small company that provided services, to a big corporation that is profit driven. This company has done little to improve our services, in fact, little has changed other than the monthly meter readers. Our service remains a shared well that requires only a filtration system, a few pumps and a generator. Despite that, since Northwest Water Services acquired our water system, we have already seen an 80% increase in our rates since 2015.</p> <p>With this proposed increase, we will see an increase of 350% to our water bill since 2015 (not even 10 years). This is not an exaggeration. Our first year living here, our water bill averaged \$28 per month. With this proposed rate increase, our bill will reach \$108 per month. Our current bill is \$49 per month. This is nearly quadruple our rates 10 years ago. And this is over double what we are paying now. This would be a rate increase of nearly 350% in less than 10 years. THIS IS UNSUSTAINABLE.</p> <p>Our water system is not complex. It does not require extreme maintenance and does not need "high tech solutions". What it does need are sustainable rates. Their argument that this will make rates "even" for all the systems is unfair. Why should we have to pay double the rates for someone else's water system? Our system was not included in their "key infrastructure projects", why should we be forced to pay for them?</p> <p>Not only that, but just down the road is Snohomish County PUD's main water service pumps. PUD provides service for everyone else not in our tiny neighborhood. Their rates will be just a little over half of what this proposed increase will be. I would much prefer that SnoCo PUD take over our water service, if this is the case.</p> <p>While I cannot attend your meeting, I would greatly appreciate someone looking into our individual water system, and the exorbitant rate increases they are proposing. I think you will find that their costs do not justify the proposed increase.</p>

	Amber Maddalena	E-mail	<p>Dear utility regulatory commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the rate increase by Cascadia water company for the Lake Alyson community in granite falls washington.</p> <p>The significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable.</p> <p>Our community well has not received any updates or improvements, and the rate increase does not propose to update or improve our community well. Additionally we often experience intermittent water pressure issues.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a vote of voluntary service, and formally file a cost complaint against cascadia water company.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p>
	Amy Fenlon	E-mail	<p>I am writing to express my concern regarding the Cascadia Water’s request for a rate increase for my neighborhood's water system on Bacus Hill, Sedro Woolley, WA- we are on a local community well of about 50 homes, formerly owned by Northwest Water Services. Cascadia Water purchased our small water system, along with 4 others in the last 2 years- a huge expansion of their corporation in a short period of time. They now want to raise our rates by 75%. They report that the rate increase is “to recover costs” ... They list one improvement specifically identified to Bacus Hill, and 4 other general improvements that could be attributed to Bacus Hill, though some of these are infrastructure costs that will likely provide cost savings for their company in the future. Eight of the 13 improvements listed, are stated to be improvements to other water systems, and four seem to be major infrastructure improvements specific to the Island County system. We are asking, as Bacus Hill residents, if we are being asked to bear a heavy financial cost of these other system improvements of the last two years.</p> <p>Cascadia Water is also stating that they want to “consolidate the Northwest Water Services system (of which Bacus Hill is part) into their Island/Mainland rate structure”. They state that “it will provide long-term benefits for all of its customers by developing a larger customer base.” They report “revising and consolidating rates...will promote more efficient use of billing and SPREAD COSTS EVENLY AND MORE BROADLY ACROSS EACH RATE STRUCTURE- That sounds like it will be a cost saving measure and improved efficiency for the company which will lead to increased profits, but how does it benefit the Bacus Hill customer?</p> <p>Cascadia Water states that they are asking for an average monthly increase of 84% for their Island/Mainland System, of which they propose Bacus Hill will be a part. The increase of the base rate for a 5/8” or 3/4" from \$43 to \$56 a month, may be reasonable. But the first cubic block rate, up to 500 cu ft, (dropped from 668 cu ft) is proposed to go from \$1.30 to \$5.52 per cubic ft; and the 2nd block rate of 501-10009 is going from \$2.40 to \$8.72 per cubic ft. And all of these cubic blocks are being reduced by 25%.</p> <p>Bacus Hill is a rural largely 20-acre plot neighborhood on Bacus Hill consisting of forest lands and gardens sequestering carbon to help the environment. A reasonable amount of water is needed to maintain this habitat and to keep enough moisture in our grounds to deter possible wildfires which are a growing concern these days. We are not an urban neighborhood and should not expect to have water consumption similar to them. It is with great sadness that, what we consider as a basic need, “water”, has become a commodity, with an expectation of profits. Ground water in Washington has been determined to belong to the people of Washington. A private company providing the</p>

			<p>delivery of water which the people own, should not be given the opportunity for rapid growth and profit, and expect to pass these costs on to their customers. We, as customers, have no other option to get water elsewhere in a free market- this is a monopoly on our water, and we are being held hostage to it.- we cannot live without water.</p> <p>I recommend that the Bacus Hill water system continue to be maintained as a separate water billing system. If the other water systems have had costly system improvements, the costs of those should be paid by the system that will feel the benefits, not water systems that have needed little improvements.</p> <p>We understand that rate increases are inevitable; but increases should be gradual and reasonable for customers to adjust to over an extended period of time.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of this matter. Amy Fenlon</p>
	Amy Fenlon	E-mail	<p>Dear UTC Commissioners</p> <p>Regarding: Docket Number :UW-240151 Cascadia Water - request for rate increase</p> <p>Below is a copy of my letter sent in May 2024 to you following Cascadia Water's request for a water rate increase. Everything that I stated below still stands, except that Cascadia Water has come back now and proposed for my household an 80% average monthly bill increase, rather than an 84% one, effective May 2025. My average monthly bill would jump to \$102/mth., from a present average of \$57/mth. Their new proposal is a \$2.57/mth decrease for our neighborhood, from their original proposal in May. This can't even buy a cup of coffee. I am not privy to the average proposed rate increase for other water systems in Cascadia Water's customer base. I am still very concerned that our little water system on Bacus Hill is bearing an unrealistic cost increase to benefit a proposed "consolidated" water system. I advocate for a slow rate increase over a period of several years for our Bacus Hill water system to adjust to.</p> <p>I am writing to express my concern regarding the Cascadia Water's request for a rate increase for my neighborhood's water system on Bacus Hill, Sedro Woolley, WA- we are on a local community well of about 50 homes, formerly owned by Northwest Water Services. Cascadia Water purchased our small water system, along with 4 others in the last 2 years- a huge expansion of their corporation in a short period of time. They now want to raise our rates by 75%. They report that the rate increase is "to recover costs" ... They list one improvement specifically identified to Bacus Hill, and 4 other general improvements that could be attributed to Bacus Hill, though some of these are infrastructure costs that will likely provide cost savings for their company in the future. Eight of the 13 improvements listed, are stated to be improvements to other water systems, and four seem to be major infrastructure improvements specific to the Island County system. We are asking, as Bacus Hill residents, if we are being asked to bear a heavy financial cost of these other system improvements of the last two years.</p> <p>Cascadia Water is also stating that they want to "consolidate the Northwest Water Services system (of which Bacus Hill is part) into their Island/Mainland rate structure". They state that "it will provide long-term benefits for all of its</p>

			<p>customers by developing a larger customer base.” They report “revising and consolidating rates...will promote more efficient use of billing and SPREAD COSTS EVENLY AND MORE BROADLY ACROSS EACH RATE STRUCTURE- That sounds like it will be a cost saving measure and improved efficiency for the company which will lead to increased profits, but how does it benefit the Bacus Hill customer?</p> <p>Cascadia Water states that they are asking for an average monthly increase of 84% for their Island/Mainland System, of which they propose Bacus Hill will be a part. The increase of the base rate for a 5/8” or 3/4" from \$43 to \$56 a month, may be reasonable. But the first cubic block rate, up to 500 cu ft, (dropped from 668 cu ft) is proposed to go from \$1.30 to \$5.52 per cubic ft; and the 2nd block rate of 501-10009 is going from \$2.40 to \$8.72 per cubic ft. And all of these cubic blocks are being reduced by 25%.</p> <p>Bacus Hill is a rural largely 20-acre plot neighborhood on Bacus Hill consisting of forest lands and gardens sequestering carbon to help the environment. A reasonable amount of water is needed to maintain this habitat and to keep enough moisture in our grounds to deter possible wildfires which are a growing concern these days. We are not an urban neighborhood and should not expect to have water consumption similar to them. It is with great sadness that, what we consider as a basic need, “water”, has become a commodity, with an expectation of profits. Ground water in Washington has been determined to belong to the people of Washington. A private company providing the delivery of water which the people own, should not be given the opportunity for rapid growth and profit, and expect to pass these costs on to their customers. We, as customers, have no other option to get water elsewhere in a free market- this is a monopoly on our water, and we are being held hostage to it.- we cannot live without water. I recommend that the Bacus Hill water system continue to be maintained as a separate water billing system. If the other water systems have had costly system improvements, the costs of those should be paid by the system that will feel the benefits, not water systems that have needed little improvements.</p> <p>We understand that rate increases are inevitable; but increases should be gradual and reasonable for customers to adjust to over an extended period of time.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of this matter.</p> <p>Amy Fenlon</p>
	Amy McVee	Web	<p>I am writing to comment on the proposed rate increases by Cascadia for the Pelican Point subdivision in Moses Lake.</p> <p>The rate increase for water meters is simply too high and beyond the usual and customary charges for Moses Lake:</p> <p>1) The current monthly rate for a water meter is \$26. Cascadia proposes to nearly double this to \$51 per month. Even Amazon and Netflix raise their prices, but they don’t double the cost of a subscription in one year.</p> <p>2) Benchmarking: the current rate of \$26 per water meter per month is in line with the water system charges for our nearest water utility neighbor, the city of Moses Lake. The cheapest meter in Quincy is \$18.50 per month and includes 400 cf of usage; our neighbor to the south, Othello, has a monthly meter fee of \$35.53. Similar issues can be found with the pricing for water as described by Cascadia, although not quite as severe. Even Cascadia admits</p>

			<p>that water meter rates for households in the Pelican Point subdivision would increase by 97%.</p> <p>3) What can we expect for our meter rates increasing from \$300 to \$600+ per year and our average monthly bills increasing from 92 to 103%? The letter from Cascadia mentions multiple projects in western Washington while Pelican Point in eastern Washington gets one line mentioning chlorination, which doesn't justify a 100% rate increase. What this means is that increased revenue from Pelican Point would be drained by Cascadia to benefit water systems that are geographically distant from ours.</p> <p>It's unclear from the Cascadia letter (undated) whether the majority of the infrastructure projects are operating in eastern Washington. In general, these projects should be about improving efficiency and conserving water, resulting in lower costs for the consumer, not price gouging because they have a monopoly.</p> <p>The rate proposal increases are unreasonable, unrealistic and out of line with local water utility rates in eastern Washington. Cascadia does not offer improved efficiency or assistance in conserving water. It may be that rates have to be raised but Cascadia needs to do a better job of explaining this to its eastern Washington consumers.</p> <p>DON'T RAISE THE RATES!</p>
	Ander Robinson	E-mail	<p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission, I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living. Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues. In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water. Thank you for your attention to this matter</p>
	Andrea Marsden	E-mail	<p>Hello Melissa,</p> <p>I got your contact information from the lady who is organizing the Water Consumer Advocates of the Olympic Peninsula. I live in Sequim and am part of the Estates system.</p> <p>I received Cascadia Water's letter describing their application to the UTC to increase their rates. It turns out, they want to increase Estates' rates by 100%.</p> <p>I understand the need for additional revenue, especially with inflation and the cost of everything going up, but cost increases also affect homeowners and consumers. If you add 100% more to the cost of water for us, we will need to cut back in other areas (food and healthcare come to mind), or not pay our water bills. There is only so much that consumers can afford - we are not endless sources of money for companies to tap into whenever they need more revenue. As far as I am aware, the Estates system has no alternative to a source of water aside from Cascadia's system. To me, it seems unreasonable to expect water consumers to shoulder a 100% increase in the amount we pay for something that is required for all living things. In addition, I already pay \$24/month (\$288/year) as a base rate just to be part of the Estates system, whether I use any water or not. What does Cascadia use that money for? They want to double it AND increase the rate for gallons used. I'm sure you've seen their block rate figures - for the first</p>

			<p>block (0-500 cubic feet), they want to raise the rate OVER 100%, from \$1.00 to \$2.83, and the subsequent blocks are the same, increasing by more than 100%. The example Average Monthly Bill Impact is not accurate at all, especially for the summer months when everyone in my neighborhood waters their garden and fruit trees.</p> <p>I would like to see more information from Cascadia on how they have "prudently managed operating expenses" and what they are going to be doing to further reduce their operating costs.</p> <p>There are a large number of retired citizens living in my neighborhood, who are all on limited incomes. I think a 100% increase is unreasonable and unfair. We didn't ask Cascadia to buy other, smaller private water systems, and before they did, they should have made sure they had the finances to cover repairs and maintenance of these new systems. We do not have an alternative to Cascadia's water system, so without UTC help, we are screwed.</p> <p>Thank you very much for reading this. I appreciate your thoughtful consideration and discussion at the UTC of this rate increase, and hope you agree with me that it is unreasonable.</p> <p>Kind regards, Andrea Marsden</p>
	Andrew L	Web	<p>Doubling service rates is unconscionable. In my latest bi-monthly bill, my water usage accounted for a grand total of \$4; I can't get much more water-conservative than that. Under the proposed rate change, the time it would take for installing my own water well to pay for itself would drop, from about ten years, to just over three years.</p> <p>I would contend that if the company needs extra capital to cover expenses, they can divest from some of their extensive service portfolio across Washington, Oregon, Arizona, and Texas.</p> <p>I will admit that I am of the persuasion that believes Utilities should not be run for-profit.</p>
	Annie B	E-mail	<p>I am writing to please ask you to Not increase our water rates, especially not by 94%!!! I moved here in 2018, and one of the draws to moving here concerned the low cost of water. I am a 71-year-old woman living in Monterra, and on a fixed income. My cost of living raise by Social Security has not allowed for everything else that has gone up recently such as medical, car and house insurance; utilities, and groceries. I already have had to "tighten my belt" and have canceled frills such as cable, hobbies, and eating out. I started a garden to help with food costs and am doing my own yardwork. Most of my clothes I wear are over 10 years old and have only bought shoes to replace holey ones. I am really struggling financially, so PLEASE don't add to my burden.</p> <p>Most sincerely, A very concerned Senior Citizen</p>

Anthony Chambers	Web	<p>I received a notice from Cascadia Water about their request to the Washington UTC for a rate increase. If the rate increase is allowed it essentially doubles the water bills of the citizens of Pelican Point community in Moses Lake, WA. Currently the water supply issues in our community revolve around very poor water pressure, especially in the summer when yard watering is in full swing. this to the point of not enough pressure to rotate sprinkler heads or watering in the middle of the day to obtain enough pressure to accomplish the task. In the letter from Cascadia it was outlined that the only enhancement of the Pelican Point water system was installing chlorine analyzers. nothing addressing the pressure issues. The citizens of Pelican Point community are captured patrons of the Cascadia Water monopoly with no other options. I request that the UTC deny the the rate increase request that doubles water bills of the citizens of our community. Thank you.</p>
Anthony D Chambers	Web	<p>docket number-UW-240151</p> <p>I am unable to attend the public comment sessions but want to voice my concerns as a consumer and customer of Cascadia Water. The proposal submitted by Cascadia Water basically doubles the costs of water for the citizens of Pelican Point community of Moses Lake, WA.</p> <p>Cascadia has a monopoly on water supply for our community. I understand that many services are awarded monopolies with the understanding that the monopoly frees the companies from market competition with a small profit for the company and affordable and reliable service for the customers who have no choice. I have no idea what Cascadia Water's profits are or what they pay their employees or more importantly their executives or how that compares to other water companies, but the proposed rate increases seem to me to be exploiting a monopoly. The only protection we citizens and consumers have is the WUTC. I ask that the rate increase proposed by Cascadia Water be denied. Thank you.</p>
Antoinette Fulkerson	Web	<p>April 26, 2024</p> <p>Dear Washington Utilites & Transportation Commission:</p> <p>Cascadia Water, LLC sent everyone in our Monterra 55 and older community a letter saying they're requesting that you approve a 94% increase in our water bill effective June 1, 2024.</p> <p>I live in an old trailer in this community. My only income is social security and I have no savings. When Cascadia purchased our water company, Cascadia's owners told us that they planned to install meters and that our water bills would not go up very much. 94% is outrageous!</p> <p>My only income is social security. My husband died in 2013. I do not water my lawn in the summer, I take short showers. My faucets and toilets do not leak. I have a wash machine that conserves water.</p> <p>Please do not approve Cascadia Water's proposed rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Antoinette Fulkerson</p>

	Ashley and Curtis Hackworth	E-mail	<p>Hello, I am writing to comment on the proposed rate increase that we are facing from Cascadia Water. UW-240151</p> <p>This has been an extremely frustrating case as we are on a small (8 home) shared well managed by this company. They have been extremely unhelpful in the time of their management. Our water will at times come out brown, has obvious dirt particles in it at times (occurs occasionally during winter season, so can not be blamed on summer and low levels). We have extremely HORRIBLE water volume/pressure; at all times of the year- but especially summer when usage is high. They have had no resolution to this. There are times when the water is trickling out of our faucets. To the point I can barely rinse my hair in the shower because the water volume is so poor. We have children that can't play in the sprinklers because our volume is so low the sprinklers barely work. We tried planting new grass a couple years back and could barely water the grass. You can imagine how frustrating this is especially when they are trying to potentially double our rates and we can't even use our water as should be intended. Multiple of us on this well have made complaints and have gotten no resolution. This company has done nothing to assist with our water concerns but is more than happy to take our money- including "accidental" double billing of all 8 of our homes. Our next steps are to explore how to get annexed into the city to get away from this horrible water company as we all feel that if we are paying for water we should have full access to water usage. If they are going to increase our rates we need to be provided with better water quality and consistent availability to all the homes on this system.</p> <p>Thank you for reading my concerns.</p> <p>Ashley Hackworth</p>
	Aylanah Chartier	E-mail	<p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues. On another note, I have been concerned about the accuracy of my current water usage readings, seeing as even after fixing a bad leak my usage readings haven't seemed to change at all since.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter</p>

	Barb Walberg	Web	I am opposed to the rate increase. I don't want to subsidized other systems. The new large 33-foot-tall tower is in my front yard, and I don't believe we need this tower. Nor the new generator. This is wasted money. I am absolutely opposed this. I am senior citizen on a fixed income and cannot afford a 92% rate increase.
	Barbara Brugman	Web	<p>“Your current water rates will not change because of this water system sale and transfer.” This is what Lehman Enterprises, Inc. (Lehman) represented to the UTC and to Lehman customers in a letter dated August 30, 2018. At that time, Lehman was seeking UTC permission to be absorbed by Cascadia Water, LLC and Cascadia’s ultimate parent, Northwest Natural Gas Company, Portland, Oregon. The August 30, 2018 letter is available on the UTC web site.</p> <p>We customers, of course, realized our water prices wouldn’t stay the same forever. And indeed, in mid-2021, Cascadia embarked on a series of rate increases. In fact these were hefty increases, heftier than one might expect given Lehman’s letter of assurance from three years earlier. Between July 2021 and the end of 2022, Cascadia boosted the base rate by 68%, from \$17.50 to \$29.35 a month, and increased by 200% the rate for Block 1, from \$0.75 to \$2.25 per 100 cu ft of water usage. Any Cascadia customer who used even a meager amount of water would be paying at a 200% higher rate in the Block 1 usage category than before the company ownership change. Those were very substantial rate increases for Cascadia Water’s customers.</p> <p>But on top of those recent price increases Cascadia Water is now asking for additional, and truly crushing, rate increases. The current proposal means that we customers would be paying an additional 91% more for the base rate and 145% more for Block 1 usage - - the proposed rate change from June 2024 to July 2024.</p> <p>Even more dramatic, compare the water prices in effect a short three years ago (June 2021) with the July 2024 increases now being proposed. Looking at that 3-year period, Cascadia’s rates would rise by 220% for the base rate and 636% for the Block 1 usage rate. This is a truly out of control rate escalation and will be onerous for Cascadia’s customers.</p> <p>^[1]_{SEP} We understand that the recent acquisition of new service areas and some investments in the infrastructure adds to the Cascadia’s cost of operation. And we customers would hope to benefit from improvements in water quality and reliability. So, we would understand the occasional modest price increase in our water charges, commensurate with an improved quality of service. But Cascadia has called for price increases that are not modest; they are excessive. To put matters in perspective, we note that even during the recent high inflation years of 2018 through 2023, the cumulated inflation rates amounted to less than 25 percent over the five year period, much less than the water rate increases Cascadia has proposed. Between 2018 and 2023, the Consumer Price Index (CPI) rose by some 20 to 22 percent cumulatively, and the Producer Price Index (PPI) by 20 to 23 percent, according to the data published by Bureau of Labor Statistics, US. Department of Labor. Similarly, the price indexes for the gross domestic product rose by some 22 percent, according Economic Report of the President (2024).</p> <p>We recognize that Cascadia is a private business whose owners or investors stand to gain by growing their water company into a more valuable asset. They evidently have made business decisions that these investments make business sense. We customers might benefit, but only if our water quality/reliability improves. Personally, we are unaware of any quality improvements to date in our own water area (Lehman) but remain hopeful.</p> <p>Water is the most essential item for sustaining life. Other food items also are essential, but there is a key difference. When the price of, say, milk is increased at our neighbor store, we can look for lower prices in other stores and/or</p>

			<p>search for substitute items for milk. Since Cascadia is the sole supplier of water in our neighborhood, however, we cannot look for a less costly supplier. Yes, we can reduce the use of water, but the extent to which we can do so is limited.</p> <p>We request that the UTC reject the new price increases Cascadia Water has proposed and scrutinize the need for any price increases at all, given the generous 2021-2022 increases now in effect.</p>
	Barbara Brugman and Masanori Hashimoto	E-mail	<p>“Your current water rates will not change because of this water system sale and transfer.” This is what Lehman Enterprises, Inc. (Lehman) represented to the UTC and to Lehman customers in a letter dated August 30, 2018. At that time, Lehman was seeking UTC permission to be absorbed by Cascadia Water, LLC and Cascadia’s ultimate parent, Northwest Natural Gas Company, Portland, Oregon. The August 30, 2018 letter is available on the UTC web site.</p> <p>We customers, of course, realized our water prices wouldn’t stay the same forever. And indeed, in mid-2021, Cascadia embarked on a series of rate increases. In fact these were hefty increases, heftier than one might expect given Lehman’s letter of assurance from three years earlier. Between July 2021 and the end of 2022, Cascadia boosted the base rate by 68%, from \$17.50 to \$29.35 a month, and increased by 200% the rate for Block 1, from \$0.75 to \$2.25 per 100 cu ft of water usage. Any Cascadia customer who used even a meager amount of water would be paying at a 200% higher rate in the Block 1 usage category than before the company ownership change. Those were very substantial rate increases for Cascadia Water’s customers.</p> <p>But on top of those recent price increases Cascadia Water is now asking for additional, and truly crushing, rate increases. The current proposal means that we customers would be paying an additional 91% more for the base rate and 145% more for Block 1 usage - - the proposed rate change from June 2024 to July 2024.</p> <p>Even more dramatic, compare the water prices in effect a short three years ago (June 2021) with the July 2024 increases now being proposed. Looking at that 3-year period, Cascadia’s rates would rise by 220% for the base rate and 636% for the Block 1 usage rate. This is a truly out of control rate escalation and will be onerous for Cascadia’s customers.</p> <p>We understand that the recent acquisition of new service areas and some investments in the infrastructure adds to the Cascadia’s cost of operation. And we customers would hope to benefit from improvements in water quality and reliability. So, we would understand the occasional modest price increase in our water charges, commensurate with an improved quality of service. But Cascadia has called for price increases that are not modest; they are excessive. To put matters in perspective, we note that even during the recent high inflation years of 2018 through 2023, the cumulated inflation rates amounted to less than 25 percent over the five year period, much less than the water rate increases Cascadia has proposed. Between 2018 and 2023, the Consumer Price Index (CPI) rose by some 20 to 22 percent cumulatively, and the Producer Price Index (PPI) by 20 to 23 percent, according to the data published by Bureau of Labor Statistics, US. Department of Labor. Similarly, the price indexes for the gross domestic product rose by some 22 percent, according Economic Report of the President (2024).</p> <p>We recognize that Cascadia is a private business whose owners or investors stand to gain by growing their water company into a more valuable asset. They evidently have made business decisions that these investments make business sense. We customers might benefit, but only if our water quality/reliability improves. Personally, we are unaware of any quality improvements to date in our own water area (Lehman) but remain hopeful.</p>

			<p>Water is the most essential item for sustaining life. Other food items also are essential, but there is a key difference. When the price of, say, milk is increased at our neighborhood store, we can look for lower prices in other stores and/or search for substitute items for milk. Since Cascadia is the sole supplier of water in our neighborhood, however, we cannot look for a less costly supplier. Yes, we can reduce the use of water, but the extent to which we can do so is limited.</p> <p>We request that the UTC reject the new rate increases Cascadia Water has proposed and scrutinize the need for any rate increases at all, given the generous 2021-2022 increases currently in effect.</p> <p>Barbara Brugman and Masanori Hashimoto</p>
	Barbara Jean Heessels-Petit	Web	<p>Cascadia's rate increase request is absurd - 94% when inflation & COLAs are closer to 3%. (Is this the opening salvo in a game of asking a whole lot and happy to settle for a lesser (but still healthy % .) I understand that big corporations can upgrade existing systems more easily - that makes some sense - but they can also be greedy - acquiring more systems, monopolizing the field, exercising little control over spending and raising rates, repeatedly! Where do we cut back, when we are already very careful? Who protects the consumers? I fail to understand how all this works - big companies come in, buy up our diminishing natural resources and sell them back to us at what can become exorbitant rates...something is wrong with this picture! What is Cascadia's plan for those of us on the Olympic Peninsula and where is that plan? AND, do we get to have any say in it? Water issues are going to worsen - please do something sensible and longterm now. Thank you, Jean</p>
	Barbara L Bennett	Web	<p>The previous rate hikes and the rate hikes currently proposed put a tremendous burden on retired, fixed income, low or middle income families. How can we afford to be levied some of the highest water rates in the country?</p>
	Barbara L Bennett	Web	<p>The previous rate hikes and the rate hikes currently proposed put a tremendous burden on retired, fixed income, low or middle income families. How can we afford to be levied some of the highest water rates in the country ?</p>
	Benjamin Hu and Janet Tipping	E-mail	<p>Washington Utilities and Transport Commission Re: Case Number 240151</p> <p>We, as home owners and customers of Cascadia Water LLC, object strenuously to the revised proposed rate increases sought by Cascadia Water LLC. The most current rate increase proposal still reflects a nearly 100% rate increase for most water users, and there has been no evidence that this rate increase is justified by actual costs required to operate and maintain the water system currently serving our community.</p> <p>We will unfortunately not be able to participate in the Virtual Public Comment Hearings scheduled for January 13 &</p>

			<p>14, 2025, and would like to submit our comments in this email.</p> <p>Regarding the Complaint and Order Suspending Tariff Revisions published June 28, 2024, to our knowledge, investigations of Cascadia Water LLC's books, accounts, practices, activities, property and operations has not been completed. Cascadia Water LLC's most recent request for another outrageous rate increase remains completely unsupported by any data.</p> <p>In the absence of any hard data supporting the requested rate increase, it is entirely reasonable to conclude that Cascadia Water LLC, which is owned by NW Natural Water LLC, which is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Northwest Natural Holding Company (NYSE:NWN) is only asking for pie in the sky rate increases to satisfy the profit requirements of NWN. NWN has seen purchasing small local water utilities throughout the region and turning them into a monopoly as a cash making operation. It is the UTC's duty to protect the state's citizens from profiteers who have seized what are absolutely essential basic utilities, once owned and operated locally by concerned citizens and residents, and using their monopoly power to extort profits from hapless local residents. It is the UTC's duty to assure that this model of extorting profits from local residents by seizing essential utilities becomes a failure so that essential utilities throughout the state are protected from similar attacks. NWN must fail as a profit generation machine and utilities like Cascadia Water LLC must focus not on generating profits for Private Equity Firms, but on efficient, safe and ethical management of local water systems.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for adding our comments to the case files for consideration.</p> <p>Benjamin Hu and Janet Tipping</p>
	Benjamin Hu and Janet Tipping	E-mail	<p>We received notification of a proposed rate increase that will more than double average water bills for customers of Cascadia Water Systems that is to be presented to the UTC at a meeting at 9:30am on May 23, 2024. We were not provided a docket number for the meeting.</p> <p>While the notification letter mentioned planned projects, there was no mention of financials of Cascadia Water Systems. Current rates provide a steady income stream for operations and profit.</p> <p>The proposed rate increases of over 100% are an outrageous an unjustified grab at profits during a time when inflation has been hurting all homeowners. Cascadia Water has also been moving towards creating a monopoly within the State of Washington by purchasing small community water systems and apparently seeks to leverage this monopoly into a financial bonanza.</p> <p>It is up to the UTC to protect consumers and home owners by ensuring that public utilities are operated to provide safe, reliable public utilities at reasonable rates. Nobody expects utilities to operate at a loss, but when inflation has been between 3 and 7%, it is not inherently reasonable to grant a more than 100% rate increase. The UTC should</p>

			<p>require disclosure of Cascadia Water Systems' full financials including executive and director compensation and profits. In the absence of documented losses, it is unreasonable to implement rate increases that are markedly higher than the general inflation rate.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the rate increase process.</p>
	Benjamin Huang	E-mail	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am a customer of Cascadia water on Whidbey Island. It was just a couple years back when the rates doubled, and now another proposal to double. I sat in on the WUTC hearing then, heard many negative comments about the effects of rate increase, and was disheartened to learn WUTC allowed the full rate increase.</p> <p>Their justification for the new rate increase is capital improvements. But there are little or no capital improvements we can see over many years. The rate increases outran inflation by a wide margin. We need our government to protect us from this unfair rate increase.</p>
	Bill Howard	Web	<p>Just 2 years ago Cascadia Water received approval for a 40% rate increase. Now to add another 75% is excessive. From the information sheet provided by the company, they are acquiring companies rapidly throughout the State, yet claiming rates, i.e. revenues are insufficient. If water supply is a low or inadequate return business why are they investing resources into the field?</p> <p>Again from the information sheet, it appears there is some confusion of what is expense and what is capital investment. Eight of the nine items listed are long term taxable life assets which should be amortized over an extended period not treated as an annual expense. It appears maintenance has been deferred for many years on what are small, and discontinuous systems. Bringing continuity to what is described as a fractured business will be good for customers in the long run, but should not occur as what amounts to a financial penalty for the consumers in the near term. The requested rate increase should be rejected as an inadequate presentation and reworked into a more well developed proposal.</p>
	Billie Jean Winship	Web	<p>In 2024 our private well was turned over to Cascadia. It serviced about 15 residences.</p> <p>We were told that the month rate would be around \$47.00. Then, less than 6 months later, the rates have gone up considerably. I feel that this rate increase is unfair and deceptive. I believe Cascadia knew prior to taking over our well that they were planning a huge rate increase and we weren't told. We would like to have our well back.</p>
	BillieJean Scott	Web	We can barely afford water as it is. Big No
	Blair Kipple	E-mail	<p>Washington State UTC,</p> <p>Cascadia Water has apparently requested approval for a 75% rate increase !</p> <p>75% !</p>

			<p>It appears, from the letter I received, that the projected rate increase for my service will be ... 50% ! Not 10%, not 20%.... 50% ! Our bill would be 1.5 times the current cost.</p> <p>Is the required revenue requested because of poor business practices? Over extended investment? If so, are the customers to be continually expected to cover for unsound business operations? For a requested 50-75% increase, UTC should get to the bottom of this matter and provide an objective explanation to the customers. When can the customers on this system expect to receive a justification from UTC?</p> <p>UTC has approved increases in water rates on this system numerous times since I have been a customer. The last I checked, our water rates were much higher compared to other providers in our area. Please do not allow a further rate increase at this time.</p> <p>Please advise as to your intentions in this matter.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Blair Kipple</p>
	Board of Clallam County Commission ers	Mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT
	Bob & Dot Schilling	E-mail	<p>REF: Cascadia Water / Peninsula System Docket Number: UW-240151</p> <p>Simply put, we can't support a 97% increase. Since the Monterra Water District sold out to Cascadia, we have seen several rate changes both up then down which has caused us to question their business practices. Not only the rate changes have gone up and down, since we received a new water meter to our home, our usage rates bi-monthly are completely unexplainable. For example, during our peak watering period of June-July, we were charged for 996 cubic-ft. Up from 725 cubic-ft the prior billing period. During the months of June and July, we would be watering our garden, fruit trees, flower beds and washing our vehicles. We don't water our lawn. Our last billing for December - January, we have been charged for 1,304 cubic-ft and we are NOT watering gardens, fruit trees, flowers or washing our vehicles. How can this be? We are two 70 year old retired folks who do our dishes, shower and flush a toilet...</p>

			<p>Then Cascadia tells us in their letter that they have, "...made substantial system-wide investments and completed several key infrastructure projects enhancing service". Here is where transparency comes in. We have no knowledge of any improvements to the Peninsula System that has enhanced our service. so the question is...are we paying for some other system improvements? We have a problem with this business practice.</p> <p>Next, with all the new homes being built in the area, how many are in the Peninsula System that will be adding to Cascadia's bottom line once constructed and occupied? These numbers should be projected into their revenue stream which could reduce base rates and usage block rates.</p> <p>In closing, we are on a fixed income. We paid off our home several years ago to build up savings for our future yet... between all the taxes and service rates going up, we are paying out just as much as our house payment was per month. Between the schools, EMS, Hospital District, Library District, etc., etc., and now our water system wanting a 97% increase... am I going to have to go back to work soon just to live in this state much longer. The home we paid off is needing a roof and a paint job. We have major appliances that we have needed to replace. Just painting our home, bids are coming in nearly \$16K! What's a roof going to cost? And now we may have to pay 97% more for our water and "enhanced services"??</p> <p>Please help the many other people in our situation who live in this Peninsula System who haven't heard of this increase for whatever reason and or won't or can't speak up against such a drastic, unstable and unexplained increase.</p> <p>Best Regards,</p> <p>Bob & Dot Schilling</p>
	Bob and Patti Stallone	E-mail	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>My wife and I just moved into Cascadia Water's service area last October so we are "newcomers" in this area. We understand the cost of everything has and is still going up thanks to our inept government. That's another story. However, a 75% increase in the cost of delivery is something we have never seen in our lifetime. It smacks of mismanagment which I know you will not discuss with customers at this hearing but it is the only logical conclusion that applies here. To allow this increase all at once is extrodinarily unfair and this company should be thoroughly investigated to discover what prompted them to ask for it.</p> <p>Needless to say, we are vehemently against this increase going through without some serious justification provided to the customers. Thank you for listening.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Bob and Patti Stallone</p>

	Bobbie Garza	Web	<p>We all know prices are rising, however Cascadia and the UTC are not following established protocols and legal requirements in deciding this rate increase. If this was happening to Cascadia or UTC employees or their families, they would not sit down and accept it without a fight.</p> <p>We are not talking about a lack of water that is affecting many other parts of our country, but infrastructure improvements to deliver that water. I feel like I'm being treated as a child whose parents have kept secrets and decided what's best for me.</p> <p>It's unconscionable that UTC would allow Cascadia to treat citizens like this.</p> <p>Be transparent and help us come to a rational agreement.</p>
	Bobbie Garza and Steve Carpenter	E-mail	<p>I never had to think about where my water came from or worry that the cost would stretch my budget. After our first rate case shortly after I moved here in 2020, I began to worry. We all know that inflation is driving prices up, but corporate greed should not be the driving factor in how we obtain clean water.</p> <p>Many water systems are owned by public entities. As their budgets have been stretched over the last decade, privatization has become a trend. Privatization can throw huge amounts of money to upgrade and expand utilities. Estates Water/Cascadia was already privately owned when it was purchased by NW Natural Water, but the trend is the same. Utilities don't make money from delivering water, they make profits from investing in infrastructure like reservoirs and pipes, then recovering the costs of those investments from customers through regulated rates. When a private corporation owns this vital resource, customers lose control and transparency is gone. We can't vote out those responsible and we can't force them to show us their documents. Utilities don't operate in a typical free market system where prices and profits are determined by the willingness of consumers to pay. The guaranteed rate of return leads corporations to pursue questionable new infrastructure projects, which is exactly what we have seen here.</p> <p>This is why the UTC must step in to stop this rate shock. We are not the only citizens going through this. Water consumers in Pennsylvania and Illinois are battling corporate greed and lack of transparency as well. NW Natural Water is gobbling up utilities in Idaho, Oregon and Texas as we speak. They know the formula; buy small utilities, spend millions in new and unnecessary infrastructure, use Big Water Lobbyists to influence legislation and the entities in place to protect consumers, increase rates by huge percentages, and brag to their shareholders when they enjoy record profits. What you decide in our case today will be monitored and reported on across the country. We can be the model for just, reasonable and proper rate making principles and public policy, or we can be victims of an excessive rate of return that is an affront to the regulatory compact that has long existed in Washington to protect the public from monopolistic excess.</p> <p>Water is Life.</p> <p>Sincerely, Bobbie Garza and Steve Carpenter</p>
	Bonnie Gillis	E-mail	***See Attachment

	BOYD W. SEAL	Web	The letter I received indicates an overreaching attempt to gain a monopoly on water systems in Washington State! And with that an attempt to increase rates for consumers by 92%. The residents in this community at Moses Lake, (Pelican Point) not only use the domestic water in our homes but it is the only source for irrigation of lawns and trees and shrubs. There is no separate delivery system for irrigation water. Cost would be prohibitive.....
	Brad Petrie	E-mail	<p>Melissa,</p> <p>Thank you for the invite. The only things that needs to be stated on this subject is the following:</p> <p>1. Cascadia Water has done a great job with the upgrades they have added to our older water system. Capacity has never been anything as customers we were ever given Information on so I can't address that. But additional filtration wasn't anything we thought we might need but whatever was added to the new reservoir and pump system have been an obvious improvement. The slimy build up on our petwatering bowls have vanished. Also our coffee pod brewers do not need to be cleaned as often. Great job.</p> <p>2. I think all of us understand rate increases are part of living in the inflationary period that were in. Or because of system improvements that needed to be made. But these should be incremental increases in fairness to their customers. Not like again the increase their shooting for of almost 100%.</p> <p>So I do not think it should be a determination of approving their proposed increases or not but rather approve a much reduced fair rate increase that make it possible for people with limited budgets can plan for.</p> <p>Just my thoughts on being fair as consumers and utility companies. If you would like to discuss anything further, feel free to contact me via email or phone.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Brad Petrie petriefarm@msn.com Phone: (360) 681-3254j</p>
	Brad Petrie	Web	Well with everything going up due to the economy, inflation, etc. it is already very, very, difficult to survive on a fix income. Now I am being informed our water rates could go up a huge amount. Incremental increases are bad enough, but understood. But to almost double our rates is unfair.
	Bret Fritch	Web	Hi, my name is Bret Fritch and I have lived at 1980 Island View Rd. oak Harbor, WA for 23 years. In all my years here, I have never received such a dramatic increase in fees to our water as what we received from Cascadia last

			<p>week. Honestly, the proposed percentage increase of over 100% is simply outrageous, especially given our economy, inflation and more. I understand that Cascadia Water wants to put in essential improvements, but there is absolutely no way that families can absorb 100% increases and further, at a minimum, Cascadia Water should think about how to stagger increases as to minimize the impact to consumers.</p> <p>I also want to bring up a very important matter: I had to install a Pure Life Water System just to have drinkable water and water to cook with (very expensive) SOLELY due to the fact that even today, Cascadia Water delivers terrible quality water. In fact, I argue that the water Cascadia delivers today to all the homes around us, is substandard and non-drinkable. The water has gotten worse over the years as to, it stains your whites to yellow after a few washed, your white toilets are brown stained after only 3-4 months. So if I can't trust Cascadia Water to deliver PURE, CLEAN, DRINKABLE water today, why on earth should there be this rate increase. The WA State Commission should mandate that Cascadia Water delivers this water before they ever have a right to increase fees. Lastly, we have had our property taxes increased dramatically year over year and why aren't the increased taxes (which are inappropriately high), used to offset the Cascadia water essential improvements? Afterall, that's what our extra taxes should be used for.</p> <p>In summary, I STRONGLY OPPOSE this rate increase and urge you to consider this.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, Bret Fritch</p>
	Bret Medbury	E-mail	<p>To the folks that protect the customer,</p> <p>Just the words 80% rate increase SCREAM something is seriously wrong here.</p> <p>I believe these comments are going to be read by people with the title "Consumer Protection" or words to that affect in their job description.</p> <p>We, the consumers, expect you to protect us from these corporate raider folks that think they have us backed in a corner where we, the customers, have no recourse but to pay whatever they ask.</p> <p>They claim to be doing all these "improvements" and also claim they are "necessary". First off we were operating fine without this stuff, and secondly most of these :improvements" are in systems other than The Silver Lake Water Company (our system), but they want us to pay for them anyway. Also, in the past, when major work was necessary the customers were polled and if agreed a bond was floated to pay for the work which ENDED when the work was paid off. These corporate raider people are asking for a HUGE rate increase that has no end, and THIS IS NOT THE FIRST RATE INCREASE, THEY ALREADY GOT ONE PREVIOUSLY.</p> <p>So we would definitely like to see you do your job and protect us, the customers, from this kind of customer rip-off. A rate increase of this size will force some people out of their homes, is that your job to do that?</p> <p>Thank You very much for your focused consideration of this matter.</p>

			<p>Probably best if you look at it as if YOU were the Customer.</p> <p>Thank You, Bret Medbury</p>
	Bret Medbury	Web	<p>To the folks that protect the customer,</p> <p>Just the words 80% rate increase SCREAM something is seriously wrong here.</p> <p>I believe these comments are going to be read by people with the title "Consumer Protection" or words to that affect in their job description. We, the consumers, expect you to protect us from these corporate raider folks that think they have us backed in a corner where we, the customers, have no recourse but to pay whatever they ask.</p> <p>They claim to be doing all these "improvements" and also claim they are "necessary". First off we were operating fine without this stuff, and secondly most of these :improvements" are in systems other than The Silver Lake Water Company (our system), but they want us to pay for them anyway. Also, in the past, when major work was necessary the customers were polled and if agreed a bond was floated to pay for the work which ENDED when the work was paid off. These corporate raider people are asking for a HUGE rate increase that has no end, and THIS IS NOT THE FIRST RATE INCREASE, THEY ALREADY GOT ONE PREVIOUSLY.</p> <p>So we would definitely like to see you do your job and protect us, the customers, from this kind of customer rip-off. A rate increase of this size will force some people out of their homes, is it your job to do that?</p> <p>Thank You very much for your focused consideration of this matter. Probably best if you look at it as if YOU were the Customer.</p> <p>Thank You, Bret Medbury</p>
	Bret Medbury	Web	<p>I submitted a comment yesterday objecting to the doubling of our water rates and how unfair that was, however after thinking a bit more about this ridiculous request from the water company I have some thoughts to add. The company cites all these wonderful improvements they have incorporated, HOWEVER they never asked their customers about these things, they just went and did it, now they want us to pay for it. That is not how it should work. Also Our home is on the Silver Lake Water System and I see no mention of any "improvement" being made to our system, why am I paying for other systems. These are all individual and separate neighborhood systems.</p> <p>I think Cascadia Water should sell the Silver Lake System back to Bill Massey as he operated it in an efficient manner plus when improvements were needed he got a vote from the customers, floated a bond, they we all paid for it over time.</p>

			<p>Since Cascadia water acquired the Silver Lake system are rates have already MORE THAN DOUBLED, the board should realize they are way out of line, seriously hurting low and fixed income folks, and compromising our quality of life, by doing what they want then expecting us to pay for it.</p> <p>Bret</p>
	Bret Medbury	Web	<p>No I am DEFINITELY NOT in favor of this company's proposal. A doubling of water rates is ridiculous, a travesty actually. No wonder folks can no longer afford to support themselves and end up homeless or supported by the Government. Under no circumstances should this HUGE rate increase be considered, let alone approved. Have the company learn to be more efficient, lower their overhead, do whatever to reduce their costs, but double the cost to the consumer.</p> <p>I think it takes a lot of Gall to even ask for a rate increase like this, if it were me I would be afraid to even ask.</p>
	Brian Kirst	Web	<p>Description: I do not approve of the water rate increase! Supervisor Result: Customer Resolution: Spred the increases over a 10 year period</p>
	Brian Morrish	Web	<p>The rate increase for our system - Pelican Point Water Company - is a staggering 92% over 2021 rates. The reasoning given for their proposal is inflation and system wide upgrades. I understand the need for inflation adjustments but that has not been a 92% increase since 2021. Also, should not the regular replacement and upgrade of the infrastructure be a part of any successful business operation? Stuff wears out and needs to be replaced. That should not be a shock but baked into their pricing structure. In addition, their “average bill” estimates are grossly under valued as our system is used for irrigation as well so water utilization in the summer months are much larger than their estimates account for. It seems to me they are trying to justify price gouging to cover up mismanagement of the funds they are already receiving. Near a 100% increase is unethical for a utility – of which we as the consumer have no access to a free market to price check. I wholeheartedly appose such a radical rate increase.</p>
	Brianna B McLean	Web	<p>Cascadia Water’s proposed rate increase is going to hurt struggling families who are ALREADY treading water. I understand a rate increase every now and then, but a 75% increase is going to cripple our already dwindling working class on Whidbey Island.</p>
	Bruce Blough	Web	<p>Cascadia Water has come to the Washington State Utilities' Commission, hat in hand for a nearly 100% increase in water rates for the Pelican Point Waters System. This is comprised of rural Washington State wells. Cascadia purchased this water system in 2021, and immediately filed for a 97% increase in residential rates. This increase is an usuary level increase and wholly inappropriate for residents in this small community. Many residents are retired</p>

			<p>and cannot handle a massive increase in their water bill. I strongly urge the commission to reject this rate filing in its entirety.</p> <p>Supervisor Result:</p> <p>Yes. Lip service about providing the same level of water service at twice the price. They are adding homes to this overused system and need to justify their obscene rate increase.</p> <p>Customer Resolution:</p> <p>They should lower their expectations of reasonable rate increases in the single digit percentage range. They bought this system only a few years ago. If they thought they couldn't make a profit from the rates they agreed to at the time of purchase, they shouldn't have purchased the water system. Every upgrade they have outlined is to reduce their manpower, time and costs. It seems those upgrades should pay for themselves. If not, then the upgrades are not worth the cost.</p>
	Burt Jones & Maurine Shimlock	Web	<p>Cascadia's proposed rate increases are price gouging at its worst. While we understand the need for rate increases over time, to raise our rates nearly 100% in a single increase will cause financial hardship for just about everyone who uses this water system, especially retired people on a fixed income. Cascadia has purchased several smaller water systems during the past couple of years, and obviously desperately needs more cash inflow from consumers. We the consumers do not feel we should be liable for their poor business decisions and lack of planning. Reasonable rate increases are expected. Doubling rates from one month to the next are not and should not be approved.</p>
	Burt Jones and Maurine Shimlock	E-mail	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>Cascadia's proposed rate increases are price gouging at its worst. While we understand the need for rate increases over time, to raise our rates nearly 100% in a single increase will cause financial hardship for just about everyone who uses this water system, especially retired people on a fixed income.</p> <p>Cascadia has purchased several smaller water systems during the past couple of years, and obviously desperately needs more cash inflow from consumers. We the consumers do not feel we should be liable for their poor business decisions and lack of planning. Reasonable rate increases are expected. Doubling rates from one month to the next are not remotely reasonable and should not be approved.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Burt Jones and Maurine Shimlock</p>
	buyer4me@yahoo.com	E-mail	<p>Why would you allow a company like Cascadia to pass on rate increases based on their poor business practices??</p> <p>Cascadia, with full knowledge of what they were buying, purchased these aging water systems in these other areas and yet they are now attempting to 'recoup' their 'losses' by passing on their newly acquired water system expenses</p>

			<p>(without transparency I might add) to our residential water system area.</p> <p>Basic good business practices & common sense would also dictate that Cascadia already initially negotiated a substantially lower purchase price for these other water systems based on their poor or aged condition and repairs needed. And if they somehow did not, how is their business ineptitude, yet again, our responsibility?</p> <p>I have always thought that the purpose of organizations like the UTC is to protect consumer's like us against the idiocy & greed of utility businesses which are actually monopolies. Water is an essential of daily life and yet we have no choice as to whom supplies it to us.</p> <p>Appealing to you, the UTC, seems to be the only avenue we have in order to ensure that price gouging practices of a monopolistic company is curbed.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that my faith in your organization is not misplaced and that you will uphold the trust you have been given.</p>
	Cameron Bruce	E-mail	<p>Commissioners,</p> <p>I urge you to reject Cascadia's rate increase request.</p> <p>It is a classic case of Corporate mismanagement coinciding with a \$1.9 Billion monopolistic corporate greed. If Cascadia had to compete in the open market (not protected by their monopoly) they would make better decisions. It is time to stop corporate greed and mismanagement, and hold them accountable.</p> <p>My Key Points are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Burden of Proof: Cascadia has not met their burden of proof. The \$6.5M+ capital improvements driving these unreasonable rate increases were neither prudent, necessary, nor beneficial to us, the ratepayers.2. Cascadia's Moral Hazard : Don't be an enabler. A \$1.9 billion corporation won't go bankrupt if the commission rejects the rate filing, but they will learn that they will not be rewarded for mismanagement. In the insurance industry, this is called a morale hazard, where a corporation intentionally causes losses or spend inappropriately so they can get increase rates approved. The voting public is observing an epidemic in monopolistic greed across our country being unchecked by government oversight organizations intended to protect the public. An analogous example are California Utilities increasing dividends while not maintaining their infrastructure that causes billions of dollars in wildfire damage, and the CPUC approved rate increases to cover the cost of their

		<p>intentional negligence.</p> <p>3. Consolidation and Single Tariff Pricing: There is no proof that consolidation or single tariff pricing works or benefits ratepayers. The previous rate case, UW-200979, PROVED no benefits.</p> <p>4. Unrestricted Expenses: The only difference in this case UW-240151 compared to the previous one is Cascadia's unrestricted expenses, which are under their control and aimed at extracting maximum profits, ignoring the financial burden on consumers.</p> <p>5. Largest Rate Increase in a Decade: Public Counsel's analyst highlighted this would be the largest rate increase in a decade. Cascadia's lawyer emphasized their entitlement to a profitable balance sheet despite bad business decisions. Shareholders should bear the burden, not ratepayers.</p> <p>6. Cascadia Misrepresentation of the Facts: Cascadia claims that the projects were required by the Department of Health (DOH), but DOH documents clearly show that these decisions were entirely up to Cascadia. It's important to understand that DOH approving a project does NOT mean they require it; their approval does NOT confirm the urgency, necessity, or prudence of a project.</p> <p>7. Abusive water rate increases: are reaching the state legislature as evidenced by HB1906 Legislative bill to INCREASE TRANSPARENCY AND CONSUMER PROTECTION IN WATER SYSTEM RATES.</p> <p>Commissioner Rendhal, at the end of Tuesday's hearing, requested staff provide separate rates for the Island and Peninsula. If the rate filing is not rejected, this decision should be supported, as consolidation does not work.</p> <p>Remember, Whidbey Island is a Superfund clean-up site with PFAS contamination already found on the island. While the water is currently testing negative, future costs could be substantial and potentially skyrocket out of control. Similar concerns exist for all of the 30 systems, including dissimilar systems on the Peninsula and differences with current systems like Diamond Point or Discovery Bay, as well as future acquisitions with unknown and undisclosed conditions and costs.</p> <p>No ratepayer should be financially burdened by these decisions. No ratepayer should have to subsidize the cost of systems from which they receive no benefit. Each system can and should bear its own costs for capital improvements.</p> <p>It's time to stop allowing profit to be charged on cost over runs and bad business decisions.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p>
--	--	--

			<p>Cameron Bruce;</p> <p>BS, MBA, Registered Professional Engineer (PE)</p>
	Cameron Hardison	E-mail	<p>Good afternoon, the Lake Alyson community is requesting a Vote of Voluntary Service. We have met as a community and are formally requesting this vote. I have notified Cascadia Water as well.</p> <p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living. Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water. Thank you for your attention to this</p>
	Cat Eberhart	E-mail	<p>Hello. I am a water customer within the Estates water system in Sequim, WA. The following are my comments regarding the rate case above.</p> <p>I purchased my land in 2020, the same year the water system ended up being sold by the local residents and owners to an out of state for-profit corporation. Had I any knowledge of what that would end up looking like I would have bought land elsewhere, where I could have had my own well drilled.</p> <p>At the moment my biggest concerns are that the current UTC Commissioners are failing us, the water system customers! The UTC Mission is stated as "to protect the people of Washington by ensuring investor-owned utility and transportation services are safe, equitable, available, reliable and fairly priced." Washington State law requires that utility and transportation rates must be reasonable to customers, giving regulated companies a chance to cover legitimate costs and earn a fair profit, so they can stay in business. It would appear the word fair is missing from the decision making process that the UTC has made in this case so far. Since when does fair profit mean repeatedly unprecedented rate increases?</p> <p>Customers within what is now the Cascadia Water systems are systematically being threatened with exorbitantly increasing rate charges and an attempt to consolidate 29 different water systems into a single giant conglomeration subject to a single rate! Not only is this absurd, it is a thinly veiled attempt at charging every single customer for the benefit of only the for-profit corporation which can only be described as unmitigated greed.</p> <p>It makes no sense at all to us, the consumers, to pay for improvements on other water systems, just because the</p>

		<p>profiteering corporation wants to simplify their billing and profit structure. Case in point - the Estates water system is here in Dungeness in Sequim, outside city limits in the area just south of Dungeness Recreation Area. They have already claimed a number of expenses that could and should have been avoided - not the least of which is the most recent - that being Chlorination. Their supposed reasoning for this by emailed notice in January 24, 2025, alluding to iron and manganese levels. I emailed them back the same day requesting the past 2 water tests on the current water system showing elevated levels of iron and manganese requiring chlorination which of course they did not provide. Instead they emailed Estates users 1/27/25 to state they were extending the start date of chlorination to 2/6/25 and including a link to the DOH flyer on chlorination basics. I have actually smelled Chlorine from my kitchen tap a couple different dates which I find wholly unsatisfactory. I should not be able to smell it in my tap water, ever. I have no reason to trust that Cascadia is applying proper amounts considering this, and am no longer drinking water directly from the kitchen tap nor filling my dog's water bowls directly from the tap. Their response ONLY cited a single "pilot test water quality test" for Well #2. How are we supposed to interpret that other than inadequate testing? No date, no diagram of where the heck Well #2 is. If there's a well #2, what about Well #1? Others? Where are the other tests and what dates showing continuous concentrations of iron and manganese requiring chlorination? Massive lack of information. Lack of information appears to be the hallmark of Cascadia Water.</p> <p>To continue - Cascadia Water wants to combine 27 or 28 water systems like Estates with their water system on Whidbey Island of all places - it defies logic entirely to think there is any sound reasoning to combine water systems from such hugely diverse environments as Whidbey Island and frankly any other water system on the Olympic Peninsula! The only realistic answer would seem to be so they can charge everyone for all the water system's costs, no matter what or where they stem. Whidbey Island has had water supply issues for many many years, so much so that when I was looking at properties there we found you had to be on a 3 year waiting list just to find out if you could get water to a lot within an existing development! How on earth can that sort of water supply problem compare to water systems fed from rivers from the Olympic mountain range, groundwater aquifers and rain?</p> <p>I can only surmise that because it is easier for Cascadia Water to combine all their recently purchased water systems into one giant system for the sake of billing and rate creation is obvious. It has absolutely nothing to do with customer service. It has everything to do with profit. They don't buy the actual source material (water) so they plan all these "improvements" in order to create a cost and add on many fees to confuse and obfuscate the facts.</p> <p>Water is a basic need for life and I take great offense at being taken advantage of by a for-profit corporation buying up small water systems in multiple States so they can become a regional monopoly and charge outrageous sums and employ a continuous ever increasing fee under the guise of improvements, which are highly suspect in the first place. The majority of information from Cascadia Water has been garnered only by forceful communication and complaint, mostly requiring complaint to oversight departments within the State of Washington, and still information is incomplete at best.</p> <p>From testimony documents available on this rate case there has been noted that the revenue requirement rate</p>
--	--	--

			<p>increases are unprecedented. Also that UTC Staff did not sufficiently investigate or account for the unreasonableness of Cascadia's capital investment strategy. Since when do the residents of the State of Washington need to feed the greed of an out of state corporation bent on maximizing profit for an element that is a basic requirement of life, a source that stems from the very earth beneath our feet and the local rivers from our mountains?</p> <p>I see that in the case of Cascadia Water, water has become the new Oil and they are doing everything they can to massively profit at the expense of consumers who have no other option for household water sources.</p> <p>Thank you, I look forward to the UTC Commissioners taking a much harder look at Cascadia Water's rate case and taking a stand for the customers you are entrusted to protect.</p> <p>-Cat Eberhart</p>
	Cat Eberhart	E-mail	<p>A few further comments before the comment period ends:</p> <p>So while it seems like we have a LOT of trouble getting the Utility commissioners to listen to us water customers in comparison to out-of-state for-profit corporations, I would like to remind them that not once, but twice* the Public Counsels' Tad O'Neill suggested that the rate filing be rejected. The reasoning behind that advice was laid out and surely that office's advice must make a difference.</p> <p>Let us not forget that a for-profit corporation is not the customer nor does it benefit the customer. It is only in existence to benefit its owners and stockholders. Let us not forget that Washington State still believes in the power of the people.</p> <p>(*for reference, previous rate case UW-200979)</p> <p>-Cat Eberhart</p>
	Catherine L. Wry	Mail	<p>***See Attachment</p> <p>Dear Sir or Madam:</p> <p>I would like to comment on Cascadia Water plan to increase water rates. Currently, we pay about the same rate for water that the city of Sequim customers pay.</p>

			<p>Cascadia water has bought 29 small independent water systems for a total of 8,000 customers. They say this incremental increase of 75% is needed to cover infrastructure projects. It appears Cascadia Water will triple water rates to all customers.</p> <p>I think once this infrastructure is paid for the water rates should be required to return to the base rate of \$24.00. Will there be someone from the commission to oversee Cascadia Water?</p> <p>It concerns me that Cascadia Water is creating a monopoly with no oversight and no plans to reduce water rates once this infrastructure is paid. Will we be forced to pay triple the water rates indefinitely while Cascadia Water continues to buy up more water systems offensively with customers money?</p> <p>Sincerely, Catherine L. Wry</p>
	Cathlene Michaels-Brader	E-mail	<p>please do not approve Cascadia's application to raise rates by 75%. Do not approve of the conglomeration process for Cascadia. This will cause a monopoly in whater rights. Not allowing the local community a say in what needs to be done in this particular area. We are a community that has a mean age of 65 which means that we are a community that is on a fixed income and can not withstand this amount of increase of expenditure.</p> <p>Supervisor Result: We where told as a community that the application that they submitted had all ready been approved and that we do not have a choice in the matter.</p> <p>Customer Resolution: I propose that they do a 10% increase over 7 or 8 years, so that we as a community can accommodate the increase of expenditure. We are a community that the majority is 65 and on a fixed income.</p>
	Cathy and Chris O'Bryan	E-mail	<p>Another rate increase approved by skagit county commissioners is 30 percent on garbage! Everything is going up except income. To counter some expenses we do grow our vegetables, but watering them is going to take away any cost savings. 75 percent is way out of line and we haven't seen anything improved by cascadia water since their takeover. In fact the billing services leave a lot to be desired! We had one payment applied to someone else's account, when that was corrected they sent our next 3 billing statements somewhere other than to us. I contacted them again and the only thing we got was a statement that it must be the usps. Not the billing. Oh well, like stated before, our pockets aren't as deep as every utility thinks. If we could we would have our own water source, but that's not an option per our county, or state for that matter, it might affect the fish.</p> <p>Thank you again, Cathy and Chris O'Bryan.</p>

	Cathy O' Bryan	E-mail	We wanted to voice our concerns regarding this 75% rate increase filing. We are senior citizens on fixed income and what increases we get in our income is usually in the 3% range. With inflation on every thing, food, power (17% requested by pse)and now water (75%.....!), home maintenance, property taxes, all the fees on services like phone, internet, etc, our pockets aren't that deep. It's no wonder people become homeless.
	Celine Guidry	Web	<p>We've now learned that Cascadia Water, LLC is owned by a large corporation and continues to acquire other water companies throughout the PNW and they wish to grow their business, while proposing to pass on the cost increases to its consumers in order to pay for their growth. There were recent considerable increases within the past few years and they are now proposing an immediate 107% increase (based on the average invoice in our area). Some other areas are being hit even harder. This is unacceptable as we do not have options to switch to another company. There are landlord/tenant laws to protect tenants in rental properties and we are essentially "tenants" in this respect.</p> <p>See previous years's proposed BASE Rates below (does not include usage rates which also increased - based on our 5/8" meter size). These rates are slightly different than the proposed rates that were approved but were taken from our actual invoices...very similar to proposal:</p> <p>Effective 4/1/21: \$17.50 Effective 11/1/21: \$22 (26% increase over 4/1/21) Effective 12/1/21: \$24 (9% over 11/1, 37% over 4/1/21) Effective 4/30/22: \$24.95 (4% over 12/1, 43% over 4/1/21) Effective 6/30/22: \$26 (4.2% over 4/30, 49% over 4/1/21) Effective 10/31/22: \$27.65 (6.3% over 6/30, 58% over 4/1/21) Effective 12/1/22: \$29.35 (6% over 10/31, 68% over 4/1/21) PROPOSED for 6/1/24: \$56 (91% over existing, 220% over 4/1/21)</p> <p>In a nutshell, they are requesting a 220% increase over 38 months which means our rate has tripled in barely over 3 years. This will be difficult for many residents, especially those on fixed incomes. It's not as if we can shop for where to get our water.</p> <p>WE STRONGLY URGE THE UTC TO DENY THIS AND ANY OTHER ASTRONOMICAL INCREASE to a basic need of water in order to live in a safe and healthy environment.</p> <p>Sincerely, Celine and David Guidry Langley, WA</p>

	Charles Schultz	E-mail	I can not believe that Cascadia is acquiring more water systems knowing in advance they will be needing to replace and or rebuilt these systems and want all customers to pay for these repairs/upgrades. It is unbelievable that they can use this as their business model purposely buying broken systems and expecting we the customers to foot the bill for repairs to those systems. We just went thru this with them on our Blue Ribbon Farms system less than 2 years ago. We as customers want fair treatment from this water company. Please deny their unfair rate increase.
	Charles J Schultz Sr	E-mail	I can't believe Cascadia is asking for another rate hike to our water system. They just doubled our water bills less than 2 years ago and want to double it again. They haven't shown why this latest rate increase is warranted. To buy multiple water systems in need of substantial repairs and then expect existing and new customers to pay for the needed repairs is a great business model if you can get away with it. They have created a monopoly for a product required for humans to survive and the UTC just keeps approving their requests without proper justification! This needs to stop!! They are creating hardships for retirees on fixed income which is a large share of their customer base.
	Charles J Schultz Sr	E-mail	Listen to the Public Counsels' Tad O'Neill - he suggested that the rate filing be rejected....this is the second time he has given the Commissioners the same advice. Time to tell the Commissioners to start listening! We the consumers feel this rate hike is unjustified! Regards Charles J Schultz Sr
	Charles Radey	Web	Re: Proposed rate increase for Cascadia Water, Peninsula System (for Pedersen) Comment: The proposed 65% water bill increase is, to say the least, bold and immodest. The increase mocks the public interest by being so excessive in what it would immediately demand of the average water consumer. The company should explore the financial implications of a graduated annual rate increase in the 10-15% range that would cover the costs of improvements in the system over time. Small bites are much more easily digestible than one gorging mouthful.
	CHERYL HARASTI	Web	I am a senior that lives on her own and this increase would be devastating to my budget. Plus half the time my water is brown and when I have contacted the company to explain why I never get any response. I am never informed when the lines are flushed. The explanation for an increase is to provide generators for power outages. The increase is excessive 75% not at all reasonable.
	Chet Sulgrove	Web	Chet and Danette Sulgrove 5721 Winona Ln. Langley, WA 98260

April 10, 2024

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
P.O. Box 47250
Olympia, WA 98504-7250

Subject: Urgent Protest Against Cascadia Water, LLC's Proposed Rate Increase

Dear Commissioners,

We, Chet and Danette Sulgrove, residents of South Whidbey Island, and customers of Cascadia Water, LLC, are writing to express our strong opposition to Cascadia Water, LLC's proposed water rate increase, which is slated for June 1, 2024. This staggering 75% proposed increase, seeking to generate an additional \$1,788,793 in revenue, follows a significant 53% rate hike in 2021, further straining our community financially.

Whidbey Island is cherished for its scenic beauty, close-knit community, and, importantly, its rural character, which includes significant agricultural activities. The proposed increase is not just a matter of concern for residential water users but poses a severe threat to our agricultural sector, a vital part of our local economy and community life. The added financial burden could potentially cripple our local farmers, escalating operating costs and impacting the price and viability of local produce.

Moreover, the challenge of affordable housing on Whidbey Island is already acute. This rate hike threatens to push many families to the brink. For some, it will force a difficult decision: uprooting from a community we hold dear in search of more sustainable living conditions elsewhere.

While we understand the necessity for infrastructure investments and improvements to ensure the provision of safe and reliable water services, the notification from Cascadia Water, LLC, lacks comprehensive details on these infrastructure investments. This omission raises concerns about the transparency of the proposed rate increase and its justification. It is essential for the community to understand where and how these funds will be allocated, ensuring that any financial burden placed upon the residents and the agricultural sector is indeed warranted and beneficial in the long term.

The proposed rate increase has far-reaching implications beyond financial strain; it threatens the very essence of Whidbey Island, risking the loss of the community and agricultural diversity that defines our island. A more balanced solution is necessary—one that accommodates the need for infrastructure improvements without placing an unsustainable burden on Whidbey Island's residents and farmers.

We urge the Commission to critically assess Cascadia Water, LLC's proposed rate increase, taking into full account

			<p>its impact on the diverse aspects of life on Whidbey Island. We advocate for a decision-making process that is both transparent and inclusive, ensuring that any adjustments to rates are fair, justifiable, and considerate of the community's well-being.</p> <p>We plan to voice our concerns at the scheduled open meeting on May 23, 2024, and hope for a thoughtful consideration of the impact this proposed increase will have on our community. We trust the Commission will arrive at a decision that safeguards the interests of all stakeholders on Whidbey Island.</p> <p>Thank you for considering our perspective on this critical issue.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Chet and Danette Sulgrove chet.sulgrove@whidbey.com danette.sulgrove@whidbey.com 360-969-3273</p>
	Chet Sulgrove	Web	<p>Chet and Danette Sulgrove 5721 Winona Ln. Langley, WA 98260 Email: chet.sulgrove@whidbey.com January 2, 2025</p> <p>Office of the Governor Jay Inslee Governor's Office 416 14th Ave SW Olympia, WA 98504 Email: governor@wa.gov</p> <p>Senator Patty Murray United States Senate 2988 Jackson Federal Building 915 2nd Avenue Seattle, WA 98174 Email: Contact form on website: [Senator Patty Murray Contact Form]</p> <p>Representative Rick Larsen United States House of Representatives</p>

119 North Commercial Street
Bellingham, WA 98225

Email: Contact form on website: [Representative Rick Larsen Contact Form]

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
P.O. Box 47250
Olympia, WA 98504-7250
Email: comments@utc.wa.gov

Public Counsel Unit - Office of the Attorney General
800 Fifth Ave, #200
Seattle, WA 98104
Email: utility@atg.wa.com

Subject: Urgent Concern Regarding Proposed Water Rate Hikes by Cascadia Water, LLC (Docket UW-240151)
Dear Governor Inslee, Senator Murray, Representative Larsen, Commissioners, and Public Counsel,

As long-standing residents of Whidbey Island, we are writing to express our profound concerns and to protest the proposed 75% water rate increase by Cascadia Water, LLC. This proposal, which follows a significant 53% hike in 2021, threatens to place an unsustainable financial burden on the residents of our community.

This steep rate increase will have a massive and deleterious impact on the financial stability of many families on Whidbey Island, potentially forcing them to make the untenable choice to leave their homes in search of more affordable living conditions. The cumulative impact of these successive rate hikes is not just a financial issue but a community welfare concern, threatening the very fabric of our island life.

Furthermore, the manner in which Cascadia has attempted to obstruct discovery efforts in the ongoing rate case, combined with the Department of Health's delays in disclosing public information and UTC rate staff's unilateral settlement announcement, raises serious questions about transparency and fairness in the regulatory process.

These actions suggest a pattern of behavior that prioritizes corporate profits over public welfare, undermining trust in the institutions supposed to protect us from such corporate excesses.

			<p>We urge each of your offices to take immediate action to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure full transparency in the rate-setting process, including detailed justifications for any proposed increases.• Hold Cascadia Water, LLC accountable for their business practices and ensure they operate in good faith with their customers and the regulatory bodies.• Facilitate inclusive participation of all stakeholders, particularly Public Counsel and the consumers, in any negotiations or settlements related to these rate increases. <p>The residents of Whidbey Island deserve a regulatory framework that not only protects but also prioritizes their economic and social well-being. We implore you to intervene decisively to prevent this proposed rate hike from becoming a reality.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter. We are ready to provide further details or engage in discussions as necessary to assist in your review and decision-making processes.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Chet and Danette Sulgrove</p>
	Chris Dinges	Web	<p>The recent proposal to increase everyone's bill nearly 100% is unfathomable and detrimental to the community. We struggle enough with our weak water system and many of us removed lawns to save water but still have \$250 bills, this increase will double that for a still broken system. CW does not show improvements to the performance of our system except major repairs to other communities water systems. Our community should not be financially responsible for CW poor investment decisions to acquire and repair other water systems. I fail to see how the chlorine analyzer installed in our system should result in such a price hike to us when it is "to lower operational costs". I understand inflation increases are needed but not to this extent to repair other communities systems.</p>
	Cliff and Kay Morgan	Web	<p>We understand that cost go up and the need to cover costs involved with business. We feel like a rate of this size is totally not supported. We would like to see some of the issues taken care of that have plagued the system. Water pressure is still so poor in some areas that showering is almost impossible. These issues have been discussed and whatever has been done by the company has not been adequate.</p> <p>If a raise in rate is approved, please bring it more in line with the rates in this area and in line with smaller increments of increase.</p>

	Colleen Weed	Phone	Please listen to public councils Tad O'Niels opinion and reject the bill increase.
	Connie and Jeff Spring	E-mail	***See Attachment Please find below statements from the customers indicated below. We request you seriously review and consider them. Thank you.
	Connie and Jeff Spring	E-mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT*** Attached PDF contains comments from 3 owners on West Beach Rd who's water services are with Cascadia Water rate case # UW-240151 for review. Please call if you have any questions. Connie Spring
	Connie Jo Smith	E-mail	I am a 73-year-old single woman, residing in the Monterra 55+ community. My address is 132 Cypress Cir, Port Angeles, WA 98362 and my contact phone number is 909.214.6505. I am writing you to convey my deep concerns to you and the Commissioners deciding this proposed water increase that I am STRONGLY OPPOSED TO THIS LARGE RATE INCREASE, especially when it will not benefit our Monterra community at all. Our Monterra rate increase is proposed to be 94% of the current rate. THIS IS UNACCEPTABLE. I am not opposed to a small increase to cover staffing and overhead costs relating to our water system but DO NOT WANT TO FUND OTHER EXPENDITURES TO HELP OTHER WATER SYSTEMS - they need to cover their own expenses. I say No to the proposed increase - especially such a large one that will impact myself and my neighbors who all are on fixed incomes and struggling as it is with ever-increasing prices of living expenses. I also request that this and all communications BE MAINTAINED AND INCLUDED IN THE PERMANENT DOCKET/FILE Thank you for your consideration. Connie Jo Smith
	Connie Jo Smith	E-mail	Dear Commissioners:

		<p>I am a 74-year-old single woman, residing in the Monterra 55+ community. My address is 132 Cypress Cir, Port Angeles, WA 98362 and my contact phone number is 909.214.6505. I am also a customer of Cascadia Water.</p> <p>I am writing to convey my strong and profound concerns to the Commissioners deciding on this proposed water increase. Please note that I AM STRONGLY OPPOSED TO THIS LARGE RATE INCREASE, especially when it will not benefit our Monterra community at all. Our Monterra rate increase is proposed to be 100% of the current rate for the next 3 years. THIS IS UNACCEPTABLE. I am not opposed to a small increase to cover staffing and overhead costs relating to our water system but IT SHOULD NOT FALL UPON OUR COMMUNITY (NOR DO I WANT) TO FUND OTHER EXPENDITURES TO HELP OTHER WATER SYSTEMS - which, if approved, this increase will do. Whatever other water systems Cascadia needs to upgrade, those communities must cover their own expense for upgrades.</p> <p>I say A STRONG NO to the proposed increase - especially such a large one that will impact myself and my neighbors who all are on fixed incomes and struggling as it is with ever-increasing prices of living expenses. This increase will add an undue burden on our living expenses and one that we would not benefit from in any manner.</p> <p>I request that this and all communications BE MAINTAINED AND INCLUDED IN THE PERMANENT DOCKET/FILE</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Connie Jo Smith</p>
	Connie McDonald	<p>E-mail</p> <p>I have owned property in Freeland WA for many years. Previously water service was provided by Lehman water for many years. The Freeland water area was purchased along with SeaView water on Whidbey Island on November 2, 2018 and a new company Cascadia formed. According to Cascadia's web site Cascadia is a private, Investor owned utility company of water systems located on Whidbey island, WA and the Olympic Peninsula (not adjacent to Freeland service area boundaries). Then Cascadia acquired a number of other water purveyors which apparently were distressed systems based on the number of improvements suggested now by Cascadia. In 2020 Cascadia was granted a 53% increase in rates in the Freeland water area. It took effect in June of 2021. Cascadia continued acquiring water systems in areas like Sequim, Port Angeles, on the mainland east of Whidbey Island, and as far as Moses Lake in Eastern WA. Now back comes Cascadia for another rate increase, this time a 75% increase. Other water purveyors were also acquired on Whidbey Island, one as far north as Oak Harbor, (about 30 miles North ,and one about ten miles south of Freeland near Bailey Road). Boundary Review Board issues in this state typically require natural boundaries should be used whenever changing boundaries. The Freeland water ratepayers have been combined with others far removed on Whidbey Island and by Puget Sound east to include services on the mainland. Several years ago a Freeland Sewer district got in a lot of trouble acquiring property off island on the mainland that had little to do with services here.</p>

			<p>It appears Cascadia has planned to buy these distressed systems and bundle the repair costs across many non - contiguous boundaries with different types of supply systems . North Whidbey receives water in a large main across the Deception Pass Bridge and everything on the south 2/3rds of this 55 mile long island receives water from wells. In a period of 6 years Cascadia has asked for a combined 128 % increase. I would say that is pretty inflationary, wouldn't you think? Actually, it is far beyond inflationary.</p> <p>Other Factors to consider;</p> <p>Freeland rate layers were never informed of the companies plan to acquire a significantly large number of needy assets. Makes one wonder if the investors were aware of the needs of these very rapidly acquired assets. Freelsnd rate payers , and presumably those in other acquisitions, were not given proposed costs for their specific improvements versus the costs attributed instead to other areas. There are so many acquisitions Casacdia should have sent ratepayers a map of the areas now owned by Cascadia and information on which improvements were necessary in each and which ones were nice to have such as elimination of meter readers with new equipment, given the size of this request. The rate payers should have had an opportunity to respond long before this request was made. We were actually informed after the rate increase request had been filed. In short, more work needs to be done before this request is granted. If this request is granted it seems the rate payers should explore legal remedies with Cascadia to see if these incredible number of acquisitions were done legally and/or without appropriate notification, and ratepayer input. It seems that rates should be structured in specific local service areas based on the improvements in those service areas.</p> <p>Please send the zoom link to this email address for the meeting on June 12 so we may at least observe the questions and answers being raised. Thank you for consideration of my comments.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Connie McDonald</p>
	Corby Somerville	E-mail	<p>This is a Public Comment regarding Docket UW-240151.</p> <p>The most important duty of the Commission is the protection of the public in a monopoly marketplace for public utilities. When utility companies attempt to engage in price gouging, the Commission should not allow it. The present rate case involving Cascadia Water, where increases up to 94 percent are proposed by the company, raises several questions.</p> <p>1. If Cascadia is so unprofitable, and if such drastic rate increases are being requested in order to achieve profitability for the company, how has Cascadia been able to finance the acquisition of at least eight small independent water companies over the past five years?</p>

			<p>2. Cascadia has submitted a ‘claim of confidentiality’ in order to conceal certain financial information, including: “the confidential organization chart of NW Natural Holding Company” and “the confidential (unredacted) version of Cascadia Water’s general ledger.” Further, Cascadia has represented: “The confidential information is sensitive information due to the competitive market for water utility acquisitions and the identification of employee names and compensation data, and as such, comprises valuable commercial information. Disclosure of the confidential information could negatively impact Cascadia Water’s ability to negotiate future acquisitions ...” (Emphasis supplied.) It is evident that Cascadia has continuing ambitions to expand their holdings and acquire even more independent water companies. These acquisitions should be financed by stock shareholders. Are the present rate-payer customers being made to finance those acquisitions?</p> <p>3. Cascadia wishes to conceal ‘compensation data.’ How can the Commission assure the public that the proposed rate increases are not related to unreasonable executive compensation schemes?</p> <p>4. Without disclosure of accounting information how can we be assured that Cascadia is not co-mingling capital improvements with maintenance costs? Rate-paying customers should not be burdened with paying for capital investments. Capital improvements accrue to owners’ equity and those balance sheet investments should be made by stockholders.</p> <p>5. Previous Cascadia rate case UW-200979 requested unreasonable increases. Cascadia petitioned to combine costs between Whidbey Island rate-payers and those on the Olympic Peninsula. The Commission however directed Cascadia to: “allocate that (sic) revenue requirements appropriately between the Peninsula customers and the island customers.” Once the Commission decides (on principle) that Peninsula customers should not be burdened with Whidbey Island costs, shouldn’t that be a final determination? How can we be assured that this extraordinary rate increase is not another attempt by the company to achieve the same outcome as they requested before?</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, Corby Somerville 22 April, 2024</p>
	Corby Somerville	Web	<p>Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission This is a Public Comment regarding Docket UW-240151.</p> <p>The most important duty of the Commission is the protection of the public in a monopoly marketplace for public utilities. When utility companies attempt to engage in price gouging, the Commission should not allow it. The present rate case involving Cascadia Water, where increases up to 94 percent are proposed by the company, raises several questions.</p> <p>1. If Cascadia is so unprofitable, and if such drastic rate increases are being requested in order to achieve profitability for the company, how has Cascadia been able to finance the acquisition of at least eight small independent water companies over the past five years?</p> <p>2. Cascadia has submitted a ‘claim of confidentiality’ in order to conceal certain financial information, including: “the confidential organization chart of NW Natural Holding Company” and “the confidential (unredacted) version of Cascadia Water’s general ledger.” Further, Cascadia has represented: “The confidential information is sensitive information due to the competitive market for water utility acquisitions and the identification of employee names</p>

			<p>and compensation data, and as such, comprises valuable commercial information. Disclosure of the confidential information could negatively impact Cascadia Water's ability to negotiate future acquisitions ..." (Emphasis supplied.) It is evident that Cascadia has continuing ambitions to expand their holdings and acquire even more independent water companies. These acquisitions should be financed by stock shareholders. Are the present rate-payer customers being made to finance those acquisitions?</p> <p>3. Cascadia wishes to conceal 'compensation data.' How can the Commission assure the public that the proposed rate increases are not related to unreasonable executive compensation schemes?</p> <p>4. Without disclosure of accounting information how can we be assured that Cascadia is not co-mingling capital improvements with maintenance costs? Rate-paying customers should not be burdened with paying for capital investments. Capital improvements accrue to owners' equity and those balance sheet investments should be made by stockholders.</p> <p>5. Previous Cascadia rate case UW-200979 requested unreasonable increases. Cascadia petitioned to combine costs between Whidbey Island rate-payers and those on the Olympic Peninsula. The Commission however directed Cascadia to: "allocate that (sic) revenue requirements appropriately between the Peninsula customers and the island customers." Once the Commission decides (on principle) that Peninsula customers should not be burdened with Whidbey Island costs, shouldn't that be a final determination? How can we be assured that this extraordinary rate increase is not another attempt by the company to achieve the same outcome as they requested before?</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, Corby Somerville 22 April, 2024</p>
	Corby Somerville	Web	<p>This is a restatement of a comment submitted in April 2024 since the case is continuing adjudication and the comments remain relevant.</p> <p>Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission This is a Public Comment regarding Docket UW-240151.</p> <p>The most important duty of the Commission is the protection of the public in a monopoly marketplace for public utilities. When utility companies attempt to engage in price gouging, the Commission should not allow it. The present rate case involving Cascadia Water, where increases up to 94 percent are proposed by the company, raises several questions.</p> <p>1. If Cascadia is so unprofitable, and if such drastic rate increases are being requested in order to achieve profitability for the company, how has Cascadia been able to finance the acquisition of at least eight small independent water companies over the past five years?</p> <p>2. Cascadia has submitted a 'claim of confidentiality' in order to conceal certain financial information, including: "the confidential organization chart of NW Natural Holding Company" and "the confidential (unredacted) version of Cascadia Water's general ledger." Further, Cascadia has represented: "The confidential information is sensitive information due to the competitive market for water utility acquisitions and the identification of employee names and compensation data, and as such, comprises valuable commercial information. Disclosure of the confidential</p>

			<p>information could negatively impact Cascadia Water’s ability to negotiate future acquisitions ...” (Emphasis supplied.) It is evident that Cascadia has continuing ambitions to expand their holdings and acquire even more independent water companies. These acquisitions should be financed by stock shareholders. Are the present rate-payer customers being made to finance those acquisitions?</p> <p>3. Cascadia wishes to conceal ‘compensation data.’ How can the Commission assure the public that the proposed rate increases are not related to unreasonable executive compensation schemes?</p> <p>4. Without disclosure of accounting information how can we be assured that Cascadia is not co-mingling capital improvements with maintenance costs? Rate-paying customers should not be burdened with paying for capital investments. Capital improvements accrue to owners’ equity and those balance sheet investments should be made by stockholders.</p> <p>5. Previous Cascadia rate case UW-200979 requested unreasonable increases. Cascadia petitioned to combine costs between Whidbey Island rate-payers and those on the Olympic Peninsula. The Commission however directed Cascadia to: “allocate that (sic) revenue requirements appropriately between the Peninsula customers and the island customers.” Once the Commission decides (on principle) that Peninsula customers should not be burdened with Whidbey Island costs, shouldn’t that be a final determination? How can we be assured that this extraordinary rate increase is not another attempt by the company to achieve the same outcome as they requested before?</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, Corby Somerville 22 April, 2024</p>
	Courtney Keith	E-mail	<p>I live on Wilcox Lane, a road of low to moderately priced homes. I am protesting the outrageous increase of our water rates. This company is buying up small local wells and increasing the prices by a factor of greed. They want to upgrade the water system, but they don’t say how why or where. I don’t feel I should pay for their other water districts.</p> <p>Also, this company made finding the correct email to send this message very difficult Thank you, Courtney Keith</p>
	Courtney McCammond	Web	<p>These rate hikes have not been approved by us, the residents, and we are tired of paying for the expansion of this company. Our meters all work and do not need replacing, yet this company is making us pay for these new meters in the form of rate hikes. This is just one example. Please do not approve this company to continue to raise rates in the silverlake water district of oak harbor, or anywhere else. Most of our neighbors are senior citizens on fixed incomes and utility rate hikes like these are forcing some out of their homes. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
	Craig morton	Web	<p>To Whom it May Concern,</p> <p>Recently, the water system servicing my property was purchased by Cascadia Water. Cascadia Water proposes a revenue increase of 75% to provide the same service.</p>

			<p>Water is a vital resource, we are dependent on it. How is it that a company can buy out the system that provides this vital resource, and then charge us nearly double to make use of the system, when we have no viable alternative for a water system? There is no competition available to us, we have no other option. Why not a %200 increase? Why not a %500 increase?</p> <p>At what point is a company charging us for clean air at exorbitant rates, what is the oversight? What is the justification?</p> <p>Cascadia Water has no intention of making improvements to the system that serves my property, or the surrounding properties. They have made it clear they are not using this capital to serve our community, we will not see a penny in return. This is simply added profits for company ownership, at the price of nearly double the rate for this community, in a matter of months.</p> <p>This should be criminal to even request such a huge increase of pure profit against a community that gets no additional benefit.</p> <p>If Seattle proposes to build a new rail system, should my neighbors in Island County be charged more to pay for it? If Skagit County wanted to make improvements to it's infrastructure, should my neighbors be charged more to pay for those improvements? If my neighbor wants to build a water well system, should I be responsible for paying for it?</p> <p>It is absolutely not justifiable to charge nearly double the rate to a community that will not see anything substantial in return. Cascadia has not indicated they will make improvements to our area, nor a timeline when those improvements will be made, nor confirmation that the improvements will be made at said time.</p> <p>They have bought out our local utility service, monopolizing our critical resource, and are now demanding nearly double the fee, for nothing in return to our community, overnight.</p> <p>This should be criminal, and should not be permitted. The government is here specifically to protect consumers in vulnerable positions like this. If Cascadia planned on making huge improvements that can be confirmed and measured, that benefit my home specifically, then I could see the justification here. That is not the case.</p> <p>This is clearly corporate abuse against a community that has no alternative, price gouging their customers.</p>
	CV Wells	E-mail	<p>To WUTC.</p> <p>Cascadia Water continues to pursue unjustified and inflated rate increases, the purpose of which is to have rural water users finance their continued expansion and to line the pockets of shareholders in the company. The rate increase should be denied and Cascadia should be required to seek realistic water rates that don't hold rural users</p>

			<p>hostage to Cascadia's monopoly now and in the future.</p> <p>Sincerely, CV Wells</p>
	CV Wells	E-mail	<p>RE: UW-240151,</p> <p>I whole heartedly agree that the UTC rate staff are not water system professionals or engineers. They should not be the deciding factor on when a project is needed or prudent. Relying on water system management to answer questions about the needs of a project is like asking the fox to guard the henhouse. It is essential that independent experts assess the necessity and benefits of these projects to ensure they are truly in the best interest of the ratepayers.</p> <p>I also believe we should NOT be asked to fund expenses for problematic systems like Discovery Bay, Whidby Island and Diamond Point not to mention possible additional acquisitions by Cascadia when we derive not benefit from them.</p> <p>Cascadia has shown that it can not be trusted to provide the truth about expenses and the necessity for them. They have lied about upgrades and expenses being “mandated” or “required”.</p> <p>Their monopolistic rate increases should not be tolerated or approved.</p> <p>Sincerely, CV Wells</p>
	Cynthia L Pettit	E-mail	<p>As a senior living on Social Security & and a retirement retirement fund I cannot even imagine a doubling of my water rate with Cascadia especially as it is over \$100.00 At times now. Why, because Cascadia bought all these water districts, do we suddenly have to pay ridiculously high rates? We went from small local ownership to a large greedy corporation. Let’s not forget, greed should not be allowed to further drive the haves and have-nots. Water is something everyone should be able to afford. If quantity of users is a problem quit all the building.</p> <p>Cynthia L Pettit</p>
	Dale Birge	E-mail	<p>These comments are one person's attempt to rein in exorbitant rate increases for commodity services and life needs such as water. Many of the people in my area on the Olympic Peninsula are on a fixed income and will not be getting anywhere near a 75% income increase. Nearly doubling a monthly charge for a necessity is one of the reasons we are in an inflationary period in our economy. I strongly request the rate if ineeded, be kept to an affordable single digit value. Not one that challenges the budget of seniors and those with fixed income.</p>
	Dana Whitfield	Web	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commissioners,</p> <p>I am deeply opposed to the method that Cascadia Water has proposed for attaining increased revenues. (Please reference docket number: 240151)</p>

			<p>It's interesting that Cascadia Water is lowering the cost of water per gallon when they are requesting revenue increases. Their proposal instead relies on an excessively high monthly base rate increase to raise the revenues they are requesting.</p> <p>The proposed rate structure penalizes single home conservative water users and benefits large water users. This structure leaves no incentive for conserving water and it leaves the individual homeowner with no substantial ability to lower their water bill by using less water.</p> <p>Using my Peninsula System (Aquarius) 3/4" meter size household as an example, raising the monthly water base rate from \$19.25 to \$44.00 per month is an increase of over 225%.</p> <p>My entire Cascadia Water bill has never been more than \$44.00 per month. My new costs will be the \$44.00 new base rate plus \$10.10 for the DWSRF Surcharge that we are required to pay. This comes to \$54.10 per month, and this is before we have used a single drop of water! This is outrageous, especially for those of us that are on fixed incomes.</p> <p>Water is a resource that we all need, and we should pay for that resource on a per gallon basis. The increased revenue that Cascadia Water requests should be obtained by an increase of the per gallon cost not a decreased per gallon cost and an extremely high increase in the monthly base rate, period.</p> <p>Looking forward to your considered review,</p> <p>Dana Whitfield</p>
	Dani Devos	E-mail	<p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter</p>

			Dani DeVos
	Daniel B. Palmiter	E-mail	<p>***SEE ATTACHMENT</p> <p>Please see attached letters. Both are from us, but Letter 2 is the one several of us in the community are using.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Dave Bennett	E-mail	<p>***SEE ATTACHMENT</p> <p>Commissioners,</p> <p>Please consider my attached letter considering the proposed rate increases by Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Dave Bennett</p>
	Dave Bennett	E-mail	<p>Greetings to Washington State Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>My name is Dave Bennett</p> <p>I reside at 3881 Goldfinch Lane, Clinton WA 98236</p> <p>I am writing in concern regarding the proposed rate hike by Cascadia Water LLC, Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Cascadia Water, LLC</p> <p>The docket number is Docket #UW-240151</p> <p>I would like to voice my strong objection to the rate increase proposed by Cascadia Water LLC.</p> <p>The Commission ruled in June that Cascadia had failed to prove that its investments were prudent or that its proposed rates were reasonable and stated it was mandated by law to investigate. As the UTC is bound by its mission, "...to protect the people of Washington by ensuring that investor-owned utility and transportation services are safe, equitable, reliable, and fairly priced.", it would seem that any investigation should be open, fair and transparent.</p> <p>I understand that Staff is no longer investigating, having announced recently that Staff and Cascadia have reached a settlement in principle. Staff and Cascadia refused to divulge the terms of the settlement until January 10, 2025 giving the consumer limited time to review the details of such a complex agreement before the public comment period is closed. Regardless of whatever intentions staff may have, this gives the appearance that the Staff has abandoned any pretense of protecting consumers and basically given Cascadia an agreement substantially the same as what was offered in June that Cascadia was unable to demonstrate as equitable, reliable, and fairly priced.</p> <p>An agreement that more than doubles our water rates on top of a 37% increase only three years ago is an extreme rate shock. Cascadia admits their "goal" is to spend \$3-\$4 million area for the foreseeable future, all this without any plans as to what this spending is necessary to accomplish. This sets us up to be paying more for water utilities</p>

			<p>than any other utility, including electricity.</p> <p>I am horrified at what the future may hold. If \$1.7M of Cascadia Spending is resulting in a > 100% rate increase, what can we expect in three years when they have spent \$9M – \$12M ?</p> <p>It certainly has the appearance that Cascadia’s goal of millions each year is the goal to guarantee a specific return to investors with the only challenge being how to spend that much.</p> <p>Any reasonable business plan requires a definition of the need, based on requirements (i.e. health and safety, effective operation), then the development of a budget to meet the established needs. Cascadia’s approach appears to be just the opposite.</p> <p>It is the UTC responsibility to step in and assure the consumers best interested is represented and protected, not just Cascadia’s “interest”.</p> <p>Dave Bennett</p>
	Dave Bennett	E-mail	<p>Please add this letter to Cascadia as part of the comments.</p> <p>Thanks Dave Bennett</p> <p>Culley Lehman General Manager Cascadia Water, LLC</p> <p>RE: WUTC DOCKET #UW-240151</p> <p>Dear Mr. Lehman,</p> <p>I reside at 3845 Goldfinch La. in Clinton and am a Cascadia Water, LLC customer. I have reviewed your IMPORTANT NOTICE about a proposed rate increase and appreciate your offer to "feel free" to reach out to the WUTC and yourself if I have any questions about how it might affect me. For generations the Lehman family has provided Whidbey Island residents of small communities such as mine good water at a fair price. Since the family sold Lehman Enterprises to Cascadia and its Oregon parent companies in 2018, however, my neighbors and I have experienced Cascadia's attempt to DOUBLE our water rates in 2022, a WUTC decision to allow an approximate 25% rate increase in 2022, and now this effort to more than double our raised rates AGAIN! This seems to me to be a shocking money grab, completely unwarranted, but regrettably common to the current practices of those who seek to profit from the privatization of previously public works.</p> <p>Here are my questions (if the people who can answers these questions are employees of Cascadia Waters parent company, NW Water Resources of Portland, Oregon, or its parent company, NW Natural Holding Company</p>

(NYSE: NWN), of Portland Oregon, please forward this email to the appropriate employees).

1) What investments has Cascadia made since the rate increase in 2022 that benefit me and my neighbors' system?

You note that Cascadia has made "substantial investment system-wide and completed several key infrastructure projects that enhance service, for the benefit of its customers". In many instances I don't see any reference to where the improvements were made. For example, you list installing meters and generators, but Lehman Enterprises installed meters and a generator for our Goldfinch system well before Terry and Jim Lehman, your father and uncle, sold Lehman Enterprises to Cascadia. I've asked neighbors and no one can think of any improvements that have been made on our system since Cascadia bought Lehman Enterprises. Please advise if any improvements have been made that affect our system (I believe our system is, or is part of, T.E.L. Co #3, DOH PWS 939458).

2) Who or what is WB Waterworks?

I do see reference to "replacing two pressure reducing valves ... on the WB Waterworks system", as well as "installing a new reservoir on the WB Waterworks system...as well as a filter plant". Cascadia makes no reference to who WB Waterworks is in its Notice. Are you referring to the company W&B Waterworks, which your grandparents Wally and Betty Lehman started some 40 or more years ago? It's my understanding W&B is still active and being run by your dad, Terry Lehman. Has his company been hired to do this work? Where was this work done? Does it benefit Goldfinch customers? What did it cost?

3) What were the costs incurred by Cascadia for the improvements you claim?

I see no itemization of the costs incurred for any of the improvements Cascadia claims to have made. That seems like pretty basic information for customers and the WUTC to consider when trying to understand such a huge rate increase request. I understand I can research what you filed with the WUTC and try to make heads or tails of whatever numbers you've submitted in whatever fashion but I would think a simple spreadsheet identifying the various water systems, the improvements made for each water system and the cost of each improvement could and should be provided to your customers. Can and will you do that?

4) Cascadia and NW Natural Water state proudly that "Since its last general rate proceeding in 2021, Cascadia has continued to expand". Are customers like me being asked to pay for any or all of these expansion costs, which provide no benefit to me and my neighbors?

Cascadia and NW Natural Water, its holding company, are actively acquiring aged, small, rural water systems across the state. Yet Cascadia only provides service on Whidbey Island and contracts with other companies to do maintenance on the other newly acquired systems. Are these Contractors the same people who managed the systems before Cascadia purchased them, such as the Lehman family's situation? When your dad and brother sold Lehman

		<p>Enterprises to Cascadia you, your wife, your brother and your nephew all became well-paid salaried employees of Cascadia. Have other system managers become salaried Cascadia employees? Cascadia's website identifies former system managers as "contractors". How are they compensated? On a time and material basis or otherwise? Has Cascadia or NW Natural Water brought in anyone new with water system management experience?</p> <p>In the same vein, when Cascadia or NW Natural Water finance a new purchase of an existing system, are financing costs, loan payments, and/or interest included in items Cascadia claims qualify for recoupment and/or a Return on Investment? In simpler terms, are customers being expected to pay for Cascadia's aggressive acquisition business plan?</p> <p>It's my lay understanding that the State Department of Health sometimes loans money to water systems (a SRF Loan(?)) which has to be paid off upon sale of the system. Did any of the systems Cascadia acquired have outstanding loans to DOH or of any other type? Were they paid off by Cascadia? If not, do my water bills help pay off pre existing loans of other systems? This seems grossly unfair.</p> <p>How does Cascadia acquire new systems? Before Cascadia makes an acquisition does it conduct due diligence about existing and potential issues to calculate future anticipated expenses? For example, does Cascadia do due diligence regarding age and type and wear and tear of existing systems to calculate future anticipated expenses? Or regarding possible latent expenses such as PFAS contamination? Are such potential expenses part of the negotiating process of a sales price by which Cascadia attempts to protect itself and its future customers? Or does Cascadia simply, to put it bluntly, buy "a pig in a poke" and determine what expenses it will incur later?</p> <p>It's my understanding that Lehman Enterprises was sold for \$200,000 less than its assessed value. Is that correct? Cascadia stated that Lehman Enterprises was "underfunded" at the time of sale. If this is so had your dad and uncle considered a rate increase request prior to selling to Cascadia? Or was this sale a means of avoiding the work of a rate increase request and helping ensure the next generation of Lehmans would enjoy the fruits of their family's business through steady future employment?</p> <p>5) What overhead is Cascadia claiming in its rate increase request?</p> <p>I'd appreciate some information about Cascadia's overhead expenses. Cascadia lists 18181 SR 225 as its business office. This is also the business address of W&B Waterworks, still active and I assume now your dad's company, and B&W Pump Co. (another Wally and Betty company?). 18181 SR 225 is a relatively small, shed-like building which I'd guess your grandfather built when he started W&B Waterworks. Does Cascadia pay rent to W&B or B&W? Share office staff?</p> <p>Cascadia states its office is closed throughout the week and customer service is handled by phone by you and your wife. Does Cascadia claim overhead as part of its rate increase request? If so, how much and for what? Does any</p>
--	--	--

		<p>overhead claim include the salaries of all the Lehmans and other former system employees? How were such salaries negotiated? How are they justified if there are no office hours and customer service is limited to responses to individual customer requests? If older systems needed significant work prior to acquisition by Cascadia why were the same managers retained, and at such healthy salaries? (My understanding is that your annual salary is in the neighborhood of \$106,000, your wife Amy \$76,000, your brother Adam part time \$46,000 and cousin Bobby \$62,000. Is Adam paid part time because he holds another job?) Are salary increases for Cascadia employees included in the rate increase request? Were you all salaried employees of Lehman Enterprises before the sale? What were your respective salaries at the time of sale?</p> <p>6) Cascadia and NW Natural Water justify increasing block rates because they encourage conservation. Why should Cascadia and NW Natural Water profit from arbitrary block rates?</p> <p>Cascadia justifies incremental block rates based on increased usage as encouraging conservation. Cascadia is requesting significant increases in block rates: from \$1.30/ \$2.40/\$4.00 to \$5.52/\$8.72/\$11.04! These are roughly 4.25 times/3.6 times/ and 2.76 times greater rates respectively! What justification is there for such huge increases? Why should Cascadia make a profit from encouraging conservation? Your customers are very aware of the need for water conservation. But it seems very unfair for Cascadia to arbitrarily set quantity limits on water usage, assess a block rate penalty if its limits are exceeded, and profit thereby.</p> <p>7) Does Cascadia believe that its current business plan creates any economies of scale that benefit me, my neighbors and the rest of Cascadia's customers?</p> <p>I can't see how Cascadia's aggressive expansion program creates any economies of scale which benefit me and my fellow customers. Buying aging, small, rural water systems hither and yon across the state, retaining the same local managers and technicians who previously serviced these systems to continue servicing them, and making claimed improvements to these separate systems because of their individual pre existing or unique current problems doesn't benefit me in the slightest. What economies of scale does Cascadia or its parent Oregonian companies claim?</p> <p>One of the systems-wide "improvements" you claim involves installation of "SCADA (telemetry) systems, which allow our operators to view</p>
	Dave Bennett	<p>E-mail</p> <p>Statement to Commissioners regarding February 12th hearing on Cascadia Water, LLC Docket number 240151 Honorable Commissioners of the UTC, I appreciated being able to attend the hearing on February 12th of this month. While attending the hearing, I opted not to take copious notes and focus on the hearing as I understood a transcript would be made available. I was very disappointed in that I had to prepare this without benefit of the transcript, as the transcript will not be available until after the input deadline of 2/18/25. I did note that I heard several times that Cascadia has passed off their own fiscal responsibilities to the DOH. As I</p>

read the DOH Mission Statement “The Department of Health works with others to protect and improve the health of all people in Washington state.” The DOH website further goes on to describe “What We Do - The Washington State Department of Health (DOH) fights to defend the public’s health from threats in a rapidly evolving world. DOH’s programs and services, implemented in collaboration with local health departments and state, federal and private partners, touch the lives of all Washingtonians and visitors to the state 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. “ As was pointed out during the hearing by WCAW and the Public Counsel, the department of health assures projects meet minimum health standards. Any approval from the department of health does not imply or indicate the prudence and responsibility of any of these projects. That responsibility falls on Cascadia to develop planning, perform cost benefit analysis and apply their expertise on balancing the maintenance of a safe water system with the needs of the customers. If Cascadia acted so inappropriately as to take on costly projects without adequate planning, research and analysis to determine the most cost beneficial path to meet safety standards, that responsibility falls on their shoulders (and their shareholders) and not on the rate payers. As Cascadia stated this rate increase was needed to offset the improvements of ~\$1.7M Cascadia has put into the system. What they failed to mention was that in the previous year, the NWN audit report contained a note by their auditor:

- \$5.6 million decrease in other net income primarily reflecting higher interest expense at holding and water companies
- The water companies are upping rates to offset the interest rates on their acquisitions

This suggests that the \$2.0 to 2.8 million annual rate increase is intended to offset more than the capital improvement costs. What does the rate increase income cover once the initial capital costs are recaptured ? Shouldn’t it be inappropriate for Cascadia to implement capital improvements that are not required by the DOH and do not have customer buy in? If they do implement such improvements, reimbursement should be disallowed. The UTC website questions discuss a surcharge option for capital improvement projects:

What is a surcharge?

A surcharge is a tool a water company can use to fund specific capital projects or unusual expenses, as required by the DOH, to provide water quality or improve quantity. A surcharge has a specific use and is a temporary charge to customers. The surcharge is removed from your bill when the project is paid in full.

Why has a surcharge not been considered instead of a rate adjustment that continues long past when the capital improvement cost has been re-captured ?

I was also very disappointed in the repeated statements from Culley in the desire to provide fire flow on all systems. He is obviously ill informed as to the needs on Whidbey Island and probably for the Olympic Peninsula as well. South Whidbey Fire dispatches with water tankers on all fires on the south end. The South Whidbey fire chief himself has been outspoken (in published articles) against the dependence on fire hydrants in our area. This same message was also reflected in the WCAW witness testimony of retired fire chief, Harry Palmer (Exh.HLP-2). Fire departments respond faster and fight fires quicker with self-contained water and supplement with additional tankers. Upgrading systems to provide fire flow is not only extremely costly, but it provides no benefit to the water customers.

			<p>As a customer, it is very frustrating to hear Culley lecture about “industry standards” and “customer expectations”. When asked to define both, he could not point to anything other than his own perception of customer expectations. As a customer myself, I can tell you what I consider are the water company requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Deliver water that meets state and federal water quality requirements. 2) Have a company that responds to customer requests. 3) Continue to deliver the same quality of water I have had since moving here (free of treatment chemicals such as chlorine). 4) I want reasonably reliable water availability. Power outages are not frequent enough to concern me. 5) Be reasonable cost. That is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not expect to pay for improvements that are not necessary or for other systems. • I do not expect to pay the highest or lowest water rates in the country. • I do not expect rate increases of more than the cost of living (retired - on a fixed budget). <p>While Cascadia is spending a lot on “improvements”, we as customers don’t see the benefit. They still don’t answer the phone or respond to inquiries (letter or email). The last power outage, we received a “boil water notice” almost 24 hours after the power had gone out and the system was compromised after the automatic transfer system failed to connect the generator. The CADA system is pointless as multiple customers call in (as evidenced during the last outage) and wireless meter readers cost us but we can never expect to see any benefits or savings.</p> <p>I was very disappointed in the lack of due diligence as evidenced by the testimony of UTC Staff members. Rachel Starks submitted testimony indicates the staff looks at multiple criteria are to determine prudence, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the expense necessary ? • Whether the company considered alternatives. • Whether the company documented the decision making process for later review. <p>During her testimony she appeared to verify a negative to all three criteria which were supposed to be considered to determine if an expense was prudent. I did not hear any other staff member support the idea that any of these criteria were actually considered.</p> <p>Please give serious consideration to disallowing this rate hike as it is a horrible financial burden on Cascadia Customers.</p> <p>Thank you Dave Bennett</p>
	Dave Bennett	Web	<p>I have reviewed all correspondence received from Cascadia and discussed with neighbors . It appears Cascadia did not hold discussions with customers prior to implementing significant system changes.</p> <p>It is a broken system that allows the only incentive for a utility is to maximize profit, without regard to maintaining affordable water rates. The system is such that the more Cascadia spends, the greater their profit with no regard to customers. Customers need some type of a say on improvements and affordability.</p> <p>For example, my water bill in February 2018 (before Cascadia take over) was \$54.40 (2 month period). Applying</p>

			the current Cascadia rates and the proposed rates in UW-240151, the same bill (same water usage) would be \$386.90. That is a >7X rate increase or 611% rate increase.
	Dave Bennett	Web	<p>RATE CASE UW-240151 I am a resident of Clinton Washington and I am opposed to the proposed Cascadia Water LLC rate increase currently under review by the WUTC. Cascadia Water is an LLC that provides water for 9,000 customers through 3600 connections on Kitsap, Skagit, Snohomish and Island counties as well as service on the Olympic Peninsula and the Moses Lake areas (per Cascadia Web site). It was formed in 2018 and has been purchasing several smaller water services since that time. Many of the purchased water services have since been the subject of significant upgrade projects, required because of poor prior management choices to defer necessary maintenance (as was stated in a recent WUTC session). It is disturbing to note that current Cascadia management includes some of those responsible for the poor management practices and no information is available on current salaries, bonuses etc. As such, in 2021, a general rate increase of 53% was levied on Cascadia Water customers. Currently, Cascadia is proposing another rate increase of “75%” is required to generate \$1,788,793 for various system improvements and to earn a 12% return on their investment. It is unreasonable for a company to implement improvement projects as a means to boost earnings for the shareholders of the parent company Northwest Natural Holding Company (NYSE:NWN). As I learned at the last WUTC session, Cascadia Water LLC is buying up ailing water districts so it can create projects for profit and pass the cost of the projects plus a 12% return on investment to us as customers. While I understand improvements are necessary, I am opposed to the structure of each project as a profit generator with rates set solely by the LLC (cost plus profit plus 12% ROI plus ??). As a representative for the public interest I urge you to consider the following and take action to stop this abusive practice: 1) Cascadia has misrepresented the rate hike as a “75%” increase when it is actually much higher for most customers: i. Base rate increase of 91% ii. Block rate increases of 145 to 149% 2) To check this, I applied the proposed rates to my April 2024 bill (household of two). The bill would increase from \$79.94 to \$178.32...a 123% increase. An average family of 4 will pay an average of \$193 per month. 3) No financial data has been made available to customers to verify project costs, salaries, profits, rate base etc. We have been told such information is confidential. 4) Data from Forbes on national water utility cost (2022 data) indicate the highest average state water bill as \$91 (West Virginia). 5) With this increase, household utility water bills are likely to exceed energy rates – WA state average of ~ \$100 per month. 6) As drier months approach, this will be particularly devastating on those depending on outdoor irrigation such as for local food production or landscaping. 7) Based on my billing increase, I estimate the average customer increase will be about \$100 per month. With 3600 connections, the utility will pay for the \$1.7M expenses incurred in a few months (less than 5). What is the justification for such a rapid return and for customers to continue paying these rates long after the expenses (plus profit) have been recovered ?</p> <p>Thank you for your prompt attention to help assure accountability and transparency of what appear to be questionable utility actions.</p>
	Dave Fester	Phone	<p>wanted to send some feedback on the letter that we received this last week from Cascadia Water.</p> <p>I’m Dave Fester and both my wife Paula and I have lived at 5644 Mutiny Bay Road, Freeland, WA 98249 for coming up on 24 years. In all my years here, I have never received such a dramatic increase in fees to our water as what we received from Cascadia. Honestly, the proposed percentage increase is simply outrageous, especially</p>

		<p>given our economy, inflation and more. I understand that Cascadia Water wants to put in essential improvements, but there is absolutely no way that families can absorb this increases and further, at a minimum, Cascadia Water should think about how to stagger increases as to minimize the impact to consumers.</p> <p>I also want to bring up a very important matter: I had to install a whole home Aquasana filtration system (very expensive) SOLELY due to the fact that even today, Cascadia Water delivers terrible quality water. In fact, I argue that the water Cascadia delivers today to all the homes around us, is substandard and non-drinkable. See attached photos and videos for examples. So if I can't trust Cascadia Water to deliver PURE, CLEAN, DRINKABLE water today, why on earth should there be this rate increase. The WA State Commission should mandate that Cascadia Water delivers this water before they ever have a right to increase fees.</p> <p>Lastly, we have had our property taxes increased dramatically year over year and why aren't the increased taxes (which are inappropriately high), used to offset the Cascadia water essential improvements? Afterall, that's what our extra taxes should be used for.</p> <p>In summary, I STRONGLY OPPOSE this rate increase and urge you to consider this.</p> <p>Thank you Dave Fester 425-443-3443</p>
	Dave Fester	<p>Web</p> <p>Hi – I wanted to send some feedback on the letter that we received this last week from Cascadia Water.</p> <p>I'm Dave Fester and both my wife Paula and I have lived at 5644 Mutiny Bay Road, Freeland, WA 98249 for coming up on 24 years. In all my years here, I have never received such a dramatic increase in fees to our water as what we received from Cascadia last week. Honestly, the proposed percentage increase of over 100% is simply outrageous, especially given our economy, inflation and more. I understand that Cascadia Water wants to put in essential improvements, but there is absolutely no way that families can absorb 100% increases and further, at a minimum, Cascadia Water should think about how to stagger increases as to minimize the impact to consumers.</p> <p>I also want to bring up a very important matter: I had to install a whole home Aquasana filtration system (very expensive) SOLELY due to the fact that even today, Cascadia Water delivers terrible quality water. In fact, I argue that the water Cascadia delivers today to all the homes around us, is substandard and non-drinkable. See attached photos and videos for examples. So if I can't trust Cascadia Water to deliver PURE, CLEAN, DRINKABLE water today, why on earth should there be this rate increase. The WA State Commission should mandate that Cascadia Water delivers this water before they ever have a right to increase fees.</p>

			<p>Lastly, we have had our property taxes increased dramatically year over year and why aren't the increased taxes (which are inappropriately high), used to offset the Cascadia water essential improvements? Afterall, that's what our extra taxes should be used for.</p> <p>In summary, I STRONGLY OPPOSE this rate increase and urge you to consider this.</p> <p>Thank you Dave Fester</p>
	Dave Fester	Web	<p>Hi – I wanted to send some feedback on the letter that we received this last week from Cascadia Water.</p> <p>I'm Dave Fester and both my wife Paula and I have lived at 5644 Mutiny Bay Road, Freeland, WA 98249 for coming up on 24 years. In all my years here, I have never received such a dramatic increase in fees to our water as what we received from Cascadia. Honestly, the proposed percentage increase is simply outrageous, especially given our economy, inflation and more. I understand that Cascadia Water wants to put in essential improvements, but there is absolutely no way that families can absorb this increases and further, at a minimum, Cascadia Water should think about how to stagger increases as to minimize the impact to consumers.</p> <p>I also want to bring up a very important matter: I had to install a whole home Aquasana filtration system (very expensive) SOLELY due to the fact that even today, Cascadia Water delivers terrible quality water. In fact, I argue that the water Cascadia delivers today to all the homes around us, is substandard and non-drinkable. So if I can't trust Cascadia Water to deliver PURE, CLEAN, DRINKABLE water today, why on earth should there be this rate increase. The WA State Commission should mandate that Cascadia Water delivers this water before they ever have a right to increase fees.</p> <p>Lastly, we have had our property taxes increased dramatically year over year and why aren't the increased taxes (which are inappropriately high), used to offset the Cascadia water essential improvements? Afterall, that's what our extra taxes should be used for.</p> <p>In summary, I STRONGLY OPPOSE this rate increase and urge you to consider this.</p> <p>Thank you Dave Fester 425-443-3443</p>

	Dave Jasman	Web	Please donor approve anything Cascadia is requesting and tell them they can resubmit next year -not this comment could be duplicated as I tried to comment but received no confirmation when sent. Problem noticed 1. Letter to comment on subject of docket # UW-240151 received on 10- Feb-2025 requires comments be made before 18-Feb-2025 which is very short notice 2. Customers including myself have gone to the WUTC website to look up the document number in the letter but the site says this document does not exist. 3. The notification letter has nothing mentioned in it what we be commmenting about but with Cascadia I would assume rate increase as that is what always been in the past. 4. The letter received does state Cascadia has provided both incorrect past phone numbers and website information for contacting ATG on the subject. With the amount of lack of transparency's issues in whatever this request is it should be rejected at this time the reasoning of 100% lack of transparency as we current and past customer of Cascadia have not been informed on the subject of what we are commenting on and the closing of commenting is only 8-days out. I do have an original copy of this Cascadia letter date 3-Feb-2025 if you would like a copy please contact to request. Otherwise the answer simply needs to be a no-consideration. No
	Dave Jasman	Web	We recieved a letter from Cascadia Water on Feb. 10th 2025 for comments to WUTC concerning public comments on Docket # UW-240151 (yes I do have the letter which I can email or text to you to show the issues) 1. It doesn't state on the letter in anyway what subject we are to comment on but for cascadia it is likely another rate increase and yes I'm a cust) 2. The letter states comments must be submitted by Feb. 18th 2025 which is very small window on something that you don't know what you're commenting on 3. The letter also shows the past correspondences from Cascadia provided incorrect contact information for comments to the ATG. I believe with all these errors in disclosure to Cascadia customers that they should be denied everything that they are requesting and told to resubmit next year. 4. The Docket # Cascadia is providing the customer of UW-2400151 (WUTC) states this docket # doesn't exist which makes it again impossible for the public to comment on what the are not being informed on. Whatever they are requesting needs to be above board to go forward and obviously is not as presented. I would also hope with the State working on a proposed bill to limit rent increase to 7% per year that the WUTC look at not allowing any increase of total charges to increase by anything above the same 7% Including all taxes or other charges as us small landlords whom include. Water charges in our rent have method to make up the charges and even if any increase we are not in positions to Cary earl rate increase we are locked in with the terms of leases. State of Washington must realized small landlords can't continue experience the burden of all the expense increase not be allowed to pass it on to the consumers, While yes rents have gone up to unbearable levels in the past years the was do a lot of factors such as increase in 1. Maintenance and repairs, increase in taxes and levies 3. increase in insurance 4. Increase in labor costs 5. This is a big one is timing as small landlords could not evict tenants for non payment of rent and the state them they didn't have to pay rent during covid times. Landlords were stuck with paying for utilities, mortgages, repairs and insurance during those covid time with no no reimbursement. Then there was inflation. All that has really happened is rent increase are a correction-catch up of what was taken away during Covid times and since it's a catchup after the fact it makes the situation look worse to renters as all they can see is that rent went up \$150 per month this year and I have a greedy landlord but what what the renter isn't sayin is that he didn't have any rent increases during covid or the 5 years before covid. An if the landlord were to raise the rent another \$300 per month he still would have less return on his rental property than he did 10 years ago. Face it the math doesn't work for the small landlords or the tennant anymore and any increase in fees will be passed on to the consumers in 2 ways 1.

			Higher Rents 2. More Small Landlords will sell out and exit the market, such as we have seen happening and in turn creates a bigger shortage of affordable rental homes and will continue to increase demand and will again create higher rents. This is a vicious circle that we see over and over again especially caused by over regulation of all aspects of the housing market, taxation and ins costs all of which subjects the state of Washington has Stirred up and continues to do so. Please reject anything that Cascadia is requesting at this time as I'm sure whatever they are requesting it is excessive and will add to the housing problems in Wa State.
	David Armstraong	E-mail	<p>helped arrange sale of our small water system (Del Bay Inc; 35 hookups) to Cascadia/NWW in later 2020. As part of the sale agreement, buyers committed to major upgrades to our system that were completed last fall 2023. While we understood that rate increases would follow over time, we never anticipated increases on the scale of >100% that Cascadia now requests the UTC approve. New monthly water bills will grow by 107%...this seems exorbitant and will certainly adversely impact a number of households on small, fixed incomes.</p> <p>While Cascadia lists a number of completed and ongoing upgrades across their substantial network, it never occurred to us that we would be responsible for higher rates that effectively cover their entire water network. The impact is especially significant since it comes as a one-time action effective June 1, 2024, rather than incremental increase over a longer period of time.</p> <p>I urge the Commission to approve a lesser rate increase based on careful analyses of the underlying need Cascadia must have submitted to the Commission. In their cover letter to customers, Cascadia states that the rate increases will generate \$1,788,793 in revenue to them. We have no sense how that amount tallies against the costs they're incurring. Please be vigilant in your audit of their financial data used to justify this extraordinary request.</p> <p>Sincerely David Armstraong Freeland, WA</p>
	David Christensen	Web	<p>Subject: Opposition to Proposed Rate Increase by Cascadia Water in Lake Alyson Community</p> <p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living. Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter</p>
	David Churchill	E-mail	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to consider this rate hike by Cascadia Water. We live on Goldfinch Lane, Clinton,</p>

			<p>Wa, 98236. We are part of the Lehman Water System.</p> <p>Water is a life resource. It is unconscionable for a corporation to skyrocket rates like Cascadia Water is doing on our system.</p> <p>Are there no Federal or State Regulations to keep this kind of blatantly greedy increase from proceeding? Are corporations allowed to hike rates with abandon, with no restriction? Are they free to blast rates 100%? 200% ?1000%?</p> <p>This disgusting canker of greed is sickening. It smells of corporate indifference, and a disregard for human decency. Are the perpetrators of this rate hike not kin to the worst of humanity? What would be a decent fate for them? Forever doomed to climb a Sisyphean hill surrounded by fungal, putrid, filthy air? Whatever their fate, here's hoping Karma will deal with them justly.</p> <p>Thank you so much for your time in handling this delicate matter,</p> <p>David Churchill</p>
	David Jachim	Web	<p>Cascadia water is proposing a 50% increase in our water bill. This is an outrageous one time escalation, one that is unthinkable for most businesses. We strongly are against this current proposal and support a rate increase that is more in accord with reality/</p>
	David Jasman	Web	<p>CASCAIDIA WATER LLC took over our water system a few years ago from Cedarhearth water system. At the time they took over the water system we were told no rate increase. Then they immediately raised the rates by approximately 50% even though we were told no rate increase when they just acquired the water system and they justified the rate increase to pay for the upgrades to the system that they obviously didn't complete. Now currently Cascadia is again requesting a rate increase to cover the cost again for the upgrades which they are already being paid for which when looking at this request improvements must not have been completed so i must ask how many times are going to pay for improvements that the consumers are not getting? We all are aware that housing costs are skyrocketing in the puget sound area and have made a large strain on home owners and renters alike. i am also aware that the state of Washington has some involvement in this problem by creating some stiff regulations on water systems of this size that were requiring these water system comply to these new rules & regulations that ultimately required many of these upgrades creating a huge burden on the home owners and renters of involved water systems. I believe the state went o far on these regulations and should have made the new rules and regulations only apply to newly created water system and to any portions of an existing water system that is undergoing a repair or upgrade. Otherwise the preexisting water systems should have been grandfathered in and not need to brought up to the new standards unless there is a problem with the quality of the water. If upgrades in the water system are do to new regulations that the state is requiring then the state should be offering grants to cover the associated costs or ease up</p>

			on the standards. As this 75% proposed rate increase will for sure have an effect on making housing less affordable and we are feeling the pinch rising taxes & fees that are making homes less affordable. in case i am not clear on this my vote is definitely no on this proposed rate increase from cascadia water.
	DAVID MARTIN	Web	They have a Rate Increase public meeting scheduled for 9:30am on May 23rd to review the 75% rate increase they are proposing. This is an extreme increase in my mind. After talking to our neighbors, this is going to create a financial hardship on all of us located on Wahl Road. Their website details the rapid expansion in purchasing water systems around the state. I don't feel we should bear the financial burden of over expansion on their part.
	David Stenberg	Mail	<p>RE: UTC docket UW-240151 To whom it may concern: Public Counsel Unit Attorney General's Office 800 Fifth Ave Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104</p> <p>Last year Cascadia Water proposed an excessive rate increase, which was denied. This year they are proposing a very similar increase for their Whidbey Island Customers. As a result this request suffers from the same problems that last year's request did. Namely, the size of the increase and the suddenness of the increase. At last year's hearings these two problems were cited as reasons for rejection of the request. This year, to make matters worse the initial notice of the rate action contained errors in the contact information for public comments. Corrected contact information was only mailed out on February 3rd, 2025, which only acts to effectively reduce the time for public comment.</p> <p>In 2021, Cascadia requested a 75% rate increase. As they had not increased rates for a number of years this rate increase was granted with a limited amount of opposition, mainly concern for fixed income Cascadia customers. Now, Cascadia has come back with rate increase requests of over 100%. It has justified this huge increase because of improvements made to isolated systems that it has purchased, apparently paid for with the earlier increase. The cumulative rate increases that Cascadia is seeking is far out of line with the increase in costs of running the individual water systems. Moreover, Cascadia has benefited from being able to spread its administrative and service staff costs over the larger customer base. None of the individual systems that Cascadia operates are connected, or could economically be connected. The improvements to one system offer no benefit to the users of the other systems. The single rate structure that Cascadia seeks only benefits Cascadia by simplifying administrative operations. Users of the unimproved water systems merely subsidize Cascadia's expansion.</p> <p>With any increase of this magnitude Cascadia should be offering to implement it in phases. Which would allow its users to restructure their water use in an organized and effective manner. Simply, shoving this rate increase immediately upon its customers is irresponsible. Cascadia customers on a fixed income would likely be faced with dire choices on how to cope with this increase.</p> <p>Adding the above reasons, the errors in notification addresses, should reset the comment period, so all parties can be heard fairly. Given the extreme increase requested this seems reasonable.</p>

			<p>We ask that you postpone any implementation of this request until a phased implementation schedule is created. We also would urge the UTC to request Cascadia be required to subsidize the installation of water saving devices within their service area should this or any other rate increase be approved .</p> <p>Sincerely, David R. Stenberg</p>
	Dawn Brown	Web	<p>Opposition to Proposed Rate Increase by Cascadia Water in Lake Alyson Community</p> <p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter</p>
	Dawn Brown	Web	<p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter</p>
	Dawn Brown	Web	<p>Opposition to Proposed Rate Increase by Cascadia Water in Lake Alyson Community</p> <p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p>

			<p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter</p>
	Dawn C Wolff	Web	<p>Cascadia purchased our previous company several years ago, and our rates doubled in 2021. Now they want to essentially double our rates again (a 94% increase). Monterra is a senior community and most residents are on fixed incomes. This additional doubling simply can't be afforded by these homeowners. Nor is there any type of payment adjustment for low income homeowners like offered by other utilities. Cascadia has not finished installing meters in Monterra, but has begun charging a metered rate to those homeowners who do have meters installed, although we have not received the required written notice of that change required under Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 480-111-415 and -425. Please do not allow this increase to be implemented, or at a minimum, require them to offer a low-income adjustment.</p>
	Dawn Wolff	E-mail	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I am writing to comment on the proposed 94.1% water rate increase requested by Cascadia Water for the Monterra Water System located in Clallam County, Washington.</p> <p>In 2021 Cascadia sought a large increase in water rates for the Monterra Water System. The UTC declined the proposed increase, indicating that it was not reasonable for us to have to pay for capital improvements for other water systems owned by Cascadia, and specified that the water systems on the Olympic Peninsula should be separate from those on Whidbey Island and elsewhere, and allowed a reasonable increase to cover costs for the Monterra Water System and general inflation costs.</p>

Now, 3 years later, Cascadia is again seeking a very large rate increase to make improvements in various water systems it owns, although none of the repairs, upgrades or improvements they cite as a basis for the increase will benefit the Monterra Water System customers.

The UTC has reached a settlement with Cascadia Water, without involving the consumers, or even informing consumers what the terms of the settlement are, but apparently recommending Cascadia's proposed rate increase, and agreeing the water various water systems owned by Cascadia should be considered together, thereby reversing the UTC's previous decision from 2021 to keep the systems separate. A settlement reached without involving all concerned parties is questionable as to legality and viability.

The UTC's purpose is to regulate private water companies operating in Washington state to ensure that the services they provide consumers are safe, available, reliable and fairly priced. The recent actions of the UTC in reaching a settlement with Cascadia Water independent of the water consumers does not reflect this duty to act in the best interest of the citizens of Washington State, as is their job.

A source of clean, safe water is essential for us to continue living in our homes. We have no option to seek a different provider, which is why the UTC is supposed to oversee private water companies. Most of the customers of the Monterra water system are retirees living on a fixed income – this proposed very large increase is not something that most people here can afford, especially since there is not a justifiable basis for the proposed increase.

Northwest Natural Holding Company, owner of Cascadia Water, is a publicly traded for-profit company. Last year David H Anderson, the CEO of the company received over \$3.1 million in compensation. While we do not expect to receive our water for free or at a loss, we don't believe we should have to use our limited funds to support increased profits for a public company or its employees' large salaries.

			<p>Please consider denying Cascadia's requested rate increase, or only approve a reduced rate increase that is reasonable, fairly priced, and reflects costs that can only specifically be documented to relate to the Monterra Water System, as is the UTC's function and duty.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Dawn C Wolff</p>
	Debbie Crumb and Maryann Meersman	E-mail	<p>Greetings!</p> <p>We are writing in opposition to Cascadia Water, LLC's request to the UTC for a tariff revision (UW-240151).</p> <p>According to the UTC's website, the proposed Cascadia Water general rate increase would generate approximately \$1,788,793 (75 percent) additional annual revenue. Their last general rate case became effective 07/01/2021.</p> <p>According to an undated mailing we received from Cascadia Water on 03/15/2024, the proposed rate for the Peninsula System (for the Estates where we live and for nearby Monterra), the average monthly bill impact from the proposed rates for 5/8" meter size (which we have) would be an increase of 94%. Yikes! Off the top of our heads, we can't think of any commodity as common place as WATER that has increased in price by 94% in less than three years.</p> <p>We realize that Cascadia Water recently made some infrastructure improvements to the system which were costly. They had to upgrade the water storage facility because their existing underground tanks were out of compliance with the Department of Health's Office of Drinking Water.</p> <p>But requesting such a steep increase in less than three years is unacceptable. Please conduct a CAREFUL review of Cascadia Water's request and consider a rate increase that is much more rational, reasonable, and gradual.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration in this matter.</p> <p>Debbie and Maryann</p>

	Debbie Hogan	Web	This requested rate increase of 75% is so preposterous, I thought they missed a decimal point! Nothing justifies this astronomical increase. Cascadia is unresponsive to inquiries and all calls go to vm. They bought antiquated water systems and now want their existing customers to pay to upgrade what they bought. This should be paid through a bond issue; never an absurd 75% rate increase to customers who do not benefit from their purchase. Either issue bonds and pay interest for using other's money or sell what you should not have purchased if you can't afford to refurbish. I'd like to buy an old Lamborghini and fix it up. Maybe I need to ask my boss for a 75% pay increase. Illogical!
	Debe Skog	E-mail	Dear Utility Regulatory Commission, I am writing to formally oppose the rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living. Some of us are on fixed incomes and the increase they are asking is outrageous and criminal. Our community's well (not city water) has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. I request a vote of voluntary service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water. I have lived here over 20 years and no improvements have been made to warrant such a greedy and gluttonous increase. The current cost of living for the US is 2.9 not 80%.
	Debe Skog	E-mail	Dear Utility Regulatory Commission, I am writing to formally oppose the rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living. Some of us are on fixed incomes and the increase they are asking is outrageous and criminal. Our community's well (not city water) has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. I request a vote of voluntary service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.
	Debe Skog	E-mail	Subject: Opposition to Proposed Rate Increase by Cascadia Water in Lake Alyson Community Dear Utility Regulatory Commission, I am writing to formally oppose the rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living. Some of us are on fixed incomes and the increase they are asking is outrageous and criminal. Our community's well (not city water) has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. I request a vote of voluntary service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water. I have lived here over 20 years and no improvements have been made to warrant such a greedy and gluttonous increase. The current cost of living for the US is 2.9 not 80%. Docket number UW 240151 Debe Skog
	Deborah LaPlante	E-mail	Dear People, I am writing in opposition to the proposed 94.1% water rate increase requested by Cascadia Water for the Monterra Water System located in Clallam County, Washington. I am surprised this still remains a consideration by the UTC after indicating that it was not reasonable for customers to have to pay for capital improvements for other water systems owned by Cascadia, and specified that the water systems on the Olympic Peninsula should be separate from those on Whidbey Island and elsewhere, and allowed a

		<p>reasonable increase to cover costs for the Monterra Water System and general inflation costs.</p> <p>I would say that a 94.1% increase is UNREASONABLE for any utility or business, in general, to pass on to their customers except over a period of time of perhaps not more than 10% annually for the infrastructure that the customers utilize: Not forced to pay for others in an entirely different location and circumstance. I know of no other business model that is granted that logic.</p> <p>Another factor to consider is that the people countrywide are experiencing hardship due to financial challenges beyond their capacity due to inflation in all sectors. Please keep in mind that Monterra is a neighborhood of senior residents, most of whom are on fixed incomes and can only look forward to a 2.5% increase in Social Security Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) this year.</p> <p>The request of Cascadia Water to almost double the water rate to Monterra residents so soon following their initial increases appears to be presumptive price-gouging in the face of present hardships of their customers. If the owners of Cascadia Water miscalculated their needed startup funds when they accepted ownership and management of this resource utility, why are we having to be choked to cover the cost up front for their mistake?</p> <p>I would hope the UTC will continue to ensure that the services provided to consumers are safe, available, reliable and fairly priced. This is why people fear the speculation of private companies taking over public utilities who think they can provide better service at a savings to the customers. Please protect us from capitalists that put profit before people. Northwest Natural Holding Company, owner of Cascadia Water, is a publicly traded for-profit company. Last year David H Anderson, the CEO of the company received over \$3.1 million in compensation. While we do not expect to receive our water for free or at a loss, we don't believe we should have to use our limited funds to support increased profits for a public company or its employees' large salaries.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration in denying Cascadia Water's present water rate increase.</p> <p>Respectfully, Deborah LaPlante</p>
	Deborah LaPlante	<p>E-mail</p> <p>Dear People,</p> <p>I am writing in opposition to the proposed 94.1% water rate increase requested by Cascadia Water for the Monterra Water System located in Clallam County, Washington.</p> <p>I am surprised this still remains a consideration by the UTC after indicating that it was not reasonable for customers to have to pay for capital improvements for other water systems owned by Cascadia, and specified that the water systems on the Olympic Peninsula should be separate from those on Whidbey Island and elsewhere, and allowed a reasonable increase to cover costs for the Monterra Water System and general inflation costs.</p> <p>I would say that a 94.1% increase is UNREASONABLE for any utility or business, in general, to pass on to their customers except over a period of time of perhaps not more than 10% annually for the infrastructure that the customers utilize: Not forced to pay for others in an entirely different location and circumstance. I know of no other business model that is granted that logic.</p> <p>Another factor to consider is that the people countrywide are experiencing hardship due to financial challenges beyond their capacity due to inflation in all sectors. Please keep in mind that Monterra is a neighborhood of senior residents, most of whom are on fixed incomes and can only look forward to a 2.5% increase in Social Security</p>

			<p>Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) this year.</p> <p>The request of Cascadia Water to almost double the water rate to Monterra residents so soon following their initial increases appears to be presumptive price-gouging in the face of present hardships of their customers. If the owners of Cascadia Water miscalculated their needed startup funds when they accepted ownership and management of this resource utility, why are we having to be choked to cover the cost up front for their mistake?</p> <p>I would hope the UTC will continue to ensure that the services provided to consumers are safe, available, reliable and fairly priced. This is why people fear the speculation of private companies taking over public utilities who think they can provide better service at a savings to the customers. Please protect us from capitalists that put profit before people. Northwest Natural Holding Company, owner of Cascadia Water, is a publicly traded for-profit company. Last year David H Anderson, the CEO of the company received over \$3.1 million in compensation. While we do not expect to receive our water for free or at a loss, we don't believe we should have to use our limited funds to support increased profits for a public company or its employees' large salaries.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration in denying Cascadia Water's present water rate increase.</p> <p>Respectfully, Deborah LaPlante</p>
	Deborah LaPlante	E-mail	<p>I am writing in opposition to the proposed 94.1% water rate increase requested by Cascadia Water for the Monterra Water System located in Clallam County, Washington.</p> <p>I am surprised this still remains a consideration by the UTC after indicating that it was not reasonable for customers to have to pay for capital improvements for other water systems owned by Cascadia, and specified that the water systems on the Olympic Peninsula should be separate from those on Whidbey Island and elsewhere, and allowed a reasonable increase to cover costs for the Monterra Water System and general inflation costs.</p> <p>I would say that a 94.1% increase is UNREASONABLE for any utility or business, in general, to pass on to their customers except over a period of time of perhaps not more than 10% annually for the infrastructure that the customers utilize: Not forced to pay for others in an entirely different location and circumstance. I know of no other business model that is granted that logic.</p> <p>Another factor to consider is that the people countrywide are experiencing hardship due to financial challenges beyond their capacity due to inflation in all sectors. Please keep in mind that Monterra is a neighborhood of senior residents, most of whom are on fixed incomes and can only look forward to a 2.5% increase in Social Security Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) this year.</p> <p>The request of Cascadia Water to almost double the water rate to Monterra residents so soon following their initial increases appears to be presumptive price-gouging in the face of present hardships of their customers. If the owners of Cascadia Water miscalculated their needed startup funds when they accepted ownership and management of this resource utility, why are we having to be choked to cover the cost up front for their mistake?</p> <p>I would hope the UTC will continue to ensure that the services provided to consumers are safe, available, reliable and fairly priced. This is why people fear the speculation of private companies taking over public utilities who think they can provide better service at a savings to the customers. Please protect us from capitalists that put profit before people. Northwest Natural Holding Company, owner of Cascadia Water, is a publicly traded for-profit</p>

			<p>company. Last year David H Anderson, the CEO of the company received over \$3.1 million in compensation. While we do not expect to receive our water for free or at a loss, we don't believe we should have to use our limited funds to support increased profits for a public company or its employees' large salaries.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration in denying Cascadia Water's present water rate increase.</p> <p>Respectfully, Deborah LaPlante</p>
	Deborah LaPlante	Mail	<p>Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission P.O. Box 47250 Olympia, WA 98504-7250 Re: Cascadia Water, Docket #240151</p> <p>Dear People,</p> <p>I am writing to complain of the recent intended 94% water rate by Cascadia Water starting June 1, 2024.</p> <p>I have lived in the Monterra development for 3 years (May 2021). At that time, the bimonthly billing rate was \$12.30. Beginning 11 months later (April 2021), there was to be an increase every six months to the tune of \$71.64: An increase of 582%. Now, 2 years later, I am looking at the additional increase of 94% that Cascadia Water finds necessary after installing meters, intending to capture yet another means to charge more for water use.</p> <p>When Cascadia Water intended to install the meters, they were not to change or charge for meter readings until everyone was online. However, some neighbors have reported receiving billing for metered water in Monterra while others have not. Cascadia Water has not informed me that I have a meter attached to my water line, which I expected and requested a shut off valve be installed on March 9, 2019. If this work has been completed, I have no way to verify as I am not sure where the meter is located.</p> <p>I would expect a company who is asking more from its customers to be able to inform their customers when work has been completed. I also believe it is not fair to be charging these high and unprecedented increases, especially at a time when we all are being faced with runaway inflation in many sectors of our lives.</p> <p>Please consider no or a smaller increase in this utility's request for revenue currently.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Deborah LaPlante</p>

	Debra Joy	E-mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT
	Denise Mckay	E-mail	<p>Good morning;</p> <p>I am in receipt of your undated letter entitled “important notice” that informs of Cascadia’s plan to increase water rates a minimum of 89% effective 1 June 2024. The letter indicates Cascade has made “substantial investment system wide,” and tags inflation as a contributing cause for the proposed rate hikes. Sadly, no examples are given to back these claims up.</p> <p>The letter goes on to list several bullet points of “infrastructure projects to enhance service,” none of which are in support of Pelican Point. Further, the only “improvement” to the Pelican Point system appears to be a chlorinator which can hardly be called an upgrade.</p> <p>Additionally, Pelican Point has suffered with low water pressure for several years, yet there are no proposals to address this. A well pump which was allegedly replaced in 2022 has not increased water pressure, and a straw poll indicates that many of the residents—including me—lack the water pressure to efficiently power lawn sprinklers. This may be partially due to the significant increase in new home construction in the neighborhood, which obviously utilize the community water system. An expansion of the community would seemingly result in an expansion of the water system; alas, this is not the case.</p> <p>Your letter further states “for the purposes of this proceeding, the Company proposes to maintain a separate rate structure for the Pelican Point System, which is located across the Cascade Mountains near Moses Lake and its proposed rates do not align with either the Peninsula System or Island/Mainland System rate structures for consolidation at this time.” The letter provides no explanation whatsoever for this statement, but the attached table of current and proposed rates would seem to indicate an outrageous and usurious hike nonetheless.</p> <p>I would trust that Cascadia would show good faith and transparency to provide financial documents to illustrate the need in support of this exorbitant proposal, and the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission would utilize focus and discernment to act with both the consumer/end user and the water company’s best interest to arrive at a reasonable decision. A nearly 100% in price is most definitely not reasonable.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Denise McKay</p>

	Dennis and Carla Egerton	Web	We are opposed to Cascadia Water's proposal for a rate increase effective May 1, 2025. The rate will effectively double our current fees. We understand the inflationary pressures the company faces since they are the same pressures we, as residents, face in our daily lives as well. We also appreciate the improvements the company has made to our water system. However, the proposed increase is simply too high. It is especially burdensome to our large population of senior citizens, many of whom are dependent on fixed incomes whose cost-of-living adjustments are too small to absorb such increased fees.
	Dennis and Carla Egerton	Web	We are opposed to Cascadia Water's proposal for rate increases effective June 1, 2024. The increase represents more than 100% of our current fees. While we appreciate the inflationary pressures and understand the water company's need to make infrastructure improvements that we will benefit from, we believe the proposed rate increases are simply too high. They will be especially burdensome to our large population of senior citizens, many of whom are dependent on fixed incomes.
	Dennis Giralmo	Web	5/8 water inlet to our home does not justify a the excessively high increase being proposed.
	Diana Lanham	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners</p> <p>As a concerned resident of the Seaview community, I am here to address the recent rate hike proposal from Cascadia Water. While we understand the need for sustainable funding, we believe that the sudden 107% increase is steep and it disproportionately affects our community.</p> <p>The following are some critical points to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Over-Extended Acquisitions: Considering the company's acquisitions from at least five other water municipalities, these failing assets can be described as dilapidated, outdated, and in a state of disrepair, thus resulting in exorbitant costs for restoration or modernization. 2. This Was Reckless Planning: These unforeseen costs for upgrades and repairs are now intended to be passed on to your customers! This depicts irresponsible planning, a lack of due diligence, and most of all financial imprudence! 3. This is a Financial Burden: There seems to be no accountability here, so now you expect your customers to bear the costs of these upgrades and/or repairs with an outrageous rate increase of 107%? 4. This is Inequitable Treatment: Our community is smaller with considerably less upgrades and/or repairs needed in comparison to other acquired municipalities. This drastic rate hike is deemed inequitable and unfair, and quite frankly feels like a classic case of corporate price gouging! We urge you to reevaluate this decision with fairness in mind. 5. Local Context Matters: When assessing water demand, usage, and asset improvement costs in the Seaview community, we find that a one-size-fits-all approach doesn't align with our unique circumstances. We encourage Cascadia Water to consider a more palatable rate structure—one that reflects the realities of our local water utilities, community, and population. 6. Consider Our Fixed-Income Residents: Most homeowners in Seaview are retired and living on fixed incomes. For them, this sudden increase is not just an inconvenience; it's a financial burden! Many simply cannot afford such a

			<p>sudden and significant increase in their water bills.</p> <p>7. Consider Meaningful and Adaptable Solutions: Rather than imposing a uniform increase, let's explore options that are both meaningful and adaptable. Perhaps tiered rates based on consumption levels rather than base-rate increases could better serve our community or extending the increase over a 5-year period allowing customers more time to adapt.</p> <p>In the spirit of collaboration, I kindly request that the board engage in further dialogue with the residents of the Seaview community. Let's work together to find a viable solution that balances financial sustainability with compassion for our neighbors. We propose a more gradual, phased-in approach to this rate increase, which we believe would be more manageable for your customers, while still enabling Cascadia Water to recover its costs over a longer period of time.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter. We believe that by working together, we can create a fair and sustainable water rate structure that benefits all stake holders at hand.</p> <p>Thank you for your time reviewing our request.</p> <p>Sincerely Seaview Water customers,</p> <p>Eric and Judy Bingham, Jack and Linda Breedlove, Dan and Marilyn Egler, Diana Lanham, Joe and Debora Toro</p>
	Dick Lanman	Web	<p>I am greatly concerned with the excessive rate hike that Cascadia has requested. I can only assume that it is the standard negotiating tactic of asking for much more than you actually want, let alone need, in order to settle for a better result than you would have gotten otherwise.</p> <p>With this in mind, I would submit the following rate changes as a reasonable middle-ground between what was asked for, and what customers want (e.g. no increase): up to 5% increase for monthly standard fee; 5% for first 500 cubic feet rate; 20% for rate increases beyond that. Possibly 10%; 10%; 25% for commercial users.</p> <p>This is with the understanding that Cascadia has to invest in updates and repairs for multiple largely dilapidated or ignored systems. They are already turning a profit. Their parent company posted net income over one billion dollars in the first quarter of 2024. They don't need to extort their customers in order to fulfill their legally-mandated minimal effort.</p>
	Dionne Tillotson	Web	<p>Subject: Opposition to Proposed Rate Increase by Cascadia Water in Lake Alyson Community</p> <p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p>

			<p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter</p>
	Dionne Tillotson	Web	<p>Subject: Opposition to Proposed Rate Increase by Cascadia Water in Lake Alyson Community</p> <p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter</p>
	Dixie Mortensen	E-mail	<p>Is it really fair to raise our water rates 97% all at once? For those of us whose income is ONLY Social Security it can be a bit difficult.</p> <p>> Not to mention a small raise in January of only 2.3% for S.S., which will barely cover the Medicare increase.</p> <p>> It will be hard to cover the water increase, insurance increase, power increase, grocery increase along with how many other increases.</p> <p>> I hope you will think about this and take it into consideration.</p> <p>> Thank you,</p> <p>> Dixie Mortensen</p>
	Dixie Mortensen	E-mail	<p>Is it really fair to raise our water rates 97% all at once? For those of us whose income is ONLY Social Security it can be a bit difficult.</p>

			<p>Not to mention a small raise in January of only 2.3% for S.S., which will barely cover the Medicare increase. It will be hard to cover the water increase, insurance increase, power increase, grocery increase along with how many other increases.</p> <p>I hope you will think about this and take it into consideration.</p> <p>Thank you, Dixie Mortensen</p>
	Don & Carolyn Bohr	E-mail	<p>We are customers on Cascadia's Estates Water Supply System on the Olympic Peninsula and would like to make you aware of the following concerns we have with the system and the current rate case.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short notice received on chlorination being added to Cascadia water systems. People with health issues, e.g., dialysis, and/or pets on whom chlorination in water can have adverse effects did not have sufficient time to get needed filtration into place. • Trends in sending incorrect or late information on meeting dates, contact information and/or timing for sending in public comments on this topic. The latest was a letter from Cascadia containing incorrect contact information for the Public Counsel's office which was initially sent in December 2024 and only corrected by letter sent Feb. 3, 2025 for comments to be received NLT Feb. 18. • Rate consolidation and single tariff pricing for all water systems owned by Cascadia so users are subsidizing systems from which they receive no benefits but both Cascadia and the UTC do because they have a reduced workload! • Many unnecessary and expensive "improvements" have been made to systems without proven need. • Lack of transparency and/or communication on both Cascadia and the UTC's part regarding financial information and response to valid questions asked by system users. • Why couldn't this wait until March 11 when all three Commissioners would have been available to review the information and comments related to this very important and complicated case? <p>There are many more concerns we have regarding the subject rate case but we wanted to get the above to your immediate attention.</p> <p>Sincerely, Don & Carolyn Bohr</p>
	Don Bockelman	Web	<p>This an addendum to the beginning of my comments from yesterday.</p> <p>Most of the people who live in the area around Linda what's the name of the bay that's down by Mariner's Cove are retired and leave on fixed incomes.</p> <p>The precedent of allowing a public utility to amalgamate several different utilities from multiple counties in order maximize profits and hide underlying management dysfunction and corruption is seriously bone chilling.</p>

			<p>Demand a complete forensic audit of Cascadia's finances.</p> <p>Require corporate disclosure of top decision makers backgrounds and affiliations.</p> <p>Extend the comment period to allow consumers time to evaluate applicable RCW, and WAC statutes.</p> <p>Do turn off NOT allow Cascadia this aggressive and irresponsible increase. Your decision to facilitate this rate increase will undoubtedly lead lawsuits...</p> <p>Don and Linda Bockelman</p>
	Don Bockelman	Web	<p>Cascadia Water's proposed increase for water useage on Widbey Island dated 02/29 is pathetic, ludicrous and dangerous for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It severely impacts the economic quality of life of all residents who paid around \$8,000 dollars just to hook up to the original company's water system which originally had no meters, and then meters were installed, then water was billed in specific 'blocks'. <p>Now in order to sustain a massive expansion of Cascadia's (captive audience) base and Cascadia's profits they want the customers to foot the bill for their risky venture. Robinhood capitalism</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The "reasons" identified in the proposal are nothing less than excuses for
	Don Bockelman	Web	<p>Cascadia Water is attempting to raise capital on captive rate payers to finance ongoing 'improvements' to other recently acquired substandard projects... in order from Cascadia</p>
	Don Bockelman	Web	<p>Do not grant Cascadia Waters rate increase: this rate rape is designed to increase profit for a company that is trying force the locals to pay for their capricious' and dangerous capital ventures: just say: NO</p>
	Donna McSherry	Web	<p>· RATE CASE UW-240151</p> <p>The proposed rate increase is double what we are paying now and creates added financial stress to a budget that is already stretched thin because of inflation. The lumping of multiple water systems with varying stages of efficiency or inefficiency and then burdening those who are on an efficient system with the expenses of inefficient ones is unfair and lazy management. Rates should be based per each individual system and their expenses alone. The bully tactics of large corporations that take over smaller entities need to be held in check.</p>
	Donna Vanderheidn	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners:</p> <p>My neighbors and I have reviewed the outline of the Cascadia Water Rate increase request and have found it to be both unreasonable and unfair.</p> <p>This is simply because Cascadia operates multiple distinct water systems, each of which has its own unique needs. By structuring the rate increase as a single request, this fundamental fact is ignored. Our water tower is located on Inglewood Drive. Our costs should not be shared by water suppliers in other western states and counties.</p> <p>The outline of reasons for the rate increase, includes multiple maintenance items that impact only one of the</p>

			<p>multiple systems that Cascadia operates. These include the major overhaul of the CAL waterworks, consolidation of the Del Bay system, extension of the Bacus Road system, adding chlorine analyzers on Pelican Point, the new reservoirs for the Estates system and WB Waterworks, installation of disinfection on the Rolf Bruun system and the new well on the Sea View system. Clearly, these items should only be one time assessments to that particular water system's users.</p> <p>Standard maintenance items, like the replacement of pumps, pressure tanks and control boxes are known and expected expenses, which Cascadia should have considered as part of its prudent management. The meter upgrade and replacement is standard prudent management, which will ultimately result in reduction of Cascadia's expenses.</p> <p>Likewise, the installation of telemetry systems will result in lowering of Cascadia's operating expenses.</p> <p>None of these changes is primarily for the benefit of the system users, but rather for the efficiency of Cascadia and will increase Cascadia's profitability at the expense of all the water systems users.</p> <p>Further, since the last rate increase, Cascadia has gone on an expansion spending spree. Purchasing 6 systems across most of Washington State. From Clallam County in the West to Grant County in the East. Now, Cascadia wants to consolidate those far flung disparate systems into a single billing and rate structure. While this will simplify Cascadia's accounting system, we fail to see how this will improve service to individual water system users.</p> <p>Perhaps Cascadia wants to consolidate the systems it has purchased, these systems are in fact physically separate systems with different needs and challenges. Why group Island County water systems with any of the Mainland, Olympic Peninsula or Grant County Systems.</p> <p>Sincerely, Donna Vanderheiden</p>
	Donna/Demetri Vasiliades	Mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT
	Doug Sowdon	Web	<p>My name is Doug Sowdon and my family owns property in the area of the Bacus water system. I am very much opposed to the Cascadia Water proposed rate increase (docket number UW-240151). The amount of the requested increase is outrageous, by their own figures they are estimating bills to increase by 51-80%! Although I support water conservation, the proposed increases for actual water usage are 390% for the first block, 334% for the second block, and 253% for the third block. To contrast these figures, Skagit PUD rates are considerably less even after their 5% rate increase as of January 1, 2025. Cascadia Water has been unresponsive to phone calls and messages I have left them regarding other matters, so I</p>

			<p>have to assume they are not supporting a large office staff that needs raises or benefits like Skagit PUD employees. My guess is that Cascadia Water has acquired some water systems that need expensive improvements and upgrades and they are expecting that by lumping totally independent and unrelated water systems together to have us pay for their questionable acquisitions. Their water systems are all over the map, just look at the name of this proposal – ISLAND/MAINLAND SYSTEM (for former Northwest Water Services) Specific locations: Skagit/Snohomish counties, and Jones/Henni Road and Silver Lake area.</p> <p>Again, I am opposed to the proposed rate increase. It is far too high and unrelated to the expenses of operating my local water system in the Bacus area. Thankyou for your efforts to curtail this proposed rate increase.</p> <p>Best Regards, Doug Sowdon for Upper Elk Run LLC</p>
	Douglas and Patrice Markham	E-mail	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I am writing to voice our concerns on the recent proposed 94% water rate increase requested by CASCADIA WATER for the MONTERRA WATER SYSTEM located in Clallam County, Port Angeles, WA.</p> <p>We are a retired couple living on a low fixed income (social security and a small government assistance) with no other source of income. The proposed (unjust and unjustified) rate increase would be an extreme hardship for us. We would have to decide to do without water or many other daily necessities. With no available low income financial assistance it leaves us with very difficult decisions.</p> <p>Respectfully, Douglas Markham Patrice Markham</p>
	Douglass M Culver	Web	<p>They're proposing a totally unreasonable hike in rates. For some of us, our bills would likely triple or quadruple in pricing. I feel like they know they're our main option in our area, and because of that they're hiking rates just because they can. They've talked about making small upgrades like a backup generator and some motion lights on their well house. I get that we can be expecting a raise in rates to cover that, I know things aren't free, but charging us 3x or 4x what we were paying is totally unreasonable and unacceptable.</p>
	Dow and Marlene Lambert	E-mail	<p>To: Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission</p> <p>From: Dow and Marlene Lambert</p> <p>When I first learned from Cascadia Water of their proposed rate increase for the Pederson Water System I was not unduly alarmed. Our base rate of \$28/month was reasonable and had only changed slowly for the 17 years we have been on this water system.</p>

			<p>When we purchased our house here in the Dungeness Bay Plat, we learned that all properties in this plat are governed by certain covenants, one of which states that we must get our water from the Pedersen water system, and we are specifically prohibited from drilling a well on our property. Thus Pedersen held a monopoly on our water. Until now, this never concerned me.</p> <p>Increasing our monthly water bill by the proposed 67% seems like a big increase all at once, but I thought if that money was used for infrastructure improvements in our very old water system that it would be worth it. I am not opposed to paying our share for improvements in our system.</p> <p>However, in reading further I learned that there were no plans for improvements to the Pedersen System, and our rate increase would support infrastructure improvements to several other of the water systems that Cascadia has acquired. It does not appear that Cascadia has any plan for the Pedersen System, yet wishes us to pay for upkeep and improvements to other systems.</p> <p>It also appears that this is only the first of several annual multi-million dollar rate hikes proposed by Cascadia to support a variety of infrastructure improvements in other systems than the Pedersen System.</p> <p>I agree with testimony provided by Scott Sevall, a UTC staff member, in which he recommended “that the Commission consolidate the tariffs for Cascade’s Peninsula and Island water systems to a single tariff”, and that “the resulting rate increase be phased over two years.” Note: Pedersen Water System is now part of Cascadia’s Peninsula system.</p> <p>In closing, I refer to the WUTC mission statement: Our Mission is to protect the people of Washington by ensuring investor-owned utility and transportation services are safe, equitable, available, reliable and fairly priced.</p> <p>Please apply this mission statement to the proposed systems consolidation and rate increases.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
	Dr. Comer A. LaRue	Web	<p>Cascadia sent a very recent notice stating that they were requesting increased rates effective June 1, 2024. I quote, "Increased rates will reflect additional revenue of \$1,788,793, an incremental increase of 75%." DO NOT APPROVE THIS REQUEST!! Those in my area a forced to be on a community well and do not have the option of drilling our own well. An increase of this magnitude is not warranted. There have not been any significant changes in our area that would substantiate such a request. This request by Cascadia makes no sense.</p>
	Dwayne Wendorf	Web	<p>I am completely against the outrageous rate increase proposed by Cascadia Water, that will result in a 35% increase in my water bill, but a 75% increase in CW’s profits.</p>

			<p>The only “improvements” this company has made to Discovery Bay Water system since purchasing it is installing more accurate water meters so they can make darn sure they collect every penny due them for water used.</p> <p>If Cascadia Water wants to raise it’s customer’s rates, the Commission should require the company to actually make improvements to the system that reflect improvements, like increasing well or water storage capacity, replacing system piping, or the like.</p> <p>I strongly urge the Commision to reject this preposterous rate increase until Cascadia Water can prove that they have actually provided their customers with some tangible benefit. NO RATE INCREASE UNTIL CASCADIA EARNS IT!</p> <p>Sincerely, Dwayne A. Wendorf</p>
	Ed Harvey	Phone	<p>I'm a customer in Freeland, when I take a shower it smells like rotten eggs, I smell worse after a shower. I don't have a problem with an increase if the water is improved. I have calcium spots stains on my car. I have to wash my car in Bothell at my daughters house. My appliances are also stained because of the water, it gross. The glass on my car is damaged. I hope the same people who want to raise the rates are using the water. The water became 75% worse since Cascadia took it over.</p>
	Edwin L Hervey	Phone	<p>The water is terrible, it smells like rotten eggs, and its staining my car. No cleaning product will remove the stains from the faucets and sinks. Since Cascadia has taken over my appliances have been ruined.</p>
	Elaine and Stephen See	E-mail	<p>We are absolutely opposed to Cascadia raising their water prices (again) by almost/over 100%! If they wanted to buy up every small water company in the western region of WA, they should have done their due diligence on each company prior to purchase to see how much all the upgrades would have cost, and NOT raised everyone's rates so drastically, so often. With inflation rearing it's ugly head again, people on fixed incomes can not afford the price of this commodity to be increased so much.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Elaine and Stephen See</p>
	Elton Miller	E-mail	<p>***See Attachment</p> <p>Dear Sir or Madam:</p> <p>On behalf of the Pelican Point Community Association, I am writing to express our concern about, and formal objection to, the recent notice circulated by Cascadia Water, LLC ("Cascadia") of its request for substantial water rate increases following its recent acquisition of the Pelican Point</p>

			<p>Water Company. As detailed in that notice Cascadia is proposing immediate and permanent rate increases of 89% to 103% for its various classes of service in the Pelican Point system. We respectfully submit that those dramatic, permanent increases in the current rates are not fair and reasonable and will result in substantial and undue hardship to the members of our community. We acknowledge and appreciate Cascadia's recent operating and infrastructure expenditures to correct long-standing deficiencies in the Pelican Point Water system. We believe, however, that permanent rate increases of the magnitude proposed would be an unjustified and improper method of recovering those costs. We submit that a more limited, temporary assessment, amortized over the useful life of the improvements made, is the proper approach for recovery of the recent expenditures. We further request that any such assessment be phased in over a significant transitional period to allow our residents a period of time to adjust to any rate increase. Thank you for your consideration of our input and requests. Sincerely,</p>
	Emilie (Amy) D. Fenlon	Mail	***See Attachment
	Eric	Web	<p>April 30, 2024</p> <p>Washington Utilities And Transportation Commission 621 Woodland Square Loop SE Lacey, WA 98503</p> <p>Subject: Seaview System (Island) proposed water rate increase from Cascadia Water LLC Reference: Docket Number 240151</p> <p>Dear Commissioners</p> <p>As a concerned resident of the Seaview community, I am here to address the recent rate hike proposal from Cascadia Water. While we understand the need for sustainable funding, we believe that the sudden 107% increase is steep and it disproportionately affects our community. The following are some critical points to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Over-Extended Acquisitions: Considering the company's acquisitions from at least five other water municipalities, these failing assets can be described as dilapidated, outdated, and in a state of disrepair, thus resulting in exorbitant costs for restoration or modernization. 2. This Was Reckless Planning: These unforeseen costs for upgrades and repairs are now intended to be passed on to your customers! This depicts irresponsible planning, a lack of due diligence, and most of all financial imprudence!

3. This is a Financial Burden: There seems to be no accountability here, so now you expect your customers to bear the costs of these upgrades and/or repairs with an outrageous rate increase of 107%?

4. This is Inequitable Treatment: Our community is smaller with considerably less upgrades and/or repairs needed in comparison to other acquired municipalities. This drastic rate hike is deemed inequitable and unfair, and quite frankly feels like a classic case of corporate price gouging! We urge you to reevaluate this decision with fairness in mind.

5. Local Context Matters: When assessing water demand, usage, and asset improvement costs in the Seaview community, we find that a one-size-fits-all approach doesn't align with our unique circumstances. We encourage Cascadia Water to consider a more palatable rate structure—one that reflects the realities of our local water utilities, community, and population.

6. Consider Our Fixed-Income Residents: Most homeowners in Seaview are retired and living on fixed incomes. For them, this sudden increase is not just an inconvenience; it's a financial burden! Many simply cannot afford such a sudden and significant increase in their water bills.

7. Consider Meaningful and Adaptable Solutions: Rather than imposing a uniform increase, let's explore options that are both meaningful and adaptable. Perhaps tiered rates based on consumption levels rather than base-rate increases could better serve our community or extending the increase over a 5-year period allowing customers more time to adapt.

In the spirit of collaboration, I kindly request that the board engage in further dialogue with the residents of the Seaview community. Let's work together to find a viable solution that balances financial sustainability with compassion for our neighbors. We propose a more gradual, phased-in approach to this rate increase, which we believe would be more manageable for your customers, while still enabling Cascadia Water to recover its costs over a longer period of time.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We believe that by working together, we can create a fair and sustainable water rate structure that benefits all stake holders at hand.

Thank you for your time reviewing our request.

Sincerely Seaview Water customers,

Eric and Judy Bingham, Jack and Linda Breedlove, Dan and Marilyn Egler, Diana Lanham, Joe and Debora Toro

Cc: Culley Lehman
General Manager
Cascadia Water, LLC
info@cascadiawater.com

	Eric and Judy Bingham	E-mail	<p>As a concerned resident of the Seaview community, I am here to address the recent rate hike proposal from Cascadia Water. While we understand the need for sustainable funding, we believe that the sudden 107% increase is steep and it disproportionately affects our community.</p> <p>The following are some critical points to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Over-Extended Acquisitions: Considering the company’s acquisitions from at least five other water municipalities, these failing assets can be described as dilapidated, outdated, and in a state of disrepair, thus resulting in exorbitant costs for restoration or modernization.2. This Was Reckless Planning: These unforeseen costs for upgrades and repairs are now intended to be passed on to your customers! This depicts irresponsible planning, a lack of due diligence, and most of all financial imprudence!3. This is a Financial Burden: There seems to be no accountability here, so now you expect your customers to bear the costs of these upgrades and/or repairs with an outrageous rate increase of 107%?4. This is Inequitable Treatment: Our community is smaller with considerably less upgrades and/or repairs needed in comparison to other acquired municipalities. This drastic rate hike is deemed inequitable and unfair, and quite frankly feels like a classic case of corporate price gouging! We urge you to reevaluate this decision with fairness in mind.5. Local Context Matters: When assessing water demand, usage, and asset improvement costs in the Seaview community, we find that a one-size-fits-all approach doesn’t align with our unique circumstances. We encourage Cascadia Water to consider a more palatable rate structure—one that reflects the realities of our local water utilities, community, and population.6. Consider Our Fixed-Income Residents: Most homeowners in Seaview are retired and living on fixed incomes. For them, this sudden increase is not just an inconvenience; it’s a financial burden! Many simply cannot afford such a sudden and significant increase in their water bills.7. Consider Meaningful and Adaptable Solutions: Rather than imposing a uniform increase, let’s explore options that are both meaningful and adaptable. Perhaps tiered rates based on consumption levels rather than base-rate increases could better serve our community or extending the increase over a 5-year period allowing customers more time to adapt. <p>In the spirit of collaboration, I kindly request that the board engage in further dialogue with the residents of the Seaview community. Let’s work together to find a viable solution that balances financial sustainability with compassion for our neighbors. We propose a more gradual, phased-in approach to this rate increase, which we believe would be more manageable for your customers, while still enabling Cascadia Water to recover its costs over a longer period of time.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter. We believe that by working together, we can create a fair and sustainable water rate structure that benefits all stake holders at hand.</p> <p>Thank you for your time reviewing our request.</p>
--	-----------------------------	--------	---

			<p>Sincerely Seaview Water customers,</p> <p>Eric and Judy Bingham, Jack and Linda Breedlove, Dan and Marilyn Egler, Diana Lanham, Joe and Debora Toro</p>
	Eric Wright	Web	<p>Our rates have already been more than doubled in the years since Bill Massey sold Silver Lake Water (our system). You also brag about improvements/upgrades you have made, however we never approved these upgrades like we have in the past, you seem to just do what you want without asking then expects us to pay for them. It appears to me that Cascadia Water has overextended yourself purchasing other water systems and is now asking for this huge increase to pay for upgrades and maintenance to systems other than ours. Ours is never mentioned in their request letter.</p> <p>It appears you think you have us cornered and can charge whatever they want for a life sustaining resource. Shame on you and your naked grab for more money with nothing in return.</p>
	Erin Coughlin	Web	<p>I am writing to notify I am opposed to the proposed increase for Cascadia Water services. The proposed increases are not in any way reasonable or affordable for the majority of its customers. The financial burden this will create will be catastrophic to some families. Currently our family of 5 pays an average of \$75 monthly. The proposed increase for us would be 114% putting us at \$162 a month. This is too much of a financial impact for an essential service. We try to be conservative with our usage and have energy efficient appliances. People will just flat out not be able to pay rates that are increased as it is hard enough as is. They state inflation is affecting them but it is affecting its customers as well from several aspects, as the cost of living is becoming unsustainable. The resources this business has to access financially is far greater than that of an average person needing assistance. Passing this entire burden on to customers is beyond unfair and a recipe for disaster. The impact will be devastating especially for those on a fixed income. I would gladly pay another \$10-\$15 a month but anything greater than that is not even possible. Some people cannot even do that. You cannot request more when people don't have more to give. Please consider the ramifications this has on the elderly, working families, those on a fixed income, small businesses and all in our community.</p>
	Evan Parker	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>I am writing as a Cascadia Water customer in Sequim regarding Docket UW-240151. I am deeply concerned about the proposed rate increase that would raise our base monthly water rate from \$49.81 to \$103.28 - a 107% increase that follows another substantial increase from \$22/month in 2019.</p> <p>As a resident who depends on Cascadia Water as my sole water provider, I am troubled by both the size of this increase and the lack of clear justification for it. The Public Counsel has noted that Cascadia has not produced sufficient evidence to support their requested 12% return on equity or 10.5% cost of debt.</p> <p>I respectfully request that the Commission:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Carefully scrutinize the necessity and prudence of Cascadia's capital improvements 2. Consider the impact of such a dramatic rate increase on residential customers 3. Evaluate whether this increase is just and reasonable given Cascadia's monopoly position as our only water

			provider Thank you for considering my concerns. Evan Parker
	Ford Wilson	E-mail	<p>To the WUTC:</p> <p>I am writing to register my disapproval of the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water to the residents of L & M Acres subdivision in Oak Harbor WA.</p> <p>Cascadia Water is the third owner of our small water company since we moved here in 2012. Virtually all of these companies have done little maintenance to the water system. Cascadia is only an investment company that has bought up other small water companies and has only wanted to take profits from these companies and hasn't even attempted to maintain the quality of the water system. Cascadia has hired a company, Water & Waste Water Services, to perform any required maintenance on this system.</p> <p>Basically, Cascadia has failed to set aside money for normal maintance expenses of this system and simply taken profits as their goal of ownership.</p> <p>Please deny their attempt to make up for past poor decisions.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ford Wilson</p>
	Fred and Kathleen Swenson	Mail	***See Attachment
	Frederic Abt	E-mail	<p>External Email</p> <p>1. The Proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for their Estates Component is more than 100%. While I understand the need to upgrade systems to maintain compliance with EPA standards and ensure redundancy for Natural Disaster Emergencies, a 100% increase certainly constitutes Rate Shock.</p> <p>2. My understanding is that this rate increase has been approved by the UTC despite many comments questioning this increase.</p> <p>3. I would like a response explaining how this rate increase will be implemented and the rationale for the increase.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Frederic Abt</p>

	Frederic Abt	E-mail	<p>UTC Members:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I strongly oppose the proposed Cascadia Water company rate increase. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The proposed rate increase and consolidated tariff constitutes “rate shock” as customers serviced by Cascadia will see their usage block rates increase from 129% to over 200% in the course of 3 years. b. Cascadia Water continues to acquire Water Systems in need of capital improvement and seeks a consolidated tariff to pay for these improvements. In effect, this has all customers subsidizing improvements/operating costs that have not been made to their particular system vs. investing profits or seeking loans to pay for these acquisition costs. c. Cascadia Water was approved for a 53.5% rate increase in 2020 effective in 2021. This increase is considerably less than the currently requested 129-200% increase and did not include a consolidated tariff component. 2. If the business plan for Cascadia Water Company and it’s parent company NW Natural Water calls for continued expansion by acquiring outdated water systems then they should include a financing mechanism other than forcing existing customers to pay for these acquisitions. 3. A reasonable return on investment and acknowledgment of inflation is justification for a rate increase. However, 129-200% is neither reasonable nor commensurate with inflation since 2021. <p>Thank You Frederic Abt</p>
	Frederic Abt	Web	<p>Currently Cascadia Water is proposing a rate increase of up to 104% due to inflation and system upgrades. Cascadia Water received a rate increase in 2021-22 of around 60% depending on location, again citing inflation and system upgrades. Cumulatively, Cascadia Water is proposing a rate increase of 160% since 2021 without any specifics. While inflation and system upgrading do require appropriate rate increases, no increase without specific fiscal data supporting such an increase is required. At this point no such information has been provided. At this point no discernable system upgrades have been provided ie. no SCADA or power redundancy in effect. The cumulative US Inflation rate from 2021 to 2024 is significantly less than 160%. Until such fiscal data is provide justifying any rate increase I strongly oppose any new Cascadia Water rate increase</p>
	Frederick J. Goetz	E-mail	<p>I am strongly opposed to the unacceptable and unnecessary rate increases. 100% increases every 2-3 years are just not sustainable. You cannot APPROVE CASCADIA'S UNCONTROLLED SPENDING THAT WE ARE NOW EXPECTED TO PAY FOR.</p>
	Gail Miller	E-mail	<p>To: Melissa Castaneda-Kerson From: Gail Miller Re: Public Comment Hearing for Cascadia Water's Rate Case</p> <p>Comment: My concern, as voiced by many of the participants, is the proposed increase in our water rates that seems indicative of a very poor business model. Cascadia is claiming that current revenues are insufficient, yet we have been living with a water delivery system that is now decades old and, of course, getting older. There is nothing surprising about this! It seems the replacement and/or repair of the aging components of the system haven't been</p>

			<p>factored into the implementation of a realistic business plan that would preclude this last-hour extreme rate increase. I also question the transparency of the business plan - just how is this additional requested revenue of close to \$2million being allocated? What percentage is going to salaries of management? Is this information the UTC has requested of Cascadia?</p> <p>Does the UTC have any involvement in how Cascadia runs their business? My understanding is that Cascadia has purchased many, many small water districts - perhaps their management of this now very large system is too unwieldy, resulting in a financial catastrophe which they are hoping to pass along to consumers. The UTC will hopefully not approve this unrealistic rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you, Gail Miller</p> <p>P.S. Lehmans are the former owners and current operators of our local water system. Over the past 25years, I have personally found them to be really great to work with and have always had timely responses from them. My comments and questions should not be construed as criticism of them.</p>
	Gary Hooper	Web	<p>This 55 and older community made it clear earlier this year that the proposed rate increase would create an unnecessary hardship and now Cascadia has demanded a revenue boost that is a mere 3 percent less than the previous one.</p> <p>Cascadia explains their need for an additional 1.7 million dollars revenue in vague terms of infrastructure and inflation. Notably absent is any mention of increased profit. Also missing is any specific benefit that would accrue to the Peninsula System residents.</p> <p>The proposed rate structure appears to reflect that of a large municipal water system which seems totally arbitrary. It has yet to be demonstrated that the parallel is reasonable or necessary.</p> <p>If an adjustment to the rates for customers of the Peninsula System is required I respectfully submit that the commission determine one that is commensurate with the actual costs of this system.</p> <p>Thank you, Gary Hooper</p>
	Gary Hooper	Web	<p>This 55 and older community made it clear earlier this year that the proposed rate increase would create an unnecessary hardship and now Cascadia has demanded a revenue boost that is a mere 3 percent less than the previous one.</p> <p>Cascadia explains their need for an additional 1.7 million dollars revenue in vague terms of infrastructure and inflation. Notably absent is any mention of increased profit. Also missing is any specific benefit that would accrue to the Peninsula System residents.</p> <p>The proposed rate structure appears to reflect that of a large municipal water system which seems totally arbitrary. It has yet to be demonstrated that the parallel is reasonable or necessary.</p> <p>If an adjustment to the rates for customers of the Peninsula System is required I respectfully submit that the commission determine one that is commensurate with the actual costs of this system.</p>

	George Springer	E-mail	<p>RE: Cascadia Water Rate Request Docket # 240151</p> <p>To Whom it may Concern,</p> <p>After reading Cascadia proposal for a rate increase. We found the rate increase of 107% very high and unreasonable. Before the last 3 phase rate increase our average water bill was \$48.00. After the 3 phase rate increase. Our average water bill is \$93.00.</p> <p>In 2020 Cascadia asked for a 3 phase rate increase. Phase 1 April 1 2021 23.1% Phase 2 Oct. 1 2021 18.8% Phase 3 April 1 2022 15.8% Total Increase: 57.70% Now 2 years later a proposed 107% rate increase.</p> <p>In their recent Important Notice. Cascadia listed 14 reason for the rate increase. Please review the 14 reasons. Compare them to the last 3 phase 57.70% rate increase. The 2021 Important Notice states 7 reason for the last rate increase. Please review their new water systems acquisitions.</p> <p>Cascadia is asking for the increase to reflect additonal revenue of \$1,788.793. Through sound financial planning they could reach the additional revenue. And not increase rates again for a 2nd time in 2 years.</p> <p>Good management would be to maintain existing water systems as mentioned in their letter. General maintenance as listed; replacement of various pumps, pressure valves, control boxes new well. Meter upgrades, pumphouse upgrades, install telemetry systems, install standby generators. Installing cholorine analyzers, install & replace above ground reserviors. New well. All will make their system efficient and help reduce expenses.</p> <p>Since the last rate increase of 57.70 %. Cascadia Water has acquired additional water systems across the state. The acquisitions may not have been financially sound investments. Now upgrades & repairs are needed and the only way to cover expenses are to raise rates.</p> <p>Our only consumer rights are to appeal to the commission. 107% rate increase is very unreasonable.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention,</p>
--	-----------------	--------	---

			Rona Ishikawa George Springer
	Gerald Carpenter	E-mail	<p>Cascadia's request is for expenses related to expanding and upgrading their service area, and only minimally related to my area (Estates Water System, previously).</p> <p>While Cascadia may expand, my service fees should not provide investment type funds for this expansion. Since they have monopoly power, I hope the commission will be able to separate my fair costs for services from Cascadia's drive for expansion and profits. You are my arbitrator.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
	Glen Piper	E-mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT
	glenda Vio	Web	<p>they have put in for an increase twice now in less than a year -- as senior citizens, we simply cannot handle another water increase of 75%; Our social security DOES NOT increase that much Pls reconsider what the people can really afford...</p> <p>thank you for your time.</p> <p>a & G vio</p>
	Goss Lakeridge Acres Association	E-mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT
	Greg and Diane Spanjer	E-mail	<p>We are emailing to express our concern about the the rate increase filing from Cascadia Water to be effective June 1, 2024.</p> <p>As a homeowner serviced by this utility company it is unacceptable to experience a rate increase in one year that would be over a 84% increase in our cost for water.</p> <p>We ask that the UTC rule on behalf of the customers and grant a substantially lower rate increase. Like all of us this utility needs to find a way to operate in a more cost efficient manner. I do not question the necessity of their many projects but they need to find a way to action these needs in a more cost effective manner rather than asking their customers to pay almost double for a life necessity.</p>

	Hedi E. Voloshen	Mail	***See Attachment
	Hollie Ransdell	E-mail	<p>Melissa Castaneda- Kerson, Thank You for email email of 5/1/2024</p> <p>I purchased my home in Sept. of 2020.et up water account 9/11/20 I did not move in till June of 2021. At that time the Pederson Family LLC owned and billed in one bill, bi-monthly. The 9/11/20 , base rate was \$16. per month, .50 per 100 ft usage. Drain field \$ 55.00. Eight months later; May 4, 2021 , Bill, Base Rate \$21.00, usage \$1.00 per 100CF Jan 3, 2022 Base \$ 25.00 per month at one point Notice of Rate Hike of base rate, to \$ 30. a month 2+ months billed at that rate. Mid 2023, base rate back to, \$ 28.00 a month Drain field billed separately by, Cascadia Infrastructure Co. Cascadia purchases Pederson Water LLC ,11/1/2023 to01/01/2024 First bill. Base \$ 28.00 a month</p> <p>My current bi-monthly bill for water only, is \$ 66.00 , I am one person, NO landscape watering. My drainfield bi-monthly, bill is \$ 66. 01/01/2024 to 3/1/202</p> <p>And, Cascadia is asking for a 75% increase on base cost. I believe this is an LLC that has a monopoly on water in Olympic Peninsula, Whibey Island,Discovery Bay, Sequim Dungeness, Northwest consists of 8 Systems, ,Aquarius 's 4 Systems, Jamestown, Diamond Point, former LEHMAN which consists of 12 water ENTERPRISES, , Sea View, Estates Inc. , Monterra Del Bay, These water systems are in Clallam, Jefferson, Skagit, Snohomish, Kitsap,Mason and eleven islands.</p> <p>Drain Field issues.</p> <p>According to Cascadia. A law was passed in ?, now enforced by Cascadia,. Mandatory inspection once a year of septic system that flow to community drain field. Cost \$178. Inspection took , literally, less that 10 min. My septic was inspected in 2021. Andin 2023, 2024. My property tax statement has a Cline Irrigation charge of \$ 40.89 and a Cline Reserves of \$ 8.51 \$.A grand total of water, sewer, taxes, of \$ 88.00 a month, one person, ultra conservative of these services. In conversation with Secretary of Cline Irrigation Board . This is for office and salary of ditch walker. 99 % of the ditches in Sequim area have been piped. Ditch walkers are ? obsolete. The ditch walker, secretary, former Board members are all from one family and own cattle, veggie farms. They get</p>

			<p>some of the water used from, an open, non -piped irrigation ditch.</p> <p>This might be all OK. But.?</p> <p>Many Thanks for your hard work on this multi faceted issue</p> <p>Best Regards Hollie Ransdell</p>
	Hollie Ransdell	E-mail	<p>Description:</p> <p>Cascadia applied for a rate raise of 75% on base base now is \$28.00 and an increase on CF 100-500 price from \$1.10 to \$2.28. Lehman LLC, first owned 11 wells/districts on Whidbey and live on Whidbey Island ,WI base is \$29.35, CF \$2.25. Whidbey has gray water and needs a new filtration system.. Cascadia/Lehman has purchased several other small water district Approx. 30 total This feels like a monopoly & conglomerate. In my area , there is no other water co. Application for rate raise should be denied.</p> <p>II have never known of any improvements nor any info on what needs improving in Dungeness Bay Pats</p> <p>Supervisor Result:</p> <p>NO ANSWER. E, Phone ETC></p> <p>Customer Resolution:</p> <p>Application to raise rates should be denied. An accounting of how current billing monies are spent, In Dungeness the where, on what. What exactly needs fixing or improving .</p>
	Hollie Ransdell	E-mail	<p>NWN stock ticker, is parent of Cascadia Water , Several letters to stock holders tout the profits are due to the acquisition of small water companies in Wa. State.. The purchase of Whibey Island is the main money draw for Olympic Peninsula of the small water co purchases by NWN .Whibey Island system has had water issues for years. NWN did not vet this company, WHIBEY, properly or were misled.. The Whibey water system has been in all news venues for years. Culley Lehman, inherited Whibey Water, in short past. Mr Lehman and wife manage the Cascadia small water new acquisitions on Olympic Peninsula. This seems to be an issue , because Lehmans live on WHIBEY and used to own Whibey water. And, Whibey as stated above has lots of water provided issues.</p> <p>There is a NEW NWN BOARD President. As noted below in SEC filings. As a customer of former named Pederson Water System, in Clallam County, (Sequim). Now, Cascadia. The system is great, no need for expensive improvement or rate increase. Which would be used to pay for the other waten companies issues. Maybe even out of state companies. For, NWN has recently purchased several other small water companies in many states AS noted on the company web site.. I suggest that this rate increase case, so soon after holidays, Election, New NWN new Board. Is another attempt to rush through, at an in operatune time for consumers, this rather complicated case. That is, for us, the consumer.</p> <p>At last hearing of UTC regarding last rate increase attempt in 2024, a utc member claimed that a 12% net profit was normal. And, a 75% rate increase was appropriate.</p> <p>Using the stock of water companies around the US and locally ,NWN has a BUY rating by majority of 43 analysts price target of \$ 39. to \$56.</p>

		<p>Today , Jan 13, 2025 the stock is up 1.20% on a down day to \$ 38.77</p> <p>Performance Overview: NWN</p> <p>Trailing total returns as of 12/31/2024, which may include dividends or other distributions. IS 7% BELOW OTHER MAIN, LARGEST WATER COMPANIES IN USA</p> <p>BKHBlack Hills Corporation 58.47 +0.14%</p> <p>AWRAmerican States Water Company 77.77 -0.35%</p> <p>SJWSJW Group 49.32 -0.47%</p> <p>NJRNew Jersey Resources Corporation 46.57 +0.09%</p> <p>LANCLancaster Colony Corporation 174.23 +0.63%</p> <p>SO, Cascadia, sub, of NWN is really doing great. Their stock pays a nice dividend and hasA stock price increased in 2024. AND, I repeat per NWN stock reports . "QUOTE" Because of our acquisition of the smaller water companies On Olympic Peninsula , our profits have increased"</p> <p>Northwest Natural subsidiary filed a request for a general rate increase with the Oregon Public Utility Commission Briefing.com - 1:44 PM ET, 12/30/2024</p> <p>The filing includes a requested \$59.4 million annual revenue requirement increase, or an approximate 5.79 percent increase over current customer rates. The filing includes effects of inflation and higher interest rates, approximately \$10 million related to an updated depreciation study, and an increase in average rate base of \$204 million compared to the last rate case for several long-planned investments by NW Natural. NW Natural's filing will be reviewed by the OPUC and other stakeholders. The process is anticipated to take up to 10 months with new rates expected to take effect November 1, 2025.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Form 8-K NORTHWEST NATURAL GAS For: Dec 30 Filed by: Northwest Natural Holding Coo Filed on: January 8, 2025.
--	--	--

			<p>o NW Natural Holdings Completes Acquisition of SiEnergy Business Wire - 6:00 AM ET, 01/08/2025 Northwest Natural Holding Company today announced the closing of its acquisition of SiEnergy Operating, LLC from SiEnergy Capital Partners, LLC. “We are pleased to officially welcome SiEnergy to NW Natural Holdings,” said David H. Anderson, CEO of NW Natural Holdings. “I’m excited about the opportunities SiEnergy is pursuing, our shared values, and our combined...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue vs. Earnings NWN <p>Revenue 355.71M</p> <p>Earnings 44.64M average per quarter. WOW.</p> <p>Q4'23 Q1'24 Q2'24 Q3'24</p> <p>I suggest that this docket UW-240151 be postponed until consumers can see the business report in Feb 2025 and that the new Board President can explain her going forward plan and, inform all as to what exactly she needs a huge rate increase for,</p> <p>As far as Culley Lehman, it's possible he was not aware, as new inherited owner of WHIBEY ISLAND water, just how to manage a water co. In his letter of need for rate increase to UTC, he writes of inflation. Inflation has gone down & forward in 2025 it is an unknown. That is a totally incorrect reason for rate increase. Again, especially since we have no list of needed improvements, fixes? or to what small water co needs same. Most consumers that I have heard from seem to feel all is good.</p> <p>Cordially With Best Regards Hollie Ransdell, (Pederson Water Group)</p>
	Hollie Ransdell	E-mail	<p>Melissa, An update to Cascadia D# 240151, NWN Cascadia stock hit \$40.18, Dividend to remain at 4.88%, AND, again because of new acquisitions, BEAT STREET in 4th quarter 2024.</p> <p>Thank You for email.</p> <p>Best Regards Hollie Ransdell Formally Pederson water supplier</p>
	Howard Miller	Web	<p>Another rate increase so soon? There is no justification for this increase, service is poor, water was poor, (better now). I put in a request for service on water that looked like urine and received a voicemail response on October 6th (2023), telling me that someone would contact me. Here it is April 1st 2024 and I still have not been contacted. Why</p>

			should they be rewarded for poor service? I can understand a rate increase, but the size of the request is way too much.
	Howard Miller	Web	While I am not in favor of the proposal by Cascadia Water, I am not adamantly opposed to a reasonable rate increase. A 90 - 100% increase is not a reasonable increase!! I understand the need for a business to make reasonable profits to stay in business, but mismanagement to the point of needing such a large increase should not be rewarded. Efficient business can live well on small reasonable incremental rate increases. Do not reward greed!!!
	Howard Miller	Web	I do not believe that the company is deserving of the requested rate increase, I believe they are deserving of a reasonable rate increase, 90-100% increase is not reasonable!!!! Inflation has been pretty bad, but not that bad. Bad business practices should not be rewarded with huge rate increases, cost efficiency has its own reward in small incremental increases
	Ida Birney	Web	I strongly object to Cascadia's request for ad 94% rate increase in my area. I'm a disabled senior on Social Security. The proposed cost of living adjustment for next year seems to be are about 2.5%. We all understand that costs are up for the utilities and that prices probably need to go up a little, but 94% is just unconscionable! Increases in utility rates such as these would prices me out of my home. Further, I understand that the extra money that Cascadia is requesting would no be used to improve the water system in my neighborhood, but would be used to improve the problem water systems that Cascadia has added to it's portfolio. In other words, our little, relatively problem free, water system will have to pay to bring another system up to snuff. This is unfair. We purchased homes with a with a good known water source, and paid higher prices for our properties. Now we're being asked to subsidize Cascadia's purchase of problem water systems. It is just not fair. I ask that you limit any water rate increases to no more than projected cost of living increases. Thank you for your time and consideration.
	Irene Irvine	E-mail	Submission of my comments follows: 1. "On September 26, 2024, Cascadia Water submitted testimony seeking to increase rates effective May 1, 2025." Has this testimony been shared with those who are being asked to pay these higher rates so we can better understand why we are being asked to do so? And if not, why not. 2. " The purpose of this filing is to recover costs associated with water service." I would like to see a breakdown of the cost of installing meters specifically in our 55+ community of Monterra. This should be the only one time increased cost since we have our own well water which has been fully functional for decades without such an outrageous increase in rates. Why are we senior citizens, on a limited income, being asked to pay for other areas? As a water consumer, I am willing to pay for reasonable repairs and upkeep for our own water system, but not for other, wealthier communities. A 97% rate increase is unacceptable in my opinion without more information and details as to why.

			Irene Irvine
	Jack and Linda Breedlove	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners</p> <p>As a concerned resident of the Seaview community, I am here to address the recent rate hike proposal from Cascadia Water. While we understand the need for sustainable funding, we believe that the sudden 107% increase is steep and it disproportionately affects our community.</p> <p>The following are some critical points to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Over-Extended Acquisitions: Considering the company's acquisitions from at least five other water municipalities, these failing assets can be described as dilapidated, outdated, and in a state of disrepair, thus resulting in exorbitant costs for restoration or modernization. 2. This Was Reckless Planning: These unforeseen costs for upgrades and repairs are now intended to be passed on to your customers! This depicts irresponsible planning, a lack of due diligence, and most of all financial imprudence! 3. This is a Financial Burden: There seems to be no accountability here, so now you expect your customers to bear the costs of these upgrades and/or repairs with an outrageous rate increase of 107%? 4. This is Inequitable Treatment: Our community is smaller with considerably less upgrades and/or repairs needed in comparison to other acquired municipalities. This drastic rate hike is deemed inequitable and unfair, and quite frankly feels like a classic case of corporate price gouging! We urge you to reevaluate this decision with fairness in mind. 5. Local Context Matters: When assessing water demand, usage, and asset improvement costs in the Seaview community, we find that a one-size-fits-all approach doesn't align with our unique circumstances. We encourage Cascadia Water to consider a more palatable rate structure—one that reflects the realities of our local water utilities, community, and population. 6. Consider Our Fixed-Income Residents: Most homeowners in Seaview are retired and living on fixed incomes. For them, this sudden increase is not just an inconvenience; it's a financial burden! Many simply cannot afford such a sudden and significant increase in their water bills. 7. Consider Meaningful and Adaptable Solutions: Rather than imposing a uniform increase, let's explore options that are both meaningful and adaptable. Perhaps tiered rates based on consumption levels rather than base-rate increases could better serve our community or extending the increase over a 5-year period allowing customers more time to adapt. <p>In the spirit of collaboration, I kindly request that the board engage in further dialogue with the residents of the Seaview community. Let's work together to find a viable solution that balances financial sustainability with compassion for our neighbors. We propose a more gradual, phased-in approach to this rate increase, which we believe would be more manageable for your customers, while still enabling Cascadia Water to recover its costs over a longer period of time.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter. We believe that by working together, we can create a fair and</p>

			<p>sustainable water rate structure that benefits all stake holders at hand.</p> <p>Thank you for your time reviewing our request.</p> <p>Sincerely Seaview Water customers,</p>
	Jack Fackerell	E-mail	<p>I am writing to protest the exorbitant price increase that Cascadia Water is proposing, we live on Whidbey Island and we do not have another source for our basic water needs. Cascadia Water proposes to raise our rates by 100%. Docket UW-240151</p> <p>The proposed increase would create a great economic hardship on retired people , parents who must do loads of laundry for their kids, and for just about everyone.</p> <p>I understand that water services need to be paid for, but not a price increase that is both greedy and punitive to every day consumers. Please reconsider the proposed exorbitant price increase.</p> <p>Jack Fackerell</p>
	Jack Landsbach	E-mail	<p>I am writing to comment on the filed proposal by Cascadia Water, LLC to increase rates.</p> <p>While it is reasonable to expect increases in rates, the proposed increase is fairly absurd. To suddenly double the price is a real shock to consumers. It seems to me that the proper way to increase rates is incrementally via a schedule that spaces out the impact to consumers. In the notice, they speak to having "prudently managed operating expenses". While this may be true, it seems clear that they have expanded quickly and taken on systems that need a good deal of upgrading, repair, etc., and planned properly for that expansion. Prudently planning for these acquisitions would've meant putting a rate increase schedule in place to make proper business sense for the funding scenario used to acquire these new regions. It sure seems like they've gotten in a bit over their heads and are relying on customers to bail them out.</p> <p>I hope the commission decides to require them to increase rates over the next several years to get to where they need to be.</p>
	Jack Schwab	Web	<p>UTC Commissioners & Staff,</p> <p>As you evaluate Cascadia Water's February 29, 2024 GRC (Docket 240151) please keep in mind a few items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November 2018: Cascadia Water acquired Sea View Water, LLC. • December 8, 2020: Cascadia Water submitted a GRC, which was substantially approved. • February 29, 2024: Cascadia Water submitted this second GRC.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sea View Average Monthly Bill over time for our 5/8” meter, as outlined in Cascadia’s Dec 2020 and Feb 2024 GRCs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Nov 2018: \$32 o Apr 2021: \$35 o Oct 2021: \$42 o Apr 2022: \$49 o Jun 2024: \$103 (as requested in this GRC) • Thus, Cascadia Water is asking that, over the course of their 5 ½ year ownership of Sea View Water, they be allowed to increase monthly average bills by approximately 220%. • While we appreciate the improvements to both infrastructure and personnel/communications that have occurred since Cascadia acquired Sea View, this level of rate increase in such a short time period seems unreasonable. We ask that the UTC use its discretion to slow the increases, just as the UTC did two years ago with PSE. <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
	James A. Cone	E-mail	<p>As a consumer of Cascadia Water we knew that when this company starting buying up all of the local water companies that they would establish a monopoly and then try to raise everyone’s rates with the only justification being that they were greedy. They have not provided any benefits to the consumers that they did not have before they established their monopoly. This is the second time that they have attempted to gouge their customers without providing any benefit to them. I strongly oppose this outrageous rate increase just like I did for their first outrageous request for a rate increase. Cascadia Water is a public utility and they have an obligation to provide water service at a reasonable cost. The previous owner of water service kept the rate for basic service unchanged for nearly 20 years and nothing that Cascadia Water did improved that service. This company thinks that if they keep asking for an outrageous increase in their billings to their customers eventually they will get at least part of their request. Don’t let them get away with this unwarranted request. They even gave us a bogus address to send comments to the government agency that regulates rate increase requests.</p> <p>James A. Cone</p>
	James Allen	E-mail	<p>UTC Commisioners,</p> <p>I would like to comment on docket #240151. I have been a costumer of Silver Lake Water since 2018. The water system changed hands several times since 2018 and is currently part of Cascadia Water. I received notification that Cascadia Water was petitioning to raise our rates by 84%. The justification cited was inflation and capital improvements. Throughout the time I have been a costumer the rates have climbed but the quality has not improved. It is the worst water quality I have ever experienced in my life. We know many people on Whidbey Island using various water systems and this is the most expensive water in the area. Based on the currently available inflation</p>

			<p>figures an 84% increase is outrageous. In the notification I received there was no mention of any capital improvements for the Silver Lake system having been done, or for any being planned. Because of the poor water quality I was forced to install and maintain a costly four stage filtration system. On top of that I do an additional filtering of my drinking water. Based on my experience with the companies who have owned this water system since 2018, it appears that they are only interested in maximizing their profits. They have never invested any revenue back into system improvements. I can see no justification for raising the rates for the Silver Lake system. I feel that it would be more equitable for them to assign a special assessment to the systems that they are investing the capital improvements on. I don't think that the Silver Lake customers should be paying to improve other systems while we suffer with substandard water quality. My wife and I are retired and living on a fixed income and an 84% jump in our water bill would be very difficult for us, especially in these inflationary times.</p> <p>Thank you for your time,</p> <p>Jim and Myra Allen</p>
	James and Natasha Nichols	Mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT
	James Cone	E-mail	<p>Cascadia is at it again; trying to gouge its customers without a benefit to them. Adding a 60\$ surcharge to all of their customers because they changed service to 40 of them is unjustified and just another way that Cascadia is using its monopoly to make money that is not justified by their service. The state has an obligation to continue to deny these unjustified charges, just as they have done in the past. This company does not provide any better service than the private water service companies provided for considerably less than Cascadia is charging now. This attempt to over charge their customers has to stop and the State of Washington is the only organization that can do that. Protect the customers of Cascadia from this monopoly company and deny this unjustified request for an increase in price for service.</p> <p>James Cone</p>
	James Cone	E-mail	<p>Cascadia's outrageous request for a 75% increase in their rates is not justified by any increase in benefits to their customers. They are still going to get their water as before. The plan of Cascadia to monopolize water service by buying up all of the local water providers and then request this huge increase is not fair to it's customers because they have no alternative but to use their water service. All of their proposed "improvements" are only for their own benefit and do not in any way provide service any better than they had before this monopolistic buying of the local water services.</p> <p>They still refuse to fix the water leak that is undermining Tyler View Place private road even though their water is the only source of water anywhere near the road. There is water in the ditches beside Tyler View Place and Land's End Road even when it has not rained for days at a time. It is their water that is causing the problem and they refuse</p>

			<p>to do anything about it.</p> <p>They definitely do not deserve this outrageous rate increase. Perhaps their ploy is to ask for this huge increase in hopes that they will get part of it and line their pockets with greater profits without any real benefit to their customers.</p> <p>James Cone</p>
	James Cone	Web	<p>I am a customer of Cascadia Water LLC. I strongly object to the rate increase request of this company. Increasing our rates is not justified by their service. There is a leak in their system that is causing Tyler View Place in Sequim to be undermined and is collapsing. I have complained several times but they just say that they are not responsible even though they are the only source of water for this area. Even when it has been dry for some time there is standing water in the draining area next to Tyler View Place and also on Lands End Road. The leak has to be somewhere along these two roads, The home owners have repaired the road numerous times, including one repair that was done by Lakeside Industries after they installed a new road on Tyler View Place. I would probably not object to their request for a small rate increase if they would just take care of their system properly. When Cascadia Water started buying up all of the privately owned water systems around the area I knew that they would start asking for rate increases because they are the only water system in the area. The previous owner, Estates Water System, provided excellent service for many years unlike the poor service by Cascadia Water.</p>
	James Cone	Web	<p>As a consumer of Cascadia Water we knew that when this company starting buying up all of the local water companies that they would establish. a monopoly and then try to raise everyone's rates, with the only justification being that they were greedy. They have not provided any benefits to the consumers that they did not have before they established their monopoly. This is the second time that they have attempted to gouge their customers without providing any benefit to them. I strongly oppose this outrageous rate increase just like I did for their first outrageous request for a rate increase. Cascadia Water is a public utility and they have an obligation to provide water service at a reasonable cost. The previous owner of water service kept the rate for basic service unchanged for nearly 20 years and nothing that Cascadia Water did improved that service. This company thinks that if they keep asking for an outrageous increase in their billings to their customers eventually they will get at least part of their request. Don't let them get away with this unwarranted request.</p> <p>James A. Cone</p>
	James R. Stewart	E-mail	<p>***SEE ATTACHMENT***</p> <p>I have attached a letter sharing my concerns about the proposed water rate increase. In my opinion this rate increase is too much for consumers on Whidbey Island to manage.</p>

	James R. Stewart, MD	Mail	***See Attachment
	James Stewart	Web	The majority of people on Whidbey Island are elderly and/or retired, and can barely meet their current financial obligations. If money is needed for the proposed upgrades, another source, either state or federal government should be used.
	Jamie Hoeppner	E-mail	<p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water. Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p> <p>Kindly,</p> <p>Jamie Hoeppner</p>
	Jana Hilsinger	Web	<p>That is a huge rate increase that they are proposing. They not only shortened the block size range but also added over a \$4.00 increase on each block, that is outrageous. I understand the need for price increase due to our awful inflation however I do not see how this will benefit the customers with such a large increase. My suggestion is to either meet in the middle and do a \$2 increase per block and \$5-10 base rate or do half increase now and half next year for a full proposal increase.</p>
	Jana Hilsinger	Web	There is absolutely no reason the rate hikes should be this high. Cascadia is trying to recoup costs lost when they bought a development that has costed them more then what they are making. It's not right for them to push the buck to everyone else when they made a bad financial move. An 80% rate increase is absurd and should NOT be approved.
	Jane Cardinal	Web	<p>I am complaining about the recent letter from our water company Cascadia Water, they are proposing to raise our rates 107% ! How can this be allowed to happen, please do something to put a stop to this! This will be a financial hardship to a lot of people.</p> <p>Customer Resolution: Pay for their own expenses!</p>

	Janet Carlisle	E-mail	<p>Description: Cascadia Water application for rate increase held on March 23, 2034 should be denied not only for the horrendous 75% increase proposed but the four page outline to rate payers. It was deceptive in implying that it was approved. Only on page FOUR did it assert that rate payers could file a complaint. I believe the State Auditors office should look into any and all Cascadia Water filings past and present.</p> <p>Supervisor Result: Yes May 3rd Avery Booth, who was most helpful in giving me the date of the hearing and advising how I may Zoom the hearing.</p> <p>Customer Resolution: Refile when they get their act together and not combine us into one Utility Company as they are trying to do.....Keep us separate so we can continue to know what is done for rate payers in their best interest.</p>
	Janette Knittel & John Finneson	E-mail	<p>We are trying to understand how it is possible that a company that provides a necessary service for which there is no alternative supplier can be allowed to take such egregious advantage of us as consumers. We also are trying to understand how Washington Utilities and Trade Commission could potentially allow it to happen. We realize that Cascadia Water does produce a benefit and provide water service. However, it is taking advantage of its position as a large powerful company to run a monopoly, withhold pertinent information, and require us to pay for unnecessary improvements by unfairly doubling our rate. Yes we want clean, safe water and yes we expect our water provider to ensure the system is in compliance with Washington Department of Health's and other regulations and requirements; but we do not expect Cascadia Water to make capital improvements and pass the costs on to us in a way that is not fair, just, or reasonable, and with NO transparency.</p> <p>What was the process to determine these improvements were needed, why do we need these improvements, where is the capital improvement plan or other documentation to justify it, how do the improvements compare to what WDOH requires, why do Cascadia Water's selected investments justify increasing our rate 97%, how does the WUTC determine which capital investments are necessary or warranted, how will WUTC protect us from Cascadia Water's rate-gouging and monopolizing?</p> <p>We feel we are being victimized by a large company that clearly has its interests only in profit and not its consumers. We ask that the WUTC protect us against this monopoly, as is its purpose, and regulate Cascadia Water to provide fair, justifiable, and reasonable rates.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide our comments.</p> <p>Janette Knittel & John Finneson</p>

	Janice Brady	Web	As a resident of clallam county I am surprised that the UTC is even considering these enormous rate increases from cascadia. I hope that the UTC will carefully consider the facts and support the residents for a reasonable increase and not these enormous shocking increases.
	Janie Cribbs	E-mail	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am extremely disappointed and angry at the proposed rate hike by Cascadia Water. A 75% rate increase will make water beyond a luxury for many of us here on Whidbey Island and have a chilling effect on our monthly finances. With price hikes on everything including gasoline, regular working folks are left with few options and although no one takes water for granted, we already had our bills doubled a few years ago with added surcharges for extra use - like watering our vegetable gardens! I do not think this is fair and if they want more money for improvements they need to apply for grants or other state applications - not pass it all off onto the consumers who depend on having water for drinking, household use and gardens.</p> <p>I hope this will be considered in their application and taken to heart that we are sincere in our comments and fears.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Janie Cribbs</p>
	Janie Cribbs and Joe Reggiatore	E-mail	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>I and my neighbors are totally disgusted and against ANY rate increase by Cascadia Water! They want to increase the rate OVER 100% - and they had a rate increase that DOUBLED our water bill already! They also neglected to give the correct addresses to make this complaint - even though I sent another email in Nov/Dec...</p> <p>I hope you will consider our requests to DENY a rate increase - especially one of this size.</p> <p>Thanks and Gratitude,</p> <p>Janie Cribbs and Joe Reggiatore</p>
	Janis Machala and David Stenberg	E-mail	<p>To Whom it may Concern:</p> <p>We have reviewed the outline of the Cascadia Water Rate increase request and have found it to be both unreasonable and unfair. We find it this way simply because Cascadia operates multiple distinct water systems,</p>

		<p>each of which has its own unique needs. By structuring the rate increase as a single request, this fundamental fact is ignored.</p> <p>The outline of reasons for the rate increase, includes multiple maintenance items that impact only one of the multiple systems that Cascadia operates. These include the major overhaul of the CAL waterworks, consolidation of the Del Bay system, extension of the Bacus Road system, adding chlorine analyzers on Pelican Point, the new reservoirs for the Estates system and WB Waterworks, installation of disinfection on the Rolf Bruun system and the new well on the Sea View system. Clearly, these items should only be one time assessments to that particular water system's users.</p> <p>Standard maintenance items, like the replacement of pumps, pressure tanks and control boxes are known and expected expenses, which Cascadia should have considered as part of its prudent management. The meter upgrade and replacement is standard prudent management, which will ultimately result in reduction of Cascadia's expenses. Likewise, the installation of telemetry systems will result in lowering of Cascadia's operating expenses. None of these changes is primarily for the benefit of the system users, but rather for the efficiency of Cascadia and will increase Cascadia's profitability at the expense of all the water systems users.</p> <p>Further,</p> <p>since the last rate increase, Cascadia has gone on an expansion spending spree. Purchasing 6 systems across most of Washington State. From Clallam County in the West to Grant County in the East. Now, Cascadia wants to consolidate those far flung disparate systems into a single billing and rate structure. While this will simplify Cascadia's accounting system, we fail to see how this will improve service to individual water system users. While Cascadia wants to consolidate the systems it has purchased, these systems are in fact physically separate systems with different needs and challenges. It makes no sense to group Island County water systems with any of the Mainland, Olympic Peninsula or Grant County Systems.</p> <p>Finally,</p> <p>the sheer size of this increase is totally unreasonable. Cascadia had gotten a large rate increase in 2021, to come back to the commission 3 years later and ask for an even bigger increase is just greedy. Cascadia, clearly, has not prudently managed its growth and as a result is seeking to hold its water system users hostage to its excesses.</p>
	Jarett herbert	<p>Web</p> <p>Cascadia is proposing a rate increase of an average of 107% after they just did 4 tiered rate raises. I have lived in my home for 5 years and have already seen an increase of approx 100% while living here. I am currently in the seaview water system and can state that the water quality is abysmal. I currently spend an additional 40-50 a month on 3 stage water filtration(my 12 month filters last 2-3 months) and water softening pellets. Even after that treatment my toilets or left constantly stained. My glass has hard water stains that are permanently affixed to my shower walls. Authorizing any rate increase that does not address the condition of our water would be a detriment to the utilities commission. I understand i have to pay my share and am ok with rate increases as long as the a fair and address water quality issues. However this proposal is nothing more than a greed based attempt to bolster their revenue. We at seaview do not have an alternative option for water. I ask that the utc addresses this shameless act</p>

			of venture capitalist companies buying up water rights then turning basic human necessities into monopolistic profit monsters. It would appear that whoever is running these companies is trying to use its customers to acquire more independent water systems. Claiming inflation as a justification for such rash increases is just attempting to hide the monopoly that they truly run. I ask that this comment is taken into consideration when the UTC committee addresses this proposal.
	Jason Popp	E-mail	Cascadia recently purchased the only water well serving roughly 550 homes in Moses Lake WA. The area is known as Pelican Point. The community has started receiving notifications that individual water bills will start increasing 92% for single family homes starting June 2024. Most people can not simply afford a DOUBLING of rates for something as basic to human rights as water. Cascadia purchased this community well for the sole purpose of exploiting its members to pay for improvements outside of this community. They are for all intents and purposes holding a communities right to water hostage.
	Jay A Lovato	Web	Cascadia Water's proposal to increase rates is too large. An average 24% increase (per their undated letter recently mailed to customers) to residential customers is substantial and does not reflect the current CPI rates. Nor does the increase take into account seniors on fixed incomes, low-income households, and others struggling to meet daily basic needs. I strongly encourage the Commission to substantially scale back this proposed one-time rate increase to ease the burden on the household rate payers. Thank you for your consideration.
	Jean Heessels-Petit	E-mail	Subject: Estates Water System / Cascadia rate increase - UTC 4-22-24, 6pm scheduled meeting in Port Angeles I am deeply concerned by UTC's scheduling the 4-22-24 Port Angeles meeting on short notice and without informing all of those involved/affected. Please keep me informed re: future meetings. I am the homeowner at 253 Greywolf Road, Sequim, WA and am directly affected by Cascadia's request for an exorbitant rate increase. Jean Heessels-Petit
	Jean Heessels-Petit	E-mail	I am astounded that we in Washington State are allowing Cascadia Water and its parent company, NW Natural Holdings, to come into our state, buy up our small water companies/infrastructure, make 'improvements' that may or may not be necessary (and are not evaluated by anyone other than the company), have unlimited access to our natural resource (water), and then raise/double rates over and over again. The future of many residents of our state, now and in the future, is at stake. Water that cost a customer \$25 in Year 1, by doubling, could cost \$400 with four of these types of increase and \$800 with five increases. Who will be able to afford that? Their 70-90% increases are nowhere near the small % retirees are given and nowhere near the CPI. Washington State does not appear to be prepared to handle a big corporation working hard to take advantage of its citizenry. Cascadia Water and NW Natural Holdings do not appear to being held accountable for their decisions

			<p>AND consumers definitely are not protected from these rate increases. Few answers have been given to WCAWA.</p> <p>Re: Rate Shock - does allowing an unreasonably large rate increase to take place over time really decrease that shock when perhaps it should never have been allowed in the first place?</p> <p>Please protect this increasing number of affected rate payers!</p>
	Jean Heessels-Petit	Web	<p>For review by UTC Commissioners:</p> <p>Please listen to Public Counsel in this case. Tad O'Neill and Stefan de Villers ask the rate filing be rejected. Please don't reward Cascadia Water's and Northwest Naturals's flagrant use/abuse of the system = big, expensive, questionable 'improvements' to guarantee them rate increases forever into the future. UTC asked for Master Plans for several years and they've been incomplete for that long. Require the company to follow the rules.</p> <p>"Mitigate - make less severe, serious, painful"</p> <p>Someone from the UTC said it didn't mean the increase wouldn't go away, but it certainly could be reduced - rather than fully allowed and just spread out over more time.</p> <p>You are all that is standing between us ratepayers and a life sentence of exorbitant rate increases. Please stand up for the citizens/Washington state residents, and not the corporations using our system and our natural resources!</p>
	Jeanne Norrgard	E-mail	<p>We already had a rate increase not long ago. It was phased in over three increments. And it was a MUCH smaller increase.</p> <p>I appreciate that the new owners have made "improvements" to the Cascadia system; however, we customers never were consulted on them and how they would impact our rates. For example, we would not have agreed to installing a generator for the few days a year when the power may be out. Further, Cascadia is projecting future unspecified "improvements" that I highly doubt will benefit customers. Perhaps this is designed to justify such an exorbitant increase in order to create increased yields for investors??</p> <p>An increase of more than 100% at one time is unconscionable. I, for one, am on a fixed income, and so are many of my neighbors. I just barely get by as it is. Water is absolutely necessary to life; it is not a luxury. With the added expense of this rate increase, I will have less money to spend on food.</p> <p>Here are my specific questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are you doing to ameliorate the impact of this rate increase on low income people like myself? 2. Why on earth are you dropping the whole increase on us, all at once?

			<p>3. Why did you not so much as consult with your customers prior to spending so much money?</p> <p>4. Where else can you recover what you spent, other than from us ratepayers?</p> <p>Thank you, Jeanne Norrgard</p> <p>2066 Pheasant Farm Lane Freeland, WA 98249</p>
	Jeff and Erica Barlow	E-mail	<p>We, Jeff and Erica Barlow, live on Whidbey Island and are part of the Lehman water system. We oppose the rate increase by Cascadia Water unless the amount of the increase has been transparently shown to be justified. If a substantial rate increase should be approved, the economic impact of that decision on the customers should be spread out over period of at least 3-5 years, depending on the increased rate approved.</p> <p>Please consider the magnitude of the proposed rate increase.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jeff and Erica Barlow</p>
	Jeffrey and Sonia Killian	E-mail	<p>Jeffrey and Sonia Killian</p> <p>January 13, 2025</p> <p>Washington Utilities and Transportation Commision 621 Woodland Square Loop SE Lacey, WA 98503</p> <p>Re: Docket- UW-240151</p> <p>As we are still awaiting the required clear, and concise approved Water System Plan for the concerned systems, to include Maintenance Schedule, and Procedure Documents, the approval should be denied. If these documents are to be withheld, then I can only assume they do not exist.</p> <p>Why has the UTC combined both the Island, and Peninsula water systems? The systems are different, so the Water system Plan, Maintenance Schedule, and Procedure Documents would also be different. ie- not apples to apples, but apples to oranges.</p>

			<p>DETAILS ARE IMPORTANT!</p> <p>From document "UW240151 Multiparty Settlement Stipulation - Attachment A, Page 2 of 3 Proposed Volumetric Rates for Western Systems (Island and Peninsula) Commodity Rate Per Cubic Foot</p> <p>The rates shown to be "per cubic foot". The word foot is singular. This would equate to a 100 fold increase in the water billing rate. Should Cascadia wish to bill by the Cubic foot measure then the decimal point needs to be moved, so instead of \$4.71 it should be \$0.0471</p> <p>With these unresolved issues, and missing data we still feel this rate increase should be denied.</p> <p>Jeffrey and Sonia Killian</p>
	Jeffrey and Sonia Killian	E-mail	<p>We oppose approval of the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water systems until such time as an approved Water System Plan for each of the concerned systems, along with Maintenance Schedule and Procedures documents are provided to all interested parties involved in this rate increase request.</p> <p>Is there any way to postpone the June 27th, 2024 rate hearing until after the July 2nd, 2024 joint meeting of DOH, UTC, and Cascadia?</p> <p>Jeffrey and Sonia Killian</p>
	Jeffrey Hansen	Web	<p>Base rate increases from \$43.00/month to \$56.00/month. !st block volume decreases from 0 -668 cu.ft to 0 -500 cu. ft. !st block rate increases from \$1.30 per cu.ft to \$5.52 per cu.ft with a percentage increase posted at 84%. Rates more than double without any improvements to the system in the last 10 years. Cascadia has over extended by buying up additional companies.</p>
	Jennifer Gray	E-mail	<p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia</p>

			<p>Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p> <p>Jennifer Gray</p>
	Jere Colman	Web	<p>Although rate increases may be understandable when a new company takes over an existing business, I believe the proposed residential rate increase of 94% and the 'ready to serve' cost increase from \$24/mo. to \$44/mo. is excessive. I respectfully oppose the amount of the increase and would suggest, if need be, a lesser increase in both the residential and the 'ready to serve' aspects of the proposal by Cascadia Water, LLC. I see a new well in our future, and maybe in our neighbor's future as well.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jere Colman</p>
	Jeri Cartright	Mail	<p>Dear commissioners,</p> <p>RECEIVED MAR 27 2024 WASH.UT. & TP. COMM</p> <p>I am writing regarding my interests in the proposed rate change to our water service in Pelican Point community in Grant county outside of Moses Lake WA by Cascadia/Gem State water company.</p> <p>My husband and I moved into the community July of 2019. As of that time our water system was owned by Pelican Point water a small company who has serviced the community since it started in the early 1990s. We were told by previous owner that the water pressure is so poor he suggested irrigation be done at 11:00 pm.</p> <p>So when Cascadia/Gem state acquired this water system many issues were in dire need of repair/maintenance. We have an HOA in the community that takes care of a 9 acre park & boat ramp.</p> <p>We have had to replace sprinkler heads to a less pressure to get sprinklers to rotate on our property.</p> <p>This past summer the park irrigation was not working as the sprinklers had no pressure to rotate. We were told the pump & pipes went out and needed replacing. It was a fiasco. It took a lot longer to repair than we were informed.</p> <p>The park dried up and weeds moved in. It took months to be repaired and residents were not kept informed. We called many times as my husband is on the HOA board and was given lip service. The residents felt it was the fault of the board when it was Cascadia/gem state water. It will cost us homeowners to get the park back in shape.</p> <p>It's difficult living in Moses Lake & our water company is out</p> <p>-</p> <p>of Idaho? It seems Cascadia/Gem state water has acquired too much too soon to keep up.</p> <p>I believe a water main broke & it took days for the cascadia/ gem state to realize it.</p>

			<p>We had to notify the fire dept. to bring a pumper truck if a fire broke out in the neiahborhood as the fire hvdnants had no pressure all summer of 2023. Very scary!</p> <p>We live in the county and are on septic tank service which we maintain and have already experienced low water pressure this year and summer isn't even here yet.</p> <p>The area is stili building multi residential buildings on Goodrich rd and large homes in The Dunes area on a water system that can not keep up with the homes already on this system.</p> <p>For these reasons we feel that the proposed rate increase suggested by Cascadia/Gem State is extreme and unreasonable for our Pelican Point community.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, Jeri Cartwright</p>
	Jerry and Alene Grant	Web	<p>Rate Case UW-240151</p> <p>This company has proposed a rate increase of 75% as we in our little development have been told and sent us paperwork to verify such. We are, obviously in shock over such an increase. The case above listed can't be serious. We would understand a small increase but not this.</p> <p>The way I understand it is our small 'water system' will be lumped into paying for Cascadia's other water systems they own. When repairs or upgrades are needed they want everyone to pay. This doesn't seem fair or equitable for our system. We needn't pay for other systems upgrades when our system is fine for now. We don't understand why they can't request a small increase just for our water system. I know they feel justified but so do I.</p> <p>Please consider looking in to this further. I appreciate your time and have submitted my email address and phone number if you want to contact me. Best regards, Alene Grant</p>
	Jev R. Unick	E-mail	<p>To Whom it may concern,</p> <p>My name is Jev Unick. I live at 201/511 Wilcox Lane which is serviced by the Cascade Water Company. We are a one block area with a community well recently purchased by Cascade.</p> <p>My concern is for our aging population, many older than I at sixty eight years, who are living on this block. We also have young families who would be effected by this rate hike. The significant raise proposed for our water may and will put some retired people on a fixed income at risk. It is understandable that utilities go up once in a while. Cascade's proposed raises are exorbitant.</p> <p>Please consider a much lower and slower increase to our water bills.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

			Jev R. Unick
	Jim and Natasha Nichols	E-mail	<p>January 6, 2025</p> <p>To: Commissioners, Utilities and Transportation Commission RE: Cascadia Water Rate Increase Request Docket 240151</p> <p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>We continue to be extremely concerned about the possibility of a 133% water increase after we sustained a 37% increase these past three years. Three years ago Cascadia proposed an enormous rate increase, over 200%. The UTC Commission decided that the increase Cascadia requested was wrong, and the settlement was for a 37% increase. However, the Commission said, basically, that a onetime immediate 37% increase to ratepayers was inconsistent with the Commission's long-standing consideration of gradualism in rates. They ordered a phased in approach to the 37% increase over three years.</p> <p>We now find ourselves looking at a proposed increase of over 100%. During its initial hearing, the Commission did not approve the increase and instead ordered more research, investigation and reset a hearing date. At this point, it appears your staff and Cascadia have reached a settlement; however, we do not know what the terms of that settlement are, so are unable to comment appropriately. It seems that Cascadia is not cooperating with providing information to other interested parties, such as the Public Counsel's Unit, let alone our group from Estates Water. Further, we were very upset to learn that Cascadia was asking for \$175,000 in attorney fees related to this matter. The litigation here is because the Commission found that Cascadia failed to prove their investments were prudent, which is something we've been wondering right along. This also is one of the reasons this proposed settlement is so worrisome.</p> <p>We are concerned about the improvements Cascadia wants to make, wondering if they are, in fact, needed. Additionally, Cascadia has indicated its plan is to buy other small water districts, and looking forward, it appears we will have to pay to improve them also. We cannot sustain annual increases in the 10%-15%, let alone 50% - 100%. We have no opportunity to dig wells, or connect with another system, so we are being held hostage by a company which does not work with its customers to ensure we get water at a fair and reasonable price.</p> <p>We strongly urge you to limit the amount of increase to a very limited amount.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jim and Natasha Nichols</p>
	Jim and Natasha Nichols	E-mail	<p>Thanks for allowing us to submit comments. My husband and I are amazed that Cascadia is proposing to raise our rates so dramatically. Currently we pay about \$62 every two months, which is doable for us. The latest proposal, dated January 22, 2025 would raise our rates to over \$118/2mo in the first year, over \$148/2mo in the second and third years. granted it would drop to just over \$126/2mo in the fourth year.</p> <p>That's a 92% increase in the first year and a whopping 139% from current in the second and third years. In the fourth year, we're still at a 103% increase. These dollar amounts are unsustainable for us.</p>

			<p>Further, Cascadia is saying they need additional funds for new projects, but it seems that the projects they say are required are not. For instance for chlorination of the water here was NOT required by the Department of Health, as shows in the DOH comments.</p> <p>After speaking to DOG, we now understand that DOG approving a project does NOT mean it is required for health and safety.</p> <p>We also do not understand why all ratepayers should pay for loans that existed in systems purchased by Cascadia. Cascadia knew these loans were on the books, and we suppose assumed they could spread the payments to all of us, which does not seem fair to us.</p> <p>All in all, we respectfully urge you to reject this proposed consolidated single tariff rate proposal. It is unsustainable for us and for our community.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and understanding</p> <p>Jim and Natasha Nichols</p>
	Jim Breiling	E-mail	<p>Greetings, thank you for your email invited me to your zoom tonight at 4:00 pm unfortunately a last minute conflict arose in which I will not be able to attend the scheduled zoom meeting which I was hoping to share my concerns in regards to Cascadia Water Company's petition of a 75% rate increase effective June 1, 2024.</p> <p>My first concern is that the capital improvement project off of East Harbor Road, Freeland Washington (also located off of Pheasant Farm Lane) is on complete. I gave permission to the Cascadia Water Company to remove my post and rail fence in order for their construction trucks to have additional access to their property. My fence has yet to be replaced. I question if the final permits have been sign off as there is still an open ditch to Puget Sound Electrical Box. The community road, Pheasant Farm Lane has numerous pot holes and wear form the heavy construction (semi) trucks. This includes the driveway at the end of Pheasant Farm Lane where truck would park through out the project. End closing, on my first concern I believe it is premature for Cascadia Water Company to petition for a 75% rate increase.</p> <p>Future investigation on my part has revealed some interesting statistics for example the average monthly water bill in Washington State is \$75.00 (https://www.statista.com/statistics/1128351/water-bill-increases-united-states/).</p> <p>However the age make up of does rise concern of affordability. According to 2022 Island County Demographics the median age is 57.5 which translates into peak or just below the peak power "s" curve for potential earnings (https://www.forbes.com/advisor/business/average-salary-by-age/#average_salary_by_age_and_state_section) raising concern about the ability to generate disposable income to cover expenses such a water utilities. Future investigation reveal a white paper by Mckinsey.com raises a interesting concern; 60% of Water Utility Companies in 2022 surveyed said they experienced or anticipated financial impacts of nonpayment bills, with inflation unchecked one can assume that the nonpayment bills are even higher.(https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/electric-power-and-natural-gas/our-insights/us-water-infrastructure-making-funding-count?cid=eml-web#/).</p> <p>Thank you for reading my submission.</p>

			Jim Breiling
	Jim Russell	Mail	<p>Dear Utility Commissioners,</p> <p>The assessment on my old worn down 1977 mobile home went up 62% from last year to this, even with a discount for its bad condition factored in. My home insurance went up 25% in one year. How am I going to pay that out of my little pension and social security? See attached the Proclamation of Greed from the water utility monopoly Cascadia for our mobile home community. Also see item-3 on the attachment. This is a statement about how long these old homes last. They were made of the cheapest materials and never intended to last as long as a stick-built. By and large they were and are purchased by lower income people who, to start, are not adequately prepared financially for the maintenance costs of mobiles. See attached the photo of my mobile, with its sewer pipe resting on 220 volt wiring. This passed code in 1977. The water leak and decay were just detected two weeks ago, but it is just a small sampling of the relentless deterioration of homes in a community dominated by old people on social security. Please, we need our utility to be publicly-owned, so we can at least vote for its commissioners, and the utility's owners won't be motivated by personal greed like Cascadia. Please do not increase our rates. Old people are literally being screwed toward homelessness and out of our affordable housing.</p> <p>Jim Russell</p>
	Joe and Debora Toro	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners</p> <p>As a concerned resident of the Seaview community, I am here to address the recent rate hike proposal from Cascadia Water. While we understand the need for sustainable funding, we believe that the sudden 107% increase is steep and it disproportionately affects our community.</p> <p>The following are some critical points to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Over-Extended Acquisitions: Considering the company's acquisitions from at least five other water municipalities, these failing assets can be described as dilapidated, outdated, and in a state of disrepair, thus resulting in exorbitant costs for restoration or modernization. 2. This Was Reckless Planning: These unforeseen costs for upgrades and repairs are now intended to be passed on to your customers! This depicts irresponsible planning, a lack of due diligence, and most of all financial imprudence! 3. This is a Financial Burden: There seems to be no accountability here, so now you expect your customers to bear the costs of these upgrades and/or repairs with an outrageous rate increase of 107%? 4. This is Inequitable Treatment: Our community is smaller with considerably less upgrades and/or repairs needed in comparison to other acquired municipalities. This drastic rate hike is deemed inequitable and unfair, and quite frankly feels like a classic case of corporate price gouging! We urge you to reevaluate this decision with fairness in

			<p>mind.</p> <p>5. Local Context Matters: When assessing water demand, usage, and asset improvement costs in the Seaview community, we find that a one-size-fits-all approach doesn't align with our unique circumstances. We encourage Cascadia Water to consider a more palatable rate structure—one that reflects the realities of our local water utilities, community, and population.</p> <p>6. Consider Our Fixed-Income Residents: Most homeowners in Seaview are retired and living on fixed incomes. For them, this sudden increase is not just an inconvenience; it's a financial burden! Many simply cannot afford such a sudden and significant increase in their water bills.</p> <p>7. Consider Meaningful and Adaptable Solutions: Rather than imposing a uniform increase, let's explore options that are both meaningful and adaptable. Perhaps tiered rates based on consumption levels rather than base-rate increases could better serve our community or extending the increase over a 5-year period allowing customers more time to adapt.</p> <p>In the spirit of collaboration, I kindly request that the board engage in further dialogue with the residents of the Seaview community. Let's work together to find a viable solution that balances financial sustainability with compassion for our neighbors. We propose a more gradual, phased-in approach to this rate increase, which we believe would be more manageable for your customers, while still enabling Cascadia Water to recover its costs over a longer period of time.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter. We believe that by working together, we can create a fair and sustainable water rate structure that benefits all stake holders at hand.</p> <p>Thank you for your time reviewing our request.</p> <p>Sincerely Seaview Water customers,</p> <p>Eric and Judy Bingham, Jack and Linda Breedlove, Dan and Marilyn Egler, Diana Lanham, Joe and Debora Toro</p>
	JoEllen Burns	E-mail	<p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Furthermore, our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase.</p> <p>Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues. In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p>

			Thank you for your attention to this matter.
	JoEllen Burns	Web	<p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls.</p> <p>This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase.</p> <p>Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter</p>
	John Troberg	Web	<p>We are opposed to the Cascadia Water rate increase because the proposal shows a lack of transparency and a lack of justifications for the 107% rate increase over the last rate increase of 37%. Many of Cascadia's investments, such as oversized reservoirs, standby generators, and SCADA systems, are unnecessary and provide minimal benefit to consumers. Further, this is an unfair burden on Consumers: Cascadia and UTC Staff are proposing a settlement that would burden consumers with the \$175,000 cost of Cascadia's attorney fees, despite Cascadia's failure to meet its burden of proof in justifying the rate increase.</p>
	Joseph & Tamara Campion	E-mail	<p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues, summertime boil orders, and slow response times to issues when they arise.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

	Joseph & Tamara Campion	E-mail	<p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues, summertime boil orders, and slow response times to issues when they arise.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Joseph & Tamara Campion</p>
	Joseph Sharkey	Web	<p>The proposed rate increases are more than excessive. This is the wrong time to place such a tremendous burden on the users. It appears that Cascadia is using this to offset costs of additionally acquired water systems that require upgrading, not ours.</p>
	Josh Courteau	E-mail	<p>Formal Protest Against Cascadia Water LLC Rate Increase Proposal (Docket UW-240151) Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission PO Box 47250 Olympia, WA 98504-7250 February 18, 2025 To the Commissioners and Presiding Officers:</p> <p>I write as a captive customer of Cascadia Water, LLC, residing in Freeland, Washington, to formally dissent against the proposed 75% rate increase (Docket UW-240151). This marks my second protest in five years, following the 53% increase imposed in December 2020. Cumulatively, these hikes represent a 128% escalation in water costs since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic—a period during which household budgets have been decimated by inflation, stagnant wages, and rising housing costs. As a ratepayer with no alternative provider, I implore the UTC to reject this untenable proposal and uphold its mandate to balance corporate interests with the public good.</p> <p>1. Systemic Failure of Regulatory Oversight Cascadia's monopolistic position on Whidbey Island and the Olympic Peninsula creates an inherently unbalanced power dynamic. The company serves over 9,000 customers², none of whom can exercise market choice—a fact</p>

		<p>acknowledged in the UTC’s own 2021 decision approving the previous increase. Yet the current proposal doubles down on this captive-audience model, demanding \$1.79 million in additional annual revenue² without commensurate evidence of financial necessity.</p> <p>The company’s filing relies heavily on redacted testimony from executives Matthew Rowell and Culley Lehman (e.g., September 26, 2024 direct testimony¹), while public counsel’s November 20, 2024 rebuttal from David Garrett and Stefan de Villiers¹ reveals glaring omissions in Cascadia’s cost recovery arguments. Of particular concern is the lack of transparency around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capital Improvement Justifications: Cross-examination exhibits from February 6, 2025¹ • show inconsistent projections for pipeline upgrades and reservoir expansions. • Alternative Financing Models: No substantive analysis of phased investments or grant opportunities under the federal Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. • COVID-Era Rate Shock: The 2020 increase—implemented during peak pandemic hardship—is treated as a baseline rather than a compounding burden. <p>This pattern mirrors broader regulatory failures exposed in the Environmental Council of Sacramento’s July 2024 protest against California’s Delta Conveyance Project³, where utilities weaponize infrastructure needs to justify disproportionate customer impacts.</p> <h2>2. Economic Violence Against Vulnerable Communities</h2> <p>The UTC’s January 6, 2025 Order 041 granted Cascadia’s motion to compel discovery, yet denied similar protections for residential customers. This asymmetry crystallizes in the proposed hike’s distributional effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fixed-Income Households: Over 22% of Whidbey Island residents are retirees², for whom water bills would consume 3-5% of monthly Social Security checks. • Working Families: Median household income in Island County (\$76,000) trails the state average by 18%², making the proposed \$98/month average bill unmanageable. • Small Businesses: Testimony from Public Counsel’s Scott Duren (November 20, 2024¹) documents how restaurants and laundromats face 12-15% operational cost increases. <p>Meanwhile, Waste Connections—a similarly monopolistic utility—reduced garbage collection rates by 6% in Q4 2024 [Customer Submission]. This juxtaposition demolishes Cascadia’s inflation narrative. If a waste hauler can streamline operations amid supply chain crises, why can’t a water utility?</p> <h2>3. Violation of Human Rights Protections</h2> <p>The United Nations General Assembly Resolution 64/292 (2010) enshrines water access as a fundamental human right—a principle echoed in Washington’s 2021 HEAL Act but absent from UTC deliberations. Cascadia’s proposal would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exacerbate Health Disparities: Pediatric asthma rates in Island County (9.2%) exceed state averages; unaffordable water bills force families to ration hygiene supplies. • Undermine Climate Resilience: By prioritizing shareholder returns over leak detection and drought infrastructure, the increase jeopardizes long-term supply stability.
--	--	---

			<p>4. Procedural Irregularities</p> <p>The adjudication process itself raises ethical concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Participation Barriers: While the UTC hosted January 2025 comment hearings¹², many customers lacked Zoom access or childcare to attend evening sessions. • Settlement Opacity: The January 10, 2025 Multiparty Settlement Stipulation remains partially redacted, preventing scrutiny of backroom deals between Cascadia and “Staff.”, creating conflicts of interest • Revolving Door Dynamics: Cascadia’s legal team includes former UTC attorneys like Pamela Anderson <p>Demands for Remedial Action</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Immediate Rejection of the 75% increase proposal. 2. Independent Audit of Cascadia’s finances by the State Auditor’s Office. 3. Low-Income Rate Assistance Program funded by shareholder dividends. 4. Public Ownership Study under RCW 80.28.010 to evaluate municipalization options. <p>The UTC must prioritize human dignity over corporate profits. To approve this increase would be to sanction economic violence against Washington’s most vulnerable residents.</p> <p>Sincerely, Joshua Courteau</p>
	Josh Courteau	E-mail	<p>Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC),</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to Cascadia Water's proposed 75% rate increase. This increase is simply unaffordable for many customers and comes on the heels of a 53% increase levied in December 2020.</p> <p>Cascadia Water has not provided sufficient justification for this exorbitant rate hike. The company claims that it needs to recover costs associated with water service, but it has not demonstrated that these costs are reasonable or necessary. Planning for system upgrades, the company should consider what type of rate increases are actually sustainable by their clients - in aggregate, with the 53% increase in 2020, this amounts to a 128% increase since the start of Covid.</p> <p>For consideration, at same time as we received this notice from Cascadia Water, we received notice from Waste Connections that their rates were dropping for garbage pickup. The argument that inflation is driving up costs doesn't hold water.</p> <p>Similar to waste collection, we have no choice of water providers. This effective monopoly has a trapped audience and is acting accordingly. In 2010, through Resolution 64/292, the UN General Assembly recognized the human right to clean water - drinking water and sanitation are essential to the realization of human rights. We are living in a time where tax increases, costs for basic food and supplies and housing costs are skyrocketing - especially now, we should not permitting the further decline of peoples basic rights though pricing them out of their water.</p>

			<p>I urge the UTC to reject Cascadia Water's proposed rate increase. This increase would be a devastating blow to many customers, their rate of increases are not reasonable nor sustainable and the costs haven't been justified by the company.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Josh Courteau</p>
	Joshua adams	Web	<p>This rate hike right after the buy out is flat out greed. On multiple occasions we have woken up to no water without notice. They are hard to reach and it has only gotten worse. I accept the fact cost of living has gone up with inflation by 30 percent. A 107 percent increase is greed. We do not have a choice on where our water comes in and they are taking advantage. I am blessed to be able to afford, however alot of my neighbors are on fixed income and cost increases like this will force them out. If this proposed rate increase is not stopped, they will continue to take advantage of costumers. If like they say they need an addition 2 million in revenue, maybe they should reevaluate their business practices, not stick their greedy fingers in their costumers pockets. Rates were just increased massively in 2020, when does it stop?</p>
	Joshua Courteau	Web	<p>To the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC):</p> <p>I strongly oppose Cascadia Water's proposed 75% water rate hike. This increase is simply unbearable for many customers, especially following the already significant 53% increase in December 2020.</p> <p>Cascadia Water lacks transparency in justifying this exorbitant increase. Citing water service costs, they haven't proven the reasonableness or necessity of these expenses. Upgrading water systems requires a sustainable plan for rate increases, considering the cumulative impact on customers. This proposed increase, combined with the 2020 hike, totals a staggering 128% increase since the pandemic began.</p> <p>Further raising suspicion is the fact that Cascadia Water operates under a publicly traded parent company. Their primary focus may be on maximizing profits and increasing share price for investors, rather than prioritizing affordability for their customers. This potential conflict of interest needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Inconsistency strengthens our case. While receiving this water rate hike notice, we were notified of a decrease in garbage pickup costs from Waste Connections. Inflation cannot be the sole justification when other essential services demonstrate cost reductions.</p> <p>As with garbage collection, we have no alternative water provider. This monopoly unfairly exploits its captive audience. The UN General Assembly recognized the human right to clean water in 2010 (Resolution 64/292). Water is fundamental to human rights, and in these times of rising taxes, food costs, and housing prices, we should not further burden residents by pricing them out of this essential resource.</p>

			<p>The UTC must reject Cascadia Water's proposed rate hike. It would be devastating for many customers. The proposed increase lacks justification, is unsustainable, and prioritizes the interests of a publicly traded parent company over the needs of the community.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Josh Courteau</p>
	Joshua Courteau	Web	<p>Greetings,</p> <p>Regarding the proposed increased rates for Cascadia Water customers, docket UW-240151, I am against the rate increases as the company has recently increased rates and have not shown any indication that their costs can be controlled. At the high end, their requested increases can be over 100% current rates - this is unsustainable, and as a monopoly, residents have no alternative options. A reasonable rate of increase is to be expected, but after the covid increase of ~23-25% this additional increase infers that the company will just continue to push until they hear a clear objection. As a publicly traded company, not locally owned, Cascadia Water has an extractive relationship with our local water resources, I suggest we look into public utility district for municipal governance of the water resources for the region as growth continues, we need to be acting holistically, sustainably and in a way that guarantees affordable basic rights to the community.</p> <p>Respectfully.</p> <p>-Josh Courteau</p>
	Joshua Duerst	E-mail	<p>The implications of these skyrocketing water rates extend beyond mere financial strain. They threaten the fabric of our local community's well-being. As the cost of water soars, vulnerable members of our society, including the elderly, low-income families, and individuals on fixed incomes, are disproportionately affected. Families should not have to ration their water usage or compromise on basic needs due to financial constraints imposed by unjustifiable rate hikes.</p> <p>Furthermore, the lack of transparency surrounding the rationale behind these increases only serves to deepen the sense of distrust and disillusionment among residents. We demand accountability and transparency from the authorities responsible for managing our water resources. The community deserves a clear and comprehensive explanation for the sudden escalation in rates, as well as a commitment to fair and equitable pricing structures that prioritize the well-being of all residents. Cascadia are asking for a 75% increase in their revenue across the board, which is great if you are a shareholder, but not so much if you are a resident here.</p> <p>In light of these urgent concerns, I implore you to take immediate action to address the untenable situation facing our community. We call upon the "Commission" to conduct a thorough investigation into the reasons behind the unprecedented water rate increases and to implement measures to alleviate the burden placed upon residents.</p> <p>I personally have witnessed our water rate go from \$17.50/month base rate prior to the Cascadia takeover in 2018 to a \$24/month base rate. AND now they want to increase our rate to a \$44/month rate as of June 1, 2024. The previous ready to serve rate prior to the Cascadia takeover was \$60/year and that is now proposed to be \$44/month (\$528 year!!) as of June 1, 2024. I have also been informed that we are unable to dig a private well on our own</p>

			<p>property without Cascadia's approval. I am shocked and really disappointed this company has ruined what was once a very fairly priced and good working community water system.</p> <p>In Addition, as you may recall this exact scenario came up a few years ago resulting in our community coming together and hiring an attorney at our own expense to fight this issue, which we won. Is hiring an attorney our only course of action moving forward to prevent Cascadia Water, llc from raising their rates exponentially now and in the future?</p> <p>Our community cannot afford to wait idly by as essential services become increasingly unattainable for those most in need. As the governing body overseeing this unethical rate increase request, I urge you to heed this call to action and work towards a swift and fair resolution to this pressing issue and not allow this 94% increase in our water rates to pass!</p> <p>Kind regards, Joshua Duerst</p>
	Julie Hembree	E-mail	<p>Description:</p> <p>I received a letter from Cascadia Water (who purchased the Pederson Family LLC) regarding a 75% increase of water rates for our water.</p> <p>I vehemently oppose a 75% increase. I understand an increase to update our system may be in order, but this company is buying up all the small systems and then without making any updates locally, is attempting to increase our costs by 75%. I don't think this update is fair or reasonable. In the letter, nothing was stated about improvements to our local system.</p> <p>Supervisor Result:</p> <p>Customer Resolution:</p> <p>Deny the 75% increase and work with the company to reduce the amount.</p>
	Justin Poirier	E-mail	<p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter</p>

			Justin Poirier
	Kailey Burnett	Web	As someone who had their small community well bought out by King Water, seeing these utilities companies buying up these community wells for major profit needs to be stopped before it's too late. End this insanity, 109% increase is absolutely not OK.
	Kare Putnam	Web	<p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues. In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost increase complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter Emailed case summary to Public Involvement.</p>
	Karen and Marvin Klein	E-mail	***See Attachment
	Karen and Marvin Klein	E-mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT***
	Karen Larsen Gordon	Web	<p>I want the Commissions to know that regarding docket number UW-240151, Cascadia Water sent customers a letter dated February 3, 2025 with a correction of how to file a complaint with the Public Counsel Unit of the Washington Attorney General's Office. Here's the quote from the website, "In addition, Public Counsel is not staffed to respond to individual complaints or inquiries that are specific in nature (e.g. a specific service or billing complaint). Customers of regulated utilities who would like to file a complaint should contact the WUTC." That's a runaround. In addition, attempting to find the most recent rate proposal on the utc website requires a records request...another runaround.</p> <p>Now to the nitty gritty - a 101% monthly rate increase is unacceptable and puts the average homeowner well over what water costs across Washington State - \$73-\$81 vs. \$100.</p> <p>When WUTC required Cascadia Water to address multiple concerns on June 24, 2024, it does not appear Cascadia has done so.</p>

	Karen Mulhern Parks	E-mail	<p>Dear Mr. or Ms.</p> <p>I'm very concerned about the Huge Increase in our water bill to take place in May 2025 due to the improvement that was required to replace our concrete water tanks for L&M Acres residents in Oak Harbor, Island County Cascadia Water Company inherited old infrastructure and are replacing it however the 51%-80% Increase is Unfair to the Retired Community that resides here. Please investigate the issue Thank You for your help.</p> <p>Karen Mulhern Parks</p>
	Karissa Davis	Web	<p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living. Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a vote of voluntary service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascade Water</p> <p>Thank you for your attention in this matter.</p>
	Karl Horne	Web	<p>This proposed 75% rate increase is unwarranted, unearned opportunistic money grab from a poorly managed local water company. Most of Whidbey Island is on private wells, where they are allowed to pump as much water out of the aquifer for minimal cost. Those of us on Coles valley system are landowners that have acreage that they maintain in a natural way keeping the aquifer healthy. The bottom line is that we are paying t Cascadia to pump the water out of the aquifer which we just put there, which should involve a minor pumping fee. Additionally they are taking advantage of the out of control inflationary spiral to reward themselves for previous poor business decisions. We expect the government controlled costs of living to be a bulwark against this inflation by stabilizing costs . A reasonable increase if one is absolutely necessary</p>
	Karl Pohlod	E-mail	<p>Cascadia Water Docket# UW-240151</p> <p>I looked into the Pedersen water system on Wilcox Lane several years ago when I was a Clallam County employee. It is a roughly twenty-seven foot (27') deep surface water well prone to surface contamination. The two Serpentine Street wells on the next block are seventy-five feet (75') or deeper. They are higher pressure wells as the Wilcox well is pumped at roughly 26 pounds pressure through makeshift equipment to my knowledge. Why are the Wilcox property owners being charged an incredible rate hike for a low level shallow water system? If Cascadia wants to include us in their rate hike, my concern is that they need to improve our system to the minimum requirements, pressure, and depth of other wells they own and maintain. We are getting a raw deal.</p> <p>Thank you Karl Pohlod</p>

	Kasey Witte	Web	Cascadia Water recently purchased our independent well on Whidbey Island in 2020. Our rates went up when it was purchased and now they are wanting to increase our rates by another 75%. This is an astronomical and unacceptable rate increase. I understand work needs to be done in order to maintain the systems but a 75% increase is greedy in my opinion and if these rates go into affect they will never go back down even when all upgrades are completed. Please do not approve this unfair rate increase.
	Kasey Witte	Web	Our community water system was purchased by Cascadia Water in 2021 and it seemed like it would be a good transition since our system needed upgrades. They started upgrading our piping in April 2022 and it was a disaster. They left holes 6-foot deep up and down our road for months, consistently had to turn our water off to fix issues and then we had to boil our water for days while we waited on lab results to make sure our water wasn't contaminated with ebola. After the upgrades were completed, we are still having issues which meant the water company turning our water off for 8-10 hours. The last time this occurred was in December, so fingers crossed they got it figured out. Now, on top of all the problems over the last 3 years, they are proposing a 117% increase to our water bill to off-set the costs for the upgrades. I understand that they are a business and need to make money, BUT that percentage of increase is ASTRONOMICAL and they will recoup their costs quickly and then continue to make nothing but profit. It isn't like they are willing to lower the prices back to reasonable rates once they get their money back for the upgrades. I am willing to acknowledge an increase is needed but it needs to be a lower percentage that makes sense for our community members as well. This is greed on Cascadia Waters part and I hope you do not approve this rate increase. Please feel free to reach out to me with any questions. Thank you for your time and consideration.
	Katherine Duff	E-mail	<p>I am writing as a resident in the Pedersen Water System. Cascadia is a monopoly here as our covenants forbid us from drilling a well in our property.</p> <p>First of all, this business is actually NW Natural Water, which is owned by NW Natural Holdings, which is about 50% owned by investment firms.</p> <p>NW Natural acquired Cascadia so we must face the fact we are dealing with a for-profit corporate owner. Their first priority is to assure returns to their investors. They brag about 68 years of increasing annual dividends. NW Natural is being represented in these proceedings by Perkins Coie, a high powered and expensive law firm that can afford a lot of personal attention for their clients. Rate payers are represented by public counsel of the State AG's office. A volunteer citizen's group has kept us informed of the proceedings. This imbalance of power requires the attention of the Utilities Commission.</p> <p>The business model presented by Cascadia/NW Natural is beyond belief.</p> <p>They acquire old water systems that need upgrading for a low price and raise the rates for all in their system to pay for the upgrades. The goal it appears is to keep buying water systems and raising the rates for all under their control. If the upgrades are even made, do the increased rates ever expire? No, they become a cash cow for the corporation as long as they keep buying water systems. Why aren't their purchases of substandard water systems considered capital improvements at their own expense? These improvements will also be amortized for tax benefits to the corporation that the rate payers will not receive.</p>

			<p>We are to believe that every water system in their control needs extensive and costly improvements. They have come up with state-of-the-art requirements such as the generators when there are less expensive alternatives. They want to be able to control the system from computers far away so they have come up with expensive upgrades for that. They want expensive vehicles for their many locations. The list of “needed” improvements need to be validated by an independent source.</p> <p>Which brings us to where are the materials for the many improvements coming from? These water systems are owned by a holding company that in turn is about 50% owned by investment firms, of that, over 32% owned by the large firm, Blackrock. Are the listed costs for the “needed” improvements what will actually be paid or is it possible they would get better prices from connections through one of the many investment firms involved in this business.</p> <p>Let’s be honest. Since corporations abandoned the requirement of serving the greater good, they exist for return of investment for their shareholders. The pockets of consumers is where they get that money and ethics is gradually become something of the past. Maneuvers to get more money need to be examined closely because we frankly cannot trust corporations anymore. The Utilities Commission is out last resort.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Katherine Duff,</p>
	Katherine E. Duff	E-mail	<p>May 28, 2024 Dear Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, RE: Rate Case Number UW-240151</p> <p>I live in the Dungeness area outside of Sequim. Our water system was recently purchased by Cascadia from Pederson Water System. Cascadia is applying for a substantial rate increase, the lowest threshold being 65% and every tier has increases. I am very concerned that this rate increase is not fully justified for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The notice from Cascadia lists improvements but it appears none are for the Pedersen Water System, aka Dungeness Bay Plats Water. If this profit- making company purchases inadequate water companies I don’t think it is the responsibility of other rate payers to subsidize a bad business decision. 2. Are the capital improvements listed, for any and all, put out to bid? Since the owner of Cascadia, NW Natural Water Co., is funded 17% by the private equity firm Blackrock, is there a reciprocal agreement between all concerned to use Blackrock’s holdings to supply materials? If so, that should not be the case unless there has been a bidding process that includes outside interests. Example:

			<p>Who supplies all the generators?</p> <p>3. NW Natural Water is a shareholder owned company whose primary objective is profits for the shareholders. Increased revenue is how a company entices new investors. Proposing continual projects that require monetary investments from the company, that then require rate increases for the customers is a marketing tool, and not always necessary for the water system. That I am afraid, is what this requested rate increase is all about – at the expense of the water customers.</p> <p>I hope the Commission will closely examine this rate request and limit the amount. This vital commodity cannot turn into a cash cow for large corporations.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Katherine E. Duff</p>
	Kathleen Keehn	E-mail	<p>April 22, 2024</p> <p>Public Statement - Utilities and Transportation Commission Meeting- Please include my written statement in your public records.</p> <p>I'm here to talk about the outrageous 75% increase proposed by Cascadia Water in Diamond Point.</p> <p>I was shocked to see Cascadia Water propose a 75% increase in our water bills. My water company, Aquarius, was purchased by Cascadia Water several years ago. When this happened, we learned that Cascadia is owned by Northwest Holding Company, which is owned by BlackRock and Vanguard. What would those mega-opolies want with our little community water utility? We just learned when we received notice of a 75% increase for our water bills starting in June 2024.</p> <p>Let me share some history. In a public meeting about 15 years ago, Greg Roats, then owner of Aquarius Water, admitted this water system experiences 20% water loss. We were gob smacked! How can any company survive a consistent 20% loss? Following this revelation, Mr. Roats suggested we pay him to do a “study” on the feasibility of installing new water pipes that wouldn’t leak. After all, his dad had kluged this system together using reclaimed pipes removed from other water systems. Our community supported this study because we don’t have working fire hydrants in our neighborhood! After charging us \$250.K for the study, he discarded the idea as he never had any intention of fixing the leaky system.</p> <p>I live across the street from Washington Water service. I already pay 1/3 to ½ more for my water than my neighbors on the other side of the street. Now the delta will even be greater, and we are made fools by having to support this new form of exploitation. Cascadia Water claims they are investing in the infrastructure, but we still do not have working fire hydrants! We are given notice of a “public hearing”, but we realize this is just a formality because the decisions for large increases were made long ago.</p> <p>As it has turned out, BlackRock and Vanguard have capitalized on COVID, buying a huge percentage of American residential homes and utilities. In 2021 these behemoths bought 20% of the nation’s private homes, utilities, and</p>

			<p>local business buildings. Now in 2024 they are buying a whopping 44%! At this rate they could own almost everything by the year 2028! This will eliminate private home ownership and private property altogether! And our elected officials are helping them do it! See article included with statement.</p> <p>Imagine my surprise to learn that the North Olympic Development Council, NOPC, is populated with elected officials! Clallam County Commissioner Mark Ozias is the president! This looks like an NGO, non-government organization, steering a global climate agenda that we, the people, have not approved! It seems to be a complete conflict of interest for these public officials to be accepting salaries from our tax dollars and supporting the German based, International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives, (ICLEI) as board members for NOPC! ICLEI is a foreign organization that had attempted to gain control of Sequim over a dozen years ago but was kicked out by the Concerned Citizen's for Clallam County, aka 4C's. We didn't want this global agenda then and we don't want it now. They should all be ashamed for selling out their constituents! See article attached.</p> <p>We have learned that the Sustainable Development Goals include United Nations Climate Mitigation for homes that are not net-0 carbon friendly. Current estimates to bring a private home into "compliance" could cost as much as \$42K! This will ultimately regulate folks right out of their homes! Why are our elected officials promoting this? Where I grew up, what I learned, when governments collude with corporations in secret, to the detriment of the people, that's called fascism. We don't want that here in Clallam County and we won't pay salaries and benefits to officials as they betray us!</p> <p>There are laws preventing monopolies from becoming too large and controlling. For some reason, these laws do not apply to BlackRock and Vanguard. There are also "conflict of interest" laws that apply to public officials. Unfortunately, those laws are not just ignored, they are being thrown in our faces.</p> <p>I respectfully ask the Utilities and Transportation officials why they would consider such an increase when we already pay a premium for water, and we have no working fire hydrants? Furthermore, should we all have to pay premium water prices because BlackRock and Vanguard overpaid for a leaky kluged together water system?</p> <p>Kathleen Keehn</p>
	Kathleen Magera	E-mail	<p>Dear UTC Commissioners,</p> <p>I sincerely hope that you will ensure that Cascadia does not prevail in this matter as they certainly do not have their Water Customer's best interests in mind as they continue their poor business practices. I hope that you do.</p> <p>Why should we as customers pay for Cascadia's practice of buying up ailing, outdated water systems in Washington. Didn't they negotiate a better sales price or take into account the repairs that would be needed?</p> <p>So why should they then pass on all their costs for their decision to purchase these aging water system to us, the customers of an entirely separate water system?</p> <p>They are the sole provider of this essential resource and we, the customer are being held hostage. We cannot take our business elsewhere.</p> <p>You are the only hope we have for fair treatment.</p>

			<p>Cascadia has NOT met their burden of proof for these expenditures - were they necessary? what was spent? of what benefit were they to our water system (Estates)</p> <p>Why are we having to pay for loans that were pre-existing on their acquisitions?</p> <p>My Water bill is currently \$53 for 2 months or \$26-27 each month. The new rates as proposed will more than double my bill.</p> <p>I am retired as many others are in this community - many are on fixed incomes (i.e. social security) which only has a minimal cost of living percentage increase.</p> <p>How can you allow a sole source utility to raise rates so exorbitantly? Based on their poor business practices? They are not the government! They are a for profit business which seems to be making really poor decisions at the expense of customers who are stuck paying whatever is charged.</p> <p>Please help!</p> <p>Kathleen Magera</p>
	Kathleen Magera	Web	<p>Absolutely & Resoundingly NO!!!</p> <p>Why would you allow a company like Cascadia to pass on rate increases based on their poor business practices??</p> <p>Cascadia, with full knowledge of what they were buying, purchased these aging water systems in these other areas and yet they are now attempting to 'recoup' their 'losses' by passing on their newly acquired water system expenses (without transparency I might add) to our residential water system area.</p> <p>Basic good business practices & common sense would also dictate that Cascadia already initially negotiated a substantially lower purchase price for these other water systems based on their poor or aged condition and repairs needed. And if they somehow did not, how is their business ineptitude, yet again, our responsibility?</p> <p>I have always thought that the purpose of organizations like the UTC is to protect consumer's like us against the idiocy & greed of utility businesses which are actually monopolies. Water is an essential of daily life and yet we have no choice as to whom supplies it to us.</p> <p>Appealing to you, the UTC, seems to be the only avenue we have in order to ensure that price gouging practices of a monopolistic company is curbed.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that my faith in your organization is not misplaced and that you will uphold the trust you have been given.</p>

	Kathy Trainor	E-mail	<p>My comment is with regard to the impending increase that Cascade Water is asking for; the Docket number is 240151.</p> <p>Cascadia is asking for a 94% increase in our water rates. When is it okay to almost double the cost of a utility at once? Imagine if your bill was \$200 per month, and now it's \$388. Most of the people in my community (Monterra) are 55 or older and many are having a tough time surviving as it is. Electric just went up, trash collection has increased, and have you been to the grocery store lately? A 94% increase should be unthinkable at any time, let alone a time when getting by is already nearly impossible for so many.</p> <p>It seems to me Cascadia wants to buy up as many communities as they can and force everyone else to pay for those that are in disrepair, while they enjoy the gains. This is not fair to us, and I urge you to say no to this rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Kathy Trainor</p>
	Ken Wright	Web	<p>The proposed increase is extreme and unjustified as there has not been significant improvement to our particular water system and appears to be aimed more at funding other business expenses and expansion of Cascadia overall versus actual value to consumers. Basically the equivalent of forced crowd funding.</p>
	Kent Renshaw	E-mail	<p>***SEE ATTACHMENT</p> <p>Urgent Appeal to Maintain Stable Water Rates for Rural Communities - Cascadia Water Rate Request Docket# 240151 (please see attachment).</p> <p>I Am an 89 year old low income senior and have resided in the same house since 1991. When my Del Bay community decided to sell our water system to Cascadia Water, we were led to believe that we would have stable affordable rates. This proved to be untrue and our rates have sky rocketed.</p> <p>The proposed rate increase asked by Cascadia Water will strain my income to the point that I will probably have to sell my house and find a residence with lower water charges. My alternative will be to buy bottled water, drive to my son's house in Renton to wash my clothes, take sponge baths instead of showers, and let my garden die from lack of water.</p> <p>I ask you to turn down Cascadia Water's request for a rate increase. Withdraw their request for a rate increase,</p>

Kent Renshaw	Web	<p>***See Attachment</p> <p>Urgent Appeal to Maintain Stable Water Rates for Rural Communities - Cascadia Water Rate Request Docket# 240151 (please see attachment).</p> <p>I Am an 89 year old low income senior and have resided in the same house since 1991. When my Del Bay community decided to sell our water system to Cascadia Water, we were led to believe that we would have stable affordable rates. This proved to be untrue and our rates have sky rocketed.</p> <p>The proposed rate increase asked by Cascadia Water will strain my income to the point that I will probably have to sell my house and find a residence with lower water charges. My alternative will be to buy bottled water, drive to my son's house in Renton to wash my clothes, take sponge baths instead of showers, and let my garden die from lack of water.</p> <p>I ask you to turn down Cascadia Water's request for a rate increase. Withdraw their request for a rate increase,</p>																		
Kent Sherrer	E-mail	<p>Issue 1: Proposed Average Bill calculation incorrect</p> <p>The Average Proposed Bill does not seem correct.</p> <p>The Average Current Bill shown on page 1 is equivalent to 878 cu. ft. Average Water Usage. Based on this and the new rates, the Proposed Avg. Bill should be \$116.56, NOT \$104.41. In other words, if I currently pay the average \$56.72, my new rate will be \$116.56. If there is another method for calculation, it would be good to explain this. Details below:</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>Avg. Bill</td><td>Water cu. ft.</td><td>Base Rate \$</td><td>1st Block \$</td><td>2nd Block \$</td></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>\$56.72</td><td>878</td><td>43.00</td><td>8.68 = 668 * \$1.30/100</td><td>5.04 = 210 * \$2.40/100</td></tr><tr><td>Proposed</td><td>\$116.56</td><td>878</td><td>56.00</td><td>27.60 = 500 * \$5.52/100</td><td>32.96 = 378 * \$8.72/100</td></tr></table> <p>Issue 2: Unmetered Bill should at higher than the Average Rate</p> <p>There may be several good reasons for a residence to be unmetered. But if a house is occupied, why would the expected water usage be less than average (about 878 cu. ft. or about 6,500 gal/mo as calculated above)? On the contrary, it seems that water usage for these customers would be higher than average, either due to leaks or lack of conservation. Increasing this rate would motivate these users to consider meters.</p>		Avg. Bill	Water cu. ft.	Base Rate \$	1st Block \$	2nd Block \$	Current	\$56.72	878	43.00	8.68 = 668 * \$1.30/100	5.04 = 210 * \$2.40/100	Proposed	\$116.56	878	56.00	27.60 = 500 * \$5.52/100	32.96 = 378 * \$8.72/100
	Avg. Bill	Water cu. ft.	Base Rate \$	1st Block \$	2nd Block \$															
Current	\$56.72	878	43.00	8.68 = 668 * \$1.30/100	5.04 = 210 * \$2.40/100															
Proposed	\$116.56	878	56.00	27.60 = 500 * \$5.52/100	32.96 = 378 * \$8.72/100															

Issue 3: Prioritize Installation of Wireless Meters for Unmetered Residences

It seems that many residences are unmetered because their hookup was made prior to widespread use of meters, and it can be difficult to find or access the waterline. However, the location where the water enters the house is usually well known but several hundred feet from the road. It seems that these circumstances would be a perfect application for the new wireless meters. They can be easily installed next to the house (similar to gas and electric) and data collected from the road.

Issue 4: Publish Number of Unmetered Customers

Unmetered customers have the highest risk for leaks and excessive usage. Reducing this number would be a good indication of efforts to conserve water and control costs.

At a time of substantial rate increases, these customers have good reason to avoid meters, either because new pipes are expensive, or their lifestyle consumes a lot of water. Mariners Cove Community near Oak Harbor is a good case study. For many years they were completely unmetered, and only recently converted to all meters. They immediately identified and fixed several major leaks. And they identified several customers with exceedingly wasteful consumption that were quickly reduced. This was a significant benefit to the community and more fairly spread the costs.

Issue 5: Create New Category for DORMANT Water Usage

A new Dormant rate should be established for customers that are not using their water for long periods of time. Currently, the only options are to pay the monthly Base Rate, or to cancel water services and remove the meter. Both these options are unfair expensive alternatives, especially at these higher rates.

There are several valid reasons for a customer's account to be dormant. In some cases, waterlines must be installed and connected to a lot just to prove it is buildable, and it may be several years before a house is built. Or, a building project is delayed, and occupancy has not been granted. Or, a house is empty for an extended period of time for various reasons (e.g. illness, nursing home, deployment, remodel, etc.)

Perhaps a Dormant customer could pay the Base Rate annually. Their meter would be checked annually, and water usage would need to remain below 100 gallons, otherwise they would pay the Block Rates for water used and convert back to the regular rate.

Thanks for your thoughtful consideration,

			Kent Sherrer
	Kevin J Woodland	Web	<p>The base rate increase from \$19.25 to \$44 is far in excess of inflation. I am retired and cannot afford this. I would accept a monthly rate of about \$60/month, with a monthly amount of 1,000 cf. Usage above 1,000 cf to be at the same rate.</p> <p>Monopolies granted to utilities have historically never been intended to generate excess profits, until UTC added unnecessary conservation penalties.</p> <p>Encouraging Washington residents to plant gardens and decorative plants to generate oxygen, is the better part of conservation.</p> <p>Also, please eliminate the loan fee. The new tank was needed only because water managers unlawfully decided to add new customers. The costs for the new sub division and commercial customers should have paid all of these costs.</p>
	Kevin J Woodland	Web	<p>I am retired and cannot afford the proposed rate increase. We have disabled adult children living at home. Our monthly water bill will likely double.</p> <p>I suggest a monthly flat rate of \$60 per month for 1,000 cf and that usage over \$1,000 cf be billed at the same rate. This would be affordable for us and sufficiently fund overhead expenses. Perhaps Cascadia Water should find ways to reduce expenses?</p> <p>The Conservation related penalties are not need because the Sandhill aquifer in Belfair, is mostly ice age glacial deposits, capable of tremendous water storage, of our our ample rain.</p> <p>Encouraging home owners to plant oxygen producing vegetable gardens and other vegetation is the better part of conservation. Well watered properties are also more resistant to wild fires.</p>
	Kevin Woodland	E-mail	<p>Absolutely NO on the rate increase.</p> <p>Lynch Cove sold the water system with a commitment that the buyer and successors would act in the best interest of the community.</p> <p>Thus the operator must be frugal in their operation expense.</p> <p>It is time for UTC to stop giving rate increases without balance with the customer. This is how regulated are supposed to work.</p> <p>It is in interest of all to have enough affordable water available for families.</p> <p>Thanks, Kevin</p>
	Kim Boesch	Web	<p>Strong Opposition to Proposed 85% Increase in Water Rates for Silverlake Water.</p> <p>I am writing to express my vehement opposition to the proposed 85% increase in water rates. This substantial hike is unjustifiable given the current state of our water system and the lack of proposed improvements.</p>

			<p>First and foremost, it is imperative to note that the water supplied to our community is not drinkable without advanced filtration or purchasing commercially. This glaring issue raises serious concerns about the quality and safety of the water we are already being charged for. Without assurances of potable water, any increase in rates is simply unacceptable.</p> <p>Furthermore, there have been no proposed improvements or upgrades to our particular water system to warrant such a drastic increase in rates. As you are aware, many residents are already struggling financially, and imposing such a significant burden on households without offering any tangible benefits or enhancements to the service is unjustifiable.</p> <p>Additionally, the suggestion of adding a generator to the system seems entirely unnecessary given that our water system operates on gravity feed. It raises questions about the transparency and rationale behind the proposed rate increase. If our current system is functioning adequately without the need for additional infrastructure, then why impose additional costs on residents?</p> <p>In these challenging economic times, where every dollar counts for our community members, it is crucial that any proposed increase in utility rates be thoroughly justified and accompanied by clear plans for improvements or enhancements to the service provided. Without such justification and transparency, I urge you to reconsider this proposal and explore alternative solutions that do not place an undue burden on residents.</p> <p>I implore you to represent the best interests of our community and to reject this unjustified and excessive increase in water rates. Our residents deserve access to safe, affordable water without facing financial hardship.</p>
	Kirk Wells	E-mail	<p>My Name is Kirk Wells, my address is 113 Canyon Estates Drive Sequim WA 98382 and I am a customer in the Peninsula System which is the old Aquarius System on the Miller Peninsula Diamond Point Estates.</p> <p>The increase in rates to my particular account as shown in the rate forecast provided by Cascadia for the Peninsula System would be approximately 24%. The overall revenue increases indicated in the letter is 75%.</p> <p>The rates in my system are also proposed to be configured so that the bulk of the rate payment will be as a Base Rate which means that they now want the bulk of the monthly payment as a fixed revenue stream to them and a fixed cost to the consumer independent of the amount of water consumed.</p> <p>Cascadia has apparently been busy in the acquisition of various water systems such as the Aquarius system, is consolidating them and now making a major move to "raise the rents" so to speak to enhance their revenues and profits and justify the cost of acquisition for the owners.</p> <p>Mention is made of improvements at the Peninsula System such as generators and pumps to secure water</p>

			<p>availability during power outages. In 20 years, I have never experienced a water shut off despite over a hundred power outages, some lasting up to 2 days. You can't improve on that. All of a sudden we need new ones?</p> <p>The letter refers to an apparent cost of doing business issue involving "rate tariffs" which implies that Cascadia is required to pay an amount to an outside entity, possibly a government agency, as a tariff, for the privilege to provide water services. If this is significant to the rate increase request, then I would object to such a tariff that would cause the need for such a steep percentage increase in revenue.</p> <p>If the rate increases are more of an inflation chasing, return on investment enhancing request, I would also object to it as Cascadia has made the decision to acquire water companies for its own growth objectives and now wants to make it attractively profitable at the customer's expense.</p> <p>So, to summarize, I consider the rate of increase objectionable as I do the way the rates are being configured to be fixed cost heavy and volume usage light. It makes all the talk about water conservation taken with a certain amount of cynicism.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Kirk Wells 360-808-2102</p>
	Kris and Ben Ames	E-mail	<p>To Whom it may concern:</p> <p>My husband and I are writing about the Cascadia water rate case, docket # UW-240151. My husband, Ben, and I, Kris Ames, live at 61 Josephine PL; Sequim, WA 98382 in the Estates Subdivision. We have retired here and are on a fixed income.</p> <p>The UTC ruled that Cascadia failed to meet its burden of showing its improvements were reasonable, necessary, and prudent, and ordered the current litigation.</p> <p>Yet, Cascadia still refuses to share their capital improvement plans with rate payers. They will only admit they anticipate spending 3-4 million dollars a year for at least 5 years. But they won't say for what, or which water systems are involved or how consumers will benefit or why such investments are necessary, reasonable or prudent.</p> <p>Can you explain why an increase of this magnitude isn't rate shock? Could you also explain why this shouldn't be prohibited? Isn't the UTC's role to protect the consumer?</p> <p>Cascadia's plan is unaffordable for the working class, much less the disabled or retirees on a fixed income. This</p>

			<p>ruins property values and leaves homeowners with the choice between water or food or any of the other myriad expenses in this over inflated economy. Many people will have to choose to turn off their water.</p> <p>How can that be fair? Please, don't let it happen!</p> <p>Sincerely, Kris and Ben Ames</p>
	Kristen Swenson	Web	<p>This is a huge hike in our water prices all at once. Few people can afford to pay 75% more in one year. We think this should be spread out over several years to cushion the blow.</p>
	Kristie Pease	E-mail	<p>Dear Sir or Madam,</p> <p>I am a new resident of Clallam County as of 2022. This will be my third opportunity to submit consumer comments to your Commission regarding proposed rate increases by Cascadia Water, LLC.</p> <p>Like many others in the community, my husband and I are retired and live on a fixed income. While I certainly understand that it is inevitable in life that costs of goods and services increase, significant rate increases, such as the current rate increase of 100% proposed by Cascadia, following a 37% rate increase two years ago, will have an impact. It boils down to a consideration of what, if any, watering will we be able to afford next year and in the coming years. Having to make this choice does not resonate well with me.</p> <p>I understand that older water systems being purchased by Cascadia may require improvements due to past neglect. Are you aware that the Water Advocates group have painstakingly performed forensic accounting of Cascadia's finances? This was done in order to understand the nature of the capital improvements made by Cascadia only to prove how much spending has been discretionary rather than required for continued safe operation and that the discretionary expenditures are largely driving the "rate shock" ?</p> <p>What is really frustrating to myself and others is the absolute lack of choice we customers have to choose our water utility. We are hostage to a privately owned water company that is clearly focused on growth and profits and answers to investors only. We the consumer can rely only on you, the Commission, to work through the complexities of the business plan Cascadia is presenting to ensure that it is fair to us. Moving from an area where water was provided by a public utility, we were subject to rate increases. But it was a situation where the local government was working within an established budget to provide services and prepare for future necessary upgrades and improvements. This is not the case here. Consider Cascadia's long term goal for a single rate tariff. Here on the Peninsula, we are at the front-end of their years-long acquisition strategy of buying up small systems, which translates into the reality that WE will be paying for ALL improvements for ALL newly acquired systems for years to come. When will it end?</p>

			<p>I started paying attention to the country's water woes a long time ago. What I wasn't cognizant of was how managing water use would impact me. It isn't that water as a resource is the issue here, it's how its use is being managed. Is investor owned water systems vs government municipalities a new phenomena of which regulatory government processes need to be retooled to manage these entities and PROTECT THE CONSUMER, given the new for profit business model ? It sure seems like you are overdue in thinking long-term how privately owned utilities, which will continue to flourish, need to be governed so that consumers who have a right to water are protected from profit driven motives.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments. Please help us UTC.</p> <p>Kristie Pease</p>
	Kristie Pease	E-mail	<p>Dear Sir or Madam,</p> <p>On January 25, 2025, Gov. Bob Ferguson appointed Brian Rybarik to lead your agency in the Mission to "protect the people of Washington by ensuring that investor-owned utility and transportation services are safe, equitable, reliable, and fairly priced.</p> <p>We, the people of Washington, need you to give proper consideration of our comments and expert testimony provided to your agency, and support us by rejecting the proposed Cascadia Water system rate increase.</p> <p>We should not be held hostage to assume the burden of Cascadia's unrestricted spending so that their investors are kept happy.</p> <p>We should not assume the financial liabilities associated with Cascadia's purchase of other aging systems anywhere with unlimited plans for future growth.</p> <p>We should not be impacted by single tariff pricing as there is no proof that it benefits us.</p> <p>We should not have to pay for capital improvements that are not required.</p> <p>With all that is wrong with the world today, please be a shining star and help us. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.</p> <p>Kristie Pease</p>
	Kristie Pease	Web	<p>Resubmitted because it was not clear that my submittal was accepted. Thank you.</p> <p>Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission</p> <p>This is a Public Comment regarding Docket UW-240151</p>

To Whom It May Concern:

I was dismayed to receive yet another notification from Cascadia Water of a proposed rate increase in June 2024 for water supplied via the Estates Water System located in Clallam County. As a new homeowner to the area in 2023, and currently without any landscaping, it is giving us pause.

Like others, I have attempted to do my own due diligence in response to this proposed increase by reading and studying the Cascadia rate proposal posted on your website and Cascadia's own communication of the same. Cascadia's reasons for the rate increase are cited as inflationary drivers and continuing investments in the various systems that they are maintaining and upgrading. I truly understand that like all infrastructure, upgrades must be made to keep old systems viable, and in this case, in order to provide an adequate and safe water supply. My concerns are though that Cascadia spending is excessive and without a schedule of upgrades in hand as reference, we the customers/rate payers have no idea where in this water system acquisition/infrastructure improvement project we actually are. I can't benchmark where Cascadia is in their investment spending. So, when will this end? We certainly can't shop around; we have no other options.

I have worked for the Department of Energy most of my career as a budget analyst, and know what zero based budgeting is and, I have never witnessed an operation that on paper operates in the red and then looks for reimbursement from customers. That is not a balanced budget. I can understand an emergency unplanned expense requiring reimbursement. I can't understand what appears to be long lists of new assets such as meters and other equipment, new vehicles, and office equipment that on the surface has done nothing to improve my water quality or supply. What rates is NW Water strategically driving to? Is there a rate ceiling we are heading to that we can plan for or does the company have the right to impose increases systematically until water is simply unaffordable?

I do appreciate the meeting that the UTC rate analysts held in Port Angeles on 4/24/24. It was a great opportunity for you to hear our concerns directly and for me to hear other water system current issues of which there seems to be plenty. In particular, the peninsula has concerns regarding emergency response preparedness: 1) managing the water system infrastructure in the event of an earthquake; 2) adequate water pressure/supply in existing fire hydrants located around the county. These issues are not a problem for water companies to solve alone but should be recognized and resolved before we do have that crisis. Lack of planning is poor management. Cascadia has no plan on this issue that they are able to effectively communicate.

As a commissioner making a decision that significantly affects your constituents, my opinion is that Cascadia is expanding at a rate that far exceeds its ability to manage and improve their systems. Rights to water is a hot commodity across the country and is exciting for investors. Please make Cascadia manage prudently. Combining water systems located in different regions of the state for "economies of scale" is not equitable to the ratepayer. The UTC ruled in favor of maintaining separate rate structures for the Island vs the Peninsula, vs eastern WA during the

			<p>last rate increase. Please rule again in that manner if necessary and ensure from the tangled web of financials that Cascadia has provided as justification, that costs are directed specifically where they were incurred.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Kristie Pease Sequim WA</p>
	Kristin Ames	E-mail	<p>To Whom it May Concern:</p> <p>My husband, Ben, and I would like to express our opinion on all the things we do and do not approve of regarding Cascadia Water, the UTC, and Representative Tharinger and his new bill, HB1906.</p> <p>We do not approve of the UTC making secret deals with Cascadia Water that are revealed at the last moment before a public hearing. We do not approve of the UTC not explaining the reasoning behind the deal or even what all is included in the deal. We do not approve of consolidated single tariff rates for everyone except Pelican Point.</p> <p>We do not approve of Cascadia's lack of transparency regarding their financials. We do not approve of Cascadia's lack of information proving their expenses are just and reasonable. We do not approve of Cascadia's rate shock. We do not approve of Cascadia acquiring more and more new systems all requiring capital improvements to make a never ending cycle of rate hikes for the consumer under the consolidated single tariff rate system. We do not approve of Cascadia ruining our property values with their greed.</p> <p>We do approve of Representative Tharinger's new bill, HB1906. We approve a maximum ceiling of 7% ROE. We approve the avoidance of excessive and sudden rate changes. We approve of the new structure and guidelines for the UTC for the water system rate setting process. We do approve of the reminder in the bill that the UTC is supposed to be a consumer advocate agency.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kris Ames</p>
	Kristin Ames	Web	<p>To Whom it May Concern:</p> <p>My husband, Ben, and I would like to express our opinion on all the things we do and do not approve of regarding Cascadia Water, the UTC, and Representative Tharinger and his new bill, HB1906.</p> <p>We do not approve of the UTC making secret deals with Cascadia Water that are revealed at the last moment before a public hearing. We do not approve of the UTC not explaining the reasoning behind the deal or even what all is</p>

			<p>included in the deal. We do not approve of consolidated single tariff rates for everyone except Pelican Point.</p> <p>We do not approve of Cascadia's lack of transparency regarding their financials. We do not approve of Cascadia's lack of information proving their expenses are just and reasonable. We do not approve of Cascadia's rate shock. We do not approve of Cascadia acquiring more and more new systems all requiring capital improvements to make a never ending cycle of rate hikes for the consumer under the consolidated single tariff rate system. We do not approve of Cascadia ruining our property values with their greed.</p> <p>We do approve of Representative Tharinger's new bill, HB1906. We approve a maximum ceiling of 7% ROE. We approve the avoidance of excessive and sudden rate changes. We approve of the new structure and guidelines for the UTC for the water system rate setting process. We do approve of the reminder in the bill that the UTC is supposed to be a consumer advocate agency.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kris Ames Estates subdivision</p>
	Kyra Humphrey	Web	<p>To the UTC Commissioners regarding docket # UW-240151:</p> <p>I have watched with disbelief, dismay, and finally outrage at the high-handed dealings of Cascadia Water as it seeks to implement these abusively high rate changes.</p> <p>Cascadia's rational for these changes is laughable: why should ratepayers bear the burden of so-called "capital improvements", simply because Cascadia wants to avoid taking responsibility for whatever mismanagement has led to missed dividends to stockholders? Those "capital improvements" were neither prudent, necessary, nor beneficial to us, the ratepayers.</p> <p>Cascadia's unrestricted expenses are aimed at extracting maximum profits and a profitable balance sheet: the burden of those goals should be born by shareholders, and not balanced on the back of ratepayers. The proposed consolidated single tariff rates shift the lion's share of that burden to ratepayers who obtain NO BENEFIT from the self-defined "improvements."</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no proof that consolidation or single tariff pricing works or benefits ratepayers. The previous rate case, UW-200979, PROVED no benefits; nothing has changed. UTC Commissioners recognized that then: we hope that you will do the right thing again now.</p> <p>After all, this is WATER we're discussing, not some luxury item. No ratepayer should be financially burdened by these decisions. No ratepayer should have to subsidize the cost of systems from which they receive no benefit. Each system can and should bear its own costs for capital improvements.</p>

			<p>I urge the Commissioners to exercise wise, community-supporting judgement: Listen to the Public Counsels' Tad O'Neill - he suggested that the rate filing be rejected, and this is the second time he has given the Commissioners the same advice.</p> <p>Please, reject this rate filing.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Kyra Humphrey, DPOA Heidi Harrenstein 1031 Thornton Drive Sequim WA 360-301-6547</p>
	Kyra Humphrey, DPOA and Heidi Harrenstein	E-mail	<p>To the UTC Commissioners:</p> <p>I have watched with disbelief, dismay, and finally outrage at the high-handed dealings of Cascadia Water as it seeks to implement these abusively high rate changes.</p> <p>Cascadia's rational for these changes is laughable: why should ratepayers bear the burden of so-called "capital improvements", simply because Cascadia wants to avoid taking responsibility for whatever mismanagement has led to missed dividends to stockholders? Those "capital improvements" were neither prudent, necessary, nor beneficial to us, the ratepayers.</p> <p>Cascadia's unrestricted expenses are aimed at extracting maximum profits and a profitable balance sheet: the burden of those goals should be born by shareholders, and not balanced on the back of ratepayers. The proposed consolidated single tariff rates shift the lion's share of that burden to ratepayers who obtain NO BENEFIT from the self-defined "improvements."</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no proof that consolidation or single tariff pricing works or benefits ratepayers. The previous rate case, UW-200979, PROVED no benefits; nothing has changed. UTC Commissioners recognized that then: we hope that you will do the right thing again now.</p> <p>After all, this is WATER we're discussing, not some luxury item. No ratepayer should be financially burdened by these decisions. No ratepayer should have to subsidize the cost of systems from which they receive no benefit. Each system can and should bear its own costs for capital improvements.</p> <p>I urge the Commissioners to exercise wise, community-supporting judgement: Listen to the Public Counsels' Tad O'Neill - he suggested that the rate filing be rejected, and this is the second time he has given the Commissioners the same advice.</p>

			<p>Please, reject this rate filing.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Kyra Humphrey, DPOA Heidi Harrenstein</p>
	L H Colburn III & Vicki Colburn	E-mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT***
	Lacey and Ray Guna	E-mail	<p>Dear UTC and Public Counsel,</p> <p>We received a NEW notification, on December 13, 2024, of a proposed rate increase from Cascadia Water, LLC. Originally, Cascadia filed on February 29, 2024 for approval to increase rates, effective June 1, 2024, then extended to July 1, 2024. On June 27, 2024, the Commission suspended the Company's tariff revisions and set the rate case for adjudication. On September 26, 2024, per Cascadia Water, they submitted testimony seeking to increase rates effective May 1, 2025. I don't believe the customers of Cascadia Water were made aware of their testimony, nor is it noted on their website. Looking at the UTC Docket 240151, there have been ongoing testimonies up through November 20, 2024 that Cascadia Water failed to mention in their notification we just received. What are they trying to hid from their customers?</p> <p>The letter we received states that this new September filing is reflecting increased rates for additional revenue of \$1,726,600, which is a measly \$62,193 less that what they originally sought back on February 29, 2024. Nothing has changed for our opposition to this exorbitant rate increase - anywhere from 90% to 116% per MONTH!</p> <p>Cascadia states that they are "seeking cost recovery in rates because current revenues are insufficient to cover the ongoing cost of continuing to provide service that is safe, adequate and efficient, and in all respects just and reasonable, while allowing an opportunity for a reasonable return on the Company's needed capital investment".</p> <p>What I believe Cascadia means is since the last rate increase we all paid in 2021 and 2022, Cascadia has expanded and bought assets from FIVE more water system companies, and Cascadia wants us, the customers, to pay for it. If these systems needed upgrading, that should have been worked out in the negotiations in purchasing the systems, not having the customers pay for it. Capital investment should be coming from investors/shareholders, not the customers.</p> <p>Unlike the first filing, we only received what our Island/Mainland System rates will be, NOT their portfolio of systems. In other words, we did not get the "whole picture".</p>

			<p>So below, is our same comments, with adjustments we can figure out with what little we got from Cascadia Water, as to why we adamantly disagree with their increase. Lowering it by \$62,193 is about a 3.5% decrease, and it is not enough. That \$62,193 reduction is a slap in the face to customers who are already hit with higher living costs overall, and to ask those customers to take on a 100%+ increase in their water bill is just not right.</p> <p>Our rates for Island/Mainland System will go up 84% for the base rate, 125% for the 1st block; 129% for 2nd block, and 125% for 3rd block. The are voluminous documents on the UTC Docket website. Way too many for an average person to understand. We are hoping that the UTC does their own worksheets to see if this all makes sense.</p> <p>This type of increase, with all other increases in our lives, hurts those that live in the neighborhoods of Cascadia's water systems. Cascadia has been purchasing small community water systems at a rapid rate, and wants the homeowners to foot the bill of these capital expenditures.</p> <p>It is the UTC's responsibility to ensure that public utilities are providing safe utilities at reasonable rates. As stated before when they first requested a rate increase, we don't see where even at Cascadia's existing revenues and expenses; they are operating at a loss.</p> <p>Cascadia Water LLC is owned by NW Natural Water, LLC, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Northwest Natural Holding Company (NYSE:NWN). A publicly traded company who wants to make sure their shareholders and investors are kept happy, at the expense of the customers. We don't even know what they are now promising their investors for a rate of return on their investment.</p> <p>I appreciate you reading my entire email. More than doubling our water bill every month will put a strain on most of us. Those on social security don't receive that type of Cost-of-Living increase. Those that are still working may not even get a raise each year. This proposed rate increase will definitely put a burden on all customers.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for looking into this in more detail and not just taking their worksheets or testimony at face value.</p> <p>Sincerely, Lacey and Ray Guna</p>
	Lacey and Ray Guna	E-mail	<p>We received notification of a proposed rate increase from Cascadia Water, LLC. Cascadia filed on February 29, 2024 for approval to increase rates, effective June 1, 2024. The meeting will be held at 9:30 am on May 23, 2024.</p> <p>Cascadia notes in the docket that they service 4,000 customers. Their website says they service 9,000 people</p>

		<p>through 3,600 connections.</p> <p>Cascadia state that they are "seeking cost recovery in rates because current revenues are insufficient to cover the ongoing cost of continuing to provide service that is safe, adequate and efficient, and in all respects just and reasonable, while allowing an opportunity for a reasonable return on the Company's needed capital investment".</p> <p>What I believe Cascadia means is since the last rate increase we all paid in 2021 and 2022, Cascadia has expanded and bought assets from FIVE more water system companies, and Cascadia wants us, the customers, to pay for it. If these systems needed upgrading, that should have been worked out in the negotiations in purchasing the systems, not having the customers pay for it. Capital investment should be coming from investors/shareholders, not the customers.</p> <p>Cascadia states the increased rates will reflect additional revenue of \$1,788,793, an incremental increase of 75%. How did they arrive at that? The letter we received from them attached the proposed rates and resulting average monthly bill impact for Island/Mainland System (for Sea View/Lehman/Del Bay).</p> <p>Our rates for Island/Mainland System will go up 145% for the 1st block; 149% for 2nd block, and 145% for 3rd block. Not the 108% Cascadia shows on their excel "Cascadia-GRC-Workbook-Cascadia-Western-Systems". And why do the Northwest Water Services rates only go up by 80%, according to their excel worksheet, while our water system goes up 108%?</p> <p>The excel worksheets are very hard to follow from tab to tab, and they don't make sense, especially PFIS - Pro Form Income Statement. It is only picking up two of the five entities' income and expenses. I'm hoping the UTC does their own worksheets to see that this increase is unreasonable, seeming to pick and choose what figures they want to use. Looking at the PFIS, the Net Operating Income will be about \$692,000 or 33.6% of Operating Revenue. That is a very hefty increase to the bottom line. Again, why are the customers paying for the company's capital improvements? That is what stockholders and investors are supposed to do with their funds.</p> <p>This type of increase, with all other increases in our lives, hurts those that live in the neighborhoods of Cascadia's water systems. Cascadia has been purchasing small community water systems at a rapid rate, and wanting the homeowners to foot the bill of these capital expenditures.</p> <p>It is the UTC's responsibility to ensure that public utilities are providing safe utilities at reasonable rates. I don't see where even at Cascadia's existing revenues and expenses; they are operating at a loss. Cascadia may try to show that on their Pro Forma Income Statement, but that is only a fraction of the existing revenues and expenses. I could spend hours trying to analyze all their worksheets, but I'm in the middle of tax season. All I know is Cascadia's excel worksheet has a whole lot of numbers that when trying to trace, some just don't make sense.</p>
--	--	---

			<p>Cascadia Water LLC is owned by NW Natural Water, LLC, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Northwest Natural Holding Company (NYSE:NWN). A publicly traded company who wants to make sure their shareholders and investors are kept happy, at the expense of the customers. Wanting a rate of return of 12% for those investors, is not reasonable.</p> <p>I appreciate you reading my entire email. More than doubling our water bill every month will put a strain on most of us. Those on social security don't receive that type of Cost-of-Living increase. Those that are still working may not even get a raise each year. This proposed rate increase will definitely put a burden on all customers.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for looking into this in more detail and not just taking their worksheets at face value.</p>
	Lance Curry	Web	<p>Cascadia sent out a notice informing cusotmers of a rate increase for which they have filed for approval from WA UTC. In the notice they disclose their expected rate increase of 75% average across their different fee-zones. In the Rolf Bruun system, where I am a customer of Cascadia's, they inform me they expect the average bill to increase by 84%. However, I applied their rate increase to my latest bill which was \$98.43 on 14FEB2024, and it would have been \$246 instead, an actual increase of over 150%. I am asking you to reject their application until they recreate their average billing increase expectations and resend the notice with corrected numbers for their "dollar increase" and "percentage increase". Also, please delay the Open Meeting until customers have had a reasonable time to review their corrected notice.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Laura Medbury	Web	<p>Why is my "Silver Lake" water system being made to pay for "upgrades" to systems that have NOTHING to do with my water system? I should not be forced to subsidize other systems!</p> <p>This is poor fiscal management by Cascadia -</p> <p>Cascadia Water invested too much in one year and should be responsible for their imprudent actions and there is NO reason why Cascadia cannot file separate rates per system, they track or should track expenses per system. With computers it is not a problem to load the right rates into the system that automatically spits out the bill.</p> <p>THEY ARE A MONOPOLY!!! We have no transparency from all involved. Cascadia has misstated the justification for projects - DOH did not require the Estates reservoir - they just took advantage of a corrective action plan - actually their planning before the DOH inspected the site. I feel that my own government - UTC - is NOT LOOKING OUT FOR MY BEST INTERESTS. We are senior citizens on a LIMITED BUDGET and cannot afford a monopoly to just willy nilly keep increasing our water costs with NOTHING TO SHOW FOR IT. If Cascadia needs to raise rates for justifiable upgrades, then the system that is upgraded should have the bond issued until that upgrade is paid for --- NOT A FOREVER SURCHARGE! I'm so disgusted with the UTC for not protecting me I'm in tears. Mrs Laura Medbury</p>
	Laura Medbury	Web	<p>Why is my "Silver Lake" water system being made to pay for "upgrades" to systems that have NOTHING to do with my water system? I should not be forced to subsidize other systems!</p> <p>This is poor fiscal management by Cascadia -</p>

			<p>Cascadia Water invested too much in one year and should be responsible for their imprudent actions and there is NO reason why Cascadia cannot file separate rates per system, they track or should track expenses per system. With computers it is not a problem to load the right rates into the system that automatically spits out the bill.</p> <p>THEY ARE A MONOPOLY!!! We have no transparency from all involved. Cascadia has misstated the justification for projects - DOH did not require the Estates reservoir - they just took advantage of a corrective action plan - actually their planning before the DOH inspected the site. I feel that my own government - UTC - is NOT LOOKING OUT FOR MY BEST INTERESTS. We are senior citizens on a LIMITED BUDGET and cannot afford a monopoly to just willy nilly keep increasing our water costs with NOTHING TO SHOW FOR IT. If Cascadia needs to raise rates for justifiable upgrades, then the system that is upgraded should have the bond issued until that upgrade is paid for --- NOT A FOREVER SURCHARGE! I'm so disgusted with the UTC for not protecting me I'm in tears. Mrs Laura Medbury</p>
	Lauralea Deluca	E-mail	SEE ATTACHMENT
	Lauralee DeLuca	E-mail	<p>Hello-</p> <p>As a person who live right next to the recently built Estates water system tower (that we didn't find out about until the MORNING they started construction-25 feet from my property line) I think the a rate hike of that size for any company, any time, is outrageous. Many of us here are retired (or would like to be, as in my case) and even though I am still working and on social security, I still have trouble paying the bills, and I am not the only one.</p> <p>From what I understand, so much of what they have done here wasn't even absolute necessary, they did above and beyond what is needed now, in the future or ever. Like the giant generator that I can hear inside my house when it goes off. We didn't have that before and our water was fine. I do believe in improvements, I'm not that old fashioned, but a 107% rate increase for something we had no say in, no option for and now, some of us will have trouble paying. Rate increases, if necessary (which they have already done at least once in the recent past) should be done gradually.</p> <p>Lauralee DeLuca</p> <p>PS-I wish someone had told us this was going to happen in advance. So incredibly rude. My son and I have PTSD issues and this only made it worse. I might have gone somewhere for part of the winter (I'm self employed and can take my work with me) if I would have known. Not your problem, but it shows what an inconsiderate company they are, how little they care about their impact in this neighborhood, and their wallets.</p>
	Lauralee DeLuca	Web	I was never given a chance to have anything to say or even knowledge about the so far 6 month project of the 35 foot water tower 30 feet from my property line. Perhaps it was buried in a water bill but not one of my neighbors I talked to knew about the impending project until it started. It has not only cost a bundle with them threatening to

			raise our water rates because of it, but has wrecked havoc with my ability to work at home do to noise and vibrations, has caused me and my neighbors property value to drop (who wants this monster practically next to their home??), and causes anxiety after 12 years in this quiet neighborhood to suddenly have to wake up to all these voices, noises and big equipment-with no predictable schedule! Some of us here would have left for at least part of the winter, as all of us surrounding this well are self employed or retired. But we didn't know. And Cascadia promised me that it would be done by March 31 but they are working over there today. My business and my mental health have taken a sever toll due to this monster they built next to my home. And now Cascadia wants us all to not only pay for this this beast but for subsidizing their other, less better off wells that they have bought. We had no known chance to voice our opinion. They say we did but no one I talked to had any idea this was coming. They say they would be done over two months ago, but they are not. What else are they not telling us or doing???
	Lee Shissler	E-mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT
	Len Zeoli	E-mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT***
	Len Zeoli	E-mail	<p>Subject: UW-240151.</p> <p>Opposition to Cascadia Water Rate Filing</p> <p>Dear Commissioners and Cascadia Leadership,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase and urge you to reject it based on the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misrepresentation by Cascadia: Cascadia claims their goal is high customer satisfaction, but this contradicts their unwillingness to be clear with customers about management of water systems. Cascadia misrepresents the facts, claiming that projects were required by the Department of Health (DOH). However, DOH documents clearly show that these decisions were Cascadia's, and DOH approval does not equate to urgency, necessity, or prudence. I want honesty and clarity from them. • Burden of Proof: Cascadia has failed to justify the \$6.5M+ in capital improvements as necessary or beneficial to ratepayers. Expert testimony has shown these projects were neither prudent nor required. The Commission must take expert advice seriously in rejecting this proposal. • Public Counsel's Remarks: Tad O'Neill reminded the Commissioners to reject this rate filing. Cascadia's mismanagement should not burden ratepayers, and stockholders—not consumers—should bear the consequences of poor business decisions. • No Benefits from Consolidation or Single Tariff Pricing: There is no proof that consolidation or single tariff pricing benefits ratepayers. Previous cases, such as UW-200979, demonstrated that these policies do not provide any real advantages, and we trust the Commission will uphold its earlier decisions. • Unrestricted Expenses: Cascadia's unrestricted expenses, under their control, are designed to maximize profits at the expense of ratepayers. Cascadia is in the business of profit, not water. They chose water because it is a necessity of life so they are trying to

			<p>squeeze the people as hard as possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largest Rate Increase in a Decade: This would be the largest rate increase in ten years. Cascadia's poor business decisions should not result in higher costs for ratepayers. Shareholders, not consumers, should absorb the consequences. • Role of UTC Rate Staff: UTC rate staff are not water system professionals or engineers and should not be the deciding factor on project necessity. Independent experts, not Cascadia's own management, must assess whether these projects are truly in the best interest of ratepayers. • Concerns About Consolidation and Future Costs: Commissioner Rendhal's request for separate rates for the Island and Peninsula should be supported, as consolidation has proven ineffective. Whidbey Island's status as a Superfund clean-up site, along with potential future PFAS contamination, highlights the need for individualized cost assessments. Similar concerns exist across the 30 systems, including dissimilar systems like Diamond Point and Discovery Bay, as well as future acquisitions with unknown and undisclosed conditions. <p>In conclusion, I urge the Commission to reject this unreasonable rate increase and make decisions that protect the financial interests of the ratepayers, not corporate profits. Let me remind the commission that they are a consumer protection agency. It is surely a challenging role, yet the commission is to be guided by their own mission statement that uses this specific terminology: . . . to protect the people of Washington by ensuring that investor-owned utility and transportation services are safe, equitable, reliable, and fairly priced. Please act accordingly.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Len Zeoli</p>
	Len Zeoli	Web	<p>Public Comment to the WA UTC, Docket UW-240151 Submitted by: Len Zeoli Clallam County, WA January 14, 2025 Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>I am writing as a homeowner, taxpayer, and customer of the Cascadia Water system in the Dungeness Plat, Clallam County, to express my concerns regarding the ongoing rate-setting process and the lack of transparency and fairness in the UTC's handling of this matter.</p> <p>While I acknowledge the UTC's recent request for additional information, the premature determination of new rates, which appear to disproportionately benefit Cascadia Water, is troubling. These decisions have been made without sufficient public input, the appointment of a third commissioner, or the completion of necessary court proceedings. Additionally, the required consultation with the Department of Health regarding the safety and regulatory compliance of the water system has not been properly addressed.</p> <p>Under RCW 80.01.040, the UTC has a legal duty to act in the public interest, ensuring that utility rates are fair, just, and reasonable. The UTC is required to maintain transparency, provide meaningful opportunities for public</p>

			<p>engagement, and protect consumers from unfair practices. However, the current process appears to neglect these safeguards, undermining its responsibility to ratepayers.</p> <p>Cascadia Water, LLC is a subsidiary of NW Natural Water Company, LLC, which is owned by Northwest Natural Holding Company. This corporate structure, with its significant financial resources and influence, stands in stark contrast to the individual taxpayer and homeowner, leaving ratepayers vulnerable to decisions driven by profit motives rather than the legitimate needs of the community.</p> <p>As a profit-driven, investor-owned utility, Cascadia is not held to the same public accountability standards as government entities. In contrast, the UTC has the legal authority and obligation to ensure fairness and protect ratepayers from undue burdens. Recent litigation, such as WUTC v. Cascadia Water, LLC, Docket No. UW-240151, underscores concerns regarding the validity of proposed rate increases and the utility's practices. This case highlights the need for stronger oversight to ensure that rate increases are based on genuine needs and not excessive corporate profits.</p> <p>I respectfully request that the UTC take the following actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide clear, transparent information regarding the proposed rate increases, including a full cost-benefit analysis and a detailed plan for system maintenance and upgrades. 2. Involve the Department of Health in evaluating the safety and regulatory compliance of Cascadia's water system, ensuring that rate increases are based on legitimate needs, not corporate profit motives. 3. Refrain from finalizing rate increases until a third commissioner is appointed to ensure a fully operational and balanced decision-making body. 4. Ensure that any final decision complies with RCW 80.28.010 and RCW 80.01.040, which mandate that rates be fair, just, and reasonable and that ratepayers are adequately protected. <p>The UTC must recognize the significant power disparity between Cascadia, as a regulated utility, and individual ratepayers. It is essential for the UTC to act decisively to protect the interests of the public. If the UTC cannot fulfill its duty, I urge a reassessment of leadership to ensure fairness and accountability in this process.</p> <p>This public comment serves as a request for the UTC to uphold its role as a protector of consumers, ensuring that the rate-setting process remains transparent, equitable, and just.</p> <p>Sincerely, Len Zeoli Clallam County, WA</p>
	Lenore Norrgard	Web	<p>We had a rate increase just a few years ago. It was phased in over three increments. And it was a MUCH smaller increase.</p> <p>I appreciate the improvements that Cascadia has made to their system; however, we never were consulted on them and how they would impact our rates.</p>

			<p>An increase of more than 100% at one time is unconscionable. I, for one, am on a fixed income, and so are many of my neighbors. I just barely get by as it is. Water is absolutely necessary to life; it is not a luxury. With the added expense of this rate increase, I will have less money to spend on food.</p> <p>Here are my specific questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are you doing to ameliorate the impact of this rate increase on low income people like myself? 2. Why on earth are you dropping the whole increase on us, all at once? 3. Why did you not so much as consult with your customers prior to spending so much money? 4. Where else can you recover what you spent, other than from us ratepayers? <p>Thank you.</p>																
	Leonard Zeoli	Web	<p>Re: Current rate case UW-240151</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cascadia's "Customer Notice" claims they are asking for a 75% increase from the Peninsula water system formerly known as Pedersen. They claim it to be an average of 64% based on meter size for 3/4" service which is misleading since there are several other meter sizes not declared and they do not say how they calculated the average. Looking at the actual block rate increases, they are asking for substantially more. Please look at this carefully. If it is true, it is just plain dishonest. <table> <thead> <tr> <th>Blocks</th> <th>Old rate</th> <th>New rate</th> <th>% increase</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1st block</td> <td>rate \$1.10</td> <td>\$2.83</td> <td>157</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2nd block</td> <td>rate \$2.00</td> <td>\$4.47</td> <td>124</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3rd block</td> <td>rate \$4.00</td> <td>\$5.56</td> <td>39</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Who in the world gets a guaranteed 12% profit every year? If you give it to Cascadia then you must give it to the rest of us so we can keep up with the increases. It is patently unfair and dare I say Un-American as well. Profits come from meaningful contributions to customers. 3. The UTC seems to spend a lot of time and effort listening to Cascadia and not very much hearing the people who are served by them. The UTC mission statement makes a nice front page. Please make sure it is put into practice. 4. Any and all updates and upgrades to any water system that are not necessary or required by regulation or law must be presented to water system users before implementation. The changes must be justifiable, cost must be clearly stated up front, and the users given the right to say Yes or No. 5. Completed plans for each water system must be required by the UTC before rate increases are approved. Plans must also be readily available to all water users. 	Blocks	Old rate	New rate	% increase	1st block	rate \$1.10	\$2.83	157	2nd block	rate \$2.00	\$4.47	124	3rd block	rate \$4.00	\$5.56	39
Blocks	Old rate	New rate	% increase																
1st block	rate \$1.10	\$2.83	157																
2nd block	rate \$2.00	\$4.47	124																
3rd block	rate \$4.00	\$5.56	39																

			<p>I expected a rate increase when Cascadia bought our water system. At this time I do not see the water users involved in this increase as being an important part of the process. In the end, I am talking about transparency, fairness and common human decency. I am calling on the UTC to be the oversight agency they are in place to be.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
	Leslie Furlow, PhD	E-mail	<p>Attached and below please find my comments concerning the Cascadia requested rate increase. Thank you in advance for your consideration.</p> <p>February 10, 2025</p> <p>WUTC P O Box 47250, Olympia, WA 98504 comments@uct.wa.gov</p> <p>Commissioners,</p> <p>I wish to express My concern and objection to the handling of the current rate case, UW-240151. Where are the UTC's answers to what they investigated? It is My understanding that Staff are no longer investigating, having announced that Staff and Cascadia had reached a settlement in principle. Where are the details of this settlement and why is the UTC not providing this information for the Consumer's input and comments? Why are the public meetings and comments scheduled after the fact? Transparency and accountability are of the utmost importance. If those are missing trust is lost and anarchy ensues. Politics at its worst as demonstrated at the state and national level, of late.</p> <p>It has been My expectation & understanding in the past that the UTC works for the benefit of the Consumers. Instead, you appear to be focused only on the needs of the water system owners and their profits for which the UTC processes and policies appear to be catering to and protecting.</p> <p>Noting the last tariff revision, UW-200979, the UTC agreed that Cascadia could increase water bills an average of 37%, which they did ONLY three years ago. This increase resulted in a hardship for many Customers on fixed incomes. What was difficult has now become untenable with ANOTHER increase of 100%. Which if left intact would now total 137%. This would create a financial burden that could well lead to financial ruin for those of Us living on the edge.</p> <p>Now, during the current rate hike of just 3 years ago Cascadia has spent even more on unnecessary improvements and now asks the UTC to double Our monthly water bills going forward. Cascadia also admits that more rate increase requests are coming in the near future, as they project spending another \$3-\$4 million a year for the next five years! What and for whom will this increase be used to fund? What are the anticipated benefits for the current Customers of water systems that Cascadia has acquired on the Olympic Peninsula? What will those projects do to Our already unacceptably higher water rates, going forward?</p> <p>It is past time for the Commissioner's to take a long hard look at the capital improvements that are driving these rate requests. Water systems MUST be required to prove without question that these projects are mandated by law and</p>

			<p>will benefit the EXISTING Consumers, not future acquisitions and their new Customers. That must be left to those new acquisitions to pay for. Also, Consumers deserve to be advised of projects that will cause significant rate increases BEFORE they are done. It is extremely improper and objectionable to expect Consumers to pay project costs without prior explanation or notification. Particularly when it comes to future acquisitions and projects, all of which is a form of taxation without representation!</p> <p>If Cascadia and the Commissioners cannot prove without a doubt that these projects were necessary, prudent and a benefit for the current water Consumers, then I expect YOU, the Commissioners, to reject Cascadia's rate filing. To do anything less, then the Commission will have failed to uphold their job as the protectors of the Consumers, thereby ignoring the need for fair, just and reasonable water rates.</p> <p>Be it understood that we join with many others who strongly OPPOSE this rate filing.</p> <p>Sincerely, Leslie Furlow, PhD</p>
	Lily Todd	E-mail	<p>Melissa,</p> <p>I am a resident of Monterra, one of the water districts impacted by Cascadia's requested rate increase.</p> <p>I am also a realtor helping people buy and sell homes for 40 years and in 3 states.</p> <p>I have never encountered such a misrepresentation of facts and concepts.</p> <p>I am sure it is not and was not the intent of the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission to make us taxpayers finance a creative way for a company to make money. Each water district is a unique and separate unity. The different districts cannot be combined as one for any use just like homes in Port Angeles, Seattle and Spokane cannot be taxed the same rate if owned by the same entity. Like homes, these water districts were purchased based on their current conditions. If a district needs or will need in the future substantial work, the price paid no doubt reflected that.</p> <p>Requiring all users of water from Cascadia pay for a combined operating cost makes as little sense as making all taxpayers of the US pay the same income tax rate regardless of income.</p> <p>Each Water District is a separate entity with separate cost. Each Water District rate increase needs to be evaluated based on that unit's production and expenses.</p> <p>Lily Todd</p>

	Lily Todd	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>I wish to speak at the January 14,2025 meeting starting at 3 p.m.</p> <p>I am a memeber of the Cascadia water system. I live in Monterra at 111 Cypress Circle, Port Angeles, WA 98362 and have since 2017.</p> <p>I object to the way Cascadia operates. Cascadia purchases water systems with problems at discounted prices and lumps all systems together, passing the cost to bring the water systems into compliance to all of us. That would be acceptable, if at a future time, we, the users, are reimbursed for the added value of their holdings.</p> <p>However, we are not. I have been in real estate for over 42 years. Never have I sold a property needing repairs where the buyer expected the neighbors to pay for the new roof, foundation or whatever and planned to keep all the future profit from a well-maintained home.</p> <p>This was not the plan when the commission tried to help utility systems in trouble. This needs to change. Each system, like each property, is a stand-alone item. Maybe the guarantee of a 12% profit caused the creative thinking that is derailing legislature's well-meaning attempt at solving this problem.</p> <p>--</p> <p>LILY TODD, Realtor</p>
	Lily Todd	E-mail	<p>I was unable to access the meeting today via the Zoom link you provided.</p> <p>I understand this is not the first time people have been unable to attend a public meeting with Cascadia. When will the meeting be reheld so we can voice our concerns.</p> <p>I wanted to say 3 things:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The request for the rate increase by Cascadia Water is psychological abuse (also known as emotional abuse). This HUGE increase subjected us psychological trauma, including anxiety and depression. This bullying behavior cannot be tolerated.2. In addition this action is plain and simple blackmail unless the cost Cascadia encounters in responding to our objections do not go on their records as an expense we are required to pay. If Cascadia plans to add the costs they've encountered in defending their sky-high rate increase, I content the whole process is just part of their plan to inflate our water costs and should be disallowed.3. Increases in the stand-by rates for undeveloped property should not be allowed UNLESS the costs are justified by repairs to the system they are on. <p>All of this could be avoided with reasonable, frequent rate increases reflecting the rate of inflation.</p> <p>-</p> <p>LILY TODD</p>

Lily Todd	E-mail	<p>If this is approved, you will be subjecting the UTC and it's employees to lawsuits and putting the employees at personal risk.</p> <p>There are three (3) reasons for this.</p> <p>#1 Cascadia has not complied with the law in requesting this unjustified rate increase. Cascadia has not provided concrete facts and figures proving their financial need and the need for the repairs they have done and plan to do. If this plan is allowed to go through as shown, the employees will NOT have made a decision based on standard accounting procedures.</p> <p>#2 Cascadia is lumping multiple water systems together to spread cost over a larger group of consumers and recapturing the funds quicker.</p> <p>#3 The constant and close contact public utilities have with the employees of the UTC creates unintentional bias towards the utilities and the need for rate increases. Even IF THERE IS NOT COLLUSION BETWEEN THE EMPLOYEES OF UTC AND CASCADIA, it would be easy to make a case for it. Friendships often develop from business relationships. If one person representing the utility showed up at the counter with candy on a special occasion or brought flowers or a cake or took an employee out for coffee, that would look like a bribe. Cascadia's parent company paid their top five (5) representative over EIGHT MILLION DOLLARS (that's Million with a M) in 2023. Do you think their representatives are well trained in how to properly present their request? What chance does the average consumer have to counter that professionalism when they go to in to object?</p> <p>I would like to know who the commission deals with and breakdown between the consumers and the utility reps.</p>
Linda L Blakley	E-mail	<p>Cascadia Water Docket number UW-240151 wants to raise the water rates 100%. They are meeting Jan 14, 2025 with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. I protest this amount of increase it is ridiculous. They want to increase a 5/8 meter size from \$49.81 average bill to \$100.24.</p>
Lora & Victor Ferry	E-mail	<p>(CASCADIA WATER) DOCKET #UW-240151</p> <p>Customer Response to Cascadia Water Proposed Rate Increase -</p> <p>Not in Favor</p> <p>Washington law requires that water charges be "fair and reasonable." (RCW 80.28.010) For the Olympic Peninsula, Cascadia Water has proposed a 97% increase, hot on the heels of a 54% increase implemented during the pandemic. This is neither fair nor reasonable.</p> <p>Consider the demographics of Clallam County :</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Social Security Benefits cost-of-living increases1 </div>

			Clallam County median household income increases2
			Cascadia Water increases3
			2021
			1.30%
			14.50%
			54%
			2022
			5.90%
			6.50%
			2023
			8.70%
			0.60%
			2024
			3.20%
			unknown
			2025

			<p>2.50%</p> <p>unknown</p> <p>97%</p> <p>Cascadia’s desired increase is largely because they have recently purchased multiple fixer-upper water systems in other areas and expect us to foot the bill for the deferred maintenance on those systems.³ (Cascadia now owns 28 water systems, of which 5 are in Clallam County.⁴) That’s like buying a fixer-upper rental and expecting your other renters to pay for its new roof and septic system while you gain substantial equity in the property. But, unlike rental housing, Cascadia is our only available water source. They are a natural monopoly.</p> <p>NW Natural Holdings (NWN) is the parent company of Cascadia, and NWN pays baffling amounts of compensation to their executive management.^{5,6} Compare the actual earnings of their top executives with the average income of Peninsula households and retirees:</p> <p>2023</p> <p>2022</p> <p>2021</p> <p>NORTHWEST NATURAL HOLDING CO</p> <p>President/CEO</p> <p>3,133,139</p> <p>3,148,856</p>
--	--	--	---

			3,083,088
			Senior VP/CFO
			1,672,095
			1,445,326
			1,433,583
			VP Strategy & Business Development
			1,366,658
			972,604
			851,289
			Senior VP Operations/Chief Marketing Officer
			1,076,122
			1,046,781
			962,675
			Senior VP Regulation/General Counsel
			1,237,742
			1,142,126
			1,138,267
			TOTAL EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION ⁶
			8,485,756

7,755,693

7,468,902

CLALLAM COUNTY MEDIAN HOUSE INCOME²

67,071

66,693

62,623

AVERAGE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS⁷

22,884

21,902

19,897

From 2021 to 2023, the top five NWN executives were paid over \$1.7 million in bonuses.⁶

And they want us to pay over \$1.7 million to build their improvements and grow their equity. That's beyond unreasonable and unfair; it's unconscionable.

Stefan de Villiers, Regulatory Analyst with the Public Counsel Unit of the Washington State, testified that "...As Cascadia acquires new water systems, it invests extraordinary amounts of capital to 'improve and standardize' those systems, which are 'aging and sometimes neglected'....I propose that the Commission intervene to protect ratepayers from Cascadia's failure to invest with rate impacts in mind...³

Scott Duren, Water Systems Consulting Vice President, testified before the Commission that "Cascadia Water has

failed to demonstrate why these projects were necessary now for access to safe and reliable water.”8

Because Cascadia Water is a monopoly, we ask that you require Cascadia to reasonably phase in any rate increases, and that you impose a reasonable annual increase limit tied to the Consumer Price Index.

1 <https://www.ssa.gov/oact/cola/colaseries.html>

<<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ssa.gov%2Foact%2Fcola%2Fcolaseries.html&data=05%7C02%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7C0fb3596f896441ff95b808dd3367cfbb%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638723244494658915%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMtMiIsIkFOIjoiTWfPbCIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C40000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=gZLES%2BkYQTLYYxT8H%2FFuJcv%2FXnffl7GryKkkwAhiAwg%3D&reserved=0>> Social Security Cost of Living Adjustments

2 <https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/MHIWA53009A052NCEN>

<<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Ffred.stlouisfed.org%2Fseries%2FMHIWA53009A052NCEN&data=05%7C02%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7C0fb3596f896441ff95b808dd3367cfbb%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638723244494681299%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMtMiIsIkFOIjoiTWfPbCIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C40000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=HT5z0exSCG6NV739DQhpKKPKh3LaNsqt07ln9Zptf3Q%3D&reserved=0>> Clallam County Median Household Income by year

3 <https://apiproxy.utc.wa.gov/cases/GetDocument?docID=353&year=2024&docketNumber=240151>

<<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapiproxy.utc.wa.gov%2Fcases%2FGetDocument%3FdocID%3D353%26year%3D2024%26docketNumber%3D240151&data=05%7C02%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7C0fb3596f896441ff95b808dd3367cfbb%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638723244494694623%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMtMiIsIkFOIjoiTWfPbCIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C40000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=GQCbEK2wk%2BsbGX7UIYxfHsc99U%2F9RVgIvJdFQkKjAWM%3D&reserved=0>> Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Cascadia Water, LLC, testimony of Stefan De Villiers on behalf of the Washington State Office of the Attorney General Public Counsel Unit, November 20, 2024

4 <https://cascadiawater.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/CascadiaSystems.pdf>

<<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fcascadiawater.com%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2023%2F11%2FCascadiaSystems.pdf&data=05%7C02%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7C0fb3596f896441ff95b808dd3367cfbb%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638723244494707558%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMtMiIsIkFOIjoiTWfPbCIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C40000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=hMiPfhHr6JELmJ1UMj5%2BQ7EjAfmyY75Q2J4Kjb99%2BH8%3D&reserved=0>>

5 <https://cascadiawater.com>

<<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fcascadiawater.com%2F&data=05%7C02%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7C0fb3596f896441ff95b808dd3367cfbb%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638723244494720098%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMtIsIkFOIjoiTWfPbCIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C40000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=QH1GO38awuylf0bPOQFYoLNLd%2FDd1SB6tJvslT%2FiKwA%3D&reserved=0>>

6 <https://www.salary.com/tools/executive-compensation-calculator/northwest-natural-hldng-co-executive-salaries?year=2023>

<<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.salary.com%2Ftools%2Fexecutive-compensation-calculator%2Fnorthwest-natural-hldng-co-executive-salaries%3Fyear%3D2023&data=05%7C02%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7C0fb3596f896441ff95b808dd3367cfbb%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638723244494732326%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMtIsIkFOIjoiTWfPbCIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C40000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=8tX5r2fcmU9jjkD4lrQtmG4xo2MDhdFV5wRj%2BNxT69I%3D&reserved=0>>

7 <https://www.nasdaq.com/articles/heres-the-average-social-security-retired-worker-benefit-for-every-year-since-1950>

<<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.nasdaq.com%2Farticles%2Fheres-the-average-social-security-retired-worker-benefit-for-every-year-since-1950&data=05%7C02%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7C0fb3596f896441ff95b808dd3367cfbb%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638723244494744351%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMtIsIkFOIjoiTWfPbCIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C40000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=okVOMFQN0pIfY6%2F4FmYyg7am1pHtZSw4muQQtOwaIac%3D&reserved=0>>

8 <https://apiproxy.utc.wa.gov/cases/GetDocument?docID=341&year=2024&docketNumber=240151>

<<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fapiproxy.utc.wa.gov%2Fcases%2FGetDocument%3FdocID%3D341%26year%3D2024%26docketNumber%3D240151&data=05%7C02%7CPubInvolve%40utc.wa.gov%7C0fb3596f896441ff95b808dd3367cfbb%7C11d0e217264e400a8ba057dcc127d72d%7C0%7C0%7C638723244494756907%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwM>>

			<p>CIslIAiOiJXaW4zMlslkFOljoITWfPbCIslldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C40000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=XQmEWYQr8sHUslLVgs6zR0BEuATqq0q2%2BRFQWKXDLM%3D&reserved=0> Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. Cascadia Water, LLC, testimony of Scott Duren, Water Systems Consulting Vice President, November 20, 2024.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted by:</p> <p>Lora & Victor Ferry'</p>
	LuaraLee Deluca	Web	<p>UW-240151 in reference to. I object to the ridiculously high rate increases especially now knowing they are subsidizing other water sources; I object to the fact they did not let me know in advance as well. I object to them building unnecessary systems to increase the rates.</p>
	M. Morgan	Web	<p>The rate increases being requested by this company are excessive and punitive. They will greatly harm many people here on Whidbey. Please take a good hard look at this company.</p>
	Malcolm Huston	E-mail	<p>Since we moved to the area serviced by Cascadia Water, Systems almost 9 years ago,we have had 3 different water service providers,with Cascadia being the latest: "Effective August 16, 2022, Cascadia Water closed on the acquisition of Northwest Water Services (Skagit, Snohomish & Island Counties)." https://cascadiawater.com/about-us/ <</p>

			<p>systems: CAL waterworks, Del Bay, etc.</p> <p>The sole potential benefit MAY be infrastructure improvements listed below: Per NEW-Cascadia-GRC-Customer-Notice-02-29-2024</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continuing to install standby generators on most systems to minimize service disruptions due to power outages, often experienced by residents during the winter storm season and to add resiliency in case of natural disasters.• Continuing to install SCADA (telemetry) systems, which allow our operators to view and monitor the water systems in real time and is critical to ensuring safe and reliable system operations. This also gives advance warning to operators and allows the ability to respond effectively to issues before they become outages.• Installing new submersible pumps, booster pumps, pressure tanks, and control boxes throughout several well sites, helping to ensure reliable water delivery to our customers.• Ongoing meter replacement to allow us to more accurately track the water that is pumped throughout the system, which in effect helps prevent unnecessary leakage, and provides the ability to read meters remotely" <p>To date, Cascadia Water Systems has provided no improvement to our water service; are they likely to benefit as a result of the requested increase being approved? Based on past performance, I am doubtful. As a retiree on fixed income I am opposed to the increase request.</p> <p>For the reasons discussed above, I respectfully request the Commission deny the increase. Malcolm Huston Oak Harbor</p>
	Maralee Johnson	E-mail	<p>I would like to attend the zoom meeting 15 May. I am Maralee Johnson, 30 Spring View in Diamond Point.</p> <p>I appose the increase requested. Diamond point already pays a \$10.++ month assessment for the water tower that was built. It still has a long way to run. Diamond point was built with then used piping including, I been told, even some wood piping. I would like to know when this pipe will be replaced. Proper piping should also reduce the amount of water lost in system.</p> <p>If other locations of the Cascadia system need upgrades they should pay for them as we are doing with a monthly assessment.</p> <p>Any increase in basic water rates should be more gradual. Such as an increase every three to four years. not out of line with COLA.</p>

			Maralee Johnson
	Marilyn Egler	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners</p> <p>As a concerned resident of the Seaview community, I am here to address the recent rate hike proposal from Cascadia Water. While we understand the need for sustainable funding, we believe that the sudden 107% increase is steep and it disproportionately affects our community.</p> <p>The following are some critical points to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Over-Extended Acquisitions: Considering the company's acquisitions from at least five other water municipalities, these failing assets can be described as dilapidated, outdated, and in a state of disrepair, thus resulting in exorbitant costs for restoration or modernization. 2. This Was Reckless Planning: These unforeseen costs for upgrades and repairs are now intended to be passed on to your customers! This depicts irresponsible planning, a lack of due diligence, and most of all financial imprudence! 3. This is a Financial Burden: There seems to be no accountability here, so now you expect your customers to bear the costs of these upgrades and/or repairs with an outrageous rate increase of 107%? 4. This is Inequitable Treatment: Our community is smaller with considerably less upgrades and/or repairs needed in comparison to other acquired municipalities. This drastic rate hike is deemed inequitable and unfair, and quite frankly feels like a classic case of corporate price gouging! We urge you to reevaluate this decision with fairness in mind. 5. Local Context Matters: When assessing water demand, usage, and asset improvement costs in the Seaview community, we find that a one-size-fits-all approach doesn't align with our unique circumstances. We encourage Cascadia Water to consider a more palatable rate structure—one that reflects the realities of our local water utilities, community, and population. 6. Consider Our Fixed-Income Residents: Most homeowners in Seaview are retired and living on fixed incomes. For them, this sudden increase is not just an inconvenience; it's a financial burden! Many simply cannot afford such a sudden and significant increase in their water bills. 7. Consider Meaningful and Adaptable Solutions: Rather than imposing a uniform increase, let's explore options that are both meaningful and adaptable. Perhaps tiered rates based on consumption levels rather than base-rate increases could better serve our community or extending the increase over a 5-year period allowing customers more time to adapt. <p>In the spirit of collaboration, I kindly request that the board engage in further dialogue with the residents of the Seaview community. Let's work together to find a viable solution that balances financial sustainability with compassion for our neighbors. We propose a more gradual, phased-in approach to this rate increase, which we believe would be more manageable for your customers, while still enabling Cascadia Water to recover its costs over a longer period of time.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter. We believe that by working together, we can create a fair and</p>

			<p>sustainable water rate structure that benefits all stake holders at hand.</p> <p>Thank you for your time reviewing our request.</p> <p>Sincerely Seaview Water customers,</p> <p>Eric and Judy Bingham, Jack and Linda Breedlove, Dan and Marilyn Egler, Diana Lanham, Joe and Debora Toro</p>
	Mark and Cynthia Stoker	Mail	***See Attachment
	Mark Long	E-mail	<p>I live in Blue Ribbon Farms, Sequim Wa. Since the water system was purchased by Cascadia or rates have increased greatly as they try to put us into a large water system consisting of other older systems with expensive problems that are not even on the Olympic peninsula. They have spent large amounts on replacing parts of our system that were hardly used and without inspections that may have allowed repairs rather than replacement. Cascadia has informed us that we will be getting another huge rate increase on the order of 75 to 100%. We need the overseers of this private business that is choking us to do their over site job and bring sanity to these outrageous rate increases.</p> <p>Mark Long</p>
	Mark Long	E-mail	<p>I'm subject to your approving outrageous rate increases for Cascadia to pay for unwanted and unnecessary expenses you blindly approve.</p> <p>Listen to the Public Counsel Tad O'Neill - he suggested that the rate filing be rejected. This is the second time he has given Commissioners the same advice. Time to start listening!</p> <p>Mark Long</p>
	Mark Long	E-mail	<p>Regarding UW-240151 I make the following points;</p> <p>1. Burden of Proof: Cascadia has not met their burden of proof. The \$6.5M+ capital improvements driving these unreasonable rate increases were neither prudent, necessary, nor beneficial to us, the ratepayers.</p> <p>2. Public Counsel's Closing Remarks: Tad O'Neill reminded the Commissioners to reject this rate filing. A \$1.9</p>

			<p>billion corporation won't go bankrupt if the correct decision is made - reject the rate filing. Stockholders might miss dividends, but that's a consequence of Cascadia's mismanagement.</p> <p>3. Consolidation and Single Tariff Pricing: There is no proof that consolidation or single tariff pricing works or benefits ratepayers. The previous rate case, UW-200979, PROVED there are no benefits. Nothing has changed. We expect you to do the right thing now.</p> <p>4. Unrestricted Expenses: The only difference in case UW-240151 compared to the previous one is Cascadia's unrestricted expenses, which are under their control and aimed at extracting maximum profits, ignoring the financial burden on consumers.</p> <p>5. Largest Rate Increase in a Decade: Public Counsel's analyst highlighted this would be the largest rate increase in a decade. Cascadia's lawyer emphasized their entitlement to a profitable balance sheet despite bad business decisions. Shareholders should bear the burden, not ratepayers.</p> <p>Mark Long Retired on fixed income. Aggrieved Cascadia Victim.</p>
	Mark Modine	E-mail	<p>Cascadia Water, docket #240151</p> <p>Our Cascadia Water bill consists of two charge, Water Bi-Monthly Base and Water Bi-Monthly Usage. The base makes up approximately 80% of the bill which means it doesn't really matter how much water you use, it's cheap. This makes it so there is no incentive to conserve water since you are going to be hit with a big bill anyway.</p> <p>Cascadia states their increase is 75%. Our base rate, for a residential property is increasing from \$29.35 a month to \$56.00, a 91% increase. Water is increasing from \$5.52/500 cubic feet to \$5.52, a 134% increase.</p> <p>In their rate increase proposal they don't make any mention of management salaries and other overhead. How good is the management if they suddenly have to have increases of this magnitude? Their claim of inflation doesn't go that far.</p> <p>thanks Mark Modine</p>

	Mark Nudelman	E-mail	<p>Hello Melissa,</p> <p>I received this notice from Cascadia Water and did not receive something previously about the rate increase. I would like to say that Cascadia has always done a wonderful job and has been responsive when we have questions. That being said a 75% increase does seem excessive. I'm unaware as to why they feel they need this increase to improve the infrastructure or if this is just an opportunity for them to increase the bottom line. No such information has been forthcoming.</p> <p>Best, Mark Nudelman</p>
	Mark Ojala and Rebecca Bender	E-mail	<p>Important consumer rate increases by Cascadia Water is a holding us consumers hostage. We consumers demand considerations to resolve the issue of us subsidizing the costs of Cascadia Water perpetual aquasitions. We remain on the hook while they continue to aquire other systems. It's up to you UTC to look after the consumers best interest to call out companies that take advantage of ratepayers. Cascadia has not been transparent on their projects nor demonstrated that their costs are reasonable and necessary.</p> <p>Is UTC cutting corners because if reduced staff?</p> <p>UTC has sided with Cascadia in unreasonable ways in refusing to answer specific questions. We are confused by Cascadia Water showing different rate increases, consolidated rates, then revised rates not consolidated. Incorrect figures? Confusing us ratepayers! Adding...Is this intentional from Cascadia to give us wrong phone numbers on how to submit comments? They are untrustworthy and deceptive. We consumers deserve better representation.</p> <p>Water Consumer Advocate of WA.</p> <p>Mark Ojala Rebecca Bender</p>
	Martin Spani	E-mail	<p>Strongly urge you to disallow this phony additional charge that amounts to graft and corruption that now seems to be over taking the State. This "the sky is falling" currently prevailing is without a doubt bogus.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
	Mary Courtis	E-mail	<p>Hello</p> <p>My name is Mary Courtis and I recently bought a property at 32 Thornton pl in the Dungeness Bay Plat community in Sequim WA. I will be retiring soon from my job as a college professor and I purchased this property as my retirement home. Many other Dungeness Bay Plat community members are also retirees who live on fixed incomes. Dramatic changes in utility rates like the proposed Cascadia water increase pose a hardship for every consumer, but they are especially hard on retirees, the disabled or other people who live on fixed incomes.</p>

			<p>According to the 2024 National Council on Aging Survey, nearly 50% of adults 60 and older had household incomes below the Elder Index value for where they lived. This means their average income was below the standard needed to afford basic needs. The same survey showed that 80%—or 47 million households with older adults—are financially struggling today or are at risk of falling into economic insecurity as they age. Despite older adults' preference to age in place, 60% would be unable to afford two years of in-home long-term services and other supports. Retirees also cannot easily sell their home and move like working adults. That makes them "captive consumers", who have to weather the continuing cost of living increases--like rising utility costs--as best they can. For some that means they will become homeless.</p> <p>These statistics also mean that retirees and other people on fixed incomes are more impacted by "rate shock", especially when that rate shock is projected to continue indefinitely. Cascadia Water says it is going to continue to look for and acquire more systems needing expensive improvements. This plan could mean a long string of perpetual water rate increases for consumers and escalating rate shock that never ends. Under those circumstances, consumers on fixed incomes will increasingly have to choose between paying for water vs food, health care and other essential services. UTC is responsible for preventing "rate shock" and its effects on consumers. How can the current proposed rate increase not create rate shock? How can the UTC let this happen? How can the UTC ethically allow a water company who only seems interested in squeezing as much money out of captive consumers as they can?</p> <p>I know that I am not the only consumer and property owner who is alarmed and feels victimized by Cascadia Water's proposed plans. The UTC has previously ruled that Cascadia failed to show how its proposed improvements were responsible, necessary, or even prudent. Please act now to prevent Cascadia Water from implementing this uncalled for rate increase that will create rent shock and severely impact retirees and other populations on fixed incomes.</p> <p>Thank you for reading my email and hear my concerns.</p> <p>Mary Courtis</p>
	Mary Heller	Web	<p>We recently received from Cascadia Water a notice of rate increase (Docket #240151), for additional revenue to the company of 75%. This amount of increase all at once will result in significant hardship to many residents, who are already coping with higher rent, food, and energy costs every day. The Company's assertion that this level of increase is "just and reasonable" due to "high inflation" and the completion of "several key infrastructure projects" is astonishing. Although the rate of inflation has been high, certainly not as high as 75%. And if these infrastructure projects have been completed, it seems</p>
	Mary Heller	Web	<p>We recently received from Cascadia Water a notice of rate increase (Docket #240151), for additional revenue to the company of 75%. This amount of increase all at once will result in significant hardship to many of the Company's customers, who are already coping with higher rent, food, and energy costs every day. The Company's assertion that</p>

			<p>this level of increase is “just and reasonable” due to “high inflation” and the completion of “several key infrastructure projects” is astonishing. Although the rate of inflation has been notably high, certainly not as high as 75%. Additionally, it seems illogical that this level of additional revenue is required if the listed infrastructure projects have already been completed.</p> <p>We urge the Commission to reject this proposed rate increase, and direct Cascadia Water to submit a less onerous rate increase that will be fair to both the Company and its customers.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Mary Thompson	Web	<p>We just found out that Cascadia water company (subsidiary of Northwest Natural Water Company, LLC , which is a subsidiary of Northwest Natural Holding Company) plans to raise our rates by 75% June 1st. We understand that there was a meeting for public commentary last month in Port Angeles. You couldn't site a meeting farther away from the majority of us as consumers. We live in Freeland. It is two hours of driving plus 45 minutes each way lined up waiting for the ferry, plus the 35 minute ferry crossing. To attend would have meant driving over 4 hours each way. The plan is to have the increase go into effect June 1. They obviously do not want any input and are doing a sneaky end run around consumers. This outfit is a holding company whose mission is simply to return dividends to its owners, without regard to the people they are providing water for. This is wrong. Aren't there regulations governing the rate of annual increase? I have never heard of a utility being allowed to raise their rates by 75%. This is grab for money from your constituents. Please help us! Our water costs are high as it is.</p>
	Maurine Shimlock	E-mail	<p>Dear UTC,</p> <p>Once again we are submitting our protest over Cascadia's proposed rate hikes for the Estates water users. While we understand that rate hikes are inevitable and necessary, this hike would DOUBLE the amount we, the users, are paying. Many people on the Estates system are on a low or fixed income and cannot afford an increase of this size, not should they be expected to.</p> <p>Through the public hearings (virtual and in person) we have learned that much of this hike is for Cascadia's benefit, as the company has been on a buying spree and needs cash. There has been little mention of how the consumers will benefit from the proposed increases. Better maintenance? Doubtful.</p> <p>Thanks again for letting us express our concerns. Please do the right thing and deny Cascadia's absurd proposal.</p> <p>Sincerely, Maurine Shimlock and Burt Jones</p>
	Maurine Shimlock and Burt Jones	E-mail	<p>Dear Utility Commission and Public Counsel,</p> <p>We have written several times in the past to protest Cascadia Water's absurdly high rate hike request. But we would like to go on record again and being EXTREMELY opposed to their current request.</p>

			<p>While we understand that rate hikes are inevitable, we feel that this increase of more than twice our current rates places an undue burden on the consumer.</p> <p>We question the wisdom of a single rate across all of Cascadia's systems. We question the the necessity and actual cost, being passed to the consumer, of their capital improvements, and we question why a company, which serves the public, would be allowed to double rates from one billing period to the next.</p> <p>Why not take a more palatable approach and increase rates incrementally to soften the burden for those of us on fixed incomes? This type of price gouging should be prevented by agencies such as yours in order to protect the people you serve.</p> <p>Please do the honorable thing and make Cascadia come up with a MUCH more equitable solution to their need for higher rates.</p> <p>Sincerely, Maurine Shimlock and Burt Jones</p>
	Maurine Shimlock and Burt Jones	E-mail	<p>Dear Commission,</p> <p>We have written previously to comment on Cascadia Water's proposed +/- 97% rate hike for our water system, Peninsula System.</p> <p>While we understand that rate hikes are necessary from time to time to make up for expenses incurred while serving the public, this rate hike is unjust and unreasonable.</p> <p>Many of the customers Cascadia serves in this system are retired. A 97% rate increase from one billing period to the next will cause hardship for these customers, including ourselves. We also believe that Cascadia is proposing this huge rate increase to make up for shortfalls outside of our system, and to finance repairs and upgrades on other systems outside of Peninsula's.</p> <p>Please do not allow Cascadia to double our water usage rates overnight! This would be an unfair precedent with state-wide reverberations for every Washingtonian.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>

			Maurine Shimlock and Burt Jones
	Megan and Kyle Ostermick-Durkee	E-mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT
	Melissa Rosloniec	E-mail	<p>I currently live on the outskirts of Oak Harbor, WA and our water provider is Cascadia. I am appalled by the recent letter mentioning proposed rate increases of over 100% increase. That is absurd! In all my years here, I have never received such a dramatic increase in fees to our water as what we received from Cascadia last week. Honestly, the proposed percentage increase of over 100% is simply outrageous, especially given our economy, inflation and more. I understand that Cascadia Water wants to put in essential improvements, but there is absolutely no way that families can absorb 100% increases and further, at a minimum, Cascadia Water should think about how to stagger increases as to minimize the impact to consumers.</p> <p>I also want to bring up a very important matter: I had to install a whole home filtration system (very expensive) SOLELY due to the fact that even today, Cascadia Water delivers terrible quality water. In fact, I argue that the water Cascadia delivers today to all the homes around us, is substandard and non-drinkable. So if I can't trust Cascadia Water to deliver PURE, CLEAN, DRINKABLE water today, why on earth should there be this rate increase. The WA State Commission should mandate that Cascadia Water delivers this water before they ever have a right to increase fees.</p> <p>Lastly, we have had our property taxes increased dramatically year over year and why aren't the increased taxes (which are inappropriately high), used to offset the Cascadia water essential improvements? Afterall, that's what our extra taxes should be used for.</p> <p>In summary, I STRONGLY OPPOSE this rate increase and urge you to consider this.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
	Michael and Marilyn Kelly	Mail	<p>Cascadia Water - docket number UW-240151 Marilyn Lane <mlane1953@gmail.com> Wed, Jan 29, 2025 at 6:40 PM</p> <p>We are writing as a retired couple on a fixed income. We are very concerned with the huge 80% monthly rate increase that Cascadia Water is asking for residential homes. As a residential community over the past 10 years or so, we have had our water system change ownership several times. Each time there has been an increase.</p> <p>We are hoping that as the Commission reviews the request for such a large cost increase from Cascadia Water, they</p>

			<p>will take into consideration how this large dollar increase affects the household budgets of our community</p> <p>Thank you for allowing our input.</p> <p>Sincerely, Michael and Marilyn Kelly</p>
	Michael and Roberta Morton	Mail	<p>Dear Commission Members;</p> <p>We've received an undated letter from Cascadia Water informing us that the company was requesting an increase in rate tariffs to its customers totaling \$1,788,793. The justification for the rate increase was "due to high inflation that is beyond the company's control." This is an increase of 75% over existing rates. The combined US rate of inflation based on the Consumer Price Index for the three year period 2021 through 2023 is 16.9%, a far cry from the 75% increase requested by Cascadia Water..</p> <p>According to the information sheet provided by Cascadia Water the current average bill for a 3/4 inch meter is \$56.72. The Proposed average bill if the request is approved would be \$104.41 a month, a percentage increase of 84%. We purchased a share of the Oak Harbor Wa based Silver Lake Water Company in 1977 to provide water to our newly constructed home. Rates were stable for over 40 years until the company was sold to NW Water Services who raised monthly rates soon after purchase. Cascadia Water then purchased the Silver Lake Water company assets from NW Water and promptly raised rates again. Cascadia Water is now asking to double the current rate. This is outrageous! We are unaware of any system improvements that could possibly justify the requested increase.</p> <p>It appears that Cascadia is buying up small water systems region wide and creating a monopoly on ground water resources. They do not own the ground water and should not be able to demand additional income when ever they please. We respectfully request that you deny the requested rate tariff increase.</p> <p>Sincerely, Michael Morton Roberta Morton</p>
	Michael E. Edwards	E-mail	<p>Re:Cascadia Water Price increase</p> <p>Public Comment</p>

			<p>We will be unable to attend the public hearings on January 13 and 14, 2025 and wish to comment and make our voices heard concerning the planned project and rate increases promising a 12% profit for Cascadia at the consumer/customer's expense.</p> <p>A responsible utility company with proper administrative management and worthy board of director leadership would practice appropriate and protective monthly and annual, preventative maintenance and preservation of existing systems, and practice ethical and wise planning for future needs, rather than waiting until a project of this expense is at hand, while looking for a 12% profit rather than the needs and benefit of customers.</p> <p>Fiscal responsibility and keeping the public trust requires that financial planning be done ahead of time with funds set in reserve to preserve and protect ongoing safe supply and service. Transparent and ethical business practice appears to be lacking at Cascadia Water. Requiring massive capital input and expecting customers to pay an exorbitant rate increase, while guaranteeing a 12% profit is immoral and unethical to say the least.</p> <p>An audit and review of this project and Cascadia's maintenance, planning and financial practices seem to be in order.</p> <p>Expecting customers, many in low income areas, many on fixed incomes, and many struggling to pay living expenses as it is, will be the ones to suffer while Cascadia Water enjoys a guaranteed 12% profit if this project and rate increase goes forward. We oppose this rate increase.</p> <p>Michael and Stephanie Edwards</p>
	Michael J Sammons	Web	<p>They are asking for a 75% increase, however the numbers they sent out are 120% increase. I would be in favor of a 25% increase over 2 years.</p> <p>What they are asking for, many people in our community can not afford such an increase. Most incomes in Lynch Cove are close to poverty because of inflation over the past few years.</p> <p>Please deny their application.</p>
	Michael McComb	E-mail	<p>I have been a customer of Aquarius Utilities- now Cascadia Water since September 2010 when I started construction of my house on North Street. In 2010 I was required to pay \$5,674 to connect to the water system. This included a \$500 fee to upgrade the meter from a 3/4" service to a 1" service. The Clallam County Building Department required a 1" service to my home because I was required to install a fire prevention sprinkler system. Since I have never had a fire, I have never utilized this extra capacity nor do I intend to.</p> <p>The proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for a 1" service from the current \$32.08 to \$88.00 per month is unacceptable. There is no financial justification for this increase especially since I use no more water than my</p>

			<p>neighbors just down the street who have 3/4" services.</p> <p>My February water bill was \$53.98. Under the new proposed rate using the same amount of water my bill would be \$103.76.</p> <p>The proposed billing change would almost double my current water bill adding over \$500 to the amount I spend for water each year. As a retiree living on a fixed income this represents a significant addition to my cost of living. If you multiply \$500 dollars per year by the number of Cascadia Water customers at Diamond Point , that equates to a significant revenue increase for Cascadia Water. What justification other than greed could support this request. If Aquarius was not a profitable company and I'm sure they were, why would Cascadia have purchased them?</p> <p>Thank you for listening to my complaint. It is my hope you will deny or severely reduce the requested rate increase and restore the more fair billing method of how much water you use instead of how big your meter size is. It is my understanding that you will be in the area on April 22, 2024. I would definitely be interested in attending any meeting you might schedule. The Gardiner Community Center just off of Highway 101 often accommodates meetings for the community. Possibly you could have it there.</p> <p>Michael McComb</p>
	Michael McComb	E-mail	<p>I have been a customer of Aquarius Utilities- now Cascadia Water since September 2010 when I started construction of my house on North Street. In 2010 I was required to pay \$5,674 to connect to the water system. This included a \$500 fee to upgrade the meter from a 3/4" service to a 1" service. The Clallam County Building Department required a 1" service to my home because I was required to install a fire prevention sprinkler system. Since I have never had a fire, I have never utilized this extra capacity nor do I intend to.</p> <p>The proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for a 1" service from the current \$32.08 to \$88.00 per month is unacceptable. There is no financial justification for this increase especially since I use no more water than my neighbors just down the street who have 3/4" services.</p> <p>My February water bill was \$53.98. Under the new proposed rate using the same amount of water my bill would be \$103.76.</p> <p>The proposed billing change would almost double my current water bill adding over \$500 to the amount I spend for water each year. As a retiree living on a fixed income this represents a significant addition to my cost of living. If you multiply \$500 dollars per year by the number of Cascadia Water customers at Diamond Point , that equates to a significant revenue increase for Cascadia Water. What justification other than greed could support this request. If Aquarius was not a profitable company and I'm sure they were, why would Cascadia have purchased them?</p>

			<p>Thank you for listening to my complaint. It is my hope you will deny or severely reduce the requested rate increase and restore the more fair billing method of how much water you use instead of how big your meter size is. It is my understanding that you will be in the area on April 22, 2024. I would definitely be interested in attending any meeting you might schedule. The Gardiner Community Center just off of Highway 101 often accommodates meetings for the community. Possibly you could have it there.</p> <p>Michael McComb</p>
	Micheal H Campbell	Web	They need to correct the water pressure before they are allowed any increase. The system is very inefficient use of water with the low pressure varying.
	Michelle and Richard Polver	E-mail	***See Attachment
	Michelle and Richard Polver	E-mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT***
	Mike Morton	Web	<p>I own a five acre parcel of property on Whidbey Island located at 2271 Wood Ridge Lane and own a share of the Silver Lake Water Company, now owned by Cascadia Water LLC. I have been paying for water for three years now but have not used a drop. We are planning on building a residence there. I know of no valid reason for Cascadia Water to request a near doubling of water rates. There have been no improvements to the water system. Inflation is an excuse.</p> <p>Cascadia Water is buying up small water companies all over Washington creating a de Facto monopoly. There is no alternative water service available to us.. We are being held captive. You are the only ones who can prevent them from charging what ever they want when ever they want to. Please deny their request. Thank you.</p>
	Molly Bridle	Web	
	Monterra Homeowners, Lily Todd	E-mail	***SEE ATTACHED SIGNED PETITION
	Mr. and Mrs. Bret Medbury	E-mail	We are two retired people, almost 80 years old. We are not able to afford an 85% increase in our water charges. We just HAD an increase in our water charges. Our social security has gone up, yes, but between Medicare higher deductible, astronomical food costs, etc. this is just OUTRAGEOUS to expect anyone on social security to be able to afford an 85% increase.

		<p>We find that this new owner, has bought up all the small water companies and expect us to pay for other areas which have no affect/benefit to us on improvements.</p> <p>If the company needs to upgrade an area, bond it, with those people affected. Not to sunset an equipment requirement is highway robbery. Why should any water system need to be charging the same huge increase in price once the upgraded equipment has been placed? BOND it. Sunset the bond prices after it's completed.</p> <p>If they need a generator, BOND the cost, like we have to do when we need to fix something on our house. I don't charge someone in Coupeville to help me pay for an improvement/repair on my house!</p> <p>This company KNEW what they were purchasing and should have known what would be needed to keep the water systems running. They bought the water for PROFIT, not for humanitarian purposes.</p> <p>TO PUT THE BURDEN ON SENIORS IS ABHORENT. The UTC Rate Staff should be ashamed of themselves for not even allowing discussion with Public Counsel or us, the customers, before their email settlement with Cascadia. GREED.</p> <p>WE HAVE NO RECOURSE; WE HAVE NO ABILITY TO DEFEND OURSELVES!!!</p> <p>You, our only recourse, are making deals behind our backs and letting them get away with these insulting increases in prices.</p> <p>We NEED YOUR HELP! We need our new Governor to intervene in this debacle and find out who is lying to whom.</p> <p>Bottom line. WE CANNOT CONTINUE TO FIND MONEY IN OUR MEAGER RETIREMENT INCOME TO SUSTAIN %100 INCREASES IN WATER COSTS EVERY TWO TO THREE YEARS!!!!!!!!!!</p> <p>HELP. PLEASE.</p> <p>Mr and Mrs. Bret Medbury</p>
	Mr. and Mrs. William H. Foster	<p>E-mail</p> <p>February 17, 2025</p> <p>Person Submitting Comments: Mr. and Mrs. William H. Foster, III</p> <p>To: Washington Utilities and Transportation Board</p>

Emailed to: comments@utc.wa.gov
RE: Cascadia Water, LLC request for rate increase
Filing UW - 240151 Company: Cascadia Water, LLC
DBA:
Filing Type: Tariff Revision
Case Status: Pending Dates (Opened & Effective): 02/29/2024 & 06/01/2024

RE: Example of UTC STAFF Making Testimony / Statements that are Disingenuous, and without Expert Skill Levels and Training to support. We do NOT Support Cascadia's request for Rate Increase.

Dear Commission Members,

My comments on how we do Not Support the request as filed by Cascadia Water, LLC for a water rate increase, in part, are for the following reasons.

During the UTC Hearing this past February 11, 2025, UTC Staff Member Rachel Stark - As Team Leader as Regulatory Analyst - gave oral testimony where she re-states, in part her, written testimony, in response to questions, as follows:

CROSS-EXAMINATION EXHIBIT OF RACHEL STARK
ON BEHALF OF THE
WASHINGTON STATE OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
PUBLIC COUNSEL UNIT
EXHIBIT RS-__X
Staff Discovery Response to WCAW DR 32
February 6, 2025

TESTIMONY OF RACHEL STARK Exh. RS -1T, p. 4.

“Q. How does Staff determine whether a cost or expense was prudently incurred?

A. Staff follows established regulatory principles and considers whether the company acted reasonably based on what the company knew, or should have known, at the time it made the decision to incur the cost. To do so, Staff looks at, among other things, whether the expense was necessary, whether the company considered alternatives, and whether the company documented its decision-making process for later review”.

These data requests relate to whether Staff applied the standard above to each of the 14

projects Cascadia identifies as “major”. See CJL 1T pp. 9-10 (hereinafter “Cascadia’s major capital improvements”. These data requests speak to all Staff efforts, not just those of Ms. Stark.

For each of Cascadia’s major capital improvements did Staff assess whether the expense was necessary?

RESPONSE:

Yes, Staff evaluated Cascadia’s major capital improvements for whether those costs were necessary to the provision of the regulated service."

As Water Consumers (William and Janeice Foster) we find Rachel Stark's statements disingenuous and not based on the facts, per her own own contrasting answers to questions during the Public UTC Hearing, this past February 11, 2025

It is evident that Rachel Stark's testimony, both written and oral, were from "boiler plate standard answers" without regard for the specifics of this particular Cascadia Water, LLC Rate Increase Case.

If Ms. Stark did perform her duties as she described in her testimony:

"Staff follows established regulatory principles and considers whether the company acted reasonably based on what the company knew, or should have known, at the time it made the decision to incur the cost. To do so, Staff looks at, among other things, whether the expense was necessary, whether the company considered alternatives, and whether the company documented its decision-making process for later review”.

Then how can Ms. Stark's statement and testimony be factual when her public UTC hearing answers were contrary?. Ms. Stark was asked by Public Council in the Public Hearing some of the following questions:

Q - Did you have Data that showed that a new reservoir was cost effective or necessary?

A - "No".

Yet, Ms. Stark's written testimony states:

"Staff follows established regulatory principles and considers whether the company acted reasonably based on what the company knew, or should have known, at the time it made the decision to incur the cost. To do so, Staff looks at, among other things, whether the expense was necessary, whether the company considered

		<p>alternatives, and whether the company documented its decision-making process for later review”.</p> <p>The above "Boiler Plate" written testimony answer by Ms. Stark about Staff process to determine and support Staff's approval of Cascade Water, LLC Rate Increase Request did not happen.</p> <p>When Ms. Stark was asked "did you have Data that showed that a new reservoir was cost effective or necessary?", her answer was "No". Also, according to other statements Ms. Stark made, all she and her team were basing their decisions on to support a Rate Increase, as agreed to by Mr. Culley Lehman and Cascade Water, LLC, was all based on what Mr. Culley Lehman and Cascade Water, LLC told her. As Ms. Stark says, she is not an engineer. She left out that she is also a short term in years, four (4) year UTC employee, with no expert training, or background.</p> <p>When Ms. Stark was asked if she investigated what Culley Lehman and Cascade Water, LLC were telling the UTC and Staff, her answer again was "No".</p> <p>Ms. Stark went on to say it was the Department of Health (DOH) that required the improvements, and expensive improvements.</p> <p>This is an inaccurate statement by Stark, for the problem with Stark's statement is the improvements, and expensive improvements were not and are NOT required by DOH as Starks says. The DOH approved the improvements because they were asked for their approval, NOT because the improvements were necessary or required by DOH.</p> <p>Ms. Stark was asked directly by Public Council did you evaluate if any of the improvements were "needed"? Stark's answer was again "No", she says she relied on engineers and DOH, to fix or resolve, upgrades to address containment in water, cracking in reservoir. This says Stark did not require any alternative analysis, cost analysis, regulation requirements analysis, etc., or to "analyze" and evaluate any of these possible documents, if any.</p> <p>Ms. Stark was questioned further by Public Council did she and Staff have data "if cost effective or necessary to replace reservoir?" Stark's answer was "No".</p> <p>All that was told to Starks by Culley Lehman and Cascadia Water, LLC was taken as 100% factual. So when did, what Stark's stated below events occur?:</p> <p>"Staff follows established regulatory principles and considers whether the company acted reasonably based on what the company knew, or should have known, at the time it made the decision to incur the cost. To do so, Staff looks at, among other things, whether the expense was necessary, whether the company considered alternatives, and whether the company documented its decision-making process for</p>
--	--	---

		<p>later review”.</p> <p>Non of the highlighted in YELLOW happened on Stark's watch, it did not happen as Stark's described and assured it did happen, per her own written testimony. All information from Culley Lehman and Cascadia Water, LLC that they given to the UTC and Starks was taken as gospel, and no further actual evaluation and "analysis" by UTC Starks was taken.</p> <p>If Ms. Stark's job Title is Regulatory Analyst, why was her "Analyst" (to analyze) duty ignored, and now the UTC Board possibly gives 100% credit and acceptance for the Staff's so called work product?</p> <p>For Starks to have determined what Cascadia "should have known", or "whether the expense was Necessary", or did the "company considered alternatives", and "whether the company documented its decision-making process for later review”, Stark needed to do true analysis, it did not happen.</p> <p>NONE of these events as described in YELLOW above took place or happened as Stark said in her Testimony.</p> <p>If the UTC approves Staff and Cascadia's New Proposed Agreement, we all as Water User Customers must pay the Penalty of excessive Rate Increases, for the UTC Staff's failure to perform their regulatory duties in there analysis and evaluations (that did not occur), and Cascade for being inept, lazy to perform efficiently, and not serving the "Best needs" of its Water User Customers.</p> <p>These comments by William and Janeice Foster are about UTC Staff's lack of expertise and lack of true proper examination and analysis, and lack of proper skill sets.</p> <p>This is just another example of why we do NOT support the Rate Increase as proposed by Cascadia Water, LLC and UTC Staff.</p> <p>Our demand is simply for Just, Fair, and Reasonable Rates.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Mr. and Mrs. William H. Foster</p> <p>Customer of Cascadia Water, LLC</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Mr. and Mrs. William H. Foster</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>February 18, 2025</p> <p>Person Submitting Comments: Mr. and Mrs. William H. Foster, III</p> <p>To: Washington Utilities and Transportation Board Emailed to: comments@utc.wa.gov RE: Cascadia Water, LLC request for rate increase Filing UW - 240151 Company: Cascadia Water, LLC DBA: Filing Type: Tariff Revision Case Status: Pending Dates (Opened): 02/29/2024</p> <p>RE: UTC Staff Member - Mr. Scott Sevall (Regulations Analysis) Stated in the February 11, 2-25 UTC Public Hearing with Complete Confidence that his Analysis on Cascadia Rate Increase and Single Tariff Pricing Decision is based on "You Scratch My Back and I Will Scratch Yours!" To us, the Water User Customer, Sevall's Declaration is Insane!</p> <p>Dear Commission Members,</p> <p>In 2019 we (William and Janeice Foster) choose to spent over \$375,000 to join a Water System with (189) Homes/Users. We did not choose to Join a Socialist Commune of (17) Water Systems with 4,000 Users to be consolidated. With the Expenses of Decades of Deferred Maintenance, with Investors Demanding they be paid an ROI of 12% for their Uncontrolled High Purchase Prices of multiple Systems. Just because the Water Owner thinks they only have to ask for a Rate Increase and get "Single Tariff Pricing" to fix their Poor Judgement and Management!! For this is what is being asked of the UTC, to approve Cascadia Water, LLC's Rate Increase and to "consolidate" their (17) water systems into SINGLE TARIFF PRICING.</p> <p>We do NOT Support Cascadia's requested for Rate Increase, and SINGLE TARIFF PRICING.</p> <p>Our comments on how we do Not Support the request by Cascadia Water, LLC and the UTC Staff for a water rate increase, and SINGLE TARIFF PRICING, in part, are for the following reasons:</p> <p>During the UTC Hearing this past February 11, 2025, UTC Staff Member - Mr. Scott Sevall (Regulations Analysis) stated in the Public Hearing, with Complete Confidence, that his Analysis on Cascadia Rate Increase and Single Tariff Pricing Decision is based on "You Scratch My Back and I Will Scratch Yours!". To us, the Water User Customer, Mr. Sevall's Declaration is Insane! Sevall's declaration as part of his decision process, in particular for his Recommending to the UTC Board a Single Tariff Pricing.</p>
--	---	---------------	--

		<p>“You Scratch My Back and I Will Scratch Yours!” By Scott Sevall</p> <p>Different words that have the same meaning for "You Scratch My Back and I Will Scratch Yours!" is "Quid pro quo", or "a favor for a favor", or "this for that", or to do something that helps someone else but that is often difficult to do or wrong and with the expectation of help in return. Without a "Quid pro quo", the giving is done without any expectations of a return act. This of course would be free will, not socialisms as Mr. Sevall described.</p> <p>The example Scott Sevall gave for the need of “You Scratch My Back and I Will Scratch Yours!”, was his hypothetical event of an earthquake that takes out four (4) of the (17) water systems owned by Cascadia Water, LLC today, and who knows how many in the years to come Cascadia may own. As Cascadia says their goal is to Expand!</p> <p>If Cascadia Water, LLC water systems were to go off line for say four (4) of their systems due to an earthquake, example given by Sevall, that would be a catastrophic event and expense that even 4,000 water customer users would not be able to cover. At this point of said catastrophic event, Cascade and the effected water users would of course look to the State of Washington for assistance, and if the needs were beyond the ability of the State, then next would be to look to FEMA.</p> <p>SINGLE TARIFF PRICING with all 4,000 current Cascadia water users is not JUST, FAIR, or REASONABLE PRICING, the cornerstone and mandate for UTC Board Rulings.</p> <p>SINGLE TARIFF PRICING is a socialist model, not a free market model.</p> <p>If Arcadia Water, LLC cannot afford their business and purchase decisions, why are they looking to the UTC Board, and the innocent 4,000 water users, each with their own unique water system risks, and rewards. Mr. Sevall's dreaded socialist basis of “You Scratch My Back and I Will Scratch Yours!” has no place in a private water delivery system. it may work in a city public water system, however it does not work in a private water system like Cascadia Water, LLC.</p> <p>Mr. Sevall is mistaken, for SINGLE TARIFF PRICING and unjustified Higher Water Rates is not Just, Fair, and Reasonable Rates to the water user Customer. It may be to Cascadia, yet the UTC is to protect the water users first, not Cascadia who made their own decisions getting into this mess.</p> <p>Our demand is simply for Just, Fair, and Reasonable Rates (and not be socialism).</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
--	--	---

			Mr. and Mrs. William H. Foster Customer of Cascadia Water, LLC
	Mr. and Mrs. William H. Foster	E-mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT***
	Mr. and Mrs. William H. Foster, III	E-mail	<p>To: Washington Utilities and Transportation Board Emailed to: comments@utc.wa.gov RE: Cascadia Water, LLC request for rate increase</p> <p>Filing UW - 240151 Company: Cascadia Water, LLC DBA: Filing Type: Tariff Revision Case Status: Pending Dates (Opened & Effective): 02/29/2024 & 06/01/2024</p> <p>RE: If our inquiry to Cascadia is about us paying Cascadia, you will get an immediate response. If our inquiry is about Cascadia Water service to us as a water customer, we did not get a reply for four (4) month, after reaching out to Cascadia eight (8) times. We do NOT Support Cascadia's request for Rate Increase.</p> <p>Dear Commission Members, My comments on how we do Not Support the request as filed by Cascadia Water, LLC for a water rate increase, in part, are for the following reasons.</p> <p>During the UTC Hearing this past February 11, 2025, Mr. Culley Lehman - General Manager for Cascadia Water, LCC, stated on record, over (27) times that his and Cascadia Water's efforts and decisions were to deliver the best service to the water customers.</p> <p>Mr. Lehman's statements were most insulting to hear, especially with our dealings with Cascadia Water, LLC, Mr. Lehman, and his staff. Here is just one example of the high demand for "best customer service" Mr. Lehman does not deliver:</p> <p>William Foster reached out to Cascadia Infrastructure (Subsidiary of Cascadia Water, LLC) and Cascadia Water, LLC to resolve service issues on the following dates, by telephone, voice mail, and emails, and as of April 18, 2024</p>

William Foster has never received a return phone call or email to address his issues about service. Inquiries about other Billing issuers had been return, yet not issues about service.

If the inquiry to Cascadia is about Cascadia getting paid, you will get an immediate response. If the inquiry is about Cascadia Water service, I was not contacted by in said four (4) month period.

This is my records of my contacting, and dates, to Cascadia Water, LLC:

Type of Contact	Date and Time	Message	Result
Telephone	12/11/2023 @ 11:44AM	Please Call Back	No Call Back
Telephone	12/11/2023 @ 12:12PM	Description of Issue and to call	No Call Back
Telephone	12/20/2023 @ 4:02PM	Description of Issue and to call	No Call Back
Email	12/15/2023 @ 8:39 AM	Description of Issue and to Reply	No Reply
Email	12/20/2023 @ 4:20 PM	Description of Issue and to Reply	No Reply
Email	12/21/2023 @ 4:15 PM	Description of Issue and to Reply	No Reply
Telephone	04/18/2024 @ 3:13PM	Description of Issue and to call	No Call Back
Telephone	04/18/2024 @ 4:57PM	Description of Issue and to call	No Call Back

Therefore for over four (4) months, from December 11, 2023 to April 18, 2024, after making five (5) phone calls, and three (3) emails to Cascadia Water, LLC, William Foster had not received any response about service issues from Cascadia Water, LCC or it's manager Culley Lehman – General Manager, or his staff.

In my experience with Cascadia and Mr. Lehman, the disconnect between his over (27) times all his decisions and efforts are for the best service to the water customer, at best shows how inept Mr. Lehman and Cascadia Water, LLC

		<p>is, or his statements on the most critical events described in his testimony at the UTC Hearing were they are disingenuous and not supported by the facts.</p> <p>If Cascadia Water, LLC cannot even respond to a customer's inquires about service, not even one (1) time in four (4) months, why would they deserve a 151% plus increase in rates. As stated by De Villiers testimony on line 3, page 5, "On a per year basis, Cascadia's requested increase is larger than any other general rate case increase in the LAST DECADE".</p> <p>It appears many of the statements made by Mr. Lehman, Cascadia Water, LLC, and their witnesses are best said to be "disingenuous" and are statements not based on the facts.</p> <p>This is just one example of of why we do not support the Rate Increase as proposed by Cascadia Water, LLC and UTC Staff.</p> <p>This is our demand to Just, Fair, and Reasonable Rates.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Mr. and Mrs. William H. Foster</p> <p>Customer of Cascadia Water, LLC</p>
	Mr. and Mrs. William H. Foster, III	<p>E-mail</p> <p>Dear Commission Members,</p> <p>My comments on how we do Not Support the request as filed by Cascadia Water, LLC for a water rate increase, in part, are for the following reasons.</p> <p>During the UTC Hearing this past February 11, 2025, Mr. Rowell - Cascadia Water, LLC - Rowell is the Manager of Water Rates and Regulatory Affairs of parent company of Cascadia Water, LLC. Mr. Rowell stated on record, when asked if he knew anything about the Water industry standard grant and loan programs available for funds, that can be made available to Cascadia Water, LLC for just such items as new capital expenditures that Cascadia is asking Rate Increases for in this rate increase request.</p> <p>The important part to Mr. Tad O'Neal's question to Rowell is, these industry standard, and known grant/loan programs carry an interest rate between 1.2% to 2.25%. Mr. Rowell said three (3) times he did not have any knowledge of any such grant or loan programs, and never heard of them before.</p>

		<p>Cascadia Water, LLC in their rate increase proposal to UTC shows interest carry on loans of 10% or higher.</p> <p>As a water user customer I am enraged that a top executive of Cascade Water, LLC, et al, knew NOTHING about such available programs. Per the Assistant AG Tad O'Neal, as Public Council stated to Mr. Rowell that most likely Cascade would qualify for the lower 1.7% interest loans, a reduction by 83% in loan interest rate, and Mr. Rowell had ZERO knowledge of.</p> <p>In my free market business world (not a monopoly like Cascade) Mr. Rowell, or anyone else at Cascade NOT knowing about such grant or loan programs, would be accused of "Gross negligence" and "malfeasance" (Violation of professional duties or responsibilities", or they simply are just "inept". There is no possible other answer in this case.</p> <p>This is very harmful behavior on Cascade Water, LLC part that holds the water using customers to pay the penalty in grossly higher rates, year after year, after year. In fact going on forever if the UTC supports and approves the BAD, and lack of fact based recommendation of the UTC Staff and Cascade Water, LLC agreement with UTC Staff.</p> <p>Paying interest rates of 10% plus vs 1.7% is a huge amount of money. Yet, in the eyes of Cascade, "who cares", as it is the water customers who has to pay the gross excesses!! Is Cascade doing 10% plus interest rate loans for some undisclosed reason that is to Cascade's or it's managers best interests?</p> <p>For Mr. Rowell to have ZERO knowledge of these Water Supply Company Industry standard grant and loan programs, would be like the Pope saying "I has never heard of the "Bible". All we can say is Cascade Water, LLC and Mr. Rowell, you and displayed and acted with gross incompetence!</p> <p>Enough said.</p> <p>These comments are just another example of why we do NOT support the Rate Increase as proposed by Cascadia Water, LLC and UTC Staff.</p> <p>Our demand is simply for Just, Fair, and Reasonable Rates.</p> <p>It may be wise for the UTC to Listen to the State of Washington Public Council - Assistant Attorney General Mr. Tad O'Neal.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Mr. and Mrs. William H. Foster</p>
--	--	--

	Mrs. Laura Medbury	Web	We are an Island County resident on a fixed social security income. Cascadia Water who has purchased our water system, has already raised our water rates twice in very recent years. Now, they want to DOUBLE our rates but no one is DOUBLEING MY INCOME! We seniors cannot absorb increases to our food, property tax, heating costs AND ANOTHER increase from the water company. Water is a necessity. Should we stop eating?
	Nancy Goodwin	E-mail	<p>I am writing to you because Cascadia Water Co. is not listening to its consumers, and it is inducing harm to everyone who is drinking their controlled water. They announced in an email on Thursday, January 23, 2025, that they will begin this Monday, January 27, 2025, to add chlorine to the water supply. This is beyond outrageous and is absolutely dangerous to many of this area's retired community and their pets. We have no time to research water filters now and should not have to pay for such when this water has never had a need for chlorine. So why do we need chlorine now? Cascadia will not answer such. Why did they not give us any warning for preparation? What is Cascadia hiding? What are they not doing correctly with our water system?</p> <p>People and animals with kidney disease should not drink chlorinated water. The same goes for those with cancer. Chlorine can harm people with asthma and hypothyroid disease. Chlorinated water hinders plant growth in our landscaping and greenhouses.</p> <p>We have a freshwater aquarium. Had I not seen that email, we would have killed all of our fish using chlorinated tap water. Now we will have to purchase chemicals and treat the water ahead of time that goes into the aquarium. What is wrong with Cascadia??</p> <p>Please help the hundreds of people that are impacted in one more day from this horrid company's evil ways. Many of us very consciously bought our land and homes with specific intention to the fact that we would be on this community well with good pure water, specifically without chlorine!! This is criminal behavior from Cascadia.</p> <p>Nancy Goodwin</p>
	Nancy Goodwin	Web	This is now the 2nd time you are quickly raising water rates of an outrageous amount at 75% with very little notice! This is completely unreasonable and wrong. You don't know how to run a company. I have been a small business owner for over 30 years and know how to budget. You simply spend beyond your means and then rape us for more. This is dead wrong and you know it. We will fight every time you do this.
	Natasha Merkuloff Nichols	E-mail	***See Attachment

Natasha Merkuloff Nichols	Web	<p>RE: UW-240151</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>Cascadia Water, LLC has applied for a rate increase with the WUTC on 2-29-24. I object to the proposed rate increase and request that the Commission reject the rate filing in its entirety.</p> <p>The increase Cascadia has requested will cause financial hardship for my family as well as on many other families in this area. I don't understand why those of us living in Blue Ribbon Farms should be required to pay for repairs, upgrades, and improvements to systems other than our own. Cascadia seems to buy many small community water systems and then try to spread the upgrades to those systems among the rate payers of systems they already serve. In areas where we've lived before, rate increases have occurred gradually, so that rate payers can adjust their budgets accordingly, not in one huge fell swoop! It is a principle used by many utilities, and Cascadia should look at adopting that principle, rather than hitting customers with a huge increase.</p> <p>We understand that Cascadia claims that the consolidation of costs will help Cascadia communicate with its rate payers more effectively. Frankly we don't understand why this should be so. We also understand that Cascadia has not provided information regarding expenses over \$170,000 shown in the Water System Plan. This Water System Plan is supposed to provide customers with information on the condition of the water system as well as the need and cost of future work. We haven't heard anything about this plan and how it may impact us now or in the future. Again, we request the Commission reject this rate proposal, certainly until more information from Cascadia is provided, that would prove its investments were appropriate and that rates are just, reasonable, and fair for each customer. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
Neil Koseff	E-mail	<p>Please deny the rate increase of Cascadia Water as described in RATE CASE -240151</p> <p>I am upset that Cascadia Water who purchased the Dungeness Bay Plat Water from Peterson Water Company, Sequim Washington, recently, has informed us of a excessive rate increase. It is unacceptable that almost all of the reasons for the rate increases was to fix/improve OTHER non Dungeness Bay Plat water facilities mostly on Whitbey Island far away from Sequim. Each community should be responsible for their own improvements.</p> <p>In addition, they want to add additional items that may be superfluous to our small community and thus not necessary.</p> <p>Our system has worked fine for the many years I lived there. In addition they never asked us what we felt we needed.</p> <p>I and many others agree with Vicki Colburn and our Attorney Judy Endejan to deny the rate increase</p>
Nicole Arian	Web	<p>Our water maintenance company King Water, was bought by NWNW. Currently we pay \$786.00 a year for water maintenance. NWNW wants to raise our rates to \$1423.00+ a year. Our neighborhood, as well as many others, are</p>

			populated with low income, enlisted Navy families, and fixed income residents. Buying up all of these water systems and creating unrealistic price hikes, gives us no other options for water management companies. I didn't go to college, but that sounds like a monopoly to me.
	Nkoseff	E-mail	<p>Please deny cascada excessive water rate increase for dungeness bay plat Washington clallam county</p> <p>Unfortunately cascada is proposing excessive water rate increase for dungeness bay plat. These excessive increases are not necessary for our system.</p> <p>They have withheld critical specific information to justify why their excessive rate increase is necessary for our water system. Only vague generalized reasons to confuse us.</p> <p>Our rates have doubled in the last 10 years already Many of us our senior with fixed incomes Thanks Neil koseff</p>
	Onika Muller	E-mail	<p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living. Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase.</p> <p>Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues. In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter</p>
	Pamela and Denny Filan	E-mail	<p>My husband and I reside on Tilbury Lane in Oak Harbor and we totally agree with what our fellow neighbors are stating regarding our increase for our water from Cascadia.</p> <p>More than doubling our water bill every month will put a burden on us. We are on social security and have limited funds each month. With all of the other increases we have faced this year this is definitely one of the biggest. We simply cannot afford this increase. We are asking you to reevaluate your situation and not put the burden on all of your customers. Thank you.</p>
	Paul Jeffrey Binford	E-mail	<p>Cascadia proposed rate increase is absolutely not acceptable and will create rate shock to the 27 customers on our well. We should not be responsible for paying for whatever new projects they think they have lined up and want to do putting the burden on us.</p> <p>They have not proved that their investments were needed. please reject their request for an increase.</p>

	Paul Jeffrey Binford	Web	<p>I am protesting the outrageous price increase submitted by Cascadia water LLC. docket # is 240151.</p> <p>This increase is outrageous {7 times more then the current rate} Please do not allow this rate increase! Thank You in Advance, Paul and Annette Binford</p>
	Paulette D. Ache	E-mail	<p>Cascadia Water is requesting a proposed rate increase ranging from 65% to over 107%. The new cistern that the water company has put in our neighborhood is just over my fence and is visible to the left of my house and lurking over it when viewed from the road. This eyesore has devalued my property immensely. I requested that the company plant large trees around the cistern but was told that isn't going to happen. Now on top of all of this, we are told of the outrageous increase in our water rates. This is so unfair. In our working community with many seniors living on fixed incomes, how are we all going to be able to afford this? This is the type of increase that causes people, out of necessity, to move. It's very disappointing</p>
	Paulette D. Ache	Web	<p>Cascadia Water is requesting a proposed rate increase ranging from 65% to over 107%. The new cistern that the water company has put in our neighborhood is just over my fence and is visible to the left of my house and lurking over it when viewed from the road. This eyesore has devalued my property immensely. I requested that the company plant large trees around the cistern but was told that isn't going to happen. Now on top of all of this, we are told of the outrageous increase in our water rates. This is so unfair. In our working community with many seniors living on fixed incomes, how are we all going to be able to afford this? This is the type of increase that causes people, out of necessity, to move. It's very disappointing.</p>
	Perry Yaw	Web	<p>I just retired this year and to get hit with a 75% hike in my water bill is huge. I think any increase this size needs to be spaced out over several years in order to give families time to make room in their budgets.</p>
	Peter DiMartino	E-mail	<p>Dear UTC:</p> <p>I am against the high rate increases for the Estates Water System located in Sequim, Washington. Cascadia has not met their burden of proof that \$6.5 million dollars in capital improvements were necessary. This is an unreasonable increase. The UTC staff needs to follow the recommendations of Public Counsel Tad O'Neill and reject this rate filing.</p> <p>A single tariff will not benefit me as a rate payer. Instead, I'll be paying for water systems that Cascadia is buying that need costly improvements. The UTC has not proved this is a benefit to me. Please reject the single tariff today and in the future. I cannot afford to pay for broken systems in other cities other than my own. I don't expect other cities to pay for my water system improvements. Cascadia didn't ask for a single tariff so why did UTC staff include it? In the last rate case, Commissioner Anne Rendalh said it wouldn't benefit the Estates' customers.</p> <p>Reject this case filing. I am not a profit center for Cascadia or NW Natural Water located in Oregon. Does the UTC see a benefit in allowing an out of state corporation to sell water at gold prices? Washington water is owned by the State of Washington. The UTC should demand that Cascadia pay gold prices for water.</p>

			Peter DiMartino
	Peter Renner	E-mail	<p>Dear Folks,</p> <p>Please consider my comments to Cascade's proposal to increase their water rates to my Community, Monterra Estates, Port Angeles, WA.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cascade argues that they have prudently managed its operating costs. I have seen nothing that shows how Cascade has managed their operating costs or even what Cascades operating costs actually are. The only work that I have seen Cascade do is to install meters to the services that Cascade has in Monterra. That was only one year ago if that so they have no history of what individual service needs are or how metering will affect those needs. 2. Cascade argues they made system wide investments and completed several key infrastructure projects. What were these improvements and projects completed? What are capital expenses planned for Monterra in the coming years? We have no information as to what is budgeted for the next few years nor any information of what the current issues are for operating this system that need to be addressed? Do we take the need and planned projects on faith alone? 3. Cascade Water has purchased eight other water systems in Washington State in the last roughly six years. Has their oversight of these new systems and their ability to manage these new systems kept pace with this fast expansion. It appears that their business plan is to obtain as many of these size systems as fast as possible, raise the rates on these as much as possible and as fast as possible so they can continue to expand as fast as possible. As water becomes more scarce around the western states and water becomes a more precious commodity, it must be remembered that water is a basic, the most basic, commodity for human life. It is a commodity that a monopoly supplies to most every city, community and area in the state and that those communities must use. Monterra is held to use Cascade with no alternatives. Cascade seems set on capturing as much of this market as possible. <p>No Washington community should be held to rate increases without proof that the rates are truly needed. Much more transparency is needed. Monterra, an over 55 community, should not have to pay the price, nearly a 100% increase in rates, for Cascade's expansion plans and vaguely expressed needed improvements and projects.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Peter Renner Owner/resident /Monterra</p>
	Peter Renner	E-mail	am writing concerning the 94% rate increase purposed by Cascade Water for Monterra community. Monterra community is a 55 and over community located rurally between Port Angeles and Sequim, Washington, in Clallam

			<p>County. I am a current resident of Monterra.</p> <p>Monterra is not a gated community with a high income residents. I moved to this community in August, 2023, purchasing a typical manufactured home in the community (all homes in Monterra are manufactured homes) - for \$345,000. I moved here after living in Seattle since 1980 after my wife and I divorced. Settlement of my divorce left me with enough money to purchase this home but not much money past that with half of my monthly retirement income and retirement savings going to my wife. The point of this is that my financial situation is much like most of the folks who live in this roughly 150 home community. Large rate increases are tough to afford as most residents are on fixed incomes, just like me.</p> <p>I do not know what Cascade is proposing to do with the rate increase. I do not know what condition the water pipes and pumping systems that serve our community are in. It does not appear, however, that the money generated by this rate increase is for any project on our water system. How can this be? Is our community's system simply being leveraged by the conglomerate that owns Cascade, PNW Utilities, Portland, to obtain more water systems in the our state and beyond.</p> <p>Water is not a renewable resource. We are in a drought situation in this portion of Clallam County as it is. The Monterra community should not be held ransom so that corporations can buy up smaller water companies like ours, to capture a resource so vital to the people who depend on it. Monterra community has no alternatives to Cascade's service and more importantly has no voice in how our proposed rate increase, should be, or on even whose system, it can be used.</p> <p>Please deny or greatly reduce Cascade's proposed rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Peter Renner</p>
	Rachel Hilsinger	Web	
	Randall Wingett	E-mail	<p>Randall Winget April 23, 2024 Subject: Questions for Cascadia pertaining to Rate Case UW-240151 Mr. Culley Lehman: please respond to my questions below. Ms. Melissa Castaneda-Kerson: please add this correspondence to docket UW-240151. Dear Mr. Lehman, I am a resident within the Estates Water system, and I attended the UTC's informal customer outreach meeting held</p>

at the Port Angeles Library at 6:00 PM on April 22. I was not aware of this UTC meeting until I received an email from Vicki Colburn on April 18 informing me and 148 water consumers. It is my understanding that a few Estates water consumers had received direct email notification from the UTC about this meeting. My first question for you: Why didn't Cascadia notify Estates water consumers of this UTC meeting? Doing so would have demonstrated Cascadia's desire to meet the objective as you stated on your website: "Cascadia Water operates long-time family-run utilities, and we're very connected to the communities we serve."

Following are my questions on the status of the upgraded Estates Water infrastructure. I would appreciate your response to all these questions as soon as possible:

1. What is the status of the new above ground water reservoir? I received an Estates Reservoir Update PDF dated January 21, 2024, announcing the project, but have not received a follow-up status report. The Estates Reservoir Update document states: "For more information and background on this project, please visit the Community links section of our website: "cascadiawater.com." There are no updates provided in the Community Links section of the Cascadia website. The most recent document is dated 2/9/22.
2. When was the upgraded water system placed into service? I did not receive an email or other notification about when this would occur and whether to expect any interruptions to service or temporary changes in water quality or color. And I could not find the status of the Estates Water system upgrades on the Cascadia website even though the Estates Reservoir Update document states: "For more information and background on this project, please visit the Community links section of our website: cascadiawater.com."
3. Are the new pumps installed and operating? How much additional pumping capacity are the new pumps providing, and how many additional Estates Water users can be served with this upgrade?
4. Is the manganese filter system installed and do these filters also reduce other minerals and contaminants? Having lived here since 2017, we are familiar with the community well water leaving spots on windows, car paint and accumulated mineral deposits around plumbing and fixtures over time, unless it is completely wiped off before it evaporates.
- 2
5. Is there a backup generator installed, tested and operational? Cascadia has included a back up generator in draft plans and discussions, but I have not found any invoice or documentation on the purchase of a generator.
6. I have noticed a slight increase in water pressure and slightly less mineral deposits after washing a vehicle. Was this expected? Again, not knowing the status of the upgrades, this may be otherwise explained.
7. Should the water pressure regulator valve at the street be checked because of the upgraded system? What should the water pressure be at the meter box? Who is responsible for checking and setting the pressure regulator valve? Any increase in the water pressure delivered has the potential for causing damage to sensitive plumbing systems and equipment (e.g., connected RV house water, refrigerator water dispenser and ice maker).
8. Does the new above ground water reservoir and distribution system meet codes for natural or manmade disasters, such as a nearby explosion, small airplane impact, earthquake, fire or flood, deep winter freeze and vandalism? Of course, underground water reservoirs are much more protected from the elements and any of the above-mentioned scenarios. And I do understand that above ground reservoirs are much less expensive. However, I would like to be aware of any vulnerabilities to the upgraded infrastructure and the security of our water supply.

			<p>9. Does Cascadia Water have a disaster plan, such as with a major earthquake? I am a Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) volunteer, and during a recent meeting the subject of water supply during a major disaster, such as an earthquake was brought up along with the upgrades to the Estates Water system infrastructure. For example, in an emergency should first responders, including a Cascadia Water engineer or technician be unable to come to the Estates well site to check for damage and possibly shut off the water, it would be critical for our CERT captain and squad members to have some basic training on what to do. And if the power is out and there is no backup generator, is it still possible to get lifesaving drinking water from the reservoir?</p> <p>10. Why isn't the Cascadia Water website kept up to date, especially with posting important announcements like the status of the Estates Water system upgrades and UTC and Cascadia public meetings? As a former webmaster and technical writer, and a current social media content creator, in this era of instant information, this is one of the greatest deficiencies by Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your time reviewing and responding to these important questions.</p> <p>Sincerely, Randall Winget</p>
	Raymond J Carolus	Mail	<p>***SEE ATTACHMENT***</p> <p>Dear commission Members:</p> <p>I have received a letter from Cascadia Water for a rate increase, please refer to the attached copy. I am writing to you because I believe the rate increase to be exurbanite. The letter covers costs from several water districts purchased by Cascadia Water. Our property is in the Island Mainland System (for Northwest Water Services). The immediate rate increase requested is a whopping 84%.</p> <p>Cascadia recently purchased Northwest Water Services, formally a North Whidbey Island water district company and immediately combined it with their Skagit and Snohomish districts. They have also acquired several other water districts, one of them as far away as Eastern Washington. Their combined list of operating expenses includes nine that are not part of our district, refer to check marks on the attachment. This has led me to assume that our district is being asked to pay for expenses out of our district.</p> <p>We purchased our property in 1999. We paid for water hook up to the Silverlake Water District still owned by the original property developer. Water rates had been stable since 1977 until the district was acquired by Northwest Water Services from the developer. They raised our rates following their purchase. Shortly thereafter they installed meter bases and added usage rates to their base rate. However, their incremental rate increases were within reason but still questionable based on the former owner's history of no charge for maintenance or upgrades. Cascadia Water appears to be a sock it to you, monopoly expecting to fatten their pocketbooks based on their newly acquired investment. Please consider holding them accountable to be a real service company serving their customers first.</p> <p>It seems to me that the ground water rights should belong to the property owners in their</p>

			<p>districts, not for sale to corporate monopolies. Maybe water district customers would be better served by a cooperative owner and management system.</p> <p>Sincerely, Raymond J Carolus</p>
	Rebecca Bender	E-mail	<p>Rate Increase UW-240151 Peninsula System for Estates/Monterra</p> <p>For the record we in oppose this outrageous 94% rate increase on June 1, 2024 due to insufficient details in the filings. Cascadia's capital expenditures was premature prior to the company taking this on and other their many other operations. Our concern is what additional increases will be following if this one is allowed. What are the company's future capital plans? Was the metering done to decrease operational expense? Are the automated meters deployed or are they still under way? Questions exist on unanswered expenses...reservoir construction, generators, metering, management salaries & other operational costs from other Cascadia operations allocated to the Peninsula system.</p> <p>Attended the April 22, 2024 meeting in Port Angeles</p> <p>The need for additional information will take time. The May 23rd Commission meeting to decide the rate increase needs to be rescheduled for everyone to be fully aware of the details involved. Our attorney Judy Endejan is currently out of town and will need to have time to prepare for this meeting. Our Peninsula group includes 4 systems & 1 in Jefferson county. The commission needs to separate us from the other 29 systems. 14 of the systems are on the Island...the largest. 94% increase in a monthly bill is a outrageous.</p>
	Rebecca Bender	Web	<p>We the ESTATES water consumers are opposing tariff revisions due to the lack of transparency. The rate increases are not justified and the company has not met its burden if proof. Rate increases are drastic, unaffordable for retirees. Water system are being lumped together so that individual systems are paying costs incurred by other systems. These rate increases should not be approved.</p>
	Rebecca Bender & Mark Ojala	Web	<p>We are in the Peninsula System (Estates/Monterra) area & are not in favor of the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water. The monthly bill impact of 94% increase is outrageous for any resident anywhere. We find Cascadia Water are gouging their customers for their unsound fiscal practices and multiple project undertakings. Yes they needed upgrades to our system because of failures of preventive maintenance. Small incremental increases are understandable but this 94% rate impact all at once is not justifiable. It will result in residents losing value in their property from poor landscape/lawn maintenance. What about a potential high fire hazard on top of the financial impact to their customers. We are a retirement community with most property sizes 1-5 acres. We will see less farming, farmers getting priced out, higher prices in produce (again), undesirable landscapes. You get the picture. The amount of rainfall in our area is 16 inches/year & less every year with climate change. We have considered drilling a well on our 2.5 acres but the county does not allow wells in our area so we are subjected to Cascadia Water undertakings & unreasonable rates. It is not the customers full responsibility that Cascadia took on more than they were fiscally ready for with their upgrade projects. That is a company's poor research/development and</p>

			<p>planning. Now they want to be bailed out it seems for their poor management. Not mention the fact that if they are granted this increase, our justifiable fears are this will only be the beginning. We can easily imagine there thirst for profits continuing with rate increase after rate increase. As customers hopefully represented by the regulatory commission, we feel now is the time to pull the reins back on this price gouging.</p>
	Rebecca Bender and Mark Ojala	E-mail	<p>This is a public comment regarding the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water. UTC have not been transparent when asked about this rate-making process. Avoiding our questions only furthers our arguments about this rate hike.</p> <p>Cascadia should but have not disclosed it's capital improvement plans of \$3 to \$4 million annually over the next 5 years with the rate payers.</p> <p>Cascadia's plans to acquire other systems that require expensive upgrades, they expect the funding to fall on current rate payers. Hense, the reason why I'm writing you...we should not have to subsidize infrastructure in other systems or counties. We want UTC to oppose the proposed 100% rate increase. Also that Cascadia Water provide proof of their needed capital improvement projects.</p> <p>Thank you. Rebecca Bender Mark Ojala</p>
	Rex Cress	Web	<p>I am not in favor of the rate increase by Cascadia Water, because</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Their customer services sucks, you can never get a hold of somebody in the office. 2. The care of our community well is shit. we constantly have brown water and the pressure is crap. they said they were going to drill a new well not sure that ever happened. when we had sea view water the company was far better
	Richard and Marcia Mack	Web	<p>We are retired and on a fixed income. A 75% rate increase in our water bill is out of line. This could increase a bill to \$133 a month for two people. We do not water our yard, own do laundry once a week, run the dishwasher twice a week, showers are taken everyday and that is all.</p> <p>It makes us feel as though the water company is trying to put a lein on our home and property then take it from us and sell it. Which would make us homeless. This is totally unacceptable.</p>
	Richard Husom	Web	<p>My wife and I are retiered seniors on a fixed income with a garden to suppliment increased food prices, this extream water price increase would cause a financial burden on our household.</p>
	Richard Randahl	E-mail	<p>Dungeness Valley residents (Sequim area) are mostly senior citizens who've retired to the region and are on fixed incomes. It's a crime for water rates to increase as much as some have reported. Please consider the hardship on those if Cascadia Water Company is allowed to significantly increase water rates. Thank you!</p> <p>Richard Randahl</p>

	Richard Seibel	Web	As cost of living has increased (inflation) it would be reasonable for 5 /10 % rate increase over a 5 yr period. Cascadia's 100% increase over 2-3 yrs is excessive or unduly high. As a retired senior living on a fixed income this would make it more challenging.
	Richard Tamler	E-mail	<p>To the UTC Commissioners re: UW-240151,</p> <p>I respectfully urge you to reject Cascadia's rate filing in this case.</p> <p>Cascadia has not provided proof that their capital improvements were prudent, necessary, and beneficial to us as ratepayers. Two professionals have testified before the Commission that these improvements were not necessarily prudent, necessary, and beneficial to the ratepayers.</p> <p>A \$1.9 billion corporate monopoly has no business piling up unreasonable profits on the backs of retired folks on a fixed income like I am. On a per year basis, Cascadia's requested increase is larger than any other general rate case increase in the LAST DECADE!</p> <p>Public Counsel's Tad O'Neill has given the Commissioners the same advice twice, to reject this rate filing. If Cascadia suffers a loss, so be it. That should be a problem for their shareholders, not the ratepayers.</p> <p>I smell a big rat – not surprising in this era of corporate greed – and the Commissioners should smell it too. Please listen to Public Counsel and act on behalf of consumers, not the corporate behemoths.</p> <p>Thank you, Richard Tamler</p>
	Rick Randahl	E-mail	<p>Sequim's population is primarily made up of senior citizens and a significant increase in water rates would drastically effect their fixed incomes & quality of life. Thank you.</p> <p>Richard Randahl Sequim, Washington</p>
	Rick Smith	E-mail	<p>Hi Rachel. I had found both your email address and Scott's email address on the UTC site. Unfortunately that location had an incorrect address for Scott. That is always a good reason to send the first email to multiple recipients...so at least one person can straighten it out.</p> <p>I did not send you the WSP for Cascadia. What I sent you was just Jennifer's (DOH) initial review of Cascadia's WSP and a couple other documents I created for the last rate request. The WSP you are looking for is a pdf file named: Cascadia_Water_NoID_I_20200814_Water_System_Plan_Intial_Submittal.pdf.</p> <p>I agree with you that the water system plans are forward looking. It tells what is needed, what is planned and</p>

		<p>provides the estimated costs. I am including a comment from Commissioner Rendahl from the previous rate case. She refers to the WSP and the approval process that includes the rate payers. But I seriously doubt she wants a copy. It is 265 mb in size and 1,118 pages in length. And that is just for the Island water systems. It details some major, expensive repairs/projects that are needed on Whidbey helping explain why we didn't want to share paying for all of their work that is needed. It also explains why economies of scale do not apply. We are hoping to find the most recent version of the WSP to see what has been added.</p> <p>That is why I am asking the UTC why Cascadia/NWN can go forward with another rate increase on the Peninsula without an 'approved' water system plan for the Peninsula and the meetings of approval Commissioner Rendahl was referring to for the WSP. When I asked Greg for the WSP he told me that the rate staff did not use it because it was forward looking. He eventually got a copy for the rate staff. A WSP is expensive so I wish it was required reading and Cascadia should not be allowed to make major investments that are not part of the 'approved' WSP.</p> <p>If Scott has access to all of the emails I sent to John Cup and Greg during the previous rate case, you will understand we used the details within that plan to help explain why the Peninsula systems did not want to be part of those on Whidbey. We are concerned that Cascadia and NWN are trying to go back to a single rate. That is not something we want for all the same reasons. So all those documents we sent to the Commissioners and the rate staff back in 2021 are still good.</p> <p>I doubt there is a WSP for the Peninsula. If we had one, we would know what is being planned for the various water systems Cascadia has purchased on the Peninsula. If we found one, we could compare it to the revenues and expenses in your workbook. Somehow the rate payers need the ability to control unnecessary spending....which leads to rate increases.</p> <p>As I mentioned to Scott at the recent meeting, we are requesting that the rate staff provide us with a breakdown of revenues, assets, and expenses for Estates and Monterra. In the video of the previous rate case meeting Commissioner Rendahl told Cascadia to keep the income and expenses for Island and Peninsula separate. Ideally we would like ~3 workbooks that separate revenues and expenses for Island, Peninsula and I assume the new system in eastern Washington.</p> <p>If we find the same issues with the other systems Cascadia / NWN purchased on the Peninsula I would imagine that we will find the need to have separate rates for the different systems on the Peninsula. If Cascadia has a WSP for the Peninsula that included all of the systems purchased over the past few years, and all the repairs and planned improvements needed by each one, perhaps it would help justify the rate increase they are requesting.</p> <p>We look forward to working with you and your staff.. If I find the current version of Cascadia's WSP, I will let you know.</p>
--	--	---

			Rick Smith
	Robert B. Bagwell	E-mail	***See Attachement
	Robert Koski	E-mail	<p>Gentlemen</p> <p>Cascadia recently purchased our water system due to the owner Marty Pedersen's severe health issues.</p> <p>Now we the former Pedersen system users have been notified by Cascadia of a 65% rate increase. No reasons have been given to us that justify this, nor have we been advised of any reason for the increase. No assessment of our system, its state of repair or its current or future needs has been forthcoming.</p> <p>Their stated plan seems to be to consolidate all systems into one rate structure that spreads operational costs evenly across all users.</p> <p>This means that systems like ours requiring less input to repair or maintain will be subsidizing those that require more input. This is unfair to our system.</p> <p>This rate increase request is outrageous.</p> <p>One other consideration to this is that we do not have access to irrigation water in our neighborhood.</p> <p>Robert Koski Former Pedersen system user, Olympic Peninsula. Dungeness Bay Plat</p>
	Robert Koski	E-mail	<p>Nothing has changed, no reason has been given to justify this rate increase for our specific system. They have installed a new remote read meters that cuts their labor costs. this is not a benefit to users. No other information has been presented to us.</p> <p>The Commission ruled in June that Cascadia had failed to prove that its investments were prudent or that its proposed rates were reasonable and stated it was mandated by law to investigate.</p> <p>At this point only rate adjusted for inflation is justified.</p> <p>Thank you for your regulation robert koski</p>

	Robert O'Neill	Web	This rate increase is extreme nearly doubling our water bill. If I felt that the improvements will produce a better water quality I may be inclined to agree with the rate hike. But, we lost confidence in the water quality several years ago due to the manganese levels, and the color of the water (often brownish). I will say that the support team is great at responding to complaints but we stopped drinking the water several years ago. I also feel we are paying for the poor judgement of Cascadia Water who wants us to pay for upgrades to unrelated water systems, they must have done their due diligence to evaluate the systems prior to purchasing them and now want the consumers to pay for their investment / improvements. A 75% increase with no ramp up time for customers to plan for the increase is unjustified. I feel that there needs to be a better approach to this and urge the commission to consider better solutions.
	Robin and Ema Hartman	E-mail	<p>Dear UTC,</p> <p>We received notification of a 100+% water rate increase proposal from Cascadia Water Systems. We whole heartedly agree with everything that Ben Hu and Janet Tipping, our neighbor, stated in their comments sent to you.</p> <p>With the cost of inflation continuing to be high and living on a fixed income, this proposal is outrageous. We haven't received any documentation indicating the financial situation with Cascadia Water Systems. They created a new "well", never indicating the cost of this project or any notification of possible increases in community water rates.</p> <p>Ema and I ask you to reject this proposal. An increase of 5-7% would be more reasonable, considering the economy and fixed income we have. The both of us are retired.</p> <p>Regards, Robin and Ema Hartman</p>
	Robin Miller	Web	It is not fair to the consumer to double the water rates. A hardship for Seniors.
	Ron Norman	E-mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT
	Ron Norman	Phone	The customer called in to oppose the rate case. They mailed a letter today. I let them know the letter will be added to the case.
	Rona Ishikawa	E-mail	<p>January 12, 2025</p> <p>WUTC P.O. Box 47250 Olympia WA 98504-7250</p> <p>Subject: Cascadia Water Docket # UW-240151</p>

			<p>We are writing this letter regarding Cascadia Water proposed rate increase. Cascadia Water stated in their letter they need to recover costs associated with water service. What are they specifically improving to the Island water system? By doubling our rate fees they will have more than their additional revenue to recover operating costs. Cascadia Water states they have 3,800 connections. Example: By collecting an extra \$100.00 from each customer = \$380,000. In one year/6 billing cycles = \$2,280,000. Cascadia Water will exceed their \$1,726,600. Per example they would continue to collect per year \$2,280,000 until the next rate increase.</p> <p>In 2021 Cascadia Water received a 3 Phase rate increase total 57.70%. There were 7 reasons for the increase and to recover investments. 2024-2025 request another rate increase to recover operating cost. Cascadia Water may consider a bank loan. A bank loan will make you more accountable on how money is spent.</p> <p>We are aware of Cascadia Water has been investing in water systems in Washington State. Their investments are paid by the rate payers. Rate payers also pay for their capital improvements.</p> <p>This quote written on NW Natural Water company web site. ?Our family has been in the water business here for over 50 years. We?re deeply connected to the local community, so it was important to find a partner we trusted to take care of our customers and employees over the long term. I?m excited now to have the backing from NW Natural Water to support our company through the next chapter of growth? Culley Lehman, Manager, Cascadia Water, Whidbey Island, Washington</p> <p>NW Natural Water Company Northwest Natural Holding Company, NYSE: NWN \$39.00</p> <p>Will the water quality improve? Will we no longer see dark blackish color water fill 5 gallon white buckets? We find doubling our water We find doubling our water rate is very excessive.</p> <p>Please consider our facts when you make your decision.</p> <p>Thank you, Rona Ishikawa George Springer</p>
	Rona Ishikawa	Mail	***See Attachment***

	Rona Ishikawa and George Springer	Mail	***See Attachment
	ROSANNA ROURKE	Web	<p>Cascadia Water is requesting an 84% increase? That's inconceivable to me.</p> <p>Cascadia was granted a 53% increase for 2020, unsure of their entire rate increase history because I don't have the time to research it, 53% is substantial and now they want 84%?</p> <p>My PUD went up \$40 a month, with this 84% increase that's a weeks' worth of groceries, I'm barely making it as it is, I haven't had a raise in 5 years and my Company can't afford to give me one. Everyone just wants more and more and more and consumers just don't have it to give. Now PUD has another rate increase effective 04/01/24.</p> <p>Cascadia wants to group me into other accounts that have had improvements (bare their expense), we've had no improvements, if they are allowed to group us together then I will be impacted by the rate increase. I think, their letter was not very forthcoming. I strongly believe grouping smaller accounts together is just a ploy to get 84% out of more customers. Maybe Cascadia is coming in high at 84% hoping you'll approve a lesser increase and then everyone is supposed to feel like it was win win for everyone. I am unsure if I will escape this increase if I'm not grouped together, that wasn't mentioned.</p> <p>The way I see it is Cascadia is acquiring assets and improving them which is the cost of doing business and a tax deduction. However, Cascadia expects to have the customer bare the expense of their growth.</p> <p>When the purchases and improvements of assets has been satisfied by the customer, the rates don't lower. Instead, they continue which is now profit, which is enjoyed by the Shareholders of North West Natural Holdings or NWN of the Stock Exchange, plus any bonuses they pay out to themselves. Correct?</p> <p>There are a few items they have listed in their reason for the rate increase that was listed in the last rate increase, thrown in for filler. They had to update their system to allow on line payments, that's an expense? So how many employees did you terminate because customers are processing their own payments and not your employees.</p> <p>All I know for sure is because of inflation, and there is no end in site, my disposable income is almost non existent and you just continue to allow rate increases for ALL the utility companies, even during Covid. How am I suppose to cover necessities like rent, gas, food, etc. and pay Cascadia's business expenses.</p>
	Rosemarie Lueke	E-mail	I am a resident of Monterra Subdivision in Clallam County. I was able to move here because of the affordable housing and utilities. I know we dealt with this same issue in 2021, and it was scrapped because of the

			<p>unreasonableness of having us pay for capital improvements to other systems owned by Cascadia, that had no substantive value for Monterra water supplies. Based on the information provided to me, i feel like this is a repeat of the same thing! Yes they've purchased numerous new systems, and NO, we in Monterra should not be footing the bill for all of that! NONE OF THE EXPENSES CITED ARE DIRECTLY CORRELATED TO MONTERRA.</p> <p>We have no options for another source of clean, safe water. This is essentially a monopoly. We are all on fixed incomes here, and when i budgeted to be able to live here, it was affordable. I agree with installing meters, however, the base rate is ridiculous! Most of us are 1 or 2 in a household, not doing loads of laundry for others, pools, hot tubs, etc....but now our water bill is a huge part of my monthly expense!</p> <p>Please consider denying Cascadia's EXORBITANT RATE INCREASE OR.... Approve a lower or reduced rate increase that reflects the true cost related to the customers in Monterra.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Rosemarie Lueke</p>
	Rosemarie Lueke	E-mail	<p>To who it may concern,</p> <p>I have watched the zoom meetings & am a current customer writing to relay how important it is that our WA Utilities Commission turn down this horrific and exorbitant rate increase. We have no other options, we are stuck, and we are being used in order to render profits to this private companies' shareholders.</p> <p>We just had a rate increase in 2021; now they want more than 95% to deliver water? Totally insane and unreasonable! How come there's been no mention or discussion of a graduated rate increase? Are they that greedy? How can our state commissioners allow this?? That's the answers i hope you are trying to come up with!</p> <p>Aren't there other ways to approach this? Why are us small homeowners priced so high versus the businesses? Why not charge for USAGE versus the large base to many many homeowners, versus businesses that use alot of water??</p> <p>Isn't there a subsidy available to us? Or them ??</p> <p>This is truly disgusting if it indeed goes forth. It is already expensive to live in WA state, and i feel there truly is a quality to life here. However, this is out of the norm for any town or city to have THIS SUBSTANTIAL of an increase!!</p> <p>Sincerely, Rosemarie Lueke</p>

	Russell Underwood	E-mail	<p>I am submitting my comment for the subject rate case (UW-240151).</p> <p>I am 84 years old and live on a fixed income. I oppose the large 94% rate increase that Cascadia Water is seeking for the residents of Monterra.</p> <p>My disposable income shrinks each year due the our inflationary times.</p> <p>I understand that business expenses have increased but not 94%. I don't believe that the increase will make our local water system better.</p> <p>Please reject this large rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Russell Underwood	E-mail	<p>Madam,</p> <p>I am submitting my comment for the subject rate case (UW-240151).</p> <p>I am 84 years old and live on a fixed income. I oppose the large 94% rate increase that Cascadia Water is seeking for the residents of Monterra.</p> <p>My disposable income shrinks each year due the our inflationary times.</p> <p>I understand that business expenses have increased but not 94%. I don't believe that the increase will make our local water system better.</p> <p>Please reject this large rate increase.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Russell Underwood</p>
	Russell Underwood	Web	<p>A 94% increase in my water rate is unacceptable. I realize that cost have gone up for Cascadia Water and an increase in rates of this magnitude is not warranted for our (Monterra) community. It is my understanding that this increase is for maintaining other Cascadia water systems. Please deny Cascadia's request.</p>
	Sandra J Martin	Web	<p>Last year they tried to raise the rates 25-50% and that proposal was shut down. Now they are trying to raise them 23-48%. That's really not much of a difference. Lynch Cove is already paying a \$10 sure charge for repairs that were made over 20 years ago and were not even in our community. There have been no upgrades in this community, and I do not feel we should be funding upgrades for other communities. This large of an increase would cause undue stress on the already overtaxed elderly in the community. Many of these people have lived here for years and cannot afford to move or pay more exurbanite costs. Please consider this in your decision.</p> <p>Thank you for your time</p> <p>Sandra Martin</p>
	Sara and Bradley Tetreault	E-mail	<p>Hello ~</p> <p>This email is public comment for the rate increase to Cascadia Water.</p> <p>The new owner, NW Natural Holdings, who purchased Aquarius Water to then rename it Cascadia Water, did not do their due diligence. Rate payers should not have to pay for that.</p>

			<p>We have only lived in this area for 3.5 years and can see the water issues (sinkholes in the road, lack of transparency on the loan accounting, the old fire hydrant pipe breaking in a neighbor's yard, etc.) first hand.</p> <p>We even went to the Aquarius Water "headquarters" to drop off a check to obtain a meter and water for the home we built. Did anyone at NW Natural Holdings do that?</p> <p>A rate increase is irresponsible. Companies should be held liable for what they do or do not do.</p> <p>Sara and Bradley Tetreault</p>
	Sarah Nortz	E-mail	<p>Hello. Cascadia's apparent need for a rate increase of 75% indicates gross mismanagement. Companies that mismanage at this level should not be allowed to operate utilities.</p> <p>Sarah Nortz</p>
	Scott and Teresa Ortego	E-mail	<p>I am emailing in regards to the rate increase Cascadia Water is requesting. The average increase of 80% is unbelievable. I understand that cost have increased over the past few years but this kind of increase is way above what is required to operate the services provided. Many people on Whidbey Island and surrounding communities are retired and on fixed incomes. This size of rate increase would be very hard on retirees as well as many of the people that live paycheck to paycheck. I have to say that my pay raises over the past few years haven't kept up with inflation and I'm sure it hasn't for most people.</p> <p>The impression I get is that Cascadia Water acquired all of these water companies because they saw the rates that were being charged and figured they could aquire them and jack up the prices. If they can't handle the additional workload, maybe they shouldn't take care of so many water systems.</p> <p>To close I would say that a rate increase of 15 to 25% would be more realistic and affordable for customers.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Scott Ortego</p>
	Scott Ortego	Web	<p>I just received a letter with Cascadia Water's proposed rate increase. The amount they want to increase our rates is unbelievable. I understand that inflation has been extremely high the past fee years but in their plan they increase their revenue by 75%! They want to not only increase the basice rates, but increase the block prices while decreasing the size of the blocks. That will cost most people around \$30 a month more. That's an increase of approximately 35%. I know my pay hasn't gone up by 35% there are a lot of retirees in this area and live on social security. That 35% increase would adversely affect them. I could understand and support a 10% rate increase but the amount they are proposing is beyond reasonable.</p>

			<p>Thank you for your time. Scott Ortego</p>
	Seth Raabe	Web	<p>To the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>We oppose the proposed rate increases by Cascadia Water, LLC. This is a tremendously aggressive increase, following a few short years of similar increases by this company.</p> <p>The claim of a 75% increase (in their most recent letter from March) is misleading because, looking back to as recently as 2021, the proposed change will amount to an increase of 220% for the cost of being hooked up to the system--- before we ever use a drop of water. That's 3.2 times the price from 3 years ago. This increase only grows when you factor-in normal usage. For example, our household bimonthly bill at a usage of 3,000 cu.ft. would go up from \$78 in 2021 to \$365 in the proposed model (a 368% increase). I doubt this is "just the cost of doing business."</p> <p>While all rates will be raised across the board (both base and tiered usage rates) there is no clear plan and budget for improvements that warrants the rate increases. If improvements are paid for with the increases, will rates be brought back down after these are paid off? Again, I doubt it.</p> <p>In our family's personal efforts to reduce our environmental impact, we grow a significant percentage of our own food at home. We garden extensively and use mulch and drip irrigation to conserve as much water as possible and we never water our lawn. The proposed changes would essentially make it economically impossible to garden (peak consumption bills could cost \$2,000 or more)</p> <p>We have no option to choose another water company, and drilling a well is cost-prohibitive. Even if we build a water-catchment system providing our irrigation needs, we still need water for domestic use, and our average usage will be almost 5 times our cost from a few years ago.</p> <p>I'm a school teacher at South Whidbey and my wife also works in the district. We have both lived in this community since we were kids, and are raising 3 children here.</p> <p>Our parents live down the road and are also Cascadia Water customers. They are on a fixed income and dealing with a terminal illness. They cannot afford this astronomical increase in cost-of-living.</p> <p>Me and my family feel like Cascadia Water has gone too far and is way out of line with the proposed changes. It is a cynical and greedy move to capitalize on people's basic needs. Please deny the changes.</p>
	Shannon Callahan	Web	<p>It's important to note that Cascadia Water is not a small Washington company with limited resources. Instead, it's a wholly owned subsidiary of Northwest Natural (NYSE:NWN), a large, profitable natural gas utility in Portland. NWN is trying to move out of the fossil fuel industry and take over water rights instead. NWN is profitable has plenty of capital to make improvements to water systems without requiring water customers to pay in advance. They should use their natural gas profits to finance their new venture.</p>

			<p>Cully Lehman is Cascadia's local representative and maintenance guy, but Justin Palfreyman of Northwest Natural is the president of Northwest Natural and also Cascadia Water. He's the real operator of the the water systems and should be the one to answer our questions.</p>
	Sharman and Glen Richardson	E-mail	<p>Hello Melissa:</p> <p>Thank you for your recent letter regarding Cascadia and their recent declaration for raising our water rates. I am unsure whether we will be able to be in the virtual meeting, so wanted to express our sincere concerns about the proposed water rate.</p> <p>Our question is if this is normal for a company to do, understanding this is probably their right as owner, but is there no way to - with your help - to lessen the impact? They may be promising to fix our ailing system, but we lived with Greg Roats'(the previous owner) promise for years and he did nothing.</p> <p>This increase coupled with the potential drain of our aquifer for the Miller State Park usage PLUS increased housing in our area causes us to wonder about the impact on all of us who live in lower Diamond Point neighborhoods.</p> <p>We think of you as our safeguard for potential self serving owners of water systems and ask you for your help to mitigate unwanted scenarios - decreasing water for long time residents, potential disasters from fires (lack of water pressure) and extreme price hikes on household budgets.</p> <p>We are reasonable folk in this area but we have been asked for years to give and give with no return and no assurances.</p> <p>Thank you, Melissa, for receiving our note of concern and expressing these fears to the water commissioners, Sharman and Glen Richardson</p>
	Shelley Taylor	E-mail	<p>How much can taxpayers stand?</p> <p>Take a lesson from what has happened to California. The reverberations from California's mismanagement will extend across the country.</p> <p>Shelley Taylor Port Angeles</p>

			<p>“Our Mission is to protect the people of Washington by ensuring investor-owned utility and transportation services are safe, equitable, available, reliable and fairly priced.” — Washington UTC</p>
	Sherry and Angus Anderson	E-mail	<p>We are vehemently opposed to this outrageous proposed water rate increase. We live on a fixed income and believe it's not sustainable to have near 100% increases every few years.</p> <p>Sherry and Angus Anderson</p>
	Sheryl Wussler	Web	<p>I am opposed to Cascadia’s proposal for a 65% rate increase and the consolidation of my water system into the Peninsula System.. I as a rate payer am more then happy to have a rate increase to upgrade or fix any problems with the water system that I benefit from. I do not agree with Cascadia that it is fair and just to combine us and spread the rate increases for all the systems to all the rate payers.. I was a customer of the Pederson LLC before Cascadia took it over I don’t see any improvements that have benefited us since that time.. As far as the Scada system they installed which then had to have cyber security system installed that was a benefit to Cascadia as I am sure they had factored in that this would need to be done when they acquired our system since there place of operation is in Freeland.I do not consider this to be an expense us the rate payers should have to pay for</p> <p>I think all of us just want our water to be safe and of good quality..I see nowhere that Cascadia plans to address our high levels of iron and magnesium. I have had to replace two hot water heaters in the 9 years I have been here because of all the calcium in the water..These are the things that I think are important to me.. I do not think it is fair and just to help pay for all the other repairs and problems of the other systems they want to group us together with.</p> <p>I also think what would be fair and just is to add back in the tariff that requires the system owner to advise the ratepayers in advance of any expensive repairs..We should have a say in what we think is a prudent expense.. One expense I see is all the costs for generators when we have so few power outages..</p> <p>We had a huge rate increase in 2021 of 97.9 % phased in over 3 rate increases.. Cascadia says due to inflation they need to generate more revenue.. I would argue that we as the rate payers have and are suffering from high inflation as well.. A lot of the less then 200 ratepayers in our small water system are senior citizens on fixed incomes..Water is not something you can live without and this rate increase puts an undue burden on us.</p> <p>So bottom line I strongly oppose the consolidation of the water systems.. I only want to pay for the cost of the system that provides my water.. I don’t think Cascadia has shown me a reason to increase my rate based on what they have paid out since they acquired this system..The Scada system and cyber security and all the operating costs for these are not DOH required and only benefit Cascadia.. So the money spent on those things don’t justify a rate increase and I don’t want to pay for the repairs to the other systems..</p> <p>I hope the commission will take into consideration my comments when they come to a decision on this rate case..</p> <p>Thank You, Sheryl Wussler</p>
	Shirley Dalton	Web	<p>I think it is obscene that they want an 80% increase for our water. I don't feel that it is necessary to increase rates across the board when they aren't improving anything in our area. If they need funds in a specific area, that is where</p>

			they should adjust rates if ,in fact, it is needed.
	Sid and Virginia Lewis	E-mail	<p>UTC Commissioners,</p> <p>We are customers of Cascadia Water on Whidbey Islnd. Our particular system is the Silverlake system. We have received a notice of the proposed 80% rate increase for our water. We do not see any justification for this huge increase. It appears that Cascadia is spreading the costs of operating their other systems in different counties and locations to justify this rate hike and causing all of us to shoulder their costs.The letter that we received has no proposed changes of any kind to improve our water. We have very poor water (hardness and tannins) which requires each homeowner to install incoming filters and water treatment at the point of use. We can understand an inflation adjustment but certainly not an 80% hike.</p> <p>Wouldn't it be nice if we could all get a 80% increase in our incomes to cover inflation?</p> <p>We have been on this water system since 2004. We have not experienced any positive quality changes in our water.The only changes we have seen are higher rates for the same poor quality water. As a result, our costs have increased to post process the water that we receive. I would certainly like to pass those costs on to Cascadia Water to reduce my total bill.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration,</p> <p>Sid and Virginia Lewis PO Box 745 Oak Harbor, Wa 98277</p> <p>Docket # 240151</p>
	Sid and Virginia Lewis	E-mail	<p>UTC Commissioners,</p> <p>We are customers of Cascadia Water on Whidbey Island. Our particular system is the Silverlake system. We have received a notice of the proposed 84% rate increase for our water. We do not see any justification for this huge increase. It appears that Cascadia is spreading the costs of updating their other systems in different counties and locations to justify this rate hike and causing all of us to shoulder the costs.The letter that we received has no proposed major changes of any kind to improve our water. We have very poor water (hardness and tannins) which requires each homeowner to install incoming filters and water treatment at the point of use. I believe that each water system should be looked at individually when system cost and upgrades are being considered. We can understand an inflation adjustment but certainly not an 84% hike. We have been on this water system since 2004. We have not experienced any quality changes in our water.</p>

			Thank you for your consideration
	Stefani Christensen	E-mail	<p>See attached Word document. Cascadia Water rate increase of 107% for Tel1 users is unacceptable. Cascadia does not have the background or experience to manage island water systems. For profit water systems, buying small rural water wells, then rising rates is unfair. Our meeting request on April 17 was to attend a meeting in Pt Angeles, a 90 mile drive, with ferry and afternoon traffic. Very costly to attend in time and money.</p> <p>Allow Tel 1 and other very small water systems on the island to purchase our wells. NW Water (parent of Cascadia) is a for profit private water company. The current administrators/owners of Cascadia do not have a background to determine water use on an island with a critical aquifer recharge area. Why is arsenic in Tel one well water? How will future water testing be accomplished? Water use on an island is very different. The company needs to meet with Cascadia Water LLC rate payers and request the WA UTC attend the meeting.</p>
	Stefani Christensen and Sue Meister	E-mail	<p>***SEE ATTACHMENT</p> <p>The attached letter is for UTC staff to answer questions (per UTC public Zoom on May 15, 2024) and include in the open UTC Commissioner Meeting packet on 06/27/2024. The 107% increase in base water monthly charges, for our Tel One water system (from \$49 to 103.28), is much more than the generalized average 75% rate increase mentioned in Cascadia's Rate Proceeding notice. The rate increase takes effect on June 1, 2024.</p>
	Stefani Christensen and Sue Meister	E-mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT***
	Stephen Gordon	Web	<p>The rate increase for our area served by Cascadia Water Company is close to 105% vs. the publicized "overall revenue increase of 75 percent effective June 1, 2024." (Feb. 29, 2024 filing)</p> <p>That type of increase puts an undue burden on many in our community, as well as speaks poorly of the management of our essential utility.</p> <p>We oppose having such an unjust and inequitable rate hike and hope to additionally make our complaint heard at the May 15, 2024 virtual informal customer outreach meeting.</p>
	Stephen L Gordon	Web	<p>Cascadia Water is not working in the best interest of its customers by increasing tariffs by such a high percentage. Doubling prices when satisfaction with the system is low due to the frequency of outages indicates the efficacy of management and contractors working on our system is not optimal. Proof of how the company plans to utilize funds, as well as be sensitive to the impacts on customers' capacity to pay, has not been communicated to us in the Del Bay service area.</p>
	Steven Todd	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl and Doumit</p> <p>A couple of weeks ago I didn't give my water supplier a second thought. I turned the faucet and water came out. Every two months I got a bill and paid it without question. The bill seemed reasonable</p>

		<p>Then a neighbor mentioned that our water supplier, Cascadia Water LLC, was asking the WUTC to approve DOUBLING our water bills, only two years after the last rate increase! I'm a retired lawyer and so as both a customer and a cantankerous type this piqued my interest. I read the IMPORTANT NOTICE distributed by Cascadia, which raised numerous questions, as it offered no rationale for the size of its requested rate increase. Interestingly Cascadia bragged that it has "continued to expand" by buying other small, aged, rural water systems. I then looked at Cascadia's website and learned that Cascadia is wholly owned by NW Natural Water Company LLC, a subsidiary of Northwest Natural Holdings, which trades on the New York Stock Exchange (NWN). NW Natural Water deals extensively in natural gas. Both holding companies' headquarters are in Portland, Ore. Northwest Natural Holdings annual report for 2023 reported "record net income in 2023 of \$93.9 million...compared to \$86.3 million...for 2023" and brags of 68 straight years of increased shareholder dividends. As you might imagine, this raised more questions.</p> <p>My water system, consisting of 24 connections to homes on 5 or 2.5 acre lots on Whidbey Island, was installed in the 1970's by W & B Waterworks. Neighbors explained that W&B was owned by Wally and Betty Lehman. At some point Wally and Betty turned their business over to their sons, Terry and Jim Lehman, who operated as Lehman Enterprises. Neighbors reported that they had no problems with their water supply and that the Lehmans were always friendly and responsive. In 2018 the Lehmans sold my neighborhood's and other Whidbey systems to Cascadia Water, LLC. Terry's sons Culley and Adam, and Culley's wife and cousin, became salaried employees of Cascadia. Culley Lehman, now general manager of Cascadia, states on the website "Cascadia Water operates long-time family-run utilities, and we're very connected to the communities we serve."</p> <p>Cascadia's IMPORTANT NOTICE of its request for a rate increase stated that the percentage increase for my system would be 107%. It listed types of capital improvements but nothing about the respective costs of such improvements or which systems and customers would benefit therefrom. Luckily Culley Lehman said I could "feel free to reach out" to him if I had any questions about how this would affect me.</p> <p>So I went to Cascadia's office to talk with Culley. He wasn't there and the offices were closed, but his cousin Bobby was in another area and advised me that Culley was out of town. I noticed and later confirmed that Cascadia shares its office with W&B Waterworks and B&W Pump Co., other Lehman companies still owned by the Lehmans. Cascadia's website says "Our office is currently closed to ensure the safety of our staff and customers" and that customers could contact Cascadia "by appointment only". So I wrote Culley an email with my questions.</p> <p>My questions included some pretty basic stuff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- What investments has Cascadia made since the rate increase in 2022 that benefit me and my neighbors' water system?- What were the costs incurred by Cascadia for the capital improvements Cascadia claimed in its rate request?
--	--	---

- Are customers like me being asked to pay any aspect of the purchase costs, loans or interest incurred by Cascadia buying other systems around the state?
 - What overhead is Cascadia claiming? Culley Lehman and his wife Amy are paid salaries totalling over \$180,000, yet there are no office hours in the building shared with other Lehman companies.
 - Block rate increases for increased usage range from 2.76 to 4.25 times higher than existing rates! These rates are generally justified as encouraging conservation. How does Cascadia justify these huge increases? Is Cascadia claiming entitlement to profit and Return on Investment for encouraging conservation?
 - What economies of scale does Cascade claim its disparate systems' customers benefit from? It appears Cascadia has hired or contracted with all the original maintenance companies for the systems it is acquiring. Likewise capital improvements are directly linked to age and needs of each individual system. How do I benefit from Cascadia's expansion?
 - If no economies of scale result from Cascadia's business plan, why should I pay for another system's repairs or improvements?
 - Are these rate increases intended to be permanent? If these rate increases are based upon capital improvements why shouldn't they be a surcharge, rather than a permanent rate increase?
- Cascadia has not responded to these questions. After some additional digging I learned that Cascadia is claiming capital improvements that are not yet completed, approved or in service. This seemed contrary to common sense, and perhaps WUTC regulations, so I sent another email to Cascadia and the WUTC about whether the improvements-to-be were properly included in this rate request. No one has responded.
- Another issue is whether Cascadia's capital improvements are necessary. For example Cascadia states it is "Continuing to install SCADA (telemetry) systems, which allow our operators to view and monitor the water systems in real time and is critical to ensuring safe and reliable system operations." Think about that. It conjures visions of NASA-like engineers surrounded by computer screens. But Cascadia doesn't even operate an office with a receptionist. Who's doing this critical monitoring? And why would such a system, which might be critical for natural gas companies, be even remotely necessary for a water system? Cascadia's customers constitute an excellent warning system: when water doesn't come out of the tap or water pressure decreases we call Cascadia.
- Likewise, Cascadia's improvements bear no relationship to customer's interests. Why wouldn't Cascadia install generators bigger or sooner than needed, install new meters fancier than needed, or replace concrete tank reservoirs and install larger diameter main lines before needed or with excess capacity for future expansion? The cost of gold-

		<p>plated improvements will simply be passed on to consumers WITH A 12% RETURN ON INVESTMENT!</p> <p>Finally, I learned from other concerned customers who have tried to obtain basic information that requests are refused because information is deemed "confidential". I asked whether Cascadia is abusing public records laws by claiming information in its submissions to the Commission should be treated as confidential. The WUTC responded by simply referring me to RCW 80.04.095.</p> <p>This is entirely unacceptable. RCW 80.04.095 allows information in what would otherwise be public records to be deemed confidential if disclosure "would result in private loss, including an unfair competitive disadvantage." Cascadia has an absolute monopoly on supplying water to its customers. How could Cascadia be harmed by disclosing any information regarding the capital improvements it is asking its customers to pay for? IT HAS NO COMPETITION! Regardless, it is clear that Cascadia and Commission staff are refusing to provide necessary, relevant information to its customers and constituents on grounds of confidentiality. I'm being asked to pay for unsubstantiated numbers, or in the colloquial: a pig in a poke.</p> <p>Cascadia is entitled, under the current law, to a Return on Investment of 12%. No wonder Northwest Natural Holding wants Cascadia to buy old, aged rural water systems. Water has been called "Blue Gold." It is a fundamentally necessary commodity with limited price elasticity and increasing scarcity. Understaffed state agencies are handcuffed in trying to adjudge voluminous rate increase requests prepared by teams of well paid attorneys, accountants and engineers. It's a fool-proof means of increasing shareholder dividends paid for by hapless consumers of water.</p> <p>But consumers like myself are entitled to know, at a minimum, that the State of Washington and the WUTC have their backs and will require the Cascadias of the world to play by the rules and honor the WUTC Mission Statement "to protect the people of Washington by ensuring investor owned utility and transportation services are safe, equitable, available, reliable and fairly priced."</p> <p>I urge you to reject Cascadia's rate increase and force them to provide their customers meaningful information to justify any future rate increase request.</p> <p>Very truly yours,</p> <p>Stephen M. Todd</p>
Steven Todd	E-mail	I write in opposition to Cascadia Water LLC's outrageous rate increase request. I write specifically regarding any claim by Cascadia or its NW Natural attorney Eric Nelsen or others, including the WUTC, that any information relied upon by Cascadia in rate case 240151 is CONFIDENTIAL.

		<p>Cascadia, by letter of Mr. Nelsen, of parent company NW Natural of April 12, 2024, claims confidentiality pursuant to WAC 480-07-160(5)(a) regarding:</p> <p>"the confidential organization chart of NW Natural Holding Company; (2) the confidential (unredacted) version of Cascadia Water's general ledger and (3) additional confidential information that may be requested in this docket."</p> <p>The ambiguity of Cascadia's claim of confidentiality for "any additional confidential information that may be requested" is mind-boggling. The regulations promulgated by WAC 480-07-160(5)(a) do not treat claims of confidentiality of otherwise public records lightly. The regulation requires that Cascadia must: "make the claim in writing at the same time the provider submits the document containing the information and must state the basis of the claim." WAC 480-07-160 (emphasis added). Cascadia must also "submit both a redacted and an unredacted version to the commission." WAC 480-07-160 (emphasis added).</p> <p>I don't know if Cascadia submitted redacted and unredacted versions of its parent company's organization chart or its "general ledger" but it is categorically impossible to provide redacted and unredacted copies of any "additional confidential information that may be requested." Cascadia and its parent company counsel claims of confidentiality must be denied for failure to comply with the very regulation they rely upon.</p> <p>Additionally, Cascadia has not claimed confidentiality for the information it relies upon to request rate increases. Mr. Nelsen writes that: "confidential information is sensitive information due to the competitive market for water utility acquisitions and the identification of employee names and compensation date, and as such, comprises valuable commercial information. Disclosure of the confidential information could negatively impact Cascadia Water's ability to negotiate future acquisition and/or to attract and retain employees."</p> <p>Whether such information is truly confidential under Washington law is debatable, but has no relevance to this rate case. Cascadia offers no justification for withholding any of the documentation supporting its current rate increase request, nor the data underlying such documentation.</p> <p>Customers and this Commission are entitled to know where Cascadia made capital improvements, how much those improvements cost, whether said improvements have been completed and approved and are in service, whether Cascadia gave any notice to customers of their intention to undertake those improvements or solicited any comments about whether customers felt such improvements were necessary or warranted, who those improvements benefited, any claimed economy of scale that would justify spreading the costs of those improvements to customers not benefited by them and why such benefits should be recouped by a permanent rate increase as opposed to a surcharge.</p> <p>I know I for one have requested such information beginning on June 12, 2024. I assumed the Commission rate staff would have requested or been supplied such information. Regrettably, I have received no response from Cascadia, NW Natural, or the WUTC. I am told that requests by others for such information have been denied on the basis of</p>
--	--	---

			<p>confidentiality by Cascadia and Commission rate staff. This is entirely unacceptable.</p> <p>Cascadia's application for outrageous and unfounded rate increases must be denied and Cascadia must be ordered, in any future rate increase applications, to provide meaningful answers to customers questions and not make unfounded confidentiality claims.</p> <p>Stephen M. Todd</p>
	Stuart and Catherine Kiehl	E-mail	<p>I live on Social Security. My increases are small and the government authorizes these occasional increases. I propose Cascadia be allowed the same increases.</p> <p>Rescind now the 12% increase.</p> <p>Stuart and Catherine Kiehl</p>
	Stuart Kiehl		<p>Water is necessary for life. To increase for profit the price on many of us on Social Security is shameful and greedy and must be not allowed. This extreme attack on the community and the public interest for obscene increased profits to a few should be stopped immediately</p> <p>The application should not only be rejected, but the applicant should be reminded that to hold hostage the Public Interest as they are attempting is not acceptable, and as a reminder and remedy no increases of any kind will be permitted for x amount of years. Fill in the blank with a number, I propose three years for no rate increase of any kind as a gentle reminder.</p> <p>If their lawyers screech that their clients cannot provide water with no increase, then we vote whether to make this Public Utility truly public and no longer private for profit and take it over.</p> <p>Sincerely, Stuart Kiehl</p>
	Stuart Kiehl	E-mail	<p>Water is necessary for life. To increase for profit the price on many of us on Social Security is shameful and greedy and must be not allowed. This extreme attack on the community and the public interest for obscene increased profits to a few should be stopped immediately</p>

			<p>The application should not only be rejected, but the applicant should be reminded that to hold hostage the Public Interest as they are attempting is not acceptable, and as a reminder and remedy no increases of any kind will be permitted for x amount of years. Fill in the blank with a number, I propose three years for no rate increase of any kind as a gentle reminder.</p> <p>If their lawyers screech that their clients cannot provide water with no increase, then we vote whether to make this Public Utility truly public and no longer private for profit and take it over.</p>
	Stuart Kiehl	Web	<p>DOCKET #UW-240151</p> <p>I live on Social Security. My increases are small and the government authorizes these occasional increases. I propose Cascadia be allowed the same increases.</p> <p>Rescind now the 12% increase.</p>
	Stuart Kiehl	Web	<p>I am calling in response to docket UW-240151. I reject the request for a price increase. Any price increase should correspond to an increase in social security which I live off of. Our access to water should be a public entity.</p>
	Sue Gilman	Web	<p>Prior to Cascadia owning our water, Aquarius (Greg Roats) family privately owned our water supply. There is a very, very long history of Mr.Roats with UTC, which is documented from law suits against him and money he owes our county. Mr. Roats was a master manipulatittor . He appears to have no problems getting approved for rate increases for necessary repairs, replacement, new pipes, etc. All on paper looked good I guess, but nothing was ever done for the customers, who just had to pay more for their water, with nothing being done.</p> <p>He managed to ignore customers, county commissioners, and people would just get tired of him and onward he'd go.</p> <p>Well, our community on Diamond Point are in need of new pipes and repairs. We have no working fire hydrants. Our area is exploding with new homes being built. And because we are in the unincorporated part of Sequim, we get ignored.</p> <p>Cascadia, mega conglomerate, manager to get our commissioners to approve a sale, flying under the radar of our community . Cascadia promised not to raise the rates, and would address the issues left behind by Aquarius.</p> <p>No, in fact after maybe less than a month after taking ownership, our area's water had e-coli !!!!</p> <p>Unacceptable. Then to get a 2 page letter starting with Cascadia Water LLC on Feb 29,2024, filed for approval from UTC commission to increase rates as shown on their table to 50%.</p> <p>Rates effective June 1 2024. The rates will reflect additional revenue of \$1,788,793 an incremental increase of 75%!!!!!!</p> <p>No where in their proposal, are they planning on fixing anything in our area. Instead, we are paying more for other counties they have acquired that need repairs, etc.</p> <p>It's time the UTC come out from the secret to most people, that you in fact, don't care about the people, who unfortunately are now being served by a privately owned conglomerate. You only care about those who are owned and traded on the stock market.</p>

			<p>I am just a local citizen who watched and read about these types of companies that have come to our counties, and bought out the small owners, making a huge profit.</p> <p>And then having the audacity to say : Oh we need more money know, because we bought up all these new businesses so now we need money.</p> <p>Maybe instead, I say, did you not plan on what the cost would be, before you swiped up all this valuable water, which by the way with climate change, it will be interesting to see how high the rates will go.</p> <p>Bottom line . People can see a 3-5 % increase. NOT 50%</p>
	Sue Gilman	Web	<p>I appose the rate increase. Based on historical work from Aquarias that was never completed. E-coil in our water after Cascadia took over.</p> <p>Work never never completed by Aquarius</p>
	Sugey Hernandez	Web	<p>I would like for the UTC commissioners to please take a look at the outrageous increase proposal from Cascadia Water Company. Is it even legal to ask for such increase? I live in the pelican point area for over 12 years we've always had problems with water pressure specially during summer, however when Cascadia Water Company became the new water provider for our area it has gotten worse every year. Cascadia wants an outrageous increase in water utility because according to them they have upgraded many things, however nothing that they have done is beneficial for us the customers the only upgrade that I have seen is the meters that they installed on most of the pelican point area housing. How is this beneficial for us the customers? If anything it benefits Cascadia Water Company, they no longer need to send a person to read the meters themselves. Now Cascadia Water Company says that they're going to do "some necessary upgrades" however they don't specify what upgrades are needed or how much is the cost. If the rate increase is approved due to "unspecified" upgrades for how long are we the customers supposed to pay? Are we supposed to pay forever from the time it gets approved or are we supposed to pay until the cost of the "unspecified" upgrade is covered? Most businesses have insurance to cover damages or needed upgrades why can't Cascadia use their insurance to fix the needed upgrades and not pass the bill to us the consumers. I understand most things went up in price, however what Cascadia is asking is morally wrong. It doesn't make sense that Cascadia is asking to increase our bill, but receive less cubit feet of water. As of now the base rate for any meter size is \$26.00 0-1,000 cu. ft Cascadia wants to increase it to \$51.00 0-900 cu. ft? Most of the people in our community are older people on fixed income, retired teachers, veterans, and home stay parents. We can't pay for such increase. Please consider setting final rates lower than what Cascadia Company is asking for, if possible what we pay for right now is what most people in our area are able to pay. Thank you for your time. Sugey Hernandez.</p>
	Susan Allen	E-mail	<p>To whom may concern:</p> <p>Ever since Cascadia water has come about, it has been nothing but chaos. As I commented before, this whole deal is anything but open and honest. It is a ploy for money-profits never disclosed- and meant to be unclear with typical disregard for consumers. We were told we were in the Peninsula Systems. OK, Who does that include? A numbered, accurate list please. Now the staff?, seriously, wants us lumped in with Whidby Island? Are they fishing for a raise? This is a mess. We, here in Monterra, have already had two or three price increases in our water rate since</p>

			<p>Cascadia took over. We are a retirement community with one or two people per household. Not the “average household” of four or more.</p> <p>I ask Judge Fukano for more open sessions for more time to find the truth. Are you a consumer Judge Fukano?</p> <p>If you took the massive profit that this is all about and returned it to the original owner’s, we could all have spring water delivered to our homes for eternity.</p> <p>There is nothing wrong with our water supply in Monterra and we do not need Cascadia but due to the lure of “big time Profits” we are sucked into this corrupt mess. Are there any decent, honest people out there anymore?</p> <p>I ask the Commissioners to PLEASE do your job and protect your constituents. There is nothing but confusion and lies, all for money.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p>Susan Allen</p>
	Susan Allen	E-mail	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>I am writing concerning the 94-102% increase Cascadia Water is asking for. I live in the Monterra 55+ community on the Olympic Peninsula. Cascadia acquired our water system 3 years ago, I believe. They have installed meters at every home and have done some work at the water tower: monitoring, safety equipment and some other things. No extensive work was done beyond this that I am aware of. Our water tower reservoir is in good condition. They state in their letter they have other infrastructure projects to do here: new above-ground reservoir, new booster pumps etc. My concern is the huge increase in our water bill and are all their repairs necessary? No one has complained about water pressure that I know of. We have good water and good water pressure here.</p> <p>Cascadia stated in its letter how it is acquiring new acquisitions and how rapidly it is expanding. It has only been in business since 2018. My concern is for Monterra residents to be paying only for our water system and repairs here and not elsewhere. I do know in their rapid expansion customer service is not good. I needed to contact them and left a message at their phone number. No one returned my call, so I emailed them. No response. Sometime later I received a call from some nice lady who said she had stumbled on my email- just quite by chance- and had read it and called me. I immediately Thanked her for her call. Of course, everyone is on autopay and I did request on their website to receive paper bills as well as email notification but they have not done that.</p> <p>I realize expanding their water empire takes all their time, but anyone in business can tell you, you don’t get rich overnight. With their rapid expansion and poor customer service, I have concerns.</p>

			<p>They have raised our rates twice I think and it was needed I know. We all know the cost of everything is rising exponentially. Can't afford to live these days. In closing, I would ask the commission to consider what is just and fair for the dwellers of Monterra.</p> <p>Thank your for your time.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p>Susan Allen 242 Monterra Dr. Port Angeles,WA 98362</p>
	Susan Bonallo	E-mail	<p>Cascadia LLC wholly owned by NW Natural Holdings purchased the water co Aquarius 2022. Rates went up 30 percent. Now as of June 1 2024 rates will increase 75 percent making a total of 105 percent in two years. This is unacceptable . Their annual report states they see no requirements to upgrade water purchases now or in near future. The public thought UTC protected us from prices set at outrageous amounts. How did three commissioners think 75 percent was fair and equitable? The duty to protect homeowners falls to the state when we can't take our business elsewhere. The annual report states shareholders have enjoyed returns for 68 consecutive years. I'm just not happy with that, is this how company is able to pay dividends ?</p>
	Susan Bonallo	E-mail	<p>We here on the Olympic Peninsula are not responsible for the debt that the "new" Cascadia water company has taken on.</p> <p>We don't pay for other companies to make a profit, why should a utility be any different?</p> <p>I didn't vote for it. We are paying expenses for all their acquisitions ! Not our problem to see them make a profit. Give us a break.</p> <p>Isn't your job to manage a fair and equitable utility providers? Or is that not the case?</p>
	Susan Gilman	E-mail	***SEE ATTACHMENT
	Susan Gilman	Web	<p>I am totally not in favor of the increase in water in my area of Diamond Point.</p> <p>Not only has this new company come in and purchase water, which , should not be owned privately. and now</p>

			increasing the monthly price by 50% or more. This for all of us is a monopoly and should never be allowed by out local representatives
	Talia A Lehman	Web	The drastic increase in fees that is being proposed for Cascadia Water is ABSOLUTELY RIDICULOUS. Not only is the monthly fee going up \$13, so already a flat automatic \$26 increase per each billing cycle, the block rates are increasing exponentially. Also, the blocks are decreasing in water amount meaning each subsequent block will be charged sooner for less water usage. To increase slightly could be understandable, or even simply an increase in just the monthly fee, but to increase rates 4-5X the amount is absolutely ludicrous. This proposal is angering and maddening. Our water bills will be at least double, if not even more than that from what they currently are. Many of our neighbors will not be able to afford this change when water should be a basic resource available to all. This rate change should absolutely NOT be implemented!!! Please, please do not allow this to pass.
	Tamara Campion	Web	<p>Subject: Opposition to Proposed Rate Increase by Cascadia Water in Lake Alyson Community</p> <p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues, have to endure our system being flushed with chemicals on at minimum a bi-annual basis, and water boil orders, most recently in the days preceding Thanksgiving 2024.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Tamara and Joseph Campionw</p>
	Tamera Sheary	Web	<p>Subject: Opposition to Proposed Rate Increase by Cascadia Water in Lake Alyson Community</p> <p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we</p>

			<p>continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter</p>
	Tara Rudolph	E-mail	<p>Greetings commissioners and staff,</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of friends, neighbors, and my community regarding a situation that seems to be the reason for the UTC's existence.</p> <p>UTC's Mission:</p> <p>Our Mission is to protect the people of Washington by ensuring that investor-owned utility and transportation services are safe, equitable, reliable, and fairly priced.</p> <p>Based on your stated Mission, I encourage you to look closely at Cascadia Water LLC's entire operations. I did not know that it was even legal to implement a rate hike as high as they are proposing, let alone continue to do so as they continue to spend without transparency or input from the customers that are paying the millions of dollars they want to spend each year. Who is regulating what upgrades are truly necessary and not necessary? Would they do the proposed upgrades if they were not allowed to financially benefit from it?</p> <p>I highly encourage the UTC to disallow Cascadia Water LLC to implement the proposed rate hikes and current business practice. Water is not like cable TV where a family can decide to pay for the product or not. Water is a necessity that every WA citizen should have access to. If a private company wants to take on the responsibility of providing that service, then the customers should take priority over the financial gain of the shareholders. The message that I see coming from Cascadia Water LLC is that they need to increase the rates because of inflation and projects that they need to do, yet they continue to acquire more and more systems with the expectation that the astronomical rate hikes will pay for their continued spending. Cascadia Water has acquired so many systems that this would negatively impact a large portion of our Island County citizens (and Peninsula citizens too). I am not opposed to a nominal increase to cover items like inflation or even a project or two that the citizens agree is necessary, but Cascadia Water, LLC has taken this rate hike to the extreme.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my opinion, Tara Rudolph</p>
	Ted Stanley	Web	<p>Comments typed by Sam Cooper after call to the Consumer Protection hotline. 107% increase with less than two months to come up with the money is unacceptable, especially for those of us on fixed income. It looks like south Whidbey is subsidizing improvements in mainland systems as opposed to upgrades and increase in efficiency in our particular system.</p>

	Tera Hess	Web	<p>Subject: Opposition to proposed Cascadia Water rate increase in Lake Alyson Community</p> <p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson Community located in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community well has not received any upgrades or improvements that would warrant this substantial rate increase. In fact, we currently have water pressure issues that have been occurring for a significant period of time with no mention of repair or replacement.</p> <p>As the increase Cascadia wants would not be utilized nor benefit our community water system in any way, I respectfully request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.</p> <p>Tera Hess</p>
	Teresa and Ronald Jones	E-mail	<p>We support improvements necessary to assure safe and accessible water to our community.</p> <p>We do not support paying for the problems of other water systems.</p> <p>Lastly we require transparency by Cascadia Water to clearly communicate with us as consumers in a timely manner.</p>
	Teresa and Ronald Jones	E-mail	<p>We are consumers of Peninsula water and we request the UTC to reject this rate filing. We endorse the Public Counsel, Tad O'Neill's, remarks in the February 11, 2025 hearing.</p> <p>Consolidating all Cascadia's systems into one single tariff price will only benefit the UTC and Cascadia, not the consumer. We reject the statements made in the February 11th hearing supporting a single rate. UTC staff and Cascadia stated that separate rates for different water systems would be awkward and too much work. We should not have to pay for problems of other water systems.</p> <p>The proposed extreme and sudden rate increase is unreasonable. In the February 11th hearing we heard lack of clarity between what DOH approved and what Cascadia interpreted to be a requirement. We the consumers should not have to bear the burden of Cascadia's unjustified excessive expenditures and the large rate of return expected by</p>

			<p>Shareholders.</p> <p>We expect the UTC to advocate for the consumers to assure adequate safe drinking water through a fair, reasonable, factual process. This process needs to include advance notice, consideration for the impact on consumers, and transparency.</p> <p>Respectfully, Teresa and Ronald Jones</p>
	Teri DiMartino	E-mail	<p>Hi Melissa, Thank you for talking with me this morning. Below is the email I tried to send last night. Dear Melissa Castaneda-Kerson: I am writing to let you know that I am extremely disappointed with the UTC sudden meeting notification with Cascadia water company. Had Vicki Colburn not alerted me to this meeting, I would not know about it. There's no public notice in the Daily Peninsula Newspaper or on Cascadia's website.</p> <p>Why was Port Angeles selected for a meeting location and not Sequim? Do not schedule any meetings for this rate case at Cascadia's main office on Whidbey Island. Please see the attached screenshot of the distance between my home and Cascadia's office</p> <p>Will the meeting be recorded and available via Zoom?</p> <p>Please email me a meeting agenda before April 22.</p> <p>Going forward, I don't support a rate increase for Sequim rate payers, and please include my email on future correspondence regarding public meetings.</p> <p>Respectfully, Terri DiMartino 82 Buds Way, Sequim, WA 89382</p>
	Terri and Ron Jones	E-mail	<p>We are members of the Water Consumer Advocates of Olympic Peninsula. We strongly oppose single tariff pricing and the current unrealistic rate increase proposal. It is not fair or appropriate for our community to pay for capital improvements to other water systems outside the Olympic Peninsula.</p> <p>We expect the UTC to decide on rates that apply only to our local water systems and are realistic increases.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>

			Terri and Ron Jones
	Terri and Ron Jones	E-mail	<p>We have just learned that there is a meeting next Monday April 22 in Port Angeles about the Cascadia Water on Whidbey Island. Also there is no meeting about Cascadia Water systems for water consumers on our Olympic Peninsula. This plan is not acceptable, is not just, is not reasonable.</p> <p>A 75% plus increase in our water rates without a forum to hear the basis for this increase is unjust. The Water Consumer Advocates of Olympic Peninsula will not be overlooked and unrepresented.</p> <p>We expect fair representation, equitable treatment, open communication, and advance notice of a meeting with Cascadia Water and UTC in our location to discuss this rate case.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Terri and Ron Jones</p>
	Terri Butler	E-mail	<p>Hello,</p> <p>My husband and I own 3827 Goldfinch Lane and I'm writing to express concern over the rate increase proposed for water from the well supplying the neighborhood.</p> <p>Given water supply is an essential utility having rates that are predictable and justified seems like a reasonable expectation. Prior to raising rates a utility would be expected to educate their customers regarding conservation measures, have incentives to install low water use shower heads and toilets and encourage rainwater collection for yard use. We have not seen any of these measures taken by Cascadia.</p> <p>I hope when rate increases are needed due to cost pressures they will be limited to small increments so residents won't be caught off guard in their own budget management.</p> <p>I would appreciate your effort to restrict the rate increases currently proposed by Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Terri Butler</p>
	Terri DiMartino	E-mail	

	Terri DiMartino	E-mail	<p>Dear Melissa Castaneda-Kerson and Tad O'Neill: Please enter my comments for UW case #240 151 below:</p> <p>I listened to the Monday, January 13, 2025, 6pm meeting and wanted to comment but my new Android phone unmute feature wasn't working, hence my email.</p> <p>The underlying theme is Cascadia cannot be forced by anyone at the UTC to discuss or handover its water system financials. I know many rate customers have filed legal financial disclosures and all have been denied. The UTC cannot tell Cascadia what you're doing is too much money for our rate customers, so come back with a fair and reasonable plan.</p> <p>I am grateful the Washington State Attorney General's office is involved in this rate case. In my opinion, Cascadia is like dealing with big pharma. Cascadia and its parent company NW Holdings are like the Grim Reaper, they own our water rights and are out to make record profits. Cascadia has identified loopholes in the UTC's authority to tell them NO!</p> <p>Not to criticize staff or the commissioners, but the UTC does not have the policies nor the staff in place to handle this water case. This case needs to be assigned to the Washington State Attorney's General Office for review. If it takes years, so be it. The AG's is the only state run agency to handle this case. Mr. Nick Brown, Washington's new AG, is being sworn in on January 15. Let his team beat up Cascadia like they're doing to their water customers.</p> <p>I'm certain the UTC is supposed to protect its customers from rate shock. Sadly, this is not happening with this case. I have sent numerous emails, pictures, a video, and spent countless hours talking to my neighbors, calling my State Representative Steve Tharinger and County Commissioner Mark Ozias Offices, spoken with PBS reporter Brandon Block, and stewed about this case causing me sleepless nights and irritation. No one should endure this for fair and reasonable water rates. I feel powerless and that all the hours of my life fighting this case are falling on deaf ears. I don't see how the UTC has enough staff to read every single comment submitted on this rate case.</p> <p>Going forward, please bow out of this rate case and turn this case over to Nick Brown's office as soon as possible. If you must appease Cascadia, then tell them they cannot raise anyone's water rates more than the going rate of inflation. If they don't like this ruling, they can cut their losses and give us back our water rights.</p> <p>-- Thank you, Terri DiMartino</p>
	Terri DiMartino	E-mail	<p>Dear Cascadia, UTC Consumer Comments for UW-240-151, Representative Tharinger, Tad O'Neill and Commissioner Mark Ozias:</p>

		<p>I just read Cascadia's email notice dated 1/23/25 about the upcoming change to the Estates Water System on 1/27/25. I am not happy with the potential change in the taste and smell of my drinking water.</p> <p>Since 2016 I have enjoyed drinking water from my kitchen tap, cooking, bathing, washing my clothes, etc. with no odor or despicable taste.</p> <p>I've never worried about getting sick from my tap water nor purchased bottled water from myself or my pets. Guests that come and stay with me always remark how good the water tastes.</p> <p>I realize many large water municipalities, like the City of Seattle add chlorine to their systems, it's a cheap way to kill bacteria. Given the extravagant cost Cascadia wants for water now, a resource they don't produce nor own, why is chlorine needed on a water system that the Department of Health says we don't need?</p> <p>Isn't water owned by the State of Washington? What is Cascadia's cost to buy water from the State of Washington? I suspect nothing! Why am I expected to pay top dollar to Cascadia for water when Cascadia pays the State of Washington nothing for a resource no living organism can live without? Here's an idea...charge Cascadia top dollar to buy water from the State of Washington then refund the users for a resource Cascadia is paying nothing for?</p> <p>Why was the parts delay in Cascadia's 1/23/25 email relevant? The entire water tower construction was delayed months impacting the nearby residents with dust, dirt, alarms, construction vehicles, digging equipment, obnoxious workers yelling and swearing and beyond. Not one single email about the water tower delays. It is my opinion the parts delay mention was included to distract the seriousness of adding poison to our water system. Cascadia should of put in all caps the sentence "if you are on dialysis, you probably can't drink your tap water anymore" and "your water will smell and taste like chlorine now". I don't have my doctor or vet available 24/7 to ask if this chlorine will impact my health. Why the abrupt notice about this lethal change to a system that the DOH says is fine?</p> <p>Bottom line, I'm not interested in paying for water that I cannot drink because it smells and tastes like swimming pool water. This is not acceptable. Do not activate or add any chemicals like chlorine to my water system that will harm me, my family and my pets.</p> <p>I am calling my State representatives, County Commissioners and beyond about this situation. Cascadia continues to ruin my drinking water, and wants non sustainable monthly rates for it.</p> <p>UTC staff, please include my email above in case UW-240-151.</p> <p>Cascadia, please tell me why this life changing water system is needed? Are you sure this isn't a mistake or oversight? Please confirm that the DOH confirms this change is necessary.</p>
--	--	--

Terri DiMartino	E-mail	<p>Dear Ms. Shimomura, Ms. Stewart & Ms. Castaneda-Kerson:</p> <p>My name is Terri DiMartino. I live at 82 Buds Way, Sequim, WA 98382. I am writing to express how disappointed that Governor Inslee has not removed UTC commissioners David Danner and Anne Rendahl from ruling on any UTC rate cases. The recent news about both commissioners using racial slurs at a convention is unacceptable. I'm also troubled about recent news stories about UTC employees leaving because of a hostile work environment.</p> <p>The UTC staff deserve better leadership and should not be subjected to dealing with either commissioner. How can this important and essential department do their jobs when the leadership of two commissioners is atrocious.</p> <p>If your can't force these commissioners resignations, then please pause all rate payer rulings until further notice. The UTC needs time to adjust to the new leadership of Jeff Killip. Hopefully Mr. Killip will provide a new start for everyone.</p> <p>Just to make you aware of an alarming communication flaw from the UTC, Melissa Castaneda-Kerson, a UTC consumer protection employee alerted only a few Estates water system users of a public meeting being held on April 22 at 6 pm at the Port Angeles Library. I found out about this Q&A meeting from my neighbor. Nothing was posted on the Cascadia website or published in the the Peninsula Daily News. Very poor public outreach given Cascadia is asking for a 100 perfect increase in our base monthly rate of \$24.00 to \$48.00. I have been an Estates customer since 2016 and this is the first public meeting Cascadia has ever had.</p> <p>Cascadia owns several water systems. I am on the Estates Water System located in Sequim. As the Sequim Chamber of Commerce states "Water is Wealth". Unlike gold, water is essential. I need water to survive, live, cook, and to clean my body. Myself and all Estates customers are at the mercy of 3 UTC commissioners on this extreme rate hike. I can't seek other rates, like I can for my car or home insurance or dig a well. I feel like the Grimm Reaper now rules our water system. Just to give you an example, in 2016 when I moved to my manufactured home on Buds Way, basic monthly water service was \$12.00 a month. In 2020, the rate increased to \$18.00 per month, in 2022 \$24.00 per month. Cascadia is now asking for a new base charge of \$48.00 per month.</p> <p>Cascadia LLC is owned by NW Holdings, a publicly traded company. Justin Palfreyman, the CEO compensation is over 900,000.00 a year!</p> <p>This whole rate situation is creating a high level anxiety and stress for me. I have enough bills. My home and car insurance has doubled at no fault of mine. I am very careful with the amount of water I use. I don't water my lawn, take long showers or flush my toilet multiple times a day. Most of my neighbors who are in their 70s and 80s and working part-time don't water their lawns either. I can only conclude that since the majority of Cascadia's Estates customers are seniors and watch their water use, Cascadia is seeking a guaranteed monthly increase to keep managements compensation packages lucrative.</p>
-----------------	--------	---

			<p>I am requesting Governor Inslee's intervene and pause all rate cases under review at the UTC until further notice.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from all of you. If possible, please attend the April 22, 6 pm meeting at the Port Angeles Library.</p> <p>Respectfully, Terri DiMartino</p>
	Terri DiMartino	E-mail	<p>***SEE ATTACHMENT</p> <p>I have been in contact with several of the neighbors that homes are right next door to Cascadia's massive 33 foot concrete water tower, and I must tell you if I lived within feet of this eyesore and the ongoing construction activities, you would of gotten a call and email from me every day.</p> <p>I was recently looking for the Estates Water June 18 water shut off notice on Cascadia's website. It's not posted, but I laughed when I read this statement by Cascadia's Manager Culley Lehman, "Cascadia Water operates long-time family run utilities, and we're very connected to the communities we serve." This perception Lehman has is not any where close to being accurate or true.</p> <p>Here's how Cascadia's connects with their customers during a massive \$1 million construction project built smack dab in the middle of an established neighborhood:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Hours of noise and diesel smells from idling and running concrete trucks, delivery trucks, employee vehicles, dump trucks, and a vacuum extraction truck being the most deafening sound. A vacuum extraction truck can exceed decibels of over 90 dPA. All nearby neighbors reported they left there homes when this machinery was operating.2. No preconstruction warning that the project was starting. No construction sign posted or foreman to report problems too like random low water pressure, or losing your home Internet because buried cable were severed. You'd assume Cascadia would of had the courtesy to contact each household near the construction site and give them a heads up on what anticipate. No such action occurred.3. Home views diminished. One neighbor had a mountain view, now they look at a 33 foot water tower. Another neighbor has a 180 degree of the work site. These people are wondering if this will impact their home and property investment. I've never seen a massive 33 foot water tank built in the middle of a neighborhood. Please see attached pictures.4. Loss of privacy and security. A steady stream of contractors and curious eyes has been non stop at the construction site. One person told me they keep their blinds shut so passers by can't see inside their home or they

			<p>leave their home. Imagine how'd you feel about strangers walking by just feet from your property and driving up your private road on a daily basis.</p> <p>5. Visual pollution. The former site was grassy and well maintained. Now there are large pipes, empty welding tanks, caution tape, rebar laying around, and large holes underneath the existing pump houses. Please see the attached pictures. These neighbors have asked Cascadia when will this project be completed? Cascadia response is "we don't know."</p> <p>6. "Worksite dirt and dust are a constant on my home, vehicles and I have to keep my windows closed". A common complaint stated by everyone. Wind is common when you live near the Salish Sea and little dirt devils are frequently created when you leave mounds of dirt uncovered.</p> <p>I think the rate payers above who continue to live through project are being taken advantage of by Cascadia since late December 2023. It is my opinion Culley Lehman has let these neighbors down. He's done nothing to assist these neighbors with the human and irreversible construction impacts of this water tower.</p> <p>I hope the UTC acknowledges the Estates Water System hasn't been a family run water system that's connected to its communities for years now. It's owned by a private equity firm called NW Holdings LLC, NYSE NWN. Justin Palfreyman is the legal owner of record for the property the water tank was built on. He has demonstrated his company is not a good neighbor. This project might take months or years to finish all at the expense of the neighbors that have to deal with the ongoing construction noise and other unforeseen nuances.</p> <p>It's hard for me to believe the existing underground water tanks couldn't of been repaired or savaged. Was this 33 foot concrete eyesore the only option? As a rate payer, I would of appreciated other options over this mess, and one that wasn't so costly. I hope the UTC commissioners tell Cascadia that building a 33 foot concrete water tower was a poor business decision and Cascadia, not the rate payers, can foot the bill on this disaster.</p> <p>Terri DiMartino</p>
	Terri DiMartino	E-mail	<p>Dear UTC Staff:</p> <p>On February 11, 2025 I received a 2nd letter from Culley Lehman, Cascadia Water LLC GM noting the first letter had the incorrect phone number and email address for the Washington State Attorney General's Public Counsel. Please see the attached correspondence.</p> <p>It makes one ponder if Cully Lehman intentionally made these phone and email address typos?</p> <p>Would the UTC staff consider extending the customer comment period to March 11, 2025?</p>

			<p>I listened to Public Counsel Tad O'Neill question Culley Lehman at the February 11, 2025 hearing. It is my opinion Mr. Lehman did a knockout job providing vague answers to very basic questions regarding the Estates Water System located in Sequim, Washington were necessary improvements. He should have been better prepared to answer Mr. O'Neill's questions on the yearly budget, record keeping, water system priorities, and timelines. I suppose this goes hand in hand with giving customers the wrong phone number and email address for Washington State's highest consumer protection agency.</p> <p>The UTC staff and Commissioners need to heed the recommendations of Public Counsel Tad O'Neill and REJECT this case. Mr. Lehman has not proved that any of the Estates' water system improvements were necessary. I had no say in the million dollar price tag yet I'm expected to pay for it? Cascadia's shareholders should pay for this. Not me.</p> <p>I am against a single tariff that gives Cascadia unrestricted spending. UTC case #UW 240151 is far too complicated for anyone to track all of Cascadia's ongoing and unnecessary expenses. I don't want nor can afford the financial burden of paying for water systems other than the one I'm using. There is no proof that consolidation of all systems will benefit rate payers. There is plenty of proof that my rates will be the largest rate increase in a decade. Public counsel's analysis highlighted this. Cascadia is not entitled to a profitable balance sheet despite bad business decisions made by Culley Lehman.</p> <p>Please reject UW #240151. Please enter this email into the case docket UW#240 151.</p> <p>Respectfully, Terri DiMartino</p>
	Therese Lewis	E-mail	<p>To whom it concerns,</p> <p>With transparency comes trust, we are seeking the justifications for Capital Expenditures and clear proof of a Business Model which has not been revealed to the rate payers, is only prudent when requesting the large sum of dollars Cascadia Water LLC> is asking.</p> <p>I am not in favor of cross-subsidies, and need a fairness in rates allocation, being accountable for one's own water use. I would rather not want to subsidies watering a Golf course.</p> <p>In regard to Cascadia seeking reimbursement for attorney fees for litigation, It comes down to the cost of doing business and being honest with your customers. Seems to look like there are blinders being put up to hind what Cascadia is trying to do and are wearing masks to complete this. Cascadia knew what they were purchasing when they bought into the system.</p> <p>If the SCADA Systems and Upgraded Meters is so important to you reveal what it proves for improvement to us</p>

			<p>and our cost reduction for consumers.</p> <p>I question the prudence of investment such as oversized reservoirs, standby generators are unnecessary and provide minimal benefit to the consumers.</p> <p>Capital spending (\$ 3-4 million annually for the next five years, show how you justify this in the plans.</p> <p>If Cascadia really has all the information or maybe they don't and have something to hind, it does not look like they can be trusted, so build our trust and be transparent.</p> <p>I would rather not see it go forward</p> <p>Thank you for your attention on this very important hearing.</p> <p>Therese Lewis</p>
	Thomas	Web	<p>Rate case UW 240151. I am not in favor Cascadia Water's proposed rate increase. I live in Clallam County and have formerly been a customer of Pederson family water. Although, I understand that there are times when rates may need to be increased for a local system's repairs. That is not the case. It is unfair to increase our rates to generate income to do non-DOH repairs or upgrade systems that are not part of the Clallam county system. We should only pay for the cost of the system that we benefit from - the system that provides our water. In this case the Dungeness Homeowners - who were formerly under Pederson.</p>
	Thomas Cox	Web	<p>Ref. UTC 240151</p> <p>I am a 27 year long customer of Estates Water System. I receive their service to my resident and also am considered by UTC and Cascadia to be a “Ready to Serve” customer for the two vacant lots I own adjacent to my residential lot. Many others have stated factual considerations of why the rate increases proposed are not just outrageous, but unacceptable. I concur with those objections as the bottom line for a majority of the reasons previously stated and so shall not repeat them. UTC knows the proposal, are not fair, reasonable and in the best interest of the rate payer.</p> <p>I will speak to the Ready To Serve (RTS) increase proposal. In the many years I’ve owned my vacant lots I have not drawn one drop of water from the system that I and others with vacant lots have continuously paid into. When I ask what justifies this charge, I am told by UTC representatives that it guarantees if and when I want to receive water from the system, it will be delivered. In essence it’s nothing more than a promise. I view that as more akin to a ransom. I have no alternative but to pay the same base rate as the customers who are actually receiving something, water, for their payments. I, on the other hand, have never gotten one thing delivered, except a monthly bill that just continues to increase...and that buys me no tangible product or service.</p>

			<p>This time six years ago (June, 2018) the Ready To Serve rate I paid was \$5 a month or \$60 per year to Estates for each of my two vacant lots, costing me a total of \$120 a year for both lots. The proposed increase would drive that figure to \$1,056. So I ask what justifies a total of a 780% increase over the past six years. And yet, no systems changes have occurred in that time. The current percentage increase from \$24 to \$44 per lot is an 83% increase. What justifies this huge increase in the past three years? To me Ready To Serve are two holes in the ground with pipes running through them. Functionally inert and useless. What improvements and services have these pipes delivered to me? What has changed for me by paying thousands of dollars over the years? Again, I've never drawn one drop of water out of these pipes in the 22 years I've owned the vacant lots? Nothing...however I must pay a ransom if I wish to connect at some future date. And oh, by the way, it's the only way I can access water to build on these lots...I am held ransom. In addition, if I need to access that water running through the pipes on my property I must pay \$683 per lot just to connect. I am unsure if or when I may need the water running across my property. Maybe I am the one who should be charging the water purveyor for use on my property.</p> <p>I would ask that the Commission apply reasonable and good common sense when considering this outrageous rate increase request. Thank you.</p>
	Thomas Gray	E-mail	<p>Dear Utility Regulatory Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rate increase by Cascadia Water for the Lake Alyson community in Granite Falls. This significant increase is unjustifiable and unaffordable given the current cost of living.</p> <p>Our community's well has not received any improvements that would warrant such an increase. Additionally, we continue to experience intermittent water pressure issues.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I request a Vote of Voluntary Service and formally file a cost complaint against Cascadia Water.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter.</p>
	Tim Legree	E-mail	<p>Hello</p> <p>Regarding the above rate increase requested by Cascadia Water. To request an increase of 101% after receiving an increase of 53% three years ago is totally unacceptable.</p> <p>Either Cascadia is so poorly run they have no idea of the business they are on or they are capitalizing in their captive customer base.</p> <p>There has been no evidence of major capital improvements in our system, only referencing "key infrastructure improvements" yet to be completed. Meanwhile Cascadia and its parent company Northwest Natural Holdings continue on an acquisition binge, probably funded largely by untenable rate increases.</p>

			<p>Companies need to make a profit to exist and provide whatever services they do, but the idea of an increase of over 100% shows a lack of business sense or price gouging.</p> <p>I urge the commission to reject this and any other increase requests until such time there can be shown a reasonable cause and amount.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Tim Legree</p>
	Tim Legree	Web	<p>Since the acquisition by Cascadia of Lehman this is the second significant increase requested. The funds are to upgrade systems “built in the 70s”. The systems were in place at the time of acquisition, budgeting for replacement should have been in place at that time. A 100% rate increase is completely uncalled for and should be rejected.</p>
	Tim Norman	E-mail	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>A rate increase of over 100% is uncalled for. I am not sure exactly where the money is supposed to be allocated however, the cost of expanding should fall on the new developments or new customers being added. I should not have to pay for the expansion of your company, that is what investors are for.</p>
	Timothy Bone	Web	<p>This is the second comment I have submitted. Research shows that the 2024 water rate increases throughout Washington range from 2.25% (Othello) to 14'2% (Puyallup). Kitsap PUD is 8%, with 5.5% thereafter for the next 4 years. Tacoma Water, 9%. Aren't these more like the utility rate increases one sees? So how did Cascadia come up with a whopping 94% increase for the Peninsula System where I live? This isn't fair, just, or reasonable. Likewise, lumping us with water systems two and three counties away, on the other side of the Hood Canal Bridge, counties that don't even border Clallum County, is unreasonable. Please reduce the Cascadia water rate increase to a level commensurate with historical, reasonable practice. Thank you.</p>
	Timothy F. Bone	Web	<p>I was sent a notice informing me that Cascadia proposes to increase my residential water rate by an astounding 94%. The base rate goes from \$24 to \$44; 1st block rate from \$1.00 to \$2.83; 2nd block rate from \$2.00 to \$4.47; 3rd block rate from \$2.95 to \$5.66. Question One: Has anyone on your commission ever received a notice from a utility proposing to raise your rate by 94%? I'm guessing not. I expect increases from time to time and am glad to pay them, but this is over the top. Inflation is not at 94%. Question Two: My system, Peninsula System is to be combined with systems in Kitsap and Mason Counties (Aquarius System). Kitsap and Mason Counties are not even contiguous with Clallam County. We don't share a drop of water with counties that don't even border us and are two and three counties away, but we are now to be financially tied to them. I strongly urge the UTC to either set the proposed Cascadia rates much lower, separate us from Kitsap and Mason Counties, or both. Thank you. Tim Bone, 100 Nicole Pl, Sequim, WA 98382. 360-551-6111.</p>
	Tom and Deb Cox	E-mail	<p>January 10, 2025</p> <p>To: WUTC; Reference: Cascadia Water Docket UW-240151</p>

To whom it may concern:

This represents our comments to the above named docket. We are and have been Estates Water System customers since 1997. We have three accounts, one residential and two so-called Ready To Serve. We are members of and in total support of the Water Consumer Advocates of Washington (WCAW). We have closely followed the running dialogue and progress, or should I say lack thereof, during the mediation attempts by the parties. I will not repeat all of what our group has made so patiently clear over the past nine months. Suffice it to say, we are in total agreement with each and every objection, appeal, consideration and offer that WCAW has brought forth and/or made.

But, it cannot go without saying that we are totally disgusted with the dishonesty and disdain that Cascadia Water is treating us. It is we who pay the freight for Cascadia's so-called service. While their operational responsibilities are be marginally and questionably met, it is all on our dime. And so their refusal to be transparent in their decision making with us is not just unethical, but reprehensible as well.

As well, we are not sure that the UTC staff truly is representing we, who also pay their salary, in a fair and objective manner. Why? Because they have chosen to shut down communications by obfuscations. To wit: the supposed "Settlement" they announced with Cascadia. They were obligated to represent the consumers, but have ignored and thumbed their noses at our needs for information...even the "settlement" info. Has it occurred to anyone at the UTC that we should have been at the table for each and every "negotiation" prior to any settlement? It's obvious that they think we aren't that important to their "mission". Which to all the world resembles being in bed with Cascadia. Harsh, you're darned right...it's exactly how many if not all of us feel.

I am sure you get the picture from our perspective. I will close with one other thought about the Staff's role in this

			<p>tragic comedy. As a retired Federal employee of 35 years tenure in a vital public service, my wife and I both took an oath of office when we hired into the Federal Aviation Administration. That oath was to serve the people of this country in each and every way, each and every day. The safety of the nation's airspace was in each of our specialties, Air Traffic Control and Aviation Standards Safety Inspection and was more than an agreement; it was our promise to serve each and every one of the thousands of citizens every minute of every day while on the job. No errors, no partiality, no excuses...just 100% delivery of our oath. We believe that each government employee at every level has that same responsibility. Sadly, it appears to be missing in this case. We hope the Commissioners can right this ship in our case. Please do so.</p> <p>Tom and Deb Cox</p>
	Tom Cox	Web	<p>I know this may be after the fact, but I did not see my comments included, so am resubmitting them. However, I see that the UTC staff has recommended that the outrageous and grossly unfair rate request be approved. I must ask...is the staff tone deaf, or just wildly incompetent? After reading Cascadia's responses to the Advocates petition, the UTC staff responded with what can only be described as governmental bafflebap. It is no wonder that citizens today have an avid distrust for government. In my case they didn't even include response to "Ready To Serve" rates, which make up over 100 customers and increase those costs by 83%. Why? My comments follow:</p> <p>I am a 27 year long customer of Estates Water System. I receive their service to my resident and also am considered by UTC and Cascadia to be a "Ready to Serve" customer for the two vacant lots I own adjacent to my residential lot. Many others have stated factual considerations of why the rate increases proposed are not just outrageous, but unacceptable. I concur with those objections as the bottom line for all the reasons previously stated and so shall not repeat them. UTC knows the proposal, are not fair, reasonable and in the best interest of the rate payer.</p> <p>I will speak to the Ready To Serve (RTS) increase proposal. In the years I've owned my vacant lots I have not drawn one drop of water from the system that I and others with vacant lots have continuously paid into. When I ask what justifies this charge, I am told by UTC representatives that it guarantees if and when I want to receive water from the system, it will be delivered. In essence it's nothing more than a promise. I view that as more akin to a ransom. I have no alternative but to pay the same base rate as the customers who are actually receiving something for their payments. I, on the other hand, have never gotten one thing delivered, except a monthly bill that just continues to increase...and that buys me no tangible product or service.</p> <p>This time six years ago (June, 2018) the Ready To Serve rate I paid was \$5 a month or \$60 per YEAR to Estates for each of my two vacant lots, costing me a total of \$120 a year for both lots. The proposed increase would drive that</p>

			<p>figure to \$1,056. So I ask what justifies a total of a 780% increase over the past six years. And yet, no systems changes have occurred in that time. The current percentage increase from \$24 to \$44 per lot is an 83% increase. What justifies this huge increase? To me Ready To Serve are two holes in the ground with pipes running through them. Functionally inert and useless. What improvements and services have these pipes delivered to me? What has changed for me by paying thousands of dollars over the years? Again, I've never drawn one drop of water out of these pipes in the 22 years I've owned the lots? Nothing...however I must pay a ransom if I wish to connect at some future date. And oh, by the way, it's the only way I can access water to build on these lots...I am held ransom. In addition, if I need to access that water running through the pipes on my property I must pay \$683 per lot just to connect. I am unsure if or when I may need the water running across my property. Maybe I am the one who should be charging the water purveyor for use on my property.</p> <p>I would ask that the Commission apply reasonable and good common sense when considering this outrageous rate increase request. Thank you.</p>
	Toni Mardell Shearer	E-mail	<p>Hello Melissa....</p> <p>My husband and I received the letter regarding the shocking rate increase to our water bill. We purchased this property last year, we have livestock that require gallons of water daily to sustain them...not to mention the people who live here. Then we discover the rate increase will be to pay for water system repairs or water usage for Cascadia systems that aren't even in the same state, let alone the same county we live in. Not ok with this in the least. We aren't ok with our water system being combined with other water systems under a single tariff. We support the capital surcharge being reinstated so we, the customers, have a say in future plans for our system...the one in the city, county and state we actually live in.</p> <p>And now we've received a notice warning us of a water shut-off, less than a month before it's scheduled to occur?!?! How am I supposed to water my horses?? A few days?!?! I would need a large water reservoir to hold enough water to sustain my four horses for an undetermined amount of time. My horses are my life, if any of them becomes ill due to bad water...I will not be excited. A 550 gallon water tank from Tractor Supply is \$750. So I need to purchase a water tank, fill it (pay to fill it) so I can make certain my horses are safe. To say I'm bloody pissed off is an understatement.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Toni Mardell Shearer</p>
	Vick Kirchner	E-mail	<p>Greetings! This email is to communicate my concerns with not only Cascadia Water's proposed rate increase, but also the lack of transparency in detailing why this rate increase is necessary and why I as a rate payer am expected to accept what can truly be labeled rate shock. There also appears to be a lack of transparency in releasing the details of the settlement reached between UTC and Cascadia Water which appears to be a planned attempt to diminish the</p>

			<p>amount of time interested parties will have to review, digest and then comment on those terms during the 1/13 & 1/14 sessions where public comments can be given.</p> <p>Prior to my retirement in 2024 from my four decade long career managing 1 million sq. ft. of owned and leased commercial real estate in 16 locations across the US, I led an annual exercise where my team and I prepared detailed capital improvement plans for each site to cover a 5 year period. Annually we re-evaluated, re-prioritized and reviewed the project scope and budget for each project at each site and submitted those reviews to the CFO and Board for their review and approval. As part of the annual review, we also had to document what the ROI was for each of the proposed projects. It was a completely transparent process.</p> <p>As I understand the current proposed rate increase Cascadia Water is requesting, there is either no such detailed data or there is and they are unwilling to provide that detailed information to us. Without this detailed information, how am I to know the proposed capital improvements are not only "real and necessary" but that the capital improvements I am asked to pay for are for my specific water system vs. me paying for other water systems that Cascadia Water has or will purchase that service others than me. And, if this detailed data exists, when will it be released and will there be another public opportunity to address that data after careful review?</p> <p>I have the same concerns regarding the reported settlement between UTC rate staff and Cascadia Water. If there has been a settlement, what are the details and when will the details be released and will there be ample time to review and comment on that settlement?</p> <p>On these two points alone, there appears to be a planned lack of transparency by one or both entities which greatly impacts my ability to have sufficient time to review both points and comment publicly.</p> <p>Here's my bottom line. I retired, bought property and had my retirement home built in 2024 in Sequim and am serviced by Cascadia Water. If the proposed rate increase is approved, it not only will impact my personal financial stability, but ultimately the value of my home and ability to sell this home in the future.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Victoria Kirchner</p>
	Vicki Colburn	E-mail	<p>Thank you for speaking with me last Friday about the consumer's concerns about this rate case.</p> <p>I want to follow up on the information discussed relative to the request for the hearing to be rescheduled. I believe that I gave several reasonable, factual reasons that clearly support this request.</p> <p>There is no emergency or urgency noted in this rate case. Cascadia enjoyed unrestricted time to gather their</p>

			<p>information, complete their financials and independently choose a filing date. They are also supported by their parent company's fully staffed regulatory department, in house legal and a host of other full time, well trained staff.</p> <p>On the other hand, the water users for the most part are retired, seniors. They do not have access to a similar support system. It is important for the positions presented by the water users and the arguments for the Commissioner's review be well documented and factually correct. In order to do that, we believe that rescheduling the hearing to a mutually convenient time will best serve all.</p> <p>After reviewing other recent water cases I noted with interest - UW-220218 started 3-30-22, heard at 2 or more open meetings, continued on 5-26-22, closing 8-2-22; UW-230132 started 2-28-23, had open meetings, was continued on 4-13-23, suspended 6-16-23, reopened 11-28-23 closing on 12-8-23. Given just those 2 recent cases, our request does not seem unique or unusual.</p> <p>Certainly working together to agree on and select a reasonable hearing date will help all avoid unnecessary scheduling shifts, multiple open meeting dates and the general confusion this is sure to cause.</p> <p>I would also like to restate the request for the UTC to schedule time for an on-site visit and consumer meeting for the Peninsula's project Cascadia choose to include in this rate case. The Peninsula's Estate System appears to be an entirely new system, pump house and support equipment. That would seem to be a major project with a significant capital investment. Before beginning to review this rate case, it would seem appropriate to expect all major projects to be treated the same, which is UTC site visits for all - especially major projects.</p> <p>Should you have any questions, need to clarify anything or wish that I document all of the items we discussed so that they can be included in the case file, please let me know.</p> <p>I would appreciate knowing the status of this issue and confirming our ability to resolve it by this Friday, 4-12-24.</p> <p>Thank you for your assistance and I look forward to your reply. Vicki Colburn</p>
	Vicki Colburn	E-mail	<p>Thank you for the time you invested participating in the Public Comment Session last night.</p> <p>It is troubling that this settlement was not filed until the day before the Public Comment Session and then without the Staff's exhibits and supporting documents. It is believed that this information was available over 2 weeks ago. Is there a reason that the settlement's filing was delayed? Is this noted in the official record?</p>

		<p>It is a significant problems for the consumers that no one has been available to address consumer's questions on the settlement. As stated last night during the 1st Public Comment session, Public Comment Sessions are not to answer questions, they are to listen to the public. Is there another Public UTC process that would actually answer questions? If we send you specific questions, is it expected that we will get answers in time to be able to submit comments before the 2-11-25 hearing? Basically, how are the ratepayers to provide relevant comments or be able to make informed decisions?</p> <p>Unfortunately, the settlement document must have missed it's proofreader. There are the following errors or ommissions. Can your office address these issues; speak to the responsible party of the Full Multiparty Settlement Stipulation and request corrections?</p> <p>Once identified and confirmed, will Executive Secretary Killip be filing an errata confirming corrections have been made? I noted that he has done so in the case recently for a different matter. To avoid continued confusion, it would be helpful if Cascadia or staff could send out a notice of correction to all of the affected ratepayers or at least make those corrected pages available on the Docket with correction notice filed separately.</p> <p>1. Page 1: What docket is this document for? Filed document references UG-240151 I do believe this is a water utility filing and should be UW. Records management advises that this could cause potential search problems for anyone seeking this document.</p> <p>2. RATE PAGES - ATTACHMENT A - PAGES 2 & 3 A Western Systems: Corrections appear to be called for in the Rate per Cubic FOOT section Is the rate of \$4.71 per foot? Current filed tariff states per 100 cu ft. There is no reference to the filed tariff or foot note advising how rates are to be calculated.</p> <p>B Pelican Point</p> <p>1. Same comment as above</p> <p>2. Block size breaks appear to have a error in the 2nd and 3rd rate block</p> <p>4. Missing from the rate pages and apparently from the entire settlement is mention of Read-Serve- Rates. Are those with Ready-to Serve connections no longer going to be charged? If, no, what will the charges be?</p> <p>5. Should this settlement go into effect, what are the actual percentage increases per system?</p> <p>6. For the surcharge portions in year 2 and 3, what are the amounts to be charged in dollars with and without carrying costs?</p>
--	--	--

			<p>7. Regarding the Aquarius Surcharge, there are balances on all 4 loans. Can someone comment on how those balances will be resolved?</p> <p>Thank you Vicki Colburn</p>
	Victoria Kirchner	E-mail	<p>Greetings! Since I last wrote (below) I was finally able to obtain a basic list of capital improvements but unfortunately the list contained only the brief identification of the improvement with no specific detail or breakdown as to the cost per improvement. Without this additional information, I am once again left with the impression that there is a planned lack of transparency in terms of me, as a consumer, having the opportunity to determine who benefited from these "improvements" and if due diligence was done in terms of both the necessity of the improvements and if the most fiscally responsible route was taken.</p> <p>I understand that Cascadia may have misinterpreted the DOH's approval of the capital improvements as "required" - were/are the capital improvements required by the DOH and if so, is that documented for the consumers to see? Were/are all of the improvements necessary or could they have been or be completed in a phased approach? Is this what the rate payers can expect moving forward? Additional rate increases that clearly fall into the category of rate shock?</p> <p>When I reviewed the list of capital improvements, it was clear that the majority of the capital projects were for water systems other than the one that serves me. How is it that I am expected to share in the cost of these consolidated projects when they do not benefit me? Am I to be expected to cover the costs for all of the systems owned by Cascadia - some of which are known to be substandard and in need of costly repairs now or in the near future? Consolidating rates for ALL Cascadia customers is not fair or equitable.</p> <p>Based on the information I have been able to review, based on my 40+ years managing 1M sq. ft. of corporate real estate and capital improvement projects that were as small as \$5k and as large as \$500k per project, I am left to doubt Cascadia's ability to manage their expenses. As a rate payer, it appears that their unrestricted "improvements" now falls on the rate payers to pay for.</p> <p>Tad O'Neill has twice suggested that the proposed rate filing be rejected and I whole heartedly agree with his assessment.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to hear my continued concerns re the proposed rate increase.</p>

			Victoria Kirchner
	W. D. Parshall	Web	<p>Oppose the proposed rate increase for water by Cascadia Water LLC. Seventy five percent (75%) increase is extreme.</p> <p>Whidbey Island Silver Lake District should not have to pay for other water districts system improvements.</p> <p>Along with many mergers and acquiring of multiple water services in various Counties of Washington State it seems as if Cascadia Water LLC has created a monopoly.</p>
	William Donohoe	E-mail	<p>1. This as a huge % of increase.</p> <p>2. The company is expanding by purchasing more water systems all over the state. I am not sure that is a good thing for our system?</p> <p>As I read your info on how it spreads out the cost, I wondered if all of these new companies would pay the same as we are paying?</p> <p>Also if new water companies purchased have to be brought up to a specific standard before they are allowed to be comingled into greater company. ie newly purchased company may not have sufficient water supply, water mains, pumps etc.</p>
	William Foster	E-mail	<p>February 18, 2025</p> <p>Person Submitting Comments: Mr. and Mrs. William H. Foster, III 1491 Thornton Dr Sequim, WA 98-82-8087 Cell 214-477-7077</p> <p>To: Washington Utilities and Transportation Board Emailed to: comments@utc.wa.gov RE: Cascadia Water, LLC request for rate increase Filing UW - 240151 Company: Cascadia Water, LLC DBA: Filing Type: Tariff Revision Case Status: Pending Dates (Opened): 02/29/2024</p> <p>RE: Mr. Culley Lehman (Manager) with Cascadia Water, LLC has a Habit of Violations with WAC 480-110-315 - AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION, Sec (4) and Sec (5). Culley's Self Imposed demand for the "Best" service for his Water Customers, his statements are continually Disingenuous and not supported by the Facts We do NOT Support Cascadia's request for Rate Increase, nor SINGLE TARIFF PRICING.</p> <p>Dear Commission Members,</p>

Our comments on how we do Not Support the request as filed by Cascadia Water, LLC for a water rate increase and SINGLE TARIFF PRICING, in part, are for the following reasons.

During the UTC Hearing this past February 11, 2025, Mr. Culley Lehman - General Manager for Cascadia Water, LCC, stated on record, over (27) times that his and Cascadia Water's efforts and decisions were to deliver the "best" service to the water user customers.

Mr. Lehman's statements were most insulting to hear, especially with our dealings with Cascadia Water, LLC, Mr. Lehman, and his staff. Here are a few example of the high demand for "best customer service" Mr. Lehman does NOT deliver, in violation of WAC 480-236-3030 - AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION, Sec (4) and Sec (5) as stated here:

WAC 480-236-3030 - AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.

(4) When a nonemergency customer call is received, a water company must return the customer's call within two business days.

(5) A water company must acknowledge and respond to a customer's written inquiry within two weeks of receiving the letter.

First Examples of Mr. Culley being in violation of WAC 480-236-3030 - AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION, Sec (4) and Sec (5) is noted here:

From December 11, 2023 to April 18, 2024 William Foster reached out to Cascadia Infrastructure (Subsidiary of Cascadia Water, LLC) and Cascadia Water, LLC to resolve service issues on the following dates, by telephone, voice mail, and emails, and as of April 18, 2024 William Foster has never received a return phone call or email to address his issues about service. Inquiries about other Billing issuers had been return, where Cascadia Water, LLC was to be paid, yet not for issues about service. Four (4) months is much longer than State Required a response within two (2) days for a telephone call, and a response within two (2) weeks for a written letter or email.

This is my records of my contacting, and dates, to Cascadia Water, LLC:

Type of Contact	Date and Time	Message	Result
-----------------	---------------	---------	--------

		Telephone	12/11/2023 @ 11:44AM	Please Call Back	No Call Back
		Telephone	12/11/2023 @ 12:12PM	Description of Issue and to call	No Call Back
		Telephone	12/20/2023 @ 4:02PM	Description of Issue and to call	No Call Back
		Email	12/15/2023 @ 8:39 AM	Description of Issue and to Reply	No Reply
		Email	12/20/2023 @ 4:20 PM	Description of Issue and to Reply	No Reply
		Email	12/21/2023 @ 4:15 PM	Description of Issue and to Reply	No Reply
		Telephone	04/18/2024 @ 3:13PM	Description of Issue and to call	No Call Back
		Telephone	04/18/2024 @ 4:57PM	Description of Issue and to call	No Call Back
		<p>Therefore for over four (4) months, from December 11, 2023 to April 18, 2024, after making five (5) phone calls, and three (3) emails to Cascadia Water, LLC, William Foster had not received any response about service issues from Cascadia Water, LCC or it's manager Culley Lehman – General Manager, or his staff.</p> <p>Second Examples of Mr. Culley being in violation of WAC 480-236-3030 - AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION, Sec (5) is noted here:</p> <p>On December 12, 2024, with a 2nd follow-up request email on December 17, 2024 I contacted Mr. Culley Lehman Directly via his own email address at culley@cascadiawater.com</p> <p>On January 8, 2025 I received a telephone/voicemail response to my emailed question I sent to you on December 12, 2024 with a follow-up request email on December 17, 2024, some (27) days, one day shy of four (4) Weeks!. Lehman's response to Water Customer William Foster was (1) day shy of four (4) weeks, when the regulations require no more than two (2) weeks, and (2) weeks is a gracious plenty.</p> <p>Third Example of Mr. Culley being in violation of WAC 480-236-3030 - AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION, Sec (5) is noted here:</p> <p>On February 3, 2025 I sent Mr. Culley Lehman directly my DETAILED follow-up inquiry by email, asking for clarification to my inquiry that was not clear in his previous late telephone response voice message to me, on</p>			

January 8, 2025. As I was trying to give Mr. Lehman some time to work on other issues he may have, I waited to make my follow-up inquiry. As of today February 18, 2025, again I have not received a responses from Mr. Lehman, and the State Required two (2) week deadline was up yesterday, February 17, 2025. So again Mr. Lehman does NOT afford his Water User Customers, the "Best" service as he always claims to the UTC.

Mr. Culley Lehman talks about ensuring they give the "Best" customer service, yet we as Water User Customers have not seen it yet, and do not expect it in the future, even after possible Rate Increases and Socialist SINGLE TARIFF PRICING.

In my experience with Cascadia and Mr. Lehman, the disconnect between his public statements, over (27) times, that all his decisions and efforts are for the "best" service to his Water User Customers. At best this shows how inept Mr. Lehman and Cascadia Water, LLC have been at service to their customers. For Culley's statements on the record at the UTC Hearing about some of the most critical events as described in his testimony, Lehman's statements were disingenuous and not supported by the facts.

If Cascadia Water, LLC cannot even respond to a customer's inquires about service, not even one (1) time in four (4) months, one (1) time in four (4) weeks, or at another time - missed the two (2) week State Required Deadline, why would Cascade Water, LLC and Mr. Lehman deserve a 151% plus increase in rates, and the conversion of (17) water systems to SINGLE TARIFF PRICING?

As stated by Mr. Stefan de Villiers in his testimony on line 3, page 5, "On a per year basis, Cascadia's requested increase is larger than any other general rate case increase in the LAST DECADE".

Over and over, it again appears many of the statements made by Mr. Lehman, Cascadia Water, LLC, and their witnesses are best said to be "disingenuous" and are statements not supported by the facts.

This is just three (3) example of of why we do not support the Rate Increase, and SINGLE TARIFF PRICING, as proposed by Cascadia Water, LLC and UTC Staff.

Our demand is simply for Just, Fair, and Reasonable Rates.

Thank you,

Mr. and Mrs. William H. Foster

	William H. Foster, III	E-mail	<p>Dear Commission Members,</p> <p>My comments on how I do Not Support the request as filed by Cascadia Water, LLC for a water rate increase, for the following reasons.</p> <p>- It appears that the old “Pedersen Water” system here in Clallam County, Sequim, WA is just along for the ride to pay rate increase, with Cascadia Water, LLC asking for approval for an increase in rates of 75% - 85%, without any system improvements for the Pedersen Water system. For Cascadia Water, LLC did not install for Pedersen Water system stated improvements in the Cascadia Water, LLC IMPORTANT NOTICE Letter to all customers, like:</p> <p>a. Standby generators to minimize service disruptions due to power outages, none for Pedersen system.</p> <p>b. New submersible pumps, booster pumps, pressure tank, and control box in Water system well sites, “helping to ensure reliable water delivery to our customers” (as written by Cascadia in their ‘Purpose of General Rate Proceeding”, yet none for the Pedersen Water system.</p> <p>See Attached Letter for Full Copy of Comments Letter - Above is just page one (1) of four (4).</p> <p>William</p>
	YVONNE YOKOTA	Web	A rate increase of 65% has been proposed which is significant and no reasons have been supplied.
	Yvonne Yokota	Web	The amount of rate increase is a shock and the company has not been forthcoming with information as to why this is necessary.
	Yvonne Yokota	Web	unfair rate increases and lack of transparency