## Notice of *Ex Parte* Contact

all water

TO:	Data Center All Parties in Case No. ER-2007-0002	
FROM:	Chairman Jeff Davis Commissioner Connie Murray Commissioner Steve Gaw Commissioner Robert Clayton Commissioner Lin Appling	
DATE:	January 24, 2007	

On January 22, 2007, we received the attached letter from Peter R. Bredehoeft regarding AmerenUE. The Commission is currently considering the issues discussed in this document in case ER-2007-0002 which is a contested case. In contested cases, the Commission is bound by the same *ex parte* rule as a court of law.

Although communications from members of the public and members of the legislature are always welcome, those communications must be made known to all parties to a contested case so that those parties have the opportunity to respond. According to the Commission's rules (4 CSR 240-4.020(8)), when a communication (either oral or written) occurs outside the hearing process, any member of the Commission or Regulatory Law Judge who received the communication shall prepare a written report concerning the communication and submit it to each member of the Commission and the parties to the case. The report shall identify the person(s) who participated in the *ex parte* communication, the circumstances which resulted in the communication, the substance of the communication, and the relationship of the communication to a particular matter at issue before the Commission.

Therefore, we submit this report pursuant to the rules cited above. This will ensure that any party to this case will have notice of the attached information and a full and fair opportunity to respond to the comments contained therein.

Commissioners cc: **Executive Director** Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge General Counsel

January 24, 2007

Peter R. Bredehoeft 814 Kings Cliff Road Kirkwood, MO 63122

## 1/18/2007

Governor Office Building Missouri Public Service Commission 200 Madison Street P. O. Box 360 Jefferson City, MO 65102-0360 Attn: Mr. Jeff Davis, Chairman

Dear Mr. Davis:

Back in the early 60's I worked for Southwestern Bell as a business office Manager out of the Ballwin Office. As a Manager, the worst thing that could happen to you was to get a Commission complaint. This was a career-limiting event------and one had 24 hours in which to respond. I suspect now that the SBC has competition this situation has dramatically changed.

Anyway, I have a complaint against Ameren UE.

I was one of the unlucky thousands who lost power for the third time this year on Saturday night and regained it on Tuesday afternoon.

Basically my "bitch" is:

- 1. In our subdivision all of the service is buried-----thus the problem is elsewhere.
- 2. There is **no sense of urgency** to inform the public when the service will be resumed. If they really cared, they could put a map in the Post Dispatch daily indicating the areas that are out and advising when it will go back on-----or their best guess.
- 3. Their attitude seems to be one of----- "this is an act of god over which we have <u>no control.</u>" Frankly, I do not buy this argument. How is it that Laclede Gas can bury all of their pipes-----and Ameren cannot bury their wires? When was the last time you saw a gas pipe on the surface?
- 4. Asking for a rate hike when they provide lousy service takes a lot of gall.

1

## 5. Who pays for

- a. The food spoiled out of the freezer and fridge?
- b. The \$150 per night at a hotel in St. Charles?
- c. The added expense in the water bill to keep the cold water dripping so that the pipes would not freeze?
- d. The additional gasoline in going back and forth from the temporary housing back home to see if the power was back on?
- e. The "agro" that we go through with this experience?

The only loss to Ameren when they have a power outage is the loss of billing in terms of kilowatt-hours. To this end, when an outage exists the areas with the largest households get treated first to maximize the utility's billing. The poor sucker in the smallest area of outage gets "screwed." (That was me!!!!!!)

## How about a system of "risk and reward?"

On the risk side-----to cover the consumer's loss for every day of outage charge Ameren a "fee" of \$50 per day for the first day, \$100 for the second day and \$300 a day thereafter. Thus, for a 5 day outage the "fee" would be \$750.00 This would be given to the individual customer in the form of a credit on his bill.

Conversely, if Ameren provides 12 consecutive months without an outage they would be permitted to charge an additional \$10.00 per month as long as 100% service is provided. The first time an outage occurs they lose this premium until another 12 months of continuous service occurs. This is the reward part of the equation. An outage would be defined as a service interruption of more than one hour.

Under this system, they would have an incentive to either bury their wires or have a very active tree-trimming program. Then, stand back and watch the "chips fly."

Anyway, I feel better getting this off of my chest. I am sure they will not change their ways. But, please do not even think about giving these folks a rate increase. In my humble opinion they have not earned one. The only increase they should be given is one that includes some "penalties" or credits to the consumer for interruption of service. The last I knew was that they were in the business of providing a service. Is there some way we can get them some competition? I.e. like the telephone and cable businesses. Then perhaps they might " shape up." Very truly yours,

UNIA IN

Peter R. Bredehoeft

ł

Cc: Connie Murray, Commissioner Steve Gaw, Commissioner LRobert M Clayton III, Commissioner Linnard Appling, Commissioner

