* This transcription was prepared by the Utilities Department from the attached court document obtained from the Missouri State Historical Society. It may not be entirely correct and it is encouraged that the attached document be relied on for accuracy.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BOONE COUNTY, MISSOURI

RICHARD McDONNELL, et al,		
	Plaintiffs	
vs.) No. 44,597
CITY OF COLUMBIA, MISSOURI, et al		
	Defendants	

JUDGEMENT

The Court, having heretofore heard evidence herein, and the cause having been finally submitted on the pleadings and proof adduced and taken under advisement by the Court, now on this 18th day of January, 1964, the cause is again taken up by the Court for decision and adjudication, and having reviewed and considered the evidence and being fully advised in the premises, the Court finds the issues in favor of defendants and against plaintiffs on Count I of plaintiffs' petition, and further finds the issues in favor of defendants and against plaintiffs on Count II of plaintiffs' petition, and further finds the issues In favor of defendants and against plaintiffs on Count III of plaintiffs' petition.

It is, therefore, ordered, adjudged and decreed that plaintiffs' petition and Counts I, II and III thereof be dismissed and that all costs should be taxed against plaintiffs.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BOONE COUNTY, MISSOURI

RICHARD McDONNELL, et al,)	
	Plaintiffs)	
VS.)	No. 44,597
CITY OF COLUMBIA, MISSOURI, et al)	
	Defendants)	

COURT'S MEMORANDUM

During the course of oral argument before the Court on May 9, an objection was made to Mr. Collins' attack on the defendants' motion with reference to a "surplus" fund mentioned in the last paragraph of Section 7, on Page 12, of the 1948 bond covenants ordinance, on the ground that there was no pleading to justify the submission of such issue. The objection was overruled at the time because the court had not had the opportunity to review the pleadings and ascertain whether or not any issue had been raised with reference to this particular fund. A review of the pleadings and the evidence convinces me that this is not an issue in the case and I now reverse my ruling and sustain defendants' objection to the argument with reference to it.

Under the 1948 bond covenant ordinance, Plaintiffs' Exhibit "3", the City of Columbia became obligated to the holders of the 1948 bonds to create and maintain out of a "Water and Electric Light Fund" certain separate funds, as follows:

- (a) the "Water and Electric Operation and Maintenance Fund;"
 - (b) the "Water and Electric Revenue Bond Fund;"
- (c) the "Water and Electric Revenue Bond Reserve

Fund;' and

(d) the "Water and Electric Depreciation Fund."

The ordinance further provided that if any surplus remained in the Water and Light Fund, after making the deposits required by the funds listed as "a", "b", "c" and "d" above, might be used for any purpose as directed by the Council, except that 25% of such surplus retained shall be used only for redemption of the 1948 bonds or extension and improvement of the water and electric works.

Under the pleading and the evidence, insofar as plaintiffs rights as bondholders are concerned, no issue is presented relating to funds "a", "b" or "c", or the disposition of any surplus in the Water and Light fund.

Vigorously contested, however, was the manner of the Maintenance and operation of the Water and Electric Depreciation Fund.

The amount to be maintained in the fund was to "be determined according to a formula or formulas heretofore or hereafter established by the Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company of Kansas City, Missouri, or by some other nationally recognized consulting engineer or engineers," and said funds were to be expended "only for unusual and extraordinary repairs and replacements of the water and electric light works and for emergency expensed of said works."

The evidence shows that on December 17, 1959 (Plaintiffs' Exhibit "4") Lutz & May Company of Kansas City, Missouri, a "nationally recognized consulting engineer" firm established a "formula" for determining the amount to be paid into this fund And recommended the amounts to be accumulated annually. The

fact that the depreciation schedule originally set up by Burns & McDonnell was used and incorporated into its recommendation does not render this recommendation any the less a "formula" as contemplated by the ordinance.

The burden is on the plaintiffs to show that this fund was NOT expended "only for unusual and extraordinary repairs and replacements of the water and electric light works and for emergency expenses." Plaintiffs have not sustained this burden. The only showing made is that some of the fund was spent for "capital outlays." The fact that an expenditure is a "capital outlay" does not in and of itself mean that it is not also an "unusual and extraordinary" replacement or in fact that it is not an "emergency expense."

Under the issues as submitted by the pleadings and evidence, plaintiffs have failed to show that the City of Columbia has not performed its obligations under the 1948 bond covenant ordinance to plaintiffs as holders of a 1948 bond.

Some contention was made in oral argument that certain "in lieu of taxes" payments were considered an operation expense and could be paid out of Fund "(a)". The evidence does not show that this has been done. If it is contemplated, it will be illegal and should not be done. Such payment is not an operation expense of the utility. The City recognizes this as evidenced by Mr. Nickolaus' argument before the Court on May 9th, where he states: "I don't care what figure you would use, when you talk about in lieu of taxes, you're talking about some formula because like Mr. Collins says, they're not taxes, they're just a method of calculating a withdrawal."

Under Section 102 of the Charter, the City Council is charged with the responsibility of raising from the operation of the Water and Electric Light Works of the City, sufficient revenues to provide funds for 6 purposes, vis:

to pay the cost of operation and maintenance
of said works in good repair and working order, and
to pay the principal of and interest on all revenue
bonds of the City payable from the revenues of said works, and
to provide and maintain the adequate depreciation fund
for the purpose of making renewals and replacements, and
to provide a fund for the extension, improvement, enlargement and betterment of said works, and
to pay the interest on and principal of any general
obligation bonds issued by the City to extend or improve
said works, and

to pay into the general revenue fund of the City annually an amount substantially equivalent to that sum which would be paid in taxes if the water and electric light works were privately owned.

The Council must provide sufficient revenues from the operation of the utility to provide money for ALL of these funds. There is no order of priority allowed; that if there was not sufficient money for all funds, then 1, 2, 3 and 4 must be maintained and 5 and 6 not. The mandate is that the City Council shall "fix, establish, maintain and provide for the collection of such rates, fees and charges" as will "provide revenues sufficient to raise enough money to provide for these funds."

Therefore, whatever amount of money is necessary to pay the cost of operation and maintenance of the utility, to pay the principal and interest on revenue bonds, to provide a depreciation fund, to provide for extension, improvement, enlargement and betterments of the utility, to pay principal and interest on certain general obligation bonds, and to pay "an amount substantially equivalent to that sum which would be paid in taxes" if the utility were privately owned, MUST be provided by the City Council, and they must set the "rates, fees and charges" at such an amount that will provide the money necessary for ALL of these funds.

It is clear, therefore, that the amount "substantially equivalent to that sum which would be paid in taxes" if the utility were privately owned is merely a figure to be determined by the City Council, and whether it includes an amount equivalent to federal and state income taxes and state, county and school district taxes, or whether it be limited solely to city taxes that private utility would pay is irrelevant. Whichever amount the City determines must be raised by the operation of the utility. If it is the position of the City that the "amount substantially equivalent to that sum which would be paid in taxes" by a private utility should include federal and state income taxes, etc., then the Council will simply have to set the rates, fees and charges for the services of the utility at an amount as will provide such funds.

In the closing argument before the Court on May 9, Mr. Nickalaus pinpointed this very clearly, when in commenting on the "in lieu of taxes" feature of the case, he stated that the Charter

Commission "wanted to establish a formula that would be determinative at any one time as to how much money, during any one year, the City Council could withdraw from the utility. Now this is easily calculated and it's calculated every year by our accountants-it's in every one of the audits, and this is a set, determinate fund which will vary from year to year, depending on the tax rates that are established and the gross business of the utility, taxable income, and I think this is the only reason."

There is nothing in the evidence that indicates that the City Council has not in obedience to the mandate of the Charter provided for and maintained the 6 funds heretofore mentioned.

Plaintiffs have failed to show that the City has defaulted in its obligations to plaintiffs as citizens and taxpayers of the City of Columbia.

It is significant to note that there is nothing in the evidence casting a doubt on the integrity of the City's credit nor insinuating that the 1948 bonds are not sound. Plaintiffs apparently had confidence in them, alas they would not have invested their money in the bond.

Judgement should be in favor of the defendants and against plaintiffs, and the costs in the case should be taxed against plaintiffs.



BOOKS COUNTY, MESSOURT RICHARD McDONNELL, ot al. Plaintiffe Ho. 44, 597 CITY OF COLUMNIA, MISSOURE 9 LIDOMERT 10 The Court, having heretofore heard evidence herein, 11 and the ourse having been finally submitted on the pleadings and proof address and taken under advisoment by the Court, now on 14 this 16th day of January, 1964, the cause in again taken up by 15 the Gourt for decipion and adjustention, and having reviewed and considered the evidence and being fully edviced in the prentnes, the Court finds the Lesuce in favor of defendance and against 18 plaintiffs on Count I of plaintiffel postaton, and further finds 20 the inverse in favor of defendance and against plaintiffs on 21 Count 27 of photocaffy postation, and further finds the Leanes 22 in favor of defendance and equipmet plaintiffs on Count III of plaintiffe potition. 24 It is, therefore, erdered sadd became pur peducted 25 plaintiffer position and Country St. II and III thereof be distinged and thee all bowto librade by to 28 29 30 31 32

IN THE GEROUIT COURT OF BOOME COUNTY, MESSOURI

RYGRAND MoDONNELL, on al,

Plaintiffe

VO.

CITY OF COLUMNIA, MISSOURI,

No. 44,597

Defendante

COURT'S MINORANDOM

During the course of oral argument before the Cours on May 9, an objection was made to Mr. Gulling' abtack on the defendance notion with reference to a "surplus" fund mentioned in the last paragraph of Section 7, on Page 12, of the 1948 bond coverant ordinance, on the ground that there was no pleading to justify the substantes of such inste. The objection was over-raised at the time because the Court had not had the opportunity to review the pleadings and asserted whether or not any issue had been raised with reference to this particular finds. A review of the pleadings and the evidence tentiness as that this is not an issue in the case and I now reverse by ruling and sustain defendance, objection to the argument with reference to it.

Under the 1946 band apparent ordinates, Plaintiffet Manifet "3", the City of Caluabia basans obligated to the holders of the 1946 bands to create and miletain out of a "Nater and Mostrie Light Sund" spreads apparate funds, as follows:

- (a) the "Water and Elephric Operation and Maintenance Funds"
 - (h) the "later and Mounto Revenue Send Pends"

WAR.

(a) the "Mehor and Rhestute Revenue Real Reserve

Pendy" and

The ordinance further growled that if any surplus remained in the Natur and Light Fund, after making the deposite required by the funds listed as "a", "b", "o" and "d" above, might be used for any purpose as directed by the Council, except that 256 of each curplus retained shall be used hely for reduced of the 1968 beads or expension and improvement of the tubes and placente weeks.

There the plandings gut the spidence, impolar as plainnists rights as bandhalders are concurred, as issue is presented relating to finds "at", "h" or "o", or the disposition of any employ in the third and likely find.

Migorously consected, however, was the squary of the mintenance and operations of the Mater and Ricoterly Depresiation foods.

The amount to be militarized as this find one to "be decirrated according to a formula of formulas bereature or hereafter established by the Durae & Hellemail Regimeering Company of Rancas City, Ridenury, or by some other hattenally secognized consulting augineer or engineers," and said finish were to be expended "only for amount and entraordinary repairs and replacements of the party for amount and entraordinary repairs and replacements of the party and sleptone light works and for emergency expenses of each should

The evilence chose that he member 17, 1999 (Plaintiffer Schilds "(") Love & May Company of Remais Clay, Manual. "
"materially recognized conscious engineer" firm established a
"formula" for decommining the surest to be paid two this find and recommended the question to be questioned assumily. The

fact that the depreciation schodule originally set up by Burns & Meldonall was used and incorporated into its recommendation does not render this recommendation any the less a "deswels" as contemplated by the ordinance.

The burden is an plaintiffe to show that this fund was not expensed "anly for unusual and extraordinary repairs and replacements of the unter and electric light works and for emergency expenses," Plaintiffs have not emptained this burden. The only should nade in that some of the fund was spunt for "supplied out-lays," The fact that an expenditure is a "conjust outlay" does not in and as itself ment that is in not also an "unusual and extraordinary" replacement or in fact to the in an income of an expense."

Plaintiffe have fathed to show that the Otey of Columbia has not performed the children under the 1946 bond covered and address of a 1946 bond.

Since compension was made in crai argument that correct

"in live of terms" payments seem operational as operation expense
and could be paid out of Fand ?(a)". The evidence does not show
that this has been done. If it is embenglated, it will be
fillegal and should up be done. Such payment is not as eperation
expense of this utility. The Oldy renogalnes this as evidenced
by No. Stabeland asymmetry before the Cours on May 9th, where he
ptabons ?I don't come that figure you would use, when you talk
about is like of terms, you've talking about once formule because
like No. Scaling may, they've not textee, they've just a method of
calculating a withdrawal."

Under Section 108 of the Charter, the City Council is charged with the responsibility of raising from the operation of the Water and Electric Light Works of the City, sufficient revenues to provide funds for 6 purposes, 7188

of eald works in good repair and working order, and

bonds of the City payable from the revenues of said works, and

to provide and maintain an adequate depreciation fund for the purpose of making remembe and replacements, and

to provide a fund for the extension, improvement, en-

to pay the interest on and principal of any general obligation bonds issued by the City to extend or improve

annually an amount substantially equivalent to that sum which would be paid in taxes if the water and electric light works were privately outed.

operation of the utility to provide money for ALL of these funds. There is no order of priority allowed; that if there was not sufficient money for all funds, then 1, 2, 3 and 4 must be maintened and 5 and 6 not. The mandate is that the City Council shall "fix, establish, maintain and provide for the collection of such rates, fees and charges" as will "provide revenues sufficient to raise enough money to provide for these funds."

Therefore, winterer anoms of somey is necessary to pay
the cost of operation and maintenance of the utility, to pay the
principal and interest on revenue bonds, to provide a depreciation
fund, to provide for antenation, improvement, enlargement and
betterments of the utility, to pay principal and interest on
certain general obligation bunds, and to pay "an anount substantially equivalent to their man which would be paid in taxes"
if the utility were privately ouned, MMST be provided by the City
Council, and they man are the "mater, free and charges" at such
an anount as will provide the names accountry for ALL of these
funds.

equivalent to that sum which would be paid in tener if the utility were privately owned to messaly a figure to be determined by the district densel, and whether it isolades an amount equivalent to federal and state from takes and state, county and school district tense, or whether it be limited solely to city tense that a private athility would pay is irrelevant. Whichever amount the disy determines there be rules by the operation of the utility. If it is the position of the Chay thus the "amount substantially equivalent to that am which would be paid in tense" by a private utility should include faderal and state income tense, etc., then the Council will simply have to be the rates, form and charges for the spirituse of the utility at an amount as will provide such femile.

In the alouing argument before the Court on May 9, Mr. Mickelums pinyetused while very clearly, when in commenting on the standard than the Charter of the case, he stated than the Charter

the at may one time as to have made along any one year, among the absolute and the sixtherns from this mility. New this is much a be an any one of the amintan and this is a set, determinate that which will very from year to year, depending on the tax rates that are established and the gross business of the utility, taxable theome, and I think this is the only reason."

There is nothing in the syldence that indicates that the city Council has not in obedience to the mandate of the Charter provided for and maintained the 6 funds heretofore mentioned.

Phaintiffs have failed to show that the City has defuncted in its obligations to plaintiffs as citizens and taxpayers of the City of Columbia.

To is alguificant to more that there is mathing in the cridence desting a doubt on the integrity of the dity's credit mor intimating that the 1948 bonds are not sound. Plaintiffs apparently had confidence in them, also they sould not have invested their money in the bonds.

Judgment should be in favor of defendants and against plaintiffs, and the costs in the case should be taxed against plaintiffs.

Opacial Judes