

Exhibit No. 1

Commission – Exhibit 1
Jeannette Mott Oxford Statement
Local Public Hearing Exhibit-St. Louis
File No. ER-2024-0319

Jeanette Mott Oxford, M.Div.
 2910 Lemp Avenue, St. Louis, MO 63118-1716
 314-775-3261 (cell); jmo.mott.oxford@gmail.com

January 22, 2025

To: Kayla Hahn, Chair, and Members
 Missouri Public Service Commission

From: Jeanette Mott Oxford, Resident, St. Louis resident (Benton Park) *JMO*
 Lay member of the Ministries Team at Epiphany United Church of Christ

Re: Opposition to 15.77 percent increase to Ameren rates

Thank you for holding this series of public hearings on the double-digit rate increase requested by Ameren. I am a seventy-year-old resident of the City of St. Louis, recently retired, and I live with a disability. In December, like many other Ameren customers, I learned that my Social Security check would go up by 2.5 percent in 2025. My MOSERS check as a retired state legislator went up by 4.5 percent, for which I am truly thankful. Still, the gap between these increases and the 15.77 percent increase in electric rates proposed by Ameren is striking. Most of us are not receiving double-digit increases in our incomes in any given year, so why do investor-owned monopoly utility companies think this is appropriate?

My only option for electrical service is Ameren. I am very thankful that monopoly investor-owned utility companies have to come before the Missouri Public Service Commission to justify their rate increases. After all, the cost of their products is not controlled by competition. As a customer, regulation you provide is my only defense.

By state statute, Ameren and other monopoly investor-owned utility companies must produce safe and adequate service, and both innovation and upkeep are necessary to fulfill that promise. The questions then are: 1) How much does it cost for a monopoly investor-owned utility company to deliver safe and adequate service, and 2) What level of profit is reasonable – if we are not going to have publicly owned utilities that charge exactly what it costs for them to operate (which is an idea accepted in some locations)? It seems to me that Ameren should not be entitled to much more than the 2.5 percent cost of living adjustment that Social Security recipients saw because Ameren's investors have no right to impose hardship on their customers – customers trapped in a monopoly arrangement - in order to have a guaranteed rate of profit.

(over)