1	PLACE:	Dobbs Building, Raleigh, North Carolina
2	DATE:	July 22, 2022
3	DOCKET NOS.:	W-1125, Sub 9; W-1125, Sub 10
4	TIME:	10:00 a.m 11:51 a.m.
5	BEFORE:	Chair Charlotte A. Mitchell, Presiding
6		Commissioner Kimberly W. Duffley
7		Commissioner Jeffrey A. Hughes
8		
9		
LO		IN THE MATTER OF:
L1	Greate	r Kinnakeet Shores Home Owners, Inc.
L2		c/o Pat Weston,
L3	P.O. B	ox 853, Avon, North Carolina 27915
L 4		Complainant
L 5		V
L 6	Outer 1	Banks/Kinnakeet Associates, LLC.,
L7		Defendant
L 8		
L 9		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

```
1
    APPEARANCES:
 2
    FOR GREATER KINNAKEET SHORES HOME OWNERS, INC.:
 3
    Edward S. Finley, Jr., Esq.
    2024 White Oak Drive
 4
 5
    Raleigh, North Carolina 27608
 6
 7
    FOR OUTER BANKS/KINNAKEET ASSOCIATES, LLC:
 8
    Patrick Buffkin, Esq.
    Buffin Law Office
 9
10
    3520 Apache Drive
11
    Raleigh, North Carolina 27609
12
    FOR THE USING AND CONSUMING PUBLIC:
13
14
    Elizabeth D. Culpepper, Esq.
15
    Public Staff - North Carolina Utilities Commission
16
    4326 Mail Service Center
17
    Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-4300
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS
2	EXAMINATIONS
3	PAGE
4	PAT WESTON
5	Direct Examination by Mr. Finley 17
6	Examination by Chair Mitchell
7	Redirect Examination by Mr. Finley 37
8	
9	CHARLES JUNIS
10	Direct Examination by Ms. Culpepper 38
11	Cross Examination by Mr. Finley 72
12	Examination by Commissioner Duffley 75
13	Examination by Commissioner Hughes 76
14	Examination by Chair Mitchell 78
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	ЕХНІВІТЅ		
2		IDENTIFI	ED/ADMITTED
3	HOA Exhibit 1	30	38
4	Public Staff Junis Direct Exhibit	1 44	88
5	HOA Junis Cross Exhibit 1	74	75
6	Junis Direct Exhibit 2	84	88
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

PROCEEDINGS

1.3

CHAIR MITCHELL: All right. Good morning.

Let's come to order and go on the record, please. I'm

Charlotte Mitchell, Chair of the Utilities Commission,

and with me this morning are Commissioners Kimberly

Duffley and Jeff Hughes.

I now call for hearing Docket No. W-1125,
Sub 9, In the Matter of Complaint of Greater Kinnakeet
Shores Home Owners Association, Inc. against Outer
Banks/Kinnakeet Associates, LLC, as well as Docket No.
W-1125, Sub 10, In the Matter of Complaint of Kashf
Ain against Outer Banks/Kinnakeet Associates, LLC.
I'll refer to Greater Kinnakeet Shores Home Owners,
Incorporated as the HOA, and I'll refer to Outer
Banks/Kinnakeet Associates, LLC as the utility.

Before we proceed further, as is required by the State Government Ethics Act, I remind Members of the Commission of our duty to avoid conflicts of interest and inquire, at this time, as to whether any member of the Commission has a known conflict with respect to matters coming before us.

(No response)

CHAIR MITCHELL: The record will reflect that no conflicts have been identified, so we'll

```
1
    proceed. As to the Complaint filed by the HOA, on
 2
    December 13th, 2021, HOA filed a complaint in Docket
 3
    No. W-1125, Sub 9 against the Utility alleging
 4
    operational deficiencies with the Kinnakeet Shores
 5
    Wastewater Treatment Plant and requesting that the
 6
    Commission require comprehensive due diligence,
 7
    investigation into the Utility's suitability to own
 8
    and operate the Wastewater Treatment Plant and
 9
    Collection System.
10
               Require the Utility to take immediate steps
11
    to rectify the deficiencies. Appoint an emergency
12
    operator if it determines that such action is
13
    necessary. Revoke the Utility's bond if it's
14
```

to rectify the deficiencies. Appoint an emergency operator if it determines that such action is necessary. Revoke the Utility's bond if it's determined that the Utility is unwilling or unable to operate the system in accordance with the Public Convenience and Necessity. Investigate the possibility of identifying a potential new owner of the Wastewater Treatment Plant. And if the Commission determines that the Utility should continue to own and operate the system, require substantial increase in the Utility's bond.

On January 27th, 2022, the Utility filed its first Answer to the HOA's complaint. Also on January 27th, 2022, the Utility filed a motion to

strike certain allegations from the Complaint.

1.3

On February 3rd, 2022, the HOA filed a response to the motion to strike.

On February 4th, 2022, the Utility filed a reply to the HOA's response to the motion to strike.

Also on February 4th, 2022, the Utility filed a motion to dismiss the HOA's complaint for lack of standing and jurisdiction.

On February 7th, 2022, the HOA filed a reply to the Utility's first Answer requesting a hearing.

On February 11th, 2022, the HOA filed a response to the Utility's Motion to Dismiss, and on March 11th, 2022, the owners of 59 lots within the Kinnakeet Shores subdivision filed a joint petition to intervene, and on May 23rd, 2022, the Commission issued an Order granting that intervention.

On April 28th, 2022, counsel of record the Utility filed a motion to withdraw, which motion was allowed by Order of the Commission.

On May 12th, 2022, Deborah Ashe and Jonathan Farrell, owners of lots 16, 19, 26, and 20 of Phase 16 of the Kinnakeet Shores subdivision filed a petition to intervene. The Commission issued an Order granting that petition on May 23rd, 2022.

On May 12th, 2022, Wiltton and Manette

Britt, owners of a home at 41196 Windlass Court and a

vacant lot at 41148 Portside Drive, located within the

Kinnakeet Shores subdivision, filed a petition to

intervene.

1.3

On May 23rd, 2022, the Commission issued an Order granting that petition.

On May 12th, 2022, seven members of the Board of Directors of the Kinnakeet Shores Home Owners Association, filed a joint petition to intervene as representatives of all members of the complainant HOA. Six of the board members also requested to intervene as current customers of the Utility.

On May 23rd, 2022, the Commission issued an Order granting that petition.

On June 12th, 2022, Marie and Stephen
Minton, owners of a home at 41198 Spritsail Court
within the Kinnakeet Shores subdivision, filed a
petition to intervene, and on June 15th, 2022, the
Commission issued an Order granting that petition.

On June 23rd, 2022, the Commission issued an Order granting in part and denying in part the Utility's motion to strike and allowing the Utility until July 8th, 2022, to respond to the remaining

allegations in the HOA's complaint.

On July 7th, Attorney Kurt Olson filed a notice of appearance in this docket as counsel of record for the Utility.

On July 7th, the Commission issued an Order extending the Utility's time to respond to July 12th.

On July 12th, the Utility filed its second Answer to the HOA's Complaint. Also on July 12th, Attorney Kurt Olson filed a motion to withdraw as counsel of record for the Utility, which motion was allowed by subsequent Order of the Commission.

On July 20th, 2022, Attorney Patrick Buffkin filed a notice of appearance as counsel of record for the Utility in this Docket.

Turning to the Complaint filed by Mr. Ain, on January 18th, 2022, Mr. Ain filed a Complaint in Docket No. W-1125, Sub 10 against the Utility alleging that the Utility's failure to operate and maintain the Wastewater Treatment Plant in proper working order resulted in a moratorium that prevented his wife from -- that prevented his wife and him from obtaining a building permit.

On February 3rd, 2022, the Utility filed an Answer to Mr. Ain's Complaint.

On February 14th, 2022, Mr. Ain filed a reply to the Utility's Answer in which he requested a hearing.

1.3

On April 28th, 2022, counsel of record for the Utility filed a motion to withdraw, which motion was allowed by Order of the Commission.

By Order of the Commission issued June 28th, 2022, Docket No. W-1125, Sub 10 was consolidated with Docket No. W-11,(sic) Sub 9 and set the matter for hearing today.

All right. That brings us to today. I now call on counsel for the parties to announce their appearances for the record, beginning with the Utility.

MR. BUFFKIN: Good morning, Chair Mitchell, Commissioner Hughes, Commissioner Duffley, I'm Patrick Buffkin of the Buffkin Law Office, appearing on behalf of the defendant/respondent Outer Banks/Kinnakeet Associates, LLC.

CHAIR MITCHELL: Good morning, Mr. Buffkin.

MR. FINLEY: May it please the Commission, my name is Edward Finley, Raleigh, North Carolina, appearing on behalf of the complainant Greater Kinnakeet Shores Home Owners, Inc.

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

```
1
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Good morning, Mr. Finley.
 2
               MS. CULPEPPER: Good morning. Elizabeth
 3
    Culpepper with the Public Staff, appearing on behalf
 4
    of the Using and Consuming Public.
 5
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Good morning,
 6
    Ms. Culpepper. All right. Before we proceed any
 7
    further, preliminary matters?
 8
               MR. BUFFKIN:
                             Thank you, Madam Chair.
    have two for the Commission's consideration.
 9
                                                   First,
10
    there have been two filings in this docket this
11
    morning with the Commission. The first is an
12
    affidavit of Mr. Ray E. Hollowell, the managing member
13
    of the Utility, and the second is a memorandum to the
14
    Commission regarding the hearing from Mr. Hollowell.
15
               The memorandum speaks for itself and tends
16
    to provide some additional context for the matter
17
    stated in the affidavit, and I think that is
    sufficient to inform the Commission of the latest
18
19
    developments. And unless the Commission has any
20
    questions, I would just ask that those filings be
21
    noted for the record.
22
               CHAIR MITCHELL: By filings, you're
23
    referring to the letter filed today and the affidavit
24
    filed also this morning?
```

1 MR. BUFFKIN: Yes, ma'am. 2 CHAIR MITCHELL: Any objections to the 3 motion? MS. CULPEPPER: As long as noted doesn't 4 5 mean entered into evidence, because we would oppose 6 the affidavit being entered into evidence. 7 CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Ms. Culpepper. 8 Mr. Buffkin, would you clarify what your motion is. MR. BUFFKIN: Yes, Madam Chair, and a brief 9 10 word of context. The memorandum tends to contradict 11 or call into question some of the statements that are 12 made in the affidavit. I feel obligated as an Officer 13 of the Court to bring that to your attention. 14 with the memorandum having been filed, I think that 15 speaks for itself and tends to provide the context and 16 corrections to any statements in the affidavit that 17 might no longer be true. 18 And, again, it would simply -- to ask that 19 the Commission take note of those filings, to have

that stated on the record, which I believe is my obligation to this tribunal.

CHAIR MITCHELL: All right.

20

21

22

23

24

MR. BUFFKIN: So to be clear, we're not asking it to be entered into evidence, only that it be

```
1
    noted into the record in this hearing that those
 2
     filings were made, and the contents of the memorandum
 3
    provide a relevant context and tend to correct any
 4
    statements in the affidavit that may no longer be
 5
    true.
 6
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Buffkin.
 7
    Ms. Culpepper.
 8
               MS. CULPEPPER: It's fine as long as it's
    not entered into evidence.
 9
10
               CHAIR MITCHELL: All right.
11
               MS. CULPEPPER: We were served with an
12
    affidavit this morning at 7:22, so it was not in
13
    compliance with G.S. § 62-68.
14
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Ms. Culpepper.
15
    Mr. Buffkin, the Commission takes note of those
16
    filings.
17
                             Thank you, Madam Chair.
               MR. BUFFKIN:
18
    the second matter, and this is also addressed in the
19
    memorandum from Mr. Hollowell to the Commission that
20
    was filed this morning under circumstances of -- that
21
    are spoken to in the Rules of Professional Conduct,
22
    Rule 1.16(a) paragraph(3), I would move that the
23
    Commission allow me to withdraw from representing the
```

Utility in this proceeding.

CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Buffkin.

Before ruling on your motion, I want to be clear as to my ruling on your first motion. We are not accepting those documents into the record, but we are taking note of them as you have asked us to do. We are not accepting those documents into the record of evidence in this proceeding as of today, but we are taking note of them as you have accepted us to do.

1.3

As to your motion to withdraw, any objection to the motion?

(No response)

CHAIR MITCHELL: Motion is allowed. Thank you, Mr. Buffkin.

MR. BUFFKIN: Thank you.

CHAIR MITCHELL: We are going to go ahead and proceed today. Notwithstanding withdrawal of counsel of record for the Utility, this is how I'd like to proceed. We'll begin with the HOA and allow the HOA to put on its evidence, and then I'd like to hear from the Public Staff. We'll start with the HOA's Complaint, and then we'll proceed to Mr. Ain, to the extent that Mr. Ain is here and desires to put on evidence.

MR. FINLEY: I don't think he's coming.

CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay. So with that said, we'll proceed with you, Mr. Finley, your clients, and then Ms. Culpepper. Again, notwithstanding withdrawal of counsel of record for the Utility and notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Ain did not appear today, I would like the Public Staff to proceed with any evidence at task as to the matters alleged in these complaints, and pertaining to the Commission's direction, to the Utility to show cause provided in the June 28 Order.

MS. CULPEPPER: Yes, ma'am.

1.3

CHAIR MITCHELL: To the extent that any intervenor in this proceeding wishes to provide evidence, they will be allowed a chance to do so too. Mr. Finley, recognizing you do not represent the intervenor, is it your understanding that the intervenors do not wish to present evidence?

MR. FINLEY: That's my understanding.

CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay. Let me just check in the audience to see if there are any intervenors here present that wish to present evidence today.

(No response)

CHAIR MITCHELL: I am not seeing any.

24 You-all are very familiar with the proceeding before

```
1
    the Commission. You will have an opportunity to
 2
    cross-examine witnesses and redirect, engage in
 3
    redirect examination.
                           If necessary, witnesses will
    also take questions from Commissioners, if
 4
 5
    Commissioners have questions, and you-all will be
 6
    allowed to ask questions on Commissioners' questions.
 7
    All right. Let me check in one last time before we
 8
    get started just to see if there's any additional
 9
    procedural issues we need to cover.
10
              MS. CULPEPPER: No, none that I'm aware.
11
              CHAIR MITCHELL: Mr. Finley.
12
              MR. FINLEY: The HOA calls Patricia Weston
1.3
    to the stand, please. Ms. Weston, if you will come up
14
    here and sit in one of these chairs, and you'll have
15
    to take that bible and be sworn in by the Chair.
16
              MS. WESTON:
                           Right here?
17
              MR. FINLEY: That's fine, I think.
18
              CHAIR MITCHELL: Yes. That's perfectly
19
           Good morning, Ms. Weston. Go ahead and pull
20
    that microphone close to you so that we can hear you,
21
    and then let me get you sworn in, please.
22
              MS. WESTON:
                            Is that okay?
23
              CHAIR MITCHELL:
                                Yes.
                                      That's good.
24
    hear you.
```

1	MS. WESTON: Is that loud enough?
2	CHAIR MITCHELL: Yes, it is. If you would,
3	ma'am, put your left hand on the bible and raise your
4	right hand.
5	PAT WESTON;
6	having been duly sworn,
7	testified as follows:
8	CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you. Mr. Finley, you
9	may proceed.
10	DIRECT-EXAMINATION BY MR. FINLEY:
11	Q Would you state your name and address for the
12	record, please, ma'am.
13	A Pat Weston, P.O. Box 853, Avon, North Carolina
14	27915.
15	Q Ms. Weston, what role did you play on behalf of
16	the complainant Greater Kinnakeet Shores Home
17	Owners, Inc. in this matter?
18	A I've served as the President of Greater Kinnakeet
19	Shores Home Owners, Inc. since the year 2000.
20	Q And are you familiar with the Complaint filed on
21	behalf of the Home Owners Association in this
22	docket, and what role did you play in gathering
23	and reciting the information set forth in the
2.4	Complaint?

A I am familiar with the Complaint and I verify the factual allegations set forth in it. On behalf of my Board, and with the assistance of our attorney, I compiled the information set forth in the Complaint and obtained approval from the Board to file a Complaint with the Commission.

The HOA is an official agency that acts for and on behalf of the property owners and utility consumers within the Kinnakeet Shores

Home Owners -- excuse me, the Kinnakeet Shores
subdivision in Dare County. The Board viewed the wastewater collection and treatment system in

Kinnakeet Shores to be in critical need of remediation and sought help from regulators
directed by the problems as quickly as possible.

- Q Do the covenants and by-laws and other empowering documents of the Home Owners Association authorized the Board to file the Complaint on the Home Owners Association's behalf?
- A Yes, sir. The provisions of this document authorizing the filing of a Complaint are addressed at length and the response to OBKA's Motion to Dismiss filed earlier in this docket.
- Q Ms. Weston, please describe, in general terms,

1		the Kinnakeet Shores service area, provided
2		wastewater service, by Outer Banks/Kinnakeet
3		Associates, Inc.?
4	А	Presently, Kinnakeet Shores consists of 379 ho
5		sites, 177 homes, and 202 vacant lots. Of the

- A Presently, Kinnakeet Shores consists of 379 home sites, 177 homes, and 202 vacant lots. Of the 202 vacant lots at the time of the filing of the Complaint, more than a dozen owners and contractors had begun the process leading up to obtaining building permits for construction immediately or by the 1st of 2022.
- Q Please address the allowed development in Kinnakeet Shores and the role played by OBKA in influencing that development.
- As recited in the Complaint, the period ending 2021 had been one of exceptional growth in the real estate market within the Outer Banks in general, and Kinnakeet Shores in particular.

 Continuation of this growth is important to the HOA, and its constituents.

During an 11-month period in 2021, Kinnakeet Shores recorded 48 property sales in the phases served by the OBKA or more than double the sales and transfers of property in any previous year. Prior to 2021, lot owners within

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

Kinnakeet Shores were on the verge of submitting plans to obtain building permits to build new residences. Some of these lot owners had already sold their former residences in anticipation that no obstacle existed preventing construction of their new homes.

1.3

Taking advantage of potential growth in Kinnakeet Shores is an important objective of our Board and it's constituents.

This growth also provides income for related providers of water and electric services, county taxes, and occupancy tax for rental properties.

OBKA is the sole provider of service, sewer service. Without access to the sewer service, the building of homes cannot take place.

- Q Please describe in summary fashion the services of OBKA provides to Kinnakeet Shores.
- A OBKA provides wastewater collection and treatment services to Kinnakeet Shores service area pursuant to a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity issued by this Commission and a permit issued by the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, permit number WQ002393484.

What is the status of the permit to OBKA from the

```
Division of Water Resources?
 1
 2
          By letter dated August 25, 2021, the Division of
 3
          Water Resources, Water Quality Regional
 4
          Operations section, placed OBKA on moratorium
 5
          effective October 13th, 2021.
 6
          What impact has the moratorium had on the
 7
          residents and homeowners within Kinnakeet Shores?
 8
          The imposition of this moratorium has resulted in
    Α
 9
          a crippling effect on Kinnakeet Shores' current
10
          economy and future economic prospects, and
11
          severely frustrates the predetermined plans of
         property owners and builders. This is frustrated
12
1.3
         by the letter filed in this docket --
14
          "This is illustrated," "illustrated," I think it
15
          would have said. It says "illustrated" instead
16
          of "frustrated."
          I'm sorry.
17
    Α
18
          It is "illustrated by."
    Q
19
          Am I in the right place?
    Α
20
          Yeah, but you said frustrated. You meant
21
          illustrated.
22
    Α
          Oh. I'm sorry.
23
    Q
          Yeah.
24
                By illustrated by the letter filed in this
          Okay.
```

1 docket, by George E. Goodrich of Outer Point 2 Joint Venture, where he states, "Several other 3 builders find themselves in the same position as 4 my company. We cannot move forward with our 5 development plans for our properties until the 6 moratorium is lifted. Dare County will 7 experience a loss of tax revenue and income from 8 tourists, the primary business of Dare County, until the situation is rectified." 9 10 Please summarize findings set forth in the 11 moratorium addressing deficiencies within OBKA 12 Treatment and Collection System? 1.3 In its letter to OBKA, DEQ states that the Α 14 Wastewater Treatment Plant, major treatment 15 units, are no longer functional. 16 clarifiers, the tertiary filter, spray irrigation 17 system and backup generator are not functional. 18 Bio solids have not been removed from the Plant

system and backup generator are not functional.

Bio solids have not been removed from the Plant
for at least seven years. DEQ has placed the

Wastewater Treatment Plant on sewer moratorium
with no new sewer taps, sewer extensions, or
additional flow effective as of the date of this
moratorium.

Q Is the moratorium still in affect today?

19

20

21

22

23

A Yes, sir, it is.

1.3

- Q Now, please state whether the conditions of the OBKA system are those arising in the recent past leading up to the imposition of the moratorium order?
- A From our recent inquiries and evidenced by the numerous notices of violations, the conditions of the Wastewater Treatment Plant, which resulted in the imposition of the moratorium, arise from years of neglect and failures of OBKA to undertake appropriate maintenance and to adequately fund operations of the system. OBKA contracts with an operations service that makes due as best it is able with a limited funds available to it provided by OBKA.

I am in frequent communication with those who provide the operations service while OBKA's acts and omissions to date have not resulted in appreciable disruptions of wastewater collection services to existing connections. In my opinion, a less major and immediate steps are taken to address the deficiencies noted by DEQ, service disruptions can be expected at any time. DEQ's letter imposing the moratorium required

1		notice to be sent to OBKA's Kinnakeet Shores
2		consumers. This notification and the perceived
3		threat have caused and continue to cause
4		substantial distrust and anxiety among users of
5		OBKA services within Kinnakeet Shores.
6	Q	To your knowledge, what has been the response of
7		OBKA to the moratorium and the conditions
8		resulting in its imposition?
9	А	As of today, the moratorium remains in place.
10		Consequently, OBKA's actions have not taken
11		been taken satisfactory to DEQ in order to have
12		the moratorium lifted. OBKA's general rates have
13		not been adjusted since initially approved in
14		1999 to 2000.
15		The principal owner of OBKA is Ray
16		Hollowell Jr., a former real estate developer of
17		Kinnakeet Shores. On past occasions,
18		Mr. Hollowell has informed the members of the
19		Board that he lacks appropriate financial
20		resources to make the needed repairs and
21		improvements.
22	Q	What is the Board's view on inference that might
23		be taken by OBKA to obtain rate levels enabling
24		OBKA to provide adequate service?

A The Board is not opposed to paying a reasonable rate for wastewater utility services. But in exchange for the payment of reasonable rates, customers should be entitled to adequate service and assurances of appropriate improvements and maintenance to the wastewater collection and treatment systems.

1.3

- Q Has the Board and to your knowledge have
 Kinnakeet residents been in communication with
 the Public Staff and the Division of Water
 Quality in an effort to obtain assistance in
 supporting -- in support of addressing its
 concerns with OBKA?
- A Yes, sir. I have personally and through our attorney of record, and on behalf of the Board, as well as other residents and property owners, have been in communication with the Public Staff and the Division of Water Quality in an effort to obtain assistance and support in addressing its concerns with OBKA.
- Q Have the latest events leading into the imposition of the moratorium been isolated instances of difficulties OBKA has experienced?

 A No, sir. We have reviewed the Commission's files

NO, SII. We have reviewed the Commission S lifes

dating back 1999 and attempted to list examples that in our opinion, demonstrated failure to comply with the responsibilities of a public utility in this state. The only allegation the Commission allows us to address has to do with a report by the Public Staff addressing the general level of OBKA's rates that have been in effect since the franchise was granted in 2000.

The Public Staff reported that due to personal moves, at least one hurricane, financial records had been moved a couple of times over the years that were not easily located. From its reviews of the tax returns, the Public Staff noted reported losses in 2008 of \$631,920, for 2009 of \$414,388, for 2010 of \$450,369, and for 2011 of \$513,064. The bulk of these losses related to utility operations. Without requesting copies of invoices, the Public Staff was unable to determine the rate base of OBKA.

- Q Have the Board's communications and interactions with OBKA been satisfactory?
- A No, sir, they have not.

1.3

24 Q In addition to the Complaint filed by the Board

1 in this docket, there have been a number of 2 requests for intervention filed by other 3 Kinnakeet Shores property owners and customers or 4 potential customers. Are you familiar with the 5 situations of those who have filed these 6 additional requests for intervention? 7 Yes, sir. I have been in communication with the 8 other individuals and property owners and have 9 coordinated with them in the filing of their 10 request for intervention in which they have 11

request for intervention in which they have implored the Commission to provide relief within Kinnakeet Shores in an expedited fashion. The purpose of these requested interventions was to reiterate to the Commission the severe difficulties existing within Kinnakeet Shores and to attempt to impress upon the Commission the need to act expeditiously.

Q Can you refer to a particular example?

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A Yes. I refer to the petition to intervene filed on March 11th, 2022, by Themy Veltsistas, Charles and Michelle Hitchens, Jamie Mazerski, Mark Roberts, Joe Roberts, Rick Barto, and Pat Weston, and on behalf of a multitude of other property owners listed in that petition.

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

In paragraph 7, the petition
stated petitioner's concur with complainant that
consumers of respondent are in immediate need of
the Commission's assistance in assessing the
deficiencies outlined in the Complaint.
Petitioners understand that even though the
Complaint requesting immediate action from the
Commission has been pending for some time and
motions from respondent had been filed and
responded to, no action by the Commission, thus
far, has taken place. By their request to
intervene, petitioners seek to impress upon the
Commission the urgent need for action and relief.
Subsequent to the filing of the Complaint by the
Board, are you aware of other actions taken on
behalf of regulators to address the Wastewater
Treatment and Collection System within Kinnakeet
Shores?
Yes, sir. My understanding is that the North
Carolina Attorney General's Office, on behalf of
DEQ, has filed a complaint in the Dare County
Superior Court seeking an injunction against
OBKA. The Complaint was filed on May 5th, 2022,
as case number 22 CVS 177. In its claim for

Q

Α

relief, the Complaint states, as of the date of the Complaint, defendant has failed to correct violations in the Treatment and Disposal System and in the Collection System, including but not limited to failing to properly maintain and operate the Wastewater Treatment Plant, failing to properly maintain and operate the Reclaimed Water Generation and Utilization facilities.

Failing to properly monitor and report results of treatment wastewater effluent, exceeding effluent limitations, failing to provide a permit modification addressing outstanding property issues, and failing to maintain the Collection System in accordance with its permit.

1.3

Defendant's failure to correct
these violations constitute continuing violations
of the Treatment and Disposal System permit and
Collection System permit. The current state of
the Treatment and Disposal System, and the
Collection System, presents a current and ongoing
threat that wastewater discharged into the
Collection System will not be adequately treated
and disposed of in violation of NC General
Statutes Subsections § 143-215.1 paragraph

(a)(2).

The continuing threat adversely affects the public interest as described in NC General Statute Subsection §143-221. The State is entitled to preliminary and permanent injunctive relief against defendant to abate the ongoing violations and prevent the threatened violations set forth in this Complaint. My understanding is that the Public Staff will address this Complaint in greater detail in its testimony.

MR. FINLEY: Madam Chair, copies have been made of this Complaint that has been filed in the Dare County Superior Court. And the Public Staff has compiled an index of it and has put on page numbers of this exhibit. It has been distributed this morning, and we would move that this Complaint and Motion for Injunctive Relief be marked for identification as Home Owners Association Exhibit Number 1.

CHAIR MITCHELL: Mr. Finley, the document will be so marked for identification purposes.

(WHEREUPON, Home Owners

Association Exhibit No. 1, is

marked for identification.)

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

1	Q	Ms. Weston, have you been in communication with
2		other providers of Wastewater Utility Services
3		that might express an interest in acquiring the
4		wastewater system from OBKA providing service
5		within the Kinnakeet Shores?
6	А	Yes, sir, I have. Desperate to find a solution
7		to the serious dilemma in which we have found
8		ourselves, I have attempted to identify
9		alternative service providers to explore the
LO		possibility that a sale or acquisition might
L1		provide a long-term remedy.
L2	Q	All right. Please recite, again, what the HOA is
L3		requesting the Commission to do in response to
L 4		your Complaint?
L 5	А	Greater Kinnakeet Shores Home Owners, Inc.
L 6		respectfully requests that the Commission grant
L 7		the following relief:
L 8		Number 1: That the Commission is,
L 9		as expeditiously as possible, require a
20		comprehensive due diligence investigation into
21		OBKA's suitability to own and operate the
22		Wastewater Treatment System and Collection System

That the Commission, in

in compliance with the public interest.

Number 2:

23

coordination with the Public Staff and the
Department of Environmental Quality, require OBKA
to take immediate steps to rectify the
deficiencies causing the imposition of the
moratorium.

1.3

- 3: That the Commission, if after investigation and due diligence, should determine that OBKA is incapable financially or operationally or otherwise to continue to operate the system, appoint an emergency operator.
- 4: That the Commission, to the extent that OBKA is unwilling or unable to operate the system in accordance with the Public Convenience and Necessity, revoke OBKA's bond.
- 5: That the Commission investigate the possibility of identifying a potential new owner of the Kinnakeet Shores Wastewater Treatment System that is willing to acquire and operate the system on terms that would not result in unreasonable rates to its ratepayers.
- 6: That to the extent the Commission determines that OBKA should continue to own and operate the system, that the

1	Commission require a substantial increase in
2	OBKA's bond to be forfeited and revoked in the
3	event OBKA's pattern of inadequate service is
4	repeated in the future.
5	6(sic): For such other relief as
6	the Commission deems appropriate.
7	MR. FINLEY: Thank you, Ms. Weston.
8	Ms. Weston is available for cross-examination.
9	CHAIR MITCHELL: Ms. Culpepper.
10	MS. CULPEPPER: No questions.
11	CHAIR MITCHELL: Thank you, Ms. Weston, for
12	your testimony. Let me check in with my colleagues to
13	see if there's any questions for you. Questions for
14	Ms. Weston.
15	(No response)
16	CHAIR MITCHELL: Ms. Weston, I do have a few
17	questions for you. Thank you, again, ma'am, for your
18	testimony this morning.
19	EXAMINATION BY CHAIR MITCHELL:
20	Q You have provided a lot of information in your
21	testimony, and I want to follow up with you on a
22	couple of points that you have made. You
23	mentioned the moratorium that was imposed by

Could you speak a little louder? I'm sorry.

```
Sure. That's okay. Is that better?
 1
    Q
 2
    Α
         That's better. Thank you.
 3
    Q
         So in your testimony, you mentioned the
 4
         moratorium that was imposed by the Department of
 5
         Environmental Quality, the Division of Water
         Resources in 2021. Are you aware of or do you
 6
 7
         have any information about any of the events that
 8
         led up to the imposition of the moratorium?
 9
    Α
         No, I did not. We were blindsided.
10
    Q
         Okay.
11
         And we did not -- shall I continue or not?
12
         Yes, you may continue.
    Q
13
                The letter was written August -- excuse
    Α
         Okay.
14
         me, August the 25th imposing the moratorium on
15
         October 13th. I did not find out on behalf of
         the Association until October 26th when I
16
17
         received a call from Donna Creef who, at that
18
         time, was the Dare County Planning Director,
19
         Planning Officer.
20
                         She asked me if I had heard about
21
         the moratorium. I said, "What moratorium?"
22
         said, "The moratorium has been placed on the
23
         sewer plant." I said, "No." She said, I'm
24
         hitting the send key right now. Read it and call
```

me back." And as I said, we were totally
blindsided. I mean, I spent the next few days
just grasping at straws, calling people, you
know, Mr. Tankard, anybody that I could get
information from. This was incredible and put a
total halt to many, many owners that I personally
new were in the process of getting ready to put
there submissions into the Architecture Review
Committee to get a rubber stamp to take it to the
building inspector's office for building
permits, so I was on the phone for days.
Okay. In your testimony, you also mentioned that
you have been in frequent communications with the
operator, the contract operator of this system.
Can you tell us who the contract operator is?
Well, I speak with Michelle Pharr and David
Pharr. They are the providers of the sewer
operations at the Plant.
And can you tell me what you have learned in your

Q

Α

Q conversations with Mr. and Mrs. Pharr?

Learned that certain things were not working. Α They were broken or they needed new filters. There was not any capital to be spent; that they were doing everything they could to treat the

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

waste as best they could without being able to order new parts and have adequate replacements, to continue to run the Plant in the manner it should be run. We never spoke about -- I feel rather ignorant, but we never spoke about notices of violations. I never heard those words until this moratorium happened.

- Q Okay. Did the Pharrs express any concerns to you about the Plant -- the performance of the Plant, other than the financial concerns that they appear to have expressed to you? Did they indicate that there could be any problems with the Plant?
- As far as serving the current customers, we did not discuss problems in that area, other than things that might happen, if it was a grease buildup at the shopping center or -- it was just run-of-the-mill talk about this is broken, we're hoping Ray will order this. This pump needs to be rebuilt, and now this other pump needs to be rebuilt. And we're hoping to get that done in the not-too-distant future, but everything depended on Mr. Hollowell.
- Q Okay. Thank you, Ms. Weston.

```
1
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Questions -- just checking
 2
          Questions on any of the questions I've asked?
 3
               MS. CULPEPPER: No questions.
 4
    REDIRECT-EXAMINATION BY MR. FINLEY:
         Ms. Weston, are the Pharrs here, by any chance?
 5
    Q
 6
    Α
          They are. And I can just further say that these
         people have gone out on a limb using every single
 7
 8
          remedy, simple remedy known to man, including,
 9
          you know, chlorine bleach and other things to try
10
          to keep this Plant going and viable and treating
11
          what was coming into it, with no money to be had,
12
          so...
13
          Why don't you identify who is here over your
          right shoulder there on the front row.
14
15
         Michelle Pharr and David Pharr.
16
         And the other gentleman?
17
         Oh, I'm sorry, and Rick Barto. Rick is also on
18
          the Board and he has known Ray for 20 years, yep,
19
          at least, and lives in Kinnakeet Shores.
20
                            No more redirect.
               MR. FINLEY:
21
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay. Thank you,
22
    Ms. Weston. I believe there's nothing further for
23
    you, so you may step down. Thank you for your
24
    testimony.
```

```
1
               THE WITNESS: Thank you.
 2
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Ms. Culpepper.
 3
               MS. CULPEPPER: The Public Staff calls
    Charles Junis.
 4
 5
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Mr. Finley, do you want to
 6
    move in your exhibit?
 7
               MR. FINLEY:
                            I'll be happy to do that now.
    We move the introduction of Home Owners Association as
 8
 9
    Exhibit 1.
10
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Any objections,
11
    Ms. Culpepper?
12
               MS. CULPEPPER: No.
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Motion is allowed.
13
14
                          (WHEREUPON, Home Owners
                          Association Exhibit 1, is marked
15
16
                          in evidence.)
17
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Mr. Junis, right hand up.
                         CHARLES JUNIS;
18
19
                     having been duly sworn,
20
                     testified as follows:
    DIRECT-EXAMINATION BY MS. CULPEPPER:
21
22
          Please state your name.
          Charles Junis.
23
    Α
24
          Where do you work?
```

- 1 Α Public Staff, for the North Carolina Utility 2 Commission. 3 What is your business address? 430 North Salisbury Street, Raleigh, North Α 5 Carolina. 6 What is your job title? 7 Director of the Public Staff Water, Sewer, and 8 Telephone Division. 9 How long have you been in that position? 10 Approximately six months. Α 11 What are your duties? 12 Α I have management responsibilities of the Water, 1.3 Sewer, and Telephone Division. I'm responsible 14 for analyzing filings, testimony, exhibits, and 15 other data presented by parties before the Commission. I evaluate the operation of 16 17 regulated water and sewer utilities, including 18 expenses, capital spending and compliance with 19 applicable regulations. My duties also include 20 preparing testimony regarding my investigation
 - Q Please describe your education and work experience.

Commission.

21

22

23

24

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

activities and making recommendations to this

A Yes. I graduated from North Carolina State
University earning a Bachelor of Science degree
in civil engineering in May of 2011. I'm a
licensed professional engineer in North Carolina
since December of 2015. I have over 11 years of
water and wastewater engineering experience. And
since joining the Public Staff in April of 2013,
have worked on general rate cases, new franchise
and transfer applications, emergency operations
proceedings, customer complaints, rulemakings and
other aspects of utility regulation.

1.3

More specifically, I have assisted in the investigation in drafting of petitions and/or testified in the Webb Creek, Docket No. W-864, Sub 11, Riverbend Estates, Docket No. W-390, Sub 13, and Mountainaire, Docket No. 1148, Sub 20 emergency operator proceedings.

Prior to joining the Public Staff,

I worked for Farnsworth Group in engineering and
architectural consulting firm. Through this
education and experience, I've gained
considerable knowledge of relevant in engineering
and construction principles and utility
operations, maintenance, and capital planning.

1	Q Do you believe that your testimony will be	
2	helpful in assisting the Commission understand	
3	the facts of these cases?	
4	A Yes, I do.	
5	MS. CULPEPPER: Chair Mitchell, at this	
6	time, the Public Staff tenders Mr. Junis as an expert	
7	in the field of Utility Operations and related	
8	regulatory matters.	
9	CHAIR MITCHELL: All right. Thank you.	
10	Ms. Culpepper.	
11	Q Mr. Junis, how did you become aware of the	
12	moratorium for the Kinnakeet Shores sewer system?	
13	A In late October, 2021, I had separate phone	
14	conversations with Eddie Goodrich, prospective	
15	customer of Outer Banks Kinnakeet Associates,	
16	LLC, and Pat Weston, President of Greater	
17	Kinnakeet Shores Home Owners, Inc. about the	
18	moratorium.	
19	Q How did you conduct your investigation?	
20	A Upon becoming aware of this (43:24) user,	
21	Kinnakeet Shores, I compiled information,	
22	including additional communication with customers	
23	and prospective customers; contacting and meeting	
24	with North Carolina Department of Environmental	

Quality, Division of Water Resources' staff; calling DEQ's Laserfiche database and company dockets. Ms. Weston, and subsequently Mr. Ain, filed formal complaints. The Public Staff monitored the Complaint proceedings and continued to compile information.

Sometime after the Complainants requested a hearing, the Public Staff, including Ms. Culpepper and myself, contemplated a motion to appoint an emergency operator, including contacting potential emergency operators and drafting a petition to appoint an emergency operator. Then this very hearing was scheduled.

- Q Have you personally visited the Kinnakeet Shores sewer system?
- 16 A Yes, I have.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

- 17 Q When did you conduct this site visit?
- 18 A This Tuesday, July 19th.
- 19 Q Who was present during the site visit?
- 20 A From DEQ's Washington Regional Office, Robert
- 21 Tankard Assistant Regional Supervisor, Robert
- Bullock, Environment Specialist, and Sarah
- Toppen, Environmental Specialist. And from
- 24 Albermarle Environmental, Inc., David and

1 Michelle Pharr, the contract operators. 2 Did you take photographs during your site visit? 3 Yes, I did. Α 4 What did you take photographs of? 5 Α While accompanying DEQ on their compliance 6 inspection, I took photographs of key components 7 of the Kinnakeet Shores Wastewater Treatment 8 Plant and Collection System. 9 Q What documentation was produced based on your 10 site visit? 11 I prepared a PowerPoint presentation of the site 12 visit. The presentation incorporates the 1.3 photographs that I took. In addition, DEQ 14 completed a compliance inspection report. 15 Are you prepared --16 Α Oh. I'm sorry. I would like to add I'm prepared 17 to provide a narrative account along with the 18 PowerPoint of the inspection. 19 Do the photographs, incorporated into the site 20 visit PowerPoint presentation, accurately 21 represent what you observed during the site 22 visit?

Yes. As the saying goes, "A picture is worth a

thousand words," and I think everyone here today

23

24

Α

```
1
          would be appreciative, especially the court
 2
          reporter, if we save several thousand words from
 3
         being spoken today. However, DEQ staff and I
 4
         made additional observations that is important
 5
          context that I can provide.
 6
               MS. CULPEPPER: Chair Mitchell, at this
 7
    time, we request that Mr. Junis be allowed to present
 8
    the PowerPoint of the site inspection which has been
 9
    premarked for identification as Public Staff Junis
10
    Direct Exhibit 1, which we provided paper copies of,
11
    and then also provide testimony describing the
12
    inspection.
1.3
                          (WHEREUPON, Public Staff Junis
14
                          Direct Exhibit 1 is marked for
15
                          identification.)
16
               CHAIR MITCHELL: All right. You may
17
    proceed.
18
                           Just giving it a second to get
               MR. JUNIS:
19
    set up.
20
         All right.
21
         Please proceed.
22
          So pictured here is the Kinnakeet Shores
    Α
23
          Wastewater Treatment Plant. It's the building in
24
          the top left-hand corner.
                                     The inspection, as
```

previously stated, was conducted this past

Tuesday. From the Washington Regional Office,

Robert Tankard, Robert Bullock, and Sarah Toppen,

myself, and then the contract operators David

Pharr and Michelle Pharr.

1.3

The Kinnakeet Shores Wastewater

Treatment Plant, as stated, the permit number is

WQ0002284. It is permitted for 350,000 gallons

per day and is a Reclaimed Water Generation and

Non-conjunctive Reclaimed Water Utilization

System. And what you have pictured there in the background is one of the tanks.

On this page is a Plant diagram that I've prepared in consultation with DEQ staff, and in the background is the picture of the tank that it is describing. So this is an aerial perspective of that tankage, and you can -- oh, this actually works.

If you would draw a horizontal line crossing basically from equalization basin all the way through external clarifier, you can assume that there's a catwalk going across that tankage that we proceeded across, and then there's actually a circular catwalk that goes

around the internal clarifier.

1.3

So from sort of left and moving clockwise, you have the equalization basin, the -- let me back up. There's sort of two trains of treatment here. 175,000 gallons each, and so flow can either go to either of the anoxic basins at the top or bottom, and then proceed to the aeration basins, and then to the clarifiers.

So, now, we'll start at the sort of head of the Plant where the influent comes into the Plant. So the far right pipe, in the picture to the left, is the influent line, so you can assume you have the Collection System. All that Collection System eventually comes through that pipe and into the Plant.

Then, it goes up into the manual bar screen, so that's the picture to the right. That flow would come through the pipe at the top of the picture, travel through the bar screen to try to take down as many solids, debris. Large foreign objects, essentially, that can make their way into a Wastewater Collection Treatment Plant. You can see sort of the condition of, just generally, the Plant, the cleanliness, and then

deterioration.

On this page is the flow equalization basin. So from the manual bar screen, the flow goes into the flow equalization basin that is 140,000 gallons. It's aerated and it should have two submersible transfer pumps. Those transfer pumps pump the flow from the EQ basin into the splitter box, and then the aeration basins.

As you can see in these pictures, the EQ basin has considerable solids at the top sort of floating in these basins. That is not ideal. That can impede proper treatment. You'll also notice that the EQ basin's intention is to regulate flow. You'll have I@I events, you'll have storms, you'll have high usage. And sometimes, that can overwhelm a plant's capacity. So the EQ is intended to sort of be a capture point, and then they can regulate the flow that goes through the rest of the Plant because you need proper retention time and treatment.

This Plant, as you'll see in both pictures, the EQ basin is being kept at a very low level. That exposes the tank walls to air,

which promotes corrosion, so it's actually not good for the long-term health of this facility to have that level that low. It would be one thing if you knew a storm was coming and wanted to prepare for that, to pump that tankage down, but for every day operations, this is far from ideal.

1.3

This page, you have the flow splitter box. So like I said, you go from the EQ basin. It should be pumped into this splitter box. Unfortunately, that is not used because essentially, half this Plant is offline. It is not being utilized for its purpose. Again, I would note the deterioration of that structure.

Next, you have the anoxic tank.

So, again, from the perspective of that diagram,
you have two pads, two sides of the Plant to go.
You have an anoxic basin, sort of, to your right
from the catwalk, and to the left, and so this is
an attempt to provide that perspective.

On the left-hand picture, you will see that that anoxic basin or tank is not being utilized for treatment. Currently, that anoxic tank is essentially a holding tank for sludge.

And then on the right-hand side, you will see the

anoxic tank in current operation. Again, a significant amount of solids at the top of that tank, which is not -- would not be representative of ideal -- ideal normal operations.

The course bubble aeration basin. This is, again, on the right-hand side of the Plant. You have essentially a 50,000 gallon and then a 125,000 gallon tankage that was phased for a total of 175,000 gallons for that side of the Plant. It is in active use. You can see some level of bubbles and aeration. However, it is probably not at the design level as will be talked about later.

The picture on the left is the other side of the Plant with the aeration basin. Again, this is not being utilized for treatment. It is functioning as storage and has been used for storage for approximately the past 10 years, the extent of Albermarle environmental's 10-year as contract operator of this system.

Then on the right, you have the internal clarifier. So from the aeration basins, the flow of the Plant is supposed to go to the clarifiers for treatment. The clarifiers are

supposed to function as sort of a settling tank, and there is a sweeping arm both at the top and bottom of that tank that would sweep away solids and push solids through the Plants, so those solids would then be moved to the digester or potentially cycled back through the Plant. That clarifier, again, as you can see, is at a very low level, and that's because it's not operating. The sweep arms don't function, and so under normal circumstances, that tank should be full of liquid waste. And the weirs down there at the bottom of the page, the flow should be going over those weirs into that trough and moved to the next stage of treatment.

1.3

Next page is the external clarifier. So, again, you have that first initial tankage, circular, that has an internal clarifier, and then the other components around it, but then you have a separate tank that is the second or external clarifiers as its referred to. This is just over 31,000 gallons. It also is currently not functioning as intended and has not functioned as intended for sometime now, and has been documented repeatedly by DEQ. Deterioration

of the interior of the tank, again, that level is not high enough for flow to go over the weir and proceed to the next stage of treatment. You have a substantial amount of solids at the top. And while on our site visit, the operator used a device called a Sludge Judge that was dipped into that tankage to take a sample of how much solids or sludge is at the bottom of that tank, and there was nearly three feet of sludge at the bottom of this tank. That again -- any solids at the bottom of a clarifier would be pushed by that bottom sweep arm into the digester.

1.3

Unfortunately, with that not functioning, you're just building up sludge that would eventually have to be pumped out.

I'm going to pause right there, and I just want to sort of connect some dots here with the document that was entered into the record, the Complaint and Motion for Injunctive Relief. You would note on page 28 of that document, which is towards the top, there's an Item 75, and then a heading, "Prayer for relief." And as you go down in that document, Item 2(b)(i) is the repair and replacement of all broken

malfunctioning or otherwise nonoperational mechanical elements of the treatment system, "including but not limited to: 1. clarifiers." As you've seen from the pictures and the description I've given from my account of the inspection, the clarifiers are not functional. The aeration tank -- well, I haven't gotten there yet. So I just wanted to connect that dot, and there are more aspects here that will pull together as we continue through my presentations, but have that handy because we're going to flip back and forth.

1.3

Gear box assembly. I'm going to send you-all for another trip in the documents. You will recall -- number one, there was letters to DEQ in response to NOVs, and then there was a letter submitted by Mr. Hollowell dated May 27th, 2022 that laid out sort of a -- I want to say Mr. Hollowell is a writer of fiction in the genre of fantasy when he talks about what will happen with his Plant, and it's repeated numerous times of this will happen and then it doesn't, and then it strings along both the regulators, his operators, and this community repeatedly.

He refers to sort of a magic part, 1 2 this gear that they spent money, waited for. That's what's pictured here, is the gear box 3 4 assembly, and specifically, sort of that sprocket 5 and cog at the top of the picture on the left. 6 It's our understanding from the operator that 7 that part was delivered, installed. 8 subsequently, this device broke yet again. So, 9 perhaps, for a couple of days at most, the 10 clarifier sweep arm functioned, but --11 Mr. Junis, can I ask you one question. 12 letter you were talking about dated May 27th, 1.3 2022, was that filed with the Chief Clerk on 14 June 14th? 15 Yes, ma'am. 16 Okay. I just wanted to clarify. 17 So I just want to draw that parallel because Α 18 we've seen numerous writings from Mr. Hollowell 19 that say something's going to happen, and then 20 subsequently over time, those things do not end 21 up happening. And I will just note that that 22 letter also goes through a string of events that 23 would supposedly happen within about 30 to 45 24 days. And I would note that this inspection that we went on was July 19th, approximately 50 some-odd days after this letter. None of this had come to fruition. Yes, the gear showed up, but it broke, and would have only gotten one clarifier potentially to semi-function. There was no effort to pump sludge. There was no efforts to move forward with repairs to the filter. No efforts to fix the turbidity meter. All the subsequent actions, there was no progress and no evidence upon the site visit that those things occurred.

All right. Back to the presentation. And I apologize for jumping around, but I think it's important to sort of connect the dots here of what's in the record and the evidence being submitted by the parties.

This is the tertiary filter. So from the clarifiers, that what should be top water, and relatively clear, should go through this tertiary filter with the traveling bridge. It's basically a sand filter. Unfortunately, as you can see in the picture, it has what -- it's sludge, to call it nicely. This whole structure is bypassed. It's not attempted to be used, it

does not function properly, and you will note in the bottom left-hand of the -- the bottom left-hand picture, there are a couple of chemical feed pumps that are supposed to be the chlorine disinfection system. That was not functional when we were on site.

1.3

The next pictures on the left is the bypass piping of the tertiary filter, so that is the back side of the external clarifier where the waste is going, and then you saw was sitting was substantial solids both at the top and bottom of that tankage. So there are pumps set in that external clarifier, and those pump down those lines to some PVC pipe that run along the wall of the building and then enters at the top left of the right-hand picture. If you see those PVC pipes coming in, into that basin, which was formally the UV disinfection basin, but the disinfection system had fallen into disrepair, and the permit was modified to include a chlorine and de-chlor system.

Again, the lines at the bottom right of the right-hand picture is the de-chlor chemical feed not in use, and we were told by the

operator upon the site visit that they were currently using chlorine tabs in that structure. I will tell you it was my account and the account of the DEQ inspectors that we did not visually see any chlorine tabs in that structure, but there was a bucket nearby. Another -- all right. I'm going to continue.

The on-site backup generator, which is pictured in the left-hand side, is not functional. This piece of equipment dating back to the Public Staff's report, that was filed in May of 2013, they had not had a functioning backup generator.

- Q Mr. Junis, can I ask you, was that filed in Docket No. W-1125, Sub 4, the report you're talking about?
- 17 A Yes, ma'am.
- 18 Q Okay.

A That was actually the only noted deficiency at the time by the Public Staff's report. I was not privy to that report. I didn't work on it. I had only recently joined the Public Staff at that time. But I have reviewed that report, and there has been considerable changes in the

circumstances since then.

So why is the generator a problem? If you don't have backup generation, let's say during a storm that has -- now normally, this community is evacuated or is not there during a storm event, but you have to deal with I@I or you are subject to flooding on both the Collection System and the Plant if you do not have power. They don't have backup power, and outages can be weeks, even months long at the Outer Banks, and this has been a known issue for a long time. Another item where Mr. Hollowell has promised action, suggested costs, and nothing's been done.

On the right-hand side is the intended blowers for this Plant. You have a string of three blowers, all of which are supposed to be 3,000 cubic feet per minute. The farthest one does not have a motor. You'll notice a void right there. There's no motor, so that one's not working. The middle one, which it has a number 2 under it, that one was tried to be turned on while we were on-site, and sparks and smoke shot out of it. That one doesn't work, and then the third didn't do anything. That one

doesn't work. The only source of aeration to this site is the tiny little blower on the left which has a capacity of about less than a tenth of just one of the intended blowers on this Plant, and its air flow is being diverted between the EQ basin, which is the intended purpose, and the aeration basin. So, again, you can't get proper treatment without adhering to the approved design components, and so you're just not getting enough air to promote that bacteria and proper treatment.

1.3

The building, in general, was probably in the best condition out of any of the components, and even that would be considered to be in relatively poor condition. You have in the left-hand picture structural damage. That's a horizontal support at the top of the building that has fallen and is just hanging there. That beam is supposed to go straight across just like the rest of them that are subsequently below, and then the roof line is an item that has been repeatedly identified by DEQ, but it's, I would say, the least of priorities in the grand scheme of the issues of this Plant. But, essentially,

they have an open skylight running down the middle of this Plant, so you can understand that's letting in the salt air. That's letting in moisture and rain events, and you're starting to see corrosion in the structural steel at that ridge.

So, at this point, I'm again going to jump back into the injunctive relief just to correlate those items, so page 28 of the exhibits submitted by the HOA. So we've now seen the tertiary filter, Item 2(b)(i)3 not functional, being bypassed. You have the aeration tank blowers, Item 4, not functional. Some are missing. You have the backup generator, not functioning, and probably it won't be -- well, can't be repaired, likely needs to be replaced.

A number of the pumps, the waste return pumps, many are missing or not functioning. Item 2(ii), "Repair the disinfection system." That's a problem. It's not operating, it's not functional given the current layout of the Plant and how it's being bypassed. You have then Item (iii), "Remove solids from clarifiers and sludge holding tank

and dispose of properly." That will likely be hundreds of thousands of dollars just to pump out all of that waste. That is a significant problem.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Now, we will move on to the next pictures. On the left-hand side, you have the five-day upset pond which is a lined three-million gallon structure, and on the right-hand side, you have the storage/infiltration pond which is unlined and over five-million gallons. Here's the problem with this. Currently, despite not meeting effluent limits, despite bypassing the Plant and not having treated wastewater, the flow is not going to the five-day upset pond. The flow is going directly into the unlined infiltration That will lead over time to the pond. accumulation of solids. You are looking at significant leaching of contaminants from the waste.

You also have a pond just on the other side of that line of trees on the right-hand side in a small, sort of, berm.

There's a pond that houses are adjacent to.

There is a tent and kyaks literally on that water when I was there. So there are people using an adjacent pond that is most definitely hydraulically connected to the pond that essentially raw, untreated wastewater is going to. So not only do you have an environmental hazard, you have a potential health hazard here. So, as I said, you bypass the tertiary filter you're sending waste from that external clarifier. You saw the solids, you saw that it was not clear, and that is all going to that storage infiltration pond, and that is all noncompliant with their permit.

1.3

Here's a picture on the left-hand side of the irrigation pump. That is not functional. They are not using the irrigation system, but that is one way to dispose of effluent on this system. You have irrigation piping. This is just some of the irrigation.

That's a drip irrigation system that's around the Plant. It doesn't look like that's getting much moisture. I would say that is an aerate environment, very dry, not utilized. And then the irrigation system throughout the community

that's supposed to cover 16 acres is not functional. Hasn't been used, even according to Mr. Hollowell, for over 12 years. Again, that is not how this system was designed. It's not how it's supposed to work.

or to the DEQ and the DOJ's prayer for relief, you have repair and replace the irrigation pumps and irrigation system, repair and replace the turbidity meter and flow meter, calibrate those.

None of that has been -- has happened. The turbidity meter was reading 3.9, which is supposedly compliant. It has been reading 3.9 from both the operator and DEQ staff for ages, so that is -- it's not compliant. You're not getting an accurate measurement because there's no possible way -- the turbidity would be a magnitude of 10 or more if your getting an accural reading based on the clarity of that wastewater.

The Collection System. So there are two main pump stations on this system. You have Lakeside and Dory. The picture on the left is Lakeside Lift Station. I would note the grease and foreign debris in that pump station.

That can lead to damage or blockage of the lines and/or pumps, and, again, will be counterproductive for the Wastewater Treatment Plant. If you're sending that grease, it's going to build up in the lines. It's going to build up in the Plant. It's going to damage components. It needs to be addressed.

And then also previous to the conversation that we had with the operator, that this system has numerous pump stations on it, and I would just like to reference this is Exhibit A of the Complaint and Motion which is page 32 of the PDF. And if you go all the way to actually page 36 of that document, you will see that this has at least permitted or plan approval 13 simplex pump stations and 32 duplex.

From the operator, most, if not all of those duplex pump stations, only have one pump. That's not compliant. It will lead to reliability issues, and that's why I have this picture on the right-hand side. Those are portable sump pumps that the operators use, so they'll get an alarm or call from homeowners, this pump station's out of service, they don't

have that backup pump in the duplex.

The duplex pump stations, those pumps are supposed to alternate operation as they're kicked on, and that redundancy provides reliability of service. They run out, throw one of these sump pumps in, and make due in the short-term until they can get either that pump repaired or a possible replacement, but fewer and fewer replacements as time has gone on.

 $\ensuremath{\textsc{I}}$ think that concludes the presentations from the inspection.

- Q What did you conclude from the site visit?
- A The Wastewater Treatment Plant and Collection

 System are in very poor condition and have

 suffered from substantial deferred maintenance
 repair and replacement.
- 17 Q So you had reviewed a number of documents,

 18 including what was entered -- what is identified

 19 as HOA Exhibit Number 1. Is that correct?
- 20 A Yes, ma'am.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

- 21 Q What is your opinion regarding the allegations 22 and the relief sought?
- 23 A So I believe the allegations are substantiated 24 and the relief sought is necessary and

appropriate. As we've walked through, those
conditions have not changed and have possibly
worsened since that document was compiled.

- Q In your opinion, does OBKA have the technical, managerial, and financial capacity to become compliant?
- A No. This that has become clear when you contrast the Public Staff report from May, 2013 filed in Docket No. W-1125, Sub 4 to the condition of the system and the Utility's finances now. This is a company that is delinquent on its 2020 annual report, and has shown both leading up to that 2013 report and in subsequent annual reports that we do have of considerable losses.

And Mr. Hollowell, in response to DEQ regarding the NOVs, has consistently said that he does not have the funding. At one point, he said he had funding from elsewhere, but there's been no actual evidence that there has been an influx of funding from elsewhere.

- Q And his correspondence with DEQ, those are exhibits too?
- A Yes, ma'am.

1.3

24 Q What did you conclude regarding your

investigation?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q

A I conclude that a real emergency regarding the provision of adequate safe and reliable sewer utility service exists at Kinnakeet Shores necessitating the appointment of an emergency operator. Both North Carolina General Statutes Section § 62-116(b) and § 62-118(b) define an emergency as "The imminent" -- I'm sorry. As quote "The imminent danger of losing adequate water or sewer utility service or the actual loss thereof."

There has been an actual loss of adequate sewer utility service at Kinnakeet It may not be in the form of that a Shores. customer can flush their toilet that the system still is receiving wastewater, but it is not The wastewater is collected and being treated. pumped into the Wastewater Treatment Plant. It's not properly treated, and has not and would not meet permanent limits for effluent disposal. has determined that the Wastewater Treatment Plant and Collection System are not compliant. What company did you contact regarding their willingness to serve as an emergency operator?

1	A	The Public Staff has discussed the
2		Carolina I'm sorry, has discussed with
3		Carolina Water Service, Inc. of North Carolina,
4		also referred to as CWS NC, their willingness to
5		become the emergency operator of the Kinnakeet
6		Shores Wastewater Treatment Plant and Collection
7		System.
8	Q	How did CWS NC respond regarding the Public

Q How did CWS NC respond regarding the Public Staff's inquiry?

1.3

- A CWS NC has performed preliminary due diligence, is familiar with the Outer Banks system, and has informed the Public Staff it is willing to become emergency operator of the Utility system as soon as reasonably possible, subject to certain conditions that are required to ensure that CWS NC's ratepayers and shareholders do not assume financial responsibility for the situation created by Outer Banks Kinnakeet Associates.
- Q What are the qualifications for CWS NC's to perform the service of emergency operator?
- A CWS NC was appointed emergency operator by Order issued October 1st, 2014 in Docket No. W-408, Sub 9 and is currently serving as emergency operator at the 3 Cross Street Development

Company Water Utility Systems in Ashe County. CWS NC is currently serving as the emergency operator by Order issued January 31, 1997 and September 4th, 1998 in Docket Nos. W-796, Sub 12 for the Hardscrabble Plantation Wastewater Utility System in Durham County and the River Oaks Wastewater Utility System in Wake County. CWS NC has -- was also appointed emergency operator for the Riverbend Estates Water Utility System in Macon County for -- by Order issued May 16th, 2017 in Docket No. W-390, Sub 13, and served as emergency operator until the Commission approved the transfer of the Riverbend Estates Water System to CWS NC by Order issued May 16th, 2019 in Docket No. 3 -- W-354, Sub 358. Furthermore, by Order issued May 4th, 2021 in Docket No. W-1148, Sub 20, CWS NC was appointed as emergency operator of the Mountainaire Water and Wastewater Utility System in Yancey County and is currently serving as emergency operator.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q What is your opinion as to CWS NC's qualifications to provide emergency operator services?

A The Public Staff believes that CWS NC is well-qualified to perform the duties of emergency operator.

1.3

- Q What facilities does CWS NC own and operate in the coastal region?
- A CWS NC owns and operates 10 wastewater treatment plants and collection systems in the coastal region, the closest being the Village of Nags Head which is approximately 40 miles away from the Kinnakeet Shores System.
- Q How much do you think improvements will cost to get this system back into compliance?
- A significant amount. A professionally-managed utility would need to be on-site, operate the system, and triage all major components. The relief sought by DEQ is a good starting point. The hope is that the building and tankage could be rehabilitated, but a significant portion of the mechanical and electrical equipment will need to be replaced. Then there is what lies beneath. For example, there's likely solids in storage. Infiltration pond and irrigation system piping hasn't been used in over a decade.

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

What is your recommendation to the Commission

1		regarding the appointment of CWS NC to service
2		the emergency operator for the OBKA system?
3	А	CWS NC should be appointed emergency operator
4		today and effective as soon as reasonably
5		feasible for CWS NC.
6	Q	To your knowledge, does OBKA have bond posted
7		with the Commission?
8	А	Yes.
9	Q	Do you know how much, approximately?
LO	А	Yes. Approximately \$110,000.
L1	Q	What is your understanding of the statutory
L2		provisions regarding bond and the appointment of
L3		emergency operator?
L 4	А	Just give me one second. I want to refer to that
L 5		section. So G.S. § 62-110.3(d), "The appointment
L 6		of an emergency operator either by the superior
L 7		court in accordance with G.S. § 62-118(b) or by
L 8		the Commission with the consent of the owner or
L 9		operator, operates to forfeit the bond required
20		by this section."
21		So there are sort of two paths.
22		It's G.S. § 62-116(b) where the Commission
23		exercises its authority subject to consent from
24		the Utility, which I think the memorandum filed

by Mr. Hollowell this morning is informative that -- he indicated that it was his intention to recommend that the Commission take that bond to be utilized to make improvements on the system. At that point, he was originally contemplating Currituck Water and Sewer Company. His mind is apparently changed in that memorandum, and he now contemplates a similar action potentially with CWS NC.

1.3

I think it needs to be clarified whether he has truly consented. But if so, that bond money should be immediately taken by the Commission and utilized to offset costs for necessary improvements to re-establish a system's environmental compliance.

- Q Do you have any additional recommendations?
- A I think that it is fully within the Commission's powers under G.S. § 62-310 to issue penalties to this system. They are noncompliant, not only with environmental regulations, which is required under the Commission's rules, but have also strayed in compliance with Commission's orders. They, again, are delinquent on its annual report for 2020, and I think the Commission should fully

exercise those powers to issue penalties.

MS. CULPEPPER: Mr. Junis is available for cross-examination and Commission questions.

CHAIR MITCHELL: All right. Thank you,
Ms Culpepper. Mr. Finley.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. FINLEY:

1.3

Mr. Junis, thank you. The first request of the Home Owners Association, as was read earlier today by Ms. Weston, is that the Commission, as expeditiously as possible, require a comprehensive due diligence investigation into OBKA's suitability to own and operate the Wastewater Treatment and Collection System in compliance with the public interest.

Do you view the investigation that you have conducted recently, the pictures you have taken, and the coordination you've done with the operators, and the environmental regulators, to meet that requirement of comprehensive due diligent investigation?

A I believe that it is a proper due diligence inspection. It depends on your of definition comprehensive. I think it was significant and substantive, but to call it comprehensive,

there's always -- there's more work to be done here. There's significant concerns about ownership and control. There are other questions about their financial viability that could only worsen the situation. But I would say based on our findings, at this point, they are not suitable for ownership and operation of the system.

- And if the Commission were to order right away the appointment of an emergency operator, how soon could that emergency operator move onto the system and start taking over.
- A I can only speculate on that, but in prior discussions, I think within, you know, a week or two that that could be facilitated, possibly sooner, but that conversation needs to be had directly with Carolina Water.
- Q And when the Commission appoints an emergency operator in a situation such as this, assuming that the activities taken are reasonable and prudent, for the most part, the emergency operator is recompensed for whatever expenses and costs are in operating the system as an emergency operator?

```
1
         Yes, sir.
    Α
 2
         All right. Now, Mr. Junis, you mentioned twice
 3
          Public Staff's investigation report in Docket No.
 4
          1125, Sub 4, did you not?
 5
    Α
         Yes, sir.
 6
               MR. FINLEY: May I approach?
 7
               CHAIR MITCHELL:
 8
          I do have a copy.
    Α
 9
         Let me see if I've got it. Is this it?
10
         Yes, sir.
    Α
11
               MR. FINLEY: I'd like to mark this for
12
    identification as Home Owners Association Junis
13
    Cross-Examination Exhibit Number 1. I have the only
14
    copy because I didn't realize I would get anything and
15
    have it introduced.
16
               CHAIR MITCHELL: The document will be
17
    identified as HOA Junis Cross Exhibit 1.
18
                          (WHEREUPON, HOA Junis Cross
19
                          Exhibit 1, is marked for
20
                          identification.)
21
               MR. FINLEY: And those are all the questions
22
    that I have for Mr. Junis, and I would move at the
23
    appropriate time that that exhibit be received into
    evidence.
24
```

1	CHAIR MITCHELL: Hearing no objection,
2	motion is allowed.
3	(WHEREUPON, HOA Junis Cross
4	Exhibit 1, is marked in
5	evidence.)
6	CHAIR MITCHELL: Let me check in with my
7	court reporter. We're doing okay. We'll keep going.
8	Questions from Commissioners. Commissioner Duffley.
9	EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER DUFFLEY:
10	Q Good morning, Mr. Junis.
11	A Good morning.
12	Q I have one question about the storage
13	infiltration pond in your testimony regarding
14	that pond. And what I'd like to know is whether
15	the Washington Regional Office of DEQ has
16	notified the community that is using the pond,
17	that may be connected with this pond, that has
18	non-properly treated waste.
19	A So it's my understanding a conversation was had
20	with the County Health Department. And some
21	efforts in the past have been made to inform that
22	community and to advise them not to use that, but
23	I don't have an authoritative document on hand
24	that can identify the timing and exactly how that

1 was communicated.

1.3

- Q Okay. Thank you.
- A But I would be happy to attempt to find the document and provide it as a late-filed exhibit.
- That would be helpful. If you could reach out to Robert Tankard, Robert Bullock, and Sandra (sic) Toppen to see if there's been official notification to that community. Thank you.

CHAIR MITCHELL: Mr. Hughes.

EXAMINATION BY MR. HUGHES:

- Q Just one really quick clarification. You had mentioned that you had seen a bucket, and I just want to ask if that was a bucket that was labeled chlorine tablets or had chlorine tablets in it?
- A So Mr. Tankard noted the bucket of chlorine tabs.

 I don't believe that he -- I think it was lidded,
 so it was identified as chlorine tabs. I don't
 know if it had any in it. And like I said, we
 did not see any personally in that -- in the UV
 structure, the disinfection chamber.
- Q Okay. You showed in your photos quite a bit of electric equipment: blowers, pumps, that appear to rely on a significant amount of energy if they were operated. Would it be indicative of the

1		operation of the facility in the past if one
2		looked at the electric bill for this facility to
3		see whether those equipment had operated?
4	А	You would likely see a correlation between energy
5		use and the functionality of the Plant,
6		especially those blowers. You know, there's
7		supposed to be actually ventilation fans in that
8		building. There's three well, supposed to be
9		three. One was completely gone and the other two
10		were rusted to the point where they're completely
11		nonfunctional. So, yes, you should see a
12		correlation, especially then with all the pumps,
13		the traveling bridge filter at the time when you
14		had UV disinfection. All of those would be
15		energy users and should correlate to their
16		functionality.
17	Q	Okay. It would be possible to at least infer
18		whether the equipment was ever running.
19	А	(Nods in the affirmative).
20	Q	The last question about the question of adequate
21		service, I think you had made a mention about
22		sort of distinguishing between the service
23		related to at a consumer's premises and then

the entire chain. Would it be your opinion that

24

1		when a consumer pays you know, pays for
2		wastewater service, that that service would
3		include the treatment beyond just essentially
4		simply flushing the toilet and having it go away?
5	А	Yes. I absolutely agree with that, and that's
6		why I concluded that there is a real emergency.
7		That despite, you know, service in the concept of
8		most customers just being flushing a toilet,
9		still existing, that full treatment and
10		comprehensive service does not exist because
11		those customers are customers of this Utility.
12		That by not properly treating, has created
13		significant liabilities and potential future
14		costs that I'm sure they would have the intention
15		of attempting to recover from customers, but we
16		would absolutely oppose.
17	Q	Okay.
18		COMMISSIONER HUGHES: No further questions.
19		CHAIR MITCHELL: Mr. Junis, thank you for
20	your	testimony today.
21	EXAM	INATION BY CHAIR MITCHELL:
22	Q	Is it the opinion of the Public Staff that
23		there's an immediate and pressing need for the
24		Commission to take action here?

A Absolutely.

1.3

- Q Okay. You testified as to your personal experience in investigating and being involved with systems that were in emergency condition.

 Give us your sort of high-level impression of this system relative to other systems you've seen before or investigated before that have been in an emergency condition.
- A So in direct comparison to a wastewater treatment plant, Webb Creek comes to mind, and I would say that this is as bad, if not worse, than Webb Creek. I know we had a brief moment of comedy when I suggested that I had Mr. Grantmyre walk ahead of me at Webb Creek because of the deterioration of the catwalk. There were comparable concerns here just from the safety of the inspectors to be on-site.

While the aluminum grading was in good condition, the structural steel below that, which actually holds it up, had deteriorated significantly. You definitely kind of wanted to watch where you were stepping just in case.

Mr. Tankard actually had an experience where he fell through such walkway and fell into a plant,

so it is a health concern for the operators and inspectors, and, again, condition of the Plant.

Multiple components are not functioning at all.

The Plant is not providing treatment to any significant degree. It's not compliant with its effluent standards. It's not compliant with its permit. Not only the Treatment Plant, but the Collection System too. So this draws parallels. And like I said, it — if I had to do like an item-by-item, it's probably worse than Webb Creek.

- Q Okay. The Commission has a couple of late-filed exhibits it would like to request. First, a copy of the sewer moratorium documentation issued by DEQ, Division of Water Resources, late last year. Second, we want to see --
- 17 A So --

1.3

- 18 Q Go ahead.
- 19 A I hate to interrupt you, but that moratorium
 20 notification is Exhibit K to the Complaint and
 21 Motion for Injunctive Relief.
- Q Perfect. So I'll retract that request then. As noted by Mr. Junis, it's already in the record.
- 24 A You ask and you will receive, Chair.

Q I like it. I like it. Mr. Junis, we're interested in the relevant permits for the treatment facility.

1.3

- A So, again, Exhibit A is the Collection System

 permit, and Exhibit B is the Wastewater Treatment

 and Disposal System renewed permit. That's the

 most recent one, and I am happy to get you

 previous versions, if you so request.
- Q We have -- there's been issue noted by the Commission Staff as to the permit numbers for the Treatment Plant, so let me flip to Exhibit B here. So Exhibit B is permit number 2284, and we have seen reference to permit number 23934. I'd ask Public Staff counsel to investigate permit number WQ0023934. If you-all can figure out what it is, would you please provide it as a late-filed exhibit.

One last request. And, again, this request may be covered by what's already in the record. Outstanding notices of violation issued to the Utility. I see a number of NOVs.

A There are more. There was another one issued. I guess that would have been Wednesday. So an NOV and civil penalty was issued on Wednesday

- regarding their March 2nd inspection. And then
 you would likely expect eventually another NOV
 and possible civil penalty stemming from our
 inspection on Tuesday.
 - Q Okay. To the extent that there are NOVs that have been issued, that remain unaddressed or open matters with the DWR, please provide those as late-filed exhibits, to the extent they're not attached to the document Public Staff introduced as evidence.
- 11 A And you're referring to the HOA Exhibit 1?
- 12 That's right. Yes. Thank you for that Q correction. To be clear, HOA Direct Exhibit 1, 1.3 14 yeah. I'd like to make additional requests for 15 late-filed exhibit. To the extent the Public 16 Staff is able to audit the electric usage at the 17 Wastewater Treatment Plant, we'd like to see 18 analysis of that usage.
- 19 A Any expectation of how far back to go?
- 20 Q As far back as you can go.
- 21 A Okay.

5

6

7

8

9

10

22 Q I don't know what the electric utility will be 23 able to provide. Just one last question for 24 purposes of clarity of the record. Mr. Junis,

1		has the Public Staff had an opportunity to
2		communicate directly with Mr. Hollowell or his
3		attorney or his counsel, to the extent that he
4		has one, about the appointment of CWS NC as
5		emergency operator?
6	А	So previous conversations with Mr. Hollowell
7		directly, and then to my knowledge, conversations
8		between counsel had been that he was not
9		supportive of appointment of emergency operator.
10		Like I said, there seems to be a changing of
11		opinion and facts here with the memorandum filed
12		this morning that indicates otherwise, and that's
13		the only piece in writing, to my knowledge.
14	Q	So is my understanding correct that the Public
15		Staff was unaware that Mr. Hollowell was going to
16		make that communication to the Commission, the
17		communication that appeared in the docket this
18		morning?
19	А	Absolutely unaware. I mean this has been a
20		shifting sand leading up to this hearing of what
21		was going to happen.
22	Q	Okay.
23		CHAIR MITCHELL: Questions on Commission's
24	questions?	

```
1
               MS. CULPEPPER: I don't have any questions.
 2
    We do have a copy of DEQ's compliance inspection
 3
    report for the site visit this week, if you would like
 4
    that. I have copies or we can file it as a late-filed
 5
    exhibit.
 6
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Do you have copies
 7
    available right now?
 8
              MS. CULPEPPER: Yes. Sure.
 9
               CHAIR MITCHELL: If you could, why don't you
10
    go ahead and distribute those, please, ma'am.
11
                            (Handed)
12
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Let's go ahead and mark
13
    this document.
14
              MS. CULPEPPER: I guess I don't really know
    how you want it marked. I don't know if it's --
15
16
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Let's mark it as -- well,
17
    let's just mark it as Junis Direct.
18
              MS. CULPEPPER: Exhibit 2?
19
              CHAIR MITCHELL: Yes. Junis Direct
20
    Exhibit 2. Any objection?
21
                          (No response)
22
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Okay.
23
                          (WHEREUPON, Junis Direct Exhibit
24
                          2, is marked for identification.)
```

1		MR. FINLEY: What is 1?
2		CHAIR MITCHELL: The PowerPoint.
3	BY C	HAIR MITCHELL:
4	Q	Mr. Junis, just looking at this document quickly,
5		it's the compliance inspection report prepared.
6	А	I'm happy to provide some context regarding this
7		document.
8	Q	Let me ask you a few questions just real quick
9		for purposes of the record. So it's an
10		inspection report dated July 19th, 2022 related
11		to permit WQ0002284. Type of inspection was the
12		compliance evaluation.
13	А	Is that the question?
14	Q	No, I don't have the question yet.
15	А	Okay. Sorry.
16	Q	Indicates primary inspector was Robert Tankard.
17		Did you were you present with Mr. Tankard when
18		he conducted this inspection?
19	А	Yes, I was.
20	Q	Okay. And so you observed the same conditions
21		and the same situation at the Plant as
22		Mr. Tankard?
23	А	Yes. I participated in all the conversations
24		amongst Mr. Tankard, Mr. Bullock, and Ms. Toppen,

```
along with David and Michelle Pharr.
 1
 2
          alongside them or right behind them at every
 3
          stage of the inspection.
 4
          And I note on page 2 of 6, down at the bottom,
 5
          second to last paragraph, "Wastewater's being
 6
          pumped into the Wastewater Treatment Plant
 7
          facility and there is no treatment from the
 8
          Plant. Do you see that sentence?
 9
    Α
          Yes.
10
          Do you agree with that observation?
11
    Α
          Yes.
12
          Do you also agree with the following
1.3
          observations: "Effluent will not meet permit
14
          limits"?
15
    Α
          Yes.
16
          That "The irrigation infiltration pond is loaded
    Q
17
          with algae and possibly solids"?
18
    Α
          Yes.
19
          And that "Not sure how long infiltration pond
20
          will work based on effluent going into pond"?
21
    Α
          Yes.
22
    Q
          Okay.
23
    Α
          So just context there regarding the functionality
24
          of an infiltration pond, those solids will
```

```
1
         basically clog or create a layer preventing the
 2
          infiltration of that water into the ground, and
 3
          so then you're going to see continued rising of
 4
          that pond to the point of you either can't keep
 5
          discharging into it or it could end up
 6
          overflowing.
 7
          Okay. Thank you, Mr. Junis.
 8
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Questions, additional
 9
    questions for Mr. Junis?
10
                          (No response)
11
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Any questions on Commission
12
    questions?
13
              MS. CULPEPPER: No questions.
14
               CHAIR MITCHELL: With that, Mr. Junis, you
15
    may step down.
                     We've moved Junis Direct 2 into
16
    evidence.
17
              MS. CULPEPPER: I don't think we've moved 1
18
    or 2.
19
               CHAIR MITCHELL: All right.
                                            I'll take a
20
    motion.
21
               MS. CULPEPPER: I move that Public Staff
22
    Junis Direct Exhibits 1 & 2 be admitted into evidence.
23
               CHAIR MITCHELL: Hearing no objection, the
    motion will be allowed.
24
```

```
(WHEREUPON, Junis Direct Exhibits
 1
 2
                          1 & 2, are marked in evidence.)
 3
               CHAIR MITCHELL: We are -- given that
 4
    Mr. Ain is not here, we will conclude. Before we
 5
    adjourn though, and before I -- I'm not going to call
 6
     for post-hearing filings at this point in time.
 7
    tuned for further order of the Commission. Thank you
    very much, everybody, for your participation today.
 8
 9
    We'll be adjourned. Let's go off the record, please.
10
               (The proceedings were adjourned.)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, TONJA VINES, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the proceedings in the above-captioned matter were taken before me, that I did report in stenographic shorthand the Proceedings set forth herein, and the foregoing pages are a true and correct transcription to the best of my ability.

Tonja Vines