

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Salvatore and Elizabeth Galante	:	C-2023-3042213
Suzanne Fletcher	:	C-2023-3042265
Mark & Eileen Lyons	:	C-2023-3042295
Porntipa Mukasatit	:	C-2023-3042332
James H Snyder	:	C-2023-3042334
Rajab Dastgir	:	C-2023-3042348
Dominick York	:	C-2023-3042377
Michael Kowalski	:	C-2023-3042486
Patrick Dunleavy	:	C-2023-3042487
Patrick and Andrea Fricchione	:	C-2023-3042488
Laurie Ciecich	:	C-2023-3042545
David and Jean Wadas	:	C-2023-3042588
Bernard Povanda	:	C-2023-3042639
Kathleen Povanda	:	C-2023-3042641
Paul Kobierecki	:	C-2023-3042822
Ryan R. McBride	:	C-2023-3043135
Adrian J. Mihalko	:	C-2023-3043222
Frank Serafini	:	C-2023-3043458
Joseph Petrosky	:	C-2023-3043459
Lana Grzybicki	:	C-2023-3043676
Sandra Grzybicki	:	C-2023-3043677
Louise Spinelli	:	C-2023-3043734
	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
	:	
Pennsylvania-American Water Company	:	

INITIAL DECISION

Before
Marta Guhl
Administrative Law Judge

INTRODUCTION

This Initial Decision denies the Consumer Complainants' Formal Complaints because they have not met their burden of proving that Pennsylvania-American Water Company's wastewater tariff is unjust or unreasonable, which is used to determine the charges for their wastewater system.

HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDINGS

On August 14, 2023, Salvatore and Elizabeth Galante filed a Formal Complaint with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) against Pennsylvania-American Water Company (PAWC) which alleged that they were being improperly billed for their wastewater service. Their Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3042213.

On August 15, 2023, Suzanne Fletcher filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that she was being improperly billed for her wastewater service. Her Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3042265.

On August 17, 2023, Mark and Eileen Lyons filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that they were being improperly billed for their wastewater service. Their Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3042295.

On August 18, 2023, Porntipa Mukasatit filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that he was being improperly billed for his wastewater service. His Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3042332.

On August 18, 2023, James H. Synder filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that he was being improperly billed for his wastewater service. His Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3042334.

On August 18, 2023, Dominick York filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that he was being improperly billed for his wastewater service. His Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3042377.

On August 22, 2023, Rajab Dastgir filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that he was being improperly billed for his wastewater service. His Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3042348.

On August 23, 2023, Michael Kowalski filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that he was being improperly billed for his wastewater service. His Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3042486.

On August 23, 2023, Patrick Dunleavy filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that he was being improperly billed for his wastewater service. His Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3042487.

On August 23, 2023, Patrick and Andrea Fricchione filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that they were being improperly billed for their wastewater service. Their Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C 2023-3042488.

On August 24, 2023, Laurie Ciecuch filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that she was being improperly billed for her wastewater service. Her Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3042545.

On August 28, 2023, David and Jean Wadas filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that they were being improperly billed for their wastewater service. Their Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3042588.

On August 30, 2023, Bernard Povanda filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that he was being improperly billed for his wastewater service. His Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3042639.

On August 30, 2023, Kathleen Povanda filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that she was being improperly billed for her wastewater service. Her Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3042641.

On August 30, 2023, Paul Kobierecki filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that he was being improperly billed for his wastewater service. His Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3042822.

On September 19, 2023, Ryan R. McBride filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that he was being improperly billed for his wastewater service. His Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3043135.

On September 20, 2023, Frank Serafini filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that he was being improperly billed for his wastewater service. His Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3043458.

On September 21, 2023, Joseph Petrosky filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that he was being improperly billed for his wastewater service. His Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3043459.

On September 22, 2023, Adrian J. Mihalko filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that she was being improperly billed for her wastewater service. Her Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3043222.

On October 2, 2023, Lana Grzybicki filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that she was being improperly billed for her wastewater service. Her Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3043676.

On October 2, 2023, Sandra Grzybicki filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that she was being improperly billed for her wastewater service. Her Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3043677.

On October 10, 2023, Louise Spinelli filed a Formal Complaint with the Commission against PAWC alleging that she was being improperly billed for her wastewater service. Her Complaint was docketed at Docket No. C-2023-3043734.

PAWC filed timely Answers to the Complaints. The Company also filed a Motion for Judgement on the Pleadings to the cases as well, alleging that the parties had no standing to bring Complaints against PAWC since they received their wastewater service from another entity.

On January 4, 2024, I issued an Order denying the Motion for Judgement on the Pleadings.

On January 24, 2024, PAWC filed a Petition for Interlocutory Review and Answer to Material Question with the Commission, alleging an error in denying the Motion for Judgement on the Pleadings.

On February 20, 2024, the Commission issued an Opinion and Order which denied PAWC's Petition for Interlocutory Review and returned the cases to the Office of Administrative Law Judge for adjudication.

On March 11, 2024, the matters were consolidated, and I was assigned to the cases. On March 5, 2024, a Prehearing Conference Notice was issued and a prehearing conference in these cases was to be held on April 29, 2024, at 10:00 a.m.

On April 8, 2024, I issued a Prehearing Conference Order which outlined the procedures for the prehearing conference.

On April 25, 2024, PAWC filed a Prehearing Memorandum.

On April 29, 2024, the prehearing conference convened, and the parties discussed litigation issues and a schedule. The parties requested time for discovery and a hearing date after October 2024.

On December 12, 2024, an Initial Call-In Telephonic Hearing Notice was issued and served on the parties, and the matter was scheduled for an initial hearing on January 29, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.

On January 8, 2025, I issued a Prehearing Order which outlined the procedures for the hearing.

The initial hearing was convened as scheduled on January 29, 2025. Complainants Salvatore Galante, James Snyder, Dominick York, Paul Kobierecki, Ryan McBride, Joseph Petrosky, Lana Grzybicki, and Sandra Grzybicki appeared for the hearing *pro se* and testified on behalf of their Complaints. The Complainants sponsored

five exhibits at the hearing which were entered into the record at that time. The Respondent was represented by Michael Gruin, Esquire, who presented the testimony of Daniel Rickard and Cheryl DiSanti. The Respondent also presented six exhibits, which were entered into the record at that time.

At the time, additional information was requested regarding the customers who were covered by the agreement between Lackawanna River Basin Sewer Authority (LRBSA) and PAWC. PAWC offered to submit a late filed exhibit that would cover this additional information. However, it was determined that a further hearing would be necessary to address this additional information.

On January 31, 2025, a Further Call-In Telephonic Hearing Notice was issued, and a further hearing was scheduled in these cases for March 28, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.

On March 28, 2025, the further hearing in this matter convened as scheduled. Salvatore Galante, James Snyder, Paul Kobierecki, and Dominick York appeared *pro se* and presented further testimony regarding their Complaints. Respondent was represented by Michael Gruin, Esquire, and the Company presented additional testimony from Cheryl DiSanti who also presented one additional exhibit which was entered into the record at that time.

The record in the case closed on April 29, 2025, when I received my copy of the transcript of the second hearing.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Complainants are Salvatore and Elizabeth Galante, Suzanne Fletcher, Mark and Eileen Lyons, Porn-tipa Mukasatit, James H. Snyder, Rajab Dastgir, Dominick York, Michael Kowalski, Patrick and Andrea Fricchione, Laurie Ciecuch, Patrick Dunleavy, David and Jean Wadas, Bernard Povanda, Kathleen Povanda, Paul Kobierecki, Ryan M. McBride, Adrian Mihalko, Frank Serafini, Joseph Petrosky, Lana Grzybicki, Sandra Grzybicki and Louise Spinelli.
2. The Respondent is Pennsylvania-American Water Company.
3. The Complainants receive wastewater service from the Lackawanna River Basin Sewer Authority (LRBSA) as part of the Montage Sewer District. Tr. 71.
4. In 2003, the City of Scranton, Lackawanna County, the Scranton Sewer Authority and LRBSA entered into an agreement where the County would construct the Montage Sewer District and then LRBSA would own and operate the system. Tr. 59; PAWC Exh. 1.
5. LRBSA agreed to discharge the wastewater to a single point in the Scranton Sewer Authority system for which treatment and disposal are provided. Tr. 59; PAWC Exh. 1.
6. Under the agreement, the Scranton Sewer Authority would bill LRBSA directly at the same rate that was in effect for Scranton's customers. Tr. 60; PAWC Exh. 1.
7. In 2016, PAWC acquired the assets of the Scranton Sewer Authority. Tr. 61.

8. PAWC assumed all of the Scranton Sewer Authority's agreements, including the one related to the LRBSA. Tr. 61.

9. PAWC's acquisition of the Scranton Sewer Authority was approved by the Commission on October 19, 2016, at Docket No. A-2016-2537209. Tr. 62.

10. LRBSA collects the wastewater in the Montage Sewer District and pumps it to PAWC's Scranton Wastewater Treatment Plant where it is treated and disposed. Tr. 72.

11. PAWC bills LRBSA at a bulk rate that is included in the 2003 agreement. Tr. 62; PAWC Exh. 1.

12. PAWC does not own the wastewater lines and mains in the LRBSA's service territory. Tr. 63.

13. The bulk billing is handled by PAWC's special accounts department. Tr. 73.

14. LRBSA provides PAWC with a list of all properties that are connected to the Montage Sewer District. Tr. 73.

15. For those customers that receive water service from PAWC, the Company uses the metered water usage from those properties and then multiplies that usage by the rate on its wastewater tariff for customers located in the City of Scranton. Tr. 73.

16. The rate for City of Scranton residential customers for wastewater is \$20.00 per month service charge plus a usage charge of \$2.6117 per 100 gallons. Tr. 74; PAWC Exh. 3.

17. For the period from October 16, 2024, to November 15, 2024, the total charges for the bulk bill to LRBSA was \$61,837.59. Tr. 75; PAWC Exh. 2.

18. LRBSA also receives a 15 percent discount on services provided by PAWC as per the 2003 agreement. Tr. 77; PAWC Exh. 4.

19. Outside of the Montage Sewer District, customers of LRBSA whose wastewater is not treated by PAWC are billed by LRBSA at its rates based on water usage data provided by PAWC. Tr. 78.

20. An agreement between LRBSA and PAWC's predecessor was filed with the Commission on March 18, 2004, which outlines the customer account and usage information that is shared to allow LRBSA to bill its customers. Tr. 78; PAWC Exh. 5.

21. The Commission approved PAWC's current wastewater tariff by Order entered on July 22, 2024, at Docket Nos. R-2023-3043189 and R-2023-3043190. Tr. 79.

22. There have been no changes in the way that the bulk bills are calculated by PAWC for LRBSA since the original agreement from 2003. Tr. 79.

23. The only changes are the approved rates for PAWC for its wastewater and water tariffs. Tr. 79.

24. PAWC does not have any control over LRBSA's billing practices, timing of billing and the calculation of bills that are sent to LRBSA customers. Tr. 80.

DISCUSSION

The Public Utility Code, 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a), places the burden of proof upon the proponent of a rule or order. As the proponent of a rule or order, Complainants have the burden of proof in this matter pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

To establish a sufficient case and satisfy the burden of proof, Complainant must show that the respondent public utility is responsible or accountable for the problem described in the Complaint. *Patterson v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, 72 Pa.P.U.C. 196 (1990); *Feinstein v. Phila. Suburban Water Co.*, 50 Pa.P.U.C. 300 (1976). Such a showing must be by a preponderance of the evidence. *Samuel J. Lansberry, Inc. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 578 A.2d 600, 602 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1990). That is, by presenting evidence more convincing, by even the smallest amount, than that presented by the other party. *Se-Ling Hosiery v. Margulies*, 70 A.2d 854 (Pa. 1950). Additionally, any finding of fact necessary to support the Commission's adjudication must be based upon substantial evidence. *Mill v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 447 A.2d 1100 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1982); *Edan Transp. Corp. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 623 A.2d 6 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1993); 2 Pa.C.S. § 704. More is required than a mere trace of evidence or a suspicion of the existence of a fact sought to be established. *Norfolk & W. Ry. Co. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 413 A.2d 1037 (Pa. 1980); *Erie Resistor Corp. v. Unempl. Comp. Bd. of Rev.*, 166 A.2d 96 (Pa. Super. 1960); *Murphy v. Pa. Dep't of Pub. Welfare, White Haven Ctr.*, 480 A.2d 382 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984).

Upon the presentation by the Complainant of evidence sufficient to initially satisfy the burden of proof, the burden of going forward with the evidence to rebut the

evidence of the Complainant shifts to the Respondent. If the evidence presented by the Respondent is of co-equal weight, the Complainant has not satisfied her burden of proof. The Complainant would be required to provide additional evidence to rebut the evidence of the Respondent. *Burleson v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 443 A.2d 1373 (Pa. Cmwlt. 1982).

While the burden of persuasion may shift back and forth during a proceeding, the burden of proof never shifts. The burden of proof always remains on the party seeking affirmative relief from the Commission. *Milkie v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 768 A.2d 1217 (Pa. Cmwlt. 2001).

Standing

It should be noted that the Complainants in these cases are customers of LRBSA for their wastewater services. The Commission does not have jurisdiction over the actions of a municipal authority, if it is operating within its municipal territory. *McDonough v. Pbg. Water & Sewer Auth. & Allegheny Cnty. Sanitary*, Docket No. C-20066472 (Final Order entered Nov. 16, 2006). There has been no evidence presented in the record to indicate that LRBSA is operating outside of its municipal boundaries. As such, the Commission does not have jurisdiction regarding any actions taken by LRBSA as a municipal authority.

However, the Complainants contend that they have felt major effects from the PAWC rate increase, which has affected their wastewater bills. PAWC argues that it is not responsible for the billing from LRBSA or the rates that it charges the customers.

This question seems to relate directly to 66 Pa.C.S. § 701. Here, the Public Utility Code states that “any **person**, corporation, or municipal corporation having an

interest in the subject matter, or any public utility concerned, may complain in writing, setting forth any act or thing done or omitted to be done by any public utility in violation, or claimed violation, of any law which the [PUC] has jurisdiction to administer, or of any regulation or order of the [PUC].” 66 Pa.C.S. § 701 (*emphasis added*). Additionally, under 52 Pa. Code § 1.8, a “party” is “[a] person [with] a direct interest in the subject matter of the proceeding.” “An interest is ‘direct’ where the subject matter causes harm to the interest.” *Interstate Gas Mktg., Inc. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 679 A.2d 1349, 1353–54 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1996).

Based on the above, it appears clear that a non-customer may be able to challenge the tariff so long as they otherwise have standing. To have standing, the complainant “must have a direct, immediate, and substantial interest in the subject matter of the controversy.” *Mun. Auth. of Borough of W. View v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 41 A.3d 929, 933 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2012).

In this instance, the Complainants have standing in this matter to bring Complaints against PAWC. The Complainants in these matters have felt a direct impact of PAWC’s rate increase for wastewater because it is tied to the bulk billing that PAWC does to bill LRBSA for wastewater treatment of the Montage Sewer District. While there have been no changes in the way that the bulk bills are calculated by PAWC for LRBSA since the original agreement from 2003, the only changes are the approved rates for PAWC for its wastewater and water tariffs. Tr. 79. As such there is a direct and immediate and substantial interest in the matter and the Complainants have standing to bring these Complaints.

Rates Billed

The Complainants are contesting the rates that PAWC is charging LRBSA which, in turn, affect their billing. The Complainants have indicated that their bills have increased dramatically over the past two years. To the extent that the Complainants challenge PAWC's Commission-approved, tariffed rates for service, the Complainants have the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the rates are unjust, unreasonable or in violation of a Commission regulation or order. *Schellhammer v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 629 A.2d 189 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1993); 66 Pa.C.S. §§315(a), 332(a), 1301.

Further, a strong presumption exists that rates in a utility's Commission-approved tariff are just and reasonable. *Popowsky v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 669 A.2d 1029 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1995). To satisfy the burden of proving that the utility's Commission-approved rates for the WNA are unjust and unreasonable, the Complainant cannot merely state personal beliefs or pose questions without offering concrete proof. "Mere bald assertions, personal opinions or perceptions do not constitute evidence. *Pa. Bur. of Corr. v. City of Pittsburgh*, 532 A.2d 12 (Pa. 1987); *Mid-Atlantic Power Sup. Assn. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 746 A.2d 1196, 1200 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2000); *see also Steffy's Pattern Shop v. Frontier Comm. of Pa., Inc.*, Docket No. R-00994808C0001 (Order Entered Mar. 3, 2000).

The Complainants receive wastewater service from LRBSA as part of the Montage Sewer District. Tr. 71. In 2003, the City of Scranton, Lackawanna County, the Scranton Sewer Authority and LRBSA entered into an agreement where the County would construct the Montage Sewer District and then LRBSA would own and operate the system. Tr. 59; PAWC Exh. 1. LRBSA agreed to discharge the wastewater to a single point in the Scranton Sewer Authority system for which treatment and disposal are provided. Tr. 59; PAWC Exh. 1. Under the agreement, the Scranton Sewer Authority

would bill LRBSA directly at the same rate that was in effect for Scranton's customers. Tr. 60; PAWC Exh. 1.

In 2016, PAWC acquired the assets of the Scranton Sewer Authority.

Tr. 61. PAWC assumed all of the Scranton Sewer Authority's agreements including the one related to the LRBSA. Tr. 61. PAWC's acquisition of the Scranton Sewer Authority was approved by the Commission on October 19, 2016 at Docket No. A-2016-2537209.

Tr. 62.

LRBSA collects the wastewater in the Montage Sewer District and pumps it to PAWC's Scranton Wastewater Treatment Plant where it is treated and disposed. Tr. 72. PAWC bills LRBSA at a bulk rate that is included in the 2003 agreement. Tr. 62; PAWC Exh. 1. PAWC does not own the wastewater lines and mains in LRBSA's service territory. Tr. 63. The bulk billing is handled by PAWC's special accounts department. Tr. 73. LRBSA provides PAWC with a list of all properties that are connected to the Montage Sewer District. Tr. 73.

For those customers that receive water service from PAWC, the Company uses the metered water usage from those properties and then multiplies that usage by the rate on its wastewater tariff for customers located in the City of Scranton. Tr. 73. The rate for City of Scranton residential customers for wastewater is \$20.00 per month service charge plus a usage charge of \$2.6117 per 100 gallons. Tr. 74; PAWC Exh. 3. The Commission approved PAWC's current wastewater tariff by Order entered on July 22, 2024, at Docket Nos. R-2023-3043189 and R-2023-3043190. Tr. 79.

For the period from October 16, 2024, to November 15, 2024, the total charges for the bulk bill to LRBSA was \$61,837.59. Tr. 75; PAWC Exh. 2. LRBSA also

receives a 15 percent discount on services provided by PAWC as per the 2003 agreement. Tr. 77; PAWC Exh. 4.

Outside of the Montage Sewer District, customers of LRBSA whose wastewater is not treated by PAWC are billed by LRBSA at its rates based on water usage data provided by PAWC. Tr. 78. An agreement between LRBSA and PAWC's predecessor was filed with the Commission on March 18, 2004, which outlines the customer account and usage information that is shared to allow LRBSA to bill its customers. Tr. 78; PAWC Exh. 5.

In this matter, there was an initial agreement in 2003 that was entered into by LRBSA and PAWC's predecessor, the Scranton Sewer Authority, which set the bulk billing for treatment and disposal of wastewater for the Montage Sewer District. When PAWC acquired the assets of the Scranton Sewer Authority in 2016, it also assumes all of the agreements and that was approved by the Commission. PAWC testified that it still calculates the bulk billing in the manner agreed to in the 2003 agreement and that the only thing that has changed is its approved wastewater tariff rates. The Complainants did not present any evidence that PAWC is violating the terms of the 2003 agreement, or its Commission approved tariff. The Complainants have not offered any concrete evidence to substantiate their contention that PAWC's Commission-approved rates for wastewater are unjust and unreasonable. As such, their Complaints must be denied.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Commission has jurisdiction over the parties to and subject matter of this proceeding. 66 Pa.C.S. § 701.

2. Pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a), the burden of proof in this proceeding is upon the Complainant. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).
3. Any finding of fact necessary to support the Commission's adjudication must be based upon substantial evidence. *Mill v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 447 A.2d 1100 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1982); *Edan Transp. Corp. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 623 A.2d 6 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1993); 2 Pa.C.S. § 704.
4. A utility may only implement rates only after receiving rate approval from the Commission. 66 Pa.C.S. §§ 1301, 1303, 2812.
5. A utility's rates for the unbundled component charges subject to the Commission's jurisdiction must be just and reasonable. 66 Pa.C.S. § 1301.
6. A strong presumption exists that rates in a utility's Commission-approved tariff are just and reasonable. *Popowsky v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 669 A.2d 1029 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1995).
7. Mere bald assertions, personal opinions or perceptions do not constitute evidence. *Pa. Bur. of Corr. v. City of Pittsburgh*, 532 A.2d 12 (Pa. 1987); *Mid-Atlantic Power Sup. Assn. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 746 A.2d 1196, 1200 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2000); see also *Steffy's Pattern Shop v. Frontier Comm. of Pa., Inc.*, Docket No. R-00994808C0001 (Order Entered Mar. 3, 2000).
8. The Complainants have not met their burden of establishing that PAWC's wastewater tariff rate is unjust or unreasonable. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Formal Complaints of Salvatore and Elizabeth Galante, Suzanne Fletcher, Mark and Eileen Lyons, Porntipa Mukasatit, James H. Snyder, Rajab Dastgir, Dominick York, Michael Kowalski, Patrick and Andrea Fricchione, Patrick Dunleavy, Laurie Ciecuch, David and Jean Wadas, Bernard Povanda, Kathleen Povanda, Paul Kobierecki, Ryan M. McBride, Adrian Mihalko, Frank Serafini, Joseph Petrosky, Lana Grzybicki, Sandra Grzybicki and Louise Spinelli.v. Pennsylvania-American Water Company at Docket Nos. C-2023-3042213, C-2023-3042265, C-2023-3042295, C-2023-3042332, C-2023-3042334, C-2023-3042348, C-2023-3042377, C-2023-3042486, C-2023-3042487, C-2023-3042488, C-2023-3042545, C-2023-3042588, C-2023-3042639, C-2023-3042641, C-2023-3042822, C-2023-3043135, C-2023-3043222, C-2023-3043458, C-2023-3043459, C-2023-3043676, C-2023-3043677, and C-2023-3043734 are denied;

2. That the record at Docket Nos. C-2023-3042213, C-2023-3042265, C-2023-3042295, C-2023-3042332, C-2023-3042334, C-2023-3042348, C-2023-3042377, C-2023-3042486, C-2023-3042487, C-2023-3042488, C-2023-3042545, C-2023-3042588, C-2023-3042639, C-2023-3042641, C-2023-3042822, C-2023-3043135, C-2023-3043222, C-2023-3043458, C-2023-3043459, C-2023-3043676, C-2023-3043677, and C-2023-3043734 be marked closed.

Date: July 25, 2025

/s/
Marta Guhl
Administrative Law Judge