

**From:** spectre163 [mailto:spectre163@charter.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 04, 2016 6:51 AM  
**To:** Data Center - PSC  
**Subject:** WC-2016-0113

From: Steve Sinclair  
Subj: Staff Summary, WC-2016-0113

To: 4 Jan 2016

1. Complainant received the PSC Staff Report sent by Jessica Luebbert on 31 Dec 15.

2. The billings was resolved with Respondent quickly; it seems Respondent may yield quickly on these errors if they are noticed. There is no proof they do not make money from the unsuspecting who have automated billing and failed to notice the sneak theft. It is not a question of whether errors have been reported before (Staff Finding of Facts, para. 6, but if they have been made before. The only way to determine if the error affects others is would be to make it public. The program, whether home-grown or not, used for billing was referred to as "The Matchman Transfer Program" (or something that sounded like that) by a representative working for the Respondent. The last sentence in Staff Finding of Facts, para 4, makes it sounds like an imperfect match on an SSN would call for human review. Complainant continues to believe any automatic transfer of billing between addresses is tantamount to fraud.

3. Tables 1 & 2 (pp. 6 and 7) of the original complaint show and explain a pattern of meter misreadings. The staff seem to believe Respondents actual readings are reliable, but that is contradicted by the 29 December 14 reading which replaced the 15 December reading and was much, much lower (too much lower, as it turned out). The high reading on 15 December triggered all this not because of the high bill but because the complainant thought he might have a leak he couldn't find. The "Matchman" billing seemed like retaliation.

Stephen J. Sinclair