

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of

Electronic Application of Bluegrass Water Utility)
Operating Company, LLC for Certificates of)
Convenience and Necessity for Projects at the)
Delaplain Site)

Case No. 2022-00104

Bluegrass Water’s Response to Staff’s Second Request for Information

The Applicant, Bluegrass Water Utility Operating Company, LLC (“Bluegrass”) herewith submits its Response to the Commission Staff’s Second Request for Information. A signed, notarized verification for this Response appears on the following page. The undersigned counsel is responsible for any objection noted for a particular response.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kathryn A. Eckert

Katherine K. Yunker
kyunker@mcbayerfirm.com
Kathryn A. Eckert
keckert@mcbayerfirm.com
MCBRAYER PLLC
201 East Main Street; Suite 900
Lexington, KY 40507-1310
859-231-8780
fax: 859-960-2917
Counsel for Bluegrass Water Utility Operating Company

Bluegrass Water Utility Operating Company, LLC
Verification

I, **Aaron Silas**, Regulatory Case Manager of Central States Water Resources, Inc., the manager of Applicant Bluegrass Operating Company, LLC being duly sworn, state that I prepared or supervised the preparation of the following responses to PSC's Second Request for Information, and that the matters and things set forth in the responses are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief formed after reasonable inquiry.



Aaron Silas

STATE OF MISSOURI)
COUNTY OF St. Louis)

Subscribed, sworn to, and acknowledged this 11th day of July, 2022, before me, a Notary Public in and before said County and State.

My Commission expires: 11-13-2022



NOTARY PUBLIC

{seal}



MERANDA K. KEUBLER
My Commission Expires
November 13, 2022
St. Louis County
Commission #14631487

Request

1. Refer to Bluegrass Water's responses to Commission Staff's First Request for Information (Staff's First Request), Item 8.
 - a. State the expected useful life of the integrated fixed-film activated sludge (IFAS) components considered as an alternative to the MBBR system.
 - b. Provide documentation to support Bluegrass Water's estimate of the useful life of the IFAS.
 - c. State the expected useful life of the additional conventional aeration tankage and blowers considered as an alternative to the MBBR system.
 - d. Provide documentation to support Bluegrass Water's estimate of the useful lives of the additional conventional aeration tankage and blowers.
 - e. State the expected useful life of improvements that would be required to connect to the city of Georgetown sewer system.
 - f. Provide documentation to support Bluegrass Water's estimate of the useful lives of the improvements that would be required to connect to the city of Georgetown sewer system.
-

Response

- a. The IFAS alternative considered would have the same estimated useful life as the proposed MBBR system (i.e. 20 years).
- b. The estimated useful life is based on useful lives and depreciation rates approved for affiliated companies operating in Missouri and Louisiana.¹ There was no documentation generated in estimating this useful life.
- c. The additional aeration tankage and equipment alternative considered would have the same estimated useful life as the proposed MBBR system (i.e. 20 years).

¹ Please see Missouri PSC Case No. WR-2020-0053 (docket linked [here](#)) and Louisiana PSC Case No. U-35822 (docket linked [here](#)).

- d. The estimated useful life is based on useful lives and depreciation rates approved for affiliated companies operating in Missouri and Louisiana. See n.1. There was no documentation generated in estimating this useful life.
- e. The estimated useful life of the improvements required for connection to the city of Georgetown is 50 years.
- f. The estimated useful life is based on useful lives and depreciation rates approved for affiliated companies operating in Missouri and Louisiana. See n.1. There was no documentation generated in estimating this useful life.

Request

2. Refer to Bluegrass Water's responses to Staff's First Request, Item 17.
 - a. State the expected useful life of tertiary filters considered as alternatives to the proposed improvements.
 - b. Provide documentation to support Bluegrass Water's estimate of the useful life of the tertiary filters.
 - c. State the expected useful life of secondary clarifier components considered as an alternative to the proposed improvements.
 - d. Provide documentation to support Bluegrass Water's estimate of the useful lives of the secondary clarifier components.
-

Response

- a. The other tertiary filtration equipment considered would have an estimated useful life of 20 years.
- b. The estimated useful life is based on useful lives and depreciation rates approved for affiliated companies operating in Missouri and Louisiana. See response to 2 PSC 01 n.1.
There was no documentation generated in estimating this useful life.
- c. The secondary clarifier alternative would have an estimated useful life of 20 years.
- d. The estimated useful life is based on useful lives and depreciation rates approved for affiliated companies operating in Missouri and Louisiana. See response to 2 PSC 01 n.1.
There was no documentation generated in estimating this useful life.