

BEFORE THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

File No.: EC-2026-0218

Complainant: Brett Felber

Respondent: Ameren Missouri

FILED
April 23, 2026
Missouri Public
Service Commission

COMPLAINANT’S FINAL EXHIBIT AND STATEMENT OF RECORD

Comes now the Complainant, Brett Felber, and respectfully submits this final exhibit and statement in support of the record before the Commission.

I. PURPOSE OF THIS EXHIBIT

This submission constitutes the final evidentiary piece necessary to establish the authenticity, integrity, and transmission characteristics of the disputed email communication dated April 8, 2026.

Attached hereto is the Complainant’s copy of the email, which clearly reflects the presence of Transport Layer Security (TLS) as the security protocol used during transmission.

II. SECURITY LAYER EVIDENCE (TLS)

The Complainant’s email demonstrates that:

- The message was transmitted using TLS (Transport Layer Security)
- TLS is the industry-standard encryption protocol used to secure email in transit
- TLS ensures data integrity, protection against interception, and authentication of sending servers

TLS is not optional in modern enterprise email systems—it is a baseline compliance mechanism widely required across regulated industries, including utilities.

III. DEFICIENCIES IN RESPONDENT’S PRODUCED COPY

The copy produced by Ameren Missouri lacks critical indicia of authenticity and security:

- No reference to TLS or any transport-layer encryption
- No indication of secure transmission methodology
- No metadata or header information demonstrating compliance with standard email security practices
- Absence of any end-to-end encryption (E2EE) or equivalent safeguards

These omissions introduce substantial evidentiary concerns including risk of alteration, lack of verifiable chain of custody, and failure to meet basic standards of digital communication integrity.

IV. INFERENCE OF NON-AUTHENTICITY

Emails from Ameren are routinely delivered to Gmail using TLS-secured channels. The absence of TLS indicators in Respondent’s version is inconsistent with normal system behavior.

It is reasonable to conclude the Respondent's document was either not transmitted in the same manner or has been altered or recreated outside its original transmission context.

V. DELAY AND DOCUMENT PRODUCTION CONCERNS

Respondent initially refused to provide a copy on or about April 8, 2026, later producing a version after delay and lacking standard security indicators.

This raises concerns regarding spoliation, reconstruction of records, and reliability.

VI. CORROBORATING ADMISSION

A customer service representative acknowledged that the Complainant's copy reflects a minimum reconnection amount of [REDACTED]

VII. CONDUCT OF RESPONDENT REPRESENTATIVE

The conduct of Aubrey Krcmar is placed into issue, including handling of documents, inconsistencies, and failure to provide contemporaneous records.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The Complainant has provided a contemporaneous email record, evidence of secure TLS transmission, and supporting acknowledgment.

Respondent's document lacks verification, integrity indicators, was delayed, and conflicts with admitted facts.

The Complainant's exhibit should be afforded full evidentiary weight, and Respondent's version deemed unreliable.

IX. FINAL STATEMENT

The Complainant rests his matter before the Commission, having provided sufficient evidence to establish the authenticity of his records and the deficiencies in those of the Respondent.