

exhibit 00


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

**From :** Dottie Hogan <dottiehogan@gmail.com>  
**To :** Barbara Anderson <barblander@gmail.com>  
 Bob Buttars <robertbuttars@hotmail.com>, Bryce Wiser <lorikilgore@juno.com>, Buddy Hogan <eugenehoganjr@gmail.com>, Charles Jennings <vigilguy@gmail.com>, Clyde Summers <mewsummers@yahoo.com>, Daryl Anderson <jalmaraa@citlink.net>, David Thompson <zcabinets@comcast.net>, Dee Doney <deedoney@aol.com>, Devin King <horseshoe5@frontiernet.net>, Doug Adams <riverwood@frontiernet.net>, Frank Walker <h2oright@hotmail.com>, "J. R. Adams" <jrandjudy@citlink.net>, Jake Thompson <jacobthompson@comcast.net>, "Jon Z. Thompson" <jzt37@yahoo.com>, Larry Maughan <lmaughanster@frontiernet.net>, Leone Scott <leone.scott@atk.com>, Louise Behnert <louisebehnert@yahoo.com>, Luhuana Herrin <l.herrin@yahoo.com>, Lynn Darley <yelrad41@yahoo.com>, Mary Merrill <merbergmary@gmail.com>, Paul Rogers <pnrodg@frontiernet.net>, Randal Hatch <randal.hatch@atk.com>, Todd Summers <nancilee@frontiernet.net>, Troy Arbon <tjenarbon@yahoo.com>  
**Cc :**  
**Subject :** Re: 2nd water email  
**Date :** Wed, Feb 02, 2011 11:12 PM

My apologies Barbara but I have to disagree on this path. We have several well thought out, well researched alternatives to provide leverage to put a halt to starting a "new" water company without due diligence. This initiative is coming at the 11th hour and it is a bit late.

Cedar Ridge Distribution has not operated in the best interests of our neighborhood community. It is entirely willing to give us a company with a failing infrastructure reassigning the liabilities and risks to us. That company by law has supposed to have been a certified water utility and was bound to put a percentage of the revenues aside to provide for maintenance and repairs of the infrastructure. That did not happen. A meter was to have been put at the source to determine the baseline and true volume of water consumption. It was not.

Lori Wiser has done an outstanding job of researching the issue, getting informed opinion by state officials on the state of Cedar Ridge Distribution to date and what our actions should be going forward to ensure our rights and safety. There is *already* in motion a petition to intervene to allow for full disclosure of this company's assets, liabilities and books so that our neighborhood community can make an *informed* decision without being railroaded by a company that was remiss in it's duties thus far. The petition to intervene is already well in progress so it is very late for a totally different initiative now to take us on another path. This will only serve to muddy the water again when we had a clear strategy signed on to by an informed group thinking in concert.

Cedar Ridge Distribution absolutely must produce full disclosure of its past practices and documentation. If all had been in order, the books, board meeting minutes, inspections, water consumption numbers would have been in order. If at that time the Cedar Ridge mgmt. were simply tired and unable to continue - that would be one thing. But to allow that group to determine the path forward now after such a shoddy effort is unconscionable. It's not personal, it's just business.

*Never lose sight of the fact* that our properties are at significant risk for loss of indemnification in the event of a multi-dwelling fire. That is not my mere assumption but that of the insurance companies who insure our properties. Why? It is because there is no assurance that any of the data is correct and nor proper documentation that fire suppression is adequate. In fact, there was a report to the opposite from at least 7 years ago and nothing has changed. Also, who is going to take on the liability of improving the infrastructure? If the books are put in strict order, there are Federal grants and loans for this but failing that documentation I am not willing to subsidize this water company for what it should be responsible for and for which the law had put a procedure in place. If they had followed this, there would be no issue now. A good company would have contracted with a professional to provide 24/7 maintenance on the pumps, cisterns and perhaps even the pipe infrastructure. This is not the place for non-water professionals. It is our safety and health that is in question and only a professional water service is in a position to ensure that as well as to issue warranty on the equipment. Had that been in place, Cedar Ridge Distribution would not have needed to come to everyone hat in hand looking for a subsidy of \$987.00 apiece from it's customers. It would have had the set aside funds for this and, perhaps, have had to issue a slight raise in rates (also clearly regulated by the state) to pay for any deficit.

No, we need to see the process through that is already underway with paperwork en route to the State for intervention. If the State finds in our favor then the appropriate steps will have to be taken to put this company to rights and inform us of the true condition of the company. Until that is done, we can only expect *business as usual* which has not served us well to now. It's too little too late to start in this new direction now.

My opinion respectfully submitted,  
Dottie Hogan

On Wed, Feb 2, 2011 at 5:10 PM, Barbara Anderson <barblander@gmail.com> wrote:  
Dear neighbors,

I have heard back from enough of you already that I think we should go ahead with the idea of choosing a water committee. We need to find out now who would be willing to serve...learn how they feel about the issues...and then take a vote. So.....please send me an email stating whether or not you would be able/willing to serve. Please make sure you respond by listing your name and putting yes or no beside it. However, chose only one person where there are 2 or more adults in your household. Every household served by the present water company

will then get only one vote...so you'll have to agree within your household.

Someone reminded me that at our meeting in August a water board was chosen, but actually that was not done through voting. It was more of an expression of willingness to serve and acceptance of that offer. Those same people certainly could offer again now. But we will make sure this time that everyone--even those not present--gets the opportunity to vote.

I see this as a committee whose purpose is to work with David to get the "new" water company going. Therefore he would be part of the group without a vote for him being necessary. We would need to decide how long it will serve and when it's purpose is completed.

The town hall is available to us (free of charge--which is awfully nice of Deweyville) on Tuesday Feb 8 at 7:00. Would that be a good time for the whole group to meet?

Please hurry and respond.

Barbara A

---