

RE: End Justifies The Means  
From: **Sam Schwalm** (waterforpinestrawberry@hotmail.com)  
Sent: Mon 2/11/08 6:57 AM  
To: CINDY MAACK (\*\*\*\*\*@msn.com)  
Hello Ms. Maack,

Please see my responses below.

Sam Schwalm

---

From: \*\*\*\*\*@msn.com  
To: waterforpinestrawberry@hotmail.com  
Subject: End Justifies The Means  
Date: Thu, 7 Feb 2008 13:53:27 +0000

Mr. Schwalm,

The difference between your perspective and RCW is that for you, the end justifies the means. We've explored the alternatives and are there are more economical solutions for the same goal: Water for our communities. This is our focus. Your scope is narrow-minded and is directed only on one "speculative " interim solution.

SS-> From what I have observed, RCW is not going to evaluate any alternative where PWCo and SWCo continue to be privately owned. So I don't think RCW has explored all the alternatives. The details for those alternatives that RCW has explored are not being provided to the public so the public can determine whether they are reasonable. What is RCW hiding?

K2 is much less expensive than buying the water companies and it provides water this summer instead of three or four years from now.

The current board has no respect for our community. They are arrogant, and acts as if they have a blank check. They operate without consideration of the business-minded progressive people of RCW. The PSWID obviously have no regard for the ACC RULES and REGULATIONS, as evidenced by their actions of putting money into escrow without a ruling from the ACC.

SS-> When someone doesn't agree with you, it doesn't mean that they are arrogant. The board had spent about a year negotiating the agreement and had voted unanimously to go ahead with it. The agreement was signed. That some people showed up at the end and objected isn't a reason to abandon the project. The open meeting laws

prevent them from answering questions or responding to public comment. I think they would have been more approachable outside of the meetings.

As to the ACC, they ruled last summer that they have no role with regards to the agreement. The only role they have is with the encumbrance, which RCW has managed to turn from a routine matter into a circus. Since that isn't a fundamental part of the project, it is being set aside for the moment.

The K2 is already over budget and this is only the beginning.

"Economical" and viable solution? Open your mind to the FACTS.

SS-> Let's be correct here, the K2 project is still within its budget of \$1,300,000. The test well portion of that looks like it will cost more than anticipated because it is being done so that it can be a backup to the production well. The PSWID's portion is still \$300,000, with PWCo covering the rest.

Cindy Maack

Cinthyan L Maack