

Nicole R. Forde
27 Young Drive
Carlisle, PA 17015
Nicole.Brobst@aol.com
717-331-4595
Date: April 15, 2025

RCVD PUC SEC BUR
APR 18 2025 AM 10:16

To:
Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd floor
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Subject: Nicole R. Forde v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation
Docket No: C-2025-3054097

Dear Secretary Chiavetta,

I am writing in response to documentation I recently received by mail regarding my case with PPL Electric. Unfortunately, I am unclear on which specific questions or statements are being addressed in the paperwork I received. To better understand the context, I respectfully request a copy of the original paperwork that was sent to PPL Electric and their attorneys related to this matter.

Regarding Electric Service and Payment Arrangement:

Our electric service has not been terminated. However, on March 20, 2025, when my husband, Colvin Forde Jr., signed into our online portal to make the regular monthly payment, he was unable to proceed without accepting a payment arrangement for the disputed back balance. Out of fear of service interruption, he entered into the arrangement—but please note that we **do not agree** with the back balance being charged. Our acceptance of the arrangement was made solely to avoid disconnection of service, and should not be interpreted as an acknowledgment of or agreement with the disputed amount.

Contradictory Statements Regarding Meter Readings:

There appears to be a contradiction in the response from PPL and their legal representatives regarding how meter readings are collected. On one hand, they deny my assertion that the meter automatically transmits readings to PPL (thus eliminating the need for manual readings), but then directly state that the meter **does** transmit readings remotely. I respectfully ask that this inconsistency be reviewed.

Transparency and Billing History Access:

During a recorded call, I informed a representative that I wished to review past bills to determine whether they were marked as estimated. I was told that those bills were no longer available. However, on November 19, 2024, a compliance department representative emailed me copies of

the same bills that were previously stated to be inaccessible during an earlier call on October 24, 2024.

This creates a transparency issue. Removing canceled or past bills from the online portal significantly limits a customer's ability to verify and review past charges. I should not be required to call customer service to request historical billing information—it should remain accessible via the portal. During the October 24, 2024 call, it was also stated that a “system error caused the actual reading to be temporarily unavailable in the system that generates the bills.” Please review this recorded call for reference.

This home was a new construction with a temporary service setup. Once the temporary service was removed and a permanent meter was requested, it is reasonable to assume that someone was moving into the home. The electric usage naturally increased from construction-related use to residential living, and it should not have taken six months to address or adjust for this change.

Additional Update – Meter Replacement:

On Wednesday, April 2, 2025, at 11:08 a.m. EST, our Blink front door camera recorded two individuals who identified themselves as representatives from PPL Electric arriving at our home. They informed my husband, Colvin Forde Jr., that they were there to replace the electric meter. My husband contacted me by phone, and I spoke with the representatives over speaker.

I was told the meter replacement had been **requested by the consumer**—however, I never made such a request. I informed the representatives that I am currently disputing charges with PPL and that we are in the midst of an appeal with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission. One of the individuals stated that typically, this would be noted on the account—but no such notation existed. He also stated the meter would be sent back for testing.

My husband noted that the representative said the meter they planned to replace was already a “new digital meter” and is unsure whether a replacement actually occurred. I am now questioning why PPL proceeded with a meter replacement—especially if they did not believe there was an issue with the existing one—and why it was stated that I made the request when I did not.

I appreciate your time and attention in reviewing this matter. I respectfully request a copy of the documentation originally sent to PPL and their attorneys, and I ask that the above concerns be taken into full consideration during the ongoing appeal process.

Sincerely,



Nicole R. Forde



Mr. & Mrs. Forde
27 Young Drive
Carlisle, PA 17015

HARRISBURG PA 171

17 APR 2025 AM 2 L



Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd floor
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

17105-326565

