

August 9, 2008

6910 Winchester Drive  
St. Louis, MO 63121

**FILED**<sup>3</sup>

AUG 12 2008

Missouri Public  
Service Commission

Secretary of the Public Service Commission  
Post Office Box 360  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0360

RE: Case Number WC-2008-0354  
Reuben L. Crenshaw v. Missouri-American  
Water Company (MAWC)

Greetings:

I file herewith my response to Mo PSC's "ORDER DIRECTING FILING" issued 7/8/2008. At the risk of violating Mo PSC's protocol, I must go back to the beginning of this matter and express my sincere and heartfelt cogitations as I continue to convey factual information to Mo PSC.

Upon receipt and analysis of Mo PSC's response to my informal complaint (letter dated 1/24/2008 from Michelle Bocklage), it became apparent to me under all circumstances that Michelle Bocklage is biased in favor of MAWC. Furthermore, in reviewing Mo PSC's "STAFF REPORT OF INVESTIGATION," I find said report to be a continuance of Ms. Bocklage's pattern of ignoring my earnest pleas for justice. I therefore concluded that Mo PSC's response to my formal complaint was foreordained after the filing of the informal complaint. Thus I deem the filing of the formal complaint to have been an exercise in futility. However, I must press on.

Neither Michelle Bocklage nor the Investigating Commission Staff acknowledged that the truth of "LaDonna's" disclosure to me on 12/20/2006 was borne out by the recent admission by MAWC that the prior tenant's final meter reading of 515 (on 5/31/2006) was indeed an actual reading and not an estimate. It should have been obvious that Theresa Duba had been giving me the "runaround" and was trying to "cover up" the fact that the "culprit" meter, with the water service having been shut off at the street since 5/9/2006, showed substantial water usage on 10/3/2006. This accounts for the outlandish billings on the 7904 Page account. I submit to you that Theresa Duba and pertinent other individuals at MAWC need to be interrogated under oath.

According to her statement, Ms. Bocklage was (at that time) convinced by MAWC that the final bill for the previous tenant had to be estimated due to the fire. This is certainly untrue, as I pointed out in my formal complaint and as recent revelations corroborate. My conversation with Theresa Duba of MAWC is detailed in my 12/29/2007 letter to Terry Gloriod of MAWC.

The matter of testing the extricated meter seems to be quite an issue with Michelle Bocklage and the Investigating Commission Staff. I did not withdraw from witnessing the test without cause. As I said heretofore, I had a just cause and stated it in my 12/29/2007 letter to Terry Gloriod of MAWC. The Mo PSC's Responders to my complaints seem to feel that my withdrawal from witnessing the test was tantamount to conceding my complaints to be unwarranted and frivolous. I submit to you now additional relevant information concerning this matter. On 4/12/2007 at or about 10:35 a.m. I engaged in a telephone conversation with LaMarr White of MAWC, who is the person Theresa Duba listed to be contacted for testing of the meter. I told Mr. White that Ms. Duba's 4/6/2007 letter to me did not address all the issues I raised in my 3/31/2007 letter to Terry Gloriod of MAWC. I told Mr. White further that I was going to write another letter to Mr. Gloriod, with the hope of arriving at a satisfactory solution to this dilemma, and if such be the case, there would be no need to test the meter. I asked Mr. White to hold the meter and that I would call him in advance if I decided later to proceed with the testing of the meter. Mr. White then said that he would hold the meter and wait to hear from me.

Now the Mo PSC's Responders seem to be of the opinion that my filing of Chapter 13 Bankruptcy with the consequential dismissal of MAWC's charges serves to absolve MAWC of any culpability in the matter at hand. The bankruptcy was a coincidental occurrence, but I know it was part of God's Providence in preventing MAWC from committing the dastardly and inhumane deed of interrupting the water service at my residence.

Turning now to MAWC's "ANSWER" to the Mo PSC's order upon MAWC to respond to my complaint, I now state to you my comments regarding MAWC's individual answers. I simply state whether I feel that MAWC's answer is honest or dishonest.

1. Honest
- 2(1). Dishonest
- 2(2). Dishonest
- 2(2)(a). Dishonest
- 2(2)(b). Dishonest
- 2(2)(c). Dishonest
- 2(2)(d). Dishonest
- 2(2)(e). Dishonest
- 2(3)(a). Dishonest
- 2(3)(b). Dishonest
- 2(3)(c). Dishonest
- 2(3)(d). Dishonest
- 2(3)(e). Dishonest
- 2(3)(f). Dishonest

The next two answers (not numbered) are deemed to be "Honest" and "Dishonest" in that order. Noteworthy is the fact that, in its answer to 2(2)(b), MAWC concurs with my

contention that the prior tenant's final meter reading of 515 was actual (not an estimate) and was taken on 5/31/2006. Theresa Duba originally told me this (prior to her recantation). Now since the prior tenant's water service was turned off at the street on 5/9/2006, it is undeniable that the meter in question was defective, having registered my start-up reading as 518.

After analyzing the 'REPORT OF THE STAFF,' I submit to you my critique of the same.

1. I find it puzzling and suspicious that the "Staff" did not comment on the meter reading discrepancy noted above and demand answers from MAWC.
2. "Staff" appears to be critical of the fact that I did not respond to its telephone voice messages. I was on a very busy schedule during that time. You see, I work for Catholic Charities (delivering "Meals On Wheels") Monday through Friday during the a.m. hours. During the time in question, I had additional afternoon duties of transporting (and some tutoring) underprivileged elementary school kids for another Catholic Charities Program.
3. "Staff" erroneously reported that I requested that disciplinary action be taken against MAWC customer service representatives. I simply wanted MAWC to admit that certain things told to me by its public service representatives were true.
4. "Staff" concluded that I am "very hostile toward MAWC." Please give me a break! Anger is what precipitates complaints in the first place. Nobody likes being victimized.
5. "Staff" made the ludicrous and insulting assumption that, due to my failure to answer its telephone messages, my dissatisfaction is simply due to the fact that the responses provided by MAWC customer service representatives were not the responses I was seeking.

In closing, I am compelled to tell you that I am very unhappy with the conclusions reached by the Mo PSC in this matter. I feel that this entire investigative process has been, to borrow a line from Shakespeare, a "Comedy of Errors."

Yours very truly,



Reuben L. Crenshaw

A Member of Kiwanis International ('78)