

✓ Gen. Ask sent 11/14/07

✓ To AV.

✓ To Commus. ; H

Jean Jewell

From: the5woodards@clearwire.net
Sent: Tuesday, November 06, 2007 3:22 AM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Craig Woodard follows:

Case Number: UWI-W-07-04
Name: Craig Woodard
Address: 7147 Bluebird Drive
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip: 83714
Home Telephone: 208-853-6406
Contact E-Mail: the5woodards@clearwire.net
Name of Utility Company: United Water
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

I realize the ease of monthly billing, but with gas and grocery prices going up I really don't want to pay more just to have monthly billing. \$0.04 per day may not seem like much, but to my household every little bit counts. I've gotten quite use to the bi-monthly billing as I've been here paying United Water for many years for their service.

I don't know how the issue of water conservation and more frequent visits will positively affect the pocket book. I only hope that the homework has been done to really verify that the benefits will outway the costs that will be incurred.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 15.235.137.72

✓ Gen Ack sent 11/6/07

✓ To AV.

✓ To Commms.
: H

Jean Jewell

From: bjkboise@juno.com
Sent: Monday, November 05, 2007 7:23 AM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Joyce Knox follows:

Case Number: UWI-W-07-04
Name: Joyce Knox
Address: 2813 Starlington Dr.
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip: 83712
Home Telephone: 208-344-9576
Contact E-Mail: bjkboise@juno.com
Name of Utility Company: United Water
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

The present bi-monthly billing process works efficiently for us. This method is 'not broken.' Therefore, I urge the PUC to resist any attempts to 'fix it,' especially since a change to monthly billing would require a rate increase to fund the costs of additional billing. Instead, I suggest Boise Water offer a similar discount to customers who elect automatic payment! Such prompt and guaranteed payments, should be worth something. Thanks for this easy opportunity to make comment.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 4.253.99.95

✓ Ben Ask
sent 11/6/07

✓ To Commis.
JH

Jean Jewell

From: roseboise@yahoo.com
Sent: Monday, November 05, 2007 4:22 AM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Douglas Rose follows:

Case Number: UWI-W-07-04
Name: Douglas Rose
Address: 5383 S. Farmhouse Pl.
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip: 83716
Home Telephone: 2083870492
Contact E-Mail: roseboise@yahoo.com
Name of Utility Company: United Water Idaho
Add to Mailing List: no

Please describe your question or comment briefly:
I wish to register my opposition to the proposed change in United Water's billing cycle. The company's literature presents a list of benefits, but these are all clearly for the company, not the consumer. The company acknowledges the increase in our water bills under the proposed change. It fails to mention the doubling of postage costs to pay the bills and the added base upon which United Water will be able to present future proposals for percentage-based increases in its rates. In a public utility monopoly environment, the only recourse we have as consumers to represent our interests is the Commission. We need the Commission to stand against the unnecessary increase in the cost of this essential commodity when there is absolutely no benefit to the consumer.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 67.60.166.247

✓ Gen Bk sent 11/6/07

✓ To A.V.

✓ To Comm. : H

Jean Jewell

From: michaelnk@peoplepc.com
Sent: Monday, November 05, 2007 4:01 AM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Michael Killworth follows:

Case Number: UWI-W-07-04
Name: Michael Killworth
Address: 4158 S Barber Station Way
City: Boise
State: Idaho
Zip: 83716
Home Telephone: 2083760899
Contact E-Mail: michaelnk@peoplepc.com
Name of Utility Company: United Water
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:
I recently received a letter from United Water informing me of their desire to go to monthly billing and presenting their reasons for the needed change. I find their justifications for wanting monthly billing to be so weak that they border on the ridiculous! The only merit (depending on point of view) of this proposal is the creation of eight new jobs and more timely cash flow to the company. As a United Water customer for many years I do not support their request. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. MK

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 4.227.160.84

✓ Gen Ack sent 11/6/07

✓ To Adv.

✓ To Comm. : H

Jean Jewell

From: boisesell@aol.com
Sent: Monday, November 05, 2007 3:57 AM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Cliff Sell follows:

Case Number: United Water dated 09/17/2007
Name: Cliff Sell
Address: 5223 Cheyenne Ave
City: Boise
State: Id
Zip: 8309
Home Telephone: 208-362-4068
Contact E-Mail: boisesell@aol.com
Name of Utility Company: United Water
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

United Water's application to change billing frequency to a monthly basis overlooks one aspect that is extremely important to me and I'm sure to many others. The company claims this is a cost saving measure to both customer and company but, will, nevertheless, cost each subscriber only \$1.15 a month more than currently charged. This additional cost is meant to handle the expense of more frequent billing and meter reading. I don't believe this is necessary as the benefit is weak to the customer (does not equal the cost of more frequent meter reading) and to customers like myself who automatically pay their bills electronically without benefit of any economic offset by the company. A measure that saves them money by not having to pay postage and process checks. I am already saving the company money and I don't want to pay more for the privelege. Thank you. Cliff Sell

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 207.200.116.203

✓ Ann Ask sent 11/0/07

*✓ To Commis.
; H*

Jean Jewell

From: fiveringers@cableone.net
Sent: Sunday, November 04, 2007 11:57 PM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Steve Ringer follows:

Case Number: UWI-W-07-04
Name: Steve Ringer
Address: 3054 Starview Drive
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip: 83712
Home Telephone: 208-342-4465
Contact E-Mail: fiveringers@cableone.net
Name of Utility Company: United Water
Add to Mailing List: no

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

Changing to monthly billing is idiotic if it costs more to the customer. The reasons stated for the change are phony and not the true reasons they want to do this. The real reason is probably to speed up their cash flow. If they want want to do it they should pay for it themselves and not charge ratepayers. If monthly billing is such a great idea perhaps going to weekly billing would even be better. Is it really good to have more cars driving around polluting our air. I don't want to pay extra and go through the hassle and expense of writing more checks solely to benefit United Water so that they can collect their revenue a few weeks faster.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 69.92.211.102

✓ Gen Ack
sent 11/6/07

✓ To AV.

✓ To Commis.
; H

Jean Jewell

From: dan@raceme.cc
Sent: Sunday, November 04, 2007 5:58 AM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Dan Kern follows:

Case Number:
Name: Dan Kern
Address: 11408 W. Columbia
City: Boise
State: Idaho
Zip: 83709
Home Telephone: 208-362-1531
Contact E-Mail: dan@raceme.cc
Name of Utility Company: United Water
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

I would like to let you know my displeasure with United Water, as for starters their rate is high enough, when they took over as our provider of water we were notified that we should look for other ways to water our lawn so our bills would be less as this was a big leap in paying for water service. As you know their is no way for us to use another source so we are stuck with them it seems to me they added nothing for us out here and now would like us to pay for more of the same, I say NO to rate hike to pay for monthly billing I like it as well as I can the way it is. I hope you (PUC) see this as a way to continue having us pay for more and receive less PLEASE say NO. I hope this doesnt fall on deaf ears, if you were to drive around our area you would see several lawns dead and not kept up as a result of their rates, I have lived here since 1975 and this is the worst I have seen this area, this area is econmically challenged as it is, and United Water has not helped in any aspect, as far as I am concerned we are worse off than before, UW. All they really want it to collect money each month so they can get it sooner rather than later, and I should care? If they can not make ends meet, so be it, I hope the next water company will do a better job but than again who couldn't, as they would have to do nothing to stay the same.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 71.215.29.56

✓ Gen Ack
sent 11/6/07

✓ To Adv.

✓ To Comm. H

Jean Jewell

From: rookery1@cableone.net
Sent: Saturday, November 03, 2007 2:03 PM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Todd McCulloch follows:

Case Number: UWI-W-07-04
Name: Todd McCulloch
Address: 3244 S. Rookery Lane
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip: 83706
Home Telephone: 208-392-8439
Contact E-Mail: rookery1@cableone.net
Name of Utility Company: United Water Idaho
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

I am not opposed to a justified increase in utility billing. 3.75% seems reasonable if this improves customer satisfaction and helps conserve a valuable natural resource. However, I am not convinced by Mr. Wyatt's testimony to the IPUC that adding 4 new meter readers and 4 new office staff will accomplish that. Providing monthly billing, as opposed to bi-monthly billing to United Water customers without improving available online usage information and bill payment options for customers seems to only result in more fees and no value added. Mr. Wyatt is asking for \$1,125,905 annually from all United Water customers equally and his primary reasons as stated in his testimony are 1. to decrease the amount of each bill to the customer, making it easier to pay; and 2. to conserve water by providing customers with information to make better usage decisions depending on the season. As I stated, I do not disagree with the amount of the proposed increase or the creation of jobs for the Treasure Valley labor market. Nor do I disagree with the fundamental objectives of Mr. Wyatt- to lower monthly expenses of users and to provide better information to UW customers. I do, however disagree with the methods proposed. I am not an expert in this field and I am not familiar with the complex workings of a public utility but judging from UW's current website, current billing practices and public awareness program it seems that there may be better more beneficial strategies to increase customer satisfaction. I welcome any response and look forward to discussing this matter in more detail if circumstances warrant. Thank you for your consideration.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 69.92.233.127

✓ Gen. Ack
sent 11/6/07

✓ To AV.

✓ To Commus.
; H

Jean Jewell

From: JosephWillmus@msn.com
Sent: Friday, November 02, 2007 2:42 PM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from J Willmus follows:

Case Number: UWI-W-07-04
Name: J Willmus
Address: PO 8422
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip: 83707
Home Telephone: 888-888-8888
Contact E-Mail: JosephWillmus@msn.com
Name of Utility Company: United Water
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

Charging me an extra \$14/year to send me six additional mailings is silly and greedy. I think they either twisted the survey numbers or twisted the survey questions to get these results. I think the truth is more likely they wish to have a lower average accounts receivable balance. If they really do have a very few folks that really do want a monthly bill then simply estimate it. In fact, if they must send a monthly bill to all they could estimated all with a reading about four times a year.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 71.37.166.216

✓ Ann. Ack
sent 11/6/07

✓ To Commms.
? H

Jean Jewell

From: mdwilson@boisecenter.net
Sent: Friday, November 02, 2007 1:41 PM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Monte D. Wilson follows:

Case Number: ??
Name: Monte D. Wilson
Address: 700 E. Parkway Ct.
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip: 83706
Home Telephone: 208.344.4344
Contact E-Mail: mdwilson@boisecenter.net
Name of Utility Company: United Water
Add to Mailing List: no

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

There is no need, or consumer desire, for a monthly meter reading and billing. Budgeting and paying is twice as easy for the consumer with the current bi-monthly bill, and it costs \$13.80/yr less than the proposed rate. Water conservation is more likely to result from a noticeably large bi-monthly bill than from a smaller monthly bill. The current bi-monthly billing works better than a monthly billing, so I encourage commissioners to heed my grandmother's advice, 'If it ain't broke, don't fix it.'

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 208.100.250.187

✓ Gen. Ask
sent 11/6/07

✓ To AV.

✓ To Commis.
: H

Jean Jewell

From: wwc1@cableone.net
Sent: Friday, November 02, 2007 7:41 AM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Bill Cheeseman follows:

Case Number: UWI-W-07-04
Name: Bill Cheeseman
Address: 3677 E Arborvitae Ct
City: Boise
State: Idaho
Zip: 83716
Home Telephone:
Contact E-Mail: wwc1@cableone.net
Name of Utility Company: United Water
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

I disagree with United Water's request to change to a monthly meter reading and billing cycle. Their reasoning doesn't justify the increased expense and inconvenience to customers nor the significant increase in pollution caused by the doubling of road miles driven by their vehicles. United Water states that it is easier for customers to budget and pay monthly than bimonthly. This is subjective and not supported by any testing or proof by the company. I believe the only way to substantiate this anecdotal statement is to survey United Water customers and ask them if monthly billing is easier and more convenient. Personally, the more times I have to pay a bill the less convenient it becomes. And, unless you participate in United Water's automatic direct payment program, the company does not offer any cost-free way to pay the water bill; the company currently charges a convenience fee to pay by phone or on line. Consequently, this change will double my costs to buy stamps to continue mailing my water bills. Additionally, United Water claims that enhanced water conservation and quicker leak detection and meter problems will be identified. Again, this is not proven and subjective at best. Most people watering their lawns and plants during the summer already know what their consumption and water costs are, and getting a monthly water bill will not change their water usage during the high consumption months. Are United Water meter readers going to know if a water leak exists just by reading the meter? No, the bill will have go to the customer who would have to ascertain whether a problem exist with their water consumption. Lastly and most importantly, increasing meter readings from six times a year to twelve times a year will double the paper products produced for billing, and add to our pollution problems by significantly adding to the number of miles that United Water vehicles must travel; don't we have enough pollution and congestion in the Treasure Valley without needlessly adding to it?. If Idaho Public Utilities Commission feels compelled to approve this request, than it should stipulate that United Water must provide a cost-free convenient way for customers to receive and pay their water bills online, in the same way that Intermountain Gas and Idaho Power currently provides.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 24.119.117.203

✓ Myr Ack.
sent 10/6/07

✓ To AV.

✓ To Commus.
; H

Jean Jewell

From: dkwolf2@msn.com
Sent: Thursday, November 01, 2007 3:08 PM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from David Wolf follows:

Case Number: UWI-W-07-4
Name: David Wolf
Address: 12780 West Gisborne St.
City: Boise, ID
State: ID
Zip: 83709
Home Telephone: 362-2914
Contact E-Mail: dkwolf2@msn.com
Name of Utility Company: United Water
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:
I am opposed to the United Water application for conversion to monthly billing. This application appears to be a thinly veiled attempt by United Water to increase its revenue through billing its customers for the costs of its own bills. I do not believe United Water's customers should be 'allowed' to pay for their own billings just for the convenience of United Water. If United Water wants to reduce its bi-monthly billing workload it could certainly implement a one-time one month bill for half its customers and split customer's bi-monthly billing into two groups. Rather than billing each customer monthly, this would have the effect of allowing United Water to process bills monthly, halve United Water's current bi-monthly billing workload and still allow customers to have only six bills per year rather than twelve. By reducing United Water's bi-monthly workload they could save time and staff effort and rather than raise rates, they could lower them by refunding the savings.

I request that you not approve this rate request. It is not to the benefit of the customer.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 71.221.128.155

✓ Gen Ack sent 11/6/07

✓ To A.V.

✓ To Commis. # 14

UNITED WATER IDAHO INC.
8248 West Victory Road, Boise, ID 83709
P.O. Box 190420, Boise, ID 83719-0420
Tel: 208.362.1300 • Fax: 208.362.1479



Dear United Water Idaho Customer: 2007 NOV -5 AM 8:33

On September 17, 2007 United Water Idaho filed an Application with the Idaho Public Utilities Commission (IPUC) asking for authority to convert to monthly meter reading and billing for all customers. Currently, water meters are read and billed every two months.

There are a several benefits of monthly billing, including:

- Easier budgeting and easier to pay than a bi-monthly bill;
- Enhanced water conservation and lower bills through the provision of more timely information on consumption, allowing customers time to make changes in water use practices during the irrigation season, thus saving money;
- More frequent visits to your premises by United Water Idaho personnel, enabling quicker detection and troubleshooting of customer leaks or meter problems.

In the Application United Water Idaho is proposing a revenue increase of \$1,125,905. Under the proposed Application the increase will be applied to the fixed Customer Charge portion of your bill which is not affected by how much water you use. The requested increase would raise rates for all customers by about \$1.15 a month (about 4 cents a day), bringing the average annual residential customer bill from \$368.61 to \$382.44, or 3.75%.

The proposed increase is necessary to cover the increased costs of additional personnel, billing, and collections attributable solely to the conversion to monthly meter reading and billing.

To learn more about the company's Application please visit the company's website at <http://www.unitedwateridaho.com>.

The proposal to convert to monthly billing and the proposed increase in rates are subject to review and approval by the IPUC. A complete copy of the proposal is available at the company's office at 8248 W. Victory Road, Boise, ID and at the Commission's office at 472 W. Washington, Boise, ID. It is also available on-line at the IPUC website: <http://www.puc.state.id.us/FILEROOM/water/water.htm>.

You can also file a comment on the Application via the IPUC website at: <http://www.puc.state.id.us/scripts/polyform.dll/ipuc>.

Or mail comments to:

Idaho Public Utilities Commission
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0074

Sincerely,

United Water Idaho

06010012007

Thank You,
Mel Jackson
1553 E. Corniche Ct. Boise ID 83706

Hi, ←
This website does not work.
The benefits to the consumer do not outweigh the costs.
Consumers don't mind bi-monthly bills. Please remain efficient.

✓ Men Ark
sent 11/6/07

✓ To A.V.

✓ To Comms.
: 14

Dear Sir,

In response to
your request for
information regarding
the proposed Bill
concerning the
rights of the
disabled to
work.

As a retired
and a permanently
disabled war
veteran, I am
obligated to
you for your
concern.

I already pay
my property
taxes and
am a member
of the
company.

JOHN P. ARNOLD
7095 CHILACOT DR.
BOISE, ID 83709

Nancy Halliwell
3001 S. Roosevelt #7
Boise, Idaho 83705

✓ Gen. Inks
sent 11/6/07

✓ To Adv.

✓ To
Comms
? It

RECEIVED

2007 NOV -6 AM 8:04

Idaho Public Utilities Comm
PO. Box 83720
Boise, Id. 83720-0074

IDAHO PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

I wish to protest the United Water
application to convert to monthly billing!

Already most of our bill goes to administrative
fees - Out of my \$20.00 bill \$16.21 goes to
customer charge and only \$3.64 for water use.

Now they want to add more to the customer
charge just so they can convert to monthly.

I liked paying a bi-monthly bill - less
stamps, checks + time used.

They should be looking for ways to help
the customer not add to their bill just
for administration costs.

PLEASE DENY THE APPLICATION!

Nancy Halliwell