

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

JEFFREY DAVID EVANS
COMPLAINANT

v.

RATTLESNAKE RIDGE WATER DISTRICT
DEFENDANT

)
)
)
) CASE NO. 95-372
)
)
)

O R D E R

On September 13, 1995, Rattlesnake Ridge Water District ("Rattlesnake Ridge") notified the Commission that it had satisfied the complaint of Jeffrey David Evans. Mr. Evans was asked to advise the Commission whether Rattlesnake Ridge had fully satisfied his complaint or whether he wished to continue the matter. On October 12, 1995, Mr. Evans notified the Commission by letter that he had not been fully satisfied. It appears further proceedings will be necessary in this case.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the parties shall file the original and 12 copies of the following information with the Commission with a copy to the other party of record no later than fifteen days from the date of this Order. The parties shall furnish with each response the name of the witness who will be available to respond to questions concerning each item of information requested should a public hearing be scheduled.

Rattlesnake Ridge shall respond to the following:

1. Was an extension to Mr. Evans' property included in the construction project approved by the Commission on October 3, 1995, in Case No. 94-341?¹

2. If the extension to Mr. Evans' property was included in Case No. 94-341, was it referred to as Line B-1 under Contract "L" of that project? If not, what were the specifications of the approved extension to Mr. Evans' property?

3. If the extension to Mr. Evans' property was included in Case No. 94-341, has Rattlesnake Ridge deviated from the construction approved in that case concerning the extension to Mr. Evans' property? If Rattlesnake Ridge has deviated from the approved construction, under what authority and for what reason has it done so?

4. If the extension to Mr. Evans' property was not included in Case No. 94-341, under what authority and for what reason has Rattlesnake Ridge agreed to provide 500 feet of service line to Mr. Evans rather than the standard 50 feet as required by Rattlesnake Ridge's current tariff and 807 KAR 5:066, Section 11(1)?

5. If the extension to Mr. Evans' property was not included in Case No. 94-341, under what authority and for what reason has Rattlesnake Ridge agreed to allow Mr. Evans to pay a tap fee of

¹ Case No. 94-341, The Application of Rattlesnake Ridge Water District, Carter, Elliott and Lawrence Counties, Kentucky, (1) For a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity Authorizing Construction of Major Additions and Improvements to Its Water Distribution System; and (2) Seeking Approval of the Issuance of Certain Securities.

\$350.00 rather than a tap fee of \$500.00 as required by Rattlesnake Ridge's current tariff and KRS 278.170(1)?

Mr. Evans shall respond to the following:

1. Provide the Commission with the factual grounds on which you base your contention that Rattlesnake Ridge should be required to run a water line to your property line.

2. Provide the Commission with the legal grounds on which you base your contention that Rattlesnake Ridge should be required to run a water line to your property line.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 3rd day of November, 1995.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION


For the Commission

ATTEST:



Executive Director