

Legal Department
2301 Market Street / S23-1
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Direct Dial: 215.841.6863
February 7, 2019

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

Re: Nancy and James Colbert v. PECO Energy Company
Docket No. C-2016-2561993

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

PECO has a Motion to Dismiss pending in which it requested (§ 50) that the Colberts contact PECO to confirm whether they wish to proceed with an evidentiary hearing; in that paragraph PECO stated that if the Colberts did contact PECO it “will take responsibility to inform Your Honor of any such communications.”

PECO previously reported to the Commission that, on January 31, 2019 PECO received a voice mail from Nancy Colbert in which she confirmed that the Colberts have “cancelled our formal complaint” and do not wish to proceed with an evidentiary hearing.

On February 6, 2019, PECO received another voice mail from Nancy Colbert, in which she again confirmed that the Colberts have “cancelled” their complaint. The February 6, 2019 voice mail stated:

This is Nancy Colbert to give four docket numbers that were created by the PUC. 2015-2515607, *Nancy & James Colbert v. PECO*. Then the PUC created 2016-2561993 *Nancy Colbert v. PECO*. Then in December 2018 the PUC created two more dockets, 2016-2561993 *Nancy & James Colbert v. PECO*; 2015-2515607 *Nancy & James Colbert v. PECO*. No longer just Nancy Colbert. All these and all bogus document docket numbers hidden and twisted have been cancelled by the Colberts. Good day sir.

By this letter, PECO is fulfilling its commitment to inform the ALJ and Commission of this communication, which PECO understands to be a statement by the Colberts that they have comprehensively cancelled all complaints in their names.

PECO would also like to briefly clarify the various docket numbers that have been assigned to the Colberts’ complaints over time.

On November 29, 2015, the Colberts filed a formal complaint in the names of Nancy and Jim Colbert. The Commission assigned docket number C-2015-2515607 to the 2015 Complaint and assigned the caption “*Nancy and Jim Colbert v PECO Energy Company.*” (A copy of the

2015 Complaint is attached as Attachment A.) The 2015 Complaint was dismissed, and the docket was marked closed, by Commission Opinion and Order entered on June 30, 2016.

PECO has reviewed the online docket entries for the 2015 Complaint. Every document served by the Commission or filed by PECO used the caption "*Nancy and Jim Colbert v PECO Energy Company.*" The Colberts made several filings in the 2015 Complaint docket, and in those filings used no caption at all. There have been no entries in the 2015 Complaint docket since the June 30, 2016 Opinion and Order.

The record therefore does not support a conclusion that, in December 2018, the Commission altered the caption of the 2015 Complaint.

On August 5, 2016 (that is, a few days after the 2015 Complaint was dismissed), a formal complaint was filed in the name of Nancy Colbert and signed solely by Nancy Colbert. The Commission assigned docket number C-2016-2561993 to the 2016 Complaint and assigned the caption "*Nancy Colbert v PECO Energy Company.*" (A copy of the 2016 Complaint is attached as Attachment B.) The 2016 Complaint docket remains open and is the subject of PECO's pending Motion to Dismiss.

PECO has reviewed the online docket entries for the 2016 Complaint. Through October 2018, every document served by the Commission or filed by PECO used the caption "*Nancy Colbert v PECO Energy Company.*" The Colberts made one filing other than the Complaint during this period; it used no caption at all but was signed solely by Nancy Colbert. On October 26, 2018, the Colberts filed a letter with the Commission (*ex parte*) which did not use a caption, but which was signed by both Nancy Colbert and James Colbert. On November 1, 2018, the Commission issued a Secretarial Letter to cure the October 26, 2018 *ex parte* letter filing; in that Secretarial Letter, the Commission adopted the caption "*Nancy and James Colbert v PECO Energy Company.*" On November 5, 2018, the Colberts filed a letter with the Commission, signed by both Nancy Colbert and James Colbert, in which they stated (paragraph 1) that: "The puc is trying to create a Nancy Colbert v Peco hearing when the formal complaint is under Nancy and James Colbert v PECO, albeit acknowledged in PUC response to our October 26 letter." The November 5 letter was signed by both Nancy Colbert and James Colbert. Since that time, the Commission has sometimes used the caption "*Nancy Colbert*" and has sometimes used the caption "*Nancy and James Colbert;*" PECO has uniformly used the caption "*Nancy and James Colbert.*"

The record therefore supports a conclusion that in November (not December) 2018 the Commission and PECO began routinely, but not uniformly, to use the caption "*Nancy and James Colbert*" and that this caption change was made at the Colberts' request after Mr. James Colbert began to co-sign pleadings in this matter. The caption change thus does not reflect anything "bogus" or "hidden" or "twisted."

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary

Page 3

In any event, the Colberts have made it clear that they have “cancelled” all of their pending complaints and will not prosecute this matter via evidentiary hearing¹ or other Commission process.

Very truly yours,



Ward L. Smith
Counsel for PECO Energy Company

WS/adz
Enclosures

c: Honorable Darlene D. Heep, ALJ
Certificate of Service

¹ By January 31, 2019 Cancellation Notice, the Commission has cancelled the scheduled February 12-13, 2019 evidentiary hearing.

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Nancy and James Colbert :
 :
 v. : Docket No. C-2016-2561993
 :
 :
 PECO Energy Company :

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Ward L. Smith hereby certify that on February 7, 2019, I served a copy of PECO Energy Company's *Letter*, upon all interested parties via overnight delivery to:

Nancy Colbert
142 Pennsylvania Avenue
Phoenixville, PA 19460

Dated: February 7, 2019



Ward L. Smith
Counsel for PECO Energy Company
2301 Market Street, S23-1
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Phone: (215) 841-6863
Fax: 215.568.3389
Ward.Smith@exeloncorp.com

Attachment A

Formal Complaint

Nancy and Jim Colbert v PECO Energy Company

C-2015-2515607

Botak, Amy:(PECO)

From: eServe@pa.gov
Sent: Tuesday, December 01, 2015 12:01 PM
To: Lee, Shawane L.:(PECO)
Cc: Botak, Amy:(PECO)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] PA PUC eServe Notice
Importance: High

Dear Shawane L Lee,

A(n) **Formal Complaint** has been served in this proceeding. This document is docketed as **C-2015-2515607**.
You may view this document at

Formal Complaint

You are receiving this email because you are a(n) **Respondent** for this case and have agreed to be served electronically. By selecting electronic service (eService), you have agreed that this notification constitutes valid service. Electronic service of any and all documents will be in place of paper service.

Thank You,
Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

** Please do not respond to this automatically generated email.*

PVC

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Formal Complaint

Filing this form begins a legal proceeding and you will be a party to the case. If you do not wish to be a party to the case, consider filing an informal complaint.

To complete this form, please type or print legibly in ink.

1. Customer (Complainant) Information

Provide your name, mailing address, county, telephone number(s), e-mail address and utility account number. It is your responsibility to update the Commission with any changes to your address and to where you want documents mailed to you.

Name Nancy + Jim Colbert

Street/P.O. Box 142 Pennsylvania Ave Apt # _____

City Phoenixville State PA Zip 19460

County Chester

Telephone Number(s) Where We Can Contact You During the Day:

(610) 917 1116 (home) () (mobile)

E-mail Address (optional): _____

Utility Account Number (from your bill) 35558-00208

If your complaint involves utility service provided to a different address or in a different name than your mailing address, please list this information below.

Name _____

Street/P.O. Box _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

2. Name of Utility or Company (Respondent)

Provide the full name of the utility or company about which you are complaining. The name of your utility or company is on your bill.

PECO

RECEIVED

NOV 23 2015

3. Type of Utility Service

Check the box listing the type of utility service that is the subject of your complaint (check only one):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ELECTRIC | <input type="checkbox"/> WASTEWATER/SEWER |
| <input type="checkbox"/> GAS | <input type="checkbox"/> TELEPHONE/TELECOMMUNICATIONS (local, long distance) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WATER (local) | <input type="checkbox"/> MOTOR CARRIER (e.g. taxi, moving company, limousine) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> STEAM HEAT | |

4. Reason for Complaint

What kind of problem are you having with the utility or company? Check all boxes below that apply and state the reason for your complaint. Explain specifically what you believe the utility or company has done wrong. Provide relevant details including dates, times and places and any other information that may be important. If the complaint is about billing, tell us the amount you believe is not correct. Use additional paper if you need more space. Your complaint may be dismissed without a hearing if you do not provide specific information.

The utility is threatening to shut off my service or has already shut off my service.

I PAY ALL BILLS ON TIME!

I would like a payment agreement.

Incorrect charges are on my bill. Provide dates that are important and an explanation about any amounts or charges that you believe are not correct. Attach a copy of the bill(s) in question if you have it/them.

I am having a reliability, safety or quality problem with my utility service. Explain the problem, including dates, times or places and any other relevant details that may be important.

see attached letter

Other (explain).

Note: If your complaint is only about removing or modifying a municipal lien filed by the City of Philadelphia, the Public Utility Commission (PUC) cannot address it. Only local courts in Philadelphia County can address this type of complaint. The PUC can address a complaint about service or incorrect billing even if that amount is subject to a lien.

In addition, the PUC generally does not handle complaints about cell phone or Internet service, but may be able to resolve a dispute regarding voice communications over the Internet (including the inability to make voice 911/E911 emergency calls) or concerns about high-speed access to Internet service.

5. Requested Relief

STOP CORRUPTION

How do you want your complaint to be resolved? Explain what you want the PUC to order the utility or company to do. Use additional paper if you need more space.

S.T.O.P. pressuring me to put a smart meter on my house. They are ^{hazardous} dangerous, they do not save residential customers any money. See letter for all the evidence.

S.T.O.P. profitting by violating the U.S. + PA Constitutions

GUARANTEE in writing PECO/PUC WILL TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR ALL DAMAGES INCURRED FROM METER FIRE, RADIATION POISONING, IDENTITY THEFT, BANKRUPTING THE TAXPAYER

Note: The PUC can decide that a customer was not billed correctly and can order billing refunds. The PUC can also fine a utility or company for not following rules and can order a utility or company to correct a problem with your service. Under state law, the PUC cannot decide whether a utility or company should pay customers for loss or damages. Damage claims may be sought in an appropriate civil court.

S.T.O.P. preventing ^{reform} legislation - Coatsworth

S.T.O.P. unpromulgated regulation in the first place

6. **Protection From Abuse (PFA)**

Has a court granted a "Protection From Abuse" order that is currently in effect for your personal safety or welfare? The PUC needs this information to properly process your complaint so that your identity is not made public.

Note: You must answer this question if your complaint is against a natural gas distribution utility, an electric distribution utility or a water distribution utility AND your complaint is about a problem involving billing, a request to receive service, a security deposit request, termination of service or a request for a payment agreement.

Has a court granted a "Protection From Abuse" order for your personal safety or welfare?

YES

NO

If your answer to the above question is "yes," attach a copy of the current Protection From Abuse order to this Formal Complaint form.

7. **Prior Utility Contact**

a. Is this an appeal from a decision of the PUC's Bureau of Consumer Services (BCS)?

YES

NO

Note: If you answered yes, move to Section 8. No further contact with the utility or company is required. If you answered no, answer the question in Section 7 b. and answer the question in Section 7 c. if relevant.

b. If this is not an appeal from a BCS decision, have you spoken to a utility or company representative about this complaint?

YES

NO

Note: You must contact the utility first if (1) you are a residential customer, (2) your complaint is against a natural gas distribution utility, an electric distribution utility or a water utility AND (3) your complaint is about a billing problem, a service problem, a termination of service problem, or a request for a payment agreement.

SILLY ME - I FORGOT THE ONLY "LAW" THAT MATTERS NOW IS DICTATORIAL REGULATION

Dear Shawane Lee, Esq.:

November 21, 2015

I am in possession of a threatening shut off notice today for not providing access to a PECO meter on private property. Of course, I realize what an intimidation tactic this is for several reasons.

1. I am a timely paying customer under the contract established back in 2003 when this account began. This contract has been honored by both parties until now, meter fully working.
2. Now PECO is forcing a change of contract by installing a NON-saving (energy/money), radiation emitting, cheap-plastic-parts-therefore- fire-risking, identity theft- prone, SURVEILLANCE device without customer consent -a violation of the contract and of US & PA Constitutional Laws.
3. Therefore, PECO does not have lawful access to install a "smart" meter.
4. Worse, ACT 129 "mandate" is unpromulgated regulation, not legitimate law by elected officials.
5. Therefore, PECO's threat is unlawful.

IF PECO decides to operate lawfully, it has two options going forward:

1. PECO CAN LEAVE THE CURRENT METER ALONE. CONTRACT REMAINS IN FORCE UNLESS CUSTOMER FAILS TO PAY FOR ELECTRICITY USEAGE EACH MONTH BY DUE DATE.
2. PECO CAN HAVE ACCESS TO PROPERTY ONLY TO TAKE ITS METER OFF CUSTOMER'S PROPERTY. A certified electrician will be present immediately to replace it with a General Electric analog meter purchased with customer's own funds. A PECO METER is not needed. Customer agrees to new contract with GE meter only and timely payments for electricity useage. Analog function in the "new" system, just ask any customer in other states who are allowed by law to keep them without threat of being cut off.

EVEN IF PECO WERE TO HAVE A VALID "SMART" CONTRACT, THEN IT WOULD HAVE TO INFORM CUSTOMERS OF THE RISK OF DAMAGE FROM "smart" METERS, just like a pharmaceutical drug advertisement does with all its warnings of damaging side effects. Acting forcefully, PECO should GUARANTEE IN WRITING THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR ALL REAL AND POTENTIAL DAMAGES INCURRED :

- Loss of privacy from BIG DATA NSA surveillance for profiteering against the customer
- Radiation poisoning (multiple sources from real medical science)
- Identity theft (hacking is all too easy, just ask a former CIA director)
- Meter /house fire damage to property value (insurance will not cover)
- Threat of Bankruptcy from skyrocketing electric bills with hidden taxes (fees)

I am not a fool to risk my health, safety, security and finances so that a few privileged at the top can make all the money at customer/taxpayer expense. ALL THESE REALITIES HAVE BEEN REVEALED by alternative media, honest professionals and whistleblowers from what is left of our civilized society since the degree of damage is apocalyptic and many people have died unjustly. Lastly, A FORMAL COMPLAINT HAS BEEN FILED (assuming it will be handled lawfully) AND CUSTOMER FALLS UNDER THE 250% POVERTY LINE TO PREVENT WINTER SHUT OFF.

Most seriously and lawfully-abiding,

Nancy Colbert

WELCOME TO SLAVERY OF

THE NEW WORLD ORDER

PATRICK WOODS'S "TECHNOCRACY RISING: THE TROJAN HORSE OF GLOBAL REFORMATION"

TWO LIBRARY BOOKS BY JOAN WHITEHEAD
 "A GOVERNMENT OF WOLVES: THE EMERGING AMERICAN POLICE STATE"
 "BATTLEFIELD AMERICA: THE WAR ON THE AMERICAN PEOPLE"

DO WHAT YOU'RE TOLD, SHUT UP!
 IF YOU DON'T LEARN OF IT

c. If you tried to speak to a utility company representative about your complaint but were not able to do so, please explain why.

You know why. Or it is explained in attached letter.

Note: Even if you are not required to contact the utility or company, you should always try to speak to a utility or company representative about your problem before you file a Formal Complaint with the PUC.

8. Legal Representation

If you are filing a Formal Complaint as an individual on your own behalf, you are not required to have a lawyer. You may represent yourself at the hearing.

If you are already represented by a lawyer in this matter, provide your lawyer's name, address, telephone number, and e-mail address, if known. Please make sure your lawyer is aware of your complaint. If represented by a lawyer, both you and your lawyer must be present at your hearing.

Lawyer's Name _____

Street/P.O. Box _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Area Code/Phone Number _____

E-mail Address (if known) _____

Note: Corporations, associations, partnerships, limited liability companies and political subdivisions are required to have a lawyer represent them at a hearing and to file any motions, answers, briefs or other legal pleadings.

Monthly Electric Bills

Account Number 35558-00208

Ten Years by Month	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Monthly Average	2005- 2014 Average
Jan	96.66	98.21	90.45	62.47	69.34	65.66	64.41	72.13	64.54	74.41	71.58	75.44	182
Feb	79.76	77.03	72.38	64.94	57.97	76.65	67.25	48.43	54.87	69.55	58.86	66.15	364
Mar	90.02	62.62	76.38	76.98	47.72	70.39	61.06	45.4	49.09	65.28	59.52	64.04	182
Apr	101.34	80.1	88.52	57.31	61.53	57.59	87.09	67.06	54.13	91.76	64.97	73.76	364
May	72.21	84.86	77.27	49.98	60.34	43.57	76.41	59.84	47.49	97.08	59.07	66.19	273
Jun	82.03	73.11	84.1	41.45	76.53	60.19	61.3	57.65	64.98	58.53	75.76	66.87	545
Jul	65.07	81.79	78.45	76.38	45.49	66.44	88.1	54.3	70.86	61.9	68.24	68.82	
Aug	70.89	84.65	65.87	57.45	61.5	63.54	69.26	63.08	60.88	53.28	55.95	64.21	364
Sept	82.18	80.65	87.64	72.27	55.43	56.54	88.25	71.57	49.69	58.8	55.9	68.99	273
Oct	65.46	82.19	81.86	49.83	54.08	56.38	93.19	56.82	52.15	50.8	54.58	63.39	455
Nov	64.17	95.9	67.94	46.6	64.92	50	75.24	56.5	63.11	45.66		68.04	
Dec	78.33	85.27	58.46	64.94	73.97	60.69	81.57	51.87	66.22	62.53		68.385	
Annual total	948.12	986.38	929.32	720.6	728.82	727.64	913.13	704.65	698.01	789.58			814.625

November 18, 2015

Dear Ms Eison,

I am in receipt of your letter in which you inform me PECO wants to save customers energy and money. Thank you so much for "customer care" you manage. In fact, there are many facts for care.

First of all, enclosed please see the Excel spreadsheet of my account for over 10 years monthly bills. I am well aware of my family's energy usage and ensure excellent stewardship of this resource in our household. That is, my spouse and I were raised by our parents to be "green" WAY BEFORE (early 1960's) that word became so overused. *"Money doesn't grow on trees. Shut the light off when you leave the room," were some of the repeated cliches and warnings we received and so naturally passed them onto the next generation, our children. We use electricity as sparingly as possible as with all other resources; we have limited electrical appliances. PECO will not be able to help with energy and money saving with "smart" meter technology. We are "smart" ourselves in our own little house, "to make informed decisions ...and identify opportunities..."*

SECONDLY, HERE ARE THE MOST RECENT FACTS REACHING MORE OF THE PUBLIC:

1. Eversource Energy, (a NH utility company) in September 2015, submitted these key points to the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission:

"Eversource does not believe smart meters and/or AMI are key enabling investments for the future of the modernized grid. As demonstrated by Eversource's plan in Massachusetts, there are many more cost effective technologies that can help meet the grid modernization objectives that Eversource considers to be key in any modernization program."

"Key Operational Benefits from an AMI Deployment are Insufficient. Eversource's analysis also indicates that the incremental operational benefits of moving to an AMI platform are insufficient to warrant the increased cost."

Smart Meters Not Cost Effective

"In addition to the legal and logistical issues related to the deployment of Advanced Metering Infrastructure ('AMI') in New Hampshire, Eversource believes that a broad-based deployment, or a multi-stage roll-out, of smart meters or AMI is not cost-effective for New Hampshire customers. In its recently submitted grid modernization plan in Massachusetts, Eversource conducted a careful analysis of the costs and benefits of a broad deployment of AMI and found such deployment to be highly cost ineffective.

On the cost side, AMI deployments experience a set of high fixed upfront costs beyond the smart meters themselves.

2. The only savers are the big businesses! As K.T. Weaver, SkyVision Solutions summarized, "the vast majority of residential customers do not have sufficient load available to shift to off-peak periods to benefit from time-of-use rates. This is different from large commercial customers which typically have industrial equipment-type loads and which can likely significantly alter work and product line schedules to take advantage of time varying rates. For those residential customers who want time varying rates, let them take advantage of so-called smart metering as outlined by the Energy Policy Act of 2005 on an opt-in basis. There is no need (or net benefit) for smart meters being provided to anyone else.

3. Many US Attorney Generals, including Ontario CANADA and Australia's and more have stated "there are no cost savings." Not surprisingly, ONLY the third party distributors of all the usage data they collect are making BIG profits at public expense -- all in the name of surveillance, spitting upon Amendment IV of the United States Constitution. confirmed by former NSA senior executive Thomas Drake who blew the whistle (see 54:08 point in video)

Therefore, such installations, without owner consent, are and shall be violations of the U.S. Constitution BOR 4th Amendment; the U.S. Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 119 Sec. 2511 (**wiretapping**), and U.S.C. Title 18, Sec. 351(e) (**assault**) and numerous other laws and protections, i.e., for **criminal trespass, stalking, battery, public endangerment, pollution, damage to property values – and most notably – when smart meters explode and catch on fire.**

4. Reports from all over the country and world notify that residential electric bills have SKYROCKETED despite the same usage. Several years ago, Stanford University students were able to PROVE that their household had been erroneously charged. They are just one of too many examples which would be too long to list here. But more dramatically in the more recent news, hundreds of Edenorte customers in the Dominican Republic removed so-called 'smart' meters from their homes and businesses and angrily returned them once their bills skyrocketed despite reducing their usage. See "Dominican Republic Smart Meters".

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VXGII6FVzts&list=PLrAx2F4evwzofyH5Fh5F6UZ6V_16MK1fk

There is ample evidence, more facts, determining several other critical reasons why this grid program, which is set to end in 2030, is harming not only the public finances, but also **public health and national security and safety**. I am sure as a Customer Care Manager you are aware of so many of the experts and honest scientific researchers who have spoken out. Here is JUST a sampling:

ON PUBLIC HEALTH

Dr Barrie Trower, a former Royal Navy microwave weapons expert and former cold-war captured spy debriefer for the UK Intelligence Services

Institute for Geopathology SA <http://geopathology-za.wikidot.com/barrie-trower>

Dr David Carpenter, Harvard Medical School and founder of the University of Albany School of Public Health, NY. Dr Carpenter author of 220 publications confirms:

Adverse health effects from electromagnetic radiation begin at 0.05 units. Smart meters emit 7.93 units per cm squared one foot away, split into 10,000-190,000 pulses, each at 4.5 millisecond in duration every few seconds, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks in the year—with no let up!

HERE YE! HERE YE! – THIS JUST IN:

**Former CPUC President Loretta Lynch—Flanked by Physicians and Researchers—
Delivers Searing Indictment of Smart Meters and EMF Risks at Mountain View
Wireless Summit**

On Saturday October 10th, the Wireless Technology and Public Health Summit was held in the heart of Silicon Valley at the Mountain View Center for the Performing Arts. The event was sponsored by the Santa Clara Medical Association Alliance Foundation. Doctors, researchers, and public policy experts in the field of wireless health impacts joined together for the first time in the heart of Silicon Valley and declared that there is more than enough evidence to reign in wireless technology, particularly in schools and other locations where sensitive populations spend time.

**Loretta Lynch, Former President of the California Public Utilities Commission, and one of
California's most influential Attorneys**

- The science is clear: EMP's affect health, particularly the most vulnerable among us.
- Those living within 150 feet of power lines are at increased risk of serious disease
- Utilities and telecommunications companies know these facts but obtain "obscenely obsessive profits" from this technology and are in a "desperate scramble" to set regulations in stone before public awareness increases and reforms are widely demanded.
- Health and environmental costs from wireless tech are "externalized" to society at large
- At this point, we are lucky if regulators are ignorant about this issue. More often they are co-opted and corrupted.
- "Smart grid" and "smart meters" are a "lucrative boondoggle" approved by the CPUC.
- CPUC says "pay me and I'll give you what you want" in secret backroom deals- a classic case of corruption and bribery, revealed in e-mails.
- CPUC has become a "rogue agency" essentially controlled by corporations (which is what we have also been saying for five years!)
- This has made a mockery of due process, and Michael Peevey, former CPUC President, has acted as if the CPUC were his own personal playground.
- CPUC has allowed utilities to cut corners, skip safety regulations, etc.
- A parade of former CPUC Commissioners now work for the utilities- the so-called "revolving door."
- The smart meter roll out was plagued with problems, and the only way regulators approved it was that they have "drunk the kool-aid."
- The \$2.2 billion+ cost of smart meters and the smart grid came about because of a secret deal between Peevey and the utilities, and the costs have been borne by ratepayers.
- Analog meters are "simple, accurate, and reliable." There was no need to change them out. The only reason they were replaced with smart meters is that the utilities were not profiting off them any longer- they had "fully depreciated."
- Utilities have entered the "big data" game and using and profiting from your private electric usage data. Protecting the privacy of our home has become harder and harder.
- She is optimistic even though she has "seen the sausage made" because the science is so strong. She sees a change in public policy coming within 5 years, and urges us to educate the legislature, as you never know when you will find an intrigued official (though most are corrupt).
- We need to continue educating the media about the facts (i.e. the John Oliver Tom Wheeler "dingo" segment really raised awareness)

NOW BACK TO THE LETTER:

Dr Frank Springob reports: One foot away from SMs for two minutes of exposure causes red blood cells to become abnormal and broken.

People with SMs on their homes have inflammatory markers in their blood – TGF Beta 1, MMP-9, and copper, which increase, while neurotransmitters and hormone levels become abnormal, as discussed by Dietrich Klinghardt, MD, PhD.

"The smart meter is number one in terms of devastation to our nervous system. It permanently destroys and alters the manufacture of brain proteins ... meaning that it completely changes the human organism - permanently."

Dr Dietrich Klinghardt MD PhD

Over 6,000 scientific studies have been conducted since the 1930s, which document adverse human health effects from microwaves and radiofrequency non-ionizing radiation, including the 1972 U.S. Navy report, **Bibliography of Reported Biological Phenomena ('Effects') and Clinical Manifestations Attributed to Microwave and Radio-frequency Radiation.**

The list could continue onto more and more pages, but you get the point easily. In summary, "smart" meters have caused health problems throughout the US. In May 2011, the **World Health Organization** determined that radiofrequency electromagnetic fields emitted from wireless devices are a class 2B possible **human carcinogen**, in the same class as lead, DDT, and chloroform. **The American Academy of Environmental Medicine opposes** the installation of wireless smart meters based on the current medical literature. Every day that the public, not to mention Nature in our "green" world consciousness, is exposed to all the radiation emitting from this technology, including all the other telecommunications apparatus, its health is paying the price.

Ottawa Environmental Health Clinic <http://www.oehc.ca/environmental-illnesses/emf.html>

"I have no doubt in my mind that at the present time the greatest polluting element in the earth's environment is the proliferation of electromagnetic fields. I consider that to be far greater on a global scale, than warming, and the increase in chemical elements in the environment."

Dr Robert O. Becker, M. D., Orthopaedic Surgeon twice nominated for a Nobel Prize

LOOK AT THIS 3.5 MINUTE VIDEO "STRATFORD SMART METER KILLING SHRUB" DOCUMENTING THE EFFECT SINCE 2012 OF A SMART METER **CONTINUALLY EMITTING** RADIATION AS MEASURED BY A SCIENTIFIC INSTRUMENT TO SEE WHAT IS HAPPENING IN OUR ENVIRONMENT, INCLUDING FROM ALL THE OTHER SOURCES OF RADIATION. THIS IS **NOT** SUSTAINABILITY:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IsuP_WB8r2c&list=PLgAx2F4evwzofyH5Fh5F6UZ6V_I6MK1fk&index=4

ON NATIONAL SECURITY AND SAFETY

Every day that this vulnerable grid entrenches, hackers are waiting with glee, confirmed by **James Woolsey, former CIA Director.** From other technical expert sources I have learned:

Smart meters can be hacked and will be hacked. The small CPU in these meters cannot protect itself as good as a home PC can, and home PCs are well known for being compromised. By deploying these in the millions with the same exact software and hardware they become a huge target and will endanger the community if an attacker can switch the power on and off from remote in mass. This makes these Smart Meters dangerous and a liability to the ratepayers

Furthermore, the public is learning:

EXPOSE IN THE MAKING OF ACT 129 HEARINGS (more facts substantiated):

Here's a brief, but clear account, of the history of PA House Bill 2200 as it worked its way into becoming Act 129 of 2008.

February 11, 2008 House Journal pp. 386-403

PN 3218, p. 388

PA State Rep. Mr. Freeman addresses the Speaker:

Mr. Speaker, this amendment would require that all public utilities, electric utilities, install smart meters for residential and business customers across the Commonwealth. [...] by allowing the customer to be able to opt in – and it is optional – in to a purchasing process where they could purchase their electricity at off-peak hours, thereby saving on cost.

PN 3218, p.390

PA State Rep. Mr. Hutchinson addresses the Speaker:

Mr. Speaker, [...] The consumers of Pennsylvania are about to experience an increase in the electricity costs over the next couple of years because rate caps will be phasing out in various areas over the next 2 or 3 years, and with that, consumers are going to see their electric rated increased. [...], they will be mandated to pay for these new meters to be installed in their home whether they save on their electric costs or not.

It only makes sense to say smart meters should go to consumers who can save money by installing them. Those who can save by having a smart meter, it would make sense for them to have smart meters in their home. Mandating it across the board mandates that everybody pays whether they save or not, and that just does not make sense.

I am very concerned that we continue to ignore the consumers by making more mandates and increasing their costs, whether it is through mandating meters, through trying to have some kind of a surcharge, all these things at a time when their electric costs are going up anyways.

So although on a case-by-case basis, smart meters might be a good thing to do, making a 100-percent mandate does not make sense. So I am opposing this amendment.

PA State Rep. Mr. Godshall states:

In this case are we not taking the choice away from the consumer by saying you have to put this in service in your district rather than you may or you have a choice? Are we not saying that you must do it? *We are taking that choice away from the consumer, I believe, and I would have no problem with this if we do it on a choice basis, as you used the word "choice" before. We are taking that choice away.*

PN3218, p.391

PA State Rep. Mr. Freeman

Well, I would only point out, Mr. Speaker, that *we are requiring the utility company to install the meter*, not the customer, and it is the utility company.

PA State Rep. Mr. Godshall

[...] What I am not in full agreement on in any way is that everyone is mandated to, whether they intend to use it or not, whether they know how to use it or not, everyone is mandated, under this legislation, to go ahead with the smart meter technology.

[...], but then if there was a question at the bottom that says you are going to be paying \$300 for the installation through your utility bill for this meter and the software that goes with it, I am not sure what the answer would be.

PN3218, p.393

The Speaker says, The Chair recognizes the minority leader, Representative Smith, who says.

If we really want to encourage people to use it, I think we ought to allow them to engage it themselves as opposed to forcing them to pay for something they may not use, and that is really the difference, Mr. Speaker, in what I think is right or wrong with the amendment. While I certainly appreciate the direction it is trying to go, *I think the fact that it forces the cost of the meters onto every consumer of electricity in Pennsylvania, I think that is the wrong direction to go and would ask for a vote against the amendment.*

PA State Rep. Mr. Saylor says,

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear to everybody, this is a mandate. *This is not voluntary*; it is a mandate required to use smart meters in Pennsylvania. [...], the choice is up to the consumer to use that technology and whether they want that smart meter installed on their house. *The key is, should we in the General Assembly mandate something on consumers that is going to cost them more dollars in their electric bill?*

This issue in particular should be a choice by consumers, not a mandate by the General Assembly onto an additional cost to electric bills in Pennsylvania. So remember, voting for this amendment, while I think it has great goals and where the gentleman wants to get to is very admirable and where we need to get to at some point in time, *it still needs to be a consumer choice, not a General Assembly mandate onto consumers that is going to cost them more in their electric bills.*

PN3218, p.395

PA State Rep. Mr. Benninghoff

I guess my reservation, obviously, is do we want a statewide mandate? Do we want the government telling you that you have to have a meter put in your property? [...] I think it is important that we are smart about our energy use, but I also think we have to think about what government's role is in mandating such a thing.

PN3218, p.397

PA State Rep. Mr. Gabig

The problem I am having with the amendment is [...] But if they start saying, well, for the smart legislator you are going to pay five times more money and for the dumb legislator you are going to pay five times less money, for the smart card you are going to pay five times more money and for the dumb card you are going to pay five times less money, for the smart meter you are going to pay we do not know how much more money because we will not tell you, but it is not going to be the utilities that pay for it because we took care of them in our amendment; they are taken care of in this Freeman amendment. The big utility companies and corporations, they are all right with it; they support this, but the customer, well, you are going to pay the freight for this mandate, this State mandate.

February 12, 2008 House Journal, pp. 430-432

PN3233 Pg. 431

PA State Rep. Mr. Hutchinson

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to passage of HB2200, and let me tell you why. I believe in its original unamended form, before it came to the House floor, there were a lot of redeeming qualities in the bill. It did promote conversation, and that is a laudable goal for Pennsylvania, to try to conserve energy.

However, by the amendments passed yesterday, which mandated universal smart meters across Pennsylvania, that is a fatal flaw that makes this bill a bad idea for Pennsylvania. It is bad for the consumers of Pennsylvania who will have to pay for those smart meters, whether they save on their electric bills or not. It makes no sense whatsoever to force people to pay for those smart meters and then, in addition, still pay higher and higher utility bills. It was said yesterday that if only 1 percent of the people used smart meters, we would have huge savings in energy use in Pennsylvania, and, Mr. Speaker, I agree with that statement. But my idea is, let us get the smart meters only to those 1 percent of the people and get this same savings in energy use. That is the smart way to move forward to promote energy conservation, to use technology like smart meters in a targeted and commonsense way instead of a mandated, across-the-board consumer tax – that is what it is, a couple hundred dollars per person – that will have to be paid to pay for these smart meters. So after adding that fatal flaw to this bill, I think it is incumbent upon everyone in this chamber to vote against HB2200, and I ask them to join me in that vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

October 8, 2008 Senate Journal, pp. 2626-2631

PA State Senator Mr. Tomlinson (p.2626)

Mr. President, I rise to ask for support for House Bill No. 2200 as amended by the Senate. [...] It also contains language in there that we will have smart meters. It is not mandated, but it allows for the deployment of smart meters through a depreciation process, through new home construction process, and through the depreciation of 15 years, and for anyone who wants to purchase a smart meter which they feel will help them manage their electric load better.

Question: So, why are PECO and other utility companies sending out shut off notices to customers who don't want them and don't have to have them in accordance with the above statement by State Senator Tomlinson? Apparently, utility companies are not abiding by the law, or its proper interpretation as written, as these discussions of the bill and amendments document.

PA State Senator Mr. Boscola

So-called smart meters by themselves are not magically – anyone's monthly electric bill is not going to go down just because you are getting a smart meter. That will not happen. [...] We also made sure that smart meters would not be mandated for every single ratepayer. Not only is that a smarter approach to smart meter deployment, but it will also save electric customers hundreds of millions of dollars paying for something that will not provide a real benefit in their own households.

Question: If Pennsylvania State Senators feel they passed a bill that would not mandate smart meters for every single ratepayer, how come PECO and other utility companies can break the law and shut off electric power to fully-paid customers?

PA State Senator Mr. Fumo

In addition, we did not mandate smart meters, but we made them optional. We did say in new construction, where they really are practical, they will be put in.

The Senate approved-bill goes back to the Pennsylvania House. The discussion does not mention anything about whether the meters are mandated or not.

Furthermore, to reiterate what Pennsylvania state legislators said:

Representative Saylor: "...it still needs to be a consumer choice, not a General Assembly mandate onto consumers that is going to cost them more in their electric bills."

Representative Benninghoff: "I think it is important that we are smart about our energy use, but I also think we have to think about what government's role is in mandating such a thing."

Representative Gabig: "...but it is not going to be the utilities that pay for it because we took care of them in our amendment; they are taken care of in this Freeman amendment. The big utility companies and corporations, they are all right with it; they support this, but the customer, well, you are going to pay the freight for this mandate, this State mandate."

Senator Tomlinson: "It also contains language in there that we will have smart meters. It is not mandated, but allows for the deployment of smart meters through a depreciation process, through new home construction process, and through the depreciation of 15 years, and for anyone who wants to purchase a smart meter which they feel will help them manage their electric load better."

Senator Boscola: "We also made sure that smart meters would not be mandated for every single ratepayer."

Senator Fumo: "In addition, we did not mandate smart meters, but we made them optional."

Ms Eisen, it appeared that PECO had a measure of "customer care" in mind with the following *excerpts from a petition by the Metropolitan Edison Company, the Pennsylvania Electric Company, the Pennsylvania Power Company and the West Penn Power Company ("EDCs"), written by Attorney Kathy Kolich, Senior Corporate Counsel at FirstEnergy, in August 2012, representing the EDCs to the Secretary of the PA PUC:*

Part III Section a, p. 3: *The PUC did not adhere to the formalities required to adopt a "regulation" and as a consequence the August 3 Implementation Order does not have the "force of law" that attends a regulation.If orders are so interpreted, then they are illegal because they are in the nature of unpromulgated regulations. ***Part III Section a, p. 4:*** ...the PUC has acknowledged in the past, Implementation Orders (IO) do not create "binding norms" that have the force of law. Therefore, as a policy statement, the August 3 IO cannot establish binding penalties on Electric Distributor Companies pursuant to 66 Pa. C.S. 3301(a). And second, the PUC as a creature of statute, is only authorized to act within the scope of its duties as established by the Pennsylvania legislature. Nowhere in Act 129 did the Pennsylvania legislature establish penalties should an Electric Distributor Company fail to achieve specific customer segment carve out requirements.*

p. 5 *"In sum, the Companies respectfully ask the Commission to clarify that its August 3 IO is deemed by the Commission to be a policy statement with which the Companies should strive to comply, rather than an order that creates binding norms and has the force of law. If the Commission deems it the latter, then the Commission has erred (i) by failing to follow the procedural guidelines established either to develop regulation or to properly adjudicate the issue, thus violating the Companies' due process rights; an (ii) by creating penalties sua sponte when no such penalties were established in Act 129 and no enabling statute was created under which the Commission was so authorized to act.*

On page 6 and onto p. 7, the lawyer continues that EDCs need more time to determine the "potential participants" [my insertion: NOTICE NOT "MANDATORY" PARTICIPANTS] among other things in order to comply with the Energy Efficiency benchmarks. Instead, the required timing to meet those EE goals put them in a no-win situation, that is, "left with no choice but to file a petition in order to preserve their rights" of due process.

Unfortunately, money talked more? [PECO] is supported by a \$200 million federal smart-grid grant. Under terms of the stimulus Grant, PECO promised to install 600,000 smart meters by April, 2014." [Source: -Philly.com, 10 October 2012]

And so now everyone's right of due process is denied; US Constitution Amendment 14 gone. Really?

There is pending legislation *PA Smart Meter PA House Bills 396, 393, 394, 395* to opt out as other states provide. Representative Godshall, whom I hear has a body riddled with cancer, heads the committee while his son operates the installation program. As Pasma has reported, "Rep Godshall's previous stalling of Act 129 corrective bills is indicative of his "strong arm" governance tactics, possible collusion with utility lobbyists, and a definite indication that he has not been working to ensure consumer protection, consumers' rights to be informed, or safe in their lives and homes." Currently, there are more than 34 members of the PA State House who are co-sponsors of various Smart Meter revision bills.

But another route is needed anyways as the New Hampshire utility company advises that **the vast majority of residential customers do not have sufficient load available to shift to off-peak periods to benefit from time-of-use rates.** For those residential customers who want time varying rates, let them take advantage of so-called smart metering as outlined by the Energy Policy Act of 2005 on an **opt-in** basis. There is no need (or net benefit) for smart meters being provided to anyone else.

Here are the prime sources:

Docket No. DE 15-296, Electric Distribution Utilities Investigation into Grid Modernization for New Hampshire. Eversource Energy comments, September 17, 2015, available at <https://www.puc.nh.gov/Regulatory/Docketbk/2015/15-296/LETTERS-MEMOS-TARIFFS/15-296%202015-09-17%20EVERSOURCE%20COMMENT.PDF>

"New Hampshire utilities grapple with confusion over 'grid modernization'"

<http://web.archive.org/web/20150930220638/http://www.intelligentutility.com/article/15/09/new-hampshire-utilities-grapple-confusion-over-grid-modernization>


New Hampshire utilities grapple with confusion over 'grid modernization', *Public Power Daily*, by the American Public Power Association (APPA), at <https://www.publicpower.org/media/daily/ArticleDetail.cfm?ItemNumber=44582>

State of New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission, IR 15-296, Electric Distribution Utilities; Investigation into Grid Modernization, "Order of Notice," July 30, 2015, available at <https://www.puc.nh.gov/Regulatory/Docketbk/2015/15-296/INITIAL%20FILING%20-%20PETITION/15-296%202015-07-30%20ORDER%20OF%20NOTICE.PDF>

Please Ms Eisen, allow for the larger picture emerging with many a red flag all over the scenery, join awakening utility companies, and then finally let PECO put the "care" back in its "Customer Care" Department. In other words, apart from the technical fiasco of these cheap surveillance meters, people's finances and health, and our nation's safety and security are on the line. Do you care not?

With the above stated and referenced, **I have no logical reasoning for any "smart" meter towards an upgraded network.** I am not a fool.

Most seriously,
Nancy Colbert
Account 35558-00208



7014 2120 0000 0629 9124



1000



17120

U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PHOENIXVILLE, PA
19400
NOV 23 15
AMOUNT
\$7.89
R2304M115056-10

first class

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
PA Public Utility Commission
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA

first class

17120

Attachment B

Formal Complaint

Nancy Colbert v PECO Energy Company

C-2016-2561993

Botak, Amy:(PECO)

From: eServe@pa.gov
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2016 11:24 AM
To: Lee, Shawane L.:(PECO)
Cc: Botak, Amy:(PECO)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] PA PUC eServe Notice

Importance: High

Dear Shawane L Lee,

A(n) **Formal Complaint** has been served in this proceeding. This document is docketed as **C-2016-2561993**. You may view this document at **Colbert Formal Complaint**

You are receiving this email because you are a(n) **Respondent** for this case and have agreed to be served electronically. By selecting electronic service (eService), you have agreed that this notification constitutes valid service. Electronic service of any and all documents will be in place of paper service.

Thank You,
Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

** Please do not respond to this automatically generated email.*

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Formal Complaint

Filing this form begins a legal proceeding and you will be a party to the case. If you do not wish to be a party to the case, consider filing an informal complaint.

RECEIVED

AUG 08 2016

To complete this form, please type or print legibly in ink.

1. Customer (Complainant) Information

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Provide your name, mailing address, county, telephone number(s), e-mail address and utility account number. It is your responsibility to update the Commission with any changes to your address and to where you want documents mailed to you.

Name NANCY COLBERT

Street/P.O. Box 142 PENNSYLVANIA AVE Apt #

City PHOENIXVILLE State PA Zip 19460

County CHESTER

Telephone Number(s) Where We Can Contact You During the Day:

(610) 917 1116 (home) () (mobile)

E-mail Address (optional): _____

Utility Account Number (from your bill) 35558 - 00208

If your complaint involves utility service provided to a different address or in a different name than your mailing address, please list this information below.

Name _____

Street/P.O. Box _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

2. Name of Utility or Company (Respondent)

Provide the full name of the utility or company about which you are complaining. The name of your utility or company is on your bill.

peco

3. Type of Utility Service

Check the box listing the type of utility service that is the subject of your complaint (check only one):

- ELECTRIC WASTEWATER/SEWER
 GAS TELEPHONE/TELECOMMUNICATIONS (local, long distance)
 WATER MOTOR CARRIER (e.g. taxi, moving company, limousine)
 STEAM HEAT

4. Reason for Complaint

What kind of problem are you having with the utility or company? Check all boxes below that apply and state the reason for your complaint. Explain specifically what you believe the utility or company has done wrong. Provide relevant details including dates, times and places and any other information that may be important. If the complaint is about billing, tell us the amount you believe is not correct. Use additional paper if you need more space. Your complaint may be dismissed without a hearing if you do not provide specific information.

DOCKET C-2015-2515607

- The utility is threatening to shut off my service or has already shut off my service.
- I would like a payment agreement.
- Incorrect charges are on my bill. Provide dates that are important and an explanation about any amounts or charges that you believe are not correct. Attach a copy of the bill(s) in question if you have it/them.
- I am having a reliability, safety or quality problem with my utility service. Explain the problem, including dates, times or places and any other relevant details that may be important.

Other (explain).

CORRUPTION

ALL PARTIES HAVE
ALL DOCUMENTATION
DOCKET No

C-2015-2515607

Note: If your complaint is only about removing or modifying a municipal lien filed by the City of Philadelphia, the Public Utility Commission (PUC) cannot address it. Only local courts in Philadelphia County can address this type of complaint. The PUC can address a complaint about service or incorrect billing even if that amount is subject to a lien.

In addition, the PUC generally does not handle complaints about cell phone or Internet service, but may be able to resolve a dispute regarding voice communications over the Internet (including the inability to make voice 911/E911 emergency calls) or concerns about high-speed access to Internet service.

5. Requested Relief

How do you want your complaint to be resolved? Explain what you want the PUC to order the utility or company to do. Use additional paper if you need more space.

JULY 4, 2016 letter

ATTACHED

6th NOTICE

8 Staples

copied

Note: The PUC can decide that a customer was not billed correctly and can order billing refunds. The PUC can also fine a utility or company for not following rules and can order a utility or company to correct a problem with your service. Under state law, the PUC cannot decide whether a utility or company should pay customers for loss or damages. Damage claims may be sought in an appropriate civil court.

6. **Protection From Abuse (PFA)**

Has a court granted a "Protection From Abuse" order that is currently in effect for your personal safety or welfare? The PUC needs this information to properly process your complaint so that your identity is not made public.

Note: You must answer this question if your complaint is against a natural gas distribution utility, an electric distribution utility or a water distribution utility AND your complaint is about a problem involving billing, a request to receive service, a security deposit request, termination of service or a request for a payment agreement.

Has a court granted a "Protection From Abuse" order for your personal safety or welfare?

YES

NO

If your answer to the above question is "yes," attach a copy of the current Protection From Abuse order to this Formal Complaint form.

7. **Prior Utility Contact**

a. Is this an appeal from a decision of the PUC's Bureau of Consumer Services (BCS)?

YES

NO

Note: If you answered yes, move to Section 8. No further contact with the utility or company is required. If you answered no, answer the question in Section 7 b. and answer the question in Section 7 c. if relevant.

b. If this is not an appeal from a BCS decision, have you spoken to a utility or company representative about this complaint?

YES

NO

Note: You must contact the utility first if (1) you are a residential customer, (2) your complaint is against a natural gas distribution utility, an electric distribution utility or a water utility AND (3) your complaint is about a billing problem, a service problem, a termination of service problem, or a request for a payment agreement.

c. If you tried to speak to a utility company representative about your complaint but were not able to do so, please explain why.

CORRUPTION

Note: Even if you are not required to contact the utility or company, you should always try to speak to a utility or company representative about your problem before you file a Formal Complaint with the PUC.

8. Legal Representation

If you are filing a Formal Complaint as an individual on your own behalf, you are not required to have a lawyer. You may represent yourself at the hearing.

If you are already represented by a lawyer in this matter, provide your lawyer's name, address, telephone number, and e-mail address, if known. Please make sure your lawyer is aware of your complaint. If represented by a lawyer, both you and your lawyer must be present at your hearing.

Lawyer's Name _____

Street/P.O. Box _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Area Code/Phone Number _____

E-mail Address (if known) _____

Note: Corporations, associations, partnerships, limited liability companies and political subdivisions are required to have a lawyer represent them at a hearing and to file any motions, answers, briefs or other legal pleadings.

9. **Verification and Signature**

You must sign your complaint. Individuals filing a Formal Complaint **must** print or type their name on the line provided in the verification paragraph below and **must** sign and date this form in **ink**. If you do not sign the Formal Complaint, the PUC **will not accept it**.

Verification:

I NANCY COLBERT, hereby state that the facts above set forth are true and correct (or are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief) and that I expect to be able to prove the same at a hearing held in this matter. I understand that the statements herein are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa. C.S. § 4904 (relating to unsworn falsification to authorities).



(Signature of Complainant)

8/5/16

(Date)

Title of authorized employee or officer (only applicable to corporations, associations, partnerships, limited liability companies or political subdivisions)

Note: If the Complainant is a corporation, association, partnership, limited liability company or political subdivision, the verification **must** be signed by an authorized officer or authorized employee. If the Formal Complaint is **not signed** by one of these individuals, the PUC **will not accept it**.

10. **Two Ways to File Your Formal Complaint**

Electronically. You must create an account on the PUC's eFiling system, which may be accessed at <http://www.puc.pa.gov/efiling/default.aspx>.

Note: If you are appealing your Bureau of Consumer Services (BCS) decision, you must file your formal complaint by mail.

Mail. Mail the completed form with your original signature and any attachments, by certified mail, first class mail, or overnight delivery to this address:

Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
400 North Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Note: Formal Complaints sent by fax or e-mail will **not** be accepted.

If you have any questions about filling out this form, please contact the Secretary's Bureau at 717-772-7777.

Keep a copy of your Formal Complaint for your records.



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
400 NORTH STREET, HARRISBURG, PA 17120

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO OUR FILE
C-2015-2515607

July 7, 2016

Nancy Colbert
142 Pennsylvania Avenue
Phoenixville, PA 19460

RE: Nancy and Jim Colbert v. PECO Energy Company
Docket No. C-2015-2515607

Dear Mrs. Colbert:

On July 5, 2016, my office received the enclosed document challenging the Commission's June 30, 2016 Opinion and Order in the above-referenced case. I am returning it unfiled because it does not comply with the Commission's Regulations. You may file again, following the instructions below.

By July 15, 2016, you may file a Petition for Reconsideration. After that date, you may file a Petition for Rescission or Amendment. 52 Pa. Code § 5.571(e) and (d). Regardless of which type of petition you file, you should give specific reasons why you believe the Commission's decision is incorrect. It is recommended that you identify each finding of fact or conclusion of law that you dispute, and give supporting reasons why the Commission should change its decision.


In addition, regardless of which type of petition you file, you should:

- include a verification (a form is enclosed);
- mail a copy to the attorney for PECO Energy Company (PECO) at:
Shawane L. Lee
Exelon Business Services
Legal Department, S23-1
2301 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19101
- include a certificate of service proving that a copy of your filing was sent to PECO Energy Company (a form is enclosed).

PECO would then have an opportunity to respond to your filing before the Commission takes any further action in this proceeding.

Should you have any questions, you may contact the Office of Special Assistants, Cheryl Walker Davis, Director. Please direct your inquiry to Jonathan Nase, Deputy Direct - Legal, at (717) 787-3490 or jnase@pa.gov.

Sincerely,


Rosemary Chiavetta
Secretary

Enclosure

JULY 4, 2016 INDEPENDENCE DAY - 242 Years Since Signing MO to Liberty

How tragic and unfortunate this letter has to be written on the birth date of our nation for testimony against the violations of its Constitution and the assault on the Pennsylvania citizen

Rosemary Chiavetta, all commissioners and associated personnel

puc

P.O. Box 326

Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

C-2015-2515607
RE: Docket # **2015-2515607**

RECEIVED

JUL -5 2016

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

As a Formal Complainant receiving an "Opinion and Order" which declares the right to deny all evidence of FACT and to force UNPROMULGATED REGULATION (which also has ~~deliberately~~ been denied legislative reform clamored by the public), this letter exercises the right to an in-person hearing during normal business hours in Philadelphia on Market Street where many events occurred as our Founding Fathers first established the founding principles of the United States of America, beginning with the Declaration of Independence and ending with the Bill of Rights. You will need to provide public testimony with the same manner of treating me despicably just like all the other Complainants dismissed with prejudice which will further testify of your ever-increasing liability. No foolery here, THIS IS AMERICA. And as Jesus Christ said; "If they slap one cheek, offer them the other."

We both know the case cannot be closed until due process has been completed, especially since it has already been delayed on several accounts which you know full well also and has been carefully documented. In any case, a new formal complaint will be considered for commencement with new and continually emerging factual evidence and legal fact included as the public grows increasingly aware.

Furthermore, please be advised this matter is being addressed at a higher level of authority according to the Real Law of Pennsylvania, the United States of America and beyond.

A response to the June 30, 2016 OPINION and ORDER has been sent to the appropriate office about which you may be informed when appropriated by law. Legal action based on Real Law - Real Law does not harm humanity - has already commenced internationally since enough people take offense at being treated abusively like inconsequential waste.

In the meantime, here is a suggestion for your next vacation trip: GO VISIT THE ADAMS NATIONAL PARK IN QUINCY, MA TO LEARN A FEW VITAL HISTORICAL LESSONS THAT LED TO JULY 4 INDEPENDENCE DAY and bring the Pennsylvania state motto with you! In fact, the former estate has a certain house transformed into the "Pennsylvania State House" (Independence Hall) wherein the public acts to respect the miraculous events of 18th century Philadelphia!!!

Lastly and of most importance: By the Principle of Freedom, Universal Law allows you to sow your seeds of unpromulgated regulation, but if you fail to awaken to the harm you are inflicting upon humanity (including yourselves), in due season, that Law will have no choice but to allow you to reap what you have sown.

in other words, "...they have the desire for power, and the disguised aristocratism of the 'super-man,' who lives in the illusion of being such, while in reality he is prey to mostly sub-human instinct. These directions claim the right to be served by the masses, but bear no responsibility toward them. The

142 PA Ave
PHX, PA 19160

CERTIFIED MAIL



7016 0340 0000 1433 8774



1000



17150

U.S. POSTAGE
KIMBERTON, PA
17150
AUG 08 10
AMOUNT
\$3.77
R2305M145720-01

RECEIVED

AUG 08 2016

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISS-
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

SECRETARY
PA puc
400 NORTH STREET
HARRISBURG, PA

17120

1712090211 0000

