

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Gerald and Robyn Massey
Submission Time: Mar 6 2024 5:33PM
Email: gerald.massey@gmail.com
Telephone: 360-903-8600
Address: 210 Par Loop
Blanchard, ID 83804

Name of Utility Company: CDS StoneRidge Utilities

Case ID: SWS-W-24-01

Comment: "To the IPUC:

As the owners of 210 Par Loop, Blanchard, ID 83804 we are customers of Stoneridge Utilities and are writing to comment on this proposed rate increase. The percentage increase proposed, ranging from 261% to 543%, is patently absurd. We are relying upon the IPUC process to shield customers like us from an abusive action by a regulated entity. While some reasonable degree of increase may be justified, this is not. To assess what may be justified the IPUC will necessarily have to understand the degree of financial and operational overlay between SRU, the neighborhood sewer utility and the onsite golf course - all of which are owned by a single individual. We encourage the IPUC to thoroughly investigate, audit and assess the various related entities and how they impact the regulated water utility.

Gerald & Robyn Massey"

Name: carole pace
Submission Time: Mar 6 2024 6:08PM
Email: coolcatcarole@aol.com
Telephone: 208-437-2223
Address: 152A columbia blvd
blanchard, ID 83804

Name of Utility Company: Stoneridge Utilities

Case ID: SWS-W-24-01

Comment: "My comment will be "NO WAY". Why should the people in the Stoneridge community have to pay for the mismanagement of funds. With all of the other costs of living expenses that have gone up in the last few years (which include some hefty costs in Stoneridge) will put a burden on homeowners. As some homeowners are single people, and most homeowners live on a limited incomes. Please deny this case number request. Thank you."

Name: Phillip Hayes
Submission Time: Mar 6 2024 6:50PM
Email: imprhayes@gmail.com

Telephone: 435-640-2239
Address: 304 par loop
Blanchard , ID 83804

Name of Utility Company: Stone ridge water utility

Case ID: SWS-W-24-01

Comment: "I oppose increase in water fees"

Name: Jack Brand
Submission Time: Mar 6 2024 6:52PM
Email: popsjb4@gmail.com
Telephone: 541-941-5958
Address: 110 Par Loop
Blanchard, ID 83804

Name of Utility Company: Stoneridge Utilities

Case ID: SWS-W-24-01

Comment: "Dear sirs
I own in Stoneridge MCV and see the absurd increase in water rates that Stoneridge Utilities is asking for. We are a retirement community and that is not reasonable for an increase. I feel this is in retaliation to the suit that was settled last year. Please extend the time frame and reconsider something more reasonable. A 261 to 534 percent increase is not realistic.
Sincerely
Jack and Rebecca Brand"

Name: Craig Young
Submission Time: Mar 6 2024 7:54PM
Email: craigyoung1961@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-777-7771
Address: 860 S Spokane St
Post Falls, ID 83854

Name of Utility Company: Stoneridge water association

Case ID: SWS-W-24-01

Comment: "I am a owner in the Stoneridge neighborhood...
It is ridiculous that a private owner who will not comply to our association terms and agreement, try a increase the water cost to justify his own personal debts.
I strongly urge the committee to revisit his motivation and fairness to his overwhelming water charges

Best Regards

Craig Young. PAR LOOP #74"

Name: Sandra and Charles Finan
Submission Time: Mar 6 2024 10:19PM
Email: scfinan@msn.com
Telephone: 406-750-2762
Address: 157 Par Loop
Blanchard, ID 83804

Name of Utility Company: Stoneridge Utilities SRU

Case ID: SWS-W-24-01

Comment: "To the IPUC:

As the owners of 157 Par Loop, Blanchard ID 83804 we are customers of Stoneridge Utilities and are writing to comment on this proposed rate increase. The percentage increase proposed, ranging from 261% to 543%, is patently absurd. We are relying upon the IPUC process to shield customers like us from an abusive action by a regulated entity. While some reasonable degree of increase may be justified, this is not. To assess what may be justified the IPUC will necessarily have to understand the degree of financial and operational overlay between SRU, the neighborhood sewer utility and the onsite golf course - all of which are owned by a single individual. We encourage the IPUC to thoroughly investigate, audit and assess the various related entities and how they impact the regulated water utility.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.
Sandy and Chuck Finan"

Name: Alex Pringle
Submission Time: Mar 7 2024 8:27AM
Email: alex.pringle@comcast.net
Telephone: 925-212-1819
Address: 8207 E Teton St
MESA, AZ 85207

Name of Utility Company: Stoneridge Utilities

Case ID: SWS-W-24-01

Comment: "To the IPUC:

As the owner of 32 Eagle Way, Blanchard, we are customers of Stoneridge Utilities and are writing to comment on this proposed rate increase. The percentage increase proposed, ranging from 261% to 543%, is patently absurd. We are relying upon the IPUC process to shield customers like us from an abusive action by a regulated entity. While some reasonable degree of increase may be justified, this is

not. To assess what may be justified the IPUC will necessarily have to understand the degree of financial and operational overlay between SRU, the neighborhood sewer utility and the onsite golf course - all of which are owned by a single individual. We encourage the IPUC to thoroughly investigate, audit and assess the various related entities and how they impact the regulated water utility.

Thanks you,
Alex Pringle

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Ronald Bacon
Submission Time: Mar 7 2024 2:04PM
Email: ronbacon.mrb@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-437-0449
Address: Box 507
Blanchard, ID 83804

Name of Utility Company: CDS Stoneridge LLC

Case ID: SWS-W-24-01

Comment: "A 261% increase in rates? Seriously? "

Name: Annette Sandberg
Submission Time: Mar 7 2024 2:37PM
Email: asandberg@transsafeconsulting.com
Telephone: 202-321-9485
Address: 54 Hanaford
Blanchard, ID 83804

Name of Utility Company: CDS Stoneridge Utilities LLC

Case ID: SWS-W-24-01

Comment: "To Whom It May Concern:

I have the following questions and concerns with the request for increase of water fees filed in this case. These questions are outlined below:

1) The Idaho Secretary of State document attached as "A" to the letter is confusing. It shows "Stoneridge Utilities"(Idaho Secretary of State file #0003351752- shows this is the assumed business name) yet the letter that was sent to all property owners served by the Utility was signed CDS Stoneridge Utilities, LLC (this appears in the Idaho Secretary of State as file #3501980). While both entities are managed by "Esprit Enterprises" they appear to be different entities. Additionally, it seems Esprit Enterprises owns many different entities in the Stoneridge Community making it difficult to unwind the many connections between the entities. This makes it difficult to understand how costs have been

allocated since Esprit Enterprises purchased Stoneridge Golf Community and the Utility in 2018 as stated in Attachment B.

2) In the statement of related entities, the filing does not show that the Sewer Company being leased to JD Resort from Esprit Enterprises is in fact a related entity to Esprit Enterprises. However, the Idaho Secretary of State shows this as JD's Resort (Idaho Secretary of State Filing 0000098126) and is managed by J. D. Resort, Inc. (Idaho Secretary of State filing 0000315307) and this filing shows Mr. Chan Karupiah is the President. He is also the owner of Esprit Enterprises, Inc. (Idaho Secretary of State Filing 535971) though the filing shows the Manager of Esprit Enterprises in JD Resort Inc.)It seems the Commission has also questioned these very intertwined entities based on an explanation letter filed by Stoneridge Utility in PUC case SWS-W-20-2. In that letter the company stated they were going to have JD's Resort operate and provide the financial resources to operate the Utility. They indicated it was due to the financial strength of JD's Resorts. However, the current case should not put into question the ability of JD's Resort to properly operate this Utility.

3) The notes on Attachment D- shows that the golf course moved to its own water source in 2023- however, this should not mean the golf course should not absorb some of the expenses of the water system as it contributed to the degradation and use of the facility and services up until is switched to its own well in 2023.

4) In reviewing operating income/expenses and income statement – Attachments K, L and M shows the utility losing money as expenses exceed income. However, it is my understanding that this Utility had a case before the PUC in late 2023 whereby it applies for authority to borrow \$980,000 of debt through Esprit Enterprises, LLC and/or JD Resort. In that case it was stated that the debt was incurred to keep the company solvent since it was purchased in 2018 (See Case No SWS-W-23-03). In that case the Commission rightly questioned the intercompany transactions. It now seems that the proposed rate increases are attempting to make up for denial of the Commission in the 2023 case.

5) Additionally, it is my understanding that Stoneridge Utilities will no longer be providing “new water connection services” and instead would require customers to use outside contractors as a much higher rate. (PUC Case #SWS-W-23-02). The Utility indicated it “no longer had an employee” to make these connections. Was this reduction in staff reflected in the Operating Income provided for 2023?

6) Is it typical for a Utility to include residential and commercial in the same tariff? This clearly would be an advantage to the commercial properties owned by Esprit Enterprises in this community.

7) The rate tariffs reflected in this filing do not take into account the current case of New Hook ups before the commission- nor do they mention those increases.

8) Attachment W Documentation of Known Changes- includes replacement of 3 well pumps. However, these wells were used by the golf course up until 2023 and the golf course should assume a bulk of this expense since it was a large user of the water in the system.

9) It seems the Utility is moving many items on its balance sheet around without clear explanation of where some of these costs came from and who should bear the burden of losses. If the revenue and expenses are truly accurate a smaller rate increase would be justified. However, I would request the Commission dig into these various companies financials and understand the costs being shifted between companies and whether there has truly been \$900,000 of “investment” as stated in the customer letter mailed out by Stoneridge Utilities.

As a property owner in this community, I have significant concerns about a rate increase of this magnitude. I respectfully request that this case be given a very thorough review and that there is a clear understanding of all the “related company dealings” with this Utility prior to any increase being approved."
