

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

Noranda Aluminum, Inc., et al., Complainants, v.)	
Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri,)	Case No. EC-2014-0224
Respondent.)	Case No. EC-2014-0223


NOTICE OF COMMUNICATION

Issue Date: June 25th, 2014

I received the attached letter, regarding the above referenced case.

The Missouri Public Service Commission (“Commission”) has promulgated rules denoted as the “Standards of Conduct” at 4 CSR 240-4.010 and 4.020. Section 4 CSR 240-4.20 specifically deals with Ex Parte and Extra-Record Communication Rules. This notice is filed in conformance with the rule.

Respectfully Submitted,


Stephen M. Stoll
Commissioner


Mark D. Hughes
Adviser to Commissioner Steve Stoll

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri,
On this 25th day of June, 2014.



Corporate Offices

436 Old Mt. Holly Road
Goose Creek, SC 29445
Tel 843.572.1100 • 800.588.1100
Fax 843.572.1049

June 19th 2014

SENT VIA U.S. MAIL AND BY FAX (573) 526-7341

Robert S. Kenney, Chairman
Stephen M. Stoll, Commissioner
William P. Kenney, Commissioner
Daniel Y. Hall, Commissioner
Missouri Public Service Commission
200 Madison Street
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0360

Re: Noranda Aluminum, Inc., et al. Complainants v. Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri, Respondent – Case No. EC-2014-0224

Dear Honorable Chairman and Commissioners:

I am writing to notify you of JW Aluminum Company's ("JW Aluminum") opposition to a February 12, 2014 rate case filing made with the Missouri Public Service Commission ("PSC") by Noranda Aluminum ("Noranda"), a Tennessee-based company with a facility in New Madrid, Missouri. The rate case will adversely impact JW Aluminum and its St. Louis, Missouri operation.

JW Aluminum's St. Louis, Missouri operation employs approximately 204 people and purchases its electricity from Ameren Missouri.

We understand that Noranda currently has a more favorable rate than JW Aluminum. The rate case filed by Noranda seeks to further reduce their rate by another 25 percent. This reduction would shift costs to other consumers, totaling more than a half of a billion dollars, and more than two percent per year for the next decade. If this rate shift is approved, it will cost JW Aluminum an additional \$472,673 over the 10 year rate shift request.

Forcing Ameren to subsidize Noranda's power cost is unfair to JW Aluminum and other Ameren customers who would be required to absorb the subsidy. Forcing JW Aluminum to subsidize Noranda is especially unfair to JW Aluminum because Noranda is a direct competitor. JW Aluminum directly competes with Noranda on the following products produced in Missouri: light gauge foil and rolled aluminum sheet which would include light gauge foil products, flexible packaging, film stock, container stock and cable wrap.

While JW Aluminum opposes the subject rate case filing on the grounds that it is unfair and bad policy, if the PSC is inclined to grant all or any part of Noranda's request, JW Aluminum hereby requests the opportunity to join in the subject rate case filing and receive the same rate relief.

Thank you for your time and attention to this urgent matter.

Sincerely,

Lee McCarter, Chief Executive Officer