```
1
 2
 3
 4
     STATE OF MISSOURI
     PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
 5
 6
     PETER B. HOWARD
 8
          VS.
     UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY, d/b/a AMERENUE
9
    Case No. EC-2008-0329
10
11
12
     TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
13
     PREHEARING CONFERENCE
14
        VOLUME I
15
      JUNE 30, 2008
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
 2
                          STATE OF MISSOURI
 3
                      PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
 4
                      TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
 5
                        Prehearing Conference
 6
                            June 30, 2008
                      Jefferson City, Missouri
 8
                              Volume I
 9
10
     Peter B. Howard,
                                        )
11
                Complainant,
                                      ) Case No. EC-2008-0329
12
                                        )
     v.
                                       )
13
                                        )
     Union Electric Company,
     d/b/a AmerenUE,
14
                                        )
                                       )
15
                Respondent.
16
                      NANCY DIPPELL, Presiding,
17
                              DEPUTY CHIEF REGULATORY LAW JUDGE
18
19
20
     REPORTED BY:
     Patricia A. Stewart
21
     RMR, RPR, CCR 401
22
     Midwest Litigation Services
     3432 West Truman Boulevard, Suite 207
     Jefferson City, Missouri 65109
23
     (573) 636-7551
24
25
```

```
1
    APPEARANCES:
 2
     FOR PETER B. HOWARD:
 3
    PRO SE
 4
 5
    FOR UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY, D/B/A AMERENUE:
    Wendy K. Tatro, Associate General Counsel
 6
     1901 Chouteau Avenue
     St. Louis, Missouri 63155
     (314) 554-3484
 8
     FOR STAFF OF THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION:
 9
10
     Sarah Kliethermes, Legal Counsel
     P. O. Box 360
     Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
11
     (573) 751-6726
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

- 1 PROCEEDINGS
- 2 JUDGE DIPPELL: This is Case
- 3 No. EC-2008-0329 in the matter of Peter B. Howard,
- 4 Complainant, versus Union Electric Company, doing business
- 5 as AmerenUE.
- 6 My name is Nancy Dippell. I'm the
- 7 regulatory law judge assigned to this case, and I'll be
- 8 conducting the prehearing conference -- the on-the-record
- 9 portion of the prehearing conference this morning.
- 10 What we'll do is we'll take entries of
- 11 appearance from everyone and then discuss a few
- 12 preliminary matters, and after we do that formal part
- 13 that's on the record, if you-all want some time to discuss
- 14 your case together, we'll go off the record and you guys
- 15 can remain on the line and do that without the court
- 16 reporter transcribing everything.
- 17 So the purpose today is really to bring you
- 18 all together and see if we can work out kind of a
- 19 settlement to this or to proceed with procedural details
- 20 so that we can keep this case moving.
- 21 I'll go ahead and begin then with entries of
- 22 appearance, and we'll start with Staff.
- 23 MS. KLIETHERMES: Sarah Kliethermes for the
- 24 Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission, Governor
- 25 Office Building, Suite 800, 200 Madison Street,

- 1 P. O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.
- 2 JUDGE DIPPELL: And can you-all on the phone
- 3 hear Ms. Kliethermes?
- 4 MS. TATRO: Barely.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Just barely.
- 6 MS. KLIETHERMES: I'll speak up.
- 7 JUDGE DIPPELL: She'll speak up if she has
- 8 some input later. I'm right next to the phone, and she's
- 9 a little bit away from it.
- 10 Then Ms. Tatro.
- MS. TATRO: Wendy Tatro for AmerenUE,
- 12 1901 Chouteau Avenue -- are you still there?
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes.
- Has someone joined us?
- Mr. Howard, are you still there?
- MS. TATRO: Should I complete my entry of
- 17 appearance.
- 18 JUDGE DIPPELL: Go ahead and complete your
- 19 entry of appearance, and then we'll go off the record.
- 20 MS. TATRO: 1901 Chouteau Avenue, St. Louis,
- 21 Missouri 63103.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Let's go off the record.
- 23 (OFF THE RECORD.)
- JUDGE DIPPELL: We can go back on the
- 25 record.

б

- 1 Technical difficulties here. Mr. Howard is
- 2 back on the line with us.
- 3 So, Mr. Howard, would you like to make your
- 4 entry of appearance?
- 5 MR. HOWARD: Peter Howard. I want to make
- 6 an entry of appearance on this matter, Case No.
- 7 EC-2008-0329.
- 8 JUDGE DIPPELL: Great. All right. I just
- 9 recently took this case over from Judge Lane, so I'm not
- 10 as familiar with the facts, but I have read the general
- 11 facts and the pleadings and so forth.
- 12 Mr. Howard, do you still have facts that
- 13 are -- facts about this case that you contend are
- 14 different than those that were -- have you received a copy
- of the Staff recommendation?
- MR. HOWARD: Yeah.
- 17 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Did you have facts
- 18 that you believe are still in dispute, something you
- 19 disagree with according to that Staff recommendation?
- 20 MR. HOWARD: Yes. The facts disputed are
- 21 this: The residence has been unoccupied since 1998.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you.
- MR. HOWARD: The billing -- this reading
- 24 they received was July 23rd, 2006. However, if you look
- 25 prior to that, 2005, 2004, you see that the average usage,

- 1 when the readings were good, I assume, the transmitter was
- 2 working properly, the readings were averaging around \$25,
- 3 \$30 a month, and that pretty much reflects an unoccupied
- 4 residence.
- 5 They sent me a letter stipulating that in
- 6 2000-- the last reading was 2000-- July 23rd, 2006. Then
- 7 they sent me a letter informing me that they changed the
- 8 meter, and once they changed the meter, they realized that
- 9 I had been undercharged for usage to the area. So they
- 10 sent me a bill for \$1,000 or something like that. Then
- 11 they corrected it to \$500, which is still inaccurate.
- 12 They made repeated -- they've contradicted
- 13 themselves repeatedly. They've been inconsistent in their
- 14 statements to me and to you guys as well.
- 15 I've indicated that I've sent you -- the
- 16 last communication I had with you guys, I sent you
- 17 readings from August 21st to September of 2005, where the
- 18 bill was \$29.11.
- 19 The month prior to that, assuming the beam
- 20 was transmitting properly then, 2005, prior to that
- 21 there -- August 25th -- it was 28.56 prior to that month.
- 22 Okay?
- This is -- now we're talking about August.
- 24 We're talking about the height of the summer, when it's
- 25 really hot outside. And this is when the meter supposedly

- 1 was working accurately, and my average bill was \$29,
- 2 because no one lives at that residence. And that should
- 3 accurately reflect, you know, the fact that no one lives
- 4 there, other than my animals, and they don't consume a lot
- 5 of electricity.
- 6 They came up with the story -- I asked you
- 7 guys to check back -- there has been no gas service there
- 8 for at least ten years. I know that.
- 9 Then they make the accusation that the house
- 10 is heated by electricity, which is a lie. They just --
- 11 you know, they just keep coming up with things off the top
- 12 of their head, it seems to me.
- They're wrong. I think this is a fetal
- 14 attempt to apportion the costs for Taum Sauk, for trimming
- 15 tree limbs away from lines, from burial lines. They're
- 16 trying to apportion it off to the consumer, and it's just
- 17 that simple.
- 18 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. So basically,
- 19 Mr. Howard, you still dispute that the reading that they
- 20 have is accurate?
- 21 MR. HOWARD: Yes, I do. It's their line
- 22 (inaudible).
- THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me?
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Howard, can you slow
- 25 down a little bit? With the telephone connection, it's a

- 1 little difficult for the court reporter to understand you.
- 2 MR. HOWARD: I'm sorry.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: That's all right.
- 4 MR. HOWARD: My point of contention being no
- 5 one lives there. No one has lived there since 1998. The
- 6 readings reflect that fact.
- 7 You know, after this Taum Sauk thing and
- 8 Johnson State Park scenario, they're trying to apportion
- 9 that cost off to the consumer.
- 10 And, you know, I had disputed bills before.
- 11 When I know you're wrong, I know you're wrong, and, I
- 12 mean, there is nothing to talk about. You know, and
- 13 they're sending me a bill that says I owe them \$700. For
- 14 what? What do I owe you \$700 for?
- No one lives there. You can't -- they can't
- 16 justify that bill. They can't justify it. They really
- 17 can't.
- 18 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Well, my job here
- 19 today is not really to hear your case. It's just to --
- 20 today we're just talking about what is still in dispute.
- 21 So it's obvious to me that you still have a
- 22 factual dispute, so --
- MR. HOWARD: The last bill they sent me was
- 24 I think for \$35. I think it's \$30, something like that.
- 25 It more -- more accurately reflects what is used there.

- 1 I think that's pretty liberal. I think it should be less
- 2 than that.
- Prior to that they sent me a bill for \$77.
- 4 Prior to that they sent me another bill. I paid them, you
- 5 know. I had to because this thing is contingent, so I
- 6 have to pay them while this thing is proceeding. So I
- 7 paid them those costs.
- 8 They're just wrong. You know, basically
- 9 they're just wrong. They are.
- 10 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Ms. Tatro, did you
- 11 have anything to add?
- MS. TATRO: Well, I mean, the purpose today
- 13 is to see whether or not there is room for settlement, and
- 14 at this point I don't know that that's going to happen.
- 15 AmerenUE believes that Mr. Howard actually
- 16 owes more than the 500, but we cut it in half to 500 in an
- 17 attempt to resolve this as part of the informal process.
- 18 I suggest that perhaps we just set this for hearing.
- 19 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Ms. Kliethermes, did
- 20 you have anything to add?
- 21 MS. KLIETHERMES: Staff's recommendation was
- 22 that we -- Staff's recommendation after their
- 23 investigation was that Mr. Howard's complaint not be --
- 24 well, there is no need to proceed to hearing on this
- 25 matter and that this investigation was consistent with

- 1 Ameren's investigation.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Well, I don't think
- 3 there is anything else that we need to do on the official
- 4 record. Like I say, it sounds like there is still a
- 5 factual dispute, and I'm going to go ahead then and
- 6 conclude the formal part of this.
- 7 If you-all want to still attempt to discuss
- 8 a possible settlement of the issue, I'm going to leave you
- 9 to do that. When I go off the record, I'll leave the room
- 10 here and leave you-all on the conference line and let you
- 11 have however much discussion you want. And I'll ask
- 12 Ms. Kliethermes if she'll terminate the call from this end
- 13 and let me know when you're finished.
- 14 I hope that you can discuss settlement.
- 15 It's never really an efficient thing for anybody to have
- 16 to go through the time and trouble of hearing, but if
- 17 that's what you need to do, then that's what we're here
- 18 for and we will do that.
- 19 So with that I guess that will conclude
- 20 this, unless somebody has something they want to put on
- 21 the record.
- 22 Mr. Howard?
- MR. HOWARD: No.
- 24 Her name is Wendy Tatro. Right?
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes.

1 MS. TATRO: That's correct. 2 MR. HOWARD: T-a-t-r-o, Bar No. 60261, Associate General Counsel for Ameren Services Company, 4 Phone No. 534-3434 -- 534-3484. 5 MS. TATRO: It's 554-3484. MR. HOWARD: Thank you. 554-4014. 6 7 JUDGE DIPPELL: That's all correct then, 8 Ms. Tatro? 9 MS. TATRO: Yes. JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there anything else, 10 Mr. Howard? 11 12 MR. HOWARD: No. We need to set this for 13 hearing, I guess. JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Ms. Tatro, did you 14 have anything further? 15 MS. TATRO: No, I do not. Thank you. 16 JUDGE DIPPELL: We can go ahead then and go 17 off the record. 18 19 WHEREUPON, the on-the-record portion of the 20 Prehearing Conference was concluded. 21 22 23 24

1	
2	
3	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
4	
5	I, Patricia A. Stewart, RMR, RPR, CCR, a
6	Certified Court Reporter in the State of Missouri, do
7	hereby certify that the testimony that appears in the
8	foregoing transcript was taken by me to the best of my
9	ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting by me; that
10	I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any
11	of the parties to the action in which this hearing was
12	taken, and further that I am not a relative or employee of
13	any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto,
14	nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of
15	the action.
16	
17	
18	
19	Patricia A. Stewart
20	CCR No. 401
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	