

From: [PUC Consumer Comments](#)
To: [Jan Noriyuki](#)
Subject: Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb
Date: Saturday, October 3, 2020 2:00:04 PM

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Thomas Cantrell
Submission Time: Oct 3 2020 1:17PM
Email: jacksoncantrell@cableone.net
Telephone: 208-343-2165
Address: 4510 N Waterfront Way
Boise, ID 83703

Name of Utility Company: Suez

Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "I have been a resident of Boise all of my life (71 years) and have always been happy to pay my fair share to enjoy the lifestyle we appreciate her in our beautiful valley. After reading the notice from Suez about a \$115 million upgrade in our water system, I have to ask, "Why have improvements not been made as were necessary through the years rather than force a 22.3% increase when things could not be worse financially for our country and it's citizens?" When I read that the rate of return for Suez is expected to be around 8%, I actually gasped. I sure would like to be able to get that rate of return on my investments instead of less than 1%. I am not sure whether the administration has been lax in responding to needed repairs or have been too busy adding new customers to our growing community, but in either case I feel that yearly repairs and upgrades would be a more prudent way to conduct business rather than sticking it to us all at once during a recession. I might be more sympathetic to Suez if they had been more sympathetic to me. I had a leak last year after I turned my water on for the yard, which was the day we left for a month vacation. When we returned there was severe water leak and the plumber actually clocked how much had been leaking and for how long. I reported the loss to Suez and they told me it didn't amount to enough for them to adjust my bill. \$50 might not mean much to some people, but I am retired and on a limited income and that does mean something. So does the \$33 increase that would be on my summer bills for watering my lawn. Does putting in an up to date meter reader eliminate jobs for the meter readers? If so, we could save \$7.5 million right there. We don't need less jobs at this point and time. I think a reexamination of the overall project should be done and only the most pressing problems should be addressed at this time. None of them seemed that pressing to me. But I am confident I cannot support \$115 million for a little more pressure in my line. Thank you for your consideration of my opinion."

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