

Exhibit No.:
Issue(s): *Certificate of Convenience*
Feasibility Analysis
Witness: *Andrew Harris, PE*
Sponsoring Party: *MoPSC Staff*
Type of Exhibit: *Surrebuttal Testimony*
Case No.: *WC-2022-0295*
Date Testimony Prepared: *November 8, 2023*

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

INDUSTRY ANALYSIS DIVISION

WATER, SEWER & STEAM DEPARTMENT

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

ANDREW HARRIS, PE

**Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission,
COMPLAINANT**

v.

**I-70 Mobile City, Inc., d/b/a I-70 Mobile City Park,
RESPONDENT**

CASE NO. WC-2022-0295

Jefferson City, Missouri
November 2023

1 **SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

2 **OF**

3 **ANDREW HARRIS, PE**

4 **Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission,**
5 **COMPLAINANT**

6 **v.**

7 **I-70 Mobile City, Inc., d/b/a I-70 Mobile City Park,**
8 **RESPONDENT**

9 **CASE NO. WC-2022-0295**

10 Q. Please state your name and business address.

11 A. My name is Andrew Harris. My business address is 200 Madison Street,
12 Jefferson City, Missouri, 65201.

13 Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

14 A. I am employed by the Missouri Public Service Commission (“Commission”) as
15 a Senior Professional Engineer in the Water, Sewer, and Steam (“WSS”) Department. I am
16 also an A Certified Water Treatment System Operator, an A Certified Wastewater Treatment
17 System Operator, and a Certified Distribution System Operator III.

18 Q. Are you the same Andrew Harris who filed direct testimony on October 5, 2023
19 in this case?

20 A. Yes

21 Q. What is the purpose of your Surrebuttal testimony?

22 A. The purpose of my Surrebuttal testimony is to respond to the Rebuttal testimony
23 of I-70 Mobile City Park (“MCP”) witness Jennifer Hunt, where Ms. Hunt discusses the initial
24 contact and investigation that Staff undertook of the customer complaint that initiated this

1 matter, as well as to clarify the scope and of the inspection of the I-70 MCP sewer and water
2 systems that was conducted in March 2023.

3 Q. Are there any details of the contact timeline and investigation of the tenant's
4 complaint that are missing or that could use clarification from Ms. Hunt's written Rebuttal
5 testimony?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. What details are not included?

8 A. Ms. Hunt indicates on lines 4-12 of Page 5 of her written Rebuttal testimony that
9 there was a contact gap between an initial Staff email inquiry on April 6, and June 28, 2021,
10 when the questionnaire was received. The reality is that the questionnaire was initially emailed
11 to Ms. Hunt on April 20, 2021, but it received no response. That the questionnaire was received
12 in June is true, but only because it was sent again to the same address two months later in June
13 than in was initially sent in April.

14 Q. Does Staff agree with Ms. Hunt's understanding in lines 12-14 of Page 6 of her
15 written Rebuttal testimony that an investigation of a customer complaint was completed and
16 that claims were determined to be false?

17 A. No.

18 Q. What is it about Ms. Hunt's understanding that Staff disagrees?

19 A. After an initial call with a customer and receipt of electronic copies of water
20 billing and repair documents from the customer, Staff attempted several times but was never
21 able to reach the customer again by phone or email. Therefore, no determination of the

1 customer's claims was completed, and additional information was requested from I-70 MCP
2 through the questionnaire.

3 Q. Was it significant that the customer's claims were not substantiated?

4 A. While information from both customer(s) and utility provider(s) is useful in
5 resolution of challenges with respect to a regulated company's tariff rules and charges, in this
6 situation it was not significant. Where I-70 MCP does not possess a Certificate of Convenience
7 and Necessity ("CCN") from the Commission, it was the answers to the questionnaire that led
8 Staff to investigate and ultimately determine that I-70 MCP is a public utility operating without
9 a CCN.

10 Q. On lines 5-7 of Page 9 of Ms. Hunt's written Rebuttal testimony, she brings up
11 the fact that Staff's Complaint makes no mention of the "safety or quality of the water and/or
12 sewer service at I-70." Did that factor into Staff's decision to bring this action against I-70 MCP
13 in asking the Commission to find that it should be regulated as a water and/or sewer utility
14 under PSC laws and regulations?

15 A. No.

16 Q. Why was this not a factor during Staff's investigation?

17 A. While safe and adequate provision of water and sewer service was considered
18 based on source of water supply and on treatment plant discharge reports filed with Department
19 of Natural Resources ("DNR"), significant safety concerns were not found. Safe and adequate
20 service to include the water distribution system and sewer collection system will be further
21 investigated during a CCN request case.

1 Q. On lines 17-18 of Page 18 of Ms. Hunt’s written Rebuttal testimony, Ms. Hunt
2 states that Staff conducted a “full inspection” of I-70 MCP “as ordered by the Commission.”

3 Does Staff agree with Ms. Hunt’s statement?

4 A. No.

5 Q. What does Staff take exception to in Ms. Hunt’s statement?

6 A. The Commission did not order a “full inspection” as claimed by Ms. Hunt,
7 rather the Commission ordered a rather limited inspection as requested by Staff. Those
8 limitations were specifically set out in the *Order and Judgment* entered by the Cole County
9 Circuit Court and adopted by the Commission in its February 8, 2023 *Order Denying I-70*
10 *MCP’s Motion For a Protective Order*.¹ As discussed in my direct testimony, it took
11 approximately a year to gain access to I-70 MCP facilities. Because access had been denied
12 and a protective order had been sought, Staff requested a limited access inspection in order to
13 facilitate any inspection at all.

14 The limitations Staff requested in order to move this complaint case forward included
15 only observing above-grade system components (no opening of manholes for inspection of
16 sewer condition) and strictly limited photographs that might illustrate the number of very
17 long-term rental units versus “tires-on” temporary mobile recreational units that might possibly
18 carry self-contained water. I-70 MCP’s primary contribution to further ensure a limited
19 inspection was the denial of access to the lagoon treatment plant by qualified wastewater
20 treatment staff not employed by DNR.

¹ Schedule AH-s1: *Order Denying I-70 Mobile City Park’s Motion for a Protective Order* entered on February 8, 2023 in file no. WC-2022-0295 and *Order and Judgment* entered by the Circuit Court of Cole County, Missouri on January 29, 2023.

1 Q. Had Staff always requested a limited inspection of the I-70 MCP property?

2 A. Yes. As Staff became increasingly aware that I-70 MCP likely not only owned
3 and operated a water distribution system, but also a wastewater collection and treatment system,
4 the primary focus of the inspection was to field verify and confirm that I-70 MCP is operating
5 as a water corporation, a sewer corporation and a public utility. From Staff's first formal
6 discovery request, *Complainant's Request for Permission for Entry Upon Land for Inspection*
7 (EFIS filing #13 dated 6/3/22)², a request for greater scope has not been made. Additional
8 inspections will follow during a CCN request case.

9 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

10 A. Yes it does.

² Schedule AH-s2: Claimant's *Request for Permission for Entry Upon Land for Inspection*, filed on June 3, 2022 in case WC-2022-0295.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

The Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission,)	
)	Case No. WC-2022-0295
Complainant)	
)	
v.)	
)	
I-70 Mobile City, Inc. d/b/a I-70 Mobile City Park,)	
)	
Respondent)	

AFFIDAVIT OF ANDREW HARRIS, PE

STATE OF MISSOURI)	
)	ss.
COUNTY OF COLE)	

COMES NOW ANDREW HARRIS, PE and on his oath declares that he is of sound mind and lawful age; that he contributed to the foregoing *Surrebuttal Testimony of Andrew Harris, PE*; and that the same is true and correct according to his best knowledge and belief.

Further the Affiant sayeth not.



ANDREW HARRIS, PE

JURAT

Subscribed and sworn before me, a duly constituted and authorized Notary Public, in and for the County of Cole, State of Missouri, at my office in Jefferson City, on this 17th day of November 2023.

D. SUZIE MANKIN Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri Commissioned for Cole County My Commission Expires: April 04, 2025 Commission Number: 12412070



Notary Public

**STATE OF MISSOURI
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

At a session of the Public Service Commission held at its office in Jefferson City on the 8th day of February, 2023.

The Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission,
Complainant,
v.
I-70 Mobile City, Inc. d/b/a I-70 Mobile City Park.
Respondent.

File No. WC-2022-0295

**ORDER DENYING I-70 MOBILE CITY PARK'S MOTION FOR A
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Issue Date: February 8, 2023

Effective Date: February 8, 2023

On April 22, 2022, the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission (Staff) filed a complaint against I-70 Mobile City, Inc. d/b/a I-70 Mobile City Park, alleging that it is providing water and sewer services for gain without Commission authorization. Staff and I-70 Mobile City Park were unable to resolve a discovery dispute at a June 30, 2022, discovery conference concerning Staff's request to enter onto I-70 Mobile City Park's premises to conduct an inspection of the water and sewer system. Staff filed a motion to compel discovery on July 8, 2022, which the Commission granted on July 27, 2022. On September 9, 2022, the Commission directed its General Counsel to seek enforcement of the Commission's July 27, 2022 order.

On November 13, 2022, I-70 Mobile City Park filed a motion for summary determination, which is currently stayed pending resolution of the action in Circuit Court to enforce the Commission's order to allow entry on land. Subsequently, on

December 8, 2022, I-70 Mobile City Park filed a *Motion for Protective Order* that asks the Commission to issue an order staying discovery until its motion for summary determination has been ruled upon.

I-70 Mobile City Park filed its *Motion for Protective Order* pursuant to Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 56.01(c), which provides that a protective order may prevent or limit discovery. In support of its motion I-70 Mobile City Park states that it has filed a motion for summary determination for the Commission to determine whether it has jurisdiction in this complaint. I-70 Mobile City Park's motion further indicates that Staff could get some of its discovery from the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, and implies that Staff is conducting discovery with the purpose of vexing or harassing I-70 Mobile City Park.

On December 13, 2022, Staff filed a response to I-70 Mobile City Park's *Motion for Protective Order*. Staff states that I-70 Mobile City Park's motion questions whether Respondent I-70 Mobile City Park is a public utility requiring the Commission's regulation. Staff response further states that "In order to answer the questions at the heart of this case, facts need to be examined and discovery needs to be completed." Staff indicates that by physically examining the water and sewer system it can determine to what extent I-70 Mobile City Park is providing service and whether that service is safe and adequate.

On January 29, 2023, the Circuit Court of Cole County, Missouri, issued its *Order and Judgment* enforcing the Commission's July 27, 2022, *Order Granting Staff's Motion to Compel and Denying Respondent's Request for a Protective Order*.¹ That Commission order compelled I-70 Mobile City Park to allow Staff entry onto its property to perform an

¹ I-70 Mobile City Park previously requested a protective order on June 13, 2022, which was denied in the Commission's July 27, 2022, *Order Granting Staff's Motion to Compel and Denying Respondent's Request for a Protective Order*.

inspection. The Circuit Court's *Order and Judgment* notes that I-70 Mobile City Park argued that Staff should not be allowed to inspect I-70 Mobile City Park's property until the Commission determines it has jurisdiction over I-70 Mobile City Park in this complaint case. The *Order and Judgment* analyzes the jurisdictional issue, in part, as follows:

"Respondent² argues that Staff should not be permitted to inspect Respondent's property until the Commission first determines whether it has jurisdiction over Respondent in the underlying case. But the Commission's jurisdiction over Respondent is precisely the contested issue in the underlying Staff Complaint case, and Staff's Request is reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence that will assist the Commission in deciding the jurisdictional issues before it. Parties before the Commission must have access to reasonable discovery so they can present a complete, accurate and detailed record to the Commission to aid its determination of such jurisdictional issues."


The Commission concurs with Staff and the Cole County, Missouri, Circuit Court's analysis. I-70 Mobile City Park appears to be asking the Commission to determine its jurisdiction with one hand, while seeking to prevent the Commission from having the means to determine its jurisdiction with the other hand. I-70 Mobile City Park's *Motion for Protective Order* seeks to prevent Staff from conducting discovery necessary to respond to I-70 Mobile City Park's motion for summary determination. The Commission again finds that Staff's discovery requests are appropriate and reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and comply with the requirements of Missouri Rule of

² I-70 Mobile City Park.

Civil Procedure 56.01(a) and (b). The Commission does not find that Staff's discovery requests are for the purpose of harassing, vexing, or embarrassing I-70 Mobile City Park. The Commission will deny I-70 Mobile City Park's second request for a protective order.

THE COMMISSION ORDERS THAT:

1. I-70 Mobile City Park's December 8, 2022, *Motion for Protective Order* is denied.
2. 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

Rupp, Chm., Coleman, Holsman, and
Kolkmeier CC., concur.


Clark, Senior Regulatory Law Judge

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 2nd day of March, 2023.



Nancy Dippell
Secretary

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

February 8, 2023

File/Case No. WC-2022-0295

**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
Marc Poston
200 Madison Street, Suite 650
P.O. Box 2230
Jefferson City, MO 65102
opcservice@opc.mo.gov


I-70 Mobile City Park
Stephanie S Bell
308 East High Street, Suite 300
Jefferson City, MO 65101
sbell@ellingerlaw.com

I-70 Mobile City Park
Marc H Ellinger
308 E. High Street, Ste. 300
Jefferson City, MO 65101
mellinger@ellingerlaw.com

**Missouri Public Service
Commission**
Carolyn Kerr
200 Madison Street, Suite 800
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102
Carolyn.Kerr@psc.mo.gov

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

Sincerely,



**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.

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COLE COUNTY
STATE OF MISSOURI**

Public Service Commission)
of the State of Missouri,)
)
Petitioner,)
)
v.)
)
I-70 Mobile City, Inc.)
d/b/a I-70 Mobile City Park,)
)
Respondent.)

Case No. 22AC-CC05836

ORDER AND JUDGMENT

Findings of Fact

1. On April 22, 2022, the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission (Staff) filed *Staff's Complaint* (Complaint) against Respondent I-70 Mobile City, Inc. d/b/a I-70 Mobile City Park (Mobile City or Respondent) before the Commission pursuant to Section 386.390, RSMo (Cum. Supp. 2018). (Complaint, Petitioner's Hearing Ex. C).

2. Staff's Complaint alleged that Respondent Mobile City is operating as a "sewer corporation" pursuant to Section 386.020(49), RSMo, a "water corporation" pursuant to Section 386.020(59), and a "public utility" pursuant to Section 386.020(43), RSMo (Cum. Supp. 2019) without the required certification or other authority from the Commission in violation of Section 393.170, RSMo (Cum. Supp. 2018). (Complaint, Pet. Hearing Ex. C).

3. In its *Answer and Affirmative Defenses of I-70 Mobile City, Inc.* filed to the Commission, Respondent denied that it is a “water corporation,” a “sewer corporation,” or a “public utility” subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission. (Respondent Ex. I, Pgph. C).

4. On June 3, 2022, Staff served *Complainant’s Request For Permission For Entry Upon Land For Inspection* (Request) upon Respondent pursuant to Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 58.01(a)(2). (Request, Pet. Hearing Ex. C).

5. Staff’s Request enumerated six inspection requests:

1. The I-70 Mobile City Wastewater Treatment Facility and lagoon, as more fully described in the Missouri State Operating Permit issued by the Department of Natural Resources to I-70 MHP and included as Attachment A to the Complaint.

2. Water service connections that are visible.

3. Sewer service connections that are visible.

4. A representative number of water meters located in I-70 Mobile City (approximately 20 percent) plus the master meter to I-70 MHP.

5. System appurtenances that are at or above grade, including access to any structures containing systems-related components.

6. Photographs of the above-listed locations. (Request, Pet. Hearing Ex. C).

6. Staff requested permission to enter Mobile City’s business premises beginning at 11:00 a.m. on July 6, 2022, for the purpose of inspecting, measuring, surveying, photographing, testing or sampling designated property within the scope of Rule 56.01(b). (Request, Pet. Hearing Ex. C).

7. Respondent objected to Staff's Request on June 13, 2022. (Docket Sheet, Pet. Hearing Ex. C).

8. At Respondent's request, the Commission's Regulatory Law Judge assigned to the Complaint case held a discovery conference between the parties on June 30, 2022. (Pet. Hearing Ex. A).

9. On July 8, 2022, Staff filed a *Motion to Compel Discovery* (Motion). (Motion, Pet. Hearing Ex. C).

10. In its Motion, Staff explained that a Staff attorney contacted Mobile City and inquired about a site visit to Mobile City's property on a voluntary basis prior to filing formal discovery. (Motion, Pet. Hearing Ex. C).

11. In response to that inquiry, Staff's attorney received an email from Mobile City's attorney, stating "my client does not consent to a 'site visit,' although I understand you are permitted under discovery rules to seek Entry Upon Land for Inspection. I'm happy to discuss via phone." (Motion, Pet. Hearing Ex. C).

12. Staff's Motion included an affidavit from Staff Engineer Andrew Harris, stating that the scope of the photographs to be taken will be to capture images of the assets with enough background to demonstrate the location of the assets, to document the water and/or sewer service connections provided to residents of Mobile City, to document the condition and quality of the equipment used for provision of safe water and/or sewer service, and to examine the discharge from the wastewater treatment system and document any visible impacts on human health and the environment. Harris stated

Staff does not intend to enter, inspect or take photographs of Respondent's business office or any of the residents' homes. (Motion, Pet. Hearing Ex. C).

13. On July 27, 2022, the Public Service Commission issued its *Order Granting Staff's Motion To Compel and Denying Respondent's Request For A Protective Order* (Order). (Pet. Hearing Ex. A).

14. In its Order, the Commission found that Staff seeks information related to the physical structure and layout of the water and sewer systems in order to understand how the systems are set up and how they operate. (Pet. Hearing Ex. A).

15. The Commission's Order found that the information listed in Staff's Request is relevant to the Complaint because the Request could establish what real estate, fixtures and personal property Respondent owns, operates, controls or manages, and how Respondent actually uses this property to provide water and sewer services. (Pet. Hearing Ex. A).

16. The Commission found that the information sought in Staff's Request is likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence because it involves the physical structure of the water and sewer systems. (Pet. Hearing Exhibit A).

17. The Commission found that the issue raised in Staff's Complaint is of utmost importance in determining whether an entity should be regulated by the Commission for the provision of safe and adequate service. (Pet. Hearing Ex. A).

18. The Commission found that the discovery was not cumulative or duplicative because the only way Staff can ascertain that Respondent is providing the

services as it professes is by physically examining the water and sewer systems. (Pet. Hearing Exhibit A).

19. Further, the Commission found that Staff's Request would not impose an unreasonable burden upon Respondent because the water and sewer systems occupy a large physical presence, and Staff expressed no desire to enter any residence or disrupt the daily operations of Respondent. (Pet. Hearing Ex. A).

20. In response to Respondent's assertion that it would be burdened because its president resides out of state and desires to be present for any in-person inspection, the Commission found that is a preference of Respondent's president and not a requirement for an in-person inspection. The Commission found that someone manages day-to-day operations and manages the property in the president's absence, so that person should be available to show Staff the water and sewer system. (Pet. Hearing Exhibit A).

21. The Commission found that Staff's request was not made for the purpose of vexing or harassing Respondent. (Pet. Hearing Exhibit A).

22. Based on these findings and conclusions, the Commission's July 27 Order granted Staff's *Motion to Compel*, denied Respondent's motion for a protective order, and directed Respondent to provide Staff access to the property for the purpose of inspecting the water and sewer system and taking photographs of the systems. (Pet. Hearing Exhibit A).

23. On September 14, 2022, the Commission issued its *Order Directing The Commission's General Counsel To Seek Enforcement of the Commission's Order In Circuit Court*, noting that Respondent has refused to comply with the Commission's

Order, and as provided by statute that Order may only be enforced by action of the circuit court. (Pet. Hearing Ex. B).

24. Staff's Complaint against Respondent Mobile City remains pending before the Commission in Commission Docket No. WC-2022-0295. (WC-2022-0295 Docket Sheet, Pet. Hearing Exhibit C).

25. No testimony has been filed in WC-2022-0295 and the Commission has not held a hearing on Staff's Complaint. (Docket Sheet, Pet. Hearing Ex. C).

Conclusions of Law

26. Pursuant to Section 536.073.2, RSMo (2016), this Court has jurisdiction to enforce an administrative order requiring a party in an administrative agency proceeding to permit entrance upon land and inspection of property for purposes of discovery.

Section 536.073.2, RSMo states in relevant part:

Except as otherwise provided by law, no agency discovery order which:

...

(2) Permits entrance upon land or inspection of property without permission of the owner...

... shall be enforceable except upon order of the circuit court of the county in which the hearing will be held or the circuit court of Cole County at the option of the person seeking enforcement, after notice and hearing.

27. Under Section 536.073.2, the circuit court considers only the "limited issue" of the enforceability of an administrative agency discovery order. *Mo. Dept. of Pub. Safety v. Troupe*, 555 S.W.3d 475, 478 (Mo. Ct. App. W.D. 2018).

28. Therefore, this Court need only determine whether or not the Commission's Order is enforceable.

29. Commission Rule 20 CSR 4240-2.090(1) provides that discovery before the Commission "...may be obtained by the same means and under the same conditions as in civil actions in the circuit court."

30. Section 386.020(49), RSMo (Cum. Supp. 2019) defines "sewer corporation" as including "every corporation, company, association, joint stock company or association, partnership or person, their lessees, trustees or receivers appointed by any court, owning, operating, controlling or managing any sewer system, plant or property, for the collection, carriage, treatment, or disposal of sewage anywhere within the state for gain, except that the term shall not include sewer systems with fewer than twenty-five outlets..."

31. Section 386.020(50), RSMo defines "sewer system" as including "all pipes, pumps, canals, lagoons, plants, structures and appliances, and all other real estate, fixtures and personal property, owned, operated, controlled or managed in connection with or to facilitate the collection, carriage, treatment and disposal of sewage for municipal, domestic or other beneficial or necessary purpose..."

32. Section 386.020(59), RSMo defines "water corporation" as including "every corporation, company, association, joint stock company or association, partnership and person, their lessees, trustees, or receivers appointed by any court whatsoever, owning, operating, controlling or managing any plant or property, dam or

water supply, canal, or power station, distributing or selling for distribution, or selling or supplying for gain any water...”

33. Section 386.020(60), RSMo defines a “water system” as including “all reservoirs, tunnels, shafts, dams, dikes, headgates, pipes, flumes, canals, structures and appliances, and all other real estate, fixtures and personal property, owned, operated, controlled or managed in connection with or to facilitate the diversion, development, storage, supply, distribution, sale, furnishing or carriage of water for municipal, domestic or other beneficial use.”

34. Pursuant to Section 386.020(43), RSMo, every water corporation and sewer corporation as defined in Section 386.020 is a “public utility” that shall be subject to the jurisdiction, control and regulation of the Commission and to the provisions of Chapters 386 and 393.

35. In determining whether a corporation is or is not a public utility, the important thing is “what it actually does.” *State ex rel. M.O. Danciger & Co. v. Pub. Serv. Comm’n. of Mo.*, 205 S.W. 36, 39 (Mo. 1918).

36. The Public Service Commission has exclusive jurisdiction over all public utility corporations, including all water corporations and all sewer corporations within Missouri. Sections 386.250, RSMo (2016); 386.020(43), (49), (59), RSMo.

37. Matters within the primary jurisdiction of the Commission are to be decided by the Commission in the first instance, and not by the courts. *State ex rel. Taylor v. Nangle*, 227 S.W.2d 655, 657 (Mo.banc 1950).

38. The Commission has the duty to determine, in the first instance, whether an entity alleged to be offering utility service unlawfully is a public utility subject to its jurisdiction. *State v. Carroll*, 620 S.W.2d 22, 24 (Mo. Ct. App. S.D. 1981); *State ex rel. & to Use of Cirese v. Ridge*, 138 S.W.2d 1012, 1014-15 (Mo.banc 1940); *State ex rel. & to Use of Kansas City Power & Light Co. v. Buzard*, 168 S.W.2d 1044, 1046 (Mo.banc 1943).

39. Section 386.510, RSMo (Cum. Supp. 2019) provides:

No court in this state, except the supreme court or the court of appeals, shall have jurisdiction or authority to review, reverse, correct or annul any order or decision of the commission or to suspend or delay the executing or operation thereof, or to enjoin, restrain or interfere with the commission in the performance of its official duties.

40. Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 56.01(a) provides that parties may obtain discovery by, among other things, seeking permission to enter upon land or other property, for inspection and other purposes.

41. Missouri Rule 56.01(b)(1) provides:

“[p]arties may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action... provided the discovery is proportional to the needs of the case considering the totality of the circumstances, including but not limited to, the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in controversy, the parties’ relative access to relevant information, the parties’ resources, the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues, and whether the burden or expenses of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit.”

42. Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 58.01(a)(2) permits any party to serve on any other party a request to “[p]ermit entry upon designated land or other property in the possession or control of the party upon whom the request is served for the purpose of

inspection and measuring, surveying, and photographing, testing, or sampling the property or any designated object or operation thereon, within the scope of Rule 56.01(b).”

43. Rule 58.01(b)(1) provides that, in consecutively numbered paragraphs, the request shall “[s]et forth with reasonable particularity each item or category of items to be inspected” and “[s]pecify a reasonable time, place, and manner of making the inspection and performing the related acts...”

Analysis

The issue in this case under Section 536.073.2, RSMo is the enforceability of the Commission’s July 27, 2022, Order directing Respondent to permit an inspection of its water and sewer facilities by the Commission’s Staff for purposes of discovery in Staff’s administrative Complaint against Respondent now pending before the Commission.

Respondent has filed a Motion To Stay this case unless and until the Commission rules on a motion for summary determination that Respondent has filed to the Commission. However, Section 386.510, RSMo prohibits this Court from interfering with the Commission in the performance of its official duties. The Commission is authorized to decide the merits of Staff’s Complaint, and this Court cannot interfere with that duty by instructing the Commission how to proceed in that underlying case. The Court’s authority under Section 536.073.2 pertains only to the enforceability of the Commission’s discovery Order. The Court will decide this discovery matter on the merits of the Commission’s *Petition* so that the underlying matter before the Commission may proceed. Respondent’s Motion for Stay is overruled.

This Court finds Staff's Request complies with the form and contents required by Rule 58.01. The Court finds Staff's Request and the Commission's Order is within the scope of Rule 56.01 because the Commission Staff's Complaint against Respondent Mobile City pending before the Commission alleges that Respondent is operating as a "water corporation," a "sewer corporation" and a "public utility" as defined in Section 386.020, RSMo without a certificate or other authority from the Commission as required by Section 393.170, RSMo. Respondent denies it meets those statutory definitions. Thus, Staff's underlying Complaint creates a controversy regarding the water and sewer facilities that Respondent owns and operates, how Respondent uses those facilities to provide water and sewer service to its tenants, and whether Respondent's use of those facilities meets the statutory definition of "public utility." The Staff inspection as ordered by the Commission in its Order is therefore relevant to the subject matter of the Complaint and reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in the Complaint case.

The Staff inspection ordered by the Commission is not duplicative or cumulative of existing discovery. The physical details of Respondent's water and sewer facilities, and whether Respondent is actually providing water and sewer service as it professes, can only be confirmed by an in-person inspection. Entrance upon land for purposes of inspection are authorized by Missouri's discovery rules and are a reasonable means for the Commission to gather evidence to inform its decision regarding Staff's Complaint.

Finally, the Court does not find that Staff's inspection as ordered by the Commission creates an unreasonable burden upon Respondent that outweighs the value

of the information at issue. Staff's request is reasonably limited to specific facilities. The water and sewer infrastructure Staff seeks to inspect occupies a large physical presence in a public area, and Staff expressly states no intent to enter Respondent's business offices or any tenant residences. There is no reason to conclude Staff's inspection will be obtrusive or disruptive to the Respondent's business activities or to its tenants. The Court concludes the Staff inspection as ordered by the Commission in its July 27, 2022, Order complies with Rule 56.01 and should be enforced as provided in Section 536.073.2, RSMo.

Respondent argues that Staff should not be permitted to inspect Respondent's property until the Commission first determines whether it has jurisdiction over Respondent in the underlying case. But the Commission's jurisdiction over Respondent is precisely the contested issue in the underlying Staff Complaint case, and Staff's Request is reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence that will assist the Commission in deciding the jurisdictional issues before it. Parties before the Commission must have access to reasonable discovery so they can present a complete, accurate and detailed record to the Commission to aid its determination of such jurisdictional issues.

Respondent argues that Staff's Complaint is barred by the doctrines of unclean hands and laches. Those arguments go beyond the scope of this limited proceeding regarding the enforceability of the Commission's discovery Order under Section 536.073.2, RSMo that is before this Court. Those arguments must be presented to the Commission for its determination in the underlying Complaint case.

Respondent further argues that Staff's Complaint to the Commission fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. In support of this argument, Respondent offers documents from a previous Commission case (Respondent's Exhibits A, B, C, D and E as offered separately and as attached to Respondent's Exhibit F). Whether Staff's Complaint states a claim upon which relief can be granted is within the Commission's exclusive, primary jurisdiction and must be decided by the Commission in the first instance, not by the Court in this matter. Under 536.073.2, this Court must make its ruling based on whether the Commission's discovery Order permitting Staff's inspection of Respondent's property complies with the rules of discovery. Respondent's proffered evidence related to previous Commission cases involving prior jurisdictional determinations is not relevant to this proceeding under the limited scope set forth in Section 536.073.2. Accordingly Petitioner's Motion in Limine is granted and Respondent's Exhibits A, B, C, D, and E as offered separately and as attached to Respondent's Exhibit F are not admitted to the hearing record, and the Court will exclude consideration of any issues within the exclusive primary jurisdiction of the Commission.


WHEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED THAT, pursuant to Section 536.073.2, RSMo, that the Commission's *Petition For Order To Permit Entrance Upon Land And Inspection of Property* is hereby granted. Respondent shall permit Staff to conduct the inspection as set forth in Staff's Request, as ordered by the Commission in its July 27, 2022, *Order Granting Staff's Motion To Compel and Denying Respondent's Request For A Protective Order*. Staff and Respondent shall agree upon a reasonable date and time for the inspection, not to exceed

30 days beyond the effective date of this order. Should Respondent not submit to the inspection as required by this order, the Commission may impose sanctions, consistent with the statutes and regulations governing the Commission, as the Commission sees fit.

That Respondent's Motion for Stay is hereby overruled.

That Petitioner's Motion In Limine is hereby granted.

SO ORDERED this 29th day of January, 2023:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'A. Brown', written over a horizontal line.

Judge, Circuit Court of Cole County, Missouri

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

The Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission,)	
)	
Complainant,)	
v.)	
)	<u>Case No. WC-2022-0295</u>
I-70 Mobile City, Inc. d/b/a I-70 Mobile City Park,)	
)	
Respondent)	

**COMPLAINANT'S REQUEST FOR PERMISSION
FOR ENTRY UPON LAND FOR INSPECTION**

Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Staff"), through counsel, and pursuant to Missouri Rules of Civil Procedure 58.01(a)(2) and § 393.140(7), RSMo (2016) requests permission to enter upon the business premises operated by Respondent I-70 Mobile City, Inc. d/b/a I-70 Mobile City Park ("I-70 MHP"), located at 1449 Outer Rd., Bates City, Missouri 64011 for the purpose of inspecting, measuring, surveying, photographing, testing, or sampling the property or any designated object or operation thereon, within the scope of Rule 56.01(b):

DEFINITIONS

- (a) The words "you" and "your" refer not only to whom these Requests for Entry Upon Land are addressed, but also include your present and former representatives, officers, employees, directors, shareholders, agents, servants, or investigators, and, unless otherwise privileged, your attorneys.
- (b) The term "person" shall mean the plural as well as the singular and shall include any natural person, and any firm, association, partnership, joint venture, business trust, corporation, governmental or public entity, department, agency, office, or any other form of legal entity.

(c) The term “Complaint” refers to the Complaint filed with the Public Service Commission on April 22, 2022, and any amendments thereto.

(d) “I-70 Mobile City” refers to the mobile home park owned and operated by Respondent I-70 Mobile City, Inc. and may also be referred to as “I-70 MHP.”

INSTRUCTIONS

Staff requests permission to enter upon the business premises operated by Respondent located at 1449 Outer Rd., Bates City, Missouri 64011 beginning at 11:00 a.m. on July 6, 2022.

INSPECTION REQUESTS

1. The I-70 Mobile City Wastewater Treatment Facility and lagoon, as more fully described in the Missouri State Operating Permit issued by the Department of Natural Resources to I-70 MHP and included as Attachment A to the Complaint.

2. Water service connections that are visible.

3. Sewer service connections that are visible.

4. A representative number of water meters located in I-70 Mobile City (approximately 20 percent) plus the master meter to I-70 MHP.

5. System appurtenances that are at or above grade, including access to any structures containing systems-related components.

6. Photographs of the above-listed locations.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Carolyn H. Kerr

Missouri Bar Number 45718

Senior Staff Counsel

Missouri Public Service Commission

P.O. Box 360

Jefferson City, MO 65102

573-751-5397 (Voice)

573-526-6969 (Fax)

Carolyn.kerr@psc.mo.gov

Case No. WC-2022-0295

Schedule AH-s2

Page 2 of 2