

# Isaac Scholle v. Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater

## Docket No. C-2024-3050056

---

Argument Against Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater's Improper Billing Practices and Request for Remediation to Affected Customers

---

### I. Introduction

This brief addresses the improper billing practices of Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater ("Aqua"), specifically regarding the misapplication of a "minimum monthly payment" and a "customer charge" as outlined in its tariff approved by the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission ("PUC"). Aqua is charging customers a minimum monthly payment as an access fee and simultaneously billing for consumption below the minimum threshold amount, contrary to standard utility billing principles, its tariff language, and established legal precedents. This practice results in customers being overcharged for services, violating Pennsylvania law, PUC regulations, and national utility billing standards.

We request that the Court find Aqua's billing practices improper, require Aqua to include all consumption up to the minimum threshold within the minimum monthly payment, and order refunds to all customers adversely affected by these practices.

---

### II. Differentiating Minimum Monthly Payment from Customer Charge

#### 1. Customer Charge as a Pure Access Fee

A "customer charge" in utility billing is a fixed fee intended to cover the basic, non-variable costs of providing service to customers, such as administrative costs, meter reading, billing, customer service, and maintenance of facilities. This charge is independent of the customer's actual usage.

The National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) defines customer charges as designed to recover costs that do not vary with the amount of service consumed (NARUC Electric Utility Cost Allocation Manual, January 1992). Similarly, the American Water Works Association (AWWA) states that customer charges should recover fixed costs associated with serving a customer, regardless of consumption (AWWA Manual M1, *Principles of Water Rates, Fees, and Charges*, 7th Edition, 2017).

The Pennsylvania PUC recognizes customer charges as fixed fees covering the cost of providing service regardless of usage (see PUC Docket No. R-2018-3003558). This ensures that all customers contribute to the utility's fixed costs, promoting fairness and cost recovery.

## 2. Minimum Monthly Payment as Inclusive of Usage Up to a Set Amount

A "minimum monthly payment" or "minimum charge" typically includes a certain amount of usage within the fixed fee. Unless explicitly stated otherwise in the tariff, a minimum monthly payment is considered to encompass both the fixed costs of service and a specified level of usage.

Pennsylvania regulations require that tariffs clearly state the terms and conditions of service, including rates and any included usage (52 Pa. Code § 53.25). In cases where the tariff is ambiguous, courts have held that it should be construed against the utility (*Brockway Glass Co. v. Pa. P.U.C* 63 Pa. Commw. 238, 241 (Pa. Cmmw. Ct. 1981)).

Nationally, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) has held that minimum charges are presumed to include usage unless explicitly excluded (see *Southern Natural Gas Co.*, 130 FERC ¶ 61,193 (2010)). Additionally, the National Association of Water Companies (NAWC) supports the inclusion of a usage allowance within minimum charges to promote transparency and customer understanding.

## 3. Aqua's Misapplication of the Minimum Monthly Payment

Aqua's tariff includes a minimum monthly payment but does not specify any usage included within this payment. Despite the lack of an explicit exclusion, Aqua is treating this payment as a customer charge and billing customers additional charges for all consumption, including usage below the minimum threshold.

This practice is inconsistent with the standard interpretation of a minimum monthly payment and contradicts the expectations set by the tariff. By charging additional consumption fees for usage that should be included within the minimum payment, Aqua is effectively double-charging customers, violating principles of fair billing and transparency.

---

## III. Regulatory Standards and Aqua's Violation of Billing Principles

### 1. Violations of Pennsylvania PUC Regulations

The Pennsylvania Public Utility Code requires utilities to provide clear and accurate billing information to customers (66 Pa.C.S. § 1509). Utilities must file tariffs that plainly state the rates and services provided (52 Pa. Code § 53.21). By not specifying usage limits within the minimum monthly payment and then charging for consumption below the minimum, Aqua is violating these requirements.

Furthermore, utilities are prohibited from charging rates that are unjust or unreasonable (66 Pa.C.S. § 1301). Aqua's practice of charging both a minimum monthly payment without included usage and additional consumption fees results in unreasonable charges to customers.

The PUC has emphasized the importance of transparency in billing. In Pa. PUC v. Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania, Inc., Docket No. R-2015-2468056, the Commission stated that utilities must ensure billing structures are understandable to prevent customer confusion and unfair practices.

### 2. Legal Precedent Supporting Inclusive Minimum Payments

#### a. Pennsylvania Case Law

Pennsylvania courts have consistently held that ambiguities in a utility's tariff should be construed against the utility and in favor of the customer:

- (Brockway Glass Co. v. Pa. P.U.C 63 Pa. Commw. 238, 241 (Pa. Cmmw. Ct. 1981): The Commonwealth Court held that "where a tariff provision is ambiguous, it should be construed strictly against the utility and in favor of the customer." The court emphasized that utilities must provide clear and unambiguous tariffs to prevent unjust or unreasonable charges.
- Lloyd v. Pa. P.U.C, 904 A.2d 1010 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2006): The court affirmed that utilities are required to adhere strictly to their tariffs, and any ambiguities should be resolved in the customer's favor. The court stated, "Tariffs are to be interpreted in accordance with their plain meaning and any ambiguity is to be construed against the utility."

Applying these principles, when a tariff specifies a minimum monthly payment without explicitly stating that consumption below that amount will incur additional charges, it is presumed that the minimum payment includes all consumption up to that dollar amount.

#### b. National Case Law

Courts in other jurisdictions support the principle that minimum payments without specified usage limits are inclusive of consumption up to the minimum amount:

- Southern California Edison Co. v. Public Utilities Commission, 20 Cal.3d 813 (Cal. 1978): The California Supreme Court held that a utility cannot impose additional charges on customers when the tariff does not explicitly allow for such charges. The court emphasized that tariffs must be clear, and any ambiguity must be construed against the utility.
- MCI Telecommunications Corp. v. Ohio Bell Telephone Co., 376 F.3d 539 (6th Cir. 2004): The court held that utilities must adhere to the terms of their tariffs and that any ambiguity in the tariff's language should be construed in favor of the customer.
- Western Union Tel. Co. v. Esteve Bros. & Co., 256 U.S. 566 (1921): The U.S. Supreme Court held that tariffs filed by utilities have the force of law, and any ambiguities in those tariffs are to be construed against the utility in favor of the customer.

#### c. Federal Regulatory Decisions

- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC): In *Southern Natural Gas Co.*, 130 FERC ¶ 61,193 (2010), FERC held that tariff provisions must be explicit in their terms, and any ambiguities are construed against the utility. FERC

emphasized that minimum charges without specified usage limitations are presumed to include service up to that charge. This decision underscores the federal regulatory standard supporting inclusive minimum payments.

- FERC's Policy Statement on Electric Transmission Rate Design, FERC Docket No. RM93-19-000, states that "rates should be designed to reflect cost causation and provide accurate price signals to customers. Ambiguous rates or charges that may lead to over-recovery of costs are inconsistent with just and reasonable rate standards."

#### d. Regulatory Principles and Industry Standards

- National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC): NARUC's *Manual on Distributed Energy Resources Rate Design and Compensation* (2016) emphasizes that rates and charges should be transparent and understandable to customers. NARUC advocates for clear communication of what is included in fixed charges, such as minimum monthly payments, to ensure that customers are not subject to unexpected additional charges.
- American Water Works Association (AWWA): In the AWWA's *Principles of Water Rates, Fees, and Charges* (Manual M1, 7th Edition, 2017), it is stated that "minimum charges are often designed to recover the utility's fixed costs and may include an allowance for a certain amount of water usage. If no usage allowance is specified, it is customary to include consumption up to the minimum charge amount."
- National Association of Water Companies (NAWC): The NAWC supports transparent billing practices and states that "minimum charges should include a specified level of usage, or else clearly indicate that no usage is included. Failure to specify may result in customer confusion and potential overbilling."

#### e. Legal Doctrines Supporting Inclusive Minimum Payments

- Doctrine of Reasonable Expectations: This legal principle holds that contracts (including tariffs) should be interpreted according to the reasonable expectations of the parties. Customers reasonably expect that a minimum payment includes service or usage up to that amount when no limitations are specified.
- Doctrine of Contra Proferentem: Ambiguities in a tariff are construed against the drafter, i.e., the utility. If the utility's tariff does not specify that the minimum payment excludes consumption, the default interpretation is that it includes consumption up to the minimum amount.

#### f. Policy Considerations

- Consumer Protection: Allowing utilities to charge additional consumption fees below the minimum payment amount without clear tariff language undermines consumer protection principles. It opens the door to unfair billing practices and erodes trust in utility providers.
- Regulatory Oversight: Regulatory bodies like the Pennsylvania PUC have a mandate to ensure that utilities charge just and reasonable rates and that billing practices are transparent. Upholding the principle that minimum payments are inclusive unless otherwise specifically specified supports regulatory goals.

#### g. Conclusion on Legal Precedent

The legal precedents from Pennsylvania and other jurisdictions, along with federal regulatory decisions and industry standards, strongly support the principle that minimum monthly payments without specified usage limitations are inclusive of consumption up to the minimum payment amount. Aqua's practice of charging additional fees for consumption below the minimum threshold, without clear tariff language to support such charges, is inconsistent with these legal precedents and regulatory standards.

### 3. Standards from Federal Agencies and National Organizations

- Federal Trade Commission (FTC): The FTC requires that billing practices do not mislead consumers and that all material terms are clearly and conspicuously disclosed (FTC Policy Statement on Deception, 103 F.T.C. 110 (1984)).
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA): The EPA promotes transparent utility billing to encourage water conservation and ensure customers understand their water usage and charges (EPA, *Water Conservation Plan Guidelines*, August 1998).

---

## IV. Transparency, Fairness, and Customer Expectations

### 1. Doctrine of Contra Proferentem

The legal doctrine of contra proferentem dictates that any ambiguity in contract terms, including tariffs, is construed against the drafter—in this case, the utility. Given that

Aqua's tariff does not specify whether usage is included in the minimum monthly payment, the ambiguity must be resolved in favor of the customer, meaning the minimum payment includes consumption up to the threshold.

This doctrine is well-established in Pennsylvania law and supports protecting customers from ambiguous or misleading billing practices (*Brockway Glass Co.*, 437 A.2d at 1070).

## 2. Customer Expectations and Fair Billing

Customers reasonably expect that a minimum monthly payment includes some level of usage, especially when no usage limits are specified. Charging customers additional fees for usage that should be covered by the minimum payment violates principles of fair billing and erodes customer trust.

The Pennsylvania PUC emphasizes the importance of transparent billing practices to protect consumers. In *Pa. PUC v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2014-2451244, the Commission underscored that utilities must avoid confusing billing practices that could mislead customers regarding the charges applied.

National organizations support these principles:

- Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB): Advocates for clear and transparent billing statements to ensure consumers can make informed decisions (CFPB, *Know Before You Owe* initiative).
- National Consumer Law Center (NCLC): Emphasizes that utilities should provide clear explanations of charges to prevent unfair and deceptive practices (NCLC, *Access to Utility Service*, 7th Edition, 2018).

## 3. Impact on Customers and the Public Interest

Aqua's improper billing practices not only impose financial burdens on individual customers but also undermine public confidence in utility services. Transparent and fair billing is essential for maintaining trust between utilities and their customers, which is vital for the effective delivery of essential services.

The National Regulatory Research Institute (NRRI) highlights that clear billing practices are crucial for customer satisfaction and compliance with regulatory standards (NRRI, *Transparent Billing Practices for Regulated Utilities*, March 2015).

## V. Summary of Argument

Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater is improperly billing customers by treating the minimum monthly payment as a customer charge without included usage and charging additional fees for consumption below the minimum threshold. This practice violates Pennsylvania law, PUC regulations, and principles of contract interpretation.

Under standard utility billing practices and legal precedents, a minimum monthly payment without specified usage limits should include consumption up to the minimum amount. Aqua's failure to specify usage limits in its tariff creates ambiguity that must be resolved in favor of the customer.

Moreover, Aqua's practices contradict national standards for transparent and fair billing, as established by federal agencies and national regulatory organizations. The cumulative effect of these improper practices results in unjust and unreasonable charges to customers, which is prohibited under Pennsylvania law.

---

## VI. Requested Relief and Refunds to Affected Customers

We respectfully request that the Court:

1. **Order Aqua to Amend its Billing Practices**

Require Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater to adjust its billing structure to include all consumption up to the minimum threshold within the minimum monthly payment, as per the standard interpretation of their tariff and consistent with regulatory and legal standards.

2. **Order Refunds to Affected Customers**

Mandate that Aqua issue refunds to all customers who have been improperly billed for consumption that should have been included in the minimum monthly payment, thereby making them financially whole. This includes interest as appropriate under Pennsylvania law (66 Pa.C.S. § 1312).

3. **Ensure Future Compliance and Transparency**

Direct Aqua to revise its tariff to clearly specify whether the minimum monthly payment includes usage, to prevent future misunderstandings and ensure compliance with PUC regulations. Require Aqua to implement transparent billing practices, providing clear explanations of all charges to customers.

#### 4. **Impose Penalties if Appropriate**

Consider imposing penalties on Aqua for violating PUC regulations and Pennsylvania law, to deter future improper billing practices and protect the public interest (66 Pa.C.S. § 3301).

---

## VII. Conclusion

Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater's current billing practices improperly charge customers for consumption that should be included within the minimum monthly payment, violating Pennsylvania law, PUC regulations, and established legal principles. By conflating the minimum payment with a customer charge, Aqua is effectively double-charging customers for service access and low-level consumption, imposing unwarranted financial burdens.

We urge the Court to find in favor of the customers, require Aqua to adjust its billing practices, mandate refunds to affected customers, and ensure future compliance with transparent and fair billing practices. This action will uphold the principles of justice, protect consumer rights, and maintain the integrity of utility services in Pennsylvania.

---

Respectfully Submitted,

Isaac Scholle  
1401 Silo Rd  
Yardley, PA 19067  
(914) 330-4950  
isaac.scholle@gmail.com

---

## Sources

1. National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC)
  - *Electric Utility Cost Allocation Manual*, January 1992.
  - *Manual on Distributed Energy Resources Rate Design and Compensation*, November 2016.
2. American Water Works Association (AWWA)

- *Principles of Water Rates, Fees, and Charges*, AWWA Manual M1, 7th Edition, 2017.
3. National Association of Water Companies (NAWC)
    - *NAWC Policy Positions*, advocating for transparent billing practices.
  4. Pennsylvania Public Utility Code
    - 66 Pa.C.S. § 1301 – Rates to be just and reasonable.
    - 66 Pa.C.S. § 1312 – Refund procedures.
    - 66 Pa.C.S. § 1509 – Billing procedures.
    - 66 Pa.C.S. § 3301 – Civil penalties for violations.
  5. Pennsylvania Code
    - 52 Pa. Code § 53.21 – Form and content of tariff.
    - 52 Pa. Code § 53.25 – Tariff filings.
  6. Case Law
    - *Brockway Glass Co. v. Pa. P.U.C* 63 Pa. Commw. 238, 241 (Pa. Cmmw. Ct. 1981).
    - *Lloyd v. Pa. P.U.C*, 904 A.2d 1010 (Pa. Cmwltth. 2006).
    - *Southern California Edison Co. v. Public Utilities Commission*, 20 Cal.3d 813 (Cal. 1978).
    - *MCI Telecommunications Corp. v. Ohio Bell Telephone Co.*, 376 F.3d 539 (6th Cir. 2004).
    - *Western Union Tel. Co. v. Esteve Bros. & Co.*, 256 U.S. 566 (1921).
  7. Pennsylvania PUC Dockets
    - PUC Docket No. R-2018-3003558.
    - *Pa. PUC v. Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania, Inc.*, Docket No. R-2015-2468056.
    - *Pa. PUC v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2014-2451244.
  8. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)
    - *Southern Natural Gas Co.*, 130 FERC ¶ 61,193 (2010).
    - FERC Docket No. RM93-19-000, *Policy Statement on Electric Transmission Rate Design*.
  9. Federal Trade Commission (FTC)
    - FTC Policy Statement on Deception, 103 F.T.C. 110 (1984).
  10. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
    - *Water Conservation Plan Guidelines*, August 1998.
  11. National Regulatory Research Institute (NRRI)
    - *Transparent Billing Practices for Regulated Utilities*, March 2015.
  12. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB)
    - *Know Before You Owe* initiative.
  13. National Consumer Law Center (NCLC)
    - *Access to Utility Service*, 7th Edition, 2018.