1		
2		
3	BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSOURI	SION
4		
5	MISSOURI COALITION FOR FAIR COMPETITION,	1
6	Petitioner,	
7	v.	Case No. EC-99-327
8	UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY, doing business) as AMEREN UE,	
9	Respondent.	3/26/99
10		
11		
12	PREHEARING CONFERENCE	
13		
14	KEVIN THOMPSON, Presiding Deputy Chief Regulatory La	w Judge.
15	ALSO PRESNENT:	
16		
17	LERA L. SHEMWELL Missouri Public Service Commission Assisant General Counsel	
18	TOUN B. COEFNAN	Tema
19	JOHN B. COFFMAN, Office of the Public Counsel Deputy Public Counsel	ILED
2 0	APF	1 4 1999
21	JAMES J. COOK, Ameren Services Associate General Counsel (Dublic Ser	lissouri vice Commission
22		vice Commussion
23	TERRY C. TLLEN ALLEN & HOLDEN LAW OFFICES, L.L.C. Counsel for Missouri Coalition	
2 4	for Fair Competition	
25		

JUDGE THOMPSON: Good morning. My name is 1 Kevin Thompson. I'm the Regulatory Law Judge 2 3 assigned to this matter, which is the Missouri Coalition for Fair Competition, Petitioner, versus 4 Union Electric Company, doing business as Ameren 5 6 UE, Respondent. 7 Could I have oral entries of appearance? How about Petitioner? 8 Terry C. Allen, Allen and 9 MR. ALLEN: Holden Law Offices, LLC. I've handed my card to 10 the reporter. My office is in Jefferson City, and 11 I represent the Missouri Coalition for Fair 12 Competition. With me today is a representative of 13 my client for the purpose of just sitting in and 14 listening, Mr. Perry, P-e-r-r-y, Moore, M-o-o-r-e. 15 16 JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Allen. 17 Respondent? James J. Cook appearing for 18 MR. COOK: Ameren UE, Union Electric Company, Post Office 19 20 Box 66149, St. Louis, Missouri 63166-6149, appearing on behalf of Respondent, Union Electric 21 Company. 22 23 JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you, sir. 24 Office of the Public Counsel? 25 MR. COFFMAN: Yes. John B. Coffman,

1	appearing on behalf of the Office of the Public
2	Counsel, P.O. Box 7800, Jefferson City, Missouri
3	65102.
4	JUDGE THOMPSON: And Staff of the
5	Commission?
6	MS. SHEMWELL: Lera Shemwell, appearing
7	for the Staff of the Missouri Public Service
8	Commssion, Post Office Box 360, Jefferson City,
9	Missouri 65102.
10	JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you. I assume
11	you've all received the order or you wouldn't be
12	here today. What is the status of settlement
13	negotiations between the parties, if any?
14	MR. ALLEN: We never talked.
15	JUDGE THOMPSON: You haven't talked yet?
16	MR. ALLEN: They haven't talked to us and
17	we haven't talked to them. No offense intended, by
18	the way.
19	MR. COOK: I don't think we've decided to
20	shun the other, we just have not gotten together.
21	JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay. Well, this room is
22	yours until five o'clock today, and I hope you will
23	take advantage of the fact that you are all here
24	face to face across the table and that you've got
25	an uninterrupted space where you can discuss

settlement possibilities in this matter.

In terms of the hearing, I have taken the liberty to get some dates off of our calendar. Our calendar is very full. Do the parties have any idea how many days they believe they would need?

MS. SHEMWELL: I can't think it would be more than one.

MR. COOK: I wouldn't think so.

MR. ALLEN: That would be my best guess.

I think just frankly from the response of UE, which I think was a reasonably fair response with regard to the items referenced in our petition, that they basically admitted that that occurred, and I think the issue that we see is the extensiveness of what went on beyond that.

You know, whether we need to address those by a separate complaint, whether we can address it through this process and try to reduce everybody's time and effort, because we have received additional examples of the same problem with other customers, and we would really be interested, I think, in the long run, to know, you know, how many people they sent these to and the circumstances under which they sent them and how they corrected it.

1	And then there's another issue that came
2	up recently as to a boiler operation, by phone,
3	that they use that we would like to try to address
4	with them. And, you know, granted the petition
5	only addresses ostensibly two matters. We think
6	it's more extensive than that, and we need to
7	discuss it.
8	JUDGE THOMPSON: Well, you'll have, as I
9	said, every opportunity to discuss these matters
10	informally today
11	MR. ALLEN: Okay.
12	JUDGE THOMPSON: and ask for the
13	hearing. Of course, the only matters before the
14	Commission for hearing will be those matters in the
15	pleadings. So if you need to amend your pleadings
16	to add additional incidents, then I urge you to go
17	ahead and do whatever is necessary.
18	There are two days in April which is, I'm
19	sure, way too soon.
20	MS. SHEMWELL: Much.
21	JUDGE THOMPSON: But I'm mentioning them
22	simply because they are there, and even finding a

single day is not an easy matter over the next

several months. We do not double up on hearings,

that is hold two hearings simultaneously if we can

23

24

25

avoid it, because the Commissioners are only able to attend one at a time.

In May, the 20th and the 21st are both open. In June I was able to find only one day, the 16th. In July only two days, the 22nd and 23rd, and I did not look later than that. So if you want to look later than that, you can go look at our calendar.

It is the practice, according to our rule, that a procedural schedule be developed jointly by the parties and most of you, I'm sure, are well familiar with the sorts of things that are contained therein. Basically a date is set for the filing, pre-filing of direct testimony, which is simultaneous. Thereafter there's an opportunity for simultaneous filing of rebuttal testimony.

There's also typically a hearing memorandum which sets out the issues for determination. Often the parties will agree who their witnesses are, the order in which they're going to be presented, the order of cross, items of that kind, and that proposed procedural schedule is due April 2nd. So that's something you would want to address today as well.

Do any of the parties have any idea as to

how many witnesses they plan to present yet?

2 MR. ALLEN: No. Not many.

JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay. And you've indicated you think there's additional issues that you are going to bring in as well?

MR. ALLEN: Well, again, the -- at the time we filed the complaint, we only had the limited examples, and we realize that the way they do business in sending out bills that there were more than just those examples, and we've gathered some more. We don't know how many of these things they've actually sent out, and I think, you know, we could ask. They say it's inadvertent. I think that burden's on the present pleadings, frankly.

The other thing we're concerned about is any other forms, whether it be by phone or otherwise, that has been undertaken without complying with the statutes since August 28th of 1998, which I believe is the effective date of the law.

And I guess our concern comes from the fact that, you know, first, they shouldn't be doing it, but more importantly, the legislation itself was an effort of both parties and many parties to avoid the problems that we have here, and it was,

you know, I think, a consensus legislation. So we're real concerned that, you know, it's more than just inadvertence, and perhaps it is; perhaps it isn't.

But the other things that bother us in terms of the law when we talked about penalties back in the legislative process, the penalties were substantially higher, and the penalty figure in the statute was a penalty figure arrived at by consensus again. And we also believe that any penalty should be addressed to each billing, not just to the two in the pleading.

Again, this may necessitate amending the pleading unless we can get some kind of agreement on where we're going and work with UE and them with us on this.

JUDGE THOMPSON: Very well. Do you anticipate extensive discovery?

MR. ALLEN: I would like -- you know, unless we can get something resolved today, I would like to inquire of them of how many of these things were actually sent out since August 28th, and be a little bit more precise on how they are addressing the issues currently. And also now that I've learned about this boilerplate issue, I'd like to

1	get into that as it bears on their so-called
2	inadvertence.
3	MS. SHEMWELL: Staff anticipates that
4	there may be some discovery.
5	MR. ALLEN: That's the short of it, I
6	suppose.
7	Yes, we would do some, and I think there's
8	certain things, obviously, they can agree to as
9	they already have. And in light of the nature
10	in light of the answer that they have submitted to
11	the Commission.
12	JUDGE THOMPSON: Very well. I've noticed
13	that Staff often takes the lead role in developing
14	the hearing memorandum. Is Staff willing to do
15	that in this case?
16	MS. SHEMWELL: Certainly.
17	JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you. I think that
18	takes care of all of the matters that we need to do
19	on the record today, unless there's anything else
20	that a party has.
21	MR. COOK: I have nothing further.
22	JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you, sir. We'll go
23	ahead and go of: the record then and conclude the
24	pre-hearing conference in this matter. I urge you

to use this time here to get this thing settled if

25

	F
1	possible. Thank you very much.
2	(WHEREUPON, the recorded portion of
3	testimony of this case was adjourned.)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	
25	