


ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT & ACCEPTANCE OF SERVICE

AND NOW, to wit, this 27<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2006,

the undersigned, as evidenced by execution hereof, acknowledges receipt, and accepts service of an Opinion and Order, an official Commission document entered, issued, or otherwise promulgated under date of June 27, 2006 at Docket No.C-20043520 on behalf of:

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
BUREAU OF FIXED UTILITY SERVICES  
PO BOX 3265  
HARRISBURG PA 17105-3265

**DOCUMENT FOLDER**



\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Kindly sign and date this acceptance of service and acknowledgement of receipt, and, return the same for filing to:

SECRETARY'S BUREAU RECORD RETENTION  
PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
KEYSTONE BUILDING 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR  
400 NORTH STREET  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

SECRETARY'S BUREAU

2006 JUN 28 PM 12:34

RECEIVED

SECRETARY'S BUREAU  
RECORD RETENTION

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

DATE: July 13, 2006  
SUBJECT: C-20043520  
TO: Office of Special Assistants  
FROM: James J. McNulty, Secretary *KS*

Jean Reese  
v.  
Verizon North Inc.

---

Attached is a copy of a Ltr/Petition for Reconsideration, filed by Jean Reese in connection with the above docketed proceeding.

This matter is assigned to your Office for appropriate action.

Attachment

cc: ALJ  
OTS

.ksb

**DOCKETED**

JUL 13 2006

**DOCUMENT  
FOLDER**

**ORIGINAL**

Jean Reese  
6938 Lentz Road  
New Tripoli, PA  
610-298-2218

**RECEIVED**

JUL 11 2006

July 11, 2006

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
SECRETARY'S OFFICE

James J. McNulty, Secretary

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
400 North Street  
Commonwealth Keystone Bldg.  
P. O. Box 3265  
Harrisburg, PA 17105

**RE: Jean Reese v. Verizon North Inc.  
Docket No. C-20043520**

Public Meeting held June 22, 2006

Commissioners Present:

Wendell F. Holland, Chairman  
James H. Cawley, Vice Chairman  
Bill Shane  
Kim Pizzingrilli  
Terrance J. Fitzpatrick

**DOCUMENT  
FOLDER**

**DOCKETED**

JUL 13 2006

1

57

RECEIVED

JUL 11 2006

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

To Whom It May Concern:

It has come to my attention that as the complainant in the above mentioned case, I can file a Petition for Reconsideration of the PUC's Opinion and Order. Please be advised that I am filing said petition at this time.  
(Orig. & 3 copies)


My reasons for the petition are as follows:

1. Many of the Commission's decisions to modify or reverse the initial decision of the Administrative Law Judge Ember S. Jandebaur in the referenced proceeding are based on the testimony of one customer - myself. While my petition did "not have the necessary support in this record for our consideration", it clearly indicated additional customer support for the EAS. Previous EAS requests for this same subject area also included petitions as noted in original testimony. I am curious! What qualifies a petition to be rendered as supporting evidence in testimony and why was my petition disallowed? A PUC Order in Bubner v. Verizon North, C00004308, order entered December 24, 2002, allowed a petition as a deciding factor in favor of the complainant.
2. Your decision that Schnecksville is NOT a Community of Interest was based on the fact that the testimony of only two people, myself and Mr George of the Ironton Telephone Company, stated otherwise. However, as stated in original testimony, Verizon's witness had NO first-hand or practical knowledge of the subject area.
3. In regard to the cost of customer polling, I am under the impression that a poll concerning the increased cost to customers was not ever required to implement the EAS. The cost increase, I thought, was not considered a rate change but a surcharge. The EAS could have been implemented without the poll. Please note, the additional cost to customers was very minimal.

4. Why wasn't a Public Input Hearing in the Service Territory ordered? Is it not the responsibility of the PUC to schedule such a hearing in light of the fact I am a pro se complainant and should not have been expected to know that a Public Hearing could be requested. Fortunately, this information just recently presented itself. My understanding is that the ALJ can schedule these hearings. Obviously that was not done previously as the ALJ's decision was in my favor. Or, the case can be remanded back to the ALJ for the holding of a public input hearing in the New Tripoli exchange. Since the Commission's decision seems to be based on what was cited numerous times as the testimony of "just one customer" concluding that there was a lack of apparent customer interest and lack of apparent proof that Schnecksville is a Community of Interest, shouldn't the Commission schedule the Public Hearing? Is it the PUC's position that a lone customer can NEVER win such a case? It is noteworthy that I stated in my original testimony AND in my Reply Exceptions that the location of the original hearing was problematic. Wouldn't a Public Input Hearing in the Service Territory solve those problems?

In conclusion, I respectfully request that the PUC Reconsider their Opinion & Order by allowing the petition to be included as supporting testimony and schedule a Public Input Hearing in the Service Territory to allow other interested customers to present testimony. The hearing would finally settle this matter!

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jean Reese". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Jean Reese