COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

CARROLL COUNTY WATER DISTRICT NO. 1)
COMPLAINANT)
V.	CASE NO. 2007-00202
GALLATIN COUNTY WATER DISTRICT)
DEFENDANT)

<u>ORDER</u>

On September 24, 2007, Whitehorse Development Company ("Whitehorse") filed a motion to intervene in this proceeding. At the hearing on July 18, 2007, it was agreed that Whitehorse, as the property developer, has an interest in this case. Neither party objects to Whitehorse's intervention.¹

807 KAR 5:001, Section 3(8)(b), states that the Commission should permit intervention for anyone who is not otherwise adequately represented in the matter or is likely to present issues that will assist the Commission without unduly complicating the proceedings. Although the deadline for discovery has expired, the Commission finds that Whitehorse will present issues that will assist the Commission without unduly complicating the proceedings.

¹ <u>See</u> e-mail from Ruth Baxter, attorney for Carroll County Water District No. 1, to Todd Osterloh, Staff Attorney, Public Service Commission (Sept. 30, 2007)(copy attached as Appendix A).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. The motion of Whitehorse to intervene is granted.

2. The procedural schedule established on August 13, 2007 shall remain in effect; however, Commission Staff shall be permitted to request necessary information from Whitehorse.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 11th day of October, 2007.

By the Commission

ATTEST: outive Director

APPENDIX A

.

APPENDIX TO AN ORDER OF THE KENTUCKY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION IN CASE NO. 2007-00202 DATED October 11, 2007

Osterloh, Todd (PSC)

From: CBJRuthBaxter [cbjruthbaxter@aol.com]

Sent: Sunday, September 30, 2007 3:22 PM

To: Osterloh, Todd (PSC)

Subject: sphuddleston@insightbb.com

Mr. Osterloh: The email that I sent you on September 27, 2007, was returned to our server. This email read: The Carroll County Water District No 1 will be filing a response to the Motion to Intervene filed by Whitehorse Development Company. It does not object to the Motion, but disagrees with the 'factual statements' made within the body of the Motion and the supplement, as to the District's involvement in its water acquisition process. The Hearing Officer indicated when we were last in Frankfort that the intervention would be appropriate since the business was affected by the Commission's decision.

Sincerely,

Ruth H. Baxter Crawford & Baxter, P.S.C. Attorneys at Law 523 Highland Avenue P.O. Box 353 Carrollton, Kentucky 41008 (502) 732-6688

cc: Jim Smith, CCWD#1