

Renegade Mountain Community Club  
848 Livingston Road  
Suite 101, #62 PMB  
Crossville, TN 38555

August 17, 2015

Tennessee Regulatory Authority  
500 Deadrick St., 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Nashville, TN



RE: Public Comments for Docket 12-00077 Hearing

Mr. Chairman:

The Renegade Mountain Community Club represents the interests of over 530 owners on Renegade Mountain as well as virtually all the customers of the Laurel Hills water system, now the subject of this hearing in Docket 12-00077.

First, let me say, on behalf of the vast majority of our members, thank you for being proactive and getting involved in and concluding Docket 12-00030. The TRA has professionally and responsively addressed the issues that we brought forth over three years ago after our water was turned off. Equally responsive to our needs in this docket was the Consumer Advocate Division (CAD), the further focus of this correspondence.

The CAD was absolutely an instrumental and necessary party to the proceedings in Docket 12-00030, but has been repeatedly denied intervention authority in the penalty phase, Docket 12-00077. This was, and remains a serious flaw in the system, especially when it comes to the users of a governed utility, and here are some examples

On April 22, 2015 Laurel Hills filed a motion with the TRA to revise the schedule in Docket 12-00077 to allow time to "explore new options". In that filing, Laurel Hills cited several potential plans involving the Renegade Mountain Community Club (RMCC) and another plan involving "another developer". As current President of the RMCC, I can assure you that no such plans were being "explored" and that most of that letter was simply not true. The problem was/is, that without intervening authority by the "customers" (denied by the TRA) or the Consumer Advocate Division (repeatedly denied by the TRA), there was absolutely no legal method available to object to this motion or even to point out the false statements contained therein. Secondly, there were obvious issues in the Proposed Settlement Agreement before you, some of which were amended, that greatly affect the customers of the Laurel Hills water system, but again, there was/is no legal method to object to any of these legitimate concerns... all additional parties were denied intervention authority.

The customer's rights and the utility's responsibilities to its users, must be championed by someone during any TRA proceeding, in any docket, if not by third party interveners, then certainly by the Consumer Advocate Division. Will this make negotiations more difficult? Probably so, but the

consumer's rights and protections must be tantamount to any final decision. After all, they will be the ones most affected by the decision and will need to live with it for years to come. The bottom line is that the TRA needs to err on the side of the consumers/users and grant the Consumer Advocate Division intervention authority into all proceedings.

Again, without the assistance of the TRA, this critical water system would have gone another 42 years without resolution in regards to its user's needs; TRA intervention in this matter was absolutely critical to a final resolution.

I request that this correspondence be made a part of the public record in Docket 12-00077.

Regards,

John Moore  
President