

**SIGNATURE PAGE**

Please sign this sheet if you would like to **join** in the Joint Petition for Settlement signed by Aqua Pennsylvania, Inc., Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater, Inc., the PUC's Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement, the Office of Small Business Advocate, the Office of Consumer Advocate, and other active parties in the case of Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. Aqua Pennsylvania, Inc. and Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater, Inc., Docket Nos. R-2018-3003558 and R-2018-3003561.

By adding my signature below, I am indicating that I have read the terms of the Settlement Agreement and wish to **JOIN** in the Settlement. I am willing to allow the terms of the Settlement resolve my Formal Complaint in this matter if the Public Utility Commission approves the Settlement without modification.

MICHAEL LUCIANO  
Please Print Your Full Name

Michael Luciano  
Please Sign Your Full Name

Date: 02/25/19

Please Write Your Address Here:

236 HONEYCROFT BLVD  
COCHRANVILLE, PA  
19330

Docket Number of Your Complaint(s)      C-2018-3004856    *et. al.*

PLEASE SEE THE ATTACHED SHEET.

RECEIVED  
2019 FEB 27 AM 10:09  
PA P.U.C.  
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

**In the Matter of Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission et al. v. Aqua  
Pennsylvania Wastewater Inc. et al.**

My interest is in the Wastewater rate increase; and I should state, at the outset, that I reside in Honeycroft – Rate Zone 4. Honeycroft received NO relief from the proposed settlement and I view that as an indication of discriminatory treatment both, in setting the Originally Proposed Rate, and in setting the Settlement Rates.

Viewing the entire wastewater rate increase picture, across all of the Wastewater Territories: Note that the originally proposed increases range from 21% to 92% and that the proposed settlement increases range from 8% to 129%. The range of different increases for originally proposed rates is very wide and, in itself evidences discriminatory treatment of Aqua customers; but the even wider range of increases for proposed settlement rates is just short of shocking! How can customers be treated fairly and still be subjected to such different rate increases for the same services? Rate Zone 5 is apparently a special case of some sort and will be ignored herein.)

Further, as a comparison of originally proposed increases vs. settlement increases:

- In Rate Zone 1, only 2 territories out of 4 have lower increases
- In Rate Zone 2, only 1 territory out of 3 has a lower increase
- In Rate Zone 3, only 3 territories out of 10 have lower increases
- In Rate Zone 4, only 1 territory out of 8 has a lower increase.

To summarize, only 7 territories out of 25 have realized a reduction of rate increases as a result of what has been offered as a "settlement" proposal. That is a certain case of capricious and discriminatory treatment. These several customers of Aqua are provided with the same services and they are strapped with rate increases which bear no relation to the services provided. Even accepting an assumption that customers in one Rate Zone may receive services that are somewhat different from customers in other Rate Zones, the same conclusion is certain - some customers in one Rate Zone are treated in a capricious and discriminatory manner compared with other customers in the same Rate Zone.

Any rate increase settlement offering across-the-board rate changes, must, to avoid discrimination and severe rate shock, offer the same changes to each member of the class.

Michael Luciano  
C-2018-3004856

Luciano  
236 Honeycroft Awd.  
Cochranville, PA 19330

Secretary's Bureau  
Penn. Public Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Bldg  
400 North St.  
Harrisburg, PA 17120



1712090079 0000

