Dear Idaho PUC,

I am strongly opposed to Suez's request for a 22% increase in customer bills. This increase far outstrips any inflation or raise I will see. As evidenced by Suez's detailed report, most of the improvements are going to Eagle, Meridian, and West Boise, all areas of expansion, where new infrastructure is needed. Why is the entire customer base being penalized for improvements and expansion that doesn't represent them? I am a resident of the Bench and have personally seen the pipes here continue to degrade as they try to explain away the "yellow water" problem, yet, there has been no actual action or improvements besides water flushing. This is a classic example of taxation without representation. In addition, their math is mis-leading, I'm not sure which average customer base they are using, but my family's average winter bill is around \$40-50 and roughly doubles in the summer to water the yard (and I don't keep it super green either). I remain OPPOSED to the rate increase.

Regards, Jackson Goss The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Andrew Harold Submission Time: Oct 20 2020 9:03PM Email: dharold1@q.com Telephone: 208-338-1591 Address: 807 N 21 Street Boise, ID 83702

Name of Utility Company: Suez

Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "Idaho Public Utilities Commission, The request for a 22.3% in Suez residential water bill is not fair or right for a home owner that has lived in the same home since 1973. If I can not afford to water my residential lot and trees, the City of Trees could soon be called the City of Dust. Please do not price us out of our home. "

[Open in the PUC Intranet application]

From:	<u>DF</u>
To:	Jan Noriyuki
Subject:	Public Comment - Idaho PUC Case No. SUZ-W-20-02
Date:	Wednesday, October 21, 2020 9:14:17 AM

The following comments are being submitted in response to Suez' proposed general rate increase (Idaho PUC Case No. SUZ-W-20-02).

Suez recently advised customers of a proposed \$115 million investment plan to improve water system infrastructure serving 230,000 Treasure Valley residents. Under this proposal, customers' water bills would increase 22.3% a month while Suez revenues would grow by \$10.2 million per year.

While Suez' 5-year \$115 million infrastructure investment plan may be a reasonable means of keeping pace with growth in the Treasure Valley, introducing a staggering 22.3% increase to residential and commercial monthly water bills is simply NOT reasonable.

I respectfully request the Commission deny Suez' proposed 22.3% rate increase, and instead approve a significantly lower rate increase. A lower rate increase would still allow Suez to realize a return on its investment, albeit over a longer period of time, and it would do so without unfairly subjecting 230,000 Treasure Valley families, senior citizens, and businesses to an otherwise overly aggressive rate increase at a time when many are struggling financially.

Thank you for your consideration.

Daniel Fowler 18808 N Summer Place, Boise, ID 83714 Name: Logan Barclay Submission Time: Oct 21 2020 9:39AM Email: bogusbasinsucks@gmail.com Telephone: 208-914-5171 Address: 3000 W. Stewart Ave. Boise, ID 83702

Name of Utility Company: Suez Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "I think it is absurd to ask for a 22.3% rate increase during this pandemic and economic recession while many are already struggling to pay their bills. The entire country is cutting back budgets, Suez needs to do the same. I suggest Suez utilize their profits to make improvements, not take the money from their customers. Maybe they can divert some of the executive bonuses?"

Name: Fred Genton Submission Time: Oct 21 2020 9:47AM Email: fredlgenton@gmail.com Telephone: 208-336-1102 Address: 2014 N Hillway Boise, ID 83702

Name of Utility Company: Suez Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "Concerned about Suez asking for a 22.3 percent increase and \$10.2 million per year. Paychecks and pension checks are not increasing even close to that amount. Idaho PUC mission is to serve and protect Idahoans from unfair and unreasonable increases on basic necessities. Please be our advocate and disallow this very high increase to something more moderate." To Whom It May Concern:

It is obvious that infrastructure needs upgrade. Nonetheless, the postcard sent by Suez states that, "Company revenues would increase by \$10.2 million per year." The piece of information missing is how much of that increased revenue is increase in profit. In a competitive market, firms' profit margins are extremely low due to competition. Water distribution, being a natural monopoly, it is not a competitive market. Water is a necessity for life; hence, government intervention (the Idaho Public Utility Commission) is necessary to maintain affordability and limit indiscriminate price increases.

Will the entire increase revenues be used to improve the existing infrastructure, or will some go to increase profits? Unless the entire rate increase is used to improve the current infrastructure system or to cover for increased verifiable cost of production, the Public Utility Commission should ask Suez modify the proposal.

Thank you very much,

Guido Giuntini 1422 S Gourley St. Boise ID 83705