

STATE OF MISSOURI
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

At a Public Hearing of the Public
Service Commission, held at Clayton,
Missouri, on the 16th day of
September, 1980.

In the matter of Union Electric)
Company of St. Louis, Missouri,)
for authority to file revised)
tariffs for incandescent lighting)
service provided to customers in) CASE NO. ER-80-190
the Missouri service area of the)
company.)

BEFORE:

EDWARD J. CADIEUX, Presiding,

HEARING OFFICER.

REPORTED BY:

Jan A. Williams

Missouri Public Service Commission

APPEARANCES:

MICHAEL BARNES, Attorney at Law,
P. O. Box 149,
St. Louis, Missouri 63166,

FOR: UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY.

KENT RAGSDALE, General Counsel,
P. O. Box 360,
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102,

FOR: STAFF OF THE MISSOURI
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION.

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Written Entries of Appearance Filed.)

EXAMINER CADIEUX: The hearing will come to order.

The Missouri Public Service Commission has set for hearing at this time a local hearing in the matter of Union Electric Company's request for authority to file tariffs regarding their incandescent lighting service provided to customers in their service area.

At this time, the Commission will accept oral entries of appearance from the appearing Counsel.

MR. RAGSDALE: Kent Ragsdale, General Counsel, Missouri Public Service Commission, P. O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri, appearing on behalf of the Staff of the Public Service Commission.

MR. BARNES: Michael Barnes, appearing for Union Electric Company, Post Office Box 149, St. Louis, Missouri, 63166.

EXAMINER CADIEUX: The Missouri Public Service Commission regulates the rates charged and the rules applied by the various public utility and transportation companies within its jurisdiction to ensure that those rates are just and reasonable and that the service provided is safe and adequate.

On December 26, 1979, Union Electric Company

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 submitted to the Commission revised tariffs designed to
2 limit the maintenance on private area and municipal incandes-
3 cent lighting for electric service provided to customers in
4 the Missouri service area of the company. Those tariffs
5 have been suspended pending determination by the Commission
6 after hearing.

7 The Commission has scheduled a formal hearing
8 in this matter for October 2, 1980, at 10:00 a.m., at the
9 Commission's offices in Jefferson City, Missouri, for the
10 presentation of exhibits and witnesses. Additionally, the
11 Commission has scheduled this evening a local public hearing
12 in St. Louis County in order to provide an opportunity to
13 members of the public who might be affected by the proposed
14 tariff revision to inform the Commission of their views on
15 the subject.

16 A record of this hearing is being compiled
17 by the Court Reporter. The Commission will give full considera-
18 tion to the record which is compiled here tonight.

19 I would ask that the witnesses spell their
20 names for the Reporter as they begin their statements.
21 Mr. Fagsdale will have a few preliminary questions. And
22 then you should proceed to make whatever statements you
23 wish on the subject. I would just ask that you try to be
24 loud and clear so we get a good record of all the testimony
25 tonight.

1 Mr. Ragdale.

2 MR. RAGSDALE: The first witness I have on
3 the list is Mr. Joe Mooney.
4

5 JOE MOONEY testified as follows:

6 WITNESS MOONEY: My name is Joseph W. Mooney.
7 I'm the Mayor of University City. And I'm here representing
8 University City, who happens to be one of the larger cus-
9 tomers of Union Electric with bills currently in the \$350,000
10 level and going up to \$390,000 a year. This is not only
11 a significant budget item, but something that we look at
12 very carefully.

13 We are requesting, formally, that we intervene
14 in the request of Union Electric to increase our rates. And
15 we want to intervene with a request that requires the com-
16 pany to maintain a historic lighting in University City that
17 we now have.

18 We have threats by them to impose a conversion
19 charge on 468 lights in other parts of the city that was a
20 threat unheard of a few months ago and now threatens to
21 wipe us out with \$500 charges and suggestions that it be
22 raised to \$700 per light standard. We feel strongly that
23 the Commission should authorize the formation of a committee
24 of knowledgeable citizens to review the fixtures included
25 as alternates under the proposed contracts. We see a

1 lot of alternatives that University City, up to this point,
2 has not chosen to consider at all.

3 I have with me this evening our City Manager,
4 Frank Ollendorff, who I am going to ask to--I think he's on
5 the list to appear next. And he's backed up by a number of
6 our citizens. I'll leave it to him to introduce them as he
7 completes his remarks.

8 That's all I have to say at the moment.

9 MR. RAGSDALE: Mr. Mooney, does University
10 City have a city council or attorney?

11 WITNESS MOONEY: Absolutely. I'm the Mayor.
12 And we have six council. We have a council manager form of
13 government.

14 MR. RAGSDALE: Do you have a city attorney?

15 WITNESS MOONEY: Yes, we do.

16 MR. RAGSDALE: Could you have him contact us
17 at the Public Service Commission.

18 If you want to intervene in this matter,
19 University City will have to file a motion to intervene.

20 WITNESS MOONEY: Is that a Missouri Public
21 Service Commission rule?

22 MR. RAGSDALE: Yes, it is.

23 EXAMINER CADIEUX: The record should reflect
24 that Mr. Dennis Kay contacted me today by telephone and
25 indicated that he would file a motion to intervene in the

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 formal hearing. I think that's all I could say on that sub-
2 ject at this point.

3 MR. RAGSDALE: Thank you.

4 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Mr. Barnes, do you have
5 any questions?

6 MR. BARNES: No, I don't.

7 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Excuse me. Mr. Mooney,
8 the record should reflect that the testimony you gave was
9 sworn. Would you state for the record that the testimony
10 that you have given is the truth, the whole truth, and
11 nothing but the truth, so help you God.

12 WITNESS MOONEY: Yes, I do.

13 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Thank you, sir.

14 (Witness excused.)

15
16 MR. RAGSDALE: The next name on the list
17 is Frank Ollendorff.

18 (Witness sworn.)

19
20 FRANK OLLENDORFF testified as follows:

21 WITNESS OLLENDORFF: My name is Frank
22 Ollendorff. I'm the City Manager of University City.

23 MR. RAGSDALE: Mr. Ollendorff, do you have
24 some comments or suggestions to give to the Commission con-
25 cerning Union Electric's proposed request?

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 WITNESS OLLENDORFF: Yes, I do, sir.

2 MR. RAGSDALE: Please proceed.

3 WITNESS OLLENDORFF: I prepared a written
4 statement which I've given to the presiding official. I'll
5 try not to read it verbatim, but I'd like to cover most of
6 what's in it.

7 The company, in our opinion, has continually
8 acted in an arbitrary and capricious manner concerning all
9 phases of street lighting in our community. They take posi-
10 tions which are unreasonable and, worse yet, constantly
11 changing. Fortunately, our contract with this utility pro-
12 vides that we have the right to go to the Public Service
13 Commission in times of disputes. And it authorizes Public
14 Service Commission intervention in disagreements between
15 the company and the city. We request the Commission take
16 action on the following:

17 First, to require the company to maintain
18 the existing historic lighting in University City. The
19 company has an obligation in this regard. The necessary
20 parts are readily available. The company could modernize
21 the electrical system. Not only is this possible, but they
22 can do it at half the cost as compared to anyone else since
23 they do not have to follow the National Electric Code as
24 would the city or any other contractor.

25 The lights can be converted to mercury vapor,

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 should the company so desire, at a reasonable cost. The
2 lights must be changed immediately from series to 110 multiple
3 systems by the company. The model 231 University model
4 antique cast-iron street lights in Pershing, University Heights
5 II and III, and University Hills can and should be modernized
6 electrically. And they may be converted if the company so
7 desires. There are many parts available in company storage.
8 There would be more had the company not sold them at quite
9 a profit. The missing parts can be made available from
10 private companies.

11 The historic lighting in Ames Place and
12 University Hills should also be maintained and converted.
13 The changeover, utilizing existing standards, posts, and
14 tops, is a relatively simple matter. The company workers
15 have confirmed to us that they can accomplish this with no
16 particular difficulty, even though that's denied by company
17 officials.

18 The city has paid for these lights many times
19 over. As the Public Service Commission knows, the rates
20 charged to the city include amortizing the lights. They
21 include maintenance, which has taken place in a questionable
22 way. These lights have been paid for. The upgrading of
23 the lights has been paid for. The company policy seems to
24 be one of purposeful neglect; neglect to the point that,
25 after a time, they can say, "These lights are no longer

1 usable; we need to replace them." In a very real sense,
2 maintenance of these systems ended some time ago, although
3 the city has continued to be billed and has continued to pay
4 those bills.

5 Second, we ask that the threat to impose a
6 conversion charge on 468 street lights in other parts of
7 the city must be defeated. The company, several months ago,
8 for the first time, announced a \$500 conversion fee; which,
9 by the way, they will waive if it's a light that they have
10 determined they don't want to maintain any more. We want
11 to change a number of lights for better location, spacing,
12 and intensity. And this conversion fee amounts to a large
13 sum of money. If these poles do have a useful life, we are
14 certain the company will find another use elsewhere for them.
15 If they do not have a useful life, there's no reason for
16 us to pay to have them removed.

17 There was no such charge a year ago. In
18 February the company announced a \$500 charge. We saw no
19 rate approval from the Public Service Commission. But we
20 assume the company did obtain that before announcing this
21 charge. We've learned through the press that the company
22 has decided to charge \$700. We have not been officially
23 notified of that.

24 Third, the Commission should authorize the
25 formation of a committee of knowledgeable citizens to review

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 fixtures to be made available to cities under their street
2 light contracts. This committee could review major manu-
3 facturers' fixtures. Standards that are selected by the
4 committee could be reviewed by company personnel. Recommenda-
5 tions, together with company comments, could be forwarded
6 to the Public Service Commission and a wider variety of
7 standards made available to us by the company.

8 University City is probably the company's
9 largest individual street lighting customer in this part
10 of the state. We want a fair voice in their decisions con-
11 cerning street lights. We hope the Commission will make it
12 clear to the company that the company must work with the
13 customer. The company must learn that they cannot dictate.
14 The city must constantly remember that Union Electric has
15 a government authorized privilege which cannot be abused.

16 The company not only sneers at its customers,
17 they constantly show contempt for the Public Service
18 Commission. As the presiding officer indicated earlier
19 this evening, the rule requested was suspended; yet, the
20 company writes us that they intend no longer to maintain
21 incandescent lights. We find out today through company
22 workers, Union officials, that the workers who have, in
23 the past, been assigned to maintain incandescent lighting
24 have been transferred to other duties. We think this flies
25 in the face of the Commission action to suspend the requested
rule.

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 The city intends to return again and again
2 to the Public Service Commission, as their contract suggests,
3 until the company demonstrates a basic change in attitude.
4 We are customers, not subjects. The company is privileged
5 to serve; they have not been authorized to dictate.

6 Thank you.

7 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Mr. Ragsdale.

8 MR. RAGSDALE: I have no questions.

9 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Mr. Barnes.

10 MR. BARNES: Mr. Ollendorff, do you have an
11 extra copy of your prepared remarks?

12 WITNESS OLLENDORFF: Sure.

13 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Thank you, sir.

14 (Witness excused.)

15
16 MR. RAGSDALE: The next name on the list is
17 James Carl.

18 (Witness sworn.)

19
20 JAMES CARL testified as follows:

21 WITNESS CARL: My name is James Carl. I
22 live at 7110 Washington Avenue in University City.

23 It is my purpose here tonight to amplify
24 the position taken by the city in regard to the city's dealings
25 with Union Electric. As a subdivision trustee and as a

1 private citizen, for the last four years I have been engaged,
2 off and on, in dealing with representatives of Union Electric
3 Company in an attempt to save a series of 30 historically
4 valuable street lights. In the process of those dealings,
5 I have learned facts relating to the installation of street
6 lighting wiring by Union Electric Company. I am and have
7 filed, if you are Mr. Cadieux?

8 EXAMINER CADIEUX: I am.

9 WITNESS CARL: I have filed a formal request
10 to intervene in Jefferson City on October 2. I don't wish
11 to repeat in detail what we have to say, but I wish, at the
12 present moment, to state that Union Electric has an economic
13 advantage that gives it a virtual monopoly in the street
14 lighting business in St. Louis County because it is exempt
15 from the National Electric Code. This is a very important
16 fact, which I beg the Commission to investigate to the
17 fullest possible extent.

18 I wish the Commission to see that I have with
19 me a copy, a master copy, of the NFPA Handbook of the National
20 Electric Code, which is an annotated edition. I would like
21 to read into the record a paragraph from the preamble to
22 the code.

23 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Mr. Carl, I'd just ask
24 that you do it not too quickly so we can get a clear record.

25 WITNESS CARL: This is Article 90, the

1 introduction to the code. This is from Article 92, "Scope."
2 And it is from subparagraph B, "Not covered." This code,
3 which governs all electrical installations in the county
4 of St. Louis and is part of the law of the county of St. Louis,
5 does not apply to Union Electric Company. I'll read the
6 relevant paragraph. This is Article 92 B, "Not covered,"
7 paragraph 5.

8 "Installations under the exclusive control
9 of electric utilities for the purpose of communication or
10 metering or for the generation, control, transformation,
11 transmission, or distribution of electric energy located
12 in buildings used exclusively by utilities for such purposes"--
13 now this is the important part of this sentence--"or located
14 outdoors on property owned or leased by the utility on
15 public highways, streets, roads, et cetera, or outdoors
16 by established rights on private property."

17 That means that the National Electric Code
18 does not apply; nor does Union Electric have to follow the
19 National Electric Code in the installation of street light-
20 ing wiring. What that means, in effect--and I wish the
21 Commission to investigate, independently, the statement
22 I make--that Union Electric Company is able, by virtue
23 of its exemption from the code, to utilize old cable as
24 much as 50 years old in the conversion of mercury vapor
25 street lighting to 110 volt multiple. This gives it, I

1 would say, in effect, a monopolistic advantage against which
2 no private contractor can compete.

3 Now, in the course of my dealings with Union
4 Electric, I have repeatedly been offered, and the city has
5 been offered, by Union Electric the system that is under
6 discussion by Mr. Ollendorff for the sum of \$1. The company
7 has said, "Take it. If you don't like the way we are doing
8 or what we intend to do with your system, you can buy it for
9 \$1 and do what you want."

10 In effect, what the company is asking is:
11 Any city that is not satisfied with what the company does
12 in the way of street lighting--they are asking them to take
13 an economic bath. If a city buys a system from Union Electric,
14 they are immediately under the scope of this code which for-
15 bids the use of the old street lighting cable.

16 Now, I have with me, and I wish to turn over
17 to the Commission as evidence, a type of cable currently
18 used by Union Electric in the incandescent series strings
19 that are used in our neighborhood. This cable is also used
20 in the 110-volt multiple conversions by the company.

21 I would bring the Commission's attention to
22 the fact that this is a cable that has a heavy plastic
23 insulated conductor on its inside. And, on its outside,
24 you see a wrap of bare spiral. The company is able, because
25 it is exempt from that code, to use that bare spiral as a

1 neutral and the center conductor as the hot. No private
2 contractor doing street lighting can use this kind of cable
3 in that fashion. This means that if the company turns a
4 street lighting system over to a city, all of the cable,
5 if any work is done on 50 percent or more of the system,
6 has to be abandoned, new cable must be trenched to code
7 standards, and both of these conductors, the hot and the
8 outside neutral, have to be insulated and buried 3 feet
9 underground or have to be buried at a lesser distance with
10 a running board.

11 I give it to the Commission to imagine what
12 the cost accruing to a city in working on its own system
13 would be. I would also recommend to the Commission that they
14 investigate the way the street lighting is done in the city
15 of St. Louis. It has its own street lighting department,
16 all of the work is done under this code, and all of the
17 cable in the city of St. Louis is two insulated conductors
18 buried at the specified distance underground.

19 So what I am saying is that if the company
20 wants to abandon these incandescent systems, what they are
21 doing is asking cities to undertake something they're not
22 financially capable of because they're exempt from this code.
23 That is the economic club that it pains me to say--because
24 I have good relationship with the people that I've worked
25 with at Union Electric--has been held over our heads in

1 our negotiations regarding these incandescent street lights.

2 I have one other thing to say. And I would
3 also ask the Commission to confirm our results independently.
4 There are two things. First of all, Mr. Ollendorff has
5 averred to the fact that the original catalog price of
6 the antique street lights, which, by the way, were cast
7 for the founder of University City by the Banner Iron Works,
8 in 1905 was \$56. They have been in Universtiy City since,
9 I think, about the year 1910. There were, at first, arc
10 lights and they were converted to incandescent lights.

11 We have been attempting, vainly, to go along
12 with the company policy of converting these lights to mercury
13 vapor and have failed. The city has recently received a
14 communication from the company, saying that all negotiations
15 regarding these lights are terminated forthwith.

16 Now, I would like the Commission to investigate,
17 independently, the following facts: I have been told by
18 Mr. Jack Petrovich, the Manager of the Dorsett Road pole yard,
19 that the company donated, as a charitable gesture, one of
20 these antique model 231 cast-iron street light posts to a
21 charitable auction in St. Charles. That is a fact. I also
22 ask you to ask Mr. Jim Beisman, the Public Relations Manager
23 of Union Electric, how much that light fetched at that auction
24 in St. Charles. Mr. Beisman informed me that light brought
25 \$1,000.

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 We have 30 street lights in our neighborhood
2 which we would like to keep, which are valuable, monetarily
3 and historically. And, which as we hope to demonstrate in
4 October, can be converted in 10 minutes to mercury vapor.
5 The route the company has chosen to convert them to mercury
6 vapor probably will take two or three days. And we'll go
7 into that in October.

8 There's one other fact I would like the
9 Commission to investigate, independently, of the results
10 we have done. The city had the virtue of having light measure-
11 ments made by Kiyakowa Associates, registered engineers.
12 Some of their measurements were witnessed by City Council
13 members in the audience at present. And these are our
14 findings in summary:

15 The residential--and that's an important
16 qualification--street lights that Union Electric has installed
17 in many parts of University City are less efficient than
18 a naked 150-watt incandescent bulb. And we have data to
19 prove it. I beg you to confirm that yourselves. The Colonial
20 post top lantern used in the southern part of University City
21 consumes 175-watts for its mercury vapor bulb and, we would
22 assume, another 25-watts for its ballast. Total power con-
23 sumption: 200-watts. The series naked incandescent bulbs
24 with the pipe hand reflectors that you all will see in
25 Jefferson City, put in by our grandfathers, run at a wattage
of 150.

1 Our data show that these naked incandescent
2 bulbs put out more light than the mercury vapor conversions
3 that the company wishes to install. Furthermore, the naked
4 incandescent bulbs at present are costing the city some \$4.20
5 or \$4.30 a month. We, the city, will be charged \$8.21 a month
6 for so-called ornamental mercury vapor lights. I ask the
7 Commission to confirm that independently.

8 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Any questions of this
9 witness?

10 MR. RAGSDALE: I have none.

11 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Mr. Barnes.

12 MR. BARNES: Mr. Cadieux, Mr. Carl has, I
13 guess, asked the Commission to look at the cable. If he
14 intends to introduce it now, then I object against that
15 being admitted because he has not laid a sufficient founda-
16 tion. But that would just permit him to introduce the
17 cable into evidence at the October 2 hearing with a more
18 sufficient foundation.

19 EXAMINER CADIEUX: I believe the formal hear-
20 ing probably would be the more proper forum to offer tangible,
21 physical evidence.

22 WITNESS CARL: Okay. Would it be possible
23 to request that the Commission, deep down, literally, in
24 the multiple 110-volt areas of University City or, for
25 that matter, in Hampton Park, investigate as well?

1 There is a private subdivision in Richmond
2 Heights named Hampton Park. And, in that subdivision, are
3 30 incandescent lights, model 231, exactly the same as in
4 University City. And that subdivision has had its incandes-
5 cent lighting converted to 110 volts, using the old cable.

6 Therefore, it should be possible for the
7 Commission, independent of any allegations or assertions
8 I make, to confirm the fact that old lead covered concentric
9 wire cable, that is the lead sheath that's being used as
10 the neutral and the center as the hot--in other words, to
11 confirm the fact that the company is able to do what a
12 private contractor cannot do at a great economic advantage.

13 We also wish to know why it was possible for
14 Hampton Park to get its lights converted to 110-volt multiple
15 and it is not for us. We have never been given a satisfactory
16 reason why a private subdivision, which is considered by
17 Union Electric to be a separate lighting district, can get
18 what we cannot get; and, I would also add, can get what we
19 cannot get without paying a \$400 or more special facility
20 charge per light. Hampton Park simply paid from a lower
21 incandescent rate to a higher incandescent rate.

22 We, the University City, would be required
23 not only to pay a \$400 or \$400-plus special facility charge
24 for conversion of these old cast-iron lights to mercury,
25 but would, also, have to pay the mercury vapor higher rate.

1 Hampton Park got a great deal of work done by the company
2 for just its tiny increase in rate step. University City
3 not only has to pay the increase in rate step, but it has
4 to pay the special facility charge on top of it. We wonder
5 why there's a double standard.

6 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Well, it would not be
7 proper for the Bench to address that question. Unless
8 Mr. Barnes would want to respond now, I think the more proper
9 forum, again, for that type of question would be at Jefferson
10 City when there is a company witness on the stand.

11 WITNESS CARL: Mr. Cadieux, is it possible
12 for the Commission to pursue the avenues suggested in the
13 way of finding out facts? Does the Commission have the power
14 or facility to investigate independently of the company?

15 EXAMINER CADIEUX: The Commission has its
16 own Staff. Mr. Mitchell is here with Mr. Ragdale.
17 Mr. Ragdale is the General Counsel and Mr. Mitchell is with
18 the technical Staff of the Commission. The Commission does
19 have a technical Staff to do investigative work in preparation
20 for these hearings. I think anything that has been said at
21 this hearing will be considered.

22 Are there any other questions?

23 MR. RAGSDALE: No.

24 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Thank you, Mr. Carl.

25 (Witness excused.)

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 MR. RAGSDALE: The next witness is Jim Hennessy.
2 (Witness sworn.)
3

4 JIM HENNESSY testified as follows:

5 WITNESS HENNESSY: My name is Jim Hennessy.
6 I'm a resident of University City. I'm President of Trustees
7 for the Altadi, a subdivision which is a subdivision within
8 University City.

9 First, I would like to thank the members of
10 the Commission for holding this hearing in St. Louis County
11 since, I believe, a number of the residents would not have
12 been able to attend, and probably will not attend, the hear-
13 ing that will be held in Jefferson City.

14 The issue that I would like to address is
15 Union Electric's request to terminate maintenance of incandes-
16 cent lighting. Originally, I thought, just in the subdivision
17 of University Hills; apparently, though, for all incandescent
18 street lighting throughout University City. I think a number
19 of people have gone over the background. So just let me
20 say that over the last several years Union Electric and
21 the city have been working to convert the older incandescent
22 street lighting to what I assume to be more energy-efficient
23 lighting. In general, the residents of the Altadina sub-
24 division have gone along with the idea of the conversion,
25 based upon the assumption that it is more energy efficient

1 and, hopefully, less costly.

2 What we have not agreed with in the manner
3 of the conversion, initially, were the standards themselves,
4 the poles, which Union Electric had been proposing. To be
5 frank, the residents perceived the poles as fairly ugly and
6 not consistent with the rest of the neighborhood's, which
7 are at least 50 years old in some instances. In terms of
8 Altadina, they are over 50 years old.

9 We, also, do not agree with the attempt by
10 Union Electric to, apparently, just turn off the maintenance
11 much the same way as you turn off the electricity or turn
12 off somebody's water. We feel that that type of action is
13 totally inappropriate. Union Electric is a monopoly, which
14 the residents of University City, among others, pay for
15 services. As a monopoly, the Public Service Commission
16 controls, to some extent, the Union Electric Company's
17 actions.

18 We are asking you, as the representatives
19 of the Public Service Commission, to stop UE's actions and
20 order UE to act in a more responsive manner to the customers,
21 the residents of University City.

22 Initially, I didn't think that the action
23 by Union Electric would directly affect the people that live
24 in the Altadina subdivision; apparently, it does. I thought
25 that at some later date we would probably face the same type

1 of maintenance cutoff; apparently, it also affects us directly
2 now. I was not aware of that until I came to this hearing.

3 I'd like to reiterate one point and then
4 thank you for listening to me. We appreciate your coming.
5 We ask that you, first, order Union Electric to continue to
6 provide maintenance to the incandescent street lighting;
7 second, to work more cooperatively with the residents and
8 the city to convert the street lighting in a more--how shall
9 I say--planned manner.

10 Thank you very much.

11 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Any questions of this
12 witness?

13 MR. RAGSDALE: I have none.

14 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Mr. Barnes.

15 MR. BARNES: I'd just like to clarify.

16 Mr. Hennessy, is it your position that the
17 residents of your subdivision do want your street lights
18 converted from the present incandescent to mercury vapor?

19 WITNESS HENNESSY: I think, if you took a
20 vote of the residents, you would probably find that 50
21 percent do and 50 percent don't. They are, in fact, happy
22 with the incandescent lighting. The city has been acting,
23 at least from our point of view, as a liaison between Union
24 Electric and the subdivision. They've been acting in good
25 faith. They have presented us with the alternatives.

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 What we've basically told them is: "We don't
2 like the poles you are offering. We really think they're
3 ugly." That put us off the list, so to speak, in getting
4 any conversion. The issue just was unsettled until we were
5 notified of Union Electric's request to cut off maintenance;
6 initially, we were told just to the subdivision of University
7 Hills, which is adjacent to ours.

8 MR. BARNES: If Union Electric told you that
9 they would take down the old standards, which, I think you
10 believe, are ugly?

11 WITNESS HENNESSY: No. The current standards
12 we have are acceptable. It's the new standards we think
13 are ugly.

14 MR. BARNES: Oh, I'm sorry. I misunderstood.
15 I have no further questions.

16 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Thank you, Mr. Hennessy.
17 (Witness excused.)

18
19 MR. RAGSDALE: The next name I have on the
20 list is Bruno Sonnino.

21 (Witness sworn.)

22
23 BRUNO SONNINO testified as follows:

24 WITNESS SONNINO: My name is Bruno Sonnino.
25 I haven't written a formal speech for this evening. In

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 fact, this is my first time at one of these hearings.

2 I come here as a concerned citizen. I live
3 in University City and have lived there all my life, which
4 is 24 years. And I live in the area where Union Electric
5 has proposed to tear down the beautiful street lights.

6 I really don't understand why they have not
7 considered these alternatives that the people here have
8 presented tonight, which seem very feasible and more economical
9 to the company. Basically, that's the only question I have
10 to ask. I'm very puzzled by the behavior of Union Electric
11 and how they have been very disrespectful to the citizens
12 and, also, have not taken into consideration these proposals
13 and alternatives and looked over them seriously.

14 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Are there any questions
15 of this witness?

16 MR. RAGSDALE: No questions.

17 MR. BARNES: No questions.

18 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Thank you, sir.

19 (Witness excused.)

20 _____
21 MR. RAGSDALE: The next name on the list
22 if Patrick Kelley.

23 (Witness sworn.)
24 _____
25

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 PATRICK J. KELLEY testified as follows:

2 WITNESS KELLEY: My name is Patrick J. Kelley.
3 I am a Council member of University City, representing the
4 First Ward.

5 The First Ward contains a number of different
6 subdivisions and private subdivisions as are consistent with
7 some of the historical development of University City. And
8 these subdivisions often contain historic street lights that
9 the residents want to continue to maintain as part of the
10 ambiance of the neighborhood. The proposed replacements
11 that Union Electric has given are not really consistent with
12 the feeling of those neighborhoods or not as aesthetically
13 pleasing as the old street lights. And, according to some
14 studies that we have done, they do not, in fact, provide
15 the lumens per street light that the old incandescent street
16 lights in these historic standards, in fact, provide.

17 We are requesting the Public Service Commission
18 to take a careful look at this proposal to discontinue main-
19 tence of all incandescent lighting. It seems to me that
20 there is a place in government regulation and even in large
21 utilities for diversity. I think, when it's in Union Electric's
22 interest in terms of public relations in other areas that
23 may be a little more prominent than University City, some
24 kinds of provisions are made that are solely for public
25 relations purposes. We are not asking just for public

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 relations consideration. We're asking for diversity to
2 preserve the historic character of a community in a particular
3 area.

4 We are asking that the incandescent standards
5 be allowed to remain. Obviously, they all need to be changed
6 over from series to 110 multiple. Some of the areas in
7 University City want to maintain the incandescent lights
8 after you convert to 110 multiple and some would rather
9 convert to mercury vapor. But, either way, it seems to
10 me that the Public Service Commission has a responsibility
11 to make sure that that option is available and that the
12 community, itself, can maintain its historic integrity in
13 these beautiful street light standards.

14 I think the proposals and the reasons for the
15 proposals should be looked at very carefully by the Public
16 Service Commission. One of the reasons, as I understand it,
17 is efficiency in rate administration. I would hope that
18 that isn't given substantial weight in making this determination.

19 Another proposal is a question of energy
20 efficient utilization. It seems to me that that should be
21 looked at very carefully. I'm not sure from the data that
22 we've seen that the incandescent lights are significantly
23 detrimental in terms of energy utilization. I would want
24 the Commission to look at that very carefully.

25 But, over and above all these concerns, I

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 think the Public Service Commission should take into account
2 the importance of something other than simple efficiency
3 and standardization throughout the service area. What Union
4 Electric, in effect, is attempting to do is to destroy a
5 very important part of a community: the historic character
6 that is added by these street lights that are, I think, very
7 beautiful. I think that the Public Service Commission has
8 to take that into account and work out some way that we can
9 maintain the diversity and the unique character of our
10 neighborhoods, while upgrading these systems from series
11 to 110 multiple at a reasonable cost.

12 I further request that the Public Service
13 Commission look very carefully at the conversion and cost
14 figures provided and to justify any conversion and figure,
15 because it may be less costly than Union Electric has
16 suggested. We have some evidence to suggest that that's
17 so.

18 Thank you.

19 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Any questions of this
20 witness?

21 MR. RAGSDALE: I have no questions.

22 MR. BARNES: No.

23 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Thank you, sir.

24 (Witness excused.)
25

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Let's take a ten-minute
2 break here.

3 (A recess was taken.)
4

5 EXAMINER CADIEUX: The hearing will come to
6 order.

7 Mr. Ragsdale.

8 MR. RAGSDALE: The next name I have is
9 Gary Poor.

10 MR. POOR: I believe I'll pass at this time,
11 please.

12 MR. RAGSDALE: Thank you.

13 Louis Zambrana.

14 (Witness sworn.)
15

16 LOUIS ZAMBRANA testified as follows:

17 MR. ZAMBRANA: My name is Louis Zambrana.
18 Basically, my presence here has to do with a plea that the
19 citizens of Hampton Park have to the Public Service Commission
20 to retain the beauty of the fixtures that we do have now.

21 We have struggled for about 10 years with,
22 first, difficulties of maintenance. During the first 4 or
23 5 years, we always had breakage of the cable, which was an
24 inadequate type of system we tried to maintain. And, later
25 on, when the conversion was made, we were very pleased that

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 the conversion was performed--was able to retain the type
2 of fixtures that we now have, which are the historical type
3 that date back to about 1920.

4 My understanding was that tonight's hearing
5 would be strictly about the rates. And I came more to learn
6 than to protest and to inform myself on what would the new
7 rates be and what would justify the change of rates.

8 So my plea to the Public Service Commission
9 is to please consider the aesthetic, architectural beauty
10 of all residential areas, such as Hampton Park and many
11 places in University City, and, perhaps, extend the time
12 where this incandescent lighting ought to be allowed to
13 remain for a period of years. I don't know what would be
14 the dictating element; the lack of parts to replace the
15 elements that would go bad or the actual energy use of
16 these incandescent lights to new types of lighting.

17 That's all. Thank you.

18 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Any questions of this
19 witness?

20 MR. RAGSDALE: I have none.

21 MR. BARNES: I have none.

22 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Thank you, sir.

23 (Witness excused.)

24 _____
25 MR. RAGSDALE: Dennie Neilson.

1 (Witness sworn.)
2

3 DENNIE NEILSON testified as follows:

4 WITNESS NEILSON: My name is Dennie Neilson.
5 I'm an architect. I live in Clayton, but I live on Linden
6 Avenue, which is wholly in University City. I live on
7 the Clayton side. We have the old University light standards
8 on Linden Avenue. My house was built in 1904. And most of
9 the houses on our street were built before 1920. I think
10 the light fixtures that we have on our street are very in
11 keeping with the kinds of architectural structures on the
12 street. I believe most of the streets in University City,
13 also, face the same light fixtures.

14 I am involved with urban housing projects
15 in the city. And, in many cases, in these kinds of projects
16 the city has seen fit to replace the cobra-head fixtures,
17 or some of the newer mercury vapor fixtures, with copies of the
18 antique fixtures. I think we are very fortunate with the
19 University light standards that we've got; that we do not
20 have to search for some kind of a fixture that's more in
21 keeping with our old neighborhoods. We've already got them.

22 I understand this conversion to the mercury
23 vapor fixture will give us a fixture which will be economical
24 to operate, as well as a very architecturally significant
25 fixture.

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 I just wanted to put in my two cents. I
2 would certainly like to see those saved.

3 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Any questions?

4 MR. RAGSDALE: I have none.

5 Thank you.

6 MR. BARNES: I have none.

7 Thank you.

8 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Thank you, sir.

9 (Witness excused.)

10
11 MR. RAGSDALE: Brent Mandry.

12 (Witness sworn.)

13
14 BRENT MANDRY testified as follows:

15 WITNESS MANDRY: My name is Brent Mandry.

16 I also am an architect and a citizen of West Portland
17 Place, which is a public subdivision in the same historic
18 area of University City that contains the cast-iron lamp
19 poles which we're talking about.

20 Many of our elected city officials, public
21 officials, and private citizens have, over the last several
22 years, worked very diligently and given up their own hours
23 and lots of their time and effort to come to a conclusion
24 and work with Union Electric to come to a solution to be
25 able to save these poles. I was, personally, very distressed

1 to recently learn that this is evidently no longer going
2 to be possible.

3 I think that, as a homeowner in the area and
4 also a person who has some interest in keeping with the
5 architecture of the area and real estate in the area, that
6 there is a great resurgence of return of people from the
7 county to this particular area because of the particular
8 ambiance of the age and quality of the homes and, also,
9 because of the ambiance of the street scape. A significant
10 factor to this street scape ambiance is the cast-iron poles
11 and their continued presence in the area.

12 Many people have spoken to me and to others.
13 There is great interest in being able to save these poles
14 and come to a satisfactory conclusion, as far as being able
15 to convert them as necessary or save them as is, if that
16 be the case. So I would urgently request the Public Service
17 Commission to diligently work to save the poles and, also,
18 to maintain their present workability whenever possible.

19 Thank you very much.

20 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Any questions?

21 MR. RAGSDALE: No.

22 MR. BARNES: I have no questions.

23 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Thank you, sir.

24 (Witness excused.)
25

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 MR. RAGSDALE: Katie Gentry.

2 (Witness sworn.)

3
4 KATIE GENTRY testified as follows;

5 WITNESS GENTRY: My name is Katie Gentry.
6 I'm a resident of University City in the subdivision known
7 as University Hills. I serve as the Trustee in that area.

8 I don't wish to take your time. I simply
9 reiterate, I think, what everyone else has said, particularly,
10 from the University City area. It seems that this is being
11 handled in a very backwards manner. I question whether,
12 in fact, it will be an efficient change in terms of the
13 amount of usage and the way that it is used.

14 I question doing away with the old standards
15 that we have. The feasibility of putting the mercury vapor
16 into the system that we have now seems to me to be a logical
17 solution and one that I would like to see utilized.

18 The residents in my subdivision have raised
19 several questions as to whether, in fact, the mercury vapor
20 is the best solution. What about sodium vapor? There have
21 been many discussions as to the alternatives. And, as resi-
22 dents and citizens, I think they would like to have some input
23 as to what the Commission is doing and how they've reached
24 their decisions in allowing Union Electric to proceed or
25 not to proceed.

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Any questions?

2 MR. RAGSDALE: I have none.

3 MR. BARNES: I have none.

4 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Thank you.

5 (Witness excused.)

6
7 MR. RAGSDALE: Robert Edmonds.

8 (Witness sworn.)

9
10 ROBERT EDMONDS testified as follows:

11 WITNESS EDMONDS: My name is Robert Edmonds.

12 I am the President of the West Portland Place Neighborhood
13 Association.

14 I would like to express, as a representative
15 of that association, our collective frustration over the
16 length of time and manner that this proceeding has taken.
17 I think we've had agreements with Union Electric that have
18 occurred over the past year which have, evidently, been
19 dissolved.

20 We would like to have you, the Commission,
21 work toward an expeditious solution of this problem. I
22 don't have all the mathematical facts and figures that some
23 of the people here tonight have. But we would like to see
24 this matter resolved as quickly as possible.

25 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Any questions?

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 MR. RAGSDALE: I have none.

2 MR. BARNES: I have no questions.

3 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Thank you, sir.

4 (Witness excused.)

5
6 MR. RAGSDALE: Cynthia Metcalfe

7 (Witness sworn.)

8
9 CYNTHIA METCALFE testified as follows;

10 WITNESS METCALFE: My name is Cynthia Metcalfe.
11 I am a Councilman in University City, representing the First
12 Ward, which contains many neighborhoods that have the old
13 architectural features we've been discussing tonight.

14 I would second most everything that's been
15 said tonight, but I want to emphasize a few points. It
16 would appear to us that Union Electric is making an effort
17 to price itself out of the street light market.

18 I am sympathetic, I think most everybody is,
19 with the desire for the utility company to be efficient so
20 that it can keep its rates down. But this should be done
21 within the bounds of being responsible.. And to price itself
22 out of the street light business, for older areas such as
23 University City, is not responsible. I think that's the
24 thing that you have to take a look at.

25 The architectural lights are more than just

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 something that people are fond of. They are one of the major
2 assets of an older community. Communities like University
3 City have to work extremely hard to maintain their assets
4 to be viable communities. One of the most important things
5 we have to offer is good, old structure. That's private housing
6 and public structures. These street lights are a major part
7 of that.

8 So it is not just a frivolous desire. It's
9 a major part of our effort to remain a viable community.
10 And, for Union Electric to, in the name of efficiency,
11 abdicate its responsibility to maintain these light fixtures
12 and standards is to be an irresponsible part of the metro-
13 politan St. Louis County.

14 Thank you.

15 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Any questions of this
16 witness?

17 MR. RAGSDALE: No.

18 MR. BARNES: I have none.

19 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Thank you.

20 (Witness excused.)

21 _____
22 MR. RAGSDALE: Matthew McCauley.

23 (Witness sworn.)
24 _____
25

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 MATTHEW P. MCCAULEY testified as follows:

2 WITNESS MCCAULEY: My name is Matthew P.
3 McCauley. I, too, don't want to take up your time. And I'm
4 not sure I have a lot of new information for you.

5 I feel, first of all, that I ought to apologize
6 for not being better prepared. Obviously, some of that is
7 my fault. But I also think that it brings up the procedure
8 that we're following here tonight.

9 I would like, as Mr. Hennessy did, to thank
10 the Commission for coming, in part, at least, to St. Louis
11 to hear this. Obviously, most of us won't be in Jefferson
12 City when the real hearing happens. I suppose, at that time,
13 the Union Electric staff will make a case that we'll then
14 know what we're talking about.

15 It's hard to argue in a vacuum. And I cer-
16 tainly feel as if I'm arguing in a vacuum because, while
17 some of the subdivisions in University City have been talking
18 to Union Electric about an effort to convert their existing
19 street lights to mercury vapor lights, the subdivision of
20 which I'm a Trustee, Ames Place, has had no such conversations
21 with University City and only finds out about this scheduled
22 tariff change and these meetings by ragtag phone calls at
23 the last minute. And the result is you come with alarm,
24 but not with the sort of technical background that might
25 enable one to make a contribution.

1 I also regret that we are proceeding in this
2 way. It seems to me that if Union Electric has a serious
3 concern about energy, there ought to be a way for Union
4 Electric and the street light users to sit around a table
5 and hammer out some sort of a solution that would serve
6 the utility's needs and, also, the needs of the subdivision,
7 rather than this sort of Draconian approach, which gets
8 everybody frightened and seems to promise, for the subdivisions,
9 a sort of an all-or-nothing solution. We'll either lose our
10 rights or we'll win the privilege of fighting with Union
11 Electric about our lights some other day, perhaps.

12 Besides the question of procedure, I would
13 like to just make a pitch on behalf of aesthetic standards.
14 Sitting in this room tonight reminds me of something that
15 I've observed many times in seeing building, particularly
16 interior building. And I'm not an architect. But the
17 architects who are here, I'm sure, would bear me out that
18 an architect who's designing an interior, if he wants to
19 make it attractive, tends to use incandescent lighting.

20 This room is a good example of the fact that
21 the fluorescents are sort of on the edge and what we are
22 sitting under are the more soft light that's provided by incandes-
23 cent lights. I think that's important. It's a demonstrable
24 fact that there is an aesthetic preference for incandescent
25 bulbs.

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 In my neighborhood, unlike some of the neighbor-
2 hoods which have been discussed or which have made presentations
3 this evening, we have lights every 15 feet on the street.
4 And, if pole for pole conversion is undertaken to mercury
5 vapor, we're extremely concerned that we'll never get any
6 sleep. The lighting will be very, very bright because we
7 already have a lighting system which is, from the point of
8 view of illumination, quite satisfactory.

9 One problem that we certainly recognize with our
10 incandescent system is that the bulbs burn out all the time.
11 We're always having to call the trouble truck to come and
12 change them. It seems that Mr. Kelley, among others, has
13 averred, quite clearly, the solution to that which is to
14 rewire these lights so that they aren't having this heavy
15 dose of power run through the bulbs at all times.

16 If you converted them to what I'm informed--
17 and I'm not a technical person--to 110 volts, you will have
18 much less problems with bulbs burning out. It's the same
19 thing that could happen in your house. And, of course, also,
20 I presume that would reduce the danger to people that occurs
21 now when the street lights are knocked over by a truck or
22 something.

23 So there are two technical reasons why, at
24 least in our neighborhood, this conversion doesn't make a
25 great deal of sense. I know in the Union Electric proposal

1 the suggestion is that the materials, which are now being
2 used in subdivisions like the ones in University City and
3 Hampton Park which are being discussed, are no longer available.

4 I can say to the Commission that the globes
5 in my subdivision, Ames Place, are similar to the subdivisions,
6 I believe, in University Heights. And they're made of plastic.
7 So they're not made of something rare that is no longer
8 available. I'm not sure that I've seen a standard which
9 is identical elsewhere, but we all know the point has been
10 made here this evening that the wheel of fashion is turning
11 back to the wrought-iron standards so that newly developed
12 projects in the city and new projects of a commercial sort
13 everywhere are installing wrought-iron standards very much
14 like ours. So these standards are obviously available.

15 It brings me to the question, I guess, of
16 the rates. I have no official poll of my neighbors to say
17 that they prefer the incandescent bulbs at any price and the
18 existing wrought-iron standards at any price. But I think
19 it's safe to say that there is a strong enough preference
20 that would withstand some sort of a differential rate charging
21 apparatus.

22 I think it's also fair to say that in the
23 great passing out of civic responsibilities and rewards,
24 sometimes you get more than you pay for; sometimes you
25 get less. I know in my neighborhood we're subsidizing

1 other neighborhoods in the matter of trash collection. It
2 won't offend me greatly if some of the other neighborhoods
3 subsidized us somewhat in the matter of electric lights.

4 I guess I'd like to close by taking some of
5 the high ground here away from Union Electric. We're talking
6 about saving energy. Of course, saving neighborhoods also
7 saves energy because it makes it less necessary for people
8 to do long drives. It fosters integration among people
9 of different races and different ages and, generally, a
10 social good, just as much as a rather simplistic solution
11 which has been proposed by Union Electric.

12 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Any questions.

13 MR. RAGSDALE: I have none.

14 MR. BARNES: I have none.

15 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Thank you, sir.

16 (Witness excused.)

17
18 MR. RAGSDALE: Mr. Examiner, I do not have
19 any more names on my list at this time.

20 EXAMINER CADIEUX: I would ask if there are
21 any other individuals that wish to testify that have not
22 testified already or signed the sheet. I see one hand.

23 Mr. Carl.

24 MR. CARL: Mr. Cadieux, would it be possible
25 to make a tiny supplement to the testimony I gave?

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Certainly.

2 (Witness sworn.)

3
4 RAY LEIFIELD testified as follows:

5 WITNESS LEIFIELD: My name is Ray Leifield.
6 I am employed with University City. One of my obligations
7 is the street light division.

8 We've discussed the historic lighting. But
9 I'd like it to be brought to attention that we also have
10 units that are incandescent. And we are getting the story
11 that there is no increase in cost. But we do pay an increase
12 because we've been caught with removal and reinstallation
13 charges.

14 In the incandescent rates, with the rate
15 filings, we pay 98 cents a month more for an ornamental
16 standard over distribution incandescent lighting. When
17 converted, we pay \$3.16 more, which roughly breaks down
18 to about a 220 percent increase. We would like that brought
19 to attention where a pole we've paid for for 30 or 40 years--
20 you start paying additional rates. We would like the Public
21 Service Commission, also, to investigate that.

22 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Any questions?

23 MR. RAGSDALE: I have none.

24 MR. BARNES: I have none.

25 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Thank you, sir.

Massachusetts Public Service Commission

1 WITNESS LEIFIELD: If it wasn't brought up,
2 our historical lighting is a small percentage of our incandes-
3 cent problems. We have other problems in the city, which
4 would really be an economic problem to the city. We're
5 talking about an increase of nearly \$20,000 a year in our
6 lighting changes.

7 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Thank you, sir.

8 (Witness excused.)
9

10 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Mr. Carl.

11 JAMES CARL testified as follows:

12 WITNESS CARL: I would just like to clarify
13 that, first of all, the lights about which the people in
14 Hampton Park are speaking and the people in University
15 Heights III, University Heights II, and West Portland
16 Place, are exactly the same kind of light made by the
17 Banner Iron Works, the University Model No. 231.

18 Mr. McCauley raised a point that I would like
19 to amplify regarding spares. There are, first of all--I
20 have, with my own eyes, seen at the company's Dorsett Road
21 facilities--and I would make it clear to the company that
22 I was given expressed permission to enter those facilities
23 by the Manager of the pole yard, Mr. Petrovich. We have
24 inventoried the spare parts on hand at Dorsett Road and
25 find that there are 16 spare poles and any number of spare

Missouri Public Service Commission

1 cross arms and finials for the top of these poles, both in
2 Hampton Park and University City. And there are one or two
3 short poles of the same design that apply to Mr. McCauley's
4 subdivision.

5 But I would like to make another important
6 point. Banner Iron Works still exists and is doing business
7 in this city today. A committee of citizens, including myself
8 and the Chairperson of the Historic Preservation Committee,
9 Mrs. Tirzah Berthoff, have inspected personally and have
10 confirmed the existence of the molds for the cross arms and
11 finial tops of these poles in the pattern shop of Banner Iron
12 Works.

13 Further, we have, in the possession of the
14 city of University City, a hard bid given to us by Banner
15 Iron Works for the fabrication of new parts from these
16 original molds, which are more than 50 years old. New
17 finials will now cost \$36 instead of, probably, some very
18 small sum. And cross arms can be had for \$185 each. And
19 we will present copies or the originals, if we can find
20 them, of that bid from Banner Iron Works. The question of
21 spare parts is not a problem.

22 We have not had the opportunity to explore
23 the pattern shop warehouse at Banner Iron Works where, I
24 think, we will find, in a packing case somewhere in the
25 corner, the mold, the long flask mold for the pole itself.

Massachusetts Public Service Commission

1 There is one other point that I would raise.
2 It has to do with an assertion made. And I would ask the
3 Commission to check into this. Street lights are efficient
4 if they are cleaned. In other words, if you start with a
5 brand new clean street light and you don't wash its globe
6 or clean its bulb, it loses over 50 percent of its efficiency.
7 And I would state now, and I've lived in University City most
8 of my life, and in the part of University City having to
9 do with these historic street lights for 8 years, I have
10 never seen a Union Electric cleaning truck approach and clean
11 or do anything, to the best of my knowledge and belief,
12 to any street light in University City. There is no routine
13 cleaning, to the best of my knowledge and belief, of the
14 lights of University City, which cuts down their efficiency.

15 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Any questions?

16 MR. RAGSDALE: None.

17 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Thank you, sir.

18 (Witness excused.)

19
20 EXAMINER CADIEUX: Is there anyone else in
21 the audience who wishes to testify this evening?

22 (No response.)

23 EXAMINER CADIEUX: If not, this local hearing
24 will be adjourned. Thank you very much.

25 WHEREUPON, the public hearing of this case
 was concluded.

Missouri Public Service Commission

I N D E X

PUBLIC'S EVIDENCE:

PAGE

JOE MOONEY

5

FRANK OLLENDORFF

7

JAMES CARL

12

JIM HENNESSY

22

BRUNO SONNINO

25

PATRICK J. KELLEY

27

LOUIS ZAMBRANA

30

DENNIE NEILSON

32

BRENT MANDRY

33

KATIE GENTHY

35

ROBERT EDMONDS

36

CYNTHIA METCALFE

37

MATTHEW P. McCAULEY

39

RAY LEIFIELD

44

JAMES CARL

45