

**From:** Barbara Anderson <barblander@gmail.com>  
**To:** <psc@utah.gov>  
**Date:** 12/17/2011 4:26 AM  
**Subject:** Cedar Ridge (water) Dist. Co.

UTAH PUBLIC  
SERVICE COMMISSION

Dear Public Services Commission,

2011 DEC 20 P 1:23

294695 Sat, Dec. 17,

2011

RECEIVED

Thank you for the work you have done on docket # 11-2423-02, concerning the Cedar Ridge Dist. Co. in Deweyville. I am an intervener and, along with many others, had been anxiously awaiting your ruling, which was emailed to us on Friday (Dec. 16, 2011).

You did a great job, but feel I must hurry and point out one important thing, from pages 14-15, wherein you state, "the Company and its corporate shareholders may wish to compensate Mr. Thompson for his dedication and many years of service."

One of the major reasons we sent in a complaint to the PSC in the first place was that, according to the company bylaws, David Thompson and his two brothers, Jon and Henry are the ONLY shareholders with any voting rights. Jon told me personally, however, that the brothers turned control of the company back to David immediately and have never had anything to do with its management. Therefore, David has exercised complete control over all company dealings, financial and otherwise, from its inception. He ignored bylaws which called for meetings of the company officers, approved budgets, etc. He also managed to avoid any state intervention by simply not applying for a CPCN, after having been repeatedly instructed to do so.

Henry, who doesn't live in Deweyville, declined my invitation, lately, to get involved and has not attended any of the many meetings we've held as we have tried to iron out our water problems. Jon, whose home is outside the subdivision but connected to the water system, has been a supporter of David and sent in his notarized affidavit saying he felt David should get the \$190,000 for the sale of the well. I feel it would be very unfair to give these three men, the only "corporate shareholders," power to order that David be compensated (retro-actively) for his service as water master. I am certain that others will feel the same once they have read the ruling and that it will become yet another bone of contention in an already torn neighborhood.

We did not accept, last year, David's offer to become a mutually-owned company for one reason: he said we could not participate in the setting up of the new company, that would be "worked out" between him and his lawyer. In thirty years we have never been given any voice, any "say" in company matters. David has always felt it's his company to run as he pleases. Last year, when things became truly intolerable, we discovered we could appeal to the PSC for help and we jumped at the chance. We have been told that, now, the state will monitor company dealings.

And we find that to be a wonderful solution. (In time we may be able to become a mutually-owned company, but there are things that have to be worked out before that can happen.)

Therefore, I would suggest to you, (IMPLORE you, really) to have the DPU be the ones to decide if past-compensation is due, rather than David and his brothers. If you agree, it would sure help keep the lid on a very volatile situation if you could add that to your decision before a new brouhaha begins.

Thank you again for helping with this very, very unfortunate problem. All of us are sick at heart over the contention and praying for it to end. I hope my suggestion has not been offensive. I just thought I should bring this to your attention.

Barbara Anderson