

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [TPUC DocketRoom](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Docket 24-00044  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 25, 2026 6:11:34 PM

---

**This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender**

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.  
Please exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email - STS-Security

To Whom It May Concern,

Please include this comment in the official record for Docket 24-00044. I am unable to attend the public hearing in person, and I respectfully request that this written comment be given the same consideration as in-person testimony.

I am a property owner in L [REDACTED] E [REDACTED] and am writing to strongly oppose the proposed Phase II rate increase by Limestone Water.

The scale and pace of these increases are unreasonable. Rates for customers in our community reportedly increased by roughly 200% in 2024, and now Limestone is seeking to impose yet another increase. For property owners in L [REDACTED] E [REDACTED], this is not a modest adjustment. It is severe rate shock, imposed in successive waves, with little meaningful time for customers to absorb the financial impact.

What makes this even more troubling is that homeowners have not seen clear, proportionate benefits that would justify this level of increase. We are being asked to accept rapidly rising charges without sufficient transparency showing exactly what improvements have been made, how those costs are being allocated, and why existing customers should be expected to bear them at this pace.

A very large majority of the homes in L [REDACTED] E [REDACTED] are vacant for approximately nine months out of the year. This is a seasonal community. Because of that, it is fundamentally unfair for the bulk of the charges to be imposed as a flat monthly amount rather than being more closely tied to actual usage. A rate design that places too much weight on fixed monthly charges disproportionately harms seasonal property owners who use little or no water for much of the year. Customers should not be required to pay nearly the same amount when a house sits empty as when it is occupied and actively using water and wastewater services.

The Commission should also carefully examine whether L [REDACTED] E [REDACTED] customers are being required to shoulder costs that are disproportionate to the benefits received, including broader acquisition and system-wide improvement costs that may not directly benefit our subdivision. Existing homeowners should not be treated as a captive source of revenue simply because a private utility has chosen to acquire and invest in a system.

I respectfully ask the Commission to reject this proposed increase as currently structured, or at a minimum to significantly moderate and delay it until Limestone provides a much clearer and more compelling showing that the rates are just, reasonable, and fairly allocated.

I specifically ask the Commission to consider the following:

- spreading any approved increase over a longer period so homeowners are not hit with repeated sharp jumps in such a short timeframe;
- requiring Limestone to identify, in detail, which projects, upgrades, and operating costs directly relate to L [REDACTED] E [REDACTED];
- scrutinizing the proposed cost allocation to ensure our subdivision is not bearing expenses that should be assigned elsewhere in the system;
- revising the pricing model so monthly charges better reflect actual consumption, especially in a community where many homes are unoccupied most of the year; and
- withholding additional increases unless and until the company demonstrates concrete service-related benefits and a fair basis for the added charges.

Homeowners in L [REDACTED] E [REDACTED] deserve transparency, fairness, and rates that reflect actual use and actual benefit. At this point, this proposal does not appear to meet that standard.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Mark Weber, P.E.

L [REDACTED] E [REDACTED] Property Owner  
[REDACTED]