



PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>

Re: Docket No. 25-2280-04, Order Dismissing Complaint

1 message

Sam Ray <samuelynnray@gmail.com>
To: PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov>

Sun, Mar 1, 2026 at 7:04 PM

This is a response to DOCKET NO. 25-2280-04 ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT, which omits significant details and misrepresents the facts of the complaint. The complainant requests the record be corrected and the recommendations be amended.

Omissions / Misrepresentations:

1 - The original complaint was "deceptive business practices," filed with the Sanpete County Sheriff after more than a month of delay by the Sanpete County Attorney. The complainant learned that the criminal complaint had been forwarded to the PSC more than 50 days later, in a lie-laced letter "Motion to Dismiss" (see response to PSC dated 10/14/25) from Legacy Sweetwater Inc. (LSI)'s attorney. Neither the county attorney nor PSC notified the complainant of the status of the complaint, hardly professional practice by either governmental entity, created to safeguard the public. Since when is a criminal complaint referred to another agency and the complainant notified 50 days later by the attorney for the accused criminal? I have now seen it all.

The complaint included evidence of violations of the following Utah laws:

Utah code 76-6-507(2)(c), (evidence 10A), (deceptive business practices),
Utah Code 13-11-4, (evidence #9), (deceptive business practice),
Utah Code, Title 19, Chapter 4, Section 102, (8) (a) reads, (evidence #8), (water system rules),
Utah Code. Title 19. Chapter 4. Section 112 (evidence #8), (water system rules),
Utah Code 76-6-409, (evidence 10B), (theft of services), and
Utah Code 76-10-1602, (evidence 10C), (pattern of unlawful activity).

None of these issues, the nature of the complaint, alleged violations of criminal law, nor the evidence submitted was referenced in the "Order Dismissing Complaint," thereby misrepresenting the "Procedural History and Factual Background."

2 - When the PSC notified the complainant that the complaint would be addressed by a neutral arbiter; the complainant responded that a "neutral arbiter," addressing the power imbalance between a utility monopoly and a customer; would NEVER provide needed relief. The complainant proceeded to officially document LSI treatment of its customers. The Order Dismissing Complaint fails to accurately document the complaint, the evidence or the actions of LSI. Decades ago, when the PSC was reformed, dismissing consumer advocates, the public was promised the PSC would still stand-up for customers, when mistreated by monopolistic utilities. This "Order Dismissing Complaint" clearly disproves that promise.

3 - The complainant has been billed (Jan 2025 - now March 2026) for access to "culinary" water, when a boil order has been in effect the entire time (NOT "indoor culinary water" as stated in evidence #1, item 5). The complainant was not officially notified by LSI when the boil order began (1/2025?) and has not been notified that the boil order has been terminated (3/2026). The boil order is/was open-ended and after more than a year, is still in effect. LSI could have simply shut off meter access for non-compliant customers and rescinded the boil order (evidence #7), but LSI chose instead to cover themselves from all liability by issuing an open ended boil order; a direct contradiction to the promised services LSI bills customers to provide. A 24-48 hour boil order, while repairs are completed, may be reasonable, but billing for "culinary water" for more than a year, while a boil order is in effect, is clearly deceptive business practice. Neither this history, nor evidence was included in the Order Dismissing Complaint, thereby misrepresenting the nature of the complaint and reasons for dismissal in the "Procedural History and Factual Background."

4 - The complainant did not request a connection prior to May 2025, because LSI customers (neighbors) said NO connections were allowed due to problems with the water system. The neighborhood (water system) was also under significant snow. Delays from May to August 2025 were specifically due to LSI negligence with the US Postal Service (evidence 13A). LSI knew their mail was not being delivered to their business address for more than 30 days at a time, but LSI failed to even call the post office to inquire. Once LSI contacted the Post Office, months of their mail was promptly delivered. Months of delay between mailing in an application for connection and receipt of the application was delayed as a result of this known, but unaddressed problem. Delay in receiving the complainant's check for connection was delayed for more than a month due to LSI's known problem with mail delivery, resulting in the complainant putting a stop payment on the check. The complainant then filed an electronic payment with his bank, thinking electronic funds transfer would immediately resolve the delay. Unknown to the complainant, LSI does not live in the 21st century. In this day of ApplePay

and Venmo, LSI has set-up no electronic funds transfer option, even with their own bank. As a result, the complainant's bank sent a paper check through the US Postal Service to LSI for the connection fee, further delaying connection. LSI either intentionally delayed connection by refusing to address delays in US Postal Service delivery, or through negligence, took advantage to delay connections. NONE of this history was included in the Order Dismissing Complaint, thus misrepresenting the "Procedural History and Factual Background."

5 - The LSI "Application for Utility Water Connection" (evidence #1) clearly states, "it is the responsibility of the lot owner to bring the water from the connection in the street to their residence." It is a "connection" request, a "connection fee" and "a connection in the street" not a water meter set request, water meter set connection or water meter set fee. All lot owners are required to provide a poly water line to the road for connection to the water meter, before connection, so the pipe to the residence can be connected to the water meter. According to the LSI employee, every lot owner but one, extended poly pipe (copper pipe size) to the street, exactly as done by the complainant. As a result, the LSI employee had plenty of poly pipe connections (iron pipe size) to provide for the connection, but had run out of copper pipe size fittings to "connect" the complainant to the system as the complainant paid for in the "connection fee." The LSI employee required the lot owner to provide the fitting to make the "connection," even though other customers, using both copper sized poly pipe and iron sized poly pipe were "connected" to the water meter as paid for by the "connection fee." Furthermore, the complainant provided multiple photos (evidence 11F, 11G & 11H), showing the meter was buried several feet in the ground and the connection fitting in question was buried under the edge of the water meter box, making connection after the meter set, without disrupting the meter set impossible. LSI again engaged in deceptive business practice as asserted by the complainant and supported by provided evidence. Failure to include these details in the "Order Dismissing Complaint" materially misrepresents the "History and Factual Background" of the complaint.

6 - The "Order Dismissing Complaint" reconfirmed that an LSI employee, in writing (evidence #4a), reported that no connections would be made until the legal issues with the HOA were resolved. The PSC reported that the "Complainant also attached an email from LSI, dated May 30, 2025, explaining the connection application could be found on the HOA's website," asserting falsely that connection was available; but failed to include the rest of the email stating, "We don't dig up and connect until your build is nearing completion" (evidence #7); thereby refusing to connect the water for years, as completion of the cabin will take years. The cabin being connected is built using Insulated Concrete Forms (concrete walls to the roof), requiring multiple concrete pours. LSI failed to provide water for the first pour, requiring prep, placement, finish, clean-up and post-finish watering (in direct August sun), WITHOUT A WATER CONNECTION; seriously compromising the concrete, causing cracks, weakening the slab, etc. LSI refusing to connect water for subsequent pours, as documented in the email provided, would have compromised the entire structure. Delays in the US Postal Service (known to, but unresolved by LSI) for the connection application, payment, etc.; further delayed connection, risking structural integrity of the cabin. Furthermore, in the previous year (2024), LSI took more than 30 days to mark the waterline after a Blue Stakes request, so the complainant could dig a driveway without puncturing the waterline (evidence #3). This delay required the complainant to dig the driveway by hand, several feet deep, ten feet wide, a hardship for sure; delaying driveway construction. Stating that the connection application was available on the website and failing to mention other delays was again incompetence at best by LSI; deceptive business practice at worst by LSI; and a misrepresentation in "History and Factual Background" of the "Order Dismissing Complaint."

7 - For years we have been told that throwing money at a problem will never solve that problem, yet that is exactly the recommendation of the "Order Dismissing Complaint." LSI requested release from PSC oversight (evidence #3), reported by the Legacy Mountain HOA, so LSI can raise rates 1000%. Members of the Legacy Mountain HOA board have reported that LSI selectively collects water fees (favoritism due to family connections, friends, etc.) resulting in funding shortfalls for LSI operations. The complainant requested investigation into this assertion, but the Order Dismissing Complaint recommends approving raised water rates for LSI without investigating billing or collection practices. The PSC needs to require LSI to serve its customers as promised verbally and in writing, not reward deceptive business practices, which is a criminal offense.

I humbly suggest Commissioner Dr Harvey (if not all signatories to the Order Dismissing Complaint) review the entire complaint, all attached pieces of evidence and reevaluate their approval of the Order Dismissing Complaint. In my doctoral studies at USU, and in 35 years of public sector leadership (federal, state and local, at the highest levels), I learned that facts matter, reports must be accurate and signatures mean that documents have been reviewed prior to approval. Dr Harvey surely learned the same in his doctorate. I can only guess that either too many reports require signatures to allow for full review of all evidence or that all evidence is not available to signatories. In either case, the complainant requests that all signatories review the "Order Dismissing Complaint," make factual corrections and either send to the appropriate agency for enforcement (County Attorney, Attorney General, etc.) or the PSC itself protect utility customers from an inept at best or predatory monopoly at worst.

Sincerely, Samuel Ray, EdD

On Fri, Feb 13, 2026 at 4:10 PM PublicService Commission <psc@utah.gov> wrote:
Formal Complaint of Sam Ray against Legacy Sweetwater, Inc.

To view the Order, please click on the link below or see the attached:
<https://pscdocs.utah.gov/water/25docs/25228004/34387125228004odc2-13-2026.pdf>

--

Public Service Commission of Utah
160 E 300 S, 4th Floor
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
801-530-6716
psc@utah.gov