

✓ Men Ack  
sent 3/24/07

✓ To AV.

✓ To Comments  
§ 14

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** Barbedan@aol.com  
**Sent:** Monday, March 26, 2007 10:03 AM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Barbara Hornby follows:

-----  
Case Number: SWS-W-06-01  
Name: Barbara Hornby  
Address: PO Box 127  
City: Blanchard  
State: Idaho  
Zip: 83804  
Home Telephone: 208-437-4480  
Contact E-Mail: Barbedan@aol.com  
Name of Utility Company: CDS STONERIDGE UTILITIES  
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

I have lived in Blanchard on and off since I was a little girl. I am now approaching my senior-citizen years. As far back as I can remember water was an issue of argument in this valley, perhaps because our water is as good and valuable as gold but not always appreciated as such. I have lived in other parts of the country that are not blessed with the abundance of water found here.---The cost in other places always higher and quality always poorer. Customers in the Stoneridge area are fortunate to have good guidance and management as well as the improved water quality and system that we have today. In spite of this, I have strong objections about taking the goodness that nature provides and making a profit without properly explaining the necessity. This concern is especially important in an area where there are many low-income and retired residents who really can not afford a sudden doubling PLUS of the price. Rate increases should always be gradual and made out of need that is well documented. Otherwise it appears as greed.

Specifically, as a Stoneridge Resort Timeshare Owner, my concern is the proposed charge to be imposed on the Resort. It is my understanding that each of the 146 units are being accessed individually at a \$38 rate even though there are only 5 meters to the buildings. The pipes to the timeshares are smaller and older than pipes in the rest of the water service area. The increase for the Timeshares amounts to 1,800 % (treating each unit as a household), for the Golf and Recreational Community-57 % and for Happy Valley users 93-169 %. The Golf Course is the highest user of water and yet the increase percentage rate is the lowest. I worry that such a hike would mean an additional increase in yearly timeshare fees. It seems unfair for timeshare owners to have to supplement the needs of the rest of the water users PLUS face the potential of an additional increase to yearly timeshare fees.

I also feel that water conservation should be an issue of utmost importance. I am unfamiliar with Idaho laws concerning water wastage and/or use of treated water. I feel that effluent/waste water could (and should) be utilized for benefit especially in the case of a golf course. The effluent water is presently pumped off site, at a loss of water and a loss of dollars for disposal. This water still goes to the aquifer that we all pull from. It makes no sense to get rid of the wastewater that we could use to irrigate the golf course and/or grounds.

The water company make-up and their jurisdiction, without representation also bothers me. It is my understanding that the water company is run exclusively by CDS BRIDGE PARTNERS, the owners of the golf course, who are they, themselves, consumers. Even though this company has managed the system well and have made some positive changes, the proposed rate increase on the golf course is the lowest of all of the entities that use the water. This puts them in a bad light with other consumers. There is the appearance of a conflict of interest if they do not allow input and decision making abilities by all entities...Stoneridge Resort, Happy Valley Residents, StoneRidge Homeowners (as well as StoneRidge Golf and Recreational Community). At the very least, management should have a diverse advisory board to help them with decision making. I believe that proper representation can only improve service, promote better customer/management relations and ensure a better balance and understanding for decisions that affect us all.

Lastly, I would like to comment on the way the PUC conducts workshops. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to talk with you. However, it was apparent from the large number of participants at the workshop that there were reasonable objections that needed to be voiced as well as an interest in getting the facts straight. Many facts were not available at the meeting, which fueled some of the anger. It was apparent that several issues still needed to be investigated before questions could be accurately answered. It is my understanding that the water company gets the final word before consideration by the water commissioners. I believe the consumer should also have a final hearing where clear answers and rebuttal (on both sides) could be given after the facts are all in. It would make more sense to do the investigation prior to the workshop or hold the workshop (for fact gathering/negotiation) and then come back for a final public workshop/hearing before a decision is made. Perhaps, if the water company had been given an opportunity to give their position/justifications for the increase there would have been a better understanding. Additionally, representatives from all entities involved should have been introduced. It would have been good to know what interests were represented in the room...example—Timeshare Users, Resort Manager, Water Company Representatives, Happy Valley Users, Stoneridge Homeowners. A simple introduction and/or show of hands would have helped defuse (and possibly even alleviated) the defensiveness that was apparent in the room.

Thank you for your kind consideration and for taking the time to come to Blanchard to hear concerns. Hopefully, the decisions you are faced with will be fair, justified and equitable so that good relations will prevail with management as well as with the consumer.

Respectfully submitted by Barbara R. Hornby

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 207.200.116.203