

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Patricia A. Noonan,	)	
	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<u>Case No. EC-2008-0335</u>
	)	
Kansas City Power & Light Co.,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

NOTICE OF COMPLAINT

Issue Date: April 16, 2008

Kansas City Power & Light Company
1201 Walnut
P.O. Box 418679
Kansas City, Missouri 64141

CERTIFIED MAIL

On April 14, 2008, Complainant Patricia A. Noonan filed a formal complaint with the Missouri Public Service Commission against Respondent Kansas City Power & Light Company ("KCPL"), a copy of which is enclosed. Under Commission Rule 4 CSR 240-2.070(7), Respondent shall have 30 days from the date of this notice to file an answer or to file notice that the complaint has been satisfied. Since this notice is being issued on April 16, 2008, KCPL's response is due no later than May 16, 2008.

In the alternative, the Respondent may file a written request that the complaint be referred to a neutral third-party mediator for **voluntary mediation** of the complaint. Upon receipt of a request for mediation, the 30-day time period shall be tolled while the Commission ascertains whether the Complainant is also willing to submit to voluntary mediation. If the Complainant agrees to mediation, the time period within which an answer is due shall be suspended pending the resolution of the mediation process. Additional information regarding the mediation process is enclosed.

If the Complainant declines the opportunity to seek mediation, the Respondent will be notified in writing that the tolling period has ceased and will also be notified of the date by which an answer or notice of satisfaction must be filed. That period will usually be the remainder of the original 30-day period.

All pleadings (including the answer, the notice of satisfaction of complaint, or request for mediation) shall be mailed to:

Secretary of the Missouri Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0360

A copy of such pleadings shall be served upon the Complainant at her home address as listed within the enclosed complaint. A copy of this notice has been mailed to the Complainant.

BY THE COMMISSION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Colleen M. Dale', is written over a horizontal line.

Colleen M. Dale
Secretary

(S E A L)

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri,
on this 16th day of April, 2008.

Lane, Regulatory Law Judge

Copy to: Patricia A. Noonan
4120 N.W. 79th St. #16
Kansas City, Missouri 64151

FILED
April 14, 2008
Data Center
Missouri Public
Service Commission

To: Missouri Public Service
Commission

Fax 314.573-522-6176

From: Patricia A. x1...

4120 NW 79th St, # 16

KCMO 64151

Phones: 816-456-5593
816-505-0740

Date: April 13, 2008

Re: Formal Complaint against
Kansas City Power and Light

Last month (March 2008)
I called Kansas City Power
and Light (KCP&L) twice
because someone at the leasing
office made a mistake and thought
I owed money to the apartment
complex on a KCP&L bill. Both
times I was given an
indication everything was OK
with my account.

Some months prior, I was
put on a payment plan of \$120.00
per month. I was not told
exactly how this \$120.00 was
broken down.

Last week (on or about
Tuesday, April 8th) I called
KCP&L to make a payment.
The person I spoke with said
there is a \$481.17 cutoff fee (or
charge) which had to be paid, or
my electricity would be cut off.
I then spoke with a supervisor
who said the same thing.

I was not told this was
the amount owed on my account.
A cutoff fee (or charge) is not

the same thing. The supervisor said something to the effect that an initiation fee for the \$126.00/month plan was never paid.

That was the first time I heard of such a fee. To date, I still have no idea of the amount of the fee.

I never received my bill for March 2008, and just this weekend received the "IMPORTANT NOTICE" bill. It was only then that I saw the Past Due Amount: \$481.17 notice, and realized the \$481.17 was for amount KCP&L is saying I owe, and not an amount to cutoff my electricity.

I am a senior citizen, working two jobs. This matter with KCP&L has caused me to have considerable distress. I have lost sleep over this, and have had heart palpitations (I have a heart condition).

I have done my best to create a proper Formal Complaint. Please

advise me if anything is lacking.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia A. Noonan

Patricia A. Noonan

Dated: April 13, 2008



Commissioners

JEFF DAVIS
Chairman

CONNIE MURRAY

ROBERT M. CLAYTON III

LINWARD "LIN" APPLING

TERRY JARRETT

Missouri Public Service Commission

POST OFFICE BOX 360
JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102
573-751-3234
573-751-1847 (Fax Number)
<http://www.psc.mo.gov>

WESS A. HENDERSON
Executive Director

DANA K. JOYCE
Director, Administration

ROBERT SCHALLENBERG
Director, Utility Services

NATELLE DIETRICH
Director, Utility Operations

COLLEEN M. DALE
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge

KEVIN A. THOMPSON
General Counsel

Information Sheet Regarding Mediation of Commission Formal Complaint Cases

Mediation is a process whereby the parties themselves work to resolve their dispute with the aid of a neutral third-party mediator. This process is sometimes referred to as "facilitated negotiation." The mediator's role is advisory and although the mediator may offer suggestions, the mediator has no authority to impose a solution nor will the mediator determine who "wins." Instead, the mediator simply works with both parties to facilitate communications and to attempt to enable the parties to reach an agreement which is mutually agreeable to both the complainant and the respondent.

The mediation process is explicitly a problem-solving one in which neither the parties nor the mediator are bound by the usual constraints such as the rules of evidence or the other formal procedures required in hearings before the Missouri Public Service Commission. Although many private mediators charge as much as \$250 per hour, the University of Missouri-Columbia School of Law has agreed to provide this service to parties who have formal complaints pending before the Public Service Commission at no charge. Not only is the service provided free of charge, but mediation is also less expensive than the formal complaint process because the assistance of an attorney is not necessary for mediation. In fact, the parties are encouraged not to bring an attorney to the mediation meeting.

The formal complaint process before the Commission invariably results in a determination by which there is a "winner" and a "loser" although the value of winning may well be offset by the cost of attorneys fees and the delays of protracted litigation. Mediation is not only a much quicker process but it also offers the unique opportunity for informal, direct communication between the two parties to the complaint and mediation is far more likely to result in a settlement which, because it was mutually agreed to, pleases both parties. This is traditionally referred to as "win-win" agreement.

The traditional mediator's role is to (1) help the participants understand the mediation process, (2) facilitate their ability to speak directly to each other, (3) maintain order, (4) clarify misunderstandings, (5) assist in identifying issues, (6) diffuse unrealistic expectations, (7) assist in translating one participant's perspective or proposal into a form that is more understandable and acceptable to the other participant, (8) assist the participants with the actual negotiation process, (9) occasionally a mediator may propose a possible solution, and (10) on rare occasions a mediator may encourage a participant to accept a particular solution. The mediator will not possess any specialized knowledge of the utility industry or of utility law.

In order for the Commission to refer a complaint case to mediation, the parties must both agree to mediate their conflict in good faith. The party filing the complaint must agree to appear and to make a good faith effort to mediate and the utility company against which the complaint has been filed must send a representative who has full authority to settle the complaint case. The essence of mediation stems from the fact that the participants are both genuinely interested in resolving the complaint.

Because mediation thrives in an atmosphere of free and open discussion, all settlement offers and other information which is revealed during mediation is shielded against subsequent disclosure in front of the Missouri Public Service Commission and is considered to be privileged information. The only information which must be disclosed to the Public Service Commission is (a) whether the case has been settled and (b) whether, irrespective of the outcome, the mediation effort was considered to be a worthwhile endeavor. The Commission will not ask what took place during the mediation.

If the dispute is settled at the mediation, the Commission will require a signed release from the complainant in order for the Commission to dismiss the formal complaint case.

If the dispute is not resolved through the mediation process, neither party will be prejudiced for having taken part in the mediation and, at that point, the formal complaint case will simply resume its normal course.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Colleen M. Dale', with a stylized, cursive script.

Colleen M. Dale
Secretary