

Mr. Jeff DeRouen Executive Director Kentucky Public Service Commission 211 Sower Boulevard Frankfort, Kentucky 40602-0615 PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Kentucky Utilities Company State Regulation and Rates 220 West Main Street PO Box 32010 Louisville, Kentucky 40232 www.eon-us.com

Rick E. Lovekamp Manager - Regulatory Affairs T 502-627-3780 F 502-627-3213 rick.lovekamp@eon-us.com

January 22, 2010

RE: EWING LEE BROWN COMPLAINANT V. KENTUCKY UTILITIES

COMPANY DEFENDANT CASE NO. 2009-00421

Dear Mr. DeRouen:

Kentucky Utilities Company files herewith the original and ten (10) copies of its Response to the First Data Request of Commission Staff dated January 8, 2010 in the above-cited case.

Also enclosed are an original and ten (10) copies of a Petition for Confidential Protection regarding certain information provided in response to Question No. 7.

A copy is being mailed to the Complainant.

Please contact me if you have any questions concerning this filing.

Sincerely,

Rick E. Lovekamp

### COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

### BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

	PECELLED
In the Matter of:	JAN 22 2010 PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
EWING LEE BROWN COMPLAINANT	) CASE NO. ) 2009-00421
V.  KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY DEFENDANT	) 2009-00421 ) )

RESPONSE OF
KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY
TO
COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST DATA REQUEST
DATED JANUARY 8, 2010

FILED: January 22, 2010

### **VERIFICATION**

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY	)	
	)	SS:
COUNTY OF JEFFERSON	)	

The undersigned, **John Wolfram**, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is Director – Customer Service and Marketing for E.ON U.S. Services, Inc., and that he has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the responses for which he is identified as the witness, and the answers contained therein are true and correct to the best of his information, knowledge and belief.

John Wolfram

> Victoria B. Harper (SEAL) Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

Sept 20, 2010

# Response to Commission Staff's First Data Request Dated January 8, 2010

Case No. 2009-00421

Question No. 1

- Q-1. Refer to the Answer of Kentucky Utilities Company ("KU's Answer"), paragraph 3.a. On what date did Mr. Brown visit the KU Lexington Service Center and ask to be taken off the budget billing plan?
- A-1. Mr. Brown visited the KU Lexington Business Office on September 4, 2009. At that time, he asked to have his home account removed from the budget billing plan, and the Company did as requested.

### Response to Commission Staff's First Data Request Dated January 8, 2010

Case No. 2009-00421

#### **Ouestion No. 2**

Witness: John Wolfram

- Q-2. Refer to KU's Answer, paragraph 3.c.
  - a. State whether Mr. Brown's two accounts have the same meter reading and due dates or whether they differ.
  - b. Explain how Mr. Brown's home account was mistakenly removed from budget billing.
  - c. When was the mistake discovered?
  - d. Explain why KU was unable to properly and timely address Mr. Brown's concerns.

#### A-2.

- a. Mr. Brown's two accounts have the same meter reading and due dates.
- b. Upon further review of Mr. Brown's account, it was determined that Mr. Brown's home account was not mistakenly removed from budget billing. It was done at his request on September 4, 2009. In addition, prior to that date on July 10, 2009, the Company received a bill stub for Mr. Brown's garage account with a note requesting the Company to remove the account from the budget billing program.
- c. After removing Mr. Brown's home account from budget billing on September 4, 2009, a Company representative inaccurately advised Mr. Brown that his account had a credit balance of \$78.96. Mr. Brown then made a payment of \$23.84 to satisfy what he believed to be the amount owed to keep the account current. Our representatives discovered that problem on September 16, 2009 when Mr. Brown called to inquire about the brown bill he received. In fact, Mr. Brown did not have a credit in his accumulator balance. He would only have had a credit if had he paid the \$189.00 bill that was due on September 8, 2009. Because the September bill was not reversed, the system was expecting

payment in the amount of \$189.00. When that payment did not occur, Mr. Brown's service was disconnected. When Mr. Brown's service was disconnected on September 25, 2009, the Company reconnected service the same day.

d. Once the Company understood that Mr. Brown had been told an incorrect payment amount due, representatives explained to Mr. Brown the actual amount that needed to be paid. The last conversation that the Company had with Mr. Brown prior to disconnection was on September 17, 2009. At that point, the Company considered the complaint closed, because the complaint pertained to the potential for disconnection, and the correct amount due in order to avoid disconnection had been provided to Mr. Brown. When no additional payment was received by September 24, 2009, Mr. Brown's service was disconnected for nonpayment the next day. Following disconnection of service, Mr. Brown again contacted the Company and the complaint was reopened. When it became clear that a dispute was still pending, the Company took action and reconnected service to Mr. Brown's home the same day.

## Response to Commission Staff's First Data Request Dated January 8, 2010

Case No. 2009-00421

Question No. 3

- Q-3. Refer to KU's Answer, paragraph 3.d. Is there a 30-day notice requirement related to starting or discontinuing budget billing? If yes, explain.
- A-3. No. There is no notice requirement related to starting or discontinuing budget billing. However, if a customer requests discontinuing budget billing after a bill is issued (but not paid), unless the bill is reversed, payment of the budget amount is necessary to avoid disconnection.

## Response to Commission Staff's First Data Request Dated January 8, 2010

Case No. 2009-00421

Question No. 4

- Q-4. Refer to KU's Answer, paragraph 3.f. Provide the time that service to Mr. Brown's home was disconnected on September 26, 2009.
- A-4. Mr. Brown's home was disconnected on September 25, 2009 at 2:22 p.m.

### Response to Commission Staff's First Data Request Dated January 8, 2010

Case No. 2009-00421

Question No. 5

- Q-5. Refer to KU's Answer, First Affirmative Defense. KU states that it has attempted to contact Mr. Brown several times to discuss the complaint. Provide the methods used by KU to attempt to contact Mr. Brown.
- A-5. KU's attempts to contact Mr. Brown were by telephone.

	,	
•		

# Response to Commission Staff's First Data Request Dated January 8, 2010

Case No. 2009-00421

### Question No. 6

- Q-6. Provide copies of any and all correspondence between Mr. Brown and KU relating to the complaint.
- A-6. All correspondence with Mr. Brown was by telephone. Please see response to Question No. 7 for available recordings.

### Response to Commission Staff's First Data Request Dated January 8, 2010

Case No. 2009-00421

Question No. 7

- Q-7. Provide copies of any and all audio recordings of telephone conversations between Mr. Brown and any representative of KU relating to the complaint.
- A-7. Enclosed on the CD are recordings between Mr. Brown and KU representatives with personal information redacted. Although other conversations between Mr. Brown and representatives of KU took place, only the attached conversations were recorded.