

Jean Jewell

From: mjs2892@msn.com
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2012 5:34 AM
To: Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness
Subject: PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Michael J. Sato follows:

Case Number: FLS-W-12-01
Name: Michael J. Sato
Address: 3062 Sndy Dr.
City: Idaho Falls
State: Idaho
Zip: 83401
Daytime Telephone: 208-589-6954
Contact E-Mail: mjs2892@msn.com
Name of Utility Company: Falls Water Company
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

I'd like to first address the proposal of the rate increase Falls Water Company (further known as 'the company') is requesting with an analogy of a typical working person. A man walks into his boss's office and asks for a raise. He tells his boss he wants a raise in his weekly 40 hour salary of 19.1%. He then informs his boss that along with the increase of salary, he wants THAT AND his 40 work week to be reduced to 16.67 hours. Then he states that he now receives overtime pay after his 40 hours but now he wants overtime pay after the 16.67 hrs and a 9.7% increase in that pay as well. My boss would be laughing as he's kicking me out his office door telling me not to let the front door hit me on the way out! If you calculate the real impact of the 19.1% water base and the 9.7% water commodity price increase (taking into account the 58.33% decrease in volume of water base) proposed by the company, you come out with a 48.26% increase in price at the 12,000 gal use level for a 3/4" or less meter. This is a totally unreasonable request! The Commission is the boss in this scenario. We" the customers" have no choice in our water supplier. We cannot fire them and say we'll get someone else. You, as The Commission, are our protectors. Concerning the AMR metering project, I agree with the Commission Staff comments and findings. We should not have to burden the cost of their replacement. It was not authorized by you or the customers. If the company really cared about the customer as they claim in that they wanted to help the customer detect leaks in the winter months, then they would have been reading the ones that are already installed, and as they installed new ones, during the winter months now. My house has had an AMR since its construction in 2009 and it has never been read in the winter months. The comments of the Commission Staff concerning the lease of the extra space in the building owned by the owner of the company, and the dump truck and backhoe owned by the owner of the company, speaks for itself. That seems to me a bit unethical (at the very least) to try to pass that cost on to the customer. The comments by The Commission Staff appear to be sound in fact and I completely agree with their findings and recommendations. The recommendation of no reduction in volume of the water base and no price increase in water commodity with a 1.6% average increase in water base price seems reasonable and fair. The majority of customers (which have a 3/4" or less meter) are still going to have a 2.1% increase in water base price. I don't believe most people have had a wage increase by 2.1% in the last two years.

I hope you as The Public Utilities Commissioners follow and adopt all the 18 recommendations of The Commission Staff.

Thank You

Michael J. Sato

7/12/2012

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>

IP address is 134.20.11.89
