

*Lynne P. and Sherman N. Shewmaker*  
7330 Maple Avenue  
Maplewood, MO 63143

September 14, 2006

Missouri Public Service Commission  
ATTN: Ms. Tracy Leonberger  
Post Office Box 360  
Jefferson City, MO 65102

**FILED<sup>2</sup>**  
SEP 15 2006  
Missouri Public  
Service Commission

**Re: Case No. GC-2006-0549, Lynne Shewmaker vs. Laclede Gas Company**

Dear Ms. Leonberger:

According to the Commission's Order of August 9, 2006, we have until September 18, 2006 to respond to your "Staff Recommendation" letter, which we received on Saturday, September 9, 2006. This is our response.

1. OUR COMPLAINT AGAINST LACLEDE GAS COMPANY HAD NOTHING AT ALL TO DO WITH ESTIMATED BILLS.
2. OUR COMPLAINT AGAINST LACLEDE GAS COMPANY HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH THE OLDER 1997 TRACE READER ON OUR HOUSE OR THE OLD 1997 METER.
3. OUR COMPLAINT WAS MADE BECAUSE THE FIRST AMR READER INSTALLED IN JULY 2005 WAS MISCALIBRATED AND WAS OVER-READING OUR METER USAGE FOR THE WINTER MONTHS OF NOVEMBER, DECEMBER, JANUARY AND FEBRUARY (2006). THE FIRST AMR READER IS THE ONLY ITEM THAT FAILED. In February 2006 a new second AMR Reader was installed and appears to be working correctly. The meter installer informed me at this time, when the second AMR reader was installed, that I would have no more problems with a mal-functioning AMR reader!
4. The meter was never a problem. That was only the suggestion of Laclede Gas. IT WAS THE FIRST AMR METER READER which was the problem. We showed regression analyses attached to the Complaint displaying the readings were totally out of character with the rest of our usage over years. No one apparently took these into consideration while making the conclusions.
5. Our complaint was clearly stated in our original official complaint written on June 27, 2006. It stated under item 1 "that Laclede Gas's FIRST AMR READER was miscalibrated with my OLD METER and misread more than twice the usage."
6. **We would ask you to reconsider your decision by disallowing Laclede's collection of the \$969.29 from us because all our evidence supports the facts, Laclede Gas' does not.** An independent assessor comparing our evidence with Laclede's would in no way rule in favor of Laclede.
7. What recourse do we have if we are in the 1% of "misreads" that Laclede admits can happen with their new AMR readers? As they state on their webpage: "Reads on the Cellnet system have a 99% accuracy rate" (<http://www.lacledegas.com/customer/amr.htm>). With the installation of the AMRs, it is no longer possible for consumers to read the METER ITSELF to determine if they are (as we have been) one of the unlucky "1%"!

Sincerely,

  
Lynne P. Shewmaker