

¹ A “[c]ontested case” means a proceeding before an agency in which legal rights, duties or privileges of specific parties are required by law to be determined after hearing.” Section 536.010.4, RSMo 2016.

receipt of requests for mediation, the 30-day time period shall be tolled while the Commission ascertains whether Staff is also willing to submit to voluntary mediation. If Staff agrees to mediation, the time within which answers are due shall be suspended pending the resolution of mediation. Additional information regarding the mediation process is enclosed. If Staff declines to mediate the dispute, Respondent will be notified in writing that the tolling has ceased and will also be notified of the date by which answers must be filed. That period is usually the remainder of the original 30-day period.

As required by Section 536.067(2)(f), RSMo 2016, the Commission informs the parties that the Commission's provisions governing procedures before the Commission, including provisions relating to discovery, are found at Commission Rule 4 CSR 240-2.090.

THE COMMISSION ORDERS THAT:

1. The Commission's Data Center shall send, by certified mail, a copy of this notice and order and a copy of the complaint to the following:

Attn: Gary Cover
P.O. Box 506
137 West Franklin
Clinton, Missouri 64735

2. Osage Water Company shall file an answer to the complaint or request mediation no later than July 16, 2017. All pleadings (the answer, the notice of satisfaction of complaint, or request for mediation) shall be filed using the Commission's Electronic Filing and Information System or by mail to the Secretary of the Commission.

3. This order shall be effective when issued.



BY THE COMMISSION

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Morris L. Woodruff".

Morris L. Woodruff
Secretary

Kim S. Burton, Senior Regulatory
Law Judge, by delegation of authority
pursuant to Section 386.240, RSMo 2016.

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri,
on this 16th day of June, 2017.

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

The Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission,)	
)	
)	
Complainant,)	
)	<u>Case No. WC-2017-</u>
v.)	
)	<u>Case No. SC-2017-</u>
Osage Water Company)	
Gary V. Cover)	
P.O. Box 506)	
137 West Franklin)	
Clinton, MO 64735,)	
)	
Respondent)	

COMPLAINT

COMES NOW the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission, through the undersigned counsel, and pursuant to Section 386.390 RSMo (2000)¹ and 4 CSR 240-2.070(1), files this Complaint with the Missouri Public Service Commission (“Commission”) against Respondent, Osage Water Company (“Osage” or “Company”), for violation of the Commission’s statutes and rules relating to the filing of annual reports. In support of its Complaint, Staff respectfully states the following:

Introduction

1. This matter concerns Respondent’s failure to timely file its annual reports as required by Section 393.140(6), RSMo and Commission Rules 4 CSR 240-3.335 and 4 CSR 240-3.640.

¹ All statutory references are to RSMo 2000, as currently supplemented.

Parties

2. Complainant is the Staff of the Commission, acting through the Staff Counsel's Office as authorized by Commission Rule 4 CSR 240-2.070(1).

3. Respondent Osage Water Company, a Missouri corporation, was administratively dissolved on September 21, 2016.² Respondent's Official Representative, as listed in EFIS, is Gary V. Cover, P.O. Box 506, 137 West Franklin, Clinton, Missouri 64735. This Commission granted Respondent a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity ("CCN") authorizing the Company to provide water and sewer service to the public for gain WM-89-73. Pursuant to that CCN, Respondent provides water service to approximately 370 customers and sewer service to approximately 386 residential and commercial customers in Camden County, Missouri.

General Allegations

4. Respondent owns, controls and manages water sources and other plant and infrastructure by which it sells water to the public for gain and is therefore a "water corporation" as defined by § 386.020(59), RSMo. Respondent also owns, controls and manages sewer systems, plants or property for the collection, carriage, treatment and disposal of sewage for the public for gain and is therefore a "sewer corporation" as defined by § 386.020(50), RSMO. Respondent is a "public utility" as defined by § 386.020(43), RSMo, and thus is subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission pursuant to § 386.250(3), RSMo.

5. Section 386.390.1, RSMo authorizes the Commission to entertain a complaint "setting forth any act or thing done or omitted to be done by any...public

² According to the Missouri Secretary of State's website, the Company was administratively dissolved on September 21, 2016, for failure to file its annual registration report. On May 25, 2017, the Company filed a change of address with the Missouri Secretary of State's Office, but there is no record of an updated registration report.

utility...in violation, or claimed to be in violation, of any provision of law, or of any rule, or order or decision of the commission.”

6. Section 386.600, RSMo provides, “an action to recover a penalty...under this chapter or to enforce the powers of the commission under this or any other law may be brought in any circuit court in this state in the name of the state of Missouri and shall be commenced and prosecuted to final judgment by the general counsel to the commission.”

Respondent has failed to submit its 2016 Annual Reports

7. Complainant hereby adopts by reference and re-alleges the allegations set out in paragraphs one (1) through six (6) above.

8. Section 393.140(6), RSMo. requires every water corporation and every sewer corporation to file with the Commission an annual report, and Rules 4 CSR 240-3.335(1) and 4 CSR 240-3.640(1) require the annual reports to be filed with the Commission on or before April 15 of each year.

9. On May 10, 2017, Staff mailed a letter to the Company’s Annual Report Representative, Randy Taylor, notifying Respondent that the Commission had not received the Company’s 2016 Annual Reports and that the Respondent would be subject to legal action if the Company did not file its 2016 Annual Reports by May 20, 2017.

10. Respondent did not file its 2016 Annual Reports by May 20, 2017.

11. On May 26, 2017, Staff mailed a letter to the Company’s Official Representative, Gary V. Cover, notifying Respondent that the Commission had

sent the May 10, 2017 letter and that Respondent would be subject to legal action if the Company did not file its 2016 Annual Reports by June 5, 2016.

12. Respondent did not file its 2016 Annual Reports by June 5, 2016.

13. As of the date of this filing, Respondent has failed, omitted, or neglected to file its calendar year 2016 Annual Reports.

14. Section 393.140(6), RSMo. states, “[a]ny such person or corporation which shall neglect to make any such report or which shall fail to correct any such report within the time prescribed by the commission shall be liable to a penalty of one hundred dollars and an additional penalty of one hundred dollars for each day after the prescribed time for which it shall neglect to file or correct the same...”

WHEREFORE, Staff respectfully requests the Commission give notice to the Respondent as required by law and, after the opportunity for hearing, issue an order that finds the Respondent failed, omitted, or neglected to file its Annual Reports for 2016 and authorizes the General Counsel’s Office to bring a penalty action against the respondent in circuit court as provided in Sections 386.600 and 393.140(6), RSMo.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Marcella L Forck

Associate Staff Counsel
Attorney for the Staff of the
Missouri Bar No. 66098

Attorney for the Staff of the
Public Service Commission
P. O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(573) 751-4140 (Telephone)
(573) 751-9265 (Fax)
Marcella.Forck@psc.mo.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that true and correct copies of the foregoing were mailed, electronically mailed, or hand-delivered to all counsel of record this 9th day of June, 2017.

/s/ Marcella L. Forck



Commissioners

DANIEL Y. HALL
Chairman

STEPHEN M. STOLL

WILLIAM P. KENNEY

SCOTT T. RUPP

MAIDA J. COLEMAN

Missouri Public Service Commission

POST OFFICE BOX 360
JEFFERSON CITY MISSOURI 65102
573-751-3234
573-751-1847 (Fax Number)
<http://www.psc.mo.gov>

SHELLEY BRUEGGEMANN
General Counsel

MORRIS WOODRUFF
Secretary

WESS A. HENDERSON
Director of Administration
and Regulatory Policy

CHERLYN D. VOSS
Director of Regulatory Review

KEVIN A. THOMPSON
Chief Staff Counsel

Information Sheet Regarding Mediation of Commission Formal Complaint Cases

Mediation is a process whereby the parties themselves work to resolve their dispute with the aid of a neutral third-party mediator. This process is sometimes referred to as “facilitated negotiation.” The mediator’s role is advisory and although the mediator may offer suggestions, the mediator has no authority to impose a solution nor will the mediator determine who “wins.” Instead, the mediator simply works with both parties to facilitate communications and to attempt to enable the parties to reach an agreement which is mutually agreeable to both the complainant and the respondent.

The mediation process is explicitly a problem-solving one in which neither the parties nor the mediator are bound by the usual constraints such as the rules of evidence or the other formal procedures required in hearings before the Missouri Public Service Commission. The Regulatory Law Judges at the Public Service Commission are trained mediators and this service is offered to parties who have formal complaints pending before the Public Service Commission at no charge. In addition, the assistance of an attorney is not necessary for mediation. In fact, the parties are encouraged not to bring an attorney to the mediation meeting.

The formal complaint process before the Commission invariably results in a determination by which there is a “winner” and a “loser” although the value of winning may well be offset by the cost of attorneys fees and the delays of protracted litigation. Mediation is not only a much quicker process but it also offers the unique opportunity for informal, direct communication between the two parties to the complaint and mediation is far more likely to result in a settlement which, because it was mutually agreed to, pleases both parties. This is traditionally referred to as “win-win” agreement.

The traditional mediator’s role is to (1) help the participants understand the mediation process, (2) facilitate their ability to speak directly to each other, (3) maintain order, (4) clarify misunderstandings, (5) assist in identifying issues, (6) diffuse unrealistic expectations, (7) assist in translating one participant’s perspective or proposal into a form that is more understandable and acceptable to the other participant, (8) assist the

participants with the actual negotiation process, (9) occasionally a mediator may propose a possible solution, and (10) on rare occasions a mediator may encourage a participant to accept a particular solution. The Judge assigned to be the mediator will not be the same Judge assigned to the contested complaint.

In order for the Commission to refer a complaint case to mediation, the parties must both agree to mediate their conflict in good faith. The party filing the complaint must agree to appear and to make a good faith effort to mediate and the utility company against which the complaint has been filed must send a representative who has full authority to settle the complaint case. The essence of mediation stems from the fact that the participants are both genuinely interested in resolving the complaint.

Because mediation thrives in an atmosphere of free and open discussion, all settlement offers and other information which is revealed during mediation is shielded against subsequent disclosure in front of the Missouri Public Service Commission and is considered to be privileged information. The only information which must be disclosed to the Public Service Commission is (a) whether the case has been settled and (b) whether, irrespective of the outcome, the mediation effort was considered to be a worthwhile endeavor. The Commission will not ask what took place during the mediation.

If the dispute is settled at the mediation, the Commission will require a signed release from the complainant in order for the Commission to dismiss the formal complaint case. If the dispute is not resolved through the mediation process, neither party will be prejudiced for having taken part in the mediation and, at that point, the formal complaint case will simply resume its normal course.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "Morris L. Woodruff". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of each word being capitalized and prominent.

Morris L. Woodruff
Secretary

STATE OF MISSOURI

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

I have compared the preceding copy with the original on file in this office and I do hereby certify the same to be a true copy therefrom and the whole thereof.

WITNESS my hand and seal of the Public Service Commission, at Jefferson City, Missouri, this 16th day of June 2017.




Morris L. Woodruff
Secretary

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

June 16, 2017

File/Case No. WC-2017-0331 and SC-2017-0332

**Missouri Public Service
Commission**

Staff Counsel Department
200 Madison Street, Suite 800
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102
staffcounsel@psc.mo.gov

Office of the Public Counsel

Hampton Williams
200 Madison Street, Suite 650
P.O. Box 2230
Jefferson City, MO 65102
opc@psc.mo.gov

Osage Water Company

Legal Department
137 W. Franklin
P.O. Box 506
Clinton, MO 64735

Enclosed find a certified copy of an Order or Notice issued in the above-referenced matter(s).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "Morris L. Woodruff". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of the first and last names being capitalized and prominent.

**Morris L. Woodruff
Secretary**

Recipients listed above with a valid e-mail address will receive electronic service. Recipients without a valid e-mail address will receive paper service.