

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** nyteowler@msn.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 11, 2011 1:05 PM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Colleen Patterson follows:

-----  
Case Number: *UWI-W-11-02*  
Name: Colleen Patterson  
Address: 7255 W. Lamplighter St.  
City: Boise  
State: Idaho  
Zip: 83714  
Daytime Telephone: 208-853-3154  
Contact E-Mail: [nyteowler@msn.com](mailto:nyteowler@msn.com)  
Name of Utility Company: United Water  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

The proposed 20% rate increase by United Water is absolutely unreasonable and unwarranted. 2011 has been one of the best water years in Idaho for a long, long time, and expecting customers to pay more is absurd and quite frankly, the most blatant attempt of theft by a utility company of its customers I have EVER seen. When I moved to my current home I was on Garden City Water, which was both reasonably priced and good quality. I was switched to United Water approximately a year later without my consent or approval. My water rates DOUBLED after that change and have done nothing but increase ever since. I realize that inflation and shortages of a natural resource can induce rate hikes for utilities, but never in my life have I encountered a company that wants to raise rates so high just because they can. We are not in a drought, there are no shortages at this time, if anything our rates should be going DOWN! United Water is nothing more than a greedy, self serving utility that doesn't care about it's customers in the least, and this proposed rate hike is unfair, unjustified and just plain wrong. So many people are struggling right now to keep thier families fed and roofs over their heads, and a rate increase like this could very well push more families over the edge with bills they cannot afford to pay. Do the right thing, DO NOT APPROVE THE UNITED WATER PROPOSED RATE INCREASE!

Thank you for considering my comments,  
Colleen M. Patterson  
Boise, ID

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 71.209.57.248

-----

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** feased1@aol.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 11, 2011 7:41 AM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Deborah D Fease follows:

-----  
Case Number: UWI-W-11-02  
Name: Deborah D Fease  
Address: 1119 Oaklawn Dr  
City: Boise  
State: Idaho  
Zip: 83709  
Daytime Telephone: 208-230-2712  
Contact E-Mail: [feased1@aol.com](mailto:feased1@aol.com)  
Name of Utility Company: UNITED WATER IDAHO  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

I oppose the rate increase United Water is seeking under case #UWI-W-11-02. I followed their suggestions to reduce my water usage and now I am being charged for taking their advice. Simply put, I will be paying more for getting less. Has United Water done their due diligence internally to cut costs? I would recommend and like to see all areas (overhead, administrative, pay cuts, etc) that United Water has reduced in their operating expenses before they charge end users to make up the shortfall. Why is it a surprise to United Water that water consumption is down when they have been campaigning for this very thing? I believe poor management has a direct impact on United Water not being able to pay their bills. Good management would have had a strategy in place BEFORE the money was spent for paying the costs. Why should end users pay for LESS product AND bad management? United Water is owned by Suez Environment; this is listed on the United Water web site under 'about us': Global, world-class resources targeted at local communities 'United Water, and its parent company, SUEZ ENVIRONNEMENT, participate in global water research and development programs with a budget of \$102 million, the largest in the world.' Why can't United Water pay for the shortfall by using monies from one of the largest budgets in the world? United Water has internal resources and ways to cover the shortfall instead of passing it along to the customer. If United Water can PROVE without a shadow of a doubt this shortfall or large portion of this shortfall cannot be paid for by their parent company's budget and/or cutting operating expenses, I would be receptive to a rate hike. I need proof that the rate hike is justified. At this time, it has not been justified.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 15.203.233.80  
-----

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** rsnyder@fiberpipe.net  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 11, 2011 3:39 AM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Rick Snyder follows:

-----  
Case Number: *UWI-W-11-02*  
Name: Rick Snyder  
Address: 7229 Lamplighter  
City: Boise  
State: Id  
Zip: 83714  
Daytime Telephone: 208-631-2754  
Contact E-Mail: [rsnyder@fiberpipe.net](mailto:rsnyder@fiberpipe.net)  
Name of Utility Company: United Water  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

I am writing this message as an opposition the rate hike of 20% requested by United Water corp. I can't even imagine what they are thinking. They have spent money over the years to preach water conservation and the people responded, not as much to help out the utility company, but because of their outrageous prices they already charge.

I see this as a wave of last resort that they are going to try and survive without cutting back and being fiscally responsible. It is time for all of the people to stand up against a company that is mis managing its resources.

Take a page out of the United States postal service, (another that we are forced to use) cut back just like the rest of the business and companies have to do in times like these. It's time for an all-out blitz of Facebook and twitter to be heard.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 71.209.7.41

-----

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** anoonan@ctcweb.net  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 09, 2011 9:59 AM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Aimée Noonan follows:

-----  
Case Number: UWI-W-11-02  
Name: Aimée Noonan  
Address:  
City: Boise  
State: ID  
Zip:  
Daytime Telephone:  
Contact E-Mail: [anoonan@ctcweb.net](mailto:anoonan@ctcweb.net)  
Name of Utility Company: United Water Id  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

It is possible that an increase is needed to protect your profit, which is the real reason for your request, but an increase of 19.9 percent is unconscionable. One of the executives interviewed suggested the size of the increase was to force consumers to cut usage, but it was also stated that usage is down. Can't have it both ways. Please eliminate the request or, at least, reduce it.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 66.232.81.47

-----

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** dakrull@hotmail.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 09, 2011 10:43 AM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Don Krull follows:

-----  
Case Number: uwi-w-11-02  
Name: Don Krull  
Address: 5371 W. Hidden Springs Dr  
City: Boise  
State: ID  
Zip: 83714  
Daytime Telephone:  
Contact E-Mail: [dakrull@hotmail.com](mailto:dakrull@hotmail.com)  
Name of Utility Company: United Water Idaho  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

I wish to register a negative vote for the proposed 19+% increase that United Water Idaho has requested. Part of their justification is that there is lower water useage resulting in less income. We all have heard the stories about water shortages and many of us have acted to conserve as much water as possible. Now as a result we are potentially penalized for our actions. This is not fair. In addition the need for updating and replacing old water lines is understood and supported. But it seems that better budgeting for these items rather than just raising rates significantly at one time would be a more appropriate financial decision. Hasn't UWI been budgeting for these updates all along. Also, we are in a high water year and it is recognized that there are no guarantees that this will occur again; but, requesting higher rates when ample water is available does not seem to be the way to go. We all have encountered higher costs of living following the difficult last few years. But 19% increase is just too much.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 66.232.81.180

-----

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** chiwah4@ctcweb.net  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 09, 2011 1:59 PM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from ARTURO FRAGA follows:

-----  
Case Number: UWI-W-11-02  
Name: ARTURO FRAGA  
Address: 12723 N. 9TH AVE  
City: BOISE  
State: ID  
Zip: 83714  
Daytime Telephone: 208-229-2662  
Contact E-Mail: [chiwah4@ctcweb.net](mailto:chiwah4@ctcweb.net)  
Name of Utility Company: UNITED WATER IDAHO  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

The reported requested increase of 19.9% for residential customers is excessive considering the current economic condition we are in. Current rates should not be used to pay for the full cost of capital improvements; as was reported for the Hill Rd water line. United should better budget capital improvement costs over a period of years. United has ads on the TV pushing water conservation, yet it was reported that declining water usage was part of the reason for the rate increase. The Commission should consider only a more reasonable rate, and only grant any increase based on proper management planning and supported costs.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 66.232.81.238  
-----

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** jmarcotte@cableone.net  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 10, 2011 2:40 AM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Jon Marcotte follows:

-----  
Case Number: *UWI-W-11-02*  
Name: Jon Marcotte  
Address: 2811 W Jefferson Street  
City: Boise  
State: Idaho  
Zip: 83702  
Daytime Telephone: 208-870-5759  
Contact E-Mail: [jmarcotte@cableone.net](mailto:jmarcotte@cableone.net)  
Name of Utility Company: United Water Idaho  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

I strongly oppose allowing United Water Idaho to raise their water rates. Like many people, my first thought was of how strongly they encourage us to conserve water and how odd it is that we are now to be punished by doing so. In our current economy any increase is painful and this one is unwarranted.

I recently heard that the company who owns United Water Idaho has been recognized in other states as pulling this same stunt and they are no longer managing water in those states. It would be worth the Public Utility Commission's time to investigate this.

Thank you for asking for public comment. Again, I encourage you to vote 'no'.

Jon Marcotte  
Boise

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 63.227.241.129  
-----

**Jean Jewell**

---

**From:** cjverhalen@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 10, 2011 5:31 AM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from CJ Ensign follows:

-----  
Case Number: *UWI-W-11-02*  
Name: CJ Ensign  
Address: 3801 E. Pecan Street  
City: Boise  
State: ID  
Zip: 83716  
Daytime Telephone: 208-383-7127  
Contact E-Mail: [cjverhalen@yahoo.com](mailto:cjverhalen@yahoo.com)  
Name of Utility Company: United Water  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

A 19% rate increase is unfair and will create great hardship in a suffering economy. Appropriate 'cost of living' increases year to year might be tolerable. Obviously, the problem with essential resources like water is the monopoly. Where do we go and what do we do if we cannot afford the increase? Please consider carefully the businesses that will be adversely affected and the impact on employment as well as personal well being. Thank you for considering my comments.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 170.135.241.46

-----

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** mcneillkp@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 10, 2011 12:10 PM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Kevin McNeill follows:

-----  
Case Number: *UWF-W-11-02*  
Name: Kevin McNeill  
Address:  
City: Boise  
State: Idaho  
Zip:  
Daytime Telephone:  
Contact E-Mail: mcneillkp@yahoo.com  
Name of Utility Company: United Water  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

Thankfully, the Idaho Public Utility Commission is accepting public comments on the United Water Company's request for a 20% increase in water rates; therefore, I respectfully submit the following items for the Commission's consideration.

### Background

The media reports of United Water Company's intention to increase water rates do little to enlighten consumers as to the Company's actual funding situation. A review of the voluminous supporting documentation prepared by the Company and their New Jersey-based financial consultants adds little clarification. This is due to the fact that much of what is presented is generic data that could support a standard utility request for a rate hike.

### Concerns

The lack of succinct, relevant information that is understandable to the layman (such as a simplified summary of the situation) raises these concerns:

1. The actual % drop in revenue that Company experienced over the past year should be specified.

The actual drop in revenue (if any) is never clearly presented in any of the media reports. It is difficult to consider the magnitude of a rate hike without having any idea of how much that revenue has actually decreased.

2. Likewise, the actual % drop in Operation and Maintenance (O&M) costs that the Company experienced over the same time period should be specified.

A decrease in water demand will result in a corresponding decrease in water production, which will lead to a corresponding decrease in O&M costs. Decreasing O&M costs should offset decreases in revenue. For example, decreased production results in less chemicals for treating less water, less chemical sludge for disposal, decreased costs for less disinfectant, decreased power costs for pumping less water, decreased fuel for and maintenance for the vehicle fleet etc.

3. In addition to the proposed rate hike, the cost-cutting measures that have been proposed by the Company should be clearly specified.

Instead of raising the cost to consumers, United Water Company should be finding imaginative ways to cut costs e.g. mothballing under-used facilities and unit treatment processes while optimizing production at key locations in the distribution system; postponing non-essential capital projects and confining spending to projects that are absolutely necessary; reducing

personnel costs by decreasing overtime, reducing travel and training costs etc. No clear evidence is presented that the Company is doing anything of this nature to decrease costs.

4. The Company should present and explain the other financial means of debt retirement (besides raising the cost of their water product) that the Company has explored. For example, the Company should discuss options such as retiring capital project debt using available federal grants and low-interest loans, possibly with some principal forgiveness (such as from state revolving loan funds); re-negotiating the terms of existing indebtedness with borrowers; scheduling the installation of essential projects to take advantage of the time value of money; or use of available maintenance reserve funds.

5. Raising the cost of water in these difficult financial times is most counterproductive. Significantly raising the water rate - especially at a time of extreme financial uncertainty - will only encourage more conservative water use on the part of domestic consumers, thus leading to even less revenue.

6. Raising the cost of water may have the greatest impact on the commercial sector - the largest water consumers.

If any significant rate hike is approved this may potentially drive the largest water-consuming commercial users either to relocate to another City or to go out of business altogether, especially in the current extremely competitive commercial climate. This will again result in even less revenue, leading United Water to request additional rate hikes etc., etc.

7. The Company should clearly specify the options available to retire short-term debt other than long-term rate hikes.

An Assessment of ratepayers to pay down existing indebtedness would be preferable to a long-term dramatic increase in rates which never come down again once they are raised. This option should be developed and presented by the Company, in conjunction with other available mechanisms (grants, low-interest loans etc.) to reduce the Assessment.

#### Conclusion

The only difference between private enterprise and the United Water Company situation is that the Water Utility has a monopoly on providing Boise citizens with an essential product. Faced with decreasing demand for their product, the Company is attempting to justify a 20% rate increase in order to maintain an apparent 8.43% return on investment.

The only way that there is any sense in this application for a 20% rate increase is if the Water Company hopes to gain approval for a lower increase that the Company might otherwise not have been granted in light of the decreasing demand for water.

In these times of economic uncertainty, high unemployment, and belt-tightening, it is completely disingenuous that the United Water Company can request a rate hike based on the reasoning that revenue has declined due to their customers' good water conservation practices. The Company should explore a more creative solution that is - in the long run - both in the Company's and the public's best interests.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 24.116.137.225

## Jean Jewell

---

**From:** zoozatska@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 10, 2011 3:59 PM  
**To:** Jean Jewell; Beverly Barker; Gene Fadness  
**Subject:** PUC Comment Form

A Comment from Linda Johnson follows:

-----  
Case Number: *UWI-W-11-02*  
Name: Linda Johnson  
Address:  
City: Boise  
State: Idaho  
Zip:  
Daytime Telephone:  
Contact E-Mail: [zoozatska@yahoo.com](mailto:zoozatska@yahoo.com)  
Name of Utility Company: United Water Boise  
Acknowledge: acknowledge

Please describe your comment briefly:

You know why I don't use more water? I can't afford it. It has nothing to do with conservation and I'm getting real tired of big companies spending money they don't have and then sticking it to the poor, and getting poorer by the day, American citizen. I don't recall any announcement to the people of Boise justifying the need for these improvements. If they want to raise rates on Boise's public, then I think it only fair that ALL their financial expenditures, and justifications for them, be made public. I just love it --- use less, get charged more. Now that is the new American way --- the way that is killing this once fine country.

The form submitted on <http://www.puc.idaho.gov/forms/ipuc1/ipuc.html>  
IP address is 97.121.25.67

-----