- BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH -

In the Matter of the Formal Complaint of DAMMERON VALLEY WATER WORKS VS. UTAH POWER AND LIGHT	)))	DOCKET NO. 03-035-04 REPORT AND ORDER

ISSUED: October 22, 2003

By The Commission:

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This is a customer complaint case, but is unusual in that the complaining party and the respondent are both utilities regulated by this Commission. Dammeron Valley Water Works ("Dammeron Valley") is a regulated water company providing water service to about 300 customers. Dammeron Valley filed this complaint against Utah Power and Light ("Utah Power") alleging that Utah Power had failed to provide adequate service to Dammeron Valley. Specifically Dammeron Valley alleged that five times in a three month period it experienced power surges that burned up its surge protectors and other equipment including pump motors. For relief Dammeron Valley requested that the line be looped so it would not continue to receive power surges.

Utah Power filed a response and request for dismissal of the complaint. In that response Utah Power cited a tariff provision concerning "Duplicate Service Facilities" that it said requires customers to pay for such facilities. Utah Power further stated that duplicate service facilities would not solve Dammeron Valley's problem "because the customer does not have single phase protection equipment installed on their pumps." Utah Power then cited a tariff provision requiring customers to have such equipment.

Hearings were held. Carol Thorpe, Manager of Dammeron Valley, and Ross Gregorson of Southwest Sales, the company that maintains the equipment for Dammeron Valley, appeared and offered testimony. Utah Power was represented by David Elmont, and offered the testimony of Greg Bean, a field engineer for Utah Power.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

Dammeron Valley's pumping equipment is served by Utah Power from a tap line off of a 208 volt distribution line. At the hearing testimony was offered about the specific equipment used by Dammeron Valley. That equipment includes surge protection and also industry standard single phase protection equipment. Detailed specifications of the equipment were offered as exhibits. It was also explained that the magnetic contacts and relays used to start the pumps provide additional single-phase protection. The Dammeron Valley witnesses described how numerous times their equipment, including the surge protection equipment, had been burned out by surges in the power line. We find that the equipment utilized by Dammeron Valley meets their obligations under the single-phase protection requirements of Utah Power's tariff.

Utah Power offered the testimony of Mr. Bean, a field engineer in the Utah Power office covering the Dammeron Valley area. Mr. Bean testified regarding the applicable American Standards Institute Standard requirements.[(1)] In short, Mr. Bean testified that the ANSI standards require a utility to maintain line voltage within plus or minus five percent of the line nominal voltage. Mr. Bean testified that to the best of his knowledge, the Dammeron Valley line conforms to the ANSI standards. Mr. Bean based that testimony readings from test gauges put on this line for 15 to 20 days. Those tests, Mr. Bean testified, showed voltage to be within ANSI requirements. Mr. Bean also testified that the substation that serves Dammeron Valley has voltage regulators with gauges that would register extremes in voltage, and those gauges had not shown any spikes. However, Mr. Bean also testified that those gauges would register only if the surge or spike lasted more than about one minute.

Regarding the specific damage to Dammeron Valley's equipment Mr. Bean and Mr. Gregorson both testified that power fluctuations outside the range allowed by ANSI standards would have necessarily occurred to cause the damage done to Dammeron Valley's equipment.

Utah Power has already taken some steps to improve service on the line serving Dammeron Valley. Mr. Bean stated that company studies indicated that by the summer of 2003 voltage regulators would be needed on this line to keep voltage within ANSI limits during summer loads. As a result, voltage regulators were installed, and put in service just before the 2003 summer. Since that time Dammeron Valley has not experienced any problems with their power supply.

Mr. Bean explained the reasons why looping the line would not solve the problem. It was also established, however, that Dammeron Valley was told by Utah Power employees that looping the line would solve the problem, and that is why Dammeron Valley included that possible remedy in its complaint. Utah Power testified that duplicate facilities, that it claims Dammeron Valley should be required to pay for, might improve the situation.

It is evident that on at least a few occasions the voltage of the electrical supply to Dammeron Valley fell outside the range required by ANSI standards. It is unclear though just how and why this happened. Both parties believe that further study, testing, and monitoring would aid them in determining what is causing the problems and possibly how to prevent them in the future. The situation has also apparently improved since installation of the voltage regulators on this line. Under these circumstances, further study is warranted and we will so order. This study should include further monitoring and recording of the line voltage. The parties should also take any other steps that can reasonably be taken to determine the cause and extent of voltage fluctuations on the Dammeron Valley line. To obtain the most useful data we will extend this study through the summer months of 2004, specifically until the end of August 2004. In order to determine how to then proceed we will direct each party to, by September 15, 2004, file a brief report of the outcome of the study, the occurrence of any more events that caused damage to Dammeron Valley equipment, stating what, if anything, further that party believes needs to be done to address the power supply to Dammeron Valley, and containing any proposals for further action by this Commission. If, before that time, further problems arise that either party deems necessary to bring before the Commission, they are free to do that.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The parties are to conduct further study as described herein.

2. By September 15, 2004, both parties are to file a report with the Commission containing the information and recommendations set forth above in this Report and Order.

3. Further proceedings, if necessary, will be set after receipt of the parties' reports.

4. Any person aggrieved by this Order may petition the Commission for review/rehearing pursuant to the *Utah Administrative Procedures Act, Utah Code Ann.* §63-46b-1 *et seq.* Failure so to do will preclude judicial review of the grounds not identified for review. *Utah Code Ann.* §54-7-15.

Dated at Salt Lake City, Utah, this 22nd day of October, 2003.

/s/ Douglas C. Tingey
Administrative Law Judge

Approved and Confirmed this 22nd day of October, 2003, as the Report and Order of the Public Service Commission of Utah.

/s/ Ric Campbell, Chairman

/s/ Constance B. White, Commissioner

/s/ Ted Boyer, Commissioner

Attest:

/s/ Julie Orchard
Commission Secretary

1. Our rule R746-310-4(B)(1) states:

Unless otherwise directed by the Commission, the requirements contained in the American National Standards Institute Standard for Electric Power Systems and Equipment-Voltage Ratings, 1989 edition, incorporated by this reference, shall be the minimum requirements relative to utility voltages.