

DECISIONS OF

# The Public Service Commission

OF THE

## COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

---

November 20, 1920, to August 21, 1922

---

VOLUME V

---



HARRISBURG, PA.  
J. L. L. KUHN, PRINTER TO THE COMMONWEALTH  
1925

MOSES W. SEWELL,

COMPLAINT DOCKET NO. 4186

WALLACE SWARTZ,

COMPLAINT DOCKET NO. 4198

*vs.*

THE MOSCOW WATER COMPANY

---

*Water companies—Service—Facilities—Reasonableness—Evidence.*

---

APPEARANCES:

William J. Wilcox for Complainants.

M. J. Martin for Respondent.

---

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION

---

BY THE COMMISSION, February 21, 1922:

In these complaints against the Moscow Water Company, it is alleged that the respondent fails to furnish complainants and others of its patrons with an adequate supply of water for domestic use; that they are frequently without water for several hours at a time; that the water supplied is frequently muddy and unfit for use; and that the pressure and facilities are inadequate. The Commission is asked to require the respondent company to install such additional equipment as is necessary to furnish adequate service to all its patrons.

The Moscow Water Company was incorporated in 1891 for the purpose of supplying water to the Borough of Moscow. It has two impounding reservoirs on a small stream about one and one-half miles east of Moscow, and from these reservoirs the water is distributed to its patrons by means of gravity.

The Borough of Moscow is situated at the convergence of four hills and the topography of the ground is very uneven, no two of the streets being on the same level. The difference in elevation is not

disclosed by the testimony. The complainants live on Maple Street, which is approximately the highest point on the respondent's lines, being only a few feet lower than the reservoirs of the company. The complainants suggest that the respondent company should construct an auxiliary tank or reservoir on one of the high hills near town and force the water into this reservoir by means of a booster pump, and then distribute it by gravity. The complainants estimated that the cost would be about \$15,000 and the estimate of the respondent was \$40,000. The testimony as to these estimates was very meagre and apparently was nothing more than a guess by the respective parties. If these improvements were made, it would add only from fifteen to twenty additional patrons; eleven of these proposed patrons are now supplied by A. N. Sawyer.

Assuming that there would be twenty new takers of water at \$18 per year, the present rate, the gross revenue to be derived would be \$360. And assuming further that the suggested improvements could be made for \$15,000, the company would be entitled to a return of 7 per cent., which would be \$1050 and \$150 for a depreciation reserve. In addition to this, the cost of operating the booster pump should be taken into consideration, which the respondent company insists would be at least \$600 per year. We do not consider this amount unreasonable. The total added expense would, therefore, be at least \$1800 per year. To take care of this, the respondent would only receive an additional sum of \$360.

The testimony further shows that the population of the Borough of Moscow is not increasing and that no new patrons could reasonably be expected in the near future. Under these circumstances the Commission finds and determines that it would be unreasonable to compel respondent company to expend this large sum of money at the present time which would necessarily be followed by an increase in rates visited upon all the patrons of the company in order to secure the additional revenue.

An order will, therefore, issue dismissing the complaints.

---

### APPLICATION OF THOMAS H. QUINN

---

APPLICATION DOCKET No. 5588-21

---