

From: [PUC Consumer Comments](#)
To: [Jan Noriyuki](#)
Subject: Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb
Date: Wednesday, July 7, 2021 7:00:06 AM

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Michael Hope
Submission Time: Jul 6 2021 9:42PM
Email: hopemf@aol.com
Telephone: 408-828-7780
Address: 737 W Headwaters Dr
Eagle, ID 83616

Name of Utility Company: Suez Water

Case ID: EAG-W-18-01

Comment: "I previously sent in comments but after doing additional research I would like to add comments. In summary, I am against approving the purchase of Eagle Water by Suez Water because of the potential impact of external influence on a valuable resource to the economy and well being of Idaho and specifically, Eagle; because of the poor transaction under which this sale is structured and because of the significant impact on water quality in Eagle. Briefly, my career was working as a management and technology consultant in the utility industry across the world, primarily in the USA, Europe and Central Europe; I am a retired CPA and was after I retired I was The Dean's Executive Professor of Management at a private University. 1. I do not believe that the PUC should allow an outside organization acquire significant control over a valuable resource of the local residence. While I do support reasonable global organization structures, I do not believe it is feasible over the control of valuable resource that can significantly affect the economy and lives of local citizens. I would have been against the acquisition of any water companies by United Water and even more strongly against The acquisition of United Water by Suez. 2. This transaction is not structured with an common sense except to reward people who have added no value. I can see no reason that given the rate base of Eagle Water that a price of \$10.5 Million is justified. If my research is correct, about \$1.5 Million is to pay off the City of Eagle for a breached agreement and \$2 Million will go to a third party that added no value but tried to create an Company did not meet the PUC justification of a Water Company. I do not see how the PUS can justify approving this transaction. 3. The PUC has put itself in a position of having to control the water resource quality for the entire State of Idaho. Your decision will be continuously evaluated on the effect of water quality and the effect on citizens of Idaho. Recent weather conditions have just highlighted the potential misuse of water by an entity without local citizen focus. The growing number of dry wells in the ADA County area show that a water company will have strong profit motives to move the water for higher profitability. I don't think that the PUC should take on all the responsibility to control the water quality in any area. WHAT SHOULD THE PUC DO? This case should be dismissed and a better solution for water company structured should be developed. I am not sure how this should be structured but a Commission should be developed to look at the best structure for the City, County and State of Idaho. I believe that supporting an economically strong structure at a City or County level is feasible. I hope that the PUC find this useful. I know I have not submitted a complete answer but this is a difficult decision that will require careful analysis on the long-term effect of any

decision made. Regards, "

[\[Open in the PUC Intranet application\]](#)