1	BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2	STATE OF MISSOURI
3	
4	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
5	PRE-HEARING
6	JANUARY 3, 2002
7	Jefferson City, Missouri
8	Volume 1
9	
10	
11	In the Matter of the Application of the City) of Pacific, Missouri, and Public Water Supply)Case No.
12	District No. 3 of Franklin County, Missouri,)WO-2002-226 for Approval of a Territorial Agreement)
13	Concerning Territory Encompassing Part of) Franklin County, Missouri.)
14	
15	
16	BEFORE:
17	BILL HOPKINS, Presiding,
18	SENIOR REGULATORY LAW JUDGE.
19	
20	
21	REPORTED BY:
22	TRACY L. THORPE CAVE, CSR ASSOCIATED COURT REPORTERS
23	
24	
25	

1

573-636-7551 JEFFERSON CITY, MO 573-442-3600 COLUMBIA, MO

1	APPEARANCES
2	BRENT STEWART, Attorney at Law JOHN MILLER, Attorney at Law
3	1001 Cherry Street, Suite 302 Columbia, Missouri 65201-7931
4	573-499-0635 FOR: City of Pacific/PWSD No. 3 of Franklin County
5	MICHAEL DANDINO, Senior Public Counsel
6	RUTH O'NEILL, Legal Counsel P.O. Box 7800
7	Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 573-751-5559
8	FOR: Office of Public Counsel and the Public
9	VICTORIA KIZITO, Associate Counsel P.O. Box 360
10	Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 573-751-6434
11	FOR: Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

- 1 JUDGE HOPKINS: It is 10:00 a.m. on the
- 2 3rd day of January, year 2002 and this is Case
- No. WO-2002-226. Operation of law doubt is Saturday,
- 4 March 9th, 2002 and it is in the matter of the application
- 5 of the City of Pacific, Missouri and Public Water Supply
- 6 District No. 3 of Franklin County, Missouri for approval

of

- 7 a territorial agreement concerning territory encompassing
- 8 part of Franklin County.
- 9 I'm Bill Hopkins, the law judge for you today.
 - 10 And let's have entries of appearances. We'll start over
 - 11 here to my right with Mr. Dandino. Sir, go ahead.
 - MR. DANDINO: Michael Dandino, Office of the
 - 13 Public Counsel. Also entering appearance for Ruth O'Neill
 - 14 with the Office of Public Counsel. Post Office Box 7800,
 - 15 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102, representing the Office of
 - 16 Public Counsel and the public.
 - 17 MR. STEWART: Charles Brent Stewart and
 - 18 John D. Miller of the law firm of Stewart and Keevil, LLC.
 - 19 1001 Cherry Street, Suite 302, Columbia, Missouri 65201.
- 20 Appearing on behalf of joint applicants the City of Pacific,
- 21 Missouri and Public Water Supply District No. 3 of Franklin
 - 22 County, Missouri.
 - JUDGE HOPKINS: Are there any preliminary
 - 24 matters on this? I'm sorry. Go ahead, Ms. Kizito.
 - 25 MS. KIZITO: Victoria Kizito, appearing on

- 1 behalf of the Staff. Also present will be Dale Johannsen of
 - 2 the Staff, but he's in an agenda meeting right now.
- 3 address is Governor Office Building, Suite 800, 200
- Madison
- Street, P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102. 4
- 5 JUDGE HOPKINS: Now I'll ask, are there any
- preliminaries matters?
- 7 MR. STEWART: Judge, I guess I'd just like

to

- 8 ask a question as a preliminary matter. I notice in the
- initial notice that was issued in the case the defender 9

case

- 10 was referenced and the possibility of proceeding without an
 - actual hearing was also referenced. 11
 - 12 It has been my experience in cases of this
 - 13 type that we had in the past gone through at least an
 - 14 abbreviated hearing. And I was just curious if the
 - 15 procedure had changed or if -- I mean, either way is fine
 - 16 with me, but I was just curious if there had been a change
 - in Commission policy. 17
 - 18 JUDGE HOPKINS: I can just tell you what my
 - 19 speculation is. We've had a lot of talk about that very
 - question. And, as you know, some of the statutes are a 20
 - 21 little different on what you must have.
 - 22 And I would suspect that we would do like we
 - 23 have done in the past, have an abbreviated hearing where
 - there's no contest. As you also know, some territorial 24

4

- 1 unless one of the other parties contests it.
- 2 So I would say I would suspect right now

that

- 3 we could have an abbreviated hearing and if the
- 4 Commissioners had any questions, I don't know. I'll let

you

5 all give me a procedural schedule. And I didn't know if

you

- 6 wanted to have a local public hearing, which of course,
- 7 we'll be glad to do or --
- 8 MR. STEWART: Well, I don't think any of the
- 9 parties have talked yet, but that's helpful to know the
- 10 procedure that you prefer when we sit down and talk about
- 11 the schedule.
- 12 JUDGE HOPKINS: That question that you asked,
- 13 we've talked about a lot. And to my knowledge -- if I'm
- 14 wrong, I'd like somebody to educate me. I don't know that
- the courts have ever actually ruled on that.
- MR. STEWART: I don't think they have.
- JUDGE HOPKINS: Because we've tried finding
- 18 cases and couldn't find anything on it.
- 19 MR. STEWART: Not to my knowledge. As far

as

- I know, they haven't.
- JUDGE HOPKINS: But you're right. That
- 22 statute does state that in 247.
- Okay. Any other preliminary matters or any
- 24 unruled motions? We're here to see if we can define the
- 25 issues, which I don't suspect there's really much of a

1 contest of anything since it was a joint application. So Ι 2 guess we want to know basically what your witnesses would 3 be, exhibits would be and how long you think such an abbreviated hearing would take. 4 5 MR. STEWART: Judge, just based on my 6 experience in the past, the way we've done it is the Staff 7 prepares a standard Stipulation and Agreement, which joint 8 applicants review and probably sign. That is offered into 9 evidence at the hearing. 10 The only witness that we've ever called in the 11 past has been a Staff witness who had pre-filed some 12 testimony. And we go to the hearing and he introduces that testimony into evidence and, again, in my experience we're 13 14 in and out in about 20 minutes. So unless there's a problem 15 that I'm unaware of, I would expect that's how we'd proceed 16 here. 17 JUDGE HOPKINS: Okay. All I request is that we can get this wound up, keeping in mind the 9th of March 18 19 is the operation of law date and that's not a whole lot of time. 20 21 MR. DANDINO: Have the 49 customers been 22 notified of the pendency of this? 23 MR. STEWART: Apparently they have not.

24

MR. DANDINO: Okay. I think that's probably

6

	1	maybe a direct mailing to them and telling them to contact
	2	our office or the Staff if they have any objections to it.
	3	That way at the time of the hearing, you know, we'll have
	4	information whether any of the customers object to it or,
in	5	you know, if they don't, we can, you know, so state that
	6	the record too.
	7	JUDGE HOPKINS: All right. I was just
	8	checking the statute for notice provision, but I think
	9	Mr. Dandino has got a real good idea there. Certainly
	10	wouldn't help any I mean, wouldn't hurt anything.
	11	I think you may not be required to do that
just	12	just as a brief just ran down the statute here and I
	13	can't find anything that actually says that, but I think
	14	you'd certainly be helpful to the parties if you did it.
	15	And considering the small number of people that are
	16	involved, it shouldn't be much of a problem.
	17	So we do need the procedural schedule by
you	18	January the 11th, and it would be real helpful to me if
	19	could send an electronic copy of that procedure or have
	20	somebody send it to me, please.
be	21	Any other questions or matters that need to
	22	brought up before we go off the record?
	23	Okay. We'll go off the record and I will be
	24	around all day if you all need to talk to me.
	25	(PRE-HEARING ADJOURNED.)