

PAUL S. DEFORD (816) 842-0820 EMAIL: PDEFORD@LATHROPGAGE.COM WWW.LATHROPGAGE.COM

326 E. CAPITOL AVENUE JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65101 (573) 893-4336, FAX (573) 893-5398

April 24, 2002

HAND DELIVERY

Mr. Dale Hardy Roberts Secretary/Chief Regulatory Judge Missouri Public Service Commission P. O. Box 360 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Re: Office of the Public Counsel v Warren County Water and Sewer Company, Case No. WC-2002-155

Dear Secretary Roberts:

Enclosed for filing with the Commission is the following:

Original and eight (8) copies of Surrebuttal Testimony of Gary L. Smith

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Very truly yours,

LATHROP & GAGE L.C.

Paul S. DeFord

Enclosures

cc:

Ruth O'Neill

Office of Public Counsel Office of General Counsel

11969.1

Exhibit No.:	

Issues(s): Introduction & Qualifications;

Meter Reading;

Service Condition; Service Complaints;

Well Inspector; Receivership;

Sale of Company;

Other Options; and

Conclusion

Witness//Type of Exhibit: Smith/Surrebuttal

Sponsoring Party:

Respondent

Case No.:

SC-2002-160

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

GARY L. SMITH

Submitted on Behalf of Warren County Water & Sewer Company and Gary L. Smith

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC COUNSEL v. WARREN COUNTY WATER AND SEWER COMPANY AND GARY L. SMITH

Case No. SC-2002-160, et al.

Table of Contents

Introduction and Qualifications	Page 1
Meter Reading	Page 2
Service Connection	Page 2
Service Complaints	Page 3
Well Inspector	Page 4
Receivership	Page 4
Sale of Company	Page 4
Other Options	Page 5
Conclusion	Page 6

		Issue: Witness: Gary L. Smith Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony Sponsoring Party: WARREN COUNTY WATER AND SEWER Case No.: WC-2002-155, et al. Date: April 23, 2002
1 2 3 4 5	Q.	SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF GARY L. SMITH PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, ADDRESS AND DESCRIBE YOUR WORK
6	i.	RELATIONSHIP WITH RESPECT TO WARREN COUNTY WATER AND
7		SEWER COMPANY.
8	A.	My name is Gary L. Smith and I reside at 1248 Mimosa Court, Forest Hill, Missouri,
9		63348. I am the sole stockholder of Warren County Water & Sewer Company and
10		Warren Lincoln Investments, Inc.
11	Q.	ARE YOU THE SAME GARY L. SMITH THAT CAUSED TO BE FILED IN
12		THIS DOCKET REBUTTAL TESTIMONY ON MARCH 28, 2002?
13	A.	Yes, I am.
14	Q.	MR. SMITH, DO YOU HAVE A RESPONSE TO THE REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
15		OF MR. MERCEIL?
16	Α.	Yes. Mr. Merceil does not really raise any new points and I have no disagreement with
17		most of what he says. However, he continues to reference matters that are not in context,
18		are exaggerated, or, represent half-truths.

Issue:

Exhibit No.:

Q. COULD YOU PROVIDE EXAMPLES OF SUCH ALLEGATIONS OR STATEMENTS?

A.

Yes. The Staff has continually made allegations that meters are routinely not read. However, the Company has available meter worksheets dating back to at least 1993, showing readings each month and, if a meter was not read, an explanation as to why it was not read. On one occasion, the Staff representatives sat in my house making that allegation while I physically possessed and offered the worksheets for their review. To date, they continue to refuse to look at utility records to determine what meters are read and which are not. One Staff member, on one occasion, even accused me of being too lazy to bend over and read the meters when, had he looked at the records, he would have seen that I hire a meter reader and the reader does read outside meters (inside meters are the ones we have trouble on occasion accessing) and, in general, that only 2-5% of the active meters are not read in an average month.

Q. ARE THERE OTHER EXAMPLES OF SUCH ALLEGATIONS OR STATEMENTS?

A. Yes. Staff continues to raise unfounded concerns about connection policies. The Company operates under the same policy that has been in place since utility began operations. Although, in response to Staff complaints, I have asked for written clarification of Staff's recommended policy and also asked that the connection fees be adjusted to reflect the Company's obligations, there has been no written response from Staff. The last request was almost one year ago and, to date, there has been no response to my request for clarification and fee adjustment on this issue. In fact, recently the Staff

1045102v1

confused the situation even more by saying that sewer laterals are not the Company's responsibility. This position was adopted after previously being advised that it was the Company's responsibility to make all road crossings.

Q. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT POSITION WITH REGARD TO CONNECTIONS?

A. Because I can not get a definitive decision on the connection issue, I have decided to sell my non-utility equipment and simply leave it to the customer to make their own service connection arrangements. This is how it has been done since 1983 except that my construction company will no longer be an option available to the customer. I also decided against buying a new boring machine since the utility does not have that responsibility, or at least the connection fees do not cover the cost.

Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENT ABOUT SERVICE COMPLAINTS IN GENERAL?

A. Yes. Incline Village Trustees, for ten years, have jumped on every opportunity to orchestrate complaints and, rather than dispose of them, the Staff simply continues to regurgitate them when the opportunity arises. An objective evaluation of the system by an independent third party would produce, in my opinion, a completely different conclusion. A continued rehashing of old issues is clearly not the solution to anything in this matter.

Q. DO YOU HAVE A RESPONSE TO THE REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF STAFF WITNESS LOETHEN?

A. My experience in dealing with Mr. Loethen has not been positive. For example, Mr. Loethen indicates that he has asked for records of inspections at the well. While I do not recall any such requests, had he made even the most cursory inspection, while he was on site, he would have seen, in plain view, a monthly record sheet in the well house showing the time each day the well was inspected and the daily pumping. In addition, in reviewing Company files, it appears there are 27 monthly reports in the current file. Prior records are in closed files. All of these files and posted record sheets are available to Staff and with even minimal effort could have been reviewed.

Q. HAVE YOU GIVEN FURTHER CONSIDERATION TO THE IDEA OF PUTTING THE COMPANY INTO RECEIVERSHIP?

A. Yes. In light of Mr. Merceil's testimony, I would agree that placing the Company into receivership will not provide a permanent solution to resolve any problems that may exist. Nor do I believe that it would be in the best interest of the utility, its customers or myself, because it would add another layer of expense to utility operations that would somehow need to be recovered.

Q. HAVE YOU FURTHER CONSIDERED THE OPTION OF SELLING THE COMPANY AS SUGGESTED BY MR. MERCEIL?

A. Yes. I have preliminarily talked with a number of people representing different entities about this option. However, in discussing this matter with one potential purchaser, it was disclosed that there had been discussions with both Mr. Merceil and an Incline Village Trustee in which false information was given to the potential purchaser, which would mean that no sale could likely be consummated with the agreement of all current

1045102v1 4

parties in interest. I am, therefore, extremely concerned that under the present circumstances it will be difficult to obtain an arm's length and fair disposition of the Company.

Q. ARE YOU CURRENTLY CONSIDERING, OR EXPLORING, ANY OTHER OPTIONS?

A. Yes. I am considering obtaining protection in Federal Bankruptcy Court in order to accomplish debt restructuring and hopefully allow time to develop a permanent solution that would protect the Utility, its customers and myself. Because the Company has failed, through the informal rate process, to get rates in place which reflect the cost of doing business, there are current outstanding payables in the neighborhood of \$50,000. It would be my hope that these utility debts could be restructured under the supervision of the bankruptcy court while at the same time seeking rate adjustments, perhaps with federal intervention to ensure positive cash flow and the ability to obtain financing for necessary capital improvements. Electing this option may be somewhat complicated and cumbersome, but given the animosity of the respective parties and the dire financial condition of the utility, I nonetheless believe it deserves further serious consideration.

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

A. Yes, it does.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Office of the Public Counsel,) Complainant,)						
v .	Case No. SC-2002-155, et al.					
Warren County Water and Sewer) Company and Gary L. Smith,) Respondents.)						
AFFIDAVIT OF GARY L. SMITH						
STATE OF MISSOURI)						
COUNTY OF WARREN) SS						
I, Gary L. Smith, of lawful age and bein	g first duly sworn, deposes and states:					
1. My name is Gary L. Smith. I a and Sewer Company.	m the sole shareholder of Warren County Water					
2. Attached, hereto and made a testimony consisting of pages 1 through	part hereof for all purposes, is my surrebuttal					
 I hereby swear and affirm that re are true and correct to the best of my knowledge 	by statements contained in the attached testimony a.					
<u>o</u>	RIGINAL SIGNED BY GARY L. SMITH					
Subscribed and swom to me this day of April, 2002.						
	My					
	ptary Public					
My Commission Expires:						
1036709-2						

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
2	
3	I hereby certify that a copy of the above and foregoing was served this 24 th day of
4	April, 2002, upon the following:
5	
6	Ruth O'Neill
7	Office of Public Counsel
8	Governor Office Building
9	Jefferson City, MO 65101
10	
11	Office of General Counsel
12	Missouri Public Service Commission
13	Governor Office Building
14	Jefferson City, MO 65101
15	
16	
17	(Vaul SNO toul
18	Attorney for Warren County Water
19	and Sewer Company