



**BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

FILED

11-09-12
04:59 PM

In the Matter of the Application of Golden State Water Company, on Behalf of its Bear Valley Electric Service Division (U 913 E), for Approval of Costs and Authority to Increase General Rates and Other Charges for Electric Service by Its Bear Valley Electric Service Division

Application 12-02-013
(Filed February 16, 2012)

MOTION OF GOLDEN STATE WATER COMPANY (BVES)

TO REOPEN THE RECORD

Keith Switzer

Vice President of Regulatory Affairs
Golden State Water Company
630 East Foothill Boulevard
San Dimas, California 91773
Telephone: (909) 394-3600
Facsimile: (909) 394-7427
E-mail: Kswitzer@gswater.com

Fred G. Yanney

Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P.
555 South Flower Street 41st Floor
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 892-9200
Facsimile: (213) 892-9494
E-mail: FYanney@Fulbright.com

November 9, 2012

**BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Application of Golden State Water Company, on Behalf of its Bear Valley Electric Service Division (U 913 E), for Approval of Costs and Authority to Increase General Rates and Other Charges for Electric Service by Its Bear Valley Electric Service Division

Application 12-02-013
(Filed February 16, 2012)

**MOTION OF GOLDEN STATE WATER COMPANY (BVES)
TO REOPEN THE RECORD**

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Rule 13.14(b) of the California Public Utilities Commission’s (“Commission”) Rules of Practice and Procedure, Golden State Water Company, on behalf of its Bear Valley Electric Service (“BVES”) Division, respectfully moves that the record in this proceeding be reopened for the taking of additional evidence.

II. FACTS CONSTITUTING GROUNDS IN JUSTIFICATION OF REOPENING RECORD

The hearings in this proceeding were adjourned on September 19, 2012. (Tr. at pp. 411-412, lines 27-28, and 1, respectively) Administrative Law Judge Wilson stated that “This proceeding will be submitted upon ruling by me at a later date.” (Tr. at p. 411, lines 18-19). BVES is not aware of any ruling to date by ALJ Wilson to submit this case for decision.

Pursuant to Rule 13.14(b), BVES requests that the record be reopened for the taking of additional evidence. This request is based upon the following material changes of fact since the conclusion of the hearing on September 19, 2012. And Mr. Karuna Warren, the Operations and Planning Manager over the Engineering Department and Operations at BVES, is prepared to provide testimony generally as follows.

On Friday, November 2, 2012, Mr. Warren received a call from a representative of PARKIA, Inc., an engineering consultant firm (Consultant). He advised Mr. Warren that preliminary information from the strength and loading studies performed on 55 of the 111 poles along Big Bear Boulevard indicates that a significant number of the tested poles failed to meet the requirements of Rule 44.3 of GO 95 to have poles that have safety factors that are no less than two-thirds of the applicable construction safety factors specified in Rule 44.1 of GO 95. In follow-up telephone conversations between Mr. Warren and the Consultant on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, November 5-7, 2012, the Consultant reported that its findings indicate that approximately 90% of the 55 poles tested failed to meet the requirements of Rule 44.3 of GO 95 to have poles that have safety factors that are no less than two-thirds of the applicable construction safety factors specified in Rule 44.1 of GO 95.

A meeting with the Consultant occurred the morning of November 9, 2012 to further review and analyze the information from the strength and loading studies performed by the Consultant. At the conclusion of that meeting, based upon the results of studies of 55 of the 111 poles along Big Bear Boulevard by the Consultant, 54 of the 55 tested poles failed to meet the requirements of Rule 44.3 of GO 95 to have poles that have safety factors that are no less than two-thirds of the applicable construction safety factors specified in Rule 44.1 of GO 95. The replacement of these non-compliant poles are assigned a Level 2 priority level for corrective action under Rule 18(A)(2)(a)(ii) under GO 95. The time period for corrective action determined by a qualified BVES representative is 36 months, in accordance with Rule 18(A)(2)(a)(ii) under GO 95. In light of the facts that the poles and wires along Big Bear Boulevard represent a main feeder line within BVES' system and is located on the main thoroughfare of the City of Big Bear, and to maintain adequate reliability, safety, clearance, capacity and continuity of this main feeder line, from an engineering and operational standpoint it is prudent to replace all of the poles and wires along Big Bear Boulevard with stronger and taller poles and higher ampacity

wires. Replacement of the poles should be scheduled to begin in 2013 in order for the project to be completed by 2015.

An alternative to replacing all of the poles and wires along Big Bear Boulevard and still be in compliance with GO 95 would be to underground the electrical system along Big Bear Boulevard consistent with BVES' proposed Big Bear Boulevard Undergrounding Project. If new poles and related facilities are installed along Big Bear Boulevard, they will likely have a useful life of approximately 25 to 35 years. If the poles and wires along Big Bear Boulevard are replaced, it would not make economic, engineering, or operational sense to underground the electrical system along Big Bear Boulevard until a significant number of the poles need to be replaced.

If the Big Bear Boulevard Undergrounding Project is not authorized by the Commission and if the Commission also does not authorize \$4.1 million for the replacement of the overhead poles and other equipment along Big Bear Boulevard, in order to comply with GO 95 and replace the Big Bear Boulevard overhead poles and equipment BVES will be faced with having to defer other capital plant additions planned for 2013-2016. The deferral of other capital plant additions planned for 2013-2016 would impair BVES' efforts to substantially increase the reliability and safety of the BVES system through its capital improvements program.

III. REQUEST TO TEMPORARILY SUSPEND DATE OF FILING OPENING BRIEF

In light of this Motion, BVES requests that the date of the filing of opening briefs in this matter be temporarily suspended. BVES believes that parties could be disadvantaged if they are required to file their opening briefs prior to a ruling on this Motion. In opening briefs, parties must by necessity set forth their positions on issues. In this proceeding, the issues of BVES capital additions and the proposed Big Bear Boulevard Underground project are very significant, contested issues. If additional evidence on these contested issues is accepted into the record, it may alter one or more parties' positions. Parties should not be disadvantaged by being required to file opening briefs when additional evidence on important issues may be entered into the record after the briefs have been filed. In addition, a suspension of the filing date for opening briefs would allow all parties to promptly respond to this Motion and not be unfairly burdened by trying to simultaneously complete and file their opening briefs under the current schedule and promptly respond to this Motion.

