

[Print Message](#) | [Close](#)

From : Shauna Benvegna-springer <sbenvegn@utah.gov>
To : "lorikilgore@juno.com" <lorikilgore@juno.com>
Subject : Re: mutual water company vs. public utility
Date : Tue, Jan 18, 2011 10:27 AM

Hi Lori - There is not a place that defines what a mutual water company. The does define what a public utility is. If there is a group of individuals who can trust each other and want to control their costs i.e., a mutual water company then the costs could be less by \$150. But if there is not trust, a public utility is better in my opinion. The only costs are a \$100 application fee (one time) with a \$50 regulator fee each year. What this provides is a regulatory agency who assists the utility in maintaining balance between the owners and the customers i.e., insuring the utility is financially stable, operationally sound, conducts audits and reviews every four years or more if necessary for rates, and provides a medium for handling complaints and resolution between customers and owners and on the customers side insures that rates, fees and costs are contained to provide safe, reliable, service. Some will say that you have to hire an attorney to deal with the Public Service Commission, but there are many companies and customers such as the Pineview, White Hills and Highland cases where attorneys were not hired. Without regulation the customers and utility must hire attorneys to deal with issues in civil court, which can be costly if they do not get along. Again, my opinion.

In Utah Code Annotated statue reference, 54-1-4 has the definition of a public utility.

Hopes this helps..

Shauna

>>> "lorikilgore@juno.com" <lorikilgore@juno.com> 1/16/2011 4:49 PM >>>
Hello Shauna.

Where can I find information that tells what the similarities and differences are between a mutual water company and a public utility. We are told that it will cost us more to be a public utility and I am wondering if that is true?

Thanks for your help.
Lori Wiser