

**From:** Ruben Arredondo  
**To:** Behr, Trixie  
**Date:** 7/21/2010 3:53 PM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Hidden Creek Water Company -Docket No. 09-2440-01  
**Attachments:** Tracy Tanner.vcf

Can you file this in the docket No 09-2440-01 as comments and response by Hidden Creek Water Company and issue it to those on service list.

>>> Tracy <[tracytan48@gmail.com](mailto:tracytan48@gmail.com)> 7/21/2010 3:49 PM >>>

Dear Judge Arredondo,

Hidden Creek Water Company formally objects to additional testimony, whether written or oral, regarding Docket No. 09-2440-01 that has been submitted to the Public Service Commission after the July 6, 2010 hearing. According to the Scheduling Order and Notice of Hearing issued May 27, 2010 Fact and expert discovery were to be completed by June 24, 2010; Responses to the Division's Recommendation and Expert pre-trial testimony were to be completed by July 1, 2010. The hearing conducted on July 6, 2010 then provided for public witness testimony and rebuttal opportunity. The July 6, 2010 hearing was properly and duly noticed as per the instructions by the Commission. The rate case is over a year since original submission. The extended nature of the rate case has placed financial hardship on the Company.

The Company objects to and is in disagreement with the information and/or proposals submitted by various customers since the July 6, 2010 hearing namely that information advanced in letters submitted by Mr. Brett Scharffs, Steve Thompson and Paul & Dion Barron dated July 13, 14 & 19th respectively. The Company asserts that some customers have misrepresented material facts to other customers in order to obtain signatures on the signature document which has been submitted after the July 6, 2010 hearing. The Company also questions the validity of some of those signatures since they are not notarized. Furthermore, the Company believes certain customers are attempting to stall the rate case and subvert the process in order to avoid paying summer useage charges based upon a new rate structure.

The Company has been fully cooperative with the Division's audit of the Company's system and operations over the past full year's time and has complied with the procedures and process outlined by the Commission in regards to the rate case. If a clear and predictable process is not adhered to by both the utility company and its customers then "all" customers will ultimately suffer due to an increased cost burden related to the rate case to the Company, namely additional legal fees.

The Company requests that the Commission approve the Division's recommendation dated June 14, 2010 along with the clarifications agreed upon by the Company and Division at the July 6, 2010 hearing.

Respectfully,

Tracy Tanner  
Hidden Creek Water Company

**Tracy Tanner**

[TracyTan48@gmail.com](mailto:TracyTan48@gmail.com)