

---

**BEFORE THE**  
**PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

---

Petition of PECO Energy Company for a Finding Of Necessity Pursuant to 53 P.S. § 10619 that the Situation of Two Buildings Associated with a Gas Reliability Station in Marple Township, Delaware County Is Reasonably Necessary for the Convenience and Welfare of the Public

P-2021-3024328

DATED: May 17, 2021

---

**OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED PROTECTION ORDER  
BY PECO ENERGY COMPANY  
(JULIA M. BAKER)**

---

According to 52 PA Code sub section 5.365, a Protective Order is permissible where potential harm to a participant would be substantial and outweighs the public interest in having access to confidential information. It is of course also understood that the Commission is officially authorized to prohibit disclosure to third parties as defined in the Public Utility Confidential Security Information Disclosure Protection Act and the Commission's regulations regarding its implementation (35 P.S. §§ 2141.1 to 2141.6 and PUC Regulations at 52 PA Code §§ 102.1 - 102.4).

Having reviewed these rules thoroughly, in addition to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 52 PA Code §§ 5.423, 5.362, 5.363, 5.365 (a-f), and 5.371-372, I most respectfully offer the following discussion:

Chapter 102.2 defines a "member of the public" as including "a legal resident of the United States, a public utility certified by the Commission, the Office of Consumer Advocate, the Office of Small Business Advocate or authorized Commission employees."

As a legal resident of the United States, It is my understanding that I am entitled to the same rights and bound by the same responsibilities as any other Party in this matter, and as an Active Participant I feel it is my duty to bring forward these rights and to act in accordance with these responsibilities.

As such, I submit that there exists no salient reason to suspect, predict, or any way to fear my breaching any confidential information, either intentionally or inadvertently. I have no ties to any contacts with competing contracts, technologies, or even public relations strategies, no conflicting interests of any kind, and no other person has access to my electronic communication devices, which are all password-protected. My background and reputation are as honorable as any other Party, and there is no reason that my ethics and sworn word is of less value than anyone else's, regardless of their profession.

As if that were not sufficient, there are no deficits in my level of education and intellectual capacity, no record of any criminal activity; in point of fact I have criminal background (PA and Federal) and child abuse clearances, have been entrusted with the care of cultural collections materials in secure areas, and have routinely honored HIPAA regulations for many years.

While is neither necessary nor germane to speak for Mr. Uhlman, I wish to add that I have known him and Mrs. Uhlman for over 25 years as congenial and considerate next-door neighbors with a peaceful, socially-appropriate and civic-minded lifestyle. They have raised a remarkable and talented daughter for whom they provided an excellent education, and have created an extremely commendable horticultural oasis in their backyard. I know of nothing in their character, background, or intentions, as with my own, to justify such an extreme, excessive, and frankly quite frightening set of threats as outlined in Mr. Lewis's Appendix A Paragraphs 2, 3 and 4. The sanctions that would be imposed upon a breaching party are clearly outlined in the Commission's Rules and sufficiently represent the public interest. I will have no problem agreeing to a standard Order of Protection as Your Honor sees fit, but I do see serious problems with the Appendix Paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 and do not think that they should be included because they are entirely out-of-proportion and do not in any way outweigh the public interest.

Mr. Uhlman would be offered no protection if I happened to be a breaching party and PECO might to seek to project blame upon him also; unfortunately I could also imagine the reverse situation occurring.

In regard to Mr. Lewis and his colleagues holding a "meet and confer" with Mr. Matlawski, Mr. Ewald, Mr. Uhlman, and myself; it saddens me that I am compelled to offer this comment: it was not entirely clear what the intentions of PECO's esteemed counsel were at the time, however it seems to me best understood as a flimsily-veiled intimidation and divisive tactic. Upon Mr. Lewis's suggestion that Mr.

Matlawski and Mr. Ewald consent to accommodating Mr. Uhlman and me to read confidential materials at their offices, Mr. Matlawski was entirely adroit, justified and prudent in responding that such would place him and Mr. Ewald in unacceptably vulnerable and potentially compromised positions.

As legal residents of Marple Township and non-attorney intervenors, Mr. Uhlman and I are only able to participate pro se, and while we have every confidence in the abilities and professional conduct of Mr. Matlawski and Mr. Ewald, they report to the Marple Board of Commissioners and the Delaware County Council, respectively, and we have neither authority nor decision-making power with respect to their plans, preparations or actions in this matter. In the extremely highly unlikely event that Mr. Uhlman or I might breach confidential information intentionally or inadvertently, the Sanctions as covered in 5.371-.372 dictate that we would lose our status as intervenors, and have no assurance that our circumstances as being among the most impacted citizens would be represented per se. We operate on the strong belief, shared by the community and its governance, that this project presents significant adverse effects to our Neighborhood Center District, and so it is absolutely counterintuitive to consider that we would do anything to jeopardize our standing as Active Participants. The “potential harm” imposed by PECO’s proposed gas expansion plant is aimed directly at our quality of life, physical and mental health, net worth, and potentially life and limb; and so I submit most respectfully that in response to PECO claiming an “enhanced” protective order is necessary to protect the Company from us perpetrating “substantial harm” upon it- that this assertion is diametrically opposed to the truth, is bordering upon inflammatory, is most certainly unseemly, and therefore Paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 should be stricken.

It pains me even further to add, and only as a matter of absolute necessity for self-protection, that some reasonable degree of prejudice might need to be considered in this matter. Notwithstanding the absence of any uncivil conduct on our parts whatsoever (let alone actual threats, which are clearly present in Appendix A, Paragraphs 2, 3 and 4), PECO has already been known to deploy a Revenue Protection Specialist to research the public profiles of concerned Marple Citizens on social media. As I am not in possession of any sophisticated cyber subterfuge training, know-how or skills myself, I cannot begin to imagine what other kinds of factual information the Company would seek, or what falsehoods might be planted. Assuming in good faith that Your Honor will authorize an Order that is in keeping with your professional discretion, is aligned with the public interest, and is acceptable to the Company, I do perceive the need for and will close all of my social media accounts and limit my communication to email and telephone, the security for which I will continue to safeguard most carefully.

I must also take exception with PECO's invocation of 52 PA Code §§ 5.365 (e) in that, by PECO's own repeated assertions that they have built similar facilities in approximately 30 other locations, that these are not "extraordinary circumstances;" and that if the Company believes that "a greater restriction is necessary to avoid severe and extreme prejudice" then this demonstrates their knowledge that they have not exercised proper conduct and good faith in their infrastructure and land acquisition planning, cooperation with county and municipal governments, and interaction with the public, and are now attempting to conceal evidence of operations and performance *not* in the public interest, despite these all subject to PUC regulation under PECO's Default Service Plan.

Should Your Honor decide that different restrictions should be ordered or that a Protection Order is not necessary, I will of course abide with and will uphold in good faith and assiduous practice all Commission Rules and Regulations regarding Confidential and Proprietary information. I hope and trust that Your Honor will duly consider that any resulting Order "will apply the least restrictive means of limitation which will provide the necessary protections from disclosure." (52 PA Code §§ 5.365(a).

I thank you most sincerely for your kind attention.

Respectfully,

Julie

Julia M. Baker  
2150 Sproul Rd.  
Broomall, PA 19008  
(610) 745-8491  
jbakero@msn.com

**VERIFICATION**

I, Julia Mary (Julie) Baker, hereby verify that the facts contained in the foregoing pleading are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and that I am duly authorized to make this verification, and that I expect to be able to prove the same at any hearing held in this matter.

*/s/* \_\_\_\_\_

Julia Mary (Julie) Baker

2150 Sproul Rd  
Broomall, PA 19008  
[jbakeroa@msn.com](mailto:jbakeroa@msn.com)  
(610) 745-8491

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Petition of PECO Energy Company for a Finding Of Necessity Pursuant to 53 P.S §10619 that the Situation of Two Buildings Associated with a Gas Reliability Station in Marple Township, Delaware County Is Reasonably Necessary for the Convenience and Welfare of the Public : Docket No. P-2021-3024328  
: May 17, 2021

---

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

---

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true and correct copy of the foregoing Objections to PECO's Proposed Protection Order and Appendix A upon the parties listed below, in accordance with the requirements of 52 PA Code § 1.54 (relating to service by a participant) in the manner listed below upon the parties listed below:

---

CHRISTOPHER A. LEWIS ESQUIRE  
FRANK L. TAMULONIS ESQUIRE  
STEPHEN C. ZUMBRUN ESQUIRE  
BLANK ROME, LLP  
ONE LOGAN SQUARE  
130 NORTH 18TH STREET  
PHILADELPHIA PA 19103  
**215-569-5793**  
[lewis@blankrome.com](mailto:lewis@blankrome.com)  
[ftamulonis@blankrome.com](mailto:ftamulonis@blankrome.com)  
[szumbrun@blankrome.com](mailto:szumbrun@blankrome.com)  
Accepts eService  
*Representing PECO Energy Company*

JACK R. GARFINKLE ESQUIRE  
PECO ENERGY COMPANY  
2301 MARKET STREET  
PO BOX 8699  
PHILADELPHIA PA 19101-8699  
215.841.6863  
[jack.garfinkle@exeloncorp](mailto:jack.garfinkle@exeloncorp)  
Accepts eService

KAITLYN T. SEARLS ESQUIRE  
J. ADAM MATLAWSKI ESQUIRE  
MCNICHOL, BYRBE & MATLAWSKI, P.C.  
1223 N PROVIDENCE ROAD  
MEDIA PA 19063  
[ksearls@mbmlawoffice.com](mailto:ksearls@mbmlawoffice.com)  
[amatlawski@mbmlawoffice.com](mailto:amatlawski@mbmlawoffice.com)  
Accepts eService  
*Representing Marple Township*

ROBERT W. SCOTT ESQUIRE  
CARL EWALD ESQUIRE  
ROBERT W. SCOTT P.C.  
205 NORTH MONROE STREET  
MEDIA PA 19063  
**610.891.0108**  
[rscott@robertwscottpc.com](mailto:rscott@robertwscottpc.com)  
[carlewald@gmail.com](mailto:carlewald@gmail.com)  
Accepts eService  
*Representing County of Delaware*

THEODORE R. UHLMAN  
2152 SPROUL RD  
BROOMALL PA 19008  
**484.904.5377**  
[uhlmantr@yahoo.com](mailto:uhlmantr@yahoo.com)  
Accepts eService

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_

Julia Mary (Julie) Baker

2150 Sproul Rd  
Broomall, PA 19008  
[jbakero@msn.com](mailto:jbakero@msn.com)  
(610) 745-8491