

RECEIVED

2015 APR 24 AM 10:45

PA P.U.C.
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Vincent Feldman
717 S. 20th Street
Philadelphia, PA
19146

EXCEPTIONS TO VINCENT FELDMAN v. PECO ENERGY COMPANY
(C-2014-2442308)

April 22nd, 2015
Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
P.O. BOX 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Dear Secretary Chiavetta,

I am making this Exceptions to Administrative Law Judge Ember S. Jandebour's Initial Decision on Vincent Feldman v. PECO Energy Company of April 10th, 2015. Firstly, I will state that I am satisfied that my request for safety testing information (UL Certification of the Smart Meter) has been satisfied. However, it should be noted, for the public record, that the current generation of Smart Meters PECO is installing are more liable to have safety issues and concerns than the generation of Smart Meter currently installed in my home.

The need for increased scrutiny of Smart Meter safety is confirmed by the actions taken by Underwriters Laboratories (UL) to require the creation of a new testing category UL 2735 in 2012 specifically for these new electrical meters to address the "potential safety hazards associated with smart meters" (quote from UL's website <http://industries.ul.com/energy-and-industrial-systems/smart-meters>) This new hazard is associated with the launch of the newest generation of Smart Meters and was not a concern for testing of electric power meters in the past.

Because of this increase in liability posed by the roll out of these new meters it is imperative for me to know precisely who the owner of the meters are and what liabilities this owner are taking on by installing this device within my home. I have not had this determination of ownership presented to me either verbally or in written documents.

It appears to me that Administrative Law Judge Jandebour did not examine the information PECO supplied to me regarding its validity. It is true PECO responded to my Formal Complaint by sending me information but this information should have been examined for accuracy and for validity in addressing my questions.

Concerning my request for information on the potential for impacts on the health in both biological and nervous systems, particularly in the bodies of small children, I received only a two page document (New Meter Technology) which included only one hundred and sixty words addressing Radio Frequency none of which mentions health or safety. In addition this document includes a quarter page dominated by graphics that shows a smart meter, a microwave oven, a cordless phone and a cell phone.

I would like to point out for the public record that the information regarding emissions of the smart meter in the document, New Meter Technology, is false as I protested in my hearing of March 5th, 2015. "These meters will only transmit less than one second every 90 minutes and during emergencies" (from New Meter Technology). The graphic states that the smart meter produces less RF emissions than a cell phone. I have tested both of these type of devices and found this to be grossly inaccurate. The smart meters in my neighborhood produce near constant RF emissions peaking two to three times a minute at higher RF emission values than a cell phone's emissions.

Another major point of inaccuracy in the comparisons made in the New Meter Technology document, using simple graphics, is that consumers have complete control over their use of a microwave oven, cordless phone or cell phone. I can choose the amount of exposure and risk I believe is acceptable to expose my body or my home environment. I can choose to eliminate these from my home environment if I find that the risks they pose are significant. This can not be said for the Smart Meter. It will remain within our household functioning on a 24/7 duty cycle which will increase the RF emissions of our living environment on a permeant basis. There is no opportunity for the reversal of this position.

This duty cycle of the smart meter has no comparison to the other three RF emitting devices shown in the New Meter Technology document. It is a classic case of comparing apples and oranges and in this case it is patently misinforming the public. This new situation that PECO is attempting to force on my household, using a draconian application of police powers, will create a situation where we will be unable to control the level of radiation created within our home. This violates our right to control the quality of our household living environment, a legal precedent which has served our civilization for nearly four hundred years.

PECO provided no information regarding the health safety of a Smart Meter operating on a 24/7 duty cycle within the residential home. One can only find from the information presented by PECO that they are only making assumptions on the health safety of Smart Meter installations within the home without any studies on the possible consequences of such an experiment. Because of the unknowns that are clear to see here and were even acknowledge by PECO's legal representative, Shawane Lee the Public Utility Commission must protect a citizen's right to err on the side of safety when presented with clear and outstanding issues of health which concern them within the confines of their home.


Administrative Law Judge Jandebaur did not challenge the validity of PECO's presentation of the privacy policy presented for the hearing. I stated in the hearing of

March 5th, 2015 that the privacy policy sent to me was a screen shot from some uncategorized section of their web page. This policy statement was general in nature and describes a conduct of policy one is lead to believe concerns the users interaction with their online web presences not the function of a FCC controlled communications device. I requested the privacy policy that by law must address the use and functionality of the FCC controlled communications device. The screen shot - privacy policy PECO provided me, which used a tiny font size of six point text, did not refer to the smart meter in any way.

PECO Energy Company must have a privacy policy which addresses the functionality and use of it's smart meter technology. The smart meter is a FCC licensed communications device and has capabilities not unlike a cell or smart phone. I believe it is within my rights to know and understand the capabilities of this device which will be function inside my home and to know and understand the nature of my information it collects and disseminates. PECO has not done this. I have no record, document or fact sheet describing the nature of the information harvested from my household. Can this Smart Meter collect more than wattage use? Can it, like a smart phone, run applications (Apps)? Can it interface with other devices. Administrative Law Judge Jandebaur should have noted that PECO did not respond to my request for this documentation.

PECO Energy has multiple privacy policies. They decided to only send me the one covering the operations of their public webpage in what I must determine was an attempt to subvert my request. When visiting PECO headquarters I was presented with a privacy policy which contradicted all of what I read in the policy sent to me or heard from representatives of PECO. The Exelon Corporation, owner of PECO Energy states at their entrance that users of the Exelon computer network should have no expectation of privacy and that all their communications are liable to search and access to the network is given to government agencies. Reading this privacy statement destroyed any confidence I had in the validity of the PECO's privacy policy submission in this dispute.

Secretary Chiavetta, I hope that you will take the time to review my Exceptions to Administrative Law Judge Jandebaur Initial Decision. I believe there are some important points to consider in this case which greatly effect the public's interest. I feel that the concerns I addressed in my Formal Complaint before the Public Utility Commission where not fully weighed or considered. I continue to feel I have not been given the opportunity of informed consent to the installation of L + G's Focus AXR-SD because of the lack of information PECO Energy Company will disclose regarding this communications device. My hope is that you will direct Administrative Law Judge Jandebaur to reexamine the facts in this case so I can understand the conditions of this installation.



Vincent Feldman


DOCKET NO. C-2014-2442308

ENCL: Cert. F. rate of Service to
Shavane Lee, PECO Energy Co.

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of the EXCEPTIONS TO VINCENT FELDMAN v. PECO ENERGY COMPANY (C-2014-2442308) upon the parties, listed below, in accordance with the requirements of § 1.54 (relating to service by a party).

Shawane Lee
PECO Energy Company
Legal Department
2301 Market Street/S23-1
P.O. Box 8699
Philadelphia, PA 19101-8699


Dated this day of April 22th, 2015



Vincent Feldman

RECEIVED
2015 APR 24 AM 10:45
PA P.U.C.
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

V. Feldman
717 S. 20th St.
Pitt., PA 19146



Rosemary Chiavetta
Secretary
PA Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

17105326565

