

✓ Gen Hike
sent 1/9/08

✓ To AV.

✓ To Commms
: H

Jean Jewell

From: juliewrites@yahoo.com
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2008 12:49 PM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from Julie Fanselow follows:

Case Number: UWI-W-07-04
Name: Julie Fanselow
Address: 1504 Columbus St.
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip: 83705
Home Telephone: 208-859-9006
Contact E-Mail: juliewrites@yahoo.com
Name of Utility Company: United Water
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:
As you consider United Water's plea to convert to monthly billing AND raise service charges by 3.75 percent, please know:

Unlike Intermountain Gas and Idaho Power, United Water charges a \$3 'convenience fee' for people who want to pay their bill online. Many other utilities and companies allow customers to pay their bills at no charge. I pay about a dozen bills online each month at no charge. United Water is the ONLY creditor I have that wants to charge me for the service.

United Water also charges a \$3 'convenience fee' for people who want to pay their bills by phone.

If the Idaho PUC approves United Water's request, it also ought to require that the company to set up a free online bill paying system for its customers.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 66.233.148.122

✓ Gen Ack
sent 1/9/08

✓ To AV

✓ To Commus.
SH

Jean Jewell

From: jkeifer@q.com
Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2008 7:51 AM
To: Tonya Clark; Jean Jewell; Gene Fadness; Ed Howell
Subject: PUC Comment/Inquiry Form

A Comment from John Keifer follows:

Case Number: UWI-W-07-04
Name: John Keifer
Address: 3355 N Five Mile Rd #335
City: Boise
State: ID
Zip: 83713
Home Telephone: 208-378-1829
Contact E-Mail: jkeifer@q.com
Name of Utility Company: United Water Company
Add to Mailing List: yes

Please describe your question or comment briefly:

I am stating my objection to United Water's proposal to convert to monthly meter readings from the current bi-monthly program. I read previous comments from the Company to the effect that customers want the change, I don't believe that is the case. There has been considerable discussion among my friends and neighbors about this and none of them are in favor of a change. In this day and age when evryone is concerned about cost management, allocating an additional \$1.5 million to overhead by raising customer expenses, is not a good business decision. I cannot support an increase to my bill that provides no benefit to me. Finally, there is nothing in Company's proposal that discusses the value of the monies received by reducing the billing cycle from 60 to 30 days, and moving a significant amount money from the receivables column to the cash side of the ledger. If they are convinced this is such a good deal, then they should pay the additional expense for monthly billing from the intrest received as a result of the improved cash flow and not by increasing our costs for water service.

Sincerely
John C Keifer

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>
IP address is 71.209.42.224
