LAW OFFICES

BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND

PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
312 EAST CAPITOL AVENUE
P.O. BOX 456

JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65 102-0456
TELEPHONE (573) 635-7166
FACSIMILE (573) 635-0427

DEAN L. COOPER
MARK G. ANDERSON
TIMOTHY T. STEWART
GREGORY C. MITCHELL
RACHEL M. CRAIG
BRIAN T. MCCARTNEY
DALE T. SMITH

OF COUNSEL RICHARD T. CIOTTONE

FILED²

June 2, 2000

Mr. Dale Hardy Roberts Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge Missouri Public Service Commission P.O. Box 360 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

Re: Case No. EA-2000-764

souri 65102 Service Commission

Dear Mr. Roberts:

DAVID V.G. BRYDON

GARY W. DUFFY

PAUL A. BOUDREAU

SONDRA B. MORGAN

CHARLES E. SMARR

JAMES C. SWEARENGEN

WILLIAM R. ENGLAND, III

JOHNNY K. RICHARDSON

Enclosed for filing in the referenced case on behalf of The Empire District Electric Company, please find an original and eight (8) copies of a Reply of The Empire District Electric Company to Response of Staff to Motion for Expedited Consideration.

Would you please see that this filing is brought to the attention of the appropriate Commission personnel.

I thank you in advance for your cooperation in this matter.

By

Sincerely yours,

BRYDON SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND P.C.

Paul A. Boudreau

PAB/lar

CC:

Enclosure

Bruce Bates, Assistant General Counsel

Office of the Public Counsel

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

OF THE ST	TATE OF MISSOURI	FILEDZ
In the Matter of the Application of The)	long [
Empire District Electric Company for)	UN 2 2000
an Order authorizing it to Renew its)	~ 2000
Shareholders Rights Plan by Making a	Service	Souri n
Dividend Distribution to All Holders of		e Commissio
its Common Stock of Certain Rights,)	souri public e Commissior
including, among other things, the Right) Case No. EA-2000-764	
to Purchase Additional Shares of		
Preference and Common Stock of the		
Company, to issue and sell such Additional)	
Shares of Stock as may be required by the)	
Exercise of such Rights.)	

REPLY OF THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY **TO RESPONSE OF STAFF TO MOTION** FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION

Pursuant to the Order of the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Commission"), the Commission Staff ("Staff") filed its Response to Order Establishing Time in Which to Respond to Motion for Expedited Consideration ("Response") in the referenced case on May 25, 2000. A number of statements made by the Staff in that Response require a reply or explanation by The Empire District Electric Company ("Empire").

- 1. With respect to the timing of the filing, Empire's current shareholder rights plan expires July 25, 2000. When it had become apparent that the pending merger between Empire and UtiliCorp United Inc. ("UtiliCorp") would not close by the June 1, 2000 initial termination date provided for in the Agreement and Plan of Merger, Empire's Board of Directors, at its April 27, 2000 meeting, voted to approve an extension of the Rights Agreement. As a consequence, the Rights Plan is dated as of April 27, 2000, and was available for filing with the Commission shortly thereafter.
- 2. While it is true that many utilities do meet with representatives of the Staff and the Office of the Public Counsel ("OPC") prior to the filing of certain novel, complicated or urgent matters, and Empire has done this in the past, it certainly has not been the customary practice with

respect to routine or ministerial filings. Given that Empire's proposal in this case is simply an extension of the existing shareholder rights plan, and similar to plans approved by the Commission for Laclede Gas Company (GF-86-131 and GF-96-309), St. Joseph Light & Power Company (EF-87-56 and EF-97-114) and UtiliCorp (EF-97-202), Empire considered its request to be routine. Nonetheless, Empire appreciates the Staff's courtesy and willingness to meet on this routine matter and Empire is prepared to meet with the Staff and OPC on short notice, answer questions and provide information to assist in an expedited review process. As a result, the Staff and OPC will find that the Rights Agreement, which is the subject of this *Application*, is substantially the same as Empire's existing shareholder rights plan previously approved by the Commission, modified only as necessary to comply with intervening changes in the law and circumstance.

- 3. The Staff states it is "concerned that immediate approval of Empire's Application will ... fail to include all necessary conditions to prevent public detriment." Empire fails to see how this can be a legitimate issue in light of the fact that a nearly identical Empire Rights Agreement was approved by the Commission in its Case No. EF-91-21. That plan is currently in effect and Empire is unaware of any detriment resulting to the public during the time that it has been in place.
- 4. Finally, the Staff states that it is concerned that the shareholder rights plan will "preclude another company from acquiring Empire on more favorable terms to the public than proposed by UtiliCorp." This statement misinterprets Empire's goal in renewing the shareholder rights plan through the proposed Rights Agreement. The goal of the Rights Plan is to provide Empire's Board of Directors a tool that gives it the time and the means to ensure that a potential acquirer (particularly a hostile acquirer) offers the best terms for shareholders and other affected interests. The effectiveness of such an agreement is demonstrated by the fact that the protective

provisions of very few such plans have ever been implemented because they have worked, that is, any acquiring entity has been compelled to work with the company's Board of Directors. It is this fact that provides the basis for Empire's statement that "It is not currently expected (or likely) that the Rights will ever be exercised." This does not mean, however, that the plan is not necessary. In fact, just the opposite is indicated. The Staff's statement also reflects a misunderstanding of the standard applied in merger proceedings. That standard is whether or not the merger will be detrimental to the public; a public benefit does not have to result.

5. Empire has other concerns about the Staff's Response and reserves the right to address them in a reply to the Staff's Recommendation concerning the merits of the *Application*. The Staff states that it can file its Recommendation by July 14, 2000. If Empire deems it necessary to reply, however, this date will not allow Empire a fair or reasonable opportunity to do so, nor will it give the Commission sufficient time to prepare and issue an Order with respect to the *Application* prior to the expiration of Empire's current Rights Agreement on July 25, 2000. Consequently, Empire believes that an earlier Staff filing, perhaps by June 30, 2000, is appropriate in light of the routine nature of Empire's request and the fact that there are no material differences between the shareholder rights plan that Empire currently has in effect and the Rights Agreement which is the subject of this *Application*. To facilitate this filing date, Empire will meet with the Staff and will provide expeditious responses to any Staff data requests.

WHEREFORE, having replied to the Staff's Response to Empire's Motion for Expedited Consideration, Empire reserves the right to file a response to the Staff's Recommendation in this case and requests the Commission to direct the filing of that Recommendation by June 30, 2000.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul A. Boudreau

#33155

BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND P.C.

P.O. Box 456

Jefferson City, MO 65102-0456

Telephone: (573) 635-7166

Facsimile: (573) 635-0427

E-Mail:

Paulb@brydonlaw.com

Attorneys for The Empire District Electric Company

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document was sent by U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, or hand-delivered, on this 2nd day of

Missouri Public Service Commission General Counsel's Office Truman State Office Building Room 530 P.O. Box 360 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Office of the Public Counsel Truman State Office Building Room 250 P.O. Box 7800 Jefferson City, MO 65102-7800

