COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

T	41	N/I - 44	- C.
ın	tne	Matter	01:

ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF BLUEGRASS)	
WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC)	
FOR ADJUSTMENT OF SEWAGE RATES)	CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Bluegrass Water Utility Operating Company, LLC, ("Bluegrass Water" or the "Company") by counsel, files its responses to the Office of the Attorney General's Supplemental Request for Information, issued in the above-captioned case on June 1, 2023.

FILED: June 16, 2023

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-1: Regarding all open dockets as of March 31, 2023, at state utility regulatory commissions involving wastewater or water utilities owned by CSWR, provide the following information for each:

- a. Identify the applicable state regulatory agency,
- b. The Docket or Case Number,
- c. A brief description of the nature of the docket.
- d. Identify the employees of CSWR who've provided testimony in the docket.

RESPONSE: Bluegrass Water objects to this request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not proportional to the needs of this case because it seeks information for all open dockets without regard to subject matter or relevance to this proceeding. Bluegrass Water further objects to this request as seeking information contained within the public record. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, Bluegrass Water provides the following information for all open rate proceedings involving wastewater or water utilities owned by CSWR as of May 31, 2023:

Great River Utility Operating Company: Mississippi Public Service Commission Docket Nos. 2022-UN-86 and 2022-UN-87. CSWR employees who presented testimony are Josiah Cox, Todd Thomas, Jacob Freeman, Brent Thies, and Mike Duncan.

<u>Confluence Rivers Utility Operating Company</u>: Missouri Public Service Commission Docket No. WR-2023-0006 and SR-2023-0007. CSWR employees who presented testimony are Josiah Cox, Todd Thomas, Jacob Freeman, and Brent Thies.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

<u>CSWR-Texas Utility Operating Company</u>: Texas Public Utility Commission Docket No. 54565. CSWR employees who presented testimony are Josiah Cox, Todd Thomas, Jacob Freeman, Brent Thies and Mike Duncan.

Witness: Aaron Silas

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-2: Refer to the response to PSC 2-21. Provide data in the format provided in response to PSC 2-21 for the period 7/1/22 through 4/30/23.

RESPONSE: Please see Exhibit OAG 2-2.

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-3: Provide all due diligence performed prior to entering into an

operating agreement with Midwest Water Operations LLC. This response should include any bid

information from other vendors as well as internal memos outlining the various options to acquire

such services from other vendors with conclusions on why Midwest Water was the preferable

option.

RESPONSE: Please see CONFIDENTIAL Exhibit OAG 2-3 for bid information. No

formal scoring was completed.

Witness:

Todd Thomas

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-4: Regarding the proposal to implement a 10% late fee as set forth on

page 36 of Mr. Thies' testimony, provide cost support justifying this proposal.

RESPONSE: As relates to the 10% proposed fee, there is not specific cost support to

attempt to quantify the financial impact of customers not paying their bills in a timely

fashion. Much like a cash working capital analysis, the Company sought to avoid the expense

of trying to exactly determine the cost to the Company of late payment. Instead, as reflected

at pages 37-38 of Mr. Thies' testimony, the proposed 10% late fee simply mirrors that

previously approved by the Commission with regard to Herrington Haven, Woodland

Estates, Springcrest Sewer, and other Kentucky water and sewer companies.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-5: Provide a specific description of the types of revenue recorded in accounts 532, Revenue-Sewer Other and 536 Revenue-Sewer Other.

RESPONSE: "Account 532 Revenue-Sewer Other" is late fee revenue, and "Account 536 Revenue-Sewer Other" is NSF (Non-Sufficient Funds) fee revenue.

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-7: Refer to the attachment supplied in response to OAG 1-66. The

pro-forma late fee revenue is based upon the amount of active 30 days past due balances. However,

according to the proposed tariff as well as the testimony of Mr. Thies, the late fee would be assessed

to any balance that is past due, rather than 30 days past due. Please amend the attachment 1-66 to

calculate pro-forma late penalty fees to all balances past due to which the late payment fee would

apply. For purposes of this response, exclude those past due balances which are associated with

systems already subject to the 10% late payment fee.

RESPONSE:

Please see Exhibit OAG 2-7.

Witness:

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-8: Refer to the attachment supplied in response to OAG 1-66. The

response suggests that there were 9 returned checks. Please confirm the accuracy of this response

in light of an annualized number of bills of approximately 41,652 (3,471 monthly customers

multiplied by 12). If this returned check count is accurate, describe why the Company believes it

is cost effective to implement such a charge given the rarity of returned checks.

RESPONSE: Confirmed. The Company's bank charges Bluegrass Water \$16 per

returned check. Bluegrass Water then suggests passing a portion of this fee on to the

customer whose check was returned through a \$15 returned check fee. Bluegrass Water

believes implementation of the charge is cost effective because the benefits of being able to

recover a portion of the fee charged by Bluegrass Water's bank will significantly outweigh

the minimal costs associated with implementing this fee. Bluegrass Water further believes

implementing the charge will best result in "fair, just and reasonable" rates because it is

unfair to customers who do not cause the returned check fee to be incurred to bear a portion

of that fee through rates.

Witness:

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-9: Does CSWR incur hourly charges for mowing? If so, provide the

justification for incurring such costs in light of the contractual terms contained in the operating

contract supplied in Confidential Exhibit 22.1

RESPONSE: The contract provided in Confidential Exhibit 22 includes mowing and

trimming of plant and right of way areas in the basic scope of services provided by Midwest

on page 12. (Please note that Midwest has since been acquired by Clearwater Solutions and

the rights and obligations of the Midwest contract have since been assigned and assumed by

Clearwater). Any mowing that is considered outside of the basic scope is billed at \$70/hour

as outlined on page 3 of that contract.

Witness:

Todd Thomas

While Exhibit 22 is subject to a pending confidentiality motion, the highlighted portion of the request merely refers to the Exhibit number. Consequently, while the Company appreciates the Attorney General's abundance of caution,

the Company has removed highlighting from the data request.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-10: Refer to the Attachment to OAG discovery request 1-105. Please provide the May 2022 invoices from Bluegrass' vendor Nitor and Muni Link, respectively.

RESPONSE: Please see Exhibit OAG 2-10.

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-11: See response to OAG 1-107. Identify the Starnik costs reflected

on the books of Bluegrass, split between those direct charged, jointly allocated and those allocated

using the three-part allocator, by month for the period January, 2020 through December 31, 2022.

RESPONSE: Please see Exhibit OAG 2-11. The Jointly Billed and Allocated costs

are first booked to the prepay account and then expensed throughout the year on the books

of Bluegrass Water. The three factor allocation expenses are booked in accordance with the

CAM and the OHA Workpapers provided as Exhibit OAG 1-43.

Witness:

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-12: Regarding the legal expenditures reflected in tab BT-12 of Exhibit

PSC 2-17, provide the following:

a. The monthly costs incurred to date by Dinsmore & Shohl LLP for services

performed associated with this rate filing.

b. A copy of the firm's invoice for April, 2022.

c. Support for the total expenses reflected for D&S reflected in Exhibit BT-12.

RESPONSE: Bluegrass Water objects to the extent that this request seeks

information subject to the attorney-client or attorney work product privileges. Subject to

and without waiving these objections, the Company states as follows.

Please see Exhibit OAG 2-12. In preparing Exhibit OAG 2-12, Bluegrass (a)

Water realized the "To Date Expenses" of Dinsmore & Shohl LLP in BT-12 contained an

error. The total amount as of the filing of BT-12 was \$80,140.19.

Dinsmore & Shohl LLP did not provide any services for this proceeding in **(b)**

April 2022. As a result, no invoice for April 2022 exists.

(c) Please see attachment Exhibit OAG 2-12.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-13: Regarding the Depreciation Study costs identified in tab BT-12 found within Exhibit PSC 2-17, provide the costs of Gannet Fleming through April 30, 2023.

RESPONSE: Please see Exhibit OAG 2-13.

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-14: Regarding the response to OAG 1-117, provide the following:

a. Identify the monthly accrual made each month for the period January 1, 2021

through April 30, 2023.

b. Quantify the amounts of annual 'write-offs' referenced in this response for the years

2020 - 2022, further identified by system.

c. For each account written off during the 2020 - 2022 period, indicate whether such

customer or address later returned to the system as a customer and/or connection.

RESPONSE: (a) Please see Exhibit OAG 2-14(a). The Company began recording

revenue accruals October 2022 as a month end close improvement process.

Please see Exhibit OAG 2-14(b). **(b)**

Accounts are written off after they have been inactive for a period of time. The (c)

connection/service address may return to the system after an account is inactive, when a new

account at that connection/service address is activated.

Witness:

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-15: Refer to the response to OAG 1-120. The insurance costs assigned

to Bluegrass decreased significantly in January 2023. With respect to this reduced level of expense

provide the following:

a. Provide a copy of all insurance invoices or cost support for December 2022 and

January 2023's accounting entries, including the basis by which costs were

assigned to Bluegrass.

b. Provide a comprehensive explanation of why insurance costs decreased in January,

2023.

RESPONSE:

(a) Please see Exhibit OAG 2-15, which is provided in two

subparts.

(b) Faced with a large renewal increase, Bluegrass sought to refine and specify the

asset values that were insured. Please see the Exhibit OAG 2-15 (Part 2 of 2) for updated

insured values.

Witness:

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-16: Refer to the attachment provided in response to OAG 1-130 and

respond to the following:

a. Provide a comprehensive explanation of the source used to develop the values

reflected as Operating Expense adjustments.

b. Provide a copy of the excel file supporting the response to PSC 1-32.

RESPONSE: (a) The source of the Operating Expense adjustments for

Randview is the test year actual expenses. The sources of the Operating Expense adjustments

for Site Waiver/CPCN is a calculation for annual subscription costs and the annual reduction

in operating contract costs per the analysis provided in Case No. 2022-00216.

(b) Please see Exhibit OAG 2-16.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-17: Refer to Exhibit PSC 2-17. Provide a breakdown of the components of 2023 Long-Term Liabilities as shown of \$11,298,783.² This response should clearly identify each account and account title that makes up this balance.

RESPONSE: Please see Exhibit OAG 2-17.

² While a portion of Exhibit PSC 2-17 is subject to a pending confidentiality motion, the information contained within the request is not subject to that motion and the information is already contained within the public record. Consequently, while the Company appreciates the Attorney General's abundance of caution, the Company has removed highlighting from the data request.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-18: Refer to the Trial Balance provided as attachment to PSC request 1-3 as of June 30, 2022, and respond to the following concerning Contributions in Aid of Construction, account 272-000-04-012:

- a. Activity in this account for the twelve months ended June 30, 2022, reflects net debit activity of \$36,516. Please reconcile this amount with the CIAC Amortization amount of \$24,960 reflected in the attachment to PSC Request 2-17, specifically on tab "Exhibit 26", row 51.
- b. Identify any adjustments made by Bluegrass to the balance of Accumulated Contributions in Aid of Construction Amortization at the time of, or subsequent to any acquisition of a Kentucky wastewater system during the period January 2020 through April 30, 2023. If such an adjustment was made, provide the amount of the adjustment to the contra-liability account as well as the supporting calculation and the rationale for the adjusting entry. This response would include any such adjustments made to record the acquisition of a new system on the books of Bluegrass.
- c. Provide the underlying calculations for the CIAC Amortization reflected in this case of \$24,960, including the basis for the amortization period utilized.

RESPONSE: (a) & (b) Please see Exhibit OAG 2-18 for the reconciliation. The difference is due to PSC Request 1-3 including both water and sewer amounts. Please see the "CIAC Schedule" tab for additions made through April 30, 2023; which reflects that no adjustments have been made.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

(c) Please see Exhibit OAG 2-18. Bluegrass uses a 30-year amortization period for CIAC to approximate the average depreciation rate of all assets.

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-21: Refer to the annualization adjustment identified in the workpapers

provided in OAG 1-113 and provide the following:

a. Identify the amount of internal labor charged accounts 701, 703, 705 and 711 as

found within the Darlington Creek Details tab within the attachment to OAG 1-113.

Provide the name of the employee(s) whose time is charged to these accounts.

b. For each employee identified above provide the level of base compensation charged

to Bluegrass by month for the period July 2021 through June 2022.

RESPONSE: No internal labor is charged to accounts 701, 703, 705 and 711; it is all

contract labor.

Witness:

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-23: Please specify how the Company defines Business Development

activities for purposes of determining the appropriate level of costs to exclude from the revenue

requirement.

RESPONSE: The Company defines business development activities as the expenses

of an employee whose primary purpose is the sourcing of new systems. Also included in

business development expense is a portion of executive salary and expense associated with

the supervision of those employees.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-24: For the period January through March 2023, provide the percentage of customer payments made online.

RESPONSE: 63.8% of customer payments were made online, representing 56.8% of the total dollar amount collected.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-25: With respect to the response to OAG 1-53 (Confidential), respond to the following:

- a. Confirm that the percentage of compensation identified as "Indirect Allocated" reflects the portion of costs subject to the three-factor allocation of Utility Plant in Service, Customer Connections and Direct Labor and that further the resulting allocated costs are not designated as Business Development Expense.
- b. Confirm that all labor costs considered Business Development costs are removed prior to determining the Indirect Allocated percentage reflected in Attachment OAG 1-53.
- c. Please confirm that none of Josiah Cox's compensation is designated as Business Development expense.
- d. Confirm that no CSWR labor is 'Jointly Billed' as that term is used in the attachment to PSC 1-1. If this is not confirmed, identify the percentage of Jointly Billed Labor charged to Kentucky for each employee identified in OAG 1-53 and indicate whether such jointly billed labor costs are reflected in the KY% column.
- e. Please confirm that the data in the KY% column reflects the percentage of each employees' direct labor charges assigned to Kentucky.³

RESPONSE: (a) Confirmed.

³ While Exhibit OAG 1-53 is subject to a pending confidentiality motion, the highlighted portion of the request generically refers to the Exhibit. Consequently, while the Company appreciates the Attorney General's abundance of caution, the Company has removed highlighting from the data request.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

(b) Confirmed.

(c) A portion of Josiah Cox's compensation expense is designated as Business

Development.

(d) Confirmed. Costs are billed to Bluegrass based on the percentage of time

worked as reflected in employee timesheets. This percentage is reflected in the KY% column

of OAG 1-53.

(e) Confirmed.

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-27: Refer to the Attachment OAG 1-43, part 6 of 8. The Direct Labor

charges attributed to Bluegrass for this quarter totaled \$1,125,000. Please provide a breakdown of

the employee's name and title comprising the total labor charges of \$1,125,000.

RESPONSE: Direct labor represents contract operations cost and not employee

expenses. Expenses associated with employees are allocated consistent with the Cost

Allocation Manual.

Witness:

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-28: Please refer to the testimony of Mr. Thies on page 16, lines 1-5,

as well as to the attachment to the response to OAG 1-43.

a. In testimony, Mr. Thies indicates that one of the three factors used to allocate

general and administrative costs is Operating Expenses. In the attachment to OAG

1-43, the corresponding factor is clearly labeled "Direct Labor". Please define the

third factor other than Utility Plant in Service and Customer Connections is used

within the three-factor overhead calculation; is it Direct Labor or Operating

Expenses?

b. If this represents Operating Expenses, provide a summary of such costs which

supports the \$1,125,000 amount used in developing the 2022 2nd quarter Overhead

Allocation Percentages.

RESPONSE: Direct labor and operating expense are synonymous in these instances.

As stated in response to OAG 2-27, the relevant costs are contract operations costs.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-29: Provide the job descriptions for the following employees:

Title	Date of Hire
President	3/19/2014
Director Business Development	8/20/2018
Director Business Development	4/1/2019
In House General Counsel	6/10/2019

RESPONSE: Please see Exhibit OAG 2-29 for the available job descriptions.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-30: Refer to the attachment to response OAG 1-124 and respond to the following questions:

- a. Provide the support for the actual charges of \$445,726 as reflected in cell I23 within the OHA Cal tab.
- b. Define the term Payroll/EE Removed as reflected in this schedule. Confirm this includes payroll that is direct charged to CSWR affiliates and define the reference to EE. Provide support for these total amounts. If the support can be extracted from the data supplied in the detail tab of Attachment OAG 1-124, please provide instructions on how to access the information.
- c. Explain how Executive and Business Development exclusions were developed and provide the support for the totals found in the OHA calc tab. If the support can be extracted from the data supplied in the detail tab of Attachment OAG 1-124, please provide instructions on how to access the information.
- d. Provide a supporting schedule for Other Line-Item Exclusions to the extent and independent reviewer could understand the nature of the excluded item. If the support can be extracted from the data supplied in the detail tab of Attachment OAG 1-124, please provide instructions on how to access the information.
- e. Provide support for the allocation of overhead costs between water and wastewater services.

RESPONSE: Please see Exhibit OAG 2-30. For subpart (e), please also see Response to OAG 2-76.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-31: For any management consulting service costs that have not been

adjusted out of the corporate costs allocated to Bluegrass, identify the outside contractor and

provide a full description of services to be performed and a copy of the consulting contract.

RESPONSE: Please see Exhibit OAG 2-31.

Witness:

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-32: For any legal related costs incorporated in the response to OAG 1-

124, that have not been adjusted out of the corporate costs allocated to Bluegrass, identify the

outside legal firms and provide a full description of services to be performed and a copy of the

contract and/or engagement letter.

RESPONSE: Please see attached Exhibit OAG 2-32. There are no contracts

or engagement letters for these vendors.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-33: Refer to the response to OAG 1-128 and provide copies of invoices supporting the following acquisition costs:

Asset No.	Vendor	Invoice No.	Amount
AP.352.100.01	McBrayer McGinnis Leslie & Kirkland PLL	415185 JHF	2,350.98
AP.352.100.01	The Beckemeier Law Firm LC	67-035	5,000.00
AP.352.200.02	The Beckemeier Law Firm LC	67-030	4,255.00
BR.352.100.02	21 Design Group Inc.	3666	10,401.25
FR.311.000.03	Midwest Water Operations LLC	809	10,283.59
HH.352.200.03	21 Design Group Inc.	5564	11,497.50
PR.352.100.03	The Beckemeier Law Firm LC	61-012	12,586.50

RESPONSE: Bluegrass Water objects to the extent that this request seeks information subject to the attorney-client or attorney work product privileges. Subject to and without waiving these objections, the Company states as follows. Please see Exhibit OAG 2-33, for a copy of the engineering invoices.

Invoice No. 415185 JHF issued by McBrayer McGinnis Leslie & Kirkland PLLC was for legal fees incurred to provide local counsel services for the closing of the Arcadia Pines acquisition. Invoice No. 67-035 issued by The Beckemeier Law Firm LC was for the preparation and issuance of an opinion letter relating to the closing of the Arcadia Pines acquisition. The amount of \$4,255.00 included from Invoice No. 67-030 was for legal services incurred in the preparation of documents necessary to purchase the Arcadia Pines system. Invoice No. 61-012 issued by the Beckemeier Law Firm LC was for legal services incurred in the preparation of documents necessary to purchase the Persimmon Ridge system, which included the negotiation of certain easements.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-34: See response to AG DR 1-31. Confirm that this response indicates the Company does not consider affordability in setting rates.

RESPONSE: Bluegrass Water objects to OAG No. 2-34 because Bluegrass Water's Response to OAG 1-31 speaks for itself. Bluegrass Water further objects to Request No. 2-34 because it again misstates the legal standard established by KRS 278.030(1). Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, Bluegrass Water states that it did consider the correct legal standard established by KRS 278.030(1) - "fair, just, and reasonable" when proposing rates in this proceeding. As was explained in response to OAG 1-19 and Scott County 1-2, Bluegrass Water believes that continuing to propose a unified rate across all systems best serves the "fair, just, and reasonable" standard because it allows Bluegrass Water to make the necessary improvements to the acquired systems - including those necessary to eliminate environmental violations that have persisted for years without remedy from the prior owners – while mitigating the rate impact of these investments to Bluegrass Water's customers. For example, as was shown in Case No. 2020-00290 in Response to OAG 1-2, without consolidation, the cost-based rates for the Fox Run system would have been \$313.69 per month versus \$89.58 on a unified rate. As a result, Bluegrass Water does consider whether rates are "fair, just, and reasonable" in requesting approval of the proposed rates in this proceeding through its requests for rate consolidation.

That Bluegrass Water's proposal for a unified serves the "fair, just, and reasonable" standard is solidified by the Commission's Order in Case No. 2020-00290, which found that "The majority of Bluegrass Water's customers are in the residential class. A separate rate Bluegrass Water's Response to OAG 2-34

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

for each geographically distinct merged system of Bluegrass Water would create unreasonable and undue hardship to individuals in some areas served by Bluegrass Water."

Case No. 2020-00290, August 2, 2021 Order, at 113.

Witness: Josiah Cox

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-35: See response to AG R 1-121. Please supplement all answers to all

sections of the request to include a definition of legislative advocacy which defines legislative

advocacy to include activities performed, by an employee or a contractor on behalf of CSWR or

Bluegrass Water, to affect the passage of legislation and/or rules before the legislative body of any

state, any administrative agency of any state, as well as Congress and federal executive agencies.

RESPONSE: Bluegrass Water objects to OAG Request No. 2-35 as unduly

burdensome and seeking information not relevant to this proceeding as it seeks information

related to expenses that are not allocated to Bluegrass Water and for which recovery is not

sought in this proceeding. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, during

the test year, Bluegrass Water did not engage in any legislative advocacy activities either

before a federal or state legislative body. As such, Bluegrass Water did not incur any costs,

either for CSWR employees or for a retained lobbyist (contractor) associated with legislative

advocacy activities. Please also see Exhibit OAG 1-6 filed with Bluegrass Water's

Supplemental Responses on May 26, 2023.

Witness:

Brent Thies

Bluegrass Water's Response to OAG 2-35

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-36: Reference Discovery Response to OAG 1-33 response regarding Airview Wastewater Treatment Facility (Exhibit_OAG_1-33_(Part_1_of_4)_-_KY_Permits.pdf). Please provide the following:

- a. Explain why the average flow is greater than the design flow (0.057 MGD vs 0.055 MGD).
- b. Provide the expected average flow and design flow after completion of the upgrades approved in Case No. 2020-290.
- c. Provide all an update on the progress, scope, costs and any design and construction change orders related to the improvements approved in Case No. 2020-290.

RESPONSE: (a) The 57,000 gpd figure was based on "bucket test" flow measurements performed by the previous ownership. Bluegrass has installed a flow meter at the facility that has shown that the actual average daily flow is less than 40,000 gpd.

(b) The upgrades presented are aimed at bringing the treatment plant into a condition where it can effectively treat the wastewater received by the facility in compliance with permit limits and will not directly alter the amount of flow coming to the facility. Inflow and infiltration (I&I) flows, however, will continue to be reduced in normal course of business collection system repairs as any areas where I&I is occurring will be repaired as they are identified through ordinary collection system inspections. This will result in flows reducing, though as described above, the actual flow is not currently in excess of the design flow.

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

(c) All planned improvements were completed as of February 15, 2023. The only

significant change from the originally planned scope was the conversion of the existing

lagoon for flow equalization rather than the installation of new tankage for flow equalization.

This was selected to maximize the utility of existing infrastructure and eliminate the cost of

additional tankage. Costs can be compared between the capital figures provided in Exhibit

PSC 3-9 and the estimate from the engineering memorandum referred to in the testimony

filed in Case No. 2020-00290. It is important, however, to recognize that the engineering

memo estimates and preliminary project plan were not finalized plans or budgets and were

prepared prior to Bluegrass Water taking ownership of the system. Changes occur during

the final design phase for improvements and repairs to the facility arising from a greater

understanding of the facility that can only be gained after operating the facility. The estimate

provided was a third-party opinion of probable cost based on preliminary analysis, not a

final budget, a proposal, or quote. Furthermore, the estimate for this system was prepared

in 2018, with a significant portion of cost change attributable to inflation and impacts of the

COVID-19 pandemic on material costs, material lead time, and labor costs.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-37: Reference Discovery Response to OAG 1-33 regarding Brocklyn Wastewater Treatment Facility (Exhibit_OAG_1-33_(Part_1_of_4)_-_KY_Permits.pdf). Please provide the following:

- a. Provide the expected average flow and design flow after completion of the upgrades approved in Case No. 2020-290.
- b. Provide all an update on the progress, scope, costs and any design and construction change orders related to the improvements approved in Case No. 2020-290.
- c. Compare costs of upgrades with the estimates provided in the engineering memorandum provided in response to OAG 1-77 (Exhibit OAG 1-77(b) -CONFIDENTIAL Engineering Memo - Brocklyn.pdf) and explain the change in costs, scope and construction.

RESPONSE: (a) As with the project at Airview, improvements to the treatment plant will not affect the actual flow received by the facility. Per the KPDES permit fact sheet published with the May 2023 permit renewal, the expected average flow to the facility is 25,000 gpd and the design flow is 40,000 gpd.

(b) Significant changes to the project plan occurred, primarily due to the facility performing better than anticipated and difficulties acquiring a construction permit for the proposed project. The EEC/DOW did not immediately grant a construction permit, instead encouraging Bluegrass Water to seek the option of either completing repairs at the facility that would not require a permit, or seeking to connect to the City of Richmond. Upon contacting the city, it became clear that the cost to complete the projects required to connect Bluegrass Water's Response to OAG 2-37

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

to the city, the connection fees, and the ongoing cost of treatment from the city would result in capital costs many times the costs of the proposed project, which would result in higher customer rates. Therefore, Bluegrass Water worked, instead, to complete repairs to the facility, and the facility has achieved compliance with permitted limits on the merits of the repairs to the aeration system. The facility tankage is, however, still in very poor condition and further improvements will be required in the future to preserve the structural integrity of the plant or provide an alternative means of treatment. Costs can be compared between the capital figures provided in Exhibit PSC 3-9 and the estimate from the engineering memorandum referred to in the testimony filed in Case No. 2020-00290. It is important, however, to recognize that the engineering memo estimates and preliminary project plan were not finalized plans and no budgets were prepared prior to Bluegrass Water taking ownership of the system. Changes occur during the final design phase for improvements and repairs to the facility, which are developed based on a greater understanding of the facility that can only be gained after operating the facility. The preliminary engineering estimate was a third-party opinion of probable cost based on the preliminary analysis, not a final budget, a proposal, or a quote. Furthermore, an estimate for this system was prepared in 2018, with a significant portion of cost change attributable to inflation and impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on material costs, material lead times, and increased labor costs.

(c) Costs can be compared between the capital figures provided in Exhibit PSC 3-9 and the estimate from the engineering memorandum referred to in the testimony filed in Case No. 2020-00290. It is important, however, to recognize that the engineering memo Bluegrass Water's Response to OAG 2-37

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

estimates and preliminary project plan were not finalized plans or budgets and were

prepared prior to Bluegrass Water taking ownership of the system. Changes occur during

the final design phase for improvements and repairs to the facility arising from a greater

understanding of the facility that can only be gained after operating the facility. The

preliminary engineering estimate provided was a third-party opinion of probable cost based

on a preliminary analysis, not a final budget, a proposal, or a quote. Furthermore, the

estimate for this system was prepared in 2018, with a significant portion of cost change

attributable to inflation and impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on material costs, material

lead times, and increased labor costs.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-38: Reference Discovery Response to OAG 1-78(b) (Exhibit OAG 1-78(b) - CONFIDENTIAL Engineering Memo - Darlington Creek.pdf) regarding Darlington Creek Wastewater Treatment Facility. Please provide the following:

- a. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering
 Memo and the actual work and expenditures completed to date and explain
 differences.
- b. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering Memo and the forecasted work and expenditures over the next 5 years.
- Provide the expected average flow and design flow after these improvements are completed.

RESPONSE: (a) The work at the facility is expected to remain consistent with the recommendations presented in the engineering memorandum; the only exception is that the existing digester will be replaced with a polymer tank digester on the same site. In comparing the capital amounts provided in Exhibit PSC 3-9 and the estimates included in the engineering memorandum referred to in the request, it is important to recognize that the engineering memo estimates and preliminary project plan were not finalized plans or budgets and were prepared prior to Bluegrass Water taking ownership of the system. Those estimates were based on a third-party opinion of probable cost based on a preliminary analysis, not a final budget, a proposal, or a quote. Furthermore, the estimate for this system was prepared in 2021, with a significant portion of cost change attributable to inflation, and

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

the continued impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on material costs, material lead time, and

labor costs.

(b) While a majority of the work (repairs) has been completed, the installation of

a new digester is still in progress. It is not expected to increase costs over what was originally

proposed. Please see the above discussion of cost comparison.

(c) The improvements will have no impact on expected average flow or design

flow, which can be seen on the permit fact sheet from EEC as an average flow of 15,500 gpd

and design flow of 49,500 gpd. Average flow will increase as more homes are built in the

subdivision.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-39: Reference Discovery Response to OAG 1-80 (b) (Exhibit OAG 1-80(b) - CONFIDENTIAL Engineering Memo - Delaplain Disposal.pdf) regarding Delaplain Wastewater Treatment Facility. Please provide the following:

- a. Compare the cost, scope and design of the improvements addressed in Case No.
 2022-104 with the referenced engineering memo and explain differences.
- b. Provide the expected average flow and design flow after completion of the upgrades approved in Case No. 2022-00104.

RESPONSE: (a) The figures from the engineering memorandum are not the most up to date figures provided, as new more detailed estimates and plans were presented in and discussed thoroughly throughout the CPCN application (See Case No. 2022-00104) for the system and in the current rate case. Additionally, as in all other cases, the engineering memo estimates and preliminary project plan were not finalized plans or budgets and were prepared prior to Bluegrass Water taking ownership of the system. Changes occur during the final design phase for improvements and repairs to the facility arising from a greater understanding of the facility that can only be gained after operating the facility. The estimate provided was a third-party opinion of probable cost based on a preliminary analysis, not a final budget, a proposal, or a quote. Furthermore, the estimate for this system was prepared in 2020, with a significant portion of cost change attributable to inflation and impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on material costs, material lead time, and labor costs.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

(b) The proposed project has no impact on the design flow or actual flow to the facility. The figures from the most recent KPDES permit fact sheet show an average flow of 236,000 gpd and a design flow of 240,000 gpd.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-40: Reference Discovery Response to OAG 1-85 (a) (Exhibit OAG 1-85(a) - CONFIDENTIAL Engineering Memo - Fox Run.pdf) regarding Fox Run Wastewater Treatment Facility. Please provide the following:

- a. Compare the cost, scope and design of the improvements to date with the referenced engineering memo and explain differences.
- b. Provide the expected average flow and design flow after these improvements are completed.
- c. Discuss any plans in the next five years to pursue improvements or upgrades that would require the Commission to issue a CPCN.

RESPONSE: (a) The work performed at Fox Run has remained substantially consistent with the work recommended in the engineering memorandum. When comparing the capital amounts provided in Exhibit PSC 3-9 and the estimate from the engineering memorandum referred to in the testimony filed in Case No. 2020-00290, it is important to recognize that the engineering memo estimates and preliminary project plan were not finalized plans or budgets and were prepared prior to Bluegrass Water taking ownership of the system. Changes occur during the final design phase for improvements and repairs to the facility arising from a greater understanding of the facility that can only be gained after operating the facility. The preliminary engineering estimate provided was a third-party opinion of probable cost based on the preliminary analysis, not a final budget, a proposal, or a quote. Furthermore, the estimate for this system was prepared in 2018, with

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

a significant portion of cost change attributable to inflation and impacts of the COVID-19

pandemic on material costs, material lead time, and labor costs.

(b) The proposed project has no impact on the design flow or actual flow to the

facility. The figures from the most recent KPDES permit fact sheet show an average flow of

12,000 gpd and a design flow of 20,000 gpd.

No projects requiring CPCN approval are anticipated in the next five years at

this time.

(c)

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-41: Reference Discovery Response to OAG 1-79 (b) (Exhibit OAG 1-79(b) - CONFIDENTIAL Engineering Memo - Herrington Haven.pdf) regarding Herrington Haven Wastewater Treatment Facility. Please provide the following:

- a. Compare the cost, scope and design of the improvements addressed in Case No.
 2022-102 with the referenced engineering memo and explain differences.
- b. Provide the expected average flow and design flow after completion of the upgrades approved in Case No. 2022-00102.

RESPONSE: (a) The figures from the engineering memorandum are not the most up to date figures provided as new more detailed estimates and plans were presented in and discussed thoroughly throughout the CPCN application (See Case No. case 2022-00102) for the system and in the current rate case. Additionally, as in all other cases, the engineering memo estimates and preliminary project plan were not finalized plans or budgets and were prepared prior to Bluegrass Water taking ownership of the system. Changes occur during the final design phase for improvements and repairs to the facility arising from a greater understanding of the facility that can only be gained after operating the facility. The preliminary engineering estimate provided was a third-party opinion of probable cost based on a preliminary analysis, not a final budget, a proposal, or a quote. Furthermore, the estimate for this system was prepared in 2020, with a significant portion of cost change attributable to inflation and impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on material costs, material lead time, and labor costs.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

(b) The proposed project has no impact on the design flow or actual flow to the facility. The figures from the pending KPDES permit renewal fact sheet show an average flow of 28,000 gpd and a design flow of 40,000 gpd.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-42: Reference OAG 1-34 part 7 regarding LH Treatment Wastewater

System. Please provide the following:

a. Average flow and design flow ratings of the facility.

b. 911 address for the facility.

RESPONSE: (a) Per the most recent KPDES permit renewal fact sheet,

the average flow to the facility is 76,000 gpd and the design flow is 100,000 gpd.

(b) The facility has no street address, but is located at the end of the driveway at

the North corner of the paved area at the Condos at Longview Golf Club House facility

located at 3243 Frankfort Pike, Georgetown, KY 40324.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-43: Reference Discovery Response to OAG 1-72 (b) (Exhibit OAG 1-72(b) - CONFIDENTIAL Engineering Memo - LH Treatment.pdf) regarding LH Treatment Wastewater Treatment Facility. Please provide the following:

- a. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering
 Memo and the actual work and expenditures completed to date and explain
 differences.
- b. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering Memo and the forecasted work and expenditures over the next 5 years.
- Provide the expected average flow and design flow after these improvements are completed.

RESPONSE: (a) The work performed at the LH treatment facility was consistent with the recommendations presented in the engineering memorandum. When comparing the capital amounts provided in Exhibit PSC 3-9 and the estimate from the engineering memorandum referred to in the testimony filed in Case No. 2020-00290, it is important to recognize that the engineering memo estimates and preliminary project plan were not finalized plans or budgets and were prepared prior to Bluegrass Water taking ownership of the system. Changes occur during the final design phase for improvements and repairs to the facility arising from a greater understanding of the facility that can only be gained after operating the facility. The preliminary estimate provided was a third-party opinion of probable cost based on the preliminary analysis, not a final budget, a proposal, or a quote. Furthermore, the estimate for this system was prepared in 2019, with a significant Bluegrass Water's Response to OAG 2-43

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

portion of cost change attributable to inflation and impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on

material costs, material lead time, and labor costs.

(b) The proposed work has been completed and no major projects are planned for

the next five years.

(c) The proposed project has no impact on the design flow or actual flow to the

facility. The figures from the most recent KPDES permit fact sheet show an average flow of

76,000 gpd and a design flow of 100,000 gpd.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-44: Reference OAG 1-34 part 9 regarding Arcadia Pines Wastewater

Treatment. Please provide the following:

a. Average flow and design flow ratings of the facility.

b. 911 address for the facility.

RESPONSE: (a) The average flow to the facility is estimated to be 10,000 gpd with a design flow of approximately 20,000 gpd (non-discharging system flows are not

reported or listed as with KPDES regulated facilities).

(b) The facility is located in between 1020 and 1100 Red Pine Cir, West Paducah,

KY 42086.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-45: Reference Discovery Response to OAG 1-74 (b) (Exhibit OAG 1-74(b) - CONFIDENTIAL Engineering Memo - Arcadia Pines) regarding Arcadia Pines Wastewater Treatment Facility. Please provide the following:

- a. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering
 Memo and the actual work and expenditures completed to date and explain
 differences.
- b. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering Memo and the forecasted work and expenditures over the next 5 years.
- Provide the expected average flow and design flow after these improvements are completed.

RESPONSE: (a) The work performed at the Arcadia Pines facility was consistent with the recommendations presented in the engineering memorandum. When comparing the capital amounts provided in Exhibit PSC 3-9 and the estimate from the engineering memorandum referred to in the testimony filed in Case No. 2020-00290, it is important to recognize that the engineering memo estimates and preliminary project plan were not finalized plans or budgets and were prepared prior to Bluegrass Water taking ownership of the system. Changes occur during the final design phase for improvements and repairs to the facility arising from a greater understanding of the facility that can only be gained after operating the facility. The preliminary engineering estimate provided was a third-party opinion of probable cost based on the preliminary analysis, not a final budget, a proposal, or a quote. Furthermore, the estimate for this system was prepared in 2019, with Bluegrass Water's Response to OAG 2-45

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

a significant portion of cost change attributable to inflation and impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on material costs, material lead time, and labor costs.

- (b) The proposed work has been completed and no major projects are planned for the next five years.
- (c) The improvements have no bearing on design flow or actual flow so the figures will remain 10,000 and 20,000 respectively.

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-46: Reference OAG 1-33 part 2 regarding the Magruder Village Water

Corporation. Please provide the following:

a. Why was information for this facility included in discovery response?

b. Explain why the average flow is greater than the design flow (0.0086 MGD vs

0.0075MGD).

Bluegrass Water states that any information related to **RESPONSE:** (a)

Magruder Village Water Corporation was inadvertently included among the records

provided in Response to OAG 1-33. Bluegrass Water does not own the system located in

Magruder Village and does not seek to recover any expenses associated with the system at

Magruder Village in this proceeding.

(b) Please see Bluegrass Water's Response to Subpart (a).

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-47: Reference OAG 1-33 part 3 regarding the Moon River Resort Wastewater Treatment Plant. Please provide the following:

- a. Provide all confidential exhibits in Case No. 2023-00181 related to these facilities.
- b. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering Memo and the forecasted work and expenditures over the next 5 years.
- c. Provide the expected average flow and design flow after these improvements are completed.

RESPONSE: (a) Bluegrass Water objects to Request No. 2-47(a) because it seeks information not relevant to this proceeding because Bluegrass Water has not been granted approval to acquire the Moon River Resort Wastewater Treatment Plant, and no expenses or revenues are included in this proceeding as a result of Bluegrass Water not owning the system. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, please see CONFIDENTIAL Exhibit OAG 2-47 attached hereto.

- (b) Bluegrass Water objects to Request No. 2-47(b) because it seeks information not relevant to this proceeding because Bluegrass Water has not been granted approval to acquire the Moon River Resort Wastewater Treatment Plant, and no expenses or revenues are included in this proceeding as a result of Bluegrass Water not owning the system.
- (c) Bluegrass Water objects to Request No. 2-47(c) because it seeks information not relevant to this proceeding because Bluegrass Water has not been granted approval to acquire the Moon River Resort Wastewater Treatment Plant, and no expenses or revenues are included in this proceeding as a result of Bluegrass Water not owning the system.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-48: Reference OAG 1-34 part 9 regarding the Carriage Park

Wastewater Treatment. Please provide the following:

a. Average flow and design flow ratings of the facility.

b. 911 address for the facility.

RESPONSE: (a) The average flow to the facility is estimated to be 7,000

gpd with a design flow of approximately 19,000 gpd (non-discharging system flows are not

reported or listed as with KPDES regulated facilities, however drawings indicate the drain

field is sized for 19,000 gpd).

(b) The facility access is located at the West terminus of Tarpan Trail, West

Paducah, KY 42086.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-49: Reference Discovery Response to OAG 1-75 (b) (Exhibit OAG 1-75(b) - CONFIDENTIAL Engineering Memo - Carriage Park.pdf) regarding Carriage Park Wastewater Treatment Facility. Please provide the following:

- a. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering
 Memo and the actual work and expenditures completed to date and explain
 differences.
- b. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering Memo and the forecasted work and expenditures over the next 5 years.
- Provide the expected average flow and design flow after these improvements are completed.

RESPONSE: (a) The work performed at the Carriage Park facility was consistent with the recommendations presented in the preliminary engineering memorandum. When comparing the capital amounts provided in Exhibit PSC 3-9 and the estimate from the engineering memorandum referred to in the testimony filed in Case No. 2020-00290, it is important to recognize that the engineering memo estimates and preliminary project plan were not finalized plans or budgets and were prepared prior to Bluegrass Water taking ownership of the system. Changes occur during the final design phase for improvements and repairs to the facility arising from a greater understanding of the facility that can only be gained after operating the facility. The estimate provided was a third-party opinion of probable cost based on the preliminary analysis, not a final budget, a proposal, or a quote. Furthermore, the estimate for this system was prepared in 2019, with Bluegrass Water's Response to OAG 2-49

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

a significant portion of cost change attributable to inflation and impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on material costs, material lead time, and labor costs.

- (b) The proposed work has been completed and no major projects are planned for the next five years.
- (c) The improvements have no bearing on design flow or actual flow; the figures will remain 7,000 and 19,000 respectively.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-50: Reference OAG 1-33 part 3 regarding the Yung Farm Estates Wastewater Treatment Plant. Please provide the following:

- a. Provide all confidential exhibits in Case No. 2023-00181 related to these facilities.
- b. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering Memo and the forecasted work and expenditures over the next 5 years.
- c. Provide the expected average flow and design flow after these improvements are completed.

RESPONSE: (a) Bluegrass Water objects to Request No. 2-50(a) because it seeks information not relevant to this proceeding because Bluegrass Water has not been granted approval to acquire the Yung Farm Estates Wastewater Treatment Plant, and no expenses or revenues are included in this proceeding as a result of Bluegrass Water not owning the system. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, please see CONFIDENTIAL Exhibit OAG 2-47.

- (b) Bluegrass Water objects to Request No. 2-50(b) because it seeks information not relevant to this proceeding because Bluegrass Water has not been granted approval to acquire the Yung Farm Estates Wastewater Treatment Plant, and no expenses or revenues are included in this proceeding as a result of Bluegrass Water not owning the system.
- (c) Bluegrass Water objects to Request No. 2-50(c) because it seeks information not relevant to this proceeding because Bluegrass Water has not been granted approval to

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

acquire the Yung Farm Estates Wastewater Treatment Plant, and no expenses or revenues are included in this proceeding as a result of Bluegrass Water not owning the system.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-51: Regarding the Commonwealth Wastewater Treatment Plant Bluegrass Water is proposing to acquire in Case No. 2023-00181, please provide the following:

- a. Provide all confidential exhibits in Case No. 2023-00181 related to these facilities.
- b. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering Memo and the forecasted work and expenditures over the next 5 years.
- c. Provide the expected average flow and design flow after these improvements are completed.

RESPONSE: (a) Bluegrass Water objects to Request No. 2-51(a) because it seeks information not relevant to this proceeding because Bluegrass Water has not been granted approval to acquire the Commonwealth Wastewater Treatment Plant, and no expenses or revenues are included in this proceeding as a result of Bluegrass Water not owning the system. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, please see CONFIDENTIAL Exhibit OAG 2-47.

- (b) Bluegrass Water objects to Request No. 2-51(b) because it seeks information not relevant to this proceeding because Bluegrass Water has not been granted approval to acquire the Commonwealth Wastewater Treatment Plant, and no expenses or revenues are included in this proceeding as a result of Bluegrass Water not owning the system.
- (c) Bluegrass Water objects to Request No. 2-51(c) because it seeks information not relevant to this proceeding because Bluegrass Water has not been granted approval to

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

acquire the Commonwealth Wastewater Treatment Plant, and no expenses or revenues are included in this proceeding as a result of Bluegrass Water not owning the system.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-52: Reference OAG 1-33 part 3 regarding the River Bluff Wastewater Treatment. Please provide the following:

- a. Explain why the average flow is greater than the design flow (0.0710 MGD vs 0.0660 MGD).
- b. Update the information provided in the table on page 33 and 34 of the direct testimony of Jacob Freeman in Case No. 2020-00290 to reflect the actual scope, cost and status of improvements. If all improvements are not complete, provide a forecast of the final actual scope, cost and status.
- Provide the expected average flow and design flow after these improvements are completed.

RESPONSE: (a) Recent readings from the flow meter measure between 240,000 and 430,000 gpd, which is well in excess of the 66,000 gpd design flow. However, observations of flows at the facility do not appear to account for the readings from the meter. This indicates that there is likely a problem with the flow meter itself that was present prior to Bluegrass Water's acquisition of the facility. This will be investigated to ensure accurate flow measurement occurs at the facility.

(b) An updated scope and more thorough analysis of the initial condition of the River Bluffs facility was covered in depth in Mr. Freeman's Direct Testimony. The final improvements at the site were recently completed.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

(c) The improvements will have no effect on the quantity of flow to or the design

capacity of the facility; design flow will remain 66,000. As described above, the average flow

is currently difficult to estimate as the electronic flow measurement equipment appears to

be drastically over reporting flow and is currently being investigated.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-53: Reference OAG 1-33 part 3 regarding the Timberland Substation Wastewater Treatment, Please provide the following:

- a. 911 address for the facility.
- b. Update the information provided in the table on page 19 of the direct testimony of Jacob Freeman in Case No. 2020-00290 to reflect the actual scope, cost and status of improvements. If all improvements are not complete, provide a forecast of the final actual scope, cost and status.
- Provide the expected average flow and design flow after these improvements are completed.

RESPONSE: (a) 8340 Timberland Dr, West Paducah, KY 42086.

(b) Work performed was consistent with the plan presented in Case No. 2020-00290. The work was completed as of May 15, 2023. When comparing the capital amounts provided in Exhibit PSC 3-9 and the estimate from the preliminary engineering memorandum referred to in the testimony filed in Case No. 2020-00290, it is important, however, to recognize that the engineering memo estimates and preliminary project plan were not finalized plans or budgets and were prepared prior to Bluegrass Water taking ownership of the system. Changes occur during the final design phase for improvements and repairs to the facility arising from a greater understanding of the facility that can only be gained after operating the facility. The estimate provided was a third-party opinion of probable cost based on the preliminary analysis, not a final budget, a proposal, or a quote. Furthermore, the estimate for this system was prepared in 2019, with a significant portion Bluegrass Water's Response to OAG 2-53

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

of cost change attributable to inflation and impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on material

costs, material lead time, and labor costs.

(c) The upgrades presented are aimed at bringing the treatment plant into a

condition where it can effectively treat the wastewater received by the facility in compliance

with permit limits and will not directly alter the amount of flow coming to the facility. The

most recent KPDES permit fact sheet shows an average flow of 10,000 gpd against a design

flow of 25,000 gpd.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-54: Reference OAG 1-34 part 10 regarding the Springcrest Sewer Wastewater Treatment. Please provide the following:

- a. 911 address for the facility.
- b. Average flow and design flow ratings of the facility.
- c. A table showing the scope, cost and status of improvements. If all planned improvements are not complete, provide a forecast of the final actual scope, cost and status.
- d. Provide the expected average flow and design flow after these improvements are completed.

RESPONSE: (a) The western end of W. Old Coach Rd., Nicholasville, KY 40356.

- (b) The average flow to the facility is estimated to be about 11,000 gpd with a design flow of approximately 20,000 gpd (non-discharging system flows are not reported or listed as with KPDES regulated facilities, however drawings indicate the drain field is sized for 20,000 gpd).
- (c) The work to be performed at the Springcrest Sewer system was discussed at length in Mr. Freeman's Direct Testimony. Please refer to pages 54-59 of Mr. Freeman's Direct Testimony in this case for thorough discussion of the Springcrest project.
- (d) Aside from work directed specifically at addressing inflow and infiltration in gravity collection systems (which is not applicable here as this is a low pressure collection system), rehabilitation projects have no effect on average flow to a facility. As a result, Bluegrass Water's Response to OAG 2-54

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Bluegrass Water's proposed improvements will not affect average flow to the Springcrest

facility. The average flow to the facility is estimated to be 11,000 gpd with a design flow of

approximately 20,000 gpd (non-discharging system flows are not reported or listed as with

KPDES regulated facilities, however drawings indicate the drain field is sized for 20,000

gpd).

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-55: Reference OAG 1-81 regarding the Woodland Acres Wastewater Treatment. Please provide the following:

- a. 911 address for the facility.
- b. Average flow and design flow ratings of the facility.
- c. A table showing the scope, cost and status of improvements. If all planned improvements are not complete, provide a forecast of the final actual scope, cost and status.
- d. Compare costs of upgrades with the estimates provided in the engineering memorandum provided in response to OAG 1-81 (Exhibit OAG 1-81(b) -CONFIDENTIAL Engineering Memo - Woodland Acres.pdf) and explain the change in costs, scope and construction.
- e. Provide the expected average flow and design flow after these improvements are completed.

RESPONSE: (a) The facility is located in between 273 and 309 Hemlock Dr., Shepherdsville, KY 40165.

- (b) Per the most recent KPDES fact sheet the average flow is 12,500 gpd and the design capacity is 25,000 gpd.
- (c) This table, as well as a thorough analysis of the project to be performed were included in the application and subsequent data requests of the CPCN filing for the projects at Woodland Acres. Please refer to Case No. 2022-00015 for all related documents.

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

(d) When comparing the capital amounts provided in the above referenced CPCN

case (since approved, Case No. 2022-00015) and the estimate from the engineering

memorandum it is important to recognize that the preliminary engineering memo estimates

and preliminary project plan were not finalized plans or budgets and were prepared prior

to Bluegrass Water taking ownership of the system. Changes occur during the final design

phase for improvements and repairs to the facility arising from a greater understanding of

the facility that can only be gained after operating the facility. The preliminary estimate

provided was a third-party opinion of probable cost based on the preliminary analysis, not

a final budget, a proposal, or a quote. Furthermore, the estimate for this system was

prepared in 2020, with a significant portion of cost change attributable to inflation and

impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on material costs, material lead time, and labor costs.

(e) These improvements will not affect the expected flow to or the design capacity

of the facility. The average flow is 12,500 gpd and the design capacity is 25,000 gpd.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-56: Reference OAG 1-76 regarding the Marshall Ridge Wastewater Treatment. Please provide the following:

- a. 911 address for the facility.
- b. Average flow and design flow ratings of the facility.
- c. Update the information provided in the table on page 28 of the direct testimony of Jacob Freeman in Case No. 2020-00290 to reflect the actual scope, cost and status of improvements. If all improvements are not complete, provide a forecast of the final actual scope, cost and status.
- d. Compare costs of upgrades with the estimates provided in the engineering memorandum provided in response to OAG 1-76 (Exhibit OAG 1-76(b) -CONFIDENTIAL Engineering Memo - Marshall Ridge.pdf) and explain the change in costs, scope and construction.
- e. Provide the expected average flow and design flow after these improvements are completed.

RESPONSE: (a) 245 Harting Ridge Rd, West Paducah, KY 42086.

(b) As referenced in the engineering memorandum for the system, discussions with the County Department of Health revealed that designs for the system existed, however the county refused to provide them stating that they did not have time to locate the designs. As a result, the location and capacity of the drain field could not be determined. The county indicated the facility was in good standing. The average flow to the facility is expected to be 12,000 gpd and the design flow higher than that.

Bluegrass Water's Response to OAG 2-56

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

project were consistent with what was presented initially. However, unrelated to the initial

Improvements at the facility completed as part of the initial improvements

projects, the county has since completed an inspection and provided the previously withheld

facility plans. The county also issued a NOV for failing to maintain the drain field. The drain

field had trees planted in it by previous ownership and was allowed to overgrow, masking

the issues with the system. Bluegrass Water has since secured an engineering partner to

design a new drain field, which will be constructed in the future. Designs and capital

estimates are not yet complete, pending clarification from the county which has stated that

it changed design requirements for the drain fields since initial construction of the facility.

Thus far, the county has failed to provide information on the new requirements.

(d) As discussed in part (c), estimates of the new drain field project for the

Marshall Ridge system are incomplete at this time, and while the rest of the work remained

unchanged, cost differences will be impossible to estimate until designs are complete.

(e) The average flow will not be expected to change. While the design flow of a

non-discharging facility is not as clearly defined as discharging systems, the new drain field

will ultimately dictate the system capacity and cannot be finalized until the county provides

the new, yet to be disclosed regulatory requirements for the drain field.

Witness:

(c)

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-57: Reference OAG 1-86 regarding the Golden Acres Wastewater Treatment. Please provide the following:

- a. 911 address for the facility.
- b. Average flow and design flow ratings of the facility.
- c. Update the information provided in the table on page 15 of the direct testimony of Jacob Freeman in Case No. 2020-00290 to reflect the actual scope, cost and status of improvements. If all improvements are not complete, provide a forecast of the final actual scope, cost and status.
- d. Compare costs of upgrades with the estimates provided in the engineering memorandum provided in response to OAG 1-86 (Exhibit OAG 1-86(a) -CONFIDENTIAL Engineering Memo - Golden Acres.pdf) and explain the change in costs, scope and construction.
- e. Provide the expected average flow and design flow after these improvements are completed.

RESPONSE: (a) The end of the driveway at 359 Golden Acres Loop, Calvert City, KY 42029.

- (b) Per the most recent KPDES fact sheet, the average flow is 19,000 gpd and the design capacity is 25,000 gpd.
- (c) Improvements to the facility were consistent with the ones detailed in Mr. Freeman's Direct Testimony and all improvements are complete. When comparing the capital amounts provided in Exhibit PSC 3-9 and the estimate from the engineering Bluegrass Water's Response to OAG 2-57

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

memorandum referred to in the testimony filed in Case No. 2020-00290, it is important,

however, to recognize that the engineering memo estimates and preliminary project plan

were not finalized plans or budgets and were prepared prior to Bluegrass Water taking

ownership of the system. Changes occur during the final design phase for improvements and

repairs to the facility arising from a greater understanding of the facility that can only be

gained after operating the facility. The estimate provided was a third-party opinion of

probable cost based on the preliminary analysis, not a final budget, a proposal, or a quote.

Furthermore, the estimate for this system was prepared in 2019, with a significant portion

of cost change attributable to inflation and impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on material

costs, material lead time, and labor costs.

(d) Please see the discussion of changes in cost included in the response to part (c)

of this question.

(e) These improvements will not affect the expected flow to or the design capacity

of the facility. The average flow is 19,000 gpd and the design capacity is 25,000 gpd.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-58: Reference Discovery Response to OAG 1-82 (b) (Exhibit OAG 1-82(b) - CONFIDENTIAL Engineering Memo - Persimmon Ridge.pdf) regarding Persimmon Ridge Wastewater Treatment Facility. Please provide the following:

- a. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering
 Memo and the actual work and expenditures completed to date and explain
 differences.
- b. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering Memo and the forecasted work and expenditures over the next 5 years.
- Provide the expected average flow and design flow after these improvements are completed.

RESPONSE: (a) Work completed to date was consistent with the work proposed in the preliminary engineering memorandum, however the system has proven to require more significant improvement to ensure consistent compliance with ammonia limits. This was thoroughly documented in the CPCN application for the additional work to be performed at the Persimmon Ridge facility, including a detailed analysis of the costs and additional scope required to ensure consistent compliance with ammonia limits. Please refer to Case No. 2022-00046 for a thorough discussion of the project. When comparing the capital amounts provided in Exhibit PSC 3-9 and the estimate from the engineering memorandum referred to in the testimony filed in Case No. 2020-00290, it is important to recognize that the preliminary engineering memo estimates and preliminary project plan were not finalized plans or budgets and were prepared prior to Bluegrass Water taking ownership of the Bluegrass Water's Response to OAG 2-58

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

system. Changes occur during the final design phase for improvements and repairs to the

facility arising from a greater understanding of the facility that can only be gained after

operating the facility. The estimate provided was a third-party opinion of probable cost

based on the preliminary analysis, not a final budget, a proposal, or quote. Furthermore,

the estimate for this system was prepared in 2018, with a significant portion of cost change

attributable to inflation and impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on material costs, material

lead time, and labor costs.

As with part (a) of this question, please refer to Case No. 2022-00046 for the **(b)**

details of the approved upcoming work and capital estimates for the work.

The proposed project has no impact on the design flow or actual flow to the (c)

facility. The figures from the pending KPDES permit renewal fact sheet show an average

flow of 229,000 gpd and a design flow of 142,000 gpd; however, a review of daily flow meter

measurements show a consistent error was occurring in the calculation of the daily flow

figures for the facility. Recalculation shows that the actual average flows rarely exceed

100,000 gpd.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-59: Reference Discovery Response to OAG 1-87 (a) (Exhibit OAG 1-87(a) - CONFIDENTIAL Engineering Memo - Great Oaks.pdf) regarding Great Oaks Wastewater Treatment Facility. Please provide the following:

- a. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering
 Memo and the actual work and expenditures completed to date and explain
 differences.
- b. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering Memo and the forecasted work and expenditures over the next 5 years.
- Provide the expected average flow and design flow after these improvements are completed.

RESPONSE: (a) Improvements to the facility were consistent with those detailed in the engineering memorandum and all improvements are complete. When comparing the capital amounts provided in Exhibit PSC 3-9 and the estimate from the engineering memorandum referred to in the testimony filed in Case No. 2020-00290, it is important to recognize that the engineering memo estimates and preliminary project plan were not finalized plans or budgets and were prepared prior to Bluegrass Water taking ownership of the system. Changes occur during the final design phase for improvements and repairs to the facility arising from a greater understanding of the facility that can only be gained after operating the facility. The preliminary estimate provided was a third-party opinion of probable cost based on a preliminary analysis, not a final budget, a proposal, or a quote. Furthermore, the estimate for this system was prepared in 2019, with a significant Bluegrass Water's Response to OAG 2-59

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

portion of cost change attributable to inflation and impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on

material costs, material lead time, and labor costs.

(b) No significant projects are planned for the next 5 years at this time.

(c) The completed improvements have no impact on the design flow or actual flow

to the facility. The figures from the pending KPDES permit renewal fact sheet show an

average flow of 35,000 gpd and a design flow of 70,000 gpd.

Witness: Jacob

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-60: Reference Discovery Response to OAG 1-70 (b) (Exhibit OAG 1-70(b) - CONFIDENTIAL Engineering Memo - Kingswood.pdf) regarding Kingswood Wastewater Treatment Facility. Please provide the following:

- a. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering
 Memo and the actual work and expenditures completed to date and explain
 differences.
- b. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering Memo and the forecasted work and expenditures over the next 5 years.
- Provide the expected average flow and design flow after these improvements are completed.

RESPONSE: (a) Improvements to the facility were consistent with the ones detailed in the engineering memorandum and all improvements are complete. When comparing the capital amounts provided in Exhibit PSC 3-9 and the estimate from the engineering memorandum referred to in the testimony filed in Case No. 2020-00290, it is important to recognize that the preliminary engineering memo estimates and preliminary project plan were not finalized plans or budgets and were prepared prior to Bluegrass Water taking ownership of the system. Changes occur during the final design phase for improvements and repairs to the facility arising from a greater understanding of the facility that can only be gained after operating the facility. The preliminary estimate provided was a third-party opinion of probable cost based on the preliminary analysis, not a final budget, a proposal, or quote. Furthermore, the estimate for this system was prepared in 2019, with Bluegrass Water's Response to OAG 2-60

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

a significant portion of cost change attributable to inflation and impacts of the COVID-19

pandemic on material costs, material lead time, and labor costs.

(b) No significant projects are planned for the next 5 years at this time.

(c) The completed improvements have no impact on the design flow or actual flow

to the facility. The figures from the pending KPDES permit renewal fact sheet show an

average flow of 28,000 gpd and a design flow of 50,000 gpd.

Witness: Jacob

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-61: Reference Discovery Response to OAG 1-71 (b) (Exhibit OAG 1-71(b) - CONFIDENTIAL Engineering Memo - Lake Columbia.pdf) regarding Lake Columbia Wastewater Treatment Facility. Please provide the following:

- a. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering
 Memo and the actual work and expenditures completed to date and explain
 differences.
- b. Compare the cost and scope of the improvements anticipated by the Engineering Memo and the forecasted work and expenditures over the next 5 years.
- Provide the expected average flow and design flow after these improvements are completed.

RESPONSE: (a) Improvements to the facility were consistent with the ones detailed in the engineering memorandum and all improvements are complete. When comparing the capital amounts provided in Exhibit PSC 3-9 and the estimate from the preliminary engineering memorandum referred to in the testimony filed in Case No. 2020-00290, it is important to recognize that the preliminary engineering memo estimates and preliminary project plan were not finalized plans or budgets and were prepared prior to Bluegrass Water taking ownership of the system. Changes occur during the final design phase for improvements and repairs to the facility arising from a greater understanding of the facility that can only be gained after operating the facility. The estimate provided was a third-party opinion of probable cost based on the preliminary analysis, not a final budget, a proposal, or a quote. Furthermore, the estimates for this system was prepared in 2019, with Bluegrass Water's Response to OAG 2-61

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

a significant portion of cost change attributable to inflation and impacts of the COVID-19

pandemic on material costs, material lead time, and labor costs.

(b) No significant projects are planned for the next 5 years at this time.

The completed improvements have no impact on the design flow or actual flow (c)

to the facility. The figures from the pending KPDES permit renewal fact sheet show an

average flow of 11,000 gpd and a design flow of 12,000 gpd.

Witness:

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-62: Please provide the weighted average cost of debt of US Water, with

supporting calculations as of December 31, 2022. The support for this calculation should tie to

the US Water financial statements requested in OAG 1-61.

RESPONSE: Bluegrass Water objects to this Request as seeking the records of a

non-applicant that is not its direct parent, which are not relevant to this proceeding, unduly

burdensome to produce, overly broad, and outside the control of Bluegrass Water. Subject

to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, please see CONFIDENTIAL Exhibit PSC

3-27, which contains the audited financial statements of CSWR, LLC, Bluegrass Water's

direct parent, as of December 31, 2022.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-63: The response to OAG 1-116 did not provide any analytical support for the claimed 1% bad debt ratio. Provide any analytical support in the Company's possession which supports this revenue requirement component.

There is no significant analytical support to provide. **RESPONSE:**

Brent Thies Witness:

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-64: Does the Company have the capability to terminate service to

customers? If so, identify the number of customers whose wastewater service was terminated for

non-payment during the twelve-month period of July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2022.

RESPONSE: Bluegrass Water objects to Request No. OAG 2-64 as vague and

unclear as it is unknown whether "capability" calls for a legal analysis of Bluegrass Water's

ability to terminate service or operational capability to terminate service. To the extent

Request No. OAG 2-64 seeks a legal conclusion, Bluegrass Water objects as calling for a legal

conclusion. To the extent Request No. OAG 2-64 refers to "operational capability," the

Company states that, short of the excavation and physical disconnection of a customer's

sewer service line, the Company does not currently have the ability to disconnect sewer

customers and is exploring its opportunities to do so.

Witness:

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-65: For any customer whose service was terminated for non-payment

during the July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2022 period, provide the disposition of each account into

one of the following categories:

a. The customer subsequently satisfied their arrearages and is currently a customer as

of May 31, 2023.

b. The customer subsequently satisfied their arrearages but was later terminated.

RESPONSE: There has been no service terminated for a customer's non-

payment in this period.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-66: Refer to the attachment to Confidential response to OAG 1-119.

Has the Company considered the impact of its Business Interruption Insurance on its risk in developing its ROE recommendation? If so, quantify the reduction in ROE that is achieved through the Business Interruption Insurance and explain how such reduction was determined.⁴

RESPONSE: No, the Company has not considered the potential impact of its Business Interruptions Insurance in developing its proposed return on equity.

⁴ While Exhibit OAG 1-119 is subject to a pending confidentiality motion, the highlighted portion of the request does generically refers to information within the Exhibit. Consequently, while the Company appreciates the Attorney General's abundance of caution, the Company has removed highlighting from the data request.

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-67: Confirm that the Company in preparing its revenue requirement

analysis, did not go beyond the end of the test period to reflect increases in Accumulated

Depreciation. If confirmed, provide the rationale for including post test period capital projects in

Rate Base, but not reflecting post test period increases in Accumulated Depreciation as an offset

to Rate Base.

RESPONSE: Confirmed. Bluegrass is requesting post-test year adjustments,

not a future looking test year. Therefore, accumulated or depreciation expense have not been

included.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-68: Does Bluegrass record Allowance for Funds Used During

Construction on its books? If so, respond to the following:

a. Identify and provide supporting documentation for the AFUDC rate.

b. Identify the amount of AFUDC recorded in the twelve-month period ending June

30, 2022.

c. Indicate the account(s) credited for AFUDC and whether such accounts are

included in the revenue requirement calculation.

RESPONSE: Bluegrass Water has not booked AFUDC.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-69: Refer to the Confidential response to OAG 1-119. Provide a copy of the corresponding insurance policy(ies) in place for the twelve month period ending June 30, 2022.

RESPONSE: Please see CONFIDENTIAL Exhibit OAG 2-69.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-70: Refer to the Operator Agreement contained in Confidential Exhibit 22 and the attachment provided in response to OAG 1-119 and respond to the following:

- a. Provide the distinction between the property damage coverage purchased in the policy contained in OAG 1-119, and that required in the Operating Agreement with Midwest Water Operations LLC.
- b. Identify examples of property damage that would be covered under the policy provided in OAG 1-119 but would not be covered by insurance required in the Operating Agreement.
- c. Identify examples of property damage that would be covered by insurance required of the operator, Midwest Water Operations, LLC that would not be covered under the policy provided in OAG 1-119.
- RESPONSE: (a) The policy provided in response to OAG 1-119 covers the "Real and Personal Property including Improvements and Betterments, Business Income, Extra Expense, Property of Others in the Care, Custody or Control of the Insured for which the Insured has legal responsibility to insure" for CSWR entities. Midwest Water Operations policy covers their property that is utilized in providing services to Bluegrass Water.
- (b) Any event that causes property damage that is not explicitly outlined in Section 7 (Exclusion) of the policy provided in response to OAG 1-119. Some examples of property damage covered would include fire or flood.

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

(c) Midwest Water Operations policy covers their property that is utilized in providing services to Bluegrass Water. Examples would be equipment or vehicles used in providing those services.

Witness: Todd Thomas

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST 2-71: Provide monthly actual and budget expenses in the same format as contained in Exhibit 15 for the period July 2022 through April 2023.

<u>RESPONSE</u>: Please see Exhibit OAG 2-71, which provides an updated Application Exhibit 15 through April of 2023.

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-72: Refer to Confidential Exhibit BT-14 provided within the

Company's revenue requirement Exhibits file, (Exhibits 10, 15, 17, 18, 20, 26 and 27). Provide

the date each identified system was acquired by Bluegrass.

RESPONSE: Bluegrass Water objects to this Request as vague and unclear.

Exhibit BT-14 is not confidential, nor does it identify specific Bluegrass Water systems.

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, please see Exhibit OAG 2-72 for

the date each system identified in Confidential Exhibit BT-13 was acquired.

Witness:

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-73: Refer to tab BT-13. Provide a table reconciling the information

found on BT-13 with the balance of Utility Plant in Service at June 30, 2022 found on BT-14 into

the following categories:

a. The original cost of the acquired assets on the books of the acquired system,

b. Improvements – per BT-13

c. Acquisition related costs per BT-13

d. Acquisition adjustment as identified on page 29 of Mr. Thies' testimony

e. Acquisition Premium (Account 114)

f. Value assigned to Land

g. Acquisition value recorded to account 352

The sum of the system totals should tie to the balance of Utility Plant in Service at June

30, 2022 as found in tab BT-14.

RESPONSE:

Please see Exhibit OAG 2-73.

Witness:

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-74: Please reconcile the balance of account 108 as found in the Exhibit

provided in response to PSC 1-3 (\$3,375,990), with the Accumulated Provision for Depreciation

balance found in tab BT-14 as of June 30, 2022 (3,134,954).

RESPONSE: Account 108 in the Trial Balance provided in PSC 1-3 includes both

water and sewer amounts. The sewer value is \$3,134,954 and the remainder in that account

is for water.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-75: Refer to the Trial Balance provided in response to PSC 1-3. Provide the June 30, 2022 ending balances split between water and wastewater for all 300 series plant accounts.

RESPONSE: Please see Exhibit OAG 2-75.

CASE NO. 2022-00432

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

REQUEST NO. 2-76: Provide a comprehensive discussion supporting the methodology

and supporting calculations used to assign overhead costs between the Company's water and

wastewater operations. This response should also include a discussion and support for the

allocation of the operating contracts provided in Confidential Exhibit 22 as well as the various

insurance costs incurred in the test period.

RESPONSE: Overhead costs are allocated to Bluegrass Water from the

parent entity, CSWR, LLC. Once those costs are allocated, they are further allocated

between water and wastewater operations based on customer counts. Operations contracts

are expensed based on the contract and/or the invoice totals as billed by the contract

operations vendor. Insurance costs are assigned based on the value of covered assets for

each system, whether water or sewer.

Witness:

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

As to Objections,

/s/ Edward T. Depp

John E. Selent
Edward T. Depp
R. Brooks Herrick
Sarah D. Reddick
DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP
101 S. Fifth St., Suite 2500
Louisville, KY 40202
(502) 540-2300
(502) 585-2207 (fax)
john.selent@dinsmore.com
tip.depp@dinsmore.com
brooks.herrick@dinsmore.com
sarah.reddick@dinsmore.com

Counsel to Bluegrass Water Utility Operating Company, LLC

BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

VERIFICATION

	I, <u>Todd T</u>	Chom	as, ver	ify, sta	ate, an	d at	ffiı	m that t	he in	ıform	ation	request	resp	onse	s file	d v	vith
this	verification	for	which	I am	listed	as	a	witness	are	true	and	accurate	to	the	best	of	my
kno	wledge, info	rmati	on, and	l belie	f form	ed	af	ter a reas	onal	ole in	quiry						

	Toorton
	Name: Todd Thomas
	Title: Senior Vice President
	Bluegrass Water Utility Operating Company, LLC
STATE OF MISSOURI)
) ss:
COUNTY OF ST. LOUIS)
	1, th

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me on this the day of , 2023.

My commission expires: OCT 10th, Zb76

Notary Public



BLUEGRASS WATER UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, LLC'S RESPONSES TO THE OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

VERIFICATION

I, Aaron Silas, verify, state, and affirm that the information request responses filed with

this verification for which I am list knowledge, information, and belief fo	ed as a witness are true and accurate to the best of my ormed after a reasonable inquiry.
	Cid M
	Name: Aaron Silas
	Title: Director of Regulatory Operations
	Bluegrass Water Utility Operating Company, LLC
STATE OF MISSOURI)
) ss:
COUNTY OF ST. LOUIS)

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me on this the the day of d

My commission expires: DT 16th, 7424

Notary Public

