Steven E. Clyde (Bar No. 0686)

<u>SEC@clydesnow.com</u>

Emily E. Lewis (Bar No. 13281)

<u>EEL@clydesnow.com</u>

CLYDE SNOW & SESSIONS

One Utah Center, Thirteenth Floor
201 South Main Street

Salt Lake City, UT 84111-2516

Telephone: 801-322-2516

Telephone: 801-322-2516 Facsimile: 801-521-6280

Attorneys for Community Water Company

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

In the Matter of Community Water Company, LLC))))) DOCKET NO. 16-098-01)
)))

SUR-REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

MIKE FOLKMAN

COMMUNITY WATER COMPANY

NOVEMBER 14, 2016

1 I. INTRODUCTION

- 2 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS AND POSITION
- 3 WITH COMMUNITY WATER COMPANY.
- 4 A. My name is Mike Folkman. I am employed as a System Operator with Summit
- 5 Water Distribution Company and contracted to do business with Community
- Water Company. Summit Water Distribution Company is located at 8506
- 7 Bluebird Lane, Park City, UT 84098.

8 II. <u>IDENTIFICATION OF WITNESS</u>

- 9 O. FOR WHICH PARTY WILL YOU BE TESTIFYING?
- 10 A. I am testifying on behalf of Community Water Company ("Company").
- 11 O. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED BEFORE THE UTAH PUBLIC SERVICE
- 12 COMMISSION ("COMMISSION") ON PRIOR OCCASIONS?
- 13 A. Yes. I testified as a fact witness in this matter in person at a hearing held on
- September 13, 2016 on the Company's Application for Interim Rate Increase. I
- also supplied written Direct Testimony on September 21, 2016 regarding several
- priority improvement requests for the Company. I also assisted with preparing
- responses to several of the Division's data requests for the Company.

18 II. PURPOSE OF SUR-REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

- 19 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
- 20 A. The general purposes for my Sur-Rebuttal Testimony is to respond to the Rebuttal
- 21 Testimony of Mark Long regarding the Company's priority improvements
- requests and the Division's changes to the recommended rate structure.

23 III. <u>RESPONSE TO MARK LONG REBUTTAL TESTIMONY</u>

Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY GENERAL COMMENTS BEFORE ADDRESSING SPECIFIC ISSUES RAISED IN MR. LONG'S TESTIMONY?

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

A.

Yes. I want to reiterate why the Company submitted its priority improvements list attached to my Direct Testimony and further explained in the Company's Response to the Division's Fourth Data Request. The Company understands the current rate case is to establish a rate to support the operations and maintenance of the Company and is not a rate case for capital improvements. As discussed, the Company is currently in negotiations to transfer ownership of the Company to an established water supplier, most likely Summit Water Distribution Company. Transfer of the Company will most likely require certain generally needed infrastructure improvements be made to safely and practically consolidate the Company system into an existing system. The Company continues to believe transfer to another provider is the most efficient and least expensive way to provide safe and sustained water service to its customers. An unfortunate consequence of simultaneous transfer negotiations and a rate case is that many of the specific improvements needed to consolidate systems are still evolving, many are beyond the scope of maintenance and operations, and the optimal timing of a transfer may be before a second capital rate case is initiated and completed. Accordingly, the Company requested the rate be adjusted to increase its capital reserve account to fund the priority improvements as a "bridge" between this limited rate case and future capital improvement rate case. While the Company felt it prudent to explain the circumstances, the Company

acknowledges negotiations are ongoing and cost estimates remain the best

information available until specific infrastructure improvements are identified and can be bid on. The Company understands estimates lack the specificity needed to be included in the current rate. It defers to the Division's decision to exclude the priority improvement requests. If the Company is to remain publically regulated, a future capital rate case will most likely be needed to raise the needed funds to improve the Company system.

Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY RESPONSES REGARDING THE DIVISION'S STATEMENTS ON TIME TO PREPARE EXPENDITURE REQUESTS?

A.

The Company takes issue with the Division citing to previous rate cases as being informative for this rate case. While the cited provisions are responsive to the threshold needed to include infrastructure requests in a rate base, which we do not generally meet, prior cases should not inform the adequacy of time needed or passed to properly prepare expenditure requests. Prior rate cases presented entirely different infrastructure scenarios than the present circumstance where new and evolving negotiations may change the scope and scale of needed infrastructure.

While the Company fully understands and appreciates the Division's need for supportable numbers, we ask the Commission to not use past rate cases to decide whether the Company has timely complied with preparing a new expenditure request. Preparing for a future capital rate case may present a novel configuration of infrastructure not contemplated in the past. Collecting supportable costs for that rate should be judged against a new and contemporary timeline.

IV. RESPONSES TO THE DIVISION'S RECOMMENDED RATE CHANGES

70	Q.	DOES THE COMPANY SUPPORT THE CHANGES TO THE RATE AS
71		RECOMMENDED IN MR. LONG'S REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
72	A.	Yes. The Company generally supports the new recommendations of the Division.
73	Q.	DO YOU HAVE ANY SPECIFIC RESPONSES TO THE DIVISION'S
74		RECOMMENDED CHANGES?
75		The Company understands the reasoning for reallocating the Water System Repair
76		costs between Fixed and Variable Expenses to make customer's proportion of
77		repair costs more in-line with their actual usage of the system. The Company also
78		supports the inclusion of a new line item of \$6,491.00 for water purchased from
79		Summit Water Distribution Company. The Division correctly points out that the
80		system is aging and the need to continue to purchase water will most likely
		continue until the system is ungraded

82 <u>CONCLUSION</u>

- 83 Q. DOES THIS COMPLETE YOUR TESTIMONY?
- 84 A. Yes it does. Thank you.

DATED this14th day of November 2016.

Mike Folkman

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing SUR-REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF MIKE FOLKMAN was emailed on the 14th day of November, 2016 to the following:

Community Water Company,

LLC

Justin Atwater <u>jatwater@tc-fc.com</u>

Spencer White <u>spwhite@replayresorts.com</u>

Steven E. Clyde sec@clydesnow.com
Emily E. Lewis eel@clydesnow.com

Division of Public Utilities

Chris Parker chrisparker@utah.gov
William Duncan wduncan@utah.gov
Mark Long mlong@utah.gov
Erika Tedder etedder@utah.gov

DPU Data Request dpudatarequest@utah.gov

Patricia Schmid pschmid@utah.gov

Intervenors

Art Brothers

William Grenney

Wan J. Martin

artbros@xmission.com
wgrenney@gmail.com
Van.deepshade@gmail.com

Red Pine Homeowners

Association

Terry Lange TLange55@comcast.net dolas@comcast.net

Hidden Creek Homeowners

Association

Francis Armendola dolas@comcast.net

Plant B&D Homeowner's

Association

Scott Savage <u>ssavage@sywlaw.com</u>

Courtesy Copy

Guy Rawson 808rawson@gmail.com

Amanda Bianchi
Legal Assistant