

✓ Gen. Acc sent 9/25/08

✓ To AV.

✓ To Commis.
3 H

Jean Jewell

(Note: The Kents are on the customer list provided by the company.)

From: jakentfam@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2008 4:51 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell
Subject: PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Amber Kent follows:

Case Number: ROC-W-08-01
Name: Amber Kent
Address: 3889 E. Ash Lane
City: Rigby
State: Idaho
Zip: 83442
Daytime Telephone: 208-745-0437
Contact E-Mail: jakentfam@yahoo.com
Name of Utility Company: Rocky Mountain Utility Add to Mailing List yes

Please describe your comment briefly:

First, I would like to make the commission aware that my family, as property owners in the Pepperwood Crossing subdivision, did not receive the notices of Application or Public Workshop from the Commission. We did receive a notice from the utility company about their application, but no more contact was made. I am wondering if they considered us a customer enough to send us their own notice, why were we not included on their list provided to you as a Commission to receive the official notices of the meetings and such that we should have been able to participate in? I know several other families that we built with are in the same position. This of course is a rhetorical question to provoke thought as to why they sent notices to some but not all of their either current or future customers. In my opinion, they should be required to notify all property owners, whether or not they are currently residing there, as we all will be paying these utility costs and should have a say, or at least know that rates are changing.

Second, I am wondering if the price being debated is being figured only on the current number of customers, will the rate be dropped after the subdivision reaches capacity? It seems very unfair that those who live here currently have to make up for those who do not yet live here.

Third, I am wondering if we who actually occupy our lots and are paying the difference for all the empty lots, shouldn't the owner of the subdivision be responsible for the lots not yet sold to anyone? When a person buys a lot, they figure in utility expenses, but it seems rather ridiculous that we would have to figure in higher costs because not all the lots are occupied. That is not fair to us, the consumers.

I am sure that I could have received actual answers to these questions had I known about the Public Workshop that was held, but now I hope that these questions provoke some serious thought into the rates we will be asked to pay for a basic necessity. Are we paying because the owner truly needs that high rate, or because he feels justified in asking a price that he would like right now because he still has empty lots to account for?

Thank you for your time and efforts in this matter.
Amber Kent