



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
P.O. BOX 3265, HARRISBURG, PA 17105-3265

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO OUR FILE

August 16, 2017

Via Electronic Filing

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Re: Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Bureau of Investigation and
Enforcement v. North Heidelberg Sewer Company
Docket No. P-2017-2594688 **(I&E Main Brief)**

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed for electronic filing please find the Main Brief of the Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement in the above-referenced proceeding. Copies have been served on the parties of record in accordance with the Certificate of Service.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Swindler", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael L. Swindler
PA Attorney ID No. 43319
Deputy Chief Prosecutor
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement

Enclosure

cc: As per Certificate of Service

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission,	:	
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. P-2017-2594688
	:	
North Heidelberg Sewer Company	:	

**MAIN BRIEF OF THE
BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT**

Michael L. Swindler
Deputy Chief Prosecutor
PA Attorney ID No. 43319

Stephanie M. Wimer
Prosecutor
PA Attorney ID No. 207522

Bureau of Investigation & Enforcement
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265
(717) 783-6369
mwindler@pa.gov

Dated: August 16, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	3
III. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	8
IV. ARGUMENT.....	9
1. The Evidence Presented By NHSC On Remand Regarding Its Financial Condition And Cash Flow Does Not Warrant Revision Of The Payment Arrangement Set Forth In The Commission’s May 4 Order.....	9
2. The Evidence Presented By NHSC On Remand Regarding The Repayment Schedule Does Not Warrant Revision Of The Payment Arrangement Set Forth In The Commission’s May 4 Order.....	12
3. The Evidence Presented By NHSC On Remand Regarding A Lump Sum Payment Component Does Not Warrant Revision Of The Payment Arrangement Set Forth In The Commission’s May 4 Order.	14
4. The Evidence Presented By NHSC On Remand Regarding Late Payment Charges Does Not Warrant Revision Of The Payment Arrangement Set Forth In The Commission’s May 4 Order.....	15
5. No Evidence Was Presented By NHSC That Warrants Modifications To The Commission’s May 4 Order Regarding The Initiation Of A Section 529 Proceeding Should The Company Fail To Comply With The Payment Arrangement.....	15
V. CONCLUSION.....	17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Norfolk and Western Railway Co. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n</i> , No. 413 A2d 1037, 1047 (Pa. 1980)	12
<i>North Heidelberg Sewer Company. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n</i> , No. 696 C.D. 2017 (Pa. Cmwlth. July 5, 2017).....	2, 7

Statutes

66 Pa.C.S. § 529	4, 17
66 Pa.C.S. § 1501	3

Rules and Regulations

52 Pa. Code § 3.2	1, 5
-------------------------	------

I. INTRODUCTION

Since an event in 2010 which was described by North Heidelberg Sewer Company (“NHSC” or “Company”) as a power surge that allegedly damaged equipment belonging to NHSC, NHSC began to withhold certain payments due and owing to The Metropolitan-Edison Company (“Met-Ed”), the electric distribution company (“EDC”) serving NHSC, for services rendered to NHSC by the electric company. NHSC blamed Met-Ed for the power surge and took this “self help” measure of withholding payments in lieu of properly filing either a complaint with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (“Commission”) regarding the adequacy of service provided by NHSC or with the local court system regarding any recovery of monetary damages for costs allegedly incurred by NHSC for the repair or replacement of equipment damaged by the event. Over the years, with the accrual of late charges, a substantial arrearage accumulated and Met-Ed indicated its intention to suspend service to NHSC for its failure to pay. Such suspension of service would be damaging to NHSC’s customers as well as potentially the surrounding environment.

For these reasons, the Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement (“I&E”) filed a petition for emergency order, pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 3.2, seeking a stay of any termination of electric service to NHSC. This petition was granted by *Ex Parte* Emergency Order dated March 22, 2017 (“*Ex Parte* Order”), which was then ratified by the Commission by Ratification Order entered on April 6, 2017. A hearing was held and in a Recommended Decision issued on April 11, 2017, a payment arrangement was established by the presiding Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) for NHSC to repay its arrearage to Met-Ed over time. NHSC filed Exceptions, arguing that the established payment arrangement was unreasonable. The Commission denied NHSC’s Exceptions and adopted the ALJ’s recommendation, as modified in its Opinion and Order that was entered on

May 4, 2017 (“May 4 Order”). NHSC then filed a Petition for Review with Commonwealth Court. In expedited fashion, the Petition for Review was granted and the matter was remanded to the Commission for further hearing to afford NHSC an opportunity to present evidence regarding its financial position relevant to establishing a reasonable payment arrangement. *North Heidelberg Sewer Company v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n*, No. 696 C.D. 2017 (Pa. Cmwlth. July 5, 2017).

A second hearing was held before the presiding ALJ on August 2, 2017 and the parties now await the entry of a disposition regarding this matter.

II. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In January, 2016, I&E was initially advised by the Commission's Bureau of Technical Utility Services of the past due amount owed by NHSC to Met-Ed and Met-Ed's potential termination of electric service to NHSC as a result of the payment arrearage. I&E drafted and sent a letter to Mr. Joseph Aichholz Jr., CEO of NHSC, on January 29, 2016. At the time, NHSC was allegedly in arrears to Met-Ed in the amount of approximately \$118,000. In its letter, I&E advised NHSC that such an arrearage – and the resulting threat of termination of electric service – “puts at risk the safe, adequate, and reasonable service North Heidelberg Sewer Company is obligated to provide its customers under Section 1501 of the Public Utility Code. 66 Pa.C.S. § 1501” and threatened further action if the matter was not quickly resolved. I&E's informal correspondence failed to garner any resolution of the matter.

By March 2017, the situation had grown dire. By this time, I&E understood that the arrearage owed by NHSC to Met-Ed for electric service now totaled approximately \$157,000. I&E further understood that over the past fourteen months since I&E first corresponded with NHSC, Met-Ed had sent numerous notices to NHSC demanding payment and threatening loss of electric service, all to no avail. At this juncture, it appeared that termination of electric service to NHSC for non-payment was imminent.

Consequently, on March 21, 2017, I&E filed a petition with the Commission requesting that it issue an *ex parte* emergency order 1) requiring Met-Ed to immediately cease and desist from terminating electric service to NHSC due to non-payment, and 2) directing NHSC to immediately cease the unauthorized withholding of current and past due electric service payments. I&E deemed it imperative to file its Petition due to the continuing failure of NHSC to pay for electric service rendered by Met-Ed, and Met-Ed's clear and imminent threat of termination of electric service to

NHSC. I&E was compelled to file its Petition for Issuance of Emergency Order wherein, if granted, the Commission would direct that Met-Ed immediately cease and desist from terminating electric service to NHSC without prior authorization from the Commission, that NHSC ensure its customers by way of written correspondence, as specified in the Emergency Order, that said NHSC customers would continue to be provided safe, adequate and reasonable wastewater services, and that NHSC pay its current and past due amounts due and owing to Met-Ed as deemed appropriate by the Commission and set forth in the Emergency Order.

Moreover, the Petition requested that should NHSC fail to abide by the terms of the Emergency Order, including making payments of current and past due amounts due and owing to Met-Ed as set forth therein, the Commission shall be compelled to utilize the power granted to it by the Legislature regarding the acquisition of small water or sewer entities by a capable public utility pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 529. I&E's Petition did not propose a specific "capable public utility" to become involved in the matter should a Section 529 action be initiated.

On March 22, 2017, an *Ex Parte* Emergency Order was executed by Commission Chairman Gladys M. Brown granting I&E's Petition. It was in this *Ex Parte* Order that Chairman Brown named Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater Company ("Aqua") as the "capable public utility" should the Commission engage its authority under Section 529, stating:

NHSC is cautioned that, upon notice from Metropolitan Edison Company that it has failed to make timely and full payments on its electric bill, Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater Inc., will be directed to assume immediate and complete control for all billing and operations of NHSC to ensure safe, adequate and reasonably continuous wastewater service to NHSC customers and the public. In that event, the Commission will also initiate a proceeding to determine an appropriate payment from NHSC to Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater Inc. to operate NHSC, up to and including an acquisition proceeding under 66 Pa. C.S. § 529.

Ex Parte Order at 4. On April 6, 2017, the Commission entered a Ratification Order ratifying the *Ex Parte* Order as being in the public interest.

On April 3, 2017, an evidentiary hearing was held before assigned ALJ Elizabeth H. Barnes (“ALJ Barnes”). Participating parties included NHSC, Met-Ed, I&E, Aqua and the Office of Consumer Advocate. The issue before the Commission was whether the *Ex Parte* Order as ratified by Ratification Order entered on April 6, 2017, should remain in effect, be modified or rescinded. Also at issue was whether I&E carried its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that 1) its right to relief was clear; 2) the need for relief is immediate; 3) the injury would be irreparable if relief is not granted; and 4) the relief requested is not injurious to the public interest. 52 Pa. Code § 3.2.

On April 11, 2017, ALJ Barnes issued a Recommended Decision amending the *Ex Parte* Emergency Order signed by Chairman Brown on March 22, 2017, and ratified by the Commission at its Public Meeting. ALJ Barnes found that I&E carried its burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence and ordered that Met-Ed be enjoined from terminating electric service to NHSC without prior authorization from the Commission. In return, the presiding ALJ found, in pertinent part, that the current outstanding arrearage balance at that time was “approximately \$160,000,” (R.D. at 23), directed that \$25,000 in late payment charges be reversed, and instructed that the remaining \$135,000 past due amount be paid as a lump-sum amount of \$67,500 to Met-Ed within sixty (60) days of the date of entry of the Commission’s Final Order at the above docket and the remaining \$67,500 paid as a monthly arrearage payment of \$2,812.50 for two years (24 consecutive months) over and above current monthly charges billed until paid in full. *Id.*

On April 14, 2017, NHSC filed Exceptions to the Recommended Decision of ALJ Barnes, specifically regarding Ordering Paragraphs 3 and 4 pertaining to the payment arrangement. Therein, NHSC argued that the payment arrangement established by ALJ Barnes

was “unreasonable.” NHSC did, however, admit its “responsibility to meet its financial obligations,” but argued that the lump sum payment amount was on a time frame that was “not realistic.” The Company requested that the Commission direct Met-Ed to cease assessing further late payment charges provided NHSC continues to pay in full its monthly EDC and electric generation supplier consumption charges, and to modify the proposed lump-sum payment amount to a number that more fairly reflects NHSC’s ability to pay.

By its May 4 Order, the Commission denied NHSC’s Exceptions and adopted the Recommended Decision of ALJ Barnes, as modified therein. The Commission found that NHSC had not asserted any exceptions regarding the application of the Section 3.2 emergency order petition factors; did not raise any objection regarding the method of calculation and the accrual of late payment charges; offered no evidence that the late payment charges were improper; failed to adequately explain its poor payment history since 2011; offered nothing to bolster its claim of being financially distressed and unable to pay the late payment charges over a four year period; and never clarified the record regarding whether the Company withheld payments due to self-help reasons or because NHSC unexpectedly incurred a large cost in repairing and replacing its broken equipment and used its revenue to pay for that rather than pay for its electric service. Nevertheless, the Commission did elect to modify the recommended payment arrangement to reflect that a larger amount of late payment charges had been paid during 2016 and 2017. As such, the amount of late charges to be reversed was modified from \$25,000 to \$37,326. This decreased the then outstanding arrearage balance at the time to \$122,674. NHSC was to pay one-half, or \$61,337 as a lump-sum payment within 60 days of the Order, and the remaining \$61,337 as twenty-four payments of \$2,555.71 to be paid monthly in addition to each month’s

billed current charges. The May 4 Order also directed the Company to take other, non-payment related action.

NHSC appealed the Commission's ruling, filing a Petition for Review with the Commonwealth Court on June 2, 2017. NHSC contended that it had not been given proper notice of the Commission's intention to implement a repayment schedule and an opportunity to present relevant evidence of its financial situation and arguments regarding the validity of the arrearage and the Company's ability to pay. NHSC requested that the matter be remanded for further hearing.

By Order entered July 5, 2017, upon consideration of NHSC's unopposed expedited application for remand, the Commonwealth Court granted the application, relinquished jurisdiction and remanded the matter back to the Commission for further proceedings and the issuance of a new adjudication. *North Heidelberg Sewer Company v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, No. 696 C.D. 2017 (Pa. Cmwlth. July 5, 2017). On July 10, 2017, the Commission's Secretary served a letter upon all parties of record referring the matter to Office of Administrative Law Judge ("OALJ") for further hearing and the issuance of a recommended decision by September 8, 2017. It directed that the further hearing address repayment of the arrearages owed by NHSC to Met-Ed, a repayment schedule, an initial lump sum payment, repayment of late payment charges, the present financial condition and cash flow of NHSC and all other issues related to repayment of the arrearages in question. The Secretarial Letter directed that a prehearing conference and schedule for discovery be scheduled, a hearing held and briefs filed, each proposing an appropriate repayment plan.

III. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The payment arrangement established in the Commission's May 4 Order in this proceeding presents a reasonable outcome that should not be disturbed. NHSC failed to present substantial evidence on remand concerning its financial condition and ability to pay to warrant a revision of the payment arrangement. NHSC also failed to demonstrate the alleged "unreasonableness" of the repayment schedule, lump sum payment and late payment charges. Moreover, the remand hearing only highlighted the dysfunctional management of NHSC, thus rendering the potential initiation of a future Section 529 proceeding to be a real possibility.

IV. ARGUMENT

I&E had indicated in its original petition as well as on the record of the hearing held April 3, 2017, that it did not intend to take a position regarding the amount of repayment due by NHSC to Met-Ed or the form or duration of any repayment, whether amicably agreed to between NHSC and Met-Ed or directed by the presiding ALJ. Nevertheless, the Secretarial Letter referring the matter on remand to OALJ for further hearing directed that the parties' briefs "shall each propose an appropriate repayment plan for NHSC's arrearages." Accordingly, I&E proposes that the presiding ALJ reinstate her original payment arrangement, as modified by the Commission's May 4 Order. Specifically, Met-Ed would credit the amount of \$37,326 from the total arrearage, representing the late payment charges billed by Met-Ed in 2016 and 2017; with the remainder being the amount of the arrearage due, NHSC would be directed to make a lump-sum payment to NHSC of one-half of the arrearage due, and then 24 consecutive equal monthly payments of the remaining half of the arrearage due, over and above payment of all current monthly charges as they become due.

1. **The Evidence Presented By NHSC On Remand Regarding Its Financial Condition And Cash Flow Does Not Warrant Revision Of The Payment Arrangement Set Forth In The Commission's May 4 Order**

The primary purpose for the remand of this matter to the Commission for further hearing was to provide NHSC with an opportunity to present relevant evidence of its financial situation and arguments regarding the validity of the arrearage and the Company's ability to pay. A second hearing was conducted by ALJ Barnes on August 2, 2017, for the purpose of providing NHSC the opportunity it sought to provide documentation and testimony explaining the financial condition of the Company regarding its ability to meet its repayment obligation. I&E avers that the evidence gleaned from this additional hearing only further muddy the water -or wastewater - by opening up

many more questions than answers with regard to not only its ability to comply with the terms of a payment arrangement, but with the overall viability of this Company.

The evidence presented on behalf of NHSC consisted of the sole testimony of Joseph Aichholz Jr, and a balance sheet, profit and loss statements for 2011 through 2015 and the Company's federal tax returns for 2013 through 2015. Asked about the current financial status of the Company, Mr. Aichholz testified that the Company pays an accountant, an assistant, and his son, Joseph Aichholz III, who is on call 24-hours a day. He also stated that he also takes out \$300 a month as repayment for what he loaned the Company. T. 116. (Later, Mr. Aichholz testified that his withdrawal from the Company is \$300 *a week*. T.133. It is not clear which is correct.) No loan document was presented into evidence. It was not clear what the original amount of the loan was, what the current balance of the loan was, or whether an interest rate is charged.

Mr. Aichholz presented testimony regarding the Company's profit and loss statements.

BY MR. COOPER:

Q. Mr. Aichholz, do you recognize this document?

A. Yes.

Q. And what is this document?

A. It's the profit and loss statement for January through December of 2011.

Q. In your capacity as the person responsible for the finances for the sewer company, does this document accurately reflect the profit and losses of the company from January 2011 through December 2015?

A. Sewer income, and we use some hook-ups for the people that build houses and help the contractors and they pay us.

Q. The question is: Is this an accurate document?

A. According to our CPA....

T.118-19.

Mr. Aichholz was then asked to direct his attention to the Company's federal tax returns.

BY MR. COOPER:

Q. Mr. Aichholz, do you recognize these three documents?

A. These are tax returns.

Q. In your capacity as the person responsible for the finances of North Heidelberg Sewer Company, are these documents accurate to your knowledge?

A. The CPA says they are.

T.120.

No CPA was offered as a witness for the Company. The Company's sole witness was questioned regarding Met-Ed discovery posed to NHSC.

BY MS. GIESLER:

Q. Do you recognize this document?

A. Interrogatories. They were asking questions.

Q. Okay.

A. And I don't know how complete they were done.

Q. Okay.

A. Sean's been working with our - - with the accounting guy that gets it ready for the CPA, and I don't know the answer.

Q. But you verified and authorized these responses; did you not?

A. Yes.

T.137-38.

No "accounting guy" was offered as a witness for the Company.

The Commission's decision must be supported by substantial evidence, which consists of evidence that a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. *Norfolk and Western Railway Co. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 413 A2d 1037, 1047 (Pa. 1980). A mere "trace of evidence or a suspicion of the existence of a fact" is insufficient. *Id.* NHSC offered no new substantial evidence concerning its financial condition and cash flow to disturb the payment arrangement established in the Commission's May 4 Order.

2. **The Evidence Presented By NHSC On Remand Regarding The Repayment Schedule Does Not Warrant Revision Of The Payment Arrangement Set Forth In The Commission's May 4 Order**

The actual amount due by NHSC to Met-Ed was not firmly established by NHSC. On cross examination, the Company's witness was unable to determine the balance due to Met-Ed by reviewing the Company's Balance Sheet, but agreed that the most current bill appeared to be \$172,000. T.131.

BY MS. GIESLER:

Q. Okay. And can you tell me where on that balance sheet the amount you owe to Metropolitan Edison Company is - - which account that's held in?

A. Now, wait just a second.

Q. Sure.

A. It's with accounts payable. This is assets and liabilities, current liabilities.

Q. Would it be - -

A. Now, wait a second. They moved this around quite a bit, you know.

...

A. It says it's \$126,000, but we don't have the breakdown of that.

...

- A. -- I was looking for it to say Met-Ed, and it did before. That was before they - - we just got this a couple days ago.
- Q. Okay. Do you happen to know roughly how much you owe today to Met-Ed?
- ...
- A. It's a hundred and something, hundred and forty-six, hundred and fifty-one thousand.

T. 127-29.

It was determined that the Balance Sheet did not accurately reflect what was believed to be the total amount due to Met-Ed.

BY MS. GIESLER:

- Q. That's fine. But let's take a look then at that number and compare that to how much money is listed in the account, total 2000 accounts payable - -
- A. Oh, no, it don't - - with you a hundred percent. They don't match. It's in there - -
- Q. Why don't they match?
- A. Because the CPA - - I don't know how they do it. I'm not familiar
- Q. So am I correct that your balance sheet does not account for everything you are being billed from Met-Ed?
- A. No, it does not.

T.131.

NHSC failed to explain the discrepancy.

According to the Mr. Aichholz, the Company could offer, at most, \$1,000 per month toward repayment of the arrearage. T.125. The Company had proposed to simply pay off any arrearage over a 120-month period. Met-Ed's witness testified that no such payback term would ever be granted to a non-residential customer. To the contrary, the Met-Ed witness was clear.

Q. Okay. And as of today, what is the current, the total amount owed on the account?

A. \$172,434.95.

Q. How much of that is past due?

A. \$172,434.95.

T.158.

NHSC presented no evidence to the contrary. I&E avers that the record should reflect that the arrearage owed to Met-Ed by NHSC at the time of the further hearing on remand should be reflected as \$172,434.95. Met-Ed witness Mr. Lowe further testified that Met-Ed would still be willing to accept the payment arrangement that was adopted by the Commission in its May 4 Order, which comprised removal of late payment charges billed for 2016 and 2017 from the arrearage total, a 50% lump sum payment of the total after removing those late charges, with the remainder paid over twenty-four consecutive months over and above the current monthly charges. T.173.

NHSC offered no convincing argument or evidence to alter revision of this payment arrangement.

3. **The Evidence Presented By NHSC On Remand Regarding A Lump Sum Payment Component Does Not Warrant Revision Of The Payment Arrangement Set Forth In The Commission's May 4 Order**

NHSC's repayment proposal did not include an upfront lump-sum payment. T.105. As Met-Ed's Mr. Lowe testified, even when his management discretion allows a payment arrangement to move outside the electric company's guidelines, an upfront lump-sum payment is still required.

BY MS. GIESLER:

Q. Okay. Let me rephrase. So when you do exercise your judgment and move outside the bounds of what the guidelines are, do you still require an up-front payment?

A. Absolutely, yes.

- Q. And is that typically negligible? Is it still 50 percent? How significant are we talking?
- A. It's - - generally, I want half of the balance, half of the total account balance before I'm willing to talk about a payment or payment arrangement.
- Q. So do you ever grant a non-residential payment arrangement without an up-front payment?
- A. No, I do not.

T.171. The lump sum payment of the May 4 Order should stand.

4. The Evidence Presented By NHSC On Remand Regarding Late Payment Charges Does Not Warrant Revision Of The Payment Arrangement Set Forth In The Commission's May 4 Order

NHSC did not challenge the legality of Met-Ed's late payment charges. Nevertheless, in an effort to resolve the matter, Met-Ed in good faith offered to reduce the arrearage amount by eliminating a certain amount of billed late fees. In its May 4 Order, the Commission increased the amount of late charges to be removed from the arrearage due. Met-Ed's witness testified that it is not typical for the electric company to refund late payment charges or to waive late payment charges going forward. Nevertheless, Met-Ed would still be willing to accept the payment arrangement that was adopted by the Commission in its May 4 Order, which included removal of late payment charges billed in 2016 and 2017.

5. No Evidence Was Presented By NHSC That Warrants Modifications To The Commission's May 4 Order Regarding The Initiation Of A Section 529 Proceeding Should The Company Fail To Comply With The Payment Arrangement

NHSC did not challenge the potential initiation of a Section 529 proceeding should it fail to comply with the payment arrangement that is ultimately imposed in this proceeding. While not directly impacted by this remand, I&E avers that the eventuality of such a subsequent proceeding is likely given the further testimony and documentary evidence presented by the Company in the

latest hearing. In its effort to portray the financial condition of the Company for purposes of establishing what it would deem to be a “reasonable” or “realistic” payment arrangement, NHSC instead proffered testimony of a CEO who exhibited a limited understanding of the financial condition of the Company and financial documentation that divulged a disorganized commingling of funds among alleged affiliated entities with no explanation of the random transactions between NHSC and affiliated companies as set forth in the Company’s responses to Met-Ed discovery, entered into the record as Met-Ed Exhibit 8. Met-Ed counsel questioned NHSC’s witness on cross-examination:

BY MS. GIESLER:

Q. Who is the affiliate company that owes that money for - -

A. Our one company, Tubin Air, our one company.

T.135-36.

Mr. Aichholz continued:

A. And sometimes Tubin Air had a lot of money and it paid the payroll for the sewer company. So there’s mix and match, but nobody took any lump sum of money out, not one dime.

T.142.

Mr. Aichholz continued:

A. We sold the water company for \$800,000 to Reading Area Water Authority and we paid a lot of bills for the sewer company.

T.144.

Moreover, when questioned about the Company’s ability to pay the large arrearage balance that it owed to the electric company, the witness replied, “There’s no chance in the world.” T.123.

V. CONCLUSION

NHSC sought, and was given on remand, a further evidentiary hearing for the purpose of presenting evidence regarding its financial position relevant to establishing a reasonable payment arrangement. However, the Company completely squandered the opportunity, presenting as a witness no accountant, tax preparer or anyone able to comprehend and explain the complexity of the financial documentation offered by the Company. Moreover, the financial documentation offered by NHSC with its mismatched numbers and unexplained affiliate transactions left one with many more questions than answers regarding the viability of the operation. Based on the testimony and documentary evidence presented by the Company, NHSC failed to provide any worthy alternative to the payment arrangement as set forth in the Commission's May 4 Order.

As a result of this further hearing, I&E is neither optimistic that any payment arrangement will be adhered to by NHSC, nor convinced that NHSC is a viable public utility that should remain in business. In the event of NHSC's failure to comply with whatever repayment plan results from this proceeding, then - as set forth in the Commission's May 4 Order - notice to the Commission and the parties of record that the Company has breached the terms of the set payment arrangement will result in the initiation of a separate proceeding pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 529 wherein Aqua as named by the Commission in its *Ex Parte* Order, is to be designated as the "competent utility" to either take control of the operation of NHSC or to acquire the troubled company outright.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, NHSC failed to present sufficient evidence to warrant a revision of the payment arrangement set forth in the Commission's May 4 Order and the same should be upheld.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Swindler", written over a horizontal line.

Michael L. Swindler
Deputy Chief Prosecutor
PA Attorney ID No. 43319

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265
(717) 783-6369
mwindler@pa.gov

Date: August 16, 2017

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission,
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement

v.

North Heidelberg Sewer Company

:
:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. P-2017-2594688

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of the foregoing document upon the parties, listed below, in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54 (relating to service by a party).

Service by First Class Mail and Email:

Sean M. Cooper, Esquire
Cooper Law PLLC
P. O. Box 312
Elizabethtown, PA 17072
sean@cooperlawpa.com

Christine Maloni Hoover, Esquire
Office of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut Street – 5th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923
choover@paoca.org

Tori L. Giesler, Esquire
FirstEnergy Service Company
2800 Pottsville Pike
P.O. Box 16001
Reading, PA 19612-6001
tgiesler@firstenergycorp.com

Thomas T. Niesen, Esquire
Thomas, Niesen & Thomas, LLC
212 Locust Street, Suite 600
Harrisburg, PA 17101
tniesen@tntlawfirm.com

The Honorable Elizabeth Barnes
Administrative Law Judge
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
P. O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265
ebarnes@pa.gov

Beth Liss Shuman, Assistant Counsel
Department of Environmental Protection
Office of Chief Counsel
Southcentral Regional Office
909 Elmerton Avenue
Harrisburg, PA 17110-8200
bshuman@pa.gov

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265
(717) 783-6369
mwindler@pa.gov



Michael L. Swindler
Deputy Chief Prosecutor
PA Attorney ID No. 43319

Dated: August 16, 2017