

**BEFORE THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF KANSAS**

In the Matter of the Application of Southern )  
Pioneer Electric Company for Approval to ) Docket No. 25-SPEE-353-TAR  
Make Certain Changes to its Rules and )  
Regulations Tariff. )

**TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF UNANIMOUS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT OF**

**CHANTRY C. SCOTT  
EXECUTIVE VP, ASSISTANT CEO & CFO  
SOUTHERN PIONEER ELECTRIC COMPANY**

**ON BEHALF OF**

**SOUTHERN PIONEER ELECTRIC COMPANY**

August 18, 2025

1    **INTRODUCTION**

2

3    **Q.     Please state your name and business address.**

4    A.     My name is Chantry C. Scott. My business address for legal service is 1850 W. Oklahoma,  
5           Ulysses Kansas 67880 and for mail receipt is PO Box 430, Ulysses Kansas 67880-0430.

6    **Q.     Are you the same Chantry C. Scott who provided direct and rebuttal testimony in**  
7           **this docket?**

8    A.     Yes.

9    **Q.     What is the purpose of your current testimony in this proceeding?**

10   A.     The purpose of my current testimony is to provide support for the Unanimous Settlement  
11           Agreement entered into in this docket between Southern Pioneer, Kansas Corporation  
12           Commission Staff (“Staff”) and Citizens’ Utility Ratepayer Board (“CURB”).

13   **Q.     Please provide a brief description of the Company’s issues leading to the filing of this**  
14           **docket.**

15   A.     As summarized and addressed in my direct testimony filed in this docket, because of the  
16           unique history and corporate structure of the Southern Pioneer, it had become important  
17           for Southern Pioneer to make substantial changes to its Rules and Regulations tariff.  
18           Southern Pioneer’s proposed changes to its Rules and Regulations are warranted because  
19           Southern Pioneer has only made limited revisions to its Rules and Regulations since they  
20           were initially adopted in 2007 after the approval of the Aquilla acquisition. In the interim,  
21           industry and corporate changes have occurred that warrant revisions of the Rules and  
22           Regulations, which govern Southern Pioneer’s interactions and relationship with its  
23           customers.

1 Southern Pioneer, therefore, proposed to make numerous changes to its Rules and  
2 Regulations, which I placed into four categories in my direct testimony: changes to update  
3 the Rules and Regulations to reflect current market conditions, practices, expectations and  
4 changes in technology,<sup>1</sup> changes necessary to align Southern Pioneer's Rules and  
5 Regulations with those of its parent, Pioneer Electric Cooperative,<sup>2</sup> changes necessary to  
6 align the Rules and Regulations with its Southern Pioneer's new rate structure established  
7 in Docket No. 25-SPEE-415-TAR,<sup>3</sup> and various other miscellaneous revisions and  
8 clarifications identified in my direct testimony, and in the direct testimony and exhibits  
9 provided by Mr. Brian Beecher on behalf of Southern Pioneer.<sup>4</sup>

10 **Q. Are Southern Pioneer's initial requested revisions reflected in this docket?**

11 A. Yes. They are described in the table attached as Exhibit A, and in the redline tariff attached  
12 as Exhibit B to the direct testimony of Brian Beecher in this docket.

13 **Q. Did any parties state objections to Southern Pioneer's requested revisions in this**  
14 **docket?**

15 A. Yes. Both Staff and CURB filed direct testimony in this case. In Direct Testimony,  
16 filed by witness Douglas W. Hall, Staff objected to Southern Pioneer's requested  
17 revisions reflected in the following tariff sections:

- 19 • R3, Section A.2.b
- 20 • R3, Section A.2.c
- 21 • R3, Section B. (1), (2), (3), (6), (7) and (8)

---

<sup>1</sup> Scott Direct Testimony, p. 8–9.

<sup>2</sup> Id. at p. 9–10.

<sup>3</sup> Id. at p. 10.

<sup>4</sup> Id. at p. 10–11.

- R4, Section A.13.a
- R4, Section E.1
- R4, Section E.4
- R5, Section C.i.6
- R5, Section C.ii.4. 6 and 9.
- R10

In addition, in its Direct Testimony filed by witness Patrick Orr, CURB objected to Southern Pioneer's requested revisions reflected in the following tariff sections R5, Section C.i.(6), and objected to revisions in R3 to the extent they would allow Southern Pioneer to require security deposits from certain residential and small commercial customers.

**Q: Were there any requested revisions that Staff and CURB agreed to accept in their Direct Testimonies?**

Yes. Staff witness Hall and CURB witness Orr both expressly confirmed that Staff and CURB agreed to Southern Pioneer's proposed revisions in R4, Sections H.4 and H.5 to limit the availability of payment by credit card to only residential customers and customers receiving single-phase service.

In addition, there were numerous revisions included in Southern Pioneer's initial requested revisions which were not expressly addressed in the Direct Testimonies of Staff or CURB. Ultimately, the parties unanimously agreed to accept and include those additional revisions in the final Unanimous Settlement Agreement in this docket.

1    **TERMS OF THE UNANIMOUS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

2

3    **Q.     Can you generally describe the final terms of the Unanimous Settlement Agreement?**

4    A.     The parties to the Unanimous Settlement Agreement all reached agreement as to all  
5           disputed issues, and therefore the Unanimous Settlement Agreement is comprehensive as  
6           to all issues presented in this docket. In general, the terms of the Unanimous Settlement  
7           Agreement can be described as follows:

- 8
- 9           • Regarding revisions requested in Section R3 of Southern Pioneer's  
10           Rules and Regulations related to when and from what customers  
11           Southern Pioneer may request or require a security deposit, the Parties  
12           agreed to a modification of the original proposed language offered by  
13           Southern Pioneer, which is reflected in Exhibit 1 to the Settlement  
14           Agreement at R3, Sections B.6, 7 and 8. The Parties further agreed that  
15           Southern Pioneer's requested revisions to R3, Sections A.2.b, and c,  
16           B.1, 2, 3 and 7 will not be adopted, and agreed to revert back to the prior  
17           language for those sections.
- 18          • Regarding revisions requested in Section R4 of Southern Pioneer's  
19           Rules and Regulations related to notifications and disclosures in bills  
20           and in nonpayment notices, the parties agreed that Southern Pioneer's  
21           requested revisions in R4 should be adopted with the exception of  
22           Southern Pioneer's requested revisions to R4, A.13.a, E.1.a. and b, and  
23           R4, F.4.ii.b. As stated above, the parties specifically agreed accept  
24           Southern Pioneer's proposed revisions in R4, Sections H.4 and H.5 to  
25           limit the availability of payment by credit card to only residential  
26           customers and customers receiving single-phase service.

- 1           • Regarding revisions to Section R5 related to contents and timing of  
2           disconnection notices the parties agreed that the requested revisions in  
3           R5 will be accepted, except those proposed revisions to R5, C.i.6, and  
4           C.ii.4., 6, and 9.
- 5           • Regarding revisions to Section R10 related to parallel generation and  
6           interconnection standards and obligations related thereto, the parties  
7           agreed that the revisions to R10 should be permitted in light of Southern  
8           Pioneer's plans to file a separate docket for approval of a new parallel  
9           generation tariff in the near future. The parties further agreed that R10  
10          would be amended to incorporate specific language related to  
11          interconnection standards stating that interconnection to Southern  
12          Pioneer's system is governed by specific State and Federal statutory and  
13          regulatory provisions, including K.S.A. 66-1,184 et seq., 66-1263 et  
14          seq., Public Utility Regulatory Policy Act and related regulations. This  
15          language is reflected on the redline Exhibit 1 to the Unanimous  
16          Settlement Agreement.
- 17          • The parties agreed that all other requested revisions would be accepted  
18          as part of the Unanimous Settlement Agreement.

19  
20          The Unanimous Settlement Agreement includes attachments Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2,  
21          which, respectively, are redlined and clean versions of the agreed Rules and Regulations  
22          tariff for Southern Pioneer pursuant to the Unanimous Settlement Agreement entered by  
23          the parties in this docket.

1 **THE SETTLEMENT MEETS THE COMMISSION'S THREE-PART TEST FOR**  
2 **UNANIMOUS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS AND SHOULD BE APPROVED**

3  
4 **Q. Are you familiar with the factors the Commission considers when reviewing a proposed**  
5 **settlement agreement?**

6 A. Yes. I am aware that the Commission will evaluate, and must make an independent finding,  
7 that a settlement agreement (a) is supported by substantial competent evidence in the record  
8 as a whole, (b) results in just and reasonable rates, and (c) is in the public interest.<sup>5</sup> The  
9 Commission has established a five-factor test to determine the reasonableness of proposed  
10 non-unanimous settlement agreements. These factors are:

- 11 • Whether each party had an opportunity to be heard on reasons for opposing  
12 the settlement.
- 13 • Whether the settlement is supported by substantial competent evidence in  
14 the record as a whole.
- 15 • Whether the settlement conforms to applicable law.
- 16 • Whether the settlement will result in just and reasonable rates.
- 17 • Whether the results of the settlement are in the public interest.<sup>6</sup>

18  
19 However, since this is a unanimous agreement, it is my understanding that the first and third  
20 factors are not applicable. I will address the other three factors.

---

<sup>5</sup> See Order Approving Nonunanimous Stipulation and Agreement, Docket No. 12-WSEE-112-RTS, issued April 18, 2012, ¶ 24; see *Citizens' Utility Ratepayer Board v. State Corp. Comm'n*, 28 Kan.App.2d 313, 316, 16 P.3d 319 (2000).

<sup>6</sup> See Order Approving Contested Settlement Agreement, Docket No. 08-ATMG-280-RTS, issued May 12, 2008, ¶¶ 9-10.

1 **The Settlement is supported by substantial competent evidence.**

2 **Q. Is there substantial competent evidence in the record of this docket to support the**  
3 **Settlement submitted by the Signatory Parties?**

4 A. Yes. All items agreed to and included in this Settlement are supported by substantial  
5 competent evidence in the record as a whole. Southern Pioneer provided substantial  
6 testimony supporting the reasons for and need for the revisions requested in this docket and  
7 agreed to by the parties, including the corporate and regulatory history of Southern Pioneer,  
8 and the need to update the Southern Pioneer Rules and Regulations to modernize and to  
9 conform with the Rules and Regulations in use by Pioneer. Although some requested  
10 revisions were met with some objection by Staff and CURB, the vast majority of the  
11 revisions have been accepted by the parties. Those areas of objection were identified and  
12 discussed in testimony submitted by Staff and CURB, as well as in my rebuttal testimony.  
13 The parties reached a reasonable agreement, which is overall supported by the substantial  
14 testimony provided in this docket.

15  
16 **The Settlement results in just and reasonable rates.**

17 **Q. Does the Settlement result in just and reasonable rates for EKC's and EKM's customers?**

18 A. The settlement does not have any specific rate impact for Southern Pioneer customers. As  
19 such, the settlement does not impact rates charged by Southern Pioneer, which have  
20 previously been determined by the Commission to be just and reasonable. Therefore, the  
21 settlement does result in just and reasonable rates.



1    **The results of the Settlement are in the public interest**

2    **Q. Is the Settlement in the public interest?**

3    A.     Yes. The settlement is in the public interest, and in particular in the interest of the  
4           Southern Pioneer customers. The revisions to the Rules and Regulations clarify,  
5           streamline and modernize much of the Rules and Regulations which had not been  
6           substantially revised since 2007.

7           Moreover, many of the revisions to the Rules and Regulations harmonize the  
8           provisions of Southern Pioneer's Rules and Regulations with those of its parent  
9           company, Pioneer. As discussed in my Direct Testimony filed in this docket, Southern  
10          Pioneer and Pioneer are generally managed by one management team overseeing both  
11          entities, and the day-to-day work of both entities is generally carried out by one set of  
12          employees shared by both entities. Conforming the Southern Pioneer and Pioneer Rules  
13          and Regulations as much as possible creates efficiencies that are directly beneficial to  
14          Southern Pioneer customers.

15          In addition, certain revisions in Section R3 pertaining to security deposits allow  
16          Southern Pioneer to require a security deposit in situations and from certain customers  
17          whose non-payment may be a financial threat to Southern Pioneer. This will allow  
18          Southern Pioneer more security and means to recover against substantial customer  
19          nonpayment, as opposed to having to spread recovery of any substantial non-payment  
20          loss over the entire Southern Pioneer customer base.

21          Finally, the revisions to R4, H.4 and H.5 limiting the availability of payment by  
22          credit card to only residential customers and customers receiving single-phase service  
23          is a substantial benefit to Southern Pioneer customers. Southern Pioneer had incurred

1 substantial merchant fees related to numerous and large credit card payments made by  
2 certain large commercial customers, which again had to be spread over the entire  
3 customer base. The substantial need for this revision was discussed in my Direct  
4 Testimony at pages 13–17, as well as in Docket 25-SPEE-307-MIS.

5 Overall, the terms of the Unanimous Settlement Agreement are substantially  
6 beneficial to Southern Pioneer, its customers, and the public at large.

7  
8 **CONCLUSION**

9  
10 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

11 **A.** Yes, it does.

## **VERIFICATION**

I, Chantry C Scott, of lawful age, state:

That I am Executive VP – Assistant CEO & Chief Financial Officer of Southern Pioneer Electric Company; that I do solemnly, sincerely and truly declare and affirm that I have read this Testimony In Support Of Unanimous Settlement Agreement and know the contents thereof; and, that the facts therein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, and I affirm this under the pains and penalties of perjury.



---

Chantry C. Scott

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of the above and foregoing was electronically filed with the Kansas Corporation Commission on August 15, 2025, and that one copy was delivered electronically to all parties on the service list as follows:

JOSEPH R. ASTRAB, CONSUMER COUNSEL  
CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD  
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD  
TOPEKA, KS 66604  
[Joseph.Astrab@ks.gov](mailto:Joseph.Astrab@ks.gov)

TODD E. LOVE, ATTORNEY  
CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD  
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD  
TOPEKA, KS 66604  
[Todd.Love@ks.gov](mailto:Todd.Love@ks.gov)

SHONDA RABB  
CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD  
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD  
TOPEKA, KS 66604  
[Shonda.Rabb@ks.gov](mailto:Shonda.Rabb@ks.gov)

DELLA SMITH  
CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD  
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD  
TOPEKA, KS 66604  
[Della.Smith@ks.gov](mailto:Della.Smith@ks.gov)

PATRICK HURLEY, CHIEF LITIGATION COUNSEL  
KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION  
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD  
TOPEKA, KS 66604  
[Patrick.Hurley@ks.gov](mailto:Patrick.Hurley@ks.gov)

CARLY MASENTHIN, LITIGATION COUNSEL  
KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION  
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD  
TOPEKA, KS 66604  
[Carly.Masenthin@ks.gov](mailto:Carly.Masenthin@ks.gov)

VALERIE SMITH, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

MORRIS LAING EVANS BROCK & KENNEDY  
800 SW JACKSON  
SUITE 1310  
TOPEKA, KS 66612-1216  
[vsmith@morrislaing.com](mailto:vsmith@morrislaing.com)

TREVOR WOHLFORD, ATTORNEY  
MORRIS LAING EVANS BROCK & KENNEDY  
800 SW JACKSON  
SUITE 1310  
TOPEKA, KS 66612-1216  
[twohlford@morrislaing.com](mailto:twohlford@morrislaing.com)

GLEND A CAFER, MORRIS LAING LAW FIRM  
MORRIS LAING EVANS BROCK & KENNEDY CHTD  
800 SW JACKSON STE 1310  
TOPEKA, KS 66612-1216  
[gcafer@morrislaing.com](mailto:gcafer@morrislaing.com)

SHELBY HUGHART, LEGAL ASSISTANT  
MORRIS LAING EVANS BROCK & KENNEDY CHTD  
300 N MEAD STE 200  
WICHITA, KS 67202-2745  
[shughart@morrislaing.com](mailto:shughart@morrislaing.com)

WILL B. WOHLFORD, ATTORNEY  
MORRIS LAING EVANS BROCK & KENNEDY CHTD  
300 N MEAD STE 200  
WICHITA, KS 67202-2745  
[wwohlford@morrislaing.com](mailto:wwohlford@morrislaing.com)

BRIAN BEECHER, OPERATIONS AND ENGINEERING MANAGER  
SOUTHERN PIONEER ELECTRIC COMPANY  
3997 NE WELL ROAD  
PO BOX 347  
MEDICINE LODGE, KS 67104  
[BBEECHER@SOUTHERNPIONEER.NET](mailto:BBEECHER@SOUTHERNPIONEER.NET)

LINDSAY CAMPBELL, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER  
SOUTHERN PIONEER ELECTRIC COMPANY  
1850 W OKLAHOMA  
PO BOX 430  
ULYSSES, KS 67880-0368  
[lcampbell@pioneerelectric.coop](mailto:lcampbell@pioneerelectric.coop)

SHERRY EASTON, MANAGER OF ACCOUNTING  
SOUTHERN PIONEER ELECTRIC COMPANY  
1850 W OKLAHOMA  
PO BOX 430  
ULYSSES, KS 67880-0368  
[seaston@pioneerelectric.coop](mailto:seaston@pioneerelectric.coop)

LARISSA LAYMAN, LEGAL & REG AFFAIRS COORDINATOR  
SOUTHERN PIONEER ELECTRIC COMPANY  
1850 W OKLAHOMA  
PO BOX 430  
ULYSSES, KS 67880-0368  
[LLAYMAN@PIONEERELECTRIC.COOP](mailto:LLAYMAN@PIONEERELECTRIC.COOP)

CLINT MEIER, VP - ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS  
SOUTHERN PIONEER ELECTRIC COMPANY  
1850 WEST OKLAHOMA  
PO BOX 403  
ULYSSES, KS 67880  
[cmeier@pioneerelectric.coop](mailto:cmeier@pioneerelectric.coop)

CHANTRY SCOTT, EXEC VP, ASST CEO & CFO  
SOUTHERN PIONEER ELECTRIC COMPANY  
1850 WEST OKLAHOMA  
PO BOX 403  
ULYSSES, KS 67880  
[CSCOTT@PIONEERELECTRIC.COOP](mailto:CSCOTT@PIONEERELECTRIC.COOP)

/s/ Will B. Wohlford  
Will B. Wohlford