

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Karen Truss
Submission Time: Mar 12 2024 6:04PM
Email: vettesnwolves@aol.com
Telephone: 208-437-1458
Address: 396 Mountain View Rd
Blanchard , ID 83804

Name of Utility Company: Stoneridge Utilities

Case ID: SWS-W-24-01

Comment: "I am opposed to this water rate hike of a minimum of 261%. The owner of Stoneridge Utilities Chan Karupiah is a deceitful, shady business owner who cries poverty but continues to buy around the area. Many in this community, including me, are on fixed incomes and this rate is insane."

Name: Thomas Larson
Submission Time: Mar 12 2024 7:11PM
Email: tomlarson67@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-819-7415
Address: 729 Mt view Rd
Blanchard , ID 83804

Name of Utility Company: Stoneridge utilities

Case ID: SWS-W-24-01

Comment: "I have been at my current residence for almost 30 years and I am strongly against this new proposal to raise our monthly utility cost. To my understanding this request to raise prices is due to the amount of new people that want to hook into Stoneridge. Easy solution is to not accept any new users in this area to keep cost affordable for the long-term faithful customers. I understand a slight increase to keep up with rising cost but not the outrageous amount this proposal is asking. My vote is a hard NO!!!"

Name: Junie Christensen
Submission Time: Mar 12 2024 7:39PM
Email: juniel@frontier.com
Telephone: 208-437-2610
Address: 704 Stoneridge Rd.
Blanchard, ID 83804

Name of Utility Company: Stoneridge Utilities

Case ID: SWS-W-24-01

Comment: "I have lived in the Stoneridge resort since 2016 when my husband died and I bought a house here.

My water bill has always been \$24/month. Now we have received notification from Chan K. of huge increases in the monthly water bill - initially an increase of 261% and up, if I understand correctly. Please advise how to handle this outrageous increase."

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: DONNA BROWN
Submission Time: Mar 13 2024 7:54AM
Email: DEARDRB@YAHOO.COM
Telephone: 208-437-4473
Address: PO BOX 91
BLANCHARD, ID 83804

Name of Utility Company: STONERIDGE

Case ID: SWS-W-24-01

Comment: "The proposed charges for water by Stoneridge Utilities are above reason and unjustified for this company. We are a small community of lower income and many retired living on a fixed income, who cannot absorb such an inflated cost for water usage. Beyond regular usage, household and garden, at these higher rates, we won't be able to use extra water for fire prevention and suppression."

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Joey Logue
Submission Time: Mar 13 2024 9:34AM
Email: Joeylogue81@yahoo.com
Telephone: 208-608-9768
Address: 218 Vista Dr.
Blanchard, ID 83804

Name of Utility Company: Stoneridge Utilities

Case ID: SWS-W-24-01

Comment: "Idaho Public Utilities Commission P.O. Box 83720 Boise, ID 83720-0074Vonn Case # SWS-W-24-01

IPUC Commissioners,
I am writing to you in respect to Case # SWS-W-24-01 at the request of Stoneridge Utilities, LLC. The proposed rate increases of 261% and 543% for a base rate increase is not only against fair practice, but also creates an undue hardship on the citizens who rely on the water provided by this utility company.

The average annual rate increase per year across the nation for utilities is 4.1% according to Bluefield Research. In fact, the largest water rate increases across the nation was in El Paso, Tx and San Jose California which boasted an 8% increase. Monthly water bills range from a low of \$19.15 in San Antonio, Texas, to a high of \$114.25 in San Francisco, California.

Stoneridge Utilities has stated that there hasn't been a rate increase since 2007, even with an annual increase since 2007 of 4.1% annually, the base rate should only be at \$47.52 after 17 years of 4.1% annually for a ¾ or 1-inch meter. While we all understand that need for a rate increase to ensure Stoneridge Utilities maintains and is profitable, a single jump rate increase of 261% or 543% is unacceptable and unfair to the customers that rely on these services and also have no other choice. I have provided tables below based on an annual rate increase of 4.1%.

Subsequently Stoneridge Utilities has requested a monthly user fee increase from \$.79/1,000 gallons up to \$2.94/1,000 gallons which is a 272% increase. Again, far above the national average and while we understand a need to increase revenue, this type of increase is increasingly impactful to our community. The two-person home uses approximately 6,090 gallons of water according to www.fatherresource.org/family-water-usage.com. With this increase to both base rate and water usage the monthly bill will go from \$28.74 to \$107.23 for residents with a ¾ in meter, for those with a 1-inch meter will go from \$28.74 to \$174.82 per month. Which is a 508% increase in monthly fee and usage. We strongly urge IPUC to decline this significant rate increase, and adhere to the national average of rate increases that can be absorbed steadily by the communities and users of the water provided by Stoneridge Utilities.

We also request that IPUC review the request and conduct an audit of Stoneridge Utilities, as using customer-based rate increases to pay for debt capitalization, and a reduction of revenue from the golf irrigation down to zero is not acceptable. The below points indicate areas that we believe should be reviewed for consideration that supports the request for a comprehensive audit of Stoneridge Utilities. Costs requested based on the rate increase proposal

- The utility wants to replace 3 pump motors. To our knowledge, there are currently two wells for the utility. The application document cites attachment W-1, but it is not included in the available download paperwork. This is an expenditure for which the utility bears sole responsibility for, not its users.
- The owner of the utility claims to have financial harm from the reduction in water sales to the golf course. However, the golf course drilled its own well to avoid water charges from the utility. Please note that the owner of the golf course is the same owner of the utility, so in summary the owner was in fact paying himself. Through this increase the owner is transferring what the course owed the utility onto the customers, with this proposed increase the owner is doubling his gains which is approximately 50,00,000 gallons of water cost annually.
- The utility also wants the users to fund the connection costs of 20 vacant plotted lots owned by the owner of those lots, which is also the owner of the utility. This cost should not be passed onto the users.
- The utility wants to install approximately 360 water meters to remotely read the water usage. This expense should be covered by the utility not the users.
- The utility wants to install (replace?) "backup electrical generators" at water pump sites. No paperwork is included in the available downloaded documents. This expenditure is the sole responsibility of the utility not the users.

In summation, we strongly urge IPUC to deny this rate increase request in its entirety.

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Jeri Cyr
Submission Time: Mar 13 2024 10:57AM
Email: gramma.spud@gmail.com
Telephone: 805-217-5672
Address: 212 Ironwood Dr.
Blanchard , ID 83803

Name of Utility Company: Stoneridge

Case ID: SWS-W-24-01

Comment: "I am a resident of Stoneridge who feels this price increase is excessive. I do not oppose price increases, but this one is over the top. As residents of Stoneridge, we should not have to pay exorbitant rates to pay for irrigation of the golf course. It is a public, not a private course. If Chan wants an increase, it should be incremental, not all at once. Hopefully, the IPUC will realize that this increase is exorbitant and will be a hardship to some in Stoneridge and not approve this increase."

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Stacie Howard
Submission Time: Mar 13 2024 1:28PM
Email: oxerridge@yahoo.com
Telephone: 503-410-0441
Address: PO Box 915
Blanchard, ID 83804

Name of Utility Company: stoneridge utilities

Case ID: SWS-W-24-01

Comment: "I would like to reach out regarding the 261% increase for utilities for the Stoneridge Water district. That high of a jump is astronomical and unethical by no stretch of anyones imagination. We need to be protected from this type of price gouging in regards to basic rights. Our water comes from a 960gpm well that is then sourced to our neighborhood. As someone who is in the water well industry, it is understood that processing and distribution as well as overhead costs for the software that does our billing comes with a small expense, but not at a 261% increase. That is price gouging. I would like to protest this rate and to have the IPUC protect us as citizens from this type of extortion."

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Shannon Pittman
Submission Time: Mar 13 2024 2:31PM

Email: shannonrw95@gmail.com

Telephone: 509-991-2435

Address: 247 Vista Dr

Blanchard , ID 83804

Name of Utility Company: Stoneridge Utilities

Case ID: SWS-W-24-01

Comment: "Idaho Public Utilities Commission,

We are residents in the Happy Valley Community here in Blanchard and are water customers of Stoneridge Utilities. This is regarding the 261% increase that is being proposed by Stoneridge Utilities. Our community is small and residents are for the most part retired and living on fixed, low income seniors. Stoneridge Resort golf course caters to the higher income tourism and residents. It uses the largest percentage of water to keep the golf course up and running. As a senior resident, to expect us to fund the expenses of the resort is just insane. This increase would bring Stoneridge Resort to a 0 expense, causing residents to fund the large water usage at the resort. Please consider this as we work through this.

Sincerely,

Eric and Shannon Pittman"

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Steve Moss

Submission Time: Mar 13 2024 3:32PM

Email: stevemoss65@yahoo.com

Telephone: 925-698-7090

Address: 379 Hanaford Road

BlanchardID83804, ID 83804

Name of Utility Company: CDS Stoneridge Utilities LLC

Case ID: SWS-W-24-01

Comment: "As homeowners and residents of Stoneridge community I would like to express my concerns and options regarding the proposed water rate increases. I have heard the owner of CDS Stoneridge Utilities, LLC state that he is only interested in putting money in his pocket. I am not agonist a Bunises making a profit. Also, he has expressed to this community that he does not care about anything, including, the community, the grill, golf Corse, which he owns. He is only interested in the utilities. I would request a full audit of CDS Stoneridge Utilities. His Bunises practices in the past and currently has not been accurate and truthful. The fact that 1 of the 2 wells providing water for this community has not been in operation for a while and he drilled a new well for his golf course seems that he wants to relieve himself of his financial obligation to pay what he owes. I believe He is putting his financial burden on this community. When the utilities were purchased, it was said that there were enough funds for

improvements and was debt free. To the best of my knowledge there has been no capital improvements done. "

-----Original Message-----

From: joan@budai.com <joan@budai.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2024 4:07 PM
To: secretary
Subject: Case SWS-W-24-01

CAUTION: This email originated outside the State of Idaho network. Verify links and attachments BEFORE you click or open, even if you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact your agency service desk with any concerns.

I'm writing to protest the overly burdensome price increases to users of water from StoneRidge Utilities. My reasons are expressed in the following PDF file: StoneRidge PDF.pdf

Joan Budai
248 Vista Drive
Blanchard, ID 83804

-----Original Message-----

From: nowak623 <nowak623@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2024 9:17 PM
To: secretary
Subject: RE: Case number, SWS-W-24-01, Stoneridge water rate increase

To whom it may concern.

Re: Case number SWS-W-24-01

The the proposed water rate increase for Stoneridge Resort Community is atrocious. The proposed increased exceeds any normal increase for a community water usage. The Owner should not be able to request such an increase and furthermore the community should not be liable or responsible for the resort owners past operating costs or losses. Thanks for considering our decision to not increase such a exaggerated amount.

Regards,

William and Donna Nowak
372 Hanaford Rd
Blanchard, ID 83804

From: evelyncorrigan@gmail.com <evelyncorrigan@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2024 2:30 PM

To: secretary

Subject: SWS-W-24-01

Importance: High

Good afternoon!

I am a property owner in the Stoneridge community and a customer of CDS Stoneridge Utilities. I am attaching a letter that another homeowner composed, and it speaks to my thoughts and feelings about the proposed issues. I am submitting this letter as coming from my husband and I.

We are requesting that the IPUC perform an AUDIT of the CDS Stoneridge Utilities company before they allow any form of increase or our water and sewer rates.

Evelyn Corrigan

Cell: (208) 603-8895

John and Evelyn Corrigan

191 Hanaford Rd

Blanchard, ID 83804

JOHN & EVELYN CORRIGAN
191 HANAFORD RD
BLANCHARD, ID 83804

IPUC
PO Box 83720
Boise, Idaho 83720

Case No. SWS-W-24-01

March 14, 2024

Hello,

I am writing regarding a water rate increase proposed by CDS StoneRidge Utilities (PO Box 298, Blanchard, Idaho 83804). This is regarding Case number SWS-W-24-01.

This utility has proposed water rate increases of 261% to 543%. After reviewing the rationale for these increases, all of the reasons given are completely unwarranted.

I ask that you decline the entire rate request by CDS StoneRidge Utilities.

- 1) CDS StoneRidge claims to have “invested” more than \$900,000 since ownership transfer. This claim was made in the official notice to users. There is no documentation about what types of investment the utility has made. We suspect it is to try to recoup \$980,000 the utility owner transferred from Esprit Enterprises/JD’s Resort, as found in Case number SWS-W-23-03 where it was declared this was to be treated as owner’s equity. PLEASE verify this claim by the utility. We suspect that the claimed investment has not been in infrastructure or system improvements, such as the water system infrastructure....the wells, pumps, transfer pipe system, etc. are the same as when purchased by the utility operator. I suspect the owner has transferred his OWN money as capitalization, which should be regarded as owner’s equity and not an expense to be recouped from utility customers, as noted in SWS-W-23-03. Additionally, this current rate increase request includes infrastructure expenditures, which we note are questionable, and are detailed below.
- 2) I believe that when CDS StoneRidge purchased the utility, Chan Karupiah, the owner, claimed to have enough cash and assets to fund improvements and capitalization. He should live up to this agreement without impacting users of the utility. Please refer to Case number SWS-W-18-01 when Karupiah purchased the utility. That action declared that “JD Resort (applicant) must demonstrate his financial ability to operate on its own accord. The notarized personal guarantee of Chan Karupiah to use his personal finances to support the financial needs of the company is of uncertain value. If Mr. Karupiah were to file bankruptcy or otherwise being unable to meet all of his financial obligations, a signed personal guarantee to financially support a legally separate company is dubious value compared to more standard cash capital or debt instruments likely held by other creditors. Therefore, we require assurances that JD Resort has the financial ability to operate the system in the public service, not JD Resort by and through Chan Karupiah. JD Resort must be able to make and pay for ongoing repairs and have access to capital for major repairs, including pump or well failures...JD Resort must file balance sheets and income statements with the commission quarterly...JD Resort must file its balance sheet and income statement for the quarter ended 30 June, 2019, within 60 days of this Order. Subsequent quarterly financial statements must be filed within 45 days of the quarter end. JD Resort must file monthly bank statements showing at least a \$50,000 balance until JD Resort establishes a bank line of credit of at least \$250,000.”

- 3) The operating expenses absolutely do not justify a rate increase. We believe this proposal is about greed. The owner of CDS StoneRidge also owns a golf course....StoneRidge. The golf course used to get its water from the utility, about 50,000,000 gallons annually...we have heard the golf course did NOT pay its water bill at times, if at all. The golf course drilled its own water well recently and has separated from the utility for water supply. The utility is trying to recapture that lost income from current users. This is unconscionable.
- 4) The employee related expenses are minimal. One person to read meters for six months of the year, who also takes chlorine readings every few days...a part time employee at best. Another part time person to administer billings and receive payments. Chan Karupiah reportedly spends one day per week at StoneRidge...where he oversees the utility, the sewer system, the golf course, and the bar/grill. We suspect he has allocated too much overhead for expenses into the rate increase paperwork. **A complete forensic audit by IPUC would be appropriate in this instance to verify all financial documents and claims.**
- 5) We understand that, at times, if not currently, CDS StoneRidge, the utility, has been chronically late with filings and reports due to the IPUC since it was purchased by the current owner.

Now, let's review Attachment W in the current CDS StoneRidge Utilities rate increase application.

- 1) The owner claims to have financial harm from the reduction in water sales to the golf course. The golf course drilled its own well to avoid water charges from the utility. The same individual, Chan Karupiah owns the golf course and the utility. In essence, he was paying himself...the utility he owns was billing the golf course he owns for water. Now...as a result of the new golf course well, the golf course has a significantly lower cost for water, a huge savings to Karupiah. BUT...now he wants utility users to pay for what HE used to pay. That is simply unconscionable. This proposal actually doubles his gain...reduced water fees for the golf course AND replace that lost income at the expense of the utility users... nearly 50,000,000 gallons of water cost annually! This should not be allowed.
- 2) The utility wants to replace 3 pump motors. To my knowledge, there are currently two working wells for the utility. The application document cites attachment W-1, but it is not included in the available download paperwork. This expenditure is a responsibility of the utility, not the users. The owner should fund this and absorb the expense, per the agreements made when Karupiah purchased the utility (noted above).
- 3) The utility wants to install (replace?) "backup electrical generators" at water pump sites. The application document cites attachment W-2, but it is not included in the available download paperwork. This expenditure is the responsibility of the utility, not the users. The owner should fund this and absorb the expense, per the agreements made when Karupiah purchased the utility (noted above).
- 4) The utility wants to purchase a pickup and a 4 wheeler. The application document cites attachment W-3, but it is not included in the available download paperwork. The use of these vehicles would likely be shared by other entities owned by Karupiah, and the expense should be accurately allocated. The owner should fund these purchases and absorb the expense, per the agreements made when Kaupiah purchased the utility (noted above. HOWEVER, in the "Related Entity Narrative, Asset ownership and Existing Leases" document in the current request, it states that Esprit leases to the water company the following: vehicles and other light truck equipment. How can you have it both ways?

- 5) The utility wants the users to fund the connection costs for 20 vacant plotted lots. What Karupiah fails to mention in the application is that he owns the 20 lots. The cost for this is detailed in attachment W-4, which is not included in the available document download. This clearly is an expense of the utility and the lot owner(s)...not the utility users.
- 6) The utility wants to install approximately 360 meters to remotely read water usage. The application cites attachment W-5, but it is not included in the available document download. What is not noted or projected is the effective savings to the utility by not manually reading the meters. This should be an expense of the utility and certainly not the users.

Now let's take a look at some other concerns.

In Exhibit 1, schedule B, Accumulated Depreciation, there is a line item for "structures and improvements." Also included are things like supply mains, power pumping equipment, purification systems, meters, hydrants, etc. But the largest line item is "Structures and Improvements" at \$774,820...by far the largest amount on this schedule. What could this utility possibly have at more than 3/4 of a million dollars in this line item? In the documentation, it is reported that the utility leases facilities from other entities owned by Karupiah. In the "Related Narrative, Asset Ownership and Existing Leases" it states "There is no land included nor, water rights, or miscellaneous equipment included in the balance sheet for CDS StoneRidge Utilities" and "Esprit owns all buildings, and miscellaneous equipment not on the StoneRidge Water Company balance sheet as well as the remainder land parcels, and ROW rights." Esprit leases to the water company the following: office and shop space, vehicles and other light truck equipment, office equipment, and water rights and use of ROW. What is included in this "structures and improvements" line item that totals \$774,820? Also in this listing is a line item for "Services" at \$30,101. What services are depreciated?

Regarding Attachment L, Exhibit #2 Schedule B Expenses: Labor and Salaries total a whopping \$223,267. I would encourage the IPUC to review, forensically audit and validate this level of expense for a relatively small, simple water utility. Meters aren't read half the year. Chlorine levels are only sampled 2-3 times per week. Billing and payments are processed at a part time level at best. This number is highly suspicious.

Regarding Attachment N Exhibit 3 Cost of Capital: Long term debt is listed at \$104,005. Water utility users should not be repaying a loan for the owners capital/equity.

The application for a rate increase should not be considered or approved until an accurate, honest, complete and evidence based application is submitted.

Please deny this rate increase request in its entirety.

Thank you.

IPUC
PO Box 83720
Boise, Idaho 83720

Case No. SWS-W-24-01

March 14, 2024

Hello,

I am writing regarding a water rate increase proposed by CDS StoneRidge Utilities (PO Box 298, Blanchard, Idaho 83804). This is regarding Case number SWS-W-24-01.

This utility has proposed water rate increases of 261% to 543%. After reviewing the rationale for these increases, all of the reasons given are completely unwarranted.

I ask that you decline the entire rate request by CDS StoneRidge Utilities.

- 1) CDS StoneRidge claims to have “invested” more than \$900,000 since ownership transfer. This claim was made in the official notice to users. There is no documentation about what types of investment the utility has made. We suspect it is to try to recoup \$980,000 the utility owner transferred from Esprit Enterprises/JD’s Resort, as found in Case number SWS-W-23-03 where it was declared this was to be treated as owner’s equity. PLEASE verify this claim by the utility. We suspect that the claimed investment has not been in infrastructure or system improvements, such as the water system infrastructure....the wells, pumps, transfer pipe system, etc. are the same as when purchased by the utility operator. I suspect the owner has transferred his OWN money as capitalization, which should be regarded as owner’s equity and not an expense to be recouped from utility customers, as noted in SWS-W-23-03. Additionally, this current rate increase request includes infrastructure expenditures, which we note are questionable, and are detailed below.
- 2) I believe that when CDS StoneRidge purchased the utility, Chan Karupiah, the owner, claimed to have enough cash and assets to fund improvements and capitalization. He should live up to this agreement without impacting users of the utility. Please refer to Case number SWS-W-18-01 when Karupiah purchased the utility. That action declared that “JD Resort (applicant) must demonstrate his financial ability to operate on its own accord. The notarized personal guarantee of Chan Karupiah to use his personal finances to support the financial needs of the company is of uncertain value. If Mr. Karupiah were to file bankruptcy or otherwise being unable to meet all of his financial obligations, a signed personal guarantee to financially support a legally separate company is dubious value compared to more standard cash capital or debt instruments likely held by other creditors. Therefore, we require assurances that JD Resort has the financial ability to operate the system in the public service, not JD Resort by and through Chan Karupiah. JD Resort must be able to make and pay for ongoing repairs and have access to capital for major repairs, including pump or well failures...JD Resort must file balance sheets and income statements with the commission quarterly...JD Resort must file its balance sheet and income statement for the quarter ended 30 June, 2019, within 60 days of this Order. Subsequent quarterly financial statements must be filed within 45 days of the quarter end. JD Resort must file monthly bank statements showing at least a \$50,000 balance until JD Resort establishes a bank line of credit of at least \$250,000.”

- 3) The operating expenses absolutely do not justify a rate increase. We believe this proposal is about greed. The owner of CDS StoneRidge also owns a golf course....StoneRidge. The golf course used to get its water from the utility, about 50,000,000 gallons annually...we have heard the golf course did NOT pay its water bill at times, if at all. The golf course drilled its own water well recently and has separated from the utility for water supply. The utility is trying to recapture that lost income from current users. This is unconscionable.
- 4) The employee related expenses are minimal. One person to read meters for six months of the year, who also takes chlorine readings every few days...a part time employee at best. Another part time person to administer billings and receive payments. Chan Karupiah reportedly spends one day per week at StoneRidge...where he oversees the utility, the sewer system, the golf course, and the bar/grill. We suspect he has allocated too much overhead for expenses into the rate increase paperwork. **A complete forensic audit by IPUC would be appropriate in this instance to verify all financial documents and claims.**
- 5) We understand that, at times, if not currently, CDS StoneRidge, the utility, has been chronically late with filings and reports due to the IPUC since it was purchased by the current owner.

Now, let's review Attachment W in the current CDS StoneRidge Utilities rate increase application.

- 1) The owner claims to have financial harm from the reduction in water sales to the golf course. The golf course drilled its own well to avoid water charges from the utility. The same individual, Chan Karupiah owns the golf course and the utility. In essence, he was paying himself...the utility he owns was billing the golf course he owns for water. Now...as a result of the new golf course well, the golf course has a significantly lower cost for water, a huge savings to Karupiah. BUT...now he wants utility users to pay for what HE used to pay. That is simply unconscionable. This proposal actually doubles his gain...reduced water fees for the golf course AND replace that lost income at the expense of the utility users... nearly 50,000,000 gallons of water cost annually! This should not be allowed.
- 2) The utility wants to replace 3 pump motors. To my knowledge, there are currently two working wells for the utility. The application document cites attachment W-1, but it is not included in the available download paperwork. This expenditure is a responsibility of the utility, not the users. The owner should fund this and absorb the expense, per the agreements made when Karupiah purchased the utility (noted above).
- 3) The utility wants to install (replace?) "backup electrical generators" at water pump sites. The application document cites attachment W-2, but it is not included in the available download paperwork. This expenditure is the responsibility of the utility, not the users. The owner should fund this and absorb the expense, per the agreements made when Karupiah purchased the utility (noted above).
- 4) The utility wants to purchase a pickup and a 4 wheeler. The application document cites attachment W-3, but it is not included in the available download paperwork. The use of these vehicles would likely be shared by other entities owned by Karupiah, and the expense should be accurately allocated. The owner should fund these purchases and absorb the expense, per the agreements made when Kaupiah purchased the utility (noted above. HOWEVER, in the "Related Entity Narrative, Asset ownership and Existing Leases" document in the current request, it states that Esprit leases to the water company the following: vehicles and other light truck equipment. How can you have it both ways?

- 5) The utility wants the users to fund the connection costs for 20 vacant plotted lots. What Karupiah fails to mention in the application is that he owns the 20 lots. The cost for this is detailed in attachment W-4, which is not included in the available document download. This clearly is an expense of the utility and the lot owner(s)...not the utility users.
- 6) The utility wants to install approximately 360 meters to remotely read water usage. The application cites attachment W-5, but it is not included in the available document download. What is not noted or projected is the effective savings to the utility by not manually reading the meters. This should be an expense of the utility and certainly not the users.

Now let's take a look at some other concerns.

In Exhibit 1, schedule B, Accumulated Depreciation, there is a line item for "structures and improvements." Also included are things like supply mains, power pumping equipment, purification systems, meters, hydrants, etc. But the largest line item is "Structures and Improvements" at \$774,820...by far the largest amount on this schedule. What could this utility possibly have at more than 3/4 of a million dollars in this line item? In the documentation, it is reported that the utility leases facilities from other entities owned by Karupiah. In the "Related Narrative, Asset Ownership and Existing Leases" it states "There is no land included nor, water rights, or miscellaneous equipment included in the balance sheet for CDS StoneRidge Utilities" and "Esprit owns all buildings, and miscellaneous equipment not on the StoneRidge Water Company balance sheet as well as the remainder land parcels, and ROW rights." Esprit leases to the water company the following: office and shop space, vehicles and other light truck equipment, office equipment, and water rights and use of ROW. What is included in this "structures and improvements" line item that totals \$774,820? Also in this listing is a line item for "Services" at \$30,101. What services are depreciated?

Regarding Attachment L, Exhibit #2 Schedule B Expenses: Labor and Salaries total a whopping \$223,267. I would encourage the IPUC to review, forensically audit and validate this level of expense for a relatively small, simple water utility. Meters aren't read half the year. Chlorine levels are only sampled 2-3 times per week. Billing and payments are processed at a part time level at best. This number is highly suspicious.

Regarding Attachment N Exhibit 3 Cost of Capital: Long term debt is listed at \$104,005. Water utility users should not be repaying a loan for the owners capital/equity.

The application for a rate increase should not be considered or approved until an accurate, honest, complete and evidence based application is submitted.

Please deny this rate increase request in its entirety.

Thank you.

From: Stephan Rezac <stephanrezac@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2024 1:56 PM

To: secretary <disabled@puc.idaho.gov>

Subject: SWS-W-24-01

Hello,

Attached is a public comment letter for IPUC case number SWS-W-24-01. It is in PDF format.

Thank you.

Stephan and Nancy Rezac

28 San Souci Drive

Blanchard, Idaho

208-255-8243

Idaho Public Utilities Commission
P O Box 83720
Boise, Idaho 83720-0074

RECEIVED
DECEMBER 13 AM 9:01
IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

CC:
Stoneridge Utilities, LLC
P O Box 298
Blanchard, Idaho 83804

RE: Company Case No. SWS-W-24-01

Dear Sirs of Idaho Public Commission,

Your entity is aware of the application from Stoneridge Utilities to increase monthly user fees and non recurring fees for water service. Please let us assure you that we are not unreasonable, we understand all utilities eventually increase in cost to the customer. That being said, we strongly oppose the exorbitant increases in fees for water usage in the application as it now stands.

Perhaps some of our wealthier neighbors residing in the Stoneridge resort properties area can absorb these increases but, we cannot.

We are retired and live under the line of poverty. We don't receive enough Social Security to even file income tax. The State of Idaho helps us to manage paying for our property taxes due to our low income and medical expenses. We raise a modest vegetable garden here in our yard each year from which we are able to can and freeze for our winter food supply. It is our fear that should our water rates skyrocket as proposed, we could not afford to even water our garden.

We have no lawn, hot tub, livestock or any other item that requires large quantities of water. Even still, our water bill increases in the summer. I can't imagine going from a \$47+ water bill to \$86 - \$154 + the prospect is overwhelming.

As far as new hookup fees, Stoneridge Utilities should be able to ask whatever they feel is equitable for them. But for us who have lived here for years, can there be a provision for "Grandfathering" at a reasonable rate? Can a sliding scale based upon income tax brackets be used to accommodate those who can ill afford this disastrous increase to our water cost? We hope this proposal comes to a fair conclusion for everyone concerned. We respectfully rely on your good judgement and experience as you consider this matter.

Sincerely Yours,

Kenneth W Peterson

Laurie M. Peterson

Kenneth and Laurie Peterson
92 West Skyline Dr
Blanchard, Idaho 83804

Deferson SWS-W-24-01
92 West Skyline Dr.
Blandhard, ID 83804

SPOKANE WA 990
6 MAR 2024 PM 4 L



Idaho Public Utilities Commission

P.O. Box 83720

Boise, Idaho 83720-0074

83720-0074

