



An Exelon Company

Legal Department
2301 Market Street / S23-1
P.O. Box 8699
Philadelphia, PA 19101-8699

Direct Dial: 215-841-6863

August 5, 2016

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, Second Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120

**RE: Maria Povacz v. PECO Energy Company
Docket No. C-2015-2475023**

Dear Ms. Chiavetta:

Enclosed for filing is PECO's Energy Company's Motion to Compel Answers to Discovery.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ward L. Smith".

Ward L. Smith
Counsel for PECO Energy Company

WS/ab
Enclosure

cc: Christopher P. Pell, ALJ
Darlene D. Heep, ALJ
Certificate of Service

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

MARIA POVACZ	:	
COMPLAINANT	:	Docket No. C-2015-2475023
v.	:	
	:	
PECO ENERGY COMPANY	:	
RESPONDENT	:	

NOTICE TO PLEAD

Pursuant to the discovery modifications in this case, you are hereby notified that you must reply to this Motion to Compel within 3 days. You must provide a full copy of answer to counsel for PECO and to the Commission and the Administrative Law Judges.

File with:
Rosemarie Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, Second Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120

With a copy to:
Ward L. Smith
PECO Energy Company
2301 Market Street, S-23
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Dated at Philadelphia, PA, August 5, 2016



Ward L. Smith
Counsel for PECO Energy Company
2301 Market Street S-23
Philadelphia, PA 19101-8699
215-841-6863
Ward.Smith@exeloncorp.com

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Maria Povacz	:	
	:	C-2015-2475023
v.	:	
	:	
PECO Energy Company	:	

**PECO Energy Company's
Motion to Compel Answers to Discovery**

On May 23, 2016, PECO posed its Set III interrogatories to Complainant Maria Povacz. Under the modified discovery rules of this proceeding, objections were required to be lodged within three days, and answers were due within ten days. No objections were lodged, and no answers have been provided.

Seventy-four days have now passed. PECO has made repeated requests for status updates on when these discovery questions will be answered. As of today, PECO has not even been able to elicit a status update from Complainant.

PECO therefore moves to compel answers to its Set III Interrogatories, Questions 5-7¹, within five days, and in support thereof states as follows:

1. On May 23, 2016, PECO served its Set III interrogatories on counsel for Complainant. A copy of the transmitting email and the Set III interrogatories are attached to this Motion as Exhibit 1. Set III is comprised of seven questions tied to the written prefiled

¹ PECO believes that the Set III interrogatories, Qs1-4 were adequately answered during the cross-examination of Ms. Povacz. The Set IV interrogatories, which were served that same day, were adequately answered during the cross-examination of Dr. Talmor. PECO is therefore is not seeking to compel answers to those questions.

Direct testimony of Complainant Ms. Murphy; questions 5-7 relate to her testimony about the Americans with Disabilities Act.²

2. On May 23, 2016, PECO also filed and served a transmittal letter and certificate of service for Set III. A copy of the transmittal email and certificate are attached as Exhibit 2.

3. On Monday, May 30, the period for lodging objections expired. No objections were lodged.

4. On Monday, June 6, the 10-day return date expired. No answers were provided.

5. On June 16, 2016, Mr. Harvey entered an appearance in this docket as co-counsel.

6. On June 28, 2016, PECO sent a request for an update to Complainant's counsel. The email re-transmitted the discovery requests and asked, in relevant part: "I recognize that these questions were sent during a very busy time [during preparation for the Povacz hearing], but it has now been 36 days since these questions were asked. May I please have an update on when we can expect answers to them?" A copy of the June 28 email is attached as Exhibit 3.

7. On June 28, 2016, Mr. Harvey replied by email: "Let me discuss with Ed and we will get back to you soon, although probably not today, on this." A copy of Mr. Harvey's June 28 email is attached as Exhibit 4.

8. On July 8, 2016, Mr. Lanza replied by email: "I received your emails regarding outstanding discovery responses in the different smart meter cases. I'm on vacation this week, but I will get you those answers when I return." A copy of Mr. Lanza's July 8 email is attached as Exhibit 5.

² PECO mis-numbered the questions in the original service as questions 5, 5, and 6.

9. On July 19, 2016, PECO sent Complainant's counsel an email proposal for a joint schedule in the *Van Schoyck* matter.

10. On July 19, 2016, Mr. Lanza replied by email: "We would like to discuss the schedule for these cases and other issues with you soon. I will confer with Steve and we will circle back to you shortly." A copy of Mr. Lanza's July 19, 2016 email is attached as Exhibit 6.

11. On July 19, 2016, PECO replied with a request for a date for such discussion, inquiring and stating: "When can we expect that discussion to occur? I realize that you likely have matters other than discovery that you want to roll into the discussion, but you are now deeply overdue on discovery answers – and even on updates on the status of discovery matters We need to hear from you this week [that is, by July 22] on discovery, even if the other agenda items need more time to ripen." A copy of PECO's July 19 email is attached as Exhibit 7.

12. PECO received no response to this request. On July 28, PECO sent Complainant's counsel an email with the subject line: "pls call me." It stated: "Ed: Pls call me. I'm going to have to start filing motions in the next day or so unless I hear something substantive from you ASAP. Please call me. 267-324-8426." A copy of PECO's July 28 email is attached as Exhibit 8. The number provided in the email was to Mr. Smith's cell phone.

13. On July 28, 2016, Mr. Lanza replied by email: "Ward, no need to file the motions. I'll call you tomorrow. Thanks." A copy of Mr. Lanza's July 28, 2016 email is attached as Exhibit 8.

14. On Friday, July 29, 2016 at 4:00 p.m., Mr. Lanza called Mr. Smith's office phone and left a message with PECO administrative staff that he had called.

15. On Friday, July 29, 2016 at 4:30 p.m., Mr. Smith returned Mr. Lanza's call. There was no answer, and Mr. Lanza's voice mail box was full. PECO therefore sent the following email to Complainant's counsel: "Ed: I see that I missed your call at 4:00. I just tried to leave you a voice message – you voice mail is full. Please call me back on my cell phone – 267-324-8426. I really need to talk today or this weekend." A copy of PECO's July 29 email is attached as Exhibit 10.

16. As of the date of the filing of the instant Motion, an additional seven days have passed since PECO's most recent request for a status update on discovery. Complainant's counsel has not contacted Mr. Smith to discuss the discovery matters at issue through email or phone.³

17. Answers to these discovery questions were due 10 days after service.

18. PECO's Set III and Set IV discovery were served 74 days ago today.

19. PECO respectfully submits that it has exhausted all reasonable efforts to resolve this discovery dispute informally between the parties.

³ Mr. Lanza did communicate with Ms. Lee by email on several occasions during that week to coordinate the relocation of the Tucker meter.

WHEREFORE:

PECO respectfully requests that Your Honors issue an Order requiring Complainant to provide full and complete answers to PECO's Set III and Set IV discovery within five calendar days of the issuance of such Order.

Respectfully submitted,



Ward Smith
Assistant General Counsel
PECO Energy Company
215-841-6863
ward.smith@exeloncorp.com

August 5, 2016

Exhibit 1

Smith, Ward L:(PECO)

From: Smith, Ward L:(PECO)
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:21 PM
To: 'Edward Lanza'
Cc: 'Tom Watson'; Lee, Shawane L.:(PECO)
Subject: Povacz v PECO C-2015-2475023 -- PECO Interrogatories Sets III and IV and Requests for Admission Set I -- Substance
Attachments: D2016-05-23 Povacz -- PECO Rogs Set III.pdf; 2016-05-23 Povacz PECO Request for Admissions Set I.pdf; 2015-05-23 Povacz PECO Rogs Set IV.pdf

Ed:

A copy of PECO's Interrogatories, Set III, Qs 1-6; Set IV, Qs 1-3; and Requests for Admission, Set I, Qs 1-4 are attached.

Ward

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

María Povacz

v.

PECO Energy Company

:
:
:
:
:

C-2015-2475023

**PECO Energy Company's
Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents
Set III**

Respondent PECO Energy Company ("PECO") hereby submits the following Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents, Set III, upon Complainant María Povacz, to be answered separately and fully in writing and in accordance with 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.341 and 5.349 of the rules and regulations of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission. The questions in this set relate to Povacz Statement No. 2, the written Direct Testimony of Complainant María Povacz.

PECO Interrogatory III-1:

In Povacz Statement No. 2, page 7, lines 6-9, you state that: "I intend to perform measurements of my existing AMR meter and my neighbor's AMI meter and compare the results of the meters with the information provided by PECO."

- a. Did you conduct any such measurements?**
- b. If so, please provide the make and model number of the meter used for such measurements.**
- c. If so, please describe the method used to perform these measurements.**
- d. If so, please provide the results of all such measurements taken.**

PECO Interrogatory III-2:

In Povacz Statement No. 2, page 12, lines 1-2, you state that "I started keeping a journal and recording the days when I felt different." Please provide a copy of the referenced journal.

PECO Interrogatory III-3:

In Povacz Statement No. 2, page 22, lines 1-7, you state that you consulted with Dr. Hanoch Talmor.

- a. Did Dr. Talmor recommend that you take any steps to reduce or protect yourself from exposure to radio frequency fields from PECO's meters?
- b. If so, what steps did he recommend?
- c. Of the steps that were recommended, which did you implement?
- d. Of the steps that you did not implement, why did you not implement them?

PECO Interrogatory III-4:

In Povacz Statement No. 2, page 22, lines 1-7, you state that you consulted with Dr. Hanoch Talmor.

- a. Did Dr. Talmor recommend that you take any steps to reduce or protect yourself from exposure to radio frequency fields from sources other than PECO's meters?
- b. If so, what steps did he recommend?
- c. Of the steps that were recommended, which did you implement?
- d. Of the steps that you did not implement, why did you not implement them?

PECO Interrogatory III-5:

In Povacz Statement No. 2, pages 39-43, you discuss the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA").

- a. Is it your contention that the ADA requires PECO to install a non-AMI meter at your residence?
- b. If so, please identify the specific section of the ADA or its implementing regulations that is the basis for that requirement.

PECO Interrogatory III-5:

In Povacz Statement No. 2, pages 39-43, you discuss the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA").

- a. Have you sought any ADA accommodations related to your electrical hypersensitivity from your employer?
- b. If so, what accommodations did you seek?

- c. If so, what accommodations, if any, were granted?
- d. If accommodations were sought but denied, what was the stated basis for denial?
- e. If accommodations were sought but denied, have you continued to pursue those ADA claims with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, a court, or other regulatory agency?

PECO Interrogatory III-6:

In Povacz Statement No. 2, pages 39-43, you discuss the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA").

- a. Have you sought any ADA accommodations related to your electrical hypersensitivity from any entity responsible for radio frequency exposure other than PECO or your employer, including the owners of cell towers and antennas in New Hope, PA?
- b. If so, what accommodations did you seek?
- c. If so, what accommodations, if any, were granted?
- d. If accommodations were sought but denied, what was the stated basis for denial?
- e. If accommodations were sought but denied, have you continued to pursue those ADA claims with the Department of Justice, a court, or other regulatory agency?



Ward Smith
Assistant General Counsel
PECO Energy Company
215-841-6863
ward.smith@exeloncorp.com

5-23-2016

Date:

Shawane Lee
Assistant General Counsel
PECO Energy Company
215-841-6841
shawane.lee@exeloncorp.com

Exhibit 2

Smith, Ward L:(PECO)

From: Smith, Ward L:(PECO)
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:21 PM
To: 'Heep, Darlene'; 'Pell, Christopher'; 'Edward Lanza'
Cc: 'Tom Watson'; Lee, Shawane L:(PECO)
Subject: Povacz v PECO C-2015-2475023 -- PECO Interrogatories Sets III and IV and Requests for Admission Set I --COS
Attachments: C2475023_Cert_Serv_Rogs_Set_II.PDF; C2475023_Cert_Serv_RFA_Set_I.PDF; C2475023_Cert_Serv_Rogs_RPD_Set_IV.PDF

Your Honors and Mr. Lanza:

Today PECO served its Interrogatories, Set III, Qs. 1-6 and Set IV, Qs 1-3, and its Requests for Admissions, Set I, Qs 1-4 on Ms. Povacz. Transmittal letters and certificates of service evidencing service of those documents are attached.

The full substance of the filings will be forwarded to Mr. Lanza separately.

Ward Smith



PENNSYLVANIA
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

CONSUMERINFO UTILITY&INDUSTRY FILING&RESOURCES ABOUTPUC CONTACTUS

[Log Off eFiling](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Search](#)

- [Mr. Efilina](#)
- [New Filings](#)
- [Modify Account](#)
- [POR Search](#)
- [eService Directory](#)
- [Substitutions](#)
- [Technical Assistance](#)
- [eFiling FAQs](#)
- [Log Off](#)

eFiling Successfully Transmitted



Your filing has been electronically received. Upon review of the filing for conformance with the Commission's filing requirements, a notice will be issued acknowledging such compliance and assigning a Docket Number. The matter will receive the attention of the Commission and you will be advised if any further action is required on your part.

Print this page for your records. The date filed on will be the current day if the filing occurs on a business day before or at 4:30 PM Harrisburg, PA time. It will be the next business day if the filing occurs after 4:30 PM Harrisburg, PA time or on weekends or holidays.

If your filing exceeds 250 pages, you are required to submit one paper copy of the filing within 3 business days of submitting the electronic filing. This paper copy can be mailed to: Secretary, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Commonwealth Keystone Building, 400 North Street, 2nd Floor, Harrisburg, PA 17120. Please print a copy of this page and attach it to the paper copy of your filing as the first page.

eFiling Confirmation	
Docket Number:	C-2015-2475023
Description:	Marla Povacz - PECO Energy Company Certificate of Service
Transmission Date:	5/23/2016 1:51:18 PM
Filed On:	5/23/2016 1:51:18 PM
eFiling Confirmation Number:	1634747

Uploaded File List

File Name	Document Class	Document Type
Marla Povacz - Certificate of Service.pdf	Other Filing	Certificate of Service



An Exelon Company

Legal Department
2301 Market Street / S23-1
P.O. Box 8699
Philadelphia, PA 19101-8699

Direct Dial: 215-841-6863

May 23, 2016

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, Second Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120

RE: Maria Povacz v. PECO Energy Company
Docket No. C-2015-2475023

Dear Ms. Chiavetta:

Enclosed for filing with the Commission are this transmittal letter and a Certificate of Service that demonstrates that today PECO Energy Company served its Interrogatories, Set III, Qs. 1-6, on Complainant.

Very truly yours,

Ward L. Smith
Counsel for PECO Energy Company

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Ward L. Smith".

WS/ab
Enclosure

cc: Christopher P. Pell, ALJ (letter and COS only)
Darlene D. Heep, ALJ (letter and COS only)
Ed Lanza, Esquire

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Maria Povacz

v.

PECO Energy Company

:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2015-2475023

NOTICE TO PLEAD

Pursuant to the modified discovery rules in this proceeding, you are hereby notified that, if you object to any of these discovery questions, you must do so within 3 days. In the absence of such an objection, you must answer the questions in full within 10 days. You must provide a full copy of any objection to the Administrative Law Judges and to counsel for PECO. If you serve an answer, you must serve the answer on counsel for PECO, and file a transmittal letter and certificate of service evidencing that service with the Commission and the Administrative Law Judge.

File transmittal letter and certificate of service with:

Rosemarie Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, Second Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120

With a full service copy to:

Ward L. Smith
PECO Energy Company
2301 Market Street, S-23
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Dated at Philadelphia, PA, May 23, 2016



Ward L. Smith
Counsel for PECO Energy Company
2301 Market Street S-23
Philadelphia, PA 19101-8699
215-841-6863
Ward.Smith@exeloncorp.com

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Maria Povacz

v.

PECO Energy Company

:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2015-2475023

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

**I, Ward L. Smith, hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of PECO's
Interrogatories, Set III, Qs. 1-6, via e-mail to:**

**Ed Lanza, Esquire
The Lanza Firm, LLC
P.O. Box 61336
Harrisburg, PA 17106**

Dated at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, May 23, 2016



**Ward L. Smith
Counsel for PECO Energy Company
2301 Market Street, S23-1
Philadelphia, PA 19101-8699
(215) 841-6863
Fax: 215.568.3389
Ward.Smith@exeloncorp.com**

Exhibit 3

Smith, Ward L:(PECO)

From: Smith, Ward L:(PECO)
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2016 3:29 PM
To: 'Edward Lanza'; 'steve@steveharveylaw.com'
Cc: Diaz Jr, Romulo L:(PECO); Lee, Shawane L.:(PECO); 'Tom Watson'
Subject: Povacz v PECO -- Request for Status Update on Discovery Answers
Attachments: 2015-05-23 Povacz PECO Rogs Set IV.PDF; D2016-05-23 Povacz -- PECO Rogs Set III.PDF

Ed and Steve:

On May 23, 2015, PECO served the attached discovery requests on Ms. Povacz (via email to Ed).

The Povacz matter is under discovery modifications, so these questions had a 10-day reply, and thus were due on June 2.

I recognize that these questions were sent during a very busy time, but it has now been 36 days since these questions were posed. May I please have an update on when we can expect answers to them?

Thanks.

Ward

Exhibit 4

Smith, Ward L:(PECO)

From: Steve Harvey <steve@steveharveylaw.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2016 3:34 PM
To: Smith, Ward L:(PECO); Edward Lanza
Cc: Diaz Jr, Romulo L:(PECO); Lee, Shawane L.:(PECO); Tom Watson
Subject: RE: Povacz v PECO -- Request for Status Update on Discovery Answers

Thank you, Ward. Let me discuss with Ed and we will get back to you soon, although probably not today, on this.

Stephen G. Harvey
Steve Harvey Law LLC
1880 John F. Kennedy Blvd.
Suite 1715
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215.438.6600
vCard

The information contained in this email message is intended only for use of the intended recipient. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender and destroy the original message. The information contained in this communication may be confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege. If you are the intended recipient and you do not wish to receive similar electronic messages in the future, then please respond to the sender to this effect. Thank you.

From: Smith, Ward L:(PECO) [<mailto:ward.smith@exeloncorp.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2016 3:32 PM
To: Edward Lanza <ed@lanzafirm.com>; Steve Harvey <steve@steveharveylaw.com>
Cc: Diaz Jr, Romulo L:(PECO) <Romulo.Diaz@exeloncorp.com>; Lee, Shawane L.:(PECO) <Shawane.Lee@exeloncorp.com>; Tom Watson <tw@w-r.com>
Subject: RE: Povacz v PECO -- Request for Status Update on Discovery Answers

Typo below – these were originally sent on May 23, 2016.

W

From: Smith, Ward L:(PECO)
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2016 3:29 PM
To: 'Edward Lanza'; 'steve@steveharveylaw.com'
Cc: Diaz Jr, Romulo L:(PECO); Lee, Shawane L.:(PECO); 'Tom Watson'
Subject: Povacz v PECO -- Request for Status Update on Discovery Answers

Ed and Steve:

On May 23, 2015, PECO served the attached discovery requests on Ms. Povacz (via email to Ed).

The Povacz matter is under discovery modifications, so these questions had a 10-day reply, and thus were due on June 2.

I recognize that these questions were sent during a very busy time, but it has now been 36 days since these questions were posed. May I please have an update on when we can expect answers to them?

Thanks.

Ward

This Email message and any attachment may contain information that is proprietary, legally privileged, confidential and/or subject to copyright belonging to Exelon Corporation or its affiliates ("Exelon"). This Email is intended solely for the use of the person(s) to which it is addressed. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivery of this Email to the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this Email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and permanently delete this Email and any copies. Exelon policies expressly prohibit employees from making defamatory or offensive statements and infringing any copyright or any other legal right by Email communication. Exelon will not accept any liability in respect of such communications. -EXCIP

Exhibit 5

Smith, Ward L:(PECO)

From: Edward Lanza <ed@lanzafirm.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 06, 2016 3:37 PM
To: Smith, Ward L:(PECO)
Cc: Steve Harvey
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Outstanding Discovery - Smart Meter Cases

Ward,
I received your emails regarding outstanding discovery responses in the different smart meter cases. I'm on vacation this week, but I will get those answers to you when I return.
Thanks,

Ed

The Lanza Firm, LLC
P.O. Box 61336
Harrisburg, PA 17106
(717) 653-1126
www.idl12.com

Exhibit 6

Smith, Ward L:(PECO)

From: Edward Lanza <ed@lanzafirm.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2016 5:58 PM
To: Steve Harvey; Smith, Ward L:(PECO)
Cc: Lee, Shawane L:(PECO); Tom Watson; Curt Renner
Subject: RE: Van Schoyck v PECO C-2015-2478239

Thanks, Ward.

We would like to discuss the schedule for these cases and other issues with you soon. I will confer with Steve and we will circle back shortly.

Ed

THE LANZA FIRM, LLC
P.O. Box 61336
Harrisburg, PA 17106-1336
(717) 576-2696

----- Smith, Ward L:(PECO) wrote -----

Counsel:

The purpose of this email is to discuss interim scheduling issues in the *Van Schoyck* matter.

As you know, in their April 8, 2016 Prehearing Order, the ALJs previously set forth a schedule for this proceeding that was predicated on the previously scheduled but now inoperative July 26-27 hearing dates. That schedule was:

May 19: Settlement discussions (we had a couple of discussions, but remain open to more)
May 24: Expert witness identification (we exchanged expert witness identification on this date per the schedule. See attached).
May 31: Dispositive Motions
July 12: Exhibit exchange
July 22: Stipulations

On April 19, we jointly proposed that the above schedule be superceded by the following schedule for the exchange of written testimony:

Van Schoyck Direct -- June 9
PECO Rebuttal -- June 30
Van Schoyck Surrebuttal -- July 18
Hearing -- July 26-27

As you know, that schedule also became inoperative.

On June 21, by email, the ALJs informed us that we would not be using written testimony in *Van Schoyck* and that "Prehearing Orders in *Van Schoyck* and *Randall* will contain deadlines for exchange of expert reports."

We subsequently received a new Prehearing Order in *Randall* (attached), but not *Van Schoyck*. We could just ask the ALJs to issue a template Prehearing Order #2 in *Van Schoyck* based on the *Randall* template, but I would prefer to translate the *Randall* template to a concrete schedule, and then jointly propose those dates.

The *Randall* prehearing has six key deadlines, each designated as "x days before hearing." Based on the *Randall* instructions that we have a ten-day return on discovery and that "the timing of discovery requests must allow time for responses" prior to the end of the discovery period, I've interpolated an additional deadline for the final day to pose discovery. That results in the following:

70 days: expert witness id

50 days: exchange expert reports

40 days: ask final discovery (really, 10 days prior to close of discovery, which itself can vary with weekends; interposed by me)

30 days: discovery closes

20 days: settlement conference

15 days: exhibit exchange

5 days: stipulations

If I make that concrete for *Van Schoyck*, based on the scheduled October 23 start of hearings, and taking into consideration the days on which the deadline falls on a weekend, we get the following:

Expert witness id – complete

Monday, September 5: exchange expert reports

Wednesday, September 16: ask final discovery

Monday, September 26: discovery closes

Tuesday, Oct. 4: settlement conference

Monday, Oct. 10: exchange exhibits

Wednesday, Oct. 19: stipulations

May I have your comments and concurrence at your earliest convenience?

Ward

This Email message and any attachment may contain information that is proprietary, legally privileged,

is intended solely for the use of the person(s) to which it is addressed. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivery of this Email to the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this Email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and permanently delete this Email and any copies. Exelon policies expressly prohibit employees from making defamatory or offensive statements and infringing any copyright or any other legal right by Email communication. Exelon will not accept any liability in respect of such communications. -EXCIP

Exhibit 7

Smith, Ward L:(PECO)

From: Smith, Ward L:(PECO)
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2016 8:15 PM
To: 'Edward Lanza'; 'Steve Harvey'
Cc: Lee, Shawane L.:(PECO); 'Tom Watson'; 'Curt Renner'
Subject: RE: Van Schoyck v PECO C-2015-2478239

Ed:

Thanks.

When can we expect that discussion to occur?

I realize that you likely have matters other than discovery that you want to roll into the discussion, but you are now deeply overdue on discovery answers – and even on updates on the status of discovery answers -- in *Van Schoyck*, *Murphy*, and *Randall/Albrecht*. We need to hear from you this week on discovery, even if the other agenda items need more time to ripen.

W

From: Edward Lanza [<mailto:ed@lanzafirm.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2016 5:58 PM
To: Steve Harvey; Smith, Ward L:(PECO)
Cc: Lee, Shawane L.:(PECO); Tom Watson; Curt Renner
Subject: RE: Van Schoyck v PECO C-2015-2478239

Thanks, Ward.

We would like to discuss the schedule for these cases and other issues with you soon. I will confer with Steve and we will circle back shortly.

Ed

THE LANZA FIRM, LLC
P.O. Box 61336
Harrisburg, PA 17106-1336
(717) 576-2696

---- Smith, Ward L:(PECO) wrote ----

Counsel:

The purpose of this email is to discuss interim scheduling issues in the *Van Schoyck* matter.

As you know, in their April 8, 2016 Prehearing Order, the ALJs previously set forth a schedule for this proceeding that was predicated on the previously scheduled but now inoperative July 26-27 hearing dates. That schedule was:

May 19: Settlement discussions (we had a couple of discussions, but remain open to more)
May 24: Expert witness identification (we exchanged expert witness identification on this date per the schedule. See attached).
May 31: Dispositive Motions
July 12: Exhibit exchange
July 22: Stipulations

On April 19, we jointly proposed that the above schedule be superceded by the following schedule for the exchange of written testimony:

Van Schoyck Direct -- June 9
PECO Rebuttal – June 30
Van Schoyck Surrebuttal – July 18
Hearing – July 26-27

As you know, that schedule also became inoperative.

On June 21, by email, the ALJs informed us that we would not be using written testimony in *Van Schoyck* and that “Prehearing Orders in *Van Schoyck* and *Randall* will contain deadlines for exchange of expert reports.”

We subsequently received a new Prehearing Order in *Randall* (attached), but not *Van Schoyck*. We could just ask the ALJs to issue a template Prehearing Order #2 in *Van Schoyck* based on the *Randall* template, but I would prefer to translate the *Randall* template to a concrete schedule, and then jointly propose those dates.

The *Randall* prehearing has six key deadlines, each designated as “x days before hearing.” Based on the *Randall* instructions that we have a ten-day return on discovery and that “the timing of discovery requests must allow time for responses” prior to the end of the discovery period, I’ve interpolated an additional deadline for the final day to pose discovery. That results in the following:

70 days: expert witness id

50 days: exchange expert reports

40 days: ask final discovery (really, 10 days prior to close of discovery, which itself can vary with weekends; interposed by me)

30 days: discovery closes

20 days: settlement conference

15 days: exhibit exchange

5 days: stipulations

If I make that concrete for *Van Schoyck*, based on the scheduled October 23 start of hearings, and taking into consideration the days on which the deadline falls on a weekend, we get the following:

Expert witness id – complete

Monday, September 5: exchange expert reports

Wednesday, September 16: ask final discovery

Monday, September 26: discovery closes

Tuesday, Oct. 4: settlement conference

Monday, Oct. 10: exchange exhibits

Wednesday, Oct. 19: stipulations

May I have your comments and concurrence at your earliest convenience?

Ward

This Email message and any attachment may contain information that is proprietary, legally privileged, confidential and/or subject to copyright belonging to Exelon Corporation or its affiliates ("Exelon"). This Email is intended solely for the use of the person(s) to which it is addressed. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivery of this Email to the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this Email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and permanently delete this Email and any copies. Exelon policies expressly prohibit employees from making defamatory or offensive statements and infringing any copyright or any other legal right by Email communication. Exelon will not accept any liability in respect of such communications. -EXCIP

Exhibit 8

Smith, Ward L:(PECO)

From: Smith, Ward L:(PECO)
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 2:21 PM
To: 'Edward Lanza'
Subject: pls call me

Ed:

Pls call me. I'm going to have start filing motions in the next day or so unless I hear something substantive from you ASAP. Please call me.

267-324-8426

W

Exhibit 9

Smith, Ward L:(PECO)

From: Edward Lanza <ed@lanzafirm.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2016 7:15 PM
To: Smith, Ward L:(PECO)
Subject: RE: pls call me

Ward,
No need to file motions.
I'll call you tomorrow.
Thanks,

Ed

THE LANZA FIRM, LLC
P.O. Box 61336
Harrisburg, PA 17106-1336
(717) 576-2696

----- Smith, Ward L:(PECO) wrote -----

Ed:

Pls call me. I'm going to have start filing motions in the next day or so unless I hear something substantive from you ASAP. Please call me.

267-324-8426

W

This Email message and any attachment may contain information that is proprietary, legally privileged, confidential and/or subject to copyright belonging to Exelon Corporation or its affiliates ("Exelon"). This Email is intended solely for the use of the person(s) to which it is addressed. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivery of this Email to the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this Email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and permanently delete this Email and any copies. Exelon policies expressly prohibit employees from making defamatory or offensive statements and infringing any copyright or any other legal right by Email communication. Exelon will not accept any liability in respect of such communications. -EXCIP

Exhibit 10

Smith, Ward L:(PECO)

From: Smith, Ward L:(PECO)
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2016 4:33 PM
To: 'Edward Lanza'
Subject: Pls call

Ed:

I see that I missed your call at 4:00. I just tried to leave you a voice message – your voice mail is full.

Please call back on my cell phone. 267-324-8426. I really need to talk today or this weekend.

W

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

MARIA POVACZ	:	
COMPLAINANT	:	Docket No. C-2015-2475023
v.	:	
	:	
PECO ENERGY COMPANY	:	
RESPONDENT	:	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Ward L. Smith, hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of PECO'S Energy Company's Motion to Compel Answers to Discovery in the above matter upon all interested parties via e-mail and postage prepaid to:

Via Electronic Mail
Ed Lanza, Esquire
The Lanza Firm, LLC
P.O. Box 61336
Harrisburg, PA 17106

Via Electronic Mail
Stephen G. Harvey
Steve Harvey Law LLC
1880 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Ste 1715
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Dated at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, August 5, 2016



Ward L. Smith
Counsel for PECO Energy Company
2301 Market Street, S23-1
Philadelphia, PA 19101-8699
(215) 841-6863
Fax: 215.568.3389
Ward.Smith@exeloncorp.com