0001	
2	STATE OF MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
3	
4	
5	
6	
7 8	STAFF OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI
9	VS. NEW FLORENCE TELEPHONE COMPANY
10	Case No. TC-2006-0184
11	Case No. 10-2000-0104
12	
13	
14	
15	DDELIE A DI INC. CONTEDENCE
16	PREHEARING CONFERENCE
17	VOLUME I
18	DECEMBER 15, 2005
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
0002
 1
                         STATE OF MISSOURI
 2
                      PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
 3
                      TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
 4
 5
                        Prehearing Conference
 6
                          December 15, 2005
 7
                      Jefferson City, Missouri
 8
                              Volume 1
 9
10
     Staff of the Public Service Commission
    of the State of Missouri,
11
                                                )
12
               Complainant,
                                                ) Case No.
                                                ) TC-2006-0184
13
     v.
                                                 )
    New Florence Telephone Company,
14
                                                )
                                                 )
15
               Respondent.
16
17
                     STEVEN C. REED, Presiding,
                        REGULATORY LAW JUDGE
18
19
20
    REPORTED BY:
21
   Patricia A. Stewart
    RMR, RPR, CCR
22
    Midwest Litigation Services
     714 West High Street
     Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
23
     (573) 636-7551
24
```

25

1	APPEARANCES:
2	FOR NEW FLORENCE TELEPHONE COMPANY:
3	W. R. England, Attorney at Law Paul A. Boudreau, Attorney at Law
4	Brydon, Swearengen & England 312 East Capitol Avenue
5	Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 (573) 635-7166
6	(373) 033 7100
7	FOR OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC COUNSEL:
8	Michael Dandino, Deputy Public Counsel P. O. Box 2230
9	Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 (573) 751-5559
10	
11	FOR STAFF OF THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION:
12	Nathan Williams, Senior Counsel Dan Joyce, General Counsel
13	-
14	(573) 651-8702
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

- 1 PROCEEDINGS
- 2 RLJ REED: We're here today for a prehearing
- 3 conference in Staff of the Public Service Commission
- 4 versus New Florence Telephone Company, Case
- 5 No. TC-2006-0184. My name is Steve Reed. I'm the
- 6 Regulatory Law Judge assigned to handle this case.
- 7 Let's have entries of appearance, first
- 8 starting with Staff.
- 9 MR. WILLIAMS: Nathan Williams, Senior
- 10 Counsel, and Dana K. Joyce, General Counsel, appearing on
- 11 behalf of the Staff of the Missouri Public Service
- 12 Commission, P. O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri
- 13 65102.
- 14 RLJ REED: Public Counsel.
- 15 MR. DANDINO: Michael Dandino, Office of the
- 16 Public Counsel, Post Office Box 2230, Jefferson City,
- 17 Missouri 65102, representing the Office of Public Counsel
- 18 and the public.
- 19 RLJ REED: Thank you.
- 20 And for New Florence Telephone Company.
- MR. ENGLAND: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 22 Let the record reflect the appearance of
- 23 W. R. England and Paul A. Boudreau of the law firm of
- 24 Brydon, Swearengen and England. Our mailing address is
- 25 Post Office Box 456, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102,

- 1 appearing on behalf of New Florence Telephone Company.
- 2 RLJ REED: Thank you.
- 3 Are there any other appearances? I take it
- 4 there aren't.
- 5 Gentlemen, are there any pending motions
- 6 that are not ruled on?
- 7 MR. WILLIAMS: No.
- 8 RLJ REED: No.
- 9 The purpose of today's hearing is to have a
- 10 prehearing conference in order for the parties to put
- 11 together a procedural schedule.
- 12 I was curious about a couple of things. Has
- 13 discovery in this case already commenced? Has there been
- 14 some discovery?
- MR. WILLIAMS: Not at this point.
- 16 RLJ REED: And I wonder if -- maybe I'll
- 17 leave it to you guys to figure this out, what period of
- 18 time within which you think this will come to hearing.
- 19 Do you have any ideas at this point?
- MR. ENGLAND: My suggestion would be to
- 21 maybe let the parties try to work that out, and if we
- 22 can't, we'll bring it back to you.
- 23 RLJ REED: All right.
- In some complaint cases I understand that
- 25 there is often live testimony, but I think that given

- 1 some of the issues in this case, this will be a case of
- 2 prefiled testimony.
- 3 MR. ENGLAND: That certainly would be
- 4 New Florence's preference, for exactly the reason you
- 5 just mentioned.
- 6 RLJ REED: That's likely what the Commission
- 7 will order in this case.
- 8 MR. WILLIAMS: Staff is of the view that
- 9 there would be quite a bit of live testimony.
- 10 RLJ REED: Ouite a bit of live direct
- 11 testimony?
- MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.
- 13 RLJ REED: I guess if that can't be worked
- 14 out, then I can take that to the Commission to see what
- 15 they want to do with regard to prefiled or live
- 16 testimony.
- 17 MR. WILLIAMS: Unless some agreement is
- 18 reached regarding the use of depositions or some
- 19 depositions that were taken in an investigation matter,
- 20 we anticipate there would be a need to have some
- 21 employees of the Company that provided services to
- 22 New Florence appear.
- 23 RLJ REED: Okay.
- 24 And I think the last thing that I have was
- 25 that -- and maybe this is included in many of the

1	procedural schedules that the Commission enters, but this
2	may be a case where there is some dispositive motions
3	that the Respondent may want to file, and so I would ask
4	that if that is the case, to include that, the time
5	period for that, in the procedural schedule. That would,
6	of course, be a time after depositions or the prefiled
7	testimony is taken.
8	So if that is a consideration, please
9	account for that in the procedural schedule and proposed
10	schedule.
11	All right. Is there anything else?
12	Okay. I think that's it.
13	Off the record.
14	WHEREUPON, the on-the-record portion of the
15	Prehearing Conference was concluded.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	