

1 Q. So some of the difference between what's shown
2 as book cost and what's shown on the rate base analysis
3 would have to do with what was contributed capital; is
4 that right it?

5 A. That's one of the things that certainly would
6 effect it, yes.

7 Q. And you weren't given those pages out of the
8 annual report that would show contributions or anything
9 like that?

10 A. The only ones that -- the only page that was
11 attached to the exhibit this morning was W-5, which, I
12 believe, is the full cost plant service.

13 Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Johansen, in some of the
14 pre-filed testimony for witnesses that have not yet
15 testified there are some allegations that you are
16 biased in this proceeding. Do you recall reading that
17 pre-filed testimony?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Mr. Johansen, that seemed to have to do with
20 your involvement as a consultant for Osage Water
21 Company prior to your employment with the Commission;
22 is that correct?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And to -- it had to do with Osage Water
25 Company not paying you some money that was owed; is

1 that correct?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Now, so the record is clear, are you biased in
4 favor or against the principles of the applicant in
5 this case, Environmental Utilities, based on your
6 involvement as a consultant for Osage Water Company
7 prior to the time that you became employed by this
8 Commission?

9 A. No.

10 Q. Are you biased either in favor or against the
11 principles of Environmental Utilities based on your
12 participation in case before the Commission involving
13 Osage Water Company or other issues between Osage Water
14 Company and the Staff of the Commission?

15 A. Well, I don't think biased would be the right
16 word, but I think it certainly does have an impact on
17 the Staff's overall view of things.

18 Q. And what impact is that?

19 A. Well, I think when you're -- when you're
20 looking at one of the issues of the -- the applicant's
21 general qualifications. I -- I think history of
22 participants in both companies certainly comes into
23 play. And I think that's the basis for some of the
24 Staff's stated concerns regarding the applicant in this
25 case.

1 Q. Would that be because the company has
2 generally or has from time to time not agreed with
3 Staff's position in different cases?

4 A. That would be -- that would be one item.
5 I -- I think actually the -- more of the history would
6 have to do with compliance issues versus disagreements
7 on positions.

8 Q. Okay. And would you agree with me that the
9 manager of Environmental Utilities, Debra Williams, has
10 not participated in Osage Water Company's management
11 prior to last summer?

12 A. That's correct.

13 Q. And so you don't have any history of that
14 management?

15 A. Not as much as we do with other people, that's
16 correct.

17 Q. And Mr. Mitchell you had extensive history
18 with?

19 A. Yes.

20 MR. WILLIAMS: I don't think I have any
21 further questions.

22 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. Then we'll come
23 up to questions from the Bench.

24 Commissioner Lumpe?

25 QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER LUMPE: