| 1 | STATE OF MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | PREHEARING CONFERENCE | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | November 2, 2001 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | Jefferson City, Missouri Volume 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Staff of the Missouri Public) Service Commission,) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Petitioner,) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 |) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | v.) WC-2002-146) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | St. Louis County Water Company,) doing business as Missouri-) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | American Water Company,) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Respondent.) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | BEFORE: KEVIN A. THOMPSON, Presiding, DEPUTY CHIEF/REGULATORY LAW JUDGE. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | REPORTED BY: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | PATRICIA A. STEWART, RMR, RPR, CSR, CCR ASSOCIATED COURT REPORTERS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | 714 West High Street Post Office Box 1308 JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | UEFFERSON CIII, MIDSOURI 001UZ | | | | | | | | | | | |

ASSOCIATED COURT REPORTERS JEFFERSON CITY * COLUMBIA * ROLLA TOLL FREE - (888) 636-7551

| 1 | (573) 636-7551 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | APPEARANCES: RICHARD T. CIOTTONE, Of Counsel BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | P. O. Box 456 312 East Capitol Avenue | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | AND | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | DAVID P. ABERNATHY, Vice-President, General Counsel and Secretary | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | St. Louis, Missouri 63141-6875 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | FOR: St. Louis County Water Company, d/b/a Missouri-American Water Company. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | ROBERT H. GRANT, Deputy County Counselor Office of County Counselor/St. Louis County | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | County Government Center 41 S. Central | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Clayton, Missouri 63105 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | FOR: St. Louis County. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | RUTH O'NEILL, Legal Counsel | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | P. O. Box 7800 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | FOR: Office of the Public Counsel. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Ton office of the fabric compet. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | KEITH R. KRUEGER, Deputy Counsel P. O. Box 360 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | FOR: Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 1 | Ρ | R | 0 | С | Ε | Ε | D | I | Ν | G | S | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

- 2 (Written Entries Appearances were filed.)
- 3 JUDGE THOMPSON: Good morning. My name is
- 4 Kevin Thompson. I'm the regulatory law judge assigned to
- 5 preside over this matter, which is in the matter of the
- 6 Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission,
- 7 Complainant, versus St. Louis County Water Company,
- 8 Respondent.
- 9 This is Case No. WC-2002-146.
- 10 We'll go ahead and take oral entries of
- 11 appearance at this time, beginning with Staff.
- MR. KRUEGER: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 13 Keith Krueger for the Staff of the Missouri
- 14 Public Service Commission. My address is P. O. Box 360,
- 15 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you.
- 17 Ruth.
- 18 MS. O'NEILL: Ruth O'Neill for Office of the
- 19 Public Counsel. The address is P. O. Box 7800,
- 20 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you.
- 22 Company.
- 23 MR. CIOTTONE: Richard T. Ciottone appearing on
- 24 behalf of Respondent, St. Louis County Water Company. My
- 25 address is 949 East Essex, St. Louis, Missouri 63122.

ASSOCIATED COURT REPORTERS

- 1 My co-counsel is David P. Abernathy. He's
- 2 Vice-President and Corporate Counsel of the Respondent,
- 3 St. Louis County Water Company, d/b/a Missouri-American
- 4 Water Company.
- 5 MR. ABERNATHY: With an address -- a different
- 6 address than him of 535 North New Ballas Road, St. Louis,
- 7 Missouri 63141.
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you.
- 9 MR. GRANT: My name is Robert H. Grant. I'm
- 10 Deputy County Counselor, St. Louis County, Missouri. Our
- 11 address is 41 South Central, Clayton, Missouri 63105.
- We filed a motion to intervene, Judge, which I
- 13 understand has not been ruled on, but we ask that we be
- 14 allowed to intervene.
- 15 JUDGE THOMPSON: Do you know when you filed
- 16 that?
- 17 MR. GRANT: It was, I believe, Wednesday of
- 18 this week.
- 19 JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay. I don't think it's made
- 20 its way into my file yet.
- 21 Does anyone have any objections to the
- 22 intervention application filed by St. Louis County?
- MR. KRUEGER: Staff does not.
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Staff does not.
- 25 Public Counsel?

- 1 MS. O'NEILL: No, Your Honor.
- 2 MR. CIOTTONE: No, Your Honor.
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Hearing no objections, the
- 4 application to intervene of St. Louis County will be
- 5 granted.
- 6 MR. GRANT: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 7 JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you, sir.
- 8 Do the parties have anything to bring to my
- 9 attention at this time?
- MR. CIOTTONE: No, Your Honor.
- MS. O'NEILL: No.
- MR. KRUEGER: No.
- 13 JUDGE THOMPSON: I don't want to keep the
- 14 reporter any longer than necessary, but, Keith, could you
- 15 give me a brief synopsis of exactly what it is that you're
- 16 fighting about in this case?
- MR. KRUEGER: Briefly, a statute was enacted
- 18 authorizing the Company to authorize the collection of
- 19 monies for the purpose of service line repairs, and
- 20 St. Louis County then enacted an ordinance in compliance
- 21 with that. Then the County and the Company made a
- 22 contract attempting to comply with the ordinance and the
- 23 statute.
- 24 It's the Staff's position that the contract --
- 25 the terms of the County contract differ somewhat from the

- 1 terms of the statute and the ordinance, in that the terms
- 2 of the contract would impose this fee upon customers
- 3 rather than upon the owners of the -- of the line.
- 4 JUDGE THOMPSON: I see.
- 5 MR. KRUEGER: That is one issue.
- 6 Another issue is the date at which those --
- 7 those fees started to be collected.
- 8 The Staff believes that it is to be collected
- 9 beginning July 1, and the Company began collecting it on,
- 10 I think, March 1 or March 31.
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay.
- MR. KRUEGER: So those are the main issues.
- 13 JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Krueger.
- Do you want to respond?
- MR. CIOTTONE: Well, Your Honor, that's a
- 16 reasonable characterization, I think, of the Staff's
- 17 position, and it wouldn't serve me to restate what they
- 18 believe.
- 19 The Company's position is that we have filed an
- 20 approved tariff stating what we should do. We are not
- 21 married to the terms of the tariff, and we're perfectly
- 22 willing to discuss some sensible, expedient way to modify
- 23 that in the future.
- 24 We have no desire to aggravate or displease the
- 25 Staff. We have no desire to aggravate or displease

- 1 St. Louis County. We're somewhat -- not somewhat. We are
- 2 intermediaries in this matter, and we simply would like to
- 3 work something out that serves the interests of everyone.
- 4 And to the extent that that's possible, we hope to
- 5 accomplish that today.
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you, sir.
- 7 Public Counsel?
- 8 MS. O'NEILL: I don't have anything to add to
- 9 the previous discussion, Your Honor.
- 10 JUDGE THOMPSON: St. Louis County?
- 11 MR. GRANT: Just briefly, Your Honor.
- 12 I think the only thing that was directed
- 13 towards St. Louis County pertains to the ordinances that
- 14 the County passed. And the County actually passed two
- 15 relevant ordinances in this case.
- 16 One was to actually impose the fee of \$1 per
- 17 customer, or whatever, and that that ordinance was
- 18 effective back in December of 2000 and provided for its
- 19 immediate collection.
- The second ordinance actually provided the
- 21 program by which the water lines would be repaired. It
- 22 did have an effective date of July 1st, 2001.
- 23 But the County's firm position is that the
- 24 collection of the dollar pursuant to the contract with the
- 25 water company was definitely in effect prior to the

- 1 July 1, 2001 date for the implementation of the practice.
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you, sir.
- 3 There is a procedural schedule -- or proposed
- 4 procedural schedule due, I believe, a week from today.
- 5 And most of you are old hands at practice here, so you
- 6 know what it will need to contain.
- 7 It sounds as though there is a reasonable
- 8 possibility of a settlement, perhaps, being reached. In
- 9 that case, you could perhaps just in a week tell me that
- 10 settlement negotiations are going on. Perhaps you'll want
- 11 to push the proposed procedural schedule off if it looks
- 12 like you're going to be able to settle and you don't need
- 13 to start filing testimony and the like.
- 14 Whatever you want to do is fine with me, and
- 15 nice to see you all here today.
- 16 There being nothing further, we will adjourn
- 17 the recorded position of the prehearing conference.
- 18 This room is available to you until
- 19 five o'clock. I hope you will have fruitful discussions
- 20 and make this case go away.
- Thank you.
- 22 WHEREUPON, the recorded portion of the
- 23 Prehearing Conference was concluded.

24

25