

Hello Ms. Maack,

I apologize for the delay in responding. Hotmail filed your email in the junk email folder and it took awhile before we noticed it.

I have addressed each of your points below. One, however, I would like to address here. You stated: "We have all identified ourselves. Who are you and what is your background?".

I would like to point out that nowhere on the RCW website is anyone identified. Other than the woman that has stood up in the public meetings and identified herself as the spokeswoman for RCW, I don't recall hearing any of the speakers claim that membership. In any case, you know us. We are the people who have been giving support to K2 all along.

I suspect that the thrust of your question is who is directing the content of the website. I am financing, writing, and have 100% editorial control over the content. I get some assistance in researching topics and reviewing the material that I have written from others.

The website was my idea. I got so disgusted with the abusive nature of the anti-K2 speakers in the public meetings, particularly the November PSWID meeting, and the distortion of the facts that I decided that I needed to do something to help bring some facts and common sense into the discussion.

Sam Schwalm

From: *****@msn.com
To: waterforpinestrawberry@hotmail.com
Subject: Cindy Maack's response to unidentified composers of web site.
Date: Sat, 19 Jan 2008 17:34:07 +0000

Cindy Maack's response to unidentified composers of web site.

Strawberry experienced its first water shortages and no water was available to send to Pine

What happened to the wells in Strawberry owned by Pine? Was it made available to Strawberry so that Hardcastle could continue to charge for water hauling to Pine?

SS-> I haven't done any research on this, so I don't have a comment one way or the other. A successful K2 well will remove water hauling as a topic of discussion.

PSWID and PWCo entered into an agreement to jointly pursue development of the K2 site. PSWID would provide funding (\$300,000) for the initial test well to

determine if the site will have sufficient yield. If the K2 site proves to be successful, PWCo will reimburse the PSWID funding plus 6% interest and will invest up to \$1,000,000 to drill a production well and connect the well into the water distribution infrastructure. **Where is Brooke going to get the money to pay back the district? From rate hikes to Pine users.**

SS-> Brooke will have higher revenues due to increased usage of water in Pine during the summer and the addition of the 81 properties that are currently on the waiting list. There may be an impact to rates in order to pay for it. No one has ever claimed that solving the water shortages could be done for free.

too much of a hurdle for a water company that has only broken even on its [operating earnings](#) over the last five years and had gross revenues of only \$847,000 in 2006.

Mismanagement. I have managed many different business over the last 20yr and I believe Hardcastle is at fault. If it is that bad for him then he needs to sell.

SS-> If you had had the government setting your prices for you, you might have been less successful. In any case, it doesn't make sense to block the efforts that PWCo and the PSWID are taking now to bring water to Pine because you don't like what they have done in the past. It isn't fair to deny your neighbors water to settle your grudges.

Strawberry gets access to a large source of water without paying the development costs

How is this a benefit to Pine users? If Strawberry needs a well let them pay for it and let us in Pine use the existing wells in Pine now right now. \$20 a foot is the estimate for under ground piping installation.

SS-> Pine gets the water it needs. The point being made is that there is sufficient water being developed that Strawberry achieves a benefit without the cost. Strawberry has half the customer base of Pine and a deep well just for Strawberry would not make economic sense.

4. Removes the water hauling charges.

How is it so if the water will only be taken to Pine if we are in a stage 1,2. Not stage 3,4. Don't pee on my leg and tell me its raining.

SS-> The point of the K2 well is that we won't get to stage 3 and above during the summer. I have not seen anything that would indicate that water would not be able to flow to during certain stages.

Where I was raised a gentleman does not pee on a ladies leg, so I won't be in the position to tell you it is raining.

If the drilling site was in Pine the opposition would be making most of the same arguments against a Pine well.

Stop speculating on what we would or wouldn't be for.

SS-> I don't believe that this is speculation. Your most often repeated claim is that this violates the Arizona constitution and is a bad use of taxpayer money. If you

truly believe that, then it apply to wells in either town and you would be against the well being drilled in Pine.

This claim typically refers to the Milk Ranch well. The owner of this well has shown no interest in providing water to PwCo. The owner of the Milk Ranch well is currently suing to be removed from PwCo's area of operation so that he doesn't have to provide water to PwCo.

Bull, that is a lie! Read the testimony and see who is the one difficult to deal with. That's right believe a California lawyer who has proven unscrupulous characteristics over our own local residents who have invested their own money and recourses in finding water.

SS-> Mr. Pugel has been quoted as saying he will never sell water to Brooke. He isn't saying that he won't sell water to Brooke based on the current offer. It is Mr. Pugel's right to not sell the water since it is his property. It takes two parties to negotiate. Brooke has said they are willing, Pugel has said he is not. I have some concern over the hatred that RCW seems to have for people from California. The RCW literature that was handed out at your January 19th meeting stated: "Allows for foreign (California) ownership...". California is part of the United States. Many of our neighbors are from California and they aren't some lower form of life. When you sell a bottle of wine from Napa Valley do you worry about the foreign (California) ownership?

The other factor that is considered when obtaining water from private sources is the cost to get the water into the distribution system. That cost can be significant, \$891,000 for the Milk Ranch well (See [TetraTech estimate](#)), and can make the water too expensive to use.

If Hardcastle wouldn't of sold the storage tanks to Jim Richey that are now being used for potable water some where else, the cost to those storage tanks would have been significantly lower. Makes me wonder what really motivated the sale of that property and the those tanks. Coincidentally, the same time Richey was lead negotiator for PSWID. *Things that make you go hum.*

SS-> As the website states, Gila County condemned all three tanks as hazardous. Two of the tanks were structurally unsound and were cut up and sold as scrap. The third tank was structurally sound, but would not hold water. This tank was moved next to the Buckhorn Mesa landfill. A liner was put into it and it is used for non-potable fire-fighting water.

The tanks are not being used elsewhere for potable water.

And further more it would be a lot cheaper than the estimated cost of K2 at \$1.3 million.

SS-> Extra storage doesn't do anything if you can't pull the water out of the ground fast enough. A few hundred thousand gallons of storage isn't going to do anything to solve the millions of gallons that we are short each summer.

Our point exactly!

Hydrology Reports: Analysis of the initial hydrology report for the K2 site and the three peer review reports

SS-> I'm not sure what exactly the point you are trying to make with this reference to the hydrology reports.

In conclusion:

I wish the current board members and who ever you are would get your heads out of the sand and start being for the people and not a corporation in California.

Considering there are no bad guys and our goal is the same why wouldn't you understand that keeping our recourses local would be in ever ones best interest?

SS-> There is the California thing again. We believe that the RCW plan will be an expensive disaster that won't provide any additional water for years. We believe that the agenda behind RCW is the developer's desire to remove ACC oversight and have a water district whose board they control.

We don't believe that any of that is "for the people".

We have all identified ourselves. Who are you and what is you back ground?

Cindy Maack

Cinthy L Maack