

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF BATH COUNTY)	
WATER DISTRICT FOR A CERTIFICATE OF)	
PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY TO)	CASE NO.
CONSTRUCT AND FINANCE IMPROVEMENT)	2023-00097
PROJECTS PURSUANT TO 278.020 AND)	
278.300)	

COMMISSION STAFF'S SECOND REQUEST FOR INFORMATION
TO BATH COUNTY WATER DISTRICT

Bath County Water District (Bath District), pursuant to 807 KAR 5:001E, shall file with the Commission an electronic version of the following information. The information requested is due on May 31, 2023. The Commission directs Bath 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.

Bath District shall make timely amendment to any prior response if Bath 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 Bath District fails or refuses to furnish all or part of the requested information, Bath 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, Bath District shall, in accordance with 807 KAR 5:001E, Section 4(10), encrypt or redact the paper so that personal information cannot be read.

1. Refer to the Application, Exhibit B, Bid Tabulation. Refer also to Bath District's response to Commission Staff's First Request for Information (Staff's First Request), Item 1. For each of the proposed projects, identify what specific basis Bath District might use to accept a bid that is not the least cost bid.

2. Refer to Bath District's response to Staff's First Request, Item 2. Explain whether Bath District has received or expects to receive an extension on the expiration date of the bids.

3. Refer to Bath District's response to Staff's First Request, Item 9.

a. Explain the basis for Bath District's statement that rehabilitation of the tanks is "the more practical and cost-effective option" as compared to replacing the existing storage tanks.

b. For each tank replacement considered as an alternative to rehabilitation, provide the estimated capital costs, an itemized breakdown of any incremental change (increase or decrease) in annual operating and maintenance expenses expected to arise from the replacement as compared to rehabilitation, and the expected useful life of the replacement tank.

c. If Bath District did not estimate the costs and useful life of a tank replacement as an alternative to a proposed rehabilitation, explain how it determined that rehabilitation is the more cost-effective option.

4. Refer to Bath District's response to Staff's First Request, Item 10.

a. For Alternative 2 to the Midland Station project, provide the estimated capital costs, an itemized breakdown of any incremental change in annual operating and maintenance expenses likely to arise from the project as compared to Alternative 3, and the expected useful life of the project.

b. Explain why rehabilitation of Ore Mines Station, along the lines of Alternative 3 for the Midland Station, was not considered as an alternative to the full replacement of the Ore Mines Station proposed. If the decision was based on the

economics of the proposed project as compared to rehabilitation, provide and explain the costs that resulted in that decision.



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

DATED MAY 22 2023

cc: Parties of Record

Case No. 2023-00097

*Bath County Water District
21 Church Street
P. O. Box 369
Salt Lick, KY 40371

*Attorney Earl Rogers III
Campbell Rogers & Hill, PLLC
Campbell & Rogers
154 Flemingsburg Road
Morehead, KENTUCKY 40351

*Holly Nicholas
Kentucky Engineering Group, PLLC
161 N Locust Street
Versailles, KENTUCKY 40383

*Sarah Price
Bath County Water District
21 Church Street
P. O. Box 369
Salt Lick, KY 40371