FILED
October 17, 2019
Data Center
Missouri Public
Service Commission

Exhibit No.:

Issues: Investigation of Water Systems

and Sewer Systems

Witness:

David C. Roos MoPSC Staff

Sponsoring Party:

MoPSC Staff Surrebuttal Testimony

Type of Exhibit: Case No.:

WA-2019-0299

Date Testimony Prepared:

September 23, 2019

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSION STAFF DIVISION

WATER and SEWER DEPARTMENT

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

DAVID C. ROOS

CONFLUENCE RIVERS UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, INC.

CASE NO. WA-2019-0299

Jefferson City, Missouri September 2019

** Denotes Confidential Information **

Staff Exhibit No. 105

Date 10 17 119 Reporter Substitute

File No. WA-2019-029 9

1	SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY					
2	OF					
3	DAVID C. ROOS					
4	CONFLUENCE RIVERS UTILITY OPERATING COMPANY, INC.					
5	CASE NO. WA-2019-0299					
6	Q. Please state your name and business address.					
7	A. My name is David C. Roos and my business address is Missouri Public Service					
8	Commission, P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, MO 65102.					
9	Q. What is your position at the Missouri Public Service Commission					
10	("Commission")?					
11	A. I am a Utility Engineering Specialist III in the Commission Staff Division					
12	Water and Sewer Department.					
13	Q. Are you the same David C. Roos that contributed to Staff's Recommendation					
14	filed as the attachment Confidential Schedule ND-d2 to Natelle Dietrich Direct Testimony in					
15	this case?					
16	A. Yes. I contributed to the section of Staff's Investigation of Water Systems an					
17	Sewer Systems starting on page 2 and ending on page 4 in Staff's Recommendation filed in					
18	this case.					
19	Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?					
20	A. The purpose of my testimony is to respond to Lake Perry Lot Owner					
21	Association's ("LPOA") witness Glen Justis' rebuttal testimony critiquing Confluence Rivers'					
22	(Confluence Rivers Utility Operating Company, Inc.) engineering reports and cost estimates					
, 2	relating to Lake Perry's water and wastewater systems					

1	Q. Are you aware of the inconsistencies found in the Confluence Rivers	•			
2	engineering reports that Mr. Justis summarized on pages 15 through 17 of his rebutta	1			
3	testimony?				
4	A. Yes. I have reviewed both Mr. Justis' rebuttal testimony on this issue, and the)			
5	Confluence Rivers' engineering reports as attached as Confidential Schedules GJ-04 through	ì			
6	GJ-06 of Mr. Justis' rebuttal testimony. These inconsistencies are a concern; however, it is	3			
7	my understanding that the cost estimates and scopes of work found in Confidential Schedule				
8	GJ-05 are the correct cost estimates and scopes of work that Confluence Rivers has provided				
9	in this case.				
10	Q. What repairs and upgrades to Port Perry's water and wastewater systems has	}			
11	Confluence Rivers proposed in this case?				
12	A. Confluence Rivers has proposed the following repairs and upgrades:				
13	Port Perry Water System				
14	 Install disinfection equipment and remote monitoring, 				
15	 Improve access roads and fencing, 				
16	• Rehab interior and exterior of well house,				
17	Overhaul the backup wellhead, and				
18	Install remote operations monitoring.				
19	Estimated costs for these repairs and upgrades, including a contingency is ** **.				
20	Staff notes that these costs do not include **				
21	**. At this time, the costs	ı			

1 for these items are indeterminate and it is my understanding it will require the operator to 2 further investigate the system before the need for these items can be assessed. 3 Port Perry Wastewater Treatment System Replace some sprinkler heads 5 Replace sprinkler control system Fencing for lagoon area 6 Brush removal 7 8 Estimated costs for these repairs and maintenance, including a contingency is ** 9 Q. What is Staff's opinion of Confluence Rivers' proposed repairs and upgrades? 10 A. Staff reviewed Confluence Rivers' proposed repairs and upgrades and the costs 11 for those repairs and upgrades. Staff considers the proposed repairs and upgrades as general 12 maintenance, or repair/replacement of outdated and worn out equipment with new, more 13 advanced technology. In Staff's opinion, the scope and costs of these proposed repairs and 14 upgrades are not unreasonable. 15 Is the Commission required to make the determination of what repairs and Q. upgrades should be made to Port Perry's potable water and waste water treatment systems in 16 this case? 17 No. The determination as to what are the appropriate repairs and upgrades for 18 A. 19 the water and wastewater system are made by the owner(s) of the utility. Whether or not the 20 utility may recover the costs of those improvements is a decision that would be made by the 21 Commission in a subsequent rate case, As Staff noted on page 4 of Staff's Recommendation 22 "Staff has reviewed CRU's capital improvement plan, but does not take a position and makes

1 2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

no recommendation at this time regarding the prudency and costs of any specific improvement. This will be addressed in a future rate case, after CRU has completed some or all of its planned improvements."

How does Staff evaluate the prudency of system repairs and upgrades in a 0. rate case?

A multi-disciplinary team of Staff engineers, economists, and accountants will A. be assigned to review the actual repair that was made and the actual cost of the repair. In evaluating prudence, Staff reviews whether a reasonable person making the same decision at that time would find both the information the decision-maker relied on and the process the decision-maker employed were reasonable based on the circumstances at the time the decision was made; i.e., without the benefit of hindsight. The decision actually made is disregarded and the review is instead an evaluation of the reasonableness of the information the decision-maker relied on and the decision-making process the decision-maker employed. If either the information relied upon or the decision-making process employed was imprudent, then Staff examines whether the imprudent decision caused any harm to ratepayers. Only if an imprudent decision resulted in harm to ratepayers, will Staff recommend a partial adjustment or a total disallowance of the cost.

- Does this conclude your Surrebuttal testimony? Q.
- A. Yes.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of Confluence Rivers Utility Operating Company, Inc. to Acquire Certain Water and Sewer Assets and for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity)))	Case No. WA-2019-0299

AFFIDAVIT OF DAVID C. ROOS

STATE OF MISSOURI)	
)	SS
COUNTY OF COLE)	

COMES NOW DAVID C. ROOS and on his oath declares that he is of sound mind and lawful age; that he contributed to the foregoing *Surrebuttal Testimony*; and that the same is true and correct according to his best knowledge and belief.

Further the Affiant sayeth not.

DAVID C. ROOS

JURAT

D. SUZIE MANKIN
Notary Public - Notary Seal
State of Missouri
Commissioned for Cole County
My Commission Expires: December 12, 2020
Commission Number: 12412070

Notary Public