

Name: Steven Fischer
Submission Time: Oct 26 2020 4:49PM
Email: pfisch14@yahoo.com
Telephone: 208-721-0485
Address: 6549 S Covewood Way
Boise, ID 83709

Name of Utility Company: Suez

Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "Dear Commissioners, I'm currently a customer of SUEZ. As a currently licensed water operator, I have insight into the water industry. The request to increase rates is very large. SUEZ is already quite a bit more expensive than neighboring water providers(Garden City and Meridian for example). I feel SUEZ has forced customers into a predicament by providing water system enhancements and then requesting it be covered financially after the fact. Though I appreciate system upgrades, I believe the tactics used to pay for the upgrades after the fact are very concerning. The proper way to handle this is for SUEZ list the improvements (and why needed) and then show how much it would cost to fund those improvements. When the improvements are itemized financially, then a reasonable rate increase can be determined. It also allows rate payers to determine if the rate increases were worth the cost of the upgrades. Government run water systems generally utilize the bond approach which allows for the government entity to make a case for increased rates and allows rate payers to vote on it. It also creates an additional check and balance because elected officials are held accountable for these rate hikes. With SUEZ, the Public Utility Commission is the ONLY check on this process. I cant vote out an elected official when SUEZ forces a gigantic rate hike like they have. That is why I ask you, the Public Utilities Commission, to not approve this rate increase. It will send a message to SUEZ that they need to create customer buy-in on water system improvements BEFORE they request a rate hike. Thank you for your time, Steven "

From: [PUC Consumer Comments](#)
To: [Jan Noriyuki](#)
Subject: Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb
Date: Tuesday, October 27, 2020 7:00:16 AM

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Michele Cooper
Submission Time: Oct 26 2020 5:28PM
Email: plumariagirl@live.com
Telephone: 208-919-3172
Address: 4581 S Cochees Way
Boise, ID 83709

Name of Utility Company: SUEZ Water

Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "I am sending in my comment regarding the proposed rate increase sent out by Suez Water. I strongly disagree with their request for over 22%! This is horrendous for the homeowners having to pay that much more for the company to redo their Infrastructure due to new homes being added or older facilities. The new customers need to pay the additional fees for adding into the existing structure or increasing the structure's size to accommodate. We are not California here and 22%+ is ridiculous for the already burdened customers!"

Name: Kevin Rank
Submission Time: Oct 26 2020 9:43PM
Email: krank13@hotmail.com
Telephone: 208-991-4263
Address: 5907 S. Harrington Way
Boise, ID 83709

Name of Utility Company: Suez

Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "To whom it may concern, I'm writing about SUEZ's request for a 22.3% rate increase over the rate agreed to in 2015. In the past 5 years, we have an increase of about 9.81% in cumulative inflation. Even basing it on a basic cost of living increase (which I have not seen every year in 15 years) that is 15.93%. People are hurting, and they want to stick us with much higher fees? Judging by some of the pipeline upgrades, they are bringing water to a lot of new developments. So, we, as home owners are paying to get services to new homeowners. That should honestly be borne by the developers, not existing home owners. This is a rotten year. Going for a massive rate increase in a bad year is the height of hubris, and they do NOT deserve to be rewarded. I'd say nothing above a 9.81% increase due to the poor economy. Jobs are flat, a lot of people are out of work. Growth is nearly non-existent, and we live in one of the most prosperous states despite the pandemic. Ultimately speaking, requesting this kind of rate hike during the pandemic is just the underpinnings of a morally

bankrupt company. Please do not allow this to pass. I have given you some percentages to look at as alternatives to keep the numbers manageable yet still allow Suez realize higher profits. Kevin"

Name: Marian Herz
Submission Time: Oct 26 2020 5:17PM
Email: morherz@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-514-0416
Address: 7351 W Old Country Ct
Boise, ID 83709

Name of Utility Company: Suez

Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "Suez is asking for a 22.3% rate increase. Really? Inflation isn't anywhere near that. They say it's for capital improvements. Capital improvements should be completed as part of doing business. I understand they need to raise rates to cover some of those costs, but 22.3% at one time is WAY too much. They only deserve a much smaller increase. I wish I could get a 7.46% rate of return on my investments. 5% is sufficient for a rate of return. Especially with impacts from Covid, this rate increase is just too high."

Name: Janae Willey
Submission Time: Oct 27 2020 8:06AM
Email: marykaybeautyexpert@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-830-4263
Address: 3910 N Buckingham Pl.
Boise , ID 83704

Name of Utility Company: Suez

Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "I am very upset that Suez would ask for another increase in our water prices! They should be required to update our lines as needed And absorb those costs as the price of doing business! They have profits over \$5 billion a year!! And yet they want us to pay for he costs of the, doing business?! No way! Please reject this outrageous price increase! I do not agree with them asking for any increase! Especially looking at their gross income! They can afford to absorb the costs of upgrades and doing business! There is no reason why they need to increase our bill again and impact Boise families. Our costs everywhere are increasing at an alarming rate. Please reject this request to increase our bill completely! No more compromising for this greedy company!"

From: [PUC Consumer Comments](#)
To: [Jan Noriyuki](#)
Subject: Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb
Date: Tuesday, October 27, 2020 10:00:05 AM

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Tara Howard
Submission Time: Oct 27 2020 9:51AM
Email: tmr1sunfire@yahoo.com
Telephone: 541-212-1914
Address: 11057 W. Hazelwood Dr.
Boise, ID 83709

Name of Utility Company: Suez

Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "I believe that a 22.3% increase is too high. This amount is much more than the current inflation, and what other public utilities are charging. It is clear that growth continues, but so does the amount of customers paying in. I think that with some effort a more reasonable rate increase can be possible. Thanks for your consideration, Tara Howard"

Name: Robert Arrate
Submission Time: Oct 27 2020 9:27AM
Email: robert.arrate@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-571-7622
Address: 10914 W Leilani Dr
Boise, ID 83709

Name of Utility Company: Suez Water

Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "When a driver of a 22% increase in rates is explained as a foreign multi-national company basically wants to hire a bunch of admin positions and past the cost along to you, you vote NO!! NO!! Completely tone deaf to the COVID-19 environment and challenges faced by our economy this year. NO! NO! NO! NO! Note the exchange in PUC testimony below: " Please identify and explain the increase in staffing from the Company's Test Year level of staffing. 'The net increase of 10 positions from the test year is due to the filling of vacancies and accounted for by the hiring of an Engineering Admin, Customer Service Representative, Environmental Health & Safety Manager, Engineering Design Technician, Operator, Utility Worker, Inventory Control Specialist, Operations Supervisor, Operations Manager and Project Manager.' " So, basically, they want to hire, not work within their own budget, and past the cost along to the consumer. A terrible idea that should be soundly rejected!"

Name: Richard Lee
Submission Time: Oct 27 2020 10:22AM
Email: pigeon_magician@yahoo.com
Telephone: 208-853-5585
Address: 4645 N Chapala Way
Boise, ID 83713

Name of Utility Company: Suez

Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "Thank you for taking my comments regarding the Suez pay rates. Overall, I am not in favor of it for the reasons that Suez states. Suez is a profitable international company, and they have room in their overall budget to make adjustments and to save up slowly for the infrastructure changes they are requesting. For example, the money they have already wasted on legal fees regarding acquiring Eagle Water, and the purchase of it if they won, has already put into their budgeting. They should first take that money and apply it to what they already have, which apparently is needing monetary attention. Back to the specific points of the Suez press release: All the new growth which requires new infrastructure should be placed squarely upon the developers of all that new land. They are making a crap-ton of money off the housing market, and they can pay for the utilities to get there. My wife is a real estate agent, and most of those new buyers are out-of-state cash buyers, who run up house prices far and beyond appraised values in bidding wars, so they have room in their budgets to pay a higher lot fee that the developer passes down to them. (this is not against out-of-staters, its merely a statement about the amount of money they have in their pockets when they get here). The stated reasons about "fire protection" and "emergency" are misleading. These requirements are already built into the DEQ drinking water rules. Almost every wellhouse and booster station already has the required fire protection generator in place for emergencies. Nothing additional is going to be provided to the consumers in these monies. The postcard states this new money will install "new pumping stations to ensure everyone has adequate water pressure". The PUC should contact DEQ to see if there are any documented pressure problems before they accept that reason. The efficiency upgrades - new water meters and new control system replacement at the water treatment plants are simply niceties, and not needed. Computer technologies are outdated the minute they are bought. They should budget a certain number of meter replacements each year. Heck, I have one of those fancy meters on one of my rentals already. Suez installed it 2 years ago when I was trying to diagnose an internal leak, and it is my understanding they were already replacing them out back then. More specific to efficiencies, I should not help pay for them, by definition, they will pay for themselves."

Name: Jennifer Forsberg
Submission Time: Oct 27 2020 10:05AM
Email: cougaargray@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-401-4441
Address: 7955 W Madronawood Ct
Boise, Id 83709

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

Comment: "In regards to the Suez rate 22.3% case, this increase is hard for consumers to swallow. Please reject the increase. Comparing Suez's "customer charge" of \$21.11 to Idaho Power's "Service Charge" of \$5.00. Suez should be able to maintain their infrastructure allowing current pricing to not change. Thank you, Jennifer Forsberg"

Name: Richard Murray
Submission Time: Oct 27 2020 11:34AM
Email: rbmurray@icloud.com
Telephone: 360-609-4069
Address: 5550 Misty Ridge Way
Boise, ID 83713

Name of Utility Company: Suez Water

Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "I oppose the proposed rate increases request by Suez Water. Please do not approve the requested rate increases. Suez water stated in their rate increase request that: "The revenue realized by Applicant under its presently authorized rates produces a rate of return of 4.09% based on a test year ending June 30,2020. Applicant seeks additional revenues to recover increased operating expenses and costs associated with plant additions, and to produce a fair rate of return, thereby enabling it to continue to provide adequate and reliable service to its customers." I do not believe this statement contains sufficient and fair grounds to justify the requested rate increase. I argue that current water rates are sufficient to provide an adequate and reliable service to customers. I believe that Suez Water's rate of return on their business should be limited to no more that an additional 1% rate of return increase per each rate request change. Furthermore, I disagree within the statement by Suez Water that 7.46% is a fair rate of return on SUEZ Water's investment in property used and useful in rendering water service. I argue that 7.46% is an excessively high rate of return on their investment. Furthermore, I believe that Suez Water should be held accountable to reduce their overall business operating costs and expenses by over 5% annually before any additional rate requests are approved."

From: [PUC Consumer Comments](#)
To: [Jan Noriyuki](#)
Subject: Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb
Date: Tuesday, October 27, 2020 2:00:04 PM

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Liz Schneider
Submission Time: Oct 27 2020 1:12PM
Email: vikings_girl@hotmail.com
Telephone: 208-901-0161
Address: 9125 W Thor Drive
Boise, ID 83709

Name of Utility Company: Suez

Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "22% is an excessive amount to increase our water bills."
