

September 25, 2010

Administrative Law Judge Angela T. Jones

801 Market Street

Suite 4063

Philadelphia, PA 19107

RE: Jerry Cordisco vs .Aqua Pensylvania, Inc.

Docket No. C-0009-2137247

Enclosed is my main brief in this proceeding:

C: Ms. Margaret A Morris, Esq.

Reger, Rizzo, & Darnall LLP

Cira Centre, 13th Floor

2929 Arch Street

Philadelphia, PA 19104-2899

RECEIVED

SEP 28 2010

Public Utility Commission
Philadelphia Office
Administrative Law Judge

RECEIVED

AUG 16 2011

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

September 25, 2010

Post Hearing Brief

Docket # C-209-2137247

When I filed my complaint with the PUC my main point was that the PUC allow Aqua to classify customers into groups, like residential class, commercial class, residential class, the groups are used for different purposes. Like billing, rates, etc, as I discussed to use these classes to determine the type of back flow device needed is not right. As I testified for example the risk for a building with 2 residential units or 3 residential units, is the same as far as backflow criteria is evident. That is why the PUC should have made Aqua determine on the present risk of the customer, not the potential risk due to future changes. In most cases simple backflow device recommended by the DEP would be sufficient. This would be an acceptable solution for most customers no matter that class Aqua puts them in.

In closing I agreed that different backflow devices are needed to protect water quality but which is not needed is an expensive unit with yearly testing on water service that according to the DEP is low risk and a simple unit is accepted and recommended by them.

Sincerely,

Jerry Cordisco

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jerry Cordisco", written over a white background.