

Response as Readdress to order of denial of Petition due to I followed the protocol of substantive in CSR prerequisite procedural that required my petition to be within 10 days of commission decision their vote was on January 7, 2026 my petition was timely under terms of CSR I submitted prior to move 2 separate submissions @ docket OX-2026-0045 on the same date of my Petition whereby to proceed to open the Petition. Those submissions were to entry that I had the procedurals accurately cited as prerequisite from my same day submission in regard to protocol of petition process which I then was able to advance and to be able to proceed to do the seated submissions required in order to do that I was petitioning docket OX-2026-0045 with 2 submissions on CSR protocols completed and was ready to case transfer from OX-2026-0045 to open the Petition as a separate case OX-2026-0180 please refer to ITEM #1 in this Petition's docket for those specificities on procedural I followed to the letter.

Requesting permission for Response to readdress my denial with pleadings

(1) Although the promulgation and enactment are in August 2026. The pertinence of my pleadings are not premature in that my pleadings were required within 10 days according to CSR procedurals.

My brief does not include the steps I submitted in process as prerequisite items prior to transfer from entry same date as this case opened

Those entries of procedural pleadings are in OX-2026-0045 and they describe in detail with all CSR citations procedurals that in fact required that

I had only 10 days after a decision was made by the Commission to petition their decision. The Commission vote was made public on Jan. 7, 2026.

See the CSR procedurals I cited that are also in item #1 in this Petition case

(2) The choice that the wording of statute 386.820 declaratory is a proponent of the NEW RULE is not to say it is limited as applicable presently regardless to the future enactment of full promulgation future date in Aug. 2026. That is why the my comment from OX-2026-0045 is actually additionally a current rule comment as separately applicable and not dependent upon future date in Aug. 2026.

My intent of this petition was to procure out some particulars of 386.820 in that it describes to view to read as Traditional in "language". This would be applicable to all known meters both the standard the non standard of the Opt out Electric and

also the Mechanical Analog. As the point of wording is ambiguous and does not state any specific type of meter. All 3 meters just stated cannot all be construed as Traditional. The other wording about non communicating is also vague as the interpretation that the non standard as non RF communication does not portend that it is a non communicating meter and in fact it as an Electric meter with a circuit board and digital system can retain information from the interior appliances via hard wire currency the circuit board is retaining and literally communicating with appliances usage for measurements of 15 minute window for usage %.

Mechanical meter is the only non communicating meter and it cannot retain communication as it has no circuit board. Since all 3 cannot be Traditional and 2 out of 3 are Digital according to universal MO statute 407.005 and those are the ones labeled in Vendor Tariff's as standard and non standard. The remaining meter is Mechanical not Electric it does not operate on electricity. That one is a Traditional meter according to added statute cited that reveals the Analog is the only 1 of the 3 that can be viewed to read that is also not Digital. This clarification to request amend was to correct any interpretation that a Traditional meter is not a Mechanical meter and to eliminate that a Electric meter is per improper interpretation of 386.820 being described to be categorized as Traditional due to the fact that it can be viewed to be read.

However, regardless of amend the hope I had was for the Petition was promptly brought to render interpretation clarity for the Vendor's who are opposing currently that statute 386.820 is well an Electric meter and a mechanical meter both? per improper interpretation of the Vendors.

(3) Yes, I asked for an amend by interpretation being clarified via putting the word ANALOG in the statute 386.820 and according to my pleadings prerequisite submitted the same day as the petition it was my understanding that a Petition can allow the Commission to amend and correct any portion of the Regulatory inclusive of the statute involved in "**current**" **Tariff Regulation 386.820 despite the upcoming changes mentioned in item #4. Vendor's are using wrongful interpretation of 386.820 and I am in current petition of that concurrent**

ongoing ISSUE.

(4) The only *added amend that was permitted for NEW RULE was asked by Vendor's on Nov. 13th docket whereby that specific amend was acknowledged as acceptable? in the rule making process portion of Rule 20 CSR 4240-10.035. that *added amend is not currently the rule and in fact it contradicts the purpose of NEW RULE per it extinguishes the Mechanical Analog meter via Vendor intervening in Consumer supply and demand. The vote was cast to approve Vendors *added amend and that *added amend was not part of the Senate Bill #4 which was specifically to allow removal of **advanced meters** for \$125.00 and to also reduce the Tariff fee to \$15.00 or allow Consumers to read it and post card mail for no charge. It is very much been permitted that Vendor's were provided a means to in fact put in a new clause per thier accepted *amend that they will in Aug. only be required to look for meters with Commercial suppliers. This is appalling as the entire reason for the NEW RULE in AUG is so that we can remove the advanced meters and replace with Mechanical. **So, the vote is defying the purpose of the NEW RULE for the Consumer's intent in asking for that Bill was to get rid of Advanced meters not take one off and put another one on.**

SO, this pre approved Vendor added *amend is literally killing the purpose of the BILL known as Rule 20 CSR 4240-10.035. **This *amend by Vendor's defies the point of the purpose of the new rule and that needs immediate attention per this petition process was started according to the 10 days of the decesion of the Commission not to regard the intent of the Public getting lawmakers to put this new Regulation in on our behalf was to rid us of these Advanced Electric meters so that we can return to safe Analog meters.** The word traditional is only part of the problem of interpretation which is not to expect that a Judge can change statutory but rather that a Judge can use statutory to interpret statutory.

It was my request at that hearing yes for an amend that would be provided that is cited in this order that I am responding to. That request for amend with Commission was ignored not one thing that Public commented was awarded for

amend. That is only a portion of the purpose of the petition which came as Public response within 10 days of Commissions Decesion vote as was required, if the petition is appearing to be premature then there is now my clarification that I followed the rules in CSR as I submitted those prior to explaining that from OX-2026-0045 I was presenting that CSR prerequisite to that docket prior to transfer of the matter of the Petition which I was told required required a seperate case to distinguish it as a Petition case. I used all the procedural CSR protocols so I do not see why my petition is being denied as there is urgent matter that the purpose prime objective of the NEW Rule is literally being extinguished by an * amend granted to the Vendors that will literally enable them to claim they can in Aug. extinguish our request for Mechanical Analog meters per the fact that they are not currently commercially available. So, then why would that amend be granted when it defys the New Rule's purpose. Waiting until August to address the many faucets of this Petition or reopen it then is in contradiction to the fact that my cited CSR procedural already submitted literally required me to take out the Petition out within 10 days of the vote.

I would like the ask to review this as readdress to the order denying Petition.

I can render further clarity to CSR procedural but it is located in docket OX-2026-0045 on the same date as the Petition was opened and it is also submitted in this petition case ITEM #1.