

-----Original Message-----

From: Melnykovych, Andrew (PSC)

Sent: Monday, September 11, 2006 1:15 PM

To: 'N\_E\_O\_THING@YAHOO.COM'

Subject: RE: extension of sewer surcharge for Airview Estates (case 2006-00094)

Mr. Underdonk:

Thank you for your letter.

As you may be aware, this matter is currently before the PSC. The case number is 2006-00094. Please reference this number in any future correspondence, as it will assist us in placing your comments into the case file. The case number also is the easiest way in which to locate case records on the PSC Web site.

Your comments will be placed into the case record for the PSC's consideration.

Thank you again for your interest in this matter.

Andrew Melnykovych  
Director of Communications  
Kentucky Public Service Commission  
(502) 564-3940 x 208

-----Original Message-----

From: PSC - Public Information Officer

Sent: Monday, September 11, 2006 12:33 PM

To: Melnykovych, Andrew (PSC)

Subject: FW: extension of sewer surcharge for Airview Estates

-----  
From: Chad Underdonk[SMTP:N\_E\_O\_THING@YAHOO.COM]

Sent: Monday, September 11, 2006 12:33:16 PM

To: PSC - Public Information Officer; Attorney General (KYOAG);  
N\_E\_O\_Thing@yahoo.com

Subject: extension of sewer surcharge for Airview Estates  
Auto forwarded by a Rule

To Whom it may concern,

I am a resident of the Airview neighborhood and for nearly three years I have had a hefty sewer surcharge added to my water bill. My total bill is approximately \$68 a month, which is three times the going rate in any other neighborhood. It has come to my attention that the company that runs the sewage "station" for this neighborhood has filed for an extension on this surcharge, and it is my intent to file a letter with the PSC opposing this action.

These are the facts as I understand them based upon a cursory examination of the public electronic files from the PSC.

#1 The original owner of the sewer facility was out of compliance for years, and simply added his fines to our bill.

#2 The original owner applied to the PSC for a surcharge to cover repairs.

#3 The original owner claimed to have sent a letter to the residents of Airview to inform them of the application. This letter was never seen by anyone I have ever spoken to.

#4 The original owner also employed the new owners in various capacities for the purpose of running the sewer station.

#5 After the surcharge was added to our bill, the original owner made little to no necessary repairs for a period of nearly 2 years.

#6 The original owner then "sold" the sewer station to the new owners transferring no equity to them.

#7 The new owners, who formed a Limited Liability Corporation, then claimed that they needed to do a number of costly emergency repairs. They claimed they knew nothing about the state of the station at the time of sale although they acknowledge by their own statement that the previous owner picked them through "competitive bid" to work for him prior to their "purchase".

#8 The new owners charged anything they could against the surcharge, to include basic maintenance like mowing the grass. They also charged themselves advisory fees, and a number of other fees which can only be termed unconscionable. This is even more outrageous when it is understood that the residents of Airview Estates are already paying a fee for sewer service which should cover normal maintenance and service.

#9 The new owners have now filed for an extension of the surcharge so that they can pay for the "additional fixes" that have needed to be made. Supposedly a notice should have been sent to the residents of Airview Estates, but again, I know no one who knows of such notice.

There are many extremely suspicious goings on involved with the sewer service for Airview. As the "protected" consumer I would like to know what happened to all the money that was payed prior to the transfer of the sewer station to the new owners. I would also like to know how they can claim that they purchased it without knowledge of its state. And further I would very much like to know how they can justify charging normal maintenance and service (fair wear and tear) against a surcharge when they are

already charging a quite large fee against nearly two hundred households to provide sewer service.

An enquiry should certainly take place, and a hearing ought to be conducted ON SITE where the residents and representatives from the KY attorney general can attend to petition the PSC and attempt to get satisfactory answers from the new owners. I dare say the station owners will have a hard time looking the residents in the eye and justifying their assertions.

Sincerely,  
Chad Underdonk  
34 W. Airview Dr,  
Elizabethtown, KY 42701  
(270) 317-2865