FILED
May 1, 2025
INDIANA UTILITY
REGULATORY COMMISSION

STATE OF INDIANA

INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF THE TOWN OF WINFIELD, LAKE COUNTY, INDIANA, FOR APPROVAL OF A REGULATORY ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING A SERVICE TERRITORY FOR THE TOWN'S MUNICIPAL SEWER SYSTEM PURSUANT TO IND. CODE § 8-1.5-6 ET SEQ.

CAUSE NO.: 45992

NOTICE REGARDING PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE

The Town of Winfield, Lake County, Indiana ("Winfield"), by counsel, respectfully submits to the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission ("Commission") its Notice Regarding Procedural Schedule ("Notice"). In support of its Notice, Winfield states the following:

- 1. This Cause was initiated on December 13, 2023, when Winfield filed its Verified Petition. The Cause has now been pending for 505 days.
- 2. The City of Crown Point, Indiana ("Crown Point"), and LBL Development, Inc ("LBL") intervened more than one year ago in April 2024.
- 3. On March 19, 2025, the Commission issue its docket entry establishing an expedited procedural schedule with an initial filing date for Winfield and Crown Point on April 21, 2025.
- 4. Although Crown Point had the opportunity to serve discovery for almost a year, it waited until March 20, 2025, to serve a 108-page data request to Winfield that contained 101 separate requests, including 33 additional questions as subparts (for total of 134 requests).
- 5. Winfield's response was originally due on March 31, 2025, which was 21 days before the Parties' prefiling date.

- 6. In light of the upcoming testimonial deadline, Winfield sought a 30 day extension (to April 30, 2025) from Crown Point, which Crown Point denied. Winfield subsequently filed a formal motion with the IURC seeking a 30 day extension to respond to the data request.
- 7. On April 21, 2025, Winfield prefiled its testimony and exhibits, which responded to a significant portion of the Data Requests.
- 8. On April 30, 2025, Winfield filed its response to Crown Point's the Data Requests. The response included a 35 page written response and hundreds of pages of documents. The response is in addition to the documents provided as part of Winfield's prefiling.
- 9. Crown Point, LBL, and the remaining parties now have almost five weeks to review and analyze the responses before the next round of responsive testimony is due on June 2, 2025.
- 10. Although Crown Point argued in its April 1, 2025 Response to Winfield's Motion for Extension of Time that all procedural dates should be extended by the same amount as the Winfield's requested extension (i.e., 30 days), LBL and Crown Point are now suggesting a 50 day extension of time on grounds that "the discovery has been outstanding for 50 days". Contrary to LBL and Crown Point's representations, the discovery has not been outstanding for 50 days.
- 11. In its March 19, 2025 docket entry, the Commission established an expedited procedural schedule that allowed for 72 days from the initial prefiling through the filing date for rebuttal. The most recent request by LBL and Crown Point would extend this portion of the case alone (i.e., the prefiling of responsive testimony) until July 22, 2025, or 82 days from today. The Commission's March 19, 2025 docket entry only provided 42 days for this portion of the case. Even the requested 50 day extension is greater than the total amount of time the Commission allotted for responsive testimony.

12. The Parties now have almost five weeks to review, analyze, and address these responses in their testimony which is close to the amount of time that the Commission originally provided to the Parties for this portion of the case.

13. As interveners, Crown Point and LBL are prohibited from unduly delaying this proceeding. When considering the expedited procedural schedule and the need have a prompt decision in this Cause, a 50 day extension is excessive and constitutes undue delay.

14. While Winfield is open to a slight delay to accommodate the Parties if and when necessary, 50 days is excessive and should be denied by the Commission.

WHEREFORE, the Town of Winfield, Lake County, Indiana, respectfully request that the Commission maintain the current procedural schedule and grant all other appropriate relief.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christopher Janak, Atty. No. 18499-49

Jacob Antrim, Atty No. 36762-49

BOSE MCKINNEY & EVANS LLP

111 Monument Circle, Suite 2700

Indianapolis, IN 46204

(317) 684-5000 | (317) 684-5173 Fax

 $cjanak@boselaw.com \mid jantrim@boselaw.com$

David M. Austgen, No. 3895-45

AUSTGEN KUIPER JASAITIS P.C.

130 N. Main Street

Crown Point, Indiana 46307

(219) 663-5600 | (219) 662-3519 Fax

Counsel for the Town of Winfield, Indiana

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on May 1, 2025, the foregoing was filed electronically with the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission using the Commission's electronic filing system and was served electronically on the parties below:

Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor PNC Center, Suite 1500 South infomgt@oucc.in.gov dlevay@oucc.in.gov

Robert M. Glennon: robertglennonlaw@gmail.com Mark W. Cooper: attymcooper@indy.rr.com

Steven W. Krohne: steven.krohne@icemiller.com Jennifer L. Schuster: jennifer.schuster@icemiller.com Jack M. Petr: jack.petr@icemiller.com

Brett R. Galvan: brettgalvanlaw@gmail.com

Jonathan Lotton: Jonathan.lotton27@gmail.com

4990240.3