

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF LYON COUNTY)	CASE NO.
WATER DISTRICT FOR A CERTIFICATE OF)	2023-00096
PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY)	

COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
TO LYON COUNTY WATER DISTRICT

Lyon County Water District (Lyon District), pursuant to 807 KAR 5:001, shall file with the Commission an electronic version of the following information. The information requested is due on July 5, 2023. The Commission directs Lyon District to the Commission's July 22, 2021 Order in Case No. 2020-00085¹ regarding filings with the Commission. Electronic documents shall be in portable document format (PDF), shall be searchable, and shall be appropriately bookmarked.

Each response shall include the question to which the response is made and shall include the name of the witness responsible for responding to the questions related to the information provided. Each response shall be answered under oath or, for representatives of a public or private corporation or a partnership or association or a governmental agency, be accompanied by a signed certification of the preparer or the person supervising the preparation of the response on behalf of the entity that the

¹ Case No. 2020-00085, *Electronic Emergency Docket Related to the Novel Coronavirus COVID-19* (Ky. PSC July 22, 2021), Order (in which the Commission ordered that for case filings made on and after March 16, 2020, filers are NOT required to file the original physical copies of the filings required by 807 KAR 5:001, Section 8).

response is true and accurate to the best of that person's knowledge, information, and belief formed after a reasonable inquiry.

Lyon District shall make timely amendment to any prior response if Lyon District obtains information that indicates the response was incorrect or incomplete when made or, though correct or complete when made, is now incorrect or incomplete in any material respect.

For any request to which Lyon District fails or refuses to furnish all or part of the requested information, Lyon District shall provide a written explanation of the specific grounds for its failure to completely and precisely respond.

Careful attention shall be given to copied and scanned material to ensure that it is legible. When the requested information has been previously provided in this proceeding in the requested format, reference may be made to the specific location of that information in responding to this request. When applicable, the requested information shall be separately provided for total company operations and jurisdictional operations. When filing a paper containing personal information, Lyon District shall, in accordance with 807 KAR 5:001, Section 4(10), encrypt or redact the paper so that personal information cannot be read.

1. State whether Lyons District considered any alternatives to the Jack Thomason Tank Rehabilitation project, and if so, identify each alternative and describe it in detail and explain why the proposed rehabilitation project was chosen over each alternative considered.

2. For each alternative to the Jack Thomason Tank Rehabilitation project considered, provide an itemized breakdown of the estimated capital costs of the

alternative, an itemized breakdown of any incremental change (increase or decrease) in annual operating and maintenance expenses expected to arise from the alternative as compared to rehabilitation, and the expected useful life of the alternative project e.g. the expected useful life of the a new tank if replacement was considered.

3. If no alternatives to the Jack Thomason Tank Rehabilitation project were evaluated, explain in detail why no alternatives were evaluated.

4. If replacement of the tank with a new tank was not considered as an alternative to the Jack Thomason Tank Rehabilitation project, explain in detail why that alternative was not considered.

5. Identify when the Jack Thomason Tank was placed in service.

6. Provide the current expected useful life and remaining useful life of the Jack Thomason Tank, and what they will be after rehabilitation.

7. State whether Lyons District considered any alternatives to the Lamasco Tank Rehabilitation project, and if so, identify each alternative and describe it in detail and explain why the proposed rehabilitation project was chosen over each alternative considered.

8. For each alternative to the Lamasco Tank Rehabilitation project considered, provide an itemized breakdown of the estimated capital costs of the alternative, an itemized breakdown of any incremental change (increase or decrease) in annual operating and maintenance expenses expected to arise from the alternative as compared to rehabilitation, the expected useful life of the alternative project e.g. the expected useful life of the a new tank if replacement was considered, and explain how each of those items were estimated or determined.

9. If no alternatives to the Lamasco Tank Rehabilitation project were evaluated, explain in detail why no alternatives were evaluated.

10. If replacement of the tank with a new tank was not considered as an alternative to the Lamasco Tank Rehabilitation project, explain in detail why that alternative was not considered.

11. Identify when the Lamasco Tank was placed in service.

12. Provide the current expected useful life and remaining useful life of the Lamasco Tank, and what they will be after rehabilitation.

13. State whether Lyons District considered any alternatives to the replacement of the waterline creek crossing at state Highway 272, and if so, identify each alternative and describe it in detail, and explain why the proposed project was chosen over each alternative considered. If no alternatives were considered, explain in detail why no alternatives were evaluated.

14. State whether Lyons District considered any alternatives to replacing the Indian Hills water line section, and if so, identify each alternative and describe it in detail, and explain why the proposed project was chosen over each alternative considered. If no alternatives were considered, explain in detail why no alternatives were evaluated.

15. State whether Lyons District considered any alternatives to replacing the Tinsely Creek Subdivision water line, and if so, identify each alternative and describe it in detail, and explain why the proposed project was chosen over each alternative considered. If no alternatives were considered, explain in detail why no alternatives were evaluated

16. State what criteria Lyons District will use in selecting a bid for each project.



Linda C. Bridwell, PE
Executive Director
Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 615
Frankfort, KY 40602

DATED JUN 26 2023

cc: Parties of Record

Case No. 2023-00096

*Lyon County Water District
5464 U. S. Highway 62 West
P. O. Box 489
Kuttawa, KY 42055

*Marvin L Wilson
Wilson Law Firm, PLLC
635 Trade Avenue
PO Box 460
Eddyville, KENTUCKY 42038