

✓ Ken Beck  
sent 12/4/07

✓ To A.V.

✓ To Commis  
; H

RECEIVED

2007 DEC -3 AM 8: 22

IDAHO PUBLIC  
UTILITIES COMMISSION

November 29, 2007

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

We have received information from United Water Idaho regarding their application to change from meter reading and billing from every two months to monthly readings and billings.

I am writing for both my husband, Oscar O. Nelson, and myself regarding this request that would increase our rates approximately 3.75%. This doesn't include extra postage of \$2.46 for those of us that pay by mail.

Being retired and on very limited income this extra increase would make a lot of difference to us and perhaps others like us.

As to their proposed benefits, we can't see that the extra money is worth the effort of having to write a check each month (12 instead of 6) + more postage.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

*Oscar O. Nelson*  
*Elizabeth F. Nelson*

Oscar O. Nelson and  
Elizabeth F. Nelson  
3644 E. Immigrant Pass Court  
Boise, ID 83716-6906  
Telephone: (208) 343-7079

✓ Jean Ack  
sent 12/4/07

✓ To Commms  
JH

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** ltccmusar@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 04, 2007 12:12 AM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Paul Schneider follows:

-----  
Case Number: UWI-W-07-04  
Name: Paul Schneider  
Address: 4976 N. Tumbleweed Pl.  
City: Boise  
State: ID  
Zip: 83713  
Home Telephone: 208-608-8001  
Contact E-Mail: ltccmusar@gmail.com  
Name of Utility Company: United Water Idaho  
Add to Mailing List: no

Please describe your question or comment briefly:  
United Water Idaho rate increase

United Water indicates that the rate increase is solely for the purpose of covering the increased costs associated with billing the customer monthly vs. bimonthly. I do not see where the customer should pay the cost of their operational change that does nothing more than increase United Water's cash flow. Their stated reasons for wanting the change, while valid, are very minimal at best. Id Water staff read my meter, they don't look for leaks in my system.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 67.60.230.65

-----

*✓ Gen Beck sent 12/4/07*  
*✓ To Comments*  
*id*

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** marcwhitehead@msn.com  
**Sent:** Monday, December 03, 2007 12:59 PM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Marc Whitehead follows:

-----  
Case Number: UWI-W-07-04  
Name: Marc Whitehead  
Address: 5415 Paulson Circle  
City: Boise  
State: Idaho  
Zip: 83704  
Home Telephone: 208-322-8196  
Contact E-Mail: marcwhitehead@msn.com  
Name of Utility Company: United Water Suez  
Add to Mailing List: no

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

I cannot conceive of a simple change of billing from bi-monthly to monthly resulting in a cost and rate increase of \$1,125,905! This is outrageous. It's just another in a long string of United Water's rate increases over the years. There is NO WAY that anything like an increase is needed to do a simple billing. Is United Water saying the company will pay it's meter readers an additional \$1.1 million in wages? If so, I can't oppose it. But, if the rate increase is going into the corporate coffers and into the French Suez's stockholder pockets, I am definitely opposed. With monthly billing, the company will receive the customers' money on an accelerated schedule with the ability to invest those funds. If anything, the company's rates should be CUT to compensate for the increased income it will reap from early payment of customers' bills through monthly billing.

I suggest you graph-out the average customer's cost over the last 10 years and send that out as a billing insert.

On another topic, your PUC website is the WORST website I think I have seen in 10 years!!!! It doesn't look like it has been updated ever. Your lack of links and clear navigation, explanation of cases under consideration, etc., borders on negligence (seriously). If this website reflects the quality of the work that the PUC staff does, then I suppose you are happy and satisfied. If not, then do something to change it!!!

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 71.37.163.185

-----

✓ Gen Ack  
sent 12/4/07

✓ To AV. ✓ To Commrs.  
: H

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** mingram@lso.idaho.gov  
**Sent:** Monday, December 03, 2007 5:06 AM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Maureen Ingram follows:

-----  
Case Number: UWI-W-07-04  
Name: Maureen Ingram  
Address: 10350 Skycrest Drive  
City: Boise  
State: Idaho  
Zip: 83704  
Home Telephone: 208-377-1031  
Contact E-Mail: mingram@lso.idaho.gov  
Name of Utility Company: United Water of Idaho  
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:  
The two-month billing cycle works very well, and has for years and years. It is not difficult for the average residential customer to anticipate the bill amount in that 2-month time frame. Usage is always higher in the summer and lower in the other months, in general.

To bill monthly will be much more costly to the company, which of course will be passed on to the customer. Not only does it appear UW is asking to bill monthly, which means the customer charge will be billed each month thereby doubling UW's income from that source and doubling the cost we now pay for that, which is beyond the cost of water usage, but they are also asking to increase that fee.

Who really is contending the two-month billing cycle is not satisfactory? I do not think it is the average residential customer who writes a check six times a year.

Why would those of us who pay six times a year want to now pay twelve times a year, double what we pay for the customer fee, and pay even more for that same fee, without any enhancement to the service or a reduction in rates?

Utility costs across the board continue to rise, as do the administrative fees charged. This request by United Water is unnecessary and contrary to the interests of a majority of its customers. Consolidation to save costs is what private enterprise tends to do; why is a public utility not paying attention to that money-saving strategy and going in the opposite direction? It makes no sense, and will cost everyone more. Who wins in this scheme, on the backs of those of us who are paying the bills?

Thank you for allowing me to comment, and I hope you will consider the plight of us taxpayers who now spend more of our limited disposable income for basics than we used to even a few years ago. This trend to extract more and more for the same service is not necessary and should not be supported by IPUC.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 164.165.113.142

*Gen Ack  
sent 12/4/07*

*✓ To A.U.*

*✓ To Commrs  
JH*

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** gobull\_1@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Monday, December 03, 2007 4:06 AM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Gordon Bullock follows:

-----  
Case Number: uwi-w-07-04  
Name: Gordon Bullock  
Address: 4452 N. Marcliffe way  
City: Boise  
State: ID  
Zip: 83704  
Home Telephone: 208 375 6643  
Contact E-Mail: gobull\_1@yahoo.com  
Name of Utility Company: United Water Idaho  
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

I fail to see the advantage of paying more money for a service, 'to make it easier' for one to pay. With bi monthly billing, people have twice as long to make room for the payment in their budget which should make it easier to pay. especially when they know they will Save Money. With this comment, I do oppose the increase in the water fees by changing to a monthly billing system. Thank you. Gordon Bullock.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 66.233.154.126

-----

✓ Ken Beck  
sent 12/4/07

✓ to AV.

✓ to Commis  
JH

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** gfleisch986@hotmail.com  
**Sent:** Monday, December 03, 2007 1:35 AM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Gerald Fleischman follows:

-----  
Case Number: UWI-W-07-04  
Name: Gerald Fleischman  
Address: 11535 W. Hazeldale Ct.  
City: Boise  
State: ID  
Zip: 83713  
Home Telephone: 208-287-4896  
Contact E-Mail: gfleisch986@hotmail.com  
Name of Utility Company: United Water  
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

It does not make sense to increase costs by going to monthly billing and then put it on the 'fixed fee' portion of the bill. The fixed fee portion of a bill cannot be conserved away. If the costs are reasonable, they should be added to the unit cost of water to futher encourage conservation. As is it, while monthly billing may encourage conservation by giving quicker feedback on water use, putting the extra cost in the fixed fee portion of the bill discourages conservation. See if United Water will go for putting this cost in the unit cost of water. Why should you approve something that gives cross-messages for conservation?

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipucl/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 164.165.96.2  
-----

*✓ Men Ack sent 12/4/07*      *✓ To AW.*      *✓ To Commes. i H*  
**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** rj\_rogers@netzero.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 02, 2007 6:55 AM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Richard Rogers follows:

-----  
Case Number: UWI-W-07-04  
Name: Richard Rogers  
Address: 1066 Saratoga  
City: Boise  
State: ID  
Zip: 83706  
Home Telephone: 208-338-9614  
Contact E-Mail: rj\_rogers@netzero.com  
Name of Utility Company: United Water Idaho, Inc.  
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

I am against the proposed rate increase by United Water of Idaho to cover the costs of going to monthly billing.  
If they were wanting to make things easier for the customer they would have proposed a flat pay plan similar to Id. Power. or they could allow a person to pay once or twice a year.  
Cost of gathering information for a bill is the responsibility of the utility. There is nothing to gain for the customer except a higher bill and additional postage of \$\$2.46 per meter per year which is not discussed.  
The city of Boise bills bimonthly and they have not increased their fees to cover the additional cost of collecting money.  
Has United Water provided the PUC with any reliable data showing unaccounted for water loses 3- 10 % is normal so if there is not excessive losses why do the additional monitoring? They offer a leak guard program to the customers so what percentage of the customers are paying for this protection? Is there any data showing the number of service lines being replaced annually.  
Did they show any information showing lost income on the bimonthly income that would be in earning interest? A good manager would invest part of the collected bills in some sort of an interest bearing account and make a little money.

I see that the City of Boise owns the fire hydrants as per this years budget plan hopeful United Water is not using these fire hydrants as part of their assets if so they need to be removed from their asset base.

Richard Rogers  
1066 Saratoga Dr.  
Boise, Id. 83706

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 63.24.52.232

-----

*✓ Gen Ack sent 12/4/07*      *✓ to Comments: H*  
**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** littlelarryb17@cableone.net  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 02, 2007 5:22 AM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Douglas P. Dodson follows:

-----  
Case Number: *UWI-W-07-04*  
Name: Douglas P. Dodson  
Address: 1403 S. Island Glenn Way  
City: Eagle  
State: Idaho  
Zip: 83616  
Home Telephone: 208-939-7860  
Contact E-Mail: littlelarryb17@cableone.net  
Name of Utility Company: United Water  
Add to Mailing List: no

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

On 9/17/07, United Water Idaho filed an application to convert to monthly meter reading and billing. Currently, the company is on a two month meter reading and billing cycle. I am opposed to monthly reading and billing. United Water is increasing its costs without providing corresponding benefits. I want the PUC to reject this application. I want to maintain the current two-month cycle we currently have. Thank you.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 67.60.162.188

-----

✓ Gen Ack  
sent 12/4/07

✓ To Commis.  
; H

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** hhagens@promission.net  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 01, 2007 10:13 AM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Hoyt Hagens follows:

-----  
Case Number: UWI-W 07-04  
Name: Hoyt Hagens  
Address: 4687 N. Syracuse Place  
City: Boise  
State: ID  
Zip: 83713  
Home Telephone: (208) 939-9698  
Contact E-Mail: hhagens@promission.net  
Name of Utility Company: United Water  
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

I have read through the proposed billing change.  
The supposed benefits do not outweigh the additional cost of implementing such a change.  
The result of United Water's request will:

1. Increase administrative overhead
2. Increase field staff
3. Increase wear and tear on vehicles
4. Increase vehicle requirements
5. Increase fuel consumption
6. Increase emissions

If the proposed request presented a strategy to integrate meter reading technology that decreases points 1-6 above, then the request would deserve some consideration. In this age of presenting 'environmental friendly' solutions, I can't believe a wiser solution is not under consideration.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipucl/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 24.119.165.225

-----

✓ Gen Ack sent 12/4/07

✓ To AV

✓ To Commus. ; H

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** zzdna@hotmail.com  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 01, 2007 7:10 AM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Carla Finis follows:

-----  
Case Number: UWI-W-07-04  
Name: Carla Finis  
Address: 10350 W Petearana St  
City: Boise  
State: ID  
Zip: 83704  
Home Telephone: 208-321-8230  
Contact E-Mail: zzdna@hotmail.com  
Name of Utility Company: United Water Idaho  
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

The 'benefits' to monthly billing laid out by United Water in their consumer information letter are ludicrous.

- 1) A recurring expense is a recurring expense and is no more difficult to address on a bi-monthly basis than a monthly basis - in fact it is less tedious on a bi-monthly basis.
- 2) Enhanced water conservation occurs because of a conscious decision on the consumers' part and changing to monthly billing will have little practical effect.
- 3) More frequent visits, in theory, could result in quicker problem detection and troubleshooting but, in practice, I have serious doubts. I would submit that irrespective of billing cycle, the consumer is more likely to detect the problems before United Water meter-reading personnel.

Whatever the reason for United Water's decision to switch to monthly billing it most certainly has more to do with stabilization of accounts receivable on their part rather than any effort to enhance customer service. There has been no demand on the part of the consumer for more frequent billing. This does not reflect an increase in service to the consumer and, therefore, the cost of this transition (change in their business practice) should not be borne by the consumer.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 69.92.157.48

-----

*Den Ask  
sent 12/4/07*

*✓ To Commes  
JH*

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** rtaylor@ieee.org  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 01, 2007 7:07 AM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Richard Taylor follows:

-----  
Case Number: UWI-W-07-04  
Name: Richard Taylor  
Address: 1752 N Chaucer Way  
City: Eagle  
State: ID  
Zip: 83616  
Home Telephone: 208-938-1997  
Contact E-Mail: rtaylor@ieee.org  
Name of Utility Company: United Water  
Add to Mailing List: no

Please describe your question or comment briefly:  
I am strongly opposed to monthly billing by United Water. It would be an unnecessary administrative cost increase with dubious benefits. This is exactly the kind of waste and irrational monopolistic behavior that the IPUC is intended to protect us from.

Although the cost increase is small, the flippant attitude of waste is offensive. They should instead be looking at ways to improve their administrative efficiency.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 72.24.238.232

-----

*✓ Gen. Ack  
sent 12/4/07*

*✓ To Commrs.  
i H*

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** john@ramshaw.org  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 01, 2007 5:11 AM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from John Ramshaw follows:

-----  
Case Number:  
Name: John Ramshaw  
Address: 8853 Westbrook Drive  
City: Boise  
State: ID  
Zip: 83704  
Home Telephone: 208-375-9573  
Contact E-Mail: john@ramshaw.org  
Name of Utility Company: United Water Idaho  
Add to Mailing List: no

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

I urge IPUC to reject United Water Idaho's request to convert to monthly meter reading and billing. The current bimonthly system works fine. The proposed change to a monthly system would simply increase costs to customers but provide no significant benefits in return.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 71.209.46.217

-----

*✓ Ken Ack  
sent 12/4/07*

*✓ To Commis.  
3/4*

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** cinbil@cableone.net  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 01, 2007 2:19 AM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Cindy Thompson follows:

-----  
Case Number: UWI-W-07-04  
Name: Cindy Thompson  
Address: 1077 W. Colchester Dr.  
City: Eagle  
State: ID  
Zip: 83616  
Home Telephone: 208.938.8525  
Contact E-Mail: cinbil@cableone.net  
Name of Utility Company: United Water  
Add to Mailing List: no

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

As a United Water customer I would like to respond to the letter we received from United Water on the proposed increase in our bills with a change from bi-monthly to monthly billing. Per the benefits listed on the letter:

1. Easier budgeting and easier to pay than bi-monthly bill - First, it takes less of our time and is "easier" to pay six payments a year to United Water than twelve. And how does a 3.75% increase in our bill (due strictly to this monthly billing change) contribute to making it financially "easier" to pay our bill? I realize there are some with higher bills in the summer due to yard watering but the season for these higher bills is well known and can be planned for accordingly.
2. Enhanced water conservation and lower bills.... - The bills have been very clear about when the summer rates start and when they stop. I don't think we need monthly bills to make this clearer.
3. More frequent visits for troubleshooting - Is this really an issue? Are there that many problems that we need to pay another 3.75% for water? I don't know the answer to this but would ask the PUC to find the answers to these questions and determine whether it would really save customers/United Water enough to justify this increase in rates.

This increase is to be added to the fixed charge portion of our bill. So for those customers that try to improve their water conservation practices, this increase would not benefit them at all.

I think United Water has a responsibility to be as cost efficient as possible and pass the results of that efficiency onto their customers. Obviously, bi-monthly billing makes them more efficient. Why do we want to go to a less efficient process, passing all the costs to customers, if the only benefits to the customers are those listed in the letter? I don't think it is worth a 3.75% increase in our water bill

Cindy Thompson  
1077 W. Colchester Drive  
Eagle, ID

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 67.60.59.25

-----

*✓ Gen Ack sent 12/4/07*      *✓ To Commis. S.H.*

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** bandpj@netzero.com  
**Sent:** Friday, November 30, 2007 12:22 PM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Pat Laing follows:

-----  
Case Number:  
Name: Pat Laing  
Address: 1610 no 23rd st  
City: Boise  
State: Idaho  
Zip: 83702  
Home Telephone:  
Contact E-Mail: bandpj@netzero.com  
Name of Utility Company: United Water  
Add to Mailing List:

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

United Water has filed an application to change to monthly billing, which for some might be an advantage. However they also wish to have a rate increase to offset the cost of this billing which is not a benefit to anyone except united water. I should hope that the commision would not allow United Water an increase in the basic rate to increase the cash flow of this company.  
                  thanks for your time

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 64.136.49.226

-----

✓ Men Ack  
sent 12/4/07

✓ To AV

✓ To Commus.  
? H

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** dave\_robbyn82@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Friday, November 30, 2007 10:45 AM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from David Chamberlain follows:

-----  
Case Number: UWI-W-07-04  
Name: David Chamberlain  
Address: 2636 W Sugar Crest Dr  
City: Eagle  
State: Idaho  
Zip: 83616  
Home Telephone: 208-855-0776  
Contact E-Mail: dave\_robbyn82@yahoo.com  
Name of Utility Company: United Water  
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

Absolutely NO to the monthly billing and rate increase. The stated 'benefits' are not real and of no value to me. 1) I can budget fine over 2 months. Don't assume we're stupid and not capable. 2) I won't conserve more because I got 6 extra bills in a year, including the summer. 3) I don't want more visits or more expense. I'll take my chances of a meter problem. This must be a revenue growth scheme disguised as a customer benefit, or someone wanting to hire their family and friends. If there are a few customers out there who need or want the monthly billing for visibility to irrigation levels, monthly charges, meter problems, etc. then let them 'OPT IN' and pay for the additional visits and overhead. Don't burden all of us, by assuming we will receive or will want the 'benefits.' This one seems easy to say NO to, or to let them add resources and charge for services given to those who 'OPT IN.' Please say NO.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 67.60.43.70

-----

*1/24/07 sent*

*To Commis. ;H*

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** joyerb@juno.com  
**Sent:** Friday, November 30, 2007 9:56 AM  
**To:** Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell  
**Subject:** PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Roger & Joy C. Erb follows:

-----  
Case Number: UWI-W-07-04  
Name: Roger & Joy C. Erb  
Address: 6572 W. Wintergard St.  
City: Boise,  
State: Idaho  
Zip: 83714  
Home Telephone: 208-853-0529  
Contact E-Mail: joyerb@juno.com  
Name of Utility Company: United Water  
Add to Mailing List: no

Please describe your question or comment briefly:  
We do not want to pay for this company to change their billing cycle in order to make it 'easier' for someone else or the company.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipucl/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 67.41.253.234

-----