

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** dfhutton9180@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 02, 2015 3:43 PM  
**To:** Beverly Barker; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness  
**Cc:** dfhutton9180@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** Case Comment Form: Donald Hutton

Name: Donald Hutton  
Case Number: SCH-W-15-01 Schweitzer Basin Water Company  
Email: [dfhutton9180@yahoo.com](mailto:dfhutton9180@yahoo.com)  
Telephone: 208-290-7238  
Address: 745 Crystal Springs Rd.  
Sandpoint ID , 83864

Name of Utility Company: Schweitzer Basin Water, LLC Acknowledge public record: True

Comment: Donald Hutton  
745 Crystal Springs Rd.  
Sandpoint, ID 83864

5/24/15  
Idaho Public Utilities Commission  
P O Box 83720  
Boise, Idaho 83720-0074

Re: Case SCH-W-15-01 Schweitzer Basin Water Company

Dear IPUC Commissioners,

I would like to comment on the application of Schweitzer Basin Water LLC, I constructed a triplex on Telemark Rd. and was serviced by SBW where I paid a hook up fee of \$9942 on 4/8/2005 and also purchased the existing fire hydrant, on 9/30/2005 for an additional \$2000. After the building was occupied in 2006 we would lose all the water in the building whenever the fire hydrants were tested or flushed. I complained to the owners of the water system and the fire chief for years, but no solutions were ever implemented. I recently learned that SBW was aware that the fire hydrant would not meet the fire flow requirements when I purchased it, which is why the other residents had refused to pay for the fire hydrant originally. The fire chief informed me that SBW had been made aware of this issue multiple times since 1996. In 2014 SBW found that there was a valve in the line before the pressure regulating valve that regulates pressure to that area. The valve that was found was almost completely closed restricting the flow and causing a vacuum in the water system whenever the fire hydrants were used. The ONLY reason that SBW had investigated the problem after my many years of complaints is because of an enforcement action by the Schweitzer Fire District. If not for this enforcement action the water users in this area would still be dealing with the problem. This is an example of how poorly SBW treats it customers and is not maintaining or improving their system.

In reviewing SBW financials many items need to be questioned:

1. Why do three part time people need five pickups, most of which I never have seen on the job?
2. Employee housing, none of the other water systems that I have found on the PUC web site, nor the other two companies in the area, charge for employee housing.
3. Where is this storage/shop/facility and are they storing their numerous classic cars there?
4. Why is there a second line item for tools where they are depreciating another \$16,000.

5. What are the two tractors used for and where are they?
6. Why do they require two backhoes and operators on repairs a job? No one else does.
7. The Ford backhoe is mainly used to plow the road to their B&B, are the water customers compensated for the use of water company equipment?
8. What are they renting which increased from \$36,000 to \$60,000/year?
9. The adjacent Resort Water Co. shows a net income of \$54,286 for 2013 and they have more employees and are on site during normal working hours in addition to checking their system 365 days a year, SBW does not and yet their labor costs are even higher.
10. Why are they not showing any hookup fee income?

I would like to be notified if there is a hearing so I can attend.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Donald F. Hutton

Unique Identifier: 50.52.17.217