

From: [PUC Consumer Comments](#)
To: [Jan Noriyuki](#)
Subject: Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb
Date: Saturday, October 24, 2020 7:00:04 AM

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: John Chaney
Submission Time: Oct 23 2020 10:50PM
Email: jpchaney22@gmail.com
Telephone: 206-383-6428
Address: 2230 S Skillern Dr
Boise, ID 83709

Name of Utility Company: Suez

Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "I, like many others that have commented, oppose this proposed rate hike. There is already a customer charge of over \$20 each month. These improvements should be covered under that monthly cost that is not paying for the water. Since the water is also charged by how much we use that amount would, by most, be considered to be the cost of transporting that water to our residences. The fact that this proposal will increase Suez's revenue each year by \$10,200,000.00 a year tells me that this is not for any customers' benefit. I am sure that these estimates of yearly increase in revenue are based on the current customer base and not including all the new customers that will be forced to buy water from Suez. The cost of increasing infrastructure to service customers should be considered part of the operating costs associated with doing business. When a mom and pop company needs to buy new equipment they don't jack up prices to do so. The budget for it and find a way to purchase the equipment without making their customers pay for it. If they don't do this then they will lose business and getting new equipment becomes the least of their worries. Just because Suez has a monopoly doesn't mean that they should be allowed to charge its customers whatever they want because they can, knowing that there is no way for them to lose customers to other companies. "

Name: DAWN CUELLAR
Submission Time: Oct 23 2020 6:03PM
Email: dmcclbiz@gmail.com
Telephone: 206-651-6449
Address: 7454 West Sagebrush Way
BOISE, ID 83709

Name of Utility Company: SUEZ aka ENGIE

Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "Hello, We are not in agreement with SUEZ's request to increase water/sewer rates at their requested 22.3%. This is too high, aggressive at any one given moment in time. Long-term, elderly, established homeowners/renters of Idaho are not in a fiscal position to absorb

this into their personal budgets. We use water everyday and are conscious about leaving the tap off when brushing teeth, using water miser faucet adapters, watering landscape when sun is down, and checking for/fixing leaks. Water/sewer (sewer, which we pay for yet are not on the city/county sewer system bc we have septic) is already expensive. Currently, cost-of-living wages are not in step with such an increase. Given the economic crisis, a cost-of-living wage increase does not seem forthcoming. Even without a pandemic creating a job crisis, 40% of Idahoans, 1.8 million, are asset limited, income constrained, employed. Many are underemployed, working 2-3 jobs to make ends meet, etc. This sizeable hike will further burden consumers while creating greater profits for SUEZ board of directors and upper management via bonuses, stock options gifts. SUEZ is owned by ENGIE North America, a power generator, energy services company and retail electricity supplier committed to shaping a more sustainable future throughout the United States and Canada. A 22.3% rate increase is not SUSTAINABLE. SUEZ is owned by a BIG conglomerate. IPUC, please stop do not lean into supporting this monopolized situation by approving the rate hike at anything higher than 8%. Alternatively, allow existing city's with water management companies to remain in place to support their local constituencies. SUEZ report's they are responding to a growing community. This growth should NOT be at expense of residents who already contributed to such utilities growth. When developers build more homes, new homeowners will pay into the system, hence more/future revenue. Perhaps developers need to pay into utilities through a per home surtax at time of permitting out developments. Grabbing 22.3% from current customers at one time is unconscionable, disgusting and gentrifying. We oppose strongly a 22.3% rate increase. It is too high. A 6-8% increase would be more fitting with finding a balance between *housing development, *growing our infrastructure, *keeping people already employed with SUEZ in hourly waged jobs AND *supporting existing customers as they manage their personal budgets. Thank you."

From: [PUC Consumer Comments](#)
To: [Jan Noriyuki](#)
Subject: Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb
Date: Sunday, October 25, 2020 7:00:06 AM

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Jeffrey Baehr
Submission Time: Oct 24 2020 7:00PM
Email: jeff.baehr@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-391-5333
Address: 1590 South Grant Avenue
Boise, ID 83706

Name of Utility Company: Suez

Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "Can IPUC levy new development to pay for new water infrastructure vs increasing rates for existing customers? Suez states they need a reasonable rate of return but they may not be operating efficiently. For example, automated meters are a large one-time expense but it reduces meter-reader labor & vehicle expense long-term. Are they temporarily raising costs, or highlighting large one-time expenses, to justify a rate increase when operating costs per customer may actually decrease in future years, after the rate increase?"

From: [Loren & Tracy Hilliard](#)
To: [Jan Noriyuki](#)
Subject: Suez rate increase
Date: Sunday, October 25, 2020 12:31:39 PM

Good Morning,

I am writing reference the rate increase that Suez is applying for. Our average monthly cost for 2020 so far is \$165.63, our average cost in 2019 was 188.22. With a 22.3% increase we will be paying 202.56 for 2020 and 230.17 for 2019. This is a significant increase with the only explanation for the increase is for Suez to have a larger profit margin when they are already making a profit. When our water provider switched from United Water to Suez we saw a significant jump in our bill, especially during the summer months. We have no recourse to this rising cost. There are no other options for a water provider. It is imperative that we do not allow a company that has a monopoly on a resource that is necessary for all people to be able to raise the cost to simply pad their pockets. If Suez has additional costs that need to be covered they should be covered by the countless number of developments that are being done around the Treasure Valley and not passed to established customers that have no impact or ability to influence the development/improvements of the water system.

Respectfully,

Loren Hilliard
12653 N Andys Gulch
Boise ID 83714
208-590-4554
L3thilliard@gmail.com

From: [PUC Consumer Comments](#)
To: [Jan Noriyuki](#)
Subject: Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb
Date: Monday, October 26, 2020 7:00:04 AM

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Jessica McGinnis
Submission Time: Oct 25 2020 10:14PM
Email: 0jessmc0@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-631-1998
Address: 6008 W. Clinton St.
Boise, ID 83704

Name of Utility Company: Suez

Case ID: SUE-W-18-02

Comment: "I am in support of Suez increasing rates to expand and improve the water infrastructure. I believe it is a good investment for our community and am willing to help pay for it. Thank you."

From: [PUC Consumer Comments](#)
To: [Jan Noriyuki](#)
Subject: Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb
Date: Saturday, October 24, 2020 5:00:05 PM

The following comments were submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Donald George
Submission Time: Oct 24 2020 4:31PM
Email: donaldgeorge01@gmail.com
Telephone: 208-258-0034
Address: 4394 S. Tillamook Way
Boise, ID 83709

Name of Utility Company: Suez Water

Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "The request by Suez Water for a rate increase is both a substantial increase and will substantially impact residents after the recent financial impacts caused by COVID-19 throughout 2020. I oppose this rate increase request. "

Name: Donald Shaff
Submission Time: Oct 24 2020 4:24PM
Email: dshaff25@cableone.net

Telephone: 208-890-5337
Address: 4552 N FOOTHILL DR
BOISE, ID 83703

Name of Utility Company: Suez

Case ID: SUZ-W-20-02

Comment: "Commissioners, given Suez has come before the IPUC for a rate increase, this would be an excellent time to examine the Suez extraordinary Customer charge of \$21.00 for the two month billing period. By comparison, Idaho Power has a \$5.00 monthly charge. Similarly, Intermountain Gas has a Customer charge of \$5.50 monthly. The Suez, a multinational corporation, simply has an exorbitant Customer charge. Rate payers in Boise and Eagle, if the merger is approved, are fleeced for billing that apparently covers accounts payable costs in Suez as a whole rater than Boise and Eagle. As to the rate increase, I'm sure aging service lines require maintenance. The extent of the costs and scope of the project must have very close examination by IPUC staff. The adjusted costs to rate payers will put a financial burden on rate payers beginning this year for a five year project is astounding. Many customers will be hard pressed to afford the little water they use in their homes. A smaller increase on an annual basis over each year of the project would be prudent without front loading the reserves of giant Suez to cover each year of projected costs."

From: [PUC Consumer Comments](#)
To: [Jan Noriyuki](#)
Subject: Notice: A comment was submitted to PUCWeb
Date: Monday, October 26, 2020 11:00:03 AM

The following comment was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: John Brueck
Submission Time: Oct 26 2020 10:44AM
Email: abrueck@mindspring.com
Telephone: 208-345-9667
Address: 5450 N. Citadel Way
Boise, ID 83703

Name of Utility Company: Idaho Power

Case ID: IPC-E-20-26

Comment: "I am an Idaho Power Customer, who is enrolled in the Idaho Power Green Power Program and I want to submit a comment on this case to support Farmers and other Small Businesses to have a fair and equitable option to provide solar energy on their farms and for their businesses for their energy needs and get fairly compensated for any energy they place back into the grid also considering the fair costs of Idaho Power to maintain the power grid. This is similar to the homeowner net metering issue that has been reviewed in the past and I believe is still being studied which I hope is completed soon so that all cases can be resolved in a positive way to encourage solar power investment. Also, in this case, to help investment, I think the 100 kw/meter limit should be lifted and there should not be a proposed solar power grandfather deadline of Dec. 1, 2020. This date should be set after a fair solar value study is completed. If such a grandfather date is needed, it should be for at least 25 years and not ten years so solar power investment costs can be recouped. Finally, rapidly growing solar powered irrigation is a success of an Idaho PUC approved program that is helping Farmers meet their energy needs and assisting Idaho Power meet its 2045 clean energy goal. Thank you for considering my comments."

From: PUC Consumer Complaints <Do.Not.Reply@puc.idaho.gov>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2020 7:00 AM
To: ConsumerComplaintsWeb <ConsumerComplaintsWeb@puc.idaho.gov>
Subject: Notice: A complaint was submitted to PUCWeb

The following complaint was submitted via PUCWeb:

Name: Mary Beth Nagle
Submission Time: Oct 24 2020 9:05PM
Email: beth.nagle@gmail.com
Telephone: 317-694-5053
Address: 2017 N 32nd Street
Boise, ID 83703

Name of Utility Company: Suez Water

Contacted Utility: No

Comment: "Hello, I wanted to share my concerns that the proposed rate increase for Suez Water customers is too high at a 22.3% rate increase. I am all for increasing the rates some, to provide for better water, but 22% is too much too fast. This is especially a concern for neighborhoods like mine where we don't have access to the irrigation water for watering our lawns & gardens in the summer (Suez destroyed our irrigation pipe when they did some sewer repairs a few years ago and it has not been replaced), so it will be much more than just an extra \$6 per month like their flyer suggests. I think that a 10% rate increase would be much more reasonable and I would support that kind of an increase. As an aside, I also would like to advocate for the irrigation water being restored to our part of the neighborhood. Thank you for taking the time to hear my concern. "
