

ANDERECK, EVANS, MILNE, PEACE & JOHNSON, L.L.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

EUGENE E. ANDERECK
TERRY M. EVANS
ERWIN L. MILNE
JACK PEACE
CRAIG S. JOHNSON
RODRIC A. WIDGER
GEORGE M. JOHNSON
BEVERLY J. FIGG
WILLIAM S. LEWIS
VICTOR S. SCOTT
COREY K. HERRON
MATTHEW M. KROHN

700 EAST CAPITOL AVENUE
COL. DARWIN MARMADUKE HOUSE
P.O. BOX 1438
JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102-1438
TELEPHONE 573-634-3422
FAX 573-634-7822

LANETTE R. GOOCH
SHAWN BATTAGLER
JOSEPH M. PAGE
LISA C. CHASE
JUDITH E. KOEHLER
ANDREW J. SPORLEDER
REBECCA L. SELLERS
JASON A. PAULSMEYER
BRYAN D. LADE
CONNIE J. BURROWS
OF COUNSEL
MARVIN L. SHARP
GREGORY C. STOCKARD (1904-1993)
PHIL HAUCK (1924-1991)
PHIL HAUCK (1924-1991)
PHIL HAUCK (1924-1991)

March 2, 2004

Secretary
Missouri Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

FILED⁴
MAR 02 2004

Re: Ozark Border Electric Cooperative
PSC Case No. EC-2003-0452

Missouri Public
Service Commission

Dear Secretary:

On January 30, 2004, we filed testimony of Stanley Estes in the above matter. We inadvertently filed the testimony without having numbered the lines. Enclosed please find an original and eight copies of the testimony of Stanley Estes revised to include appropriately numbered lines.

We apologize for any inconvenience our omission may have caused the Commission.

Sincerely,


Lisa C. Chase

LCC:lw

Enclosures

Trenton Office
9th And Washington
Trenton, Missouri 64683
660-359-2244
Fax 660-359-2116

Springfield Office
1111 S. Glenstone
P.O. Box 4929
Springfield, Missouri 65808
417-864-6401
Fax 417-864-4967

Princeton Office
207 North Washington
Princeton, Missouri 64673
660-748-2244
Fax 660-748-4405

Smithville Office
119 E. Main Street
P.O. Box. 654
Smithville, Missouri 64089
816-532-3895
Fax 816-532-3899

WITNESS: STANLEY ESTES
TYPE OF EXHIBIT: DIRECT TESTIMONY
SPONSOR: OZARK BORDER ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE
CASE NO. EC-2003-0452

FILED⁴

MAR 02 2004

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

**Missouri Public
Service Commission**

CASE NO. EC-2003-0452

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

STANLEY ESTES

JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI

January 30, 2004

1 Q. Please state your name?

2 A. Stanley Estes.

3 Q. By whom are you employed?

4 A. Ozark Border Electric Cooperative.

5 Q. What is your job title?

6 A. General Manager

7 Q. What are your job duties?

8 A. I manage the day to day operations of the Cooperative.

9 Q. How big is Ozark Border Electric Cooperative?

10 A. the Cooperative serves 36,000 member consumers and serve in parts of 11 counties.

11 Q. With regards to this complaint case, are you authorized to provide testimony in this

12 matter?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. What is the basis of the complaint filed by Ozark Border Electric Cooperative?

15 A. Ozark Border has a territorial agreement with the City of Poplar Bluff which was entered

16 into on August 22, 1997 and approved by the Public Service Commission in Case No.

17 EO-98-143, on December 31, 1997, and an issue of customer purchase after an

18 annexation has arisen.

19 Q. What do you mean an issue has arisen.

20 A. The territorial agreement has a provision that is identical to Section 386.800 with regards

21 to newly annexed areas. The City of Poplar Bluff is supposed to notify Ozark Border

22 within 60 days of an annexation that the City is willing to purchase the newly annexed

23 customers from the Cooperative.

1 Q. What does the territorial agreement provision actually say?

2 A. Paragraph 4b states as follows:

3 "B. If the City annexes a parcel or parcels located within Zone 1, the City shall, within
4 sixty (60) days after the effective date of annexation, 1) provide the notice by publication
5 in a newspaper of general circulation, and 2) provide written notice to the Cooperative of
6 City's intent to include any structure served by the Cooperative within the annexed area
7 into the City's service territory, as provided in Section 386.800 RSMo. 1994."

8 Q. Did Ozark Border get notice for some of the annexations?

9 A. No. There are approximately 41 customers that were voluntarily annexed in the City
10 limits of Poplar Bluff that the Cooperative did not get actual notice of, and Poplar Bluff
11 is now wanting the Cooperative to sell these customers anyway.

12 Q. As you understand the territorial agreement with Poplar Bluff, is the Cooperative
13 required to sell these customers to Poplar Bluff?

14 A. No. As I stated earlier, the territorial agreement has an actual notice requirement. The
15 Cooperative did not receive notice of the voluntary annexation within the 60 days period
16 that would trigger the provision that would have the Cooperative sell the annexed
17 customers to the City of Poplar Bluff.

18 Q. How do you know that the City of Poplar Bluff wants to purchase these customers?

19 A. The City approached the Cooperative and notified me that it wanted to purchase the 41
20 customers.

21 Q. Was this notification within the time frame as set out in the territorial agreement?

22 A. No. In some cases the annexations were over 2 years old.

23 Q. Is this where the disagreement between the Cooperative and Poplar Bluff has arose?

1 A. Yes, the City believes that the Territorial Agreement provision for notice is not actual
2 notice, but that constructive notice is sufficient to trigger the sale provision.

3 Q. Do you agree with the City's position?

4 A. No, that is why we are at the Commission now. The Territorial Agreement has a
5 provision that any disagreements between the parties will be resolved by an informal
6 opinion of the Commission.

7 Q. Is that what you are asking the Commission to do?

8 A. Yes. Ozark Border is asking the Commission to determine the meaning of paragraph 4B
9 of the Territorial Agreement. As stated earlier, Ozark Border believes that there is an
10 actual notice requirement for each annexation and each customer that the City of Poplar
11 Bluff wants to purchase. However, the City has taken the position that constructive
12 notice of the annexations is sufficient to trigger the sale provision of the Territorial
13 Agreement.

14 Q. Do you think that the City of Poplar Bluff knows that there is an actual notice
15 requirement?

16 A. Yes. In discussions with City representatives it was admitted that there was a mistake
17 made in that no notice was given within 60 days after the effective date of various
18 annexations.

19 Q. Then why do you think that the City of Poplar Bluff is taking the position that
20 constructive notice is sufficient to trigger paragraph 4b of the Territorial Agreement.

21 A. As I understand the City's position, the City made commitments to the annexed
22 customers to serve them with municipal services, including electric service. This
23 commitment has made the City take a position with the notice provision of paragraph 4b

1 of the Territorial Agreement that they know is inconsistent with the requirement that
2 actual notice is to be given within 60 days of the annexation to trigger the sale provision.

3 Q. In negotiating the Territorial Agreement what was the consideration for including
4 paragraph 4 in the Agreement?

5 A. Because the Territorial Agreement has 3 zones that cover the exclusive service provider
6 for each zone, with zone 1 being the City's exclusive service area, consideration was
7 given to areas that are outside the city limits, but would be annexed into the City in the
8 future. To cover those future annexations it was decided to include language from
9 Section 386.800 on how the City can buy the annexed customers.

10 Q. Did you alter any of the language of Section 386.800 when you included it in the
11 Territorial Agreement?

12 A. Yes. The only alteration was that it is not discretionary to sell as provided in Section
13 386.800, but makes it mandatory to sell the customers.

14 Q. Does Section 386.800 have an actual notice requirement?

15 A. Based on my understanding of Section 386.800, it does have an actual notice
16 requirement.

17 Q. Is the actual notice requirement contained in Section 386.800 the same requirement
18 contained in the Territorial Agreement?

19 A. Yes, the notice is the same.

20 Q. Why was the notice provision of Section 386.800 included in the Territorial Agreement?

21 A. It was included in the Territorial Agreement to establish a process and procedure that has
22 certainty in establishing a deadline by which changes in the service territory may occur.

23 This certainty enables the parties to make long-term plans and development of

1 infrastructure which includes providing proper maintenance. Without a deadline on when
2 the City can purchase customers after an annexation leaves the Cooperative in an
3 awkward position. Not knowing if and when the City is going to exercise its right to
4 purchase the customers would unduly burden the Cooperative.

5 Q. How would it unduly burden the Cooperative?

6 A. Once an area is annexed, if the 60 day notice isn't followed, the Cooperative is required
7 to maintain the facilities. Long-term planning takes into consideration providing the
8 necessary power and energy to these same customers after an annexation. If there was no
9 time limit placed on the notice provision, the Cooperative would be placed in the
10 precarious position of having its long-term planning subject to change based on the
11 whims of when the City wanted to exercise the option to purchase.

12 Q. The City contends that the Territorial Agreement contemplates that the annexed areas in
13 zone 1 be served by the City and that the Cooperative is not harmed by failure to receive
14 actual notice within the 60 day time frame.

15 A. While the City may believe that there is no harm, no foul, in not providing the 60 days
16 notice, the City's position ignores the express language of the Territorial Agreement.
17 Such position ignores the fact that the Cooperative has a right to rely on the contracts it
18 enters into. If you ignore this provision of the Agreement, then what other provisions
19 could be ignored? That is a major concern of the Cooperative, because if you can't rely
20 on the express language of the Territorial Agreement, then the Agreement is meaningless.

21 Q. What are you asking the Commission to do?

22 A. The Cooperative is asking the Commission to find that the notice provision in paragraph
23 4B requires actual notice of the requested purchase within 60 days of the annexation. In

1 the alternative, if the Commission finds that constructive notice is sufficient to trigger the
2 sale provision as argued by the City, then it is Ozark Border's position that the Territorial
3 Agreement is either 1) no longer in the public interest as it does not establish with
4 certainty the exclusive service areas of Ozark Border Electric Cooperative, or 2) that the
5 Agreement is no longer in the public interest and/or is void as there was an apparent
6 failure of the parties to have a "meeting of the minds" with respect to the 60 day notice
7 provision in paragraph 4(B) of the Territorial Agreement with respect to whether said
8 provision was a substantive provision that was to be strictly adhered to, or a procedure
9 provision that need not be adhered to.

10 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

11 A. Yes.


BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Ozark Border Electric Cooperative)	
)	
Complainant)	
)	
)	Case No. EC-2003-0452
City of Poplar Bluff,)	
)	
Respondent)	

AFFIDAVIT OF STANLEY ESTES


STATE OF MISSOURI)
) SS
COUNTY OF)

Stanley Estes, of lawful age, on his oath states that he has participated in the preparation of the foregoing Direct Testimony, in question and answer form, consisting of 6 pages to be presented in the above case; that the answers in the foregoing Direct Testimony were given by him; that he has knowledge of the matters set forth in such answers; and that such matters are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.


Stanley Estes

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 29th day of January, 2004.

TERESA H. FANSLER
Notary Public-Notary Seal
STATE OF MISSOURI
Wayne County
My Commission Expires July 17, 2006


Notary Public

(seal)

My commission expires: July 17, 2006