

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

May 12, 2025

VIA E-MAIL

Khadijah Scott

2301 Market Street, S23-1

Philadelphia, PA 19103

RE: Dayna Sobanko v. PECO Energy Company

Docket No. C-2025-3054654

Complainant's Response to PECO Energy Company's Answer

Dear Ms. Scott, PECO Legal and PUC teams:

I, Dayna Sobanko, submit this written response to PECO Energy Company's Answer to my formal complaint, filed under Docket No. C-2025-3054654. While PECO has acknowledged the installation of the new pole with transformers in 2021 next to an existing pole, it has failed to address material concerns regarding health and safety risks posed by the configuration of the equipment, and possible violations of state and federal codes.

1. Health and Safety Concerns from Transformer Placement

PECO's answer fails to respond to my core concern: **the installation of three high-voltage transformers on a utility pole located directly outside my bedroom and my children's bedrooms.** These transformers emit **constant noise, vibration, and electromagnetic fields (EMFs)** that have interfered with our sleep, caused me to develop a sleep disorder and my son currently undergoing sleep study testing, raising serious concerns about long-term exposure risks to our family's health and well-being. I request that PECO specifically address:

- What safety studies or EMF exposure assessments were conducted prior to installation of the transformers in such close proximity to occupied bedrooms?
- Is PECO meeting the residential code and standards to the number of devices and their proximity to our bedroom windows.
- Whether PECO can provide data showing that noise and EMF emissions fall within safe residential limits according to state or federal health guidelines.

2. Violation of Clearance Codes

The power lines connected to this equipment run **less than 3 feet** of my home's siding, windows, and balcony—an arrangement that **appears to violate National Electrical Safety Code (NESC) and/or Pennsylvania utility clearance requirements**, which mandate safe horizontal and vertical distances between energized lines and habitable structures of minimum 3 feet

I request that PECO:

- Clarify what codes or safety standards governed the installation of the lines and equipment.
- Confirm whether the current setup meets **minimum required clearance distances**, including:
 - **Horizontal distance from windows and balconies**
 - **Vertical clearance above walkable surfaces and egress points**
- Provide **inspection records or compliance documentation** supporting their adherence to those standards.

3. Request for Relocation and Alternative Remediation

While PECO asserts that relocation is only available at the property owner's expense, the concern here is not aesthetic or optional—it is **based on potential code violations and public health risks**, which may justify utility-funded correction. I ask PECO and the PUC to consider whether:

- The placement of these transformers and lines, in such close and constant proximity to bedrooms and living space, creates an unreasonable burden under 52 Pa. Code § 57.194 (relating to service adequacy, safety, and reliability).
- An independent safety inspection can be ordered by the PUC to assess compliance and recommend mitigation steps.

Conclusion

I respectfully request that the Commission require PECO Energy Company to provide a full response and supporting documentation regarding transformer safety, EMF exposure, and proximity of energized equipment to my residence. Should violations or risks be confirmed, I request that PECO be required to relocate or remediate the installation at no cost to me, as a matter of public safety and code compliance. I look forward to your response.

Thank you in advance,

Dayna Sobanko

1433 E. Columbia Avenue

Philadelphia, PA 19125

daynaimam@gmail.com

(215) 3019441