

February 24, 2025

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

Re: Docket No. C-2025-3053079

Dear Ms. Chiavetta,

I thought it would be valuable to provide additional context in response to PECO's preliminary objection filed on February 12, 2025:

- PECO incorrectly asserts I received notification on “two documented occasions” of the gas project before the work commenced. To set the record straight:
  - I never received a notification letter prior to PECO and ULS representatives handing me such notice on November 26, 2024, the date on which they pressured me to consent to work being completed on my property because of their timelines and which I agreed to allow based on their verbal pledges to bear full responsibility for any damage caused. Without those reassurances from PECO and ULS, I would not have allowed the work to begin.
  - PECO has produced no evidence that they mailed the notification letters ahead of time (e.g., no documentation of certified mail).
- PECO claims the work they completed on November 26, 2024 is on the opposite side of the property from the security gate at issue. To set the record straight:
  - The corner where PECO completed the work is precisely where Verizon installed a communications box which housed both a fiber optical cable and the wire connecting the security gate to my home.
  - It is without question that PECO severed the fiber optical cable and the wire connecting the security gate to my home. Daniel, a Verizon technician, verified this when he fixed the fiber optic cable. I can provide Daniel's contact information so you can hear from him directly.
- PECO incorrectly asserts that I am seeking a monetary award for damages. To set the record straight:
  - I would like PECO to repair the damage they and their subcontractor, ULS, caused to my property as part of the gas project they completed on my property.
  - My original formal complaint included an estimate of the cost to repair the damage from a third-party security gate maintenance company that has serviced my property for several years.

- PECO has a track record of disregarding personal property. ULS already reimbursed me for damage they caused to my lawn during a different phase of this project. Notwithstanding that, PECO and its agents operate with disregard for homeowners and lack the professionalism to communicate truthfully or honor the verbal reassurances that they offer homeowners.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide important additional context.

Best regards,

*Claudio Waller*

Claudio Waller