1	STATE OF MISSOURI				
2	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION				
3					
4	HEARING				
5	February 7, 2002				
6	Jefferson City, Missouri Volume 2				
7					
8					
9	In the Matter of the Application)				
10	of the City of Pacific, Missouri,) and Public Water Supply District)				
11	No. 3 of Franklin County,) Missouri, for Approval of a) Territorial Agreement Concerning)				
12	Territorial Agreement Concerning) Territory Encompassing Part of) Franklin County, Missouri)				
13	riankin councy, missouri				
14					
15	BEFORE:				
16					
17	BILL HOPKINS, Presiding, SENIOR REGULATORY LAW JUDGE.				
18					
19					
20					
21	REPORTED BY:				
22	KRISTAL R. MURPHY, CSR, RPR, CCR				
23	ASSOCIATED COURT REPORTERS 714 West High Street Post Office Box 1308				
24	JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102 (573) 636-7551				
25	(3/3) 030-/331				

1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	CHARLES BRENT STEWART, Attorney at Law JOHN DOWE MILLER, Attorney at Law
4	Stewart & Keevil 1001 Cherry Street, Suite 302
5	Columbia, Missouri 65201 573.499.0635
6	FOR: City of Pacific, Missouri.
7	Public Water Supply District #3 of Franklin County.
8	M. RUTH O'NEILL, Legal Counsel
9	P.O. Box 7800 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
10	573.751.5559
11	FOR: Office of Public Counsel and the Public
12	VICTORIA KIZITO, Legal Counsel P.O. Box 360
13	Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 573.751.6434
14	FOR: Staff of the Missouri Public Service
15	Commission.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
4	

- 1 PROCEEDINGS
- 2 (Written Entries of Appearance filed.)
- 3 JUDGE HOPKINS: My name is Bill Hopkins, and
- 4 this is an evidentiary hearing on the joint
- 5 application for approval of a water service area
- 6 territorial agreement, Case No. WO-2002-226.
- 7 In the Unanimous Stipulation and Agreement
- 8 that was filed on February 1st, 2002, all of the
- 9 parties stated that the only witness to be called
- 10 would be a person appearing on behalf of Staff. Is
- 11 that still correct?
- 12 (No response.)
- JUDGE HOPKINS: I don't see any
- 14 disagreement.
- MS. O'NEILL: That's correct.
- 16 JUDGE HOPKINS: So I'll let Staff call the
- 17 first and only witness in this proceeding. Go ahead.
- MS. KIZITO: I have three exhibits. I
- 19 haven't had those marked.
- JUDGE HOPKINS: Okay. So you have exhibits
- 21 to be marked. Go ahead and mark them.
- 22 (EXHIBIT NOS. 1 THROUGH 3 WERE MARKED FOR
- 23 IDENTIFICATION.)
- MS. KIZITO: We haven't entered our
- 25 appearances.

- 1 JUDGE HOPKINS: I'm sorry? Go ahead.
- MS. KIZITO: We haven't entered our
- 3 appearances for the record.
- 4 JUDGE HOPKINS: You're going to have to
- 5 speak into the microphone. I can't hear you up here.
- 6 MS. KIZITO: We haven't entered our
- 7 appearances for the record. Would you like us to do
- 8 that first?
- 9 JUDGE HOPKINS: Yes, you can do that. We've
- 10 already had written entries of appearance, but go
- 11 ahead. Go ahead.
- 12 MS. KIZITO: My name is Victoria Kizito.
- 13 I'm here on behalf of the Staff of the Missouri Public
- 14 Service Commission. Our address is P.O. Box 360,
- 15 Jefferson City, Missouri, 65102.
- 16 MS. O'NEILL: Good morning. Ruth O'Neill
- 17 appearing on behalf of the Office of Public Counsel
- 18 and the public, P.O. Box 7800, Jefferson City,
- 19 Missouri, 65102.
- 20 MR. MILLER: Charles Brent Stewart and John
- 21 Dowe Miller with the law firm of Stewart & Keevil,
- 22 LLC. Our address is 1001 Cherry Street, Suite 302,
- 23 Columbia, Missouri, 65201, representing the Joint
- 24 Applicants, City of Pacific, Missouri and Public Water
- 25 Supply District No. 3 of Franklin County.

- JUDGE HOPKINS: All right. Now, you've had
- 2 your exhibits marked, Ms. Kizito?
- 3 MS. KIZITO: Yes.
- 4 JUDGE HOPKINS: And you're ready to call
- 5 your witness?
- 6 MS. KIZITO: Yes, I am.
- 7 (Witness sworn.)
- JUDGE HOPKINS: Thank you.
- 9 Please be seated.
- 10 Now, please state and spell your name for
- 11 the court reporter.
- 12 THE WITNESS: My name is Dale Johansen,
- 13 J-o-h-a-n-s-e-n.
- 14 JUDGE HOPKINS: Go ahead, Ms. Kizito.
- 15 DALE JOHANSEN testified as follows:
- 16 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. KIZITO:
- 17 Q. For whom do you work and in what capacity?
- 18 A. I work for the Missouri Public Service
- 19 Commission, and my position is Manager of the Water
- 20 and Sewer Department in the Utility Operations
- 21 Division.
- Q. And what is your address?
- 23 A. Post Office Box 360, Jefferson City,
- 24 Missouri, 65102.
- Q. How long have you worked for the Commission?

- 1 A. For a total of nearly nineteen-and-a-half
- 2 years, and I've been in my current position for a
- 3 little over six-and-a-half years.
- 4 Q. Have you previously testified in cases
- 5 before this Commission?
- 6 A. Yes, I have. I've testified in several
- 7 cases, including seven previous cases involving the
- 8 approval of territorial agreements.
- 9 Q. I'm now going to hand you what's previously
- 10 been marked as Exhibit No. 1.
- 11 Are you familiar with this document?
- 12 A. Yes, I am.
- 13 Q. And what is it?
- 14 A. This is the Joint Application for Approval
- of a Written Water Service Territorial Agreement,
- 16 which was filed by Public Water Supply District No. 3
- 17 of Franklin County and the City of Pacific, Missouri,
- 18 and that was filed originally on November 9th, 2001.
- 19 Attached to the Joint Application as
- 20 appendix A is a copy of the Territorial Agreement
- 21 between the District and the City which was entered
- 22 into on June 19th, 2001. And also attached to the
- 23 Joint Application as appendix B is a listing of the
- 24 customers that will have their water supplier changed
- 25 as a result of the Agreement.

- 1 And then also attached to the Agreement are
- 2 a legal description of the affected service areas and
- 3 three maps that depict those service areas. And
- 4 regarding these attachments, I would note that the
- 5 legal description is not specifically identified as an
- 6 exhibit, but the maps are identified as Exhibits A, B,
- 7 and C to the Agreement.
- 8 Q. In your capacity as Manager of the
- 9 Commission's Water and Sewer Department, have you had
- 10 an opportunity to review the Joint Application, the
- 11 Territorial Agreement, and the related attachments?
- 12 A. Yes, I have.
- 13 Q. Please briefly describe your review of these
- 14 documents.
- 15 A. First, I conducted an overall review of the
- 16 provisions of the Joint Application, the Territorial
- 17 Agreement, and the attachments to the Agreement.
- 18 Second, I compared the provisions of the Application,
- 19 the Agreement, and the attachments to the statutory
- 20 requirements that apply to water service territorial
- 21 agreements. And, third, I compared the provisions of
- 22 the Application to the requirements of the Commission
- 23 rules that pertain to applications for review and
- 24 approval of territorial agreements.
- Q. Regarding the statutory requirements you

- 1 just referenced, where are those found?
- 2 A. They are found in chapter 247, section 172
- 3 of the Revised Statutes of Missouri.
- 4 Q. Would you please summarize the applicable
- 5 statutory requirements as you understand them?
- 6 A. Certainly. First, the agreement must
- 7 specifically designate the boundaries of the water
- 8 service areas of each service provider subject to the
- 9 agreement. Second, the agreement must specify the
- 10 powers granted by the entities subject to the
- 11 agreement to operate within one another's corporate
- 12 boundaries. Third, the Commission's approval of a
- 13 territorial agreement shall in no way affect or
- 14 diminish the rights and duties of any water service
- 15 supplier that is not a party to the agreement to
- 16 provide service within the boundaries designated in
- 17 the agreement. And, fourth, Commission approval of a
- 18 territorial agreement may come only after an
- 19 evidentiary hearing is held and after the Commission
- 20 determines that approval of the agreement is not
- 21 detrimental to the public interest.
- 22 Q. Regarding the Commission rules that you
- 23 previously mentioned, where are those found?
- 24 A. Those are found in 4 CSR 240-2.060 and
- 25 4 CSR 240-51.010.

- 1 Q. And what are the subjects of these rules?
- 2 A. Section 1 of 4 CSR 240-2.060 contains the
- 3 general requirements that all applications filed with
- 4 the Commission must meet, while section 13 of that
- 5 rule contains the specific requirements that
- 6 applications for Commission review and approval of
- 7 territorial agreements must meet.
- 8 4 CSR 240-51.010 contains the requirements
- 9 regarding the schedule of fees applicable to
- 10 applications for Commission review and approval of
- 11 water service territorial agreements.
- 12 Q. Regarding the statutory requirements that
- 13 you previously mentioned, is it your opinion that the
- 14 Joint Application and the Territorial Agreement
- 15 satisfy those requirements?
- 16 A. Based on my review of the Application, the
- 17 Agreement, and the attachments to the Agreement, it is
- 18 my opinion that the statutory requirements have been
- 19 satisfied for the following reasons: First, the legal
- 20 description and exhibits A, B, and C attached to the
- 21 Agreement designate the boundaries of the water
- 22 service areas of the District and the City; second,
- 23 the Agreement clearly sets out the powers that each
- 24 party to the Agreement grants to the other to operate
- 25 in their respective corporate boundaries; third, the

- 1 Joint Application contains a provision acknowledging
- 2 that the Agreement in no way affects or diminishes the
- 3 rights of any water service provider that is not a
- 4 party to the Agreement to provide service within the
- 5 boundaries designated in the Agreement; and, fourth,
- 6 as a result of these three items and additional items
- 7 I will cover later in this testimony, it is my opinion
- 8 that Commission approval of the Agreement would not be
- 9 detrimental to the public interest.
- 10 Q. Regarding the Commission rules that you
- 11 previously mentioned, is it your opinion that the
- 12 requirements found in those rules have been met in
- 13 this instance?
- 14 A. Based on my review of the Joint Application
- 15 and the fact that the Joint Applicants tendered the
- 16 necessary filing fee at the time they filed the
- 17 Application, it is my opinion that the requirements
- 18 have been met to date.
- 19 Q. Will any existing customers of either the
- 20 District or the City experience a change in their
- 21 water service provider as a result of the Agreement?
- 22 A. Yes, they will. As is noted in the Joint
- 23 Application, 49 customers will have their water
- 24 service supplier changed as a result of the Agreement.
- 25 Also, as is noted in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the

- 1 Stipulation and Agreement that the parties filed in
- 2 this case on February 1, these customers are all
- 3 currently served by the District, and the District
- 4 sent notice of the Territorial Agreement to those
- 5 customers on January 4th. And as I mentioned earlier,
- 6 a listing of the affected customers was attached to
- 7 the Joint Application as appendix B.
- 8 Q. Will the customers that will be affected by
- 9 implementation of the Territorial Agreement experience
- 10 a change in their water service rates?
- 11 A. Yes, they will. However, as is stated in
- 12 the notice that the District sent to the affected
- 13 customers which was attached to the Stipulation and
- 14 Agreement as schedule 1, these customers will see a
- 15 reduction in their water service rates as a result of
- 16 the Agreement.
- 17 Q. Are you aware of any customer inquiries or
- 18 complaints that have been received regarding the Joint
- 19 Application or the Territorial Agreement?
- 20 A. To my knowledge, the Staff has not received
- 21 any contacts of any kind regarding the Joint
- 22 Application or the Territorial Agreement, and I base
- 23 this upon responses to an inquiry that I made of my
- 24 staff and the staff of the Commission's Public
- 25 Information and Education Department regarding

- 1 customer calls or other contacts they may have
- 2 received about the case. Also, had such calls or
- 3 contacts been received by other members of the Staff,
- 4 I'm sure I would have been made aware of those.
- 5 Additionally, Ms. O'Neill of the Office of
- 6 the Public Counsel has informed me that her office
- 7 received two telephone calls in response to the
- 8 District's customer notice and that the comments made
- 9 during those calls were in support of the Agreement.
- 10 Q. Is there anything else you think the
- 11 Commission should consider in reaching its decision on
- 12 whether to approve the Joint Application and the
- 13 Territorial Agreement?
- 14 A. Yes. There are five additional items
- 15 pertaining to the Agreement to which I believe the
- 16 Commission should give positive consideration. First,
- 17 implementation of the Agreement will enable the
- 18 parties to avoid wasteful and costly duplication of
- 19 facilities and services in the areas that are the
- 20 subject of the Agreement. Second, implementation of
- 21 the Agreement will preclude any destructive
- 22 competition that might otherwise arise between the
- 23 parties to the Agreement in the subject service areas.
- 24 Third, implementation of the Agreement will improve
- 25 the ability of the parties to the Agreement to plan

- 1 for future water service and will enable prospective
- 2 customers to know who will provide their service.
- 3 Fourth, implementation of the Agreement will establish
- 4 a method for the parties to amend their service
- 5 territories in the future. And, fifth, I would ask
- 6 the Commission to note that it is my opinion that both
- 7 parties to the Agreement have the ability to provide
- 8 adequate service to the customers in the agreed-upon
- 9 service areas and that they both have adequate system
- 10 capacity to provide service currently and into the
- 11 foreseeable future.
- 12 Q. Okay. I'm now going to hand you what's been
- 13 marked as Exhibit No. 2.
- 14 Are you familiar with that document?
- 15 A. Yes, I am.
- 16 Q. And what is it?
- 17 A. This is the Unanimous Stipulation and
- 18 Agreement that the District, the City, the Commission
- 19 Staff, and the Office of Public Counsel filed in this
- 20 case on February 1, 2002.
- 21 Q. Are you familiar with the terms of the
- 22 Stipulation and Agreement?
- 23 A. Yes, I am.
- Q. Did you participate in the development of
- 25 the Stipulation and Agreement?

- 1 A. Yes, I did.
- 2 Q. And do you recommend that the Commission
- 3 approve this Agreement?
- 4 A. Yes, I do.
- 5 Q. I'm now going to hand you what's previously
- 6 been marked as Exhibit No. 3.
- 7 Are you familiar with that?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Can you identify that for us?
- 10 A. This is a Waiver of Condition that the
- 11 District and City filed in this case on January 31st
- 12 of this year.
- 13 Q. And what does the Waiver of Condition do?
- 14 A. The Waiver of Condition modifies the
- 15 provisions of paragraph 8 of the Territorial Agreement
- 16 pertaining to the date by which the Commission must
- 17 act on the Agreement for it to remain effective.
- 18 Specifically, it changes that date from June 1st,
- 19 2002 -- I'm sorry -- June 1st, 2001 to March 31st,
- 20 2002.
- Q. Do you have anything further to add?
- 22 A. No, I do not.
- Q. Does that conclude your testimony?
- A. Yes, it does.
- 25 MS. KIZITO: Your Honor, I would like to

- 1 offer Exhibits 1, 2, and 3 for acceptance into the
- 2 record, and I also tender the witness for
- 3 cross-examination.
- 4 JUDGE HOPKINS: Any objections to these
- 5 exhibits being entered into evidence?
- 6 MS. O'NEILL: No.
- 7 JUDGE HOPKINS: Hearing no objection, I will
- 8 enter them into evidence.
- 9 (EXHIBIT NOS. 1 THROUGH 3 WERE RECEIVED INTO
- 10 EVIDENCE.)
- JUDGE HOPKINS: And, Mr. Miller or
- 12 Mr. Stewart, do you have any cross-examination
- 13 questions?
- MR. MILLER: No questions.
- JUDGE HOPKINS: Ms. O'Neill?
- MS. O'NEILL: No questions, your Honor.
- JUDGE HOPKINS: Thank you.
- I have a couple of questions, Mr. Johansen,
- 19 and some of this will be repetitive to what you've
- 20 already said, and I apologize for that. I just need
- 21 to clear up a couple little technical things.
- 22 QUESTIONS BY JUDGE HOPKINS:
- Q. The District here, it's principal place of
- 24 business is located at Villa Ridge; is that correct?
- 25 A. I believe so. Let me double check.

- 1 Yes, that's correct.
- Q. And the City, of course, is located in
- 3 Pacific?
- 4 A. Correct.
- 5 Q. This Territorial Agreement, does that
- 5 designate the boundaries of the water service area for
- 7 each of these applicants, for the District and for the
- 8 City?
- 9 A. Yes, it does.
- 10 Q. Are any of these service areas overlapping?
- 11 A. They were previously, and that's basically
- 12 the reason for the Agreement. It designates in those
- 13 areas where they currently overlap who is going to
- 14 serve the customers, and it also designates on a
- 15 going-forward basis for those overlapping areas which
- of the providers is going to provide the service.
- 17 Q. So will there be some overlap after this
- 18 Agreement goes into effect?
- 19 A. Technically, there still -- there is still
- 20 an overlap of the -- of the -- for example, of the
- 21 corporate boundaries of the City and the boundaries of
- 22 the District, but what this Agreement does is, in
- 23 those areas where there is an overlap, it designates
- 24 who is going to provide the service on a going-forward
- 25 basis.

- 1 Q. All right. And I noticed in the Agreement
- 2 that if there is a landowner that has the line running
- 3 through the property, then the landowner can choose
- 4 which provider that he wants; is that correct?
- 5 A. Yes. That's my understanding.
- 6 Q. But you're saying there is no overlap unless
- 7 it's a technical overlap. In other words, there is an
- 8 agreement that would cover any overlap; is that
- 9 correct?
- 10 A. That's my understanding, yes.
- 11 Q. I'm not trying to put words in your mouth.
- 12 A. Right.
- 13 Q. I just want to understand.
- 14 Okay. And this Territorial Agreement sets
- 15 forth the powers granted to the District by the City
- 16 to operate within the corporate boundaries of the
- 17 City; is that correct?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And it also sets forth the powers granted to
- 20 the City to operate within the boundaries of the
- 21 District?
- 22 A. That's correct.
- Q. And you talked about the future. This
- 24 Agreement sets out for future purposes where the
- 25 extensions are required or how those extensions are

- 1 going to be made and provides for each party to
- 2 connect to existing facilities of the other one and to
- 3 purchase water under certain circumstances to serve
- 4 new customers rather than installing new facilities;
- 5 is that true?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. All right. And it's your expert opinion
- 8 that the customers being transferred to the City will
- 9 be served well by the City?
- 10 A. Yes. I believe both providers here are --
- 11 you know, have adequate -- they both have the ability
- 12 to provide good service. They both provide good
- 13 service now. And they also either have the capacity
- 14 necessary to do that or the provisions for
- 15 interconnections and the purchase of wholesale water
- 16 takes care of those things.
- 17 Q. Okay. So you just said that the City was a
- 18 reliable service provider and their existing
- 19 facilities -- the City's existing facilities are
- 20 adequate; is that true?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. And the extension arrangements that are in
- 23 the Territorial Agreement for the purchase and sale of
- 24 water back and forth to one another, this avoids
- 25 duplication; is that true?

- 1 A. That's correct.
- 2 Q. And I'm not sure if you testified to this,
- 3 so let me ask you: Will these customers being
- 4 switched experience a rate decrease or increase?
- 5 A. They will actually experience a decrease in
- 6 rates.
- 7 Q. Okay. And it's your expert opinion that the
- 8 Territorial -- Territorial Agreement is not
- 9 detrimental to the public interest?
- 10 A. That's correct.
- 11 Q. Do you think this Territorial Agreement will
- 12 avoid future duplication of services and undue cost to
- 13 customers?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And do you feel that the Joint Applicants
- 16 are each capable of adequately and safely providing
- 17 the water supply service and maintenance needs of the
- 18 customers in their service areas as designated in the
- 19 proposed Territorial Agreement?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And so the overall effect of the proposed
- 22 Territorial Agreement would not be harmful to
- 23 ratepayers. True or false?
- 24 A. True.
- 25 Q. And that the Territorial Agreement would

- 1 promote efficiency and safety. True or false?
- 2 A. True.
- 3 O. And that the Territorial Agreement would
- 4 reduce customer dissatisfaction?
- 5 A. True.
- 6 JUDGE HOPKINS: Thank you very much.
- 7 Is there any redirect or cross on -- based
- 8 on my questions?
- 9 MR. MILLER: No, your Honor.
- MS. O'NEILL: No, your Honor.
- JUDGE HOPKINS: Or redirect or cross -- or
- 12 recross, whatever.
- 13 Thank you, Mr. Johansen.
- You're excused.
- 15 (Witness excused.)
- JUDGE HOPKINS: Anything else from any other
- 17 party?
- 18 (No response.)
- JUDGE HOPKINS: Thank you very much.
- This hearing is concluded.
- 21 WHEREUPON, the hearing of this case was
- 22 concluded.

23

24

25

1	INDEX					
2						
3	STAFF'S EVIDENCE: DALE JOHANSEN:					
4	Direct Examination by Ms. Kizito Questions by Judge Hopkins		12 22			
5	Quescions by dadge nopkins		22			
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11	EXHIBITS INDEX					
12		Marked	Received			
13	Exhibit No. 1 Joint Application for Approval of a Written Water Service Territorial Agreement	10	22			
15 16	Exhibit No. 2 Unanimous Stipulation and Agreement filed February 1, 2002	10	22			
17	Exhibit No. 3 Waiver of Condition	10	22			
18		-				
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						