

C-2013-2369063

Jones, Angela

From: Doris Miller <deedee417pa@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 18, 2013 1:08 PM
To: Jones, Angela
Subject: RE: Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania-American Water Company - Docket No. R-2013-2355276

Your Honor:

Regarding docket no. R 20132355276 Pennsylvania American Water Co. vs Pennsylvania Utility Commission.
My stance on the settlement is that I do not object to the settlement.

RECEIVED

Doris Miller

OCT 28 2013

From: angeljones@pa.gov
To: jneuf100@gmail.com
CC: dheep@pa.gov; DeeDee417Pa@hotmail.com; adecusatis@morganlewis.com;
Susan.Marsh@amwater.com; CHoover@paoca.org; cappleby@paoca.org; ctunilo@paoca.org;
bpierce@paoca.org
Date: Fri, 18 Oct 2013 10:24:27 -0400
Subject: RE: Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania-American Water Company - Docket No. R-2013-2355276

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Ms. Neufeld,

Thank you for your inquiry. It does seem to be contradictory. Both of the presiding officers thought that the active pro se complainants should not have the burden to write a statement in support if they do not desire to do that, and yet they do desire to support the settlement. However, because you and Ms. Miller chose to be active participants, you do have the burden to provide in writing an indication of your stance on the settlement. That being said, we do not need a statement in support (unless you choose to provide one), but we do need something in writing that indicates your stance on the settlement. That is how the sentences that you pointed out below were to be interpreted.

Thank you for the opportunity to give you clarification.

Judge Jones

From: J Neufeld [<mailto:jneuf100@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, October 18, 2013 10:07 AM
To: Jones, Angela
Subject: RE: Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania-American Water Company - Docket No. R-2013-2355276

Your Honor,

I have received a copy of Order #7....

There seems to be a contradiction on page 3 and page 4: