1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI		
2	WESTERN DIVISION		
3			
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
5)	
6	Plaintiff,)	
7	STATE OF MISSOURI,)	
8	Plaintiff-Intervenor,))Case No.	
)13-00319-CV-W-BP	
9	BENTON COUNTY SEWER DISTRICT,)	
10	NO. 1 OF BENTON COUNTY, MO, et al.,)	
11	Defendants.)	
12			
13			
14	PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS		
15	On Wednesday, July 30, 2014, the above-entitled		
16	cause came on before the Honorable Beth Phillips, United		
17	States District Judge, sitting in Kansas City, Missouri.		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	1		

1	APPEARANCES	
2	For the Plaintiff:	MR. CHARLES M. THOMAS Assistant United States Attorney
3		Charles Evans Whittaker Courthouse 400 East Ninth Street, Floor 5 Kansas City, Missouri 64106
	D +b	Ransas City, Filssoull 04100
5	For the	
6	Plaintiff-Intervenor:	MR. JOHN K. McMANUS MR. JACOB T. WESTEN
7		Missouri Attorney General's Office PO Box 899
8		Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
9		MD GUADI EG E MEEDMAN ID
10	For the Defendant:	MR. CHARLES E. WEEDMAN, JR. Crouch Spangler & Douglas
11		117 South Lexington Street Harrisonville, Missouri 64701
12	Also Present:	MR. MARK J. BREDEMEIER
13		Law Office of Mark J. Bredemeier 305 SE Alexandria Drive
14		Lee's Summit, Missouri 64063
15		
16		polt, RMR, CRR
17	Charles Evans Whi	orter, Room 7552 Littaker Courthouse
18	400 East Ninth Street Kansas City, MO 64106 (816) 512-5641	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		2

MR. THOMAS: All right. Let me sort of repose the 1 2 -- or not repose but recite what -- the question that you raised through Anne Hershewe. RSMo. Section 204.390 provides 3 that revenue bonds issued under authority of Sections 204.250 4 5 to 204.70 [as spoken] shall be payable solely from the 6 revenues derived and to be derived from the operation of the 7 sewage system. 8 And it goes on to say that revenue bonds do not constitute indebtedness of the common sewer district. 9 10 THE COURT: Right. 11 MR. THOMAS: Now, the court has posed the question 12 whether that's compatible with the payment provision of the 13 APA, the asset purchase agreement. The payment provision 14 provided that Missouri American, the buyer, will pay the USDA 15 \$750,000, and the USDA will release claims under a number of 16 agreements and documents. 17 There are five independently sufficient reasons why 18 the sale is compatible with the statute that you cite, and let 19 me run through those quickly. If you wish, I can brief it 20 afterwards. I have not had the chance to brief that yet, but 21 I will tell you I think pretty much all I have to say on that. Number one, the payment does not have to be 22 attributed to the bond. Paragraph X of the recitations of the 23 APA recites that upon Missouri American's payment of \$750,000, 24

the USDA will release the district and Missouri American and

25

all of its successors and the trustees of the district of all liability and all obligations under four documents. It's not just the bond.

It's the bond resolution, which is the same thing as a bond ordinance; the loan resolution, also passed by the board of trustees; the grant agreement by which the USDA made a \$913,000 grant to the district for construction of the sewer system; and the bond itself. So it's four documents from which all obligations are deemed released under the provisions of the APA and the release it contemplates.

The grant agreement, let's look at the grant agreement. It contains numerous provisions that the district must necessarily violate if it proceeds with dissolution, if it ceases to operate as a district. The grant agreement — and incidentally, Judge, there are two exhibits that are really demonstrative that may be helpful in this.

Exhibit 14 is my abstract of the key provisions of these four documents, and Exhibit 15 sets forth verbatim the key statutes that I think are pertinent to this issue. And I'm going to cite some of those statutes, but I have set those forth in bold in some of the language that I think is particularly important.

But the grant agreement provides that the district will operate the sewer system continuously. It provides that they -- that the district will make sufficient charges to pay $^{\prime}$

1	the debt, the bond debt. It provides that the district will	
2	use the property acquired for the purpose of the grant only,	
3	and if it is no longer needed for that purpose, it must be	
4	used in connection with a federally-sponsored activity.	
5	It also says the district will not transfer or	
6	dispose of the property. Upon default, and you will see there	
7	where the provision is, upon default under any of those	
8	agreements, the district owes back to the USDA \$913,000.	
9	There is nothing in Missouri law that negates that liability.	
10	The provision that you cited has to do with payment	
11	of bonds. The grant debt of two hundred of \$913,000 plus 5	
12	percent interest from default exceeds the amount of the	
13	payment that is contemplated under the APA. So	
14	THE COURT: What was the total amount that the USDA	
15	gave the sewer district?	
16	MR. THOMAS: Well, they granted \$913,000. They made	
17	a bond they lent through a bond \$1,529,000.	
18	THE COURT: An additional 1.5 million?	
19	MR. THOMAS: Yeah, yeah. And the State of Missouri	
20	made a grant of approximately \$1.4 million.	
21	This came out it was about a \$3.8 million	
22	project. The current balance on the bond is about \$1.2	
23	million.	
24	But my point in this first point in this first	
25	reason why the APA is valid is that you don't even have to	

look to the bond to account for that payment. That is a debt that is owed by the district, and it is being extinguished by this -- by the APA, so you don't have to rely on the bond.

Number two, even putting aside the grant agreement, the payment to the USDA is justified as resolution of a claim by the U.S. that is specifically conferred by Missouri statutes. Missouri statutes are clear that a district has an absolute obligation to generate sufficient revenue to pay all principal and interest on revenue bonds, and the statutes are clear that the bondholder has a legal right to enforce that obligation.

I'll run through a few -- this is a repeated theme throughout Section 204 -- Chapter 204 and Chapter 250, both of which are applicable. I'll cite a few of those.

204.400, it says it's the mandatory duty of a sewer district to pay interest and principal -- that issues the revenue bonds -- to pay the interest and principal, to provide funds necessary to meet the district's obligations under the bond ordinance as well.

Now, the bond ordinance here, which is one of those -- Exhibit 11, I believe, says -- Section 802 says that a district will fix and collect rates and charges sufficient to pay the bond's principal and interest. Section 804 says the district will not pledge, encumber, sell, or dispose of the system. Section 1002 states that the bondholder may by

mandamus or other action enforce the bondholder's rights including by enjoining any violation of the bond resolution.

Then Section 204.410 says the sewer district must pledge a sufficient amount to pay revenue bonds. 204.440 says the board of trustees must fix rates that are sufficient to pay all principal and interest on revenue bonds. 204 -- and these get better actually. 204.470 says it's the duty of all governing bodies of counties and state officials to perform all acts necessary to carry out the purposes of that section.

Then 250.120 -- and 250 is also applicable to districts that are formed under 204.250 to 470. It says it's a mandatory duty of any sewer district to maintain rates and collect charges sufficient to pay the principal and interest on revenue bonds, and I'll quote what it goes on to say. It says as long as any bond so issued or the interest thereon shall remain outstanding and unpaid, rates and charges sufficient to meet the requirements of this section shall be maintained and collected.

As long as unpaid, you shall, you shall impose charges and rates. Not just rates. Charges. It could be a one-time charge, but you must do that until the bond is paid.

250.130 reiterates that obligation. 250.170 says that the holder of a revenue bond may by civil -- and we are -- of course, the USDA is the holder -- may by civil action compel a sewer district to perform all duties imposed

by a bond ordinance -- that's our bond resolution -- or by law, including four specifically-enumerated things, that you can by in equity, that you can by injunction, or mandamus require, continued operation of the sewer system, fixing charges to customers, payment of any bonds chargeable to revenues, performance of any covenant in a bond ordinance. In short here's the point: The USDA has a right under Missouri law to make the district collect sufficient charges to pay the bond. Is there a right under Missouri law to require the imposition of taxation? No. But there is a right to require the collection of sufficient charges to pay the bond. And 204.455 -- and this makes it very real for every resident there, for every customer there. 204.455 says that if those charges are unpaid, it becomes a lien on the customers' land. We do not want that to happen. There is nothing in Missouri law that would prevent the district from dealing with this problem by resolution through settlement. It doesn't have to be seen as a payment

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There is nothing in Missouri law that would prevent the district from dealing with this problem by resolution through settlement. It doesn't have to be seen as a payment on the bond. It is simply taking the very prudent step of acceding to the payment of a sum to the USDA by Missouri American, and that's a sum far short of the liability here, to compromise and eliminate the claim. That's what it's doing, getting rid of this claim that does exist under Missouri law.

Third reason, here's the third reason why the 8

payment provision is compatible with the statute that you cited. The payment is consistent with Missouri statutes because the USDA has a security interest recognized by Missouri law in the proceeds of the sale of the system. It has a security interest.

250.150 provides it's the mandatory duty of a sewer district to perform all duties set out in a bond ordinance.

204.400 further provides that it is the mandatory duty of a sewer district to provide funds ample to meet the valid and reasonable requirements of the bond resolution.

And here's what the bond resolution says. Section 401 provides that the bond is secured as to payment of principal and interest by a pledge of the net income and revenues derived from operation of the system, and I'm going to go on to the key language here, and other funds made available to the district from sources other than funds raised by taxation. The bond resolution says that this security interest lies in funds available to the district other than through taxation. In short the USDA has a security interest in the proceeds of the sale of the system.

Fourth reason, Missouri statutes would not be violated even if the \$750,000 payment were deemed to be a simple payment on the bond. I'm kind of working down to -- backward here to now hypothesizing that we simply deem this to be a payment on the bond, and that -- and here's why. 204.390

says that revenue bonds are payable not only from revenues 1 2 derived from the operation of the sewer system but also from 3 revenues to be derived from operation of the sewer system. Not from operation of the district, from operation of the 4 5 sewer system. In other words, bond payments can be based on 6 anticipated future revenue. 7 Why is Missouri American willing to pay the USDA 8 \$750,000? Two reasons. One, it wants to eliminate any cloud 9 on its ownership of the sewer system after it buys them, and 10 it will do so because the USDA is releasing all claims. But, 11 number two, it anticipates that in the long run revenue from 12 operation of the system will more than fund the payment being 13 made to the USDA. 14 So even if the payment is deemed a bond payment, it 15 is in conformity with 204.390 because it is in effect a 16 payment from revenues to be derived from operation of the 17 system in the future. Missouri American will be operating it, 18 and, frankly, everybody will be better off with Missouri 19 American operating it. 20 Heroic efforts were made by trustees here, but Missouri American does this all over Missouri. They know how 21 22 to do it. THE COURT: Okay. So what's your point number five? 23 24 MR. THOMAS: Point number five, the APA, the asset purchase agreement, and the payment to the USDA are in 25

conformity with Missouri law because they are necessary to 1 2 fulfill the purposes of Chapter 250, and the district is empowered to undertake all things necessary to fulfill the 3 purposes of Chapter 250. Let me cite -- 250.240 says three 4 5 things. It says it's the purpose of the chapter to protect 6 public health and welfare by preventing and abating water pollution. 8 Number two, it says sewer districts have the power 9 to do all things necessary to carry out that purpose in 10 addition to the powers that are expressly conferred. 11 And, number three, it says that these powers are to 12 be liberally construed. 13 The APA absolutely serves the purposes of Chapter 14 250. It keeps the sewer system alive for those who need it 15 and thus promotes public health and welfare. 16 So payment provided in the APA, while leaving the 17 USDA with a significant hit, the USDA is voluntarily taking a 18 significant hit on this, helps advance the goal of Chapter 19 250. In fact, this sale is essential, I think, to that. It's 20 by no means a stretch of the term all things to deem it to include the district's entry in to the APA. 21 22 I think that answer -- that is my response to this, 23 but that fifth reason says, look, they have to do -- they are 24 empowered, mandated to do what's necessary, and it's to be 25 considered liberally to do what's necessary to serve the

1	interests of 250, Chapter 250, and that's exactly what this
2	APA does.
3	* * * * * * * * *
4	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
5	
6	I certify that the foregoing pages are a correct
7	transcript from the record of proceedings in the
8	above-entitled matter.
9	
10	
11	Date Registered Merit Reporter
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	12