

ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

Docket Nos. 08-0619, 08-0620, 08-0621 (cons.)

REVISED

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

of

ROGER L. PONTIFEX

Submitted On Behalf Of

CENTRAL ILLINOIS LIGHT COMPANY

d/b/a AmerenCILCO

CENTRAL ILLINOIS PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY

d/b/a AmerenCIPS

ILLINOIS POWER COMPANY

d/b/a AmerenIP

THE AMEREN ILLINOIS UTILITIES

March 10, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Witness Identification	1
B. Purpose and Scope	1
II. DISPUTED CHARGES.....	3
III. CONSUMER PROTECTIONS	16
IV. CONCLUSION.....	17

1 **ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION**
2 **REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**
3 **of**
4 **ROGER L. PONTIFEX**
5 **Submitted On Behalf Of**
6 **THE AMEREN ILLINOIS UTILITIES**

7 **I. INTRODUCTION**

8 **A. Witness Identification**

9 **Q. Please state your name.**

10 A. My name is Roger L. Pontifex. My business address is 370 S. Main
11 Street, A – 14, Decatur, Illinois 62523.

12 **Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?**

13 A. I am employed by the Ameren Illinois Utilities (AIU) as an Energy Delivery
14 Business Advisor within the Customer Care Administration.

15 **Q. Please describe your education and work experience.**

16 A. Please see my statement of qualifications, attached as an Appendix to this
17 testimony.

18 **B. Purpose and Scope**

19 **Q. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony in this proceeding?**

20 A. The purpose of my testimony is to respond to Staff and intervenor
21 arguments and recommendations presented in direct testimony
22 concerning disputed charges and consumer protection. I have reviewed

23 and am responding to the direct testimony of the Illinois Commerce
24 Commission Staff (Staff) witness Clausen, Dominion Retail, Inc. (DRI)
25 witness Barkas, and Citizens Utility Board (CUB) witness McDaniel.

26 **Q. Please summarize the conclusions of your rebuttal testimony.**

27 As detailed below, regarding the subject of disputed charges, I conclude:

- 28 • Staff witness Clausen is correct that the original tariffs represent the
29 AIU as being the entities that decide whether a RES charge is
30 disputed.
- 31 • While there should be a more consistent process in handling RES
32 disputed charges regardless of bill method, I do not agree with Staff
33 witness Clausen that specific language within the tariff is needed to
34 detail the process.
- 35 • Leveraging the existing AIU “Dual Bill” and “Single Bill Option” (SBO)
36 disputed charge process where a third party supplier is involved to be
37 applied to the UCB/POR bill method would provide a consistent and
38 common customer experience.
- 39 • CUB witness McDaniel is incorrect that there is no clear dispute
40 process and that the customer’s voice has been removed by excluding
41 the customer’s ability to contact the AIU and dispute RES charges.
42 Clear dispute processes exist today for customer disputes and will
43 exist when the UCB/POR tariffs are implemented.

44 As detailed below, regarding the subject of consumer protection I
45 conclude:

- 46 • CUB witness McDaniel is incorrect to submit that the tariffs should be
47 rejected and held in abeyance until additional consumer protections
48 are developed. Although I am not an attorney, it is my understanding
49 that consumer protection laws and regulations do exist in Illinois.
50 While it may be warranted to develop additional protections in the
51 future, there is no reason to withhold compliance of SB 1299 at this
52 time.
- 53 • The AIU does not object to the opinion of CUB witness McDaniel that a
54 “Do Not Contact List” should be maintained by the utility and provided
55 monthly to RESs so they do not market to residential customers who
56 elect to place their account on the list.

57 **Q. Will you be sponsoring any exhibits with your rebuttal testimony?**

58 A. Yes, I am attaching and sponsoring the following exhibits:

59 • Ameren Exhibit 7.1 – A work flow chart that describes the
60 process currently used when handling a customer contact
61 regarding the AIU price question.

62 • Ameren Exhibit 7.2 – A work flow chart that describes the
63 process currently used when handling a customer contact
64 regarding RES – Dual Bill price question.

65 • Ameren Exhibit 7.3 – A work flow chart that describes the
66 process currently used when handling a customer contact
67 regarding RES – SBO Bill price question.

68 • Ameren Exhibit 7.4 – A work flow chart that describes the
69 proposed process to be used when handling a customer contact
70 regarding RES – UCB/POR Bill or Rate Ready price question.

71 • Ameren Exhibit 7.5 – the Ameren Illinois Utilities Response
72 to Retail Energy Supply Association Data Request No. RESA 2.05.

73

74 **II. DISPUTED CHARGES**

75 **Q. Several witnesses to this proceeding offer testimony regarding**
76 **disputed charges. Staff witness Clausen, (Staff Ex. 3.0, pp 21 – 23);**
77 **DRI witness Barkas, (DRI Ex. 1.0, pp 5 – 7); and CUB witness**
78 **McDaniel, (CUB Ex. 1.0, pp 5 – 6). Please explain your understanding**
79 **of the issues surrounding disputed charges?**

80 A. There are several interrelated relationships implicated when a customer
81 disputes a third-party supply charge on an AIU bill. There is the
82 relationship between the customer and the utility, the customer and the
83 supplier, the utility and the supplier, and the relationship that exists
84 between the Commission and all applicable parties when a complaint

85 process is initiated. First let me state that the tariffs submitted in this case
86 govern the relationship between the customer and the utility and the utility
87 and the supplier only. The AIU have no practical ability to govern the
88 relationship between the customer and the supplier. Moreover, as an
89 Integrated Distribution Company (IDC), it is our role to deliver the power
90 and energy selected by the customer in a manner that is neutral and
91 disinterested to the customer's choice of supplier. It would therefore be
92 inappropriate for the AIU to adjudicate contractual disputes between
93 suppliers and customers, because it potentially calls into question the AIU'
94 supply neutrality as an IDC.

95 The tariffs filed in September 2008 contained to the best of our ability the
96 desires of all interested stakeholders at the time of the filing was made.
97 As AIU witness Pearson states in her rebuttal testimony, the AIU' position
98 on bill inquiries and disputed charges have evolved since that time. The
99 AIU have filed revised tariff language as Ameren Exhibit 4.3 further
100 address concerns for more consistent language and ensuring the AIU not
101 be the entity that decides whether a RES charge is disputed. Moreover,
102 the AIU agree that there needs to be a consistent process for handling
103 RES disputed charges. This will make the customer experience better
104 and further ensure neutral handling by the AIU with respect to supply
105 choice. A common process does exist today under the Dual and SBO bill
106 options for third party supplied energy. By leveraging this approach to
107 UCB/POR the customer experience and general administration should be

108 consistent. Finally, CUB expressed a concern that the customers' voice
109 will be lost by their not being able to contact the utility and dispute a RES
110 charge. As discussed below the customers' voice will never be lost in the
111 existing or recommended process.

112 **Q. Please respond to the observations advanced by Staff witness**
113 **Clausen on page 21 - 23 of his direct testimony.**

114 A. Staff witness Clausen correctly observes on page 21, lines 444 – 453, that
115 there is no definition reference for a dispute of AIU charges in the SBO
116 applicable tariff provisions. He logically concludes the process for
117 disputed charges would be the same regardless of whether the AIU or the
118 RES sends the bill to the customer. Hence he concludes such references
119 are absent from the SBO provisions.

120 **Q. Do you agree with Staff witness Clausen's observations?**

121 A. Not entirely. Comparing SBO to UCB/POR is an apples to oranges
122 comparison. The SBO process does not involve the acquisition of utility
123 receivables by a RES and subsequent socialization of the uncollected
124 portion of those receivables to other customers. RES customers should
125 not knowingly be allowed to sell the AIU receivables related to contracts
126 that are unenforceable. Hence some tariff language to that effect is
127 necessary. However, we do agree it is not appropriate for the AIU to
128 mediate or interfere in disputes between suppliers and customers. We
129 have resolved this potential misinterpretation of our tariffs with some

130 adjusted language. AIU witness Pearson sponsors the language change
131 in her rebuttal testimony, and my rebuttal testimony provides the
132 substantive response with regard to how disputed charges are handled. I
133 draw on my experience in utility customer relations and systems in support
134 of the AIU position.

135 **Q. Please provide an overview of the AIU disputed charge process.**

136 A. Ameren Exhibit 7.1 depicts the process that is used by the AIU when a
137 customer contacts the utility because it disputes an AIU rate or price
138 charge:

- 139 • First we determine if the disputed charge is an AIU (delivery) or RES
140 (supply) item.
 - 141 ○ If the disputed charge is a supply price item we follow the
142 appropriate steps either for Dual or SBO disputed charge
143 process by referring the customer to the appropriate RES.
 - 144 ○ If the disputed charge is a delivery rate or price item we review
145 the rate assignment and current price charges with the
146 customer.
- 147 • If the customer is not satisfied or has previously talked to the AIU
148 about the dispute and after additional sharing of information is still not
149 satisfied, AIU refers the customer to the Illinois Commerce
150 Commission's Consumer Services Division (CSD) by providing the
151 telephone number and/or address.
- 152 • If the customer continues its dispute the AIU may receive notification
153 via a three-party call from the CSD that may include the customer to
154 discuss the specific facts in question.
- 155 • If the CSD and/or the AIU determine more time will be required to
156 determine the final determination of a dispute and/or we are concerned
157 about late payment fees or potential service interruption to the
158 customer, the AIU will be prepared to enter a suspend charge on the
159 customer's account. This is done with the expectation that these
160 disputes should be quickly addressed.

- 161 • If appropriate, the AIU will make a disputed charge correction to the
162 customer's account.

163 **Q. Why does the AIU have a process for handling a RES Dual Bill**
164 **disputed charge when AIU separately bills the delivery charges and**
165 **RES separately bills their supply charges?**

166 A. Since generally all electric customers within the AIU service territories are
167 delivery customers they naturally reach out to us for information and
168 education. We have a defined process to aid our customer service
169 personnel to understand the different interrelationships, be able to better
170 explain these to the customer, and to provide as consistent a customer
171 experience as possible while remaining neutral and disinterested in the
172 customer's supply choice. The Dual Bill disputed charge process is
173 depicted in Ameren Exhibit 7.2.

174 **Q. Please describe the process for handling a RES Dual Bill disputed**
175 **charge.**

176 A. Ameren Exhibit 7.2 depicts the process that is used by the AIU when a
177 customer contacts the utility because it disputes a RES Dual Bill charge:

- 178 • First we determine if the disputed charge is an AIU (delivery) or RES
179 (supply) item.
- 180 ○ If a delivery item we follow the process discussed above that
181 depicts the AIU disputed charge price process.
- 182 • If the disputed charge is a supplier item we check to determine if the
183 item is in a time frame for the active Supplier;
- 184 ○ If not, we refer the customer to the former Supplier and offer the
185 phone number and web address.

- 186 • If the disputed charge is with the active Supplier we ask if the customer
187 has spoken with its Supplier;
- 188 ○ If not, we refer the customer to the active Supplier and offer the
189 telephone number and web address.
- 190 • If the customer has previously talked to the Supplier about the dispute,
191 AIU refers the customer to the CSD by providing the phone number
192 and/or address.

193 The AIU process then ends since the AIU has no charges as part of the
194 RES Dual Bill nor is the AIU the entity deciding the resolution on the RES
195 Dual Bill disputed charge. This process allows the Suppliers to resolve
196 their own disputes on supplier issues while still affording the customer with
197 reasonable and consistent treatment that is aligned to the current
198 practices the AIU use today for our own billing.

199 **Q. Please describe the process for handling a RES SBO disputed**
200 **charge.**

201 A. Ameren Exhibit 7.3 depicts the process that is used by the AIU when a
202 customer contacts the utility because it disputes a RES SBO price charge:

- 203 • First we determine if the disputed charge is an AIU (delivery) or RES
204 (supply) item.
- 205 ○ If a delivery item we follow the process discussed above that
206 depicts the AIU disputed charge price process.
- 207 ○ If a delivery item that is simply an unpaid amount previously
208 submitted to the RES for inclusion on the SBO bill we then,
- 209 ▪ Advise the customer of the unpaid delivery amounts and
210 of their ultimate accountability for payment of those
211 charges and refer them to the appropriate Supplier.
- 212 • If the disputed charge is a supplier item we check to determine if the
213 item is in a time frame for the active Supplier;

- 214 ○ If not, we refer the customer to the former Supplier and offer the
215 telephone number and web address.

- 216 • If the disputed charge is with the active Supplier we ask if the customer
217 has spoken with its Supplier;

- 218 ○ If not, we refer the customer to the active Supplier and offer the
219 telephone number and web address.

- 220 • If the customer has previously talked to the Supplier about the dispute,
221 AIU refers the customer to the CSD by providing the telephone number
222 and/or address.

- 223 • If the customer continues their RES SBO dispute and there are AIU
224 charges involved, AIU should receive notification from either the CSD
225 and/or Supplier, via a 3 or 4 party call that may include the customer.

- 226 • If there are no AIU delivery charges involved then AIU would not
227 expect to receive any notification from either the CSD and/or Supplier
228 similar to the Dual Bill disputed charge process.

- 229 • The AIU will suspend charges related to the delivery charges on the
230 customers RES SBO billed account at the direction of either the CSD
231 or Supplier until the dispute has been resolved with the expectation
232 that these should be quickly addressed.

- 233 • The AIU Retail Supplier Key Account group will be available to work
234 with the RES to resolve the dispute as required.

235 This process allows the Supplier to resolve their own disputes on supplier
236 issues while still recognizing multiple interrelationships exist that need
237 coordination, neutral treatment regarding supply, and affording appropriate
238 consumer protection within a process that is consistent to existing
239 practices the AIU use today for our own billing.

240 **Q. Do you have other observations regarding Staff witness Clausen’s**
241 **testimony?**

242 A. Yes. Staff witness Clausen observes in his testimony, pages 21 -23, that
243 the AIU tariff needs a more consistent approach to defining the process of
244 resolving disputed charges. While I agree with Mr. Clausen there should
245 be a consistent process in handling RES disputed charges regardless of
246 bill method, I do not agree that specific language within the tariff is needed
247 to detail the process. Resolving disputes will require some combination of
248 communication between the AIU, the participating RES, the AIU, and
249 potentially the Commission. Every dispute can have its own unique facts
250 and circumstances. Therefore, attempting to codify a roadmap for all
251 future disputes would be difficult, if not impossible. Attempting to do so
252 would likely only frustrate speedy resolution of customer disputes as they
253 arise in the future.

254 I do agree with Mr. Clausen in the sense it is appropriate to define the AIU'
255 role in disputes that relate to third party supply. AIU witness Pearson has
256 included in her rebuttal testimony modifications to the tariff to remove the
257 sentence "Charges billed by the Company to a Retail Customer for the
258 RES' electric power and energy supply service are deemed to be disputed
259 if such Retail Customer contacts the Company and claims that such
260 charges are not correct" (Reference Original Sheet No. 5.034). This
261 important change reflects the recognition that the AIU are not the
262 appropriate entity to decide whether a charge between a RES and RES
263 customer is disputed. I also agree with Mr. Clausen that it is logical that
264 there be a common approach or process for handling disputed charges.

265 The AIU have, as a result of reviewing intervenor testimony and
266 completing detail design work for implementing UCB/POR, developed a
267 recommended consistent process for RES disputed charges under
268 UCB/POR.

269 **Q. Do you have any recommendations for a common RES disputed**
270 **charge process under UCB/POR?**

271 A. Yes. As a result of reviewing intervenor testimony and completing detail
272 design work in collaboration with the SB 1299 working groups on EDI and
273 RES Portal requirements¹, I recommend we leverage the AIU existing,
274 Dual and SBO disputed charge processes and apply them to UCB/POR.

275 **Q. Please describe your recommended processes for a common RES**
276 **disputed charge process under UCB/POR.**

277 A. Since in UCB/POR the AIU are providing two billing methods, Bill Ready
278 and Rate Ready to expand the potential number of RES' offering mass
279 market supply services, there would be one process.² This one process
280 would be identical for either bill method except for the final step that
281 accommodates for the billing method a RES uses, should it be appropriate
282 for the RES to make a correction for a disputed charge. Ameren Exhibit

¹ The AIU ascribe no position to any party to the ORMD workshops. However, it should be noted that throughout the SB 1299 implementation process, technical and systems coordination with participating RES has occurred and will likely continue to occur under the purview of the ORMD.

² "Rate ready" is simply a formula where a supplier price per unit of energy (kwh) is multiplied times usage. "Bill ready" provides a blank price field on the utility bill that a supplier fills in on a utility bill without any formulation.

283 7.4 depicts the process the AIU recommend when a customer contacts
284 the utility because it objects to an UCB/POR Supplier bill under Bill or
285 Rate Ready.

- 286 • First we determine if the disputed charge is an AIU (delivery) or RES
287 (supply) item.
 - 288 ○ If a delivery rate or price item we follow the process discussed
289 above that depicts the AIU disputed charge price process.
- 290 • If the disputed charge is a supplier item we check to determine if the
291 item is in a time frame for the active Supplier;
 - 292 ○ If not, we refer the customer to the former Supplier and offer the
293 telephone number and web address.
- 294 • If the disputed charge is with the active Supplier we ask if the customer
295 has spoken with their supplier;
 - 296 ○ If not, we refer the customer to the active Supplier and offer the
297 telephone number and web address.
- 298 • If the customer has previously talked to the Supplier about the dispute,
299 AIU refers the customer to the CSD by providing the telephone number
300 and/or address.
- 301 • If the customer continues its RES dispute the AIU, since it provides
302 UCB/POR service for the RES, may receive notification from the CSD
303 and/or RES via a three or four party call that may include the customer.
 - 304 ○ This occurs if the CSD and/or RES determine more time will be
305 required to determine the final determination of a dispute and/or
306 they are concerned about late payment fees or potential service
307 interruption to the customer.
- 308 • AIU will be prepared to enter a suspend charge on the supply charges
309 on the customers account at the direction of either the CSD or
310 Supplier until the dispute has been resolved within the expectation that
311 these should be quickly addressed.
- 312 • If appropriate to make a disputed charge correction the UCB/POR RES
313 will depending on UCB/POR bill method either:

314 ○ If the RES is using UCB/POR Bill Ready the RES sends an 810
315 cancel transaction or a new 810 transaction with correct
316 charges.

317 ○ If the RES is using UCB/POR Rate Ready the RES enters an
318 adjustment through the RES Portal to correct the charge.

319 **Q. Please address the concerns expressed by DRI witness Barkas**
320 **testimony concerns, page 6 – 7, regarding disputed charges.**

321 A. DRI witness Barkas is correct that workshops have further defined how
322 the disputed charge process can function to best serve the
323 interrelationships of all involved: customer, supplier, utility, and CSD. The
324 AIU are active participants in that process and our participation has
325 definitely influenced our position on this issue since the time the tariffs
326 were filed in the above captioned docket. The ORMD-led process has
327 been beneficial in this regard and the AIU appreciate the opportunity this
328 forum provides. Additionally, certain of the discovery and testimony
329 provided in this docket has also influenced our position. The AIU has
330 also agreed to remove the sentence referenced in Mr. Barkas direct
331 testimony at page 6, lines 125 – 128. (See the Ameren Illinois Utilities'
332 Response to Retail Energy Supply Association Data Request No. RESA
333 2.05, attached hereto and identified as Ameren Exhibit 7.5.) The AIU
334 believe its current position and recommended approach to handling RES
335 disputed charges significantly resolve the issue at present

336 **Q. Please identify the arguments made by CUB witness McDaniel on p.**
337 **5 - 6 with regard to dispute resolution.**

338 A. CUB witness McDaniel's direct testimony concludes there is no clear
339 dispute process that is fair to both customers and suppliers (lines 110 -
340 124), the customer's voice from the dispute process has been removed by
341 excluding the customer's ability to contact AIU and dispute RES charges
342 (lines 127 – 139), and the AIU filing should be rejected until all details can
343 be explained in a way to provide a positive customer experience (lines 141
344 -148).

345 **Q. Do you agree with these arguments?**

346 A. No. While Mr. McDaniel's concerns (page 5, lines 110 -124) are
347 understandable, the proposed tariffs, existing processes for Dual Billing
348 and SBO along with the AIU recommended process for UCB/POR
349 appropriately respond to these concerns at this time. Clearly, these
350 processes have provided customers with a consistent and straightforward
351 customer experience. While customer-utility interaction will never be
352 perfected, it can and should be improved on an on-going basis. That said,
353 in the present docket, the processes in place today and the planned
354 processes developed for the offering of UCB/POR are sufficient to
355 prudently administer the UCB/POR program. It would be inappropriate to
356 delay implementation of a program mandated by the Illinois Public Utilities
357 Act indefinitely with the expectation that all possible future customer
358 dispute-related issues are addressed. Moreover, such delay would only
359 eliminate the best means of determining the best practices going forward,
360 practical experience.

361 **Q. As suggested by CUB witness McDaniel on page 6, lines 127 – 139 of**
362 **his direct testimony, has the customer’s “voice” been removed from**
363 **contacting the AIU for a RES disputed charge?**

364 A. No. The customer is not removed in the dispute process from contacting
365 the AIU. Again, Ameren Exhibits 7.1 – 7.4 clearly depict the ability to have
366 the customer contact AIU. By recognizing and being supportive of choice
367 and following the recommended process, the AIU does continue to be an
368 educator, neutral to the customer’s supply choice, and a trusted source to
369 the customer. The customer is free to contact the AIU knowing we will
370 provide guidance on the process steps to follow and that the steps are
371 consistent. The inclusion of the CSD within all these processes insures
372 fair treatment of the customer.

373 **Q. Should the AIU filing be rejected until all details can be explained in a**
374 **way to provide a positive customer experience?**

375 A. No. The AIU revised tariffs, along with the recommended process for
376 handling RES disputed charges for UCB/POR, go a long way to address
377 the related concerns (See CUB Exhibit 1.0, page 6, lines 141 – 148).

378 **Q. Why should this recommendation for a RES disputed charge process**
379 **for UCB/POR should be adopted?**

380 A. The recommended process allows the Suppliers to resolve their own
381 disputes on supplier issues while still affording the customer with
382 reasonable, appropriate and consistent treatment irrespective of supply

383 choice or bill method that is aligned to the current practices the AIU use
384 today. The on-going workshops can be a forum to discuss
385 interrelationships of how the RESs would interact with the offices of CSD
386 and ORMD and what is necessary to support those interrelationships.

387 **Q. Do you have any other observations with regard to how disputed**
388 **charges should be handled?**

389 A. No.

390 **III. CONSUMER PROTECTIONS**

391 **Q. Do you agree with CUB witness McDaniel, that the tariffs should be**
392 **rejected and held in abeyance until additional consumer protections**
393 **are developed?**

394 A. No. First, clearly the General Assembly intended choice for all customers
395 in the law passed in 1997, including residential and small commercial
396 customers. Given that it is now 2009, I would surmise that the intention of
397 SB 1299 was to encourage residential and small commercial customer
398 choice, not delay it further. Second, although I am not an attorney, I am
399 advised that consumer protections do exist including the Commission's
400 Part 451 ARES certificate requirements and the Illinois Consumer Fraud
401 and Deceptive Business Practices Act which includes electricity specific
402 protections as well as those of general applicability.

403 **Q. Do you have any other observations related to the testimony of CUB**
404 **witness McDaniel?**

405 A. Yes. On page 8, line 191, Mr. McDaniel observes that the utility should
406 maintain a “Do Not Contact List” as an additional consumer protection.
407 The AIU have already agreed to provide on a monthly basis a “Do Not
408 Contact List” to the RES. My recommendation is it would be more
409 appropriate and less confusing to rename it a “Do Not Market List”. There
410 already exists a National Do Not Call listing that is for any residential
411 customer to use to remove their phone number from marketing lists. By
412 renaming this list it would not be confused with other lists the RES might
413 receive from other sources. Likewise it would be less confusing to train
414 our customer service personnel on the function of each list.

415 **IV. CONCLUSION**

416 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

417 A. Yes, it does.

APPENDIX

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS OF ROGER L. PONTIFEX

I graduated from Western Illinois University with a Bachelor of Science degree in Recreation and Parks Administration in 1971. I began my employment with Illinois Power Company d/b/a AmerenIP) in 1979. Following is a list of positions I've held with AmerenIP and the AIU:

- August 1979 - 1981: Assistant Customer Service Supervisor, Champaign/Urbana
- 1981 - 1984: Customer Relations Advisor, Decatur Headquarters
- 1984 - 1991: Customer Service Supervisor, Champaign/Urbana
- 1991 - 1992: Customer Information System Project Director, Decatur Headquarters
- 1992 - 1995: Director of Customer Service, Decatur Headquarters
- 1995 - 2001: Regional Manager, Champaign/Urbana
- 2001 - 2003: Senior Director Eastern Region
- 2003 - 2004: Senior Director Customer Service, Decatur
- 2004 - 2008: Managing Supervisor Customer Service, Decatur
- 2008 to present: Energy Delivery Business Advisor, Customer Care Administration

Work experience in the positions above included; customer relations, customer call handling, community relations, meter reading, customer billing, customer inquires, customer credit and collections, along with the systems to support the customer service functions, and customer relations liaison support to Illinois Commerce Commission Consumer Service Division customer disputes. Experiences covered direct customer interactions, supervision, administration, policy, and customer system development.

I testified before The Illinois Commerce Commission one previous time in reference to Illinois Powers implementation of a replacement Customer Information System.

In my current responsibilities within Customer Care Administration, I provide leadership and guidance from the customer business perspective on special projects, such as the start up of the Power Smart Pricing Program; Post 2006 rate implementation; rate implementations; rate relief implementations; Senate Bill 1299; Smart Grid; and other similar projects. My focus is to insure that the AIU customer care administration can provide timely, cost effective, customer focused results in the implementation of projects and system improvements to the Ameren Energy Delivery Suite.