

Tori L. Giesler, Esq.
(610) 921-6658
(330) 315-9263 (Fax)

610-929-3601

January 10, 2019

VIA E-FILING

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Re: Richard F. Wilson v. West Penn Power Company
Docket No. C-2018-3006410

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Attached please find the Preliminary Objections of West Penn Power Company in the above-referenced matter. This document has been served on the Complainant as shown in the Certificate of Service.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

Handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Tori L. Giesler" followed by the initials "TBW".

Tori L. Giesler

krak
Enclosures

c: As per Certificate of Service

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

RICHARD F. WILSON

v.

WEST PENN POWER COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2018-3006410

NOTICE TO PLEAD

TO: Richard F. Wilson

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.101 you are hereby notified that if you do not file a reply to the enclosed Preliminary Objections of West Penn Power Company within ten (10) days from service of this notice, the facts set forth by West Penn Power Company in the Preliminary Objections may be deemed to be admitted, thereby requiring no other proof. All pleadings, such as a Reply to Objection, must be filed with the Secretary of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, with a copy service to counsel for West Penn Power Company, and where applicable, the Administrative Law Judge presiding over the case.


File with:

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

With a copy to:

Lauren M. Lepkoski
Tori L. Giesler
FirstEnergy Service Company
2800 Pottsville Pike
P.O. Box 16001
Reading, Pennsylvania 19612-6001

Date: January 10, 2019


Lauren M. Lepkoski, Esquire
Tori L. Giesler, Esquire

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

RICHARD F. WILSON

v.

WEST PENN POWER COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2018-3006410

**PRELIMINARY OBJECTION TO THE AMENDED FORMAL COMPLAINT OF
RICHARD F. WILSON**

TO THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION:

AND NOW, West Penn Power Company ("West Penn" or the "Company"), by and through its counsel, Lauren M. Lepkoski and Tori L. Giesler, files this Preliminary Objection pursuant to Section 5.101(a) of Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission ("Commission") regulations, 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a)(1), and in support thereof, avers as follows:

I. Introduction

1. In his recently filed Amended Formal Complaint, Richard F. Wilson ("Complainant"), who receives electric service at 841 Gans Woodbridge Road, Smithfield, Pennsylvania 15478-1407 ("Service Location") alleges that he does not want a smart meter installed at the Service Location. (Amended Formal Complaint ¶ 5.) The Complainant states as requested relief:

I insist that West Penn Power remove the smart meter from my garage, which West Penn installed around 12-10-18, without notice or my consent. I require my house and garage to both have analog meters. Please review attached letter, which I sent to the U.S. Dept. of energy, requesting a smart meter exemption.

(Amended Formal Complaint ¶ 5.)

2. The Company is in the process of deploying smart meters in its service territory in accordance with Act 129 of 2008 (“Act 129”).¹

3. On April 26, 2018, the Complainant contacted the Company to refuse installation of the smart meter at the Service Location for the House Account. The Complainant was advised there was no opt-out available in accordance with Act 129. The Complainant reiterated his refusal of the smart meter installation due to health threat and stated he would look into changing to another utility company. The Complainant indicated that he was not satisfied with the results of his telephone call and dispute rights were provided. On May 15, 2018, the Company sent correspondence to the Complainant regarding the installation of a smart meter at the Service Location for the Garage Account. On July 18, 2018, the Company completed installation of a smart meter at the Service Location for the Garage Account. On November 20, 2018, the Company attempted to contact the Complainant in an attempt to address his concerns relative to the smart meter installation for the House Account and left a message seeking a return telephone call. No return telephone call was received. On November 21, 2018, the Company sent correspondence to the Complainant in an attempt to schedule installation of a smart meter at the House Account. On November 27, 2018, the Complainant contacted the Company in response to the letter issued on November 21, 2018. The Complainant was advised that continued refusal could result in an interruption of service. The Complainant stated that other states have a moratorium on smart meter installation. The Company representative advised that the Company is required to follow Act 129. The Company representative also explained that the radio frequency emitted from the smart meter is much lower than cell phone and cordless phones. The Complainant terminated the call. Later

¹ 66 Pa.C.S. § 2806.1 *et seq.* Among other things, Act 129 specifically directed that electric distribution companies with at least 100,000 customers file a smart meter technology procurement and installation plan with the Commission for approval. 66 Pa.C.S. § 2807(f)(1) and (2).

that day, the Company spoke with the Complainant who reiterated his refusal of the smart meter installation at the Service Location. The Complainant stated that he will not allow installation until the Company proves that the smart meter will not “cause cancer or interfere with his deep brain stimulator.” The Company mailed information to the Complainant regarding the smart meter. The Complainant asked about termination in the winter months. The Company representative advised that the winter termination prohibition pertains to low income customers. The Complainant was further advised that he can shop for the supply portion of his monthly service bill but not the delivery of electricity and the meter is part of the delivery of electricity. The Complainant stated that he contacted the Commission. He was advised that the Company will abide by a Commission Decision. The Company representative further advised that the only way to change Act 129 was to speak with the legislature as the Company must abide by current Pennsylvania law. The Complainant disconnected the call. On November 29, 2018, the Complainant filed the Formal Complaint with the Commission and, on December 7, 2018, the Company was electronically served with the Formal Complaint. On December 17, 2018, the Complainant filed the Amended Formal Complaint with the Commission and, on December 21, 2018, the Company was electronically served with the Amended Formal Complaint.

4. As explained in greater detail below, even if all of the facts in the Amended Formal Complaint are accepted as true, they do not constitute a violation of any law which the Commission has jurisdiction to administer, or of any regulation or order of the Commission, such that relief can be granted.²

² See 66 Pa.C.S. § 701.

5. As a result, the Company requests that this Preliminary Objection be granted and that the Commission: (1) strike the Complainant's request for an exemption from the installation of a smart meter; (2) dismiss the Amended Formal Complaint in its entirety with prejudice; and (3) grant the Company such other relief as may be just and reasonable under the circumstances.

II. Background

6. West Penn is an electric distribution company that is certificated as a public utility in Pennsylvania.

7. On April 26, 2018, the Complainant contacted the Company to refuse installation of the smart meter at the Service Location for the House Account. The Complainant was advised there was no opt-out available in accordance with Act 129. The Complainant reiterated his refusal of the smart meter installation due to health threat and stated he would look into changing to another utility company. The Complainant indicated that he was not satisfied with the results of his telephone call and dispute rights were provided. On May 15, 2018, the Company sent correspondence to the Complainant regarding the installation of a smart meter at the Service Location for the Garage Account. On July 18, 2018, the Company completed installation of a smart meter at the Service Location for the Garage Account. On November 20, 2018, the Company attempted to contact the Complainant in an attempt to address his concerns relative to the smart meter installation for the House Account and left a message seeking a return telephone call. No return telephone call was received. On November 21, 2018, the Company sent correspondence to the Complainant in an attempt to schedule installation of a smart meter at the House Account. On November 27, 2018, the Complainant contacted the Company in response to the letter issued on November 21, 2018. The Complainant was advised that continued refusal could result in an interruption of service. The Complainant stated that other states have a moratorium on smart meter

installation. The Company representative advised that the Company is required to follow Act 129. The Company representative also explained that the radio frequency emitted from the smart meter is much lower than cell phone and cordless phones. The Complainant terminated the call. Later that day, the Company spoke with the Complainant who reiterated his refusal of the smart meter installation at the Service Location. The Complainant stated that he will not allow installation until the Company proves that the smart meter will not “cause cancer or interfere with his deep brain stimulator.” The Company mailed information to the Complainant regarding the smart meter. The Complainant asked about termination in the winter months. The Company representative advised that the winter termination prohibition pertains to low income customers. The Complainant was further advised that he can shop for the supply portion of his monthly service bill but not the delivery of electricity and the meter is part of the delivery of electricity. The Complainant stated that he contacted the Commission. He was advised that the Company will abide by a Commission Decision. The Company representative further advised that the only way to change Act 129 was to speak with the legislature as the Company must abide by current Pennsylvania law. The Complainant disconnected the call. On November 29, 2018, the Complainant filed the Formal Complaint with the Commission and, on December 7, 2018, the Company was electronically served with the Formal Complaint.

8. On December 17, 2018, the Complainant filed the Amended Formal Complaint with the Commission. On December 21, 2018, the Company was electronically served with the Amended Formal Complaint.

9. West Penn is timely filing its Answer and New Matter contemporaneously with this Preliminary Objection, which Answer and New Matter is incorporated into this Preliminary Objection as if fully set forth herein.

III. Argument

10. The Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure permit parties to file preliminary objections. The grounds for preliminary objections are limited to those set forth in 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a) as follows:

- (1) Lack of Commission jurisdiction or improper service of the pleading initiating the proceeding.
- (2) Failure of a pleading to conform to this chapter or the inclusion of scandalous or impertinent matter.
- (3) Insufficient specificity of a pleading.
- (4) Legal insufficiency of a pleading.
- (5) Lack of capacity to sue, nonjoinder of a necessary party or misjoinder of a cause of action.
- (6) Pendency of a prior proceeding or agreement for alternative dispute resolution.
- (7) Standing of a party to participate in the proceeding.

11. The Commission's procedure regarding the disposition of preliminary objections is similar to that utilized in Pennsylvania civil practice.³

12. A preliminary objection in civil practice seeking dismissal of a pleading will be granted only where relief is clearly warranted and free from doubt.⁴ The Commission has adopted this standard.⁵

³ *Equitable Small Transportation Intervenors v. Equitable Gas Company*, Docket No. C-00935435 (Opinion and Order entered July 18, 1994).

⁴ *Interstate Traveler Services, Inc. v. Pa. Dept. of Environmental Resources*, 406 A.2d 1020 (Pa. 1979); *Rivera v. Philadelphia Theological Seminary of St. Charles Borromeo, Inc.*, 595 A.2d 172 (Pa. Super. 1991).

⁵ *Montague v. Philadelphia Electric Company*, 66 Pa. PUC 24 (1988).

13. In accordance with Section 701 of the Code⁶ a person may file a complaint which sets 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 commission has jurisdiction to administer, or of any regulation or order of the commission.” As explained below, the Company has not violated the Public Utility Code or the orders or regulations of the Commission.⁷ In fact, the Company’s action have been in compliance with Act 129 and the June 5 Order.

14. The moving party may not rely on its own factual assertions but must accept for the purposes of disposition of the preliminary objection, all well-pleaded, material facts of the other party, as well as every inference fairly deducible from those facts.⁸ Therefore, in ruling on a preliminary objection, the Commission must assume, for decisional purposes only, that the factual allegations of the Amended Formal Complaint are true.⁹

15. West Penn’s smart meter deployment plan was approved by the Commission at Docket No. M-2013-2341991 by Order entered June 5, 2014. In accordance with the June 5 Order, the Company filed its final Smart Meter Deployment Plan (“SMP”) on June 16, 2014. The SMP was approved by the Commission on June 20, 2014. The Complainant challenges no aspect of the Company’s provision of electric service other than the installation of a smart meter at the Service Location, as required by Act 129 and the Company’s SMP.

⁶ 66 Pa.C.S. § 701.

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ *County of Allegheny v. Commw. of Pa.*, 490 A.2d 402 (Pa. 1985).

⁹ *Id.*

16. Commission precedent is uniform that it cannot grant exceptions to the statutory directive that smart meters be installed by allowing customers to opt out.¹⁰

17. Assuming the facts pleaded in the Amended Formal Complaint are true, as the Commission must for the purposes of ruling on a preliminary objection, the Complainant has failed to allege that West Penn has committed or omitted an act in violation of a Commission statute, regulation, order, or West Penn's tariff, a finding of which must be made in order to sustain a formal complaint.¹¹

18. Because Act 129 and the Commission's orders not only authorize but require the Company to develop and implement a smart meter procurement and installation plan, and do not allow a customer to opt out of having a smart meter installed, this Complaint must be dismissed. As a matter of law, the Company is required to install a smart meter at the Service Location. As such, the Commission cannot find the Company to be in violation for having attempted to follow the law as it has done here.

19. Therefore, the Amended Formal Complaint is legally insufficient because it fails to state a claim upon which the Commission can grant relief.¹²

¹⁰ *Negley v. Metropolitan Edison Company*, Docket No. C-2010-2205305 (Final Order entered March 3, 2011); *Lutherschmidt v. Metropolitan Edison Company*, Docket No. C-2010-2200353 (Final Order entered March 25, 2011). The Commission has continued to uphold installation of smart meters and imposition of smart meter charges on customers' bills by dismissing complaints opposing installation of smart meters and imposition of smart meter charges on the basis of legal insufficiency. *Corbett v. Pennsylvania Power Company*, Docket No. C-2011-2219898 (Final Order entered May 27, 2011); *Jones v. Metropolitan Edison Company*, Docket No. C-2011-2224380 (Final Order entered June 28, 2011); *Griffin v. Metropolitan Edison Company*, Docket No. C-2012-2300172 (Final Order entered July 31, 2012); *Brake v. West Penn Power Company*, Docket No. C-2013-2367308 (Opinion and Order entered November 14, 2013); *Drake v. Pennsylvania Electric Company*, Docket No. C-2014-2413771 (Final Order entered December 27, 2014); *Efaw v West Penn Power Company*, Docket No. C-2014-2413744 (Final Order entered December 27, 2014). See also, the Initial Decision of ALJ Susan D. Colwell in *Dennis McElwain v. Pennsylvania Power Company*, Docket No. C-2014-2451478 issued December 16, 2015.

¹¹ See 66 Pa.C.S. § 701; *County of Allegheny*, supra. (Compl. ¶ 4.)

¹² See 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a)(4).

20. The Commission may dismiss a complaint without hearing if a hearing is not necessary in the public interest.¹³

21. Recently, the Commission set for hearing two cases in which the complainant was opposed to the installation of a smart meter at their premises.¹⁴ These cases represent a departure from past Commission practice of dismissing such complaints on Preliminary Objections. The Commission stated that where a complainant has presented specific factual averments regarding the health or other effects that they have experienced after a smart meter was installed at their home, the Commission has overruled Preliminary Objections and allowed a case to proceed. Specifically, in *Kreider*, the complainant alleged specific deleterious health effects after installation of a smart meter affecting her specific medical condition. Further, in *Van Schoyck*, the complainants alleged potential health risks due to constant ringing noise in their home and their inability to sleep since the time the smart meter was installed.¹⁵ In contrast, in the instant case, the Complainant has made no specific factual averments regarding any health effects he has experienced *after* a smart meter was installed. The Complainant simply avers that he does not want a smart meter due to generic health concerns.¹⁶ The Commission is unable to grant the Complainant an “exemption” from Act 129. The Commission has not recognized a customer’s lack of consent to install a smart meter as sufficient to overcome Preliminary Objections.¹⁷

¹³ 66 Pa.C.S. § 703(b); 52 Pa. Code § 5.21 (d).

¹⁴ *Susan Kreider v. PECO Energy Company*, Docket No. C-2015-2469655 (Order on Reconsideration entered January 28, 2016); *Stephen and Diane Van Schoyck v. PECO Energy Company*, Docket No. C-2015-2478239 (Opinion and Order entered February 25, 2016).

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ Formal Complaint ¶¶ 4, 5.

¹⁷ *Richard and Marie Fugo in care of Fugo Eye Institute v. PECO Energy Company*, Docket Nos. C-2015-2519763 and C-2015-2519770 (Order entered April 6, 2016).

22. In *Charles F. Jackson v. Pennsylvania Electric Company*, Docket No. C-2017-2600495 (Order Entered August 31, 2017), the Commission approved the Initial Decision of ALJ David A. Salapa, dated June 26, 2017, which granted the Preliminary Objections of Pennsylvania Electric Company and dismissed the formal complaint of Mr. Jackson (who was disputing the installation of a smart meter) finding that formal complaint was legally insufficient, pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a)(4), in that the complaint fails to allege that the utility violated the Public Utility Code, Commission regulations or orders or its tariff provisions. The respondent was found to be authorized to install smart meters and impose a charge on its customers to develop and implement a smart meter procurement and installation plan that will lead to the installation of smart meters throughout its service territory. ALJ Salapa further found that the respondent was authorized to terminate the Mr. Jackson's service if he refused to provide the respondent with access to its meter and equipment to install the smart meter.

This Commission decision was entered after *Kreider*. The instant formal complaint is nearly identical to the alleged averments in the formal complaint at Docket No. C-2017-2600495, in that the Complainant has only alleged that he does not want a smart meter installed at the Service Location. The Complainant has not set forth in his complaint that any act done by the Company violates a Commission regulation, statute or order.

23. Therefore, the Company respectfully submits that the matters plead in the subject Formal Complaint do not meet the standards set in *Kreider* and *Van Schoyck* such that this matter can survive dismissal on preliminary objections.

24. Further, the Commission has upheld decisions granting preliminary objections and dismissing complaints for legal insufficiency opposing smart meter installation. In *Negley*, ALJ Susan D. Colwell dismissed a complaint opposing installation of smart meters for legal

insufficiency. ALJ Colwell concluded that Act 129 of 2008 authorized the installation of smart meters by EDCs. ALJ Colwell held that the Commission's orders approving the EDC's smart meter plans did not exempt any customers from the smart meter plans. By Commission final order entered March 3, 2011, ALJ Colwell's Initial Decision became final without further Commission action.

25. Rule 9 of the Company's Commission-approved tariff,¹⁸ allows the Company to have access to its customers' premises for any and all purposes relating to the supply of electric energy which includes the exchange of meters. The Complainant's refusal to allow the Company access to its own meter is a violation of Rules 9 and 20 of the Company's Commission-approved tariff¹⁹ and is grounds for termination of service. The Commission has also upheld decisions finding that a utility has the ability to terminate the service of a customer who refuses installation of a smart meter.²⁰

26. Because Act 129 of 2008 and the Commission's orders authorize the Company to develop and implement a smart meter procurement and installation plan, the Complainant has not set forth in his complaint any act done by the Company that violates a Commission regulation, statute or order.

IV. Conclusion

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, West Penn Power Company respectfully requests that the Commission grant its Preliminary Objection and that the Commission: (1) strike the Complainant's request for an exemption from the installation of a smart meter; (2) dismiss the

¹⁸ *West Penn Power Company Retail Electric Service Tariff*, Electric Pa. PUC No. 52, p. 40 issued May 1, 2015, effective May 3, 2015.

¹⁹ *West Penn Power Company Retail Electric Service Tariff*, Electric Pa. PUC No. 52, pp. 40, 55, issued May 1, 2015, effective May 3, 2015.

²⁰ *Art Larson v. PECO Energy Company*, Docket No. C-2014-2451754 (Opinion and Order entered June 11, 2015). See also, *Catherine J. Frompovitch v. PECO Energy Company*, Docket No. C-2015-2474602 (Opinion and Order entered May 3, 2018).

Amended Formal Complaint in its entirety with prejudice; and (3) grant the Company such other relief as may be just and reasonable under the circumstances.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 10, 2019

Tori L. Giesler / *kgw*

Lauren M. Lepkoski

Attorney No. 94800

Tori L. Giesler

Attorney No. 207742

FirstEnergy Service Company

2800 Pottsville Pike

P.O. Box 16001

Reading, Pennsylvania 19612-6001

(610) 921-6203

(610) 921-6658

llepkoski@firstenergycorp.com

tgiesler@firstenergycorp.com

Counsel for West Penn Power Company

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

RICHARD F. WILSON

:

:

v.

:

Docket No. C-2018-3006410

:

WEST PENN POWER COMPANY

:

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of the Preliminary Objections of West Penn Power Company to the Amended Formal Complaint of Richard F. Wilson upon the individual listed below, in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54 (relating to service by a participant).

Service by First Class Mail, postage prepaid, as follows:

Richard F. Wilson
841 Gans Woodbridge Road
Smithfield, PA 15478-1407

Dated: January 10, 2019

Tori L. Giesler | *LBW*
Lauren M. Lepkoski
Tori L. Giesler
FirstEnergy Service Company
2800 Pottsville Pike
P.O. Box 16001
Reading, Pennsylvania 19612-6001
(610) 921-6203
(610) 921-6658
llepkoski@firstenergycorp.com
tgiesler@firstenergycorp.com