

200 Brook Hollow Road  
Mount Pleasant, PA 15666  
February 4, 2019

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
Attn: Secretary Rosemary Chiavetta  
400 North Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Re: PA PUC Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (L-2018-3004948)

Dear Secretary Chiavetta,

We are residents and consumers who live in Pennsylvania. We are concerned that the PUC is contemplating an elimination of the Consumer Advisory Council. We are not in favor of doing away with any entity that is clearly to support consumers.

A clear example where consumers need help is the onerous, grueling, formal complaint process with the smart meter deployment. One thing we find missing is consumer support. Our family has Americans with Disabilities claims and there is no one there to help us with accommodations or to direct us. We have contacted many organizations, including Tanya Closkey, Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate, and they are not helping people who question the smart meter deployment.

We are tired of hearing, "It's law." Consumers need to be heard on this issue. Consumers are people and this is what is missing in this whole fiasco. We are not chattel. We are people who have many issues on the smart meter subject and we are NOT being heard. We need more consumer advocacy groups, not less. Our voices should count on all decisions which will affect our lives. Consumers have few ways to give input and we do not anticipate improvements unless we as consumers, taxpayers, and utility customers speak out and are heard.

Pennsylvania is the only state in the US who did not give consumers any type of opt-out. Actually, we have heard Act 129 was to be an opt-in bill and was misconstrued. Is this constitutional? When we learned we didn't have any choice in this matter of having a meter on our home, we asked ourselves if we were living in the US. So far four states have opted out of the smart meter technology: Kentucky, Massachusetts, New Mexico, and Virginia. What do these states know that Pennsylvania is ignoring?

We fear the elimination of the Consumer Advisory Council would erode transparency and consumers will know very little of what is actually transpiring. We are opposed to the repealing of Chapter 91.

The Consumer Advisory Council should work more closely with consumers to get a true understanding of the real concerns of consumers. Concerning the smart meter deployment, there are thousands of valid peer-reviewed studies that outline many health consequences that are being ignored and instead using industry-backed studies in the smart meter hearing process. This is reminiscent of the tobacco and Monsanto cases which clearly uncovered erroneous findings in their research studies.

Thank you for this opportunity to have our voices heard.

Sincerely,

  
Michael T. Jennings

  
Susan M. Jennings