

June 27, 2018

First Energy Service Company
Lauren M. Lepkoski, Esquire
Tori L. Giesler, Esquire
Teresa K. Harrold, Esquire
2800 Pottsville Pike
P.O. Box 16001
Reading, PA 19612-6001

Ms. Lepkoski, Ms. Giesler and Ms. Harrold,

Given the nature of the treatment of my case by the PUC, utility, attorneys involved and ALJ judge, I see no point in participating in the telephone conference scheduled for Thursday, June 28, 2018 at 10am.

I have had my interrogatory questions ignored. In lieu of fully answering my questions, West Penn Power sent me two packets of corporate smart meter propaganda. They also ignored deadlines to object to questions and deadlines to answer questions. My motion to have my hearing moved to Harrisburg was ignored. Judge Watson also ignored my motion to compel West Penn Power to answer interrogatories.

There is also the issue of overcharges on my monthly bills. Ever since West Penn Power installed smart meters in my neighborhood, they have been overcharging me for my electric usage even though I do not have a smart meter on my home. I believe that the smart metering of my neighborhood including the homes with which I share a transformer has precipitated overcharges by West Penn Power for my home's very conservative electrical usage. I have even requested on several occasions transient and harmonics testing of the wiring entering my home, to which West Penn Power never responded. And I have no intent to pay for overcharges for my very conservative electric usage.

And now West Penn Power wants to have a phone conference with me after I answered all of their interrogatories and they failed to answer mine. This does not strike me as a level playing field and will undoubtedly lead to an unproductive meeting.


I am also knowledgeable of the treatment of prior cases. This treatment includes the ignoring of factual information presented by expert witnesses during hearings. These people represent some of the best scientists in their fields. These cases have all failed in PUC court hearings and not been granted the proper due process. In fact, no case has been won by the disabled customer.

History has shown that telephone conferences have resulted in Pennsylvania utilities not providing adequate accommodations for customers. What has been offered to disabled individuals is an Aclara smart meter that has been modified. These modifications still produce a transmitting meter, only the location is moved to a pole away from the home. This does nothing to address the transmissions that still enter the home and property in the form of radiation along with transients and harmonics on the home wiring. All of which are harmful to EHS sufferers as well as others who suffer heart conditions, cancer and the general public as a whole. This can in no way be construed as a reasonable accommodation for a person suffering from EHS. This also does nothing to address the harm from neighbor's meters transmitting onto and through the home and property of EHS sufferers.

I believe collusion exists between the ALJ judges, utilities and PUC. With time, this collusion will come to light.

Having seen the PUC's attempts at justice, this is obviously not the correct path to take my complicated case and I will seek other avenues.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ann V. Sheehan', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ann V. Sheehan

Cc via email: The honorable Judge Watson
Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission