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RE:CASE NO. GNR-W-97-1 (GROUSE POINT WATER COMPANY)

APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY

On July 23, 1997, Walt Wanner, President of Statewide Construction, Inc. filed an Application on behalf of Grouse Point Water Company LLC (Company; Grouse Point) for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to serve the Grouse Point Subdivision in Ada County, Idaho.  Reference Application, Attachment 4, Legal Description and Maps of Subdivision and Service area; Idaho Code 61-526; Commission Rules of Procedure, IDAPA 31.01.01.111.  The Grouse Point Subdivision, consisting of 24 lots in varied states of development, is located on the east side of Cloverdale Road about one-quarter mile south of Hubbard Road and just north of the New York Canal.

Presently, domestic water service, which commenced November 1996, is provided at a flat rate of $20 per month per customer.  No connection fees are collected.  As represented, it is the Company’s intention to contract with EM², a United Water Idaho Inc affiliate, to provide operation and management services.  Financing for the water system was out-of-pocket financing.  All costs have been paid and there are no liens or incumbrances on the system.

Grouse Point contends that issuance of the requested Certificate is required by and consistent with the Public Convenience and Necessity.

Commission Decision

The time lapse from date of filing to present was at the request of Applicant who was negotiating with United Water Idaho for the sale of the system.  The parties are no longer negotiating.  Commission Staff recommends that the Commission cause to be issued a Notice of Application in Case No. GNR-W-97-1.  Staff will thereupon conduct an investigation of the water system and upon completion of same report back to the Commission with recommendation for further procedure.  Does the Commission find Staff’s proposed procedure to be acceptable?  If not, what is the Commission’s preference?

Scott Woodbury
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