

**From:** Dry Well <drywellboise@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 31, 2023 7:49 PM  
**To:** Adam Rush <adam.rush@puc.idaho.gov>  
**Subject:** Veolia rate case. VEO-W-22-02

Dear Mr. Rush,

Thank you for holding a public workshop. I could not make it to the meeting, and wish I had. Veolia undoubtedly must have estimated the costs of upgrading Eagle Water before acquisition, so I, as a prospective subscriber, question the 24.1% increase asked of all subscribers from an independent for-profit company providing a necessary service. These are substantial costs raised by one utility. Added to increased costs by all the other utilities, and a 24.1% rate increase will increase the cost of living at a time when subscribers already deal with the costs of inflation affecting their cost of living. In my personal experience, the end cost of rate increases nearly always exceeds the stated minimal cost in the application to consumers. The vast majority of subscribers cannot simply choose another vendor for their water supply; they are a captive audience who cannot shop for a less expensive water source. As the municipal water purveyor, for-profit status notwithstanding, Veolia has a responsibility to keep their rates affordable.

I am also reaching out, representing the community of well owners, many of whom have been dealing with a dry well situation in the wake of substantial development. Some have been without water for nine months and counting while waiting for a water mainline funded by ARPA funds projected at the earliest in seven months. Most cannot connect to Veolia independently without a substantial cost they do not have, \$30,000 or more when the mainline is only one or two houses away, one quoted around \$100,000 for a connect further away. It seems unfair for a new subscriber in this predicament to have to pay an even higher rate should the case be approved as written. In addition, Veolia's policy has been that they do not ask their subscribers to pay for "new construction" and for this reason, Veolia will not put in mainlines without prearranged funds, from wherever the source.

The current case and proposed rate increase seems inconsistent with the company policy, because they are asking all subscribers throughout their service area to pay a substantial portion for what they did with the newly acquired Eagle Water Company. It can be argued the acquisition is not considered "new construction" in the strictest sense of the term, however it was a new acquisition. A rate increase to all subscribers because as of several months ago the Eagle Company joined the lines of the Veolia Water family in Idaho and this cost the company money IS a for-profit business decision. In the same way, denying water access without upfront funding is a business decision. This raises the question of whether necessary life requirements such as water should be handled as a for-profit endeavor. Veolia looks to its bottom line and a projected profit margin as any business would; the easiest way to maintain a desirable profit margin in to raise rates on a captive audience. Businesses, who know their customers can easily shop elsewhere, must balance the product cost with production costs, and make different internal decisions to keep business costs down. Please consider these points as the rate case moves forward. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,  
Suzanne Knorr  
Resident

In addition, Veolia's policy has been that they do not ask their subscribers to pay for "new construction" and for this reason, Veolia will not put in mainlines without prearranged funds, from wherever the source.

The current case and proposed rate increase seems inconsistent with the company policy, because they are asking all subscribers throughout their service area to pay a substantial portion for what they did with the newly acquired Eagle Water Company. It can be argued the acquisition is not considered "new construction" in the strictest sense of the term, however it was a new acquisition.

A rate increase to all subscribers because as of several months ago the Eagle Company joined the lines of the Veolia Water family in Idaho and this cost the company money IS a for-profit business decision. In the same way, denying water access without upfront funding is a business decision. This raises the question of whether necessary life requirements such as water should be handled as a for-profit endeavor. Veolia looks to its bottom line and a projected profit margin as any business would; the easiest way to maintain a desirable profit margin in to raise rates on a captive audience. Businesses, who know their customers can easily shop elsewhere, must balance the product cost with production costs, and make different internal decisions to keep business costs down.

Please consider these points as the rate case moves forward. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Knorr  
Resident  
Southwest Ada County Alliance

**From:** [PUCWeb Notification](#)  
**To:** [Jan Noriyuki](#)  
**Subject:** Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 1, 2023 7:00:35 AM

---

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Gregory Fisher  
Submission Time: Jan 31 2023 6:13PM  
Email: gkfisher48@gmail.com  
Telephone: 208-863-5962  
Address: 4737 North Waterfront Way  
Boise, ID 83703

Name of Utility Company: Veolia Water

Case ID: VEO-W-22-02

Comment: "I'm commenting on the rate increase request submitted by Veolia Water. I've had billing issues with this company which required my calling for information and clarification. The error was with the company and it took two phone calls over two weeks to get it straight. This doesn't set in my mind a company deserving of a rate increase since taking over from Suez Water. Equally, my wife and I are on fixed incomes. With inflation already impacting our resources, a rate increase would further strain our budget."

-----

Name: Scott mcdougall  
Submission Time: Jan 31 2023 6:24PM  
Email: cs2mscott@pobox.com  
Telephone: 208-409-4050  
Address: 4455 North Mackenzie  
Boise, ID 83703

Name of Utility Company: Viola

Case ID: VEO-W-22-02

Comment: "There is nothing cited in the application that was not a known ongoing/increasing expense at the time viola acquired this Suez business. If they grossly overpaid, that's not an expense to be compensated by a rate increase. "

-----

---