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AMENDMENT TO CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY

NO. 143

On June 16, 1997, United Water Idaho Inc. (United Water; Company) filed an Application in Case No. UWI-W-97-3 with the Idaho Public Utilities Commission (Commission) requesting authorization to amend and revise its Certificate of Convenience and Necessity No. 143 (as amended)  by enlarging and extending its certificate area service boundaries to include the Ada County residential subdivision of Hidden Springs, an area in the Dry Creek Valley and contiguous to its present system and certificated territory.  Reference Application Exhibit A Map of Proposed Boundary Expansion and Exhibit C Legal Description; Idaho Code 61-526; Commission Rules of Procedure IDAPA 31.01.01.112.  United Water contends that the area requested is not within the authorized territories of any water utility corporation under the Commission’s jurisdiction.  The Company contends that there are no known public utilities, persons or corporations with whom the expansion is likely to compete.

United Water represents that the developers of the Hidden Springs subdivision have requested that United Water provide service to the area.  Reference Application—Exhibit B March 24, 1996 letter.  As represented in the letter request, the Hidden Springs subdivision is a 915 unit planned community.  There also will be a limited amount of commercial development (100,000 sq. feet maximum) within the community and public facilities including a school, community center, park and playing fields, fire station and equestrian facilities.  United Water represents that all facilities necessary for service including transmission mains, booster and a reservoir will be fully paid for by the developer in accordance with a special facilities agreement to be executed by the developer.  All on-site facilities, the Company contends, will be constructed at the expense of the developer in accordance with United Water’s current rules and regulations.

United Water contends that the requested extension is consistent with the public convenience and necessity.  United Water recommends that its Application be processed under Modified Procedure i.e. by written submission rather than by hearing.  Reference Commission Rules of Procedure, IDAPA 31.01.01.201-.204.

Commission Decision

Staff recommends that the Application in Case No UWI-W-97-3 be processed pursuant to Modified Procedure.  Does the Commission agree that such a procedure is appropriate?  If not, what is the Commission’s preference?

Scott Woodbury
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