

RONNA DZMURINSKY,
Complainant,

Case No. WC-2010-0215

v
Missouri American Water Company,
Respondent

Motion to order Staff (Investigator) present an investigative report (for May 18 and August, 18 2010) visiting my property and its findings

As by an order of the MPSC to deny my motion To strike the Staff's recommendation or to have the Case Reinvestigate, it's my understanding the physical investigation is not over yet, (and as I promised I apologize and will do so publicly to the Staff, Mr. Steven Leathen Peter, if given opportunity) but it's not clear to me why the Staff has been still collecting information and for whom, if no investigating reports has been filed since the prehearing conference, where the Staff tried to mediate the case, and Peter for May, 18 and August, 18 2010 revealing a purpose of the investigation and visits on my property, even I asked him to file a report, particularly after May 18, 2010 visit's including all the true facts revealed. And as the MAWC indicated they have no any reports regarding May 18, 2010 visiting my property, in response to my subpoena, I am asking the MPSC to order Staff (Investigator) to present his investigating report(s) for May, 18 and August, 18 2010 revealing the true facts and findings, including but not limited to his opinion and recommendations as:

1. Why Staff tried to convince the MAWC to install the device on my property in our prehearing conference if the company previously denied this, motivating I had a leak and later agreed with Staff's March, 2010 recommendation to install the device (Connection between a leak and the device - how they are both related).
2. Why attending my property several times and observing the water meter pit, the Staff insisted to install a device by his own way (loop), even I told him it would create an alteration and technical difficulties. (Indeed, generally, it could be the best deal for me financially just only at that time to agree to install).
3. Who were those people from St. Louis County (Inspector and/or Director of the Plumbing/Public Work Department) the Staff invited on my property on May 18, 2010 and for what purpose.

4. What the St. Louis County inspector, after physical inspection (The MAWC employees refused to follow him inside even after my invitation) inside and outside of my house found wrong with my entire plumbing, no compliance with the local plumbing code or any appliance separately, particularly with the water heater and expansion tank. And if so, was I given a citation or any legal note to correct a violation.
5. Is that true the St. Louis County Inspector declared no homes in St. Louis County have been required to have a backflow device installed by the local plumbing code. And what a reaction from the MAWC employees. (Their own declaration that my water flows into their system, not indicating what was wrong with my plumbing and not explaining why their own water meter doesn't register water).
6. Why the MAWC refused to install a device (their own words and motives) not to mention as they say right now "It's possible but not practicable".
7. Have I asked all the parties involved what was the best place to install the device (on which side of the water meter, explaining why/and why the MAWC agreed with me why on the side closer to the main, viewing a digital water pressure recording taken by Staff dept
8. Have I asked all the parties involved if the device will help/stop the water meter rotate not a leak. And what respond and guarantees I was given.
9. If the Staff believes (after St. Louis County Inspection (twice) founded nothing wrong with my plumbing system, not confirming my water directly goes into MAWC system but only triggers the water's meter dial) that I still have plumbing problems and which exactly ones, how this problem(s) could force the water at about 45psi in the main to flow backward and if it's dangerous safety issue, and how much water. Why the water meter doesn't register backflow water coming through it (or it's just a ratcheting effect letting the water playing "forward-backward" game triggering the flow indicator in both direction but not register water somehow) and how it connects to the problem. My original complaint only specifies not registering water in back flow, so I pay twice. I can live with other issues raised by the MAWC which are baseless and without merit - (Please note, the MAWC doesn't claim anymore that I have a leak and it has never been).
10. Findings facts of August 18, 2010 on my property.

Respectfully submitted,

10/01/2010

by: Roman Izumirskiy
32 Crabapple Ct.
St. Louis, MO 63132
PH# (314) 652-0224