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TROY HOFFMAN WATER CORP.—GENERAL RATE CASE

On August 31, 1995 Troy Hoffman Water Corporation, Inc. (Troy; Company) filed an Application with the Idaho Public Utilities Commission (Commission) requesting authority to implement a 30% increase in rates (a general rate case).  The Company serves approximately 144 customers, all residential.  Based on a 1993 test year, the Company submits that the proposed increase will result in $4,535 of additional revenue.

Staff Analysis

The Troy Hoffman Water Corporation was purchased in 1994 by James Magnuson and Rick Gunther.  This is the first Application for a rate increase under the new ownership.  Troy has not filed proposed tariff schedules as required by Idaho Code 61-307.  Troy has not requested a proposed effective date.  Commission Rule of Procedure 123.01 states “If no effective date is proposed for the change, the changes do not go into effect until approved by Order.”  The Company’s filing is incomplete (or insufficient) and does not satisfy the requirements of Commission Rule of Procedure 121.01(a) no tariff submitted, (d) no statement that applicant stands ready for immediate consideration of application, (f) workpapers or documentation showing how test year data were adjusted is incomplete and/or inconsistent.  Troy has not provided sufficient information for Staff to complete its assessment and some of the information provided is inconsistent.  The Commission is advised that under Commission Rule 65 defective or insufficient pleadings may be returned or dismissed.  Staff recommends however, that it be permitted to continue working with the Company on an informal basis to obtain the necessary information.  When the information has been obtained and when the Company has supplemented and completed its filing, Staff intends to promptly bring the matter before the Commission to establish further procedure.

Commission Decision

Does the Commission agree with Staff’s suggested procedure?  If not, what is the Commission’s preference?
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