# COMMENT FORM FOR: BOB & JUDI COOK - ID# 25363

Consumer Info	rmation	<b>L</b>					
					Contact Meth	od • Email 🔾	Mail O None
Name	BOB &	JUDI COOK					
Organization Company					*		
		S CLEARVIEV EWICK WA		T OO220			
Zip Code	IXEI VI VI		STIMOTOR	N 99000			
Email	jrlcook	3b@gmail.cor	n				
Primary Phone #					Fax	<b>: #</b>	
Secondary Phone #							
Comment Infor	mation						
	Theme	man a series de la constante d			And the second section of the section of the second section of the second section of the second section of the section of the second section of the	Open Date 0	02/02/2011
Filing S	upport	○ Yes	<ul><li>No</li></ul>		Undecided	Closed Date	erita di kacamatan di Kabupatèn Kabupatèn Kabupatèn Kabupatèn Kabupatèn Kabupatèn Kabupatèn Kabupatèn Kabupatèn Kabupatèn Kabupatèn
	Source	○ Email ●	Mail O	Phone	○ Web	Web Create	
						Date	15815 *** 197 \$
Pubilc Invol		John Cupp					
Duplicate Cor	Lead	○ Yes ○ N					
						1 .1	
Pesc		Department	of Ecology I	Permit a	well is adequate t pproves this well	for up to 100 ho	mes.
					will unfairly impos		
		similar comn				nparable to thos	e accessed in other
						tain, LLC, and T	ri City Development
		Corporation	are register	ed as sh	aring "Affiliated Iı	nterest." Togeth	er, they represent the
		real estate de	evelopers of	Summi	t View neighborho	od . Therefore, t	here is an inherent
		cost enabling	the further	develo:	that we, the existing price of this area	ng nomeowners, for the profit of	, pay any part of the
							: View neighborhood .
		The develope	er proposes	that, in	addition to the cur	rrent hook up ch	arge of \$1,500, each
							e additional \$1,000 fee
		of the new w		than \$2	200,000 for the dev	eloper. This app	proaches the total cost
							nould pass on these
							uired to subsidize the
					n project. The burc ne real estate devel		an additional well
Attach	nments		2 Teoponoioi	, 01 11		oper,	

# COMMENT FORM FOR: BRIAN MASSEY - ID# 25333

Consumer Info	rmatior	1				
				Contact Me	ethod 🗣 Email	○ Mail ○ None
Name	BRIAN	I MASSEY				
Organization Company						
Address		GRANDVIEW LAN				
City, State,	KENN	EWICK WASHINGT	TON 99338			
Zip Code						
	granden er en 1900. Fig	1@clearwire.net		en e i mili a i inganasyana i i i	e trensmission in the control of	
Primary	509 628	3-9554			Fax #	
Phone #				e Synthesis siya karak karakta ay karak ay daga karak	en de la composition	en englestet i op i een met van septembergen van de sa
Secondary Phone #		·				
T HOLLE #						
Comment Info	rmation					
	Theme	Drastic Increase			Open Da	te 01/27/2011
Filing S	Support	○ Yes • N	o C	Undecided	Closed Da	daniel s
	Source	○ Email ○ Mail	• Phone	Web	Web Crea	te
					Da	te
Pubilc Invol	민준하다 회교 대학생들이	John Cupp				
	Lead					시간 1985년 6일 시간 중 1일 중 1일 1일 경험 주민들은 경우 기계를 받고 했다.
		○ Yes ● No				
Desc	ription	FORM LETTER - 1.	The current	well is adequat	te to supply the	existing homes . The
		Department of Ecolo 2. The proposed rate				
						hose accessed in other
		similar communities			1	
						d Tri City Development
		Corporation are regis	stered as sha	ring "Affiliate	d Interest ." Tog	ether, they represent the
						e, there is an inherent
		cost enabling the furt				ers, pay any part of the
						mit View neighborhood.
						charge of \$1,500, each
						The additional \$1,000 fee
			nore than \$2	00,000 for the o	developer. This	approaches the total cost
		of the new well.	o not agree t	hat Summit Vi	orer Maton Monte	o ob out it was a sure that
						s should pass on these required to subsidize the
						ng an additional well
		should be the respon				
Attacl	hments					

## COMMENT FORM FOR: BRIAN & SHERRY BUROWS **Consumer Information** Contact Method • Email O Mail O None Name BRIAN & SHERRY BUROWS Organization Company Address 15803 FAIRVIEW LOOP City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code Email burowsrus@pocketinet.com **Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # Comment Information Theme Open Date 02/03/2011 Filing Support O Yes • No Undecided Closed Date ○ Email • Mail ○ Phone ○ Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment O Yes O No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers . 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost

5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

Attachments

of the new well.

## **COMMENT FORM FOR: DAVID B. DARLING Consumer Information** Contact Method • Email O Mail O None Name DAVID B. DARLING Organization Company Address 16108 S FAIRVIEW LOOP City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code Email ddarling@att.net **Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support | O Yes O Undecided Closed Date Source ○ Email • Mail ○ Phone ○ Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ○ No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

Additional comments dated February 27:

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

Even though many of us submitted a "form" letter, the letter was very well written and described our concerns. The Summit View Water company is trying to make existing water users pay for their expansion into new areas they are developing for profit. We existing users should not have to pay more when the existing system was designed for our use and meets all of our needs. Neither should water irrigation charges be increased to a much higher uniform rate that makes both 5 acre lots and 1/2 acre lots pay the same

Attachments



#### **Issue Information**

Issue ID 500

Company Summit View Water Works, Llc

Filing 110107

Staff Amy White

#### **Activites For David B. Darling**

View: (vwComtActyEmbed)

## COMMENT FORM FOR: DON GIRVIN **Consumer Information** Contact Method • Email O Mail O None Name DON GIRVIN Organization Company Address 16504 S GRANDVIEW LN KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 City, State, Zip Code Email donkayak3@gmail.com **Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/09/2011 Filing Support O Yes **N**o Undecided Closed Date Source Email Mail Phone Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ○ No **Description** Form letter received Feb 7: FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood . Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers . 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the

real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

Additional comments, dated Feb 16:

February 16, 2011

Re: Commission docket UW-110107. More input on Redundancy offered by a proposed new well.

Dear Sirs,

During the Commission's February 10 open meeting regarding a new well in the Summit View development Jerry Wolf, president of the Summit View Home Owners Association, spoke to the redundancy issue and pointed out that any redundancy offered by the proposed new well was relatively 'short lived' . As a Summit View resident I am writing this note to the Commission to further elaborate our view on the 'short lived' nature of any redundancy the new well would provide to existing customers. The proposal of January 12, 2011 by Summit View Water Works (SVWW) is requesting that a Facilities Construction Surcharge of \$115,000 to be passed on to existing customers. I am one of those customers, along with many others, who are opposed to being ask to pay for half of a new well. In the January 12 proposal to the Commission SVWW's attorney stated that this new well would provide "increased reliability for existing customers". In a January 25, 2011 newsletter sent to existing customers and submitted to the Commission (commission website posting 1/24/2011) SVWW stated that "the development of a second well provides a redundant supply for the current residences. Clearly no redundancy exists once the customer count reaches 360, which is the maximum number of customers the existing and proposed new wells can support. But redundancy is gone long before 360 customers are being served. Consider the following: The maximum number of customers that the existing well and the proposed new well can provide are 100 and 260, respectively. Assume both wells supply the system and we start with 85 base customers, which is the number of current customers. Depending on the total number of customers being served at the time of a well failure, any redundancy would depend upon which well failed. For example, if the new well failed there would be no redundancy if more than 15 additional customers had been added to the base of 85 customers. If the old well failed there would be no redundancy if more than 175 additional customers had been added to the base of 85 customers. SVWW stated that from 2006 to 2010 they were adding 15 new customers per year (page 2 of Data Response 1). Based on customer data in the Table on page 1 in SVWW's Data Response 2 to the Commission, the average rate is 25 new customers per year from 2007 to the start of 2010. In 2010 and currently this rate is accelerating even more. So, using a figure of 25 customers per year any redundancy could vanish within a time frame of 7 months to 7 years (i.e., 16 customers/25 customers per year = 0.6 years or 7 months). Considering the lifespan of service these wells should provide and the lifespan of our homes the redundancy time frame is short lived.

In my view this short span of redundancy is hardly worth the \$115,000 (actually \$177,486 over 15 years) that SVWW is asking current customers to pay. Most current customers I have spoken with (63 to be exact) share this view. In addition, most feel that redundancy is a smoke screen by which SVWW is suggesting that existing customers are getting a "long lasting" benefit by paying for half of the new well. In fact any redundancy is short lived.

Thank you for your consideration.

Don Girvin

16504 S. Grandview Ln, Kennewick, WA 99338

# COMMENT FORM FOR: FRED DECORIA - ID# 25323

Organization Company	RED E	DECORIA		Contact M	ethod 🌑 En	nail 🔾 Mail 🔾 None
Organization Company	RED D	DECORIA				
Company						
A 11						
		GRANDVIEW LA EWICK WASHIN		338		
Email fs	sdecori	ia@yahoo.com				
Primary 50 Phone #	09 628	-3838			Fax #	
Secondary Phone #						Company of the Compan
Comment Inform	nation					
	heme	Drastic Increase			Oper	n Date 01/27/2011
Filing Sup	pport	○ Yes	No	$\bigcirc$ Undecided	Closed	l Date
So	ource	○ Email ● Mail	O Phor	ne O Web	Web (	Create Date
Pubilc Involve	ement Lead	John Cupp				
Duplicate Com	ment	○ Yes ● No				
Descri		Department of Ecc 2. The proposed ra existing customers similar communiti 3. Summit View W Corporation are re real estate develop conflict of interest cost enabling the fi 4. There are more to The developer pro new lot will be ass alone will generate of the new well. 5. In summary, we costs to existing ho	ology Permite surcharge. The current sin our area working istered as the requestion requestion and 200 loposes that, essed an action one agreement since do not agreeme the reservance of the reservance do not agreeme the reservance do not agreement the reservance do not agre	it approves this were will unfairly import water rates are rea.  Is, LLC, Candy Most sharing "Affiliate mit View neighborng that we, the exelopment of this are ts remaining to be in addition to the dditional \$1,000 For \$200,000 for the ree that Summit View Current resident	ell for up to pose a rate i comparable untain, LLC d Interest." rhood. There isting home rea for the properties Characteristics Characteristic	the existing homes. The 100 homes. ncrease of 15%-25% on to those accessed in other and Tri City Development Together, they represent the refore, there is an inherent owners, pay any part of the rofit of the developers. Summit View neighborhood. It is approaches the total cost vorks should pass on these the required to subsidize the ancing an additional well

## **COMMENT FORM FOR: GERALD WOLF Consumer Information** Contact Method Email Mail None Name GERALD WOLF Organization Company Address 16901 S GRANDVIEW LANE City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code Email jjwolf76@gmail.com Primary 509 627-5445 Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Drastic Increase Open Date 01/27/2011 Filing Support O Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source C Email Mail Phone Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ● No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well.

On 2/07/11, Mr called to further object to the proposed rates . Mr stated he hasn't yet

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

thought too much about the proposed rate increase on the irrigation rates. I told Mr that staff advised me that their intention is to request the filing be suspended at this week 's open meeting because staff has not yet completed their analysis of the company's information. Mr stated he may call in and voice his concerns during this week 's open meeting.

#### 2/10/11 8:20 am:

John Cupp called Mr. Wolf. He confirmed that he intends to call in this morning, and has signed in with the Records Center. I sent him via e-mail a copy of the staff memo so that he could read it and understand better what staff position is at this time.

#### Attachments



3923\_001.pdf

#### **Issue Information**

Issue ID 500

Company Summit View Water Works, Llc

Filing 110107

Staff Amy White

#### **Activites For Gerald Wolf**

View: (vwComtActyEmbed)

# COMMENT FORM FOR: <u>IOEL & ANDEE RAKER</u> - ID# 25327

Consumer Info	rmation					
				Contact M	<b>lethod</b>	● Email ○ Mail ○ None
Name	JOEL &	ANDEE R	AKER			
Organization Company						
Address	15103 S	GRANDV	IEW LANE			
City, State, Zip Code	KENN	EWICK W	ASHINGTON	99338		
Email	andeer	aker@yahoo	o.com			
Primary Phone #	509 628	3-2715	*		Fax #	
Secondary Phone #						
Comment Info	rmation					
		Drastic Inc	rease			Open Date 01/27/2011
Filing S	Support		No No	○ Undecided		Closed Date
111116			• Mail OP			Web Create
	bource	Cilitan	• Wan • I	none o web		Date
Pubilc Invol	lvement Lead	John Cupp	)			
Duplicate Co	mment	○ Yes ●	No			
Desc		Departmer 2. The proper existing cursimilar con 3. Summit Corporation real estate conflict of it cost enabling 4. There are The development lot will alone will go of the new 5. In summosts to eximple the exist of	nt of Ecology Personsed rate surch stomers. The cumunities in our View Water Word are registered developers of Sinterest in requiring the further of the more than 200 per proposes the generate more to well. Heary, we do not sting homeowy developer's expensed rate of the sting homeowy developer's expensed rate.	ermit approves this wharge will unfairly in arrent water rates are area.  Orks, LLC, Candy Medias sharing "Affiliate ummit View neighborsting that we, the extended are additional \$1,000 Feath and \$200,000 for the agree that Summit Viers. Current residen	vell for appose a compose	a rate increase of 15%-25% on arable to those accessed in other in, LLC, and Tri City Development rest." Together, they represent the Therefore, there is an inherent homeowners, pay any part of the the profit of the developers in the Summit View neighborhood in thook up charge of \$1,500, each is Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee oper. This approaches the total cost fater Works should pass on these ald not be required to subsidize the a of financing an additional well

## COMMENT FORM FOR: NANCY KELLY-GIRVIN - ID# 25397 Consumer Information Contact Method • Email O Mail O None Name NANCY KELLY-GIRVIN Organization Company Address City, State, Zip Code Email nancykg3@gmail.com Primary Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/07/2011 Filing Support O Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source • Email O Mail O Phone O Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment O Yes O No Description February 7, 2011 Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive, SW P.O. Box 47250 Olympia, WA Dear Ladies/Gentlemen: Subject: UTC Docket # UW-110107 – Implementation of a Facilities Construction Surcharge I am writing to you because Summit View Water Works and the developer (s) of this neighborhood, Candy Mountain, LLC and Tri-City Development Corporation are being greedy, dishonest and sneaky in their attempt to require current residents to cover some of their new real estate development costs! I have been a resident of the Summit View neighborhood here in Kennewick for more than four years and own one of the current, existing homes in this area. When I

purchased my lot, I paid a \$1500 hook-up charge for house water. I requested one of the smaller water lines so I pay \$40 each and every month plus additional charges each

month depending upon how much water I use.

I have lived in the Tri-Cities for almost 40 years and have owned homes in Richland, Pasco, Kennewick and West Richland so I have a reasonable knowledge of water prices in this area. Based on this knowledge, I consider the price I pay every month for house water in the Summit View neighborhood to be VERY HIGH! Now, the developer/water company (owned/operated by the same individuals) wants to increase my house water charge by 29%!!! They state this is to pay for an additional well for new lots they plan to sell and to provide more reliable water service to current residents. More reliable service? BALONEY! Any reasonable person can see what this developer/water company is trying to do. They want the current residents to bear the burden of their new overhead costs! This is unfair, greedy and dishonest!

I am writing to you to respectfully request that you give this matter very careful consideration when you review it on February 10th. I implore you to look at this from the resident's point of view. Summit View Water Works and the developer have attempted in the past to make residents bear the brunt of what should be the developer's costs. They are doing it again now and I have no doubt they will attempt to do it again in the future! I hope you can see through this blatant and self-serving attempt to defray their costs.....by putting these costs on the backs of residents who have already paid, and continue to pay, dearly for water!

Thank you for your efforts on our behalf.

Respectfully, Nancy Kelly-Girvin 16504 S. Grand View Lane Kennewick, WA 99338 509-521-1965 nancykg3@gmail.com

Form letter received Feb 7:

FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes.

- 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area.
- 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers.
- 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well.

5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

#### Attachments





February 7 comments: Scan001.PDF Additional comments receive Feb 9; 4022\_001.pdf

#### **Issue Information**

Issue ID 500

Company Summit View Water Works, Llc

Filing 110107

Staff Amy White

#### **Activites For Nancy Kelly-Girvin**

View: (vwComtActyEmbed)

onsumer Info	rmatioi				
			Contact Me	ethod (	● Email ○ Mail ○ None
Name	RAYT	ELLER			
Organization Company					
Address City, State, Zip Code					
Email	raytelle	er@gmail.com			
Primary Phone #				Fax#	e de la Maria de La Maria de La Carlo de La Maria de Maria de La Maria de La Maria de La Maria de La Maria de La composição de la Carlo de La Maria d
Secondary			Construenting of points in relief to one of the entry before the gr		n de la composition de la composition La composition de la
Phone #					
omment Infor	rmation				
	Theme				Open Date 01/31/2011
Filing S	upport	○ Yes • No	O Undecided	Closed Date	
	Source	Email O Mail O Pho	one O Web		Web Create
		ti. Marijani di kalendari di kalenda			Date
Pubilc Invol	vement Lead	John Cupp			
Duplicate Co	mment	○ Yes ○ No			
Desc	ription	Dear Sir			
		Regarding summit view wa	iter works request fo	r rate	increase, it is obvious to me that
		this increase is intended to additional residential home If allowed this increase wo this development.  This is unfair and I respectf	cover the costs of a ness that the rate increases uld mean that currer	ew we se req nt hom	ell for new juesters are developing themselves ne owners would be subsidizing
		this increase is intended to additional residential home If allowed this increase wo this development.	cover the costs of a ness that the rate increases uld mean that currer	ew we se req nt hom	ell for new juesters are developing themselves ne owners would be subsidizing
Attacl	nments	this increase is intended to additional residential home If allowed this increase wo this development.  This is unfair and I respectf	cover the costs of a ness that the rate increases uld mean that currer	ew we se req nt hom	ell for new uesters are developing themselve ne owners would be subsidizing
Attacl		this increase is intended to additional residential home If allowed this increase wo this development.  This is unfair and I respectf	cover the costs of a ness that the rate increases uld mean that currer	ew we se req nt hom	ell for new uesters are developing themselve ne owners would be subsidizing
sue Informați		this increase is intended to additional residential home If allowed this increase wo this development.  This is unfair and I respectf	cover the costs of a ness that the rate increases uld mean that currer	ew we se req nt hom	ell for new uesters are developing themselve ne owners would be subsidizing
sue Information	<b>on</b> 500	this increase is intended to additional residential home If allowed this increase wo this development.  This is unfair and I respectf	cover the costs of a ness that the rate increases uld mean that currer	ew we se req nt hom	ell for new uesters are developing themselve ne owners would be subsidizing
sue Information	on 500 Summi	this increase is intended to additional residential home If allowed this increase wo this development.  This is unfair and I respectf	cover the costs of a ness that the rate increases uld mean that currer	ew we se req nt hom	ell for new uesters are developing themselve ne owners would be subsidizing

**Activites For Ray Teller** 

# COMMENT FORM FOR: RAYMOND TELLER - ID# 25322

Consumer Info	rmation	1				
			Contact Method	l ● Email ○ Mail ○ None		
		IOND TELLER				
Organization Company						
	\$-	CLEAR VIEW LOOP EWICK WASHINGTON 993	38			
Email	raytelle	er@gmail.com				
Primary Phone #	509 619	9-1501	Fax #			
Secondary Phone #						
Comment Info	rmation					
	Theme	Drastic Increase		Open Date 01/27/2011		
Filing S	Support	○ Yes • No	O Undecided	Closed Date		
	Source	○ Email ● Mail ○ Phone	e 〇 Web	Web Create Date		
Pubilc Invol	lvement Lead	John Cupp				
Duplicate Co	mment	○ Yes ● No	H			
Desc		Department of Ecology Permit 2. The proposed rate surcharg existing customers. The currer similar communities in our ard 3. Summit View Water Works Corporation are registered as a real estate developers of Summit conflict of interest in requesting cost enabling the further devel 4. There are more than 200 lots The developer proposes that, in new lot will be assessed an adalone will generate more than of the new well.  5. In summary, we do not agree costs to existing homeowners.	t approves this well for a will unfairly impose in water rates are completed.  LLC, Candy Mountains and Maring "Affiliated Intention View neighborhoods that we, the existing dopment of this area for additional \$1,000 Faciliti \$200,000 for the development of the current residents shown project. The burder	a rate increase of 15%-25% on parable to those accessed in other in, LLC, and Tri City Development erest." Together, they represent the d. Therefore, there is an inherent homeowners, pay any part of the rather profit of the developers. in the Summit View neighborhood. Ent hook up charge of \$1,500, each es Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee oper. This approaches the total cost water Works should pass on these and not be required to subsidize the nof financing an additional well		
Attacl	nments		and the second control of the second control			

### **COMMENT FORM FOR: RYAN BENTLEY** - ID# 25261 **Consumer Information** Contact Method • Email O Mail O None Name RYAN BENTLEY Organization Company Address 15307 S. MOUNTAIN RIDGE CT. City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code Email bentley2gs@hotmail.com Primary 509-392-2515 Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 01/18/2011 Filing Support O Yes No Undecided Closed Date ○ Email ○ Mail Source O Phone • Web Web Create 01/14/2011 Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead **Duplicate Comment** O Yes O No Description If a new well is required to extend the growth of the community the new building sites should be responsible for higher rates. Existing homeowners should be "grandfathered" in to the current rate. An increase of 11.60 is a 25% rate hike. That to me is unheard of. I have not had any problems with well reliability pertaining to water service and therefor see that as an obsolete excuse for construction. Form letter received Feb 7: FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers . 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood.

The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee

alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well.

5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

#### Attachments



Scan001.PDF Attached Letter received Feb 7, 2011.

#### **Issue Information**

Issue ID 500

Company Summit View Water Works, Llc

Filing 110107

Staff Amy White

## **Activites For Ryan Bentley**

View: (vwComtActyEmbed)

## COMMENT FORM FOR: SANDRA ENGLISH - ID# 25265

Name SAI		Contact Method	● Email ○ Mail ○ None
Name SAI	NIDDA ENICITOTI		Eman O Man O None
	NDKA ENGLISH		
Organization Company			
그리 스타일 바다 바다 등하다 되다.	.01 S GRAND VIEW LANE NNEWICK WASHINGTON 99	338	
Email sler	nglish@owt.com		
Primary Phone #		Fax #	A de la constanta de la consta
Secondary Phone #			
Comment Informat	tion		
The	eme Drastic Increase		Open Date 01/18/2011
Filing Supp	oort O Yes • No	O Undecided	Closed Date
Sou	rce 🔾 Email 🔾 Mail 🔾 Pho	ne 🔾 Web	Web Create
	에 역할 및 기본 등 시설 - 대한 사람들 이 기본 - 기본 등		Date
	ead		
Duplicate Comm	ent ● Yes ○ No		
Descripti	Summit View Water Works 8428 W.Gage Blvd Kennewick, WA 99338 I am a current user of Summ water that is similar to the cl Kennewick rates address the services. I am not opposed to a reaso rate increase which is about Since there is only one well s well as a good back-up in ca current base rate by about 10 it will supply an emergency The notice did not explicitly	it View Water Works an narges for the City of Ke ir sewer costs or not. Conable rate change. I am 20-25% of the base charges of emergency needs. 3% (approximately \$5.00 back up service. guarantee the 2nd well talso did not explain hoought on line.	nd pay a base rate for a quantity of nnewick. I am not sure if Obviously - we do not utilize sewer concerned about the amount of the
Attachme		of my confinents.	energie en

## COMMENT FORM FOR: AARON & LEANN ANDERSON **Consumer Information** Contact Method Email Mail None Name AARON & LEANN ANDERSON Organization Company Address 13308 S GRANDVIEW LANE City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 32/11/2011 Filing Support O Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source C Email Mail Phone Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ○ No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

Attachments

# COMMENT FORM FOR: ALAN & SONYA NEWTON - ID# 25356

Consumer Info	rmation					
				Contact Me	thod ○ Email ● Mail ○ None	
Name Organization	No	& SONYA N	IEWTON			
Company						
Address	11617 (	GRANDVIEV	V LN			
City, State,	KENN	EWICK WA	SHINGTON 99	9338		
Zip Code						
Email				y mangampan garapan ng ng mga ng		
Primary Phone #					ax #	
Secondary Phone #						
Comment Info	rmation					
	Theme				Open Date 02/02/2011	
Filing S	Filing Support ○ Yes • No			O Undecided	Closed Date	
	Source	C Email	Mail O Pho	ne O Web	Web Create Date	
Pubilc Invo	lvement	John Cupp				
	Lead					
Duplicate Co	mment	○ Yes ○ N	Vo			
Desc		Department 2. The proportion cust similar comma. Summit V Corporation real estate deconflict of in cost enabling 4. There are The develop new lot will alone will ge of the new w 5. In summa costs to exist real estate deconflict of the costs to exist real estate deconflict of in cost enabling 4. There are alone will ge of the new w 5. In summa costs to exist real estate deconflict of the costs to exist real estate deconflict of the costs to exist real estate deconflict of the costs	of Ecology Permosed rate surchar comers. The current of the curren	nit approves this we rge will unfairly imprent water rates are carea.  It is, LLC, Candy Mouses sharing "Affiliated nmit View neighboring that we, the exist relopment of this are obts remaining to be standard to the care additional \$1,000 Facus \$200,000 for the decree that Summit Views. Current residents	e to supply the existing homes. The all for up to 100 homes. So a rate increase of 15%-25% on comparable to those accessed in other untain, LLC, and Tri City Development Interest." Together, they represent the shood. Therefore, there is an inherent sting homeowners, pay any part of the ea for the profit of the developers. Sold in the Summit View neighborhood. Current hook up charge of \$1,500, each cilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fees eveloper. This approaches the total cost ew Water Works should pass on these should not be required to subsidize the orden of financing an additional well yeloper.	
Attac	hments					

### COMMENT FORM FOR: ANDREW G WOEHLER Consumer Information Contact Method ○ Email ● Mail ○ None Name ANDREW G WOEHLER Organization Company Address 10309 GRANDVIEW LANE City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support Undecided ○ Yes No Closed Date ○ Email ● Mail ○ Phone ○ Web Source Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ○ No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well.

5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

Attachments

# COMMENT FORM FOR: BEN & LESLIE PEARSON - ID# 25321

Consumer Infor	mation				
			Contact M	ethod 🔾 Emai	l 🌢 Mail 🔘 None
Name 1	BEN &	LESLIE PEARSON			
Organization Company					
		S GRANDVIEW LANE EWICK WASHINGTON 99338	3		
Primary ! Phone #	509 628	3-2823		Fax #	
Secondary Phone #					
Comment Inform	nation				
	Theme	Drastic Increase	The state of the s	Open I	Date 01/27/2011
Filing Su	ipport	○ Yes • No (	○ Undecided	Closed I	Total Control of
S	Source	○ Email ● Mail ○ Phone	○ Web	Web Cr	eate Date
Pubile Involv	ement Lead	John Cupp			
Duplicate Con	nment	○ Yes ● No			
Descr		FORM LETTER - 1. The current Department of Ecology Permit at 2. The proposed rate surcharge existing customers. The current similar communities in our area 3. Summit View Water Works, Corporation are registered as shreal estate developers of Summit conflict of interest in requesting cost enabling the further developer. The developer proposes that, in new lot will be assessed an additione will generate more than \$ of the new well.  5. In summary, we do not agree costs to existing homeowners. Or real estate developer's expansion should be the responsibility of the summary of the summary of the responsibility of the summary of the su	approves this we will unfairly im water rates are to the control of the control o	ell for up to 10 pose a rate incomparable to comparable to	on homes. Trease of 15%-25% on those accessed in other and Tri City Development ogether, they represent the ore, there is an inherent yners, pay any part of the fit of the developers.  Inmit View neighborhood. up charge of \$1,500, each each the additional \$1,000 fee is approaches the total cost of the required to subsidize the
Attach	Calabanas ranga				

#### COMMENT FORM FOR: BETH MAXSON - ID# 25359 **Consumer Information** Contact Method ○ Email ● Mail ○ None Name BETH MAXSON Organization Company Address 11815 S GRANDVIEW LANE City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support O Yes Undecided No Closed Date Source C Email Mail Phone Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ○ No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers . 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

Attachments

## COMMENT FORM FOR: BONNIE WHITE - ID# 25385

Consumer Info	rmation				
				Contact N	Method ○ Email ● Mail ○ None
Name	BONN	IE WHITE			
Organization Company					
		S CLEARVIEW : EWICK WASH	•	99338	
Email					
Primary Phone #					Fax #
Secondary Phone #					
Comment Info	mation				
	Theme				Open Date 02/03/2011
Filing S	upport	○ Yes	<ul><li>No</li></ul>	O Undecided	Closed Date
	Source	○ Email ● N	Mail O P	hone O Web	Web Create Date
Pubilc Invol	vement Lead	John Cupp			
Duplicate Co	mment	○ Yes ○ No			
		Department of 2. The propose existing custom similar commu 3. Summit View Corporation ar real estate deve conflict of intercost enabling th 4. There are more than the developer new lot will be alone will gene of the new well 5. In summary, costs to existing real estate developer new lessage of the existing the state developer new lessage of the new well summary, costs to existing real estate developer new lessage of the existing real estate d	Ecology Ped rate surch ners. The continuities in our water Water Water water elopers of Strest in require further core than 20 proposes the assessed a crate more fil.	ermit approves this we harge will unfairly in arrent water rates are area. Orks, LLC, Candy Medias sharing "Affiliate sting that we, the endevelopment of this area to be a distingted by the additional \$1,000 February (1900), agree that Summit Viners. Current residents	tate to supply the existing homes. The well for up to 100 homes. Impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on the comparable to those accessed in other.  Idountain, LLC, and Tri City Development the development the Interest." Together, they represent the porhood. Therefore, there is an inherent existing homeowners, pay any part of the area for the profit of the developers. The sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The current hook up charge of \$1,500, each facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee to developer. This approaches the total cost. View Water Works should pass on these that should not be required to subsidize the burden of financing an additional well developer.
Attaci	hments				

### COMMENT FORM FOR: CHARLES HOUGHAN - ID# 25319 **Consumer Information** Contact Method ○ Email ● Mail ○ None Name CHARLES HOUGHAN Organization Company Address 9915 GRANDVIEW LANE City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email** Primary 360 621-7849 Fax # Phone # Secondary

rning support	O res	VO U	Undecided	Closed Date
Source	○ Email ● Mail	○ Phone ○	Web	Web Create Date
Pubilc Involvement Lead	John Cupp			
Duplicate Comment	○ Yes ● No			
	Department of Ecolo 2. The proposed rate existing customers. similar communities 3. Summit View Wa Corporation are regreal estate develope conflict of interest ir cost enabling the fur 4. There are more the	ogy Permit appers of surcharge will The current was in our area. Iter Works, LLC istered as sharing of Summit Was requesting the other development an 200 lots ren	proves this we all unfairly implater rates are confused. C, Candy Moung "Affiliated iew neighborlat we, the existent of this are naining to be s	e to supply the existing homes. The ell for up to 100 homes. So a rate increase of 15%-25% on comparable to those accessed in other untain, LLC, and Tri City Development I Interest." Together, they represent the shood. Therefore, there is an inherent sting homeowners, pay any part of the ea for the profit of the developers. Sold in the Summit View neighborhood current hook up charge of \$1,500, each

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost

5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

Open Date 01/27/2011

Attachments

Phone #

**Comment Information** 

Theme Drastic Increase

of the new well.

## COMMENT FORM FOR: CINDY PACHECO Consumer Information Contact Method O Email Mail O None Name CINDY PACHECO Organization Company Address 17538 FAIRVIEW LOOP City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/03/2011 Filing Support O Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source C Email Mail Phone Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ○ No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes . The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost

5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

Attachments

of the new well.

### **COMMENT FORM FOR: COURTNEY HESLA** Consumer Information Contact Method ○ Email ● Mail Name COURTNEY HESLA Organization Company Address 11616 S. GRANDVIEW LANE City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support O Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source C Email Mail Phone Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead **Duplicate Comment** O Yes O No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the

real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

Attachments

### COMMENT FORM FOR: DAN RECORD Consumer Information Contact Method O Email Mail O None Name DAN RECORD Organization Company Address 15617 S CLEAR VIEW LOOP City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email** Primary 509-308-1278 Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # Comment Information Theme Drastic Increase Open Date 01/27/2011 Filing Support O Yes **)** No Undecided Closed Date Source C Email Mail Phone Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ● No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers . 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

Attachments

#### COMMENT FORM FOR: DAN TANO - ID# 25374 **Consumer Information** Contact Method Email Mail O None Name DAN TANO Organization Company Address 15705 S MOUNTAIN RIDGE CT City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support | O Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source C Email Mail Phone Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead **Duplicate Comment** O Yes O No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer. Attachments

# COMMENT FORM FOR: DAN & TAMMY ELKINS - ID# 25379

Consumer Inform	mation							
					Contact M	lethod	○ Email ● Mail ○ None	
Name I	DAN &	TAMMY	ELKINS					
Organization Company								
		S CLEAR VIEW LOOP NEWICK WASHINGTON 99338						
Email								
Primary Phone #		Fax #						
Secondary Phone #								
Comment Inform	nation							
Т	heme		anna danadasa dan 11 Sana.	agentaria de la composition de la comp	or the term of the section of the se		Open Date 02/03/2011	
Filing Su	pport	○ Yes	<ul><li>No</li></ul>		Undecided		Closed Date	
S	ource	○ Email ● Mail ○ Phone ○ Web		Web		Web Create Date		
Pubilc Involv	ement Lead	John Cup	0					
Duplicate Com	nment	○ Yes ○	No					
Descri		Department 2. The proper existing cursimilar cor 3. Summit Corporation real estate conflict of cost enablid 4. There are The develonew lot will alone will of the new 5. In summit costs to extreal estate	ot of Ecology cosed rate si stomers. The munities in View Water on are registe developers interest in re- ing the furth e more than oper propose generate mo- well. hary, we do isting homes developer's	y Permit apurcharge we current was our area. Works, Lered as shaped as constituting the er develop 200 lots read an additure than \$2 mot agree towners. Cuexpansion	pproves this world unfairly invater rates are  LC, Candy Moring "Affiliate View neighborhat we, the expension of this are  addition to the ional \$1,000 F  00,000 for the hat Summit Varrent residen	vell for appose a compountained Interpreted interpreted in the control of the current development develop	upply the existing homes. The up to 100 homes. The up to 100 homes. The arate increase of 15%-25% on arable to those accessed in other on, LLC, and Tri City Development trest." Together, they represent the laterative and the existing and the ex	
Attachi	ments						The state of the s	

### COMMENT FORM FOR: <u>DAVID & ANGIE CAUDILL</u> **Consumer Information** Contact Method O Email Mail O None Name DAVID & ANGIE CAUDILL Organization Company Address 14907 CLEARVIEW LOOP City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support O Yes **)** No Undecided Closed Date Source O Email Mail O Phone O Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment O Yes O No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes . The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these

costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

Attachments

## COMMENT FORM FOR: DAVID & LISA WIGHT - ID# 25371

Consumer Inform	mation					V. Francisco				and the second s
					Cont	act Met	hod C	Email	Mail	○ None
Name I	DAVID	& LISA W	<b>IGHT</b>							
Organization Company										
Address 1 City, State, I Zip Code		GRAND V EWICK W			38					
Email							**. *			
Primary Phone #						F	ax#			and the state of t
Secondary Phone #										
Comment Inform	nation									
1	heme						(	Open Da	te 02/02,	/2011
Filing Su	pport	○ Yes	● No		O Undecid	ded	C	osed Da	te	
Source ○ Email ● Mail ○ Pho				O Phone	e O Web		Web Create Date			
Pubilc Involv	ement Lead	John Cup	p							
Duplicate Com	ıment	○ Yes ○	No							
		Departmen 2. The propersisting cursimilar cor 3. Summit Corporation real estate conflict of cost enabli 4. There are The develonew lot will alone will of the new 5. In summit costs to extreal estate	nt of Ecology posed rate so stomers. The munities if View Wate on are regist developers interest in reng the furth e more than oper propose Il be assesse generate m well. hary, we do developer's	by Permi surcharg the current in our arear Works tered as tof Sumi requestir ther deve in 200 lot ses that, ed an add ore than	t approves to the will unfair the will unfair the water rate eat.  LLC, Cand sharing "Afmit View neing that we, to lopment of the same remaining in additional \$1,0000 for the water that Summer to the water that Summer to the water that Summer to will unfair the water that Summer to will unfair the water that Summer the water that Summer the water that Summer the water that Summer that Su	his well rly imples are consisted ighborh the exist this are to be so to the consisted ight of the consistent of the con	Il for u ose a roompar ntain, Intere- nood. ting he a for to old in current cilities evelop w Wat should rden o	p to 100 rate increased to the LLC, and the second the profit the Sum thook up Charge. This ter Work I not be of financial to the second the se	homes.  d Tri Cit gether, the ers, pay of the d mit View charge The add approace as should required	ressed in other ty Development ney represent the is an inherent any part of the
Attachi	ments									

#### COMMENT FORM FOR: <u>DEBORAH TAYLOR</u> - ID# 25367 **Consumer Information** Contact Method O Email Mail O None Name DEBORAH TAYLOR Organization Company Address 15618 S MOUNTAIN RIDGE CT City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code Email taylordeborah21@yahoo.com **Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support ○ Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source ○ Email ● Mail ○ Phone ○ Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment $\bigcirc$ Yes $\bigcirc$ No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers . 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer. Attachments

# COMMENT FORM FOR: DON & LISA WASHBURN - ID# 25372

Consumer Info	rmatior										
					Contact	Method	○ Email ● Mail ○ None				
Name	DON 8	LISA WAS	SHBURN	I							
Organization Company											
Address City, State, Zip Code	1	111 GRANDVIEW LANE NNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338									
Email		•									
Primary Phone #					Fax #	The transfer of the transfer o					
Secondary Phone #											
Comment Infor	rmation										
	Theme		e se como e antico facilio cada		il com dia lan alpedition late		Open Date 02/02/2011				
Filing Support		○ Yes • No			O Undecided		Closed Date				
Source		○ Email ● Mail ○ Phone ○ Web					Web Create Date				
Pubilc Involvement Lead		John Cupp					47 m 1				
Duplicate Co	mment	○ Yes ○	No								
Desc.		Department 2. The properties of the new 5. In summ costs to exist real estate of the n	at of Ecoloposed rate stomers. In the work was a region of the function of the function of the function of the per proper of the assessence of the function of the desire	ogy Permire surcharg The currers in our are ter Works istered as a rs of Summarther develoan 200 lots oses that, it ssed an admore than do not agre neowners. r's expansi	t approves this e will unfairly at water rates a ea.  , LLC, Candy I sharing "Affilianit View neighing that we, the lopment of this remaining to in addition to t ditional \$1,000 \$200,000 for the ethat Summit Current reside	well for impose are compose wisting area for be sold the curre are developments should be the curre are developments should be burder	supply the existing homes. The rup to 100 homes. a rate increase of 15%-25% on parable to those accessed in other on, LLC, and Tri City Development erest." Together, they represent the d. Therefore, there is an inherent homeowners, pay any part of the ruthe profit of the developers. In the Summit View neighborhood. In the Summit View neighborhood. In the hook up charge of \$1,500, each less Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee toper. This approaches the total cost vater Works should pass on these and not be required to subsidize the not financing an additional well per.				

### COMMENT FORM FOR: EARLINE M. PATTILLO - ID# 25354 Consumer Information Contact Method O Email Mail O None Name EARLINE M. PATTILLO Organization Company Address 16107 S FAIRVIEW LOOP City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support | O Yes Undecided • No Closed Date Source C Email Mail Phone Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead **Duplicate Comment** ○ Yes ○ No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

Attachments

# COMMENT FORM FOR: EDWARD KAUER - ID# 25324

Consumer Info	rmation	q		
			Contact Me	ethod○ Email ● Mail ○ None
	Daniel Control	ARD KAUER		
Organization Company				
트로 보고 그림 중단하다 봤다면하다니다.		GRANDVIEW LANE EWICK WASHINGTON 99338		
Email				
Primary Phone #	509 374	1-3970		Fax #
Secondary Phone #				
Comment Infor	mation			
	Theme	Drastic Increase		Open Date 01/27/2011
Filing S	upport	○ Yes • No ○	Undecided	Closed Date
	Source	○ Email ● Mail ○ Phone ○	Web	Web Create
				Date
Pubilc Invol		John Cupp		
Duplicate Co	Lead	○ Yes ● No		
	- the professional design and a first professional and the color		wall is adaguet	
		Department of Ecology Permit ap 2. The proposed rate surcharge wexisting customers. The current we similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, Li Corporation are registered as shareal estate developers of Summit conflict of interest in requesting to cost enabling the further develop 4. There are more than 200 lots reached the cost of the lot will be assessed an additional alone will generate more than \$20 of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree to costs to existing homeowners. Current was summary and contains the costs of the summary.	pproves this we will unfairly imported the provest this water rates are of the control of the provest that we, the existence of this are addition to the control of the con	pose a rate increase of 15%-25% on comparable to those accessed in other untain, LLC, and Tri City Development d Interest." Together, they represent the thood. Therefore, there is an inherent sting homeowners, pay any part of the ea for the profit of the developers. sold in the Summit View neighborhood. current hook up charge of \$1,500, each cilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee developer. This approaches the total cost ew Water Works should pass on these is should not be required to subsidize the urden of financing an additional well

#### **COMMENT FORM FOR: ELINOR WOEHLER** ID# 25365 **Consumer Information** Contact Method O Email Mail O None Name **ELINOR WOEHLER** Organization Company Address 10309 GRANDVIEW LN City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support | O Yes No Undecided **Closed Date** Source ○ Email • Mail ○ Phone ○ Web Web Create **Date** Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead **Duplicate Comment** O Yes O No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

#### **COMMENT FORM FOR: FRED SWINDLER** - ID# 25351 **Consumer Information** Contact Method ○ Email ● Mail ○ None Name FRED SWINDLER Organization Company Address 16601 S GRANDVIEW LN City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support O Yes **)** No Undecided Closed Date Source ○ Email ● Mail ○ Phone ○ Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ○ No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

## COMMENT FORM FOR: GARY ALBERT - ID# 25401

Consumer Info	rmation		and of the second secon					And the second s
				Co	ntact Met	hod O Email	<ul><li>Mail</li></ul>	O None
Name	GARY	ALBERT		n too oo oo At o Hoe Kilpendo ya garanjii oli isto	palamete la aguar su guta su la accidi a accidi d	Market Audit		
Organization Company								
City, State, Zip Code		GRANDVIEW EWICK WASH		99338				
Email				1 11 VS V, satisfy amountain				The state of the s
Primary Phone #					Fa	ıx #		
Secondary Phone #								
Comment Info	rmation							
	Theme					Open Da	ate 02/09/2	2011
Filing S	upport	○ Yes	No	○ Unde	ecided	Closed Da	transferring of the	
	Source	○ Email ● N	Mail O Ph	none 🔾 Web	) 	Web Crea	ite ite	
Pubilc Invol	lvement Lead	John Cupp						
Duplicate Co		○ Yes ○ No	*					
		Form letter red	ceived Feb 7	' <b>:</b>	!			ut med line Min est talig talify
		Corporation ar real estate development of intercost enabling the 4. There are more than the developer new lot will be alone will generof the new well	Ecology Period rate surchaners. The curtimities in our water Worker eregistered elopers of Surest in requeste further deproposes that assessed an erate more that I.	rmit approve arge will und rrent water r r area. orks, LLC, Ca as sharing " ammit View esting that we evelopment of lots remaini at, in additional st ann \$200,000	es this well fairly important and Mourant Affiliated neighborher, the exist of this are not the control of the control of the control of the definition of t	I for up to 100 ose a rate incremparable to a natain, LLC, ar Interest." Togewood. Thereforting homeown a for the profit old in the Sunurrent hook untilities Charge. Eveloper. This	homes.  ease of 15 chose acce  ad Tri City gether, there iners, pay t of the de amit View p charge The addi approach	5%-25% on essed in other by Development ey represent the san inherent any part of the evelopers. The reighborhood of \$1,500, each itional \$1,000 feenes the total cost
		5. In summary, costs to existing real estate developments the real estate developments about the real estate.	g homeowne eloper's expa	ers. Current ansion projec	residents ct. The bu	should not be rden of financ	required	to subsidize the

#### **COMMENT FORM FOR: GREGORY PIPER** - ID# 25336 **Consumer Information** Contact Method O Email Mail O None Name GREGORY PIPER Organization Company Address 15313 S CLEAR VIEW LOOP City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email** Primary 208-691-3467 Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # Comment Information Theme Drastic Increase Open Date 01/27/2011 Filing Support \( \cap \) Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source 🔘 Email 🌘 Mail 🔝 Phone 🔾 Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment Yes No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost

5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

Attachments

of the new well.

#### COMMENT FORM FOR: <u>IAMES BLOUNT</u> - ID# 25313 Consumer Information Contact Method C Email Mail O None Name JAMES BLOUNT Organization Company Address 12409 GRANDVIEW LANE City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email** Primary 509 942-9602 Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # Comment Information Theme Drastic Increase Open Date 01/27/2011 Filing Support \( \cap \) Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source C Email Mail Phone Web Web Create **Date** Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ● No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers . 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer .

#### **COMMENT FORM FOR: JAMES IRELAND** - ID# 25334 **Consumer Information** Contact Method ○ Email ● Mail ○ None Name JAMES IRELAND Organization Company Address 16025 SOUTH CLEAR VIEW LOOP City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email** Primary 509-542-6406 Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Drastic Increase Open Date 01/27/2011 Filing Support No Undecided Closed Date Source O Email Mail O Phone O Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead **Duplicate Comment** 🔾 Yes 🌑 No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

#### **COMMENT FORM FOR: JAMES MCALOON** - ID# 25357 **Consumer Information** Contact Method ○ Email ● Mail O None JAMES MCALOON Organization Company Address 15206 S MOUNTAIN RIDGE CT City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone# **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support O Yes No O Undecided Closed Date Source C Email Mail O Phone O Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead **Duplicate Comment** O Yes O No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

#### COMMENT FORM FOR: <u>IASON M. DAVIS</u> - ID# 25373 **Consumer Information** Contact Method ○ Email ● Mail ○ None Name JASON M. DAVIS Organization Company Address 9505 S GRANDVIEW LN City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support Undecided No Closed Date Source C Email Mail O Phone O Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead **Duplicate Comment** ○ Yes ○ No Description | FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

#### COMMENT FORM FOR: **IEREMY EDER** - ID# 25339 **Consumer Information** Contact Method C Email Mail Name JEREMY EDER Organization Company Address 17102 S GRANDVIEW LANE City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email** Primary 509-628-1520 Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Drastic Increase Open Date 01/27/2011 Filing Support | O Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source C Email Mail Phone Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp. Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes **●** No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

#### COMMENT FORM FOR: <u>IOE TURNER</u> - ID# 25355 Consumer Information Contact Method ○ Email ● Mail ○ None Name JOE TURNER Organization Company 15308 MOUNTAIN RIDGE CT Address City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # Comment Information Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support ○ Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source C Email Mail Phone Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead **Duplicate Comment** ○ Yes ○ No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers . 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

### COMMENT FORM FOR: JOHN D. PHILLIPS - ID# 25263 **Consumer Information** Contact Method O Email Mail O None Name JOHN D. PHILLIPS Organization Company Address 15211 S. CLEAR VIEW LOOP City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code Email rjor2055@msn.com Primary 509.627-5492 Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 01/18/2011 Filing Support O Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source O Email O Mail O Phone Web Web Create 01/12/2011 Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ● No Description When we initially built our home in 2007 we were informed by the builder and realator that the water rates were high compared to surrounding areas (20% - 25%) but would be reduced as additional homes were added to the grid in our subdivision . Since 2007 the area has doubled the number of homes and the rates have not gone down. The surcharge Summit View Water Works is requesting represents a 25% increase to the existing customers to pay for an additional well they say is needed for future customers that may or may not materialize. This is a cost that should be borne by the developer and passed on to the users of the new system and not customers of the existing system. We have nothing to gain from a new well that will service future customers in other subdivision. Attachments **Issue Information** Issue ID 500 Company Summit View Water Works, Llc Filing 110107 Staff Amy White

Activites For John D. Phillips

#### COMMENT FORM FOR: JOHN MICHEL - ID# 25340 **Consumer Information** Contact Method O Email Mail O None Name JOHN MICHEL Organization Company Address 17002 S GRANDVIEW LANE KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 City, State, Zip Code **Email** Primary 509-627-0500 Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # Comment Information Theme Drastic Increase Open Date 01/27/2011 Filing Support | O Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source 🔘 Email 🌑 Mail 🔘 Phone 🔾 Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ● No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

# COMMENT FORM FOR: <u>IOSH PFENNING</u> - ID# 25395

Consumer Info	rmatior	1					
					Contact M	<b>l</b> ethod	○ Email ● Mail ○ None
Name	JOSH I	PFENNING			e esta will be a superior of		
Organization Company							
The second secon	RAND	VIEW LAN	E		en er e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e		
City, State,	KENN	EWICK W	ASHINGT	ON 99338			
Zip Code		was a second					
Email	E00 200	2556				T 4	en de la composição de la Composição de la composição de la composiç
Primary. Phone #	309 308	5-3006				Fax #	
Secondary							
Phone #							
Comment Info	rmation						
Comment mio	Theme						Open Date 02/07/2011
Filing S		○ Yes	• N	o (	Undecided		Closed Date
		O Email				الانتشاع الروايات الله الله	Web Create
							Date
Pubilc Invol		John Cupp	)				
Duplicate Co	Lead	O Vas 🗪	No			- 100	
		f manager of the		The current	well is adoque	ato to s	upply the existing homes . The
	PO	1			_		up to 100 homes.
							a rate increase of 15%-25% on
		Į –				e comp	arable to those accessed in other
		t-		in our area er Works I		ountai	n, LLC, and Tri City Development
							rest." Together, they represent the
		real estate	developer	s of Summit	View neighbo	orhood	l. Therefore, there is an inherent
							homeowners, pay any part of the
			_				the profit of the developers . in the Summit View neighborhood .
		P.					nt hook up charge of \$1,500, each
		new lot wi	ll be assess	sed an addit	tional \$1,000 F	acilitie	es Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee
				ore than \$2	200,000 for the	develo	oper. This approaches the total cost
		of the new 5. In summ		o not agree	that Summit V	liew W	ater Works should pass on these
							ald not be required to subsidize the
		real estate	developer'	s expansion	n project. The	burder	n of financing an additional well
		§-	_	-	ne real estate d	-	
		Also an ad	aitional le	tter disputii	ng the propose	ed irrig	ation water rate increase.

#### COMMENT FORM FOR: **IOSIE MICHEL** Consumer Information Contact Method O Email Mail O None Name JOSIE MICHEL Organization Company Address 15004 S MOUNTAIN RIDGE CT City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support $|\bigcirc$ Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source C Email Mail Phone Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ○ No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers . 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these

costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

#### COMMENT FORM FOR: J.J. & RENE' LANE - ID# 25368 Consumer Information Contact Method ○ Email ● Mail ○ None Name J.J. & RENE' LANE Organization Company Address 83611 SUMMITVIEW DR City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code Email **Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support ○ Yes **D** No Undecided Closed Date Source ○ Email ● Mail ○ Phone ○ Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ○ No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer. Attachments

#### COMMENT FORM FOR: KEITH SEXTON - ID# 25383 **Consumer Information** Contact Method ○ Email ● Mail Name KEITH SEXTON Organization Company Address 15003 MOUNTAIN RIDGE CT City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/03/2011 Filing Support O Yes Undecided Closed Date ○ Email ● Mail ○ Phone ○ Web Source Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ○ No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers . 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each

new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost

5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

Attachments

of the new well.

## COMMENT FORM FOR: KEN WALKER - ID# 25521

Consumer Info	rmation						
					Contac	t Methoc	l ○ Email ● Mail ○ None
Name	KEN W	ALKER					
Organization Company							
		S. MOUNTAI EWICK WA			338		
Email							
Primary Phone #						Fax #	
Secondary Phone #							
Comment Info	rmation						
	Theme						Open Date 02/24/2011
Filing S	upport	○ Yes	• N	Jo	O Undecide	ed .	Closed Date
	Source	○ Email ●	Mail	O Phon	ie 🔾 Web	1.0	Web Create
		ı					Date
Pubilc Invol	lvement	John Cupp					
	Lead						
Duplicate Co	mment	$\bigcirc$ Yes $\bigcirc$ N	lo .				
Desc	ription	FORM LET	ΓER - 1.	The curre	ent well is ade	quate to	supply the existing homes. The
		Department	of Ecolo	ogy Perm	it approves thi	is well fo	r up to 100 homes.
	The second of the second of					_	a rate increase of 15%-25% on
						are comp	parable to those accessed in other
	[대유화문 다리다]	similar comr				Maranta	in IIC - IT'C' D
							in, LLC, and Tri City Development erest." Together, they represent the
	ACCURAGE TO LOOK INCOME.				_		d. Therefore, there is an inherent
							g homeowners, pay any part of the
							or the profit of the developers .
							in the Summit View neighborhood .
							ent hook up charge of \$1,500, each
							es Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee
		of the new w		nore thar	1 \$200,000 for	tne aeve	loper. This approaches the total cost
				lo not agr	ee that Summ	it View V	Vater Works should pass on these
							ould not be required to subsidize the
							en of financing an additional well
					of the real estat		-
Λttad	hmonte						<del>eren</del> er en er en generalen er i 1800 en

## COMMENT FORM FOR: LEE SCHMITT - ID# 25314

<b>Consumer Info</b>	rmation					
				Contact Mel	thod O Email 🌘	Mail O None
Name	LEE SC	HMITT				
Organization Company						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			TEW LANE ASHINGTON 9	9338		
Email				and the second s		
Primary Phone #	509 727	-0983		F.	ax #	
Secondary Phone #						
Comment Infor	mation					
	Theme	Drastic Inc	crease		Open Date (	01/27/2011
Filing S	upport	O Yes	● No	O Undecided	Closed Date	
Source ○ Email ● Mail ○		● Mail ○ Ph	one O Web	Web Create Date		
Pubilc Invol	vement Lead	John Cupp	)			
Duplicate Co	mment	○ Yes ●	No			
Desc		Departmer 2. The propersion of the new soft the new soft to eximal propersion of the new soft th	nt of Ecology Per cosed rate surcha stomers. The cur nmunities in our View Water Wor on are registered developers of Su interest in reques ng the further de e more than 200 oper proposes tha ll be assessed an generate more the well. hary, we do not a sting homeowned	ks, LLC, Candy Mou as sharing "Affiliated mmit View neighborl sting that we, the exist evelopment of this are lots remaining to be s at, in addition to the c additional \$1,000 Fac an \$200,000 for the de	Il for up to 100 horose a rate increase omparable to those antain, LLC, and To Interest." Togeth hood. Therefore, the fining homeowners are for the profit of sold in the Summi current hook up checilities Charge. The eveloper. This apparament was a should not be requireden of financing	omes. The of 15%-25% on see accessed in other The City Development there, they represent the there is an inherent the developers. The developers of the the developers of \$1,500, each the additional \$1,000 fee proaches the total cost thould pass on these quired to subsidize the
Attacl	nments		-			

#### COMMENT FORM FOR: MALON COWGILL - ID# 25394 **Consumer Information** Contact Method O Email Mail Name MALON COWGILL Organization Company Address 16620 FAIRVIEW LOOP City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email** Primary 509 727-4904 Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # Comment Information Theme Open Date 02/07/2011 Filing Support O Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source O Email Mail O Phone O Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes • No FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Description Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well.

5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

#### **COMMENT FORM FOR: MARK SKIFFINGTON** - ID# 25358 **Consumer Information** Contact Method ○ Email ● Mail ○ None Name MARK SKIFFINGTON Organization Company Address 13003 GRANDVIEW RD KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 City, State, Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support ○ Yes **N**o Undecided Closed Date ○ Email ● Mail ○ Phone ○ Web Source Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ○ No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost

5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

Attachments

of the new well.

## COMMENT FORM FOR: MELODIE HEATH - ID# 25366

Consumer Info	rmation					
				Contact Mo	ethod	○ Email ● Mail ○ None
Name	MELOI	DIE HEATI	H			
Organization Company						
Address City, State, Zip Code		SUMMIT V EWICK W	IEW DR ASHINGTON 993	38		
Email						
Primary Phone #			•		Fax #	
Secondary Phone #						
Comment Infor	rmation					
	Theme	and the state of the same of t				Open Date 02/02/2011
Filing S	upport	○ Yes	<ul><li>No</li></ul>	O Undecided	A come of come	Closed Date
	Source		● Mail ○ Phone	e 〇 Web		Web Create
				•		Date
Pubilc Invol	lvement	John Cup	ρ			
	Lead					
Duplicate Co	mment	○ Yes ○	No			
Desc	ription	Department 2. The proper existing cursimilar cor 3. Summit Corporation real estate conflict of cost enablid 4. There are The develonew lot will alone will of the new 5. In summit costs to extreal estate	nt of Ecology Permit posed rate surcharg stomers. The current munities in our ar View Water Works on are registered as developers of Suminterest in requesting the further developer proposes that, all be assessed an adgenerate more than well.  The possibility was a possible of the proposes of the proposes that, and generate more than well.  The possibility was do not agressiting homeowners.	t approves this we will unfairly import water rates are ea.  , LLC, Candy Mosharing "Affiliate mit View neighbourg that we, the explopment of this are remaining to be in additional \$1,000 Feb \$200,000 for the eathat Summit View that Summit View Current resident ion project. The best will unfail with the eathat Summit View Current resident ion project. The best water wat	ell for pose a compountained Interpolation of the control of the c	a rate increase of 15%-25% on parable to those accessed in other on, LLC, and Tri City Development erest." Together, they represent the d. Therefore, there is an inherent homeowners, pay any part of the rathe profit of the developers. in the Summit View neighborhood. In thook up charge of \$1,500, each es Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee oper. This approaches the total cost vater Works should pass on these ald not be required to subsidize the nof financing an additional well
Attac	hments					

## COMMENT FORM FOR: MICHAEL CLARK - ID# 25317

Consumer Info	rmatior								
				Contact M	ethod 🔾 I	Email • Mail O None			
Name	MICHA	AEL CLARI	X						
Organization Company									
			IEW LANE ASHINGTON	99338					
Email									
Primary Phone #	509 628	3-8787			Fax #				
Secondary Phone #									
Comment Infor	mation								
	Theme	Drastic Inc	crease	en en der er en men er kommente Entwere militarie en kommente Entwere en kommente en en kommente en en en en e	Ор	en Date 01/27/2011			
Filing S	Filing Support $\bigcirc$ Yes $lacktriangle$ No			O Undecided	Clos	ed Date			
	Source	O Email	● Mail ○ P	hone O Web .	Wel	Create Date			
Pubilc Invol	vement Lead	John Cupp	) )						
Duplicate Co		○ Yes ●	No						
Desc	ription	Departmer 2. The propexisting custing custing custing custing custing and a summit Corporation real estate conflict of a cost enabling. The development of the new lot will alone will gof the new 5. In summicosts to eximal estate of the properties of the costs to eximal estate of the properties of the costs to eximal estate of the properties of the costs to eximal estate of the properties of the properties of the costs to eximal estate of the properties of th	nt of Ecology Personsed rate surch stomers. The cumunities in our View Water Word are registered developers of Sinterest in requiring the further of the more than 200 per proposes the generate more to well. He was a second and the developer's expended on the sting homeowed developer's expended on the proposes of the second of the proposes o	ermit approves this warge will unfairly in arrent water rates are area.  Orks, LLC, Candy Mod as sharing "Affiliate ummit View neighborsting that we, the explevelopment of this a lots remaining to be nat, in addition to the nadditional \$1,000 F than \$200,000 for the agree that Summit Viers. Current resident	rell for up of apose a rate comparable ountain, LI ed Interest or hood. The isting home rea for the exold in the current heacilities Chacilities Chaci	ly the existing homes. The to 100 homes. The increase of 15%-25% on alle to those accessed in other  "C, and Tri City Development." Together, they represent the acrefore, there is an inherent neowners, pay any part of the profit of the developers.  E Summit View neighborhood.  This approaches the total cost.  Works should pass on these act be required to subsidize the financing an additional well.			
Attacl	nments	Divaid De (	re responsibility	iy of the real estate di	eveloper.				

#### COMMENT FORM FOR: MICHELLE HERRIN - ID# 25335 **Consumer Information** Contact Method O Email Mail O None Name MICHELLE HERRIN Organization Company Address 16806 S GRANDVIEW LANE City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email** Primary 509-628-1165 Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # Comment Information Theme Drastic Increase Open Date 01/27/2011 Filing Support ○ Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source C Email Mail Phone Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ● No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers . 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer. Attachments

#### **COMMENT FORM FOR: PAM KIRKPATRICK Consumer Information** Contact Method O Email Mail O None Name PAM KIRKPATRICK Organization Company Address 16722 FAIRVIEW LOOP City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support O Yes **N**o Undecided Closed Date Source ○ Email • Mail · ○ Phone ○ Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ○ No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

#### COMMENT FORM FOR: PAUL SANTILLIE - ID# 25316 Consumer Information Contact Method ○ Email ● Mail ○ None Name PAUL SANTILLIE Organization Company Address 15604 GRANDVIEW LANE City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code Email Primary 509 627-2303 Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Drastic Increase Open Date 01/27/2011 Filing Support | O Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source ○ Email ● Mail ○ Phone ○ Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ● No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood . Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood . The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer. Attachments

#### **COMMENT FORM FOR: RANDY BROCKMAN** - ID# 25369 Consumer Information Contact Method ○ Email ● Mail ○ None Name RANDY BROCKMAN Organization Company Address 17115 S GRANDVIEW LANE KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code Email **Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support O Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source ○ Email • Mail ○ Phone ○ Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead **Duplicate Comment** O Yes O No FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Description Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

#### COMMENT FORM FOR: ROBERT COOK - ID# 25320 **Consumer Information** Contact Method O Email Mail O None Name ROBERT COOK Organization Company Address 15517 S CLEARVIEW LOOP City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email** Primary 509 438-1543 Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Drastic Increase Open Date 01/27/2011 Filing Support O Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source ○ Email ● Mail ○ Phone ○ Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes **N**o Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers . 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

# COMMENT FORM FOR: ROBERT KING - ID# 25382

Consumer Info	rmatior					
				Contact M	ethod	○ Email ● Mail ○ None
Name	ROBEF	RT KING		And the second section of the section of the second section of the secti	and the second of the second of	The state of the state of the particle of the state of th
Organization Company						
Address City, State, Zip Code		CLEARVIEW EWICK WA		99338		
Email						
Primary Phone #					Fax #	
Secondary Phone #						
Comment Info	rmation					
	Theme			termina and the transference are seen and a second of the content		Open Date 02/03/2011
Filing S	upport	○ Yes	<ul><li>No</li></ul>	O Undecided		Closed Date
	Source	○ Email <b>《</b>	Mail O I	Phone O Web		Web Create Date
Pubile Invol	lvement Lead	John Cupp				
Duplicate Co	mment	$\bigcirc$ Yes $\bigcirc$ N	lo			
	inpuon	Department 2. The proportion existing cust similar command 3. Summit V Corporation real estate de conflict of in cost enabling 4. There are The develop new lot will alone will ge of the new w 5. In summan costs to exist real estate de	of Ecology Posed rate surce omers. The commers. The committees in ordinary water Water Water Ecologisters of Sterest in request the further more than 20 er proposes to be assessed at the ecologisters of Sterest in request in the proposes of Sterest in request in the proposes of Sterest in request in the ecologisters of Sterest in the ecolo	ermit approves this we harge will unfairly im urrent water rates are ur area. Yorks, LLC, Candy Mod as sharing "Affiliate Summit View neighbouesting that we, the exidevelopment of this area additional \$1,000 Fathan \$200,000 for the ottagree that Summit Viners. Current resident	ell for pose a compountain d Inter rhood isting rea for sold i curre acilitie development with the work of the wor	a rate increase of 15%-25% on arable to those accessed in other in, LLC, and Tri City Development trest." Together, they represent the l. Therefore, there is an inherent homeowners, pay any part of the the profit of the developers. In the Summit View neighborhood. In thook up charge of \$1,500, each es Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee oper. This approaches the total cost after Works should pass on these ald not be required to subsidize the nof financing an additional well
Attacl	hments	onound be til	e responsibili	ity of the real estate de	velop	

#### **COMMENT FORM FOR: ROBIN PHILLIPS** - ID# 25326 **Consumer Information** Contact Method ○ Email ● Mail ○ None Name ROBIN PHILLIPS Organization Company Address 15211 CLEAR VIEW LOOP City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email** Primary 509 627-5492 Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Drastic Increase Open Date 01/27/2011 Filing Support O Yes No O Undecided Closed Date Source C Email Mail Phone Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment ○ Yes ● No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

#### **COMMENT FORM FOR: RYAN & NATALIE GRAVES** - ID# 25362 **Consumer Information** Contact Method ○ Email ● Mail ○ None Name RYAN & NATALIE GRAVES Organization Company Address 16926 FAIRVIEW LOOP City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 Filing Support O Yes Undecided **Closed Date** Source Email Mail Phone Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead **Duplicate Comment** ○ Yes ○ No Description | FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well.

5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

# COMMENT FORM FOR: <u>SAMUEL WARD</u> - ID# 25325

Name				T. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7. 7.	the second secon					
Name					Contac	t Metho	d 🔾 Email	● Mail ○ None		
	SAMU	EL WARD								
Organization Company										
Address City, State, Zip Code		GRANDVIEW EWICK WA			9338			and the second s		
Email										
Primary Phone #	509 851	851-4141 Fax #								
Secondary Phone #										
Comment Info	rmation									
	Theme	Drastic Inc	rease				Open Da	ite 01/27/2011		
Filing Support ○ Yes • No ○ Unde			O Undecide	ed .	Closed Da	erioarid on the control of				
	Source ○ Email ● Mail ○ Phone ○ Web						Web Crea	ite		
							Da	ite		
Pubilc Invol	lvement Lead	John Cupp								
Duplicate Co	mment	○ Yes ● 1	No							
Desc	ription	Department 2. The proper existing cussimilar com 3. Summit V. Corporation real estate department of incost enabling 4. There are the development lot will alone will go of the new v. 5. In summa costs to exist	t of Ecolorsed rate tomers. It is munities with a re region of the furth of the furth of the assessence at the furth of the assessence rate revell.	ogy Perme surchar The curres in our a ter Work istered as rs of Sum request rther dev lan 200 lo oses that ssed an a more that	nit approves the ge will unfairly ent water rates area.  As, LLC, Candy as sharing "Affiliamit View neighing that we, the relopment of the ots remaining to dditional \$1,00 n \$200,000 for the tree that Summers. Current resident.	is well for impose are com  Mountaliated Intelligent in the current in the current in the development in the development in the development in the short in the short in the development in the short in	or up to 100 e a rate incre parable to the parable to the profit in the Summent hook upies Charge. Hoper. This water Work puld not be	existing homes. The homes.  ease of 15%-25% on chose accessed in other ad Tri City Development gether, they represent the re, there is an inherent hers, pay any part of the tof the developers.  mit View neighborhood. In the properties of \$1,500, each additional \$1,000 fee approaches the total cost as should pass on these required to subsidize the ing an additional well		

## COMMENT FORM FOR: TAMARAH & MICHAEL PATTILLO - ID# 25402

Consumer Info	rmation						
				Contact Me	ethod (	○ Email ● Mail ○ None	
Name	TAMA	RAH & MICHA	EL PATTILLO	and an arrive and the first state of the sta	. ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) (		
Organization Company			•		na e na e		
		FAIRVIEW LP EWICK WASH	IINGTON 9933	3			
Primary Phone #				]	Fax #	make that are the first the second of the	
Secondary Phone #					The control of the co		
Comment Info	rmation						
	Theme			er er er en		Open Date 02/09/2011	
Filing Support ○ Yes • No		• No	○ Undecided	Closed Date			
	Source	○ Email ● M	Iail O Phone	○ Web		Web Create	
				•		Date	
Pubile Invol	42 Carlotte (1997)	John Cupp					
Dunlicata Ca	Lead	○ Yes ○ No					
- 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH		oived Feb 7				
Desc		Department of 2. The proposed existing custom similar communia. Summit View Corporation are real estate deve conflict of interecost enabling the 4. There are months developer in the developer in the developer in the developer in the new well 5. In summary, costs to existing real estate developer and the new well the new well 5. In summary, costs to existing real estate developer and the new well 5.	E-1. The current Ecology Permit I rate surcharge ters. The current nities in our area Water Works, e registered as shopers of Summest in requesting te further develope than 200 lots proposes that, ir assessed an additate more than \$1.  we do not agree thomeowners. Coloper's expansions.	approves this we will unfairly important water rates are a.  LLC, Candy Monaring "Affiliated it View neighbors that we, the existence of this arremaining to be a addition to the itional \$1,000 Fa \$200,000 for the centre of that Summit Vicurrent residents.	ell for pose a compa untain d Inter rhood isting lea for sold in currer acilities develo	apply the existing homes. The up to 100 homes. Trate increase of 15%-25% on arable to those accessed in other  a, LLC, and Tri City Development rest." Together, they represent the . Therefore, there is an inherent homeowners, pay any part of the the profit of the developers .  In the Summit View neighborhood .  In thook up charge of \$1,500, each is Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee per. This approaches the total cost after Works should pass on these ld not be required to subsidize the of financing an additional well	

#### **COMMENT FORM FOR: TERRY M. STEPHENS** - ID# 25406 **Consumer Information** Contact Method ○ Email ● Mail ○ None Name TERRY M. STEPHENS Organization Company Address 9704 GRANDVIEW LN City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email** Primary Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # Comment Information Theme Open Date 02/09/2011 Filing Support O Yes Undecided Closed Date Source C Email Mail Phone Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment $\bigcirc$ Yes $\bigcirc$ No **Description** Form letter received Feb 7: FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers . 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well

should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

## COMMENT FORM FOR: THOMAS COYNE - ID# 25380

Consumer Info	rmation					
				Contact Me	thod 🔾 Email 🌘	Mail O None
Name	THOM	AS COYNE				
Organization Company						
Address City, State, Zip Code		FAIRVIEW LO EWICK WAS		99338		
Email						
Primary Phone #				F	ax #	
Secondary Phone #						
Comment Info	rmation					
	Theme	apar 1961 - 1991 - 1911 - 1966 - 1966 - 1966 - 1966 - 1966 - 1966 - 1966 - 1966 - 1966 - 1966 - 1966 - 1966 -			Open Date	02/03/2011
Filing S	upport	○ Yes	No	○ Undecided	Closed Date	<u> </u>
	Source	○ Email ●	Mail O Ph	none O Web	Web Create	•
					Date	
Pubilc Invol	lvement Lead	John Cupp				
Duplicate Co	mment	○ Yes ○ N	o			
Desc		Department of 2. The propose existing custors similar common 3. Summit Vio Corporation areal estate deconflict of introst enabling 4. There are not the developenew lot will be alone will ger of the new west. In summar costs to existing the estate deconflict of introst enabling 4. There are not be alone will ger of the new west. In summar costs to existing the estate deconflict of the existing the estate deconflict of the proposed p	of Ecology Persed rate surch omers. The cununities in our ew Water Woare registered velopers of Suerest in request the further donore than 200 er proposes the assessed and a serate more the ell.  y, we do not a nog homeown veloper's expersed and nog homeown veloper's expersed and a serate was a serate.	arks, LLC, Candy Mou as sharing "Affiliated ammit View neighbor sting that we, the exist evelopment of this are lots remaining to be stat, in addition to the of additional \$1,000 Factorian \$200,000 for the designed	all for up to 100 he cose a rate increase omparable to the comparable to the profit of the profit	omes. se of 15%-25% on ose accessed in other  Tri City Development ther, they represent the there is an inherent rs, pay any part of the f the developers. ait View neighborhood. Tharge of \$1,500, each the additional \$1,000 fee oproaches the total cost should pass on these quired to subsidize the
Attac	hments		······································	·		

## COMMENT FORM FOR: TIM MARKHAM - ID# 25315

Name Organization Company Address City, State, EENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code Email Primary Phone #  Comment Information  Theme   Drastic Increase   Open Date 01/27/2011 Filing Support   Yes	Consumer Info	rmation								
Organization Company  Address  I2607 S GRANDVIEW LANE City, State, Zip Code Email  Primary 509 531-5761 Phone #  Secondary Phone #  Secondary Phone #  Source  Filing Support Source  Public Involvement Lead Duplicate Comment  Description  Description  FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes.  2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area.  3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers.  4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Fea clintees. This approaches the total cost of the new well.  5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well					Contact Me	ethod 🔾 Email	Mail	○ None		
Company  Address City, State, Zjp Code Email Primary Phone # Secondary Phone #  Comment Information  Theme Filing Support Source  Public Involvement Lead  Duplicate Comment  Lead  Duplicate Comment  Comment Information  Posscription  Description  FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well	Name	TIM M	ARKHAM							
City, State, Zip Code   Email										
Primary Phone # Secondary Phone # Drastic Increase Open Date 01/27/2011  Theme Drastic Increase Open Date 01/27/2011  Filing Support Ore Source Mail Mail Phone Ore Web Web Create Date  Public Involvement John Cupp Lead  Duplicate Comment Ore Source Ore No FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes.  2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area.  3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers.  4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Feallities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well.  5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well	City, State,				338					
Phone #  Secondary Phone #  Comment Information  Theme	Email				t til storre skaller skalle skalle til storre til skalle til storre til skalle til skalle til skalle til skall	ggyengganggerang panakalan na manahan na mining mengalan la				
Comment Information  Theme Filing Support Source Filing Support Source Filing Support Source Fubilc Involvement Lead Duplicate Comment Description  FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area.  3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers. 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developers of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well		509 531	-5761			Fax #				
Theme Filing Support Source  Yes No Undecided Closed Date Source  Public Involvement Lead Duplicate Comment Description  Description  FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes.  2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area.  3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers.  4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well.  5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well										
Filing Support  Source  Email Mail Phone Web  Web Create Date  Public Involvement Lead  Duplicate Comment  Description  Description  FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes.  The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area.  Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers.  There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well.  In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well	Comment Info	rmation								
Filing Support  Source  Email Mail Phone Web  Web Create Date  Public Involvement Lead  Duplicate Comment  Description  Description  FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes.  The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area.  Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers.  There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well.  In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well		Theme	Drastic Increa	ise		Open D	ate 01/27/:	2011		
Pubilc Involvement Lead  Duplicate Comment  Description  FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes.  2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area.  3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers.  4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well.  5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well	Filing S	Support	○ Yes	<ul><li>No</li></ul>	O Undecided	. The 15th Control of the	U. 75 (74			
Public Involvement Lead  Duplicate Comment  O Yes ● No  Description  FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes.  2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area.  3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers.  4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well.  5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well		Source	○ Email ● 1	Mail O Phor	ne O Web	Web Cre	ate			
Duplicate Comment  Description  PORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes.  2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area.  3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers.  4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well.  5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well						D	ate			
Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes.  2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area.  3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers.  4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well.  5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well	Pubilc Invo		John Cupp							
Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes.  2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area.  3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers.  4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well.  5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well	Duplicate Co	mment	○ Yes ● No							
	Desc		Department of 2. The propose existing custor similar commu. 3. Summit Vie Corporation at real estate dev conflict of inte cost enabling to 4. There are must be alone will be alone will be alone will generate the new west. In summary costs to existing real estate dev	f Ecology Permed rate surchary mers. The curre unities in our aw Water Work re registered as relopers of Sumprest in requestion and the further device assessed an acceptance more than 11.  To we do not agong homeowners reloper's expan	it approves this we ge will unfairly impent water rates are detected.  s, LLC, Candy Modes sharing "Affiliated mit View neighboring that we, the exitelopment of this are ts remaining to be in additional \$1,000 Family \$200,000 for the content of t	ell for up to 100 pose a rate increomparable to untain, LLC, and Interest." Togethood. Therefore the profit sold in the Surger Current hook uncilities Charge developer. This ew Water Works should not be urden of finance.	o homes.  The account of the account of the account of the denomit View of the account of the ac	5%-25% on essed in other y Development ey represent the is an inherent any part of the evelopers . v neighborhood of \$1,500, each itional \$1,000 fee thes the total cost pass on these to subsidize the		

#### COMMENT FORM FOR: TOM & MELISSA CLARK - ID# 25370 **Consumer Information** Contact Method C Email Mail None Name TOM & MELISSA CLARK Organization Company Address 10507 S GRANDVIEW LN City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code **Email Primary** Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Open Date 02/02/2011 No Filing Support O Yes Undecided **Closed Date** Source ○ Email ● Mail ○ Phone ○ Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead **Duplicate Comment** ○ Yes ○ No FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Description Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers . 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.

#### COMMENT FORM FOR: WILLIAM YOUNGSTRAM - ID# 25337 **Consumer Information** Contact Method ○ Email ● Mail ○ None Name WILLIAM YOUNGSTRAM Organization Company Address 15703 S GRANDVIEW LANE City, State, KENNEWICK WASHINGTON 99338 Zip Code Email Primary 571-278-1419 Fax # Phone # Secondary Phone # **Comment Information** Theme Drastic Increase Open Date 01/27/2011 Filing Support O Yes O Undecided No Closed Date Source C Email Mail Phone Web Web Create Date Pubilc Involvement John Cupp Lead Duplicate Comment | O Yes • No Description FORM LETTER - 1. The current well is adequate to supply the existing homes. The Department of Ecology Permit approves this well for up to 100 homes. 2. The proposed rate surcharge will unfairly impose a rate increase of 15%-25% on existing customers. The current water rates are comparable to those accessed in other similar communities in our area. 3. Summit View Water Works, LLC, Candy Mountain, LLC, and Tri City Development Corporation are registered as sharing "Affiliated Interest." Together, they represent the real estate developers of Summit View neighborhood. Therefore, there is an inherent conflict of interest in requesting that we, the existing homeowners, pay any part of the cost enabling the further development of this area for the profit of the developers . 4. There are more than 200 lots remaining to be sold in the Summit View neighborhood. The developer proposes that, in addition to the current hook up charge of \$1,500, each new lot will be assessed an additional \$1,000 Facilities Charge. The additional \$1,000 fee alone will generate more than \$200,000 for the developer. This approaches the total cost of the new well. 5. In summary, we do not agree that Summit View Water Works should pass on these costs to existing homeowners. Current residents should not be required to subsidize the real estate developer's expansion project. The burden of financing an additional well should be the responsibility of the real estate developer.