

Vincent E. Collier, III.
3282 Horizon dr
Lancaster Pa 17601

January 17, 2015

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor North
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

RE: Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Columbia Water Company, Docket no. R-2014-2445660
and Vincent E. Collier, III v. Columbia Water Company, Docket No. C-2014-2451639

I am enclosing my Reply to New Matter raised in Columbia's January 8, 2015 filing.

I am mailing copies as indicated on the Certificate of Service.

Respectfully,



Vincent E. Collier III

RECEIVED

JAN 17 2015

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

another surcharge while it pays off its new Pennvest loan and then continue charging me for the same Pennvest plant in my base rates. Admitted, in part. I do not have knowledge whether it was a volumetric surcharge but it is my understanding that a Pennvest surcharge was eliminated in June 2011 after Columbia paid-off a Pennvest loan.

4. Denied as stated. I am aware that the Pennvest surcharge was eliminated in June 2011 after Columbia paid-off a Pennvest loan. I do not want Columbia to charge me another surcharge while it pays off its new Pennvest loan and then continue charging me for the same Pennvest plant in my base rates. My complaint clearly objected to the new Pennvest surcharge and states my opinion that I should not pay a surcharge for a loan and then keep paying for the item bought with the loan – whatever kind of rate it is. My complaint clearly asks the Commission not to let Columbia charge the new surcharge. My complaint is similar to other complaints that have been filed in this case. My complaint should not be dismissed.

5. Denied as stated. I mailed my Answer to Preliminary Objections to counsel for Columbia. My complaint clearly objected to the new Pennvest surcharge and states my opinion that I should not pay a surcharge for a loan and then keep paying for the item bought with the loan – whatever kind of rate it is. Columbia's interpretation of the Commission's January 9, 2014 Order sounds like its legal argument. My complaint states my understanding of the Commission's January Order. I do not want the Commission to let Columbia charge a new surcharge until it pays off its Pennvest loan and then continue to charge me for the same Pennvest plant in my base rates.

6. Admitted.

7. No answer needed.

8. Denied. Columbia's interpretation of the Commission's January 9, 2014 Order sounds like its legal argument. My complaint in this case is truthful and based on my understanding of the 2013 base rate case and what the Company wants to do after it pays off its new Pennvest loan. I do not want the Commission to let Columbia charge a new surcharge until it pays off its Pennvest loan and then continue to charge me for the same Pennvest plant in my base rates.

9. Denied. Columbia's interpretation of the Commission's January 9, 2014 Order sounds like its legal argument. My complaint is about the new surcharge.

10. Denied. Columbia's interpretation of the Commission's January 9, 2014 Order sounds like its legal argument. My complaint is about the new surcharge.


11. Admitted in part, denied in part. I was a participant in Columbia's last rate case. I do not want to argue about the old Pennvest surcharge or what is in current base rates. My complaint is about the new surcharge and whether the Company is allowed to continue charging me for the new Pennvest plant in base rates after the Company pays off its new Pennvest loan.

12. No answer needed.

13. Denied. I do not want to argue about the old Pennvest surcharge or what the Commission did in the last rate case. My complaint is about the new surcharge and whether the Company is allowed to continue charging me for the new Pennvest plant in base rates after the Company pays off its new Pennvest loan.

For these reasons, my Complaint should not be dismissed.

Respectfully,



Vincent E. Collier III

DATE: *January 17, 2015*

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Pa. Public Utility Commission	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. R-2014-2445660
	:	
Columbia Water Company	:	
	:	
	:	
Vincent E. Collier III	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. C-2014-2451639
	:	
Columbia Water Company	:	

Certificate of Service

I am mailing copies of my Reply to New Matter to:

Judge Susan D. Colwell
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Thomas J. Sniscak, Esquire
William E. Lehman, Esquire
Hawk, McKeon & Sniscak
100 North Tenth Street
P.O. Box 1778
Harrisburg, PA 17105

Phillip C. Kirchner
Bureau of Investigation & Enforcement
Commonwealth Keystone Building
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

RECEIVED

JAN 17 2015

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Erin Gannon
Office of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut Street, 5th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923

Respectfully,



Vincent E. Collier III


DATE:


VINCENT E. COLLIER III
3287 Horizon Dr.
Lancaster, PA 17601

CERTIFIED MAIL™



7013 1710 0001 0248 5989



UNITED STATES
POSTAL SERVICE



U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
SILVER SPRING, PA
17575
JAN 17, 15
AMOUNT

1000 17105

\$7.19
00030253-04



Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor North
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

**RECEIPT
REGISTERED**

**RECEIPT
REGISTERED**